

Jim Wright, 8300 Osgoode Drive, Richmond

Mayor Brodie and councillors,

In this presentation, I will try to clear up the remnants of the straw men that have been set up and then blasted to smithereens in the staff report attachments.

First, the letter from our two members of parliament states two things:

- (1) They oppose modifying the existing agreements to extend the ALR-exclusion time limit.
- (2) They are committed to helping enable the lands to be returned to the federal government for the benefit of their constituents.

The letter from our MPs does NOT threaten a Musqueam interest or anything else. In fact, the offer could easily help the Musqueam to **succeed**. The Musqueam injunction efforts blocked the federal government's sale of the property to CLC in 2004, and the Musqueam have expressed an interest in restoring the injunction. That could lead to the federal government having to find ways to take back direct ownership. A federal program need would be required, and the MPs could help get that in place. Mr. Cummins has already taken effective steps as a service to his constituents.

The people of Richmond are tremendously fortunate to have two MPs who are so committed to helping. Let's **all** work **WITH** them.

Second, Richmond has already fulfilled **ALL** of its obligations under the agreement of purchase and sale and gone far **beyond** them to help CLC-Musqueam to succeed. We do not deserve to have our honour questioned by the CLC lawyer. We do **not** deserve to be expected to shut up and do what we're told.

(continued on other side)

(continued from other side)

We **do** have ongoing obligations under the **MOU**, particularly Sections 1(22), 1(23), and 2(1) of the MOU. The CLC lawyer has invoked them, and I hope that the City will follow his lead. The right thing to do is to follow those provisions for **renegotiation**—and perhaps arbitration and restoration—to the fullest extent possible.

We are engaged in the renegotiation part right now. But Richmond council was not even consulted. And then you're asked for hasty acceptance of a done deal with two votes in one day. I encourage you to vote **NO** today and then insist on your right to **direct** the City's renegotiating position.

Third, Council is either fettered or not fettered in its voting on this issue. If the agreements bound council to vote a certain way, it would be fettered. That is illegal, and the agreements could be thrown out. However, council is actually not fettered. In other words, the members do have legislative discretion to vote for what's right. The consequence of voting **No** is that CLC-Musqueam won't get their wish for a particular **new** agreement that is bad for the people of Richmond. There is no breach of anything.

Fourth, the offers that you have been asked to make to the Agricultural Land Commission in return for approval of the ALR-exclusion would cause a lot of collateral damage.

I'll be happy to add details if you have questions.

In conclusion, City staff have indicated that the Garden City Lands ALR-exclusion application has "very little chance" of approval. You are most certainly **not** required to take extraordinary measures to keep it on life support for another six months. Please, let it expire with dignity.