

Subject: Correspondence - Councillor Denault

Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 23:45:48 -0800

From: Ernie Crist <CristE@dnv.org>

To: "pat.muroe@shaw.ca" <pat.muroe@shaw.ca>

CC: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Dear Pat:

I have received a copy of an e-mail exchange between you and Councillor Denault re getting rid of Crist, Muri etc. in the fall election. Don't ask me how I got it, it just appeared on the screen.

I am sure you understand that I have no desire to engage in any kind of discourse about any member of the present CCA endorsed District Council. In fact other than business I try to stay clear of them. I try to stay clear not because THEY MAY HAVE VIEWS DIFFERENT FROM MINE but because they are witch hunters. I had the same problem with people wearing brown shirts at an earlier stage of my life. Witch hunters are NOT people who deceive the public by superimposing Hi rises on the DEEP Cove skyline with the caption that this is what you will get if you support the Waterfront Task Force Report costing you \$ 600 million to boot. That is just normal North Vancouver politics albeit rather primitive and cheap.

NEITHER is witch hunting supporting two laws, one for one part of the community and another one for another part. Witch hunting is NOT even lying, being deceitful, conniving or devious, indeed it is NOT any of these things, witch hunting IS HOWEVER to deprive the opposition in this case the only none CCA endorsed member of Council of his right to submit and explain motions unless they are seconded by a CCA endorsed member of Council first.

This IS witch hunting, it is also cowardly. And this is why I call this gang a gang of witch hunters.

Incidentally, your pen pal Bill told you in his e-mail that the reason why he is not seconding my motions is because they are frivolous. The question is why would I hand my enemies a cheap victory by doing such a stupid thing? I grant, however, that Councillor Bill D may have difficulties knowing the difference. He also claims that I am submitting motions a week before staff comes forward with similar suggestions and that I am trying to beat them to it so as to get the credit. That too is a total fabrication. It also is an extraordinarily dumb suggestion. Were I to do this, I would look stupid indeed.

To repeat - it is not my intention to dwell on issues raised by Councillor Bill D in his e-mail other than to say that I think he likes the smell of dung. I fully appreciate that he will work hard to get me off Council. I should rather think so - he being in favor of plastering the District with Billboards, trying to get rid of neighborhood planning, the right to address Council, the Quality Assurance Committee and TPAC to mention but a


few items on his liquidation list.

I just wanted to clarify the difference between the right to submit a motion and explain it within the allowed time frame prior to the chair calling for a seconder for debate and NOT having the right to explain a motion before the chair calls for a seconder for debate. One is real democracy and the other is CCA democracy fitting for a banana republic.

The CCA endorsed Councillor apparently does not know the difference between one and the other even though it has been explained to him many times. What is truly remarkable, however, is that he assumes that you do not know the difference either. As for trying to get me off Council as he has threatened - my response to such utterances is the same as in all previous elections "neither will I rely on good fortune alone". That is provided I run, of course.

Cheers and best regards to Barbara.

Ernie

 Part 1.2	Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64
--	---