

Product & Packaging Stewardship Review

MANAGING WASTE RESPONSIBLY

An information service for municipal governments
Vol 2, Issue 6, January 2002

*INSIDE THIS
EIGHT-
PAGE
ISSUE*

<i>Milk containers</i>	<i>2/8</i>
<i>Hansard Follies</i>	<i>4/8</i>
<i>News in brief</i>	<i>5/8</i>
<i>Calendar</i>	<i>7/8</i>
<i>Editorial</i>	<i>8/8</i>

BILL 90 DELAYED

Another bump in the road for Ontario blue box funding

The ongoing story of stewardship in Ontario has now stretched into another year and the next episode will not be written until at least March, probably even later.

Bill 90, the legislation that would have seen the setting up of Waste Diversion Ontario, which in due course should have led to industry support of the municipal recycling programs, was not passed in the fall session of the Ontario Legislature. But it did not die on the order paper as feared.

There were many suggested amendments to the bill at the committee level (see *PPSReview #11*). While some changes were made by the General Government Committee, recommendations from opposition parties to make the industry payments to municipalities retroactive to the passage of the bill, increase the municipal representation on the WDO board and to provide funding for organics diversion were not endorsed by the committee.

There had been concern that either or both of the opposition parties would insist on sending the bill back to the committee for further discussion, setting up the possibility of it not getting back to the Legislature before the end of the session and dying on the order paper.

That eventuality was avoided when it was agreed to carry over the bill to the next session, which begins in March.

(For extracts from the debate in the legislature in the closing days of December, see pages 4/8 and 5/8.)

Given the likelihood of a cabinet reshuffle after a new leader is decided, the possibility of more delays to Bill 90 appears very real.

There may, however, be further roadblocks in the way of the bill's passage. The Ontario Progressive Conservative Party is looking for a new leader following the resignation of Premier Mike Harris (as party leader), last fall. Among the candidates for the leadership are environment minister Elizabeth Witmer and finance minister Jim Flaherty. Given the likelihood of a cabinet reshuffle after a new leader is decided, the possibility of more delays to Bill 90 appears very real.

With no retroactive payments

clause or other wording in the bill aimed at bringing ahead the time industry payments would start to be made to municipalities, and with a minimum estimated time from passage of the bill to dollars changing hands, the earliest municipalities can expect to see any funding is February 2003.

In the meantime, the net cost of recycling in Ontario is estimated at roughly \$50 million per year. To offset this, the LCBO has agreed to pay \$5 million per year. Changes in the glass market in the past year, however, have seen prices for recovered glass fall to such an extent that any benefits from the LCBO funding have been offset by the decline in revenues. Prices for recovered plastics and steel have also fallen considerably in the past few months.

Happy New Year!

**PPS
Review
January
2002**

Page 1/8

Milk container recycling stewardship across Canada

The past two years have seen significant progress around milk container stewardship in Canada. It all started in Alberta when then Minister of Environment Ty Lund gave Alberta dairies an ultimatum: implement a voluntary recycling initiative or join the Alberta deposit return program. In response, the Alberta Dairy Council Plastic Milk Jug Recycling Program was launched on July 1, 1999.

The program raises money from Alberta dairies and funds milk jug collection programs through municipal authorities or municipal designates. The minister gave the dairies two years to increase the capture rate of jugs to 75% from 31%. By the end of Year Two, milk jug recovery was at 42%, and the dairy industry received an extension on the 75% target until June 2004. This month, milk cartons will be added to the program with a recovery target set at 35% by June 2003.

Also launched in 1999 and amended in February 2001 is Saskatchewan's Unified Dairy Recycling System (UDRS), which like Alberta's program, charges dairies levies based on the type of milk container sold in the province. Consumers are requested to voluntarily bring containers to one of the 71 province-wide beverage container depots operated by SARCAN. The UDRS program guarantees material salvage values to depots or designated collectors.

The most recent program is Nova Scotia's Milk Packaging Stewardship Agreement from February 2000. Initiated as a result of pressure to expand the deposit return program to include dairy containers, the dairy industry signed an agreement with the Department of Environment and Labour and the Province's Solid Waste Management Regions. Nova Scotia dairies pay a levy into a fund and the monies are distributed to municipal authorities for milk cartons collected through curbside programs.



STEP ON IT

This innovative promotional angle is part of the recycling education program comes from the Capital Regional District, in Victoria, BC.

Funding for collected HDPE jugs ranges from an average of \$149 in Alberta to \$400/tonne in Saskatchewan. For milk cartons (gable top) in Saskatchewan collectors get \$150/tonne and municipal authorities in Nova Scotia about \$326/tonne.

Ontario's new Bill 90 -Waste Diversion Ontario (pending second and third reading this spring) proposes 50% funding of efficient recycling programs based on the "basket of goods" net cost. Ontario's average blue box costs are estimated to be somewhere around \$100/tonne, which means that municipalities will be eligible (if they are deemed efficient) for about \$50/tonne for the milk containers they collect.

Product & Packaging Stewardship Review is published by Ben Bennett Communications as part of the Fair Comment Project. It is faxed or emailed to municipalities as a communications service aimed at providing a broad range of stewardship and associated information from across Canada, the United States and overseas.

The current issue of PPSReview, and past issues, are available for viewing on the Internet (www.productstewardship.org).

Anyone wishing to support the Fair Comment Project may email Ben Bennett (bbc@albedo.net). Confidentiality is guaranteed.

© Ben Bennett Communications, 2002

PPS
Review
January
2002

NOTICE: Please be advised that this publication, AND the views expressed, have NO connection with the Association of Municipal Recycling Coordinators of Guelph, Ontario.

Page 2/8

Province	Industry Levies		Recovery Revenues/Funding		Recovery Targets	Recovery Rates	Notes
	4-litre plastic jugs	cartons and jugs \geq 1 litre	Plastic jugs	Cartons			
						2000-2001	
Alberta	\$0.02	\$0.01	Average of \$149/tonne	n/a	75% by 2001	42%	Alberta dairies provide municipalities or other recycling designates with a top-up payment up to \$400/tonne (average \$149) for HDPE material. A \$25/tonne transportation subsidy is paid to municipalities outside of Edmonton and Calgary. In Jan 2002 milk cartons were added to the program. Municipalities finance disposal of milk containers.
Sask.	\$0.02	\$0.01	\$400/tonne	\$150/tonne	40% by 2002 50% by 2003	n/a (too early for reliable statistics)	Saskatchewan dairies initiated a voluntary program and award a "guaranteed salvage price" for recovered materials. Municipalities finance disposal of milk containers.
Manitoba	No industry funding		80% of the net costs of municipal recycling				Municipalities that collect milk containers through curbside collection programs receive an 80% subsidy to cover the net costs of recycling milk containers (as well as all other blue box material). Municipalities finance disposal of milk containers.
Nova Scotia	-	0.005/one-fluid litre sold	-	\$326/tonne	27% by 2000 32% by 2001 39% by 2002 43% by 2003 45% by 2004 47% by 2005	44%	Nova Scotia municipalities receive a direct payment from the dairy industry for the estimated gross costs of recycling milk cartons. In 2001, municipalities received \$326/tonne for recycling milk cartons. Municipalities keep revenues generated from the sale of the material. Costs are estimated based on the "basket of goods" /tonne gross cost times 3% (representing the weight of cartons in the recycling stream). Municipalities finance disposal of milk containers.

Milk container recycling stewardship
across Canada

PPS
Review
January
2002

Page 3/8

More goodies from Hansard for your reading pleasure

FROM DECEMBER 10, 2001

Mr. Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington, discussing Bill 90): Once designated, the Minister of the Environment would require the WDO work with the affected industry sector or sectors and other experts to develop a waste diversion program for the designated material.

Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker:
Quorum call, please.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bert Johnson): Will you check to see if there's a quorum present.

Clerk Assistant (Ms Deborah Deller):
A quorum is not present, Speaker.
The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

Mrs. Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think it's important for the members in the chamber to recognize that the quorum bells are interfering with the Christmas concert, which is on at the bottom of the stairs. I think, for the invitees to that important occasion, there should be some consideration --

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order. The Chair recognizes the member for Waterloo-Wellington.

Mr. Arnott: As I was saying, once designated, the Minister of the Environment would require the WDO to work with the--
Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member for Waterloo-Wellington has the floor and no one else. There's no need that I should hear any other voices. I do and I won't stand for it.

LATER THAT NIGHT...

On deposit-return

Mr. Sterling:... From time to time we've heard people talk about deposit return. We have deposit return, as you know, in our beer retail sector, and it has worked really quite well. That is partially

because we have relatively few stores that are selling beer in Ontario.

The problem is that if we went to a deposit-return system for other kinds of containers, we would be taking some of the most valuable assets out of the blue box container.Waste Diversion Ontario is intended to pay 50% of the cost of running the blue box program in Ontario. That's the goal they're to get to, and this legislation will enable them to get to that level. But part of the money the municipalities get out of the blue box of course is from the sale of the products that are in the box. One of the most valuable products in the box is aluminum cans. If we took aluminum cans out and put them into a deposit-return system, we would take a great deal of the value out of the blue box.When you look at that particular waste stream, if you start cutting out different pieces of what's in the blue box, pretty soon it's difficult to sustain the blue box in any form, because if they're just collecting glass bottles and newspaper, there isn't enough value to justify continuing the blue box. When you look at it in a global sense, what you try to do when you're running efficient recycling is get one collection system. Our one collection system is our blue box system, and then we take the various waste streams out of that blue box and send them on their way. For instance, if we went into a deposit-return system, we would be taking some of the most valuable assets out of it, and it would really weaken the whole aspect of the blue box. I remember when I was the Minister of the Environment and looking at it that if you took the aluminum cans out of the blue box, you were in effect putting the first nail in the coffin in terms of dealing with the blue box, and I really don't think that the government or the municipalities want to abandon the blue box at this time.

Those who would put forward deposit return as the great saviour should also remember that the beverage container part of the waste stream is only about 2% or 3% of the total. Newspapers are about 16% of the total by volume and weight (sic). In saying deposit return is going to be the be-all and the end-all (1) you weaken the blue box and (2) you've only taken care of 2% to 3% of the waste stream, a really small part of what you hope to recycle in terms of going forward.

Mr. John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): I found the logic used by the [former] minister extraordinary, to say the least. If I understood him correctly, he was basically saying that one of the reasons we don't have returnable aluminum cans is if we took them out of the blue box system and people took the cans back to the store, like you do your beer bottles and various other bottles, in effect, the contents of the blue box would not be an economic viability and couldn't be sold, then, by the municipalities. But surely the aim of recycling is to recycle as many of the materials as you possibly can, whether they're bottles, aluminum cans, steel cans, pop bottles, glass or what have you. To say that we don't want to recycle it because then the value of the blue box becomes less, to me is an absurdity. Let the people of Ontario never forget the fact that this government cut off the blue box program.

See Page 5/8.....

PPS
Review
January
2002

Page 4/8

The Hansard Follies—continued

(Mr. Gerretsen continued) It basically said that the program will no longer exist. Yes, now some of the municipalities and some of the other organizations are coming back on stream and are saying that, yes, this bill is a step in the right direction, because you killed the program in the first place and half a loaf is better than none. It reminds me of so many other government programs we've seen where they've killed the program and then brought it back to a very small degree and all of the different interest groups then said, "Well, I guess it's better than nothing." Minister, it just isn't --

The Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

LATER THAT NIGHT...

On the BC model

Mr. Sterling (on the WDO): So we came to this kind of an organization. Now, this kind of organization exists in British Columbia at the present time. ... One of the problems with the British Columbia model of a waste diversion board or organization was that they made it very complicated. Some businesses found that the formula was so complicatedthat it was costing the organization much more to figure out what the check should be than what the cheque ended up to be. This particular organization has been set up to try to keep a balance between fairness and practicality. In other words, if we're going to ask the grocery businesses, the newspapers, the hardware stores, the paint suppliers or the tire makers to contribute, we hope to make it relatively simple as to how that should be calculated, that it's not going to require a great deal of record-keeping in order to figure out what kind of a cheque to cut in order to support this organization.

STILL LATER THAT NIGHT...

Mr. Agostino (Hamilton East): To the former Minister of the Environment, I find it amazing. He's

sitting here yapping away, heckling, and his members don't have the courage to stand up and defend this bill. Get your opportunity. Speaker, through you, they have their chance. Use your 20 minutes. Set the record straight. Tell us what the facts are.

Hon. Mr. Sterling: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: If the member had been present at 7 to 7:30, 7:45, he would have heard me speak. Don't blame me if you're out gallivanting around, and don't come into the --
The Deputy Speaker: Take your seat. That's not a point of order. Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. It's your member that you're stopping from speaking. The member from Hamilton East may continue.

Mr. Agostino: I wish the member had paid some attention, because I was actually here and heard a great deal of his speech. There was some time sharing there. It's unfortunate that the member got up and gave information to the House that is not accurate once again, as he just did a minute ago. I think he should maybe set the record straight and make it clear that I was here. I heard his speech. It's unfortunate he didn't notice. The reality is --
Interjections.

Mr. Agostino: See, the problem is, they don't listen.

They'll look at the Hansard tomorrow and they'll understand clearly what I said. Let me repeat it very slowly now so the minister understands it. What I said was, here he is yapping back and forth. His members have a chance to speak. I would encourage his members to use their 20 minutes. That's what I said. I knew the minister had spoken earlier. I wish he would just listen a little more, and then he wouldn't get up and issue statements that are false.
Interjection.

Mr. Agostino: Another minister. She hasn't spoken on the bill. The junior minister of health, who hasn't spoken on the bill, is now heckling again. I say, you're next in the rotation. Use your 20 minutes --
Interjection.

Mr. Agostino: Speaker, they're using it to heckle. Use your 20 minutes to speak on the bill. You have an opportunity.

Hon. Mrs. Johns: If you have anything to say, speak to the bill. Stop harassing us and speak to the bill.

Mr. Agostino: This is more entertaining than anything I have to say. Again I say to the government, you have a chance to speak on the bill. If you think we're misinterpreting the bill, if you don't think we're speaking to the bill, you get your 20 minutes; use it. Why are you not using it?
Interjections.

Mr. Agostino: Now we have a third minister. This gets better; hang on. We now have the Chair of Management Board in the House. The Chair of Management Board wants to get into the debate too, but he doesn't want to speak. This is great. They don't want to speak.

Hon. David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): Don't be an idiot.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. First of all -- no, second of all, then first of all. The associate minister of health, I have allowed some latitude since the member from Hamilton East is one of the biggest hecklers here, so there's a little bit of fairness there. I've allowed that and I think he understands that. I want to say to the Chair of Management Board that he knows he crossed the line and I would hope he would stand up and withdraw that.

Hon. Mr. Tsubouchi: I withdraw.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Agostino: I don't mind the heckling. I actually enjoy it. I think it's part of the debate in this place.

PPS
Review
January
2002

Page 5/8

Briefly...

GREEN DOT GOES TO CSR

In November, CSR: Corporations Supporting Recycling received the rights for the use of the Green Dot trademark in Canada. A Green Dot generally indicates that a financial contribution has been paid to a private-sector organization for the collection, sorting and recycling of packaging. At this time however, the trademark cannot be used as a financing symbol. CSR will simply protect the trademark in Canada by charging a licensing fee based on cost recovery. The fee has not yet been established. CSR will develop agreements with companies wishing to use the symbol on their packaging. (www.csr.org)

CSR news release, November 2001

MANITOBA EYES HHW, ELECTRONICS RECYCLING STEWARDSHIP

The Manitoba Department of Environment has released a discussion paper and draft regulation for industry stewardship on household hazardous wastes like, batteries, paint, pesticides, flammable-gas, solvents, swimming pool chemicals, pharmaceuticals, liquid fuels, corrosives, and electrical and electronic equipment. The regulation will require industry to have stewardship program plans ready by the fall of 2002, and programs under way by January 2003. Companies that fail to meet the "plan" requirements may be prevented from selling their products in Manitoba.

Manitoba Department of Environment

STEWARDSHIP PROPOSED FOR NEWFOUNDLAND & LABRADOR

The Waste Management Advisory Committee (created by the Newfoundland & Labrador Government) has submitted its final report to the Minister of Environment and Labour. The report recommends that stewardship programs be implemented for cardboard and newsprint (within the next

six months), household hazardous wastes and programs that target specific industries, like the dairy industry, fast food industry, major retail sector and grocery stores regarding excess packaging.

Solid Waste and Recycling Magazine Dec/Jan 2002

ALUMINUM CANS NOW LESS THAN HALF

Beverage Marketing Corporation's new report, *Beverage Packaging in the US* states that plastic's market share continues to "usurp that longtime leader, cans". In 2000, plastic volume rose by 7.4% putting its beverage market share at 21.5%. Aluminum cans fell to 49.2%, (first time to drop below 50% in the modern era), glass is stable at 17.8%, aseptic containers are at 2.1% and pouches at 1.3%. The report also states: once heat-resistance and cost-issues are overcome, "additional conversions can be made from cans and glass".

Beverage World – December 2001

BC INDUSTRY LOBBIES FOR "STREAMLINED" STEWARDSHIP

In late October, industry groups representing oil producers, dairies, the beverage industry, pharmaceutical companies, and household hazardous product producers wrote a letter to the Minister of Water, Land and Air Protection in British Columbia requesting her to "streamline regulations". The letter proposed a new regulation, which would be based on certain expectations. Among them are: "Consumers, industry and all levels of government should share responsibility for reducing environmental impacts and for making the programs viable" and "Opportunities for collection of designated products should be conveniently available, and where possible, they should be collected with municipal solid waste to avoid the duplication of infrastructure."

Consumer Product Industry Group (CPIG)

Why tie up your fax machine?
Receive **PPSReview** by email

Receiving *PPSReview* by email uses fewer resources, is quicker and leaves you with the decision about whether to print. All you need is *Acrobat Reader* from *Adobe*, which can be downloaded at **no charge** (www.adobe.com).

This is the twelfth issue of *Product & Packaging Stewardship Review*. The current and past issues of *PPSReview* are posted on the Internet (www.productstewardship.org).

If you would like to receive *PPSReview* by email (.pdf format) rather than fax, please email bbc@albedo.net and insert "pdf" in the subject area. If you would like to be removed from the faxed circulation list, please email bbc@albedo.net, insert "remove" in the subject area and include your fax number in your message.

More news
briefs on
Page 7/8

PPS
Review
January
2002

Page 6/8

More briefs

(Continued from Page 6/8)

CARPET STEWARDSHIP LAID DOWN

A Memorandum of Understanding on voluntary product stewardship for carpets was signed recently between the carpet industry, state governments, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The agreement outlines negotiated outcomes, which establish national reuse and recycling goals, and develops a plan to increase the recovery of waste carpet.

The carpet industry will create, fund and manage a third-party organization (Carpet American Recovery Effort – CARE) which will be responsible for achieving the negotiated outcomes. Government has committed to developing procurement guidelines to be adopted by public entities nationally. The guidelines will reward companies offering environmentally preferable products.

Negotiated outcomes also establish reuse and recycling rates for discarded carpet. The agreement sets out recycling targets of 20-25% and a diversion rate of 27-34% for 2012. It also caps the burning of carpet in cement kilns at 3% of carpet waste.

www.moea.state.mn.us/policy/carpet

NEW TETRA PAK CARTON

A new “retortable” container being developed by Tetra Pak Canada Inc., is already in use in Europe. The Tetra Recart™ packaging system is designed for food products normally placed in glass jars or metal cans. The new cartons should be fully recyclable, comprising, as they are, of 75% paperboard with a thin polymer coating and a thin aluminum lining. They are currently being used in Italy and the UK for dog foods. Retorting involves sterilizing a filled container through a thermal process, which was not possible with the regular aseptic cartons the company normally produces.

Eco-Log Week, November 2001

COMING EVENTS

February 7-9

Federation of Canadian Municipalities Sustainable Communities Conference,
Ottawa, ON.
Call (613) 241-5221

February 24-27

Ontario Good Roads/Rural Ontario Municipal Association annual conference,
Toronto, ON.
Call (905) 795-2555

March 13-14

Saskatchewan Waste Reduction Council Spring waste minimization forum,
Yorkton, SK.
Call (306) 931-3242

May 1-4

Organization of Small Urban Municipalities annual conference,
Port Elgin, ON.
Call (519) 271-0250 ext. 241

May 31—June 3

Federation of Canadian Municipalities Sustainable annual conference,
Hamilton, ON.
Call (613) 241-5221

August 16-21

Association of Municipalities of Ontario annual conference,
Toronto, ON.
Call (416) 971-9856 ext. 307

Changes coming to *PPSReview*

Starting with the next issue of *Product & Packaging Stewardship Review*, readers will notice some changing. The next issue, which will be the thirteenth, marks the beginning of the third year of publication. While the full name of the publication will remain as *Product & Packaging Stewardship Review* the masthead will be changed to *PPSReview*, and there will be some changes to the layout.

In order to offset costs, *PPSReview* will start to carry advertisements from supporters of the Fair Comment Project, through which the publication is financed. At the same time, we will continue to urge recipients of *PPSReview* to register to receive it via the Internet.

As always, we welcome your comments, your news and your letters (emailed to bbc@albedo.net).

Ben Bennett, publisher, *PPSReview*

**PPS
Review
January
2002**

Page 7/8

Opinion Piece

The opinions expressed in this column are not necessarily those of PPSReview

THE SANTA PAPERS

The Christmas message that was never read

by Jay Arthur

(The following letter was found in a blue box at the North Pole. It seems to have been missed by its intended reader.)

Dear Santa,

As our annual gift-fest fast approaches, I was just wondering what we might expect to see in our stockings from the Ontario Government?

The municipalities have been very good this year, Santa, and really haven't made too much fuss about Uncle Mike playing golf and chewing cigars when he should have been at work. They haven't complained about all the extra chores they now have to do, often without any increase in their allowance. And on the costs of recycling and other programs they have behaved very well, and have promised to show up for the WDO meetings to perpetuate the myth that they will have meaningful input to any decisions made there about their programs.

So, dear Santa, it would be really nice if you could talk with Aunt Lizzie, and Uncle Mike (if you can track him down), and make sure local governments are near the top of the goodies list.

We certainly appreciate that there have already been commitments made to their rich relations, even if we do have a \$5 billion deficit. And we do appreciate that there are some—quite a lot actually—who would like some help with their schooling. So money will be tight.

But, it's not as if the Ontario Government—or should we say the Ontario taxpayer—would have to shell

out any money, is it? If we understand Bill 90 correctly, the plan is to have the industries whose packaging and products find their way into the blue box pay some of the costs of running the program.

Of course, it won't be the companies that pay, will it? It will be the people who buy the products.

After all, I am sure the people who buy the products will be more than happy to pay the additional two cents or whatever to make sure the municipal taxpayers have enough left at the end of the day to pay for all those chores Uncle Mike keeps sending their way.

I mean, after all, if they are all the same people, how could they mind?

Right now, it's the municipalities—or should we say the local taxpayer—who pay the whole shot, isn't it?

At every conference and workshop I go to there seems to be a middle-aged man in a nice suit (some of them the same shape as you, Santa), telling me that all these people are the same: the Ontario taxpayer, the local taxpayer and the people who buy the products.

So I am wondering why all the decisions about this being made by the industry people and Uncle Mike's family.

Sorry to ramble on so much, Santa, but this is very confusing.

I have been reading Bill 90 (it came in a Christmas card) and it looks like it could take a long time to actually get all the paperwork done that will see dollars flowing to municipalities, especially now that we won't be talking about it again until next March. I was wondering if you could have a chat with Uncle Mike. I know he is even less interested in what is happening now that he has decided to become a golf pro again, but his is still the head of the household, in theory. So, if you persuade Uncle Mike to talk to Aunt Lizzie and ask her to fix the Bill so that the industry folks can start collecting their money as soon as it's passed. (I realize you might have to speak to Uncle Jim because I know he has the piggy bank and may not be inclined to do anything right now to help Aunt Lizzie.)

Then, it won't matter how long it takes to get the paperwork done. The money will be there.

After all, I am sure the people who buy the products will be more than happy to pay the additional two cents or whatever to make sure the municipal taxpayers have enough left at the end of the day to pay for all those chores Uncle Mike keeps sending their way.

I mean, after all, if they are all the same people, how could they mind?

PPS
Review
January
2002

Page 8/8