

## **Councillors Expenses - 2016 - 17**

Posted by Newsline - 08 Dec 2016 19:51

---

WE are continuing our annual review of councillors expenses and are pleased to report that some have taken on board our criticism (2015) of using a car when they could have rested on a train at much less expense to the public. A few have now stopped claiming for short local journeys and others are now sharing taxi's.

However on looking at this years FOI disclosure we can see that, in our opinion, at least three are claiming for something that they are not entitled, including a member of the Audit Committee.

One is claiming for journeys of 1.6 miles, and one appears to be breaking the rules entirely in respect of travel.

Tomorrow.....

=====

## **Re: Councillors Expenses - 2016 - 17**

Posted by Newsline - 09 Dec 2016 18:50

---

=====

## **Re: Councillors Expenses - 2016 - 17**

Posted by Newsline - 09 Dec 2016 18:52

---

=====

## **Re: Councillors Expenses - 2016 - 17**

Posted by Newsline - 09 Dec 2016 18:57

---

**and this is the important bit.....**

26. Travel and subsistence expenses may be claimed for approved duties (as defined in

Section 49 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973)

[www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1973/pdf/ukpga\\_19730065\\_en.pdf](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1973/pdf/ukpga_19730065_en.pdf). For the majority of

instances of expenditure, councillors will be required to produce a receipt.

=====

## Re: Councillors Expenses - 2016 - 17

Posted by Newsline - 09 Dec 2016 20:08

---

### **Conservative**

Gordon McCaskill #

Charlie Gilbert #

Barbara Grant #

### **Labour**

Kenny Hay #

Alan Lafferty

Ian McAlpine

Elaine Green

### **SNP**

Vincent Waters #

### **Independent**

None

Those that it our opinion display an anomaly have been highlighted #

=====

## **Re: Councillors Expenses - 2016 - 17**

Posted by Newsline - 11 Dec 2016 17:59

---

We apologize for the delay in continuing with this thread but we required to work further on some of the material we were provided with, to confirm our conclusions due to some additional information that has come into our possession.

It is also very unfortunate that we will now require to submit a request for review to the council chief solicitor, Gerry Mahon, which could take another 20 working days to be resolved.

We are of the opinion that there is substantial material missing from our FOI that should have been provided as per our FOI request.

This does seem to be getting somewhat habitual and it seems to usually occur with material sent to us by Eamonn Daly.

We would never suggest for a nano second that there are any attempts to deliberately with hold material, it is just a mere coincidence that he is involved in each of our recent FOI's that we required to appeal, and were successful in our appeals, except the last one which relates to 'missing papers' and we will report on that shortly.

=====