

**Subject: Re: Agenda Item #9 - Bylaw 7555 Security Alarm Systems Bylaw**

**Date:** Sun, 24 Jul 2005 17:20:33 -0700

**From:** Pam Bookham <bookham@shaw.ca>

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

**CC:** John Hunter <hunterjohn@telus.net>, "Elizabeth James" <cagebc@yahoo.com>, "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>, "Council Remuneration" <wrtracey@telus.net>, "Brian Platts" <bplatts@shaw.ca>, "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>, "Eric Andersen" <eric\_g\_andersen@hotmail.com>, "Peter Thompson" <bedeconsulting@shaw.ca>, "FONVCA" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Weldon Congdon <d.w.c@shaw.ca>, Brian Konst NET <bkonst@maclaw.bc.ca>, Dan London NET <dan@sunrisesolutions.bc.ca>, David Moulton NET <dmoulton@telus.net>, Murray Dykeman <jmdykeman@shaw.ca>

I think it's time we started sending out press releases on important issues. We shouldn't have to do the reporter's work for them, but have you noticed the turnover lately? Alert the editors and underline the significance of the story.

Pam

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

From: "Corrie Kost" <corrie@kost.ca>

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

Cc: "John Hunter" <hunterjohn@telus.net>; "'Elizabeth James'" <cagebc@yahoo.com>; "'Ernie Crist'" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>; "'Council Remuneration'" <wrtracey@telus.net>; "'Brian Platts'" <bplatts@shaw.ca>; "'Cathy Adams'" <cathyadams@canada.com>; "'Eric Andersen'" <eric\_g\_andersen@hotmail.com>; "'Pam Bookham'" <bookham@shaw.ca>; "'Peter Thompson'" <bedeconsulting@shaw.ca>; "'FONVCA'" <fonvca@fonvca.org>; "Weldon Congdon" <d.w.c@shaw.ca>; "Brian Konst NET" <bkonst@maclaw.bc.ca>; "Dan London NET" <dan@sunrisesolutions.bc.ca>; "David Moulton NET" <dmoulton@telus.net>; "Murray Dykeman" <jmdykeman@shaw.ca>  
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2005 5:03 PM  
Subject: Re: Agenda Item #9 - Bylaw 7555 Security Alarm Systems Bylaw

> Ok - so nothing in NSN Wed/Fri/Sun nor in Outlook.  
> Here we have a case of an almost complete reversal  
> of a council decision ( a reversal that was fully justified  
> in the opinion of most) that would have negatively  
> impacted some 15,000 residential homes and not a peep  
> from the local newspapers? I though this would be  
> newsworthy. Anyone know a good reason why it would  
> not be reported?  
>  
> Corrie Kost  
>  
> Corrie Kost wrote:  
>  
> > Hi John,  
> >  
> > Well, I guess this event was not very newsworthy. One would have thought  
> > that the defeat of an unfair bylaw which purported to impact some 15,000  
> > residential homes and  
> > almost all businesses would have been something to report in the North  
> > Shore News. Makes  
> > one think that only bad news is newsworthy - or maybe I just missed it?  
> > Maybe the Outlook  
> > will report it.  
> >  
> > Corrie Kost  
>