

**Subject: In response to the alibis by the CCA endorsed chieftain and Councilor with Mayoralty ambitions on my motion re subsidies to the City.**

**Date:** Fri, 10 May 2002 15:10:05 -0700

**From:** Ernie Crist <CristE@dnv.org>

**To:** "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

**CC:** Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Directors Team <managecomm@dnv.org>

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

This is in response to the CCA endorsed chieftain and Councilor with Mayoralty ambitions claim of "correcting the record" sent previously on the subject below.

I have only the following to add. Clearly he does not extend any credit to mine or other people's intelligence, first and foremost to the regular Council Watchers who are quite familiar with the present CCA endorsed Council and its record.

The item in question dealt specifically with my motion of addressing the District's subsidy to the City via the present "Shared Services Agreement" via the North Vancouver Rec Commission. The District subsidizes the Commission by close to \$ 6 million annually. Although 3 out of 4 major Rec Facilities In North Van. are located in the District and are used by City residents, the City is not contributing a single penny to the capital maintenance of those facilities. It is even worse when it comes to playing fields.

You may recall that I have tried to rectify this blood letting a thousand times but without success. I even went so far as to make a comprehensive proposal on how to reorganize the Commission along the Parkgate model and save millions of dollars without cutting the level of services. It was not accepted, however. The subject is taboo. The reason is self evident to anybody who knows the power of the Rec Commission and the interests of the Sports Users who exert a great influence on the Commission but, at the same time, don't care who pays for what as long as their demands are being addressed. During the last municipal election, the Sport users played a major role in its outcome. They promoted the special interest CCA endorsed candidates lock, stock and barrel. They went even so far as to hand out election material on District playing fields.

The effect of the motion by the CCA endorsed Councillor with Mayoralty ambitions asking that my motion dealing with this issue be held in abeyance and deal with the Manager's report instead, was PRECISELY TO PREVENT a meaningful debate on the matter of subsidy to the City. The manager's report was certainly not geared to address this issue. On the contrary, it was geared to maintain the status quo which is exactly what will happen. The stage has already been set. Not only will the information to the consultant be supplied by the Rec Commission but it will also pay for the report. This, in all likelihood, will be done by raising the fees. This is the third report on the same subject. The first two cost the taxpayers close to one hundred thousand dollars.

As for the claim by the CCA endorsed Councillor with Mayoralty Ambitions in the matter of Council Committee appointments, all I know is this - as there were only two names for two Council positions for the Rec Commission at the time, mine being one of them, my appointment seemed to be assured. If, as the CCA endorsed Councillor now claims he put his name forward months before the deadline then this was clearly not apparent when the list was handed out. Had his name been on the list, I would never have put my name forward since to compete with a CCA endorsed Councillor for the same position would have been a waste of time.

Maybe the CCA endorsed member of Council with Mayoralty ambitions should refresh his memory on the subject. While he is at it, he might also try to remember the role he played when I was ousted from all GVRD Committees as soon as the CCA endorsed Council slate took control of Council. He might also recall the role he played in ensuring that the only member of District Council not endorsed by the CCA, namely myself, would have to get the permission of a CCA endorsed member of Council before being allowed to submit and explain a motion for debate.

He might also recall the role he played when the alleged staff harassment charges against the only non CCA endorsed member of Council, namely myself, were concocted. Of all the CCA endorsed witch hunters on Council, he and the Councillor who does not know the difference between a Heritage Fund and the interests generated by such a Fund were the most eager in their hunt.

As for his claim that he was the one who initiated the KPMG report; this is not necessarily so either but if he wanted a real change, he should have voted in favor of Phase Two of the KPMG Report which was the real issue in the saga of the District's mismanagement. It would certainly have been better than putting in charge those who were responsible for the fiasco in the first place. He might also have voted in favor of the other numerous motions I made to address this serious issue - maybe he should have at least seconded my motions for debate.

---

 [Part 1.2](#)

**Type:** application/ms-tnef  
**Encoding:** base64