# UN-FAB Don’t Explain, So Don’t Complain: The Un-Fabbed Constitution?

## *Before asking for another term, explain the last one.*

By Nicholas Bozza | Thorold Election Commentary

**Word count: 2,323 | Estimated reading time: Approximately 8 minutes**

Count includes article body and section headings; excludes front matter, disclaimers, source, publisher details and cartoon text. Reading time is approximate; cartoon viewing is additional.

Satire and sourcing notice: This is political opinion with deliberately exaggerated jokes and invented scenes. Personal recollections and reports from others are identified as such. Only the Canada Games Park discussion below is tied to source [1]; that source does not substantiate the separate cemetery, Woodhouse, museum or canvassing accounts. Those accounts have not been independently verified for this article.

**The so called UN-FAB FOUR herein after referred to as the Un-FAB FOUR are:** Nella Dekker, Ken Sentance, Tim O’Hare and Mike De Divitiis.

The UN-FAB FOUR is a satirical nickname used in my commentary for four councillors whose alignment on important votes has raised questions about independent judgment. The voters’ description of a perceived voting bloc is opinion, not proof of a private arrangement. Four alone were not a majority of the nine-member council. **Still, when they vote the same way, I practically expect an “amber alert” for independent judgment.** That is a joke—not an actual emergency alert. But an alert for independent judgment? Perhaps.

**But voters can examine what happened when they had a fifth vote.**

**And they should.**

**A campaign sign tells me where you want to sit. Your voting record tells me what you did while sitting there.**




Political satire. Imagined dialogue and staging; thumbs-down symbolizes the recorded no votes. No endorsement by Howie Mandel.
Nicholas Bozza | Registered Third-Party Advertiser — City of Thorold nbozza@go2cai.ca | www.thoroldelectioncommentary.ca

## Canada Games Park: please explain the purchase before asking us to renew the subscription

On October 3, 2023, all four voted against Jim Handley’s motion seeking an external legal opinion concerning Canada Games Park’s financial arrangements and consortium agreement. Mayor Terry Ugulini joined them. The motion lost 5–4. [1]

That was an opportunity to obtain further independent scrutiny of a consequential public commitment.

**They rejected it.**

O'Hare's stated position was that the city had already received advice from municipal lawyers and further legal spending could be wasteful. Dekker expressed frustration with the issue repeatedly returning. Those were public explanations. [1]

**My objection is that neither response settles the questions taxpayers were asking.**

Previous legal advice does not, by itself, explain whether residents received the deal they understood they were getting. **Being tired of a question does not answer it.**

**Taxpayers do not receive a discount because a councillor has developed an allergy to the subject.**

So campaign on that decision.

Put it on the brochure:

"I voted against obtaining that additional legal opinion. Here is why my decision protected your interests."

**Then explain the costs, rights, obligations, access arrangements and outstanding uncertainties in language residents can understand.**

**Bring a chair. We have questions.**

## Deal or No Disclosure? You think their spouses let them get away with this shit?

Imagine any of these four telling their life partner:

"I've committed our money to a major agreement."

"How much?"

"There are financial details."

"What do we get?"

"There are arrangements."

"Can I examine everything?"

"The other parties have views about disclosure."

At that point, most households would not be ordering a commemorative plaque.

They would be asking who signed what—and whether the pen could be confiscated.

The comparison has a factual starting point: during the 2023 debate, Thorold's finance director said consortium restrictions limited what financial information she could share. That does not establish that every price or term was secret. It does raise a legitimate question about public accountability. [1]

My principle is simple:

**Before committing the public to a major agreement, establish what the public will be allowed to know about it.**

If meaningful accountability cannot be secured, call Howie Mandel.

**NO DEAL.**




Fictional satire. Imagined scenes and dialogue; not actual family conduct. No endorsement by Howie Mandel or Right Guard.

**Nicholas Bozza** | Registered Third-Party Advertiser — City of Thorold
nbozza@go2cai.ca | www.thoroldelectioncommentary.ca

## The cemetery deserves a policy—not a sermon

The questions I have raised about Lakeview Cemetery deserve direct answers.

What should happen when a burial takes place in a section that has not been formally opened? Who has authority to approve what? How should council accommodate religious burial requirements while maintaining clear,

consistent rules? How should mistakes be corrected compassionately? **Should we consider mistakes repeated as decisions?**

These are questions about municipal administration, fairness and responsibility.

**A resident can question a cemetery decision without expressing hostility toward anyone's religion.**

Campaign on the policy. Explain the motion. Explain the consequences. Explain what you would do next time.

A cemetery is one place where council should be especially careful about leaving matters unresolved. **I have heard the explanation that an employee made a mistake. But how many people were involved, and who had authority to approve each step? Before invoking "higher powers," let's establish the actual chain of responsibility. Follow the decisions and the votes**—but do not mistake my questions for proof that councillors directed an improper burial. And who empowered so many employees not to follow the rules to open the new cemetery without councils vote?

Now the question: I understand O'Hare's position to be that a Muslim girl should not be buried alone. I do not disagree with that compassionate concern. **But did the original decision create the very situation council was later asked to resolve? Did O'HARE then attempt to use that departure from the rules as a precedent to obtain the outcome he wanted? If so, follow the votes: could they help explain who, if anyone, authorized or empowered city employees to open a new part of the cemetery before it was ready and without the required council approval? Was one departure from the rules being offered as a precedent for another by O'HARE?** Those are questions requiring a documented answer; I am not presenting an established finding of illegality or responsibility. If compassion is being used to avoid explaining the process, my political response is: **SHAME ON O'HARE! SHAME!**

## O'Hare, Woodhouse and a very unhappy meal

In my view, Mal Woodhouse is one of Thorold's greatest mayors—if not the greatest. Here is one reason I respect him. After he left office, I hosted a backyard dinner under a tent, with a two-piece band and more than 50 family physicians, to welcome the first cardiologist at my Thorold clinic. My recollection is that Woodhouse attended to represent and support Thorold, without fanfare or a demand for credit. That is the kind of quiet contribution I remember.

Against that background, I find the reported description of Woodhouse by O'Hare as "100% biased" especially objectionable. I have not supplied the original statement here, so readers should treat that wording as a reported account, not a verified quotation. **What evidence supports such a comment? Every time I think about it, I remember to take out the trash. My wife thanks you!** The trash line is a joke about my reaction—not a description of anyone's worth.

Maybe when O'Hare left his village to come to Thorold, he left it without an idiot? At this point, the old village-idiot joke practically writes itself: perhaps they would like theirs back. That is a deliberately rude political wisecrack, not a claim about his intelligence or health. Consider that political self-defence on Thorold's behalf. And with his reported museum involvement, O'Hare certainly knows how to make history—or at least become a talking point in it. **I credit Woodhouse with working behind the scenes, without fanfare, to help get the museum running.** Yet O'Hare seems to be taking the credit—and, in my view, claiming credit for the farmers' market too, over Handley. **When does it stop?** These are the voters assessments of public credit-taking, not a verified allocation of each person's contribution.

My understanding is that Woodhouse offered O'HARE advice before his first election. If that account is correct, which I have verified from O'Hare in the past, this is a disappointing way to repay it. Then, in my satirical version, Tim enters the "victim protection program" when an apology is requested. That program is invented. My understanding is that O'Hare declined to apologize over the possible harm to Woodhouse's reputation. That is a reported account, not a court finding. But still to date I verified with Woodhouse, no apology from O'Hare even when they were at the same meet and greet just a couple of days ago.

I credit Woodhouse with helping advance many Thorold projects, including the museum. I believe O'Hare has a museum board role, although I have not verified his current position for this article. My criticism concerns the contrast I perceive between quiet service and public credit-taking—not a proven motive. To describe Woodhouse as "100% biased," if that reported wording is accurate, strikes me as **a real McSteak—enough to make a Happy Meal cry.** As someone put it to me about O'Hare: "If you're going to be two-faced, at least make one of them pretty." **Voters need a balanced meal—with the facts printed on a nutritional label of truth.** That joke concerns perceived inconsistency, not physical appearance. In fact, I think O'Hare looks very good for a man his age.

I really want to help O'Hare out—**but first I need to know which way he came in**. That is another joke about my frustration with his reasoning, not a diagnosis. My own stories can be wildly over the top. I admit it! But I believe the questions underneath them are closer to the point than the explanations voters have heard from O'HARE on his votes and opinions. And for one good reason: **I 'SPLAIN THEM—with solid reasoning, independent thinking and transparency.** All right, that is three reasons. Apparently, I need a calculator as well as my imaginary Desi writing accent to make my point.

Tim O'Hare, **someday you'll go far. And I hope you stay there.** That is my imaginary political send-off—not a demand that he leave Thorold.

Some residents who have spoken to me describe O'Hare's comments as SAVAGE and unbecoming of a councillor. Those are their reported opinions, not findings of misconduct. My own satirical verdict? **It seems impossible to underestimate O'Hare.** Others have called the conduct "ugly to the bone"—a criticism of conduct, not appearance; he is very well groomed. To my mind, **he has become a real conversation starter—once he leaves the room.**

In the same roast spirit: "If I had a dollar for every time he said something brilliant, **I'd be broke**." No financial audit was conducted; the punchline is political exaggeration.

By now, it seems **no one has the patience—or the crayons—to explain this to O'Hare any longer.** That is comic frustration with the explanations, not a literal claim about his ability to understand.

I have also heard accounts that, while canvassing, he told Catholics to "grow a conscience" regarding the cemetery issue, and discussed heritage designation for Holy Rosary Church in Thorold. I have not independently verified those accounts or their context. It is hearsay relayed through a third party I consider reliable. If accurate, what exactly did he mean? Any heritage proposal should be explained through the public process and the actual authority of council and its committees with the willingness of the church, the parish congregation who are also Thorold voters, and the Vatican. My worry is about overreach; I have no evidence that he and his wife could personally control the church through that committee. "A little too power-happy" is political criticism—not an established account of their intentions.

## Tim, accountability does not require a hatred permit

When I encountered Tim O'Hare, my recollection is that he asked whether I was going to be nice and avoid showing hatred as a TPA. Coming from him, I found that question remarkable. To me, it sounded like projecting his own shortcomings onto me, the other person in a conversation he had started. That is my interpretation of the encounter, not proof of what he intended.

Which brings me to another roast line: "**I'll never forget the first time we met. But I'll keep trying.**" That is a joke—not a revision of my recollection.

Here is my answer:

**I can be civil and still expect an answer.**

I can disagree with your vote. I can question your reasoning. I can conclude that another candidate would serve Thorold better.

**None of that requires hatred.**

A councillor's record is not a priceless antique that taxpayers must admire from behind a velvet rope.

**We paid for the room. We are entitled to inspect the furniture.**

And every councillor should apply the same standard to their own language about colleagues that they ask residents to apply to them.

## Campaign on the difficult decisions

I am not asking candidates to pretend they accomplished nothing.

I am asking them to defend the decisions that require more than a photograph and a cheerful caption.

If you supported a controversial decision, explain why.

If you opposed further scrutiny, explain what made the existing scrutiny sufficient.

If you believe criticism is mistaken, identify the error and supply the evidence.

If you would vote differently today, say so.

"I learned something" is a considerably better campaign message than "Why are you still asking?"

**Public service requires judgment. It also requires the willingness to show your work, as we did in school. Being a councillor is a lifelong learning journey.** Nobody disagrees with that. Noooooooobody!

**At school, "trust me" was not enough to pass mathematics.**

**It should NOT become an advanced qualification for municipal finance. But in my view, these four do not just want trust; they want blind trust. They seem to expect it—and act as though it has been granted even when it has NOT.**

## The cartoons have a point. The documents have the evidence.

My cartoons exaggerate voters' frustration: answers that seem permanently delayed, transparency that needs a special opener, and a perceived political alignment that attracts more questions than explanations.

They are satire.

**The voting records and documents must carry the factual argument.**

**The joke is the packaging. Accountability is the subject.**

And the recurring question is serious: can each councillor explain their own decision, in their own words, and demonstrate how it served Thorold?




## Four more years is a substantial renewal

When I hear residents describe their treatment as an abuse of public trust, I understand the frustration. That is a political judgment, not a finding of wrongdoing.

My own conclusion is that inadequate answers should have electoral consequences.

An incumbent's approach to scrutiny gives voters a reason to consider how that councillor might respond to questions during another term.

**If getting an answer is this difficult while they are asking for our votes, what improves after they have them?**

**That is why I do not support returning the UN-FAB FOUR.**

**I want independent judgment, clear explanations, willingness to reconsider, and respect for residents who ask uncomfortable questions.**

An election is a job interview with an unusually large hiring committee.

"I'd rather not discuss my performance" is a bold interview strategy.

They are free to ask for four more years.

We are free to say:

**Explain the last four first.**

Political opinion and satire. "UN-FAB FOUR" expresses my perception of voting alignment; shared votes do not establish private coordination, improper direction or misconduct. The imagined household dialogue, "amber alert," "victim protection program," village joke, trash joke, McSteak, Happy Meal, two-faced joke, help-out joke, four added roast lines about distance, remembering our first meeting, brilliant remarks and crayons, and Desi-style wordplay are comic devices—not literal events, diagnoses or claims about appearance. The family scenes say nothing about the councillors' actual spouses or private lives. References to Howie Mandel, television characters or brands do not imply endorsement. The O'Hare encounter and Woodhouse dinner are my recollections. Other reported remarks and events are attributed accounts with the verification limits stated in the text. Questions and criticism do not establish illegality, defamation, abuse of office or improper motives. Cartoons are satire, not documentary evidence. A satire notice does not itself verify an allegation.

[1] Bernard Lansbergen, ThoroldToday, October 4, 2023, "City council closes door on Canada Games Park investigation." https://www.thoroldtoday.ca/local-news/city-council-closes-door-on-canada-games-park-investigation-7639427

Nicholas Bozza | Registered Third-Party Advertiser — City of Thorold
nbozza@go2cai.ca | www.thoroldelectioncommentary.ca