

## Council Seeking Clarification on Mayor Hoogenboom's Media Comments – June 25 & 27, 2025

---

### Mayor Hoogenboom 'I will not be bullied into quitting'

Posted on: June 25, 2025

LAURIE WEIR

['I will not be bullied into quitting': Rideau Lakes Mayor Arie Hoogenboom reacts to second non-confidence vote and resignation request](#)

### HOOGENBOOM REACTS

When reached by phone on Wednesday afternoon, June 25, Hoogenboom was forthcoming, disheartened and frustrated. He spoke candidly with *Hometown News*.

"This is part of the ongoing campaign to discredit me as mayor," he said. "They are clearly upset that I legitimately used my strong mayor powers to cancel their retrofit of the Chantry office renovation. This ongoing harassment of myself and my supporters brings more embarrassment to our township and to themselves."

Hoogenboom also addressed a recent CBC report suggesting he had received specific advice from MPP Steve Clark's office regarding his use of strong mayor powers. He said the reporter oversimplified the situation and clarified that the MPP's office directed him to consult the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's Kingston office for guidance.

Hoogenboom said he has significant community support, along with backing from fellow mayors in the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville.

"Staff fully support my role as mayor, and they're caught in the middle with 55 per cent of council regularly voting down my initiatives and ignoring staff and outside professional advice," he said.

"We've had multiple integrity commissioner investigations against them, and I know they're continuing to file complaints against me and other members of council. The taxpayer is left to foot that extremely high and growing bill."

The mayor reiterated a position he's previously expressed — that the province should declare all council seats vacant and call a new election.

"They've driven staff to resign, they've cost taxpayers dearly, and they are the ones who should reconsider their roles. They cannot and will not force me to bend to their will."

Hoogenboom said he used strong mayor powers to request data on council voting patterns.

"We've had 150 recorded votes this term. I thought it was 70 or 80, but staff said it's 150. What does that tell you? There are so many issues this council disagrees on. We've also had 17 or 18 IC investigations. I was told today there are seven more coming."

Many of the complaints, he said, are anonymous and internal. "They're digging up dirt and hoping something sticks."

Regarding the latest non-confidence vote by the “block of five” — as Hoogenboom refers to Jeff and Paula Banks, Dunfield, Hutchings, and Linda Carr — he said: “I’m incredibly disappointed. It gained us absolutely nothing. The only people who can force me out of office are the taxpayers — through a vote. Or the province, and I don’t expect they would do that.”

He accused the group of driving up legal fees at taxpayers’ expense while not being willing to fund his own representation.

“I’m not necessarily concerned about my pay or costs. I signed up for this, and I’m trying to do the best I can. I will not be bullied into resigning.”

The next municipal election is in fall 2026.

“We’ve got another year and a half with the same group of people who are not going to get along,” Hoogenboom said. “We’ve already had one councillor resign because of their antics. We’ve had multiple legal situations move forward.”

He added: “I’m sure they intend to try to take me to court using taxpayers’ money to argue my strong mayor powers should not have been exercised. This is just ridiculous.”

Still, the mayor said he’s buoyed by public support.

“People stop me at the grocery store or on the golf course and say, ‘Mr. Mayor, hang in there. We know it’s tough, but you need to stay.’ And I’m trying. I take it personally because I care so much.”

Regarding the June 26 by-election for South Crosby, Hoogenboom said he hadn’t endorsed a candidate and was disappointed in low, early turnout.

“Even if the new councillor supports some of my initiatives, it’s still a five-four vote. The makeup isn’t going to change.”

---

#### **Mayor’s Comment:**

***“We’ve had multiple Integrity Commissioner investigations against them, and I know they’re continuing to file complaints against me and other members of council. The taxpayer is left to foot that extremely high and growing bill.”***

#### **Response & Question:**

No Integrity Commissioner report has come before council at this time, and under the Code of Conduct and council protocol, all information related to Integrity Commissioner (IC) complaints is to remain strictly confidential between the Integrity Commissioner and the Clerk until it is formally brought forward in closed session. So, Mayor, how exactly do you know how many complaints have been filed, who they’ve been filed against, and, even more troubling, who filed them? IC complaints are filed in confidence for a reason: to protect the integrity of the process and to prevent retaliation or political interference. If you are publicly identifying complainants or targets without a report being released, then you are either breaching confidentiality, or you are inventing information for political effect. Both scenarios are deeply inappropriate. ***The question stands: how does the mayor know the contents and authors of confidential IC complaints, unless that information was improperly shared with him, or he is***

***making public statements that are not based on fact?*** Either possibility raises serious concerns about conduct, confidentiality, and misuse of information.

**Mayor's Comment:**

**He accused the group of driving up legal fees at taxpayers' expense while not being willing to fund his own representation.**

***"I'm not necessarily concerned about my pay or costs. I signed up for this, and I'm trying to do the best I can. I will not be bullied into resigning."***

**Response & Question:**

Mayor Hoogenboom in his previous term filed an IC complaint with council against councillor Bresee for undermining them, over the new office, at a cost of over 17k. She was found guilty of things like saying WOW and calling for recorded votes. The total cost of all eleven IC investigations into the majority of council for turning our backs on the Rideau Lakes Grassroots and for wanting to get a cost to fix Chantry was only 16k.

Any discussions related to funding the mayor's legal expenses would have occurred in closed session, where confidentiality rules apply and where the mayor, had he been involved would have been required to declare a conflict of interest and recuse himself from the discussion entirely. His recent public comments raise serious red flags. Either he is speculating about matters he was not legally permitted to be part of, or someone leaked confidential information to him from a closed meeting. Both scenarios are deeply inappropriate. If the mayor does not know what was discussed, he should not be commenting. And if he does know, then the question becomes: ***how did he come to possess that information in violation of closed meeting rules, and why is he now using it publicly for political messaging?*** This is either a breach of confidentiality or a fabrication, both of which undermine public trust and council integrity.

**Mayor's Comment:**

***"We've already had one councillor resign because of their antics. We've had multiple legal situations move forward."***

***"Even if the new councillor supports some of my initiatives, it's still a five-four vote. The makeup isn't going to change."***

**Response & Question:**

The mayor fails to acknowledge that Councillor Joan Delaney resigned on March 4, just one day after she attempted to assign blame to a fellow councillor for matters in which the Integrity Commissioner had already found no wrongdoing. To suggest she resigned because of others' "antics" is a deliberate distortion of the facts. Once again, the mayor fixates on what will happen to *his* initiatives, as though the role of council is simply to support him, not to represent the public interest. The new councillor will be elected to serve the people of Rideau Lakes, not the mayor's personal agenda. ***Does the mayor believe that council members are elected to be loyal to him, or to exercise independent judgment on behalf of their constituents? And why does he continue to frame council decisions solely in terms of whether they help or hinder his power, rather than respecting the democratic process?***

---

## Transcript Report

**Source:** 88.1 myFM News – Lanarkleedstoday.ca

**Date:** June 27, 2025

**Title:** *"They will not force me to bend to their will," Rideau Lakes mayor rebukes council's calls to resign*

---

Mayor Hoogenboom says:

"I believe that this is part of an ongoing campaign to try and discredit me."

"I believe the 'Gang of Five' are clearly upset with of what I have legitimately used, because I legitimately used my Strong Mayor Powers to cancel the Chantry office renovation and addition."

"I would say that this ongoing harassment of myself and my supporters on council brings only more embarrassment to the township and to themselves."

"I have support and sympathy of all my fellow 12 mayors from the United County of Leeds and Grenville."

"Staff also fully support my role as mayor and of course they are caught with needing to implement the decisions of 55 percent of the council."

"And this group regularly votes down my initiatives and they ignore staff, they ignore outside professional advice, both legal and architectural engineering."

"And of course we have had multiple Integrity Commissioner investigation against them and the tax payers left to pay the bill."

"I think the best thing that could happen going forward would be for the province to declare all of our council seats vacant, so that our public could elect a new council that would be more accountable, civil and transparent."

The mayor goes on to say:

"I have never formally called for it, but I doubt very much that the province would do that based on what they have done with other municipalities."

"In other municipalities where the council for example refuses to meet or there has been financial fraud and things of that nature, that's when the province has stepped in to take over the municipality or called new elections."

"This council is clearly dysfunctional and I don't think any progress is going to be made in the balance of the term, based on what I'm seeing."

"The ongoing situation where we have had over 150 recorded votes we have had and 17 or 18 Integrity Commissioner investigations, I know there are more underway and it just doesn't seem to stop."

"These people who called for my resignation, there the ones that need to reconsider their role and the appropriate role for elected ward politicians."

**When asked about the SMP to have staff do research on councillors into recorded vote and IC investigations and the illegal pay suspensions for councillors Paula and Jeff Banks:**

**"In term of the other ones, I mean, the penalty that was imposed was an error, which was an admitted error, it was immediately corrected."**

**"In fact, if we had done it the way the legislation would have suggested we could do it, the penalties to the Banks' councillor Bank's would have been higher, so they benefited from our error."**

**"So, I'm not sure what the concern is, I mean as soon as we were made aware by the Integrity Commissioner and our staff, which if we had of known that in advance, we would have done that whole process just a little bit differently."**

**"There is no smoking gun there."**

**"We were going on the basis of the information we had , once that information was corrected, we reversed that decision and as a result the Banks, the two councillor Banks ended up with a much lower penalty than what I felt would have been appropriate, given that fact that they have had multiple Integrity Investigations complaints and volitation's recorded in the past."**

**Mayor's Comment:**

***"We've already had one councillor resign because of their antics. We've had multiple legal situations move forward."***

***"Even if the new councillor supports some of my initiatives, it's still a five-four vote. The makeup isn't going to change."***

**Response & Question:**

The accusation that the majority of council has been undermining the mayor was already thoroughly investigated during the eleven Integrity Commissioner investigations conducted between November 2024 and March 2025. These complaints overwhelmingly focused on two matters: the majority's decision to turn their backs during a delegation by Wendy Alford, spokesperson for the Rideau Lakes Grassroots Group, and council's principled refusal to approve a new municipal office without first obtaining a cost to repair Chantry. One of these complaints found misconduct by the majority and recommended an apology, only. The only recommendations issued were to apologize for the symbolic protest during the delegation, and for Councillor Jeff Banks to refrain from directly challenging the mayor's authority during a meeting. That's it.

If the mayor has additional allegations, beyond what was fully investigated and dismissed, he should bring them forward. Otherwise, as with many of his recent media appearances, I must assume these statements are categorically false.

As I've said before, the real source of division is not disagreement over "HIS initiatives," but the mayor's repeated use of inflammatory and, at times, misogynistic language, including publicly referring to the majority of council as the "Gang of Five." Choosing not to support his agenda is not sabotage, it is the very essence of representative democracy.

And if the mayor genuinely believes his use of Strong Mayor Powers was lawful and justified, then he must also explain why he falsely claimed, during his June 4, 2025 interview on CBC's *All in a Day*, that his actions were backed by MPP Steve Clark and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. Those endorsements do not exist. There is no letter. No email. No statement of support. In fact, MPP Clark explicitly refuted the claim. **So the question remains: why does the mayor keep doubling down on falsehoods while accusing others of dishonesty, that this veto was made based on provincial priorities?**

---

#### **June – 4 CBC's *All in a Day* – Transcript, Mayor Hoogenboom comments.**

During an interview with on June 4, 2025, Mayor Arie Hoogenboom defended his use of Strong Mayor Powers to veto a council decision regarding the Chanty office project. He stated:

***“It completely follows the intentions of the Strong Mayor Powers. I think it is a complete waste of taxpayers’ dollars to go out and hire a lawyer to give an opinion as to whether that rationale is strong enough or not strong enough.***

***“I have spoken to the province and they certainly see this as legitimate. They have told me I’m well within my power to utilize Strong Mayor Powers in this particular case .”***

*That would be through the MPP’s office, that would be Mr. Clark. ‘I clearly have talked to Mr. Clark’s office about the potential of using the Strong Mayor Powers and I was told that I could certainly proceed in that fashion.”*

However, following the interview, journalist Alan Neal reported that Mayor Hoogenboom called back to clarify his statements. The mayor admitted:

- He did speak with MPP Steve Clark’s office but did not receive any advice or endorsement regarding the use of Strong Mayor Powers.
- He did not follow up with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s Municipal Services Office in Kingston, as recommended.
- He cited participation in a training session in Brockville on Strong Mayor Powers.
- He also stated he had previously received advice from township staff and more recently consulted his own lawyers regarding the powers.

#### **Press release from Steve Clark**

“Rideau Lakes Township Mayor Arie Hoogenboom’s comments during his interview with CBC Radio’s All In A Day that my office provided advice regarding the use of Strong Mayor Powers is **categorically false**. When contacted on this issue, our office has referred both Mayor Hoogenboom and the Township of Rideau Lakes CAO to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s Municipal Services Office in Kingston.

It is not the role of an MPP’s office to provide guidance to municipal officials and it’s disappointing that Mayor Hoogenboom has made this false claim. I encourage him to do the honorable thing and immediately retract his **untruthful comments.”**

June 27<sup>th</sup> Story by Grant Deme - Lake 88

**Mayor's Comment:**

***"I would say that this ongoing harassment of myself and my supporters on council brings only more embarrassment to the township and to themselves."***

**Response & Question:**

The true source of embarrassment is not council disagreement, it's the mayor's continued promotion of false narratives in the media, which council is then forced to correct in public meetings. A clear example is his claim of support from MPP Steve Clark for his use of Strong Mayor Powers, an assertion that has no basis in any official record or correspondence, and which was categorically denied by MPP Clark himself.

At the very time when the majority of council, derisively referred to by the mayor as the "Gang of Five", was under intense scrutiny through eleven Integrity Commissioner investigations, all of those complaints stemmed from opposition to the new municipal office project. They falsely claimed harassment, bullying, or misconduct, with the mayor and fellow councillors, but those were unfounded. They were about disagreement, disagreement over spending priorities, transparency, and process.

After more than three months of investigation, the Integrity Commissioner found no wrongdoing on the part of the majority, aside from a recommendation that Councillor Jeff Banks refrain from challenging the mayor's authority during a meeting, and that council apologize for turning their backs during a delegation, from the RLGG. Yet the mayor and former councillor Joan Delaney continue to publicly repeat these allegations as though they were proven facts.

So here is the question: ***if the mayor or anyone else has new, credible evidence of harassment since the conclusion of those investigations, then bring it forward. Otherwise, the continued repetition of unfounded claims, particularly in media interviews, can only be viewed as intentionally misleading and damaging to both council integrity and public confidence.***

**Mayor's Comment:**

***"I think the best thing that could happen going forward would be for the province to declare all of our council seats vacant, so that our public could elect a new council that would be more accountable, civil and transparent."***

***"In other municipalities where the council, for example, refuses to meet or there has been financial fraud and things of that nature, that's when the province has stepped in to take over the municipality or called new elections."***

**Response & Question:**

The mayor often speaks of accountability, civility, and transparency, but his actions and rhetoric tell a very different story. He has publicly compared the majority of his own council to a "gang" and suggested we should be disbanded, likening Rideau Lakes to municipalities suffering from financial fraud or total collapse. That comparison is not just reckless, it is false.

In Rideau Lakes, there has been no financial misconduct, no refusal to meet, and no failure of governance. What we do have is a majority of council who have lost confidence in the mayor's

leadership style and who continue to challenge his unilateral decision-making and repeated use of Strong Mayor Powers. Disagreement is not dysfunction, it is democracy. The role of council is not to rubber-stamp the mayor's initiatives but to debate, question, and vote based on the public good.

If the mayor believes that dissent is disloyalty, or that disagreement is grounds for provincial intervention, then the issue is not the conduct of council, it is his refusal to collaborate with the elected representatives of this township. ***So the question is this: does the mayor want to lead a council or control it?***

**Mayor's Comment:**

***"Staff also fully support my role as mayor and of course they are caught with needing to implement the decisions of 55 percent of the council."***

***"And this group regularly votes down my initiatives and they ignore staff, they ignore outside professional advice, both legal and architectural engineering."***

**Response & Question:**

This exact complaint was already addressed through the Integrity Commissioner's investigation into the majority of council, and we were found not to have acted improperly. If the mayor, or staff under his direction are now suggesting that council is ignoring legal or engineering advice, then I respectfully ask that they provide clear, specific examples. Vague accusations are not evidence. Broad or repeated claims without documentation only serve to mislead the public and inflame division at this table.

If such concerns are legitimate, then they should be brought forward transparently and backed by facts, not assumptions or insinuation. Council decisions require scrutiny, but that scrutiny must go both ways. If the mayor wishes to speak of professionalism and accountability, then let's start with honesty and specifics, not recycled talking points already addressed and dismissed through due process, that is suppose to be impartial.



**Mayor's Comment:**

***"And of course we have had multiple Integrity Commissioner investigations against them and the taxpayers are left to pay the bill."***

***"The ongoing situation where we have had over 150 recorded votes and 17 or 18 Integrity Commissioner investigations—I know there are more underway—and it just doesn't seem to stop."***

**Response & Question:**

Both a taxpayer and members of council explicitly warned Mayor Arie Hoogenboom in advance that his directive to staff, ordering the compilation of named Integrity Commissioner (IC) complaints and voting records would be misused for political purposes, particularly during the Ward 2 by-election. These warnings were not vague or speculative; they were clear, detailed, and formally documented. Councillor Sue Dunfield cautioned that the directive would erode public trust and deepen division. Taxpayer [REDACTED] specifically warned the mayor that releasing the data without outcomes or context would misrepresent conduct and harm reputations, especially given that several councillors had already been cleared. Councillor Jeff Banks warned it would be used as "ammunition" by the Rideau Lakes Grassroots Group (RLGG).

The mayor dismissed these warnings, claiming there was "no hidden agenda." Yet within hours of the data's release, RLGG launched a coordinated video campaign targeting his political opponents using the very figures compiled under the directive. The timing and coordination made the political misuse of that data not only foreseeable, but inevitable. Most concerning is that the mayor himself has now begun publicly citing those same raw numbers, without noting which complaints were dismissed or resolved, as justification for his ongoing use of Strong Mayor Powers and as evidence of dysfunction, dysfunction largely manufactured by this misuse of authority by overturning IC findings of innocence.

This transforms the mayor's earlier denial into a knowingly false assurance and reinforces the conclusion that Mayoral Directive MDS-2025-01 was never about transparency or accountability. It was about targeting political opponents and consolidating power. If the mayor is going to continue using this data in public discourse, then he must also take responsibility for how it was obtained, how it was weaponized, and the damage it has done to public trust in our local democracy.

**Mayor's Comment:**

***"In terms of the other ones, I mean, the penalty that was imposed was an error, which was an admitted error—it was immediately corrected."***

***"In fact, if we had done it the way the legislation would have suggested we could do it, the penalties to the Banks'—Councillor Banks—would have been higher, so they benefited from our error."***

***"So, I'm not sure what the concern is. As soon as we were made aware by the Integrity Commissioner and our staff, which—if we had known that in advance—we would have done the whole process a little bit differently."***

***"There is no smoking gun there."***

***"We were going on the basis of the information we had. Once that was corrected, we reversed the decision. And as a result, the Banks—both Councillors Banks—ended up with a much lower penalty than what I felt would have been appropriate, given that they have had multiple Integrity Commissioner complaints and violations recorded in the past."***

**Response & Question:**

The penalty in question was not just an “error”, it was the result of a group of council members colluding to override an Integrity Commissioner’s finding of innocence. It was a fundamental breach of due process. Both Councillors Paula and Jeff Banks were found innocent by the Integrity Commissioner, yet the mayor and several councillors-imposed penalties anyway. This decision was not “immediately corrected,” as the mayor now claims. It took sustained pressure, a formal legal opinion, and direct intervention from both the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Integrity Commissioner to force a reversal. That correction came only after a month of reputational harm and public damage to the councillors involved, which continues to this day with the mayor and ex-councillor Delaney’s, further false claims in the media, about bullying.

Now, rather than taking responsibility, the mayor claims the Banks “benefited” from the error because the penalties weren’t more severe. That is not only misleading, it’s deeply offensive. Councillors do not “benefit” from being wrongly penalized, falsely accused, or politically smeared. They were harmed by a coordinated, deliberate, politically motivated act that ignored the Integrity Commissioner’s rulings.

So let’s be clear: ***how does publicly and repeatedly accusing councillors of misconduct, when they were explicitly found innocent, serve the public interest? How high would the mayor like the penalty to be for actions the IC confirmed never happened? And can he point to any measurable way Councillors Paula or Jeff Banks “benefited” from an error that required external intervention and resulted in ongoing reputational damage?***

If the mayor is serious about accountability, then it must begin with honesty. He continues to cite raw figures compiled under Directive MDS-2025-01 as justification for his Strong Mayor actions, despite the fact that these numbers include no outcomes and are being used selectively. He still includes Councillor Jeff Banks in his narrative of repeated violations, even though Jeff Banks has **never once** been found guilty in any prior Integrity Commissioner investigation, another false claim made by the mayor.

***So again, why would the mayor want to increase penalties for councillors who were found innocent?***

That’s not accountability. That’s political retaliation dressed up as governance, and it has no place at this council table.

**SEE - Transcript of March 3<sup>rd</sup> and April 7<sup>th</sup> council Meetings****Mayor’s Comment:**

“There is no smoking gun there.”

**Response & Question:**

The mayor is now scrambling to manage the fallout by highlighting past Integrity Commissioner investigations involving other councillors, hoping to divert attention from the fact that he is currently under investigation himself, and that both the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Integrity Commissioner have questioned if he and his allies acted outside the law. Unlike those he’s now attacking, every councillor who breached the Code of Conduct has accepted the findings and issued an apology. None of their actions required legal intervention from the province. But what was done to Councillors Paula and Jeff Banks, ignoring rulings of innocence and imposing penalties anyway, did. It

created serious exposure for the Township of Rideau Lakes, the kind most municipalities work hard to avoid.

Rather than show leadership, the mayor continues to deflect blame and cast himself as the victim while publicly misrepresenting events, undermining cleared colleagues, and using selectively framed data to justify his conduct. This reached another level when he falsely claimed provincial backing for his actions, specifically from MPP Steve Clark, despite Clark publicly denying ever offering such support for his VETO. It's the kind of public misstatement that doesn't just damage credibility, it can have far-reaching implications when made against elected officials. At a time when Rideau Lakes depends on cooperation and funding from the province, this kind of reckless rhetoric doesn't just isolate the mayor, it risks consequences the entire township may have to answer for.

["They will not force me to bend to their will," Rideau Lakes mayor rebukes council's calls to resign | Lanarkleedstoday.ca](#)

---

## Transcript of March 3<sup>rd</sup> and April 7<sup>th</sup> council Meetings

### March 3, 2025 – Council Meeting

**Topic: Integrity Commissioner Reports – IC-35303-1124, IC-35308-1124, IC-35309-1124**

**Paula Banks**

**18:00**

Councillor Paula Banks is asked to leave despite being found innocent.

**19:00**

Mayor asks for clarification on penalties.

Councillor Maxwell proposes 15-day penalties "per complaint."

Maxwell: ***"It has already been demonstrated at this meeting again, the behavior at this table—rude, inconsiderate... I feel their behavior should be more than an apology."***

**21:00**

Banks: ***"May I ask why 15 days have been added?"***

Maxwell: ***"Rudeness. Inconsideration. Disregard for procedures. This behavior needs more than an apology."***

**23:00**

Banks: ***"I'm confused because I was found innocent."***

**28:00**

Hutchings: ***"Only the Integrity Commissioner can bring the hoe down on us."***

Delaney: ***"I don't think this Integrity Commissioner did the job she was supposed to do."***

**31:00**

Banks: *"How can a council member find me guilty when the Integrity Commissioner could not?"*  
*"You can't find me guilty of something she did not find me guilty of."*

**33:00**

Carr: *"She has been found innocent by the Integrity Commissioner. You can't say she is guilty now."*  
Mayor: *"I don't see how that is relevant."*

**35:00**

Dunfield: *"The rest of the report identified these actions were not to be found guilty."*

**Recorded Vote:** Mayor Hoogenboom, Maxwell, Pollard, and Delaney vote to impose 15-day penalties despite innocence rulings.

**37:00**

New motion for a second IC report on Paula Banks.  
Maxwell again proposes 15-day penalty.  
Pollard seconds it.  
Maxwell: *"She was found guilty."*  
Banks objects again.

**49:00**

Carr: *"How can Councillor Banks be charged three times for turning her chair?"*  
Banks: *"Why am I getting 45 days for turning my chair once?"*

**Jeff Banks**

**59:00**

Mayor: "There was no penalty suggested other than an apology, is there not?"  
Clerk: *"Not on the second one."*  
Maxwell again requests 15-day penalty.  
Delaney seconds.

**1:00**

Maxwell: *"All five of them turned their backs. It was quite obvious."*  
Dunfield: *"Point of order—we are talking about one individual, not all five."*  
Mayor: *"That is not a point of order. The action was taken by all five. We've already determined that."*

**1:02**

Maxwell: *"I'm not buying his reason for turning his back. That came after the fact."*  
Dunfield: *"There was no penalty issued here, so how can we add a penalty?"*  
Mayor: *"Whether there is a penalty or not, it is up to the majority of council."*

**1:04**

Jeff Banks: *"You've always said you support IC recommendations."*  
Mayor: *"This is not about the HUB. This is about people turning their backs on a delegation."*

**1:05**

Jeff Banks: *"I was not found guilty of that."*

Mayor: ***"It does not matter. You did it, and from my perspective, you should have been found guilty of that."***

Jeff Banks: ***"So you're the Integrity Commissioner now?"***

Mayor: ***"No, but I don't accept your 'valid reason.' We are free as a group to decide."***

**1:07**

Jeff Banks: ***"The IC confirmed I had a valid reason. Why are you trying to change the charge?"***


Mayor: ***"The public does not accept that 'valid reason.'"***

**Recorded Vote:** Mayor, Maxwell, Pollard, and Delaney vote to impose 15-day penalty again.

**1:16**

Maxwell (on Carr's report): ***"Obviously this is not going to go anywhere, so I'm not going to bother to make an amendment for the 15 days on this one."***

---

 **April 7, 2025 – Council Meeting**

**Topic: Reconsideration of Penalties and Legal Opinion**

**19:00**

Dunfield: Requests reconsideration of motions on Banks' IC reports.

Maxwell: ***"I don't know why the others are being added."***

Mayor: ***"I will be voting against this amendment. I think it's inappropriate to eliminate the penalties that the previous council agreed upon."***

**22:00**

CAO: ***"Council exceeded its authority with regards to applying penalty where no IC findings of fault were found."***

***"The legal opinion confirms council broke the rules."***

**31:00**

Banks offers olive branch: ***"Let's accept the apology and move on."***

**33:00**

Maxwell: ***"I guess I'll have to go along with the lawyer and say yes."***

Pollard: ***"Yes, I feel the same way, if the lawyer has spoken."***

**36:00**

Banks: ***"We were found innocent. You found us guilty anyway. I'm willing to move forward if there's an apology."***

**37:00**

Maxwell: ***"The public is really upset. It needs to stay the way it is."***

**41:00**

Banks: ***"I'd like to put a motion forward to ask for an apology from the mayor, Councillor Maxwell, and Councillor Pollard."***

**45:00**

Banks: *"Our reputations were damaged, and members went to the media continuing to make false claims."*

**47:00**

Jeff Banks: *"This has caused personal harm to us."*

**48:00**

Mayor: *"I'm getting a tad tired of all these accusations from the Banks'. I'll defend my position any day of the week."*

*"They feel they got off on a technicality. That's fine. But council has the right to decide."*

**51:00**

Banks: *"This was not a technicality. You applied 15 days to everything no matter what."*

Mayor: *"We could have just put all 45 days on the first one."*

*"The apology was voting to retract one of the penalties."*

**56:00**

Mayor: *"I did not break the Municipal Act and I will certainly not be apologizing."*

**59:00**

**Motion for apology fails** – Mayor Hoogenboom, Maxwell, and Pollard vote against.