From the Campaign to Elect
Donald Barber
Mayor of Mississauga - 2010

City of Mississauga
ATTN: **Mayor and all members of Council.**
ATTN: **Mary Ellen Bench** - City Solicitor
ATTN: **Janice M. Baker** - City Manager & CAO .
ATTN: **Crystal Greer** - City Clerk.
ATTN: **Pina Mancuso** - Election Project Manager

RE: A formal request and complaint, that requires immediate attention.

Dear Madam/Sirs: Oct. 18, 2010

Opening Statement;

As you know, a number of Mayoralty candidates who wanted to be and should have been part of the recently held Mayoralty debate at the University of Toronto - Mississauga, were barred from doing so. Substantial evidence has been gathered to show that the Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET) and Rogers, held a Mayoralty debate that was deeply flawed by **bias**, **Conflict of Interest, improper actions**, maybe even **Bribery** and **Frauds on the government** such that, it can be considered sufficiently tainted by **corrupt practices**. Most significant is the fact it has been and will be broadcasted more than once by Rogers, claiming it is a proper all-candidates forum that will affect who voters will choose when casting their election ballots - the power of the media in elections can not be over stated.

In this case, a bias or advantage in favour of the incumbent Mayor - Hazel McCallion and as she is running a slate of candidates who can work for with her, affects most elections currently being held. Even though some sections of the Criminal Code are noted, this matter is first and foremost the City of Mississauga's responsibility to deal with and holding an all-candidates debate in the Great hall at City hall, will significantly help to rebalance the election in the minds of Mississaugans voters. Many Mayoralty candidates who have paid their nomination fees to the City, were not able to participate in the MIRANET Mayoralty debate for various reasons, who would have liked to have, should have, participated with Mississauga's voters and taxpayers attending & asking questions.

The City is in a position to take action to ensure an election according to the highest Democratic principles of fairness for Mississaugans. Again, **it is asked that you assist us in the effort to use the great hall at City hall** or maybe some other, easy to find and use space for the desired true town hall meeting.

Overview of the situation - please read carefully;

An election in a Democracy is a sacred trust, paid for by the sacrifice of lives and blood of all those who created Canada and is not to be taken for granted. An election in Canada is an essential public service, as a free and fair election is necessary for a healthy, safe and secure Democracy. The disruption or in some way facilitating the disruption of the government process of a free and fair election by unfair and corrupt practices/means for political purposes/gains, should be seen as a threat to its integrity, its intended purpose and the accurate results regarding who Canada voters declare should form our government(s). The government body responsible for an elections operation and oversight needs to immediately take such action as to return the election to its proper state or balance for all those involved, when called upon.

The City's duty is both to the legislation that governs elections (and related legal processes), and to Mississaugans, to do all it can to ensure a lawful, fair and honest election - free of corrupt practices. It can be said the City of Mississauga has a fiduciary duty to Mississaugans, as a proper election is in their best interests. "A fiduciary is someone who has undertaken to act for and on behalf of another in a particular matter in circumstances which give rise to a relationship of trust and confidence." - Bristol & West Building Society v Mothew [1998] Ch 1 at 18 per Lord Millett. It can also be said that City staff are in an ethical relationship (or duty) of confidence and good conscience that it requires them to act at all times with good faith and loyalty for the greater benefit and interests of Mississaugans, then those of the City's politicians, in a time of election. To do otherwise would be a neglect of duties.

The Election Act may not directly say the City is to ensure fair campaigns by incumbents and their supporters, however the wording of the Act is clear in its wording and intent to ban false and misleading statements/practices by those involved as well as corrupt practices in general. Therefore; for the City of Mississauga to say it must be "complete neutrality in respect of the political campaigns conducted by candidates up to and including that date is essential." is to ignore both the fore mentioned regarding elections in Canada and the City's fiduciary duty to Mississaugans as well as Canadian Democratic traditions in general. Which can be seen as being done for the benefit of the incumbents election efforts. It also needs to be noted that in Canada, if a person or government body is in the position to help citizens in distress, being intimidated, harmed and/or bullied - there it is the expectation that efforts to help, to right a wrong should be made.

The Mississauga Judicial Inquiry (MJI) testimony has made public that for years the Mayor has been using her position in a highly questionable fashion for her own self interest and in the past she has been found to have committed a Conflict of Interest as Mayor. An invisible government she conducted to hide her and her family's business gains.

....3

Therefore; conditions favorable for corruption - it is not unreasonable to suggest that a Mayor who has been in power for more than 30 years would have a network of friends and supporters (Cronyism) in Mississauga who would do whatever they can to assist her re-election and later be rewarded in some way by the Mayor's office. Also bearing in mind the Mayor doesn't spend money on election campaigns or undertake a conventional election campaign but still gets elected.

One of the elements of the Mayor's success in getting re-elected over and over is another element of corrupt practices in Mississauga, the lack of investigative reporting in the local media that has greatly contributed the lack of administrative transparency in City hall. This will be noted in greater details later on - the City should not expect others to do their duty for Mississaugans.

The City must also seriously consider the public's perception of corrupt practices detailed in MJI testimony as to how business was/is done in Mississauga by elected officials and as no action to correct the exposed corrupt practices has been undertaken, it would be reasonable to assume they still are going on, in one form or another. Remember when it comes to Conflict of Interest and other political circumstances, its - what would a reasonable and unbias person in the community perceive, when made aware of the facts or in the wording of the MJI, the "optics" of a situation? **The City** must be seen as serving the public's interests in ensuring a free and fair election in a Democracy and not aiding the incumbents.

It is known that in Mississauga shady deals and Conflict of Interest have occurred and very likely are currently going on, such things like trading in influence, favours, influence peddling and improper influence is not a far fetched matter to consider. A conflict of interest can occur when an individual or organization is involved in multiple interests and that can be seen with both members of MIRANET and the Mayor. That a campaign contribution by way of the manner in which an all-candidates meeting or debate is held, can aid or benefit the incumbent over the other candidates. That after having done so and the successful re-election of the incumbent, those who assisted the re-election are in line for reward for helping to maintain the political status quo.

City of Mississauga staff must not underestimate the power of the media, especially TV, to influence viewers opinions and the behavior of voters. City staff must believe they have a duty to the voters and the Canadian election process to deal with the broadcasting of false, misleading statements and presentations - to do what it can to fix a wrong before election day, to save everyone the cost of trying to fix the errors later, as the City is in the best position to do so - now.

....4

The community group at the core of this matter is Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET) - the so-called umbrella organization for Mississauga Ratepayers. In fact, MIRANET notes its own representation of Ratepayers groups as follows; Ward 1, **7** - Ward 2, **9** - Ward 3, **1** - Ward 4, **none** - Ward 5, **none** - Ward 6, **none** - Ward 7, **3** - Ward 8, **4** - Ward 9, **none** - Ward 10, **2** - Ward 11, **1** = **27** City groups wide. In a City with a population of about 7000,000, they represent a minority of primarily homeowners in small sections of their Wards and even in their geological area, few are actually paying members. Their concerns are mostly those of homeowners and questionable regarding renters issues, who make up a sizable population in Mississauga. For MIRANET to presented itself as "City-wide network of Ratepayer and Residents' Associations in Mississauga", is less than accurate and misleading to Mississaugans regarding representing the true City issues of the day. MIRANET states - "Our intention is to work collectively in a positive and constructive manner with the City and other levels of government to promote the interests of Mississauga residents and contribute to the City's success.", in other words a lobbying group or their own interests. As MIRANET does business with the City as a lobbing group and it is a well known fact that to do business with the City of Mississauga, you have to be on the Mayor's good side, we wonder just how fair MIRANET could be.

Even though some sections of the Criminal Code are noted, this matter is first and foremost the City of Mississauga's responsible to deal with and holding an all-candidates debate in the Great hall at City hall will significantly help to rebalance the election in the minds of Mississaugans voters. **The City** is in a position to take action to ensure an election according to the highest Democratic principles of fairness for Mississaugans.

Miranet rules for debate;

Miranet wanted a certain kind of person/candidate at the debate, to present to the public the candidates who satisfied their beliefs or biases, knowing the voters will give greater consideration to those presented in the broadcast. To protect the Mayor at the debate from the stress a true debate would have, by breaking the group of candidates into just three at a time. As the Mayor has lost control of Council, important to give her a smaller, more manageable group. Also, by imposing a harsh set of dictatorial rules MIRANET sets out to eliminate those who either fail to jump through their hoops by accident or who have moral and ethical issues with them. It needs to be noted that is the first time candidate Donald Barber, who is in his 5th campaign for the Mayor's seat has ever been asked to sign a contract regarding the rules of an election debate and such a threatening one.

The City should take a stand against this kind of effort at muzzling election candidates by way of contract, as it is a direct attack on Canada's Democratic culture, traditions and Charter of Rights & Freedoms.

....5

They also do great harm to candidates reputation in the community if they don't sign for obvious moral and ethical reasons, it will none-the-less be suggested they can't follow rules - sucker punch.

The two pages of MIRANET's "Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates" are clearly drafted by a legal minded person with the intent to create as many ways as possible to remove candidates from the debate or intimidate them into submission. In no way can a reasonable person say these rules are "common sense" rules. In fact, Ratepayers debates before this one have never required candidates to send in a statement they agree "unconditionally" to their forum's rules. One of the true reasons for this extra level of bureaucracy is MIRANET's stated desire to ban candidates not in the debate from the room - they can't watch, record or even be a witness. Clearly, that fact shows MIRANET is setting out to create a very special environment for the Mayor. Also, these kind of rules are very useful in creating conflicts with candidates by organizations that wish to discredit a candidate in the eyes of votes, for the benefit of another candidate. Another reason the City should not allow such contact or extreme wording in debate rules, as it will likely lead to unnecessary conflict and even violence - police action in elections.

MIRANET required the signing of their rules and Rogers release, which MIRANET regards as a ironclad contract and this can be seen in video of the events at U of T, Dorothy Tomiuk, MIRANET Spokesperson - "Its in writing, he accepted it, if he doesn't accept it, he is **out on his ass** too - got that?" On the YouTube video - Fascist Mississauga debate by MIRANET at UofT. Her out-burst speaks volumes as to the kind of negative interpretation MIRANET would apply to a candidate taking a positive moral or ethical stand on a issue.

Most importantly there were two guards or Black Shirts at this meeting (that could be seen), one was even in a bullet proof vest and that has never happened before in a Mississauga all-candidates debates. Not only was MIRANET planning on conflict but they have sunk Mississauga to a new low of paranoia! Another harmful effect on the Mississauga political community that **the City** must not let happen again.

The wording MIRANET used (and in conversation with John F Walmark), targeted candidate Barber with its comments to the media and indicated MIRANET wanted to make sure the Mayor didn't have to worry about pictures and video that didn't show her at her best. "Candidates "fiddling" with recording equipment could be distracting, she says.", "Tomiuk says the policy is designed to minimize distractions for the candidates and the audience. "You can't be a candidate and be fiddling with a camera," she said." MIRANET has decided who can and can not be a candidate and projects this opinion to those who watch the debate (by the absence of the candidates) or reads these comments and thinks the same. MIRANET is aiming to make sure those who use cameras to report on the Mississauga election and post the video & pictures on the Internet, as a public service, will not even be allowed in the room!

....6

MIRANET rules are very lengthy regarding making recordings, more so then should reasonable be expected unless they had grave concerns of some kind. Like shielding the Mayor from the power of the Internet. It also needs to be noted that in terms of what is "distracting", having the candidates repeatedly playing musical chairs in front of the camera was far more so then anything that would have happened off camera.

The City needs to stand with candidates regarding the benefits to their campaigns and informing Mississaugans in general and do whatever it can to allow the candidates the same kind of access as usually granted to main stream media at election events for the purpose of recording events they attend.

The City must take note that two Mayoralty candidates - Donald Barber & Ursula Keuper-Bennett have been recognized by Judge J. Douglas Cunningham, Commissioner of the Mississauga Judicial Inquiry, as being "Citizens journalists", that "play an important role in the reporting and analysis of events." and "as Mr. Barber noted in his submissions, for freedom of expression to be meaningful, members of the public should have access to a broad range of opinions and coverage."

That John F Walmark is President of the Orchard Heights Homeowners also on the MIRANET 2010 Mayoral Debate Committee, informed Ursula that there would be no video and recording of any kind - this rule was not made known properly to invited candidates, an inquiry had to be made. Such a rule and not informing the quests, election candidates who would reasonable assume they had the same rights and freedoms that are usually extended to them, would have been caught short and a conflict would likely arise over the unreasonableness of the invented rule. That candidate Ursula was fearful enough about attending the debate that she stated - "I thoroughly condemn that neither audio or video will be allowed. As a result I won't be attending and I'm hoping other candidates committed to the public's Right to Know also not participate in this preposteroscity (new word). Wishing you all the best for an open, transparent and accountable Mississauga," and "Note, as a citizen-blogger, I will be documenting this "All candidates" meeting. I'll be videotaping from the outside --and giving my Mayoral non-campaign speech from the sidewalk! Ironic that both Donald Barber and I fought to have citizen-journalists recognized as authentic "other voices" for coverage of the Mississauga Judicial Inquiry. Justice Cunningham acknowledged the important role that non-traditional media play in providing information the the public. But we-both are being silenced. You see that's the one thing about MYTHissauga. Nobodies like Donald Barber and I need audio or videotape to be believed." It was not till after Candidate Barber took the matter up with a higher authority, the Anglican Church of Canada, regarding the Homeowners plans that were sure to create conflict in their church, that the rules were changed and Ursula felt safe enough to attend. The City can not allow groups to hold all-candidates meeting with the clear intent to create conflicts and especially making female candidates so fearful of the circumstances that they will not enter the building.

....7

The "civil behaviour" clauses given how far MIRANET is willing to go to impose such harsh rules on candidates and shut them out of the planning process, it is reasonable to believe that the interpretation of "civil behaviour" would be equally unreasonable. A true political debate can be and should be a passionate affair and MIRANET made sure the dear old Mayor would not be exposed to that. Further more, it is up to voters to decide what is correct for the circumstances behaviour by the way they vote - remember Hazel McCallion is called feisty or a hurricane, never civil.

These are some of the statements presented to the media by MIRANET to show the desire to defame the candidates not in the debate for whatever reason and an example of how willing the local media is to repeat them. "hijacked by personal agendas." - is MIRANET suggesting those who don't play by their rules are criminals?

In the quotes below comments are made in [].

Mississauga News - **Oct. 5, 2010** - By John Stewart - **Debates generate complaints**

"Several candidates objected to the conditions laid down by MIRANET, which include a "civil behaviour" clause forbidding heckling and a restriction on recording devices."
[there were other reasons and the media did not poll the candidates left out.]

"MIRANET secretary Dorothy Tomiuk stresses that all candidates were given the same deadlines for signing on and the same set of rules to follow."
[false]

"Candidates "fiddling" with recording equipment could be distracting, she says. Because candidates will be getting up from a conference table for mini-debates among each other, they could trip over wires. The event will be televised later, in any case, she said."
[trip over Rogers wires and banning equipment because it "could be distracting" is just plain wrong.]

"Tomiuk says MIRANET is "not trying to trap or trick anyone," but wants the event to be a conversation about Mississauga, "like you would have in someone's living room. We don't want to be hijacked by personal agendas."
[it walks like a duck, it quacks like a duck and ....]
["hijacked by personal agendas" - sad to say it was not the candidates who are doing so.]

""Some felt they were not able to handle a true debate format," she added."
[sounds like sour grapes that we spoke up about having rights - blame the victims and never take responsibly for your own actions.]

....8

Mississauga News - **Oct. 4, 2010** - By John Stewart - **Mayoral debate set at UTM**

""Let's get some creative thinking going and some passion," Dorothy Tomiuk, secretary of the Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET), which organized the debate along with Rogers, said this morning."
["creative thinking going and some passion" by first shutting out the free thinkers!]

"...asking for reaction to a recent statement in the media that Mississauga suffers from "lack of public discussion and opposition, the infrequent exchange of ideas and the overwhelming sense of complacency.""
[like dealing with a group to that is so authoritarian that if you don't "accept unconditionally" their rules, your are out on your "ass too". The City shouldn't accept having a group like this holding meeting in Mississauga - they are so extreme.]

"Tomiuk says the policy is designed to minimize distractions for the candidates and the audience. "You can't be a candidate and be fiddling with a camera," she said."
[bias and prejudice.]

"Tomiuk said the rules are intended to ensure "civil" interchange among the candidates."
[bias and prejudice, the media allows and City should not.]

Mississauga News - **Oct. 5, 2010** - By Julia Le - **Strict rules thin herd at debate**

"Several mayoral candidates disagreed, declining to appear at the debate, saying it was too restrictive: Conditions laid down by MIRANET included a "civil behaviour" clause forbidding heckling and a restriction on recording devices."
[not full story and even if it was the media should have really raised hell over this.]

Mississauga News - **Oct. 6, 2010** - By John Stewart - **Excluded candidates cry foul**

"MIRANET Spokesperson Dorothy Tomiuk, who moderated the debate, completely dismissed the accusations from the excluded candidates."
[clearly she couldn't care less about those MIRANET didn't want there in the first place.]

"Each of the 17 was treated exactly the same way and the six candidates who went before the cameras last night were those who accepted the "common sense" rules laid down by the group of 10 or so local ratepayer associations, Tomiuk said."
[not so.]

""The candidates were asked to accept the conditions according to the method we set out. We applied it evenly across the board," the Port Credit resident said."
[not asked to - forced to or not allowed.]

....9

"The rules were those that would normally be set out for any debate, requiring candidates to stick to their allotted times, act civilly and not personally attack opponents or give predetermined political messages rather than answering the specific question asked."
[falsehood, this is the first time rules like this have ever been seen by candidate Barber and I would challenge MIRANET to prove its statements - as should **the City** to.]

The following are transcribed comments from the UofT debate;

Opening comments by Dorothy Tomiuk, MIRANET Spokesperson/moderator - "Good evening my name is Dorothy Tomiuk, I am the spokesperson for MIRANET, which is Mississauga Residents' Associations Network. We are very pleased tonight to **bring you this true debate for Mayoral candidates** who have offer themselves before the public. ... And we are very pleased to have a format that **we believe is very fair that will allow you, the viewers at home, to be able to determine who best reflects the vision you would like to see for our City.**

[whenever people have to be told certain things it is usually because they are being mislead - "this **true** debate". "**very fair** that will allow you, the viewers at home, **to be able to determine who best reflects the vision you** would like to see for our City." meaning MIRANET has eliminated the visions they don't want Mississaugans to consider.]

Comment made by Mayoralty candidate Andrew Seitz at the MIRANET debate - "There is 17 candidates running for Mayor. All have good ideas - **some were not allowed to be here**."

[calling the Mississaugans attention to the facts surrounding why a number of candidates are not present. On the YouTube posted video - "MIRANET not allow election candidates".]

Closing comments by Dorothy Tomiuk, MIRANET Spokesperson/moderator
" ...I now have some closing comments. First of all, I'd like to thank **all the candidates for participating, the citizen groups, the volunteers who comprise MIRANET are thrilled that you have lent credibility to this event by participating** and we thank you so much. I would like to make a note that all 17 candidates for Mayor were offered this debate. As it **ended up 6 accepted our policies and rules** as laid out on our web-site and **we are thrilled tonight with the civil behaviour** and the very serious discourse that we have had. I thank you so much. ... Also like to thank Rogers Televison who has been a very good and supportive partner for us. Again, as volunteers we don't have a lot of resources but felt we had a message and some contain that we wanted to get out. The message is that there is a new spirit in Mississauga now.

....10

Citizens are getting more organized, are becoming more vocal and this is **partly because the City itself has encouraged our participation** ... We have had a **very serious discourse**, we have talked about a lot of issues, there are many more but the conversation doesn't end tonight.

["**all the candidates for participating**, ... **thrilled** that you have **lent credibility** to this **event by participating**" meaning thank you for letting us use you to gain more credibility then we had. "**thrilled** tonight with the **civil behaviour**" means we had our way with you and the Mayor didn't keel over from the shock of trying to deal with more people disagreeing with her.

VERY IMPORTANT - " **partly because the City itself has encouraged our participation**" - This is an admission **the City** was involved in getting MIRANET to hold this debate - what role did they play and who was it? "**very serious discourse**" - not that I could see.

The City needs to go on the record if they have in any way encouraged MIRANET's actions.]

Rogers Release;

First of all the City of Mississauga needs to be made aware Rogers is not a member of the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (CBSC), so they don't follow their code of conduct.

The City of Mississauga has an on going business relationship with Rogers, therefore can address them with its concerns and it can as the local municipality as well.

Enclosed with the complaint is the complaint to Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) that has more details regarding these events and must be fully reviewed by the City. Some of my concerns were used by MIRANET to change the way they ran their debate but as they would not directly respond to me or other candidates, how would we know our concerns were being properly addressed?

From Rogers Individual Release sent to Mayoralty candidates - "1. In consideration for the **opportunity to appear on the Program, which opportunity is of value to me**, "

As both MIRANET & Rogers are equally involved in the operation of the noted debate and as MIRANET required the Rogers release to be signed as well as their own contact, it forced candidates to sign Rogers release. There was no choice to be involved otherwise or even allowed in the room, unless doing so.

....11

At this point there needs to be some legal definitions presented, as Rogers and MIRANET are presenting something they know has a value to candidates and trying to alter the behavior of candidates, in a number of ways. Motivating them by the promise of political gains, for their campaign, to have the opportunity to affect voters perceptions and who they vote for. That Hazel McCallion, the current elected Mayor of Mississauga was part of the group allowed in the debate and would gain from MIRANET distorting the playing field.

The noted legal terms and laws are likely not all that can be referred to, are limiting this complaint and don't claim to fully know how certain terms should be applied but it is what would a reasonable person understand from reading the facts.

This is what I understand - Corrupt practice(s) & Bribery are both from the Election Act, so the Act speaks to them occurring and seeks to prevent them and so should the City. They both relate to the giving of something to another and that it has a value, such that the receiver gains from the transaction. That the definition is open ended and can be something of low value such as a treating, assistance, privilege or just an advantage or benefit of any kind as consideration for cooperation. Electoral fraud is illegal interference with the process of an election and otherwise interferes with the purpose of an election. In the case Bribery, I take it to mean affect how voters vote (if they feel motived to do so.), by controlling the information they receive. "suppression of the truth", in regards to how the debate was held is also an issue.

From the **Election Act** - "**corrupt practice**" means any act or omission, in connection with an election, in respect of which an offence is provided under the Criminal Code (Canada) or which is a corrupt practice under this Act; ("manoeuvre frauduleuse")
&
Bribery 96.1 No person shall, directly or indirectly,
(a) offer, give, lend, or promise or agree to **give** or lend **any valuable consideration** in connection with the exercise or non-exercise of an elector's vote;

Corrupt practices in English election law includes bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, and aiding, abetting, counselling and procuring personation.

Treating, in law, is the act of serving food, drink, and other refreshments as a method of influencing people for political gain. In various countries, treating is considered a form of corruption, and is illegal as such.

Bribery, a **form of corruption**, is an act implying money or **gift given that alters the behavior of the recipient**. Bribery constitutes a crime and is defined by Black's Law Dictionary as the offering, giving, receiving, or soliciting of **any item of value to influence the actions of an official or other person in charge of a public or legal duty**.

....12

The bribe is the gift bestowed to influence the recipient's conduct. It may be any money, goods, right in action, property, preferment, **privilege**, emolument, **object of value**, **advantage**, or merely a promise or undertaking to induce or influence the action, vote, or influence of a person in an official or public capacity.

Many types of bribes exist: tip, gift, perk, skim, favor, discount, waived fee/ticket, free food, **free ad**, free trip, free tickets, sweetheart deal, kickback/payback, funding, inflated sale of an object or property, lucrative contract, grease money, donation, **campaign contribution**, fund raiser, sponsorship/backing, higher paying job, stock options, secret commission, or promotion (rise of position/rank).

From the Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46

Frauds on the government
121. (1) Every one commits an offence who
(a) directly or indirectly
(i) gives, offers or agrees to give or offer to an official or to any member of his family, or to any one for the benefit of an official, or
(ii) being an official, demands, **accepts** or offers or agrees to accept from any person for himself or another person,
a loan, reward, **advantage or benefit of any kind as consideration for cooperation**, **assistance**, exercise of influence or an act or omission in connection with
(iii) the transaction of business with or any matter of business relating to the government, or
(iv) a claim against Her Majesty or any benefit that Her Majesty is authorized or is entitled to bestow,
whether or not, in fact, the official is able to cooperate, render assistance, exercise influence or do or omit to do what is proposed, as the case may be;
(b) having dealings of any kind with the government, directly or indirectly pays a commission or reward to or confers an advantage or benefit of any kind on an employee or official of the government with which the dealings take place, or to any member of the employee's or official's family, or to anyone for the benefit of the employee or official, with respect to those dealings, unless the person has the consent in writing of the head of the branch of government with which the dealings take place;
(c) being an official or employee of the government, directly or indirectly demands, accepts or offers or agrees to accept from a person who has dealings with the government a commission, reward, advantage or benefit of any kind for themselves or another person, unless they have the consent in writing of the head of the branch of government that employs them or of which they are an official;

(d) having or pretending to have influence with the government or with a minister of the government or an official, directly or indirectly demands, accepts or offers or agrees to accept, for themselves or another person, a reward, advantage or benefit of any kind as consideration for cooperation, assistance, exercise of influence or an act or omission in connection with
(i) anything mentioned in subparagraph (a)(iii) or (iv), or
(ii) the appointment of any person, including themselves, to an office;
(e) directly or indirectly gives or offers, or agrees to give or offer, to a minister of the government or an official, or to anyone for the benefit of a minister or an official, a reward, advantage or benefit of any kind as consideration for cooperation, assistance, exercise of influence, or an act or omission, by that minister or official, in connection with
(i) anything mentioned in subparagraph (a)(iii) or (iv), or
(ii) the appointment of any person, including themselves, to an office; or
(f) having made a tender to obtain a contract with the government,
(i) directly or indirectly gives or offers, or agrees to give or offer, to another person who has made a tender, to a member of that person's family or to another person for the benefit of that person, a reward, advantage or benefit of any kind as consideration for the withdrawal of the tender of that person, or
(ii) directly or indirectly demands, accepts or offers or agrees to accept from another person who has made a tender a reward, advantage or benefit of any kind for themselves or another person as consideration for the withdrawal of their own tender.
Contractor subscribing to election fund
(2) Every one commits an offence who, in order to obtain or retain a contract with the government, or as a term of any such contract, whether express or implied, directly or indirectly subscribes or gives, or agrees to subscribe or give, to any person any valuable consideration
(a) for the purpose of promoting the election of a candidate or a class or party of candidates to Parliament or the legislature of a province; or
(b) with intent to influence or affect in any way the result of an election conducted for the purpose of electing persons to serve in Parliament or the legislature of a province.
Punishment
(3) Every one who commits an offence under this section is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.
R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 121; 2007, c. 13, s. 5.

Breach of trust by public officer
122. Every official who, in connection with the duties of his office, commits fraud or a breach of trust is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, whether or not the fraud or breach of trust would be an offence if it were committed in relation to a private person.
R.S., c. C-34, s. 111.

Municipal corruption
123. (1) Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years who directly or indirectly gives, offers or agrees to give or offer to a municipal official or to anyone for the benefit of a municipal official - or, being a municipal official, directly or indirectly demands, accepts or offers or agrees to accept from any person for themselves or another person - a loan, reward, **advantage or benefit of any kind** as consideration for the official
(a) to abstain from voting at a meeting of the municipal council or a committee of the council;
(b) to vote in favour of or against a measure, motion or resolution;
(c) to aid in procuring or preventing the adoption of a measure, motion or resolution; or
(d) to perform or fail to perform an official act.
Influencing municipal official
(2) Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years who influences or attempts to influence a municipal official to do anything mentioned in paragraphs (1)(a) to (d) by
(a) **suppression of the truth**, in the case of a person who is under a duty to disclose the truth;
(b) threats or deceit; or
(c) any unlawful means.
Definition of "municipal official"
(3) In this section, "municipal official" means **a member of a municipal council** or a person who holds an office under a municipal government.
R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 123; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (1st Supp.), s. 16; 2007, c. 13, s. 6.

<u>Further issues;</u>

From Rogers Individual Release sent to Mayoralty candidates - "I agree that Rogers may edit, alter, dub or otherwise change the Program for any purpose whatsoever. " Regardless if Rogers did or didn't edit, Rogers should not have asked to be able to, as a person would rightfully not sign it under these circumstances, after having read it - maybe those who did not read it would signed more freely.

From Rogers Individual Release sent to Mayoralty candidates - "I hereby **waive any moral rights in connection with my appearance in the Program** I may have pursuant to the laws of any country including without limitation Canada." In an election where moral and ethical issues are front and center, it is totally wrong to require a candidate to sign away their "moral rights", especially if they are taking a strong stand on just that very issue regarding the Mayor and what she has done. This is for removing candidates from a debate who oppose the Mayor on moral grounds, especially when there is no other choice of release provided.

....15

The City should stand with candidates as this affects the outcome of the election and should not be allowed - another reason to set-up a debate in the great hall.

Further damage to candidates occurred when the true reasons why candidate didn't sign or were otherwise not present, was created by MIRANET's bias spokesperson was going on about how they wanted a civil debate or other frivolous reasons.

Candidate Barber has had many encounters with the media over the years and signing a release or contract is not mandatory before the video of a person or candidates is broadcasted. At the Sept. 23, News Conference regarding Hazel's lack of platform and scheduled City wide all-candidates debate, there were no forms to sign - not even a verbal OK was asked for. **Further more**, candidate Paul Fromm reports the following "Interestingly, when I taped a five minute message this week for Rogers, no such release was asked of me, even when I volunteered to sign one." I would submit a couple of reasons why Rogers didn't require it was, it was not really required and Rogers knew they should have not done so for the UofT debate as well as, they no longer had to try and deny candidates access to broadcasting, for frivolous reasons.

How candidates were given unequal opportunity to attend or Discrimination;

On Mon. Sept. 27, 2010, MIRANET sent a notice that the following candidates had "formally accepted MIRANET's invitation to participate in a televised A-C Forum produced by Rogers TV." The 10 participants were noted are below and list of the 6 that were at the debate is to the right. Ten debaters in itself is a lot but MIRANET would find ways to select out candidates. Candidates Ram Selvarajah and Andrew Seitz have informed me that they had problems meeting the MIRANET requirements for attending the debate. MIRANET made a point of changing its requirements to ensure they could attend, otherwise, in the eyes of Mississaugans looking for candidates to reflect both the newness and diversity of Mississauga - they would just see 4 slices of stale white bread - how would that "lent credibility to this event"?

Don Barber
Dave Cook
Paul Fromm
Ursula Keuper-Bennett
Chakkunny Antu Maprani
Hazel McCallion
Peter Orphanos
Andrew Seitz
Ram Selvarajah
George Winter

Dave Cook
Hazel McCallion
Peter Orphanos
Andrew Seitz
Ram Selvarajah
George Winter

....16

Candidate **Ghani Ahsan** - he has informed me that he sent in the MIRANET requirements only a few hours late and he was not allowed to attend the debate.

Candidate **Barber** - made no effort to send in the MIRANET requirements (because of moral & ethical issues) and was not reminded or contacted that it had not been done. He was not allowed to attend the debate in any way shape or form, even though Candidate Barber showed up at the door and asked to be allowed to record the debate. Candidate Andrew Seitz, then said he was his guest for the debate and that request was refused as well.

Candidate **Antu Maprani Chakkunny** - sent an E-mail stating "I boycott the MIRANET mayoral debate scheduled on Oct 05 with the current format."

Candidate **Paul Fromm** - tried to send in the MIRANET requirements and apparently didn't copy the text exactly (its was sent out in a locked pdf - could not copy & paste it.), enough to suite MIRANET. Mr. Fromm made it very clear that the intent to abide by their rules was clear in what he sent them. Candidate Fromm showed up at the door and asked to be allowed to into the debate and was totally refused entrance.

HOLD AN ALL CANDIDATES DEBATE FOR MAYOR
To - Janice M. Baker City Manager & CAO - Crystal Greer, City Clerk - all members of Council. Dear Ms. Baker:

I am joining a number of other Mayoralty candidates in urging that you host a public debate for ALL mayoralty candidates, perhaps next Friday evening,

Given that many candidates were not able to participate in the Oct. 5, MIRANET Mayoralty debate for various reasons, and who would have liked to have participated and should have, there is a great need for a true town hall meeting in this very important election year, that the public can attend and ask questions. (This should be true for all Councillor candidates as well.) It is asked that you assist us in the effort to use the great hall at City Hall or maybe some other, easy to find and use space for the desired true town hall meeting. We urge that Rogers broadcast this live, but, if not, we wish to video for YouTube.

The MIRANET non-debate was the only city-wide all candidates debate for mayor. The event was a disgrace. Only 6 of 17 candidates were allowed to participate. I was personally present as four candidates, including Mr. Barber, were denied entry and barred by police and security. The hostility to us by the MIRANET personality was palpable and disturbing.

I cannot speak for the other three, but I had jumped through all of MIRANET's myriad hoops, including sending a release to Rogers and signing an "unconditional" agreement to MIRANET's two pages worth of "rules". 17

Give me a break! Because their "rules" were in a format my computer could not copy, I read it over several times. Hah! They got me. As my wording missed theirs by one or two words, I was deemed not to have qualified. When so advised, I hand copied the original wording and re-submitted it. Hah! Caught again. I'd missed the Monday evening deadline by an hour. [Interestingly, when I taped a five minute message this week for Rogers, no such release was asked of me, even when I volunteered to sign one.]

This non-debate was completely sanitized and restrictive, apparently to favour the interests of one candidate and exclude other voices. Seventeen very different individuals have thrown their hats in the ring. The public should have the right to hear all who wish to participate, ask questions and judge accordingly.

In the interests of democracy, I urge you to step up to the plate and make this debate possible. Sincerely yours, Paul Fromm Mayoralty Candidate Mississauga

Candidate **Bryan Robert Hallett** - he sent in an E-mail Sept. 24, saying "By the way, if this invitation is a open to all mayoral candidates, I will attend!". Candidate Hallett showed up at the door and asked to be allowed to into the debate and was refused completely.

Candidate **Ursula Keuper-Bennett** - Sent in the signed Rogers release but forgot to sent in the separate MIRANET requirement. As Candidate Barber had sent MIRANET copies of the Mississauga Judicial Inquiry decision that noted her as a Citizen Journalist/Reporter, she mistook this as an indication that she would be allowed into at least record the debate. She met Candidates Barber, Fromm and Hallett in a stair well at UofT, hearing that security guards were blocking candidates she was too intimidated to try asking to be admitted.

Candidate **Andrew Seitz** - regarding how MIANET dealt with his missing their deadline and what I would call intimidation by MIRANET just before the debate.

My name is Andrew Seitz. I am a mayoral candidate in the municipal election. The events surrounding the MIRANET debate on Rogers 10 that was taped on October 5th, 2010 have me quite concerned. I am providing you with information that proves that not all candidates were treated equally.

I will note that in spite of these events, I was allowed to participate in the taped debate while others were not. These are the facts. I have all the proof to back up what I am stating here: MIRANET had extended their deadline to 5pm on October 4th to hand in the Rogers release form and acceptance of the MIRANET policy.

I sent my biography and a note that I would bring the Rogers release to an all candidates meeting that was to be held later that night. This was allowed. My email was sent to MIRANET at 4:25 pm. I then put down my phone so I could go back to work. 18

At 4:45 pm, MIRANET sent an email informing me that I still needed to send in the acceptance of the MIRANET policy. I did not see this email until after 5:00 pm when I received a phone call from Dorothy Tomiuk.

At 5:06 pm on October 4th (past their own deadline), Dorothy Tomiuk called me up telling me that I did not meet the requirements but if I sent in the acceptance of the MIRANET policies IMMEDIATELY, I would be allowed to participate.

At 5:13 pm I sent in this quickly written blurb:
"Sure, yes I accept the rules and consent form."

At 5:24 pm I received the following email:
"You must send the specified text, from Section 2 of the Policy document. Immediately"

My reply at 5:27 pm: ""I accept unconditionally the Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates established by MIRANET for the Mayoral debate which will be taped by Rogers TV on Tuesday October 5th, 2010.""

The final email came at 5:39 pm: "Rec'd"

While I was ultimately allowed to participate in the debate, according to MIRANET's own rules I should not have been allowed.

The MIRANET claim that all candidates were treated equally is untrue. I was clearly allowed to hand in my acceptance after the deadline. But why me? Did the debate require 6 candidates and I just happened to be the first to apply after the deadline? Did they feel like they needed to allow a token young person in?

Was there something more sinister going on? I am concerned because from what I can see, there has been a clear and concerted effort to allow some candidates in and keep others out. The rules were not applied equally in spite of MIRANET's claim to the contrary.

Also, just before the taping was to begin, I was confronted by Dorothy in a relatively hostile manner in regards to a "stunt that I pulled". This "stunt" was me offering to take in another candidate as my second guest; a rule change made on the 5th as there were less candidates than expected. Bringing in another candidate was not allowed according to the MIRANET agreement. Instead of just talking to me and explaining such, MIRANET came down hard in an effort to prevent me from causing any further disruptions. I had not intended to cause any. I had only asked if the other candidate could be my second guest. This aggression right before the taping was unwelcome and further increased my anxiety and nervousness just before a very important presentation.

.....19

This could have drastically affected my ability to debate. I did fine in spite of this, yet her threats and intimidation seem unfair at such an important time. Thank you for looking into this. Sincerely, Andrew Seitz a Mayor with a Plan

Candidate **Ram Selvarajah** - says he could not meet the MIRANET required deadline and they granted an extension.

As noted before, there are items in the complaint to the CRTC (enclosed), that should be taken note of - like "Asking Mayor for her availability for debate and not other candidates" for the debate date - bias, prejudice and improper actions.

More information will be provided, as it becomes available.

"I think the people of Mississauga have to take this election extremely seriously if they want this City to move forward - have to deal in depth with the issues"
Hazel McCallion, Mayor of Mississauga, wise words from an expert who knows what is at stake!

I am willing to discuss my letter with you and there is an answering machine you can leave a detailed private message on. My phone number is (905) 278-7877 & E-mail: donbar@eol.ca.

Sincerely yours;

Donald Barber

Donald Barber - **Candidate for Mayor 1994, 1997, 2000, 2006 and 2010.**
1614 Exbury Cres, Mississauga, Ont. L4Y 4G2

cc. Media, all candidates in the Mississauga election and other levels of government - posted on web.

Please find enclosed;

1). A copy of the Oct. 2, 2010, Complaint regarding Rogers Broadcasting Limited to the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (CBSC).

NOTE: it contains a number of E-mails to and from MIRANET and that is where to look for them, up to a certain date.

2). A copy of the Oct. 4, E-mail sent by Antu Maprani.

3). A copy of the Oct. 15, E-mail sent by Paul Fromm.

4). A copy of the Rogers Individual Release sent to candidates.

....20

5). A copy of the MIRANET Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates.

6). A copy of the MIRANET Oct. 3, E-mail.

7). A copy of the MIRANET Oct. 4, E-mail.

8). A copy of the MIRANET Oct. 4, E-mail - deadline past.

9). A copy of the MIRANET Oct. 5, E-mail.

10). A copy of a print out of E-mails between Andrew Seitz and MIRANET, covering the dates and times noted in his account.

Envelope-to: mayor-of-mississauga@eol.ca
X-Yahoo-Newman-Property: ymail-3
X-Yahoo-Newman-Id: 268755.72549.bm@omp1007.mail.ne1.yahoo.com
DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed; d=yahoo.ca; s=s1024; t=1286209384; bh=SeJsKCUJlphI4PhYtGb+M6bjsBloznoPXca3U/jhxTY=;
h=Message-ID:X-YMail-OSG:Received:X-Mailer:Date:From:Subject:To:Cc:MIME-Version:Content-Type;
b=UOufukzx3Tl/8DwWd9njoJDQK1xOQbK9edVe15LWHTuzaeuCepx/gv5Wio+2cLUrkpTCMFb93TjttfKlz8PFHTw9YXcsbhhrc/DqYU07qqOyV1w1LQhth9PWM
DomainKey-Signature:a=rsa-sha1; q=dns; c=nofws;
s=s1024; d=yahoo.ca;
h=Message-ID:X-YMail-OSG:Received:X-Mailer:Date:From:Subject:To:Cc:MIME-Version:Content-Type;

b=DjdrxMC990OoGHSLzV9GRz9dN95aGhTIO4/9NUlLyuEB7UGLS2HQdaLtArC73xaltkpWKurjqNICZ2Q6y3fbg3I4rOIikhpVgst3pGLY9rVK9JCj3cU0HoHsPR
X-YMail-OSG: FNeVPFUVM1mal5rQ7g__BqXs0b7wnaYgMLbCimw.gyc_bVA
2N2SfHewgyzvchlVp8b3A0oiuNQiqG6MCNAWMC0ap333SgFktYjDKdDdYCMR
YKDGV3J4atl587mfdou55Br1gIONKlV.qumizDWCzsj8ejEzfNZS.TuGDKQO
UduGcJ6rAos3o3Z1ejZbPaaoPRk276Pn68SvDViNQgJO95hSNetryqd67Ym9
YFsOBbn5CwfasWXdo_i3xUgyw7sHJ
X-Mailer: YahooMailRC/497 YahooMailWebService/0.8.106.282862
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2010 09:23:03 -0700 (PDT)
From: Antu Maprani <antumaprani@yahoo.ca>
Subject: Signing the Rogers Release - MIRANET - The we support re-election of Hazel show
To: "Dorothy Tomiuk \(MIRANET\)" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Cc: Mayor-of-Mississauga@eol.ca, gahsan99@yahoo.ca, rchahal@royallepage.ca,
paul@paulfromm.com, hallett4mayor@live.com, mississauga_watch@yahoo.com,
mkhan@theeasternnews.com, markopolo10123@yahoo.com, mayor@mississauga.ca,
porphanos@rogers.com, voteandrewseitz@gmail.com, ram@ram4mayor.ca,
waynesworld911@hotmail.com, andyvalenton@yahoo.com, surelyamend@msn.com,
watatinnocent@yahoo.com, georgeformayor@rogers.com
X-pstn-neptune: 0/0/0.00/0
X-pstn-levels: (S:40.55434/99.90000 CV:99.9000 FC:95.5390 LC:95.5390 R:95.9108 P:95.9108 M:97.0282 C:98.6951)
X-pstn-settings: 3 (1.0000:1.0000) s cv gt3 gt2 gt1 r p m c
X-pstn-addresses: from <antumaprani@yahoo.ca> [137/6]

To: Dorothy Tomiuk
MIRANET

Cc: Mayoral Candidates

Hi

This has reference to the formal complaint of one of the Mayoral candidates, Donald Barber, sent to CBSC and CRTC, accusing MIRANET (and Rogers TV) of suspected bias and manipulation of media for the benefit of incumbent Mayor, Hazel McCallion.

I am not aware of McCallion's specific behind-the-door connections with the eleven-members of the MIRANET mayoral debate committee; however, it's undeniably true that Hazel McCallion's campaign strategy focuses on media and information control. A free and unbiased media is an indispensable part of the democratic system. We should not let McCallion continue to corrupt our democratic system. We must end McCallion's autocratic control of Mississauga, which thrives on corruption and nepotism from top to bottom.

I boycott the MIRANET mayoral debate scheduled on Oct 05 with the current format.

Chakkunny, Antu Maprani
Mayoral candidate
www.maprani.ca

Envelope-to: Mayor-of-Mississauga@eol.ca
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2010 15:13:52 -0700
Subject: HOLD AN ALL CANDIDATES DEBATE FOR MAYOR
From: Paul Fromm <paul@paulfromm.com>
To: City.Manager@mississauga.ca
X-pstn-neptune: 0/0/0.00/0
X-pstn-levels: (S: 0.76630/99.85275 CV:99.9000 FC:95.5390 LC:95.5390 R:95.9108 P:95.9108 M:97.0282 C:98.6951)
X-pstn-settings: 3 (1.0000:0.1500) s cv GT3 gt2 gt1 r p m c
X-pstn-addresses: from <paul@paulfromm.com> [160/7]

HOLD AN ALL CANDIDATES DEBATE FOR MAYOR

To - Janice M. Baker City Manager & CAO - Crystal Greer, City Clerk - all members of Council.

Dear Ms. Baker:

I am joining a number of other Mayoralty candidates in urging that you host a public debate for ALL mayoralty candidates, perhaps next Friday evening,

Given that many candidates were not able to participate in the Oct. 5, MIRANET Mayoralty debate for various reasons, and who would have liked to have participated and should have, there is a great need for a true town hall meeting in this very important election year, that the public can attend and ask questions. (This should be true for all Councillor candidates as well.)
It is asked that you assist us in the effort to use the great hall at City Hall or maybe some other, easy to find and use space for the desired true town hall meeting. We urge that Rogers broadcast this live, but, if not, we wish to video for YouTube.

The MIRANET non-debate was the only city-wide all candidates debate for mayor. The event was a disgrace. Only 6 of 17 candidates were allowed to participate. I was personally present as four candidates, including Mr. Barber, were denied entry and barred by police and security. The hostility to us by the MIRANET personality was palpable and disturbing.

I cannot speak for the other three, but I had jumped through all of MIRANET's myriad hoops, including sending a release to Rogers and signing an "unconditional" agreement to MIRANET's two pages worth of "rules". Give me a break! Because their "rules" were in a format my computer could not copy, I read it over several times. Hah! They got me. As my wording missed theirs by one or two words, I was deemed not to have qualified. When so advised, I hand copied the original wording and re-submitted it. Hah! Caught again. I'd missed the Monday evening deadline by an hour. [Interestingly, when I taped a five minute message this week for Rogers, no such release was asked of me, even when I volunteered to sign one.]

This non-debate was completely sanitized and restrictive, apparently to favour the interests of one candidate and exclude other voices. Seventeen very different individuals have thrown their hats in the ring. The public should have the right to hear all who wish to participate, ask

questions and judge accordingly.

In the interests of democracy, I urge you to step up to the plate and make this debate possible.

Sincerely yours,
Paul Fromm
Mayoralty Candidate
Mississauga

ROGERS TV

INDIVIDUAL RELEASE

Individual Name: _____

Program Title: Mississauga Mayoral Debate

Participation: Mayoral Candidate

Date: Tuesday, October 5, 2010

Location: University of Toronto Mississauga Campus (UTM)

I have appeared in the above-referenced television program (the "Program").

1. In consideration for the opportunity to appear on the Program, which opportunity is of value to me, I hereby grant Rogers TV, a division of Rogers Communications Partnership, together with its affiliates, directors, officers, agents, representatives, employees, licensees, successors and assigns (collectively, "**Rogers**") the right to use my name, likeness, voice, personal identification in connection with the Program as well as in connection with the exercise of any and all rights in and to the Program (including, without limitation, theatrical, television, radio, publishing, merchandising, advertising, publicity and Internet rights, whether by Rogers or by a third-party who has been granted such right by Rogers). Such use may be made in any manner and by any means, whether now known or to be created. In this regard, I agree that Rogers may edit, alter, dub or otherwise change the Program for any purpose whatsoever. Nothing contained herein shall obligate Rogers to use my appearance in the Program. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, I further agree that my appearance on the Program confers on me no ownership rights and I agree that I will receive no compensation of any kind as a result of any recordings, rebroadcasts, or other broadcasts or non-broadcast uses thereof. I hereby waive any moral rights in connection with my appearance in the Program I may have pursuant to the laws of any country including without limitation Canada.

2. I further hereby release and discharge Rogers from any and all claims, demands or causes of action that I may now have or may hereafter have, for libel, defamation, invasion or privacy, infringement of copyright or violation of any other right arising out of any exhibition, use, exploitation, advertising, publicity or promotion of the Program and any subsidiary, allied and ancillary rights therein.

3. To the extent I provide any personal information to Rogers in this Release or in the course of appearing in the Program I hereby consent to Rogers' use of such personal information for the purposes enumerated in Section 1 above and for administrative purposes related to the production of the Program.

4. The provisions hereof shall be binding upon me and my successors, licensees, assigns, heirs, executors and administrators, and the rights herein granted to Rogers may be assigned in whole or in part to any person, firm or other entity. This grant and release is to be construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario.

5. I have read the foregoing and fully understand the terms and conditions contained therein and agree that it is intended to be as broad and inclusive as is permitted under the laws of the Province of Ontario and that if any portion thereof is held to be invalid, the remaining provisions shall continue to be in full force and effect.

Signature: _____

Address: _____

Date: _____

If the Participant is a minor, please complete the following:

I represent that I am a parent (guardian) of the minor who has signed the above release and I hereby agree that we shall both be bound thereby.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates
MIRANET's Mississauga Mayoral Debate
Tuesday, October 5, 2010 @ 7-9 p.m.
Held at: University of Toronto at Mississauga

All Participating Mayoral Candidates must:

1. SIGN the Rogers TV 'Individual Release'. To ensure we have your Release in good order, submit by e-mail as an attachment to rogerstv.mississauga@rci.rogers.com or MIRANET@miranet.ca or FAX to **905-848-2831** by **Monday, October 4, 2010 @ 5:00 p.m.** Without a signed copy of the Rogers TV 'Individual Release', the Candidate forfeits participation in the Debate. No conditions or exceptions may be added to the Release; it must be signed "as is".

2. ACCEPT the terms of the 'Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates' in this document (no conditions or exceptions) by **Monday, October 4, 2010 @ 5:00 p.m.** or forfeit admittance to the room and participation in the Debate. This document applies only to those Mayoral Candidates who receive it directly from MIRANET. No other Mayoral Candidates will be attending.

Acceptance will be via return e-mail to MIRANET@miranet.ca. The following statement must be sent from the e-mail address which receives this document:

> *"I accept unconditionally the Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates established by MIRANET for the Mayoral Debate which will be taped by Rogers TV on Tuesday, October 5, 2010."*

3. SUPPORTER: Each participating Candidate may bring one (1) campaign supporter to the Debate, who will sit in the audience (comprised of invited UTM students and MIRANET reps and guests). We must have the name of this supporter by **Monday, October 4 @ 5:00 p.m.** (may be e-mailed along with the statement in Section 2, *above*). This Section does not apply if the Candidate decides to observe rather than participate in the Debate per Section 5, *below*.

NOTE: An officially registered Mayoral Candidate who is not participating in the MIRANET Debate may not attend as a supporter for any participating Candidate.

4. CHECK-IN: Be present by **6:30 p.m.** at the Debate venue for check-in on **Tuesday, October 5, 2010**. Anyone not on the check-in list will not be permitted entrance to the Debate room. CANDIDATES' CAMPAIGN LITERATURE MAY BE PLACED ON THE TABLE PROVIDED (copies of one piece only). Turn cell phone ringers OFF when entering the Debate room. Interviews with MEDIA may take place prior to 6:50 p.m. and after 9:00 p.m.

NOTE: Questions for the Candidate mini-debates will be drawn by lot. The speaking order for Candidates to make individual statements (e.g. opening and closing remarks) will also be drawn by lot. The draw for speaking orders will be done at **6:40 p.m.** by each Candidate. Those not present at this time will have their numbers drawn for them.

5. RECORDING DEVICES: Except for the participating Candidates, Panelists or Moderator, any person in the room, including members of the Media or audience, may take photographs or make audio or video recordings of the proceedings, provided there is no physical interference with the Rogers TV technicians who will be taping the program for future broadcast. No flashes or additional lighting may be used; equipment must be operated quietly.

Candidates who wish such recordings or images to be made must entrust this task to the one (1) campaign supporter attending with them who will be in the audience.

NOTE: In the event a participating Candidate does not bring a supporter to the Debate, the Candidate will still not be allowed to operate any recording devices themself during the Debate. Recording devices cannot be left unattended to operate remotely within the room. Any participating Candidate insisting on operating any recording devices during the Debate will be given a choice: sit in the audience as an observer, or, participate in the Debate without any of their own recording devices operational in the room.

6. TIME: The Moderator will stop any Candidate going over their allotted time or offering silence during their allotted time. Candidates will receive a 15-second warning before time is called. Within the 2-hour timeframe of the Debate program, final decisions regarding how much time is equally allotted to each Candidate depends on how many Candidates actually participate. No time credit will be accrued for unused time by any Candidate throughout the course of the Debate.

7. CIVIL BEHAVIOUR: There is to be no heckling or uttering or any demonstration by Candidates during any other Candidates' presentations, nor during any portion of the Debate program as conducted. This clause also applies to any Candidate who chooses to sit in the audience as an observer per Section 5, *above*.

8. PARTICIPATION: Candidates may only participate in the Debate by speaking. Presentations may not include printed signs, images or recordings, for example. Demonstrations of any kind or uncivil remarks by Candidates in their presentations will not be allowed. The Moderator will also stop any Candidate straying from the topic of debate. Candidates must participate during the entire format of the Debate, or will be deemed to have withdrawn per Section 9, *below*.

9. WITHDRAWAL: Should any Candidate withdraw from the Debate at any time, the Candidate forfeits any further participation in the Debate (i.e. may not return for a closing statement). A Candidate will be deemed by the Moderator to have withdrawn if there is non-participation by the Candidate or any behaviour which constitutes constructive withdrawal.

10. EXPULSION: Deviation from the 'Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates' during the Debate will result in expulsion by the Moderator. All rulings of the Moderator are final.

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee
E-mail: MIRANET@miranet.ca
Website: www.miranet.ca

Envelope-to: donbar@eol.ca
Reply-To: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
From: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: "Mississauga Residents' Associations Network \(MIRANET\)" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Subject: MIRANET POLICIES & ROGERS TV RELEASE: Mississauga Mayoral Debate: MIRANET/Rogers TV - TUES. OCTOBER 5 @ 7-9 p.m. (Taping); Arrive by 6:30 p.m. -- UTM Room 3130
Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2010 13:59:47 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.3664
X-pstn-neptune: 0/0/0.00/0
X-pstn-levels: (S:99.90000/99.90000 CV:99.9000 FC:95.5390 LC:93.6803 R:95.9108 P:95.9108 M:97.0282 C:98.6951)
X-pstn-settings: 3 (1.0000:1.0000) s cv gt3 gt2 gt1 r p m c
X-pstn-addresses: from <MIRANET@miranet.ca> [3166/131]

To Participating Mayoral Candidates:

1. Attached is the Rogers TV **'Individual Release'** form for Mayoral Candidates, pertaining to MIRANET's Mayoral Debate to be taped by Rogers TV this Tuesday evening.

2. Attached is the MIRANET **'Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates'**. Please read this document and provide return acceptance as outlined.

3. Opening and Closing Questions: MIRANET plans to kick off the Debate by getting right into a critical issue. We believe this will be an ice-breaker for the Candidates, engage the viewers' attention and position the stakes we all have in being part of this Debate. We are publishing the FIRST question in advance to be fair to all Candidates (i.e. the first Candidate to answer will be as prepared as the last). You do not need to submit your answer ahead of time. You will have **1 minute** to answer at the very beginning of the Debate, in a speaking order to be drawn by lot prior to the Debate.

> ***Preamble:*** Recently the Toronto media have been highly critical of Mississauga and its citizens. Christopher Hume, a columnist for the *Toronto Star,* wrote in September: "Mississauga remains an abjectly car-dependent community that faces an uncertain future. ... Not that most Mississaugans give a damn; only about one-quarter of voters bothered to cast a ballot in the last election. ... The lack of public discussion and opposition, the infrequent exchange of ideas, and the overwhelming sense of complacency do not bode well for Mississauga." Subsequently, another *Toronto Star* columnist Angelo Persichilli wrote: "Mississauga is a city without an identity. ... It's basically a comfortable dormitory, heaven for developers, yet still with public housing problems. ... I see nothing but trouble on the horizon for Mississauga." **QUESTION:** Such ridicule costs every citizen of Mississauga, from our property values to our civic self-esteem to where our children decide to live. In your view, does Mississauga's reality align with these criticisms, and if not, what should be done to change Mississauga's image?

The SECOND question to all Candidates will be: **Why are you running for Mayor?** This will afford you time to present what is traditionally known as the 'opening statement'. You will have **1.5 minutes** to answer, in a new speaking order to be drawn by lot prior to the Debate.

After the first two (2) questions to all Candidates, the format will move into the round-robin phase for mini-debates, followed by a rapid round of individual questions from the audience.

CLOSING STATEMENTS will allow all Candidates to rebut anything they have heard, address questions they were not asked, clarify anything they have said and summarize their platform in the process. You will have **2 minutes** to wrap-up, in a new speaking order to be drawn by lot prior to the Debate.

4. To consolidate your submission of acceptance of the attached documents, we have extended the deadline for receipt of your bio and the name of the campaign supporter coming with you. The combined deadline for all responses: **Monday, October 4 @ 5:00 p.m.**

5. BROADCAST DATES: Rogers TV has published the following schedule for airing of the Mississauga Mayoral Debate on Rogers Cable 10:

Monday, October 11 @ 5 p.m.
Monday, October 11 @ 11 p.m.
Saturday, October 23 @ 3 p.m.

NOTE: MIRANET is the sponsor, organizer and manager of the Mayoral Debate on Tuesday, October 5, 2010. Inasmuch as Rogers TV has agreed to provide television coverage of our Debate event, we have worked collaboratively to ensure it can be technically produced, and that our policies mesh with Rogers TV procedures. MIRANET claims sole ownership for the 'Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates' outlined in the attached document. Candidates have until the deadline above to accept these terms, or decline to participate. Rogers TV has indicated that any Mayoral Candidate declining participation in the MIRANET Debate will be afforded a separately broadcast 5-minute candidate profile on their station.

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee

Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)

E-mail: MIRANET@miranet.ca
Website: www.miranet.ca

RTV Individual Release Form Candidates 2010.doc

MIRANET_Mayoral_Debate_Policies_and_Rules_2010.pdf

Envelope-to: donbar@eol.ca
Reply-To: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
From: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: "Mississauga Residents' Associations Network \(MIRANET\)" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Subject: ROGERS TV RELEASE for Mississauga Mayoral Debate: MIRANET/Rogers TV - TUES. OCTOBER 5 @ 7-9 p.m. (Taping); Arrive by 6:30 p.m. – UTM Room 3130
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2010 00:38:05 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.3664
X-pstn-neptune: 0/0/0.00/0
X-pstn-levels: (S:95.40049/99.90000 CV:99.9000 FC:95.5390 LC:95.5390 R:95.9108 P:95.9108 M:97.0282 C:98.6951)
X-pstn-settings: 3 (1.0000:1.0000) s cv gt3 gt2 gt1 r p m c
X-pstn-addresses: from <MIRANET@miranet.ca> [3166/131]

To Participating Mayoral Candidates:

One Candidate indicated on Sunday afternoon that it will not be possible from his home computer to FAX or e-mail an image of the signed Rogers TV '**Individual Release**' form for Mayoral Candidates.

This Candidate asked about the possibility of bringing the signed form to the Ward 1 All-Candidates Meeting on Monday, Oct. 4 at St. Luke's Church sponsored by the Orchard Heights and Applewood Acres Home Owners' Associations.

MIRANET's Mayoral Debate Committee met tonight and confirmed that this should be an option open to all participating Candidates. Note that per below (*as e-mailed this afternoon*), you must still e-mail your acceptance of MIRANET's '**Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates**' by **5:00 p.m.** on Monday, as outlined in the document.

> **4.** To consolidate your submission of acceptance of the attached documents, we have extended the deadline for receipt of your bio and the name of the campaign supporter coming with you. The combined deadline for all responses: **Monday, October 4 @ 5:00 p.m.**

John Walmark, President of OHHA and a member of the Mayoral Debate Committee, will be pleased to receive your signed Rogers TV '**Individual Release**' forms by **8:30 p.m.** Monday night at St. Luke's Church (i.e. at the end of the speeches).

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee

Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)

E-mail: MIRANET@miranet.ca
Website: www.miranet.ca
Copied: MDC

Envelope-to: donbar@eol.ca
Reply-To: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
From: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: "Mississauga Residents' Associations Network \(MIRANET\)" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Subject: Deadline now reached for formal acceptance of MIRANET POLICIES re the Mayoral Debate: Tues. October 5, 2010 @ 7-9 p.m.
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2010 18:30:45 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.3664
X-pstn-neptune: 0/0/0.00/0
X-pstn-levels: (S:84.85483/99.90000 CV:99.9000 FC:95.5390 LC:95.5390 R:95.9108 P:95.9108 M:97.0282 C:98.6951)
X-pstn-settings: 3 (1.0000:1.0000) s cv gt3 gt2 gt1 r p m c
X-pstn-addresses: from <MIRANET@miranet.ca> [3189/132]

Dear Mayoral Candidates: Today's deadline is now past, and this is to inform you that six (6) Mayoral Candidates have formally accepted the MIRANET **'Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates'** as required. Only these six candidates will receive admission to the Debate room and be able to participate.

The participants in the Mayoral Debate are:

Dave Cook
Hazel McCallion
Peter Orphanos
Andrew Seitz
Ram Selvarajah
George Winter

Future communications about the Debate will be sent only to the participating Candidates.

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee

Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)

E-mail: MIRANET@miranet.ca
Website: www.miranet.ca
Copied: MDC

Gmail by Google

Andrew Seitz <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com>

DEBATE DAY -- Supporters; Parking

1 message

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca> **Tue, Oct 5, 2010 at 1:13 PM**
Reply-To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: "Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

Dear Mayoral Candidates:

1. Note that some Media will be in the Debate room from **6:00 p.m.** this evening so by all means arrive earlier than the 6:30 check-in time if you wish to be available for media opportunities.

2. Previous e-mail referred to **note-taking** at the conference table, and you may have your notes at the podium as well when you are making statements or participating in the mini-debates.

3. Given that we have fewer participating Candidates than originally envisioned, a request has been made by a Candidate to bring a **second supporter**. This is reasonable, and if Candidates could please e-mail the name of their second (optional) supporter we will be able to have them on the check-in list as well, or phone my cell, below.

4. Bios: Thank you for these. A **media sheet** is being drawn up for tonight and will also be posted on MIRANET.

5. Parking: UTM advises:

> **Park in Lot 4 or 8** which are the parking lots on the right hand side as you come in via the Collegeway (and turn right..). These parking lots are directly across from the entrance to the Athletics Centre. UTM will make up some signs and put them up at the entrance to the Athletic Centre for attendees entering that way through to the William G. Davis building (Room 3130). There are no discounts. Parking is $1.00/hr. for parking after 5:00 p.m. to a maximum of $5.00. Click here for maps.

I will be the **Moderator** for the event, with assistance from our MIRANET Panelists and Timers. As noted previously, we are citizen volunteers.

I will be in the Debate room this afternoon from approximately 4:00 p.m., and can be reached on my cell phone at **(905) 301-5432**.

See you tonight, Dorothy

----- Original Message -----
From: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee
To: Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2010 6:30 PM
Subject: Deadline now reached for formal acceptance of MIRANET POLICIES re the Mayoral Debate: Tues. October 5, 2010 @ 7-9 p.m.

Dear Mayoral Candidates: Today's deadline is now past, and this is to inform you that six (6) Mayoral Candidates have formally accepted the MIRANET '**Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates**' as required. Only these six candidates will receive admission to the Debate room and be able to participate.

The participants in the Mayoral Debate are:

Dave Cook
Hazel McCallion
Peter Orphanos
Andrew Seitz
Ram Selvarajah
George Winter

Future communications about the Debate will be sent only to the participating Candidates.

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee

Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)

E-mail: MIRANET@miranet.ca
Website: www.miranet.ca
Copied: MDC

Gmail by Google

Andrew Seitz <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com>

ROGERS TV RELEASE for Mississauga Mayoral Debate: MIRANET/Rogers TV - TUES. OCTOBER 5 @ 7-9 p.m. (Taping); Arrive by 6:30 p.m. -- UTM Room 3130

8 messages

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 12:38 AM**
Reply-To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: "Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

To Participating Mayoral Candidates:

One Candidate indicated on Sunday afternoon that it will not be possible from his home computer to FAX or e-mail an image of the signed Rogers TV '**Individual Release**' form for Mayoral Candidates.

This Candidate asked about the possibility of bringing the signed form to the Ward 1 All-Candidates Meeting on Monday, Oct. 4 at St. Luke's Church sponsored by the Orchard Heights and Applewood Acres Home Owners' Associations.

MIRANET's Mayoral Debate Committee met tonight and confirmed that this should be an option open to all participating Candidates. Note that per below (*as e-mailed this afternoon*), you must still e-mail your acceptance of MIRANET's '**Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates**' by **5:00 p.m.** on Monday, as outlined in the document.

> **4.** To consolidate your submission of acceptance of the attached documents, we have extended the deadline for receipt of your bio and the name of the campaign supporter coming with you. The combined deadline for all responses: **Monday, October 4 @ 5:00 p.m.**

John Walmark, President of OHHA and a member of the Mayoral Debate Committee, will be pleased to receive your signed Rogers TV '**Individual Release**' forms by **8:30 p.m.** Monday night at St. Luke's Church (i.e. at the end of the speeches).

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee

Mississauga Residents' Associations Network (MIRANET)

E-mail: MIRANET@miranet.ca
Website: www.miranet.ca
Copied: MDC

---

voteandrewseitz@gmail.com <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 4:25 PM**
Reply-To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com
To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

Hello MIRANET,

Bellow the line is my 100 word "candidate's profile". I will be bringing Maria Seitz to sit in the crowd.
The release form for Roger's will be brought to tonight's A-C.

Hello, my name is Andrew Seitz, I'm 32 years old and I was born and raised in Mississauga. I'm a private person and ask that you respect that.

Neither mine nor anyone's past accomplishments are relevant. Judge us not on what we have done, judge us on what we intend to do. For the good of Mississauga, please judge us on our policies.

I promise to work in the best interest of Mississauga - I will do what's right and necessary, even if it is unpopular. The time of influence peddling is over. It's time for us to take back our city.

Thank you MIRANET.

Sincerely,

Andrew Seitz

a Mayor with a Plan

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 4:45 PM**
Reply-To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com

Hello: So now all we need is the acceptance of the MIRANET policy and rules document by putting the provided wording in the body of a return e-mail by 5:00 p.m. today. Thank you

----- Original Message ----- From: <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com>
To: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2010 4:25 PM
Subject: Re: ROGERS TV RELEASE for Mississauga Mayoral Debate: MIRANET/Rogers TV - TUES. OCTOBER 5 @ 7-9 p.m. (Taping); Arrive by 6:30 p.m. -- UTM Room 3130
[Quoted text hidden]

---

voteandrewseitz@gmail.com <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 5:13 PM**
Reply-To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com
To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

Sure, yes I accept the rules and consent form.

a Mayor with a Plan

From: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2010 00:38:05 -0400
To: Mississauga Residents' Associations Network \(MIRANET\)<MIRANET@miranet.ca>
ReplyTo: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Subject: ROGERS TV RELEASE for Mississauga Mayoral Debate: MIRANET/Rogers TV - TUES. OCTOBER 5 @ 7-9 p.m. (Taping); Arrive by 6:30 p.m. -- UTM Room 3130
[Quoted text hidden]

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 5:24 PM**

Reply-To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com

You must send the specified text, from Section 2 of the Policy document. Immediately

> ----- Original Message -----
> **From:** voteandrewseitz@gmail.com
> **To:** MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee
> [Quoted text hidden]

---

voteandrewseitz@gmail.com <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 5:27 PM**
Reply-To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com
To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

"I accept unconditionally the Debate Policies and Rules for Candidates established by MIRANET for the Mayoral debate which will be taped by Rogers TV on Tuesday October 5th, 2010."

Andrew Seitz

a Mayor with a Plan

From: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2010 17:24:32 -0400
To: <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com>
ReplyTo: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
[Quoted text hidden]

MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 5:39 PM**
Reply-To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>
To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com

Rec'd

> ----- Original Message -----
> **From:** voteandrewseitz@gmail.com
> **To:** MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee
> [Quoted text hidden]

---

voteandrewseitz@gmail.com <voteandrewseitz@gmail.com> **Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 5:35 PM**
Reply-To: voteandrewseitz@gmail.com
To: MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

Thank you, I wasn't trying to be difficult.

Sincerely,

Andrew Seitz,

a Mayor with a Plan

From: "MIRANET Mayoral Debate Committee" <MIRANET@miranet.ca>

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2010 17:39:33 -0400

[Quoted text hidden]
