

Nov. 06/2004

Packet and Times and the Public

Nov. 06/2004

Spin

I was told as a young man that there are two great lies. The number one great lie from men is "I will still respect you in the morning" and the second "the cheque is in the mail". Now it seems we have a third great lie "the MURF site is being cleaned up". This past week this false statement has been made over and over again in the pages of the Packet. Now I don't know whether the people knowingly make this false statement or are just reading from a prepared script handed to them and not really understanding what they have read, but I do know that there is not going to be a meaningful cleanup at the site.

Dave Dawson claims that "There is no other way this site will be cleaned up. And who better qualified than our municipal government which has called in a team of experts who have pulled off similar feats in various other cities?" But Dave what part of cover-up cap don't you understand? Dave if ever a word was mis-used it is the word clean in relation to the MURF site. Funk & Wagnal dictionary states "CLEAN adj. **1 Free from dirt, soil, impurity, or defilement. 5**

Completely cleared or rid of something. The dictionary then says **Clean-out 1 To clear of trash and rubbish.** So Dave please explain how the word clean can be honestly used as a description for what is in reality a **Cover-up.** As for using the garbage dump to store contaminated toxic soil. No Dave that is not what a garbage dump is for. You see by calling it a landfill site it sounds like we are making land which sounds better than polluting it. It's all in the language Spin isn't it?

Then we have Chris Lusty an engineer and avid outdoorsman?? writing "If we are in agreement that the level of contamination of the site is acceptable then we go ahead and build on it. If, as appears to be the case, the level of pollution requires a cleanup then we have to do it." Exactly. The majority of people recognize that the level of contamination is **Not** acceptable and that a Clean-up not COVERUP is required. Chris says that we should not moan about Molson ripping the city off. I don't recall any of our group claiming that. What we have said is that Mayor, council and city staff have ripped us off because they accepted this deal in the first place. Chris then claims that "Ron Stevens didn't pollute the ground, neither did Ralph Cipolla." That is a true statement but neither will they be responsible for cleaning it up. When Cipolla claims that finding new and more toxic chemicals is good news then there is something inherently wrong with these peoples thinking. Especially when the level of one of these contaminants is 7,300 times higher than MOE acceptable level. I suppose the good news to Ralph and Stevens and the Packet is that it was not 10,000 times higher. Chris says that "slamming city employees and elected officials is not the way to argue a point". Have we slammed these people or reported on the facts? Is it wrong to point out that documents were withheld, lies were spoke, terrible deals made and exposing every property owner in Orillia to huge financial

liability? Yes if you own property in Orillia it is your liability that these people have signed you up for.

As for the experts hired by the city. How come the mayor, council, city managers or the Packet don't find it strange to hire a company who worked for Molson's to help them unload the property. I speak to a lot of people and outside of the mayor , council, staff and Packet I have yet to hear that this was a good deal . Shouldn't we now hire an independent company who was not involved with the seller to evaluate the clean-up requirements? Wouldn't that be prudent?? I don't know what type of engineer Chris is but I'm sure he knows there is good engineering and bad engineering but one meets a high standard and the other minimum standards. Our children deserve the highest standard.

Jim Tolnai
Speaking Out