

THE NORTH BURGESS ELECTION --- WHAT HAPPENED?

Stated briefly, the facts are these. Hans Pokorny, who has served us well for the past 4 years, decided to run again. But he suggested the advisability of a running mate who could continue to represent the lake residents after Hans stepped down, as he expected, in 1982. It seemed a good idea and when Mark Semple of Perth offered his services, the executive decided to support him. So did the executives of the other 4 lakes in North Burgess. Had these men won, they would have been 2 out of 5 members of the Council. The lake associations, by the way, were scrupulous to avoid taking a stand against any of the other candidates.

Then the opposition began. Bill Dyke, the councillor who appears to have felt the most threatened began a vigorous campaign. Councillor Jim Bell joined in the attack on Pokorny and Semple and on all cottagers. The editor of the Perth Courier printed the opinions of Mr. Dyke and endorsed them. A third candidate, Mr. William Allan, was embraced for their cause.

This trio circulated literature to the permanent residents in the area, calling on all non-lake people to rally and fight off the imagined attack upon them. This campaign suggested that cottagers were "trying to win control of Council" (Courier, Oct. 22, 1980) "trying to take the North Burgess Council 'out of town'" (Courier, Nov. 5, 1980) and statements were made that: "No one wants to be told what to do by a seasonal visitor" (Courier, Oct. 22, 1980) and more, much more.

On this campaign of slurs and innuendo, the trio whipped up a campaign of hostility against lake residents; and they won their victory.

Then, to add insult to injury, the new Council in December voted for a resolution to ask the Ontario government to prohibit all seasonal residents from being allowed to serve on municipal councils.

The resolution is, of course, ridiculous, repugnant and probably illegal. Those who pay taxes are entitled to representation. It is worth noting that the Reeve and the Deputy Reeve did not support the resolution. However, Council has circulated their mischievous resolution to 800 municipalities in Ontario, asking for support. At last count, 25 councils had supported it. Councillor Bell and his wife Nadine, the Township Clerk, claim this as a victory for their cause. They are spending

.../2

Otty Lake good neighbours

YOUR TAX money to circulate this resolution.

After being approached by newspapers in Ottawa and Kingston for comment, your president felt it would be desirable to issue a statement to make clear our point of view and refute the more offensive accusations. A statement was addressed to the permanent residents of the Township and published in the Courier January 14, 1981. For those who missed it, a copy is attached.

THE ELECTION WHAT HAPPENED AND WHY? For one thing, we had attempted to fight a fair campaign and had expected others to do the same. For another, cottagers did not turn out to vote as expected; they were too complacent. Too many lake residents stayed away, thinking no doubt that their votes would not be needed. We get the government we deserve.

The result? Life will be more difficult for the people of Otty Lake for the next 2 years. Although Hans Pokorny was only one voice on Council, he was able to keep us informed of events that mattered to us in both Burgess and Elmsley. We had a fighting chance to react when our interests were at stake. Look now for an unsympathetic Council that will care little about pollution control, protection of the quality of life at the lakes or for problems of over-development. From all reports this Council will be difficult to deal with.

Some passing thoughts: It is ironical that the 5 lake associations urged their members to vote for the plebiscite to allow liquor at church parties in Stanleyville. There was no advantage for us in this. We did it entirely to oblige the permanent residents who, Mr. Pokorny advised us, would appreciate the support. The measure was voted in with the strong support of the lake residents. Ironic indeed.

The Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs is expected to rule shortly that the North Burgess resolution is illegal and improper. However, much damage will already have been done. Not only will our Township Council be made to look foolish and not only will our tax money be wasted, they will unfortunately also have succeeded in fanning the flames of hostility between lake and non-lake residents.

Your executive is giving a great deal of thought right now to the questions raised by the recent turn of events. We are concerned, as you must be, about how to protect the rights of our lake community within the context of a bigger (geographically) community of the Townships. If you have suggestions to

offer, contact any member of the executive. In the meantime, there is some consolation in that the wider community is displeased with the harmful actions of this council. Most councils in Ontario will treat the resolution with the contempt it deserves, by ignoring it.

Regardless of the antagonism shown by Council, your executive will continue to try to cooperate in the interests of good government.

Page 2 - THE PERTH COURIER - Wednesday, October 22, 1980

The Perth Courier

JOHN W. CLEMENT, Publisher

STEVE FORSTER, Editor

Cottager power

Many of our neighbouring townships are treading in dangerous waters by ignoring the strong power base of cottager's associations in their areas.

Some townships are eager to have more lake development to bring in more tax dollars, but little do they realize that with more development also comes "cottager power."

Sooner or later, if the townships do not react quickly, there will be a takeover of local township councils by cottagers--part-time residents.

Already residents of one nearby township have expressed concern that cottagers may well form the power base in that township. In other words, the local residents might be out-voted on township council when the upcoming election is over.

It's not a desirable situation. Cottagers, no matter how good their intentions or how long they have had residences in the area, do not have the same interests as full-timers.

Let's face it, cottagers are interested in preserving their weekend lakeside retreats and could probably care little about weed inspectors or the state of township roads outside their lake area.

Not that cottagers shouldn't have a say in township politics. They do indeed deserve representation, but not control.

In many townships where the cottage population is high, these part-time residents should have a voice expressing their interests on the township council.

Unfortunately the cottagers are not always happy with one voice that is easily out-voted and if they work at it they can, in some case, win control of power.

It is up to the full-time residents to assure that cottage associations in their townships do not wrestle away political control, no one wants to be told what to do by a seasonal visitor.

An example of what can happen is clearly defined by looking at North Burgess Township. That township has over 1,600 names on the voter's list, but only 424 of them are classed as full-time residents.

Area residents have to wake up and take a long hard look at cottage development or else they'll find themselves without a vote on their future.

THIS IS THE SHEET THAT WAS CIRCULATED BEFORE THE ELECTION. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT?

NORTH BURGESS VOTERS

Dear Friends,

We have been left with no choice....but to campaign in this election as your three local candidates. We must fight fire with fire to keep North Burgess for North Burgess.

The Otty Lake Association, the so-called, All Lakes 1980 Election Committee, and Mr. Hans Pokorny have left us with no choice. It has never been the intention of any local candidate or the Council of this Township to be entirely representative of any single organization in our township. It appears that David Code, Hans Pokorny and the Otty Lake Executive are trying to take the North Burgess Council..."out of town". It is a sad occasion when these few men endeavour to split our township in half.

As you all know, residents and cottagers have been friends and neighbours for quite a number of years and it is unfortunate when this Association has to draw such battle lines in this election.

The Otty Lake Association letter supports only two candidates, Hans Pokorny and Mark Semple of Perth, with the quote, "We urge you to support them both".

Mr. Pokorny's own letter says, quote, "... with the proviso that I have a running mate from the ranks of cottage owners".

The All Lakes letter says, quote, "We suggest you vote for two councillors only (Hans Pokorny and Mark Semple) to ensure their vital election for our interests".

We, your three local candidates, feel it is time to let this Association know that there are full time residents living in this township and that we do not appreciate our Council being run from Ottawa. It is to put this Association in its proper perspective in the mosaic of our township.

Local government in this township is for all the people in this township, not just a few.

It is necessary at this time to ask that ALL residents of our township come to the polls on November 10th, to exercise their franchise in support of your local candidates.

We have the necessary numbers and in this election we need all voters.

PLEASE COME AND VOTE

SOLIDARITY IS THE KEY...PLEASE VOTE...ONE...TWO...THREE

William A. ALLAN	267-2219	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jim BELL	267-4035	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bill DYKE	267-3286	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pokorny		<input type="checkbox"/>
Semple		<input type="checkbox"/>

Summer resident feels resolution will bring end to harmony in North Burgess

To The Residents of North Burgess:

By now I had hoped that the dust (and the mud) would have settled on the North Burgess election campaign. It appears that certain members of the council will not let it rest. These are the same persons who made misleading statements during the campaign, in an obvious attempt to influence the outcome. Since my name has been used by the mischief-makers, and since the whole thing has gotten out of hand, I claim the right to set a few things straight. The following is only a sample of some of the statements that were circulated in late 1980.

"ATTEMPT TO SEIZE CONTROL" This charge is sheer nonsense and bad arithmetic as well. The lake residents gave support to two candidates (and in some cases to others as well). Two out of five is not a majority, at least not where I went to school. Secondly, Mr. Bell keeps telling people that the Otty Lake Association has "considered attempting to take control of the municipal council." He has failed to tell you that the Association had already rejected the notion and had never taken it seriously. He knew that, and he had been told that in the presence of witnesses, yet he persists in saying the opposite. Mr. Bell has not been entirely honest with the people. Why?

"COUNCIL TO BE RUN FROM OTTAWA" This malicious piece of gossip was circulated by the gang of 3 candidates during the campaign. They failed to mention that Mr. Pokorny was and is a full-time resident of North Burgess and that Mr. Semple resides in Perth when he is not at his property in the Township. The insinuation contained in the rumour was insulting to these two persons, as well as very inaccurate. This is another case of someone not being honest. Why?

"A RIFT APPEARS TO HAVE DEVELOPED" between lake residents and others" Mr. Dyke is reported to have said. This is very crafty of him, considering that he is one of the creators of that rift. From the beginning, that "rift" has been a false issue, a red herring to be used apparently for the election advantage of Mr. Dyke and Mr.

Bell. It worked; but what an underhanded way to win.

"NO ONE WANTS TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO BY A SEASONAL VISITOR" In its editorial of October 22, 1980 the Perth Courier used this curious choice of words. By doing so, it perpetuated the same kind of innuendo and slur that two members of Council were circulating in the campaign literature. Besides, there is not one shred of evidence that lake residents have ever had any wish to order the affairs of non-lake people in Burgess. If anything, former Councillor Pokorny's term of office would prove the opposite. His service was amply given for the benefit of the entire community, and he worked hard at it. Why, therefore, do certain people keep trying to claim something that can only stir up trouble and that has never been true? Why?

LAKE MANAGEMENT Mr. Bell has been telling a lot of people that "a certain group have been falsely complaining about the water quality in Otty Lake." Mr. Bell's qualifications in microbiology or lake management are about the same as mine would be in farm management.

By the way, what would be so shocking if someone with a mailing address just outside the Township should be elected to office? It happens frequently elsewhere, and the world seems to survive. If the person can do the job, and is willing to make the sacrifices to serve the people, should that person then not earn thanks instead of condemnation? Surely it is the ability to do a job that ought to count, not the colour of their skin, or their sex, or their mailing address.

BUT, in North Burgess we now have a Council that has passed a resolution that asks the Ontario government to prevent non-residents from holding office, no matter how well qualified they might be, or how hard they might be willing to work. Councillor Bell says that it would be O.K. for lake residents to vote in the elections, just as long as none of them try to be candidates. Does he not realize this is the same deal people get in the Soviet Union: everyone can vote, as long as they only

vote for the approved party. Did Council (apart from the Reeve) understand what they were saying? Apparently not.

The principle of **NO TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION** was established in England, away back in the reign of King Charles I; it was confirmed later in the 13 colonies, and it has been preserved in freedom-loving countries everywhere. Did Council intend to turn back the clock of democracy to the days when only the very rich could vote at all and everyone else was taxed but without a say in the way the money was to be spent? This foolish resolution has got to be the most ignorant thing any Council has ever done. It does not say much for the ability or for the respect for democracy of the three Councillors who were elected last November.

Do the residents of North Burgess appreciate the possible mischief that can be done by an irresponsible Council? Is it appreciated, for example, that although cottagers make up 75% of the population in the Township they have never asked for a majority of the seats on Council? More importantly, is it appreciated that cottagers pay most of the taxes that support the rest of the people in the Township? The lion's share of that tax money goes for education, and every penny of that is for your benefit, not theirs. If it were not for the cottagers paying their taxes to the Township, what would you do? Lakes and lake people are important to the Township, but Council seems to have forgotten that.

A BIG QUESTION, that begs for an answer, is why certain members of Council, with ample publicity provided by the Courier, are so determinedly hostile toward non-residents and lake residents? Why have they passed a ridiculous resolution that can only stir up trouble?

From where I sit, it seems as if they were caught in their own trap. They told so many whoppers during the election campaign that they got caught up in their own momentum and had to try to look consistent. Or perhaps Messrs. Dyke and Bell are trying to disguise the fact that they are relative newcomers to the area. Some of the rest of us, of course, are not.

Whatever the reason for their hostility, these men have created a serious division between people whom I always thought would prefer to be friends. They have made much mischief.

A SECOND QUESTION that also needs answering is this: Were the non-lake residents of North Burgess misled by the false statements, defamatory remarks and innuendoes of Messrs. Bell and Dyke. Or were the non-lake residents trying to tell us that they have never liked us and do not want us in the Township? Many people would like to know the answer to this question.

If it is the former, then certain people have a great deal of apologizing to do for all the mischief they have done (and for wasting our tax money in doing it).

Contrary to what you have been told before and after the election, there are hundreds of lake residents — and I know them personally — who have never wanted to:

- a) take over the Council,
- b) tell non-lake residents how to manage their own affairs,
- c) stop paying taxes to the Township,
- d) seek separate status to govern themselves.

But certain members of Council keep telling you that this is what lake residents wanted. Does it almost seem as if this Council is daring us to do some or all of these? Obviously I, and perhaps you, have overestimated their common sense.

In the meantime, there are many lake residents who, like myself, have tried hard to create and maintain goodwill between the residents and the lake people. There are many like me who now feel a deep sense of sadness, hurt and disappointment.

David E. Code

CARSON SUBDIVISION

In our newsletter of April, 1980 we reported the difference of opinion between ourselves and Mr. Carson regarding Phase III of his subdivision. Because he, the Township and the Tay Valley Planning Board would not agree to respect the requirements of the Official Plan, your Association was obliged to file official objections with the Minister of Housing against both the O.P. amendment and the enabling By-law. Those enactments would have allowed 28 units on the land, where we maintained that 10 was the allowable maximum. The Minister referred the matter to the Ontario Municipal Board.

A hearing has not been held. Instead, there have been discussions with the solicitors for the subdivider, authorized by your executive.

It has now been tentatively agreed that Mr. Carson will have 17 lots in Phase III but that all but one of these will be set back 700' from the shore. Under the original plan, these lots would have been as close as 200 or 300' from shore.

A special executive meeting held in December, decided, on a split vote, that the new proposals would make the plan less lake oriented than originally proposed, and that the compromise figure of 17 lots was therefore more acceptable. The lands that would have been the other 11 lots will, instead, be conveyed to Mr. Carson's son and daughter, to be added to their existing cottage lots but not to be built upon or divided. As this agreement has now been concluded, your Association has withdrawn its official objection, enabling cancellation of the Ontario Municipal Board hearing.

LATE BULLETIN

In answer to the presidents letter of January 15, 1981 regarding the resolution of the Township of North Burgess, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Tom Wells, wrote

"I appreciate your concern with the Township resolution. I have replied to the North Burgess Council that I believe it is a very serious and difficult matter to disenfranchise citizens, in the context of their right to hold office, particularly as the government has long been committed to broadening participation in the electoral process.

For the above, and other reasons, I am not prepared to support the request of North Burgess Council to remove the right of non-resident electors to hold office in a municipality in which they otherwise qualify."

.

In addition, this move on the part of the Township has resulted in some activity and interest elsewhere. The Federation of Ontario Cottagers' Associations has pledged its full support in our fight to preserve our rights. The Federation has also launched a campaign to have the Elections Act changed, so that cottagers may vote in future at the Thanksgiving weekend.