

**From:** [Andreas Kalogiannides](#)  
**To:** [councilmeeting](#)  
**Subject:** [External Sender] My comments for 2026.CC39.1 on March 25, 2026 City Council  
**Date:** March 24, 2026 4:05:02 PM

---

To the City Clerk:

Please add my comments to the agenda for the March 25, 2026 City Council meeting on item 2026.CC39.1, Report on Councillor Chris Moise's Comments to a Constituent.

**Please make my comments visible/downloadable online on the item webpage.** I

understand that my comments and the personal information in this email will form part of the public record and that my name will be listed as a correspondent on agendas and minutes of City Council or its committees. Also, I understand that agendas and minutes are posted online and my name may be indexed by search engines like Google.

**My comments:**

Chris' conduct is beyond discreditable. Frankly, it is slanderous and he should be fired. I am a practising lawyer, and I view the matter through that lens. It is only by the grace and good faith of Mr. Tate, and his intention to avoid conflict, that Chris is not facing litigation for slander. Because his derogatory remarks meet the standard for a slander claim. Chris' comments were made in a public forum, in front of several people and on video; the fact that Chris made the comments knowing that he was on video shows that he believed that he has the right to say whatever he wants without impunity. This fact alone demonstrates not only Chris' arrogance, but also very poor judgment. It also demonstrates the need for a strong corrective consequence against him. He currently believes he can do whatever he wants.

The Commissioner's report doesn't mention that this is the **second** time Chris has called Daniel Tate some version of a racist. When Daniel was deputing on the name change for Yonge-Dundas Square at Executive Committee in 2023 (I believe it was 2023), Chris called Daniel "a racist" while Daniel was deputing. Daniel of course heard this, as did everyone in the gallery, specifically including Paula Fletcher who was seated next to Moise. This is, of course, all on video. Once again, it is notable that Daniel did not pursue a slander claim or commence a complaint with the Integrity Commissioner; when it happened again, Daniel must have felt compelled to act.

Further, there is absolutely zero reasonable basis for Chris labelling Mr. Tate as a racist or white supremacist. There is nothing you can find online or offline about Daniel being racist, making racist comments. And this man is online a lot, putting comments out to the public on a variety of matters and whose organization, IntegrityTO, has a very large

and engaged following in Toronto.

Rather, the only reason Chris has tried to label Mr. Tate a racist is because he disagrees with Mr. Tate's politics. I know this because A. it's obvious and B. I have engaged with Chris multiple times about issues in the ward, and he is equally dismissive of my thoughts and complaints about serious ward issues. He hasn't gone as far as to impugn my character, and if he did I would take action against him without hesitation. But this is how Chris works: if he doesn't agree with you ideologically, then he will not listen to you or, at worst, becomes hostile. This is the experience of many other constituents I have spoken with across many demographics and issues. Chris' character deficiencies and repugnant actions are not limited to Mr. Tate. This is a pattern. Further evidence for this pattern is that many constituents have called Kristyn Wong-Tam, the former councillor, to complain about Chris' lack of engagement and rude and dismissive behaviour. I was also one of these people! I know this because I know KWT and have spoken directly with her, and I have heard her dismay about Chris' dealings with constituents and that there are dozens of others who she has also spoken to. I do not intend on betraying her confidence, but I feel that, in this instance, the truth is more important. This is a very clear pattern with Chris. If he doesn't agree with you, or doesn't like you, he refuses to engage; if you push him, because he is a weak person controlled mostly by his ideology and emotions, he might lash out and become aggressive. And this is, in fact, what he did to Mr. Tate.

I would also submit that it is Chris who, as a sworn councillor, has a duty to follow the code of conduct for members. His constituents do not, including Mr. Tate. Therefore, it is of no consequence whether Mr. Tate, or anyone else, allegedly "harassed" Chris or wanted to capture him on film in some type of "gotcha" moment or did anything else short of breaking the law. The code of conduct doesn't swing both ways; it applies only to Chris as a councillor in a public role of significant trust and authority and confidence. Constituents are free to criticize and communicate with their elected representatives in a free and democratic society. Regardless of their political affiliations or thoughts or ideology. Citizens can, subject to applicable libel and slander laws, say whatever they want to their councillors. The opposite, however, is not true. Councillors **cannot** say whatever they want to constituents. They have an obligation to treat the constituent in line with the code of conduct, and act with integrity and without malice and aggression. Chris' actions fall well short of this standard. So, in the Integrity Commissioner's report, it should be of no consequence that Chris believes Mr. Tate had publicly criticized his office or his policies; or even that Mr. Tate showed up at Chris' constituency office looking to speak with Chris, or even still that Mr. Tate wanted answers from Chris at this public meeting on whether Chris intends to rename more City assets and the associated costs. Subject to the criminal code and the law, Mr. Tate is well within his right to do **all**

of these things. This doesn't justify a finding that Chris' conduct should be excused because he felt some type of political pressure from Mr. Tate – that's the job! Dealing with constituents! It's not "dealing only with constituents with whom you agree"! This is what Chris fundamentally doesn't understand. Therefore, the IC report erred in taking into consideration Mr. Tate's engagements with Chris prior to Chris calling him a white supremacist in public. It is inconsequential, and it's wrong for the IC to take Mr. Tate's actions – which are legal and normal – into account in assessing Chris' conduct.

Furthermore, the IC report notes that it accepts Chris' position that, because he has somehow – without evidence, mind you – been a victim of racism or systemic racism and/or belongs to an "oppressed class" (which "oppressed class" is this - well to do business owner councillors?), any consequences should be mitigated. Not only does Chris put forward zero evidence for whatever racism he alleges took place, but also it is completely irrelevant! What may or may not have happened to Chris in the past has no bearing on his own intentional decision, as a rational adult, to call Mr. Tate a white supremacist at a public meeting (never mind that this is the SECOND time Chris called Mr. Tate a racist to begin with). The idea that, by virtue of belonging to some "marginalized" group (again, which group is this - the group that makes more than 2x the average Toronto salary in a position of significant trust and authority while owning a business on the side and a Cabbagetown home? Can such a person be "oppressed" or "marginalized"?), a councillor can not be held responsible for their words and actions is incomprehensible.

Not only that, but it also creates a very dangerous precedent for future IC decisions. If the councillor in question was white and he called a black constituent some racist epithet, would the IC and Council accept that the white councillor shouldn't be responsible because of his past experience with racism or prejudice? What if he was made fun of as a child because he has red hair? Or glasses? Or because a Ryerson student yelled at him at a protest for allegedly "owning slaves" or some other rubbish? Would the IC and Council accept that fact pattern as a mitigating factor, with the same gusto with which it is now accepting Chris'?

To put this into perspective, consider if Mr. Tate had called Chris a gay slur – how would Moise react? More than likely, knowing his character Chris would erupt! The constituent would be banned from attending future meetings. Chris would put measures into place to never have to speak again with this person through his office. Council would pass motion upon motion supporting gays and condemning the constituent. Money and grants would flow to the LGBTQ community. Chris would launch a civil claim against the constituent for slander. He might even rename a few more squares after members of the gay community...And yet, when the fact pattern is reversed as it is here with Mr. Tate, the

IC commissioner recommends no penalties whatsoever for Chris. Does that seem a reasonable outcome within a system designed to hold councillors accountable for their dealings with the public?

Does the IC consider Chris' behaviour to be the standard to which we hold councillors? Or would it apply its DEI lens and analysis equally to the hypothetical white man who called a hypothetical black constituent some racist epithet? Does the IC and Council believe that, had Mr. Tate called Chris a slur in public, that Chris, Council and the media wouldn't erupt in a chorus of condemnation and retribution, which might reasonably have the effect of ruining that person's personal and professional life?

It cannot be all ways. There has to be one standard for all councillors, regardless of their sex, race or any other identity characteristic. With this decision, the IC is entrenching the view held by most at Council, and certainly most staffers, that there are two classes of people: the oppressed and the oppressors. And, regardless of the facts, every situation must be judged within that lens, and the oppressed can do no wrong no matter what they say or do. To put it more clearly, with this decision, the IC is demonstrating that its reports and decisions are politically and ideologically biased. It hollows the integrity of the Office of the Integrity Commissioner ('integrity' is right there in the name...)

The reality is also that Chris has doubled down on his stance that Mr. Tate is a white supremacist. In media interviews Chris gave since the IC report, he has said that he has "no regrets" and will continue to "stand up against white nationalism and supremacy". The idea that Chris feels so entitled and invulnerable that he feels he doesn't have to apologize for his conduct is beyond understanding. It shows his character. It shows that Chris knows that the IC and Council are unlikely to hold him accountable. No apology. No expression of regret. He instead says he will continue to fight "white supremacy". Where? In Toronto? as a councillor downtown? Where's all this white supremacy? Presumably, according to Chris, it lies within Mr. Tate! Because there is zero white supremacy in Toronto, particularly in downtown Toronto and particularly in Ward 13 which votes almost exclusively NDP and is far-left leaning. Where are the white supremacists you're fighting, Chris, besides allegedly Mr. Tate? This is a thinly-veiled excuse: that Chris should not be held accountable because he is righteous and virtuous and "fighting white supremacy". It is a DEI dog whistle and smokescreen.

If Council and the IC let Chris off without consequence for calling a constituent a white supremacist, in public and on video, then the articles of the code of conduct cannot mean much. What would be required to breach them? Is associating someone's character, in public, and without any evidence at all, with literal Nazis or violent white skinheads not sufficient for a consequence? Where's the line? How far would a

councillor need to go and how repugnant would their conduct need to be for a finding that they've breached the Code and are subject to a strong corrective consequence?

This is a very important issue. Perhaps more important than Council and the IC understand at this moment. The entire city and media is watching the outcome, believe it or not. The issue is whether IC and Council will hold a Councillor accountable for their conduct. That and that alone is the issue. Not Chris' alleged history of oppression or racism. Not anything else. If Chris isn't held to account, then the City is sending the message to all Councillors that there are no consequences to libelling or slandering their constituents. What does that do to the balance of power between councillors and citizens? Will more councillors start to ignore constituents' concerns (Malik, Chow, Moise, Bravo and Perks all do this currently) without fear of reprisal? Will they feel emboldened to call constituents they don't agree with "racist" or "bigoted" or any other type of slur? Will councillors feel emboldened, more than they already are, to label entire groups as "oppressors" or "colonizers", and use that as the basis for outright dismissing their concerns and thoughts without first engaging with them? Will citizens engage less with their councillors and the City because they feel that their concerns won't be taken seriously, or worse, that they'll be labelled racists or misogynist or with some -phobia *du jour*?

Council must recommend that IC impose a stiff penalty on Chris. He should be fired from Council; if not, he should be forfeiting 6 months' salary. Because, again, what would it take for someone to get fired for calling a constituent a "white supremacist" and a racist? I cannot reasonably imagine worse things for a sitting Councillor to call someone in public and on video.

- End communication

Andreas