

**Subject: Re: Rules of Conduct and Debate During a Council Meeting**

**Date:** Wed, 28 Sep 2005 10:33:54 -0700

**From:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

**To:** Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**CC:** Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>, Jim Cuthbert <Jim\_Cuthbert@dnv.org>, fonvca@fonvca.org, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>

Dear Councillor Crist,

I am not jumping with joy and I did not expect you to do so either. The Community Charter has a lot of flaws - not the least being section 133. Council recently adopted the policy, notwithstanding the Community Charter, that they would not dispose of dedicated parkland without going to a referendum. That was a step in the right direction. Of course the Community Charter should be changed but that is going to take time. Section 133 gives way too much power to the chair and this section needs to be re-balanced. That too will take time. In the meantime we should move in the direction where this potentially abusive power is put into the hands of the majority of council. This is not the best solution but it can be done now - and it sends a signal to the province that section 133 is not acceptable.

Yours truly,

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

>  
>Dear Dr. Kost:

>  
>With respect, please do not expect me to jump with joy at "half a loaf".  
>This is a principled issue and unless Janice Harris and her CCA endorsed  
>ladies and gents are challenged, the matter widely publicised and  
>denounced, it will only be perceived as "more politics". However, this  
>is not something which should be downplayed or whitewashed. If the  
>people are not told that this is dangerous and needs to be challenged,  
>they will turn their backs in disgust and stay away. Too many do so  
>already as a result of the shenanigans by the CCA endorsed District  
>Council. This may be welcome by some, but it is bad news for democracy  
>and even worse for the liveability and fiscal health of the District.

>  
>It is another way of saying that if the public had defended democracy on  
>District Council in the past, their taxes today would be lower, their  
>Heritage Fund intact and their assets in better shape. But tolerance of  
>violations is like turning blind eye to aggression. Concessions made to  
>the aggressor will only embolden him to commit more aggression.  
>Similarly in the District, violations of democratic procedure in the  
>past have only emboldened the violators to commit more violations.

>  
>As it is, violations of democratic procedure have become so common  
>place that the public, to all intents and purposes, has become immune.  
>This is dangerous. If this community does nothing to reverse this trend  
>except hope that there will be changes in the next election, those  
>changes will simply not occur. One person watching the performance on TV  
>called me to say "what can you expect"?

>  
>The price of accepting it is too high, far too high as the 2006 budget  
>will reveal. Councillor Walton objected to the prediction of a 9%

>increase in property taxes for 2006. I suppose Councillor Walton,  
>committed as he is to defend the honourable Don Bell record, realised  
>that if this news gets out it may well spell the end of this political  
>career. As for Councillor Nixon, he too objected to a story in the  
>press stating that the District faces bankruptcy. He found it  
>"appalling". Well he is right of course, Governments do not go bankrupt,  
>it is only the taxpayers who go bankrupt and that may well be the case  
>in the District. The question is will this be brought out during the  
>election or will it be ignored as it has in the past? Whitewashing  
>violations of democratic procedure would be a bad omen for the upcoming  
>election.

>  
>Ernie Crist

>  
>  
>-----  
>  
>From: Corrie Kost [<mailto:corrie@kost.ca>]  
>Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2005 11:57 PM  
>To: Ernie Crist  
>Cc: Jim Cuthbert  
>Subject: Re: Rules of Conduct and Debate During a Council Meeting

>  
>  
>I believe Councillor Cuthbert's motion is a step in the right direction  
>- and  
>likely to get support from the rest of council. Half a loaf is better  
>than none.

>  
>Personally I agree that Councillor Crist should not have been ejected  
>from  
>council chambers. The past cannot be undone. However, you can improve  
>the lot  
>of all members of council by this minor change in the District's  
>Procedure Bylaw.  
>It's not perfect but it will improve the rights of all members of  
>council.  
>I want to see improvements - however minor. Please support it for the  
>sake  
>of all present & future councillors.

>  
>Redress for past injustices is an issue that voters can address soon  
>enough.

>  
>Corrie

>  
>Ernie Crist wrote:

>  
>  
>Trust Councillor Cuthbert to not get the point again. The point  
>is that the Mayor's order that Councillor Crist leave the Council  
>Chambers because he used the word hoax was illegal to begin with.  
>Every subsequent action by the Mayor was therefore equally illegal. But  
>even if Councillor Crist had called for a vote of Council before the  
>Mayor announced her decision, Council would have upheld her decision  
>(birds of the CCA feather) and compelled me to leave the Council  
>chambers when they had no right to do so in the first place.

>  
>  
>I wonder how much it takes before Councillor Cuthbert can  
>comprehend that this was a premeditated witch-hunt and a gross violation  
>of fundamental democratic procedure which makes the District the  
>laughing stock and a rightful recipient of the title Banana Republic. I  
>just wish that Councillor Cuthbert would spare me and the community his  
>alibis.

>  
>Ernie Crist

