

City of Brampton Integrity Commissioner File 2017-01

REPORT ON COMPLAINT

The Complaint

Harkirat Singh (the Complainant) alleged that Regional Councillor John Sprovieri (the Respondent) contravened the Code of Conduct for Members of Council by making comments in two emails and in a July 5 CityNews newscast.

The specific words that give rise to the Complaint appear in the “Analysis and Findings” section of this report, and also in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.

The Complainant’s position is summarized in the following passage from the Complaint:¹

I am deeply offended by the rhetoric displayed by him in a recent email. In his email, covered by CityNews (link below) Councillor Sprovieri tells “people of all races, colour and creeds” to “learn the values of the white people.” To make matters worse, in his interview on CityNews regarding the email, the Councillor goes on to reaffirm and defend his insensitive views. Additionally, after being suggested to take on cultural sensitivity training by Mayor Linda Jefferies, Councillor Sprovieri responds in email to the Mayor, “From my understanding the Native people want their land back. Any suggestions on how that may happen?”

This statement regarding “Native people” is just as offensive as the “white people” statement as it shows a total disregard to the devastating colonial legacy and genocide that occurred of the First Nations, Metis and Indigenous people. His response trivializes and mocks legitimate grievances that the First Nations, Metis and Indigenous people are fighting for.

This is not the first time Councillor Sprovieri has made insensitive statements. In 2014, Councillor Sprovieri was also found to have forwarded “Jewish” jokes (link below).

The Complainant then cited five specific provisions of the Code that he said had been contravened.

While I understand the Complainant’s position to be that the 2014 “Jewish joke” incident was relevant because it showed a pattern of conduct, I declined to consider it because it occurred outside the time frame of this Complaint. Subsection 1(4) of the Complaint Protocol provides:

The integrity Commissioner shall not accept any complaint from any person which arises from the conduct of a member(s) that occurred, or such conduct

¹ In quoting from documents, my practice in an investigation report is to correct obvious spelling errors without drawing attention to the correction unless the correction is material. This report also edits punctuation and capitalization for consistency.

was first learned of by the complainant, six (6) months prior to receipt of such complaint by the Integrity Commissioner.

Despite the argument that they form a pattern, the 2014 joke and the 2017 emails are separate incidents and they cannot be considered a single, continuous course of conduct. I am, therefore, unable to consider the 2014 incident.

The following specific allegations became the basis of my investigation:

- A. Allegation that the Respondent contravened Principle (b) of the Code, which states that, “Members of Council should be committed to performing their functions with integrity and transparency.”
- B. Allegation that the Respondent contravened Principle (c) of the Code, which states that, “Members of Council shall perform official duties and arrange their public affairs in a manner that promotes public confidence and respect and will bear close public scrutiny.”
- C. Allegation that the Respondent contravened the *Human Rights Code* (Ontario) and thereby contravened Rule No. 1(e) of the Code, which states in part that, “Members of Council shall seek to serve the public interest by upholding both the letter and the spirit of the laws and policies established by the ... Ontario Legislature ...”²
- D. Allegation that the Respondent failed to encourage public respect for the City and its by-laws, contrary to Rule No. 13 of the Code.
- E. Allegation that the Respondent failed to conduct himself with appropriate decorum, contrary to Rule No. 15 of the Code.

As part of my consideration of allegations A and B, which involve the “Key Principles” section of the Code, I also asked the Complainant and Respondent to address whether it was even possible to bring a Complaint that alleged a contravention of a statement of principle:

- F. Issue of whether Principles (b) and (c), which are among the “key principles that underline rule in this *Code of Conduct*,” are provisions that are capable of being breached.

After the Respondent issued his apology (see “Analysis and Findings” section and also Appendix 4), the Complainant confirmed that he wanted this proceeding under the Code to continue. In the Complainant’s words:

² Initially I told the parties that I had not yet determined whether an alleged contravention of the *Human Rights Code* can give rise to an Integrity Commissioner complaint. I invite both parties to comment on this question. The Respondent, through legal counsel, subsequently conceded Rule No. 1(e) requires Council Members to abide by the spirit and intent of human rights legislation in their conduct.

An apology was indeed warranted. However, an apology only came after a complaint had been made to yourself. Councillor Sprovieri's initial response was to defend his insensitive views and make further problematic statements regarding the Indigenous, First Nation, Metis people of Canada.

I think his remarks clearly contravened the Code of Conduct and as a result Councillor Sprovieri should be held accountable.

Summary

I find that Councillor Sprovieri contravened Rule No. 15 of the Code.

I note Councillor Sprovieri's concession that Rule No. 1(e) requires Council Members to abide by the spirit and intent of human rights legislation in their conduct. Nonetheless, I have chosen to consider his conduct under Rule No. 15, which I find he contravened.

I find that Rule No. 13 of the Code does not apply to the facts of this case.

I further find the Code's "Key Principles" section cannot give rise to a Complaint. A Complaint must allege contravention of one or more of the Code's substantive rules. I could find no violation of Principle (b) or Principle (c) because these are statements of principle that are incapable of forming the basis of a Complaint.

Process Followed

In operating under the Code, I follow a process that ensures fairness to both the individual bringing a Complaint (Complainant) and the Council Member responding to the Complaint (Respondent). The process is governed by the Council Code of Conduct Complaint Procedure.

This fair and balanced process includes the following elements:

- The Respondent receives notice of the Complaint and is given an opportunity to respond.
- The Complainant receives the Respondent's response and is given an opportunity to reply.
- More generally, the process is transparent in that the Respondent and Complainant get to see each other's communications with me.³
- The Respondent is made aware of the Complainant's name. I do, however, redact personal information such as phone numbers and email addresses.

³ Occasionally, in my discretion, I may decline to share a communication when the communication is irrelevant to the investigation or I will not consider the communication and (in either case) the other party is not prejudiced by the lack of sharing.

- As a further safeguard to ensure fairness, I will not help to draft a Complaint and will not help to draft a response or reply.
- Where appropriate I will, however, invite a Complainant to clarify a Complaint. When a Complaint has been clarified the Respondent is provided with the original document and all communications between the Complainant and me related to clarification.
- When a Complaint has been clarified I deem the date of final clarification to be the official date the Complaint was made.

During this process, the Complainant and the Respondent each had full opportunity to provide information and to make representations. I have taken each party's submissions and communications with me into account.

The parties also had an opportunity to consider and to make representations on the draft findings and recommendations in this report before the report was finalized.

Analysis and Findings

There is no dispute that the Respondent sent the emails and made the televised statements that are the subject of the Complaint. The Respondent agrees they were sent and made.

The text of the emails is reproduced in Appendix 2 and the text of the televised statements is reproduced at Appendix 3.

In the case of the emails, I have also included, as context, the bulk of the email exchange in which the Respondent's comments were made. I find that the context in which the Respondent sent the emails is important and necessary to an understanding of what happened and in determining whether the Respondent contravened the Code.

The Respondent did not initiate the email exchange. He was one of 22 (later 23) recipients of an email sent by a local resident, whom I will refer to as the Initial Writer. The recipients were: Councillor Sprovieri (the Respondent), Mayor Jeffrey, Councillor Bowman, Councillor Dhillon, Councillor Fortini, Councillor Medeiros, the Mayor's Chief of Staff, another City employee, federal MP Ruby Sahota, the Chief Commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the Commission's general email address, two (later three) news reporters,⁴ a representative of the Brampton Board of Trade, a representative of B'nai Brith and seven other citizens.

The Initial Writer's first email made two general (and related) points. The writer objected to the City's decision to engage a particular individual (Individual Two) to perform a particular project. The writer felt that the engagement of Individual Two, a white male, was part of a pattern of institutional racism (and individual racism) that resulted in the

⁴ Starting with the third email in the exchange, the Initial Writer added a third news reporter to the recipients.

City's senior management and the City's workforce not being sufficiently representative and not being sufficiently diverse.

While I have deleted information that might identify specific employees accused of racism, I have left intact the Initial Writer's strongly worded allegations of institutional racism and of hiring practices that are insufficiently representative and insufficiently diverse. The reasons for doing so are explained in detail in Appendix 2. In short, I believe the portions of the Initial Writer's email included in this report are contextual information that is necessary to assess the Respondent's conduct in light of the Code. Further, while the allegations of institutional racism are strongly worded I am hesitant to do anything to the resident's words that might be considered misappropriation of voice or silencing.

In incorporating the Initial Writer's emails into this report as necessary context, I am making no comment on their content. My jurisdiction is limited to the conduct of Council Members under the Code.

The Respondent was the only recipient to respond to the Initial Writer's first email. In responding, he did not address the criticism of hiring Individual Two and he did not directly address the allegations of racism and insufficient diversity.

Instead, he wrote the following:

To be fair, people of all races, colour and creeds are eager to come to Brampton and Canada because the white people of this nation have developed a great system where everyone is welcome and can live peacefully together. I hope that the new comers will learn the values of the white people so that Brampton and Canada will continue to be a favourite destination for people who want a better and peaceful lifestyle.

The Initial Writer took issue with the Respondent's reply, and sent a second email, two-thirds longer longer than the first one.⁵ The new email mentioned a variety of topics including the First Crusade, slavery, the racism of John A. Macdonald, and the U.S. decision to drop the A-bomb on Japan. I have appended the email nearly in its entirety both because it is relevant context and because I do not wish to truncate or to silence another individual's exposition of the historic origins of systemic racism.

(In sending this email, the Initial Writer added a third news reporter to the "Cc" line. That reporter was included on all subsequent emails in the exchange.)

Once again, only the Respondent appears to have sent a reply:

Thank you for the History Lesson. As you have noted, Humans of all races have skeletons in their closets, some bigger and some smaller. As you are well aware, there was a great destruction of the Human kind about 12,000 years ago caused by the Big flood. The Jewish Bible tells us that God caused the Flood to happen

⁵ Initial Writer's first email was 1371 words, 6533 characters. Initial Writer's second email was 2276 words, 10,867 characters, 66 per cent longer.

to cleanse the earth of Human corruption. As you are also aware, the Human race may be headed that way again with Global Warming.

Just to bring you back to reality, the discussion is about today and how Canada was developed by the white folks of French and British background. People of all races have come to this land and are able to live together in peace and harmony, because of the system that those folks developed.

The Reason why we are all here is because Canada is Number 1. Happy Canada Day to everyone.

Within nineteen minutes of the Respondent's second email, Mayor Jeffrey responded (including all recipients of the previous emails) as follows:

Unfortunately, my office was recently included on an email exchange between Councillor Sprovieri and a resident on corporate email.

I believe the original intent of the correspondence was to complain about hiring practices at the City of Brampton but it has become clear that the correspondence has now deteriorated into a disrespectful, crude and insensitive tirade about ethnicity.

As a City, and as a country that is struggling to find the right language and respect for indigenous people and their role in our past, I find it disheartening to hear such insensitive language being used by a member of my Council. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident. I urge my colleague to seek some diversity training in order to better understand the role of multiculturalism in building our national fabric.

The Respondent then replied:

Mayor Jeffrey,

From my understanding the native people want their land back. Any suggestions on how that may happen?

John.

When the Respondent's emails came to the attention of CityNews, he participated in a televised interview and made the following statements:

Was it a poor choice of words? I don't believe so. Maybe it doesn't sound good but, really, I don't see how it's incorrect. It may be improper, possibly, but it's not incorrect.

and

I'm not insensitive to people. I think I am very sensitive to my constituents, especially, 60 per cent of my constituents are South Asian and probably, only, I'd say maybe 20 per cent are actually white people.

After links to news reports of the Respondent's emails started appearing on social media, the Respondent, from his @JohnSprovieri account, issued two series of identical Tweets in reply:⁶

The Values found in the Canadian Charter of Rights & freedoms passed by the English and French [White] Canadian M.P.'s in 1982.

and

Don't be like the crowd that said "Crucify Him" without knowing all the facts.

Subsequently the Respondent apologized. His statement is attached as Appendix 4. The text was as follows:

To the City of Brampton, my colleagues and my fellow Canadians,

I wish to discuss my recent comments regarding values as reported in the media. I have, with the wisdom that comes with hindsight and somber reflection, realized that I owe an apology for a confusing e-mail exchange with a constituent.

In my haste to defend my friends, colleagues, city employees, and those hired to bring their expertise and skills to the City of Brampton to help a bigger and better city for the future of all our residents, I choose my words poorly, and my comments did not reflect my intended meaning when I wrote that email. My intention was to make a point about Democratic values and Freedoms, but in so doing, I committed the very same error that I was rallying against. In categorizing people on the basis of Color, and in giving recognition to only one Color, it was improper.

I want to make myself very clear on this point: when I referred to "White Values", I was referring to "Canadian Values" and was applauding Canada's commitment to build a nation of equity, peace, democracy and prosperity. I was addressing how fortunate we all are to live in a country that has adopted great values such as multiculturalism, diversity, freedom of Religion and freedom of speech. Being Canadian is a source of great pride for me. In expressing that pride, it was not my intention to marginalize or ignore the contributions of people of all origins. My intention to highlight Canadian values of Inclusiveness, Democracy, and Freedom was lost as result.

In my haste to defend those under attack, I failed to include all those people for whom I have great respect, appreciation and admiration. In my zeal, I let my passion cloud my judgment and colour my words.

I understand that Canadian Values, Morals and Ideals, are not based on color, and I recognize it was unfair to phrase my comments in that manner. This oversight was not a deliberate slight. I reacted too quickly, and failed to appreciate how my words would be interpreted outside of the context in which they were written.

Obviously, freedom, equity and the desire to live in peace and harmony for the prosperity of all, are not "White Values" *per se*. Obviously, it wasn't "Only White People" that built this great nation, nor was it "Only White People" that have fought to defend it. I realize that my words did not pay homage to all of the

⁶ That is, the Respondent did not initiate the Twitter conversations on this subject. He only Tweeted replies.

people, of all origins, that have served our country, at home and abroad, or the people of all origins who continue to safe guard our most important ideals. To all of those people, I am forever indebted for my freedoms and my liberties.

I regret that I lost sight of my position as a public servant, of my duty to speak on behalf of my constituents. It behooves me to do better; to remember the privileges and responsibilities afforded me as a member of Council. It is my duty to reflect the values of the whole city, and in fact this whole nation. It was my duty to ensure my words acknowledged all people who helped build this great nation. In highlighting only certain contributions, as specific as it was to a particular line of communication, I neglected that duty.

And I apologize for that.

I want to thank all of the people who reached out with messages of support and understanding for the underlying message I was trying to convey. While my original comments were limited in their scope, I will forever appreciate the country that welcomed my family in 1956 and I was overwhelmed by the number of people who share in that sense of gratitude.

I hope that in issuing this apology, we can all move forward, and work together for to the betterment of all citizens, to build a free, peaceful, democratic, and prosperous city.

Sincerely yours,

John Sprovieri

The Respondent shared with me numerous emails that he received from other individuals. In summary these emails express support for the Respondent and/or opposition to the Respondent's critics. While I took all these emails into account I do not find them particularly relevant to the issues I must decide under the Code.

The Respondent formally responded to the Complaint through his legal counsel, Mr. Wesley Jackson. The legal submissions declined to address the substance of the complaint, stating that:

For the reasons that follow, the Councillor will not be commenting extensively on the complaint.

The subject matter of the complaint is intrinsically tied to issues of race, ethnicity, multiculturalism, representative democracy, and the systemic barriers to participation in the democratic process. It is simply not possible to address these issues fully, completely and respectfully in the context of this matter. After all, that is what essentially lead to the within complaint in the first place.

Counsel's submissions drew attention to the Respondent's voluntary, public apology and suggested that the apology was sufficient to resolve the issues in the investigation. According to Mr. Jackson:

Councillor Sprovieri has recognized the deficiencies in his email exchanged, has accepted responsibility for it, and will be issuing his apology to Council and the public.

It is submitted that ... the apology of Councillor Sprovieri, made voluntarily, is sufficient to resolve the within Integrity Commissioner investigation.

As I have previously noted, the Complainant did not consider the apology to be sufficient to resolve the matter.

A) Did the Respondent contravene Principle (b)?

No.

For the reasons detailed under sub-heading (F), below, I find that a statement of principle cannot be contravened and a statement of principle cannot give rise to a Complaint under the Code. As Principle (b) is only a statement of principle, I cannot find a contravention of it.

(B) Did the Respondent contravene Principle (c)?

No.

For the reasons detailed under sub-heading (F), below, I find that a statement of principle cannot be contravened and a statement of principle cannot give rise to a Complaint under the Code. As Principle (c) is only a statement of principle, I cannot find a contravention of it.

(C) Did the Respondent contravene Rule No. 1(e)?

I find that the issues raised by Rule No. 1(e) are best considered, below, in the context of Rule No. 15.

Rule No. 1(e) states as follows:

Members of Council shall seek to serve the public interest by upholding both the letter and the spirit of the laws and policies established by the Federal Parliament, Ontario Legislature, and the City Council.

The *Human Rights Code* (Ontario) is a provincial statute and therefore constitutes a law “established by the ... Ontario Legislature” within the meaning of Rule No. 1(e).

I asked the parties to address whether an Integrity Commissioner has jurisdiction to deal with alleged breaches of the *Human Rights Code*. (The alternative would be for a complainant to take a case to the Ontario Human Rights Commission.) That issue was settled, at least for purposes of this proceeding, by the Respondent’s acknowledgement, through legal counsel, that an Integrity Commissioner can apply the *Human Rights Code*. Mr. Jackson wrote:

The precedent for an Integrity Commissioner addressing a complaint in the nature of a Human Rights Complaint concerns former Toronto Mayor, the late

Rob Ford.⁷ ... With similar language to the Brampton Code of Conduct, it appears to be accepted that an Integrity Commissioner can read into the Code of Conduct an expectation that councilors will abide by the spirit and intent of our Human Rights legislation as a matter of Conduct.

The Councillor takes no exception to that interpretation in this file.

While the analysis is simplified by the Respondent's concession that an Integrity Commissioner may apply the *Human Rights Code*, there remains the issue of whether the *Human Rights Code* applies to the facts of this case.

The *Human Rights Code* applies to services, goods, facilities, accommodation, contracts, employment, and membership in various organizations. To assess whether the Respondent's emails and televised statements contravened the *Human Rights Code*, I would need to determine whether the sending of emails and making of the televised statements were subject to the *Human Rights Code*.

Two recipients of the emails were employees of the City. This means that the Respondent's emails might have been subject to the *Human Rights Code* prohibitions against employment discrimination and workplace harassment.

Nonetheless, it seems clearer and more straightforward to analyze the Respondent's comments under Rule No. 15. I do so in subsection (E), below.

(D) Did the Respondent contravene Rule No. 13?

No.

Rule No. 13 states that, "Members shall encourage public respect for the City and its by-laws."

The Commentary to this rule explains that, "A Councillor must not denigrate a City by-law in responding to a citizen, as this undermines confidence in the City and the rule of law."

In my view, Rule 13 applies to respect or disrespect for the City or a City by-law that is exhibited or encouraged by a Council Member.

While the Commentary is only an example, and does not limit the breadth of Rule 13, it does indicate that the rule contemplates specific conduct by a Councillor that relates to respect or disrespect.

The mere fact that conduct by a Councillor might tend to embarrass the City, does not, absent an intention by the Councillor to promote disrespect, contravene Rule 13.

⁷ Mr. Wesley then referenced and provided a copy of a City of Toronto precedent: *Integrity Commissioner Report Regarding Conduct of Then-Mayor Rob Ford* (March 25, 2015), Integrity Commissioner Valerie Jepson

(E) Did the Respondent contravene Rule No. 15?

Yes.

According to Rule No. 15, “Members shall conduct themselves with appropriate decorum at all times.”

The Commentary adds that, “As leaders in the community, members are held to a higher standard of behaviour and conduct, and accordingly their behaviour should be exemplary.”

This rule is not limited to decorum during Council and Committee meetings. (Rule No. 8 addresses meeting conduct.) The rule applies, “at all times.”

I find that “at all times” includes the sending of emails and the making of televised statements. The Respondent was therefore required to ensure that his emails and televised statements complied with Rule No. 15.

Oxford defines “decorum” as “Behaviour in keeping with good taste and propriety.” Merriam-Webster defines it as, “Propriety and good taste in conduct or appearance.”

I find that the Respondent’s comments about “white people” – in particular the comments that credit “white people” for values and for developing a system in which people can leave peacefully – are not proper or in good taste, and therefore fail to reflect the decorum required by Rule No. 15.

I rely in part on the Respondent’s own apology statement, where he acknowledged the following:

... I choose my words poorly, and my comments did not reflect my intended meaning when I wrote that email. My intention was to make a point about Democratic values and Freedoms, but in so doing, I committed the very same error that I was rallying against. In categorizing people on the basis of Color, and in giving recognition to only one Color, it was improper.

...

I understand that Canadian Values, Morals and Ideals, are not based on color, and I recognize it was unfair to phrase my comments in that manner. ...

...

I regret that I lost sight of my position as a public servant, of my duty to speak on behalf of my constituents. It behooves me to do better; to remember the privileges and responsibilities afforded me as a member of Council. It is my duty to reflect the values of the whole city, and in fact this whole nation. It was my duty to ensure my words acknowledged all people who helped build this great nation. In highlighting only certain contributions, as specific as it was to a particular line of communication, I neglected that duty.

In the above passages, the Respondent effectively concedes a failure to keep his comments proper and in good taste – in other words, a failure to comply with Rule No. 15.

In light of what the Respondent has acknowledged, there is no need for me to analyze Rule No. 15 any further.

(F) Is the “Key Principles” section of the Code capable of being breached?

No.

Early on in the proceeding I told each party, in writing, that an issue under consideration was whether an alleged contravention of the “Key Principles” section of the Code can give rise to an Integrity Commissioner complaint. I expressly invited their submissions on this point and I have taken their representations into consideration.

In other municipalities I have had to consider whether the “principles” section of a code of conduct can be the subject of a complaint: see Township of Scugog Investigation Report 2017-01, Town of Orangeville Investigation Report 2017-01 and Regional Municipality of Durham Investigation Report 2017-01.

In this case, the Complaint was partly based on Principles (b) and (c) of the Code. These appear in the “Key Principles” section. As the name indicates, this section does not contain rules. It states principles.

As a general matter, a statement of principle does not create an obligation. It merely states the principle(s) that may be used to interpret obligations created elsewhere in the law.⁸

The Council Code of Conduct was enacted by by-law.⁹ Principles of statutory interpretation apply. As explained in *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 6th ed.:

Purpose statements may reveal the purpose of legislation either by describing the goals to be achieved or by setting out the governing principles, norms or policies. ... However, like definitions and application provisions, purpose statements do not apply directly to facts but rather give direction on how the substantive provisions of the legislation – that do apply to facts – are to be interpreted.¹⁰ [emphasis added]

I find that the “Key Principles” section provides interpretive direction only, and it does not create rules or obligations on Council Members that can be the subject of a Complaint. Thus, even though the section declares, “The key principles that underline

⁸ *Greater Vancouver Regional District v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 309 BCAC 124, 2011 BCCA 345 (CanLII), at para. 45: “Section 3(c) purports only to state a principle ... It is plain and obvious that s. 3(c) creates no legally enforceable obligation ...”

⁹ By-law 14-2016 confirms the proceedings of Council at its January 27, 2016, meeting. These proceedings included approval of the Code.

¹⁰ Sullivan, R., *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 6th ed. (2014), at 454, §14.39.

the rules in this *Code of Conduct* are as follows” these are only statements of principle. Statements of principle are not enforceable rules. Indeed, the language the sentence indicates that the principles and the rules are different.

Another reason that I am not prepared to treat the content of the Principles section as binding rules is that its content is too general and unspecific to be treated as clear, enforceable obligations. Council Members are subject to penalties if they contravene the rules in the Code; it necessarily follows that the rules must be clear, certain and unambiguous. Council Members must be able to understand clearly the conduct that is required. In this respect I refer to the observations of Integrity Commissioner Swayze in Report L05 IN (May 12, 2015):

In my experience members of councils in Ontario are busy people serving their community and want certainty in the interpretation of the many rules that apply to them. A code, by definition, is a set of rules of behaviour and should not be interpreted by each councillor according to subjective values. The rules need to be clear and where possible, capable of only one meaning. [emphasis added]

While I do not agree that being busy is relevant to interpretation of the Code, I accept and adopt Integrity Commissioner Swayze’s comments about the need for clarity, certainty and lack of ambiguity in the rules.

I find that the “Key Principles” section of the Code provides interpretive guidance but is not itself a provision that can be contravened.

Going forward, I will not consider the “Key Principles” section as capable of giving rise to a contravention or forming the basis for a Complaint. This section may, however, be considered in the course of interpreting other sections of the Code.

Recommendation

I do not think this is a case for a suspension of compensation paid to the Respondent.

In my view, this is an appropriate case for a public apology coupled with acceptance by Council of my finding that the Respondent has contravened Rule No. 15 of the Code.

While I believe it would be a good idea for the Respondent to accept the offer of diversity sensitivity training, neither the Code nor the Complaint Protocol permit me to include this request in my recommendations for corrective action.

The Respondent has already issued a complete, voluntary, public apology. Therefore no point would be served by recommending that Council request an apology.

I recommend that Council accept this report and adopt the finding that Councillor Sprovieri contravened Rule No. 15 of the Code.

Concluding Observation

It is worth noting that this incident began when a resident wrote an email that alleged institutional racism, individual racism and a lack of representative diversity among the City's senior management and workforce.

Subsequently the focus shifted to Councillor Sprovieri and the manner in which he expressed his views.

This investigation report addresses only the Councillor's conduct. This report leaves for Council the original issues raised by the resident, including the claim that the City's senior management and workforce do not sufficiently represent the diversity of Brampton.

Respectfully submitted,



Guy Giorno
Integrity Commissioner
City of Brampton

February 9, 2018

APPENDIX 1: RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF COUNCIL CODE OF CONDUCT

Key Principles:

The key principles that underline the rules in this *Code of Conduct* are as follows:

- a) Members of Council shall serve and be seen to serve their constituents in a conscientious and diligent manner.

Commentary

This underscores that Members' carry out their official City activities in a way that will foster and enhance respect for government and above all, demonstrate respect for members of the public.

- b) Members of Council should be committed to performing their functions with integrity and transparency.

Commentary

As public officials, Members of Council recognize the public's right to reasonable access to information in relation to how decisions are made. This right of access includes the right of the public to receive complete and understandable information which must be balanced against the requirement to protect the legitimate interests of the City and the respect for approved policies of the City.

- c) Members of Council shall perform official duties and arrange their public affairs in a manner that promotes public confidence and respect and will bear close public scrutiny.

Rule No. 1 General

...

- e) Members of Council shall seek to serve the public interest by upholding both the letter and the spirit of the laws and policies established by the Federal Parliament, Ontario Legislature, and the City Council.

Commentary

A number of the provisions of this Code incorporate policies, procedures and provisions adopted by Council and contained in various statutes. The provisions of this Code are intended to be applied in concert with existing legislation and go beyond the minimum standards of behaviour.

...

Rule No. 13
Encouragement of Respect for the City and Its By-Laws

1. Members shall encourage public respect for the City and its by-laws.

Commentary

A Councillor must not denigrate a City by-law in responding to a citizen, as this undermines confidence in the City and the rule of law.

...

Rule No. 15
Discreditable Conduct

1. Members shall conduct themselves with appropriate decorum at all times.

Commentary

As leaders in the community, members are held to a higher standard of behaviour and conduct, and accordingly their behaviour should be exemplary.

APPENDIX 2: EMAILS

The *Municipal Act*¹¹ provides that I may disclose in this report such matters as in my opinion are necessary for purposes of the report.

In my view it is essential to consider the Respondent's emails in the context of the full exchange of which they form part. It is necessary to consider both the audience to which the Respondent's emails were sent and the originating emails to which the Respondent was replying.

The emails to which the Respondent replied were strongly worded, but they provide important and necessary context. The originating email, from a resident, forcefully argued that the City of Brampton senior management and workforce are not sufficiently diverse and not sufficiently representative of the City's population. The resident alleged racism, both institutional and individual.

I make no findings concerning the resident's claims, because they fall outside my jurisdiction. My jurisdiction is limited to the conduct of Council Members under the Code. It does not extend to members of the public. In reproducing the resident's communication (as necessary context) I make no comment on its content.

I have, however, chosen to edit out portions of the resident's communication that are not necessary to understanding the context. Specifically:

- I have deleted information that could identify the resident (Initial Writer) who started the email chain.
- I have deleted individuals' names.
- The original email started with a criticism of the City's decision to contract with an individual (Individual Two) to provide a particular service. It criticized the individual's track record and experience. The contract with this individual was then used as an example to support more general allegations that the City's leadership and workforce are insufficiently representative and insufficiently diverse, which the email author attributed to racism. I have removed portions of the first part of the email that could identify the individual contractor whose engagement was being criticized. The contractor is not a party to this proceeding and has had no chance to respond to the allegations. The specific allegations are not essential to this report.
- For consistency I have reformatted all emails so that they appear in the same font, but I have left intact any bolding, upper case lettering, colouring and other means of emphasis.

¹¹ Subsection 223.6(2).

On the other hand, except to remove mentions of specific individuals¹² I have reproduced entirely the resident's comments about the alleged lack of diversity, lack of representativeness and racism in the City's employment practices. These comments are strongly worded and address directly the perceived "whiteness" of the City's senior management and workforce. I did not remove those comments for the following reasons:

First, I believe they provide essential context for the Respondent's written replies and thus are necessary to this report.

Second, I have no jurisdiction over the conduct of members of the public. Editing the resident's words might wrongly imply that my role is to evaluate those words.

Third, I am in no position to dictate the manner in which an allegation of racism should be explained. The individual making the case is entitled to choose the appropriate method to express the truth as he or she sees it.

Fourth, I hesitate to edit an allegation of racism in order to soften its impact on the audience. Rewording the position of another can be associated with misappropriation of voice and/or silencing of viewpoints.

All emails in this chain were exchanged among the following individuals:

- The resident who wrote the first email, referred to as Initial Writer
- Councillor Sprovieri, the Respondent
- Mayor Jeffrey
- Councillors Bowman, Dhillon, Fortini and Medeiros
- The Mayor's Chief of Staff
- Another City employee
- Federal MP Ruby Sahota
- The Chief Commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the Commission's general email address
- Two news reporters (mid-way through the exchange the Initial Writer added a third news reporter)
- A representative of the Brampton Board of Trade
- A representative of B'nai Brith
- Seven other citizens

The email that started the exchange was sent by the Initial Writer:

Subject: Why are WHITE PEOPLE still planning Brampton's future? ...
Importance: High

It seems the INMATES still running the asylum at Brampton's City Hall.

I am appalled to read, in today's Toronto Star's GTA Section ... Monday, June 26, 2017 ... an article on the front page of the GTA Section, written by Fatima

¹² I also deleted the use of a derogatory term used to describe an Anglo-Saxon ethnic group.

Syed, that [INDIVIDUAL ONE] ... The City's [position deleted], has 'HIRED' an old, white man ... named [Individual Two] ... with white hair, much like [Individual One], himself, to be an ADVISOR to the City's [location deleted] to help Brampton [description of project deleted].

Also, in this same article in the GTA Section in today's Toronto Star ... Monday, June 26, 2017 ... there is mention of another "white man" ... [Individual Three] ... Brampton's new head of [deleted], & the former [title deleted] for the [name of municipality deleted].

How long was [Individual Three] with [name of municipality]? Or did he also come from the [a third municipality] to land a job with [name of municipality], or knew [Individual One] during [Individual One]'s previous incarnations, such as his stint in [third municipality], & now [Individual Three] is also feeding at Brampton's Public Trough, brought in by [Individual One]?

As per today's Toronto Star article, [Individual Three] will be the local Brampton partner for [INDIVIDUAL TWO], because [Individual Two] is based in [other place], and [Individual Two] & his 'team' will be embarking on six or so trips to Brampton, FOUR DAYS EACH, to engage [details that would identify project deleted].

How much can be, possibly, "achieved" in a mere SIX TRIPS or so, to Brampton, given that Brampton's population has been cited, in today's Toronto Star article as being 600,000 at the present time ... that means, that if we do the simple "math", [Individual Two] &/or his "team" will be "conferring" with some 100,000 people on each of his six or so "trips" of 4 days duration each ... which makes it 25,000 people per day, during each of the FOUR days of each of the six or so "trips" to Brampton ... and, giving the benefit of the doubt to [Individual Two]'s "team", that they will be working "an 8-hour" day, less one hour for lunch ... that's a maximum of 7 hours of work ... makes it 3571.43 people per hour, per day, during each of the 4 days per "trip" ... and, going further in doing the "math", it means that [Individual Two]'s TEAM will be conferring with 59.52 people PER MINUTE ... that's almost ONE Brampton citizen per second.

WOW.

(I have an undergraduate B.Sc. degree in Theoretical Math ... but it's been some [deleted] years since I graduated from undergrad university ... so, I haven't really used "math" in its purest form since then ... I hope the "math" I've done above, is accurate ... and I hope that the readers of this e-mail will forgive me if I've made any mistakes in the above calculations).

Frankly, based on my life's experience in Business ... now that I am [age deleted], I DON'T think that [Individual Two], himself, will be coming out here to Brampton to actually do the "grunge" work of conferring with the grass-roots level of citizens in Brampton ... I think he will be getting his "team" to do most of this "conferring" work during those six or so "trips" to Brampton ... but I'm quite certain that [Individual Two], himself, WILL BE HERE in Brampton, to "present" his "Report of Findings & Recommendations" at the end of the period of the six or so "trips" to Brampton, when he will [possibly defamatory content, not relevant to this report, deleted].

And, I think it would be interesting to find out “who” is on [Individual Two]’s so-called ‘TEAM’. [potentially defamatory content, not relevant to this report, deleted]

This [Individual Two], as mentioned in this Toronto Star article in the GTA Section, has, [description of Individual Two’s experience deleted]. Now, [Individual Two]’s ‘NEXT STOP IS BRAMPTON’.

Or, as I would prefer to put it: **[Individual Two]’s “NEXT STOP IS THIS SUCKER TOWN OF BRAMPTON”**.

First – [Individual Two] sounds like just another [deleted], much like [Individual One] & [Individual Four], who will, most probably, sweep through Brampton, [potentially defamatory content deleted], leaving behind who-knows-what, here in Brampton.

Second – [Individual Writer’s questioning of Individual Two’s track record deleted; not relevant to this report]

It is also mentioned in that same Toronto Star article in the GTA Section, today ... Monday, June 26, 2017 ... **“THAT BRAMPTON HAS ONE OF THE LARGEST SOUTH ASIAN COMMUNITIES IN THE WORLD, OUTSIDE OF SOUTH ASIA, BUT THIS DIVERSITY IS, STRANGELY, NOT VISIBLY EVIDENT”**.

This is simply because “Racist & White Supremacist” practices continue at City Hall in Brampton, & as the years go by, and the “white population” of Brampton is AGEING & shrinking rapidly, & the “non-white” population of Brampton is growing by leaps & bounds, making 2/3 of Brampton’s population ... that is 67% of Brampton’s population ... NON-WHITE, Brampton is looking more & more like a microcosm of an Apartheid nation where a minority WHITE POPULATION RULES THE MAJORITY NON-WHITE POPULATION.

The population statistics showing that Brampton is now 2/3 ... 67% ... non-white, were made public during the 2014 Municipal Election campaign ... and that was THREE YEARS AGO ... it’s now 2017, & with the rapid growth of Brampton’s population, every year, the non-white population in Brampton is now, probably, even more than 67% non-white.

The FUTURE OF BRAMPTON, in reality, is NON-WHITE ... So, why are, seemingly, white people, especially old white men, with “white hair”, such as [Individual One], & [Individual Two] (and neither of them is originally from Brampton, or has ever lived in Brampton for long), planning Brampton’s FUTURE?

And [Individual One] is, clearly, continuing the long-time practices of RACISM & WHITE SUPREMACY, at City Hall in Brampton. Just his reluctance to fire, with cause, those TWO racist, Anti-Semitic, dishonest white [national/ethnic origin] immigrant women in the [department] in Brampton, who don’t speak or understand much English, & speak a [national/ethnic origin]-version of English with a heavy [national/ethnic origin] accent, even after I spent a great deal of my time, over the phone, in Jan. 2017, to tell [Individual One] about the deceit & racism of those two [national/ethnic origin] employees at City, is a glaring example of [Individual One]’s socio-political values that are ugly & unacceptable in today’s diverse Canada, but, evidently, tolerated, &, perhaps, even encouraged, here in Brampton.

In other words, based on [Individual One]’s “practices” at City Hall in Brampton, dishonest, racist, white [national/ethnic origin] immigrants who are less than competent due to their lack of speaking or understanding English well, are worthy of being kept on the City’s Payroll, when there isn’t much of a white [national/ethnic origin] immigrant or Canadian-born [national/ethnic origin] community in Brampton to justify their employment. And, worse, the Commissioner of [deleted] in Brampton is a white man named [Individual Five] ... another white person of seemingly-[national/ethnic origin] background. How did so many “white [national/ethnic origin]” &/or white [place of origin] people get hired in one & the same small [department] at City, when the majority population of Brampton is NON-WHITE? And there are ALMOST NO or, at best, only a few, non-whites in top management positions at City Hall in Brampton.

And, we, as Taxpayers of Brampton, should be asking **HOW MUCH IS [INDIVIDUAL ONE] PAYING THIS WHITE FELLOW ... [INDIVIDUAL TWO], FROM THE PUBLIC PURSE OF THE CITY OF BRAMPTON?**

BLESSINGS ... [Initial Writer].

The Respondent was the only recipient to reply to the original email.

His first reply was as follows:

Subject: RE: Why are WHITE PEOPLE still planning Brampton’s future? ...

Hi [Initial Writer],

To be fair, people of all races, colour and creeds are eager to come to Brampton and Canada because the white people of this nation have developed a great system where everyone is welcome and can live peacefully together. I hope that the new comers will learn the values of the white people so that Brampton and Canada will continue to be a favourite destination for people who want a better and peaceful lifestyle.

Regards, John.

John Sprovieri
Regional Councillor for wards 9 & 10
City of Brampton
(905) 874-2610

The Respondent’s email triggered a lengthy reply from the Initial Writer. At this point the resident added a third news reporter to “cc” line of the email and this reporter was copied on all subsequent emails in the exchange.

Subject: My reply to John Sprovieri’s reply to: Why are WHITE PEOPLE still planning Brampton’s future? ...

Hi, John! I don’t know quite what to say about your reply below to my earlier e-mail, titled: Why are WHITE PEOPLE still planning Brampton’s future?

While your “reply” below claims “to be fair”, & sounds “politically correct” & generic, IT IS, in fact, NOT FAIR.

These are TWO points to be made here in this discussion about “white people”
...

(1) Since the FIRST CRUSADE (& you & I have had those discussions before), about a thousand years ago, the WHITE CAUCASIAN RACE has wreaked havoc all over this planet, without any awareness of the extensive permanent damage they have done in their path, more than all the non-white races put together. This damage, as seen even to this day, cannot be repaired ... be it the damage done to the “indigenous peoples” in the western hemisphere, in Australia, New Zealand, Africa, & beyond. Even Genghis Khan had more humanity & decency toward his subjects & the people he went on to conquer, than the white peoples of European Caucasian racial ancestry, in just the last thousand years.

The “slavery” inflicted upon the African peoples by the white race is, perhaps, the very worst of all documented slavery in human history. Remember the shocking docudrama “Roots”? And that was actually “tame” compared to the “real” brutality of slavery of the African peoples by whites, going back to the Portuguese, who were the first “white” people to bring African slaves to the western hemisphere.

Sure, there was “slavery” in the ancient world, but the horrors of slavery committed by the white race against non-whites are beyond belief.

If you read the “Bible”, especially the Old Testament [potentially identifying information deleted], you will find that there was some semblance of “rules” about how to treat one’s slaves, etc., not that these rules were strictly observed, or that violators were punished ... but, at least, there was some attempt to mitigate the horror & misery of slavery.

When one looks at how the white race in Canada has carried on with impunity, anyone with any sense of fairness, must speak up, as I am doing.

Did you know that one of my favorite Prime Ministers of Canada ... Sir John A. MacDonald ... cornered the Natives in Ontario, & made sure that they would be “starved” & forced to accept the only option given to them which was to “leave” the Southern Ontario regions, which the Natives then did, in huge numbers, & they went farther up north ... some went on to Ontario’s north, or they moved to parts northwest of Ontario, such as northern Manitoba.

Sir John A. did this to make room for the tidal waves of Scots who were being driven out of Scotland by the English, & these Scots needed a place to go. And Canada was that place, & Sir John A. made room for them, here in Canada. After all, Sir John A., himself, was a Scot.

There was a very realistic documentary done by an Iranian-Canadian, aired on TV Ontario, some years ago, which showed white people, mostly Anglo-Scottish types, somewhere in B.C., in the early-1900s, dancing, while singing “Canada for whites only”.

When one looks at the history of the white peoples, especially the British Anglo [deleted] during the Colonial Period, it is beyond comprehension that any race or creed could do the sort of despicable things that the [deleted] did in rich distant societies whose great civilizations were in their “down cycles”. The [deleted] were quick to take advantage of the “down cycles” of those great civilized societies, & to loot those lands as though these [deleted] had some God-given right.

All FIVE of my ancestral homelands, in the Middle East, South Asia, & Malaysia, were unconscionably looted by the British Anglo [deleted], over a 350-year period.

Even the Disney animated movie "Pocahontas" has Pocahontas singing a song to John Smith, in the first quarter of the movie, about how the "white man" thinks that he owns whatever land he puts his foot upon.

Wherever the whites have gone, throughout human history, they have plundered, lied, cheated, stolen, destroyed, burned, enslaved, etc. on an alarming scale, more than any other documented conquest by any non-white peoples.

Remember what the white Spaniards, starting with Cortes in Mexico, and Pizarro in Peru, with the help of the white Spanish Jesuits, did to the Natives in South America that nearly wiped out those indigenous peoples?

Okay ... so, IT WASN'T ALL WHITE PEOPLES who committed these horrors ... I admit that ... but enough of them did more damage on this planet than the world could ever recover from.

Too many white people think that human civilization began with them. This is the ignorant arrogance of whites.

There have been dozens of great civilizations, on this planet, that existed long before the white Caucasian peoples got out of their animal skin clothing, & stopped eating raw meat off the ground. The Chinese, the Persian, the Hindu, the Egyptian, & others, were great civilizations that successively brought all of us to where we are today. Many of these great early civilized peoples had several "cycles" of civilizations, & each of those cycles of civilization had its peaks & valleys.

Historically speaking, the wrongs done by the white race to non-whites, far outweigh any good that white race has ever done.

There is one very chilling historical fact about how the "white race" thinks: It involves the German Nazis in Europe during WWII, & the Japanese during WWII, & the horrific decision the Americans made (under President Harry Truman) that was based strictly on RACE and RELIGION.

The Americans had begun their development of the Atom Bomb in a research project called The Manhattan Project, headed by the brilliant Physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, who was a Jewish American of Germanic European racial ancestry. The Manhattan Project was well underway when WWII began in 1939. And the Americans had achieved a viable Atom Bomb about 6 months before the Germans surrendered in late-April 1945, but the Americans kept that fact a "secret". (The "actual" surrender was signed by Germany on May 7th., 1945). Japan was also at war with the U.S. at that time, but in the Pacific, when the Americans had, secretly, perfected the Atom Bomb.

President Truman sat with his top Generals & other top decision-makers & advisors & discussed the possibility of dropping the Atom Bomb on German as early as December 1944 & January 1945.

BUT ... the Americans in this "discussion" headed by President Truman, were ALL WHITE CAUCASIANS, & CHRISTIAN.

So, they decided NOT TO DROP THE ATOM BOMB ON GERMANY BECAUSE, ACCORDING TO TRUMAN & HIS ADVISORS, THE GERMANS WERE, AFTER ALL, OF THE SAME RACE & RELIGION as these Americans ... the Germans were also WHITE CAUCASIANS & CHRISTIAN.

And, therefore, it was decided NOT to drop the Atom Bomb on Germany.

But what this decision did was it continued the systematic murder of hundreds of thousands more of innocent Jews, & others, in concentration camps in Europe in the last SIX MONTHS before Germany surrendered in late-April 1945.

When it was learned, especially by American Jews, through the countless Jewish American Physicists who had worked on The Manhattan Project (but were sworn to secrecy), that the U.S. did, indeed, have a viable Atom Bomb about SIX months before Germany's surrender, but the American white Caucasian Christian President Truman & his advisors had decided NOT TO DROP THE ATOM BOMB ON GERMANY as early as Dec. 1944 & Jan. 1945, because the Germans were also white Caucasian & Christian, which then caused the continued & unnecessary murder of countless more innocent Jews & others, by Hitler, the American Jewish population was furious.

So, the white Caucasian Christian American President Truman & his Generals & Advisors ordered a highly-publicized test of the Atomic Bomb in July 1945, in New Mexico, as though that was the first time the Americans had a viable Atomic Bomb, in order to dispel any suspicions or rumors that the American Gov't. had such a viable Atom Bomb some 6 months before Germany's surrender in late-April 1945, but had decided not to drop the Atom Bomb on Germany, which then led to the death of hundreds of thousands more of innocent Jews & others, in Nazi concentration & extermination camps in Europe.

Then, came the big decision regarding the Japanese in WWII in the Pacific that continued well after Germany's official surrender in early-May 1945.

Again, President Truman & his Generals & Advisors, etc., had "discussions" about how to bring the War in the Pacific with the Japanese to a swift end.

As early as 1943, Japan was being considered as the target of the atomic bomb as it was being perfected in the Manhattan Project, but the Americans had not had the opportunity to do anything about this as long as the Americans were caught up in the War in Europe to fight Hitler.

But after Germany's surrender, in late-April 1945, the Americans decided to DROP THE ATOM BOMB ON JAPAN MOSTLY BECAUSE THE JAPANESE WERE NEITHER WHITE-CAUCASIAN, NOR CHRISTIAN.

That was it.

And in August 1945, the Americans dropped the Atom Bomb on Hiroshima, & Nagasaki, & brought the Japanese to an unconditional surrender.

So, when one looks at the unconscionable actions of white Caucasians, & especially of Christian white Caucasians, over the course of human history, anyone with an iota of fairness can clearly see that the white race has incurred the eternal wrath of almost all non-whites in the world.

(2) By the year 2060, THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF THE WHITE RACE WILL BE LESS THAN 10% OF THE TOTAL HUMAN POPULATION ON THIS PLANET.

Last year, in 2016, the UN, & other reputable agencies around the world that keep statistics on human population growth, projected that the white race will be less than 10% of the total human population on this planet, by the year 2060, which is 44 years from 2016.

In recent years, a “generation” is taken to be 22 years, whereas in earlier centuries a “generation” was about 20 years.

The increase in education & more distractions in today’s modern lifestyles, in industrialized nations, has caused the urge to reproduce for adult humans to no longer be a priority.

The UN & other reputable agencies that keep track of human population growths, have projected that the population of the white Caucasian race will be between 9.72% and 9.86% of the total human population on this planet, by the year 2060.

BUT ... THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE WHITE CAUCASIAN RACE WILL BE MASSACRED BY NON-WHITES TO BRING DOWN THE POPULATION NUMBERS OF THE WHITE RACE TO UNDER 10%.

What is projected to bring the population of the white race down to less than 10% of the total human population in the world, is that the white race will actually remain the same in numbers as it is today ... it is now at between 13% and 15% of the total human population in the world ... BUT the other races ... the NON-WHITE RACES WILL BE REPRODUCING AT AN ALARMING RATE until their total population will reach about 90.1% of the total human population on this planet. And the total human population on this planet ... both white & non-white populations together ... will be near-10 Billion by the year 2060.

And here’s the kicker ... the fastest growing race will be THE BLACK AFRICAN RACE, all over the world, to bring it up to between 32% and 33% of the total human population on this planet. That is ... the BLACK AFRICAN RACE is projected to be nearly 1/3 of the total human population of this world, by the year 2060.

I believe that the Lord always “levels the playing field” ... and I believe that the Lord will increase the population numbers of the Black African Race to make up for the millions upon millions of African Blacks that have been murdered by other races, especially by whites, & by the poverty, famine, starvation, & disease ravaging the African continent for centuries.

So, no one is out to annihilate the white race, no matter how racially paranoid too many “whites” are becoming about their “white race” being sought after for annihilation or assimilation by non-whites (e.g. The 21-year old racially-paranoid, White Supremacist who shot & mass murdered 9 innocent Black African Americans at a Bible Study class in a Historic Black Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in the U.S. in June 2015).

Actually, it seems that the whites are going to be left alone to their own devices, while the non-white populations around the world are going to go on & multiply their population numbers at an alarming rate.

And if this racial population projection by the UN & other reliable statistical agencies spooks white people, I have a good suggestion for whites:

GO LIVE ON AN ICE FLOAT WAY UP NORTH NEAR THE ARCTIC CIRCLE where you can live your "white" lifestyle without being surrounded by non-whites ... I'm sure the Natives up there will be very happy to see you white folks come up there.

And you whites probably won't like the Natives being around you up there near the Arctic circle because the Natives aren't white ... the Natives might even push your ice float out to sea where you can be assured not to have any non-whites around you ... and you'll just have to hope and pray that the Polar Bears up there don't eat you & your young.

BLESSINGS ... [Initial Writer].

Once again, the Respondent was the only recipient to send an email in reply. He wrote as follows:

Subject: RE: My reply to John Sprovieri's reply to: Why are WHITE PEOPLE still planning Brampton's future? ...

Hi [Initial Writer],

Thank you for the History Lesson. As you have noted, Humans of all races have skeletons in their closets, some bigger and some smaller. As you are well aware, there was a great destruction of the Human kind about 12,000 years ago caused by the Big flood. The Jewish Bible tells us that God caused the Flood to happen to cleanse the earth of Human corruption. As you are also aware, the Human race may be headed that way again with Global Warming.

Just to bring you back to reality, the discussion is about today and how Canada was developed by the white folks of French and British background. People of all races have come to this land and are able to live together in peace and harmony, because of the system that those folks developed.

The Reason why we are all here is because Canada is Number 1. Happy Canada Day to everyone.

Regards, John.

John Sprovieri
Regional Councillor for wards 9 & 10
City of Brampton
(905) 874-2610

Nineteen minutes later, Mayor Jeffrey emailed the group:

Subject: RE: My reply to John Sprovieri's reply to: Why are WHITE PEOPLE still planning Brampton's future? ...

Unfortunately, my office was recently included on an email exchange between Councillor Sprovieri and a resident on corporate email.

I believe the original intent of the correspondence was to complain about hiring practices at the City of Brampton but it has become clear that the

correspondence has now deteriorated into a disrespectful, crude and insensitive tirade about ethnicity.

As a City, and as a country that is struggling to find the right language and respect for indigenous people and their role in our past, I find it disheartening to hear such insensitive language being used by a member of my Council. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident. I urge my colleague to seek some diversity training in order to better understand the role of multiculturalism in building our national fabric.

Regards,

Linda Jeffrey

Mayor | City of Brampton

2 Wellington Street West | Brampton, Ontario | L6Y 4R2

T 905.874.2600

The Respondent emailed the group in reply, as follows:

Mayor Jeffrey,

From my understanding the native people want their land back. Any suggestions on how that may happen?

John.

APPENDIX 3: TV NEWS INTERVIEW

The Respondent made the following two comments (appearing at different points in the news story) in a CityNews story that was broadcast July 5, 2017:

“Was it a poor choice of words? I don’t believe so. Maybe it doesn’t sound good but, really, I don’t see how it’s incorrect. It may be improper, possibly, but it’s not incorrect.”

and

“I’m not insensitive to people. I think I am very sensitive to my constituents, especially, 60 per cent of my constituents are South Asian and probably, only, I’d say maybe 20 per cent are actually white people.”

APPENDIX 4: RESPONDENT'S APOLOGY



John Sprouieri
Regional Councillor
Wards 9 & 10



To the City of Brampton, my colleagues and my fellow Canadians,

I wish to discuss my recent comments regarding values as reported in the media. I have, with the wisdom that comes with hindsight and somber reflection, realized that I owe an apology for a confusing e-mail exchange with a constituent.

In my haste to defend my friends, colleagues, city employees, and those hired to bring their expertise and skills to the City of Brampton to help a bigger and better city for the future of all our residents, I choose my words poorly, and my comments did not reflect my intended meaning when I wrote that email. My intention was to make a point about Democratic values and Freedoms, but in so doing, I committed the very same error that I was rallying against. In categorizing people on the basis of Color, and in giving recognition to only one Color, it was improper.

I want to make myself very clear on this point: when I referred to "White Values", I was referring to "Canadian Values" and was applauding Canada's commitment to build a nation of equity, peace, democracy and prosperity. I was addressing how fortunate we all are to live in a country that has adopted great values such as multiculturalism, diversity, freedom of Religion and freedom of speech. Being Canadian is a source of great pride for me. In expressing that pride, it was not my intention to marginalize or ignore the contributions of people of all origins. My intention to highlight Canadian values of Inclusiveness, Democracy, and Freedom was lost as result.

In my haste to defend those under attack, I failed to include all those people for whom I have great respect, appreciation and admiration. In my zeal, I let my passion cloud my judgment and colour my words. I understand that Canadian Values, Morals and Ideals, are not based on color, and I recognize it was unfair to phrase my comments in that manner. This oversight was not a deliberate slight. I reacted too quickly, and failed to appreciate how my words would be interpreted outside of the context in which they were written.

Obviously, freedom, equity and the desire to live in peace and harmony for the prosperity of all, are not "White Values" *per se*. Obviously, it wasn't "Only White People" that built this great nation, nor was it "Only White People" that have fought to defend it. I realize that my words did not pay homage to all of the people, of all origins, that have served our country, at home and abroad, or the people of all origins who continue to safe guard our most important ideals. To all of those people, I am forever indebted for my freedoms and my liberties.

I regret that I lost sight of my position as a public servant, of my duty to speak on behalf of my constituents. It behooves me to do better; to remember the privileges and responsibilities afforded me as a member of Council. It is my duty to reflect the values of the whole city, and in fact this whole nation. It was my duty to ensure my words acknowledged all people who helped build this great nation. In highlighting only certain contributions, as specific as it was to a particular line of communication, I neglected that duty.

And I apologize for that.

Brampton City Hall, 2 Wellington Street West, Brampton, ON L6Y 4R2



John Sprovieri
Regional Councillor
Wards 9 & 10



I want to thank all of the people who reached out with messages of support and understanding for the underlying message I was trying to convey. While my original comments were limited in their scope, I will forever appreciate the country that welcomed my family in 1956 and I was overwhelmed by the number of people who share in that sense of gratitude.

I hope that in issuing this apology, we can all move forward, and work together for to the betterment of all citizens, to build a free, peaceful, democratic, and prosperous city.

Sincerely yours,

John Sprovieri

Brampton City Hall, 2 Wellington Street West, Brampton, ON L6Y 4R2