Enough is not enough

To the Editor,

Please note the <u>extract from the Toronto Star</u> "Greater Toronto" section, page 14 (Saturday, April 3rd, 2010).

Get a consulting engineer to answer frankly, "Yes," and say, "We will tell you what you want to hear. If you expected any other answer you would not hire us."

A scientist does experiments only to get the results he expects.

The regional medical doctors in the same locality gave the opposite answer (they have nothing to lose).

We were told by the consultants that the EFW plant was the best way to go and that locating it in the South end of Clarington was the best place.

It was a well-researched article (in the paper), but it was not in favour of incineration here in Durham.

He (McKay) is stating quite clearly that the analysis his company presented to the region was not about the local area but a broad global picture.

It is the opinion of the writer, based on this gem of information, that all discussions on the benefits of the incineration compared to other methods of waste disposal could well have been in error.

"If we were looking only at local emissions and the local airshed, (waste-to-energy incinerators) might come out on par with landfill" he says. "It might come out worse."

Is he now, at this date, saying that the choice of South Clarington for the incinerator is in error considering the already dirty airshed from the local industries and the 401 Highway?

"It might come out worse." Sure sounds like it!

It might be said, "We, the people, told you so."

Just remember the lesson of history: asbestos, DDT and PCB were once considered perfectly safe and used just about everywhere. Now they are all considered deadly to human health, so too the incinerator!

Sincerely,

Anthony Topley Newcastle