

From: [Jim Orr](#)
To: [Jim Orr](#)
Subject: Fw: Disciplinary matter
Date: 01 June 2016 18:41:48

On Saturday, 9 November 2013, 18:05, Gavin Barrie <gavinkbarrie@gmail.com> wrote:

Jim,

Whilst I hold the post of Whip, you have obviously taken the opportunity to read Standing Orders and must know the procedure for reporting an alleged breach of Standing Orders that is available to you.

At this time I do not have the knowledge to confirm whether Bill is correct and monies have been siphoned off from budgets that they shouldn't have and as such this would have a great bearing on any action I may or may not take in the future. There is no statute of limitations as to when such a matter might be addressed and I am content to wait until the full facts are confirmed. What you see as a clear breach is to me still a bit muddy.

If you believe that you have a cast iron case there is a course of action you can take.

Regards,

Gavin

On Thursday, 7 November 2013, Jim Orr wrote:

Hi Gavin

I would hope that you have this in hand already but the comments from Tuesday's paper to me at least constitute a clear breach of standing orders. I was shocked that you didn't seem to agree on Tuesday and that you seemed keen to defend Bill at all costs.

He said: "I don't see why any of the money from roads or street lighting should be allocated to cycling. Most cyclists that I talk to want the potholes fixed. So why are we taking £1m that is specifically assigned to roads when really the benefits are usually given to all road users and almost all modes of transport – car, bus, bike, even pedestrians?"

7.3 "No member shall, within or outwith the Council chamber, publicly criticise a Group decision or policy or another member of the Group."

It's our group policy to spend a proportion of the transport budget on cycling with some of that going to specific cycling projects and some already part of the regular budget (for example to repair bus lanes).

This is what Fiona Borland wrote that day: "The News today has a terrible front page story about the cycling budget, which includes a lot of criticism of the fact that the Council will be spending 7% of the transport budget on cycling next year. Dale Miller claims in the article that

this will be at the expense of road repairs, and has worked out that this will mean 21,000 less potholes will be fixed. Bill Henderson is quoted. I'm going to speak to Lesley MacPherson about this mis-reporting today."

Bill not only publically trashed our policy (which is a real success story) but did it in such a way that the EEN got the facts totally wrong and when we'd agreed a couple of hours earlier that a group of us would look into it (me, Steve, Alasdair and Bill). We've also doubled the capital budget in 13/14 (another success story) but this good news has been lost.

I have a briefing on the cycling budget on Monday to sort out fact from fiction. But to take one example, pot hole repairs are not funded from the capital budget we passed a week or so ago, they're revenue/maintenance spend. Everything he has raised on this to the group and elsewhere has been total garbage. We include streetlighting (but not, say, tram) spend in the calculation and did so last year too. End of story.

The journalist told me that a "combination of MSPs and Cllrs" suggested the story to him and given that Bill raised the same matter in the group meeting the same day, it seems to be a coincidence to say the least.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I simply want to play a constructive role in the group but otherwise focus mainly on my own really important role but this constant grief, nonsense and victimisation is wearing me down.

[REDACTED]

If this was happening to you, I'd support you without question.

Jim