

**Subject: A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST****Date:** Fri, 11 Nov 2005 16:10:46 -0800**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>**To:** <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <m.bragg@shaw.ca>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>

**CC:** "Mike Molson" <formikemolson@aol.com>, <maxzahedi@yahoo.com>, "Alan Nixon" <alan@alannixon.com>, "Roger Bassam" <roger@rogerbassam.com>, "Bruce Crowe" <gowithcrowe@telus.net>, "Robin Hicks" <robinhicks@telus.net>, "Wayne Hunter" <wayne@waynehunter.ca>, "Sabine Jessen" <sjessen@shaw.ca>, "Karen Klasen" <klasen@shaw.ca>, "Mike Little" <mlittle@westran.ca>, <macdunn@universe.com>, "David Dixon" <daviddixon@shaw.ca>, "Maureen McKeon-Holmes" <mckeonholmes@telus.net>, "Dave Sadler" <davesadler@telus.net>, <gdiebolt@telus.net>, <sandy.fleming@telus.net>, <fstratton@shaw.ca>, <tcarolan@telus.net>, <zeebayassy@aol.com>, <adson6966@home.com>, <annwen@globalvillage.net>, <nsarts@telus.net>, <maryatkins@telus.net>, <bbate@shaw.ca>, <rwmacct.@telus.net>, <brian.o'connor@nshr.hnet.bc.ca>, <bostwickm@dnv.org>, <william.cassidy@3web.net>, <catheadams@canada.com>, <info@northshorewomen.ca>, <lcraver@shaw.ca>, <cupe\_local389@telus.net>, <margaretdean@mdi.ca>, <mgecon@home.com>, <gbohn@png.canwest.com>, <2jfair@home.com>, "John Fair" <jfair@shaw.ca>, <pairofknies@telus.net>, <diana\_linklater@hotmail.com>, <losken@telus.net>, <m.bragg@shaw.ca>, <mcastle@istar.ca>, <m@blaze.ca>, <murlaw@telus.net>, <valeriem@blaze.ca>, <allandorr@home.com>, <njreeve@shaw.ca>, <csallis@vcc.ca>, <belart@axionet.com>, <patersonsheila@hotmail.com>, <gord.tomlinson@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>, <wtracey@telus.net>, <DSWELder@aol.com>, <lynnbernard@shaw.ca>

>  
> *Richard Walton is a Candidate for District Mayor. He is presently a  
> Councillor in the District. He recently issued a press release  
> defending the District's Financial status (see  
> Northvancouverpolitics.com.) Richard, among other things reassured  
> the residents of his patriotism. Isn't it good to know that Richard  
> is a patriot, in this case a local patriot. " this is an incredible  
> community, and there is a price to pay for what we enjoy". Point taken  
> Richard. And, says Richard "we can address the challenges by setting  
> policy to effect clearly stated priorities, through prudent financial  
> planning, and by CREATING PARTNERSHIPS for delivering services within  
> FAIR AND REASONABLE tax structures" he says. Reassuring INDEED, but  
> since Richard has not produced a single motion or initiative since he  
> has been on Council, I am somewhat surprised at his new found energy -  
> or maybe he just did not get around to it yet.*  
>  
> *However, it is Richard's, "partnerships" that worry me. Our recreation  
> facilities have been allowed to deteriorate. Richard Walton  
> consistently voted against any and all efforts to spend the needed  
> money before they were virtually beyond repair. Was this deliberate,  
> to set the stage for privatisation, or Richard are you just not bright  
> enough to know that if you don't protect your assets and maintain them  
> on an ongoing basis you will lose them? I have another question? We  
> might as well let it all hang out. Is this the reason also, why you,  
> Richard, with the assistance of your friends made sure that Crist  
> would not be appointed to the Rec Commission to help prevent such a  
> fiasco? In light of your statement this assumption would make sense  
> would it not Richard?*  
>  
> *Your statement that the District is in good financial shape is  
> equally worrisome. If so than why not fix the deteriorating  
> facilities? Maybe you could explain it to me. If you cannot, I must  
> ask, Richard, what kind of custodian are you to allow peoples' assets  
> worth hundreds of millions of dollars to deteriorate to the point  
> where they have to be partnered? Is it not the first duty of an  
> elected representative to protect the public's investment? Who put  
> you up to this, Richard. Is it special interests who share your  
> philosophy and are chomping at the bit to privatise and take over  
> these facilities so they can make money out of public health needs?  
> Surely you agree Richard that our Recreation, Facilities are public  
> health facilities do you not?*  
>  
> *Now, Richard, having worked with you, nothing would surprise me.  
> Indeed to survive politically and get elected Mayor I suppose you felt*

> you had no choice but to defend the record of your friends who are  
> responsible for creating the financial havoc the District is now  
> facing. It is a havoc is it not' Richard, your statement  
> notwithstanding? I mean after all, we do have debts do we not Richard  
> when we should be at least as rich as the City? After all, is it not  
> true that their Heritage Fund is still intact while ours is gone and  
> please don't insult my intelligence by telling me that our Heritage  
> Fund is intact because it has \$ 20 million dollars when it should have  
> \$ 400 million. Or could it be that your statements were merely  
> designed to achieve political survival, Richard?

>  
> How is your friend Don Bell, Richard, who is supporting you in this  
> election? It is like a horse race isn't it Richard? You bet on a  
> horse and then you are stuck, some you win and some you lose. But it  
> does remind me of a Bob Hope skit. Bob was an insurance salesman with  
> a dire sales record. When asked by his boss during a pep talk what he  
> hoped to ever become with his colossal incompetence Bob calmly  
> replied, I was hoping to become your assistant. Well said, Bob.

>  
> However, in your priceless press statement you continue "There has  
> been inaccurate commentary and fear mongering that implies the  
> District is on the brink of financial ruin. "I find it extremely  
> disappointing" you say, "that anyone wishing to lead this community,  
> would choose to mislead the public just to get headlines. Not only is  
> this a misrepresentation", you say "but it also indicates a lack of  
> basic financial understanding". I agree Richard, it is indeed  
> disappointing that anyone wishing to lead this community, should attempt  
> to mislead the public. Maybe you should look in the mirror Richard?

>  
> However, notwithstanding your prowess in matters of finances, several  
> important points seem to have escaped your attention or is it lack of  
> understanding? Facts, as the philosopher stated, are stubborn things.  
> It is one thing to accuse your political opponents of  
> misrepresentation but what do you do when your own friends have said  
> the very thing you deny? That creates a bit of a problem doesn't it,  
> Richard? I think it does, but let us look a little closer at those  
> facts shall we? Who was it who told the story about the District  
> Heritage Fund being depleted? Was it just I Richard? Is it or is it  
> not true that your own friends in the Finance Advisory Committee said  
> the same thing but were told to keep their mouths shut?

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Who refused to re-organise the District Rec facilities along the  
> Parkgate model? Was it not you, Richard, along with your friends on  
> District Council, just as did your predecessor even though it would  
> have meant great savings since Parkgate as everybody knows is far  
> more efficient and is under public control. Are you part of a  
> conspiracy to deliberately let the facilities deteriorate to the point  
> of no return to make sure that "partnership" as you call it would  
> become reality? Just asking, Richard. Is this what you had in mind  
> all along, Richard? If you did not, than your actions make  
> absolutely no sense. How about it Richard? If this is not so and you  
> did not, it can mean only one thing, you don't understand anything.

>  
> Tell us the truth - which is it. Come on Richard - be courageous and  
> let it all hang out. And what about the Infrastructure Reserve Funds?  
> Don't you find it curious that the Fund set aside to replace asbestos  
> water pipes should be siphoned off for other purposes? Let us not  
> forget, Richard, that all this took place while taxes in the District

> went from the lowest to the highest in the region. What do you say to  
> that eh, Richard?

>  
> And how about subsidizing the City? Who in his right mind would keep  
> on building playing fields if he has more than enough for his own use  
> just because the neighbouring municipality has a shortage of playing  
> fields? You defended that dumb policy did you not Richard? Any words  
> here? I am sure the Taxpayers of the District would like to hear your  
> reasons. I am sure they would like to know what more pearls of wisdom  
> they can expect should your friends succeed in getting you elected -or  
> is there something we ordinary mortals are missing - tell us Richard,  
> please do.

>  
> Ditto with the Swimming pools. Why would anybody defend a deal whereby  
> one partner of the Shared Services Agreement with a neighbouring  
> municipality with only one swimming pool but with more than half the  
> population of the other partner contributes not a single penny to the  
> capital maintenance while we in the District have 3 such pools. That,  
> Richard does not make sense to me either nor does it to anybody else  
> who has an IQ higher than room temperature. And what about the Alpine  
> Recreation Plan Richard? Who in his right mind would volunteer to  
> accept fiscal responsibility for a world sport in the District. Maybe  
> Richard you could enlighten us here as well.


>  
One final point, Richard. What about the Waterfront Industry. I hear you  
have agreed to lower their taxes - behind closed doors of course - away  
from the ears of the public. I heard you made such deal even though  
industries can write off their taxes while homeowners having to pick up  
the difference cannot, and subsequently will see their taxes go through  
the roof. Is that true Richard? Or is that just another rumour by how  
did you call those people those "who would chose to mislead the public  
just to get headlines" and which, "is not only misrepresentation but  
also indicates a lack of understanding" you said. Did you make such a  
commitment Richard? If so will you tell the public the truth before the  
election or will you wait and give the people the bad news after which  
would make your press release nothing more than blowing smoke "to  
mislead the public and get headlines" and give them the bad news after.  
As I said Richard, I am just asking.

> I am really looking forward to your explanation. There is nothing I  
> like better than to be educated. I am looking forward to your reply  
> before the election. All my friends are also dying to find out and so  
> are the rest of the taxpayers in the District.

>  
> Best regards, Richard.

>

---

 <a href="#">winmail.dat</a>	<b>Name:</b> winmail.dat <b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
---	---