



---

**COMPLIANCE AUDIT REPORT  
FOR  
THE COMPLIANCE AUDIT  
COMMITTEE  
– CITY OF TORONTO**

**RE: 2023 MAYORAL BY-ELECTION  
CAMPAIGN OF GIORGIO  
MAMMOLITI**

---

---

**NOVEMBER 26, 2024**

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose of Report .....	1
1.2	Background Information .....	1
1.3	Our Approach to the Compliance Audit .....	2
1.4	Procedures Performed .....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>OUR FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	General.....	8
3.2	Financial Reporting.....	8
3.3	Contributions .....	8
3.4	Mammoliti's Loans and Contributions to the Campaign .....	10
3.5	Campaign Expenses.....	12
<b>4</b>	<b>RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Exhibits

**Exhibit 1:** Extracts of Articles Related to Leading Candidates

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of Report

1. By letter dated April 22, 2024, Delta Consulting Group Canada Ltd. ("**Delta**") was appointed by the City of Toronto's Compliance Audit Committee ("**the Committee**") to conduct a compliance audit of the campaign finances of Giorgio Mammoliti in the 2023 by-election for mayor, in accordance with Section 88.33(10) of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* ("**the Act**"). Voting day was held on Monday, June 26, 2023.
2. This Report provides the findings resulting from conducting the compliance audit. It is being provided to the City Clerk, who will forward it to the Committee, as well as to Mr. Wiener, the Applicant for the compliance audit, and the candidate, Mr. Mammoliti.

## 1.2 Background Information

3. Mr. Mammoliti filed his nomination papers in the by-election for Mayor of the City of Toronto ("**the City**") on April 3, 2023. He opened a campaign bank account the following day.
4. Mr. Mammoliti acknowledges that his campaign expenses exceeded \$10,000. He obtained an extension for filing his audited Financial Statement to December 10, 2023. Mr. Mammoliti did not file an audited Financial Statement by the extended deadline.
5. Mr. Kevin Wiener applied for a compliance audit of Mr. Mammoliti's election campaign finances on February 24, 2024 on the basis of the failure to file an audited Financial Statement where a campaign has spent more than \$10,000. He also submitted that there was evidence of significant spending in areas such as robocalls and an expensive campaign launch that suggests the failure to file a Financial Statement may have been a deliberate attempt to avoid revealing other campaign finance irregularities. His submission included social media posts related to robocalls and online postings of photographs from a campaign event held on April 27, 2023.
6. Mr. Mammoliti's written submission to the Committee's meeting that was held on March 22, 2024 included the following:

I did spend more then 10 thousand dollars and had a gathering to kick off the campaign.

I did not over spend on the limit given to us, in fact, I was no where near over spending.

I do understand that inadvertently we broke the municipal election act by not reporting out with an Audited statement. The reason for this is because I could not find an Auditor to take the file. Apparently, in Toronto/Ontario, there are only a few Auditors that are specialized in the field now. This was explained to the courts when I took my extension. I could not find an Auditor because most Auditors feel that it's too complicated in Toronto, those that I did contact that have the specialty did not have the time to do my Audit.

### 1.3 Our Approach to the Compliance Audit

7. The objective of our compliance audit is to report any apparent contraventions of the Act identified through the course of our compliance audit. As no audited Financial Statement was filed, our compliance audit focused on the candidate's duties in relation to the campaign records maintained for contributions, expenses, and maintaining of records. The following sections of the Act and the *"2022 Candidates' Guide – Ontario municipal council and school board elections"* (**"the Guide"**) are applicable to the conduct of this compliance audit.

8. Section 88.8(8) of the Act provides that:

A contribution of money that exceeds \$25 shall not be contributed in the form of cash and shall be contributed in a manner that associates the contributor's name and account with the payment or by a money order signed by the contributor.

9. Section 88.9(3) of the Act provides that the maximum total contribution that a contributor may make to a candidate for the office of mayor of the City of Toronto is \$2,500.

10. The *2022 Candidates' Guide – Ontario municipal council and school board elections* includes guidance based on the Act, as well as the City of Toronto Act, 2006. The Guide includes the following in relation to contribution receipts:<sup>1</sup>

You must issue a receipt for every contribution you receive. The receipt should show who made the contribution, the date and the value. If the contribution was in goods or services, you must determine the value of the goods or services and issue a receipt for the full value.

11. Section 88.9.1(1) of the Act provides that the maximum contribution a candidate and his or her spouse may make to their own campaign is the lesser of a calculated amount and \$25,000, which in this by-election the maximum contribution allowed was \$25,000.
12. Section 88.22(1) of the Act sets out a candidate's duties under the Act, including:

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 20, 2022 Candidates' Guide – Ontario municipal council and school board elections.

- (a) no contributions of money are accepted or expenses are incurred unless one or more campaign accounts are first opened at a financial institution exclusively for the purposes of the election campaign;
  - (b) all contributions of money are deposited into the campaign accounts;
  - (c) all funds in the campaign accounts are used exclusively for the purposes of the election campaign;
  - (d) all payments for expenses are made from the campaign accounts;
  - (e) contributions of goods or services are valued;
  - (f) receipts are issued for every contribution and obtained for every expense;
  - (g) records are kept of,
    - (i) the receipts issued for every contribution,
    - (ii) the value of every contribution,
    - (iii) whether a contribution is in the form of money, goods or services, and
    - (iv) the contributor's name and address;
  - (h) records are kept of every expense including the receipts obtained for each expense;
  - (i) records are kept of any claim for payment of an expense that the candidate disputes or refuses to pay;
  - (j) records are kept of the gross income from a fund-raising function and the gross amount of money received at a fund-raising function by donations of \$25 or less or by the sale of goods or services for \$25 or less;
  - (m) financial filings are made in accordance with sections 88.25 and 88.32; etc.
13. Section 88.25 of the Act sets out the candidate's responsibilities in relation to filing a Financial Statement, with the deadline for a candidate in a by-election being 45 days after voting day to file an audited Financial Statement, subject to the ability to file a supplementary Financial Statement. A candidate is also entitled to apply to the Superior Court of Justice for an extension under Section 88.23(6).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Mammoliti successfully applied for an extension with the Court. He advised that he was unsuccessful in locating and engaging an auditor during the extension period, as noted in his response to the March 22, 2024 Committee meeting.

14. Section 88.25(8) does not require an auditor's report if the campaign's total contributions received or expenses incurred did not exceed \$10,000.
15. The Guide summarizes the requirement to file a financial statement as:<sup>3</sup>

All candidates must file a financial statement. This includes candidates who withdrew their nomination, candidates who were not certified and did not appear on the ballot, and candidates who were acclaimed.
16. Section 88.33(12) of the Act states, in relation to a compliance audit, that:

The auditor shall promptly conduct an audit of the candidate's election campaign finances to determine whether he or she has complied with the provisions of this Act relating to election campaign finances and shall prepare a report outlining any apparent contravention by the candidate.
17. Our compliance audit addressed matters in addition to the acknowledged failure to file an audited Financial Statement, including:
  - a) Whether appropriate recordkeeping was maintained in relation to contributions, including contributors being issued receipts in accordance with the Act;
  - b) Whether cash contributions from individual contributors that exceeded \$25 were accepted by the campaign;
  - c) Whether campaign expenses were appropriately supported by invoices or other supporting documentation;
  - d) Whether there were additional campaign expenses not paid from or reimbursed by the campaign bank account;
  - e) Whether contributions in kind, if any, were appropriately addressed in the campaign records; and
  - f) Whether Mr. Mammoliti contributed over \$25,000 to his campaign.

## 1.4 Procedures Performed

18. Our procedures related to the compliance audit included:
  - a) A review of the Compliance Audit Application filed by Mr. Kevin Wiener, dated February 24, 2024;

---

<sup>3</sup> Page 29, 2022 Candidates' Guide – Ontario municipal council and school board elections.

- b) An initial meeting with Mr. Mammoliti to obtain campaign records, obtaining authorization from Mr. Mammoliti to obtain bank records directly from TD Bank, and follow-up meetings and correspondence with Mr. Mammoliti to review specific transactions and possible apparent contraventions of the Act;
- c) A review of campaign bank records obtained directly from TD Bank;
- d) A review of documents provided by Mr. Mammoliti, including:
  - i) Invoices related to fundraising, rent, and other campaign expenses;
  - ii) Credit card records for three Visa accounts related to expenses paid using Mr. Mammoliti's personal credit cards;
  - iii) Contributor information and matching of contributions to bank deposits;
  - iv) Personal loans and contributions to the campaign by Mr. Mammoliti and related repayments; and
  - v) Review of cash deposited by Mr. Mammoliti.
- e) Evaluation of whether expenses paid by personal credit card were reimbursed by the campaign bank account;
- f) Searches using the website <https://web.archive.org> (the Wayback Machine) to review archived website content and website searches, including for the site [www.giorgiointo.com](http://www.giorgiointo.com); and
- g) Review of the following:
  - i) Municipal Elections Act, 1996 ("**the Act**") in force in the 2023 by-election campaign period; and
  - ii) 2022 Candidates' Guide for Ontario Municipal Council and School Board Elections ("**2022 Candidates' Guide**").

## 2 Executive Summary

19. The purpose of an election compliance audit is to identify apparent contraventions. Based on the procedures performed, we identified the following apparent contraventions of the Act:
- a) The Candidate failed to file an audited Financial Statement (or to file an unaudited Financial Statement), as acknowledged by Mr. Mammoliti. Campaign contributions and expenses exceeded \$10,000. In our opinion, this constitutes an apparent contravention of Section 88.25 of the Act that requires that candidates file an audited Financial Statement where campaign contributions and/or expenses exceed \$10,000.
  - b) Mr. Mammoliti contributed \$4,900 in cash to his campaign. Section 88.8(8) of the Act states “a contribution of money that exceeds \$25 shall not be contributed in the form of cash...”. The Act does not distinguish between contributions of cash from candidates and from third parties. Accordingly, in our opinion the contribution of \$4,900 (\$4,800 plus \$100) in cash constitutes an apparent contravention of Section 88.8(8) of the Act.<sup>4</sup>
  - c) Section 88.9.1(1) of the Act provides that the maximum contribution a candidate and his or her spouse may make to their own campaign is the lesser of a calculated amount and \$25,000, which in this by-election the maximum contribution allowed was \$25,000. Mr. Mammoliti contributed \$45,406.43 (\$60,646.57 including the additional expenses paid personally) to his campaign. Although \$45,500 of the contributions were in the form of a loan directly from his line of credit, as the loan was repaid personally and not from campaign funds, the balance of the loan is considered a contribution under the Act. In our opinion Mr. Mammoliti exceeded the contribution limit of \$25,000, an apparent contravention of Section 88.9.1(1) of the Act.
  - d) Mr. Mammoliti’s Visa account CIBC – 2510 disclosed payment of two campaign expenses that were not reimbursed by the campaign bank account:
    - i) May 1, 2023 – \$6,200.14 paid to Alpha Entertainment for the sound system, lighting, a video wall, a technician, and related technical support for the April 27, 2023 Grand Luxe event.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> If the \$4,800 was instead considered to be a loan to the campaign that was subsequently repaid and not a contribution, this would be an apparent contravention of Section 88.17(1) of the Act, which requires any loan to a campaign to be funded directly from a bank or other lending institution.

<sup>5</sup> The invoice from Alpha Entertainment was for \$6,034.20.



- ii) June 12, 2023 – \$9,040.00 paid to UB Media for a May video ad campaign to run on all screens in elevators in 203 buildings.

Mr. Mammoliti confirmed that these payments, totaling \$15,240.14, were campaign expenses. As these expenses were not reimbursed to Mr. Mammoliti from the campaign bank account, in our opinion these are apparent contraventions of Section 88.22(1)(d) of the Act, which requires that all expenses be paid from the campaign bank account.

- 20. On an overall basis, the Candidate's campaign expenses subject to limitation did not exceed the campaign's authorized limit.
- 21. Mr. Mammoliti stated that the reason for the failure to file an audited Financial Statement was his inability to retain an auditor to provide audit services for his campaign and the lack of campaign funds to retain an auditor. He also advised that the campaign was unable to repay his loan to the campaign due to the campaign's lack of funds. He stated that, early in the by-election, the media focused on 5 or 6 leading candidates, and that he was not one of these candidates. The campaign was unable to raise significant contributions once it became apparent that his chance at being elected Mayor was doubtful. **Exhibit 1** to this Report contains extracts from articles supporting his perspective.

## 3 Our Findings

### 3.1 General

- 22. Mr. Mammoliti cooperated fully with the compliance audit process and responded to questions and document requests.
- 23. The campaign records were provided promptly by Mr. Mammoliti. However, the records did not include all of the bank statements and related cancelled cheques. Mr. Mammoliti provided an authorization that allowed us to obtain bank records directly from the campaign's financial institution. The process of obtaining these records from the bank somewhat delayed the compliance audit.

### 3.2 Financial Reporting

- 24. The Candidate failed to file an audited Financial Statement (or to file an unaudited Financial Statement), as acknowledged by Mr. Mammoliti. Campaign contributions and expenses exceeded \$10,000.

#### **Conclusion:**

- 25. In our opinion the failure to file an audited Financial Statement constitutes an apparent contravention of Section 88.25 of the Act that requires that candidates file an audited Financial Statement where campaign contributions and/or expenses exceed \$10,000.
- 26. Mr. Mammoliti stated that the reason for the failure to file an audited Financial Statement was his inability to retain an auditor to provide audit services for his campaign and the lack of campaign funds to retain an auditor. He stated that, early in the by-election, the media focused on 5 or 6 leading candidates, and that he was not one of these candidates. The campaign was unable to raise significant contributions once it became apparent that his chance at being elected Mayor was doubtful. **Exhibit 1** to this Report contains extracts from articles supporting his perspective.

### 3.3 Contributions

- 27. The campaign retained copies of cheques from contributors and records of contributions made through PayPal and Stripe. These records contained details of the contributors and their addresses. We had difficulty reconciling deposits made through Stripe to specific contributors and the campaign's Stripe account could no longer be accessed online. We did not conduct further procedures on these differences but confirm that they were less than \$10,000.

28. Official receipts would have been required for contributors to claim rebates from the City of Toronto, but rebates are only available where an audited Financial Statement is filed. In our opinion, not issuing official receipts where no Financial Statement was filed is not an apparent contravention of Sections 88.22(1)(f) and (g) of the Act.
29. Cash deposits to the campaign bank account were made on May 1 and 2, 2023 that Mr. Mammoliti advised were from attendees of the event who wanted to support the campaign and hear speeches but not remain for the meal portion of the event. Mr. Mammoliti advised that these attendees made cash donations that were mostly for \$20 per person.
30. Cash deposits to the campaign bank account included the following:
- a) May 2, 2023 – 267 \$20 bills, for a total of \$5,340, identified on the deposit slip as being from the fundraising event;
  - b) May 3, 2023 – 20 \$10 bills and 50 \$20 bills, for a total of \$1,200, identified on the deposit slip as being from the fundraising event;
  - c) May 16, 2023 – 1 \$10 bill, 4 \$20 bill, \$3.00 in coins, for a total of \$93, identified as being from a taxi event;
  - d) May 16, 2023 – 4 \$5 bills and 4 \$20 bills, for a total of \$100, identified as being from walk-ins to the campaign office;
  - e) May 24, 2023 – 20 \$50 bills, for a total of \$1,000, identified as “Donations from Giorgio Mammoliti Collection of \$20 Donations from Walk ins”;
  - f) May 25, 2023 – 1 \$20 bill and 1 \$100 bill, for a total of \$120, identified as a \$20 walk-in donation and a \$100 contribution from Giorgio Mammoliti;
  - g) June 9, 2023 – 1 \$5 bill, 1 \$10 bill, and 11 \$20 bills, for a total of \$225, identified as donations of \$20 each, \$10, and \$5.
31. Mr. Mammoliti contributed \$4,900 in cash to his campaign, as follows:
- a) May 16, 2023 – 22 \$50 bills and 37 \$100 bills, for a total of \$4,800; and
  - b) May 25, 2023 – 1 \$20 bill and 1 \$100 bill, for a total of \$120, of which \$100 was recorded as a contribution from Giorgio Mammoliti.
32. Mr. Mammoliti advised that these deposits consisted of personal funds. Section 88.8(8) of the Act provides that:

A contribution of money that exceeds \$25 shall not be contributed in the form of cash and shall be contributed in a manner that associates the

contributor's name and account with the payment or by a money order signed by the contributor.

**Conclusion:**

33. As noted above, the Act states "a contribution of money that exceeds \$25 shall not be contributed in the form of cash...". It does not distinguish between contributions of cash from candidates and from third parties. Accordingly, the contribution of \$4,900 (\$4,800 plus \$100) in cash constitutes an apparent contravention of Section 88.8(8) of the Act.<sup>6</sup>
34. The May 24, 2023 deposit of 20 \$50 bills was from unidentified contributors. Mr. Mammoliti advised that the fundraising event and each office were organized in a manner that provided change to contributors. He also advised that on occasion families donated \$50 as a family. We have not performed additional audit procedures in relation to these cash contributions.

**Conclusion:**

35. Based on available information, we have concluded that the deposit of 20 \$50 bills was not an apparent contravention of Section 88.8(8) of the Act.

### 3.4 Mammoliti's Loans and Contributions to the Campaign

36. Mr. Mammoliti contributed the following amounts to his campaign bank account, net of repayments:

Date	Amount	Description	Cheque
10-Apr-23	\$ 2,500.00	Giorgio Mammoliti contribution	Paypal
8-May-23	\$ 4,800.00	Giorgio Mammoliti contribution - cash	
16-May-23	-\$ 4,800.00	Reimbursement for loans to campaign	cheque 0033
25-May-23	\$ 100.00	Cash - per deposit slip	
26-May-23	\$ 35,000.00	Bank draft	
5-Jun-23	\$ 10,500.00	Bank draft	
21-Jun-23	-\$ 2,500.00	Reimbursement for loans to campaign	cheque 0058
15-Jun-23	-\$ 150.00	Reimbursement for loans to campaign	cheque 0059
11-Jul-23	-\$ 43.57	Withdrawal and close account	
	<u>\$ 45,406.43</u>		

<sup>6</sup> If the \$4,800 was instead considered to be a loan to the campaign that was subsequently repaid and not a contribution, this would be an apparent contravention of Section 88.17(1) of the Act, which requires any loan to a campaign to be funded directly from a bank or other lending institution.

37. Of the above amounts, \$45,500 was deposited to the campaign via bank drafts funded directly from Mr. Mammoliti's personal line of credit. Mr. Mammoliti advised that he considered these to be loans to his campaign.
38. The Act permits loans to a candidate's campaign, and states in Section 88.17(1) that:
- A candidate and his or her spouse may obtain a loan only from a bank or other recognized lending institution in Ontario, to be paid directly into the candidate's campaign account. 2016, c. 15, s. 55 (1).
39. However, the Act also states that "Any unpaid but guaranteed balance in respect of a loan under section 88.17. 2016, c. 15, s. 53 (3)" is a contribution. As the bank drafts from Mr. Mammoliti's personal line of credit were his personal financial responsibility, the unpaid portion of these loans is considered to be a campaign contribution.
40. As addressed under campaign expenses, Mr. Mammoliti acknowledged that he personally paid campaign expenses of \$15,240.14 that were not reimbursed from the campaign bank account. These payments increase the amount of Mr. Mammoliti's personal contributions from \$45,406.43 to \$60,646.57.

#### **Conclusion:**

41. Section 88.9.1(1) of the Act provides that the maximum contribution a candidate and his or her spouse may make to their own campaign is the lesser of a calculated amount and \$25,000, which in this by-election the maximum contribution allowed was \$25,000. Mr. Mammoliti's net contribution of \$45,406.43 (\$60,646.57 including the additional expenses paid personally) exceeded this limit and as such is an apparent contravention of Section 88.9.1(1) of the Act.
42. Mr. Mammoliti acknowledged this over-contribution. He advised that his intent had been to loan funds to his campaign and to repay the loan from third party contributions to the campaign. However, due to campaign circumstances, a decision was made to shut down the campaign prior to voting day. After that decision fundraising was no longer effective.
43. Mr. Mammoliti advised that the focus on other candidates in the media and the increasing unlikelihood of being elected resulted in contributions to the campaign drying up and in the campaign being unable to repay him for his loans to the campaign.
44. **Exhibit 1** to this Report includes extracts from two articles indicating that, by early in the campaign period, Mr. Mammoliti was not included as one of the leading candidates in the by-election.

### 3.5 Campaign Expenses

45. In his application for a compliance audit, the applicant submitted that there was evidence of significant spending in areas such as robocalls and an expensive campaign launch that suggests the failure to file a Financial Statement may have been a deliberate attempt to avoid revealing other campaign finance irregularities. His submission included social media posts related to robocalls, and online postings of photographs from a campaign event held on April 27, 2023.
46. The candidate held a fundraising event on April 27, 2023 at the Grand Luxe. The cost paid to the Grand Luxe by the campaign was \$25,100.98. We also identified robocall costs paid by the campaign bank account and did not identify any apparent contraventions of the Act in relation to these direct costs.
47. Social Know How Inc. provided services to the campaign, but the terms of the arrangement were not agreed to in writing and the arrangement was severed, as supported by correspondence, invoices, and unsigned agreements. The total paid by the campaign was \$29,380.00, consisting of a campaign cheque for \$15,000 and two CIBC Visa payments from Giorgio Mammoliti's personal Visa card (\$7,000.00 and \$7,380.00), for which the campaign reimbursed him by cheque for \$14,380.00.
48. Email correspondence related to severing the arrangement is consistent with the payments. The vendor suggested that the services had a fair market value of \$40,000, whereas both parties agreed to a total payment of \$29,380. The fair value of the services is difficult to value independently and the agreement for the services had not been signed as accepted by the campaign. The reference to approximately \$40,000 was made during discussions as to what services the campaign could afford and a dispute over their value.
49. Section 88.22(1)(i) of the Act requires that the candidate retain records in relation to disputed amounts.

#### **Conclusion:**

50. The campaign appropriately retained documents in relation to disputed amounts, in accordance with Section 88.22(1)(i) of the Act.
51. The campaign entered into two lease agreements for office space and campaign headquarters:
  - a) 42 Cummer Avenue – a residential property just off Yonge Street, for a two month term for \$3,450 per month, all inclusive. The lease included the main floor and front and back yards of a one story bungalow, excluding the basement apartment. A payment of \$6,900 was made to the landlord, 42 Cummer Avenue Inc.

- b) 70 Plunkett Road, Unit 5 – a unit for which the signed lease agreement states is for two months (May and June 2023), for \$2,260 per month, including HST. The lease was with Mohammad Arabsalmany, whose business had previously occupied the unit. Mr. Arabsalmany did not cash the second cheque for \$2,260.00.
- 52. The \$2,260 payment not cashed by Mr. Arabsalmany would be considered a contribution in kind, but as no Financial Statement was filed it is not known whether this would have been recorded as such.
- 53. The campaign entered into agreements to lease two copiers, one for each location, for a cost of \$961.35 per copier; a total of \$1,922.70. The campaign paid \$1,200 by cheque to Dynasty Office Solutions. Mr. Mammoliti advised that the copiers were not used for the full campaign period and the \$1,200 was an agreed-upon settlement for the lower usage and early return of the equipment. As no Financial Statement was filed it is not known whether this would have been recorded appropriately.
- 54. Mr. Mammoliti's Visa account CIBC – 2510 disclosed the following two campaign expenses that were not reimbursed by the campaign bank account:
  - a) May 1, 2023 – \$6,200.14 paid to Alpha Entertainment. Mr. Mammoliti advised that this was for entertainment at the April 27, 2023 Grand Luxe event.
  - b) June 12, 2023 – \$9,040.00 paid to UB Media, a business that provides place-based media at locations such as condominium buildings.

**Conclusion:**

- 55. Mr. Mammoliti confirmed that these payments, totaling \$15,240.14, were campaign expenses. As these expenses were not reimbursed to Mr. Mammoliti from the campaign bank account, in our opinion these are apparent contraventions of Section 88.22(1)(d) of the Act, which requires that all expenses be paid from the campaign bank account.
- 56. In our opinion, the Candidate's campaign expenses subject to limitation did not exceed the campaign's authorized limit.

## 4 Restrictions and Limitations

57. This Compliance Audit Report was prepared for the City of Toronto's Compliance Audit Committee to identify apparent contraventions of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*. We understand that this Report will be accessible on the City's website as an attachment to the Agenda and/or other postings related to the Compliance Audit Committee. However, this Report is to be relied upon only by the Compliance Audit Committee and is not to be used for any other purpose. We specifically disclaim any responsibility for losses or damages incurred through use of this Report for a purpose other than as described in this paragraph.
58. We reserve the right, but will be under no obligation, to review and/or revise the contents of this Report in light of information which becomes known to us after the date of this Report.

Yours truly



**Ken Froese**, FCPA, FCA•IFA, FCFI, CFF  
Senior Managing Director



**Mike McNeill**, CPA, CA  
Affiliate  
License to Practice as a Public  
Accountant 3-30680





## Exhibit 1

## Exhibit 1

# I CAN'T SEE GEORGIO MAMMOLITI AND ANTHONY PERUZZA STAYING IN THE RACE FOR MAYOR, KAREN STINTZ TELLS FIGHT BACK

Apr 21, 2023

By Jane Brown

Share on   

Expect the field of candidates for Toronto's next mayor to continue to shrink.

After Gil Penalosa announced this week he was dropping out and supporting Olivia Chow, former city councillor Karen Stintz told Jane Brown on Zoomer Radio's Fight Back, he won't be the last.



"I can't see Giorgio Mammoliti going the distance, I can't see Anthony Peruzza staying in, so there will be a lot of falling off in the next couple of weeks." Stintz explained.

## Opinion | The race to be Toronto's mayor is finally set: Here are the six leading contenders

Updated July 19, 2023 at 6:48 a.m. | May 13, 2023 | 6 min read



The six leading mayoral candidates, top left to right. Ana Bailao, Josh Matlow, Mitzie Hunter. Bottom row left to right Olivia Chow, Brad Bradford and Mark Saunders.

Richard Lautens / Toronto Star