

Incineration not the best solution for trash

Mon Jan 28, 2008

To the editor:

Re: Incineration debate about money, Cindy Vautour Smith column, Jan. 13.

The Incineration debate is definitely about cost, not money as stated by Cindy Vautour Smith.

The costs are to our air quality, our health and the health of future generations, and \$250 million of taxpayers' money. There is also the cost to dispose of the highly toxic ash (approximately one-third of total trash burned) after we have supposedly solved our garbage issue.

I am sure Hamilton's steel mills are a lot cleaner now than many years ago. As it is certain we will always produce trash, it is certain that we will always need steel. However, the more steel recycled and reused the less smog emitted producing new steel. It is a fact that it is less polluting to recycle steel than to produce new steel. This is true for most industries processing raw materials.

Educating the public, politicians and corporations in waste diversion and extended producer responsibility is essential to moving forward on the trash issue. The trash issue will never be solved.

Incineration is not a solution. The trash is not gone, it is falling down around us and one third of it is in a landfill near us.

Doing everything possible to create as little trash as possible is what those against incineration are advocating. If we all do this there would be much less trash and it would be less dangerous than the ash which must still be sent to landfill after incineration.

Doug Hart

Bowmanville