

From: howard doughty

Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 6:34 PM

To: Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>; Office-Mayor Richmondhill <officemayor@richmondhill.ca>; Joe DiPaola <joe.dipaola@richmondhill.ca>; Carmine Perrelli <carmine.perrelli@richmondhill.ca>; greg@gregberos.com; Tom Muench <tom.muench@richmondhill.ca>; Castro Liu <castro.liu@richmondhill.ca>; Raika Sheppard <raika.sheppard@richmondhill.ca>; Karen Cilevitz <karen.cilevitz@richmondhill.ca>; Godwin Chan <godwin.chan@richmondhill.ca>

Subject: City of Richmond Hill Council Meeting - June 6, 2022

Members of Council and Others:

On October 13, 2021, a motion was passed by Council requiring Councillor Perrelli to provide full reimbursement to the City of Richmond Hill for his "Enviro Day" event, such that no taxpayer dollars would be spent to cover the amount owing of \$139,623.30.

The recorded vote on that motion was:

In favour: Acting Mayor DiPaola, Councillor Muench, Councillor Liu, Councillor West, Councillor Cilevitz, and Councillor Chan;

Opposed: Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli, and Councillor Beros.

On June 8, 2022, Councillor Beros intends to introduce a motion that:

"Council **reconsider** their [sic] previous decision and declare that Councillor Perrelli is not required to provide any reimbursement of the \$139K for the Enviro Day event and direct staff to unfreeze his Events Account and restore to it \$56K for Perrelli's use."

* * * * *

I respectfully submit that Councillor Beros' proposed motion to reconsider is out of order.

The rules of order for public meetings are clear:

1. According to *21st-century Robert's Rules of Order* (New York: Dell, 1995), p. 208, supported by Jones' *Parliamentary Procedure at a Glance* (New York: Hawthorn, 1971), p. 19, and all other widely recognized authorities on the matter) **in order to move**

reconsideration, the mover (in this case, Councillor Beros) *must* be someone who voted for the original motion.

Since he did not vote in favour of the original motion, Councillor Beros is prohibited from moving reconsideration;

2. Also according to *Roberts*, any motion to reconsider must be made at the same meeting as the one in which the original motion was passed or in the meeting immediately following it.

Since there have been several meetings subsequent to the one in which the original motion was passed, Councillor Beros' proposed motion is, itself, barred from consideration. Put simply, the "clock has run out."

Accordingly, both because of lack of standing and because of the expiration of eligibility for consideration, Councillor Beros' motion must be ruled out of order. It is, in my opinion, at best a frivolous and vexatious motion and at worst, a flagrant abuse of procedure. Such objections are not mere "technicalities"; rules are normally in place for a reason and prime among them is the defence of the public good and the limitation of the abuse of power.

* * * * *

Furthermore, I respectfully submit that, to its credit, this Council has displayed such improved patterns of organizational and procedural conduct over the past four months that the toxic melodrama of disruption, obstruction, incivility, and disdain for democracy of the past three years has largely dissipated. Council has taken admirable steps toward redemption.

So, this is no time to regress into past practices. Proper standards of behaviour and respect for parliamentary rules, for Council itself, and for the citizens of Richmond Hill must be upheld if the process of restoring healthy municipal governance is to be completed and Richmond Hill residents can once again feel pride in our community.

Therefore, I further call upon this Council to ensure that the decision on Councillor Beros' motion be promptly and decisively ruled out of order by the Chair; however, if for any reason, an attempt is made to remove deliberations out of the public view, I urge the Council to reject any initiative to take the matter *in camera*.

This Council has tested the patience of the public for too long to allow even the appearance of impropriety to occur. In the name of democracy itself, I ask that these matters be resolved openly and transparently, so that the attentive public may not only see that the right decision is being made in terms of proper *procedural conduct* in compliance with established rules of order regarding Councillor Beros' motion, but also in terms of the *substantive issues* embedded in the debate over the matters giving rise to Councillor Beros' proposed motion.

Howard A. Doughty
10 Cheval Court
Richmond Hill ON
L4E 2N7