

**Subject: [Fwd: Re: FW: Council Meeting 21 March 2005]**

**Date:** Tue, 22 Mar 2005 14:19:16 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

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

---

**Subject: Re: FW: Council Meeting 21 March 2005**

**Date:** Tue, 22 Mar 2005 14:16:25 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

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

**CC:** fonvca@fonvca.org, Cagebc@yahoo.com, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, 'Cathy Adams' <cathyadams@canada.com>

Dear Councillor Crist:

On the issue of the "art" work hanging in our District Hall, Cathy Adams has most certainly provided specific and compelling reasons why the material should be removed immediately and I agree with her position on the matter. Mrs. Adams has every right to be upset by the response from the Director of the Arts Council, and I don't think it is fair to suggest that her concerns -- or those of anyone else who is upset about this inappropriate display -- are not fully legitimate because more people were not as equally outraged as you were by an anonymous and unproven accusation against you. I just don't see the link.

Sincerely,  
Brian Platts

Ernie Crist wrote:

---

**From:** Ernie Crist

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2005 9:59 AM

**To:**

**Subject:** RE: Council Meeting 21 March 2005

Dear Mr. ....

It was good to see you at last night's Council meeting and thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts. You are bang on - Council DOES have the authority to ask residents whether they have a secondary suite and following this action the municipality DOES have the right to verify should the question be negative and/or is being ignored. However, the Council in my opinion does not have the will to do so. That is the crux of the issue. All other statements are in my opinion excuses and you know what the philosopher said about excuses. With an election coming up and with 6000 illegal suites (not 2500 as you were told) they are scared to do something serious. I already said so in public and even though I said it loud and more than once, it appears nobody heard me. I also have another problem. Why should people who have no objection to their taxes being used to subsidise the City and who don't say boo when they could save millions by reorganizing the Rec Commission, object to someone getting away with a freebie.

But to go back to the Secondary Suite issue. Nobody wants to understand that in a case like that the onus to prove that home owners do NOT have a secondary suite is NOT on the municipality but on the homeowner. It would be different were the municipality to go from door to door DEMANDING access to verify without asking politely first. The initial question is the key to the legality. Your analogy with the drivers licence is a good one. A policeman has the right to ask me at any time whether I have a firearm in my car. If I say no, he has the right to search my car without giving any reasons as to why he believes that I have.

The municipality too has the right to ask whether a person has a secondary suite. At the moment, when a person makes a statement that they do NOT, the municipality has the power to verify. With the action of denying it or refusing to answer, the legal weight has shifted in favour of the municipality. It is as simple as that. What people, who argue law and human rights forget, is that the fundamental premise of this issue is that the municipality HAS THE RIGHT to demand payment. The letter sent to the owners can easily be written in a fashion so as NOT to create any legal problem and still achieve the objective.

The handling of the Tsleil Waututh issue last night was not wrong since it was listed on the agenda as a deferral. Corrie, is therefore, wrong on this one. However, I do agree that it might have been better to clarify this for the benefit of the public.

As far as the ART in the Hall is concerned, if Cathy Adams or anybody else objects to a painting then he/she should give a specific reason. To simply object because she (or others) find it objectionable is not good enough in my opinion. We are talking about ART (trash as it may be in the opinion of some). I suggest FONVCA set up a Citizens Exhibition Approval Committee with stated criteria to guide them. Since the Hall belongs to the citizens they have every right to determine what may or may not be exhibited. Otherwise the objection carries little weight.

If they want me to make a motion to that effect I'd be more than happy to do that. However, I don't think Mrs Adams was nearly as upset over this issue as I was over the fact that

90,000 people (with the exception of a few) stood idly by and allowed one of their elected representatives to be harassed on unproven charges. Now that was something to get upset about, but there was silence - if I did not know already how the Jews felt in Nazi Germany, I surely would know now. Needless to say being a student of Homo Sapiens - no surprises there.

As far as the Port Security issue is concerned, I think that Councillor Walton missed the relevant point which is that, unless the Port accepts full responsibility including paying in full, we ARE involved.

As far as the transportation announcement is concerned, why would the Premier inform a level of government that does not exist under the constitution? I am being sarcastic of course. I have never seen anybody having a hernia over the fact that we do not exist but 150 Natives under the constitution do. This, after all, is Canada. But I am certainly not blaming the Natives. I rest my case.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

---