

re: Mississauga Auditor General Deliberations

(please include this as reference document for **March 11 deputation**)

March 7, 2026 (by email)

To: Diana Rusnov - Director Legislative Services & City Clerk
 Geoff Wright - CAO Mississauga
 Graham Walsh - lawyer for CAO
 Stephanie Smith - Legislative Coordinator

Cc: Amy Truong - Internal Auditor
 Five focus Council members:
 Carolyn Parrish - Mayor & Council member
 Joe Horneck - Council member
 Dipika Damerla - Council member
 John Kovac - Council member
 Natalie Hart - Council member
 Other Council members
 Miranet & ratepayer association reps
 other residents (bcc)
 media reps
 Ontario Ombudsman rep(s)

re: March 11 deputation - Mississauga Council members (and CAO) opposed to independent financial oversight

Greetings,

Regarding the March 11 Council meeting **agenda item 11.1**, please register my name for presenting a 5-minute deputation to Council members, in the context of this reference document related to the March 4 deliberations by the General Committee (hopefully March 11 Councillors Tedjo, Butt, Reid and McFadden will be able to attend).

This request is further to the understanding that, because of the controversial nature of this issue, apparently the intention of the City Clerk is to apply a generally disregarded and somewhat illegitimate procedural rule and, **ban** all 10 residents who provided deputations at the General Committee meeting (for which Councillors Tedjo, Butt, Reid and McFadden were absent) from providing deputations March 11 to address:

- a) the General Committee recommendation March 4 to not hire an Auditor General and to not obtain independent advice on whether to hire an Auditor General, and
- b) the General Committee's final-decision criteria, which had not been clearly identified March 4 until **after** the deputations were presented.

Notably however, I now recall that during the March 4 meeting, Mayor Parrish assured residents, with regards to residents being able to provide communications involving the four missing Councillors:

(@3:02:23) "we will probably have a further debate on this next week (i.e. March 11), and you'll have lots of time" (Mayor Parrish)
(also reference: @2:56:32, 3:55:40)

and **that assertion and understanding seems to very much contradict** the March 5 assertion by the City Clerk, with regards to banning residents who provided deputations March 4.

Any resident would also have the option to register in advance (i.e. per the agenda, by email prior to March 9 to stephanie.smith@mississauga.ca) to ask questions during the March 11 Council meeting (@2:56:32).

References herein to '@time' in the March 4 meeting discussions, correspond to the following video:

<https://pub-mississauga.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=3c22fb33-3231-46af-b5bd-29a30165d210&Agenda=PostAgenda&lang=English>

Three Troubling Decision Criteria March 4 (A)

1. Discrediting informed & proactive residents

Notably, as referenced in local media, one of the key decision criteria put forward after the March 4 deputations that was most troubling to residents in attendance, was the Mayor advocating to other Council members that, collectively, Council members should adopt the view that residents at the meeting (who unanimously supported the hiring of an Auditor General, or at least obtaining independent expert advice on whether to hire an Auditor General) are residents who should be discredited and disregarded by Council members as largely irrelevant complainers, even though most of them represented ratepayers groups in Mississauga.

(@3:47:42) "*Even if you had 70 people in the chamber, 500 people in the chamber, we have 750,000 people that we account to ... we (i.e. twelve elected Council members) have a lot more people to account to than the ones who have the time to come in and complain ... you (residents providing deputations etc) are a very tiny portion of the people we take care of, so we have to trust our staff, we have to trust each other (i.e. the group of twelve Council members) that we are doing the best job we can do ... our staff is not recommending that (we hire an Auditor General or obtain independent advice) ...and I have more faith in them than I do in 100, 200, 300 people coming in complaining ... (and trying to run things) like a vigilante committee ... "*

[Contrary view @3:50:50, @3:51:58]

With regards to references to "recommendations by staff" (@3:48:45, @3:55:30), in fact there does not appear to have been any recommendation by Internal Audit (as confirmed @1:06:40), and during the discussions the Internal Auditor acknowledged some of the shortcomings in the report that was prepared for Council members as a joint effort by the CAO (see the section below: "reliance on the report from the CAO").

During that process of broadly discrediting informed and proactive residents, the Mayor did not include the consideration of obtaining **independent** expert advice/guidance on whether an Auditor General should in fact be hired, nor did the Mayor acknowledge that the twelve Council members and the CAO (and the CAO's lawyer) appear to have a fundamental conflict of interest on this issue, while not identifying any plans to resolve the dishonesty glitch, as referenced in the "contradiction" section below, that is unnecessarily undermining the credibility of the CAO and Council members.

2. Not in an election year

Another decision criteria that was troubling was the rhetorical question "why would we hire an Auditor General during an election year". (@3:35:50; @3:46:45)

3. Council members to quickly rush to a lock-down rejection of an AG, because the issue is "divisive"

@3:55:45 - *"I'm not going to vote for a deferral. This is a very divisive subject that's developing amongst constituents. Some have been stirred up to do it. Others will continue be stirred up to do it. ... Deferring is not going to make any difference and I hope we don't."* (Mayor Parrish)

The request for a deferral was included in a Council motion (that 12-4-1=7 Council members subsequently opposed) and was also specifically in the context that Miranet had referenced the very short window of time for residents to learn that the proposal for an Auditor General was (finally) under consideration.

Miranet representatives had identified their objective of seeking additional time in order to help inform other residents who might help to encourage the twelve Council members to reconsider their conflicted opposition, not only to hiring an Auditor General, but also their opposition to obtaining independent expert advice on whether an Auditor General should be hired, even if doing so would result in increased transparency and an effective independent professional resource for residents seeking to resolve controversial financial issues. (@2:56:32, @3:50:50, @3:51:58)

Other decision criteria - "compromise?" (B)

The committee's March 4 decision criteria also included substituting what were deemed by some Council members to be "compromises", instead of independent financial oversight, but those "compromises" were inherently **problematic** and did not appear to help resolve current concerns nor to provide any substantive form of independent financial oversight:

1. Not addressing current dishonesty glitch

The compromise approach did **not** include any proposed action plans to resolve the dishonesty glitch that is currently unnecessarily undermining the credibility of Council, as addressed in the "contradiction" section below

Notably, the roles of the "Integrity" Commissioners were referenced but those roles have been defined such that the integrity commissioners are unable to help address various issues because they are not really independent at all regarding "integrity" concerns in the sense that they report to and take direction from Council, and their role has been defined as excluding actions of the City executives (and staff), and excluding deliberations and decision-making by Council members. (@3:47:20, @3:31:15)

The Office of the Ontario Ombudsman also does not provide a responsive alternative, with an uncertain bureaucratic mandate, and apparently very limited resources, understanding and accessibility. (@3:47:20)

2. Expanded secret (or non-secret) portal for "complaints" (no transparency, nor independence)

Under circumstances (as illustrated below) where residents are not looking for 'secrecy' to have concerns addressed (or disregarded), a secret portal is the antithesis of transparency and accountability, but advocated by the CAO's lawyer Graham Walsh. (@3:28:49, @1:15:49, @1:27:40, @2:24:50, @3:29:45, @3:46:45, @3:53:40)

Secret, or non-secret, such an approach lacks professional independence.

3. Adding two volunteer residents to audit committee (largely irrelevant to other residents)

There may be tangential value in such an approach, but doing so does not provide transparency for residents in general, nor independence, nor any interface to help residents. In addition to potential value, it represents nothing more than window dressing on this issue of independent financial oversight and can be done separately

from the issue of an AG. (@3:29:20, @3:46:20)

The City's response to prior efforts to communicate concerns to residents who were members of the Governance Committee resulted in the City identifying that communications could not be sent directly to such residents and they had no official role with regards to representing residents or responding to concerns. (@3:29:20, @3:29:45)

Also, committee members could seek our 'compliant' residents (@2:15:16, @3:46:20).

Committee members could replace volunteer residents when they felt like it and, as appears to have happened with the Governance Committee, can simply ask residents to not attend certain meetings.

4. **Adding two staff to internal audit** (status quo)

Again, such an approach does not provide any sort of direct resident interface, no real independence, and no transparent accountability.

For example, the audit committee seems to provide no authoritative transparent role with regards to resolving politicized misrepresentation and falsification of financials communicated to residents through press releases, related communications and through the media (as per "contradiction" section below).

5. **Council members selectively relying only on the CAO's report** (biased, non-determinative and not independent re CAO; with no recommendation provided by Internal Audit)

The report from the CAO lacks independence, and was perceived by residents as implicitly advocating for an expanded role for internal audit, in opposition to independent financial oversight. The CAO report had deficiencies with regards to cost comparisons, and not sufficiently identifying the relative benefits of an Auditor General. (@2:17:38, @2:39:50, @3:17:10, @3:19:40)

During the March 4 deputations, as efforts by residents and Council members tried to establish an apples-to-apples comparison of just the costs of internal audit vs. an Auditor General (as distinct from benefits of transparency and potential additional savings from an independent AG), Councillor Mahoney, as Chair, several times interjected for what seemed to be the specific purpose of obstructing efforts to identify the report's cost comparison distortion. (@ 1:07:00, @1:51:55, @1:53:00, @2:07:40).

Internal audit does not appear to be the author of that distortion in the CAO report and Councillor Mahoney appeared to be indicating that: a) he was personally uncomfortable with the distortion being highlighted for residents and b) he did not want the Internal

Auditor to be put in the position of defending a distortion that presumably Chari Mahoney was already aware was intentionally authored by others. (@3:17:10)

During the March 4 meeting, ratepayers association reps noted that that reports from other municipalities identified that direct net **savings** resulting from the role of an independent Auditor General, in addition to advantages such as transparency, significantly **exceeded** (sometime by a multiple factor) the financial cost of that role. It was notable that one Council member responded by discrediting such net savings as not being a notably high percentage of the City's total budget. (@2:07:40, @2:19:40, @2:50:05 and _____),

6. **Rationalization of not hiring an Auditor General because not in budget.**
(minor rationalization)

That seems a very weak rationalization on its own because: a) presented in context of other much more significant considerations, b) does not address reasons for opposing the relatively small cost of at least contracting for independent expert advice on whether to hire an Auditor General, c) disregards the role of the tax stabilization fund, and d) as noted in the meeting, a mid-term appointment (e.g. July) would imply \$1 million or less rather than \$2 million, with potential offsetting savings. (@4:01:15; @4:04:45, _____)

Region AG addressing City issues - NO (C)

(Region AG blocked from doing so)

Repeatedly during the March 4 meeting, Councillors provided some assurance that the Region AG might have a role in addressing some City financial issues, and could also be a "learning experience" for Region/City Councillors: (@3:15:50, @3:29:45, @3:35:20, @3:45:55, @3:32:18)

However:

1. **Region AG blocked.** Councillor Damerla confirmed that the Region CAO's lawyer has already indicated that the intention of the Region's CAO (with the support of Region Council) is to block the Region CAO from addressing issues related to the City of Mississauga (probably including not allowing him to address the honesty glitch which includes the City and media materially misrepresenting the 2026 increase in Region property taxes to be paid by Mississauga residents). (@3:30:40. @3:32:18).

2. **Rationale questionable.** It is difficult to understand the argument that it is too complicated for the Regional Auditor to be able to address certain related City issues (if the City is reluctant to hire a City AG), because supposedly the issue of Brampton and Caledon also funding the Region AG could be addressed by the Region AG's office having a fee-for-service whereby the City would directly compensate the Region for agreed-upon AG services, (@3:32:18)

3. Experience of other municipalities. Ratepayer association reps noted that Council members are disregarding the experience information that is already available from reports from other municipalities and also not seeking independent advice from experts on the issue of the role and value of hiring an Auditor General for the City. (@2:38:30, @3:17:10)

4. False rationale for no City AG. City Council is thereby deflecting their obligation to obtain an independent assessment of whether an Auditor General should be hired for the City, at the same time that they are not resolving the problems noted in the "contradiction" section below.

Key factor excluded from decision criteria (D)

(conflicts of interest; politics of Council unanimity)

Notably, none of the Council members who rejected option #4 (obtaining independent expert advice on whether to hire an Auditor General) appears to have acknowledged that the CAO and Council members would seem to have a fundamental conflict of interest when voting to not seek such independent advice, particularly as illustrated in the context of the illustrative contradiction below. (@3:25:05)

Some Council members (Parrish, Horneck, Damerla, Kovac and Hart) would presumably recognize the legitimacy of obtaining independent expert advice on the question of whether to hire an Auditor General for the City.(e.g. @2:08:10, @3:35:20) if they do not believe the merits are self-evident, not only for residents but also for helping Council members carry out their mandate, and hopefully that will influence March 11 votes.

Contradictions regarding "trust" (E)

Committee members did not reference the **fundamental contradiction** with encouraging resident to simply "trust" (@3:45:30, @3:48:50, 3:15:20) the CAO and Council members (instead of encouraging independent financial oversight), at the same time that the CAO and Council members continue to have **no plan of action** to address and resolve the fact that the CAO, Council members, "cooperative" local media, etc have, in a coordinated fashion, disingenuously asserted to residents that the 2026 percentage increase in the City property taxes was only 1.6%, and asserting the increase in the City property taxes was less than the rate of inflation, while also asserting that the increase in the Region property taxes was only 3.6%.

Problematically, neither the CAO, nor any of the Council members, and **no available documents or reports**, transparently disclose to residents the basic facts that the 2026 percentage increases to the City and Region property taxes will in fact be 4.4% (well above the rate of inflation) and 7.5% respectively.

Council members should obtain independent advice on whether to hire an Auditor General but, at the same time, pre-emptively **take action** to help **resolve** concerns (and what unfortunately provides the appearance of direct evidence) that Mississauga Council members **cannot** in fact be trusted, because such unwelcome evidence undermines the **presumption** of most residents (including myself) that there is in fact nothing nefarious going on with regards to other less visible components of the City's financials.

As noted earlier, demonstrating transparency, and rectifying existing credibility issues, seems a more constructive position for Council members to adopt, pre-emptively, particularly well in advance of an election period.

Best wishes,
Dan Anderson

PS. At this stage, it seems that there are somewhere between eight and nine residents* within the City of Mississauga who are ideologically opposed to the idea that the City should contract for independent expert advice on whether the City should hire an Auditor General, and all except one are Mississauga Council members, four of whom were absent March 4.

*excluding the CAO's lawyer

March 5, 2026

To: Geoff Wright - Mississauga CAO

DISTRIBUTION: same as March 5 email that provided the questions (bcc for simplicity)

re: Mississauga Council members (and CAO) opposed to independent financial oversight

Diana Rusnov provided the responses identified below, although has not undertaken to provide a distributed response for those providing the March 4 deputations, nor to others: Thank you to Diana for her response.

QUESTION #1:

"During the March 4 meeting, residents and the various ratepayer groups were somewhat discredited for not having participated in a prior "virtual" meeting on this subject matter, but apparently none of them had been unaware that such a meeting had taken place .. can you please identify the date of that "virtual" meeting, and provide a link for the video for that meeting as well as a link to any communications by the City identifying that such a meeting was taking place along with any related documents that were made available."

RESPONSE:

City Clerk Diana Rusnov: "**I can confirm that the City did not host a virtual meeting on this subject matter.** As such, there is no video link or related communication available regarding a virtual meeting, as no such session took place."

QUESTION #2 (including summary clarifications)

"... could you please explain why, as City Clerk, you or your staff will, or will not be, pre-emptively 1-on-1 applying the following procedural bylaw requirement to block individuals (who provided a deputation March 4 to 2/3 of the General Committee) from providing a (follow-up) deputation (e.g. to respond to the City's response to the deputations) during the Council meeting at which (the question of whether or not to hire a City Auditor General) will be decided."

RESPONSE:

City Clerk Diana Rusnov: "Once the subject matter has been received by Council or a Committee, it is considered closed, and any subsequent requests for a deputation (by that same person) on the same topic within that (12-month) period will be denied."

It is a strange notion that, for the purposes of being able to ban proactive individuals from addressing Council on a controversial issue, that the vote at the General Committee "closed" the subject of an Auditor General for the City, when in fact that decision will not be made until Council members vote at a subsequent Council meeting.

Such an approach blocks the most proactive and informed residents from addressing, as part of the Council meeting deliberations, what committee members revealed, subsequent to the deputations, regarding their own (initial) decision criteria.

Actually, I was somewhat surprised by the City Clerk's response to the second question because it suggests that ban approach is consistently applied to all residents, but my understanding is that residents and public groups are generally not banned from providing a follow-up deputation on a non-controversial subject (and sometimes are encouraged to provide a follow-up deputation), despite their initial deputation being "received" by a Committee.

Instead, the procedural ban seems to be something that is selectively reserved for certain controversial issues where City reps simply want to obstruct specific residents on certain subjects. I have observed a resident who was been made aware of the potential for such a 12-month ban, specifically ask the committee chair prior to making his deputation if such a ban would be applied to him if he proceeded, and the awkward non-verbal response was 'no'.

But clearly in the case of this controversial issue of an Auditor General for the City, the City Clerk has a clear understanding that her staff are to block any requests for a follow-up deputation at Council by individuals who provided an initial deputation on the issue March 4.

Dan Anderson (Peel-Mississauga resident)

=====

March 5, 2026

To: Diana Rusnov - Mississauga Director of Legislative Services (and City Clerk)

Cc: Miranet & Ratepayer Association reps
Council members
CAO Geoff Wright
CAO lawyer Graham Walsh
media reps
Office of the Ontario Ombudsman
some other residents (bcc)
others as indicated

re: **Mississauga Council members opposed to independent financial oversight**

Please note the **two questions/requests below** regarding the issue of an Auditor General for the City of Mississauga.

As context, yesterday's meeting (March 4) was notable for some of the unexpected rationalizations put forward in the context of what appears to be, with the exception of Councillor Damerla, an almost unanimous opposition by Council members to the establishment of independent financial oversight in the form of an Auditor General for the City of Mississauga.

It was also surprising how dismissively the leadership of the City views the input from ratepayer groups and other residents on this controversial issue, focusing only on the biased perspective of CAO Wright, legal counsel and internal audit, along with the stated objective of wanting to quickly block any further consideration of the issue prior to more residents becoming aware of what is considered by Council to be a "divisive" issue, while emphasizing a unilateral right to make such decisions as elected officials regardless of any perception of a conflict of interest and without consulting more extensively with residents and obtaining professional advice and guidance that is independent from the conflicted views of the CAO, internal audit and Council members.

It was also notable that despite the importance of the General Committee deliberations, Councillors Tedjo, Butt, Reid and McFadden were all absent (both in person and remotely), with no clear explanation provided.

In any case, as noted previously, Councillors Tedjo, Butt, Reid and McFadden are all expected to oppose an Auditor General, and would vote to do so at the next applicable Council meeting (with or without viewing a video of the March 4 deputations).

Frequently, the Council meetings that follow a General Committee meeting only involve a rubber-stamping process, in the sense of simply 'receiving' the minutes from the General Committee meeting with minimal discussion by Council members, while sometimes using procedural bylaws to block concerned residents.

Question #1 - Prior Virtual Meeting ?

During the March 4 meeting, residents and the various ratepayer groups were somewhat discredited for not having participated in a prior "virtual" meeting on this subject matter, but apparently none of them had been unaware that such a meeting had taken place.

For those copied on this email, and for others who provided deputations and questions etc, can you please identify the date of that "virtual" meeting, and provide a link for the video for that meeting as well as a link to any communications by the City identifying that such a meeting was taking place along with any related documents that were made available.

Question #2 - selectively applying 12-month ban procedural bylaw ?

Out of general interest, and for the benefit of residents who provided deputations on

March 4, could you please explain **why**, as City Clerk, you or your staff will, or will not be, pre-emptively 1-on-1 applying the following procedural bylaw requirement to block individuals from providing deputations during the Council meeting during which this issue will be decided.

The following bylaw requirement had been established January 28 2024 and then communicated Feb 2024 on a 1-1 basis by then-Acting-Mayor Joe Horneck for the specific purpose of blocking a deputation to Council, solely because the subject matter had been addressed (and 'received') at a committee meeting:

"I must point you to the Council Procedure By-law (attached) which states:

Related to Council:

*"Notwithstanding Subsection 55(1), a **Deputation** from a member of the public can only be made **one time per subject matter in a 12-month period** and once the **subject matter** has been **received** by Council **or a Committee**, it is considered **closed** and any subsequent request for a Deputation from **that** member of the public within the 12-month period will be denied."*

Related to Committees:

"Notwithstanding Section 62, a Deputation from a member of the public can only be made one time per subject matter in a 12-month period and once the subject matter has been received by Council or a Committee, it is considered closed and any subsequent request for a Deputation from that member of the public within the 12-month period will be denied."

The Councillors, City Clerk and staff have a responsibility to ensure the City's by-laws are complied with, hence their comments to you on restrictions in about speaking to your proposal again."

Please clarify under what circumstances you apply such a procedural ban bylaw provision, and under what circumstances do you simply ignore it, or do you just follow the direction of the CAO or the committee chair if it is a controversial issue?

Part of the context is that the (new) 2024 bylaw provision was established in January 2024 through a rubber-stamping process, with no discussion by Council members, nor the General Committee, nor the Governance Committee, and was predicated on what can be seen to be a fabricated altering and misrepresentation of the minutes of the preceding Governance Committee meeting, for the specific intent/effect at the time of blocking a deputation.

Although, in the context of the dismissive response by the City's leadership, supported by Council members, the ratepayer groups may see little point in investing more personal time to try to help resolve what seems a predetermined outcome.

These circumstances provide further justification for an interest in independent financial oversight, rather than reliance solely on the current oversight group that appears to have a conflict of interest on this issue.

As noted by one Council member during yesterday's meeting ... why on earth would Council members want to establish a City Auditor General during an election year? One consideration is that when it is not an election year, as was the case last year,

elected officials are perhaps even more likely to disregard residents' concerns about misrepresenting financial matters, with particular impunity.

Demonstrating transparency and rectifying problems seems a more constructive position to take, particularly in advance of an election period.

Regards,
Dan Anderson

attached:

"2024-01-28 - Council Procedure By-law 0044-2022 (including schedules).pdf"