

Press Release on the Margaret McLean Laforest's campaign: Patriot Ledger and Quincy Sun:

As you know that I had a good conversation with City Solicitor Jim Timmins on Margaret LaForest's state ethnics commission issues have to do with her job at Quincy Chamber of Commerce and her leadership to serve as role of Ward 1 City Councilor.

We both agree that Margaret did not violate any laws based on the state ethnics commission with her role at Quincy Chamber of Commerce or serving as elected official for the Ward 1 community.

I am strongly condemn Mr. Sweeney has no knowledge or experience where the information did come from which he will take a full responsibility and hold an accountable for his own actions and might be charged with the false report which it can be violated in the Massachusetts General Laws.

I do believe that Mr. Sweeney should have a lot of explaining to do to the people of Quincy including with the Ward 1 community which it could cause her re-election bid process on November 3rd.

I do believe that Margaret has a strong records with her experience to serve as role of Ward 1 City Councilor when she took office.

It's time for the City of Quincy to give Margaret a chance to make her job success in the Ward 1 community which we do have a lot of work to do throughout campaign trail. #QuincyMA #mapoli 18 Likes15 Comments1 Share

- Barbara Fitzpatrick Wilson, Kathy Gill Doyle, Frank A Doyle and 15 others like this.
 - 1 share
- Comments

•



Wendy Roman Connors Did Margaret write this? Too many typos! Good content tho!

1 · October 9 at 9:01am



Mike Sweeney Jimmy Hui.

Jimmy you are only helping me make my point. With all due respect you are writing this post without any backup documents and you are an employee of the Mayor. About one month ago, another employee of Mayor Koch, Tom Meade, stated that he had a conversation with Councilor LaForest too. She told him she had a letter from the State Ethics Commission and from City Solicitor Timmins stating it was ok for her to vote on the money to fund her own \$80,000.00 job and that she could keep her second city job. I asked Tom Meade to just post the 2 letters on facebook and I would gladly apologize and go away and that would have ended it. I asked him 3 times. He could not produce the letters. I assume then the letters do not exist. Jimmy. I get it!! Councilor LaForest has voted with the Mayor 100% of the time and the Mayor's people want the Mayor to have a rubber stamp. I like the Mayor but I wat my councilor to make sure he is doing the right thing. I don't need or want a rubber stamp. So Jimmy why has she not posted her voting record?

I like you and I think they are using you. That is not right.

Jimmy if you look into the Mass State Ethics Commission rulings, posted online, you will find several rulings against this exact scenario and Jimmy several violators state "the City Solicitor told me it was ok" The City Solicitor, in any city, renders opinions on a wide range of legal issues. It is only an opinion. Their only 2 state agencies that can give you an advisory opinion, The Mass State Ethics Commission and the Attorney General's Office. Jimmy ask Councilor LaForst for the written opinion. She is just trying to kick this issue down the road until the election is over. Jimmy that is what elections are for. When someone is not producing, returning phone calls or hurting people through her position and when someone is doing something that is against the law, Election Day is the day you get a chance to say "That is not right and I am not voting for you!"

Jimmy here is Chapter 268A Section 20

Section 20. (a) A municipal employee who has a financial interest, directly or indirectly, in a contract made by a municipal agency of the same city or town, in which the city or town is an interested party of which financial interest he has knowledge or has reason to know, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment in the state prison for not more than 5 years, or in a jail or house of correction for not more than 21/2 years, or both.

Jimmy, I would welcome a full investigation then all the facts will come out. When we are done with this investigation we can request a full investigation of the City of Quincy giving Louie's \$300,000.00 for a parking lot and, without any public input or community meeting, Councilor LaForest spent \$22,000.00 on a study to look at the public landing. The study includes looking at giving the \$300,000.00 to Louie's for the lot. Jimmy, according to the Patriot Ledger article in February 2015 the only other person on the committee is the owner of Louie's. What do you think he is going to recommend? The study is also looking at taking peoples homes. Not my words or slander, Councilor LaFores's own words. Just watch the video on facebook.

Facts don't lie....More to come.....

2 · October 9 at 9:39am



Richard Robert Massi Mike if she produces the documentation you are looking for. Then would theses allegatioons then be considered slanderous? I believe they would be because you do not have the dilocumentation either.

1 · October 9 at 6:26pm



0

Bill Zamzow Mr. Massi, No argument, producing the purported letter from the State Ethics Commission could absolve Mrs LaForest. So, far, however, such a letter has yet to be produced. Considering how doing so could easily put an end to this controversy, one can only properly wonder why it hasn't been produced. Also note that there is NO legal reason precluding its so being shared. As for slander, you might care to note that slander refers to SPOKEN false statements lodged against someone. In this instance, I think you meant to note libel, which refers to WRITTEN false statements. Also not that malice has to be proven in libel or slander cases in addition to, well, false statements. Either way, there is all but assuredly NO viable basis to win a lawsuit as there is a clear basis for Mrs. LaForest's critics to question things - specifically, it would clearly appear that she looks to be in violation of MGL 2698a Section 20. Oh, and if things worked per what you appear to be implying, you might care to note that just any indicted criminal who later was not convicted would so have a basis for pursuing libel and/or slander claims. October 11 at 10:53am



0

Mike Sweeney One other thing. Jeff LaForest also stated she has the letters. OK Jeff please post them so I can go back to sleep.

1 · October 9 at 9:42am · Edited



Jeff Laforest If there was any truth to this there would be an official inquiry, have you seen one I haven't. I feel sorry for you, you seem obsessed. Maybe that's how strongly you feel but you are doing nothing more than hurting your candidates chances of getting in. So thanks for that. Now go ahead and rip away this will be the last comment for me on this post. #fakepeopledontsleep 2 · October 9 at 11:33am

0



Mike Sweeney Where is the letter? Please post and it will be over!!

October 9 at 11:34am



Mike Sweeney I know...Just get through the election.

October 9 at 11:35am



Mike Sweeney Jimmy don't be used.

October 9 at 11:37am



Margaret McLean Laforest Mike Sweeney, what's your phone #? Let's talk or better yet, let's meet for a coffee? I have time available Sunday and Monday evenings.

1 · October 9 at 11:44am



Mike Sweeney But you never answered my calls before when I was in trouble and needed your help. For weeks I waited. You never responded when you had the chance. You were always telling people you were to busy. Now that you are in trouble you want to talk? When you had the city Enforcement Officer write me up, without warning, for \$4,000.00 in fines for parking my pickup truck in my driveway. I called you to ask you to back off and wanted to remind you your family had a carpet cleaning business and parked your tucks in your driveway. I just wanted you to stop picking on the little guy struggling to make ends meet. Now that you have a big 2nd city job and someone is running against you now want to talk. What could you possibly say? I am sorry that I caused you and your family so much hardship? No Councilor LaForest let's have this discussion in public. Right here. What do you want to say?

October 9 at 12:04pm



Stephen Durkin Mr. Sweeney, the Ethics section you cite, Chapter 268A, section 20, deals with "contracts" made by a city or town in which a municipal employee has a financial interest. What "contract" does the City of Quincy have with the Chamber of Commerce? And was Councillor LaForest a party to the contract? These would be threshold questions.

October 9 at 12:49pm



Mike Sweeney I see they brought in some help.....The City of Quincy has paid \$180,000.00 for a service to the Quincy Chamber. The service is to run the Discover Quincy program. Councilor LaForest voted on \$180,000.00 of taxpayers money that funded her job. She coll...See More

1 · October 9 at 12:56pm



Stephen Durkin She can't receive two paychecks DIRECTLY from the city treasury under the city charter. There's a distinction.

1 · October 9 at 1:00pm



Mike Sweeney I am surprised Steve. The law is clear and you know that. You would be better off just telling Councilor LaForest she is wrong. The surprising thing is that she knows it and she herself admitted it at a debate.

October 9 at 1:01pm



Stephen Durkin And no one brought me in. I just don't like seeing anyone accused of anything without sufficient factual basis substantiated by an accurate reading of the law.

October 9 at 1:02pm



Mike Sweeney Steve you are trying to spin it and if that what you have to do for her then I guess that is what lawyers do. The final judgement will come from the Ethics Commission. For now. The voters will decide if they think it is right. Her ability to be impartial and represent the voters and taxpayers of Ward One and the City of Quincy has been compromised. She is beholding to the Mayor. This is represented by her 100% voting record. She is also beholding to the same people who are developing the Downtown.

October 9 at 1:09pm



Mike Sweeney I find it interesting that Councilor LaForest challenges me to discuss these issues but send you instead. Whenever confronted with someone who has a little knowledge and who challenges her she runs and hides behind someone else. So Steve when did you get the call?

1 · October 9 at 1:12pm



Mike Sweeney Steve. I know you are not blind. The facts are clear.

1 · October 9 at 1:15pm



Wendy Roman Connors Forget it <u>Stephen Durkin</u>, as a lawyer I'm sure you nothing about interpreting the law.lol. Like beating a dead horse!

1 · October 9 at 1:53pm



Bill Zamzow Ms Roman Conners, don't forget that attorneys are paid by the hour to argue. As such, it is in their own personal best interests to keep arguing even when they are full of it in the hope that the other side gives up.

1 · October 11 at 11:10am



Perry Jameson Mike Sweeney And that's the issue exactly. Clear as day

October 11 at 5:01pm



Mike Sweeney She has lost her ability to be impartial and represent the voters and taxpayers of Ward One and the City of Quincy has been compromised. She is beholding to the Mayor. This is represented by her 100% voting record. She is also beholding to the same people who are developing the Downtown.

I find it interesting that Councilor LaForest challenges me to discuss these issues but send you instead. Whenever confronted with someone who has a little knowledge and who challenges her she runs and hides behind someone else. So Steve when did you get the call?

October 9 at 1:15pm



Mike Sweeney Alright Steve send the Councillor back in.

October 9 at 1:17pm



Mike Sweeney We have a lot to talk about

October 9 at 1:18pm · Edited



0

0

Mike Sweeney Next subject is the sea walls.

October 9 at 1:18pm



Mike Sweeney Where did she go?

October 9 at 1:18pm



Chuck MacDonald Some real haters here with nothing more to do then hate 1 · October 9 at 4:20pm



Jimmy Shea And some cheerleaders lol

2 · October 9 at 7:14pm

Bill Zamzow Mr. Durkin, Say what you may, but former C of Q ward councillor Peter Kolson was sanctioned, including a considerable financial penalty, over just about exactly the same set of circumstances as those facing now Mrs. LaForest. Further, and again, per any reasonable read of MGL 286a, Section 20, ALL state and local elected officials are PROSCRIBED from voting on ANYTHING that impacts that their own financial interests. For example, a salary at a second job - even if it's not a government job. In this matter, Mrs. LaForest voted for city appropriations to the Chamber of Commerce and its Discover Quincy unit where she is employed as its head of tourism. Oh, and as noted elsewhere as well as by others, all Mrs. LaForest has to do is provide a copy of the purported letter from the State Ethics Commission that says that her past votes for funds that paid her salary at Discovery Quincy are not a problem re MGL 286a/20. Produce it and the rancor against her is so eviscerated.



Perry Jameson If there is such a letter, just release it and the issue will go away. No?

1 · October 11 at 4:57pm



Perry Jameson So as to help clear up things, <u>QuincyQuarry.com</u> is willing to publish the letter if it is provided via http://quincyquarry.com/contact-qq/thanks.

Quincy Quarry News about Quincy, MA

Quincy Quarry | Quincy Quarry: News about Quincy News in Quincy, MA Massachusetts. Quincy Quarry reports on local government, Politics, life in the City of Quincy, MA.

QUINCYQUARRY.COM|BY QUINCY QUARRY

<u>1</u> ⋅ 53 mins