

*The Orono Weekly Times*

*Wednesday, May 5, 2010*

## **Serious misquotes in pro-incinerator letter**

To the Editor,

Re: 'Speak out in favour of Durham incinerator', letter to the editor, April 26.

Marion J. Riley, in her letter to the editor last week, is welcome to share her opinion -- but not to repeat hearsay and incorrect facts.

The "well-researched" articles she refers to -- recently published in the Toronto Star and local papers, certainly caught Minister John Gerretsen's attention and Greenpeace, which promptly wrote the Star to clarify errors and serious misquotes.

It should be noted Dr. Robert Kyle has never given this facility "the green light". In fact, Dr. Kyle's comments regarding Durham's proposed EFW facility are often taken out of context. Dr. Kyle's report (based on its limited scope) suggested the "facility should not pose unacceptable risks".

An opinion clearly not shared by many experts within scientific, environmental and medical communities around the world.

Even the consultants hired to conduct Durham's risk assessment admitted:

1. "The science is not there yet within the risk assessment community to look at these things. It cannot be quantified."
2. "The potential effects of mixtures of chemicals, in large part could not be determined."

How can any responsible government (even with "modern" incineration) reach a verdict when the facts are inconclusive? No wonder there's such growing global controversy towards incineration -- and all the more reason why the "precautionary principle" must be exercised.

Why have more than 75 doctors in Durham Region voiced major concern and opposition to incineration?

And in Europe, where the industry and proponents claim incineration is safe and widely accepted, why did several European doctors' associations representing more than 33,000 doctors recently write the European Parliament citing widespread concerns about incineration?

Beyond health concerns, we also need to consider the many environmental and economic reasons why incineration simply doesn't make sense.

Furthermore, if Ontario promised to stop shipping garbage elsewhere, how come nobody talks about the 30 per cent ash (with toxins) that's left over after burning? Shhh, quiet please ... Durham says it's OK to send that to New York where it can be -- you guessed it -- landfilled. What happens when New York doesn't want Durham's mountains of toxic ash anymore?

As for meeting outdated provincial standards -- "courageous" members of council -- and not having "sensible, viable alternatives"? Perhaps the writer and certain members of Regional council should look to Oakville and Halton for real examples of environmental leadership and responsible waste management solutions.

Respectfully,

Doug Simpson  
Courtice