

Residents did want by-election: reader

(Re. ?Gallo responds to criticism over letter?)

Regarding your reference to your appointment to Council in 2008, you state that if you had certainty that the public did not want Council to appoint, you would have declined.

Does your decision then to accept appointment suggest that you therefore had certainty that the public did not want a by-election? Certainty is a tough thing to determine, but I well remember the Council meetings in May of 2008 where the Chambers were filled with supporters of the by-election process; the several open forum speakers and delegates who spoke in support of a by-election; former Councillors and members of the community who asked for Council to honour its commitment of 'openness and transparency?'; the presentation of a staff report containing over 50 letters from Aurora taxpayers supporting by-election vs. six letters supporting appointment; countless letters and editorials in the local papers asking for Council to do the right thing and hold a by-election; and even a proposed amendment to the Municipal Act being considered by the provincial government requiring the by-election process be upheld in these circumstances.

Certainty? No. But overwhelming evidence to support a by-election, I would suggest yes. Yet, you still accepted appointment with full endorsement from the ex-mayor.

You then refer to the lawsuit. 'Town initiated'? Really, Councillor, that's quite a stretch. I'm a citizen of this Town. I didn't initiate the lawsuit, and I doubt the three affected families did either.

As Master Hawkins ruling clearly stated, 'Morris brought this action expressly in her capacity as Mayor of the Corporation of the Town of Aurora'. In my opinion, there's no question who initiated this lawsuit, and believe me, it wasn't 'the Town.'

You supported the original motion to take 'any and all action' in launching this vindictive lawsuit process. Yet, when you were faced with the reality that three innocent families were needlessly suffering both emotionally and financially, and you were then given the opportunity to cut taxpayer funding of the lawsuit, you again declined to take the high road.

I don't know which I find more distasteful, your initial actions supporting this assault on free speech, or your continued attempts to this day to make what you did sound noble, that somehow you were participating in a process to bring justice to a victim of defamation.

From Justice Brown's ruling, 'It is not the role of the Court to parse the impugned articles and blogs before it to attempt to determine, by divination or divine inspiration, which statements it should assess?.'

Ergo, defamation was never proven, nor even pled, in this case. Repeating it over and over again doesn't make it true, but I trust you are sincere when you state you believe anyone who writes slanderous and defamatory comments needs to be held accountable. If and when that ever occurs in this Town, whether it be an elected official or a private citizen under attack, I trust Councillor, you'll be one of the first to rally support.

Like Richard Johnson, I too applaud Mr Walkinshaw's letter. And at the same time, I am happy to see Mr. Johnson, one of our Aurora neighbours whose family was one of the front-line victims in the lawsuit issue, return to form in writing and stating his opinions in an intelligent, honest, and forthright manner.

Matt Maddocks

Aurora