

Subject: FW: FW:

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 21:17:12 -0700

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "FONVCA \ (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <Cagebc@yahoo.com>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

Dear Laurie:

I want to thank you for your support tonight on this matter. It was greatly appreciated. I also want to thank Alan Orr for sending a note to Mayor and Council in support of the motion.

Council refused to put the motion on the public agenda on the advice of the Clerk who stated that it is an In Camera item since a third party might be implicated and that this was contrary to policy. Whose policy?

My response was that if this is the case than why did Council bring the matter before the public in the first place? Clearly there is a contradiction here and clearly there are two laws, one for staff as interpreted by the Clerk and another one for me. There was no straight answer for the simple reason that there is no answer other than that the Distirct is a banana republic where policies are changed at will and where procedure, democratic rules and fair play is being violated on a whim and depending on the situation.

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

From: Ernie Crist

Sent: October 15, 2004 8:36 PM

To: 'Laurie Johnston'

Subject: RE: FW:

Hello Laurie;

This is great and thank you very much. The point is that a note by the Clerk was sent to all members of Council informing them that henceforth no member of Council may see the agenda. However, Councillor Crist was omitted from that list - why? Does that not suggest that this was a set up? Why would a junior clerk upon being asked as to who gave such an order state "it was I" when she had no authority to do so. Why not simply say it was the Clerk who gave those instructions? If she had said go and see the clerk I would not have said another word and simply gone to the Clerk to clarify the issue with her. This too suggests that this was a set up.

It is also a fact that Don Bell in front of witnesses and following the 1999 election results had been tabulated and after all members of Council who had supported the Waterfont Task Force policy had been defeated stated "we will now fix Crist". What does that suggest other than that he was out for revenge?

As for the mismanagement in the District and the scandals which are legend - can there be any doubt that I was harassed in an effort to silence me? But the most obvious flaw in this whole thing is that like the erstwhile Jews in Nazi Germany I was denied any and all recourse to natural justice. Don Bell and his ilk in a manner of speaking was the prosecutor, the jury and the judge. I was not even given the means to defend myself other than paying for it myself out of my own pocket, whereas they had all the money needed. As for the charges?I offered to take a lie detector test but nobody took me up on it. However, despite the fact that it never went to court the sanctions remained.

Regards.

Ernie

-----Original Message-----

From: Laurie Johnston [mailto:lauriej_v7g@yahoo.com]

Sent: October 15, 2004 7:27 PM
To: Ernie Crist
Subject: Re: FW:

Hello Ernie,

I have drafted a statement I am thinking of presenting, as you have asked us to do, and would appreciate any comments or suggestions you may have. I would liked to have been more critical of your fellow councillors, but thought I should tone it down in the hope of giving you a better chance to have the motion seconded and passed.

"I wish to express my support for Councillor Crist's motion on tonight's agenda that all forms of censure against him be terminated immediately. I have no doubt that he is correct in his position that the allegations against him were the result of attempts to stifle his justified criticism of the District's performance and operations, most notably the Northlands Golf Course embezzlement and the prolonged time that it took to detect and report it. I also believe that the original charge against him of raising his voice against a district employee for refusing to let him see a copy of a draft council agenda was a minor matter and did not warrant the prolonged and excessive harassment that this dedicated and hard-working veteran councillor has been subjected to."

I hope there will be a good turnout of the "usual suspects" and others to support you.

Regards,
Laurie J.

--- Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org> wrote:

> Dear Sir/Madam;
>
> The motion below touches on one of the most serious issues facing a
> community - freedom of expression and the freedom to criticize
> government from within without being subjected to harassment for
> doing so. The District of North Vancouver has been beset by extremely
> serious shortcomings and scandals. This was especially true under the
> Bell administration of which the "Northlands" scandal was but one
> example. In the absence of evidence I was accused of harassing staff
> and subjected to censure and subsequent harassment without having
> access to any form of natural justice.
>
> The motion below is self explanatory. I am asking for your support.
> The motion will be introduced by the Clerk at the end of the Council
> meeting this coming Monday Oct 18,2004. I am asking that you speak in
> support of my motion. The opportunity to do so will be provided
> during the 30 minute public input period when you have an opportunity
> to address Council for 2 minutes.
>
> What is at stake is the right of your duly elected representative to
> criticize without suffering undue punishment for doing so. If you
> are a candidate for the upcoming election I am asking you to fax to
> me your stand on this matter. Your response will be conveyed to my
> own circle of supporters.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> Ernie Crist
>

>
>
>
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Ernie Crist
> > Sent: October 14, 2004 8:19 AM
> > To: Agnes Hilsen
> >
> >
> > NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR CRIST
> >
> > Whereas Councillor Crist was censured by a previous Council in the
> absence of any measure of natural justice and
> >
> > Whereas the allegations against Councillor Crist were never proven
> in a court of law and
> >
> > Whereas all evidence strongly suggests that the allegations against
> Councillor Crist were the result of subjective, personal and
> politically motivated bias and must therefore be construed as an
> attempt to stifle his criticism of the District's performance and
> operations, which falls under his constitutional and democratic
> mandate and
> >
> > Whereas the Distirct has been beset by serious shortcomings and
> scandals under Don Bell's administration, including "Northlands" and
> >
> > Whereas, in the absence of proof of the allegations, continued
> censure against Councillor Crist constitutes harassment of an elected
> official impeding his ability to carry out his responsibilities to
> the electors and
> >
> > Whereas this also constitutes a violation of the "positive
> workplace policy" in effect for staff but denied to elected officials
> on the advice of District staff who enjoy the protection of this same
> "positive workplace policy" and
> >
> > Whereas the legal proceedings against Councillor Crist have been
> nonproductive, subjective, unnecessary and, above everything else,
> have resulted in unjustified expenses for the taxpayers of the
> District
> >
> >
> > Therefore be it resolved that all forms of censure against
> Councillor Crist be terminated effective immediately.
> >
> >
>

Do you Yahoo!?
 Declare Yourself - Register online to vote today!
<http://vote.yahoo.com>

