

*Principles*  
*Integrity*

Integrity Commissioner's Recommendation Report  
Regarding Complaint Against Councillor Lisa Robinson  
September 22, 2025

**Executive Summary:**

- [1] This report results from a complaint filed against Councillor Lisa Robinson in relation to her participation on a lengthy podcast publicly posted to YouTube in which disparaging, defamatory, profane and homophobic statements were repeatedly made and in which the host of the podcast exhorted the public to commit acts of violence against individually identified members of Council.
- [2] The complaint alleged that the Councillor's participation breached her obligations under the Code of Conduct in numerous ways.
- [3] We find that the complaint is substantiated and that the Councillor's conduct breached the Code of Conduct by disparaging, disrespecting and harassing members of Council.
- [4] We find that this complaint, rather than a 'one-off', can be seen as part of a pattern of behaviour where the Councillor disparages, disrespects and harasses the City of Pickering's governance. In this case, her fellow members of Council are targeted individually and collectively, whereas on other occasions it is staff. She repeatedly exploits social media to make her malicious attacks public.
- [5] We are recommending a 60-day suspension of pay.

**Process**

- [6] In conducting this investigation, Principles *Integrity* applied the principles of procedural fairness and was guided by the complaint process set out under the Code.
- [7] This fair and balanced process includes the following elements:
- a. Reviewing the complaint to determine whether it is within scope and jurisdiction and in the public interest to pursue, including giving consideration to whether the complaint should be restated or narrowed, where this better reflects the public interest;
  - b. Notifying the Respondent, and providing her with the opportunity to respond in full to the allegations;
  - c. Reviewing the Code, all relevant documentation including watching the videos posted, and interviewing relevant witnesses as necessary; and,

## *Principles* *Integrity*

- d. Providing the Respondent with the opportunity to review and provide comments to the Integrity Commissioner's Preliminary Findings Report, prior to finalizing and submitting a Recommendation Report.

### **Code Provisions**

[8] Relevant provisions of the Code are set out below:

#### **Policy Objective:**

2. Attaining an elected position within one's community is a privilege which carries significant responsibilities and obligations. Members of Council are held to a high standard as leaders of the community and are expected to become well informed on all aspects of municipal governance, administration, planning and operations. They are also expected to carry out their duties in a fair, impartial, transparent, professional, and respectful manner.

3. All Members of the Council of the City of Pickering are committed to protecting and promoting the well-being and best interests of the citizens of the City with the highest standards of integrity and ethical conduct. This Code is an affirmation of this commitment. It recognizes and is based on the following key statements of principle:

- (a) Members are committed to performing their duties of office, and arranging private affairs, in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity of Member and respect for Council as a whole.
- (b) Members are committed to acting and being seen to act with integrity and impartiality that will bear the closest scrutiny.
- (c) Members are committed to serving their constituents in a conscientious and diligent manner.
- (d) Members are committed to working with City officials and staff in a conscientious and respectful manner.

[...]

### **05 Interaction with the Public, Other Members, and Council/Staff Relations**

**05.01** Members have a duty to treat members of the public, one another, and staff, with respect and dignity and without abuse, bullying, or intimidation.

**05.02** Members have a duty to ensure that the City's work environment is safe, and free from discrimination and harassment.

## *Principles* *Integrity*

**05.09** Notwithstanding the provisions noted above, Members shall have regard for the following City Policies that outline further parameters pertaining to Council/Staff relations including..., Respectful Workplace.

[...]

**26.04** Every Member shall comply with the requirements of this Code of Conduct, and shall act in accordance with its spirit and intent, in all matters pertaining to the performance of his or her duties as a Member.

[9] The relevant provisions of the Respectful Workplace are set out below:

### **Policy Objectives**

The Corporation of the City of Pickering (City) aims to provide a safe, supportive and inclusive environment that is free from discrimination, harassment and conflict for members of our community, our employees and volunteers.

The City will not tolerate violence, vandalism, racism, abusive or demeaning rhetoric, or any activity that may constitute a criminal or provincial offence at a City facility, property, program, activity or event.

01.06 Harassment or Harass – As defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code, means engaging in a course of vexatious behavior, comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome to an individual(s) whether inside the workplace or outside. It may include but is not limited to behavior, conduct or comment that is directed at or is perceived to be offensive to another individual(s):

- which is reasonably perceived by the recipient as an intention to bully, embarrass, intimidate or ridicule the recipient.

### 05 Unacceptable Behaviors

05.01 Harassment, discrimination, vandalism and violence as defined in this Policy are unacceptable behaviors. It is also an unacceptable behavior to act in a manner that destroys, damages, defaces or compromises the safety of City property. Unacceptable behavior also includes activity that is disturbing to any employee or customer where they feel unsafe, threatened or harmed.

For greater clarity, unacceptable behaviors involving employees and/or customers include but are not limited to the following:

- Intimidation, threat of violence, verbal, written or by social media.

## Principles Integrity

- Using language that demeans, humiliates or expresses hate or incites harassment towards an individual(s).

07.01 Individuals who engage in any unacceptable behaviour, as outlined in this Policy, may be subject to immediate removal from City property and a ban period.

### **Complaints and Chronology:**

[10] On August 12, 2024 members of Council (all but the respondent Councillor Robinson) filed a complaint alleging that Councillor Robinson's participation on the Kevin J. Johnston Freedom Report Podcast of July 30, 2024 reflected conduct which breached the Code of Conduct.

[11] The complaint also alleged that the Councillor's Media Release issued and posted on social media on August 7, 2024 reflected further conduct which breached the Code.

[12] On August 14, 2024 Councillor Robinson emailed to give us a "heads-up" that we may receive complaints regarding her appearance on the podcast, and to clarify that she did not know what he would say, nor did she endorse the disparaging comments that the host made.

[13] Following our review of the complaint and the podcast, we found that there were reasonable grounds to believe that the conduct of Kevin J. Johnston, the host, amounted to criminal harassment and inciting hatred as defined under the Criminal Code of Canada, and that the participation of Councillor Robinson amounted to knowingly or recklessly aiding or abetting in the criminal conduct of Kevin J. Johnston, also a breach of the Criminal Code.

[14] S. 223.8 of the *Municipal Act* provides as follows:

If the Commissioner, when conducting an inquiry, determines that there are reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a contravention of [...] the *Criminal Code* (Canada), the Commissioner shall immediately refer the matter to the appropriate authorities and suspend the inquiry until any resulting police investigation and charge have been finally disposed of, and shall report the suspension to council.

[15] As stipulated under the *Municipal Act*, we referred the matter to the Durham Regional Police Service, who referred the matter to the Ontario Provincial Police, for investigation. Members of Council were advised, accordingly.

## Principles Integrity

[16] On June 26, 2025 we were advised that the police investigation had been closed, and as such, we have resumed our review of the complaint.

### **Background and Facts:**

[17] On July 30, 2024 Councillor Robinson participated in an online podcast hosted by Kevin J. Johnston and shown on Rumble, a video platform with an apparent conservative and far-right constituency.

[18] Kevin J. Johnston introduced himself as an individual who has served time in prison and now, in order to evade prosecution of legal responsibility under Canadian law, resides in and transmits on social media from Panama.

[19] During the podcast, the host published the names, photos and personal phone numbers of each of the Councillor's colleagues on Pickering, labelling them as 'pedophiles', 'Nazis' and 'Fascists'.

[20] The host engaged in vile and violent rhetoric, stating that these Pickering Council Members deserved "a baseball bat to the face"; suggested that a 'vicious dog' be let loose at City Council meetings to 'attack and maim' them, and invoked '70s biker types with 'big biceps and scarred knuckles' to remove them 'by force'.

[21] At certain moments, the host asked Councillor Robinson to be off-camera for a few minutes "to protect her" while he stated 'his opinions', which she later told him (on-camera) that she appreciated.

[22] During these brief moments, he then spewed his most egregious vitriol, however each time she appeared back on camera immediately following these 'off-camera' moments, she was seen nodding her head, or laughing, and in one instance, picking up and continuing with the thread of his offensive statements.

[23] The following are examples from the podcast of conduct which breached the Code of Conduct:

At time-stamp 21:00, Johnston posts a photograph of each of the six other Members of Council, including their personal cell phone numbers, and then berates, insults the physical appearance of, and criticizes each of them individually. Councillor Robinson is present and smiling throughout.

At 27:00, Johnston urges viewers to "*phone these pedophiles*" who "*allow grown men in dresses to be in the changeroom with six-year-old girls*".

Councillor Robinson smiles and nods at this complete mischaracterization of universal changerooms.

## Principles Integrity

At 44:00, while Councillor Robinson is off-camera, Kevin Johnston says about the other members of Council “*they all deserve a baseball bat to the face*”.

At 48:00, Kevin Johnston tells her:

*Lisa I'm gonna boot you out for a second 'cuz I've got some opinions that, uh, are my own and in no way, shape or form are yours.*

[Councillor Robinson leaves screen]

Johnston continues: *So you heard what Councillor Lisa Robinson just had to say. This is the City of Pickering which is to the immediate east of downtown Toronto, and the City of Pickering is run by pedophiles. That's it. Let's go through this one more time, well actually many more times tonight.*

[Johnston then proceeds with reviewing again the photos and contact info for each Member of Council, editorializing with disparaging comments about their views, their physical appearances]

*We need all of you, you, you out there, all of you, phone these people, fill the voice mail up, harass them, needle them, scream at them, do whatever it takes to understand how disgusted as a society we all are with this full support of pedophilia. Oh yeah, all of you need to do this. I've just given you their phone numbers. I'm pretty sure those are their cell phone numbers. Pretty sure. So drive them nuts. These people are elected to represent we the people but what they do. They elate. They represent the less than 1% of the perverts in the world. LGBTQ losers, Black Lives Matter, those scum bags. Antifa those losers. All these males who put on skirts. They don't pay property tax. They shouldn't have a say in anything at all. [...] Everyone, start the attack. Don't hit them. They deserve it. They all deserve a baseball bat in the face. Don't do it. Cuz the law unfortunately says it's illegal to pummel pedophiles with a bat.*

[...] *The morbidly obese [identifying a photo of a Councillor] is a far-left wing nutcase freak-show everything and we just need to get these people out of office. Let's talk about this...*

[Councillor Robinson's face re-appears on camera]

Councillor Robinson picks up the thread of the conversation:

*In 2017 I lost to Councillor XX that you showed there... [demonstrating that she has been there, but with her camera off]*

At 1:00:00 Johnston says (referring to Mayor Ashe) “*I'm going to call him Mayor Ass*” to which Councillor Robinson replies: “*You can do whatever you like to do.*”

## Principles Integrity

At 1:22:00 Councillor Robinson smiles while Johnston calls the other Councillors pedophiles.

At 1:24:00 Johnston continues:

*... this amazing lady right beside me here is the only one fighting [drag queen story time] and she's the only one being punished and of course the media gets on the Islamophobic nonsense, the homophobic nonsense, the transphobic nonsense, all that garbage.*

*So let me just remove you cuz I've got an opinion to offer here...*

[The Councillor smiles, disappears from the screen. The host proceeds to speak out against the transgendered, telling them that they need to get help or get MAiDs, and continues:]

*We gotta get rid of all this pedo nonsense...*

*Lisa you're back up. Okay.*

*Sorry, every time I've got an opinion, you've gotta go*

[24] The fact that Councillor Robinson watched the photos of the other Members of Council shown by Johnston demonstrates that she had merely turned her camera off, and that she was nevertheless present throughout the podcast.

[25] At no point did the Councillor appear uncomfortable, taken aback, or disturbed by any of the rhetoric. At no point did she attempt to distance herself from the extremely offensive statements or threats.

[26] At no point did Councillor Robinson chastise, dispute, attempt to correct or to stop any of the characterizations of the Pickering Council Members, and in fact, she repeatedly concurred with, laughed about and contributed to disparaging the credibility of Council Members, of Pickering City Council and its decision-making processes, and of the personal physical attributes and characteristics of her fellow Council Members.

[27] Up until the end of her participation in the podcast, she appeared comfortable, at ease and pleased with the way the podcast was unfolding.

[28] On August 14, 2024 the Councillor emailed Principles Integrity to 'give us a heads-up' that we may receive complaints regarding her recent appearance on the podcast. She stated that she did not know what he would say during the episode, and that she did not endorse the disparaging comments he made about Council, that she apologized for her association with making those remarks and that she publicly disassociated herself from everything he had said. She noted that she herself did not make any disparaging comments, nor share personal cell phone numbers of fellow Councillors.

## Principles Integrity

- [29] Despite this ‘heads up’ to us, it is not unreasonable to conclude that, although momentarily off-camera, the Councillor was comfortable, supportive and in agreement with the vile statements and threatening calls for violence against her fellow Pickering Council Members.
- [30] At no point did she appear uncomfortable, try to correct the host, or take the initiative to leave the podcast.
- [31] Rather, as is apparent to the viewer, she laughed at the host’s statements and comments, appeared pleased to be participating, and encouraged the thrust of the rhetoric.
- [32] Kevin J. Johnston is the host of the podcast in question and has previously been politically-involved, running for Mayor in both Mississauga and Calgary.
- [33] He has also been criminally prosecuted and convicted of wilful promotion of hatred, has been found liable in defamation, has been ordered to pay \$2.5M in damages, has been found guilty of contempt, for which he was sentenced to 18 months in jail.
- [34] In his introductory remarks on his podcast, he brags that his re-location to Panama enables him to operate beyond the laws of Canada and with impunity.
- [35] He is known to have made disparaging and offensive statements about Canada in his podcast. For example, in orienting the audience to the geographic location of Pickering, he referenced the Pickering Nuclear Generation Station, wishing for its meltdown in order to see Toronto “wiped off the map”: *“the only time you’re going to see me back in Toronto is if I’ve got a full-fledged nuclear weapon in the trunk of the car... [...] ...I would just love to see Toronto under a mushroom cloud, but I digress...”*
- [36] During the podcast in question, Council Members were defamed as pedophiles, Nazis and Fascists, whom viewers were encouraged to violently beat with baseball bats. Attacks by vicious dogs and bikers were also raised.
- [37] The Councillor voluntarily and of her own free will participated in the podcast posted July 30, 2024.
- [38] At approximately 18 minutes into the podcast, in reference to those of a similar mindset to the host, Councillor Robinson stated: *“this is an elite group that I would like to be a part of”*.

### **Analysis and Findings:**

## *Principles*

### *Integrity*

- [39] To participate, even though momentarily not visible on camera, in a podcast where viewers are invoked to take “a baseball bat to the face” of Council Members, or to let ‘vicious dog’ loose at City Council meetings to ‘attack and maim’ Council Members, or to exhort ‘70s biker types with ‘big biceps and scarred knuckles’ to remove Council Members ‘by force’ is reprehensible conduct.
- [40] The Councillor’s participation on the podcast represents an egregious disrespect for her role as Councillor, and a flagrant breach of her obligations under the Code of Conduct.
- [41] The fact that the Councillor went ‘off-camera’ for a moment during the worst of the host’s rants (in order to “protect” her from consequences) does not save her, in our view. It was obvious to the viewer that she was supportive, never protesting or seeking to correct any of his statements.
- [42] In fact, when re-appearing on-camera after his most egregious rants, the Councillor was smiling, nodding her head, laughing, and picked up immediately on the thread of the conversation.
- [43] One would have expected a participant who was not complicit – someone who was duped into participation and then shocked or dismayed by the rhetoric of the host – to refuse to continue, to exit the podcast, to leave in protest.
- [44] The Councillor did not seek to leave, but rather, on the contrary, she openly supported the statements, and expressed appreciation to the host.
- [45] On August 7, 2024 the Mayor and Councillors representing all of Council, less Councillor Robinson, issued a signed statement in the form of a News Release, denouncing Councillor Robinson’s appearance on the podcast.
- [46] That same day, in response, Councillor Robinson issued and posted on Facebook her own Media Release, in which she begins by stating that she does not condone “anything the Mr. Johnston said in a hateful manner or that advocates violence against any of my fellow councillors” and that she rejects and disassociates herself from such rhetoric.
- [47] However, for the next 9 paragraphs of her 10 paragraph Media Release, she proceeded to criticize and disparage the Members of Council and Council itself, to promote herself as a truth-teller and claims to be fighting single-handedly against imagined corruption, coercion and hypocrisy.
- [48] Her so-called ‘apology’ is therefore inauthentic; it demonstrates a lack of understanding of the flagrancy of her egregious conduct or of the damage done to her fellow Council Members.

## *Principles* *Integrity*

[49] Her ‘heads-up’ email to us as Integrity Commissioner in anticipation of a complaint comes across as a “wasn’t me” defense which, given the ‘apology’ posted the week previous, demonstrates a complete lack of acknowledgment and remorse.

### **Councillor Robinson’s Response to Complaints**

#### Can’t hold Councillor responsible for the harassment and threats spewed by podcast host

[50] The Councillor’s position is that is that she cannot be held responsible for the uttering of threats, invoking or encouraging violence against Council members or the expression of hateful vitriol spewed by the host.

[51] She points out that her “decision to go off-camera during the worst of his rhetoric was an attempt to distance” herself.

[52] We find this to be fallacious. If the Councillor wished to distance herself from the rhetoric, she could have left the podcast. She could have remained on-camera, reprimanded the podcast host for his egregious conduct towards her colleagues, and logged off. She could have issued an immediate apology, calling him out for his threatening and offensive rhetoric.

[53] Instead, she remained on the podcast throughout, going off-camera only when he suggested it as he was about to get shockingly abusive and reprehensible, in an effort to shield her from accountability.

[54] He, of course, is beyond the jurisdiction of Canadian law and certainly not constrained by any Code of Conduct or even civilized decorum.

[55] We do not accept that the Councillor – who was the featured guest and the star celebrity of the show – cannot be held accountable simply because she herself did not utter the most egregious rhetoric but simply sat by, smiling, laughing, participating and encouraging throughout.

[56] Whether she momentarily turned off her camera at certain times does not, in our view, relieve her of shared responsibility for the podcast.

[57] We find that she bears responsibility for her participation during the harassing, threatening and offensive rhetoric targeting her fellow members of Council.

#### Police Lay No Charges – Criminal Allegations Outside Our Jurisdiction

[58] The Councillor’s position is that the Integrity Commissioner lacks jurisdiction to deal with a complaint where the Integrity Commissioner determines that there

## Principles Integrity

are reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a contravention of the *Criminal Code*.

[59] As explained above, s. 223.8 of the Municipal Act requires that an Integrity Commissioner who believes that the substance of a complaint reveals a breach of the Criminal Code, then the Commissioner “shall immediately refer the matter to the appropriate authorities and suspend the inquiry until any resulting police investigation and charge have been finally disposed of”.

[60] It is clear that once the matter has been concluded by the police and the matter disposed of (which may include not pressing charges), then the Integrity Commissioner may resume a review and investigation of the complaint, as appropriate.

[61] The police have determined that no charges will be pursued and have closed their file. For this reason, our jurisdiction to deal with the complaint as filed has been restored and we have resumed our investigation.

[62] This approach is corroborated by case law. In *Michael Di Biase v City of Vaughan* CanLII 2016 ONSC 5620, the court held as follows:

***The Integrity Commissioner’s jurisdiction to deal with the complaint does not disappear even if the complaint is of a criminal nature***

[209] Allegations of a criminal nature will almost always allege conduct which also offends the Code of Conduct. For this reason, the Integrity Commissioner’s jurisdiction does not disappear because she determines that the alleged free family cottage construction allegation is criminal in nature. Rather her jurisdiction is suspended until the appropriate police service completes its investigation.

[210] The onus of proof in a criminal case is higher than the onus of proof in a civil matter. This means that a police service may decide not to lay charges, or charges may be dismissed because they are not provable beyond a reasonable doubt. Conduct that cannot be proven beyond a reasonable doubt may be provable on a balance of probabilities and thus a violation of the Code of Ethical Conduct may be proven despite an acquittal or a decision not to proceed with criminal charges.

[211] If no charges are laid or the applicant is acquitted, the Integrity Commissioner’s jurisdiction is restored and the Integrity Commissioner can, if she thinks it advisable, determine whether a violation of the Code of Conduct has nevertheless occurred. If charges are laid, the Integrity Commissioner will not proceed until the criminal proceedings have been completed.

[emphasis added]

Charter-Protected Political Expression

## Principles Integrity

- [63] The Councillor's position is that penalizing her presence on the podcast "*sets a dangerous precedent that chills democratic debate*".
- [64] We find this argument to be disingenuous. Healthy democratic debate does not include publicly denigrating opponents, character assassinations, and encouraging a host who is invoking public violence against one's fellow politicians.
- [65] In fact, holding the Councillor accountable for her participation in this despicable conduct upholds a positive democratic principle – that treating others with respect and dignity is a pillar of our civil democracy.
- [66] Freedom of expression, while a fundamental freedom, is not unrestricted; indeed section 1 of the Charter qualifies its guarantee of rights and freedoms and specifically recognizes that the right to free expression is "*subject to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in free and democratic society.*"
- [67] Laws which protect against harassment in all its forms are an example of such a limitation.
- [68] City Council adopted a Code of Conduct to guide and demand a level of integrity, respect, ethics, and decorum necessary to allow efficient and effective governance and citizen representation.
- [69] The Councillor has voluntarily taken on this role; so long as she is a member of Council, she is subject to the Code and is required to conform to the standards of behaviour required by Council.

### **Findings:**

- [70] Given all of the foregoing, we find that the Councillor's participation in the podcast violated the Code of Conduct.
- [71] We find that in both her participation in the podcast of July 30, 2024 and the Media Release she issued on August 7, 2024, her conduct breached the Code of Conduct, in particular, Policy Objective 2 and 3, and Rules 5.01, 5.02, 5.09 and 26.04.
- [72] Rule 5.09 references the City's Respectful Workplace Policy, which applies to Members of Council as well as to the City's staff and volunteers.
- [73] Under the Respectful Workplace Policy, harassment includes conduct or behaviour which is "*reasonably perceived by the recipient as an intention to bully, embarrass, intimidate or ridicule...*" and includes:

## Principles Integrity

- Intimidation, **threat of violence**, verbal, written **or by social media**.
- Using language that **demeans, humiliates or expresses hate or incites harassment towards an individual(s)**.

[74] We find that the Councillor's conduct constituted harassment as defined in the Respectful Workplace Policy.

### **Recommendations and Concluding Remarks:**

[75] We are of the view that the Respondent's conduct represents a continued pattern of violating the provisions of the Code of Conduct.

[76] In our view, a significant change in behaviour is necessary. As such, we believe that a significant sanction is warranted.

[77] Under the *Municipal Act*, upon receipt of a recommendation report from the integrity commissioner, Council may impose a reprimand or a suspension of pay for a period of up to 90 days.

[78] Unfortunately, unlike Ontario school boards in similar circumstances, municipal councils lack the authority to suspend members from attending a meeting, or to impose other remedies that are intended to be curative and preventative but which are not clearly available under the *Municipal Act*.

[79] Council is left with the blunt instrument of pay suspension. While a suspension of pay cannot per se change the Councillor's pattern of behaviour, pay suspension is a relevant penalty for violation of the Code.

[80] We note that this is the seventh time that we have had to report publicly in regard to conduct of Councillor Robinson that has been found to breach the Code of Conduct and on each occasion, a further suspension of pay has been imposed.

[81] We therefore recommend:

1. That the remuneration paid to Councillor Robinson be suspended for 60 days.

[82] We will be available to introduce this report and respond to questions regarding its contents during the Council meeting at which this report is considered.

# Principles Integrity

## About Principles Integrity and the Complaint Process

Principles Integrity was appointed the Integrity Commissioner for the City of Pickering on November 15, 2022. We are also privileged to serve as Integrity Commissioner for a number of other Ontario municipalities. The operating philosophy which guides us in our work with all of our client municipalities is this:

*The perception that a community's elected representatives are operating with integrity is the glue which sustains local democracy. We live in a time when citizens are skeptical of their elected representatives at all levels. The overarching objective in appointing an integrity commissioner is to ensure the existence of robust and effective policies, procedures, and mechanisms that enhance the citizen's perception that their Council (and local boards) meet established ethical standards and where they do not, there exists a review mechanism that serves the public interest.*

The City has as part of its ethical framework a Code of Conduct which is the policy touchstone underlying the assessments conducted in this report. It represents the standard of conduct against which all members of Council are to be measured when there is an allegation of breach of the ethical responsibilities established under the Code of Conduct. The review mechanism contemplated by the Code, one which is required in all Ontario municipalities, is an inquiry/complaints process administered by an integrity commissioner.

Integrity commissioners carry out a range of functions for municipalities (and their local boards). They assist in the development of the ethical framework, for example by suggesting content or commentary for codes of conduct. They conduct education and training for members of council and outreach for members of the community. One of the most important functions is the provision of advice and guidance to members to help sort out ethical grey areas or to confirm activities that support compliance. And finally, but not principally, they investigate allegations that a person has fallen short of compliance with the municipality's ethical framework and where appropriate they submit public reports on their findings, and make recommendations, including recommending sanctions, that council for the municipality may consider imposing in giving consideration to that report.

It is important that this broad range of functions be mentioned in this investigation report. Our goal, as stated in our operating philosophy, is to help members of the Pickering community, indeed the broader municipal sector and the public, to appreciate that elected and appointed representatives generally carry out their functions with integrity. In cases where they do not, there is a proper process in place to fairly assess the facts and, if necessary, recommend appropriate sanctions. In every case, including this one, the highest objective is to make recommendations that serve the public interest, if there are recommendations to be made.

Our role differs from other 'adjudicators' whose responsibilities generally focus, to state it colloquially, on making findings of fact and fault. While that is a necessary component when allegations are made, it is not the only component.

Our operating philosophy dictates the format of this report. The tenets of procedural fairness require us to provide reasons for our conclusions and recommendations, and we have done that. Procedural fairness also requires us to conduct a process where parties can participate in the review and resolution of a complaint.