

Mayor Thompson, Deputy Mayor Gilmer, and Councillors,

Thank you for the invitation to address you.

I have two general statements about the Entech-Rem incinerator proposal:

First: It is a very bad idea for Port Hope. I gave a detailed list of **Reasons**, in my Handout.

Second: The company's promotion is characterised by **SPIN**.

SPIN is defined as **disingenuous, deceptive and manipulative tactics in communication**. My presentation today is about Entech-Rem's SPIN.

The historical **Masters of Spin** in advertising to **promote a polluting industry as a boon to mankind**, are the "Lords" of the Tobacco Industry, who for more than a hundred years have marketed a product, **cigarettes**, that causes **cancer, heart attacks, strokes and much more**, and is **highly addictive**. But in what has been called **the greatest scam in history**, for over a century the industry adamantly denied that its product is dangerous, and convinced the public and Governments that it was not only safe, **but actually beneficial to health**.

The incinerator industry is an adept Pupil at the feet of the tobacco industry Masters of Spin. Here is a key example:

Entech-Rem, in published material, stated that curbside recycling is "notoriously difficult", and "has proved limiting, expensive and still results in...low recovery.. with a significant proportion of the materials ending up in landfills." The company was **RIDICULING RECYCLING**, to boost incineration.

But now, apparently in response to **our promotion of RECYCLING as the APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVE TO INCINERATION**, it is **SPINNING** the story that the company's project **actually entails recycling**. **A RECENT WEB IMAGE SHOWS A PAIR OF GENTLE HANDS LOVINGLY NURTURING A GREEN PLANET EARTH.**

This is SPIN 101: This is **THE ELEGANTLY GROOMED FOX IN THE HEN COOP LOVINGLY AND PROTECTIVELY NURTURING A CLUSTER OF LITTLE CHICKS IN HIS WELL MANICURED CLAWS. THIS IS TOBACCO SMOKE CURING CANCER OF THE LUNG.**

This attempt to claim the arena of recycling is a fabulous con job. **A gasification incinerator plant would ALLOW of NO recycling - GASIFICATION CAN ONLY FUNCTION IF RECYCLABLE AND COMPOSTABLE MATERIALS ARE CONSUMED IN THE GASIFIER UNITS.**

And, of course, the original Entech-Rem plans show **no facilities for doing any recycling**. This spin is an offensive scam. If accepted, this project **would put an end to any hope of further developing an ENLIGHTENED AND MODERN recycling programme in our community.**

The company claims that its incinerator would solve the landfill problem. An advert in SNAP promises **"Up to 100% Diversion of Waste from Landfill**, significantly reducing the chances of soil and ground water pollution to improve and protect our Environment".

As outrageous misinformation goes, **AN INCINERATOR TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT** is on a par with this 1950s advert: "**Tests showed three out of every four cases of smokers' cough cleared on changing to Philip Morris**".

The company's claim that it would divert from landfill is a **DOWNRIGHT AND BLATANT TERMINOLOGICAL INEXACTITUDE, as follows:**

On the company's own admission their incinerator would if constructed produce 6,000 tonnes of bottom ash/year (= 16 t/day);

and, AS ALSO ADMITTED BY THE COMPANY, the default fate of THIS HIGHLY TOXIC BOTTOM ASH WOULD BE LANDFILL. THIS WOULD BE BY FAR THE MOST TOXIC WASTE EVER DEPOSITED IN OUR LOCAL LANDFILL SITES. I will return to this in a moment.

On 8 April 2014, Mr. Lewis Staats, President of REM, made an intriguing presentation to the Hamilton Township Council. Here are some highlights:

Mr. Staats's acknowledged under questioning that **there is no Entech Municipal Solid Waste plant in Australia, despite the company's repeated claim of plants in Australia.** The company also claims plants in Europe and in Hong Kong - but there are **no such** Entech plants in Western Europe, there **may** be **one** in Eastern Europe, and there is **no** Entech plant in Hong Kong; similarly, claimed "**current projects**" in Brant County and Los Angeles don't exist.

Like the tobacco industry, Entech-Rem misleads the public about its credentials and, as with current tobacco industry policy, **Entech** has concentrated on underdeveloped parts of the world, where environmental standards and citizen vigilance may be more easily circumvented.

When a Hamilton Township councillor asked whether an Entech-Rem incinerator's emissions would be **safe** the response was that they would be within government limits. **The tobacco industry also constantly reminds us that they are within government limits: cigarettes are legal - but the question is not about "legal" but about "safe".**

When asked about disposal of the incinerator's bottom ash Mr. Staats informed the audience that the ash would be "**INERT, NON TOXIC, and could be used as an additive for cement or concrete**", but he added that if not so disposed it would "**GO - TO - LANDFILL**".

Anyone who is listening carefully will notice a little discrepancy here, with the spin I read out earlier about "Up to **100% Diversion** of Waste **FROM** Landfill".

Now Entech-Rem repeatedly tells us that this so-called "inert" bottom ash would only go to landfill IF IT WERE NOT SOLD FOR USE IN CONCRETE OR CEMENT.

So I now quote from a web-based document entitled "WASTE INCINERATION" (which can be accessed through the link in my handout):

"In an attempt to minimize the dangers of incineration, SOME operators EVEN GO SO FAR AS TO BILL incinerator ash AS AN "INERT" MATERIAL THAT CAN BE REUSED FOR CONSTRUCTION OR ROAD-BUILDING".

In Newcastle, England, ash from the Byker municipal waste incinerator was spread on pathways, parks and school playing fields. Tests revealed "dioxin concentrations as high as 9,500 nanogram/kg, compared to "target values" that should be zero to 1 nanogram/kg. These were amongst the highest dioxin levels ever recorded". "Mercury levels were 2,400 percent above background levels, and cadmium and lead levels were similarly "stratospheric"".

So much for Inert and Non Toxic Bottom Ash - a masterstroke of SPIN.

Who would buy this Ash for concrete? Where would it really end up? Does Port Hope need yet another clean-up of contaminated earth?

Much of REM's argument is based on the claim that they would be following "government limits" - so let's explore how these "limits" protect our environment.

There are three types of pollution to consider: **First**: nanoparticles - minute bits of ash one millionth the size of a pin-head, which carry cancer-causing poisons in to people's brains and other organs; **Second**: larger particulate matter, PM_{2.5} (the number refers to size of the particles); and **Third**: toxic, cancer-causing molecules.

1. **First**, re Nanoparticles: Short and Sweet: There are no government regulations.
2. **Second**, re Larger particles, PM_{2.5}: We are here in Northumberland County as we speak at a level of PM pollution 33% above our own Canadian "Reference level" and 3 times California's level.

So Government Standards are of no help with Nanoparticles and PM_{2.5}. What about the

3. **Third** kind of pollution: Cancer-causing Chemical Molecules:

Entech-Rem's Environmental Screening Report (ESR), admits that their incinerator would emit the following poisons: Arsenic, Manganese, Chromium oxides, Lead, Mercury, Cadmium, Vanadium, Cobalt, Nitrogen oxides, Hydrochloric Acid, Sulphur Dioxide, Furans, Dioxins, Nickel, Fluorides, Copper, Antimony.

All of these are **cancer-causing**, but there would in fact be **hundreds more such poisonous emissions**, that are **not mentioned** in the ESR. Of the list I read out, the company **falsely stated** that **only** four were cancer-causing; **they falsely stated** that these 4 would be at levels that would actually **PROTECT AGAINST CANCER**; **and they falsely indicated** that the other well-known cancer-causers in their list, including dioxins, furans, chromium and much more, are not cancer-causing. **The company's statements about cancer risk are totally false.**

So, in a nutshell, re regulations: There **are no regulations for nanoparticles** and we are already way above Government Standards for **Particulate Matter pollution** in our area. This is before the new Clarington Incinerator has even fired up, and furthermore there is an ever increasing pollution in our area from traffic on the 401.

For chemical poisons: It is a well known fact that St. Mary's Cement plant in Bowmanville **exceeds its allowed emissions of cancer-causing nitrogen oxides and sulphur dioxide** but it has not been closed down, and AN ENTECH PLANT WOULD POUR OUT scores and even hundreds of other **CANCER-CAUSING MOLECULES**.

BUT most importantly: THERE IS NO SAFE DOSE OF CANCER CAUSING MOLECULES, and EVEN MINUTE AMOUNTS OF THE POISONS ACCUMULATE IN CROPS AND LIVESTOCK OVER TIME.

SO: IN WHAT WAY DOES CONFORMING TO GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT?

In conclusion: Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Councillors, my Handout gave a list of over 30 **REASONS** why this proposal **should be rejected**. My reasons relate to health issues; to issues of jobs and industry; to social issues; to energy and environmental issues; to technology; the company's credibility; and, most importantly: because of all of the above **MOST PORT HOPE CITIZENS DO NOT WANT THIS INCINERATOR.**

After having read my **REASONS TO REJECT THE ENTECH-REM PROPOSAL** and the documentation I have put forward: If you believe there are reasons for **accepting** the proposal, I and, I am sure, the citizens of Port Hope, would appreciate hearing them in the discussion period that is to follow.

I thank you for inviting me to speak, and for your courteous attention.
