

Need for state-of-the-art hazardous waste treatment

By MIKE SINGLETON
Federation of
Ontario Naturalists

Ontario desperately needs a state-of-the-art facility for treatment and disposal of hazardous wastes. The recently-announced selection of a preferred site for this facility is an important step toward that goal. For the longer Ontario is without such a facility, the more we are - and will be - exposed to hazardous wastes.

Every one of us - men, women, children, birds and fish - lives, breathes, drinks and moves about in a huge chemical soup. The basic broth has been there since time immemorial, providing the very sustenance for life. But, over the past two centuries, or so, "we" (society) have begun to add vast numbers and quantities of chemicals to that soup.

It has been estimated that perhaps 500 'new' chemicals are added to our technological repertoire each year.

And this doesn't include the progressive - in some cases, exponential - increase in quantities of already-used chemicals.

Together, they constitute an enormous load of, ultimately, waste which must be disposed. Many of our more responsible waste generators do their utmost to ensure safe disposal. Others do not. Either way, so long as comprehensive, state-of-the-art facilities are unavailable, wastes will continue to go somewhere. Some find their way into ordinary dumps. There are delightful stories around Ontario of 'magic ponds', that have been filled over and over with liquid industrial wastes which simply disappeared into the ground - presumably into sand and gravel aquifers, to resurface one day in wells or springs. Others waste finds its way into insecure landfills, sometimes on the sides of valleys, or onto gravel roads - along with waste oil used to keep down

dust, or it's surreptitiously dumped - onto roads or fallow land, and into streams or lakes.

And the effects are by no means localized. PCBs, used widely as an ostensibly-contained coolant in transformers and other electrical components provides an excellent example. In the absence of suitable disposal facilities, provincial law requires indefinite storage of askorols and other high-level PCB wastes. The result is a rag-tag collection of barrels, drums and transformers - some of them doubtless leaking - stored thither and yon throughout the province.

PCBs don't quickly decompose, and if incompletely destroyed by too-low combustion temperatures, produce even more insidious byproducts. Unlike many other chemicals, PCBs are mobile in the environment, volatilized to be carried by the wind, borne in water, and accumulated through the food chain.

Not surprisingly, PCBs are in arctic Polar Bears, antarctic penguins, and almost every living thing - including you and I - in between. Yet, PCBs are but a few of hundreds of such wastes; the checklist for known chemicals in the GreatLakes approaches 400.

The result is that we are all part of a huge statistical experiment in to the combined effects of myriad chemicals upon the residents of that chemical soup.

The commissioning of that state-of-the-art disposal facility won't be a panacea. But it will be a major step in the right direction. It will sharply reduce the wastes reaching the soup. It will provide the best treatment available. And it will ensure that wastes ultimately land-filled are not placed into giant sieves - like Love Canal and the other now-leaking Niagara dumps - but rather in secure, impervious vaults.

Predictably, nobody wants such a

facility near them. They worry about spills, emissions and transportation accidents. But the facility must go somewhere. And the right place must, surely, be based not on

political unpopularity but upon ensuring that it is the most secure facility - that with the best soils, contained drainage, the least likelihood of accident and the best technology.

Impaired charges

Halton Regional Police officers have been busy laying a number of drinking and driving charges this past week.

Dec. 17, at 1:30 a.m., a 21-year-old Brampton man was charged with impaired driving at Steeles Avenue and Ninth Line. Police said he was stopped because he was driving at high speed down the centre of the highway, and was weaving from

side to side. The man is to appear in Milton Provincial Court Jan. 12.

Thursday, at 3:30 a.m., a 31-year-old Saskatoon, Saskatchewan man was charged with impaired driving after going through a red light at Guelph Street and Alcott Drive

HALTON
CAMERA EXCHANGE
1 photo
CAMERAS
SALES & SERVICE
120 Guelph St. Georgetown
877-4472

FREEZER FRENZY
Open 7 Days
Broiled Meat and Seafood
853-0101
5 Mill St. Free Delivery ACTON

RENT REVIEW UPDATE FOR TENANTS AND LANDLORDS

The Ministry of Housing announces the Rent Review Guideline for 1987

The Rent Review Guideline for next year has been calculated at 5.2 per cent. This is the amount by which a landlord can increase the maximum rent for a unit during 1987 *without* approval from the Ministry of Housing.

In passing the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986, the Ontario Government has created a new system of rent review for the Province of Ontario to increase protection for tenants and to encourage the construction of new rental housing.

One of the important features of this new legislation is a Rent Review Guideline that reflects changes in inflation and promotes proper building maintenance for tenants.

The major features of the Residential Rent Regulation Act are:

- The extension of rent review to cover all private rental units in Ontario.
- The creation of a streamlined rent review process, designed to be accessible, quicker and ensure consistency.
- The establishment of a flexible Rent Review Guideline, adjusted annually to reflect changes in inflation and other economic factors.
- The creation of an Ontario-wide *Rent Registry* to record the maximum legal rent for every rental unit in the province.
- A *Residential Rental Standards Board* to ensure the proper maintenance of all rental properties in Ontario.

The Guideline has changed.

Until now, the Guideline has been a fixed amount that did not change with economic conditions.

The new Rent Review Guideline will be adjusted annually. It will be calculated using the most up-to-date components of the Consumer Price Index and other economic indicators. And it will apply to all rental units in the province.

How the new Rent Review Guideline is calculated.

- The formula used to calculate the 5.2 per cent Guideline for 1987 is based on changes in the cost of maintaining a typical well-run rental building.
- The new Guideline calculates the average change in costs over the preceding three-year period.
- Tenants receive greater protection in times of high inflation.
- Landlords have sufficient funds for good building maintenance. A new *Residential Rental Standards Board* will help ensure proper maintenance of rental units throughout Ontario, and failure to meet these standards may result in either suspension or forfeiture of rent increases.

Tenants can apply for a review of rent increases that are at or below the Guideline.

Tenants who wish to challenge a 5.2 per cent Guideline increase may apply to the Ministry of Housing for rent review on such grounds as changes in the standard of maintenance and repairs.

Landlords are required to justify a rent increase greater than the Guideline.

A landlord who requests more than the 5.2 per cent Guideline increase must apply to the Ministry of Housing for rent review to justify the increase. The landlord and tenants will review the matter with staff of the Ministry of Housing at a local Rent Review Office. A decision reached at the local level may be appealed by either the tenant or landlord to the newly-created *Rent Review Hearings Board*.

The Guideline will be announced by August 31 each year.

In future, the Ministry of Housing will announce the Guideline by August 31 for the upcoming year.

Some landlords have already served their tenants with notices of a rent increase due early in 1987.

Tenants in buildings constructed after 1975 are protected for the first time.

These are tenants whose units are being brought under rent review by this Act.

- Landlords who have charged tenants more than the Guideline since August 1, 1985, will be given a 60-day period early in the new year to justify these increases.
- Landlords not applying to rent review within the 60-day period must rebate excess rents to tenants.
- For the present, tenants should pay the amount requested in the notice from their landlord until the matter is resolved by rent review.
- *Under no circumstances should tenants make immediate deductions from their rent cheques.*

Only one rent increase allowed annually.

- Landlords must give tenants at least 90 days written notice of a rent increase.
- The rent for a unit can be increased only once in a 12-month period.

Tenants in buildings constructed before 1976 continue to be protected.

These are tenants whose units were under rent review prior to the passage of the new Act and whose units continue to be under rent review.

- If the landlord's rent notice is for *less* than the 5.2 per cent Guideline, the tenant should pay the amount in the notice.
- If the landlord's rent notice is for *more* than the 5.2 per cent Guideline, the most the tenant should pay is 5.2 per cent.
- If the landlord has applied to the *Residential Tenancy Commission* for a 1986 rent increase but has not yet received a final order, the tenant should pay the amount in the landlord's notice or 4 per cent, whichever is less.
- If the landlord has been to rent review and has received a decision, the tenant must pay the amount approved by the *Residential Tenancy Commission*.

For more information, complete and return this coupon.

MINISTRY OF HOUSING
RENT REVIEW DIVISION
4TH FLOOR, 777 BAY STREET
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5G 2E5

YES! Please send me further information explaining the new Rent Review Guideline.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

POSTAL CODE _____



Ministry
of
Housing
Ontario Hon. Alvin Curling, Minister

Send today for more information about the new Rent Review Guideline