

**From:** [Jenn Hilsden \(Cancon Fashion\)](#)  
**To:** [councilmeeting](#)  
**Cc:** [Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** [External Sender] Item DM35.2 – Request to Post Correspondence on the Public Record  
**Date:** December 15, 2025 4:07:49 PM

---

Dear City Clerk,

Please find my correspondence regarding **Item DM35.2** attached below.

I request that this correspondence be **made readable, publicly posted, and included in the official public record** for Item DM35.2 in accordance with City of Toronto Council procedures.

---

**Letter:**

To Mayor Olivia Chow and Members of City Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Item DM35.2, which would authorize the City of Toronto to reimburse up to \$50,000 in legal expenses for third-party contractors or consultants who are subject to active or pending litigation.

This proposal represents a serious departure from established principles of public accountability and risk management. Third-party consultants are retained at arm's length precisely to limit the City's legal and financial exposure. As a condition of their contracts, they are required to carry adequate professional and liability insurance so that defence costs and potential liability do not fall on taxpayers.

Item DM35.2 undermines this framework by shifting private legal risk onto the public purse. It effectively creates a taxpayer-funded indemnity for consultants whose legal expenses are not covered by their insurers. This is neither appropriate nor justifiable, and it raises significant concerns about moral hazard and precedent.

City Council has a fiduciary duty to manage public funds prudently. Authorizing public payment of legal fees for third-party contractors—particularly in circumstances where litigation is ongoing and unresolved—fails to meet that obligation.

I am also deeply concerned by language in the accompanying report that characterizes active legal proceedings as “nuisance” claims. Residents who bring legal challenges are exercising a lawful right in a democratic society. Until a court has heard the evidence and ruled on the merits, it is inappropriate and prejudicial for Council or City staff to dismiss such proceedings. Only the judiciary has the authority to make that determination.

For these reasons, I urge Council to reject Item DM35.2 and instead conduct a thorough review to ensure that all City contractors and consultants maintain adequate insurance coverage for all foreseeable contingencies, including legal defence costs. Council should not insulate City-appointed consultants from the consequences of their conduct at public expense. Doing so would further erode public trust at a time when confidence in municipal decision-making is already strained.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,  
Jennifer Hilsden  
Ward 10

---