

Bill 46 is another swipe at the hog industry, says the chair of Manitoba Pork council, and the NDP are doing this for political reasons. It's very obvious its' not about reducing phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg. It's about sacrificing the hog industry for the upcoming provincial election.

It would seem that Manitoba's Pork Council Chairman, Karl Kynock, once again, fails to recognize (or doesn't want to remember) "who the benefactors were in bringing the Hog Industry into the province", and supporting them for the past 13 or 14 years.

He now admonishes the actions of government when, having recognized a crises in our Lake Winnipeg waters,are advertising steps to reduce the phosphorus levels by 50%.

I will remind him that the hog Industry was conceived by the Filmon Conservative government and nurtured by the present NDP government, to a high yearly production, exceeding nine million hogs.

Nine million hogs excrete a vast amount of manure. The equivalent to 35 to 40 million people. This untreated manure has to be disposed of. Crop plant usage for phosphorus will accommodate in the neighbourhood of only 20-30 pounds as fertilizer, the remaining becomes waste. This waste of excess phosphorus is what is contaminating our waters and causing the crises that the province is now attempting to address and deal with. These are scientific facts.

He makes a statement "When you implement regulation without sound science, thats a concern to a lot of people in the province"

Well once more, I will make him aware of what University of Manitoba, soil specialist, and scientist Dr. Don Flaten has previously stated in regard to a similar comment in regard to excessive phosphorus.

"We know that soils don't have an infinite capacity to retain phosphorus. At some point, sooner rather than later farmers will have to balance applications of phosphorus with crop removal"

Shutting down a billion dollar hog industry, in its present form,is a small price to pay for protecting our water sources and Lake Winnipeg. The value of water is priceless.

When an activity raises threats of harm to our health, our waters or our environment, precautionary measures must be taken, even if some cause and effects relationships are not fully established scientifically.

In this context, the proponent of an activity rather than the public must bear the burden of proof.

John Fefchak;
Virden, Man.