

**Subject: FW:****Date:** Thu, 22 Jan 2004 22:05:33 -0800**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>**To:** "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <cagebc@yahoo.com>

>  
> Dear Editor:  
>  
> Well now, the District Council Cat has finally emerged from the bag. In a recent interview in THE OUTLOOK re District Council's muzzling policy, one Councillor admitted that the matter was largely the result of an attempt to curtail - read silence - Crist. The Councillor explained to the OUTLOOK that she and other Councillors found Crist's comments and email offensive.  
>  
> This, according to her and presumably those who voted with her was, in her mind reason enough to support with considerable enthusiasm, curtailing freedom of speech including the right of a duly elected representative to criticize and communicate with the electorate. She also admitted that the comments made by Crist were "on this side of defamation and slander".  
>  
> This means in plain English that she realizes, (undoubtedly she obtained free legal advise from her friends most of whom have been endorsed by a civic party, as she was,) that nothing Councillor Crist said is defamatory. That should not have come as a surprise because how can the truth be defamatory. She also stated that she and other members of Council found Crist's statements offensive. That, of course, is too bad but then in fairness I must ask the question would it not be better to accept the truth and draw the necessary consequences rather than attempt to muzzle those who speak it although you might find it offensive. This is quite apart that I find many of her comments and even more so many of her actions offensive.  
>  
> Ernie Crist.

