



**Office of the Conflict
of Interest and Ethics
Commissioner**

**Commissariat aux
conflits d'intérêts et à
l'éthique**

The Philpott Report

made under the
CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT



December 21, 2016

**Mary Dawson
Conflict of Interest and
Ethics Commissioner**

The Philpott Report

made under the
CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

For additional copies of this publication, please contact:

Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner
Parliament of Canada
66 Slater Street, 22nd Floor
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Telephone: (613) 995-0721
Fax: (613) 995-7308
Email: ciec-ccie@parl.gc.ca

Ce document est également publié en français.

This publication is also available online at the following address:
<http://ciec-ccie.parl.gc.ca>

© Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, Parliament of Canada, 2016
122016-60E



PREFACE

The *Conflict of Interest Act*, S.C. 2006, c. 9, s. 2 (Act) came into force on July 9, 2007.

An examination under the Act may be initiated at the request of a member of the Senate or House of Commons pursuant to section 44 of the Act or on the initiative of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner (Commissioner) pursuant to section 45.

This examination was initiated under section 44 of the Act. Subsection 44(7) requires that the Commissioner provide a report to the Prime Minister setting out the facts in question as well as the Commissioner's analysis and conclusions in relation to the examination. Subsection 44(8) requires that, at the same time as a report is provided to the Prime Minister, a copy of the report shall also be provided to the Member who made the request and the current or former public office holder who is the subject of the report, and that it be made available to the public.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
REQUEST	3
PROCESS	5
FINDINGS OF FACT	7
Background.....	7
Mr. Reza Shirani.....	7
Dr. Philpott’s continued use of Mr. Shirani’s driving service following her appointment as Minister of Health	8
The “limousine”	8
The issue of rates	9
Negotiating the rates	9
DR. PHILPOTT’S POSITION.....	13
ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	15
Analysis	15
Conclusion	17
SCHEDULE: LIST OF WITNESSES	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of my examination under the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act) into the conduct of the Honourable Jane Philpott, P.C., M.P., Minister of Health, in connection with her use of driving services offered by a political supporter.

I received a request to examine Dr. Philpott's use of driving services offered by Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc., a company owned by Mr. Reza Shirani. It was alleged that Mr. Shirani was an active volunteer and supporter of the Minister's partisan activities. The media had also reported that the rates billed to Dr. Philpott were much higher than the rates charged by other driving services.

I examined the matter under section 7 and subsection 6(1) of the Act.

Section 7 prohibits public office holders, in the exercise of an official power, duty or function, from giving preferential treatment to any person or organization based on the identity of the person or organization that represents the first-mentioned person or organization.

I had to determine if Dr. Philpott, in the exercise of her ministerial duties, gave preferential treatment to Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc. on the basis of Mr. Shirani's involvement in the company. I found that there was no special relationship that would suggest preferential treatment. Furthermore, I found that Dr. Philpott had not chosen to use Mr. Shirani's driving services because of his membership in the Liberal Party of Canada or his involvement in her campaign. I therefore found that neither Mr. Shirani nor his company had received preferential treatment and that Dr. Philpott did not contravene section 7 of the Act.

Subsection 6(1) prohibits public office holders from making a decision or participating in making a decision related to the exercise of an official power, duty or function if they know or reasonably should know that, in making the decision, they would be in a conflict of interest. The Act provides that a public office holder is in a conflict of interest when he or she exercises an official power, duty or function that provides an opportunity to further his or her private interests or those of his or her relatives or friends or to improperly further another person's private interests.

I first considered whether Mr. Shirani was a friend or family member of Dr. Philpott and whether she had exercised an official power, duty or function that provided an opportunity to further his private interests. I established that Mr. Shirani is not a friend of Dr. Philpott nor do they have any family connections.



I then considered whether Dr. Philpott, in exercising an official power, duty or function, had *improperly* furthered Mr. Shirani's private interests or those of his company. Given my finding that there was no preferential treatment in the context of section 7, I determined that there was no impropriety on that account.

I considered whether there were any rules relating to driving services for ministers that were not followed. I found that while ministers are subject to some policies governing travel, I did not find any rules relating to the type of driving services that were involved in this case.

Finally, I examined whether the amounts charged by Mr. Shirani's company were so disproportionate as to constitute an impropriety in the choice of supplier. I recognized the need for Dr. Philpott to be assured of reliable transportation to meet her busy schedule. As well Dr. Philpott was very satisfied with the quality of Mr. Shirani's driving services.

I found that the rate charged for travel between Dr. Philpott's home and the airport fell within the average range for similar services. While the rates charged by Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc. for the two full day trips were higher than those of other companies, I did not consider them to be so disproportionate as to constitute an impropriety, particularly in light of Dr. Philpott's efforts to ensure that the rates were appropriate. Consequently, Dr. Philpott's decision to use Mr. Shirani's services did not improperly further his private interests or that of his company within the meaning of section 4 of the Act.

I therefore concluded that in hiring Mr. Shirani's company, Dr. Philpott did not contravene subsection 6(1) of the Act.

REQUEST

On August 18, 2016, I received a letter from Dr. Colin Carrie, M.P. for Oshawa, requesting that I conduct an examination into the conduct of the Honourable Jane Philpott, P.C., M.P., Minister of Health.

In his letter, Dr. Carrie referred to several media reports claiming that Dr. Philpott had repeatedly used the driving services offered by Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc. It was alleged that the owner of this company, Mr. Reza Shirani, is an active volunteer and supporter of the Minister's partisan activities. The letter also noted that Dr. Philpott had admitted that she knew the service was owned by her supporter, Mr. Shirani.

According to media reports, the information provided was the result of an access to information request regarding the limousine expenses of all ministers from November 3, 2015 to April 22, 2016.

Dr. Carrie stated that Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc. billed \$1,708 for a full day on March 31, 2016, \$1,994 for another day in July 2016, and \$3,814 for 20 trips between Dr. Philpott's home and the Toronto Pearson International Airport. He added that, according to the *Toronto Star*, these rates were far above the rates charged by other driving services that the newspaper had surveyed.

In his letter, Dr. Carrie stated that he felt the decision by the Minister to use the driving service of such a strong supporter appeared to be a potential contravention of sections 7 and 8 of the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act).

Section 7 of the Act prohibits public office holders from giving preferential treatment to any person or organization based on the identity of a representative. Section 8 of the Act prohibits public office holders from using information that is not available to the public to further their private interests or those of their friends, or to improperly further another person's private interests.

I was satisfied that Dr. Carrie established reasonable grounds to believe that Dr. Philpott had contravened section 7 of the Act and that his letter constituted a valid request for an examination under section 44 of the Act.

With regard to section 8, Dr. Carrie provided no information in his letter to support the allegation that Dr. Philpott may have obtained and used information that was unavailable to the public. I therefore did not pursue this matter further.





PROCESS

On August 19, 2016, I wrote to the Honourable Jane Philpott, P.C., M.P., Minister of Health, to inform her that I was commencing an examination pursuant to subsection 44(3) of the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act) in relation to section 7 based on a request I had received from Dr. Colin Carrie, M.P. for Oshawa.

In this letter, I also informed Dr. Philpott that, based on Dr. Carrie's request, along with other information from the media and public sources, I would be examining whether she had contravened subsection 6(1) of the Act. This subsection of the Act prohibits public office holders from making a decision related to the exercise of an official power, duty or function if they know or reasonably should know that, in making the decision, they would be in a conflict of interest.

I also informed Dr. Philpott that Dr. Carrie had not established reasonable grounds to believe that section 8 of the Act may have been contravened and that I would not be pursuing this matter further.

I asked Dr. Philpott to respond to the allegations in writing and provide me with any documentation that could assist me in my examination by September 23, 2016.

I also wrote to Dr. Carrie on August 19 to inform him that his request met the requirements of subsection 44(2) of the Act regarding Dr. Philpott's alleged contravention of section 7, but not section 8. I also informed him that, in accordance with subsection 44(3) of the Act, I had commenced an examination under section 7.

On September 23, 2016, I received a reply from Dr. Philpott along with the requested documentation. My Office conducted an initial interview with Dr. Philpott on October 19, 2016. I received further documentation from her on October 27 and November 23, 2016.

On November 15, 2016, I interviewed Mr. Reza Shirani, the owner of Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc.

In keeping with the practice I have established, Dr. Philpott was given an opportunity to comment on a draft of the factual sections of this report (Request, Process, Findings of Fact and Dr. Philpott's Position) before it was finalized.





FINDINGS OF FACT

Background

On April 9, 2015, the Honourable Jane Philpott, P.C., M.P., became the Liberal Party of Canada candidate for the constituency of Markham–Stouffville. She immediately began campaigning in anticipation of the election scheduled for October 19, 2015.

Dr. Philpott was elected Liberal Member of Parliament for Markham–Stouffville on October 19, 2015. On the evening of October 21, she received a telephone call and an email from the House of Commons staff inviting her to an orientation session for new Members in Ottawa the following day, October 22, 2015. Dr. Philpott told me that during the telephone conversation, the House of Commons staff made no mention of ground transportation between her home and the airport. The only transportation discussed was a flight between Toronto and Ottawa. My Office confirmed this with the House of Commons.

Dr. Philpott noted that the request to be in Ottawa on October 22, 2015 had caught her on short notice. She told me that she was unable to use her vehicle to get to the airport on October 22, 2015, and her husband was not available to drive her. She wrote that she did not have any previous experience using taxis in Stouffville and told me that she did not recall having seen taxis in the town. She told me that she remembered that one of her volunteers, Mr. Reza Shirani, had a driving service. She consulted a list of volunteers to contact Mr. Shirani. He was available.

Dr. Philpott said that she remembered Mr. Shirani from a door-to-door canvassing activity during her electoral campaign. She had noticed that he was wearing a suit, which she had found somewhat unusual for such an activity. She said that she wondered who he was and that was why she introduced herself to him. She learned that he owned a driving service.

Dr. Philpott used Mr. Shirani's driving service between her home and the airport on four other occasions before being appointed Minister.

Mr. Reza Shirani

Mr. Shirani is the owner of Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc., which was incorporated in 2004. He told me that he lives in Dr. Philpott's constituency of Markham–Stouffville. He told me that he has also been a long-time member and supporter of the Liberal Party of Canada and has been a member of the Liberal riding association in that constituency since 2002 or 2003. Dr. Philpott and Mr. Shirani both told me that they had not met before Dr. Philpott ran for election and Dr. Philpott said that she did not know whether Mr. Shirani was a member of the riding association.



Not long after Dr. Philpott won the Liberal nomination for the riding of Markham–Stouffville, her campaign team contacted Liberal supporters about door-to-door canvassing. Dr. Philpott’s campaign team contacted Mr. Shirani for the first time on April 11, 2015. He went to her campaign office the next day and offered his volunteer services.

Mr. Shirani stated that, at the end of his first day of canvassing, he chatted with the many other participants, including Dr. Philpott, and he probably gave his business card to her campaign team at that time.

According to Dr. Philpott, Mr. Shirani volunteered on her campaign as a door-to-door canvasser twice: on April 12 and on October 17, 2015, two days before the election. Documentary evidence confirms that Mr. Shirani did not participate in Dr. Philpott’s campaign to a great extent and that Dr. Philpott’s campaign team put Mr. Shirani’s name on the list of inactive volunteers on two occasions: in late June 2015 and in late August 2015.

Dr. Philpott’s continued use of Mr. Shirani’s driving service following her appointment as Minister of Health

Dr. Philpott was appointed Minister of Health on November 4, 2015. At that time, her ministerial office asked whose services she used for ground transportation outside Ottawa. She indicated that she only used one car service and gave the only name she knew, namely Mr. Shirani.

Dr. Philpott told me that she continued to use Mr. Shirani’s driving service after her appointment as Minister because he was always highly professional, reliable and never ever late, and because she knew she was safe in that vehicle.

Dr. Philpott said that she did not chat with Mr. Shirani while she was in the car because she usually had her laptop open and worked. Mr. Shirani also informed me that he did not chat with Dr. Philpott when she was in the car.

Dr. Philpott said that Mr. Shirani was “a friendly person,” but that they were not friends. Mr. Shirani said that Dr. Philpott was not a friend but a company client, and was treated as a client.

The “limousine”

Mr. Shirani described a limousine as a modern taxi that is cleaner, provides better service and is possibly \$10 more expensive. He told me that the car in which Dr. Philpott travelled was a Lexus sedan, not a stretch vehicle, with a driver and a flat rate for predetermined destinations. He also stated that Dr. Philpott had never used a stretch limousine.

Mr. Shirani told me that he operates mainly out of the Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto airport) and that his driving service is based on a flat rate rather than a metered rate.

During the interview, Dr. Philpott told me that she was uncomfortable with the term “limousine” because she considered Mr. Shirani’s vehicle to be a car. She also stated that, as Minister of Health, she had many issues to deal with besides how she got from her home to the airport.

The issue of rates

According to Dr. Carrie’s letter and media reports on the subject, Dr. Philpott took two types of trips. The first consisted of 20 trips (there were, in fact, 27 trips) between her home and the airport. The second consisted of two separate full-day trips.

The flat rate charged by Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc. for each of the trips between Dr. Philpott’s home and the airport was \$115, plus tolls, taxes and gratuities. There were additional charges from time to time for arrivals after midnight, airport surcharges and wait times when flights were late.

The first full-day trip was on March 31, 2016. Dr. Philpott travelled from her home in Stouffville to McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, to attend a meeting first and to make an announcement about the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Later in the day, she travelled to Mount Sinai Hospital in Toronto for a meeting with the Canadian Foundation for Healthcare Improvement. Her day ended at the Ontario legislature at Queen’s Park for a three-and-a-half-hour meeting with Aboriginal leaders. The invoice for \$1,708.84 included charges for the distance travelled and for 12 hours of driving services, including time spent waiting.

The second full day of travel was on July 12, 2016. Dr. Philpott left her home to pick up a staff member at the Toronto airport and then went to Niagara Falls, Ontario, to attend the annual general meeting of the Assembly of First Nations, which was also attended by other federal ministers. After that meeting, Dr. Philpott returned to her home stopping off at the Toronto airport to drop off the staff member who had accompanied her. The invoice of \$1,994.73 for that trip included the distance travelled and seven hours of driving services, including time spent waiting.

Negotiating the rates

My Office looked into whether there were any rules relating to driving services that would apply to Dr. Philpott. Ministers have a separate budget for their ministerial duties and there are policies governing travel while carrying out these duties. These policies do not set out any rules



relating to the use of driving services for ministers except for vehicles provided by the department, which was not the case for any of the trips . As well, these policies specifically exclude ministers from the requirement to follow the general travel directive for the public service.

Rates from home to the airport

As discussed above, the first trip between Dr. Philpott's house and the Toronto airport was when Dr. Philpott had to find a means to get to the airport on short notice, just after her election. That ride cost her \$162.44: a flat rate of \$115 plus tolls, taxes and gratuities.

As soon as Dr. Philpott was appointed to Cabinet, she emailed her staff asking them to negotiate the best flat rate possible for Mr. Shirani's driving services. She was not aware of the standard rate for this type of service. In November 2015, Dr. Philpott's constituency office began negotiations with Mr. Shirani to confirm his rate. Dr. Philpott told me that she did not want to be involved in the discussions and did not get heavily involved in her travel arrangements. She said she was not concerned about the amounts because she believed that her staff had checked into the rates.

Dr. Philpott's ministerial office contacted the company numerous times to negotiate a better rate for regular travel between her home and the airport.

Email communications about the rates continued until August 2016. On August 11, 2016, Mr. Shirani stated in an email that he had given the Minister's office a corporate rate in December 2015, but he told me that he had reduced his usual flat rate from \$125 to \$115 for driving services between Dr. Philpott's home and the airport as of October 2015.

Full-day rates

On March 28, 2016, three days before the first full-day trip on March 31, 2016, Dr. Philpott's ministerial office contacted Mr. Shirani to negotiate a full-day rate for March 31, 2016. Mr. Shirani responded by stating that the Minister's office was already receiving a corporate rate and that it was much lower than his standard rate. Dr. Philpott told me that when she saw the invoice for March 31, 2016, she was upset and thought that the invoice for that day was very high. She told me that she informed her staff that they should not pay so much for a day of ground transportation again.

The second full-day trip, on July 12, 2016, was for the annual general meeting of the Assembly of First Nations, also attended by the Ontario Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Dr. Philpott told me that she wondered how her office would organize transportation for that day. She thought that Mr. Shirani's driving service would not be used since the invoice for



March 31, 2016, had been excessive in her opinion. She said that when she saw Mr. Shirani's vehicle on the morning of July 12, 2016, she thought that a better rate had been negotiated. She thought her staff had found a way to use Mr. Shirani's driving service at a reasonable cost since they knew she was upset about the invoice of March 31, 2016.

On July 31, 2016, Mr. Shirani submitted his invoice relating to the July 12, 2016 trip for approval. On August 15, 2016, Dr. Philpott's ministerial office asked for an explanation in relation to some of the charges set out in that invoice. Mr. Shirani replied to that request by simply going over the description of the costs and services rendered as set out in the invoice without any further explanation.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Shirani replied in a separate email that he has never charged the Minister for extras or for her personal travel. When asked what this related to, Dr. Philpott said that she had asked Mr. Shirani on one or two occasions on her way home from the airport, to pick her daughter up from school. Mr. Shirani confirmed that this is what he had been referring to as personal travel. He said that some driving services charge for a stop between two predetermined destinations, but Mr. Shirani did not do this.

This appears to be the extent of the discussion concerning the July 2016 invoice even though the invoice raises questions as to why the amount billed for the seven-hour trip to Niagara Falls, Ontario, exceeded the lower amount billed for the 12-hour trip to Hamilton, Ontario, on March 31, 2016. It would seem it should have been lower for a significantly shorter day. The main cause of the higher charges appears to result from a \$900 charge related to the distance travelled on July 12, which was about 370 kilometres, as compared to a \$255 charge for the distance travelled on March 31, which was about 240 kilometres. The trip on July 12 was about 130 kilometres longer than the trip on March 31.

Comparing rates

Dr. Philpott sent me the rates for several other driving services in the Toronto region compiled by her department, and my Office also did some Internet research. For travel between Dr. Philpott's home and the airport, a comparison of Mr. Shirani's rates and those of 14 other companies show that Mr. Shirani's rates are neither the highest nor the lowest. The flat rates, including tolls, taxes and gratuities, varied between \$113.05 and \$235.00. At \$162.44, Mr. Shirani's rate, which was the fifth highest of the 15, fell in the middle range. The two highest rates were significantly higher than the others.

It was more difficult to gather information about specific rates for full-day travel. However, as mentioned above, Dr. Philpott sent me several rates from other companies providing driving



services in the Toronto region that had been compiled by her department. These rates ranged from \$900.11 to \$1,422.37 and were significantly lower than those charged by Mr. Shirani for days of comparable length.

Reimbursement

On August 17, 2016, the media published accounts of the amounts that the Minister had paid for travel. The next day, Dr. Carrie sent me a request for examination, and Mr. Shirani issued a news release in which he offered to pay back the full amount received from the Minister. The Minister ultimately reimbursed the government for the two full-day trips.

Mr. Shirani informed me that Dr. Philpott has not used his driving service since the media reported on this matter.

DR. PHILPOTT'S POSITION

In her written statement, Dr. Philpott stated that she did not act in bad faith and had no intention of giving preferential treatment to anyone.

Dr. Philpott told me that, on October 21, 2015, when she was invited to an orientation session for new Members, she was given information about booking a flight from Toronto to Ottawa but received no instructions about getting from her home to the airport. She wrote that she called the only person who came to mind: Mr. Shirani. Dr. Philpott told me that she made a quick decision because she had very little time in which to act.

Dr. Philpott also told me that she was accustomed to working in a place with established procedures for purchasing goods and services. When she took up her new duties, she found that her predecessor had left no documentation about procurement procedures for acquiring goods and services.

Dr. Philpott told me that she did not get heavily involved in her travel arrangements. She said her travel was of less concern to her than her important ministerial duties. She told me that she had continued to use Mr. Shirani's driving service because he provided good, reliable service and he was discreet and not talkative. She also said that she felt safe and secure in his vehicle.





ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Analysis

I must determine whether Dr. Philpott contravened section 7 or subsection 6(1) of the *Conflict of Interest Act* (Act) by using the driving services of Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc., owned by Mr. Reza Shirani, a Liberal supporter.

Section 7 of the Act: Preferential treatment

Section 7 of the Act reads as follows:

7. No public office holder shall, in the exercise of an official power, duty or function, give preferential treatment to any person or organization based on the identity of the person or organization that represents the first-mentioned person or organization.

To establish whether there was a contravention of section 7 of the Act in this case, I must determine whether Dr. Philpott, in the exercise of her ministerial duties, gave preferential treatment to Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc. on the basis of Mr. Shirani's involvement in the company.

The evidence shows that when Dr. Philpott used Mr. Shirani's driving service for the first time in October 2015, she had to get to the airport on short notice and without any guidance from the House of Commons concerning ground transportation. She then called the only person she knew of in her community who had a car service.

In my view, although Dr. Philpott met Mr. Shirani when he volunteered to help on her election campaign, it was neither his membership in the Liberal Party nor his limited volunteer activities that led her to choose his company when she became a Member of Parliament. It was simply a matter of Dr. Philpott going to the only car service she could recall at that time.

When she became Minister of Health on November 4, 2015, Dr. Philpott had already used Mr. Shirani's services as a Member of Parliament on five occasions. Shortly after becoming a minister, she had asked her staff to check Mr. Shirani's rates and assumed they had done so. Dr. Philpott viewed Mr. Shirani's services as professional, reliable and safe. There was no apparent reason for her to stop using his services.

In my view, there was no special relationship between Dr. Philpott and Mr. Shirani that would suggest preferential treatment.

In light of the above, I find that neither Mr. Shirani nor his company received preferential treatment.



Subsection 6(1) of the Act: Decision-making

Subsection 6(1) of the Act states as follows:

6. (1) No public office holder shall make a decision or participate in making a decision related to the exercise of an official power, duty or function if the public office holder knows or reasonably should know that, in the making of the decision, he or she would be in a conflict of interest.

The term “conflict of interest” is defined in section 4 of the Act as follows:

4. For the purposes of this Act, a public office holder is in a conflict of interest when he or she exercises an official power, duty or function that provides an opportunity to further his or her private interests or those of his or her relatives or friends or to improperly further another person’s private interests.

It is clear that Dr. Philpott made the decision to hire Mr. Shirani in her official capacity as Minister. I must therefore determine whether Dr. Philpott knew or reasonably should have known that in making this decision she would be in a conflict of interest.

To determine whether a conflict of interests exists in this case, I must first consider whether Mr. Shirani is a friend of Dr. Philpott or a member of her family and, if so, whether Dr. Philpott had an opportunity to further his interests. If I find that Mr. Shirani is neither a friend nor a family member of Dr. Philpott, I must then determine whether she improperly furthered his private interests or those of his company.

In *The Watson Report*, released in June 2009, I established that, for the purposes of the Act, my Office considers a friend to be a person with whom one has some history of mutual personal regard beyond simple association. I wrote that while acquaintances can become friends, they do not do so simply because of frequent interaction.

I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the testimony of Dr. Philpott or Mr. Shirani when they told me that they are not friends. The evidence shows that Dr. Philpott and Mr. Shirani did not know each other before she became a liberal candidate. The evidence also shows that Mr. Shirani volunteered only twice for Dr. Philpott’s campaign and Dr. Philpott could only recall one interaction with Mr. Shirani during that period. Following her election, any exchanges between the two related only to Dr. Philpott’s needs for transportation services.

In this instance, I do not believe that Dr. Philpott and Mr. Shirani can fall within the concept of friends under the Act. Furthermore, they do not have any family connection.

Because Dr. Philpott and Mr. Shirani are neither friends nor members of the same family, I must consider whether Dr. Philpott, in exercising an official power, duty or function, improperly furthered the private interests of Mr. Shirani or his company. If so, Dr. Philpott would be in a conflict of interest as described in section 4 of the Act.

I have already found that there was no preferential treatment and that, therefore, no impropriety exists on that account.

I considered whether there were any rules relating to driving services for ministers that were not followed. While ministers are subject to some policies governing travel, I did not find any rules relating to the type of driving services for ministers that were involved in this case.

It remains to consider whether the amounts paid were so disproportionate as to constitute an impropriety in the choice of a supplier.

Based on the information gathered during this examination, the rate charged for travel between Dr. Philpott's home and the airport, namely \$162.44, including tolls, taxes and gratuities, falls within the average range for similar services.

The amounts paid for two full days on March 31, 2016, and July 12, 2016, namely \$1,708.84 and \$1,994.73, were higher than the comparison rates that were compiled by her department and were provided to me by Dr. Philpott, particularly the amount for the second trip. However, I do not consider these amounts to be so disproportionate so as to constitute an impropriety, particularly in light of Dr. Philpott's efforts to ensure that the rates were appropriate.

One must recognize the need for Dr. Philpott to be assured of reliable and professional transportation to meet her busy schedule. As well, Dr. Philpott was very satisfied with the quality of Mr. Shirani's driving services.

For these reasons, I have concluded that Dr. Philpott's decision to hire Mr. Shirani's company did not improperly further his private interests or that of his company within the meaning of section 4 of the Act. Consequently, in making this decision, Dr. Philpott was not in a conflict of interest under subsection 6(1) of the Act.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, I find that Dr. Philpott did not contravene section 7 or subsection 6(1) of the Act.





SCHEDULE: LIST OF WITNESSES

Interview

Executive Limousine & Livery Service Inc.

- Mr. Reza Shirani, Owner

