

councilmeeting

From: Andreas Kalogiannides <andreaskalogiannides@gmail.com>
Sent: April 20, 2026 8:03 PM
To: councilmeeting
Subject: [External Sender] Re: My comments for 2026.CC40.1 on April 22, 2026 City Council

Categories: Communication (Supp)

To the City Clerk:

I am resubmitting my comments with my consent to publish and make visible online within the comments.

Please add my comments to the agenda for the April 22, 2026 City Council meeting on item 2026.CC40.1, Payment of Legal Expenses Related to an Integrity Commissioner Investigation. please publish my comments such that they're visible online.

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.

Comments

Please publish my comments online such that they are visible on the item page.

The idea that a councillor can call a constituent a white supremacist, repeatedly, on non-consecutive occasions, be found by the Integrity Commissioner to have violated the Code of Conduct for members, have that report dismissed by Council as "information," and then ask Council to pay for that councillor's legal fees... is completely beyond the pale. This means that councillors, effectively, have 100% immunity against consequences for their words and actions. This is completely unacceptable in a transparent and fair democracy. I have trouble believing that this state of affairs actually exists, and that I am deputing against it.

I'm assuming the mechanism allowing the Council to reimburse councillors for legal fees is intended to address situations where they incur fees due to a spurious or vexatious claim against them. It could not possibly have been intended to cover a situation where a councillor, having been found by the Integrity Commissioner to have violated the Code of Conduct—meaning they lost the decision—still gets reimbursed for their legal fees. There is no reasonable scenario in which this makes any sense! Even in court, losing does not grant you the right to have the other side cover your costs - for how would that be reasonable? It would only encourage further bad conduct because there are no cost consequences to bringing a vexatious claim!

This entire situation is made even worse by the fact that Moise has doubled-down on his comments in media subsequent to the Council's decision to dismiss the report. He has neither apologized nor expressed remorse

for his statements. In fact, he has said that he will never apologize, and continued to imply that Daniel Tate is a white supremacist by saying that he will 'stand up against white supremacy'.

By voting to receive the report for "information", Council is already sending the message that it doesn't hold its own members to account for their conduct. This is clear. Now, were it to also indemnify Moise for his legal bills - again, in a situation where the Integrity Commissioner judged Moise to have violated the Code - Council would be sending the message that the Code of Conduct and the Office of the Integrity Commissioner do not matter at all. There are zero consequences now. Zero. Councillors can, effectively, act with impunity as they would now have a full shield against any repercussions, whether from the Integrity Commissioner or to their pocketbook. Councillors are free to act as they please without any recourse from the citizenry whatsoever.

Elections happen only every 4 years. Between elections, mechanisms must exist to hold councillors accountable for their conduct. This is the core of the Code of Conduct. By voting to ignore the Commissioner's report, Council hollowed out the power of that office and the power citizens have to complain about their councillors' conduct. If Council were to now allow Moise to recoup his legal costs, the hollowing out of democracy will be complete.

For shame.

Andreas

Sent via [BlackBerry Hub+ Inbox for Android](#)

From: andreaskalogiannides@gmail.com
Sent: April 20, 2026 7:58 p.m.
To: councilmeeting@toronto.ca
Subject: Re: My comments for 2026.CC40.1 on April 22, 2026 City Council

Hello

Please make my comments visible on the item page. As I indicated in my original email

This happened the last time i submitted comments. Despite me indicating several times that i want my comments public.

Andreas

Sent via [BlackBerry Hub+ Inbox for Android](#)

From: andreaskalogiannides@gmail.com
Sent: April 20, 2026 1:23 p.m.
To: councilmeeting@toronto.ca
Subject: My comments for 2026.CC40.1 on April 22, 2026 City Council

To the City Clerk:

Please add my comments to the agenda for the April 22, 2026 City Council meeting on item 2026.CC40.1, Payment of Legal Expenses Related to an Integrity Commissioner Investigation. **please publish my comments such that they're visible online.**

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.

Comments:

The idea that a councillor can call a constituent a white supremacist, repeatedly, on non-consecutive occasions, be found by the Integrity Commissioner to have violated the Code of Conduct for members, have that report dismissed by Council as "information," and then ask Council to pay for that councillor's legal fees... is completely beyond the pale. This means that councillors, effectively, have 100% immunity against consequences for their words and actions. This is completely unacceptable in a transparent and fair democracy. I have trouble believing that this state of affairs actually exists, and that I am deputing against it.

I'm assuming the mechanism allowing the Council to reimburse councillors for legal fees is intended to address situations where they incur fees due to a spurious or vexatious claim against them. It could not possibly have been intended to cover a situation where a councillor, having been found by the Integrity Commissioner to have **violated the Code of Conduct**—meaning they **lost** the decision—still gets reimbursed for their legal [fees](#). [There](#) is no reasonable scenario in which this makes any sense! Even in court, losing does not grant you the right to have the other side cover your costs - for how would that be reasonable? It would only encourage further bad conduct because there are no cost consequences to bringing a vexatious claim!

This entire situation is made even worse by the fact that Moise has doubled-down on his comments in media subsequent to the Council's decision to dismiss the report. He has neither apologized nor expressed remorse for his statements. In fact, he has said that he will never apologize, and continued to imply that Daniel Tate is a white supremacist by saying that he will 'stand up against white supremacy'.

By voting to receive the report for "information", Council is already sending the message that it doesn't hold its own members to account for their conduct. This is clear. Now, were it to also indemnify Moise for his legal bills - again, in a situation where the Integrity Commissioner judged Moise to have violated the Code - Council would be sending the message that the Code of Conduct and the Office of the Integrity Commissioner do not matter at all. There are zero consequences now. Zero. Councillors can, effectively, act with impunity as they would now have a full shield against any repercussions, whether from the Integrity Commissioner or to their pocketbook. Councillors are free to act as they please without any recourse from the citizenry whatsoever.

Elections happen only every 4 years. Between elections, mechanisms must exist to hold councillors accountable for their conduct. This is the core of the Code of Conduct. By voting to ignore the Commissioner's report, Council hollowed out the power of that office and the power citizens have to

complain about their councillors' conduct. If Council were to now allow Moise to recoup his legal costs, the hollowing out of democracy will be complete.

For shame.

Andreas