

Second Session - Thirty-Ninth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Agriculture and Food

Chairperson
Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff
Constituency of Interlake

Vol. LX No. 2 - 10 a.m., Saturday, June 7, 2008

ISSN 1708-6647

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Ninth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BLADY, Sharon	Kirkfield Park	N.D.P.
BOROTSIK, Rick	Brandon West	P.C.
BRAUN, Erna	Rossmere	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
BRIESE, Stuart	Ste. Rose	P.C.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
HOWARD, Jennifer	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSON, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARCELINO, Flor	Wellington	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McFADYEN, Hugh	Fort Whyte	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Carman	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELBY, Erin	Southdale	N.D.P.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Saturday, June 7, 2008

TIME – 10 a.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Ms. Jennifer Howard (Fort Rouge); Mr. Drew Caldwell (Brandon East) at 21.52

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Struthers, Swan

Messrs. Altemeyer, Caldwell, Eichler, Goertzen, Mses. Howard, Marcelino, Messrs. McFadyen, Nevakshonoff, Pedersen

Substitutions:

Mr. Martindale for Ms. Marcelino

Ms. Marcelino for Mr. Martindale at 12:21 p.m.

Mr. Pedersen for Mr. Graydon at 4:04 p.m.

Mrs. Rowat for Mr. Maguire at 4:04 p.m.

Mr. Altemeyer for Hon. Mr. Swan at 5:08 p.m.

Mr. McFadyen for Mrs. Taillieu at 5:29 p.m.

Mr. Goertzen for Mrs. Rowat at 6:06 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Swan for Hon. Ms. Melnick at 6:06 p.m.

Mr. Caldwell for Hon. Ms. Wowchuk at 6:06 p.m.

Mr. Saran for Mr. Altemeyer 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Dewar for Ms. Howard at 9:51 p.m.

Mr. Caldwell for Ms. Howard at 9:52 p.m.

APPEARING:

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk, MLA for Swan River

Mr. Cliff Graydon, MLA for Emerson

Mr. Larry Maguire, MLA for Arthur-Virden

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu, MLA for Morris

Mr. Stuart Briese, MLA for Ste. Rose

Mrs. Leanne Rowat, MLA for Minnedosa

Hon. Christine Melnick, MLA for Riel

Ms. Marilyn Brick, MLA for St. Norbert

Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights

Mr. David Faurschou, MLA for Portage la Prairie

Mr. Gregory Dewar, MLA for Selkirk

WITNESSES:

Mr. John Morrison, Concerned Citizens of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed

Mr. Kurt Stoess, Private Citizen

Mr. Jacob Hofer, Private Citizen

Mr. Claude Lachance, Private Citizen

Mr. Richard Taillefer, Private Citizen

Mr. Jason Falk, Hespeler Hog Farms

Mr. Allen Steinke, R.M. of Victoria

Mr. Sieg Peters, Private Citizen

Mr. Ron St. Hilaire, Private Citizen

Mr. Tom Greaves, Private Citizen

Mr. Dennis Kornelsen, Private Citizen

Mr. Mike Maendel, Private Citizen

Mr. Jamie Hofer, Private Citizen

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser, Private Citizen

Mr. Jack Hofer, Private Citizen

Mr. Terry Hofer, Private Citizen

Mr. Andy Gross, Private Citizen

Mr. Dwayne Hofer, Private Citizen

Mr. Joe Dolecki, Private Citizen

Mr. Larry Maendel, Private Citizen

Mr. Peter Wipf, Maxwell Colony

Mr. Cameron Maendel, Private Citizen

Mr. Dan Van Schepdael, Synergy Swine

Mr. Perry Mohr, Private Citizen

Mr. Gerald Siemens, Siefert Farms Ltd.

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser, Private Citizen

Mr. Arnie Waldner, Private Citizen

Mr. Tom Waldner, Private Citizen

Mr. Brian Klassen, Nutricycle Inc.

Mr. Ray Wipf, Maxwell Colony

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser, Private Citizen

Mr. Ron Klippenstein, Private Citizen

Mr. Michael Wurtz, Private Citizen

Mr. David Wurtz, Private Citizen

Mr. Bill Vaags, Private Citizen

Mr. Peter Wipf, Maxwell Colony

Ms. Sandra Trinkies, Private Citizen

Mr. Doug Cavers, R.M. of Hanover

Mr. Stan Toews, Private Citizen

Mr. Chris Maendel, Private Citizen

Mr. John Bannister, Private Citizen

Mr. Alan Bell, Superior Agri-Systems Ltd.

Mr. Don Kroeker, Private Citizen

Mr. Don Flaten, The National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, University of Manitoba

Mr. Peter Hombach, ETIA

Mr. Mike Teillet, Private Citizen

Ms. Diana Ludwick, Occupational Health Centre

Mr. Brian Siemens, Private Citizen

Mr. David Gsell, Private Citizen

Mr. Joe Marshall, Private Citizen

Mrs. Betty Siemens, Private Citizen

Mr. Ernie Siemens, Private Citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Bill 17—The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities)

Elaine Henrotte, Private Citizen

Cheryl Kennedy Courcelles, Private Citizen

Mr. John Morrison, Concerned Citizens of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed

Mr. Joe Dolecki, Private Citizen

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser, Private Citizen

Ms. Diana Ludwick, Occupational Health Centre

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Bill 17—The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities)

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Good morning. The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Food, please come to order. This meeting has been called to consider Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities). The first item of business is the election of a vice-chairperson. Are there any nominations?

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): I nominate Ms. Howard.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Howard has been nominated. Are there any other nominations? Seeing none, Ms. Howard is elected vice-chairperson of this committee.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: We have a substitution, Mr. Martindale in for Ms. Flor Marcelino.

* * *

Okay, we have a number of presenters registered to speak to this bill, as noted on the lists before you

on the table and posted at the entrance of the room. Also, as was announced in the House on June 4, the committee will sit until tonight at midnight and we will sit again on the following occasions: Monday, June 9, from 10 a.m. 'til noon and then again at 6 p.m., Tuesday, June 10, at 6 p.m.

For the information of all in attendance, this committee has previously agreed to hear out-of-town presenters first. We have one presenter, Joe Dolecki, No. 40, who will not be able to be here until 2 p.m. So is it the will of the committee to not call him before 2 o'clock? *[Agreed]*

Before we—*[interjection]* Mr. Eichler?

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I was wondering if we could get leave of the committee to not call quorum count, and also, because of the number of presenters and because of the World Pork Congress, I know yesterday we sought leave to not move presenters to the bottom of the list if their name was called in order to try and get through as many presenters as we can and not have their name moved to the bottom of the list.

* (10:10)

Mr. Chairperson: The member has spoken. What's the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

Before we proceed with presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider.

First of all, if there is anyone else in the audience who would like to make a presentation this morning, please register with the staff at the entrance of the room.

Also, for the information of all presenters, while written versions of presentations are not required, if you are going to accompany your presentation with written materials, we ask that you provide 20 copies. If you need help with photocopying, please speak with our staff.

As well, I would like to inform presenters that, in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from the committee members.

Written submissions on Bill 17 have been received from the following and have been distributed to committee members: Elaine Henrotte and Cheryl Kennedy Courcelles. Does the committee

agree to have these documents appear in the *Hansard* transcript of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

Prior to proceeding with public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public about speaking in committee. Our meetings are recorded to provide a transcript. Each time anyone wishes to speak, I have to say the person's name to signal the *Hansard* recorders to turn the microphones on and off.

Thank you for your patience. We will now proceed with public presentations.

**Bill 17—The Environment Amendment Act
(Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog
Facilities)**

Mr. Chairperson: I first call Sieg Peters, private citizen.

George Witf, private citizen. I believe that's Witf—spelling mistake there. Unless I state otherwise, from this point forward, they are private citizens. If they're affiliated with another entity, I will so name.

John Allen—Please call out your name when I call your name—Clarence Froese—or call out present, please.

Dennis Thiessen. Hugh Arklie, Springfield Hogwatch. James Hofer. Jacob Waldner. Olayinka Brimoh. Menno Bergen.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if we could seek leave to let the presenters go ahead and start—I believe No. 68 and No. 80 are present—in order to save time. We want to get through as many presenters as we possibly can. I would seek leave of the committee to start with No. 68—it stays in numerical order—and then proceed with No. 80, rather than just the name call, and then resume calling names back at that point in time.

Mr. Chairperson: Agreeable? *[Agreed]*

I call No. 68, John Morrison, Concerned Citizens of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed. Mr. Morrison.

Good morning, sir. Do you have any written materials?

Mr. John Morrison (Concerned Citizens of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: I see you do. You may proceed.

Mr. Morrison: As these get handed out, I think I'll make sort of an observation comment that a lot of

farmers have, and that is that we wouldn't be having these hearings or a bill about hog production if they were cute and cuddly and didn't create quite as much manure as they do. That seems to be a general consensus from a lot of farmers that have spoken to me over the last little while.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for that, sir. The clock is running. You have the floor.

Mr. Morrison: Okay. My name is John Morrison. I reside in Rosser. There's a certain bio on myself on the front page. The group I represent is the Concerned Citizens for the Sturgeon Creek Watershed. We've had a rather serious drainage problem in our area that we were amazed to find was being called a wetland when we started finding out about some of these farm programs. Gee, it's really nice to stick together.

Having said that, our group is formed of farmers and concerned citizens in the Sturgeon Creek watershed where we've had some, as I said, serious problems, but they're rather unusual problems in a certain way. I'll start with a point on Bill 17.

Bill 17, in the opinion of our group and of a lot of the farmers out there, is an inappropriate and unreasonable attempt to limit or ban hog facilities and not supported by science, the findings of the Clean Environment Commission, nor the studies funded and directed by the Conservation Department nor the Department of Agriculture and Rural Initiatives. Further, a substantial number of the noted areas included in section 40.1 are not of any substantive risk environmentally from a concentration of hog operations or considered expansions of hog operations due to current legislation, planning requirements, and the Livestock Manure and Mortalities Management Regulation.

The publication of proposed Bill 17 has led to the tightening of review in applications of all types of confined livestock operations in the noted areas. This has led to further negative economical pressures to all producers in those areas. A common voice in rural communities is that there are confined livestock operations in these areas that are now prevented or limited in development at the stroke of a pen, even without the implementation of this bill.

LMMM outlines the operation size and restrictions of operations based on the area afforded for manure operations and MAFRI has the ability under the act to review and place limitations and recommendations on proposed operations or

expansions. It is accepted as a standard and is based on recognized science, supported by the lower levels of municipal government, and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and its farm development and support departments at PFRA. Farmers also support this by consensus as to the necessity to limit the density of large producers of manure to the available acreage for dispersal of nitrates and phosphates.

In making this presentation, I will now go on to show that the focus and direction of this government in putting forward the proposed changes to The Environment Act is neither appropriate nor reasonable and it raises the core issues that should be addressed.

It started out very simply if you read the *Winnipeg Sun* today. They talked about a record rain. So a record rain in Winnipeg; it wasn't a record rain in the area that the watershed flows through Winnipeg. The government of Manitoba is one inch away from being recognized as legally responsible for the largest intake of phosphates and nitrates into Lake Winnipeg for the 2008 year, one step closer to an irreversible environmental disaster. The cause of this environmental disaster? It isn't hogs. It isn't livestock. It's very simply overland flooding of agricultural lands due to the failure of government to properly manage the provincial drainage system. Further, it appears that the Province of Manitoba is attempting to cover up their responsibilities and their previous actions in this matter. I base this statement on the following information relating to the Sturgeon Creek watershed, the actions of the government relating to the information they've received, and the failure of government to address these issues.

I will also refer to the basic science provided by Don Flaten and others as they have attempted to provide guidance and understanding to those not directly involved in agriculture and in attempting to address Bill 17. I will underscore the following information on my personal knowledge and supported facts.

Simply put, all living matter gives off phosphates and nitrates. Plants give it off, hogs give it off, cattle give it off, those nice horses that look so nice in a pasture, all give it off. Bottom line is, how it gets into the water system and affects Lake Winnipeg and other areas of the environment is what we need to be concerned with. Frozen land and controlled drainage from agricultural land have a natural limiting of phosphate and nitrate uptake into spring run-off. Simply put, the ground's frozen. The

ground's frozen, you don't dissolve chemicals or particles out of that area and into the run-off. The other side of it is with a slow melt, which is usually what happens in the spring. There's a limited amount of run-off. So that run-off, as it slowly goes away, has not very much likelihood of carrying away organic matter as a slow run-off.

* (10:20)

Land, however, once free of frost and inundated with water, as with overland flooding after the spring thaw, is very susceptible to uptake of these nutrients by dissolving into the water, the floating away of plant matter and its subsequent decay in the water body.

The decay of organic matter in water has an additional negative impact by removing oxygen from the water. That, basically—as you've read in the newspapers two years ago or three years ago—is how fish die, from not getting oxygen, or they drown. That's one of the problems which are out there, facing a lot of areas.

The Province of Manitoba, through its drainage mismanagement, expansion of the Sturgeon Creek watershed beyond its original boundaries and attempts to maintain restrictions to prevent Winnipeg flooding during times of summer rains, has caused and will cause overland flooding of agricultural lands and subsequent substantial environmental and economic damage to those lands into Lake Winnipeg.

This substantially exceeds any risk from hog operations in the area. By that, I'm talking about the Interlake and, specifically, South Interlake.

Mr. Chairperson: Order. You're not allowed to use props at the committee, sir.

Mr. Morrison: Okay. Actually, if you go to the back of your page, there is a copy of that in every one.

Mr. Eichler: I would ask leave of the committee that—I know we did allow a presenter yesterday to use a graph which did help the committee. I ask leave of the committee that Mr. Morrison be allowed to use his graph for illustration purposes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler has asked for leave.

What is the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*
You may use your props, sir.

Mr. Morrison: The copy that you have in the back of your presentation talks about what's in blue, and

it's not blue. So here, it's graphically very easy to see as blue.

This is from a study that was done by UMA consulting for the provincial government on the South Interlake. This happens to be Winnipeg, right in here; this is the Perimeter Highway, and this is, in large part, the Sturgeon Creek watershed. One of the things that are wrong in this is, when the consulting organization did their work, they forgot that all of this watershed in the middle also backs up with water.

The Province of Manitoba, the government and the Legislature, and all of the parties have talked about a 500-year and a 100-year event for the Winnipeg floodway. This is a display of a 10-year event which consistently has been happening approximately once every 10 years.

We're looking here, in the area covered by water, at 214 square miles. We're looking at millions of acres that are under water. If this happens in the summer, where the problem is—all of this water picks up organic particles, picks up nitrates, picks up phosphates and drops them in Lake Winnipeg.

To do a comparison in this room—because we're 20 feet across and approximately 60 feet long—the outlet in the Red River that takes all of this water from all this area, comparing it to the size of this building, is a whole one-quarter of an inch in that wall, one-quarter of an inch in diameter. That's all there is to move the water, and it moves it through Winnipeg.

Part of this presentation, which I have here, is very simply this—there weren't 214 square miles in Sturgeon Creek watershed. It started out that there were about 114, but the Province of Manitoba has expanded the watershed from not just the prime agricultural land closer to Winnipeg, but further out into cattle land and other areas that become a problem.

If you look at the picture that you have in there, just where the little V is in the roads, a few miles outside of Winnipeg—and I've said that it doesn't depict the land properly—that's where I farm. I've had 120 acres of 160 acres under water for 14 days in the summer, and not one bit of the water was off of my property.

All at once, it couldn't get through Winnipeg; it started backing up. The water backed up and covered almost two-thirds of a whole section of land. All the organic matter floated out, down the creek, down—

and that's why I'm calling it a creek—down into Sturgeon Creek, down into the city of Winnipeg, down into the Assiniboine, out to the Red, all the way up the Red into Lake Winnipeg.

I'm a very lucky man. I also happen to have cattle further north of St. Laurent. We have some farmland up there. We're very close to Shoal Lake up there where we have water levels that are exceedingly high. Here's our problem. That water is within a few miles of Lake Manitoba, but no drains have been established—well, one was put halfway in and then it's partly closed in now—to drain that water into Lake Manitoba. So that water finds its way into the Sturgeon Creek watershed and it's actually not even included in these maps although it is an extension that is in there. It's a problem and it's serious.

I've laid out in point form quite a bit of information. So I want to be very quick on here so that possibly there can be a couple of questions that get interesting. I will say this, in point two, which would be in the first set of points that you come to, a diversion was put through with the provincial government in conjunction with the federal government in the 1960s so that East, West and Central Colony Creek and Omand's Creek were diverted into Sturgeon Creek. A funny thing happened. I'm on a century farm, we're there, all at once, oh my God, Winnipeg's getting flooded. Water's flowing over Ness Avenue. Oh, to protect Ness Avenue and the city of Winnipeg, we have to put restrictions in Sturgeon Creek. So you doubled the amount of inflow into Sturgeon Creek at the point where you put the diversion in, which is one mile outside of the Perimeter, and you reduced the flow from thereon going to Winnipeg to protect it.

Ever since then, my family and other people have been repetitively after the Province of Manitoba to put in a diversion. Repetitive municipal councils out in our area, other farmers, even crop insurance, before it became MACC and MASC, put forward that this is a problem. It's insurance, it's problems. What do we do? We've gotten promises from government who were going to do something. We even went out when GPS first come out, which is several years ago, and tracked the best route for that water to take. We told Agriculture, we told Water Resources, we told Conservation, we said right at Sturgeon Creek colony is the best point for you to have an exit for another diversion going to the highway.

Well, further on in here you'll notice that I bring up the Premier of Manitoba. The Premier of Manitoba was aware of this information and, following the farm rally from 2001, had us invited to the 2001 budget presentation. At the media scrum after it, Greg Selinger and Premier Doer walked over to myself, a group of farmers from all over Manitoba and said, you know what, John, here's what we've done. We've put like \$7 million in the drainage budget. We're going to fix your problem. Well, I'm sorry to say, nobody even moved any dirt, not one thing was done to fix the problem. So you're still stuck with that same problem. What do we do?

Now farmers are mad and they started suing Woodlands municipality and getting fairly involved in a couple of things to make sure things were taken care of, and that's where the Concerned Citizens for Sturgeon Creek watershed got involved a couple of years ago. Strangely, as soon as the group got organized and started going, the Province was doing a study with UMA Consulting over the problems in the watershed and what was going on. Now, all at once, it seems that study is not seeing the light of day because it identifies where all the water is leaving the ditch and going on peoples' property.

In the back part of my presentation you can see the legal precedents, okay, that are standard in Manitoba and where the Province of Manitoba themselves have lost in court over the backup of water over farmland. I'm not here to threaten you with a legal action. I'm not here to say anything except that it makes common sense to try and work together to fix a problem, and the very serious part of it is it doesn't seem that anybody is trying to work together to solve a problem.

*(10:30)

One of the other notes I'll make on here is that the drainage of Sturgeon Creek Watershed was originally 114 square miles. Now, it's over 200. We're talking about 235. The key point that we have here is with those changes and what's gone on, we've had more water coming down from areas that are not prime agricultural land. They're coming in. They're flooding the prime agricultural land, and it's a concern.

One of the key points I'll add on here is point No. 4, which should be on, I guess, your third page. That's under The Fisheries Act. The Province of Manitoba could face a requirement to provide remedial action for water flow into Lake Winnipeg now that a health warning has been issued for water

consumption from the lake. If a farmer, even in small claims court, was to have it identified that the Province of Manitoba was responsible for the nitrates and phosphates from some areas going into Lake Manitoba, you could have a requiring order to the Province of Manitoba from the federal government requiring you to facilitate all improvements required to fix the problem.

Now, the Province isn't on a very good foot here now because I understand that the Fisheries department of the federal government is currently investigating the Province of Manitoba for allowing the illegal draining of fish habitat and damage to fish habitat basically during last fall. It's a \$300,000 fine and up to six months in jail. We don't want anybody to go to jail. We don't want anybody to be fined. We want to sit together as a group and say, hold it, we're working to fix a problem.

Some recommendations, and this is what we feel should be on the table for this committee and for considerations over The Environment Act: No. 1: That any party, including government, identified as causing environmental risk or damage must be responsible for providing reparations and payment of identified losses.

Number 2: That changes to legislation affecting environmental protection be based on scientific and logical information and be addressed on the basis of ranking of risk, and, on ranking of risk, the Sturgeon Creek watershed is 84 or 85 times more damaging than the hog producers in Manitoba. That's scary when we have a government that's sitting here not doing anything about it.

Number 3: Environmental risk based on livestock production is hand-in-hand with the nitrate and phosphate levels of all types of agriculture or of simple grasslands, that a consideration of effective drainage control to prevent overland flooding of agricultural properties be a priority. And that may mean an order that a farmer that's trying to drain his own property now to make it better than it was before, can't do it, but it preserves what we do have.

Number 4: The expected one-to-10-year model produced for the Province and shown here and understanding the principles of nitrates and phosphates in all organic organisms, sometime in the next 10 years there's likely to be an environmental calamity for Lake Winnipeg.

Now, while the Province may take issue with the costs and responsibilities, there're certain economic

opportunities to cover these costs. No. 1: When the Colony Creek diversion was put in—

Mr. Chairperson: One minute, sir.

Mr. Morrison: —a FRED grant was used for that, which was federal and provincial. It wasn't used properly. There's an opportunity for the feds to resolve the issue.

Funding by the federal government has been allocated for the remediation or protection of Lake Winnipeg. Those funds can be used to fix part of this drainage. In a discussion with Steven Fletcher's office, it was indicated that Building Canada funds are available for projects like an extra diversion project for Sturgeon Creek west of Winnipeg. Mr. Fletcher's assistant indicated a willingness to support funding due to the positive effect on his constituents as well as the Manitoba rural economy.

As any diversion of water from within the Winnipeg's boundary is beneficial to Winnipeg, it is very reasonable to have Winnipeg assist in funding reduction of crop insurance costs and expenditures under farm programs, and the opportunity to have sustainable rural economics.

The rest of my presentation on there includes copies of the legal precedents that can be used by any farmer to take the Province to court. The water leaves your ditch and goes on their property.

Mr. Chairperson: You're at 10 minutes, sir. Are you complete?

Mr. Morrison: Yes, I am.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you for that. Questions, I have Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Morrison. Certainly, a different twist than what we've been looking at from the previous presenters, and very informative.

Ms. Jennifer Howard, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

My question for you: to your knowledge, has there been any test taken as far as the water test results? If so, do you have those available for the committee, out at Sturgeon Creek in particular?

Mr. Morrison: Actually, we've repetitively requested from—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Morrison, I have to recognize you before you answer, just so we can record it accurately.

Mr. Morrison: Yes. Actually, we've been asking Conservation and Water Resources for copies of their records, and we don't seem to get them. We can't figure out why, but we have an idea. I don't think I need to raise it.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Eichler, on a supplemental?

Mr. Eichler: Yes. There is the Freedom of Information, you could try that avenue. Then, I guess, my second question is—

Mr. Morrison: Could I add one small—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Oh—Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Morrison: If I could add one small point to that. A study was done by Red River College—I think Ralph and other people are aware that I've been an instructor there—was done by them over the phosphate and nitrate levels in there, but, again, that study information hasn't now been made available, although funded by the provincial government. That particular study has now been requested through the higher echelons of Red River College to be published in their library, and we expect it to be there within the next few days.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Eichler, did you have another—

Mr. Eichler: If you could get that to us, you know, either through mail or e-mail, that would be certainly be appreciated.

My other question is that you went into an awful lot of detail about the drainage and, as you know, the current government has done a lot of work in regard to conservation districts. Could you outline your opinion on how those are working and, in fact, they will be the right tool in order to provide the drainage that you see in your organization, in particular with Sturgeon Creek drain?

Mr. Morrison: Firstly—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sorry. Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Morrison: I'm just not used to waiting. Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Well, I'm new here too, so it's all right.

Mr. Morrison: I'll put it across this way. The major meetings that we've had of our group with reeves and council members from our local municipalities there, being Woodlands, Rosser, Rockwood, they have been resoundingly told they do not want the area in a

conservation district until this problem is solved. The reason we don't want it in a conservation district is we didn't create this problem.

In a conservation district, we as farmers would have to put up one-third of the cost for the repairs. It's much simpler, in the opinion of the majority of those farmers, to give the provincial government a reasonable amount of time to proceed, try and fix the problems and if they don't, they're prepared to see them in court.

Now, I'm here saying that that is their opinion. I'll be on record as saying that I'm not prepared to take the Province to court, but I do already have several parties that have requested me to be an expert witness.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Morrison, for your presentation. There's, certainly, a lot of information here that, this early in the day, is difficult to absorb in 10 minutes. However, it's a very well put-together presentation and we certainly will be going through it. But, as you pointed out in your presentation—and I'm sure you don't believe that the people in charge of different departments have acted in a responsible way in the past. I'm wondering, maybe, because of the overreaction, that—or, you said that you weren't in favour of the moratorium. Is this an overreaction? And do you believe that the regulations that are currently in effect are adequate to protect the lake?

Mr. Morrison: The legislation that is currently in place is, in my opinion, and the opinion of certain specialists in the field, which I know you've heard from, or are hearing from, and from the majority of farmers out there is very simply the legislation that's currently there with The Planning Act and now the municipalities on board that it's just not a hog barn. It's a real good way to get tax dollars, but rather we have to think of it in an environmental standard.

*(10:40)

You have enough legislation there that you shouldn't even be discussing or considering what you have for these in this proposed bill. You should walk away from these and say, you know what? We need to redesign this, and say, what do we need to do to protect the environment and get with it?

The recommendations that were put forth in there are backed by my group. I have two other speaking engagements to put that other information

out there with groups of farmers that, I think, just want to take the Province to court because of these problems, but they're not in our watershed district. They have their own can of worms.

For us, we've been pretty concise; we have good records. We don't need more legislation in the form of Bill 17. What we need to do is effectively work with the legislation that is there. The Lake Winnipeg Water Stewardship Board put a solid recommendation to the Province of Manitoba that they use the existing legislation that they have properly to provide protection of the lake. They did not need more legislation.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you Mr. Morrison. That's our time. Thank you very much for coming. I think we had agreed to—

Mr. Eichler: I ask leave of the committee to have Mr. Morrison's full written submission recorded into *Hansard*. If we could ask leave from committee for his oral and written presentation to be recorded.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Eichler asked for leave to record the full written presentation in *Hansard*. I believe that's agreed to, Mr. Eichler.

I think we had agreed next to go to presenter, No. 80 on the list, Kurt Stoess.

Welcome, Mr. Stoess. Do you have a written presentation for us?

Mr. Kurt Stoess (Private Citizen): No, just oral.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. You can proceed when you're ready then.

Mr. Stoess: First of all, I'd like to say hello to the ministers and MLAs. Thank you for this opportunity to speak out on this bill.

I'll start out by telling you a little bit about myself because that's who you are affecting as representatives of the people. You are affecting the people, and I am one of them.

I spent my first 10 years as a resident of Winnipeg. We'll keep that brief; it's not that important. The second 10 years of my life I spent in southeast Manitoba and grew up in the Steinbach area. I got some agricultural roots back there. I came back to Winnipeg, spent a few years here getting my Bachelor of Science in agriculture. Then, upon graduation, I started off my career in the hog industry. That brought me north to the Interlake, actually, the Chairperson's, Nevakshonoff's jurisdiction or area. I worked there both for a larger

corporation and a private family farm in their hog operations.

What I saw when I got there was a town that had grown over the last 20 years by servicing nearby First Nations. As these First Nations became more self-sufficient, the town was shrinking and there was less need for their services.

Shortly within my time of arrival in the community, the hog industry also started to grow in this area. That brought people, such as myself and others from different parts of Manitoba, from across Canada and around the world. There's a growing Filipino community now in Fisher Branch due to the hog industry. It's that growth that you as the government of Manitoba need to support, either that or our province will continually shrink. So now the town of Fisher Branch continues to grow slowly.

It's kind of ironic that Chairperson Nevakshonoff had to step out to attend a different standing committee on the school closures, one of which is affecting Fisher Branch.

Personally, I've now left that area, but my wife has nieces and nephews that have prospered from the hog industry and have decided to stay in the area, whether it's by directly working in hog barns or just because the local garage now has more work because the town has people.

So, like I said, it's all about people. It's not about corporations, money and animals. The last 10 years, more or less, I've been back in southeast Manitoba and seen the phenomenal growth in immigration that's happening in that area. It's wild. I bought my house there five years ago—or where I currently live—I bought that house five years ago. The number of houses going up in my area are just—Crown corporations, like MTS, are having trouble keeping up.

You, as a government, you're having trouble. The regular health-care formula for southeast Manitoba does not work anymore, because the population is growing faster than you can gather census data. The schools are bulging, as you know.

You all take part in dealing with those issues. It's just a sign how much the hog industry supports that economy, not just that farmer, not just that company, but the whole area. I think, sometimes, people forget about that. So that's just a little reminder what the hog industry means to the economy of Manitoba, from my eyes.

Now I want to bring you back to a few years ago when BSE first got recognized in Canada, or diagnosed. We, as citizens, as government, pleaded with the world to base their decisions on good science. It took some time; it took some lobbying but, more or less, we've accomplished that. We continue to have the odd case of BSE pop up, but it doesn't change our status around the world.

In the meantime, if you parallel that over to what we're doing here now, the government on record is making decisions not based on good science, but based on paranoia and public pressure.

We spent all this time and money going through the whole CEC process. It came out with a report that listed a lot of recommendations. That day when it came out, I sat there and I read it. I said, you know what, that's fair. A lot more policing, a few rules—I can live with that. That's fair because, like other presenters have said, there's already a good basis of rules and regulations to follow. Meanwhile, a couple of hours later, I hear that the government has decided to try and read between the lines and add some notes, that it said, put a moratorium. I read the report again; I still didn't see it.

In conclusion, I urge you, as the committee and as government, to step back and take another look and implement what the CEC report had to say and recommended for you to do. I realize there are a lot of recommendations. I am sure both the urban population and the rural population would understand if the government could not turn around and enact them tomorrow because, as we all know, things move a little slower here on Broadway.

To be a permanent judge and jury and to put a life moratorium on those areas is just a death sentence, so I urge you to step back and leave yourself an out. Thanks.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Stoess.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Kurt, for your presentation—well-thought-out, well-presented.

I know you hit a real good point there when you talked about BSE. The current government and us, all of Canada and the world, we tried to base BSE on science. We based our trade challenges, the border opening—I think that's the significant point that we've been trying to all work on. It just gives us that many more reasons to base our decisions here at the Legislature on science rather than politics. So I think you did a fantastic job.

* (10:50)

On that point, in your current operations, do you have the land base or the necessary requirements in order to expand your operation if you needed to without the Bill 17 if it wasn't passed?

Mr. Stoess: I am not a hog farmer. I am an employee of the hog farmer, but, in our operations, in some areas we could expand. In others, there are limits with the new phos regulations, and we're working to deal with those and find how to continue on sustainably.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation): Thanks for your presentation, Kurt. I was very pleased that you referenced the Clean Environment Commission, that you've read it. It sounds like you've read it at least twice. Congratulations.

In that CEC report, there were references to regional imbalances that have grown in the province as the hog industry has developed. There was also a reference that the framework that we have in place—I know we've heard a lot about whether the current rules are sufficient, but the Clean Environment Commission very clearly said that they were not and that we, as a province, needed to move to put a stronger framework in place.

I'm really pleased that you've asked about working on the rest of the recommendations. We do have a group that is working to see how we can implement the 48 recommendations from that document. What would your advice to me be if you clear said no to Bill 17? What would your advice to me be to put in place a stronger framework than we have now to deal with those parts of our province where the hog industry is clearly developed in an unbalanced way, where there have been some RMs with a lot of hog barns and some parts of our province with very little? How can we deal with that concentration? What's your advice?

Mr. Stoess: I don't deal with permitting or the development of barns personally a whole lot, but, from what I understand of the whole TRC process, you need to show where that manure's going. Those rules are already there to manage the phosphorus, to manage the nitrogen. So, in those areas where you're talking about where it's overdeveloped already, there can be no expansion under the current rules already because if you can't show where you're going to spread that phos, then that permit should be denied. Your question's kind of redundant. It's already there. I haven't reread the CEC report lately, but I believe

they talked about that, in those areas, the process is already there to take care of it. Going forward, those rules will cause natural attrition in those areas to get rid of animal units or increase land base. That'll be a natural process already.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Thank you very much, Mr. Stoess, for your presentation. You raised a good point when you raised the BSE. The Member for Lakeside, Mr. Eichler, has mentioned that already, but it hit me in a different way when you brought the issue of the BSE up.

That is, I know how much angst was placed on the cattle producers of Manitoba as well as the minister, both ministers. Members of the NDP and our side of the House all felt the angst of the decision that was made by the cattle producers and the U.S. government to close the border to cattle going south. That had a tremendous impact on that industry here in Manitoba as well.

It hit me that the same decision that's been made by the government here today in the moratorium has put the same angst now in the hog industry. It hasn't had the same impact to reduce the prices as quickly as the cattle closure on the U.S. border did, but our hog industry was already on its knees virtually because of high dollar values, high feed prices, the country-of-origin labelling that's been threatened to come in in the United States.

As a person working in the industry, I don't have to tell you how tough that's been in the last four, five, six months, if not longer. Do you see any comparison there that the decision that was made here? I know that the government wouldn't have wanted to have arbitrarily made a decision that had the same impact as the U.S. government made on the border to Canadian cattle, but, in my mind, it seems to be almost a parallel. Do you agree with that, or do you think that there's a better way of handling this situation?

Mr. Stoess: I believe your question is just for me to affirm that, from my eyes, what I see the government doing is exactly what the U.S. government did in the BSE situation and, yes, that is what I see. It's acting as judge and jury without listening to the testimony, and it's introducing life sentences which will change the Manitoba landscape forever.

Mr. Graydon: Thanks very much for a good presentation that you've made today. And you've indicated that natural attrition in certain areas that may be heavily populated right now with the hog

industry will take care of part of the problem, but you have travelled around the province or in different areas, lived in different areas of the province. Have you seen a big change in the technology and how it deals with a lot of the issues, and do you still think that there's more technology to deal with issues as they arise?

Mr. Stoess: From my personal opinion, yes, technologies win—very far already, or just the manure technology. It used to be the big gun was out in the field and just doing its thing. Hopefully, you didn't get too close to the road [*interjection*] or the wind, correct. And if you talk to the old-time farmer, he'll tell you scary stories of things that used to happen, like cars going by on the highway. How they never got sued, who knows. But that was a different world, a different climate.

Going forward, we've went from monitoring a bit or figuring out what that manure was worth as far as nitrogen, phosphorus and how the crops have uptake of that and what's left over. Phosphorus is a little hard to manage because weather can change what's left as residual more than anything else, but I won't go into those details. That's all available in the CEC report. But other technologies have seen—there's innovation of the nitrogen tester on field so you can get immediate results and they would know what they were doing, just with GPS coming along and everything. Most of that manure is already mapped out. It knows that it's supposed to apply X amount of litres per hectare—save the *Hansard* from having to change it from gallons and acres—and it's all done there already, whereas, yes, if you go back 20 years none of that was around.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Stoess, for your presentation.

Mr. Stoess: Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: We're going to go back.

Mr. Eichler: I ask leave of the committee to call presenter 123, Jacob Hofer.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Is there leave of the committee to call presenter 123? [*Agreed*]

Okay, we'll call Jacob Hofer.

Welcome, Mr. Hofer. Do you have written presentations for the committee?

Mr. Jacob Hofer (Private Citizen): A few notes, and oral.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay, proceed when you're ready, sir.

Mr. Jacob Hofer: I thank you all for giving us the opportunity to come and see you and talk with you. My name is Jacob Hofer. I am from Starlite Colony. The minister there, me and Minister Honourable Wowchuk are related. She is the Minister of Agriculture; I'm the minister of Starlite Colony, and I know what a minister has to go through on the colony. I can't imagine what you go through with this. I'm not going to repeat what I heard yesterday, but I have a few small briefs for you to take to heart.

* (11:00)

We're hard hit by surprise. We are a colony of 160 people. We ship 200—no, 400 hogs a week and, as you'll remember, there was a time when the producers lost \$50 a hog. That adds up to \$20,000 a week. We're going in the hole.

The hog industry, boy, it's got a tough time to survive. There is a colony not far from a golf course, and I don't know too many people or farmers that play golf, and I'll tell you why later. This golf course is complaining that this colony fix up their lagoon—it's a mile away—so they don't get the bad smell. I don't blame them, but the colony decided instead of fixing it up, they shut down the hog industry. That's it.

The reason why there are so few people playing golf, you've got to get the ball in a small hole, you know. The skills maybe aren't there, but the answer is very clear: The farmers are in the hole already. They don't need to put a ball in there. That's why they don't play golf, believe it or not.

I find it hard to believe that the government doesn't really know, that we have to come and tell them. They must have known before they made Bill 17. On what did they base the bill if they didn't know?

Now, you have to listen to all this for two, three days. I would have advised to go and ask the farmers first and then, if they can live with it, make the law. But we still appreciate the government, we've had a lot of good things from.

But, with us and with the hog farmers, it's this mistake which always happens to me. When I do something good, nobody remembers; when I do something wrong, nobody forgets. We have had very good success in living. The government took us in from the United States in 1918, and I've had a very

nice livelihood. We're able to live our community way of life as the Hutterites, and have had their protection. Sure, they can't hit everything, but they have done a few things. I'll just mention one.

Before Ed Schreyer got into the House, into government, they had passed a law that the Hutterite colonies are not supposed to have any land closer than 20 miles from each other's colony, and they were not allowed to buy land touching their colony land when a neighbour wanted to sell it. So we had to live by that. When Schreyer got in, he says, what's this doing here? We petitioned to him and said, we can't live with that. What can you do about it? Ed looked at it and said, are you paying your taxes? Yes. Are you complying to all the laws of Manitoba? Yes. And you can't buy land? The other farmer can buy it, and you can't? He threw that bill out the window, and we can buy land now. That's what I call a good government, and we appreciate that.

It's something which we will find hard to live with, Bill 17, and I'll just give you an example. You all own a car and it's parked in the driveway. What do you when somebody takes it away? Am I allowed to ask questions or just—you call the police and tell them somebody took my car. Now, somebody is going to take our hog industry. Who shall we call?

You're taking it away. I'm 68 years old, but we have young people coming who are ambitious to work. We want them to be productive, and we need that for their future material livelihood, not so much as for making money, but employment also, besides turkeys, chickens and laying hens. It reminds me, I just don't want you to live to hear that.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Four hundred years ago, there was persecution happening in Europe, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The Mennonites, the Holdeman and the Hutterites lived through it, and it happened from the church. The church leaders seen and went through the records and seen, hey, that wasn't right when we forced those people out of the country and persecuted them. We have to go back and correct that. They did.

In Prague, they called a meeting from the Mennonites, the Amish and the Holdeman. I seen it on a tape; I wasn't there. In one, in six words of the presentation, it was very good. There was a lot of joy; they were crying for joy and laughing, even dancing. This commentator said, at one time, we were wrong; you were right.

I hope this doesn't have to happen here, but it took 400 years. That's too long. There's too much at stake for poor little Manitoba. Just look at the little stretch, going up to Dauphin, which we have for agriculture. The southeast isn't so very rich, and we're making the most out of it. You can see it. We're crowding it in producing grain and all the other livestock and keeping it perfectly clean. We want to live right beside it.

I don't blame anybody for complaining. We have some complaints from our neighbours and we do the utmost to remedy it. We don't turn the blind ear. That good stuff, that material that we spread on the land, that's valuable organic fertilizer, everybody is realizing, and we're saving it.

We used to look for a place to get rid of it and, sometimes, maybe it was dumped where it shouldn't have been, but now—no way, you don't dump fertilizer or grain. You just use as much as you need, and we save it. Yet, the odour comes with it; that, we're trying to remedy too.

The government imposed that we should throw away all our old gas tanks and put in double-wall new tanks. Glass-lined beer vats, they were good; they're still good. They are not legal anymore. We had to spend \$40,000 to \$50,000 to comply. There is never an ending to it, and there's more coming.

This government, as I believe and as our teacher told us in school, is the best government. We have the best government in Canada, she said. This government is by the people, of the people, for the people. Can you be for us too, I plead?

Mr. Chairperson: You're at 10 minutes, sir.

Mr. Jacob Hofer: Mr. Chair, I'm finished.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, thank you. I'll open the floor up to questions then. I have Ms. Taillieu.

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): Thank you, Jacob, for your presentation. It's not difficult to see why you are the spiritual leader of your colony and the other colonies in the area.

* (11:10)

Whenever I've been to your colony, you've always been very respectful and you've always put questions to me—kind of put me on the hot seat, so to speak. I'm thinking back to the meeting we had in Morris the other day and all of the comments that were made by the presenters and the people that were talking about this at that time. At that time, you

asked me a question, and you said, why is government doing this to us? So I'd just like to ask you what you think is the real reason government is doing this.

Mr. Jacob Hofer: I'm glad you asked that, Mrs. Taillieu. You're looking for a golf ball which was shot the opposite way. When you shoot this way, you're going to look for the ball there, not up there.

The problem of Lake Winnipeg—I believe it's a big problem, and everybody that's living alongside of it and has a cottage there has a house in Winnipeg, too. I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong. Or he has a house somewhere else; he's got two houses. They are worried about the lake. I don't blame them. How come nobody is worried about when you go farther north, Lake Winnipegosis? Nobody says nothing, and all that stuff goes into Lake Winnipegosis. What's happening there? Is there a deaf ear or a blind eye?

Going back that the farmers are only 1.5 percent of the phosphorus to blame, I think it would be time for this meeting to see and admit it, that Winnipeg, Grand Forks, Fargo and all the other big towns in-between are responsible for dumping the raw sewage. It's being denied and not openly admitted, but Winnipeg, the City admitted it themselves—we need billions and billions. I don't know—it was \$4 billion—they could renovate the sewers and remedy that. Where shall we get the money from?

Does that answer your question, Mavis?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hofer. I want to congratulate you and your colony on the great job you're doing in regard to education, on your recent award at the past pork congress here held in Winnipeg.

I personally feel that we need to do more education, and I take my hat off to people like yourself showing leadership. I would certainly want to encourage that. Do you feel we need to, as government leaders, need to take more of a leadership role in educating not necessarily the rural people because I think most of them understand and grasp it, but do you think we do enough education in the urban classrooms in order to show how viable this by-product is, called manure, to the land and to the growth of our province through the economy in a natural way?

Mr. Jacob Hofer: Yes, you do need more. To educate them about the manure, I think, that's the last issue, but it's the most important issue. A lot of them

don't even know where the food comes from, and that it has to have a farm to grow, and that there is a smell with it. When you drive a team of horses—maybe none of you did, but when we had driven horses 50 years ago, you got the aroma off the horses because you were going against the wind and it all came back in your face, and you were glad to have something to ride with. Nobody complained. The horses did what they want when it came time.

Those poor children are so uneducated. They think it's the store shelf where they pick it up, and there's no stink and smell to it. We've had tours out there. They've seen a chicken lay an egg. Oh, oh, is that where an egg comes from? Yes. I would never eat another egg. Gosh. Where do they think they come from? I don't blame them. Maybe they were never told, but it is so important.

Just going back to our education on the farm, we're going up in grades, too. But I am a very strong promoter for promoting physical education, physical training, welding, anything on the farm. Be productive. Learn to drive a tractor, a truck, highway tractors. Learn to build. Learn to grow. Learn to develop, and we are.

We just came back from a pork congress. We go to Brandon, wherever there are speakers, to learn more. I wish the city would learn their teenagers more, because there's a generation growing up. The strap is out of the schoolhouse, the Lord's Prayer too, and the youngsters are uncontrollable. It won't work, and we still want to keep them under control.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this presentation has expired. I thank you for your time, Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Jacob Hofer: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: We call Nathan Baer, Airport Colony.

Lyle Peters. Darcy Pauls. Jason Falk, Hespeler Hog Farm. Mr. Adrien Grenier, but it's my understanding he'll be presenting in French on Monday.

Arian DeBekker, Morris Piglets Ltd. Garry Verhoog. Allan Steinke, R.M. of Victoria. Ken Rempel. Tom Greaves. Ron Johnston, Paradigm Farms Ltd. Lyle Loewen. Neil Cutler. Fergus Hand. Henry Holtman. Christine Waddell. We'll move on then.

Lara Forchuk. Marielle Wiebe, Reeve, R.M. of LaBroquerie. Geoffrey Downey. Kent Ledingham, Steinbach Auto Dealers. Randy Tkachyk. Keith

Rogers. Joel Grenier. Harvey Dann. Jack Hofer. Eric Klassen. Timothy Hofer, Willowcreek Colony.

Claude Lachance. Terry Hofer.

Mr. Chairperson: Your name is—

Mr. Claude Lachance (Private Citizen): Claude Lachance.

Mr. Chairperson: Claude Lachance, okay. *[inaudible]* Yes, if you have copies, please.

Welcome, Mr. Lachance. You may begin your presentation when you're ready.

Mr. LaChance: I'm Claude Lachance from Elie, Manitoba. I'm a hog farmer. I raise food to feed people. My great-grandfather homesteaded the very same land I farm. He had pigs. That's 108 years of sustainable farming. My profession is sustainable, renewable and an honourable way to make a living. Unscientific claims and assertions have been made that what I do is somehow responsible for the water problems in Manitoba.

On the news, Stan Struthers, the Conservation Minister, told a total lie. He claimed that all surplus nutrients from hog production must end up in the lakes. He implied that most hog nutrients end up in the lakes. In a more normal situation, he should have been sued for slander because that's just not right. When your own people are more interested in inflaming public opinion rather than governing, no wonder the average person has been given an incorrect assumption. We would appear to be in a bread-and-circuses situation. Well, beware the Ides of March. Sooner or later, your lies and deceits will come back to haunt you. This is totally fearmongering on the part of this government.

* (11:20)

Your own CEC commission made no such assertion. When the science did not back up your political agenda, you simply shoved the results into a back drawer and did what you were going to do anyway. Your agenda seems to be a hand-fisted attempt at coddling to a totally ill-conceived attempt at winning a few more votes in the next election. A short-sighted, desperate attempt to garner a few extra misinformed votes would seem to trump common sense and people's rights. If this committee approved a bill that blamed the lake's problems on native fishers or Jewish people or people in wheelchairs or black people, this government would be laughed off the planet. Let's not forget Jim Crow. Segregationist laws were based on almost laughable science. This

law fares little better in this ridiculous, callous, almost criminally stupid approach to a problem that may not even exist scientifically. This province, as a whole, is probably deficient in phosphorus compared to when the pioneers first broke the soil and, yes, brought some pigs with them.

Very small areas of the province have to be managed more carefully in terms of phosphorus use. That's right, use. The grain industry uses and places far more phosphorus into Manitoba soils than all the livestock industry put together. I don't see a moratorium placed on them. How about golf courses, lawns, detergents and, yes, your sewage? I'll bet the settling pond in the west end treatment centre is a lot less sustainable than anything I do.

The hog industry is sustainable. Your many other government-approved projects are not. Waverley West development is destroying 320 acres of prime agricultural land. All it will produce is more waste and a ceaseless demand for services by those who can afford \$400,000 housing. Heaven forbid they spend \$40,000 renovating a house in the North End. No problems here. Political expediency rules the roost.

The government is picking on one of the most regulated, controlled, structured and sustainable industries in the province. Somehow this ridiculous approach to destroying the people who have followed the rules has taken root in your minds. I suggest you ban cottage development, ridiculous projects like the causeway to Hecla Island, golf courses, hydro development that features wind turbines on premium farmland, hydro projects that permanently destroy Native lands to sell electricity to the U.S.A., sewage systems for every town that simply dumps waste into water courses by government decree.

I never thought I'd see people so stupid as to destroy the people who feed them. On your way to the cottage to enjoy your ridiculously fun-filled lives, pulling your massive boat behind your gas-guzzling SUV to park in your government-approved camping spot, I hope you fire up the barbecue to find it empty. You can cut out all this other ridiculous fun stuff before you tell me that what I do is unsustainable. Next time you get on that jet plane to burn precious non-renewable resources to produce nothing except fun, I hope that it finally hits home that what you do is unsustainable.

I guess until famine stocks the land, this government could not care less. Sadly, few parts of the world have the luxury of trying to destroy their farms. As somebody said better than me: They came for the Jews and I did not protest; they came for the gypsies; they came for the Jehovah Witnesses; they came for the gay people and anybody who opposed them, and I did not protest. And they came for me, a farmer who produces food, and when I'm gone, famine will stock the land.

This is unfair. I've done nothing wrong except try to feed people my entire life. Four generations of us have taken care of the land, have taken care of people. Yes, I know I've tried to make a living at it just like everybody in this room. Why are you doing this to me, my family, my children? I don't understand this. It's turned into a political football. Don't you realize you're destroying people's lives out there? And, no, we're not all big, huge, monstrous factory farms. I don't know what the negative connotation about that is anyway. You don't mind buying your cars from factories. You buy your motorboats from factories. You even buy your housing parts from factories.

There are so many other places that are not sustainable. What I do is. You've targeted a few small areas in two municipalities that have to be managed a little better. But, remember, you set up the rules and now you're changing the rules. These people who you say are no longer sustainable, they're willing to play ball. They'll just haul their manure another 10 or 15 or 20 miles. The economics of it may make them shut down these barns. Yes, there are eight million pigs being produced in Manitoba, but half of them are 10-pound isoweans, which hardly produce any manure. They're finished in the States, but that's not the point.

Where do you sit in judgment on this industry that, for the most part, has been highly successful, has followed all the rules, has met everything you've put in front of them, has done nothing but play ball? I don't understand this. Also, why is this even a Conservation issue? This is an agricultural issue, and it's about meeting rules, about meeting parameters and doing at the end of the day what's best for the public good, but you are wrecking people's lives out there.

What's my 25-year-old son going to do? I don't know if he has a future anymore. In an area where Cartier municipality has about, I think, 15 enterprises like mine on 172,000 acres, the grain farmers beg me

for my phosphorus. I've got a list a mile long for the phosphorus that I generate. They love the product. It's sustainable. It's renewable. I guess we should be burying up the landscape using petroleum non-renewable products. This, if anything's sustainable, it's always been the mixture of livestock, grain farming and food production.

I think this whole industry's been skewed by people and tar and feathering an industry that has really played ball. And, yes, I take it personally. Who wouldn't? You know, it's my living and it's what I've done and somehow we've been labelled as the bad people here. I don't think we are. I think anybody who's spent their lives producing food should be a good guy. We should be kind of, like, thanked a little bit and maybe at least left alone to follow the rules. Like, that's all we're asking here. A blanket moratorium is not called for. Yes, regulations because that's what governments do. Regulations are liveable. An absolute flat out no—I never thought I'd see a government do this. You say yes to many, many other projects that I think are questionable and simply fall into the fun-filled category.

Somewhere in Europe, somewhere in the Middle East and somewhere in Africa they know that the fun doesn't count, it's the food on the plate. Two-thirds of the people in the world don't have that luxury, but I guess here—and I don't know, maybe we do, for awhile, anyway. But you know, I'm just appealing to this whole committee to take a step back and ask yourself what you're doing here to people like me and my family. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Lachance. I have Ms. Taillieu.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much, Mr. Lachance, for your very passionate and, actually, very common-sense presentation today. I can feel that you are very passionate about this issue because it affects your livelihood and it isn't fair.

There are over 1.1 million people in this province and, I think, a lot of industries that contribute to the environment in negative and positive ways. Certainly, the Premier has actually said before that, with 1.1 million people in this province, it is a responsibility of 1.1 million people to look after the environment.

So now it's not fair to shift this all onto a segment of our economy, and a very important part of our economy, to simply create the illusion of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg where, in fact, as we've

heard from previous presenters, there's no science to support that, and, in fact, it's just not going to happen that way.

Do you see, and I think that you do from your presentation, that governments are, as you say, politically motivated to do this to secure their vote base rather than do what's right for all of Manitoba?

Mr. Lachance: Well, I really think that a more fair approach—the government is totally in charge of how cities and towns handle their sewage. I drive by the Elie lagoon and second stage is drained into the LaSalle twice a year. That would be a \$50,000 fine for me. There's no reason why that can't be irrigated on some of that premium farmland, the clay. That would grab ahold of that phosphorus and produce a crop and perhaps a teeny, tiny amount of it might get to the water source. Right now, I know it all gets there, every last bit of it.

*(11:30)

This filter of growing a crop, a hay crop, a grain crop, or any other crop is totally necessary to intercept these nutrients. They found in the Deerwood Wildlife Management zone that the phosphorus coming off that cute little 40-acre streak of riparian along the stream sheds far more phosphorus than the cultivated field above it, because the cultivated fields are a negative phosphorus situation. Land that's in a negative situation grabs the phosphorus as it becomes available during the spring melt, after the minus-30 rupturing of the cell membranes. The phosphorus is coming off the riparian zones. Some of what people thought was the correct approach to fixing this problem turns out to be totally false.

We have to sit back and come up with an answer, not just slam dunk little parts of the industry because most people don't really know what's going on out there. This little study out of Deerwood Wildlife Management zone is an interesting one. It shows that, perhaps, some methods of farming are much friendlier to the environment than others that simply appear to be friendly to the environment. I think if you really want to fix this problem, you have to separate the difference between appearances and fact.

Yes, in Rhineland and Hanover, there are some areas that have too much phosphorus in the soil. This should be harvested, not banned. Harvested. If you harvest that hay crop off those beef pastures that have too much phosphorus for 10 years, there won't

be a problem, and they could spread perhaps a small amount. But that's in your regulations today. Nobody can spread manure where there's an excess situation.

But how come other parts of this process get a free ride? I don't understand this narrow focus on my industry. The grain farmer right across the road from me has no problems with this. There are far far more tons of fertilizer, of phosphorus showing up on his fields, and he doesn't have to answer to anybody whatsoever.

Has anybody measured the phosphorus coming off those city and town lagoons? Go to the West End treatment plant in St. James. The water in the Assiniboine can't even freeze there where it enters the bridge at the West End Perimeter. Has anybody measured the phosphorus coming off that thing?

You're banning winter spreading of hog manure. Well, you better ban winter spreading of sewage sludge. To me, it's all part of the same problem. If the logic meter stops here, it can't just proceed over here. If 1.1 million people are part of the problem, then 1.1 million people have to work together to solve it, but what you're doing right now, it would be like bringing a bulldozer to Waverley West. Go for it and see what kind of reaction you get. They don't need that. That's just luxury housing. Why not sock it to them? Why not stop that dead in its tracks, half built? You're stopping me dead in my tracks. Why not stop them? They produce pollution. They produce issues. They produce problems. Why don't you put a complete ban on all housing?

How about cottages? That's just fun. Nobody really needs them. You're nothing but a conflict with the native entitlements on that one. Why not totally kick these guys out of all their cottages and stop all that conflict? See, but we don't do that, but that's all part of the problem. I don't see them participating in the solution, not yet. Why so harsh on my industry?

I know it sounds like a stuck record but, you know, I produce something that's irreplaceable: food. If there're a couple of molecules of phosphorus that end up causing problems, you know what? I produce something you can't cut out of your budget. Just ask people in Africa about that one. You can cut other stuff out. You can economize in a lot of other areas, and, yes, you could stop other sources of phosphorus pollution before you cut out the food on your plate because now you're going to be in big trouble over that one. It's called food riots in Mexico. What is it? Argentina banned the exporting of wheat because people were hungry. The Ukraine banned exporting

of wheat because people were hungry. There's something that we just don't appreciate here about that fact. Yeah, if farming does cause some of that pollution, I think, in a funny way, we should be the last ones to pay the price because we're producing that one commodity you just got to have.

You don't need that big car in the driveway. You don't need this. You don't need that. You don't need your bi-annual vacation. You do need food, and it has never sunk in because we've never known hunger. We're fat and sassy. But, you know, you talk to my mother-in-law who remembers Europe, who was physically hungry. I had a Dutch immigrant working for me 20 years ago who went through World War II when he was 12 years old. He can tell you about hunger and the psychological impact it has on your thinking.

We're biting the hand that feeds us here. I honestly think we should almost be given a break. We're not asking for a break; we're asking for equal treatment. Nobody else is being shut down. We're asking for equal treatment here, not special privileges. You know what? If you talk to this Mr. Bill VanMurlow, who's sadly getting on in years, he'd tell you about hunger. There are not enough people like that around here anymore, are there?

This, for the most part, been a good successful industry. If the economics dictate that I have to haul manure 15 miles because of the phosphorous load, I'm done anyway. I can't meet the regulations; I can't meet the rules.

If the real problem is excess phosphorus in one area, then that area is saturated with this industry. You can say that about a lot of other industries, can't you? You can go to Grand Rapids and check out the flooding. That's kind of a saturated industry, pardon the pun.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Lachance, your time has run out a few minutes ago. I thank you very much. I had other people who wanted to put questions, but—

Mr. Lachance: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: All right then. Appreciate it.

Mr. Terry Hofer. Dwayne Hofer. Andy Gross. Tom Crockatt. Gordie Dehnn. Cindy Vandebossche. Michael Hofer. Edward Stahl. Kelvin Waldner. Dennis Kornelson. Kurt Stoess.

Richard Taillefer. Mr. Taillefer, do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Richard Taillefer (Private Citizen): No, just a few notes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may proceed.

Mr. Taillefer: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak here.

I'm just talking on behalf of my influence and my little town. I come from La Broquerie, Manitoba. Just to give you background, my mom and dad were born and raised in La Broquerie. I have six brothers and sisters born and raised in La Broquerie; everyone is still living in La Broquerie. Four of them are directly employed by the hog industry; the other two are employed indirectly—carpentry in the local town and working at the local school.

For my personal life, I've been married for 24 years; I have three children, two attending university in Winnipeg and one working for the hog industry. I just want to say I'm thankful for a good paying job to support my two children that do attend university. I was born and raised in La Broquerie too. I still live there and I'll guarantee that I'll die there.

Just the impact on a small town for the hog industry, for what it brought to La Broquerie, Manitoba, is, for example, the Co-op, lumber yard, restaurants, golf course, schools, hockey and baseball programs, et cetera.

Our town grew and all that. I was there right—like I said, born and raised. I've seen the progress for the last 15 years, I would say; maybe it's not all contributed to the hog industry, but a big portion of it, for sure.

I would like to say, too, that I'm very proud that I do work for an industry which does feed the world, if it's meat, or manure spread on the croplands so we can have better harvests, so we can feed more people. I think, and so I think that's all, what I say. So thank you very much.

* (11:40)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Taillefer.

I'll open the floor to questions. I have Mr. Eichler and Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Richard, for your presentation.

It's interesting the responses we've had, and you hit on a couple of them. We've seen the growth in small-town rural Manitoba as a result of the hog industry. In fact, we're just in the process of a

boundary change within the constituencies, and when you look at the map of the province of Manitoba, it's really interesting when you look at where the hog barns are and where the growth is. Your points are bang on when you talk about the town of La Broquerie and some of the other areas where there are hog barns, and they have the opportunity to get the golf courses, the lumber yards that you referred to. My concern is, if Bill 17 passes in its current state, a lot of those services will be gone. First, you start with your schools because of declining population because you lose jobs, you lose people. So I think you're right on there.

Do you feel that, if it wasn't for the hog industry, you probably wouldn't be located in La Broquerie today?

Mr. Taillefer: I can't say 100 percent for sure, but it's sure been a big impact and influence that, yes. Probably I would stay there because I'm a family-oriented person, and my dad and mom are still living in town, and all my brothers and sisters. But, even though it gives me a chance of having a well-paid job in the industry and all that, so.

Mr. Eichler: Just a supplementary, Richard. In regard to the employer, how many employees are involved in the company you work with?

Mr. Taillefer: Today the company I work for includes 500 people, directly in the hog industry. After that we can't put a number on the offspring or whatever, everything else, like the restaurants and all that, so.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Richard, for making the presentation today.

In your presentation you said you were a family-orientated individual and that you would have probably stayed somewhere in the La Broquerie-Marchand area, if at all possible. Because I have a fairly good working knowledge of that area, the only other industry that would have been available would have been the logging industry. Basically, that's what is there, and we all know that the logging industry has had some terrible cycles as well.

Today, because of the livestock, and it's not just in the La Broquerie area, it's not just hogs. There's a big contingency of dairy farms there as well. They're well-managed large farms. Actually, 65 percent of the dairy industry in Manitoba is situated in two of the municipalities that are under the moratorium. However, the hog industry was singled out probably because—and the question has been asked a number

of times: why have they focussed on one industry? Because it's so terribly identifiable. It's so identifiable by its unique odour. The dairy industry, however, doesn't have the same odour, although they have the same effluent. The storage facilities are the same. The regulations for applying are the same.

In your area, what would the impact be if the dairies were faced with a moratorium the same as the hog industry?

Mr. Taillefer: The impact would be huge because it is a big industry for us, too, is the cattle, I guess. Because, like I was saying, it influences all the local businesses and all that, and definitely it brings a lot of immigrants, I guess, in the region, and all that. So the more people, the better it is for our schooling and everything else. But it would be a huge impact, for sure, if they would do the same thing.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Mr. Graydon, supplemental?

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Taillefer, if we were to lose either one of those industries, and because you said you were family-orientated, that your mom and dad are there, your brothers, your sisters, your nieces and nephews, where will your children be? If you lose one of those industries, will your children be able to stay there?

Mr. Taillefer: No. If they do choose to live in La Broquerie, it would be an hour drive to come to work to Winnipeg, I would assume, or in the Steinbach area. But Steinbach definitely has some issues for employment and all that, too, so they would have to drive to Winnipeg, which it would be an hour drive, morning, back and forth. So I would assume that they would move to Winnipeg for sure if they don't have a job locally.

Mr. Stuart Briese (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Taillefer, for your presentation. I recall a number of years ago, probably 15 to 20 years ago, a former reeve of your municipality telling me—John Giesbrecht—that one of the goals they set in that municipality was to triple the assessment base in that municipality over the next 10 to 12 years. That's an awfully ambitious goal. I know how assessments work in municipalities quite well, and they accomplished that. I think that says an awful lot for the area, that while many of our municipalities were seeing very low increases in assessment, they tripled their assessment base. I don't know whether I can emphasize that enough.

But what I'm just wondering about, I understand you are involved in the industry. Where, particularly? Like, what do you actually do in the industry?

Mr. Taillefer: My role in the company is that I am director of the sow units and nursery, so I do oversee 60,000 sows all over Manitoba-Saskatchewan, and then nurseries according to the sow barns.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much for your presentation, Richard. I just want to pick up on where the MLA for Emerson (Mr. Graydon) is going. The MLA for Emerson is a pretty decent guy, but I don't want him to leave on the record any doubts about Bill 17 and its connection to the dairy industry.

As the member has pointed out, there are some similarities, but I want to make a couple of very key differences between the two. The dairy industry over the years has operated under a quota system which does place limits on the kind of growth that you can see in the dairy industry. That doesn't exist on the hog side. In 1990, there were 3,150 hog farms in Manitoba with a total of 3.2 million hogs. In '07 the number of barns had decreased to 1,280 with 8.8 million hogs. That's a big amount of growth.

Now, I don't want to leave the impression that we shouldn't grow an industry, but we need to understand that the difference is that there were no restrictions on that growth, as was the case in the dairy industry. Much of that growth has taken place in your part of the world. What kind of advice would you give to this minister if you're not in favour of Bill 17? What kind of advice would you give to me in terms of how we manage the environment, how we manage to protect the water? What restrictions, if any, do you see we need in terms of the hog industry without dragging other industries into this, because, on the one hand people say we're singling out the hog industry with Bill 17, and then they try to connect everything else that's going on in rural Manitoba.

What advice would you be giving me in terms of any kind of management in terms of water protection?

Mr. Taillefer: Definitely, I think there is some ruling and some regulations out there, and I'm positive that our company is following all the regulations and all that. The regulations in place mean that we're not polluting or whatever, and we're utilizing all the manure that is applied to the land.

So, if we do have excess or whatever, then, yes, it is an issue, and I'm sure we can look at it, or whatever.

* (11:50)

Mr. Struthers: Yeah, I mean, even Manitoba Pork has approached me saying that they're responsible for part of this. They claim 1.5 percent; others say that's inaccurate and it's some number higher. Whatever that number is, I don't think anybody wants to come forward and say the hog industry isn't contributing, at least I think. The Clean Environment Commission has very clearly said to me the framework that's in place, the rules that are there now aren't strong enough. Now, that's clear what the Clean Environment has told us. You don't want us to go to a moratorium. Where do I go in-between?

Mr. Taillefer: That's a difficult question, I guess.

Mr. Struthers: I know. That's why I'm asking it.

Mr. Taillefer: Like for myself, I'm speaking, I guess, what impact it did for my personal life, the hog industry and all that. And we have the proper people to deal with issues of expanding and manure spreading and all that. So, for myself, I'm not involved that much in those decisions that you were asking for.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Taillefer. I see our time has expired, so thank you very much for your presentation.

It's my understanding that Mr. Jason Falk, No. 27, is in the room. Is it the will of the committee to allow Mr. Falk to present since we've called his name already? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Falk, do you have a written copy of your presentation?

Mr. Jason Falk (Hespeler Hog Farms): I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, proceed when ready.

Mr. Falk: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Jason Falk. I am from Niverville. I represent Hespeler Hog Farms. I am 31 years old, am a father of four, and have been farming full time ever since I graduated from college 10 years ago. I've grown up on a farm and I'm well-versed in its daily operations and management practices, which include good, safe environmental practices.

My love for the farm is only outdone by my love for my family and my faith. Holistically there is no occupation that can challenge one more greatly physically, mentally, emotionally or spiritually. Hard

work and the need to trust God make farming an incredible way to raise and teach a family. I'm deeply saddened that I must stand here today to defend my great heritage to preserve our present situation and to fight for my children's future.

If it was not for the hog expansion, I would not have stayed in farming at all. Diversification on our family farm is what has allowed it to succeed over the years. Hog expansion is what has kept my family clothed and fed. Now our government is removing that option from us. Our ability to adapt and to grow will be severely restricted if the option of hog expansion which the current legislation, I might add, already regulates very well, is stolen from us.

There are two major problems that my farm in particular will face in the next few years if this legislation is forced through. Let me start with the issue of fertilizer. The cost of fertilizer, as you all well know, continues to rise rapidly, and the environmental cost of producing that fertilizer is also rising. Manure that my hogs create not only saves the environment by not needing to produce that fertilizer, but reduces my input costs allowing me to be much more competitive, which also allows me to create cheaper food for you to eat. The manure that my hogs created last year was valued at \$122,156, and those are numbers I received on June 5, just a couple of days ago. That is just from my hog operation of 1,300 animal waste units.

Hog manure is not a liability or a danger as your non-scientific ways suggest. It may soon be the reason why crop farms in our area have any chance of success at all.

The other major problem I foresee is one of amalgamation. I'm involved in two farms that essentially belong to the same family. One has aging livestock facilities and infrastructure that, in the near future, will need upgrading and improvements to meet the already strict environmental rules that govern the process. The other is a well-established site with excellent infrastructure. The idea of amalgamating the two sites interests me greatly as it would not only dispose of dilapidating buildings, but also take advantage of current up-to-date infrastructure that already exists, thereby again reducing my input costs significantly. Equally beneficial, the up-to-date site has no residences within two-thirds of a mile and no non-agricultural residences for a full mile. The old site has 10 residences within that same two-thirds of a mile, of which seven are non-agricultural. By passing this

bill, I'm not allowing expansion. You will force us to maintain these old facilities much closer to rural residences.

We are, in every way, wanting to sustain our environment. We want to use our natural manure rather than man-made fertilizer. We incorporate all the manure to ensure there is no run-off. We want to combine our facilities so as to be less disruptive to our neighbours. We even recycle every possible thing at the site that we can.

I said I had two major problems, but I guess I have a third. Like I said earlier, I have four children and, at this point, all under the age of five. They are not asking me questions about the government and their decisions and the processes but, when they are old enough, what do you suppose I am to tell them about what we are doing today?

I'd like to say that our government did some scientific research and followed through with those logical conclusions, but I can't. I'd like to say our government acted responsibly, basing their decisions on facts and not simply on what would potentially get them the most votes, but I don't think I can.

You make my job, as a parent, very difficult. While I want to teach my children to make well-educated decisions, based on good science, you thumb your nose at that science and make your decisions based on what appears to be personal whim. I want to teach them to be brave and choose what is right, even if it is not popular. You act cowardly as you blame hog farmers for pollution that is created by a much more and larger influential population.

As our leaders, you are setting an example with very dangerous ramifications. If our leaders can make irrational decisions, then why can't the rest of us? Furthermore, if our leaders are willing to sacrifice the hog industry without just cause, what industry is next? No industry is safe.

The bottom line you will be sending to the public, if you follow through with this bill, is that this government can't be trusted. If I'm not mistaken, people who can't be trusted can't get votes either.

For the sake of my farm, my family and my ability to raise children before good leaders, please kill this bill. There is time to save your integrity. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Falk. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Mr. Falk. You had talked about putting your manure back onto your land and how sustainable that was for your operation. Are you at a position where you have enough land to spread your effluent on, or are you at the maximum level now?

Mr. Falk: No, we have room—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Falk.

Mr. Falk: We have room. We all have our manure spread on our own land. At this point, we have no need for land outside of our own.

Mr. Eichler: So you do the soil test and you do an injection application as well?

Mr. Falk: We actually have a third company that takes care of all of that for us, a professional company which does all the soil tests, all the analysis, which got me the numbers on what the value of this manure is. They take care of all of that for us. They're very professional and very good at what they do.

Mr. Eichler: We had a presentation earlier and they based their presentation on how we handled the BSE crisis in 2003, and asked that the world accept science, technology based on science and not just politics. We use that when we try and negotiate.

Do you feel that the government is basing their decision on science, or whether on politics?

Mr. Falk: I believe the government could answer that one better than I could—[interjection]—but I will say, in my opinion, it's political.

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Falk, because I didn't hear your total presentation, what I would like to ask you—because, at the end of your presentation, you said it was to raise your family, the ability to raise your family.

* (12:00)

I know that, in your industry, there's a large capital investment. I know that you specialize. In the hog industry, you have to understand that particular part of agriculture. I'm sure that, when you said your family and the family operation, you would like to see that operation carried on by your family and give your family the opportunity—your kids—the opportunity to carry that forward, it'll be you that's teaching those kids how to carry that forward and that knowledge.

If they don't have that opportunity, where do you expect to go and see your grandkids?

Mr. Falk: I have no doubt my children are brilliant. Even though they're all under five, I can see that already, as every parent usually does. The sky is the limit, but I don't want to take the opportunity of farming away from them.

I, myself, am a college graduate. I graduated with high honours. I could be doing many things, but I see that agriculture, hogs being part of that, because of the sustainability and the diversity, it's just an incredible way to raise a family. I could do many other things, and I've been asked to do many other things, but I choose not to because my family's more important than the money. I want to give them the opportunity to make that same choice.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Falk: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to return to presenter No. 34, Allan Steinke? [Agreed]

Mr. Steinke. Is he in the room? He is.

Do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Allen Steinke (R.M. of Victoria): Some notes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Steinke, the floor is yours.

Mr. Steinke: Just for a matter of introduction, my name is Allen Steinke. I'm from Holland, Manitoba. I am the reeve of the Rural Municipality of Victoria, and I also chair the South Central Planning District board. I thank you and the committee for allowing me to speak today, and I will be speaking against Bill 17. I've provided you with a number of notes, and it's the reasons for which I want to speak against this bill.

Many of them are probably reasons you've already heard, and I will sort of reiterate some of them for your committee.

I think Bill 17 is discriminatory. It's based on emotion. It's political and it's not science-based. It will not result in any immediate improvement to Lake Winnipeg water quality, but it will result in destruction of many family farms in the Red River Valley and in the Interlake district. It's a little bit like the not-in-my-backyard syndrome policy, I think. We all recognize that it would've been great to have a new hog processing plant in and around the city of

Winnipeg, but not in my backyard; you can't have it here. I think we have the same kind of a policy applying here. We've identified one small sector and said, you guys are environmentally polluters, you are bad people, and we're going to create a situation where we're not going to allow you to do business as you normally want to.

I had the opportunity of travelling on the *Namao*, I think it's called, on the Lake Winnipeg research boat, and the member of that Lake Winnipeg Research Consortium water study group pointed out that the problem is multi-faceted and it's not a result of any single entity. We all have a responsibility. We all have to take some ownership. However, the government of today seems to think that it's the Manitoba hog producer and, in particular, the ones living in the Red River Valley are, quote, unquote, the environmental polluters. That, I think, is wrong.

I know there was a question asked by a committee member. I, at one time, used to work for the Province of Manitoba and was quite involved in the BSE ad hoc compensation program. I very clearly remember Minister Wowchuk, Premier Doer, very emphatically announce that Manitoba and Canada were being very unfairly treated by the U.S. government for taking a position, that it was a—and it really was an emotional situation and a political situation. The science-based information was, and showed, that BSE was not going to impact or have a cause of concern in the U.S. country, yet they saw fit to close our border.

We're kind of doing the same kind of thing, I think, with Bill 17. We're saying, you know, hogs aren't bad but we really don't want you in and around the city of Winnipeg, in the Red River Valley, because you are environmental polluters. I think that's wrong. The science does not show that this is the case, and citing the hog industry as the main reason for water quality problems is also wrong. It's like cutting off a perennial thief's finger, just the one finger, and that's going to stop him from stealing. That doesn't prevent him using the other three fingers and his thumbs to still pick your pocket.

So, to come out and say that, guess what, it's pigs that are causing problem, so, if you can get pigs away from the Red River Valley, out of the Interlake, we're going to solve the Lake Winnipeg water quality issues. As I said earlier, Lake Winnipeg water study group is saying that it is multifaceted. There are a number of reasons. We have a situation,

and I think we have to look at all of them together, not individually.

If the government, however, feels very strongly that a moratorium is needed to resolve water-quality problems, then we should maybe also take a further look at housing development in the city of Winnipeg, West St. Paul, East St. Paul and St. Andrews. Until such time that those centres have water treatment facilities large enough and functioning to prevent further dumping of raw sewage in the Red River, then perhaps we should be looking at something like that as well.

To allow Waverley West, to allow continued growth in the municipalities north of Winnipeg, a number of friends that we have that have cottages in and along Winnipeg Beach, Gimli area, they have black water sewage systems, yet their grey water just goes down the ditch and into Lake Winnipeg. They don't see any problem with that. What's wrong with a little bit of soap in the water that's going out? It doesn't contain any fecal material or anything else, but the soaps are what carries a lot of the phosphate issue.

What happens if a large number of these hog producers in the restricted area want to now relocate outside the so-called closed area? We'd love to have them out in our western part of the province, in our municipality because it's an economic benefit to us, but does the government then of the day re-evaluate and extend the area? As you move out from another area, concentrate, is it going to do the same thing? Really, if the intent is to destroy the industry in Manitoba, then just say so. Like, 10, 15 years ago the government was very strong in saying, expand the hog industry. If today the government of the day wants to say kill it, then just say so. I think people can make business decisions.

Manitoba hog producers and, in fact, all farmers in general are aware of the issue of water quality. They have been proactive and have begun to change their farming practices long before the government actually got involved. I think the economics of the day dictate that. To implement this legislation is a slap in the face. Give Manitoba farmers some credit for having a little intelligence and that they are valued stewards of the land and the water.

We as municipal leaders always want to create fair and unbiased land use policies in our municipalities and planning districts. We base our decisions on technical reviews, in other words on

science, and not emotion. Why then are we introducing Bill 17?

The Clean Environment Commission review of the hog industry and the subsequent report do not support an extension to the hog moratorium. The science, in other words, does not support this bill. Not one of the 42 recommendations states an extension to the moratorium. Yet, that's exactly what we're dealing with today. I was a little concerned and, I guess, amazed that the minister of environment—and the minister is here—made a fairly, I think, a very absurd statement on TV. I know you can't control what's edited and what's going to be displayed or published on television, but it leaves many urban residents, especially in Winnipeg and urban centres who are not aware really of all the manure management regulations—I can't quote the statement exactly, but what was presented on TV was that Minister Struthers said, well, we have to proceed with Bill 17 because all the hog waste will just end up getting dumped in the Red River in excess.

* (12:10)

Well, yeah, if your manure management plan says you can only put on 2,000 gallons per acre and you put 3,000 gallons on, there is a chance that the in-excess amount could end up there, but it leaves the impression that, if I were a city of Winnipeg resident, I'd say, well, once the pig poos, the shovel is out and it gets dumped into the Red River. Wrong, wrong picture completely, but this is what farmers are dealing with all the time. In fact, there are no direct pipelines from manure storage units in the Red River Valley, but can the city of Winnipeg claim the same? We know that millions of gallons of sewage occasionally ends up out of the city of Winnipeg lift stations and goes directly in the Red River and into Lake Winnipeg.

In closing, I would strongly recommend Premier Doer and the minister to stop Bill 17. The bill is discriminatory by identifying only one industry. We need all stakeholders to share in the responsibility to clean up Lake Winnipeg. Singling out one entity is wrong. It leaves the impression that this will resolve the problem when, in fact, the hog industry only contributes a very small portion. The science does not support the bill. Allow the Clean Environment Commission report to direct what needs to be done.

The farmers are prepared to work together with the government and not against the government. I guess farmers, in general, and we as municipal

leaders want to work with you as well. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Steinke. I open the floor to questions.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Mr. Steinke, for your presentation, very logical and common sense.

You referenced Minister Struthers' comments in regard to the hog waste going straight into our rivers. I think that what we have here is a bit of a fearmongering situation where you're telling people that pigs are dirty, water is clean, and if we don't get rid of the hogs, then we're going to have a big problem.

That's just, to me, an easy message to get out to the public, but it's laziness on the part of the government to not actually look at the problem and address the problem piece by piece, instead of just blanketing a moratorium. You know, I think of the analogy, if there was a restaurant that had some issues with food preparation, would it make sense to shut down every restaurant in the province forever? No. I think you look at the problem and you go and you help that particular restaurant do what they need to do to become compliant.

But I just see this as a real lazy approach to cleaning up an issue that is really everybody's responsibility. I just ask you to comment on that.

Mr. Steinke: My comment, I guess, to that, Mrs. Taillieu, is that I agree with what you're saying and what your sentiments are. The science is there to show that there is an issue, and I don't think any farmer nor any politician is going to refute that. I think the way we're trying to resolve this issue is by doing it piecemeal and leaving the impression with other residents, especially in the city of Winnipeg and north of Winnipeg and even south of Winnipeg, that, well, if you take away the hog problem, then we're really going to solve a lot of the issue, and we're okay for another five or 10 years. The City of Winnipeg doesn't really need to spend \$10 billion on trying to improve or increase or enhance or even retrofit their waste-water treatment system, that things are fine the way we are by just doing a little bit.

But there are more than just hog farmers in the Interlake and Red River Valley. Are they ultimately going to get labelled as well? It's going to be very hard for a hog producer in the moratorium area to go to a bank and say, well, I do want to finance so that I can enhance or better my manure management

system, my facility, to meet the guidelines, but the bank is going to look at a hog farmer in the moratorium area like someone who's trying to get rid of an old gas station. The environmental implications are so great that the bank is going say, we're not getting involved here. Then what do you do? Do you just walk away? I think that's wrong.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Allen, for your comments. A couple of things, first of all, I'm really glad you're part of the South Central Planning District. I think that's a good approach, and I'm glad that you're involved with that.

Second of all, I was really pleased that you mentioned the *Namao*. I've been on the *Namao* and I've talked with the scientists on the *Namao*, as I know you have. Dr. Al Kristofferson said to me, quite clearly, exactly what you said in your statement, that we need to have a comprehensive approach. If we're going to solve the problem, we can't just single out farmers. We can't just single out cottages. We can't just single out municipalities. We can't just single out septic fields. We have to have a broad comprehensive plan. Dr. Kristofferson was very clear about that and so were the people at the Faculty of Environment at the University of Manitoba, who may believe their science is correct over the Department of Agriculture's science. So what's a poor Conservation Minister like me to do when you get all these very smart doctors, one saying their science is better than the other, and getting into these scientific battles?

I understand your point about basing this on science. But you are on the very same *Namao*, the very same research ship that I was when we were both told that there's science on the other side of the issue, too. So we have to be sure that when we look at this we just don't look at the science that fits into our own ideology, which is what I see happening.

The other thing is I will take you up on the statement about absurd statements made by the Minister of the Environment. I'm not going to hide behind the media. I'm not going to blame it on them. I didn't see what they quoted me on so I don't know if it was accurate or not, but let's assume it was. The discussion was about the excess, and even Manitoba Pork says there's an excess of 1.5 percent. That's their number. That is an excess amount. That's what we were talking about. I was being honest in saying that there is something we have to deal with here. Even Manitoba Pork says we need to deal with this. They disagree on where we're going on it, but there's

no question that there's an excess amount, and that that excess amount can get into lakes, rivers, streams and eventually into Lake Winnipeg. Manitoba Pork, as we agreed before, Dr. Kristofferson, on the *Namao* says they need to be part of this.

Mr. Chairperson: Put your question, Mr. Minister. The clock is ticking.

Mr. Struthers: I heard myself one time also say that farmers should get credit for the environmental good decisions they make. When you hear that again in the news, will you come back and tell me that I was quoted accurately on that, just as you did with the absurd statement?

Mr. Steinke: I will do that, Mr. Minister, but to just comment on your comment, I guess, a couple of things. I think Bill 17 is not going to accommodate what you're trying to accommodate, and that's to try to clean up Lake Winnipeg. I think the message that has to come out to all Manitobans and to the U.S. and to Saskatchewan and to Alberta, is to look in the mirror and say, what can I do to help, not the other way around, and say, well, hog farmers are bad, you're doing it wrong. I think the science is there that there's an issue. I think Dr. Kristofferson was very clear, when I was there, saying—because there were other parties there and everybody was saying, it's your fault, your fault. Really, what we have to do is quit pointing fingers and just get down and get the job done.

I think farmers in Manitoba, whether they're hog producers, dairy producers or poultry producers, are all prepared to work with you if you're prepared to work with them. Thank you very much.

* (12:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Steinke. I want to offer a little bit of advice here. We don't have too much time, quite often, for questions and answers so, if we can try and keep them brief, we'll have a greater opportunity for more people to participate. Just as an example, I had a presenter not too long ago that took seven minutes to answer a question, and that's unfair to other members of the committee who want to put questions.

Now, we're over time on this particular presentation, but I am going to allow the critic to put one brief question.

Mr. Eichler. And I'll be monitoring how brief it is.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for the advice. I do take it very seriously and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

My question is very quick. Do you have the necessary tools in your municipality, in your planning district in order to make decisions whether or not a hog barn should or should not be built in your area?

Mr. Steinke: Yes, we do. Based on technical reviews, the science that we're provided, we can make a good sound decision.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Steinke, and thank you for your presentation.

Is it the will of the committee to return to presenter No. 3, Sieg Peters? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: I do have a substitution: Flor Marcelino in for Doug Martindale.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Peters, are you present? Oh, there he is.

Do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Sieg Peters (Private Citizen): I do, that I could leave you, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin when you are ready.

Mr. Peters: Good morning. My name is Sieg Peters. I'm from the Randolph area. I don't usually go out and make speeches so I am in foreign territory here. I am pleased to be here and I thank you for the opportunity. I have spoken out at the CEO when the Clean Environment Commission was out and I thought that was going to be the last time we were going to deal with the issue, so I am rather disappointed that this is still a continuing issue and I think there is a lot of misunderstanding. There's a lot of hype and I can just literally cry, often. I just sit back and I can't explain it in words. I've been farming since '65 and yes, I'm deeply disappointed into what's happening.

I farm together with my brother and myself and then I have a son and a nephew, my brother's son, who are involved in the farm. We grain farm and we've had dairy for a long time and now, the last 10 years, we've been in hogs. I think it's unfortunate that the urban people are being influenced by various

people. They're being told how nice it was in the past that we had these small little farms and how great it was and then we use the word "mega" nowadays. It's a totally misused word. They use it for mega barns. I think about it like if maybe the urbanites—it would be nice if they could all work in a 7-Eleven store as well, right. I mean those would be small little corner stores but if you really ask them they would say, well, no, I couldn't make a living doing that. I would only get \$7, \$8, \$9 an hour and that wouldn't be sufficient, and so we have to work for larger corporations, larger grocery stores.

Most of us don't buy our stuff in the 7-Elevens, and why not? They're actually the little stores, but, somehow, we go to the bigger ones. I'm not opposed to them, but I think urbanites, you know, see us in an incorrect light. I'm very disappointed that we're going to continue a ban. The word "ban" means—is very negative, it's a very negative tone. We were stopped from expanding already many years ago, because, if you need a sufficient amount of land for your barns, there are rules in place now to take care of all expansion, if expansion should not happen.

I come from a municipality which is often cited—Hanover—where there are quite a few barns. At the same time, there's still a lot of fertilizer being put on the soil, so there is more than enough land to put the manure on. It may not be in the right places so, while I agree that there probably are some areas that have more manure than needed, there are still other areas that don't have enough yet.

That's one isolated municipality. When we're talking about the ban and the rest of the area, we're talking about a totally different area, where there's lots of land available. We're going to put a ban on it.

A ban is very negative and that's going to come back to haunt us in later years. It's a negative term and it does not do the industry any good at all. We're doing this and the urbanites think, with this, we have made a good attempt at starting to clean up Lake Winnipeg. That's very unfortunate, because science would not say that this was the most important thing to do in order to clean up Lake Winnipeg.

I'm not suggesting here that we aren't one very tiny—could be a tiny source of that, but it's very unfortunate that people now will think that the Winnipeg lake is going to be cleaned up, because there's a ban on hogs. I think it's unfortunate that urbanites could be driving the farm policies in the future. You might want to do this in order to win elections. I think that's rather unfortunate.

Again, I can go home; I can cry all the way home. I realize what I'm saying here may not make any difference and that's very unfortunate, very sad. I can go home and cry, and you can say I can just continue my farming. I can for awhile but, someday, we will be out of luck, because I won't be able to make the changes required because, usually, when you make a change, you always get a little bit bigger in order to take up efficiencies that come along.

These things won't matter to us tomorrow, or a month from now, or a year from now, but it will matter in a few years from now because, normally, when a grocery store expands, wants to become more mechanized, they always get a little bit bigger.

When you build tractors—it doesn't matter what you do in the industry. If you want to become more efficient and you want to bring in more machinery, you get a little bit bigger. That's one of the things, essentially. It will be essential in the future and that's something that won't be able to happen, if what we're talking about here goes through.

I understand it's almost a done deal. That's why I will continue to be very sad. On this note—and I hope you guys are more optimistic than I am—but I feel totally defeated and totally saddened. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Peters. Open the floor to questions.

Mr. Eichler: This is your building; this is your right. We commend you for coming forward and making your voice heard. My question for you comes from your presentation.

You talk about plant breeders, developing new barley varieties to reduce phosphorus. You've been in this business a long time. We need changes; you've seen changes.

With the permanent ban on expansion of hog barns, do you see science stopping as a result of that, just because of the sheer fact that there's no hope?

*(12:30)

Mr. Peters: I think in the province of Manitoba, yes. I think there will be less things being done. Like I said before, there were things being done. They invented phytase, which means that your phosphate is more available so that the reduction in the phosphate coming out of a hog was 30 percent less than it was five years ago, and that's a huge improvement, but it seems—and we mentioned this; this was talked about when the Clean Environment

committee went out and they took note of these things. While there have been big things done in the past, in the last few years, it seems like it means nothing to us in government right now when we're proposing this clean up Winnipeg lake and so-called hog farmers are supposed to be the magic bullet.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Peters, for your presentation. I know how hard it is sometimes to leave your farm on a beautiful morning and come to Winnipeg to make a presentation on something you thought had been taken care of sometime back when the Clean Environment Commission did their study.

I appreciate one paragraph. I appreciate your whole written submission, but one paragraph importantly sticks out in my mind and that is the fact that Winnipeg is supposed to reduce its nutrients in sewage by some 50 percent to 60 percent in the next few decades, and I underline and stress decades. But, by adding the phytase in the feed rations of animals, the phosphate has been reduced by 30 percent or 40 percent in the hog industry. We all know that phosphate is important to any of our lives. The excess passes through, that we can't use in our body, it passes through, and so Winnipeg, I would suggest, is passing through and going straight into the lake as well.

The point is the industry looked to technology on how to deal with phosphate. They looked at how to deal with that problem. The lake has a lot of algae growth, and it's been documented that that algae growth has also been there for many, many years. It fluctuates.

Do you believe that the government should be looking at technology that deals with that algae, that deals with that in a way that the hog industry, the feed industry, has dealt with the phosphate issue going through the pigs?

Mr. Peters: I believe we have been forced to do things in the last five years as an industry, in the ag industry, that stands up very well and is probably ahead of what some other areas have been doing, and so I feel good about that. Does that mean we can't do more? I think we can and we will be doing more. I know on my own fields we don't put one gallon of manure on our fields before we have to hand in a plan, and that plan needs to have soil tests being done and those soil tests have to show that we are short or that we don't have excess nitrogen and phosphate on that soil. If it does, we cannot put on manure. It's just that simple. And they don't have to believe my testing or my company's testing. They

can send their man out and do the testing for me, so it's not just something that we can fool the system with because it's not that simple. So there are spot checks being done, and we've had spot checks on our fields and thus we meet the requirements that they have out there.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Sieg. I enjoyed the presentation. I want to pick up on where the MLA for Emerson was going in terms of a discussion on technology. I'm really very impressed with the advances that we've made in technology, whether it be on the hog side or across the agricultural spectrum.

Is it your opinion that the advances in technology have been swift enough to keep up with the rate in growth of the hog industry? I mean, I think we always need to be researching more and looking for more and better technology. I think that has to be part of the overall big picture, the big plan, but, from 1990 to 2007, we've gone from 3.2 million hogs to 8.8 million. Has technology kept pace with that?

Mr. Peters: I think we're making a little mistake right off the bat. It's just simply Manitoba grew so late. As a province, our rate of hogs per acre is still virtually nil compared to—Ontario has more hogs than Manitoba does, and we have far more arable land. They have far more people. Norway—we can go on and on and on.

I mean, it just so happened that we grew quite a bit the last 10 years. Other people had grown 10, 15, 20, 30 years ago, and we grew rapidly the last 10 years to try and catch up. That's why we're into this hype, what I call hype. I think things have been keeping pace, if we look at national or international, quite well. Probably in our area, things grew rapidly in the last 10 years.

As a province, we grew rapidly over the last few years, but it's just that we were very small before, and if you're very small, to double in size doesn't take very much.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you for your presentation. I don't think that anybody would dispute the fact that measures need to be taken to make sure our lakes and waterways are clean. But, again, pointing the finger at one industry, it's easy because you could say dirty pigs, clean water. If we get rid of the dirty pigs, now we automatically have clean water. It doesn't work that way. To me it's just a lazy

approach to convince people that something has been done when something really hasn't been done.

So I guess my question to you would be, do you really feel that the government has done enough to involve every person, every sector, everything in the province, have they done enough to involve everybody to address the issue of clean water, or are they just creating the illusion of doing that?

Mr. Peters: I think the government has tried in a friendly way to influence people that safe water is very important, but I feel very strongly that certain areas are being targeted, and agriculture is one of them. We're being targeted and I think that is not correct.

So people in general are concerned about clean water, but they don't fully understand what makes for clean water. They may or may not know correctly what it takes to clean it up. I think there's a lot of misinformation out there. We all like headlines and headlines can be misleading. It's just as simple as that. I'm misled by headlines, too. Don't fool yourself, that I'm not fooled. I'm fooled by them as well.

But I do think that when we're researching something, like the Clean Environment did and like the government is doing now, I feel they need to get down. It should not be hype. It should not be just a little hype. That's it.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Peters.

Mr. Peters: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Claudette Taillefer, No. 82.

Wally Driedger. Carol Martens. Ron St. Hilaire.

Ron, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ron St. Hilaire (Private Citizen): Just oral.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may proceed, sir.

Mr. St. Hilaire: Okay, well, I just want to say thanks for the opportunity to let me speak on behalf of Bill 17. I know you have tough jobs and I want to respect that. I'm not going to try to tell you people how to do your jobs. I'm just going to explain to you a little bit about mine, and, hopefully, it will help, as I am opposed to this Bill 17. That's why I'm here.

* (12:40)

What I find interesting with the industry, right now it's real tough and it's challenging, and I just encourage that we keep our heads together and we work at finding solutions and helping the farming industry continue to grow. I've developed an appreciation for the industry. In the last seven years, I was working for a window manufacturer in Steinbach, which is seven miles away from my community in La Broquerie. We dealt with a lot of people world-wide. I found that industry to be very technical—dealing all over the world.

I never saw the farming industry in that same perspective until I started working for it. I thought that hogs were easy—you throw them some cabbage or something, they would eat and that it was that simple. I found that it was an industry that got very—there's a lot of detail, there's a lot of work. A lot of resources to support an industry like the pork industry, for example.

Yesterday, I drove in at 1:30 last night to speak today from Des Moines, Iowa with some colleagues. It's interesting because one question that came to us is, wow, you guys can afford to continue to travel and you're out here in Des Moines supporting the industry. How is it going? Well, that's a tough question to ask. It used to be easier to ask a couple years ago.

Now, with the industry, the way it is, optimism can sometimes shoot you in the foot. You've got to be fairly even keel. You can't high-five too many people because some of them you turn off because they are maybe having the same difficulties as we are or maybe even tougher yet. You've always got to be careful; keep the focus, just work hard and show some stability. I feel that our company and a lot of us, that's our role is to do that.

I mentioned earlier that the industry is much more detailed than I expected. There is a lot of resources—a lot of people—that there is spin-offs on the pork industry. It's even hit our family. My son's going to the Asper School of Business. He's working on doing some hedging and stock market analysis in weather patterns for the people working for our company. I never thought that a guy that was going to take that type of education would have an opportunity seven years ago in this type of work. My two daughters—same thing. They work for us. I got them to shovel, clean and sweep. My daughter said, dad, I'm not going to do this kind of work all my life. I said, great. She's going to school to be a doctor. Unfortunately, she's moved to Vancouver.

Hopefully, she comes back home and there's something for her and her kids to move back to in our area. We'd like to have her back.

That's, basically, in a nutshell, is really, I was just here to say that I am a community person. Our company thinks a lot about community. It has affected my family. It's given me a second chance at a new career outside the window and I enjoy it. I didn't know that seven years ago. I said, I'm going to try. It was time for me to move on. I'm determined to do my best in my job to support the industry and the people that are affected by it. I appreciate the opportunity to express myself.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. St. Hilaire, is it? How do you pronounce your name?

Mr. St. Hilaire: That's pretty good. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Questions.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. St. Hilaire, for your presentation.

I'm not sure if you were here earlier when I talked to or I had a question for Mr. Taillefer from La Broquerie. In that question, I presented the statements that the dairy industry in the La Broquerie municipality was a major contributor to the growth of the municipality. Also, that 65 percent of the dairy in Manitoba is situated in south-eastern Manitoba in a couple of the municipalities that are under this moratorium. At that time, I was trying to compare that they had regulations that they had to follow, but they weren't covered by the moratorium. Mr. Struthers pointed out that the dairy industries grow. The growth of the dairy industry is controlled by quota. You have said that you had the opportunity to change your career from the window industry. Are there any quotas that control the window industry that you know of? Because I think the point has been made that Mr. Struthers feels that the hog industry's growth needs to be controlled. Now, are there controls on the window industry in Steinbach? Are there controls on a Tim Hortons industry in Steinbach? And do you think they're necessary?

Mr. St. Hilaire: Well, for the window industry, I was the purchasing manager, so we worked with a lot of the tree huggers, and they had their concerns about good forestry and that, and we, too, back then respected that and the controls were that they didn't stop people from cutting trees completely. What they did is they went to selective cutting and, you know, still continue to cut trees, but they were also more selective. They worked on it, but they didn't

completely stop it. So I feel the same way about this situation here, too, as there's—lets find solutions without stopping it completely and then where can it work and allow this industry to grow, you know, is my thought on that.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Ron. Certainly, I appreciate you coming in and driving back late last night in order to be here today. We've had a number of presenters from out of town that couldn't make it because of the World Pork Congress and, hopefully, they'll be back in the next couple of days and we'll certainly hear from them as well.

I do have a question for you in regard to regulations. Do you think the regulations that have been brought down by the livestock manure management plan are sufficient in order to protect the water the way they are now? Do you think that you've had enough time to actually be valuated in order to make sure that there is enough arable land to spread the effluent onto the land and see whether or not that will work?

Mr. St. Hilaire: I think so. I, again, I'm not the expert in this. We've got people that work with the manure management quite regularly, but I do feel there's land that can continue to get manure spread on it, and I do think that continuing to be good stewards and then understand, educate each other, focus on the areas, if there are areas that are critical, then certainly I'm all for it. I mean, I drink water every day, and I want to continue to do so and, you know, right now I'm drinking it out of my tap at home and it tastes real good and it does good Kool-Aid and everything too. So, yes, I would believe strongly that there is opportunity for growth and without affecting the quality of water.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much for your presentation. Just to continue a little bit of the debate that the Member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon) and I are having, and I apologize, you end up being the tennis ball in the middle of the game back and forth, but, I think, it's useful. I think the Member for Emerson brings up some very good points in a discussion over this industry. The other factors that end up limiting the growth of this industry are the, you know, the dollar, where it's at, the input costs which are through the roof, the impending COOL legislation. Isn't that part of it as well if we're going to talk about what limits the industry? Decisions are being made every day on those economic factors that cause hog producers sometimes to decide not to expand or not to build new or not to have the

industry grow, because it certainly hasn't grown during the period of time that those factors have been in place even before the moratorium.

Would you agree that those factors, too, play a part in limiting, just as they would if applied to the window industry?

Mr. St. Hilaire: Yes, I don't disagree with that, but to me, again, the bottom line is to find solutions so we don't lose people out of our province and that we don't lose people out of our community. We got our school, a school that's being built in our home town that, you know, wouldn't happen if the pork and the dairy and the beef, you know, are not around. We're just not going to have growth in our area, and it's very important to me, and then the hockey teams and this and that. You know, we've just got to continue to find solutions so we can grow and sustain what we have. In my home town, my house is probably worth \$30,000, \$40,000 more, and I built it four years ago. That's a good feeling, and I'd love for that to continue or maintain itself.

* (12:50)

Mr. Graydon: I don't want to get into a debate with the minister today. That's not what that's for. What I want to zero in on is the quality of water. That's the purpose of this moratorium is to clean up Lake Winnipeg. The question I'll ask is, the company you're involved with or the industry that you're involved with and the one you were involved with before, had issues that had to be dealt with with the populace, people who had a concern about the forest, people who had a concern about the land. We have a concern about the lake.

Most of the technology has been developed recently in our province to deal with particular instances; however, a lot of the information has been available for many years in other provinces. What the other provinces haven't had to deal with is an algae growth. Do you believe that there should be more money directed at the research to deal with the algae, maybe a useful use for that algae in the lake? The same way that industry has dealt with issues surrounding the phosphate and how to deal with that. They've put the money up. The people that want to use the lake, the people that want to protect the lake, the people of Winnipeg, should they all be putting money forward to develop research that could be useful with that algae, like a biomass situation?

Mr. St. Hilaire: I would say, yes. Really, that's a lot what's driving this whole bill in the first place, is the

quality of water, and it's Lake Winnipeg. Certainly, it would be good to put some energies toward resolving that and coming up with a solution and at the same time, allowing agriculture to sustain and try to be profitable and survive. It's all about, I think, continuing to learn and to educate and to work together. I think that's what needs to happen. The farmers and the government just need to work together and to come to a solution to satisfy the public and also to continue growth in business.

Floor Comment: Is there more time?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, there is.

Mr. Graydon: Then the responsibility—I'll go back to the CEC. The CEC has made recommendations. They did say that there was beginning to be a buildup of phosphate in some of the lands within this moratorium. However, they said that technology—there needed to be more research done in that. Now industry has contributed towards that research. I believe there is a responsibility of government to participate in that, whether that's through the University of Manitoba, through Department of Agriculture, Conservation, Water Stewardship.

Is there a responsibility for the rest of the ratepayers or the rest of the populace of Manitoba to participate in cleaning up Lake Winnipeg?

Mr. St. Hilaire: Again, I think I'm not the expert in it, but I think for myself that's a good example where I think the more we find out about the situation and don't get too distracted by people that may or may not know what they're talking about. I don't want to say that in disrespect to anybody, but I think it's just continuing to work, and the people that have concerns, to make sure that they've got the right facts.

If I go back to the window industry, if time allows, but it was thought that good forestry was that you would cut down all the trees and you'd burn everything up and then that was good forestry. That came along from the European influence. After that they were saying with selective growth that the forest would regrow itself if you kept a couple trees there and you kept it dirty so to speak, or not dirty. For 25 years they thought that a PVC window was better for the environment and, if a house burns and you have a PVC window, it's toxic.

Again, that's what I would say, just encouraging people to know what it's going to take to solve the issue, get the facts, learn from them and move

forward. I think, then, people maybe look at it differently.

Mr. Chairperson: Time has expired. I thank you for your presentation, Mr. St. Hilaire.

Mr. St. Hilaire: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to return to presenter No. 39, Tom Greaves? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Greaves, are you present? Do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Tom Greaves (Private Citizen): I do, actually.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Mr. Greaves: Good afternoon, my name is Tom Greaves and I farm in Miami, Manitoba. I grew up on a mixed grain and livestock farm, which consisted of a farrow-finish hog operation and a cow-calf operation. After school, I attended the University of Manitoba to pursue my diploma in Agriculture with full intentions of returning to my family farm.

After two years of farming, I was forced to take a full-time job in the industry in order to maintain a steady income. I have been focussed over the past five years to continue to maintain and grow our farming operation so that, one day, I can return full-time.

The younger generation of farmers are intelligent, loyal, motivated, hard-working individuals who want to become very successful in their farm businesses. I continue to watch more and more of these individuals move to the cities or leave the province altogether in order to reach their goals. These are the individuals who will sustain and prosper in our rural communities; they're the individuals who will support and maintain our \$1 billion hog industry.

The hog industry is not the only one affected by the reduction of young farmers in the communities. All rural business is affected. Without the younger generation in or around these smaller communities, they're starting to die off, one by one; they're just not being replenished. I know my little town of Miami there is shrinking by the day. There's just no one around anymore.

Ms. Jennifer Howard, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

I believe that all young farmers realize that, in order to operate and be successful in a farming operation and a business, they have to look at

technology and science. This is an area that, my generation, we really strive for and we excel in. Bill 17 completely ignores this aspect. With proper manure management, soil testing, and integration programs, like ISO 14001, the hog industry can be very environmentally friendly.

I believe the hog industry, as a whole, is committed to ensuring best practices in order to ensure we have a sustainable environment which future generations can prosper in.

Bill 17 will do away with my ability and many other young farmers' abilities to return to the family farm. Yes, the hog industry is going through rough times currently, but is that to say we'll abandon ship?

This is a short-sighted vision. By implementing Bill 17, we are putting a permanent ban on the growth of the hog industry in Manitoba. When the industry does turn around, will there still be young farmers around to support our economy? This is a question that we really need to ask ourselves.

This is not only affecting municipalities listed in the bill, but all municipalities in Manitoba. As an individual wanting to grow within the industry, our government is sending the wrong message. What is keeping the government from restricting other areas within the province? I'm losing my trust in this fact. I feel that the government is not supporting us and, as a result of our lower voting population, we're being used as scapegoats. I'm asking that you think about all the futures for young farmers and withdraw Bill 17. Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Greaves.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): Thanks for coming in, Tom. I do know where your farm is; it's in my constituency and it's right on top of the escarpment, for those who don't know. Deerwood Soil and Management was mentioned by one of the other presenters this morning and you are acutely aware of the research work that they've done there.

We certainly share your desire to kill Bill 17. You see it as a detriment towards your farming, and I certainly agree with that. Instead of Bill 17, what in your mind should the Province be doing to help you so that you can return to the family farm full-time?

* (13:00)

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Greaves? I just have to recognize you before you speak so we make sure we get it recorded properly. Go ahead.

Mr. Greaves: Actually, on that point, I think, you know, rather than putting a permanent ban on, you know, we are, like I said, we're very involved and we're willing to work with industry. So there are lots of things that can be done out there whether—and I guess that's really all that we're asking is to work with us rather than putting a permanent ban, because once we have a permanent ban, it's permanent. It's done, right? To be able to turn that around it's going to be a lot harder.

So we're willing to work with you guys. You know, there are things, you know, they mentioned things like phytase in the feed, our manure management plans. There are all kinds of things we can do, but we're willing to work with government in order to reach these goals. Once that we do say, you know what, it's permanent; that's permanent, and that means no growth at that point. Even though the industry currently, you know, we don't see a whole lot of growth, that's not to say in the future we might not see some in different areas, but once that we say permanent, that's permanent. So I guess that would be my response.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Pedersen, you have a supplementary?

Mr. Pedersen: Many of the presenters that have been in yesterday and into the wee hours of last night, many of them were quite willing to work with the government to make sure that the regulations are being enforced and to make sure that the regulations are actually working and the research can be done. They were offering their expertise to work with the government rather than Bill 17. When the minister asked, well, what about some of the anti-hog groups, would you include them, the presenters were certainly willing to work with all the public and all opinions on this.

Do you feel that would be a better alternative, also, as compared to Bill 17?

Mr. Greaves: Definitely.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Greaves. That was my fault. Go ahead.

Mr. Greaves: No problem.

Definitely. I think, you know, we're all very willing to work with industry, with government to move forward. I'll give you an example. As a young farmer, we have this new safe farm program I'm sure you guys are aware of, obviously. I've enrolled in it and I'm encouraged. Safety is an issue out on the

farms, but we want to move forward with that. So I've enrolled in it, and I'm part of that with my farm. I want to make sure that we're doing things as safe as possible there. That rolls over into the environment side as well. We want to make sure that our farms are going to be sustainable, and they're going to be there for the future. Once, as I do have a family, I want them in the future to be around, too, and it to be sustainable. So, yes, we're definitely willing to work with any groups, and willing to find solutions to the problems that we're seeing.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Mr. Greaves, for your presentation.

I'm just quoting a line from just at the very end of your presentation, and it says: I feel that we do not have government support, and, as a result of our lower voting population, we are being used as a scapegoat.

Do you believe that governments, once they're elected, should govern for all Manitobans and not just those who voted for them?

Mr. Greaves: Yes, I do believe—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Greaves.

Mr. Greaves: Sorry. Yes, I do believe that they should be governing for everyone that's within our province. I think it's very important. The government is working for the people. You know, just because we have a smaller population out in the rural municipalities, you know, I'll use Miami as an example. We have 350 people, or something. It's very small, right? But you have to look at the people that are around those areas, and I guess the main thing is we need to find proper solutions. What we've come up with here, I do believe, you know, we see that our contribution to Lake Winnipeg is under 1 percent from the hog industry, from the information that I've seen. What about the other 99 percent? Maybe we're only 1 percent of the people out there, but, you know, we're still focussing on that. The government has to be able to govern for all people, have everyone involved whether we're in the major communities or outside of the communities. So I think it's important that we work for everyone in the province.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): Thanks for your presentation, Tom. I'm pleased to see you coming here to make your presentation. I'm pleased to see young people involved in agriculture.

You talked about farm safety, but the other issue I wanted to ask you about is, have you done an environmental farm plan for your farm, and have you taken advantage of any of the supports that are offered through that program to help you to meet environmental requirements?

Mr. Greaves: Actually, my farming operation, we have just sold our hog operation within my farm in the last year. We had started on manure management plans, and we have passed that on currently. We still do have our cattle operation, but we're at a size, currently, that, as we want to grow, we will be utilizing that portion of it.

I think it's very important, depending on your size. The main point that I want to get to here is when I do come back to the farm, we are going to need some larger numbers. When we do that, we will follow all regulations, whether it be manure management plans, any of the programs that are involved, because I understand that you guys are here to help us as well. We need to utilize information and work together moving forward.

It's not like, I hate say it, for the older generation, if there are any around, but the older generation—but farming is changing. It's changing big time right now. There's a lot of the baby boomer generation out there right now on the farms. I looked around at all the farms and the small farms in our area, and we have all the 60, 65-plus, and they're not going to be around, moving forward. They're going to pass it off to their kids, but if their kids aren't there to take over, what's going to happen with these resources? What's going to happen with this land?

There are a lot of changes, technology, science. The younger generation, like I said in my speech, those are things that we're good at and we thrive on. I think that we'd really like to incorporate that and work with you guys moving forward with our farming operations because they are businesses. They're not just farms anymore. They're businesses.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Minister Wowchuk, for a supplemental.

Ms. Wowchuk: You're talking about manure management plans, and I'm wondering whether you're aware of a program called environmental farm plans where people from MAFRI will come to visit your farm and work through a plan with you that will help you find environmental challenges, and then once you do that environmental plan, there are financial supports to help you adapt your operations

to address those issues. Are you aware of that program?

Mr. Greaves: Yes, I am aware of the program, and I think it is very useful. Any programs that we can work on together, I think that's great, and we should be taking full advantage.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Greaves, for your presentation.

Now, I look for direction from the committee and continue to go to the next name on the list, is Jamie Hofer.

I am informed that presenter No. 78 is here. Do you want to call that presenter? Is that what we'd like to do? Okay. So presenter 78 is Dennis Kornelsen. He is here, I think. Is he here? Dennis Kornelsen? Okay. Do you have written presentations for the committee?

Mr. Dennis Kornelsen (Private Citizen): Just my own notes.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Just go ahead whenever you're ready.

Mr. Kornelsen: My name is Dennis Kornelsen. I have been involved in farming all of my life. I've worked for feed companies in rural Manitoba as well as a feed company here in the city of Winnipeg for 18 years of my life. I'm currently employed by a hog farm and have been for the past 10 years. I have a family with four children that depend on my income. All of my income goes back directly into the community, the province and into the city of Winnipeg itself, too. Many other jobs are direct spinoffs from the hog industry with people like me that work on a hog farm. My future and their future depend on the hog industry.

To me, it does not make any sense. There are starving people all over the world, and we hear every day of increased food costs and food shortages all over the world. We have the land mass. We have the technology to safely build more hog barns in an environmentally friendly way in Manitoba. We have one of the largest hog farms in all of Canada, in Manitoba, who are leaders of the industry and are able to work with the regulations in place. We have the grain available to feed these animals. The Manitoba government has funded large ethanol plants in Manitoba.

* (13:10)

I believe that there should be no moratorium. In fact, the government should fund and grow the hog industry in this province. That's it.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kornelsen. You took me by surprise there. I have Mrs. Rowat on the list.

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa): I'm an MLA from the Minnedosa constituency. We have several hog industries and a feed mill within our constituency. We also have several Hutterite colonies in my constituency who are supporters of the hog industry. I do know that, within our communities and within our school system, we have seen an increase of families coming to our communities and has strengthened not only our communities, but our schools as well. I believe that when we were looking at a feed mill within our community, we realized that by bringing in the families that we were trying to secure, we were actually securing another teacher within our school system.

Can you speak a little bit about what your family and the families that represent your, I guess, barn or your business that you work in, how it has directly affected your community and your school?

Mr. Kornelsen: Like I said, I have four children that go to school—some of them not yet, but will be going to school—so for the schooling, of course, there's, you know, there's the factor of them all wanting and needing good educations and, depending on the school system, for the children to go back to school, I mean, not sure what else I can follow up on it.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mrs. Rowat, on a supplemental.

Mrs. Rowat: How many families work at the industry that you're located on your community and how many children, actually, do you think come from those families that work at that barn that actually go to the school within your community?

Mr. Kornelsen: Well, I work for a fairly large—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sorry. I just have to recognize you, for the record.

Mr. Kornelsen: I do work for a fairly large hog farm, so there are—I'm not even sure how many—there are probably 400, 500 employees directly employed, and all of their families and, you know, so there's a large number.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mrs. Rowat, one more question.

Mrs. Rowat: I want to thank you for that, 'cause what it tells me, and, I think, what it reflects in the communities that I represent is, if you have the opportunity to employ 10 families and each of those families has two or three children, you are actually working at employing another teacher within that school system. You are increasing the opportunity to have another grade, or classroom representing that grade, and from that you have the spinoff of the recreational supports.

I know in my community we work really hard at making sure we at least have one ball team or one hockey team, and I think that what you're representing and your kids are growing up through that system, is that communities are needing those supports and needing those individuals to live in that community. So I want to thank you for your presentation today.

Mr. Kornelsen: Thank you.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Kornelsen, for your presentation today. Personally, I run a beef operation and a grain operation, and I know that I don't always grow No. 1 wheat. I don't always grow the malting barley. Although that I try my hardest, I run into weather conditions and so on that are beyond my control. The feed mills, do they—are they competing for that No. 1 wheat? Are they competing for the barley for beer, because that's what malting barley's for, for those that don't understand, that's a certain market, but whenever I can't maintain the quality for that market, do you, at the feed mill, do you have a certain standard that you would use?

Mr. Kornelsen: Yes. The feed industry generally uses mostly by-products. Most of the wheat and the barley goes to the Wheat Board. So, whenever the grain does not meet the standards, for the most part the feed mills will take that grain and use that grain to feed the animals. It's also by-products from Canola-crushing plants, from soybean-crushing plants. So it's mostly the by-product. We do still have standards of the grains that we do use, but, for the most part, it's a result or a path for these grains that do not meet barley malting standards or Canadian wheat standards.

Mr. Graydon: So, then, Mr. Kornelson, you would say that the hog industry actually supplements what the grain people are faced with, supplements their industry, so to speak, as we in Manitoba are the farthest from the ports, for many export ports and the cost of export has gone up and up and up. So you

would actually say, then, that you supplement the grain industry in Manitoba and then, by doing that, also communities that there are no hogs in.

Mr. Kornelson: Yes, I would agree with that. I mean it's a direct path for farmers, growers. It's another marketing place that they can sell their grains to. So it's definitely a place for grain growers to bring their grains to.

Mr. Graydon: In saying that—and the grain farmers, I can tell you, really appreciate the fact that there is a feed mill close by, and us in the south and southeast really appreciate that; however, it's impossible, agronomically impossible for us to produce enough grain to feed the hogs in our area. So I would suggest then that there's a trucking industry that possibly needs to be supported as well. Would you agree then that you're also supporting this trucking industry by the development that you have in southeastern Manitoba or the development that you work with in the feed mill that you would be supporting a truck industry as well?

Mr. Kornelson: Yes, and, having worked for grain companies for 18 years of my life as well. I mean, the trucking industry is a huge industry for the feed industry. We get product brought in from all over Manitoba, as well as coming in from the U.S. Yes, I don't know exactly what the numbers are of trucks coming in, but I would imagine the number's huge for getting product in all over Manitoba and western Canada and the U.S.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Graydon, on a very short question.

Mr. Graydon: The trucking companies that supply the trucks are all situated in, where? The city of Winnipeg?

Mr. Kornelson: No, I would say they're mostly in the rural areas.

Mr. Graydon: The truck dealers, Mr. Kornelson.

Mr. Kornelson: The people that sell the trucks are probably mostly in the city of Winnipeg, yes. I would agree.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation, sir. I'm going to ask the committee, we can continue—our time has expired, so I thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Kornelson: Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: I'm going to ask the committee if you'd like to continue reading down the

list. I understand presenter 117, Mike Maendel is here. Should we continue to read down the list? *[interjection]*

Okay, so we'll move to presenter 117, Mike Maendel or Mandel?

Mr. Mike Maendel (Private Citizen): Maendel.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Welcome, Mr. Maendel. Do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Mike Maendel: No, I don't.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay, you can start whenever you're ready, sir.

Mr. Mike Maendel: I'm Mike Maendel of the Blue Clay Hutterite Colony located in the R.M. of De Salaberry. We're a community in the R.M. of De Salaberry. We're a community of 88 people. We've got about 50 children.

I must say that I am very nervous. That's the first time I've spoken out in a public hearing like this, and I would say that it's a direct hit at the colonies. It's a ban. We split out from Blumenort Colony in 1992 or '98. We bought land in the R.M. of De Salaberry, 4,000 acres, and we built a piggery back in 1992. In 1992 the packers wanted a 200-pound hog. Today, they want a 240-pound hog. Barn wasn't built for it. The ban has been on for a couple of years now. We want to expand our barn, not by adding more animals, but to give them what the industry wants, so many square feet per pig. Now we can't. Where do we go now?

* (13:20)

For us, I guess I'm about 40, 45 years old. We may say I'm halfway through life. What about my 12-year-old son? Where's he going to go? What chance does he have with a government that wants to put a ban on agriculture? You can think on and on and on. I've been sitting here for four or five hours listening who all is going to be involved. It's not only the farmers. It's the city of Winnipeg. It's trucking industries. It's endless, if you consider it, and our culture having to rely on agriculture which is being, we feel, threatened by the government.

Yes, there are some issues out there, but we farm 6,000 acres. Nobody has access to the land to spread manure. Why ban the whole province? Why not look at concentrated areas? There are already laws in effect. We've got manure management plans. We've got nutrient management plans. You want to put up a

barn, you have to go through technical review boards, and if you don't have the sufficient acres to cover the land, the ban is already in place.

We feel that this bill has to be killed or else the colonies, where are we going to go? We've got 50 children. We built a big school. How do you build schools without money to build schools? Our piggery is a big, big contributor to our financial backbone. I might not be a professional in talking, but I'll tell you this got me going. This is a very serious issue, and the government should be helping us. We feel that the government is not doing enough for the farmers. I know it came up here, we talked about the environmental farm plan which is a good plan but what good does it do? You go to the farm plan, everything, and there's no money there. The government can't help you. Like a couple of years ago, we got a letter saying we need to update our fuel storage. So we got the environment guys involved, built an up-to-date facility, three or four years later I get a letter saying that it's obsolete. I have to rebuild it. Why? I built it to specs. I tried fighting it. I can't.

Well, now they're saying the environmental farm plan, go after them and they're going to help you with that. Well, the environmental farm plan says, sorry we're out of money. It won't be before 2009. Yet, the environment is saying you have to because I got pushed from '07 to '08, and they're saying we're not going to push it from '08 to '09. You'll have to do it on your own. We can't afford this. Like, the hog industry already is struggling. We're struggling, and yet the government keeps putting pressure on us. Are they trying to kill hog farms? Are they trying to kill colonies or communities? If they are then tell us, then be upfront with us so we know what to deal with them all.

I mean the ban, the CEC report, one of our guys got up and we talked about it. They promised yes, there will be some regulations. The ban is going to be lifted. Yet, the government wants to put a total ban on it with absolutely no science behind it. The CEC report stated that the hog industry is sustainable. Why wreck a billion-dollar industry?

We have to start realizing that farming is a very important part of the province. We need farmers. We need to put food on the table. There are a lot of countries out there starving people, starving children. Why do we want to create an issue like that? We're trying to keep our young people at home. We're trying to keep them off the streets, keep them out of the city of Winnipeg. What are we going to do with

them? We don't want them in Winnipeg. You look at the local paper or newspaper, all you hear is shooting or kidnapping, stealing cars. We're trying to keep our people home and, by choice, they're staying home. They're working in those barns. Why ban them? That's it.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel. I have Mrs. Taillieu.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Mr. Maendel, for your presentation, and thanks for coming today to make that passionate statement because it's important. You've certainly, I think, raised some awareness for your community and for the people at the table. I just want to, first of all, welcome your son as well and ask him his name so we can record him as being here as well.

Mr. Mike Maendel: Lucas Maendel.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, and welcome Lucas. I hope this will be an experience for you here with your father today.

You did talk about how direct a hit this can be to your colony and to many other colonies. I just want to ask you what is going to happen with your colony if this happens? Will it force you to move to another location? What effect will it have on surrounding communities because nobody is just an island unto themselves. I mean, you obviously support other local economies and local business so how do you think that—first of all, how is it going to affect your colony, and secondly, how is it going to affect the community around you?

Mr. Mike Maendel: Well, when a colony gets to be to 140, 150 people, we start looking at building another colony. We look for a package of land, and the first thing, usually, a colony builds is a hog barn. When we moved over to Blue Clay, and we went in get permits for barns, for anything, the R.M. just welcomed, just waved us in with open arms. Come on, come on, Mike, put up some more barns. Put up some more barns. We need the tax money. We need your support. Where are we going to go now? I guess we'll have to move to municipalities or elsewhere where we can build barns.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I know that this is something very dear to your heart and your colony. My question for you is pretty straightforward. With the current operation that you're running now, how long will that be sustainable for your particular colony if you're forced

to stay the same. Like, is it a five-year span or a 10-year span for your particular colony?

Mr. Mike Maendel: Well, we're forced at the moment. We've been waiting for the ban to be lifted because we want to add to our feeder barn immediately. We're short on finisher space and it's not that we want to increase our sow numbers, but we need more finisher space. With the ban, we just can't do it. So we're immediately affected.

Mr. Eichler: Did you make application prior to the pause, or since the pause, have you made application to increase your operation or were you just sitting waiting, hoping, that the government would come through on their promise when they did say they would lift the ban some—almost a year ago already?

Mr. Mike Maendel: We sat and waited. We had confidence that the government wouldn't do that to us.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. Maendel, and welcome, Lucas. I have a son very similar in age to you so I give you great credit for standing up there with your dad because I know my son would have some trouble doing that. Good for you.

I want to indicate to you that I'm very pleased to hear you come forward today and share your concerns and your story. You had indicated to the Member for Lakeside that you're having some trouble accessing the next level or the finisher barns. Where are you now accessing that support? Are you having trouble finding that locally or are you having to transport your animals a further distance?

* (13:30)

Mr. Mike Maendel: We're having to—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Maendel. Go ahead.

Mr. Mike Maendel: Sorry.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: That's okay.

Mr. Mike Maendel: We're having to transport animals off site to finish. Now, with the way the hog industry, the state it's in, it's difficult to find producers that are willing to take you on. There's just no money in it. We feel at home that we have guys like him coming up, at the age of 15-16, they already work in the barn. They have their responsibilities and they could do the job.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. Maendel. I do know that in one of my colonies there were some young

men that had left for a few years and have come back to the community and were very interested and excited about the opportunities in continuing to live in the colony and to raise a family and to build their colony. They are indicating the same concerns that you have indicated.

When you were saying that you were confident that the government wouldn't put the moratorium on, do you believe that the government consulted enough and understood enough? As you indicated, when you start a colony, one of the first things you do is build a hog barn. Based on what you're saying, am I correct in assuming that the government didn't get that? They don't understand that that is part of the culture, that's part of when you're developing a community that that is a natural process or step to follow. Were you ever given the opportunity to ensure that government understood that before they put the moratorium on?

Mr. Mike Maendel: Absolutely not. That's the way I feel. I feel the government hasn't even stopped to think about the community living and what the colonies do for the province. Like, for example, we have two of our members left the colony. They're going to go on their own. The one guy has three children. He just couldn't make a living out there. Well, he's back in the colony, and it seems he's an asset there. We want him there. He wants to be there. He wants to put his children through school, and he wants to have a decent living. It just gives guys that are, you could say weak, an opportunity.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel. Time has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Mike Maendel: And, please, consider that bill.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: We're going to move on to—Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Graydon: I would ask leave if there are other questions for Mr. Maendel.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Well, there are several people on the list, and we've gone well over time with this presenter.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: I'm going to move now to No. 86, Jamie Hofer. Is Mr. Hofer here?

Welcome, Mr. Hofer. Do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Jamie Hofer (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Proceed when you're ready, sir.

Mr. Jamie Hofer: Thank you. Hello, my name is Jamie Hofer and I live on the Starlite Hutterite Colony. I thank you for the opportunity to speak here today.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

I am against Bill 17 for a number of reasons. First of all, it is a pure political decision. It has nothing to do with Lake Winnipeg unless, of course, Lake Winnipeg can vote. The government thinks that it will save Lake Winnipeg by not allowing the hog industry to expand. Well, for your information, only 1.5 percent of the phosphorus entering Lake Winnipeg comes from agriculture. So you could shut down all the hog barns in Manitoba and it still wouldn't make a difference. If they could dam the Red River or filter it before it enters Canada, then they might be onto something, because 40 percent of the nutrient load of the river is in it before it crosses the border, and after the border less nutrients enter the river before Winnipeg than after Winnipeg city. There aren't very many hog barns after Winnipeg city. The government should tackle issues like Devils Lake, not hog barns that don't even exist yet.

Secondly, the Clean Environment Commission spent a ton of taxpayers' money to find out for the government if the hog industry is sustainable. After a lot of time spent researching and doing public committee hearings, the CEC released their report. In this book they said that the hog industry is sustainable. I repeat, is sustainable. They recommend a bunch of regulations to help keep the environment clean.

Before the report's release, though, the government had promised and, as it turned out, lied, now, that it would lift the ban on new and expanding hog barns in all of Manitoba, but, contrary to their promises, on the same day, yes, the very same day of the report's release, they slapped a permanent ban on building new hog barns and expanding old ones in two-thirds of agricultural Manitoba.

It was a real shock to an industry already reeling from low hog prices and high feed prices. The government discredited all the research and recommendations that the CEC made. I wonder if they even read the report, unless they flat out missed the part that said the industry is sustainable. All the efforts that hog farmers and community people put

into the CEC hearings seems to have been a royal waste of time.

The third reason I'm against Bill 17 is because, in the future, we will definitely want to expand our hog operation at home. The barn we have was built 20 years ago, and it was built for 22 to 23 pigs per sow per year. Now we are over 27 pigs per sow per year and shooting for 30. Our weaning and finisher spaces are not big enough for all these extra pigs, so we will have to expand because space is getting limited. We might want to increase our sow herd. We are at 600 sows now, but nowadays that's small. In today's world you have to be big to survive. A lot of the 300-sow operations are gone. I know quite a few people personally, small family farms, they're gone. They couldn't survive because they were too small. I wonder if we're next if we can't expand.

The question I have is why doesn't the government take an example from Denmark? They are a country that is smaller than the size of Lake Winnipeg. They produce a lot more hogs than Manitoba produces and they have water, you know. They have water, too. How does Denmark do it? First of all, they don't do it by banning construction of new and expanding hog barns. They do it with regulations. They work hand in hand with the hog producers and research centres to come up with workable, sensible agreements and regulations to deal with any problems that arise from the hog industry. Why doesn't our government talk to producers and industry people about fixing the issues they have with the hog industry? We, as hog producers, have always been willing to talk. We have always complied with the countless regulations that the government has placed upon us, and we are willing to further do so. We have spent thousands of dollars upgrading our manure storage systems and continue to do so at the moment just to comply with new rules.

But to put a ban on the industry is the wrong approach unless the government wants to drive hog farmers and Hutterites from Manitoba. The NDP government seems to be against hog farming as a whole and agriculture as a whole. If we cannot build new hog barns, we just might leave because hog barns have been a primary source of income for the colonies over the years, unless we go into manufacturing. I suppose we could, for instance, manufacture pencils for the government to write new bills or make baking ovens and frying pans, but what good will they do if there's no more food and no more meat to cook on them?

We don't want to manufacture. We want to produce food for the world. That's all we want to do. Isn't the government aware that there are hundreds of people dying around the world of starvation? Often on the news we hear about hunger riots, mobs breaking into warehouses and stealing food. Doesn't this ring a bell, folks? We need to produce more hogs, not less hogs. If there's a shortage of hog meat, which is one of the cheapest meats, then the poor countries won't be able to afford it anymore, and more people will die of hunger. Look at the price of fish, \$5 a pound; beef, \$10 a steak, much more expensive than pork.

Another point I would like to make is that raising hogs is part of our Hutterite culture. I grew up working in a hog barn, helping my dad and uncles do chores, just anything to keep busy. I have four younger brothers, aged 16, 13, 7 and 6. They all help in the barn, not because they have to but because they want to. We love raising hogs and we want to be in it for the long run.

*(13:40)

Earlier this year, the provincial government made millions of dollars available in loans for hog farmers in Manitoba to help them get through the tough times. It's strange how, on one hand they want to help the hog industry, and, on the other hand, they make laws to destroy it.

In conclusion, I think, as Canadians we deserve better. We deserve better than the government taking away our jobs and making our future uncertain and bleak, destroying our culture and changing our way of life permanently and, on top of that, that of our next generation.

Canada has always been a free country. Let's work together and keep it that way. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer. Questions?

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, James, for your presentation.

I have a couple of questions, but I also want to indicate to you and the previous speaker that, in fact, I have been meeting with the brethren to talk about the issues facing the colonies. We certainly value the contributions that the colonies make to this economy and I know that there are some issues here. So we have met with them and indicated that there will be a follow-up meeting to work through some of these issues.

A couple of questions that you talked about—I wonder if you would just take a minute to explain to the committee how long a barn lasts and, when you're building, what has changed with respect to the industry that would require you, if you're building a new barn, to build it a little different than the barn that you have now, as far as size of hogs go.

Mr. Jamie Hofer: So the question is: What would be different when we build new hog barns?

Ms. Wowchuk: If I could clarify, how often do you have to replace your barn? In the time that you built the last barn and the time that you are building the barn now, if you were building one, what has changed that would require you to build that barn a little different?

Mr. Jamie Hofer: First of all, there seems to be a change—Maple Leaf announced this year or last year that all of their hogs in the next 10 years will phase over to loose housing in gestation. Right now, we have stalls in our gestation barn. In the next 10 years, we might have to build a new gestation barn that has loose housing.

Our barn is falling apart; everyday, we have to take 10, 12 gates out. Sows are big; they're 500, 600 pounds. They push around and the barn—there is constant wear and tear. Twenty years ago, the barns weren't built that strong. Nowadays, a lot more concrete and stainless steel is used.

While I've been working with hogs, I've learned one thing. You can never make it strong enough that it's not going to break. Never. It will always break, even if you weld it like the army does. It's going to break.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Ms. Wowchuk?

Ms. Wowchuk: You talked about Denmark and different technologies there. I have two questions: Do you have the land base to use all of your manure on the colony right now that you have, and are you looking at new technologies to use them in a different way, so you're not just spreading it on the land?

Mr. Jamie Hofer: Yes, we have enough land base, for sure; we have enough. We have quite a few acres around the colony; we have enough land. We have sold to our neighbours also. Most of it we use ourselves on our land.

What was the second question—*[interjection]*—the technology. Two years ago, we remade our lagoon system. One of our cells, we poured concrete.

The whole cell is concrete where the solids are. Just last week, we're working with a company from Alberta to put a synthetic cover over it. We're working with the University of Manitoba; they're doing studies with us to see if we can get methane off there. We're constantly trying to develop new technology.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Jamie, for your presentation. I know it's difficult sometimes to stand up in front of a committee and make your presentation, but you did a wonderful job, and sometimes it's difficult to get questions put to you, but I'll be much more friendly with my questions.

I wonder just if you could explain how this is really going to affect Starlite Colony. We heard from Jacob—I don't know if he's your grandpa—

Mr. Jamie Hofer: Grandpa, yes.

Mrs. Taillieu: Yes, I kind of sensed that just because of your sense of humour. But I just wonder if you can tell me what does this colony face now because of this, and, also, I know that your colony is involved very much to an extent to the surrounding communities because you're a very community people and you've done a lot of good things in the surrounding communities. If you were forced to leave the area, how would that affect those other communities as well?

Mr. Jamie Hofer: Well, how it would affect the other communities, we do a lot of business with the neighbours, like, let's say the Morris Brothers. That's a spraying company not far from us. We buy all our chemicals from them. Let's say we move out of Manitoba. Well, we wouldn't sell our grain to the elevators anymore. They wouldn't get the grain if we do move out of Manitoba to build hog barns. We probably wouldn't buy equipment from here for sure if we moved to another country, so the industries that make hog equipment and the construction industries—well, usually we build our own barns but, like, the manufacturing—the hog equipment manufacturing companies wouldn't sell that much equipment. It's also bad for them, the ones that make the equipment, sell the feed, the feed companies. It's not good for everybody.

And how it would affect our community, I had it in here, our hog barn. I work in the hog barn—my dad's in the States. I've been—I'm looking after the barn at home for a week now and the space is tight. Like I said, our barn was built for 22 pigs per sow per year. Right now, we're at 27. We're still

increasing. Every month it's increasing and you have to finish those pigs. You need more space 'cause you didn't build enough finishing space to finish all those pigs. We're also building a new colony. We're in the process. We bought land last year. My grandpa probably told you about that, and we have a hog site up there that's old. It's even older than ours. It's falling apart. It's only 400 sows. We definitely have to rebuild it. If we rebuild it, we'll make it bigger 'cause 400 sows nowadays is not very big. You got to be bigger to survive. To have a mill that's running, you want to make more feed than for 400 sows.

Mr. Chairperson: *[interjection]* No, I think we are out of time for this presentation, so I'll—and I have a couple others that would have put questions if they had time. So I have to thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hofer, and we will move on.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Rowat, on a point of order.

Mrs. Rowat: I was very interested in what Jamie Hofer was presenting today and I had a number of questions to ask him as a young producer and as a young man who is living on a colony that is looking at expansion. I was wondering if you would be kind enough to give him at least five more minutes to share his responses to a number of interesting points that he raised and need to be explored further, just based on the minister's questions to him.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Wowchuk, on the same point of order.

Ms. Wowchuk: Although I don't disagree that Jamie offers a lot of information, yesterday, when we were getting this committee started, we said that there were a lot of presenters, and, in order to get through all of these presenters, we would stick to the time period of 10 minutes for questioning and—10 minutes for presentation and five minutes to respond. If the individual chose to take the whole 15 minutes for a presentation, it would be a 15-minute time period. We have a lot of presenters and I think we have to stick to that recommendation, Mr. Chairman.

* (13:50)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for that. The member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: We'll move on. I'll call Dennis Stevenson.

Ian Kleinsasser. Mr. Kleinsasser, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: You do. You may proceed.

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: Okay. I'm not going to follow the exact copy of the presentation that I'm handing out. I'm just handing that in. I wrote that out, but I want to talk more about something else that I've added to the back of the presentation.

My concern is not necessarily only for the moratorium and how it affects hog producers, here, in Manitoba, how it affects the colonies. I'm more concerned is, where is this all going on a global scale? Our colony, our main industry is, actually, we produce equipment for hog barns. So this moratorium, in many ways, will not affect us as heavily as it will other communities who raise the pigs. We will simply go where the business goes. My uncle and my brother both are heavily involved in our manufacturing plant, and they've travelled extensively all over the world to sell our products.

One of the things that they have noticed and they've come back with is, they say, when, you know, for instance, they go to Malaysia, they go to China, Russia, and they say what really bothers them is how manure is treated there. Because what's happening is, because we're putting in stronger restrictions over here, it's forcing the businesses to go into the developing countries where there are no restrictions.

My uncle says one time when he was in Malaysia, and it really bothered him. He was walking down the street and, from the barn, there was an open conduit running straight down into the ocean. What are we doing when we're, with this moratorium here, we're cutting down all options here, in Manitoba. We're saying, that's it, no more building barns, instead of saying, you know, let's work with this. Let's try to find a solution that we can address the problems here instead of just chasing the problem over into somebody else's backyard. Because that, unfortunately, seems to be the trend not only in this case, but in many environmental issues.

On the back, I have this cartoon where there's a big American in a big SUV trying to stop a third-world farmer from chopping down a tree. He says, we need that tree to save the—to protect us from greenhouse gas effect. Well, we're trying to clean up our Manitoba, here, and we want to keep it clean, but

aren't we forcing the problem, now, across the sea to Malaysia? Does that make the world a better place? We have to think more on a global scale, here. What is the effect of what we're doing? I think we have the power, we have the capability here, in Manitoba, to actually make a difference.

You know, there are lots of colonies. I mention that in my presentation. There are colonies that have experimented with different methods. You know, solid separation, covering the lagoons, all of these different systems trying to find a solution. But I think if this moratorium comes in, we'll see an end to that because it'll just—colonies will simply say, okay, either we need to go out of pigs, or they're going to move away. I am going to have to, fine, move out. I mentioned that, I believe it was in 1969 in Alberta, the government passed what was called the communities land act which was aimed at the Hutterite people. It stopped them from building colonies and then later it was amended to stop them from building colonies within 50 kilometres of each other. But what was the result? You know, they were trying to limit how much land the Hutterites were buying, but they totally stopped it, and some of the Hutterites actually moved out of Alberta, moved into the United States. So here we're looking at potentially the same thing. So I'm just asking that the committee or the honourable members really think about that.

So I think that's it.

Mr. Chairperson: That concludes your presentation, sir?

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: Yes.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Ian, for your presentation. In reading quickly through your presentation while you were speaking, you talked about the various ways that the Hutterite brethren have been looking at alternative methods of handling waste. You talked about methane and looking at harvesting it for the purposes of reheating for various liquids and solids separation methods. Could you talk a little bit about that because I know that that is definitely something that has been discussed briefly within the Legislature, and I think you've got some ideas here that we should be listening to.

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: I believe there's a colony near Carberry, Riverbend Colony, that has presently set up—I'm not 100 percent sure if it's in progress yet, but the last time I was there they were pretty much finished with the setup. They have a methane plant, a

harvesting plant, where they will be harvesting the methane off from the manure.

At the present time, they are still looking at options of what to do with the methane. There're obviously different options. You could run vehicles with it or they were thinking of just feeding it back right into the system and using it to reheat their barn. So, to me, I was very impressed. I thought that was a move in a positive direction.

Mrs. Rowat: So, you know, examples like this, and I think in discussions earlier we were saying that there should have been more discussions with the Hutterian brethren regarding examples such as this and saying, okay, you know, here are ways that can address some of the faults and concerns, which I believe are raised inappropriately.

I think that when you have a community that relies so extensively on this type of industry, and based on what was being said over the last few presenters, it is a culture of establishment for your colony. Do you know of any government officials that have been working with this type of initiative with the community, and have you had an opportunity to work with government officials on developing alternative ways of utilizing waste?

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: No, I've not worked with them, but I've been to two or three different colonies and seen their setup, and from what I understood, it was either funded by them or funded by other industries. I don't believe the government was involved. As a matter of fact, I did hear some comments by someone saying they had asked for government involvement, funding, and they had not received it.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser. Just a quick question in regard to your thoughts. You've obviously indicated that the decision is, for political reasons, to have a moratorium. I paralleled it to the U.S. making a political decision to close the border to cattle because of BSE. They didn't look into the science and what we were doing, the tagging, or anything else in Canada, and the meat was proven to be fine.

Your industry is very supportive. The technology is raising one of the most high-quality products in the world today as far as feeding people. Can you elaborate on the co-operation that you think would be required to remove the moratorium and work with the industry in the meantime to come up with a better solution than a moratorium?

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: I guess what we're looking for is funding from the government to—let's say people come up with solutions, with ideas that they want to try, that the government is willing to come in and say, okay, let's look at this. Let's make some funds available for research and development and look at some real numbers of what's possible.

I think there are some alternatives out there. They have been tried in different countries. I know a number of years ago we had some people from Singapore here who were showing us some solid separation systems, where the government stepped in there and actually—I believe they had the government put in the solid separating systems into all the barns in exchange for—they said they want all the manure for the next ten years. So they took the manure, aerated it, turned it into compost, sold it back to the farmers and actually made a profit on the whole deal.

So that's what we're looking at. Let's come up with some alternatives. Let's just work together. Let's not just close the door entirely.

Mr. Maguire: Just to that, then, you agree that there are other solutions to this problem.

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: Yes.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you.

* (14:00)

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: I was going to make one more comment, but it slipped my head here. No, I think that's it.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we'll move on to Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. You spend a lot of time talking about Canada and the world. Our Finance Minister is here with us today, and I think it's very important that we talk about the economics, especially on the topic which you talked about. What kind of signal does this say to investors like you just talked about, somebody from China or Hong Kong that wants to invest in Manitoba? If, in fact, Bill 17 passes and puts a permanent moratorium on, do you feel those people will be taking initiatives to move to Manitoba?

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: I think that's already happening, because I know in many of the barns that we supply in Malaysia and China and Russia, these are investors from China, they're investors from all over the world who are choosing to go to these countries because, frankly, it's cheaper for them.

They don't have to worry about—and they say it right openly, we don't have to worry about the environmental red tape. And I think that is, it's the wrong way to go. We should be worried about it. But I think it's wrong that we are actually causing that problem.

We have the means. We have the money. We have the economy. We have everything we need here to actually solve these problems. The developing countries don't have that. They don't have that, and it's unfair of us to demand it of them. We're pushing the Kyoto protocol and all these things upon all these developing countries and, in return, they're turning around and saying, hey, wait a minute. It's not fair what you guys are doing. You guys got rich. You built up your economies by destroying the environment, and now that you're rich, you're well-off, you want to stop us from doing it. And, you know, there's an irony in that. And I think as, you know, we have a responsibility to the world. Yes, we have caused a lot of damage, but I think now we can also make a difference.

Mrs. Rowat: I want to thank you, Ian, for your presentation. I think you provide what I do here for my communities or my colonies within my constituency, that you're very entrepreneurial. You do look outside of our jurisdictions. You look world-wide for solutions in trying to be self-sustaining and providing uses for all of your products. And I want to thank you for your presentation today because I do believe that your communities do play an integral role in our province and when you stated earlier that what Alberta had done by passing their Communal Property Act and we had lost colonies to other countries I don't want to see that happen in our province, and I commend you for coming forward and sharing your ideas, which I think should be taken on record and given consideration by this government, so thank you for doing that.

Mr. Ian Kleinsasser: I just want to thank the committee for taking the time to actually listen to us and letting us come express our views. We hope that, somehow we can, in the future, work together.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser. Mrs. Taillieu? Further question?

Mrs. Taillieu: No, I'm just wondering if it's the will of the committee to have his presentation also recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. Chairperson: Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]* Agreed and so ordered. Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser.

If it's the will of the committee, I'll go back to presenter No. 61, Mr. Jack Hofer. Is that agreeable?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer, Jack Hofer. Mr. Hofer, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Jack Hofer (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Jack Hofer: My name is Jack Hofer. I'm the hog facility manager of the Walheim Colony. I've been working in the hog industry for 15 years. Hog industry is my livelihood. It's my culture; it's my way of life. It's my way to make a living. In our community, we don't promote a college education or university degrees. We kind of educate our children in the community to prosper our way of life. For me to come in here, stepping outside the box of the community. We don't do that. But to come in here and express my feelings, it's a shame that I have to come here and educate the government. We have to come in here and show them that my legal rights are being violated.

I read this letter to bring to light the imminent, negative repercussions of pending Bill 17, The Environmental Amendment Act, on the Hutterite brethren communities. The Hutterite brethren communities are a vibrant, unique part of Manitoba that not only adds to the culture and diversity of our country, but also significant economic growth by the means of the hog industry. These economic growths are a benefit directed to success for the well-managed, hog farming practices. So important is the hog farming to the Hutterite brethren community in Manitoba as a whole, that it accounts to well over 14,000 jobs and a multi-billion-dollar industry. Hog farming not only means earning a living, it has become a way life for many Manitobans and members of the Hutterite brethren communities.

In fact, hog farming is the primary source of our income for many families and a family tradition that has spanned for many generations, ensuring the preservation of our lifestyle, our employment and practices of our fundamental freedom. In addition, a provision of our sustainable employment, Manitoba has created a global competitiveness in the industry, in spite of a current volatility in the global conditions, by the means of production and expansion of the hog industry, all within the requirements outlined in the environmental act.

In our respectful opinion, our freedom, our fundamental freedom, guaranteed to us in this country, has been violated. As such, we ask the government to retract this bill that threatens and stifles new expansion of industry and the way of life. If this bill becomes law, communal life enjoyed by many will be infringed upon. It is wrecking not only our lives, but the lives of our children, expunging our rights, the legal rights of life, liberty and security of a person, and the right not to be deprived to legitimate family farming.

If Bill 17 becomes law, this government, in fact, is contributing to the communities, but to consumers, purchasers and merchants depending on the Canadian hog industry. Bill 17 discriminates, both directly and indirectly, against the Hutterite brethren communities, individual hog farmers and all business related to feeding, shipping, purchasing, on which the industry is relying. The most visible effect would be rural farmers, families and small businesses in the hog industry, with its effect and extending out to the sector of agriculture.

Bill 17, an environmental act of amendment, permanent ban on building or expanding the hog industry, was done—the environment act amendment, permanent ban on hog building practice, contradicts the government's own taxpayer-funded \$750,000 study that has been done by Dr. Tyrchniewicz and by the CEC, Clean Environment Commission, and a 10 years of additional, regulated, independent study has concluded that hog farming in Manitoba, with environmental rules and regulations, is sustainable.

Why are we here, if it's sustainable to rules and regulations? We need more rules. If we get more rules and regulations, it's better for us. It's way better for us. We can make it more economical to rules and regulations with manure programs. It's a benefit for everybody.

Bill 17 unjustly blames the hog industry of Manitoba for water issues, by putting a permanent ban on hog farm building or expansion. Furthermore, the passing of Bill 17 would eradicate probably 14,000 current and future jobs. Of those 14,000 jobs, in the Hutterite communities—there are roughly 100 Hutterite communities; there are about 50 children in every Hutterite community. Bill 17 would eradicate their future jobs, their lifestyle, their culture which otherwise would be available to Manitobans, to science research in improving and advancing a hog industry within our province and allowing it, in turn,

to remain consistent and competitive in the global market.

In conclusion, we ask the government—our needs and the future of our children not to be exposed to this vulnerability and possibly demolishing our culture, religion and livelihood, what would be brought about by passing Bill 17, which is discriminating and addresses a serious matter of breach of our rights and fundamental freedom, as an individual that is reliant on the hog industry—to allow this continuation of production and expansion of the hog industry.

It's a shame and a disgrace to be supportive of Bill 17, now here to eradicate the current and future jobs, 14,000 current and future jobs, a multi-billion-dollar industry, cultures, livelihoods, legal rights to life, liberty and security, and possibly promoting starvation.

*(14:10)

This is serious. This is serious. Do you know Canada produces the best pork in the world? Did you know Canada has the best producers in the world? I know so. Two times, we've been awarded for the top producers in Canada, in North America, top production. This is my livelihood.

Do you know supporters of Bill 17 are trying to take away our rights to produce food? That's real, and I say, in my own opinion, that's prejudiced and racist because 80 percent of the hog producers in Manitoba are Mennonites and Hutterites. There are food crises out there. There is food crisis in the real world. We're talking 900 million people are deprived by food each day. That's a lot of people. That's more than Canada will ever have. I shouldn't say ever have but more than Canada will have in a long time. There are children out there depending on us to produce food for them; come on. Supporters of Bill 17 are going to starve those people. They're going to starve those children.

We have the right to produce food if we can produce food. Promoting starvation is an act of evil. I'm a believer. I believe in a God. This is wrong. Hungry people aren't happy people. I'm serious. Most of us have probably never seen hunger. If there are any Bill 17 supporters out there, you should feel disgusted and devastated about yourselves to support such a bill, an evil act; I'd be. In my opinion, if I supported Bill 17, I'd feel like the worst criminal ever existed on the face of this planet. Think about it. Starvation is something. It's going to take jobs away.

You're going to take cultures away. You're going to take lifestyles away. That's enough.

It's time to sit down. Let's talk about rules and regulations. It is sustainable. The industry is sustainable. Let's work together. There's always an option. If it needs more rules, it needs more rules. If it needs more regulations, it needs more regulations. What's good for you is good for us. It's good for the neighbour down the road but we just can't close the door. It's impossible.

Floor Comment: Thank you.

Mr. Jack Hofer: You're welcome. I thank the government, thank you very much for taking care and time to read my issue. I hope you do your best.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer. If you would wish to remain, there are a few people that have some questions for you.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much and thanks for your presentation. I know that sometimes it's difficult to step outside your comfort zone, but you did an excellent job of your presentation today. So thank you very much for coming here and bringing your message about your culture. Pork producing is something that is part of your culture and we've heard that from several of the brethren that have come to present today.

We need to thank you, actually, for doing what you do and your way of life and your families who put food on the plates of our families. I think the message, if I'm correctly hearing you, the message that you're sending to this government today is let's work together on this, but let's not put people and businesses out of business. There's a better way. Am I right?

Mr. Jack Hofer: Yes, you're 100 percent right.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer, sorry, I have to recognize you so that your words are recorded by *Hansard*. Proceed.

Mr. Jack Hofer: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer, I have three more questions for you yet, if you don't mind. I'll go to Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you. You did a fantastic job and I'll tell you what. We appreciated hearing from each and every one of our citizens in this great province that we live in. I know that you talked about us being a world-class leader. We'd certainly encourage you and we hope that, you know, by the turnout on the

other side of the House today these colleagues of ours that are sitting on the government side do hear what you have to say.

I guess my question for you is, we know there's great science out there. We heard about barley genetics. We heard about feed programs. Do you feel that with the permanent ban coming on that those programs will then stop and there won't be any new science come forward as a result of this strain it's going to be placing on the industry?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer, would you answer again just for *Hansard*.

Mr. Jack Hofer: Yes. Who's going to support it? If the hog industry goes down, who would support science? Nobody would fund it. It's the economics and the turnover from the hog production to the feed companies to science to everything to get this thing rolling. Why would somebody stick money into science if the industry's shut down?

Mr. Struthers: Yes, thank you, very much for your presentation. I begin from the premise that your colony does things to protect Manitoba's water and would support initiatives that protect either the quantity or quality of the water in Manitoba. In conversations in the hallway with a number of different people, it was indicated a number of different things that, very practically, you're doing on your farms to protect Manitoba's water.

Can you indicate in your own operation some of those things that you're doing to protect Manitoba's water?

Mr. Jack Hofer: Well, No. 1, we have a manure management program and a management system where every year, in fall, we inject our knife, our manure into the soil where it decomposes and it turns it back into soil. Then we have approximately about three-and-a-half years where we don't have to put on any chemicals like anhydrous fertilizer on there. We get it naturally, organically from the soil that has been decomposed through the manure. That's a great advantage. We're saving piles of money—hundred dollars on an acre right now if you'd put it on, if you'd buy it and put it on. Rules and regulations help us. We need to keep our waters clean.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you for your presentation this morning or this afternoon. You talked about starving people in starving countries, and I know that a number of colonies are strong supporters and believers in soup kitchens such as Siloam Mission,

food banks. I know that blankets have been made for Siloam Mission for their homeless shelter.

Can you talk a little bit about how you provide products to help those within our own province who are maybe less fortunate?

Mr. Jack Hofer: Well, every year, we have this big hog competition and then we donate pork to the food banks. Then there are companies that bid on the best hogs and then we take the money and donate it to hospitals and to food banks to help out the communities, to help out as much as we can. We donate money if we can. Our church is set up to donate and to help in any way we can.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, thank you, Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Jack Hofer: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Do I have leave of the committee to return to presenter No. 65, Terry Hofer. [*Agreed*] Is Mr. Terry Hofer present?

Mr. Hofer, do you have any written materials for the committee? No? Okay, please proceed, sir.

Mr. Terry Hofer (Private Citizen): I am Terry Hofer from Woodlands Hutterite brethren community. I've been in the hog industry on an off for about 15 years. It's a shame we're here today arguing for our fundamental freedom and our farming rights that have been guaranteed to us in this country. Now we're here today fighting against an unfriendly Manitoba Bill 17. At first the government released a \$200-liquidating program to destroy 40,000 employees that have families to feed and to put them through education courses about hog facility programs. Not only that, but the community life and the negative precaution of pending Bill 17.

Permanent bans on building or expanding hog facilities contradicts the government's own funding money of \$750,000-study that has been done by Dr. Tyrchniewicz and with the Clean Environment Commission, and the 10 years additional independent study that concluded that hog facilities are sustainable which has been done.

* (14:20)

One point 5 percent of phosphate is revealed from hog facilities, the CEC study shows. With that low percent, this takes pride, responsibilities and farm team efforts to live up to those environmental standards. We care for our future, our country and our coming generation. We ask the government

about the rest of the 98.5 percent phosphorus that's contaminating Lake Winnipeg. No guidelines or any information has been sent out to us that we can work with.

So why is this happening? Because the hog industry is a very vulnerable target. If city waste and hog facilities would have similar regulations, we could fold the hog industry by 100 percent. The NDP has to start realizing that working in the hog industry is the biggest challenge in life, to fill the food demand of this country as we speak.

Passing on Bill 17 discriminates and addresses a serious matter in this country, a breach in rights and fundamental freedom as individuals who are entirely reliant on the hog industry that have inherited and passed down for centuries. This livelihood, religion, and culture is our way of life. That's what we have. That's all we got and to expand for many to enjoy. Why take that away from us? Is it because of political reasons? What is it?

Science has been done about how much we're contaminating. It's all a written fact with the CEC environment commission, and why is it really happening? It's a serious issue in society we're actually adding into. It's unfair, mean, and arrogant. Thank you for your time to review our concerns on this issue.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hofer. Questions.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hofer. On your current—in your colony, are you at the maximum level as far as animal units are concerned in your particular operation, and are you looking at expansion down the road? If you were allowed to, would you be expanding your operation?

Mr. Terry Hofer: If we look back like I just said, for centuries, that's our inheritance. Of course, that is our main source of income. This is all we have. Not all we have, but it's part of what helps us right through life, support what we have, our families. Our biggest thing is our religion. No matter what, we're standing up for what we have, and we definitely want to expand and come out with, yes, and for many to enjoy. We love that. Why would you want to take that away from us?

That's why we're here fighting. If we wouldn't want to expand and be with the moratorium, we wouldn't be here. We care for what we have. That's why we're all here telling you guys it's not right. We were here first. Farmers, we don't come in the city

and tell you guys how to run the city. You live in the city. It's your city. We got the country, no, not we, but we've been farming in the country for centuries and for a long time. That's our livelihood. Why destroy it? It's not right.

If you guys think you got tighter regulations and better environmental standards, hey, you know what, let's work as a team. Let's do it. Like, why not? What are we scared of? We want to have a clean environment. Why not?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler, supplemental.

Mr. Eichler: We've heard this time and time again from presenter to presenter, making it very clear to the government that there's not anybody, there hasn't been one presentation saying they would not want to work for the government. Rather than put a bill through, they would like to see regulations through negotiations, through consultation, that the industry be allowed to go ahead, to grow and prosper, and work through those regulations. Do you agree with that as well?

Mr. Terry Hofer: Well, I wouldn't come out and say we don't want to directly work with the government, but—I'm just a little tongue-tied here. Let me think. To be honest with you, tighter regulations, we can work with that, and we can work with the government. Whatever it takes to keep our facilities running and the expanding going in our culture, we will work with the government. We'll work with environmental standards.

When we go out to knife our manure or whatever we have for better environmental reasons, we got the environment. Environments are out there working with us. A Clean Environment Commission shows that they're there. It's a \$750,000 fund paying money that's been done with our money shows it's sustainable. Why are we here arguing or disagreeing with each other? For what? What is the reason, really? It's been done. It should be over.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Terry, for your presentation. It's very clear what you're asking for. The \$750,000 Clean Environment Commission study that you referred to, obviously, came out and said that the hog industry is sustainable. We have heard that from other presenters here today.

I'm assuming, and would you agree, that the \$750,000 would have been much more wisely spent if we had done what Mr. Eichler just indicated and brought the industry together with the government to sit down and try to find solutions to this?

Mr. Terry Hofer: Yes, that was actually a very good funding, really, to prove to the public, to the media, that we're not really to blame on contaminating Lake Winnipeg, that we're actually running a clean, safe environment. That's what we want to show and I think we've done an excellent job.

Mr. Chairperson: I'm going to go to Mrs. Taillieu, unless she would give leave to Mr. Maguire to put a supplemental.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Terry, for your presentation. I think we've heard many times that producers are willing to work with the rules and regulations that are in place. Certainly, it would be, I think, desirable for this government perhaps to have consulted with the producers before, if you had had input into this whole process, if they'd come to you and said, how is your operation working and are there any problems; can we all work together and make this work? Certainly, maybe, there are issues with certain areas in the province that need to be addressed, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you should shut down everybody in the whole industry across the province. You need to work with the ones that need help, I guess, is what I'm trying to say.

But I think that if you had been consulted with beforehand and worked together, maybe we could have avoided this whole issue. I guess my question would be, did you have any input or were you asked about this whole process beforehand?

Mr. Terry Hofer: I've got no comment on that because I don't know. I've got no comment on that.

Mrs. Rowat: Based on what you're presenting today, obviously, there are several young members within the colony who are probably quite concerned that a decision was made, really, that doesn't reflect the science. The CEC report obviously confirmed what you've been saying.

Are there members of your colony, your generation, that are quite concerned about your future and where this moratorium is going to lead your community?

Mr. Terry Hofer: Of course. There are so many people out there concerned, especially my generation. Why wouldn't you be, really? Why wouldn't you be? They're taking something away from you that comes from your forefathers. If you really think about it, what the government really is trying to do, it discriminates our religion, and that's not cool with us. That's not cool.

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Hofer, the hog industry creates over a billion dollars a year to the economy of Manitoba. That's more money than Manitoba Hydro contributes to the economy of Manitoba. The moratorium was put on to clean up the lake. That's the media, that's the spin to this, is that that is to clean up the lake.

However, nothing has changed from the day before the moratorium to the day after the moratorium as far as the hog operations in Manitoba. There will not be one ounce less phosphate going into the lake, but we jeopardize the future of this industry just by psychologically saying there is never an opportunity to change it. Do you agree with that type of philosophy?

* (14:30)

Mr. Terry Hofer: Yes, well, it's, like I said earlier, if it's still the amounts of phosphor hasn't been changed, right, like you said? So that's why we're asking here: where is it coming from then? Where is it? It's obvious it's not from us. Where's it coming from? What's contaminating Lake Winnipeg? Is it city contaminations? Really, what is it? Does anybody know? Can we focus on what it is? Why don't we focus on what it is instead of hitting on the hog industry? Because we've done a study. It's a shown fact that it's not us and, like you said, there's not one ounce of phosphorus since the mandatory ban has been on, so where is it coming from?

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, Mr. Hofer, I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Terry Hofer: Thanks.

Mr. Chairperson: With will of the committee, I'll go back to presenter No. 66, Dwayne Hofer. Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]*

I call Mr. Dwayne Hofer. Dwayne Hofer. Okay. If Mr. Hofer is just out in the hallway and returns shortly, he can inform the Clerk and we'll come back to him.

Mr. Andy Gross.

Mr. Gross, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Andy Gross (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No. Seeing none, you may proceed.

Mr. Gross: I'm here to share a few views and to protest about Bill 17. We had some visitors tour our

barn from Russia and envy what we have in this country. They would like to get back into what they had, but the government they had before kind of eliminated everything they had and worked for. They've got the best farming texturing soils in the world, and it was ruined by a corrupt government, and now they're coming into our country to start over and teach and learn how to go about farming again.

What we're doing here is totally going to where they were with starving people in a war-torn country. If this bill passes, we will be the next Russia. If people don't open their eyes and do some major adjusting, then that's what we're heading for. I've got six kids at home. They don't know of other life than farming. Their generations they're going to have, there is none. The food that we produce is the best in the world. The farming and all the equipment we have is the latest and the best. The animals are not abused and misused. They're there to produce food. I am concerned because of the future of my kids and everybody around us. What I would like you to do is scrap that bill and just throw it out. It is a waste of money and, like I said, we are going to be the next Russia if this keeps going. This government has to stand up and do what is right, because they've got hog barns there, they've got 24-hour armoured guards watching those barns. That how much they have and they're buying hogs and they're buying cattle and they're sending their generals from the army into our country to buy livestock. They don't know of anything else because it's been taken away from them and we're going to be where they are now if we don't open our eyes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Gross. I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Mr. Gross, for your presentation. You mentioned you have six children in your immediate family. Is your colony looking at expansion to a sister colony or a daughter colony within the next short time?

Mr. Gross: At the present time, no, but, in the future, definitely.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler, supplemental?

Mr. Eichler: If a colony was to split, we know you need a large land base in order to establish another colony in order to get started. Normally tradition follows with a hog barn. If the ban does go through, I know that a number of other presenters have talked about the regulations; would you rather

see the regulations come into effect for expansion of a barn rather than through a bill?

Mr. Gross: We need to have expansion. It's our livelihood and our main source of income is hogs. There's hardly anything else that you can get into that—like the way we're raised and the way we're brought up, that's basically our education, is livestock and farming.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Andy. I respect a guy who can just stand up, without notes and tell us exactly what he thinks of something. I appreciate that.

Tell me exactly what your community does to protect Manitoba's water. Again, I want you to know that I start from the premise that there's some very practical things being done on farms, I suspect yours included, to protect the water. Can you tell me what you do on a day-to-day basis to accomplish that?

Mr. Gross: I would be a fool to do something to hurt my family and the people around me. So we operate at the highest tolerance level that we possibly can to keep everything clean. The waters—we'd be fools to pollute them because we have to drink it. All the standards that we can basically do, that's what we do. There's a small creek running by our yard. It's clean and if it's not dried out, we don't go dumping stuff in there because we'd contaminate ourselves. Why would we go and do that?

The lakes around us—the closest is the Assiniboine River. I like to go fishing there. I'd be a stupid fool to dump some manure in there and then have to go and sit and catch a fish there. It's logic; it's stupid. We have to breathe air that is out there so why would we go and pollute it.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Mr. Gross, for your presentation.

I think that was a little bit of an unfair question to ask you, what you are doing to protect the water. I think that, if they're going to ask that question of you, they should ask that of every single Manitoban in this province because we are all part of the problem here. We all need to be part of the solution; not just you, not just the colonies, not just the hog producers, but every single person. I think that the message here should be to the government. If you want to protect the environment, and who doesn't, then talk to every single person in this province and don't try and single out an industry.

Mr. Gross: It is unfair. There are people that are probably changing oil on the streets of Winnipeg and just running it through the sewer system. There are thousands of people that contaminate water like they don't care. But it's all being pointed at the farmer. Because of the animal waste they think that's where most of it is going and it's not fair. There are big, big companies out there that produce twice the pollution that a hog farm would and three times the level. Toxic waste too. The waste that we get off the animals is organic; it's not a toxic waste.

We love to have the waters clean. We like to see the bottom of the lake too. There are not too many lakes around where you can see the bottom no more. It's not from the farmers, it's from everybody around.

*(14:40)

Mr. Struthers: Andy, it's too bad you're in the middle of this, but I did not intend that to be an unfair question. If you felt that it was unfair, I apologize to you. I do not ask that question in any way, shape or form to put you on the spot, to suggest that it is all up to you or all up to farmers to protect water. My premise is that the Hutterite colonies and other farmers, every day on the job, they make good decisions to protect Manitoba water. That's my premise. I've been clear on that. I don't want others to play politics with it when I ask an honest question to give a farmer a chance to brag about the things that he or she does on their day-to-day operations. So I suggest we just distil that kind of politics out of this. I have talked to people in that hallway this afternoon who told me about collecting water in rain barrels and using it. That is a good practice. It happens every day on Manitoba farms.

I don't want, at the end of this process, to have people mistakenly think that people on Hutterite colonies get up every morning to look for ways to screw up Manitoba's water. I don't believe that, and I don't think we should make those kinds of statements in this committee. I think we need to give Manitoba farmers, Hutterites included, every chance, every possibility to explain how good stewards they are in our land. I take that serious, and I'm offended at that kind of an insinuation by the Member for Morris (Mrs. Taillieu).

So, Andy, I'll—if you don't mind, I'll give you another chance to talk about some of the very practical ways that you do to help Manitoba protect its water. That's all good intentions and everything.

Mr. Gross: To protect water it takes a team. An individual can't do it. If I try my best to keep it clean, and the guy down the road doesn't, well, there's not much you can do. But, in our community, that we have, water is a very important source. We have lots of it. We've got artesian wells. The water quality is excellent, and it was there when we got there. It's been like that since we've been there, and we've been there for 30-some years now, so the practices we are doing, they're good, because, if the water quality would be bad, and it was good when we got there, then who'd be to blame? It would be us. But the practices that we do are—apparently we're doing the right thing because the quality is good.

Ms. Wowchuk: I just want to follow up again. Thank you for your presentation and for sharing about your colony.

I wanted to ask you whether on your colony you had enough land base to spread the manure or whether you have extra room?

I also wanted to ask you—there's a lot of talk about different kinds of technologies that can be used to process manure. So there are two questions: Do you have enough land or do you have more land than you are able to use now? And are you looking at any of the other technologies that are available to treat manure?

Mr. Gross: We have enough land to triple our hog production. That will answer the one question, and the second question you'll have to repeat because I forgot it.

Ms. Wowchuk: Well, if you have triple the land base that you need, you probably don't have to look at technologies. What I was asking is, sometimes when there isn't a large enough land base, people will look at different kinds of technologies whether to separate manure or those kinds of things. But, if you have a large land base, you probably aren't looking at those other technologies.

Mr. Gross: We're in the practice of spending over half a million dollars to update our manure system we have now. It's going to be better or more updated technology, and the reason we're doing it because it's for the environment's benefit. If we wouldn't be doing it, we wouldn't go wasting that money.

Mrs. Taillieu: I just wanted to respond to what the minister said. He said that we shouldn't be playing politics, and, you know, I agree with that. We shouldn't be playing politics, and if the minister

doesn't want to play politics, I suggest that he should kill Bill 17.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: I have a point of order, but, first of all, I just want to remind the crowd—and I did this last night—that they're not to participate. Everybody who wants to has an opportunity to participate, that's at the microphone at the end of the table here. So I ask you to just restrain yourselves, please.

Mr. Chairperson: I have Ms. Howard, on a point of order.

Ms. Jennifer Howard (Fort Rouge): I don't want to take up the committee's time, but I wonder if you could just remind us all of the guidelines when it comes to questioning presenters and the purpose of those questions.

My understanding of questions is they're to gain information from the presenters. It's not an opportunity for us to debate with each other. We've lots of time to do that in the House. This is the time for us to hear from the public.

I think we've had very good co-operation on the committee and we should try to continue that, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, one moment. Thank you, Ms. Howard. I'm going to respectfully rule that it is not a point of order, because I do not want to unnecessarily subscribe debate here or questions. However, I will read this which the Clerk has passed to me.

I would like to remind committee members that questions addressed to presenters should be for clarification, based on information contained in the brief. These questions should not be used to debate or argue with presenters or used as a vehicle to ask leading questions. I thank honourable members for adhering to these practices.

There will be ample opportunity, after the public presentations are complete, for members opposite to debate this till the cows come home, or the sun comes up, or whatever comes first. I'm sure we will not limit you in any way whatsoever at that point in time but, while we have the public before us, let's try and focus on questions to the presenters, based on their presentations, please.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Where was I? Mrs. Taillieu, I believe, had put a question? Had you?

Mrs. Taillieu: No, I'm finished. I made my point.

Mr. Chairperson: She was done her question, and it was to the presenter. Sir, do you recall the question Mrs. Taillieu put?

Mr. Gross: Absolutely not.

Mr. Chairperson: Pardon me.

Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Water Stewardship): There really wasn't a question there and then we got onto our discussion, so I think there might be about a minute more for questions to this gentleman. That's where we were.

Mr. Chairperson: Time has expired for this presentation, so I won't take any new questions.

Mr. Graydon: I ask leave of the committee because the time has been used up for other things. I have a small question for the presenter that was raised in his presentation, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: First of all, the Clerk had stopped the clock, so the clock was not running while we went through the debate over the point of order. Time has now expired so, if you want to put a question, you would have to ask leave of the committee to do so.

Does Mr. Graydon have leave to put an additional question?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Chairperson: Leave has been granted.

Mr. Graydon: I thank the committee for that and I thank you, Mr. Chair, for your indulgence.

Mr. Gross, you said that, when answering the question from the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), you had three times the land base that was required for your hog operation today. However, because of the moratorium, you'll not be allowed to expand your hog operation.

I know that your religious beliefs and your denominational beliefs are that you work with the land. If you have three times the land base, but you can't develop that, the next generation—when it comes time for that colony to split and to move on, would that happen in this province, or will that happen somewhere where they'll welcome you, like Saskatchewan?

* (14:50)

Mr. Gross: If Bill 17 is informed and we cannot build no hog operation, it will not be in Manitoba. It can't be in Manitoba because, like I said before, all we have is hogs, like our major source of income, the reason I said we've got three times the land base with the hog unit we have, I was talking about injecting and handling manure properly. A lot of farms, they don't have the land base, but we do. If Bill 17 is passed it, cannot be in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, sir.

I'm going to call Dwayne Hofer. I'd called him a few moments ago and he was out of the room. Is he present now?

Mr. Hofer, do you have any written materials you'd like to pass on? No? Seeing none, proceed, please.

Mr. Dwayne Hofer (Private Citizen): My name is Dwayne Hofer and I'd like to comment on Bill 17.

Manitoba's Bill 17 that stops the building of new swine barns is a direct attack on Hutterites and Mennonites. They comprise 86 percent of all swine producers in the area. The bill effectively prevents building in the area encompassing 75 percent of Manitoba's crop land. Mennonite families who wish to grow hog productions in their own communities will be prevented by this ill-advised draconian legislation. They will not be able to build by their family, by their church. They will be forced to move large distances or out of the province to pursue their vocation. Hutterites live in communities. When they wish to build a new community, one of the centrepieces of their development is the building of a swine barn. Preventing new swine building will in essence push all new Hutterite communities out of most of Manitoba.

Is this legislation or environmental law? We think not. It's a trade by the socialist government of Manitoba to drive conservative church folk as hard-working people of our society out of the province or into its fringes. The environment has become a mantra for social engineering. This is not environmental legislation but a direct attack that is an affront to human rights. It's free justice. It's anti-religious. It's an offence to any person who believes in freedom and the right to commerce. If ever there was an issue that needs fighting, this is it.

It appears that the socialist government of Manitoba wants to drive the Hutterite and Mennonite

communities from the province. It's the worst kind of social engineering. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Dwayne, for your presentation. We've heard a lot of comments in regard to management. Could you—and the minister had talked about it in his question, when it comes to regulations that are out there now, and some of those are fairly new, and some of them haven't been implemented yet, do you feel those regulations are, in fact, fair at the point in time that the current situation's under with regard to those nutrient management regulations?

Mr. Dwayne Hofer: No comment.

Mr. Chairperson: No comment. Supplemental to Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: I'll rephrase it. In regard to the current situation that you practise your manure management under now, do you feel that those are fair? If not, what would you see changed, or would you be prepared in order to make the necessary changes to work with the government rather than put a moratorium on?

Mr. Chairperson: You're not obliged to answer, Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Dwayne Hofer: I got no comment.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay.

We'll move to Mrs. Wowchuk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you very much for your comments. I want to assure you that this is not, as you suggested, an attack on the Mennonites and the Hutterites. We want to work with you, and I want you to know that I have met with the brethren just very recently to talk about some of the challenges that some of the colonies are facing and have given a commitment to work together with them because we recognize that the colonies play a very important role in the agriculture economy of this province. I have committed that I will meet with them again, and I guess I would look to you if you could give me any suggestions before I meet with them about what we could do to help the colonies and recognize them for what they contribute to the economy.

Mr. Dwayne Hofer: No comment.

Mrs. Taillieu: Maybe you could just tell the government what they should do with Bill 17.

Mr. Dwayne Hofer: Just throw it out. It's garbage.

Mr. Chairperson: Just throw it out. Okay. Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Hofer, on your colony, as in many colonies, there's a hog barn. I assume there's one on your colony. Do you do direct injection on your farm with the manure, with the big machine direct injection into the soil?

Mr. Dwayne Hofer: Yes, we direct into the soil. We knife it in there.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you for presenting today. It is probably making you very nervous to be answering questions, but can you tell me about what your colony does for communities such as Winnipeg with the food banks or with other communities in your area? Does your community contribute to either the soup kitchens or the food banks and the churches and the communities in any way?

Mr. Dwayne Hofer: Well, in hog competitions, we usually donate a hog for competition and all the money that is raised goes to food banks and all the food goes to guys that need it.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation.

We had a Mr. Joe Dolecki, No. 40, who had said that he would be available. Is he here? Okay, I'm going to call Mr. Dolecki, No. 40.

Mr. Dolecki, do you have any written materials for the committee? Yes, you do? You may proceed when you're ready, Mr. Dolecki.

Mr. Joe Dolecki (Private Citizen): My name is Joe Dolecki, and, in real life, I'm an associate professor in and the chairperson of the economics department at Brandon University.

I'd like to thank you for granting me this opportunity to offer a submission on Bill 17, and I'd like to thank you for your patience. It's kind of a long drive in from Brandon, and I don't get into Winnipeg very often. I also have a request that the text of my material gets submitted for the record and placed on the record inasmuch as I tend to deviate from whatever is printed in front of me. It's a four-page thing.

Mr. Chairperson: All right. Is it agreeable to the committee that the text as he submitted it be included into the record? *[Agreed]* In addition to his

comments over the microphone. *[Agreed]* Thank you. Continue, sir.

* (15:00)

Mr. Dolecki: If you were to ask me today if I supported the passage of this bill, my answer would be yes, but. In particular, it's my view that the principal strength of this bill is that it places a moratorium on new and expanding hog production facilities in certain areas of Manitoba. But it's principal weakness is that it doesn't place a moratorium on the rest of the province which, in my view, is minimally necessary in order to achieve the stated objectives of the bill.

At the outset, I would like to say that my appearance before you today is, in part, inspired by the Manitoba Pork Council, the MPC, and, in particular, the material that's been posted on its unfriendly Manitoba Web site. While reading through this material, I was reminded of something my father, who turned 90 in December actually, told me many years ago. He said, it's always easier to repeat a lie than it is to seek the truth. In my view, the Manitoba Pork Council's unfriendly Manitoba campaign, confirms the wisdom of my father's remarks.

Anyway, in the time that I've got left, I'd like to walk through or briefly talk about a number of propositions that have been advanced by the Manitoba Pork Council and which I imagine have been advanced here in various forms for the last couple of days. I'd like to consider them one point at a time individually, but collectively at the end in relation to the question of the passage of Bill 17. My comments, I must underline, concern primarily the intensive livestock operation form of swine production.

The first comment is that the MPC consistently and falsely identifies intensive livestock operation hog production as an agricultural activity, not unlike the traditional family farm. The clear suggestion here is that the environmental problems which, objectively, are actually specific to this form of production process are problems that are ingredient in agricultural activity generally. That proposition is simply false.

As Bill Weida, a resource economist from Colorado and a foremost authority, I might add, on Intensive Livestock Operations in North America, as he notes, swine ILOs, quote, are industries not

agriculture. They create industrial-sized pollution and waste problems. They masquerade as agriculture because pollution and monitoring and pollution regulation are weaker in the agricultural sector.

The second point is that the Pork Council consistently and falsely portrays intensive livestock operations hog production as a significant engine of economic growth—they reference a billion dollars a year—and job creation, 15,000. It's an engine that's seen as a significant engine of growth for the Manitoba economy, particularly in rural areas.

In fact, the alleged billion-dollar contribution is a gross figure which does not incorporate, in particular, the full-cost accounting principle. In other words, it doesn't include along with it an assessment and inclusion of attending health, social and environmental costs. As well, on the second part of this, the job-creation business, the industry-friendly George Morris Centre reports in a study that was commissioned by the Clean Environment Commission that in 2006, the hog sector's last good year, the actual direct and indirect jobs attributed to the production side of things was about 4,776 which is, in itself, hardly sufficient to inspire rural repopulation. Another 3,713 jobs are attributed to the packing side of the industry, making the industry totals 8,489, a little over half what's claimed in the advertisements.

The third point is that the MPC consistently and falsely claims that the industry is operating under the most stringent regulations in the country. In fact, as the posting on the MAFRI Web site indicates: This government and the previous government of Manitoba and industry continue to work together to ensure the success of the pork industry in Manitoba.

Among other things, what this is is a collaboration, and among other things this collaboration has resulted in what I've called elsewhere regulatory subsidization of the industry whose extent is not only significant; it is breathtaking.

This regulatory package involves a number of things. First, it involves changes to the statutory framework within which this industry has developed, most notably The Planning Act. The changes that were intended to facilitate the proliferation of swine ILOs is a matter of right. They made changes to the regulatory structure within the planning and environment acts, most notably, the phosphorus regulation which accommodates existing practices and constitutes a licence to pollute. It includes direct

and indirect interference with decision making in respect of ILOs sightings at the municipal level as in the R.M. of Daly, my home. There's the subsidy that's involved in regulatory non-enforcement, and the whole thrust of the government's attempt to hide and to secrete from the public information on their record and on the performance of the industry by using the FIPPA process as a shield and the Ombudsman as a principle gatekeeper. All these elements have facilitated cost-shifting from the hog industry and on to the public at large.

The fourth point is that the Pork Council consistently and falsely claims that hog manure is a valuable, organic, natural by-product of its operations. In fact, in ILO hog operations these operations generally have a livestock, land-base ratio that's too large to permit it to be used exclusively as fertilizer.

What you have, then, is a waste disposal problem, arguably a toxic waste disposal problem. Consequently, what you have is a situation where producers systematically over-apply manure relative to crop requirements, which is the standard set by the CEC for the question of sustainability in this sector.

Fifth, the Pork Council consistently and falsely claims that hog production is environmentally sustainable and that ILO hog producers are good environmental stewards. In fact, the hog industry's utilization of the environment, particularly for the disposal of livestock waste, is an industrial polluting practice, one that results in the degradation of our environmental resources, notably land and water. This practice conveys a considerable economic benefit to the industry, substantially reducing the ledger costs of production. Objectively, these costs of production are shifted on to others, shifted on to the environment in the form of its degradation and to the users of the environment whose utilization of it is impaired by this degradation.

I made a submission to the CEC on this point, and I provided an estimate of the dollar value of this pollution subsidy to the industry, which was calculated on the basis of 2005 numbers supplied. In a study by Salvano and Flaten of the University of Manitoba, applying their study's estimates to the threshold of 60 ppm, which is the environmental or efficiency threshold on nutrient application, where it's the maximum possible conceptual rate at which crops can utilize phosphorus, the magnitude of the industry's pollution subsidy worked out to be between \$111 million and \$128 million minimum in

2005, which represented 111 percent and 125 percent of the net earnings that the industry reported for that year.

The conclusion that you draw from that is that, in the absence of this pollution subsidy alone, the industry as a whole is not economically viable and it is certainly not sustainable within the meaning of The Sustainable Development Act.

We've had a couple of confirmations since then. If you have the opportunity, take a look at page 90 of the Clean Environment Commission report, which estimates the compliance cost for 188 operations in two municipalities of about \$50 million.

There is a submission that you had heard yesterday from Maple Leaf who indicated the cost of compliance on the order of \$5.50 or \$11 a hog. If you apply these estimates and this guys' estimates to the environmental threshold of 60 ppm, it appears that my estimate of the pollution subsidy is low, out by a factor of two at least.

Sixth, and finally, for now, the Pork Council consistently and falsely claims the hog industry has been a willing partner with government to seek solutions to the environmental problems it creates based on what is termed, quote, sound science. In fact—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Dolecki, you're at 10 minutes now. You can either continue or allow questions. It's your choice.

Mr. Dolecki: What they're really saying is, let us continue with business as usual and, if there's any environmental harm that results, the government should assume liability; the taxpayers should pay the costs of adjustment. Anything else is unfair. From the perspective of the precautionary principle, the polluter pay principal and economic theory, that's just hog wash. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks for your presentation, Joe.

*(15:10)

It underlines kind of the environment in which we're trying to move forward in this. I have, on the one hand, a number of scientists telling this committee both the science for moving forward on a moratorium and the science for not moving forward on a moratorium. I have, on the economic side, people such as Manitoba Pork and others saying, here are the numbers; here's how we contribute to the

Manitoba economy, and we have professors of economics, such as you, who are casting some doubt on that.

We've gone from 1990, when we had 3.2 million hogs in this province, to 2007 with 8.8 million. Why hasn't that, in your view, translated into better economics for our province?

Mr. Dolecki: From the perspective of economic analyses, what you're looking at is a transformation of a production structure becoming more capital-intensive, becoming more dependent on external sources of input. When you have that occurring, you have little employment on the ground—two or three people in operation, generally, and you have most of the expenditures going outside the province for imported materials, et cetera. The output is exported, which means that the secondary-multiplier effects end up materializing outside the province. Then on the other side, you have all of the costs, particularly environmental or social costs of obtaining locally.

I might say, at this juncture, that the economic argument is advanced by, I imagine, a number of people here that, if the moratorium is in place, will be forced to go out of business. I might say on that—I think most of the people who are concerned in the south where the areas are, most people in those areas want to transform from an export weanling-type of operation to a finisher operation. They're objecting to the fact that that would imply an increase in animal-unit size and, therefore, they could not, in fact, make the expansion.

There's a reason for that; there's a good reason for that. You get much more output in manure and much more pollution that results out of that.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation—very interesting comments there. In fact, I'm an auctioneer and I thought I talked pretty fast, but I think you outdid me.

I do have a question for you, though, in regard to the nutrient management regulations which have been brought forward. Obviously, in your opinion, those have not worked. That's the first part of my question.

The second part of my question is—we've heard from municipalities, we've heard from communities that say they've had lumber yards, they've had electricians move in their areas, they've had golf courses built and, yet, you say to us at the committee that the Pork Council is wrong in their determination

of that economic benefit to all of Manitoba. Is that correct?

Mr. Dolecki: What I'm saying is that the George Morris Centre, which was commissioned to do a study on precisely this matter, reports the numbers that I reported and that it's substantially less than what is claimed by the Pork Council.

You'll have to ask them why they continue to insist upon using the 15,000 job-creation figure when, in fact, there is no evidence to suggest that that's the case. But that's neither here nor there.

With respect to the first question about the phosphorus regulation, as you know, the phosphorus manure management was not under any phosphorus regulation until recently. In fact, for the next four or five years when it takes into effect, they are still not under nutrient management, under phosphorus.

The threshold levels are extraordinarily high; they're spectacular in terms of—they allow spectacular amounts of P205 to be placed on the land; 823 pounds per acre is the 180 threshold. If you ask anybody, ask any grain farmer if they would, this week, go and seek to have 838 pounds of chemical phosphorus placed on their land, they would tell you, that would be fine, but I'd turn over the keys to my house, my son's house, my daughter's house, et cetera.

The fact is that's a licence to pollute. It was designed, in my view, to accommodate the existing practice, precisely because, if the upper limit was set as it should be at the environmental threshold of 60 ppm, then you would have a situation where people would be compelled to bear the full cost of production, the true cost of production, which includes the waste disposal costs, and they would simply not be viable.

I mean, as a person who has lived in this province for almost 30 years and as a regular taxpayer in the province of Manitoba, I object to the fact that we have, on the one hand, provided them with that subsidization all these years, and now, when the markets have dictated that returns and so forth in this industry have collapsed and this industry is collapsing, we open our treasuries, federally and provincially, to assist these folks.

The reality is, if we're going to be serious about sustainable development, if we're going to be serious about protection of the waters of Lake Winnipeg, we need to apply the full-cost accounting principle and develop a variety of means and come up with some

kind of plan to have an orderly decommissioning of this industry to the point where we can actually support something environmentally.

Mr. Chairperson: We're overtime, Mr. Eichler. If you want a supplemental, you'll have to seek leave.

Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Dolecki.

Okay. I seek the advice of the committee. I'm at a crossroads here. I have a conundrum. We are starting to get more and more presenters, whom I've called earlier, now showing up seeking to present, and yet there are others ahead whom I have not called yet. I have roughly four presenters in those circumstances, so what is the advice of the committee? Do you want to proceed with those four, or to go back to the point where I'd stopped moving forward with names?

Ms. Marilyn Brick (St. Norbert): Mr. Chairman, I'm sympathetic to the people who are coming, but I do think that a number of individuals have been waiting quite awhile to have their names called. They are on our list and were expecting to have their names called, so I would suggest we go back, revert back to calling people's names from the list, and then, once we've finished with whoever's here, then we can return back to those individuals who are here.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we've heard Ms. Brick. Is that the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

We will move forward. Where are we? No. 90, Ted Neufeld?

We'll try it and, if nobody is here, maybe we'll have to revisit this.

Larry Maendel? Larry is here? Well, that proves we made the right decision.

Mr. Maendel, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Larry Maendel (Private Citizen): Just private notes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may proceed.

Mr. Larry Maendel: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Larry Maendel. I come from a farm southwest of Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, and I am here to express my dismay about Bill 17. I have been working with hogs for 15 years. This is a way of life for me and the people of the community where I live and work. If parliament passes Bill 17 and it becomes law, our future as a hog farming community is finished.

Bill 17 will ensure that our future and way of living will change permanently, and it will be a disappointing day if this comes to pass. My community's main income is hogs that we produce as food and a means of income, supported by a Black Angus herd and a turkey quota. We also custom-raise pullets and farm several thousand acres of land.

*(15:20)

Pork is a very good source of protein and economically viable to produce. Furthermore, it comes to be produced—it can be produced in an environmentally sustainable manner. As a hog producing community, we walk hand in hand with the environment that surrounds us.

The organic by-product from our hog facilities is returned to the fields by means of cultivation injection in the springtime before we seed our fields. Careful regulations are followed to ensure that the right amounts are applied to specifically selected fields that need the fertilizer for the crops that will be grown. In this way, we never have to winter spread our manure, but it is applied to the fields in the spring. This ensures that no hog manure will be laced with spring run-off from those fields.

Bill 17 will seriously undermine the ability of Manitoba's Hutterite communities to come to contribute to the economy. A colony which depends on hog farming for its main income and needs to start up a new colony because of being too large and not finding enough employment for its people will not be able to build a hog barn as means of employment for its people who work as a hog producing group. This will have a negative effect not only on my community but also on the thousands of people the hog industry supports in this province. It will not be instantaneous for some people but for others it will.

In addition to hog farmers, veterinarians, biologists and others who work with the hog industry will be adversely affected. Eventually Bill 17 will affect our potential to export overseas to Japan and other countries that purchase pork from Canadian exporters. Somebody wiser than I said, and I quote: If agriculture and livestock production prosper, so will our countries' cities, but, if agriculture and livestock production suffer, eventually so will our cities.

I thank you for letting me come to share my perspectives. Danke schön, thank you, merci beaucoup.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Larry.

On your particular colony, you talked about your farm practices and how you value the manure that you inject into your system and the method of which you use it. Do you do a rotational-based crop, as well, through your soil testing, in order to determine how much manure you actually put on that land?

Mr. Larry Maendel: Yes, that is correct. We do rotate. It's not every year the same. Sometimes it's corn. Other times, providing there are, basically, sustainable amounts for other crops like potatoes, which we are surrounded by potato growers, plus we alternate with other grains and cereals.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Larry.

I'm going to take another crack at this. I hope this is taken in the most positive way as it's intended that way. I want to learn more about the practices on farms, including yours, and I don't ask this question in any kind of way, saying that you have to carry the whole burden on your shoulders, but I'm actually interested in knowing about water conservation at your farm.

I live in Dauphin and I see examples, whether it's up No. 6 highway through the narrows or up No. 5 highway to Neepawa, of good positive examples that farmers do all the time to protect Manitoba's water. Can you help me out by telling me some of the things you do to protect Manitoba's water?

Mr. Larry Maendel: I have no comments to that.

Mr. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Maendel, for your presentation.

Just following up on your presentation, I have a couple of questions that I wanted to ask you. You talked about the size of the colony. Do you have enough land base within the colony for your manure spread or do you have to go outside the colony to spread manure?

Mr. Larry Maendel: We have enough land that we can alternately use fields for application.

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Wowchuk, supplemental.

Ms. Wowchuk: My second question was, I don't know if I quite heard you right, but I believe you were talking about a sister colony. Are you in the process of looking to establish a sister colony and, if

you are, have you identified land where you are considering that sister colony?

Mr. Larry Maendel: As far as I know, not in the near future.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much for your presentation. I just try and ask what the minister asked in a different way in that, because you actually live on the land, you work the land, does it make common sense to you that you protect the water that's on your land and the water that runs through your land?

Mr. Larry Maendel: Hundred percent. We use the water as our own drinking water from our—and not only alone for us, but also for the livestock that we produce. We also use it for our irrigation, which we apply for our fields and the crops.

Mr. Chairperson: No further questions? Seeing none, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

I call Mike Van Schepdael, Genesis Inc. George Dyck. Raymond Funk. David Mendel.

Peter Wipf, Maxwell Colony. Mr. Wipf, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Peter Wipf (Maxwell Colony): No, I don't. Nope.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Peter Wipf: My name is Peter Wipf. I'm from Maxwell Colony, and I'd like to say that the majority of our income that we generate at Maxwell Colony comes from the hog production. That is why not only myself, but the majority of the Hutterites, as you will see when they come up here, are against Bill 17. The reason why the majority of the Hutterites and our Mennonite friends in general, too, are so against Bill 17, it's not as much for ourselves, 'cause we're too old. It's our children's future. The Bill 17 is going to kill the hog industry as you know it. It's not only going to kill the hog industry, it's going to kill the Hutterite culture and the Hutterite way of life as we know it. That is why the majority of the Hutterites and Mennonites in general, too, that are in farming are so against Bill 17.

* (15:30)

Another thing about Bill 17, when we came to this country and our grandfathers came, they came to a democratic country. They thought they did. Now we're asking ourselves, where is the democracy in this country? It doesn't seem to be so free as it used to be. When the grandfathers came, they could build

as much as they wanted to. I agree that the Hutterites and the farmers, hog farming in general, are being singled out for the pollution of the big lake. The Clean Environment Commission gave you guys a report and said that the hog industry and farmers in general only put 1.5 percent of pollution into the lake, so why is the hog industry being so singled out?

If Bill 17 goes through, it seems to me that we have no choice but to move out of country. Move out of country. I mean, I might as well call you alone, and other Hutterite colonies are in the same boat as we are. We have 20 boys at home that are 15 years of age and under. That's why I'm saying I'm not talking for myself; I'm talking about for our children and our children's future. In the future when we get big enough, when our colony is big enough when we have too much employment, that's when the colony splits up, as you know, especially the guys and the friends around here that know the Hutterite culture.

When it comes to split up, those 20 boys we have at home, they want a home. They need a future. They need a new colony. How does the Doer government expect us to expand if we can't expand into our only livelihood like all of us know, that's the hog industry?

There are not many colonies around right now that I had to throw out millions of dollars to buy a layer quota, turkey quota, broiler quota or a dairy quota. You know as well as I do it costs millions and millions of dollars which not many colonies have.

Maxwell Colony is like any other colony. We run a 500-sow herd. We inject the manure like any other colony. The manure management plan almost is in place in any other, in any farm, in any hog industry. And when you had mentioned plan, which is a very good plan, should have been done years and years ago. Our grandfather should have done this years ago already. But now, with Bill 17, our children's future is at stake, and I hope the committee can see that. It's not for ourselves, brothers; it's for our children's future.

It looks like if Bill 17 goes through and our children have no future here in Manitoba, it's like some of the past speakers have said, we might have to move out of country and go back to the old country where our grandfathers came from. I ask Mr. Doer and company, is that what they want? There have been great leaders here in Manitoba before. There have been great leaders in Canada. Is the great leadership showing itself here in Manitoba now? Bill

17 talks totally different. I don't think so. I think that's all I have to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wipf. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. We've heard time and time again about the great stewardship that your organization and your leaders and your previous leaders and the next generation that you want to hand this operation over to. If Bill 17 does go through in its current state, you talked about having to leave this province. That would be shameful and totally unacceptable. I personally feel that you have a right; you have demonstrated that right by expressing your voices here today, which I commend you for coming in. I know that I've talked to a number of the Hutterite colonies around the province in the past month, month and a half, and a lot of them didn't want to come and make these presentations to the committee, but, after talking to you, you certainly did a fantastic job outlining your position in regard to that.

You came from the United States. You moved to Canada. Where would you go if you weren't going to live in Manitoba?

Mr. Peter Wipf: Right now, I guess, like the other guy said, no comment. But where can we go? Can I ask the Doer government, where do we go? Of course, we can move west, but it's just a matter of time till the government of the day has the same legislation in the west. So maybe there are only one or two places in the world where I can go is to South America or back to the country where we came from. Like I said, is that the leadership we have in Manitoba today? Is that what they really want?

Mr. Eichler: I hope that we can find resolve. I hope that we can find some type of amendments that we can bring forward, or just the withdrawal of Bill 17.

I know that we've also heard that the various organizations are more than prepared to meet the recommendations being brought out in the CEC report and the regulations that are currently in place. Do you feel that the current regulations that have been handed down by the government have had an opportunity to actually be tested to see whether or not they in fact will work, rather than bring in a moratorium at this point in time?

Mr. Peter Wipf: I really don't know what you mean with all the regulations. We have the manure management plan in place now which every farmer, I think, in Manitoba, especially the Hutterite colonies, they have been monitored very closely. More power

to their management plan because, like I say, this should've been done years and years ago. As to my mind, that manure that's generated by our livestock is liquid gold, because one of your gentlemen says, there are hundreds of thousands of dollars involved in that manure when we don't have to apply organic fertilizer.

So, in order to answer your question, the manure management plan is working perfect, very good, as far as I'm concerned. It's regulated by very nice people, people that understand the industry, but there also can be stepped on toes if they have to, as we've seen in the past.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you for your presentation, as well.

Discussions here, I guess, obviously, the first step is to stop the bill, to have the government see the light of day and change the bill, amend the bill or stop the bill, and then come in with some kind of committee to look at the rules and regulations that you've just outlined are providing very stringent means of controlling our environment today, probably some of the best to do that in North America, some would say the most stringent anywhere.

The Pork Council, other groups, were not given any notice of the moratorium coming in, when it was first brought in, and the shock and surprise that it was extended the day that the Clean Environment Commission came down. Would you agree that it's time to set those things aside and work together in a co-operative manner in some kind of a committee this summer, now that this bill won't become law until fall, to try and find a solution to this?

Mr. Peter Wipf: I think to answer your question, I have to agree with one of the other gentlemen here, is strictly kill Bill 17. It would be the straight-out answer, but, if it has to be, then negotiate. Diplomacy has always worked between other countries, when countries have fights with each other. It seems to me the hog industry has just had to fight with the Doer government right now.

Mr. Maguire: I just might reverse that for you, but I agree. Thanks.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Mr. Wipf, for your presentation. I visited Maxwell Colony before, so it's nice to see you here.

I guess I just wanted to ask: Many people have actually made similar presentations about what

would happen if the industry dies in Manitoba and you were having to go somewhere else. I know that you and your colony and many colonies are very community-minded and are committed to helping other people in the neighbouring communities. As well, you contribute to the economies of the neighbouring towns because that's where you do your business. So what's going to happen to some of the communities nearby should your colonies move away?

Mr. Peter Wipf: Ms. Taillieu, if the Hutterites should move out of Manitoba, I would not like to add, it will start at the top with our lawyers and our accountants. It will work its way all the way down to our feed suppliers, to our fuel and gas suppliers, to our machinery suppliers, to our hardware, bearings and belt suppliers, and everybody and the economy in general.

* (15:40)

I hope that this message can be given to the Doer government, what the consequences will be if the Hutterites should ever—it won't be today and tomorrow, brothers and sisters, you know that. Like I said when I started, our children's lives are at stake here.

That is why Bill 17 has to be killed. If the children have to move out of Manitoba, you think of everybody that's going to be involved in the Hutterites leaving, with the Hutterites gone, but not every Hutterite. I have to apologize when I say Hutterites only; there are just as many Mennonite friends involved as Hutterites.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, Mr. Wipf, I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Peter Wipf: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Darren Bates, Hypor Incorporated. Jason Wurtz.

Cameron Maendel. Mr. Maendel, do you have a written presentation for us?

Mr. Cameron Maendel (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Cameron Maendel: My name is Cameron Maendel and I am from Fairholme Colony, located 35 miles southwest of Portage la Prairie area. Even though my area is not in the moratorium districts, I believe that Bill 17 will indirectly affect all of the hog growers in Manitoba and, eventually, every farmer here.

I do not know what to say to this bill. I was brought up to respect the government as well as what and whom they stand for, but Bill 17 is not right. It goes against beliefs that I was brought up to respect. For example, the University of Manitoba, an institution that has probably been responsible for putting most of you where you are today, is now telling you that hog barns are not responsible for the pollution in Lake Winnipeg; yet, the sole blame is being laid on hog farmers, farmers who care for their environment more than most people.

These farmers are horrified and disappointed, because they feel wronged by their own leaders. They don't want to harm the environment because they make their living on the land. Farmers are honourable Canadians who strive to inform and educate themselves about appropriate sustainable practices in raising livestock. This includes responsible manure management, animal welfare and aquifer protection, among others. Being a farmer is not a job, but a vocation and a lifestyle.

As for me, I hope our leaders have the dignity and leadership skills to stand up for what is right when the time comes to do it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, sir. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Cameron. In regard to your colony, where you're from—in Fairholme—your land base, is it enough to sustain the manure that's off your particular operation?

Mr. Cameron Maendel: Yes.

Mr. Eichler: You're outside the area, you said in your presentation, if I remember right. If you were allowed to expand—you don't need permission to expand, other than through the licensing. Are you to the point now you'd be looking at expansion?

Mr. Cameron Maendel: No, we are not.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much for your presentation, Cameron.

Don't despair. Governments have been known to change their minds. This one did when it brought in the compulsory checkoff for BSE and turned it around to make it refundable, at least.

I think there's hope that the government will come forward, now that the bill is not coming back to be passed, at least, until fall, by the looks of it. We're hoping that this is the case. I think it gives

time for industry to make presentations and have input into a process that could be put in place.

Would you like to see a process—first of all, you've indicated that you don't think the bill is right, so it should be stopped. As an alternative to that and trying to find a better solution, we've heard from many today who believe that there is a process which could be—where everybody sat down together and tried to find a better solution—should be implemented. Do you think that should be done?

Mr. Cameron Maendel: Yes, I think that should be done and regulations that are in effect should be enforced.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

Call Mr. David Hofer. Mr. Bennett Hofer. Mr. David Gssell. Rena Hop.

Dan Van Schepdael. Mr. Van Schepdael, do you have any written materials for this committee?

Mr. Dan Van Schepdael (Synergy Swine): No, actually, I thought I'd just come watch for a bit today. I didn't think I'd be talking 'til sometime on Monday or Tuesday, so I'm going to shoot from the hip here pretty much, I guess.

Mr. Chairperson: Fire away. The floor is yours.

Mr. Van Schepdael: Okay, my name's Dan Van Schepdael and I own a finisher operation in East Selkirk in the R.M. of Brokenhead. We have an isowean operation in the same R.M. as well. I can attest to Mr. Wipf's comments about how much money the Hutterites throw at the economy because I used to be a feed salesman for East-Man Feeds and I used to visit them regularly. They paid my mortgage for a couple of years, not them in particular, but that's how I made my living, so—

Ms. Marilyn Brick, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

We're not in the moratorium area, but I guess I could be really happy and rejoice. My land values will probably go through the roof now because people want to build there. We sell breeding stock and we sell to all areas of the province, throughout the country, throughout the world, which pigs going all over the world now.

So it will affect us. It's going to affect everybody and it's a slippery slope. If there's a moratorium brought in in certain areas, it's very easy for my municipality to say, no, you can't build here either.

The precedent has been set. Why should we let you do that? So I think it's a very bad idea.

I guess I question how much it's worth for me to be talking here today because I went to the Clean Environment Commission's hearings and I didn't speak there, but I saw a lot of people that did. It seems that the recommendations of that committee were just ignored anyway. So it doesn't quite make sense to me.

On our farms, we inject our manure. We have a buffer zone around the fields where we inject it. The amount of manure that's applied to the land is equivalent to about a quarter inch of rainfall, so it's not like there's manure leaching into the ditches and whatnot.

Got to try to gather my thoughts here a little bit, so—what I'd like to know, I guess, ultimately, is how is it that hog manure is different than cattle manure or chicken manure or commercial fertilizer? Because we're all worried about Lake Winnipeg, apparently, and, somehow, it's only hog manure that's being stopped. There are more houses going up in Winnipeg every day. There are problems in Manitoba with the cities and municipalities contributing to Lake Winnipeg to the nutrient loading there. There has been no moratorium been put on houses built anywhere.

Every time I drive into Winnipeg, there are new houses built everywhere. There are new houses built in all the municipalities everywhere. There's no stop to that. I drive up by my place and I see a municipal lagoon that was built a couple of years ago for the R.M. of Brokenhead, and I'm wondering why the ditches are full of water. I drive a little further and I realize it's all coming from the lagoon. I'm not sure how much testing is done on that. It seems to me there's not as much done on that as there would be on hog operations.

So I guess I'm kind of curious more than anything as to why it's the hog farmers that are being singled out. Is it because we're a minority and we're a couple of votes and most hog farmers tend to vote Conservative, anyway, so, I guess, maybe, the NDP government doesn't care if they lose those votes? I'm not sure.

But I think governments are put in place to uphold the rights of minorities as well of that of the majority. So I guess, basically, that's all I got to say right now.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you for your presentation. Obviously, you may have heard a few presentations today, but your presentation speaks from the heart and it speaks about the question, and the question is process.

* (15:50)

You spoke about listening to what was presented at the CEC hearings. Based on what we've heard from the industry is that the regulations that have been put forward through the CEC report can be met. We've heard that throughout the day today that regulations can be met. You know, often they're looking at ways to even work ahead of the regulations and making sure that their livelihoods, I guess, are sustained because this is an issue of livelihood for a lot of the individuals that are here.

You spoke about the uncertainty. I think that speaks volumes to agriculture as a whole because, if this is happening to the agriculture sector, the swine industry right now, what's to say that this doesn't reflect down the road to the cattle industry and the poultry industry or any other industry within agriculture? There doesn't seem to be a consistency or any rhyme or reason for this to happen. So I'm just wanting you to comment again to assure what I'm saying is what you're referencing, and if you have a suggestion regarding Bill 17.

Mr. Van Schepdael: Yes, I agree entirely with what you said. It doesn't seem to make sense 'cause there's no difference if it's a pound of phosphate if it comes from a hog or a chicken or a turkey or a goat or from commercial fertilizer. It's going to have the same effect. So to say that hog farmers, there's to be a moratorium on hog barns, I can't build—well, I can build a hog barn, apparently, but, if I lived across the road—In front of my house is the dividing line been my municipality and St. Clements. So, if I lived on the other side of the road where I have land, I can't build on that side, but I could build a, I mean, I could build a million-cow feedlot if I wanted to or, I mean, as long as I meet the guidelines, so it doesn't quite make sense at all. Is the next thing going to be that, okay, we're all only allowed to apply 50 pounds of nitrogen to our crops? Well, we got to compete with the rest of the world so we have to be on the same basis. There's no reason why I as a hog farmer—

I live—my parents have a hog farm; I grew up there—I live a half mile away now. Our other barn's a

mile away from that. I'm not going to do something that's going to damage my water. I drink my water. We've done tests on our wells at home. They haven't changed at all over the past 30 years. The last thing in the world that I want to do is do something that's going to make me have to bring in truckload after truckload of water for my pigs to drink. I always get the—people always say we're contaminating the water. It doesn't make any sense, morally or economically or anything else. It makes zero sense, and it's a very lame argument. I think that if pig manure didn't stink, I think we wouldn't be here right now.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Next question, Minister Wowchuk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you for your presentation. Even though we caught you a couple of days ahead of time, you've done very well.

I wanted to ask you, you talked about the application of the manure, and you said it's equivalent to about a quarter of an inch of rain. Could you, for the committee members, tell us how often you can apply that? And when you make that application, what's the dollar value of it in comparison to commercial fertilizer?

Mr. Van Schepdael: Okay, we generally apply spring and fall. The main reason for that is because it keeps the volume of our lagoon lower, which creates less smell, so it's—sometimes it's not the best thing for us to do. Causes us to wait before we get on the field in the spring and whatnot, but, for the neighbours' sake and whatnot, we think it's better. It keeps the smell down. Nobody likes the smell.

We generally apply about 5,000 gallons an acre which, I don't have figures in front of me. I would have brought them if I had the time, but it works out to about a quarter-inch of rainfall, is about 5,000 gallons on an acre, so that's what it works out to.

What was the second part?

An Honourable Member: What was the value—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Minister Wowchuk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Sorry, Madam Vice-Chairperson. I was asking about what the value—what's the value of the commercial fertilizer that you would have to put on that land? How much money are you saving on your commercial fertilizer bill by applying the manure?

Mr. Van Schepdael: I'm not—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Van Schepdael.

Mr. Van Schepdael: Sorry. I'm not sure that we're actually saving any money. It costs a lot of money to apply it, so I know on our finisher operation, the manure's a little bit more nutrient-rich than on the sow operation. I'm not sure that—I guess if you took every single ingredient in that manure and analyzed it, we'd be probably a little bit of money ahead. If you look at the nitrogen and phosphate, we're probably cheaper just to go to commercial. Probably, but I mean it's—you know, it's not a waste product, as Mr. Dolecki had said before. We're not trying to poison our land. I'm not dumping more on there than I need to because my crop is going to lodge. There's no benefit to that. I got lots and lots of land. I could be probably five times bigger than I am and have plenty of land base still. I mean, I sometimes wonder if people think we're just a bunch of idiots or something, that we're just trying to—why in the world would we do anything like that that's going to work to the detriment of our farms? It doesn't make sense at all.

Ms. Jennifer Howard, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

Mr. Maguire: I appreciate the minister's question only because, Dan, I think that sometimes she's asking—the nature of her questions are to inform some of her colleagues on her side of the House as to the practices of agriculture, and I appreciate the fact that she's doing that because, you know, we've talked a lot about education in this room today, and there needs to be some.

I would like you to describe the term "lodging." As a farmer myself, I understand in the past—I understand what it is, but there are some that may not. That is referenced to the fact that you're just not going to pour manure or any kind of fertilizer on a field.

Can you just describe that term and explain it for those that may not understand it?

Mr. Van Schepdael: Yes, sure. Lodging is when, generally, when a crop is over-fertilized and it, instead of standing straight up, falls over flat, which, you know, causes a lot of damage, makes it hard to pick up. You lose yield and everything else. I appreciate your comments. I'm aware that not everybody is familiar with all these farming practices and whatnot. I would hope that people who are involved in this whole process would've made an

effort to be involved in this because this is all of our livelihoods we're dealing with here.

I might add, too, our operation at my dad's farm, at a finisher operation, I expanded it in 1994. Then, in 2001, we built the sow operation and that's when I quit working off the farm. You know, had we not been able to do that, I wouldn't be farming right now. There are a lot of people in my same position. We built that barn. We brought in a neighbour who's managing the barn. There are four people working there. There are probably four or five houses in the neighbourhood that have been bought or built by people who are or who were working there, and family members with them. There's a big economic boom to it and I know the cheques that we write out to everybody—you know, there's a lot of money involved just around the business, maybe not very much staying in the business right now, but there's a lot going out to everybody around us.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Dan. You said at the beginning you're shooting from the hip. You're a very good hip-shooting presenter. Thanks.

I'm big on education as is the Member for Arthur-Virden, and I think rural folks can learn a lot from urban people as well. I think that's a two-way street.

You'd mentioned a couple things that I think we need to chat about briefly. We have said no to many, many—actually, over 6,000 lots, applications for lots to build in the city of Winnipeg. We've said no to those based on the fact that there's not a water plan, a water treatment plan to go with that. Any that do get built have to have a way to treat their sewage and to provide safe drinking water. We've had people come to us about their septic fields and we've told them no, you cannot continue to operate with a septic field; you need to upgrade.

The one that I really want to key in on, though, you've mentioned a situation in the R.M. of Brokenhead. A couple of years ago, we actually did the environment licence for that. That water that is released is tested regularly like every other sewage treatment facility in the province. We do that in co-operation with the R.M. or, in some cases, with the city or the town, whoever the municipality is, and they cannot discharge that water until they have treated to such a stage that they meet certain standards. On the one case, if I remember correctly, we actually then shoot that treated water through a marsh. That's nature way of helping with that filtration.

So I wanted to make sure that we addressed those sorts of things. I don't want to have anything left on the record to suggest that we're not following up on that.

So thanks for your presentation.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Did you want to respond, Mr. Van Schepdael?

Floor Comment: Yes, please.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Go ahead.

Mr. Van Schepdael: So, if I hear you correctly here, what you're saying is there are guidelines that you have to follow, and they have to be followed. So there's no need to have a moratorium on building houses because there are guidelines to follow on those guidelines. Also, you guys use a marsh for nature's filtration of the lagoon water and, as farmers for the hog manure, we use the crop. We put in the land. The crop uptakes it and it's filtered out much the same way.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: I don't want us to get into a debate here, so do you have a question, Minister Struthers?

*(16:00)

Mr. Struthers: Yes. The only reason I put forward that is just to make sure that everybody understood that those standards are in place. I understand your point and I agree with much of what you said.

Is your advice to me that the standards in terms of the regulations that govern manure are strong enough to protect Manitoba's water?

Mr. Van Schepdael: I think that the guidelines are in place. The new guidelines that haven't even been phased in yet should probably have a chance to work. Then to single out one industry which is not doing anything more than another industry, I think, is totally unfair.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I have more of a scenario and I'd like you to respond to it. We've heard from one good steward after another, and good farm practices. I mean, I think we're sitting here waiting for somebody to come in and say, I'm the bad guy. I'm the one that actually causes all the trouble. Is this not about enforcement, rather than just more regulations and a moratorium that shouldn't be there, in your opinion?

Mr. Van Schepdael: Yes, absolutely. I sit on Manitoba Pork Council as a district delegate as well

and we've had these talks too about implementing winter-spreading bans and stuff like this, and we're all for it. Hey, if somebody's doing something that's not right, then nail them to the wall because it's hurting all of us. But every day I drive home and I drive by a cattle farm. He's got a big pile of manure and he's right beside a creek and, after this rainfall we got right now, I mean, there are puddles everywhere and whatnot, and he can do whatever he wants.

I don't want to make this against hogs, against cattle, against chickens or anything like that. Let's make it a level playing field. Let's include cities and cottage owners and everything else, too. We all have a part to play in this, so let's all play our part. Let's not pick on the small population of people that we feel we can pick on. As I've said before, too, if pig manure didn't stink, I don't think we'd be here right now. So, maybe, instead of spending time and effort and money on hearings and regulations and whatnot, maybe we should just be looking at more research into treatments for manure or cheaper lagoon covers or something like that, because, I think, if pig manure doesn't stink, I don't think we're here right now.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, sir. That's our time for your presentation. Thank you very much.

So we're going to continue down the list.

Jacob Waldner. Is Jacob Waldner here? Jacob Waldner.

Okay, Bob Waldner. Is Bob Waldner here? Bob Waldner.

Mark Waldner. Is Mark Waldner here?

Rickey Maendel. Rickey Maendel.

Rita Caya. Is Rita Caya here?

Kathy Neufeld. Is Kathy Neufeld here?

Dwayne Friesen. Dwayne Friesen.

John Doerksen. John Doerksen.

Michael Sheridan. Michael Sheridan.

Joseph Hofer. Joseph Hofer.

Garry Hofer, Elm River Colony. Garry Hofer.

Evan Penner. Evan Penner.

Isaac Hofer. Isaac Hofer.

Perry Mohr. Is Perry Mohr here? Okay.

Committee Substitutions

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Just before you start, sir, I have some substitutions for the committee. Mr. Pedersen for Mr. Graydon and Mrs. Rowat for Mr. Maguire.

* * *

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Perry Mohr (Private Citizen): I do and I'll submit it on the premise that I, like Mr. Van Schepdael, was not expecting to be here today. Subsequently, it's probably not edited to the degree that I would like it to be to present.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: That's perfectly fine. So you can just start your presentation whenever you're ready, sir.

Mr. Mohr: Okay, I would like to begin by commending the number of hog producers here, in particular the brethren. I work very closely with the brethren. Typically, they're non-confrontational, and the fact that they've come here today to show their support against the bill, as well as got up here and spoke to the group in front of you, which, even by my standards, can be a little bit intimidating, I think it shows me, and should show the rest of you how important this matter is to the hog producers of Manitoba.

Anyway, my name is Perry Mohr and I'm approaching the panel today as a citizen that has worked in the hog industry for 20 years. Throughout those 20 years, I've seen the industry grow significantly. When I started, we were producing about 2 million head annually and, today, we're about 9 million head. While the industry was growing and changing, so did the criteria and the regulations that producers needed to adhere to in order to build a barn and spread the manure that is a by-product of hog production.

Every time a barn and a lagoon were constructed, the producer had to apply for a permit, which was accompanied by a copy of blueprints complete with engineer's stamps. As the industry evolved, producers were also required to file manure management plans. A great deal of planning went into site selection, construction and the subsequent usage of the manure by-product. Soil tests were taken and the manure, rich in nutrients, was applied to the soil and supplemented with chemical fertilizers

when necessary. In all cases, the regulations in place at the time were followed and adhered to.

As most of the producers lived in the area and farmed the neighbouring land in which the manure was spread, it was extremely important to the producers and their families that their farming practices were sustainable. They utilized techniques and methods that allowed them to preserve their assets so they retained their productivity for future generations.

So why do I oppose the bill? Well, first of all, I don't think it's necessary. The hog industry is already heavily regulated, and the government is about to impose more regulations based on the recommendations made in the CEC report released in March of 2008. From an economic standpoint, the industry has been financially ravaged over the last three years, and it will be several years, if ever, before producers would consider further expansion of our industry.

As a matter of fact, as we speak, many producers are making the difficult decision to shut down their barns, reducing the industry on a daily basis. In the areas where there's already concentration of hog barns, from a disease and bio-security standpoint alone, it is not practical to expand any further without seriously breaching bio-security protocols.

Secondly, Bill 17 is not based on science. Quite frankly, I think all of us here are trying to figure out what it is based on. Our scientists tell us that the hog industry is responsible for only a small percentage of the nutrient overloading of Lake Winnipeg, 1.5 percent, according to Don Flaten, a respected soil scientist specializing in soil chemistry and fertility at the University of Manitoba. Dr. Flaten is basing his assessment on scientific research. To me, it is mind boggling and somewhat troubling that the government is choosing to ignore solid scientific research and evidence.

Lastly, the bill will have a lasting adverse effect on the business for which I'm employed and the producers that we represent that are still producing hogs, despite the financial challenges faced by the industry. The organization I work for, Manitoba Pork Marketing, represents about 500 hog producers with annual sales of over \$200 million from mostly smaller, independent producers and Hutterite colonies. I believe James Hofer and many of the other producers here have provided you with an explanation as to how Bill 17 will impact Hutterite

colonies and their ability to split once they hit a critical mass of 130 people.

The smaller, independent producers that we represent, when the new manure management regulations are imposed, may decide that, in order to meet the new criteria, an expansion may be necessary to justify the capital investment of expanding a lagoon or constructing above-ground storage for manure. If expansion to their business is not possible, this bill may effectively force them out of business.

* (16:10)

The producers that my organization represents are all land-based operators. They use the manure from their hogs to spread on their cropland to produce feed for their livestock. The pigs, when marketed, provide us all with some of the highest quality, low-cost pork in the world. If these operations do not represent sustainable farming operations, none do.

Manitoba's main economic resource, other than the hydro we produce, is agriculture. Our livestock and crop production are big economic drivers for the province. We need to provide a political and business environment for them to continue to grow and prosper. Am I suggesting that we allow unabated expansion? No. Impose the regulations suggested by the CEC and allow the industry to operate as long as the regulation and guidelines are adhered to. Hog producers have exhibited a willingness to adapt to any and all regulations that have been required of them.

In closing, I ask the government of the day to rescind the bill, impose regulations and guidelines, enforce them and let one of your natural resources grow or fail based on the economics, not some legislative process. Please be careful not to bite off the hand that feeds you, cheaply, I might add.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Mohr. I'll open the floor for questions. Are there any questions of this presenter? Seeing none, I'll thank you for—oh, okay.

Mr. Maguire: Well, Mr. Mohr, thank you very much for your presentation and taking the time to come forward. I know the Pork Marketing Board plays a vital role in Manitoba's industry.

I've asked a number of people throughout this process if they feel that coming together as a group with the government, the industry and players would

have been a more valuable way to go; \$750,000 was spent on the Clean Environment Commission hearings, and they weren't listened to, as has been said before. Perhaps we should be able to put an industry group together that would be able to come up with a solution that would allow the industry to continue to grow and thrive and have its families contribute to the future economy of Manitoba instead of some other province or state.

Do you feel that that would be possible or that that should be something that the government looks at in the next few weeks?

Mr. Mohr: I believe that the hog producers, through the leadership of Manitoba Pork Council, have exhibited a willingness to participate in any kind of forum, any kind of study. They've supplied research dollars towards finding solutions to the problems that exist.

Absolutely, positively, I believe that the producers have a willingness to try to work with government to solve the problems.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Maguire: Just a supplement to that, thank you. We didn't have much say when the borders closed to BSE going into the United States because the decision was made by an out-of-jurisdiction government, the U.S. government at the time.

But this is made by our Province, and I feel that I agree with you. We do have an opportunity to control and manage this process because it's within our boundaries. I applaud you for, again, making your presentation. Thank you for your insight into it. I just concur with you that I think that there is a better way to find a solution to this. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mohr, comment to that?

Mrs. Rowat: My question is, you spoke about leadership and the need to be accountable and open in the process. The CEC did their work. From that point, I guess I'm wondering, and I think I know the answer, but were you consulted with regard to this moratorium coming into place? Did you have any idea that this is where the government was going to be coming once the CEC process had been completed?

Mr. Mohr: The simple answer to that question is no.

Mrs. Rowat: If this government is truly open and transparent in the process that has just been completed and the CEC made no recommendation to

create a moratorium, do you see that this decision to put in Bill 17 is going to destroy an industry, and, obviously, based on the presentations we had from the brethren, do you see this as a direct hit to their economy and their livelihood?

Mr. Mohr: I believe that putting a moratorium in place in this industry will not create an environment that will foster any further growth. Hog barns have a limited life span and they have to be replaced after 20 to 30 years. In addition to that, you're not going to attract any investment into an industry that cannot expand if the economics dictate that it should. That money will go elsewhere where it is possible, and that will probably be the other Canadian provinces and/or the United States.

Mrs. Rowat: An earlier presenter had indicated that if the moratorium does stay in place that their family and their community will likely have to look at alternative locations. We talked about the Alberta communal act. Do you see that as a possibility, that we will be losing our citizens not only in industry but losing even more population base from our communities?

Mr. Mohr: Again, the potential for the colonies, in particular, is once they hit the critical mass of 130 people, they split. The first thing that they do typically is build a hog barn or some kind of livestock production entity. If they can't do that in Manitoba, obviously that investment will go someplace else, yes.

Mrs. Taillieu: I note that in your presentation that you're quoting 1.5 percent of the nutrient overload is coming from the hog industry which is a very small amount and which I think proves that many producers are living within the rules, guidelines and regulations. My question is would it not make more sense to deal with those that are not and allow those that are to go about their business?

Mr. Mohr: I guess if I was to answer your question Mrs. Taillieu, we would have to assume that the 1.5 percent that is ending up in Lake Winnipeg is from producers that are not adhering to the regulations. I don't think it's safe to assume that.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, Mr. Mohr, I thank you for your presentation.

I call Mr. David Waldner. Lyndon Waldner. Jacob Waldner. Sheldon Waldner. Doug Martin, South Interlake Land Management Association. Gerry Martin.

Gerald Siemens, Siefert Farms Ltd. Mr. Siemens, do you have any written materials for this committee?

Mr. Gerald Siemens (Siefert Farms Ltd.): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Gerald Siemens: My name is Gerald Siemens. I'm representing Siefert Farms, which is an alfalfa and straw family farm on the western edge of the R.M. of De Salaberry. I'm here to speak out against Bill 17.

Our farm grows and bales for export to the United States, alfalfa and cereal straw as well as having an interest in a hog farm primarily for the manure and diversification. The moratorium on expansion would limit our access to manure. We prefer manure to commercial fertilizer because it is more manageable. It has a slower release time than commercial fertilizer. It takes about four or five years to get the majority of the nutrients to release.

* (16:20)

The other reason we prefer the manure over commercial fertilizer is the cost. Commercial fertilizer has increased in cost two to three times just this spring alone. In fact, this spring, we applied over \$100-per-acre worth of phosphate, primarily phosphate fertilizer, to one of our alfalfa fields.

At this point, we have five of our children and their families involved in the farm. At this point, we're looking to expand the hogs to control our fertilizer cost for alfalfa production for export. The moratorium puts future viability in jeopardy. We're facing higher transportation costs, which is a big part of our costs for exporting due to fuel costs which we have no control over, also the relationship of the currencies between the Canadian and the American dollar, which we also had no control over, and then now the fertilizer situation.

We were looking at increasing our hog farm or the one we have an interest in, which is centrally located amongst the land we have as well as what my siblings have. At this point fertilizer accounts for at least half of our out-of-pocket cost for alfalfa production. Predominantly, phosphate is what we need for alfalfa, and it seems the one area where we have some control over to keep ourselves competitive in spite of the transportation and the currency issues is now getting taken away from us. The land base is more than enough under current

regulations to allow for a doubling of the hog farm. Manure application methods have come a long way over the last 11 years since our first involvement with hogs. With the price of commercial fertilizer increasing by three times this spring, manure management and application will continue to improve well ahead of provincial guidelines, recommendations and regulation.

What is the goal or purpose of the moratorium? Is it based on good science? What could be better for the environment, global warming or cooling, ozone layer, polar ice melting, polar bears drowning or starving than growing lush green forages from mild, manageable, economical, locally produced hog manure? As an aside, the straw bale for export in southern Manitoba as opposed to burning in the fall has a direct correlation to the haying equipment available in the area. Please reconsider Bill 17 and allow the next generation farm families a viable future at balanced, environmentally friendly agriculture.

Thanks for listening.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Siemans. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Siemans.

You had made reference to expansion. You have the land base. You have the necessary tools at your disposal. Did you make application to expand prior to the moratorium? Where are you at in that stage?

Mr. Gerald Siemens: Yes, we did and apparently it's been sitting on a shelf somewhere for a year and a half or whatever, but we were ahead of this thing and supposedly we were one of the ones that was approved.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for the supplement, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarification again, from what size operation were you expanding from and to?

Mr. Gerald Siemens: I have an interest in a nursery and feeder operation together with my siblings and what do we have? Eight thousand head feeder barn with a nursery to supplement that, and we were looking to double that up. We have the land base in the immediate area to more than cover that under the current manure regulations that are out there now.

Mr. Eichler: Have you had written correspondence back from the department in any way or has it just been, like you say, sitting on a shelf and collecting dust and no response from the government?

Mr. Gerald Siemens: We're being told by our guy that applied for that on our behalf that it has been okayed and it's out there, but we don't have the lagoon permit physically in hand. So I get the feeling that it's kind of there because of this whole moratorium thing and the tough environment that the hog industry's been in here in the last while, that it's just kind of out there. They tell us and assure us it's coming, but it's been a long time.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Gerald Siemens: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Mr. Brendon Penner of Border Rock Farms.

Don Winnicky.

John Gross. John Gross.

Joe Van Schepdael, Van Schepdael Farms.

John Waldner. Victor Hofer. Brian Siemens. Melvin Penner. Dave Van Walleggem. Garry Hofer, Elm River Colony. John Nickel. Steve Hofer. Christopher Tokaruk, Designed Genetics Inc. Peter Waldner.

Denny Kleinsasser. Mr. Kleinsasser, do you have any written materials?

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No? You may proceed.

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser: My name is Denny Kleinsasser. I live at the Springfield Colony in Anola, Manitoba. I'm a farmer and I work in the hog barn. I'm speaking out against Bill 17, because it's not right what you're doing.

Born and raised in a Hutterite colony, we've been raising hogs for the past 52 years. I would appreciate seeing our children grow up and teach all there is to know about raising hogs. The reason is so important. It's because our hog barn is one of the greatest reasons why our community is sustaining solid ground financially, feeding the citizens of the colony and many others around the world and providing our children with a healthy lifestyle and education. The greatest fear would be not having our children grow up and carry on the tradition that has been part of our colony for decades.

Banning hog barns would take so much out of a person's lifestyle, especially if it's your only income. It would wipe out thousands of jobs and completely destroy Hutterite colonies, businesses, financials and

individuals who have made hog farming their life and are depending on it financially.

Needless to say, millions of people enjoy work and enjoy pork as a wise and healthy food choice. Just for a moment, put yourself in our shoes, in our situation, and think of the consequences of banning hog barns. If that's the only life you've ever known, let's just say banning hog farms would affect each and every person, whether you own a barn or not.

Even if the government passes Bill 17, we will continue to fight it. We will not give up our legacy. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser. I open the floor to questions.

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser, for making your presentation. We talk about, if this act was implemented, it would not ban, but it would restrict. You wouldn't be able to expand operations.

*(16:30)

On your colony right now, do you have any plans in place that you are looking at expanding right now? I believe you're looking at a sister colony, but on the colony that you have right now, are your plans to build new barns, and, if they are, are you in the process of applying to build new barns?

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser: Not applying to build new barns. We just like to be able to modify them and meet more of the regulations and situations that will come up in the future.

Ms. Wowchuk: Have you started that process? Have you been in contact with the departments to look at how you could remodel or make those changes?

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser: Not at this moment.

Mr. Eichler: Just further to what the minister was talking about, the land base that you have, how many more animal units would you be able to add if you needed to, based on the requirements outlined in the act now?

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser: That figure I haven't got in front of me right now, but right now, we've got more than enough land to apply our manure on.

Mrs. Rowat: You spoke about modifying your operation for regulations. I'm assuming this is not only just from the government regulations, but this is also from either Maple Leaf or Hytek or whoever you deal with. There are regulations that they require you to continue to meet. It would appear that you

probably are concerned with the moratorium and how this will affect your continued relationship with your marketing opportunities. Am I correct?

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser: Yes.

Mrs. Rowat: Have you had an opportunity to meet with government officials regarding this bill at all, and have you had an opportunity to voice your concerns with regard to this bill?

Mr. Denny Kleinsasser: No. Just now.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

I call Mr. Leonard Maendel.

Mike Teillet. *[interjection]* Oh, I'm sorry. Paul Maendel, Prairie Blossom Colony.

Jack Penner. Todd Hacault. Marinus Hop. Levi Hofer. Kurt Plaitin. Ruben Waldner.

Arnie Waldner. Mr. Arnie Waldner? Okay. Do you have any written material, sir?

Mr. Arnie Waldner (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Arnie Waldner: My opinion on Bill 17 is that it's unjust and unfair. I think if you have the land base and your soil type is right, you should be able to build barns if your area is zoned agriculture. Part of the problem comes from city people building homes on land that is zoned agriculture. That's why we zone land in the first place. In other words, farmers don't move into the city and build barns in the city that's zoned for people to live in.

People from the city can move, come to the country and build their homes a few hundred yards from your hog barn, then complain about the smell. I mean, that's why we zone land in the first place. If it would be the other way around, it would never, never fly, and you all know it. In Belgium, it is against the law for city people to build houses on land that is zoned agriculture. Maybe we should consider something like that here.

Bill 17 will do nothing to clear up the real problem. All it will do is create the demise of the family farm. The family farm, in many cases, has been passed down for four or five generations. For the most part, family farms, they take care of their land. They want to pass it down to their children. Part of the problem is big corporate farms going into one small area, building big facilities, which they don't have the land base for. If you have the land

base to go on a three- or four-year rotational system with injecting your manure—I think the word "spreading" should be taken out of the equation. Nobody spreads manure anymore; they inject into the soil.

The CEC report stated that manure should be used instead of synthetic fertilizers, suggest that manure should be used instead of the synthetic fertilizer that most people use. My question is why is the report being ignored and hog manure being targeted when, actually, it's a huge asset if you have the land base to spread it on.

Some of the municipalities mentioned on the back of Bill 17 should not be on there because they hardly even have hog barns and their heavy soil is very suited for the hog manure. Like, the R.M. of Woodlands has three barns that I know of and very, very heavy soil. So where's the problem? Why is it on the list? Who drew the map? I think it hasn't been researched properly.

Not only is Bill 17 not based on truth but on half truths and innuendo. Science has proved that agriculture is only to blame for 1.5 percent of the phosphorous problem. So why would you want to shut down a billion-dollar industry?

Manitoba pork production is the envy of the world. I know that because, in our specific barn at home, we've had people from all over the world. We've had people from five or six different areas of China, Taiwan, Korea, foreign investors that want to come here. They're amazed. They can't believe what we have here. We actually had another two or three groups from Russia. The way the barns are built and the way the manure gets handled and the equipment, they just can't believe it.

These big corporate farms that have caused some of the problem, I know, I've looked at the barns. Their barns are designed to, maybe, last seven to eight, at the very most, 10 years. Our barns we build are out of cement most of the time. They're made to last 30 years, easy. Maybe you'd have to change some slats or something, but, for the most part, we're in it for the long run.

You're not shutting down the real problem. The corporate farms will move out of the moratorium area and go to Saskatchewan or on the other side of Brandon. You're doing absolutely zero to correct the problem. The family farm is not—I don't believe for a minute that they're the problem because they want to

pass that farm down to their children. They want to take care of their water. I don't know of anybody that doesn't inject the manure right into the soil. Spreading is done; it's not happening anymore.

We all know that a stagnant industry is eventually a dead industry. By shutting down the pork industry, you also shut down feed companies, trucking companies, fuel stations, truck washes, et cetera, et cetera. They're too numerous to mention.

I read an article somewhere that 70 percent of Manitobans are connected directly or indirectly to the agriculture sector. What do we want to do, end up like Saskatchewan? Saskatchewan, you drive through, in the last 30 years, it really hasn't changed. It's been the same for year after year after year. Nothing is happening. Like I say, we're the envy of the pork world. We should be proud of what we've achieved. If tougher regulations are necessary, I'm all for it. We should have tougher regulations. I think the moratorium, or Bill 17, it shouldn't be happening. If you have the land base, we should be looking at it at a case-by-case basis. You have the land bases and your soil type is right, you should be able to. If you're in a sandy area or you want to build a huge hog barn and you don't have the land base to handle the manure, well, that's too bad. Like, I agree that the environment is very, very important.

*(16:40)

I've been involved with the production of pigs for 18 years. I don't want to be rude or anything, but most of you I don't think have ever been on the inside of a hog barn. I know the way we handle pig manure is state-of-the-art. Even without hog manure, the land would be fertilized with commercial fertilizer so what's the difference? I think the NDP is catering to a few special interest groups who have probably never been outside the perimeter of Winnipeg. Own a farm to see what actually goes on in a farm or how we even do things. I think the conception is people—maybe 20 years ago things didn't get done right. I'm not going to stand up here and apologize for past mistakes, but being on the Pork Council the last six years I know how far we've come and how, year after year, I know how we sit there and figure out how we're going to deal with and do a better job of handling the manure and protect the environment.

If a government was trying to pass a bill like Bill 17 in Europe, there will be a full-scale rioting. You know, I talk to a lot of neighbours down south in the States, and they can't believe we're even dealing with

this. People all across the States envy what Manitoba has done. And another thing, because of our Canadian quota system, the only thing you can freely go into is pork production. So it's really—

Mr. Chairperson: One minute, sir.

Mr. Arnie Waldner: It really affects the whole agricultural sector, not only the pork industry, because laying chickens or broiler chickens, turkeys, you've got to have millions of dollars to get into that because a laying chicken will cost hundred and thirty bucks a chicken to buy the quota. If you want to buy a few thousand, it's millions of bucks to get into. The only thing you can actually freely do is pork production, and pork production enables you to go on into other things like buying quota if you have to.

I mean, we live in a free democratic society. You know, I can't even believe we're even here discussing this, because if Bill 17 can be forced through even though it's not based on science or truth, then we're heading straight back into the 18th century.

Most of the municipalities on Bill 17 are perfectly suited for more hog barns because of their soil type, and what if the CEC report had stated that Manitoba hog industry is very sustainable? If the NDP party doesn't believe the report, why did they blow \$800,000 of hard-earned tax dollars on it?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Waldner, you're at 11 minutes now. There are four people that would like to put questions to you. You can continue, or you can take questions. The choice is yours. You have another four minutes remaining. Okay?

Mr. Arnie Waldner: One little brief paragraph. When some city kids come out on the farm, they are amazed of where their food comes from. They think it comes from the back of a Safeway store. So I think there's a huge rift between the city and the country. I don't think people growing up in a city actually know what goes on on a farm. I think we have to all educate ourselves a little better. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir. Questions? I have Ms. Wowchuk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you for your presentation. I have to say I agree with you. I think that there is more that we have to do to educate each other about what we do. There are programs like Ag in the Classroom, and I want to recognize that many of the colonies are very good about having children come to the farm to learn more about that, and I appreciate it.

A couple of things I wanted to ask you. You had said that you could live with tougher regulations. That would be better than having Bill 17. Could you advise us on where you think things might be strengthened to address the concerns?

Mr. Arnie Waldner: See, that's why I went into talking about the zone agriculture thing, because it's no use to let people build hog barns if they don't have the land base to handle the manure on. In our situation we got a four-year rotation, where every four years it'll come back on the same land. It all gets injected. Actually the manure gets separated and just the liquids get injected, and the solids actually get used for gardening purposes.

So, like, it's very doable. I mean, if we need tougher regulations, let's do them. For example, if one car is speeding on the highway, you don't shut down the whole flow of the traffic, right? You just ticket that one car that was speeding. You don't shut down No. 1 because of it.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. Waldner, for your presentation. You spoke about regulations, and I believe that some of the regulations that have been put into play haven't even really had a chance to even be realized. I think there are regulations out there that are fairly new, and some of the industry has just been starting to implement.

So I'd just like your comment on that. Do you think some of the regulations that have already been put in place have even had a chance to see some outcomes?

Mr. Arnie Waldner: The CEC report said we should be using manure instead of synthetic fertilizer. They must have had a purpose when they said that. Like they must have had a reason for saying this.

See, what I mean is if you don't have the land base to spread the manure on, well, see, I'm not trying to discriminate against people who don't have the land base, but the environment is very important, and we don't want to pollute it more than any of you sitting here. We want to be good stewards of the land. I think on a four-year rotation injecting, there's no harm being done whatsoever.

Mr. Eichler: Very quickly, you didn't talk about enforcement. You talked about some of the corporates that weren't playing the game by the rules. They're short-term barns rather than long-term barns.

When it comes to regulations that's been in the past, do you think they've been enforced to the level which they should have been and maybe we wouldn't be where we are today?

Mr. Arnie Waldner: Maybe not, because we all know that a few R.M.s south of Winnipeg have caused a lot of the problem. I'm not trying to pick on certain people, but there's maybe too many hog barns in those R.M.s, and now we're all getting painted with the same brush. It's just not fair.

* (16:50)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Waldner, thank you for coming to present. I'm one of the ones here who's been inside the hog barn on a Hutterite colony, and it's been more than one occasion, so I've got some familiarity. I appreciate the efforts that you make to provide food for lots and lots of people.

Now, you made, I think, a very important point, and that is that when—with hogs and pork, it's one of the areas that you can now freely get into. I think you were referring to, in relationship to chicken or into other areas, not into grain or crops, but it certainly means that it's a very important part of the agricultural sector and it would be a real shame to shut down the last area where you've got some freedom to invest.

Mr. Arnie Waldner: Yes, it would be. What can I—I mean, I think, in closing comments, I think it should be, Bill 17 shouldn't happen. We should be looking at the whole thing on a case-to-case scenario. Like, if you can do a three, four-year rotation on the manure, you're not harming the environment. It should be truly checked. If everything's where it should be, then it should be allowed to proceed. That's my opinion on it.

Mr. Chairperson: Those are your final words. Thank you, sir. It's all the time we have for this presentation.

Mr. Arnie Waldner: Thank you for letting me speak here.

Mr. Chairperson: You're welcome.

Move on to Mr. Titus Baer. Tom Waldner. Brian Klassen—

Floor Comment: Tom's here.

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry. Mr. Waldner? Do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Tom Waldner (Private Citizen): No, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: No. You may proceed.

Mr. Tom Waldner: My name is Tom Waldner from Walheim Hutterian colony. I'm a farmer and I'm here to speak out against Bill 17. Farming and raising hogs, which is our main income for our people which brings— putting food on the table for us—a roof over our heads. It's our livelihood. It's our culture. It's our living. It's the future for our children and, as parents, as all parents, or any decent parent in any walk of life, we try to plan a future for our children, try to bring them up as best as they can, be it education, be it food, be it morals, and their upbringing where we try to bring our children up to be a productive human being, sensitive to other people. But what kind of future now do our children see, or do parents see on a family farm with this bill on the horizon?

We wouldn't be very willing to invest more money in hog or would—with that bill on the horizon, with an unfriendly government. Taking care of our seniors, our sick people is part of our life. Planning is our way of life for them, farming, practising our faith. I believe in God, which we have enjoyed since 1918, when we moved from the United States. It has been a privilege, but Bill 17 is a serious threat to our way of life and culture. We ask our government to seriously consider and to withdraw, we feel, an unfair bill.

The majority of Hutterites and many farmers believe in honest, manual labour. Making what is useful for man is honourable to us; it includes raising pork for food for all men all over the world. When millions of people go hungry in this world, why can't the government see it's an honourable profession or industry?

I can't see how a government can justify a bill like this—maybe changes or policies—but, to take out the feet under a farmer where there's basically no chance of walking again?

Bill 17 is with no scientific facts to back up their accusations; to us, Bill 17 is scientifically and morally wrong. Manitoba hog producers, including Hutterites, are among the best in the world, among the best of the best, be it with numbers, with weight gains, with raising a healthy product. I think we can be proud, and I think the government should be proud too. We try our best through hard work, determination, and a will to be among the best. This includes being good stewards of the land too.

Hutterites have been farmers for generations. We take our drinking water out of wells, right beside the

barns. We take our drinking well out of ponds for our livestock, a mere hundred feet from where we inject manure. Would we pollute our land? Would we pollute our livestock? Our children? I don't think so—of course not. Yet, we, as hog producers, are singled out, painted unfairly as polluters of land and water.

We as a colony have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars the last number of years to upgrade our storage, our distribution system. With those upgrades, we can evenly and accurately distribute the hog manure with flow metres, taking samples and sending them in to see what the content is and applying it accordingly.

* (17:00)

We've taken advantage of technology, new equipment, up-to-date, remote controls and installed sensing pumps if anything goes wrong. It senses if the pressure goes down or the heat goes up; it shuts the pump down from the feed. We can control the speed or the volume of the manure; driving the tractor; at all times, sees the number of gallons applied per acre to control it up or down at speed with remote or increase of travel.

All this we spend huge amounts of money not only to make it easier, but to apply it in a safe, orderly manner. Where does all this equipment come from? We buy it right here in Manitoba. The income we produce, the majority, way the majority gets spent right here, again, in Manitoba. Yet, when the economy is flourishing and the unemployment is down, the government stands up, proudly tells the public—

Mr. Chairperson: You're nine minutes, sir.

Mr. Tom Waldner: When unemployment is down, economy is up, yet they don't give the farmers any credit, or the hog producers.

We are a colony and many other farmers do lots of business in Winnipeg. I mentioned before our money goes back into Winnipeg. People benefit greatly from the business we do. Our money stays in Manitoba and Winnipeg—kinds of supplies, repairs, updates, vitamins, minerals. So it's a huge benefit for Manitoba and the hog industry, all over Manitoba. Yet our government doesn't see the true, the hog industry. We put food on the table for thousands of people. The government, they are responsible for the well-being of the people, or would they rather make handouts or pay unemployment?

Farmers use manure for nutrients for crops they grow, with the plant using up the nutrients to promote its growth. If we oversupply manure, put too much on, the crop can't utilize the sediment nutrients, so it would be a waste to put on too much manure on the field, and at a thousand dollars a tonne, synthetic fertilizer, it would be stupid to waste organic manure. It would be throwing our money away in one hand instead of utilizing our manure that we have on the farm.

And in saying that to us, hog manure is not a liability, it's an asset. To utilize an asset hog manure, we have put in at least 7 kilometres of underground pipe to reach more land so we can distribute it evenly according to the manner in the guidelines that allow us to do it. Every time we empty our slurry, we follow the procedures of sending in the—whatever they call the forms in the—where we've put on the manure. We've been doing it for, you know, six, eight years, following the procedures as we should. Yet our government paints hog producers, all of us, as irresponsible, uncaring—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Waldner. You have two minutes left in total in your presentation. Are you thinking of entertaining any questions? I know I have three people who want to put them to you.

Mr. Tom Waldner: Give me another minute.

Mr. Chairperson: It's your dime, sir.

Mr. Tom Waldner: —and with this Bill 17, polluters of land and water. I think that's very unfair. The majority of Hutterites, farmers, Mennonites are hardworking, honest people.

Again, Bill 17 is morally wrong, scientifically not sound and does a great injustice upon our producers. Why the government would promote such a drastic bill upon its own people, I don't know. I think they should sit down with the hog producers instead, one each side, and voice their concerns.

With the hog industry creating so many jobs in Manitoba, why would a government slowly destroy an industry that so people work in it, put food on their table, a roof on their heads, without any scientific fact to back it up? In our eyes, as reasonable human beings, it doesn't make any sense at all. Bill 17 is scientifically and rationally wrong. As people of Manitoba, we ask the government to withdraw this unfair and harmful to many people's lives, wrong Bill 17. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner. Your presentation went almost 16 minutes, so the time for this presentation has expired. Thank you very much.

Floor Comment: Thank you for hearing me.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: I have a substitution to announce: Mr. Altemeyer for Mr. Saran.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Let's move on. Mr. Brian Klassen of Nutricycle Inc. Is he here? Oh, okay. All right, Mr. Klassen. Do you have any written materials?

Mr. Brian Klassen (Nutricycle Inc.): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Brian Klassen: Right. My name is Brian Klassen. I'm a strategic animal by-product relocation technician, and, no, I don't transport hot dogs. I'm a custom manure applicator, and I'd like to speak to the phosphate issue, I guess.

Under the government's own admission, phosphate has risen 30 percent in the last 30 years. That would be 1 percent per year, if I understand that correctly. If you put that on a graph, it would kind of go up about an angle like that, and if you would put the hog industry on a graph for 30 years, the graph would basically run flat for 15 years, and then it would spike quite seriously at the end. If you put the graph of the growth of Winnipeg on the same graph, I think you'd probably rise 30 percent in 30 years. I guess my point is if you would give this information to 600 six-year-olds, they could all figure it out. It will be very, very simple to figure that out.

*(17:10)

My question is: How come this government can't figure it out? It's not really rocket science, and I'd like to know how come it can't be figured out where the problem actually lies. I think that time has a wonderful way of clearing up misconceptions and falsehoods and fraudulent actions. I would say Bill 17 is a fraudulent action by this government because they are pretending to do something about the environment and they're not doing anything about the environment. I would say, if anybody else did that, that would be called fraud; that is pretending to do something that you're not really doing.

Many times I hear the comment, oh well, at least they're doing something. I'd like to ask, if your house was on fire and you called the fire department and

they came down and just sort of sprinkled water on the grass, you'd confront them, hey, what's going on here? My house is burning. Well, whatever, at least we're doing something. Would you take that? No. You would say, put the water on the house. I would say you should work on where the problem actually lies. You know where the problem is; you know very well where the problem is. It's not a secret that the problem lies in the city dumping sewage into the river. You look at any graph and you can see 1.5 for the hog industry and considerably larger for the city. What are you doing putting water on the lawn? Get with it.

If there was one conservationist in this province, that person would go to where the sewer comes out of Winnipeg city and stand there and cry, or do a hunger strike, one of the two, until somebody else joined him and somebody else joined them. Then you'd see some action. I think what you should do is leave the hog industry completely alone. Naturally, you'd tax us and we'd pay for fixing your sewer system. That's where the problem actually is. Work on the problem that's there. It's fraudulent; Bill 17 is absolutely fraudulent.

I hope some day there will be a law that says—I'll back up a little. I'm not trying to equate anybody with Hitler here, okay? Don't get me wrong here, but, before World War II, the term "crimes against humanity" didn't exist. But in the Nuremberg trials, lots of those guys all of a sudden heard the term crimes against humanity. Ten of those guys got hung. Ten of Hitler's guys got hung. Now, I'm not trying to say this is the same thing here, don't get me wrong. What I'm saying, you guys are popping out more extreme environmentalists out of your public school system than Carter's making liver pills. Those extreme environmentalists are going to bite you guys if you push this through. I hope that a term "crimes against the environment" is going to be an existing term in 10 years, when it will be very obvious that you didn't do something that you should have done. You pretended to do something by attacking the hog farmers who you know can't defend themselves because they are few in numbers.

Doer, after all, wants to win the election so he doesn't care what he's doing. He doesn't care about the environment. He just cares about winning his election. Are you guys all patsies for him? Are you going to win his elections for him and ignore the environment? I would say it's time you guys do something. Just take your government hats off and

think about it. Do something real, quit pretending. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Klassen. Questions.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Klassen, you said you were in the manure spreading management business. You also talked about misconceptions. You've been in the business for a long time. Can you sort of talk about when you started in the manure business, how manure was handled and how it is handled now? I assume there are improvements made. Can you talk about that a bit?

Mr. Klassen: Yes, I started approximately 10 years ago. I was one of the first to actually build a tanker with an injection system on it. So I've been injecting manure all the time, but, yes, my brother was in it before that and he just used an irrigation gun. So, yes, times have definitely changed. Then, of course, the manure management plans came into effect where the nitrogen is limited.

By the way, I think that the hog manure business is completely self-regulating because of the price of fertilizer right now. If every regulator died and went to wherever you think they're going, it would completely regulate itself because the price of fertilizer is so expensive that farmers don't want to waste any of it.

So it's completely self-regulating. You guys could step completely away from that, and it would regulate itself perfectly well.

Mr. Gerrard: Just, again, asking a question about the application because I think a lot of people don't understand how sophisticated it's become. You are now injecting and being very careful about how much nitrogen, and, if not already, will be in terms of the amount of phosphorus that's going into the land.

Tell us a little bit about it and whether there really is any run-off of what you inject into the waterways.

Mr. Klassen: Yes, I guess I'll skirt that issue a little bit. I'm going to say the Pansy area, government has been trying to find a problem there for many, many years. There's been studies done, and trying and trying to find a problem. That, I'd like to add, is completely different than being unbiased and seeing if there actually is a problem. Here they're trying to find a problem, and they've been quite unsuccessful. I don't think that anything's really ever come out of the Pansy area, and there are piles and

piles of manure being injected there or applied. It's mostly grassland there.

In terms of the equipment we use, in my tractors, I have two outfits. I run two custom manure-applicating outfits. My tractors have a very sophisticated Titan computer in it. It has a flow monitor in it, and the manure comes into the cultivator, through the flow monitor, is computered by the Titan computer and tells me on a readout exactly how many gallons per acre I'm putting. So, if I want more gallons per acre, I slow the tractor down slightly, and instantly the number changes. If I want less, I speed the tractor up, and instantly the number changes.

So we follow the manure management plan which is put out by an agronomist. We have this manure management plan in the tractor. It says you can put on 5,000 gallons an acre, and that's where we target our computer, and it stays right there.

We also have auto-steer which doesn't allow for any overlap. We basically follow an absolute straight line, so that there's no overlap. So it's become very, very sophisticated in those terms.

Mr. Gerrard: Once you inject it, it's not on the surface and it's not very likely to run off into the waterways.

Mr. Klassen: That's right. No, there's a buffer zone all around the field.

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Klassen.

Mr. Klassen: Yup, there's a buffer zone all around the edges where there's danger, like in slopes. There are regulations for all that.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

I call Mr. Brent Manning. Stan Siemens. David Hofer.

Ray Wipf. I thought he was here. Is Mr. Ray Wipf here, presenter No. 166?

Mr. Wipf, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ray Wipf (Maxwell Colony): Yes, I do. Yes, good afternoon. I'm Ray Wipf from Maxwell Colony.

Mr. Chairperson: One second. Okay. Proceed, Mr. Wipf, please.

* (17:20)

Mr. Ray Wipf: Hi, I'm Ray Wipf from Maxwell Colony. I've been in the hog business for 24 to 25 years, and I just can't seem to see why the hog producers are being targeted. All the regulations concerning food safety, manure handling have been followed and achieved by everybody I know in the industry. Research is still going on at all times to improve what how we can handle manure efficiently. Bill 17 positively can't be good for Manitobans, the hog producers and nutrition industry people, who make their living at hogs. Folks are very worried, not just the Hutterites and the Mennonites. This includes all people who care who are involved, from the banker to the plumber. We are people producing food for the rich and the poor. That is what agriculture is all about. We can't start chewing on a piece of plastic and survive.

What are politicians thinking? They must be a government gone wrong. Now, going back to the home front, my 14-year-old son came to me and said he wanted to graduate. There was quite a list of courses he was able to pick from, but he picked the course on hog apprenticeship programs. I was pleased he wanted to because he runs the nursing and hogs in all parts of the barn. What if Bill 17 passes? Should I tell my son to take an art class? No. We're in the hog business for the long run. This is our livelihood and it's good for the people of Manitoba. So let's hope good sense is used and Bill 17 is scrapped. Let's hope that God loves our industry in the future. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wipf. Questions?

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Wipf, for being here today and making your presentation. Part of the process in Manitoba is that when we introduce the bill the public gets a chance to share your views on it, and you and many others have certainly shared your views on this one. We are here to listen.

You talked about your son. You want him to be in the industry, and that's a goal of many of us to have our children work in the same field that we are in. Right now, within your colony, are you using all of the land base that it is available to you? Do you produce more manure than you can use on the land base that you have?

Mr. Ray Wipf: No, we're not using all our land for the manure handling. We have a lot of extra land that is still very much available for our manure management program.

Ms. Wowchuk: Is it in your plan right now to make some changes to your operation? I don't know whether you're farrow to finish or whether you just raise weanlings or what you do, but is it part of your plan to make some changes in that operation?

Mr. Ray Wipf: We have a newer finisher barn. It's a farrow-to-finish operation. We have a newer finisher barn that we built in '02. We put on an older barn and plus we only have a small finisher barn there right now that we built in '02. We built a big finisher barn, and the old finisher barn which we have full of pigs, too, is a 1970 barn. Our dry sow barn was actually made in 1983, which maintenance is every day plus the farrowing at the finisher is just a few years older and the farrowing at the nursery is just few years older than the farrowing since early '80s or late '70s. We have older facilities except for the new finisher barn.

Mr. Briese: Thank you, Ray, for your presentation. I didn't get the chance because I ran out of time on a previous presenter, but it kind of follows on the Minister of Agriculture's question. Correct me if I'm wrong here, but the regulations are in place for having X amount of land to put the manure on, and I believe that regulation—and this is what I want to get from you. If you don't have enough land, you have the ability to go and make deals with your neighbours and find enough land. You don't have to necessarily own the land. You can sell the manure to somebody else. You can rent land, whatever, to put it on. I think that regulation's there. You're only allowed to put so much—if I'm understanding you right—you're only allowed to put so much manure on each acre of land.

Mr. Ray Wipf: Yes, that is correct. If we would ever have a problem, we got neighbours down the road; I guarantee you, they probably want us to dump our manure on there right now, I'll be honest with you.

Manure handling, like I say, is not what it was 10, 15 years ago—30 below, out in the middle of winter, just spreading it on the snow. We knife in our manure every fall. To be very honest with you, I have to put a point that we've got different managements in our communities. When we feed grab-grain—let's say barley for \$2 an acre—if it's going for a bushel for that price at that certain time of year, that's my expense in the hog barn. It's just to show what the income is in the hogs.

You know what? Since I gave him my manure, maybe I should just put a buck in that expense, instead of \$2. That's how much people are really

going after the manure right now. At home, we go for crop rides now and then; it's just unreal the crops that we're getting off of that field which we are putting the manure spreading on.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Mr. Briese?

Mr. Briese: Thank you again. More a comment than a question—I raised hogs myself for 30 years and I've been out of the business for about 10 or 12 years. I sure wish there was a big barn near me, because I would sure use that product on my fields. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Rowat: I'll pass to the member first.

Mr. Chairperson: Actually, Mr. Gerrard is next.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you to my colleagues and thank you, Ray, for your presentation.

You mentioned, just in the course of this conversation, that you had enough land to spread the manure or inject the manure and you also had a market for it, should you not have enough land to inject, which raises a question for me.

If there's less manure, which is organic, then we'll be running the risk of using more chemical fertilizer, which isn't really where I think we want to go. Am I making any sense here?

Mr. Ray Wipf: Absolutely. I mean I'm really not—like I say, I've been stuck in the hog barn for 25 years. All I hear are complaints about fertilizer prices going up. It's ridiculous what happened this spring; people who didn't buy last year are in trouble right now. So I'm just commenting that manure is definitely an option, if you've got it.

Mr. Gerrard: You made, I think, an important point, that manure, compared with what you were using in terms of synthetic fertilizer, has made quite a dramatic difference in terms of the yields that you're getting. Can you tell us a little bit more about that?

Mr. Ray Wipf: Yes. It seems to me, like I say, I'm stuck in a barn and, when we go around, we know which field has been injected. We go see the boys who are doing it, now and then, and see how things are going. To be honest with you, it's just look in and just wonder—look what we got here. It's just as we do ourselves, and the bushels are definitely there. I cannot compromise if it's better or worse, to be honest with you, in the bushels and the yield.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further questions? Seeing none, Mr. Wipf, I thank you for your presentation.

Floor Comment: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Leonard Waldner.

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Can we do a substitution at this stage on the committee?

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: Yes. We have a substitution: Mr. McFadyen in for Mrs. Taillieu, and, also, substituting Mr.—[*interjection*] All right. We'll just leave it with the first substitution.

* * *

* (17:30)

Mr. Chairperson: I was calling Mr. Leonard Waldner.

Mr. Jack Waldner?

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser?

Mr. Kleinsasser, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser (Private Citizen): I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not?

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser: No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser: Hi, my name is Victor Kleinsasser. I'm a school teacher. I'm from Ste. Agathe, Manitoba. Went through Brandon University. I've been teaching for nine years and I'm here to talk about what I don't like, why I don't like Bill 17.

I think Bill 17 makes us farmers sort of look like criminals, and I don't think that's fair. It's just—it's not quite fair. I don't think it's quite fair for our students. I'm teaching grade 5, 6, 7 at a Hutterite colony and part of the Hanover School Division. We're doing a lot of things. These kids are working on the farm. They're working with animals. They are looking forward to this as their life as a farmer. It's not just growing grain. It's also dealing with the manure. It's that whole gamut, you know, the animals, the manure going into the land, the land returns it back into the animals and that, and doing a good job.

We're spending a lot of time doing things like trying to teach these kids about the environment and that. We are not just, you know, pushing that aside and saying it doesn't exist. Just last year—or was it the year before?—we did a thing with the grade 7 science,

where it was—this question was: What could you do now that you've finished your unit of study? What could you do that could improve our environment? So you got the standard stuff. Some kids decided to make bird houses and they put up a certain number of bird houses along certain places. Other groups of kids decided that they're going to plant trees, so they set themselves a goal and they planted trees, and that was actually courtesy of a grant from Environmental Youth Corps out of Manitoba government.

Another group decided that they would maybe try something with the recycling and so they set up a recycling program on our colony, so now they're going to recycle glass because everything else has been—is being recycled. We're recycling paper. We're recycling the metals and all that stuff, so these kids figured they are actually doing something for the environment. I think they're positively impacting our environment. They are putting energy into this.

Well, this is what I don't like about Bill 17. Bill 17 is sort of like the end of that stop. Don't work on this. It's not constructive thinking. We're trying to teach these kids, here's a problem; these are the problems we face. Come up with solutions, you know. Let's work towards it and, I think, with education, we can do a lot of stuff.

I wanted to talk a little bit about—I think Hutterites have come a long way in the line of being conscious of the environment. Well, we have to put up with a lot of regulations, stuff like that, and I think mostly people put up with that. They know it's for a good purpose and they go with it. However, in the past, I don't think it was that way. I think, you know, just a couple generations ago, I remember you go through the drive-through, you would pick up your food and stuff. On the way home, people would roll down the window and out it goes. That's not how we're treating—teaching our kids nowadays. We're trying to teach them a better way. We're trying to do a good job, but yet we're getting stuck with Bill 17, which is sort of like a slap in the face or on the hands or whatever you want to call it. It's—or shutting us down.

Even in little things like composting. Our colony has, just in the last couple years, got into composting and we're now composting all our kitchen scraps. This is a fairly large community. We've got 31 families and it's about 150 people. We're one of the larger colonies in Manitoba. So we're composting now. I think that's positive. These kids are—they're doing the work. They're bringing it in there, the

scraps. It's being composted in a large, cement, little bunker and it's kind of rolled over and then, after awhile, they use it for the gardens and all that stuff. It's a positive thing. Just as here—I just saw it in a newspaper the other day and it was in the *Free Press*, there was this article about a group of Manitoba school from—the Baker Hutterite colony has won the Manitoba Envirothon for this year.

It's not like we don't care about the environment. We are trying, and I think these kids really do care. They're not carelessly trying to abuse the environment. I think they want to do the right thing, and I think we should be there to help them and, you know, I think for the most part we do, but I still don't think that Bill 17 is—Bill 17 I see as a little bit as the opposite of all this. It's not like an educational approach. It's more like, you know, cut it off, that's it, schleuss, no more.

As far as, I mean, I haven't gone down to Lake Winnipeg to do research and such, but you look at the reports that are available, the Clean Environment Commission or the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board report in 2006. I mean, they give you certain numbers that they've found and I think that's what we have to go on. They don't ask for a moratorium. They ask for guidelines. They ask for changes by 2013. Well, here we are in 2008, you know, we didn't go with most of these changes that they had suggested. We're sort of jumping in and just cutting it off rather than implementing the suggested changes that they have asked for.

We realize that there are parts of Manitoba which, you know, they have said it's no more hogs can be sustained in the area, which I guess everybody can respect that. The other thing that I'd like to—thinking about, is this business of the world food crisis. You're hearing a lot about this. Kids are studying about this in school. You know, there is a problem. Food is not every—not all parts of the world have as much food. Actually, my brother is in Nigeria at the moment and you get phone calls, e-mails from him just a few times a year and there is not much food there. I can see from the pictures that he's lost quite a few pounds and we can help these people. We are helping them. We're sending over funds. The Hutterite colonies are actually backing a church, a school over there, also one in Liberia. We're concerned about people in different parts of the world, but we in Manitoba can grow these crops.

To grow crops we need nutrients. We all know that. We can use potash that's mined from

underground in Saskatchewan or we can use nitrogen which is made from propane and natural gas in Alberta, but when it rains and there are too much nutrients in the water it's going to end up in the rivers and in our lakes. The same thing for the manure. They have to be managed just like manure, managed properly. We can't blame hog farmers for all the woes of Lake Winnipeg. We just can't. I don't think we can.

Just thinking about the 100-mile diet. I'm sure lots of us are having—are part of that 100-mile diet. We're eating food from Manitoba. We're eating stuff from nearby. I mean, I'm one of those guys that eats a lot of food locally. That's something we can be proud of, but we can also produce food for different parts of the world.

I still don't like Bill 17. I don't think it's a constructive situation. I think it makes—and this may sound a little cruel as I was writing this—it makes Manitoba look like Zimbabwe in the sense of what happened there with the land grab, the eviction of the white farmers, going from a country that was exporting food in 2000 and then the land seizures. Well, of course, what came into there was they had a bunch of drought years, so all of a sudden it slumped, their production, and now 25 percent of the people in Zimbabwe are on food aid just because it's a miss—it's a sort of knee-jerk reaction. Let's get the land away from these people, or let's chop off all farmers in this area here and then you get sort of precautions that maybe you just didn't foresee.

Then the other question of hog farmers, if you stop hog farmers in Manitoba, where are they going to go? I mean, okay, they could build in Saskatchewan or they could build right outside this line that we've made halfway across the province—

* (17:40)

Mr. Chairperson: You're at nine minutes, sir.

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser: Okay. They could end up polluting the north and south Saskatchewan River. They could end up polluting the American side of the Red River. Okay? Well, this sort of thing, Devil's Lake is being drained in here. We're getting all these nutrients. We're getting, according to the environmental stewardship report, we're getting something like 40-some percent of the nutrients that end up in Lake Winnipeg comes from the American side. How can we take all the blame for this?

Just one more point. I think that Bill 17 is not very friendly towards the Hutterites. There are 106

colonies in Manitoba. When they expand the general area farming colonies, where are they going to expand to. Nobody is going to expand into the land that has been set aside for Bill 17. Why would they?

So my final word is, if MLAs shut down hog farming expansion and stuff in Winnipeg, over 2 percent of phosphorus that ends up in Lake Winnipeg, what are you going to do about the 98 percent that's still out there? We can only take so much of the blame, I think, even though I don't want to look like I'm callous. I always talk about education and about how we are trying to teach our kids to do a better job with the environment. But, at the same time, I don't think we can take all the blame. You can blame us for 2 percent, but who's going to take care of the 98 percent.

I guess I better quit before I run out of time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser. Questions?

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for your presentation. I believe your community also makes machinery, and so on, for hog barns, and that you export this around the world. If we kill the industry here, then we're going to lose a lot more than just the production of hogs because you will have lost a local market and you will be less able to export these machinery and sensors, and all the things that you make, around the world.

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser: We've already felt this. This happened a year or so ago when the moratorium came down. We already knew that there's no more building of hog barns in this area, and so there you go. So that has already happened. How could we sell hog equipment in Manitoba? Why would somebody build a hog barn in this area? It would not be economically smart.

Around the world, we have a great impact. We consider ourselves to make some of the best equipment around. So we sell all around the world. That, I imagine, answers the question. I don't know.

Mr. McFadyen: I want to thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser, for that presentation and just for providing us with some insight into the lessons that are being taught to the students and the role that you're playing in that, and a whole range of different issues that are important to us as Manitobans and world citizens as well.

I want to just ask you. You have identified what you view as the problem with the bill as being going

beyond what was required to solve the issue at hand, which is to find ways of reducing the amount of phosphorus flowing into our waterways and, ultimately, ending up in Lake Winnipeg.

I am not even close to having the same level of expertise as I think you have, and many others involved in the industry, as to how best to solve the problem. I wonder if I could just give you the opportunity to state what you think, what you would do if you were in government and trying to achieve the goal of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg, with particular attention to the 2 percent issue that you have spoken to with respect to the hog industry.

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser: It's an incredibly tough question. How do you solve the problem of Lake Winnipeg? I'm not sure anybody would know the answer. But, you know, just one point would be, in 2010, the federal government has instituted, or whatever, put out legislation saying that, from now, on household cleaners, the level of phosphates in household cleaners has to go from 2.2 percent down to 0.2 percent. Anybody who's washing their hands at the sink, the detergent they use will be limited. They'll have less phosphates in it. That phosphate goes down your drain, goes down to the lake. Well, it doesn't end up in the lake. It goes to a sewage treatment plant, right? That's a good thing. I'm willing to buy detergent with less—stuff like this. I'm sure there are little loopholes, and stuff people can do a lot of things in the line of being more careful. You know, the business of when you knife in manure, so you got your tractor driving along with the manure. Well, if you put on too much manure, it'll overflow, but there are limits. So it's put into ground. Well, there should be distances between waterways and where you put in manure. That should be respected. Stuff like that, you know.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. McFadyen, supplemental?

Mr. McFadyen: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, for letting me ask the follow-up question because I didn't pose my question to you very well. I was really just wanting to give you a chance to talk about practices in the hog industry that could help deal with the issue. You've got knowledge on a range of other areas, but just expand on the comments that you were making toward the end in terms of knifing and other practices that might achieve the goal of having the manure provide the nutrients to the grain, which is then fed back into either human beings or hogs and avoid having it run into the waterways. If you can just go a step beyond in terms of the evolution of

practices in recent years and where things need to go on a go-forward basis.

Mr. Victor Kleinsasser: Not sure if I can really answer that question very well. I mean, I don't have that much expertise in that area. Like I was saying, to have crops, you can't just keep taking, you know, nutrients or whatever out of the crops as the crops grow to use nutrients, right? Well, you have to replace that with something. Now, if you load up your fields by tonnes of, you know, fertilizer, it's going to wash off. That's why there are limits. That's what we need to set, good limits where we can go and then, of course, our crops are then converted into—I mean, the nitrogen and stuff like that in the soil is converted back into crops, and then crops can be fed to animals or exported as Canada is doing a good job in that line.

I'm not really an agricultural expert. I was more going to speak today on the subject of just the children. That's what was my point. I was going to talk about children in the future of Hutterites and not just Hutterites, rural kids. Kids, you know, farming kids, who are out there; they plan to spend their lives, you know, in agriculture, but is there a future for them in this area?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kleinsasser. Time for this presentation has expired, so I thank you.

Call Mr. Guy Labossiere. Mike Hofer. Felix Boileau. Felix Boileau. Rick Fast. Miles Beaudin. Mack Waldner. Jonathan Maendel.

Jeff Mah, Envirotech Ag Systems—oh, sorry, that's inside the city.

Tom Leppelman. Stanley Hofer. Adam Waldner. Blair Cressman. Edwin Hofer, Miami Colony Farms Ltd. John Bannister. William Hoffman. Don Winnicky. Robert Krentz. Jeremy Maendel.

Ron Klippenstein. Mr. Klippenstein, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ron Klippenstein (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No? Seeing none, you may proceed.

* (17:50)

Mr. Ron Klippenstein: Thank you for the opportunity to come together here. As I have 10 minutes, I thought I would do something a little bit different today, and, no, I won't tap dance. But I

wrote a poem. Sometimes farmers have some talents other than raising livestock for the Canadian population. So here's the poem:

I got my place in the countryside, / I worked very hard, you know I've strived, / When all was set, it was fresh and free, / I felt there was nothing that could bother me, / I woke up early one spring day, / I opened my door and to my dismay, / There was an odour, I did not know why, / It became my mission to identify, / I followed the scent round hills and dale, / And as I got closer, my face turned pale, / I went in the yard to inquire on the matter, / And found an old farmer mad as a hatter, / He said times were hard and profits were low, / He was out of money, and his workers didn't show, / Government forms sent him back to school, / Farming these days? He was the fool, / I listened intently, and I tried to console, / As his stress clearly was starting to show, / I said we don't need pig farms anymore, / I just picked up some pork at the grocery store, / He looked at me, his eyes full of pity, / It seemed I had missed the nitty-gritty, / As I listened intently, I started to know, / Why farmers are needed to make the world go, / So I phoned up my M.P. and found this meeting, / I spoke of how farmers were taking a beating, / I voiced my concerns and issued my warnings, / I really want farmers to greet in the morning, / I ask that you give your heads a shake, / As the food grown by farmers fills your plate, / If you eat, then you're certainly involved, / Because it's farming that feeds us all.

So much for the poem.

Mr. Chairperson: With leave of the committee, I'll allow some applause from the audience for that. *[applause]*

Mr. Klippenstein: Thank you. Sorry, I have some more, but not poems. *[interjection]* No, you don't have to applaud.

You've heard all the stories. This isn't a poem, so I won't try—you know, get out of that mindset. You've heard all the stories and pretty much all the angles. On one side, you have people who want Manitoba to be a recreation resort and want anything resembling farming to stop. You have the farmers, whose way of life is being threatened and whose very existence has been reduced to begging to stay financially viable.

Farmers have had to become experts at everything they do, from keeping up with the most recent new law to comply with to being a master

accountant to fill out all the required application forms, just so that we can survive one more day while the world consumes our product.

It was my dream to become a farmer when I was very young, the son of a farmer from a history of farmers through the last seven generations. Early every morning till late every night, I cared for hogs. Seven days a week for 30 years, I was consumed by the worry of finances and the many risks associated with farming. With my father's farm to build on, I expanded my farm five times in 30 years. I was always too small to compete in the world. In fact, I would like to suggest that every hog farm in Manitoba is still a small family farm. As far as the multi-billion-dollar companies go in the world, we don't even light the candle.

It was my dream to feed the world. I've also seen the pictures of the anti-farm lobbyists, the ones they've shown to the politicians, farms flooded during wet seasons, most likely staged videos of animals confined or abused. With so few farmers left in Manitoba and so many people who haven't a clue where food comes from or how it's produced, it seems easier for the politicians to listen to the lobbyists who pull at the heartstrings of unsuspecting voters.

There are two people in this building who I would like to say this to, and I hope this panel understands. I brought my two sons along. The first thing I'd like to say to my two boys is, don't believe that you can make a living producing food for Manitobans. Don't worry if the cities run out of food. They don't deserve the sweat and blood you would need to put out for them to eat. Never farm like your ancestors did; it amounts to being a beggar your whole life. I regret the years I spent farming; the hard work was not worth it. Canada, and more specifically, Manitoba, does not care about farmers because they can buy all their food in the grocery stores. They have a serious disconnect with reality. To my boys, take a look at this committee. They will go home with their wallets full. They will go get their food from the grocery stores. They will not suffer any of the hardships your father suffered.

No. 7. We have become a visible minority. We are an endangered species. You are watching the process used by short-sighted lawmakers that aided our demise. Our heritage as farmers, our fiscally responsible ways of managing our farms, our hopes and dreams in this new land of being able to work hard and live with dignity and feed our families, is

disappearing before our eyes. History will judge these lawmakers and as world hunger rises, there will be fewer people around who know how to feed the world because Bill 17 will kill the farmer, make the existing farms obsolete.

No. 10. My grandfather used to have a saying. I'll translate it for you. [*Low German spoken.*] You don't know anything about the war.

I applaud the fact that this committee is listening to me, but the fact that we are even talking about this has put an ill wind in the air for farmers, when we should be standing up and offering a minute of silence for all those of us who have fallen. You talk about our systematic demise when you should be giving us few farmers left a standing ovation. You talk about legislating us out of existence and creating laws that are cumbersome to comply with and regulate. This bill is the beginning of our end. If you eat, then you will also feel the end of grown in Manitoba. Don't do it. Open your eyes. Allow farmers to build and expand as they have done in the past. All the expansions that I made, I had to ensure that I had appropriate land available. These were required of me before I got the building permits. The existing controls did their job. Stop the bill before it stops food production. Thank you.

* (18:00)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein. I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you. Wonderful poem. Great presentation. I do have a question for you though. I took very seriously your comments which you were making to your son. We've heard from other presenters that want to encourage their sons or daughters to take over the farm. If the government was to repeal Bill 17 and come back with a set of regulations or follow the recommendations put out through the CEC report, do you think that would change the mentality out there as far as the next generation of farmers, and put some confidence back in to those farm people that want to have the next generation, in fact, be farmers?

Mr. Klippenstein: Thank you. It's a very good question. Firstly, I think it's important to say—you know, I lost my train of thought, but it'll come back to me.

Would my children regain their heart for farming? This is what we do. When we, who feed the world, should be one of the richest groups on this planet, this is how we live, like beggars. This is how

we do it. You know what the costs of production are and if you're not sure what they are, they have been as bad as \$100 less than what we got for it. So when I talk to my boys, and I'm talking to them right now. You want to be a farmer, learn how to beg. Don't be proud because pride doesn't fill out forms, begging does.

When I look at the last 15 years of farming, and I find more and more and more regulations, manure management plans. Oh, we all know they're important. But I can't go to the bathroom on the field without turning around in circles for fear there may be a puddle, and I didn't file a manure management plan so if someone was there, they could make it very difficult for me for dumping manure on the land. These are ridiculous. In order for me to farm, I have more phone calls from government regulators right now than I have from concerned people. They all feel it's their God-given duty to make sure I comply. So I have to be really nice to them because if I tell them where I'd like to tell them to go, because I've got pigs to feed, they would make it very difficult for me and other farmers around. So I got to blow sunshine somewhere.

So, no. You lost me. As an individual farmer who's spent a quarter of my century, quarter of my life, or more, working, I don't want my boys to farm. I think that's the stupidest thing they could do in their lifetime. Why not join a committee? Get overweight.

It's personal. To me, it's personal. I hope I answered your question.

Mr. McFadyen: Mr. Klippenstein, I want to thank you for the comments today. I think that they've had an impact on those who are here listening to what you're saying. I want to just comment on your pessimism about the future of farming in Manitoba and say to you that there are members of this committee who are opposed to Bill 17, the members on this side of the table, in particular, many who have been extremely articulate in their opposition to this bill, including Mr. Goertzen, Eichler, Pedersen, Mr. Fauschou, Maguire, Cullen, Mr. Graydon and Mr. Dyck.

Ms. Jennifer Howard, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

As a city of Winnipeg MLA, I agree with the position, too, although I don't understand it as well as they do, but I know that Bill 17 is wrong. I think you should know there are members of this committee who support you and want to see the bill stopped.

Also, to let you know that the original plan on the part of the government was to have this bill passed by next Thursday. I want to give you—I hope, before you leave—some sense of optimism before you walk out of the room, and that is that the government has agreed to hold this bill over until October for more opportunities for people like you to come and speak and to consider changes to the bill and, we hope, changes that will give you reason to be optimistic about farming again.

I want to just share that with you. I know members on the opposite side of the table, even as the proponents of the bill, have been listening carefully. I hope that you will walk out of this room with some optimism that, between now and early October, which is when this bill is supposed to be voted on, changes can happen.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Klippenstein, did you want to respond to that?

Mr. Klippenstein: Thanks for the opportunity to say how I feel.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you. We're at the end of our time for this presentation, so we'll move on.

I have some substitutions for the committee. *[applause]* Okay. I know that we had some applause for the poem; I think that was well-placed and loud. But, just ask everyone, please to—we ask the audience that your presentations are your participation and you refrain from applauding or participating in other ways. Thank you.

Committee Substitutions

Madam Vice-Chairperson: I have some substitutions for the committee: Mr. Goertzen for Mrs. Rowat, Mr. Swan for Ms. Melnick, and Mr. Caldwell for Ms. Wowchuk.

* * *

Madam Vice-Chairperson: We'll continue calling through the list.

James Waldner, James Waldner?

Tom Leppelman, Tom Leppelman?

Albert Maendel, Albert Maendel?

Patrick Hague, Patrick Hague?

Kevin Kurbis from New Standard Ag. David Hofer. Christine Hofer. Martin Sharpe from Little Saskatchewan Feed Yard Group.

Mark Gauvin. Mark Hofer. Levi Waldner. George Hofer. Fred Hofer. Alvin Hofer. Martin Gross from Iberville Colony.

Brad Schnell. Robert Toews. Rika Coelstra. Kees Vanittersum from Micro Fan Canada.

Joe Marshall. Garry Stott. David Waldner. Darrin Warkentin. Jeroen VenBoekel. William Tshatter. Rick Friesen. Amos Stahl. Christine Kynoch. Josh Waldner.

Michael Wurtz. Michael Wurtz, do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Michael Wurtz (Private Citizen): I got the speaker, so I made a copy so the guys could follow me.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Sure, if you have copies, you can just give them to the clerk here and he'll make sure they're distributed. You can go ahead when you're ready.

*(18:10)

Mr. Michael Wurtz: Hello, I'm Michael Wurtz from around Starbuck, Manitoba.

I want to voice my concerns regarding Bill 17 which, I think, is not in the best interests of the residents of Manitoba, especially the farmers.

As a kid growing up, I looked at a lot of National Geographic magazines. Caterpillar always had in there with a quote: There are no easy solutions, only intelligent choices. I think this quote fits our situation perfectly. I believe that we as intelligent adults can and should find a better solution to this situation. This hog moratorium is not the answer. If we make a decision on a matter that affects thousands of people, it should be well thought out. It should be made on sound environmental studies and on facts, not assumption politics.

The study by CEC clearly shows hogs are not one of the big contributors to the phosphorous problem, less than 2 percent. I feel with sound manure management practices, which both farmers already had in place, this can be controlled. With a couple of regulations and guidelines on new hog set-ups or expansions, future pollution problems should not be an issue. I think we can find a solution that will sustain agriculture, hog farming, the environment without Bill 17. Let's work together like the sensible adults we claim to be.

Please don't bite the hand that feeds you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wurtz.

Mr. Michael Wurtz: I'm not done.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Are you not done? Okay, I'm sorry.

Mr. Michael Wurtz: I would like to see the NDP government go down in history as a government who helped make Manitoba a leader in supporting agriculture, manufacturing, mining and all other business sectors of Manitoba, not make one sector a scapegoat for our environmental issues. Everybody who supports Bill 17 will go down in history as a bunch of idiots who used the hog industry to mislead the public into believing they are saving Lake Winnipeg when in fact Bill 17 will do very little for the environment. Most existing hog operations will be around for the next 10-15 years. If you really want to do something positive, help existing operations meet current manure management practices that would have immediate results. Any new operations that have proper manure management plans and follow CEC's guidelines should have very little effect on the environment.

Who do you think will be most affected by Bill 17? I think mostly corporate hog operations that buy 30-40 acres and build huge hog operations that don't live near the barns or hire local people to run their operations will not be terribly affected. They will just build future barns in different R.M.s. The people who will really get hurt by Bill 17 is the family farm. People who live on the land, people who have been living in one place for two or three generations and who are tied to the lands, who live on the land they own. Take, for example, a father with two sons who would like to stay on the farm in order to generate enough income to support three families. They would like to increase their hog operations by 50-100 sows. They have the land base to properly incorporate their manure. They have a sound manure management plan in place, but because of Bill 17, their hands are tied. These people will be the real losers.

These days you hear a lot of Kyoto, greenhouse gases, wind farms and renewable energies. I would like to point out that manure properly applied is both renewable and environmentally friendly. Every acre where manure's applied, we're not using synthetic fertilizers, which are not renewable and have to be hauled long distances, both of which are bad for the environment. It costs lots of fuel and wears out the highways. Think about that.

In the past 15 years, I have been actively involved in farming. I have seen manure go from waste and nuisance that we tried to dispose of as soon as possible to a valuable commodity. We try to cover as many acres as possible. We take annual soil and manure nutrient tests to a third party. We have had very positive results.

In early April I drove over the Peguis Trail Bridge in north Main. I smelled sewer. Looking down on the south side, I saw a wide stream of sewer running into the river. It made me wonder how many tonnes of phosphorus Winnipeg is dumping into the Red River daily. Why isn't CEC doing a study on Winnipeg sewer draining into the Red River and making numbers public? If you're really concerned and want immediate results, I challenge you to stop all new housing developments and new buildings in Winnipeg till Winnipeg sewer system is upgraded to handle existing sewage and any sewage new housing would generate. Or is it easier to pick on hog farmers?

Ten or 15 years ago I got a chance to listen to Peter Warren doing a talk show on farmers. When one older lady phoned in asking why we need farmers, claiming she gets her milk and that from Safeway, Peter just hung up on her. The NDP government seems to have the same mindset. I feel anybody who supports Bill 17 has lost sight of where the food he or she eats every day comes from. They think it gets manufactured in some warehouse in Winnipeg.

If you don't want to support agriculture, I challenge every one of you to boycott farmers for the next three weeks. Don't buy or eat any pork, beef, chicken, turkey, bread, pasta, buns, milk, eggs, vegetables or anything that has any of these items in it either at home or any restaurant. Maybe after three weeks of living on water and seaweed, you will realize how much you take for granted.

In closing, I would like to say Bill 17 is an insult to farmers. We are not trying to exploit agriculture. We are trying to be good stewards of the land. We want to protect our land and environment so that we can pass it on to the next generation in as good shape as possible. We are not on some get-rich-quick scheme.

Bill 17 needs to be thrown out, or at least amended. Let's put our emphasis on proper management and stewardship. We are willing to listen and change our practices if it will help sustain agriculture and our environment. Let's work together

to find a solution that's practical. Bill 17 will never accomplish what manure management has in the last 10 years.

Have a nice day and many restless nights regarding Bill 17.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wurtz. We're open to questions.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Madam Vice-Chair. I am just going to assume, sir, that you have family. If Bill 17 goes through, how does this impact your family and your everyday life as you know it?

Mr. Michael Wurtz: It might not have any short-term effects, but it will in the long run because, currently, we bought an older hog set-up in southern Manitoba and that's in pretty rough shape. We want to wait for another couple years and then slowly upgrade it, and, with Bill 17, our hands are tied. So it's kind of a rough situation for us.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I do have a question for you in regard to the regulations that have just been put in place in the last year or so and also the Clean Environment report that's been tabled. If those changes were implemented and Bill 17 wasn't put in place, do you feel that that would be sufficient in order to maintain the water quality that's out there now in order to deal with Bill 17 rather than that of a permanent moratorium?

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Wurtz, I just have to recognize you so we know everybody who said things at the committee. So go ahead, Mr. Wurtz.

Mr. Michael Wurtz: I think we should at least give them a chance. The phosphorus regulations aren't even in place. They're in 2010 even though in our farm we're already trying to follow them. We're two years ahead of the regulations, and I think with a couple of more guidelines by CEC that were—that they had in their list, we should make sure we have enough land base before we can build barns. I think we should be able to expand our hog operations.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): Thank you very much, Mr. Wurtz, for your presentation. I don't think more truer words could be spoken in regard to the change in the last 15 years from looking at manure pile as being waste and a nuisance to something that is extremely valuable. I'm afraid that the current administration is viewing us on the farm now the way they perceived us many, many years ago, and so I thank you very much for your presentation. Indeed, I think if the government was

to take the time to go out to the rural and see exactly what our operations are today, they would be much the wiser and would be throwing this Bill 17 so far away that no one would ever find it again.

On that point, has anyone ever come to you and to your colony community from the government to ask questions of you as to how regulations and your farming techniques have changed?

Mr. Michael Wurtz: Not that I'm aware of. I personally haven't talked to anybody.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Seeing no other questions, thank you very much for your presentation, sir.

* (18:20)

Okay, next, proceeding down the list, calling Edward Maendel. Edward Maendel?

Russell Paetkau? David Waldner?

David Wurtz. Welcome, Mr. Wurtz. Do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Mr. David Wurtz (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Well, you can start whenever you're ready, sir.

Mr. David Wurtz: Well, first I'd like to thank everybody for the opportunity for us, as the people of Manitoba, to speak in front of you.

Also, before my message gets too long-winding, I'd like to just tell you that I'm against Bill 17. I'm also very disappointed when I look at all the faces here that I can't see Mr. Gary Doer here. With an important bill that's in front of us, I think the leader should be here, of our government.

In my community I'm a part-time teacher besides helping on the farm and hog raising and other livestock we're in. Two weeks ago, I had the chance for the first time to take a tour of this building here, actually, with the school tour. With 11- and 12-grade students, we came in here and toured the building, and it was fascinating, the big building, seeing one in Winnipeg here. I've seen some very interesting things that I took note of, and it made me really rethink all of Bill 17, what it's all about.

For example, we were in your House of the Legislative Assembly, I think is what you call it, and there were some interesting pictures on the walls. I don't know if you ever have time when you walk in there to take a look at them, or if the tour guide did a good chance of explaining them to us, but, hopefully,

you know what they stand for. Like, over the Speaker's head, there's a big picture of a poor man on one side and a rich man on the other side, and justice in the middle, and it seems that that justice would be served to the people of Manitoba, is what our tour guide told us. I just think that in there, there should be a picture of a young family there with his children and maybe holding a pig, just to see that we need justice too. Then the pictures all around the wall there, of all the women there, she told us stands for all the virtues; for example, honesty, fairness. So I asked a question to myself: Where is the fairness to the hog industry?

Then we also had a chance to go across the street, and we toured the Manitoba courtyards and had a chance to talk with one of the judges. He gave us interesting comments on his job, what he does. One of the things I took out of there—I knew it before, but it kind of stuck on me—is that people are innocent in Canada and Manitoba unless proven guilty. I'm just asking a question. The question I'm asking: Is this really happening with Bill 17? Where is the proof that we, as hog producers, are guilty? That's a question I've asked myself when I looked at that. I haven't seen it in the papers. I haven't read it in the documents. Maybe you could help me.

So I ask you: Are you fair with the hog industry and with Bill 17? How can you penalize us with the hog moratorium without showing us the proof that we are at fault? The only chart I've seen showed me that the hog industry is only to blame for 1.5 percent of the phosphates. Is that a reason to tie our hands and basically stop us from expanding? Is this innocent until proven guilty?

I just got a quote here from one of your own I'd like to read, quote: I don't know. A proof is a proof. What kind of a proof? It's a proof. A proof is a proof, and when you have good proof, it's because it's proven. That's Jean Chrétien. So, again, my question is: Where is the proof? So I'd like to really have you rethink what you are doing.

I'm also involved in manure injection on our farm. Comparing to 20 years ago, the rules in place now help the farmer that the government put out before Bill 17. It saves us lots of money and lots on fertilizer. It's actually helping us and we thank you for them; making rules to help the farmer not make him quit his livelihood. So I ask you to continue making rules that help us and not destroy us.

Be more open. I've got a couple of suggestions I wrote down here where you can maybe help us. Be

more open to companies coming into Manitoba to help us solve pollution problems, like a company that's working with us right now called AgCert. They're a worldwide company. They wanted to come put a tarp on our lagoons so we can avoid the stink coming from it and were actually going to pay for everything. They were planning on taking the points and selling them. Like, what they wanted to do, they wanted to burn methane and when they burn methane it's not as hard on the environment, so they figured they'll be collecting points and selling them on world market. And they're also wanting to involve University of Manitoba to do a study. What really made me excited is they're not going to ask for government funding, they're just asking for permission. So far we've had a lot of stumbling blocks, and we figured by springtime the project would be done and going, but hopefully, it will be, but so far it hasn't.

So I'd also like to beg you to look more closely at point source. Where does that phosphate really come from? Just saying it comes from the pig farm or it comes from U.S. or it comes from there, is there really studies showing that? Have we done point source? Do we know exactly where it comes from before we start making laws like Bill 17?

Also, instead of shutting us down with Bill 17, I'd also like you to take a look at it case-by-case. Do the people who want to build have enough land? Is the land suitable for putting on manure or is it leaching? And look at all the aspects of case-by-case, and that way, we're not all put in one sect.

So, I want to beg you, please help us. Don't kill us. Thank you.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Thank you, very, very much, Mr. Wurtz for your presentation, for your quote from Mr. Chrétien. I rarely agreed with the former Prime Minister, but I agree with him on that quote in relation to Bill 17. I want to thank you for, first of all, stating that you're opposed to Bill 17, and then talking about fairness and as it relates even here to the Legislature and our duty to ensure that there is fairness.

I want to read a quote for you that the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) gave in the Legislature this past Tuesday. He said that this bill, Bill 17 will actually separate people apart, those who want to protect water, and those who don't want to protect water. What he was saying is that if you're opposed to Bill 17, you don't want to protect water.

Do you think that's a fair comment for the Minister of Conservation to make?

Mr. David Wurtz: Well, I can't agree with that. We use the water surrounding us. We run our manure management plans. We try and do the best we can with it so that we don't pollute the water. We definitely want clean water and if we could help in any way, we could maybe take shovels and come up and help you shovel it out if that's what it takes.

* (18:30)

We're here to help, but we need the Manitoba government to also be willing to sit down with us across the table and discuss what we can do to help and not just throw a bill at us, and now, here, you have to live with it. I don't believe that's fair and I don't believe that's justice in Manitoba.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Any other questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I do have a question for you. Based on your operation now, do you have sufficient acres in order to spread your effluent on?

Mr. David Wurtz: Yes, we have sufficient acres. We also have farmers that are willing to pay money for it, but why should we give it to them if we can put it on our fields, and the benefit is ours. Why should we? They've approached us time and time again. We want your manure. Why should we give them any unless they're willing to pay us a large amount of money for it? So we're at the point where we're not willing to sell it. We want it on our fields to get the most benefit out of it.

Mr. Gerrard: I'm interested in your approach to the environment, improving the environment, covering the lagoons and, hopefully, that will work. You were talking a little bit about the methane. Was this as part of an effort to capture methane as well?

Mr. David Wurtz: Yes, that was the whole idea behind it. The company isn't going to give us a free tarp. I mean, it's a \$150,000 project. We know there are no freebies around. What they wanted to do, as they're a worldwide company, and they trade Kyoto points. They're going to burn the methane. When you burn methane, they say the carbon monoxide that comes from the methane is only—the methane is about 100 times more dangerous to the greenhouse, or whatever you want to call it. So in burning it, you're saving the environment. But the problem that AgCert has got, they have to prove it to our government. If doing it worldwide, they're doing it

for a living, but they come to Manitoba and the Manitoba government doesn't want to recognize it as actually helping the environment.

So what do they have to do? They have to go to the University of Manitoba, and they'll run a study. Until that study is done, they won't be able to get paid for the methane that we burn. There are a bunch of other stumbling blocks with Manitoba Conservation that we're in right now. It's tough, as farmers, to try and do something, make a good decision that'll help the neighbour, help everybody, and now we run into government problems where we can't go ahead.

What I suggested is maybe we should ask the government for a \$10 million grant and maybe it will go through then faster. I don't know. I don't have the answers.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Faurschou: Indeed, most of us out there now would much sooner use an organic-based fertilizer for the crop production rather than synthetic fertilizers. I thank you very much for bringing that point home with the committee here this afternoon.

But, once again, you have demonstrated that farmers are adopting and incorporating technology as well as innovation, and the government is lagging so far behind that they're more of a hindrance than a help.

I ask the question of yourself. When was the last time a government official was asking you for thoughts as to what would be the best way in which to bring forward new policies?

Mr. David Wurtz: Well, I have to honestly say I've never talked to—that's the first time I've talked with government people. I guess if that's what I have to do, I'll have to come in here more often, that's all, and bring a whole load of hogs.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, sir. That's the time for your presentation. Thank you very much.

We'll continue moving down the list.

Betty Siemens. Betty Siemens? James Siemens. Leonard John Friesen. Wendy Friesen.

Bill Vaags, Bill Vaags? Welcome, Mr. Vaags. Do you have a written presentation?

Mr. Bill Vaags (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay, you can start whenever you're ready, sir.

Mr. Vaags: I'll make it short and sweet. This morning, I was ready to come down here and realized I locked myself out of the car that I was supposed to come here with, and I had some notes and stuff in there. I haven't got any notes. Whatever you get is straight off the cuff.

First of all, let me tell my name is Bill Vaags. I'm a married man; my wife and I raised five children. They're all grown up. I've been in the hog business for the better part of 45 years, so that tells you how old I am. I should tell you where I'm from, right? I'm from Dugald, Manitoba.

It's been interesting sitting here, listening to all the comments. I won't make any recommendations, because I don't even know how to speak properly off the notes that are in my car, and that car's not here yet.

I'm glad that I stuck around as long as I did, so I could just let you know that I wanted to be known—not that I'm giving you any advice, because I don't think I have the proper advice—but, at least, it will go on record that I was with the committee here to try and listen to you guys and everybody else. I'll leave it with that. I said it should be short and sweet. If you have any questions, I will try and answer.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Vaags.

Mr. Eichler: Forty-five years—that's quite a milestone, Mr. Vaags, and I certainly commend you for being around the industry a long time. We've seen the highs and lows and, right now, we're into that low.

We know that everything comes in cycles and I know that, right now, there's a signal out there, not only because of decline in the prices but, with Bill 17, it brings a different signal. It brings a signal of uncertainty, a signal of whether or not we even want the industry within the province of Manitoba.

Could you give us your opinion on that, since you've been around for 45 years in this industry and you see how that might have an effect on the next generation of farmers?

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Go ahead, sir.

Mr. Vaags: Well, naturally, it speaks for itself. I've been in the business for 45 years. We do both hogs and grain, oilseeds and everything.

I think there's still a great opportunity in this province to proceed, but you mentioned the word "sensitiveness." I think that's the way you put it. That's uncertainty; that is really the big thing with this whole committee and everything. When I talked to people at home yesterday—I left here at five o'clock for a farewell thing for our pastor from our church—they asked me, what did you learn from the committee? I had to honestly say that I wasn't sure just what it was all about.

I do want to say, I know the question is going to come as far as, do you have enough land to spread your manure? We don't spread it; we inject it. We've gone along with the trend of change in production patterns and of costs and so on.

Back in the early '60s, we were hauling it out with the stoneboat, they used to call it. From there, we went to manure spreaders; from there, we went to the irrigation-type system with the big guns which was the most stupid thing that anybody could have ever gone for, but we thought it was a great idea at the time.

Then, from there, we went to the injection system. The injection system—we've been doing that now on a custom basis. We get a custom operator doing it for us, and we get it cleaned up in a hurry. We certainly we get the best use out of the by-product.

* (18:40)

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Faurshou: Thank you, Mr. Vaags, for your presentation today and for sharing some of your time, which has a wealth of experience. Your family, you mentioned you raised five children. Are you looking to see the operation continue to another generation after yourself?

Mr. Vaags: I didn't explain my family. I have one son and four daughters. My son is a full-time partner in the business and a full-time manager now because myself, I've had some medical setbacks where I've had to slow down a bit, with heart problems and so on. I wanted him to be here today and present. He could give you a better overlook from the whole situation. Unfortunately, he said, dad, I am not going there; you go do it.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Faurshou, on a supplementary.

Mr. Faurschou: He would probably have a fair degree of frustration, and I appreciate your calm demeanour here today.

The operation that you just mentioned, obviously, has changed significantly and is much more understanding of the environment and the value through the nutrient levels within the manure. I would suspect that you are using less synthetic fertilizers with the injection services that you employ. Could maybe you elaborate a little bit more on that?

Mr. Vaags: I'm sorry.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: That's okay, sir. I haven't got it right most of today, so go ahead.

Mr. Vaags: What was the question again?

Mr. Faurschou: Just in regard to the value in nutrient levels, the injection system and using less synthetic fertilizer, how this pertains to your crop production methods now.

Mr. Vaags: We use whatever we possibly can on the soil, but we have a large acreage available for applying it to, so it's not a problem for us at all where we're going. What else can I tell you?

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Faurschou, your final question.

Mr. Faurschou: Final question. This is leading up to the impact—you made mention of your operation. I believe that you're in opposition to Bill 17. With your son now the manager of the operation, are expansion plans in your future if Bill 17 wasn't staring us in the face?

Mr. Vaags: That's what we're worrying about because it caused the uncertainty. So we're very afraid unless we know exactly where we're stepping ourselves into. We're pretty nervous about it.

We've gone gradually from the early '60s, 150 feeder pigs per one time around. By the early '70s, I changed the thing to a farrow to finish operation, I had 300 sows. Another seven or eight years later, we went to 700 sows. Everybody said that this man is crazy because, at that time, there was no such thing as a 700-sow farrow to finish operation. Five years ago, we went to 1,200 sows now.

Do we worry about it? Yes, we worry about whether or not it's safe for us to proceed and invest some more. My son reminds me of it many times. He says, dad, I'm glad you had the foresight at the time

when you did because there would be far more difficulties now than we did at the time.

Mr. Gerrard: You mentioned that you're now injecting the manure. Tell us a little bit about this. I think it's probably a few inches below the surface that you inject it. Give us a perspective on what portion of the manure produced by the hog industry is now injected. What's the likelihood that that actually runs off into the water when it's injected?

Mr. Vaags: There is no run-off. My son is so conscious that, if it rains and he feels that there's someplace where it might drain off, he closes that off until it's all seeped in. We have very little run-off from the liquid manure that comes out there.

What portion do we apply? All of it. Everything that we use. Do I have the ability to have more land available? I mentioned that already. We've got close to 4,000 acres that we can work with, but 4,000 acres doesn't make it practical as some of the land is lying about two miles away.

But the custom operators are getting bigger and bigger, and they can do a very good job for us. Usually they pull in one afternoon, and they'll pump out 24 million gallons in a matter of two and a half, three days. But we apply it all to the land.

Mr. Gerrard: Do you know from a Manitoba-wide perspective what proportion of manure is now injected?

Mr. Vaags: Well, I don't have an exact figure on that, but more and more, these custom operators, they got big machines. But we pre-book them. We just had them put on a spring application during seeding. So there's—well, what can I say? I'm losing track of your question.

Mr. Gerrard: Is it 10 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, which is now injected, would you guess?

Mr. Vaags: I would guess—I'll go on the safe side—between 50 and 75. I think that's a fair assessment because there's more and more of them. Everybody else realizes that injection is the only way to go. Thank you very much.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: There's one more questioner, sir.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Bill. When you said you were in the hog business for 45 years, I couldn't help but think that when you got into the hog industry, there must have been huge changes

from about 1963 to now. In the summers in '63, '64, '65, when I was a little kid, they used to bring pigs from all over the Swan River Valley to Durban. It was called stockyard day which we really loved, every Tuesday through the summer. We used to chase the pigs up the chute into the stock car and get paid a dime by the stock master. But you don't see that anymore.

What's the biggest improvement? What's the biggest single improvement environmentally, you think, over the course of that 45 years?

Mr. Vaags: I would have to say the injection system is probably one of the strongest, biggest changes in the whole production pattern.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, sir. Thank you very much for your presentation.

We'll continue going down the list.

Zack Waldner. Les Routledge. Rick Bergmann. Heinz Reimer. Lee Perreault. Stephanie Stahl. Irvin Waldner. Ernie Siemens. Donald Friesen. Susanne Friesen. Michael Gykes.

Ed Dornn. Ingrid Penner of Penner Farm Services. Henry Rosolowski. Sandra Klassen. David Sutherland.

Robert—I'm assuming that should be Kleinsasser from Suncrest Colony.

Steve Penner from Pioneer Meat. Richard Peters. John Waldner. Tim Friesen.

Peter Wipf, from Maxwell Colony.

* (18:50)

Welcome, Mr. Wipf. Do you have copies of your presentation?

Mr. Peter Wipf (Maxwell Colony): No.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay, you can start whenever you're ready.

Mr. Peter Wipf: My name is Peter. When I'm looking at all you guys, I feel like saying, like I said to my helper at home in the barn, let's get up and go to work. Scrap that bill. She's useless information. I mean, I got a little note here. Hog farming has been a huge part of my livelihood. For many years, I lived on the Hutterite colony where we have 20 families and each and every one of our members depends on the success of our hog operation. Still, we won't be the only ones affected if this bill was passed.

Manitoba economy would also feel affected by this ban. Feed companies, construction companies, and businesses that are dedicated to manufacture ventilation fans, feeders and other equipment would all suffer. I would have to say that this government could have found a better way to target the environmental issue of this province. Why do you think the hog waste is such a major pollution? There are other more drastic environmental issues to face.

Do they think our waste is running directly into the water system? It is not. We don't have pipes running directly into the river from our manure pits. There are guidelines in place that prevent us from injecting this waste into our fields. Instead, it is stored in sealed lagoons. There are newer and safer methods to treat hog manure. Here you are trying to stop all future hog barns from being built when, at the same time, millions of gasoline-powered vehicles that pollute the very air we breathe are being manufactured constantly. I don't see anyone trying to ban these vehicles from being built and I don't expect anyone to. Instead, people are coming up with more efficient and less harmful options.

Let's apply this same concept to the hog industry. Let's find better ways to deal with the pollution of our hog barns rather than completely banning them. From my perspective of this issue, there is no greater outdoor person than I am. I spend many hours of hunting and fishing this winter. Don't you think, if the lakes and the rivers would be so polluted with manure, nothing would actually survive in them, but I have caught my share of nice fish, so that leaves us a question. Now, are our rivers and lakes so polluted as people think they are? My opinion is no, and I say, would anything survive? No.

Ban it, scrap it and let's go to work. Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wipf. Any questions from the committee?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. The manure management regulations that have just been put in place, do you feel there's been adequate time for them to be tested in order to see whether or not it will have a significant impact on the environment.

Mr. Peter Wipf: Have you tested some to say the hog barns are the culprits of the lakes being polluted? Have you run some tests from the field run-off that's running into the river?

Mr. Eichler: My question was in regard to the current regulations, the manure management

regulations. Do you feel they've had an opportunity to be tested to see whether or not they do have significant impact on the water in your operation?

Mr. Peter Wipf: I don't quite get your question.

Mr. Eichler: The regulations that have been passed in the last year, a number of those have not been implemented yet. Before Bill 17 was proposed, these were put in place to improve water quality. Do you feel those regulations have been tested yet?

Mr. Peter Wipf: No.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Any other questions from the committee? Thank you very much for your presentation, sir.

We'll continue calling down the list.

Marvin Waldner. Marvin Waldner.

Archie Waldner. Peter Wollman. David Wollmann. Reg Penner. Michael Andres. Tim Baer. Galen Peters. Peter de Jong.

Raymond Cherniak. Glen Maendel. Beverley Pachal. Julie Baird. Randy Rutherford.

Richard Prejet from Porcheria Lac du Onze—*[interjection]*—oh, he's making a French presentation on Monday? Okay.

Andrew Curry. Dave Hildebrand from Operation HOG Wash, Dave Hildebrand?

Alvin Gross. Laura Waldner. Kelvin Waldner. Gordon Gross. Adrian Gross. Jonathan Gross. Len Desilets. John Waldner. Adam Gross. Thomas Thiessen. Andy Hofer. Scott Penner. Clifford Wollman. Karen Wollman.

William Alford. Jordan Riese. Aaron Gross. Ben Ginter. George Vis from GJ Vis Enterprises Inc. Jim Peters from Silverfield Farms Inc. Trevor Speirs. Lloyd Wiebe.

Peter Hofer from Skyview Farms. Marie Hofer. Paul Beauchamp. Paul Gross. Ryan Riese. Daniel Wyrich. Elston Solberg from Agri-Trend. Brad Chappell from the Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association.

Leonard Wiebe. Gordon Siemens from Castlewood Farms. Joey Maendel. Jeff Toews. Levi Bergen. Michael Maendel. Steven Denault from Agri-Mart Livestock and Poultry Products Ltd.

Hans Kjeaar, Hans Kjeaar? Wilfred Chabot, councillor with the R.M. of La Broquerie. Rudy Dyck.

Clayton Block. Lauren Wiebe from Topeaka Farm.

* (19:00)

Mike Maendel. James Friesen. Ed Oswald. Wes Martens. Walter Hofer. Susanne Richter. Mike Gauthier. James Gross. Fred Fast. Rolph Penner.

Elie Hofer. Edward Hofer. Andy Cardy. Jake Hofer. Garry Funk. Jacob Rempel.

Sandra Trinkies. Oh, there we go. Welcome. Am I saying your name right?

Ms. Sandra Trinkies (Private Citizen): Yes.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Excellent. Do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Ms. Trinkies: I didn't.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. That's fine. You start whenever you're ready.

Ms. Trinkies: Okay. All right.

I am not a farmer right now, but I grew up on a family farm in southeastern Manitoba. As far back as I recall and have heard about, my family has farmed for a living, as I am from a Mennonite background and that is what we did. I know that my family has farmed for at least five generations. Two of my brothers are still farmers, and I'm very proud of their decision to continue what our family has done in previous generations.

In the past, our family tradition was to only add to our farm as we were able to afford it. As a result, over many years the family farm I grew up on purchased more land from surrounding neighbours, replaced older barns with new barns and slowly increased our herd size. We expanded when our farm went from a 30-sow farrow-to-finish herd in the 1970s. We expanded our farm when we demolished older buildings and built a 140-sow farrow-to-wean herd in the early 1980s. We expanded again when our farm increased to a 300-sow farrow-to-wean herd in the mid-1980s, and we expanded when our farm added a finisher barn to finish half of the weanlings we produced in the early 1990s. We expanded our farm when we built the second half of the feeder barn to finish the last half of our feeders, and rounded out our herd to a 350-sow farrow-to-finish in the late 1990s.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

This was not a knee-jerk plan as our applications to the municipality included long-term expansion plans with many of these phases of expansion clearly identified. In fact, some of our applications to the municipality asked for a 10-year window in order to complete all the phases of some of these expansion goals. I feel that it is important to interject at this time that through all of our farm expansions the result was a cleaner yard site. As older buildings were replaced with new buildings, we were able to keep up with our desires to implement more advanced farming practices and improve the way that we could be good stewards to our farm and land.

Through all these five major expansions our family felt the need to grow in order to keep up with the economic demands to be more efficient and to remain economically viable. If any one of these expansions could not have taken place my story today would be very different. Our family farm would have become insolvent and the employment that our farm generated would not have happened.

My family's economic history, lifestyle, the children's development and the social status all would have been negatively impacted, but by expanding in timely fashions we were able to stay ahead of becoming insolvent and did not produce another family farm site that had been abandoned or had just become a yard with empty barns to mow around.

We have seen this need for expansion in many sectors of our economy, including the replacement of small corner stores with larger shopping centres and large box stores. We've seen one-room school rooms become large elementary school and high schools. So we see it all around us.

I am of the opinion that, by banning the building and expanding of hog barns in Manitoba, you will effectively kill the small farmers who want to continue to compete in the global industry. They will be unable to do what we did. Small family units will not be able to remain in business by adding to their farms as we were able to do.

We hear negative talk of large factory farms in the media almost every week, and, in some way, the public has been duped into believing all the public negativity that surrounds these farms. The truth is that all farms in Manitoba are small farms. In the global economy, we are all at risk of becoming insolvent. Even though there are some companies in Manitoba that control a number of farms, this is done

to try to incorporate economies of scale in order to ensure survival.

In fact, during the current market environment of the high Canadian dollar, high feed prices, high labour cost, and high facility cost, it is still amazing that some hog farmers remain in Manitoba. I would think that it would be more appropriate to reduce the legislative burden on the hog farmers during this impossible time. I'll stand up and have a moment of silence for all the hog farmers that have given up due to the tough industry that they compete in, as well as cheer on those who are still persevering in the face of this government's negative assault on my family's business and of the many friends' and neighbours' businesses around me.

I have fond memories of the family farm, and, although we have sold the original family farm location a few years ago, I am sad that the people who bought it will not be able to make a living on the farm and it will be worthless if Bill 17 comes into effect. By putting in a law like this, it will eliminate the family farm and many people of my background will not have farms to pass on to the next generation like their fathers did for them and my father did for my family.

Our family was very careful to treat our land with respect and to ensure that whatever we did would benefit and not hurt the environment. We made sure that we did not litter on the land. We did not pour sewage into the water system. The products that we used on our farm were well researched by my father to ensure that we were doing the right thing for our farm. This was his livelihood and he would have no benefit to do something that would hurt his way of life and therefore hurt his children. To this day, I believe that we were good stewards of the land that was in our care.

I was watching the news the other day and there was talk about the world food shortage and how people are starving in Somalia and how Canada is giving millions of dollars to world food aid. According to CTV news, Canada was the second-largest donor to the world food program after the United States. Last year, Ottawa provided \$161 million for food aid. It appears to me that Canada is doing quite well. Manitoba has farms that produce food so our own people can eat and so that we can also trade to other countries.

Canada seems quite happy to share the wealth with the less fortunate countries that have quite possibly had some laws put into place by their

government that results in their own people not being able to feed their families. As a Mennonite, we remember the Ukraine being the breadbasket of the world, and our farming ancestors played an important role in that.

I am reading about Bill 17 and trying to figure out why the government would want to put a permanent ban on building any hog farms in the future without thinking about how it affects our economy and how people in our own country will be able to feed their own children. How can the government put a law like this that is so permanent when we do not know what the future needs of our country will be? We live in a huge, sparsely populated province which should reasonably support much larger human and animal population. By bringing Bill 17 into law, you are effectively ripping the heart out of my family's farming tradition. I would strongly suggest that doing this is as short-sighted as the government policies that brought on the nursing shortage in Manitoba, and we all know about that.

I want to continue to have agriculture in this province. I want to continue seeing families raised on farms and others with farm exposure. I want this province to stop its harassment of the farming community. There are so few farmers left that I would suggest that we place hog farmers on the endangered species list and write laws that preserve farmers and their habitats in general.

The proper role of government is to set standards and regulate industries as carefully and efficiently as possible, not to try to destroy the hog farming industry. Do not allow Bill 17 to pass.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Trinkies. Thank you. I'll open the floor to questions. Actually, I have Mr. Eichler and Mr. Goertzen, Mr. Pedersen.

* (19:10)

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. Obviously, somebody in your operation had the foresight to expand whenever the timing was right. Your concerns that you bring about in regard to future expansions are certainly well-heeded.

My question for you is, with Bill 17, as it comes along, in fact, if it does become law, we know that that will put an end to that. How long do you think your operation will be able to sustain being in business without being able to expand?

Ms. Trinkies: First of all, I don't own a farm, and I was never really a huge part of running the farm because I have brothers and that was their job. So I don't know, but I just know how hard my dad fought to keep up and to make things work. It almost broke his heart a few years ago having to sell the farm because it was already getting so difficult. So I don't know if that answers your question.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Sandra, for your presentation. One of the things that the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) has said in the past is that the moratorium isn't really a significant concern for farmers, and hog farmers, because they have other challenges that they're facing now. You alluded to the challenges in the industry as they currently are, but you also said that the moratorium does take away hopes for the future.

That was always my thought and that those who are in the industry might not want to hang on through these challenges, or the young people might not feel that there's hope for them in the industry if the government doesn't support it. Is that what you're saying, that the moratorium is really about taking away hope from the industry?

Ms. Trinkies: Absolutely. Why would somebody want to work really hard and have a hog production and put in all their hours of work only to have the government say, you know what, you cannot build anymore; it doesn't matter what your need is; it doesn't matter that you can't even pay your own bills anymore; we can't let you expand.

I don't know. I really credit the hog farmers in staying in business because they are going through a really tough time. They are losing thousands of dollars. With the States coming in with their law to not buy Canadian pork, it is going to be horrible.

I think that we should have a packaging plant, and that's a total other topic. I mean, I think that we need to be self-sufficient, to manage our own pork and to sell it properly, raise the prices, do what we need to do to keep the hog industry in Canada. I like pork.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Ms. Trinkies, for your presentation. We have some 400-and-some presenters to present to this committee, and we're not even a quarter of the way through them yet. There has been two overriding messages that have come out—not unanimous; there's been a few on the other side—but, by far, the loud voice coming out is to kill

Bill 17. It's a bad bill. It's not good for the hog industry. It's not good for agriculture.

But the other message that's coming through loud and clear is that there's a huge disconnect between rural Manitoba and urban Manitoba. I would just like to know, as legislators, and on both sides of the House, although we don't agree on many things, what is the message that we as legislators—how do we get the message into urban Manitoba about what is really happening out in rural Manitoba? Do you have some suggestions for us as legislators, what we should be doing, or the message—we know what the message should be, but how do we get the message into urban Manitoba?

Ms. Trinkies: That's a good question. I don't know. I honestly don't know what the best way would be to get the message, but, as rural Manitoba, if we don't produce food for the people in our country, what is urban Manitoba going to serve on their dinner tables? You know, like, the rural areas are very important to the economy. We have jobs. We have meat that they don't have.

So I don't know. Maybe they just need to take us seriously. They're not going to have any food on the table if they don't allow us to have our hog farms and our chicken barns and our area for grain. What are we going to eat?

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: I have a substitution to make: Mr. Saran in for Mr. Altemeyer.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Call Mr. Wayne Hofer.

Mr. Keith Waldner. Mr. Ken Rempel. Mr. Jerome Waldner. Denis Tetrault. Kevin Toles. Justina Hop. Jeff Bond. Karen Tjaden.

Doug Cavers, CAO R.M. of Hanover.

Welcome, Mr. Cavers. Do you have any written materials? You do, I see. You may proceed.

Mr. Doug Cavers (R.M. of Hanover): Thank you for allowing the Rural Municipality of Hanover to make a presentation to this committee regarding our concerns with Bill 17.

The Rural Municipality of Hanover is located in southeastern Manitoba, approximately 40 kilometres

from Winnipeg. Hanover is the most livestock-intensive municipality in the province of Manitoba. Based on the 2001 census data, Hanover had approximately 15.8 percent of the hog population in Manitoba. It had 26.5 percent of the poultry population in Manitoba, 13.3 percent of the dairy cow population in Manitoba and 1 percent of the beef population, but swelling to approximately 5 percent of the summer-feeder population, based on 1999 data.

We take agriculture seriously in Hanover. Livestock farming is a business and a way of life for many residents in Hanover. The Hanover council has had to consider proposals from development for various intensive livestock operations over the years. At all times, the council must consider their development plan and zoning by-laws which are reviewed and updated to reflect provincial legislation.

The Rural Municipality of Hanover views its roles in the conditional-use process which is used to consider—I said, larger livestock operations, but it is operations over the size of 300 animal units which, in today's terms, is not that large anymore.

Larger livestock proposals are integral in providing local consideration to the overall impact of livestock development in the region. When other government departments were unable to provide accurate data on where and how much livestock existed in Hanover, our municipality surveyed property owners and farmers in the area and input the information into our computerized mapping system.

To this end, Hanover has implemented a geographic information system to assist council in reviewing the cumulative impact of livestock development in our municipality. Hanover has been solely responsible for gathering and maintaining this data over the last six years.

When one is a leader in livestock development, one must consider and ensure the sustainability is maintained. This can only be done with accurate information, to allow council to make decisions, based on scientific reporting from the technical review committee and the Hanover GIS system.

The R.M. of Hanover has the following six specific concerns with the proposed legislation:

* (19:20)

Number 1. Not all municipalities are being treated equally. Bill 17 takes the local authority away

from rural municipalities in specific areas of the province and their elected councils to deal with the local land-use issues for those certain regions of the province, while maintaining the authority of other councils to deal with the same issues in the other selected municipalities.

Number 2. Provincial legislation should be based on scientific evidence which, in this case, should be supported in the recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission report. The Department of Conservation came out with a report in 2002. It's numbered 2002-04, which indicates that the amount of nutrient loading increase along the Red River from southeastern Manitoba, at the following locations, over a long-term period, is not as significant as the increase in nutrients through Winnipeg. Sample locations at Emerson for nitrogen, so the nitrogen levels in the Red River, coming in at Emerson, was 18,983 tonnes per year. The same location for phosphorus was at 2,537 tonnes per year. By St. Norbert, which is 60 miles away, the nitrogen levels had increased to 23,582. The phosphorus levels had gone to 3,103. At Selkirk, if it's not obvious, the other side of Winnipeg, the nitrogen levels have gone to 32,765 and phosphorus to 4,905.

Hanover believes that there is insufficient data to link the amount of nutrient loading in the Red River and in Lake Winnipeg to any specific sector of agriculture, let alone one species of livestock. Until 2005, the accepted nutrient measurement municipalities used to determine land capacity for the uptake of nutrients was the evaluation of nitrogen through the animal unit equivalent.

Number 3. Applications for livestock conditional use should be considered based on their specific merits. Our council has discussed this matter at length and believes that actions Hanover is proposing, through the municipal development plan process, along with direction given by the Clean Environment Commission, to improve the Technical Review Committee, or TRC, and examine each application on its own merits is the appropriate direction the province should be taking.

Number 4. The provincial legislation should make allowances for innovation and technology changes. Hanover has a start-up business that is currently establishing itself in the composting sector. They intend to take liquid hog manure from farmers in our municipality, and they're doing it, approximately 1,000 animal units right now, and to make a compost product that will be marketed

through retail outlets across Canada. Bill 17 reduces the need and incentive for innovation in the livestock agricultural sector in Manitoba.

Number 5. The affect of Bill 17 on other provincial acts. Hanover questions what affect this legislation will have on other provincial acts. Hog prices hit a low in about November of 2007. Provincial assessment has indicated that barns need to be empty for one year in order for farmers to apply for a reduction in assessment for the upcoming year. Does this mean that we could have requests from those farmers that empty their barns in the winter, asking for reassessments for the upcoming 2009 year? This could have a major affect on Hanover's overall assessment for the future.

Will the government be making further changes to The Planning Act to reflect that various species will be treated differently when dealing with any proposals for expansion or new facilities? Until now, livestock is livestock, with operations of 300 animal units being examined with greater scrutiny.

Number 6. What sector will face a moratorium next? And I'll say this twice. If, and this is only an if, if southeastern Manitoba is not capable of sustaining the amount of nutrients produced and this legislation only creates a moratorium on hogs at this time, how soon will the government be coming out with legislation that places a moratorium on dairy, poultry, beef and all livestock producers? Will commercial fertilizers sales be banned next? Will municipal lagoons and septic fields have to prove that they are below certain levels of phosphorus loading in order to operate?

The council respectfully requests that the government not proceed with Bill 17. There are more questions raised by this legislation than are answered.

Thank you for allowing me to present these concerns on behalf of the R.M. of Hanover. I am willing to respond to any questions you have regarding my presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Cavers. I have Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Mr. Cavers, for your presentation, and certainly I know that Hanover is one of the fastest growing municipalities in Manitoba and in western Canada. Given that, and given the impact that the moratorium has, clearly, on the Hanover municipality, were you consulted—either yourself or the R.M. or the councillors—consulted

about the permanent moratorium that was coming as a result of the CEC commission? Did you get any sort of opportunity to have input into the moratorium decision?

Mr. Cavers: The answer is no.

Mr. Goertzen: You may know that, as a result of efforts by opposition members in the Legislature, this bill, which was supposed to be voted on this Thursday, now it won't proceed to a vote until the fall. So that does give an opportunity for consultation over the summertime. Would the R.M.—and maybe you don't want to speak for the councillors—but do you believe that the R.M. would be willing, if the government would sort of put a pause on this bill, to enter into discussions with the government in terms of trying to find a better solution than a permanent moratorium?

Mr. Cavers: I guess in order to answer that—and you're right, I'm not a politician, so I'll take the administrative out on this—that I'll compare it to the Clean Environment Commission proceedings. In the Clean Environment Commission proceedings, the Clean Environment Commission, when they wanted additional information, they came back through the Municipal Administrators' Association to find out how certain things were dealt with at a municipal level through the conditional use process and so on.

I, specifically, was on that committee, and I was contacted multiple times by the Clean Environment Commission before they finalized their report to seek out how the rubber hit the road, like what was actually happening in municipalities and how municipalities were actually dealing with conditional use processes as it related to livestock operations, in general, and specifically for hog operations.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Goertzen, second supplemental.

Mr. Goertzen: And it's possible that a politician might soon follow you and, perhaps, he'd be better to answer that question, but you did mention, in your presentation, about the city of Winnipeg and the nutrient load that comes because of the city of Winnipeg and because of the problems of the sewer system here. That's a valid point that's been made by other presenters before you. There seems to be some concern among presenters that there's a strong focus on animal waste by the government, but not enough focus on human waste. I understand that in your own municipality, communities like Mitchell or Kleefeld, which are growing quickly and need infrastructure

dollars to deal with human waste, could you comment on that?

Mr. Cavers: That's even a more political question. Administratively, municipalities in general will never turn down money that either the Province or the federal government has to assist municipalities in improving their infrastructure. Hanover, you are correct that Hanover is one of the fastest growing rural municipalities in Manitoba and it is a unique municipality when it comes to population of people and of livestock in western Canada.

As I understand it, from the Statistics Canada information, Hanover has one of the youngest populations, at an average population age of 27.5 or thereabouts, for a rural municipality in Canada, period. With a population of approximately 12,000 people in Hanover—and we estimate that that's probably underestimated; it's probably well over 13,000 people—and the sheer number of livestock that are in Hanover as well, it is an example how people can live in close proximity to livestock and livestock development and still be compatible, still work together.

* (19:30)

Having said that, we do have concerns with the septic fields that are being developed, and we encourage the government to, with the legislation that they come out with—and I appreciate the legislation that has come out to encourage the environmental protection. When it comes to septic fields, there are greater and greater requirements being placed on municipalities to deal with municipal lagoons and dealing with the environmental side of all of our waste streams.

We have to deal with the water and waste-water management on all streams. It is always a difficult situation to try and deal with all of those issues, but we are trying to do that. We feel that we have a responsibility to carry out the legislation that the Province enacts and come out with our own by-laws to try and protect the environment even further.

So, whether it's water and water treatment, where we gather the water from our wells and treat the water with chlorination and so on and so forth before it gets distributed to the people in our urban communities, whether it is the waste-water streams coming from those households into our municipal lagoons, treating the effluent that is coming into the waste-water lagoons before it is moved into the secondary cell and released after a certain time

period and after it meets provincial requirements for treatment, that is what we want to see happening.

We would love to be able to see nutrient removal, from those waste-water treatment facilities, that are coming from our municipal lagoons. It takes money. Municipalities and small communities are just too small to pay for the kind of nutrient removal that we're moving towards.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks for your presentation, Doug. I think you're in a good position to give me some advice on the technical review committees. Whenever I go to the—whether it's the AMM or any municipal function, I tend to get pulled in about three different directions in terms of what we should do with these TRCs.

We had a presentation in here the other night that said that we should have the TRCs authorized to give a recommendation directly to the council. People have talked to me about that before. Whether it's that kind of a proposal or any other advice you have for me on TRCs, which is what the CEC put its finger on as well, what's your advice to me on that?

Mr. Cavers: Can I just seek some clarification of the one question? You made a comment about the TRC speaking directly to council?

Mr. Struthers: Yeah, there are some folks who believe the technical review committee should make a recommendation directly to council; rather than simply giving advice, make more of a definite decision and recommendation. That's just one possibility out there that I've been approached with.

Mr. Cavers: I'll take the opportunity to throw my two cents in administratively from a municipality that has dealt with a number of technical review committee reports over the years.

A number of years ago, when I first saw a technical review committee report, it was three pages long. From those three pages of reporting government agencies, there was a lack of information. From a period of about 1999 through to 2005, those technical review committee reports grew to approximately 20 pages in length. The reporting, frankly, became, protect your own agency as much as possible. So there was a lot said, but really nothing was said. Unfortunately, every agency went out and did their review independently of everybody else, and, I'm sorry, but we live in a world today where we have to be able share information.

That's where our GIS information comes in very useful, because we can show council exactly where the proposal is, what the livestock is in that area, how many other livestock operations are in the area, how many acres are being spread on in that same area, what the potential is for growth and expansion of that operation in the future

So we can see what is happening, the difficulty being that I don't think the provincial government departments—various departments—are sharing information between themselves. Any information that they are sharing has to be double-checked by their own government agency to be considered real; that's just sad.

That's unfortunate and it's just costly, and it slows down the TRC process. We still have it for the dairy operations and the chicken operations and so on and so forth, but the process got bogged, and it needed help. It was very long and very drawn out. It has improved; the time line has improved, but there's not a lot of sharing of information, so I would encourage the government to consider. Don't axe that TRC committee.

It is a good thing for municipal councils to hear. The reason I asked for clarification was because it is important that the TRC remain independent and be kept as being independent from what the council is deciding.

It is important that TRC reports at a public hearing which the council holds. It is important that TRC is able to gather that information, make sure that it's accurate and share the data that they've got with each other, so that they're not conflicting and giving reports that are conflicting to council.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for that very good presentation. Your time has expired, so we have to move on.

Stan Toews. Mr. Toews, do you have any written materials for the committee? You do? The floor is yours, sir. Begin when you wish.

Mr. Stan Toews (Private Citizen): Pardon me?

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Mr. Toews: My name is Stan Toews. For some of you, you know me. I also wear another hat, which is the reeve of Hanover, but I'm here today to present on behalf of my farm.

I farm with my son and operate a third- and fourth-generation family livestock operation in the

Rural Municipality of Hanover. My son and I are diversified into raising feeder hogs and growing crops.

If Bill 17 goes ahead, this will be the second time I get hammered, because I used to raise sugar beets and, in '96, they pulled the rug out from under us. I must say that was not the government's fault, but industry itself, maybe.

My son would like to eventually take over the whole farming operation; he has been farming with me since he graduated from school. My grandfather started farming about 80 years ago, when a quarter section of land would sustain a family and offer a fairly good living.

Today, it takes a lot more than a quarter section of farmland to survive and support a family. The same is true if you're raising hogs or whatever. If the government and the public think that thousand-head feeder barns or hog barns are factory farms or mega farms, I think they're totally out of touch with agriculture today in Manitoba, which I often believe is the case.

In the real world, where one corporation buys up another and wants to stay in business, farming is no different. My father bought out three neighbours while he was farming, and I've had to buy out more neighbours to just stay viable. It's an ongoing saga.

Everyone has to bring down their cost-per-unit, as many costs are fixed and must be spread over the total production of the operation. An example of that is—the pork industry's got a quality assurance program which needs audits; every time I get an audit, the vet charges me 400 bucks. That's once a year. If you only have a few hogs, you can't afford to belong in that program and, yet, the processor won't buy your stuff if you aren't certified.

* (19:40)

How can I pass the farming operation on to my son or other family members, which I know they will never be able to expand and will not have the ability to generate more income than I currently earn, to pay increased fixed costs and raise a family? It's a little bit like, if the government would allow the farmers of Manitoba to pass legislation that would freeze all, and I underline all, wages for members of the Legislative Assembly at current levels, knowing that the cost of living will continue to increase permanently. I kind of see that would go hand in hand.

What seems strange to me is that the government is suggesting that the land is over applied with nutrients. However, after I apply the manure from my operation and from a neighbouring livestock operator, I still have to buy commercial fertilizer. In my submission to the Clean Environment Commission, I presented information about soil nutrient loading with 12 years of consecutive soil test data and I was nowhere near the provincial government regulation thresholds.

I was impressed with the professionalism of the CEC board, their willingness to listen and their understanding of the industry. I commend the CEC because they based their report on science and not fiction.

A lot of time and effort and cost went into the Clean Environment Commission report. In my reading of the CEC report, I missed where it states that the government should place a permanent ban on hog barn development or expansion in southeastern Manitoba. If the government is convinced that the province needs to have a permanent ban on hog production, why did it go through the CEC commission study and wait for its findings just to disregard the CEC's findings? It seems that the government is now saying that the CEC board didn't know what they were doing and the government knows better. So, if they know better, why did they bother spending all this money?

For those of you who missed the news on June 4, 2008, just a couple of days ago, the United Nations is calling for a 50 percent increase in world food production. I believe the producer is up to the challenge, but I question if the Manitoba government is. To increase food production you have to use more fertilizer, better genetics, better technological advances to meet this goal. You can't create more land than is already on this world, and I also believe that you can grow more crops, raise more livestock without polluting our environment.

I recently had the opportunity to travel to Germany and visit a hog operation there. Germany has a lot of regulations on farming. When I got to the farm, I had to wait for the owner because he was out spreading phosphorous fertilizer. I checked to see what he had in his fertilizer that's why I know it was phosphorus. He had just built a new 1,200-head feeder barn in 2007, in addition to his existing operation. It seems strange that his comparable farming expansion in southeastern Manitoba would not be allowed if Bill 17 goes ahead. How are we as

Manitobans expected to compete in a world market if we can't do what our European counterparts are doing?

My final point is posed as a question to this committee. If today hogs are a concern and there is a moratorium placed to limit the growth of this industry, what will your moratorium be tomorrow? Maybe it'll be housing, I don't know.

I'd like to thank the committee for allowing me to make this submission. I must portray to you that I feel very strongly about this situation that the government is placing me in. I have never made presentations to the Clean Environment Commission before or the legislative committee before, but I have on this topic as you are threatening my livelihood and the future of farming in southeastern Manitoba for myself as well as my family. I am proud to operate a family farm and don't want to lose this opportunity for my family.

I believe I'm also speaking for a number of other families, because it is kind of intimidating to come before this committee where some people don't have the courage to do so. So that concludes my report.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Toews.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much for your words, Stan. The first thing I want to say is that I'm glad you did come forward, and that you are speaking on behalf of others because this is your building; it is their building. We heard from a lot of first-time presenters over the course of yesterday and today. I think I can speak for all of us, and we hopefully try to make it as welcoming as we can and not try not to be intimidating. So I appreciate the words that you brought here.

I had an interesting conversation not so long ago with another producer in Hanover. What he said to me was that, when we brought forward the regulations in 2006, the phosphorus regulation, we, in effect, put Hanover and maybe some other R.M.s in your part of the world in a moratorium to begin with because, if you were going to follow the phosphorus regs at that time, you would run out of available land to spread the manure. So I'm just thinking about that statement in relation to the overall ban, moratorium that we put in your area. Is that accurate? In '06, was the regulation in effect, a moratorium on expansion in Hanover to begin with?

Mr. Toews: On a large part, it would put somewhat of a ban in Hanover, but I know there are also producers that have land base and in areas that are

less intensified that would still have opportunity to have some growth than an all outright ban which is a very negative statement.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Mr. Struthers.

Mr. Struthers: So, on your farm, as of right now, if there was no moratorium in place, would you have enough land to expand your site? Could you expand, given the 2006 phosphorous regulations?

Mr. Toews: Yes, I could expand. I may not be able to get manure from my neighbour, but I have a lot of land base for my own.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Reeve Toews. I know you're not here presenting officially on behalf of the R.M., but you've earned the distinction so I'll give it to you.

I've stated before a comment that the Minister of Conservation, Mr. Struthers, had made in the House just this week saying that Bill 17 will separate people, those who want to protect water and those who don't want to protect water. While I found that comment insulting to me myself personally, as a politician, I guess you sort of get used to it, but I was more insulted for people like you. You're one of them that I had in mind. I've had the opportunity to visit your farm, and with your wife, Mary, and have seen the care and pride that you take in the farm and in the environment.

Maybe for Mr. Struthers, because I know that you are one who doesn't support Bill 17 but does support the protection of water, can you give us some indications of some of things you're doing on your farm and in the municipality to protect the environment?

Mr. Toews: Yes. On our farm, we always soil test everything before it gets applied. It also gets injected, and within 48 hours it usually gets a second working to make sure that you don't have any loss.

On the municipal side, years ago, there used to be an organization called Cesco [*phonetic*], which was funded by the government, but it was made up of various municipalities, which is a little bit like conservation districts except they looked after other soil conservation more so. They did a study on the Joubert Creek for a number of consecutive years for nutrients to see if there was an increase as you went further from east to west. They found some hot spots, and at that time they dealt with the producers that were basically causing it. I believe that for the farmers I know, nobody would willingly pollute any

water, and I believe the R.M. is also very proactive in trying to prevent any pollution.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I do have a question in regard to intensity of livestock farming, especially in your particular municipality. If you look at that in the big picture, it's all about management, and that's what the key thing here is on management of that nutrient.

One of the things that your CEO had talked about was a number of producers were looking at a compost product, and you have an opportunity to utilize all yours plus some of your neighbours. Could you maybe highlight a little bit on some of the initiatives that are taking place within that area because it can become an opportunity? It can become a very viable product that we can actually capitalize on that now and in the future.

Mr. Toews: This company is taking liquid hog manure, composting it, dewatering it and selling compost. We have other initiatives. I know there are a number of broader operators. Their manure gets loaded onto trucks and hauled further out of the municipality because it's easy to do, and they get a pretty good price for it. So I believe there are other initiatives going on.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation, sir.

Mr. Toews: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Move on.

* (19:50)

Mr. Dan Klippenstein. Chris Maendel.

Waldie Klassen. *[interjection]*

Oh, Mr. Maendel, do you have any written documentation? No? You may proceed.

Mr. Chris Maendel (Private Citizen): My name is Chris Maendel. I'm a Hutterite hog producer from the municipality of South Norfolk, which is just southwest of Portage la Prairie. I'd like to address a few serious issues that I feel I have with Bill 17.

We have an 800-sow farrow-to-finish operation. Besides that, we also produce, or run, a 500 cow-calf operation. We also produce 400,000 kgs of turkey, under turkey quota, a year, and also 24,000 pullets or layer operation. So we have a fair amount of manure to apply all year round.

We farm 6,000 acres. We also rent a thousand acres besides that. We have a pretty good standing

with our neighbours considering all the manure we have to apply. We have one neighbour whose wife is very against hog manure or even just the smell of it. But we inject the manure, and we try and inject so there's nothing staying on the surface. So it eliminates the smell by almost 90 percent, which is where the nitrogen is, which we try to conserve.

We spend about \$200,000 a year on fertilizer for this land. We figured the value of our hog manure alone is about \$100,000. We apply it on about 2,000 acres of our land, so we try and rotate about a third of our land every year with this manure. This is just the hog manure. Cattle and turkeys and pullets is applied in a dry form, so it's applied on the land and cultivated in. But all this manure is very valuable to us, especially with the fertilizer prices now. When I said the hog operation alone is worth \$100,000, that was a year ago. What it is now with fertilizer prices is just phenomenal. It's a very precious commodity to us.

We have enough land to—we could almost apply again as much. We try and apply about half on each, half to three-quarters, so we can apply it once in three years. We only apply it once a year in the fall. If we happen to have a wet fall, where there are certain fields we couldn't apply it because it's too wet, we could actually apply it again on soils where we applied it the previous year, but just at a lower rate.

Before we apply manure, we take soil tests to see what the soil needs, what it can use, and then based on what we're going to seed next year. We also agitate our lagoon for two days and then we do manure analysis to see what's in the manure. Over the last five years, we averaged about 28 pounds of nitrogen per thousand gallons of manure and only about two or three pounds of phos per thousand gallons of manure. So we apply that according to our land.

If we want to raise Canola or corn, we could apply up to 150 pounds of N. With manure, we apply between 6,000 and 10,000 gallons per acre, which is half to a little bit more than half of our needs. Then, depending on what kind of crop we'd get, if we'd get a good 100, 110 bushels an acre of corn, we could almost apply that again next year. That's what it takes to produce 100 bushels of corn.

I feel we're very good stewards of the land and the water. We live right beside the Assiniboine River, half a mile from the river. We have land along the river, river flats, but we don't apply manure down

there. We have applied manure, but we just naturally decided to quit. We didn't need to. We don't bother.

We're very aware of our water. We raise our family and our kids beside our barns. We drink the water. We work and wash and play beside it. We're very—first thing a colony does when they go out and look for a new place is see the land and then what kind of source of water they're going to have there. So it's very important to us because we have to live beside it and with it. So we take good care of it. We ought to teach our kids in school that.

Four of our students in our school—I think it's two or three years ago—won the Envirothon in Manitoba. They represented Manitoba in the U.S. They flew down to Missouri. So we're very concerned about the soil and the water.

That's basically all I wanted to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel. Questions?

Mr. Pedersen: I am assuming your colony is Fairholme Colony. That colony has been there for many, many years, since 1959, and you're on very sandy soil. You've been in livestock and poultry for so many years and yet you're doing these soil tests now. If you had been abusing the land over the years, it would be showing in your soil test now. This speaks to the management that you do, your stewardship of the soil and the land. Again, we seem to be unable to get this message out to the general public that you are very good stewards of the land.

I just want to commend you on that. I know where your colony is and I know the type of land, and the type of land that you're on is a real challenge in terms of controlling run-off and that, and obviously, you're doing it. I just wanted to congratulate you on that. As you said, your students won the Envirothon—if I got the word right—contest here a couple of years ago and it's showing that it's coming up in the next generation.

Mr. Chris Maendel: Yes, we are trying, but we're also fortunate because we have seven pivots, irrigation pivots. So we have seven miles of irrigation pipe 12 inches in diameter that we irrigate water from the Assiniboine River, rent up to a thousand acres of potatoes every year to three different producers. We also use this line to pump our manure out, but we have a special system set up so we're completely disconnected from the river when we apply the manure so we cannot irrigate and apply manure at the same time.

We can apply this manure up to seven miles away from the colony over all these acres. We use it very efficiently. It's worked very good for us. We've been doing it for 10 years. I have to say the manure management plan, at first, we were a little bit against it, but it's turned out to be a real good thing for us. That's why I feel Bill 17 is really not needed. Why don't you just set standards? Regulate where you can build hog barns. Stay away from cities, rivers, or lagoons or sloughs and low spots where it can be critical how much livestock is produced beside it. But why target hog operations so drastically? I mean everything should be regulated. I wholesaley agree—cattle, turkeys, chickens.

* (20:00)

Anything can pollute our land. We're definitely all living too fast. We have to slow down and preserve this earth. We're destroying it so fast it's just scary. We have to think of our kids, where they're going to live and how they're going to live. Farming is a test. Our neighbour just retired a year down the road, Lorne Henry. He said I think I'm abusing my kids because I let them inherit the farm. Am I doing the right thing? he asks me. Well, I said the colonies are going to do it. That's our livelihood. We're going to try and make it so that our kids want to and should and can farm and live in the same environment. So it's a real test.

Mr. Eichler: Good to see your sense of humour. I was going to ask you what you do in your spare time when you farm 6,000 acres and run the number of animal units that you do. We know that farming livestock and grain work very well together. If you were to take the livestock operations out of your operation, how viable would your colony be without livestock?

Mr. Chris Maendel: I don't think we could exist. Over half our income is from livestock, even with 6,000 acres of land. Most of that is hogs, no doubt. Cattle have been down in the dumps for a little while. We are still trying to hang tough on it.

Naturally, marketing boards have been really good to us, turkeys and chickens and pullets. There's good money in that. It's not too good for a colony wanting to expand to have to go out and buy quota. Maybe you don't want to raise any if there's no home for them. So it's a toss-up, which is the way to go. I don't have all the answers.

Mr. Faurshou: Good to see you here, Mr. Maendel. I thought you were starting out to say that

you were fortunate that you farm across the river from Faurschou Farms but—*[interjection]* Yes. You're being extremely modest here this evening, in observation of your farming operations next to the river and how you transition your cropping towards the river to maintain that buffer zone.

As well, one of your neighbours is a campground, Bambi Gardens. People flock to that campground from the city, and they are right next door. *[interjection]* That's right. I hope members opposite understand how the operations that are operating today really, truly are in harmony with nature and with their neighbours. I would just like this opportunity to compliment you on your operation. You are fulfilling a leadership role not only on the agricultural side but I will also make mention of your education, and your educational facilities are absolutely second to none for your young people.

Mr. Chris Maendel: We've been tempted to accuse our Bambi Gardens neighbour of noise pollution because of all the dance parties he's having there, and it's only a quarter of a mile from our colony. Naturally, our teenagers are tempted to go down there to all this fun. But this other neighbour too, his wife, she's just come back and complimented us a couple of times and thanked us for staying away from her fields, which we actually didn't do. We just didn't apply it where the wind took it away from herself towards her farm and she's noticed it and it's worked. So you can work with your neighbours. I think we are on very good terms with all our neighbours because we are trying. Be good stewards of the land and the water.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Chris. I just have one question. When you referred to the dance parties and the noise that was going on, was that the campground or the Faurschous?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your—Mr. Maendel, sorry.

Mr. Chris Maendel: Farmers have to be vocal, too, sometimes, and voice themselves.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Maendel.

Mr. Waldie Klassen, Manitoba Chicken Producers. Doug Sisson, private citizen. Aaron P. Hofer. Ken Foster. Maurice Gagnon. Greg Fehr, Mayor, Town of Niverville.

Gordon Dyck. Judith Hamilton. James Cotton. Phillip Hofer. Mike Waddell.

What is the will of the committee? I can go back to the beginning of the list, start with the people inside the Perimeter, or I have five or six rural presenters that we had passed by earlier, that weren't here for the first call.

Shall we listen to the rural presenters that were passed by? Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]*

I call Michael Hofer, No. 73. No. 76, Kelvin Waldner. No. 58, Joel Grenier. No. 50, Henry Holtman. No. 182, John Bannister.

There he is. We have a winner. Welcome, Mr. Bannister. Do you have a written copy of your presentation?

Mr. John Bannister (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Bannister: Thank you. My name is John Bannister. I have a dairy farm in Lockport and run it in partnership with my wife and two sons, who are both married and have families.

I've lived in Manitoba now for 14 years, coming from Scotland where we had a dairy farm with a salmon river running through the middle of it. I was quite aware of the significance of water pollution, when you consider that one rod on that river costs \$400 a day, to be on that river. So they didn't want to see any fish, belly up, floating down the river.

I'm here today to express my concern regarding Bill 17. I would like, first of all, to express my views about the hog industry, as this is the sector of agriculture targeted by this bill.

We all know that the hog industry has expanded at an enormous rate over the last few years. It appears that science hasn't been able to keep pace with this expansion with regard to the interaction of soil, manure and nutrient removal by crops. The hog industry has put considerable sums of money into scientific research in trying to establish the relationships of manure application, crop removal and nutrient loss to water sources.

* (20:10)

Hog barns of 300 animal units are already subject to strict environmental regulation as regard to land requirements for manure application and mortality regulations. Figures show that they are

only responsible for a small part of the total nutrient loading of Lake Winnipeg.

The Manitoba Clean Environment Commission report does not recommend a permanent moratorium on the construction of new, and expansion of, hog barns anywhere in our province, but outlines several recommendations for agriculture.

As a dairy farmer, you may ask, what does Bill 17 have to do with me? Doesn't affect dairy farms at the moment. "At the moment" is a reason for my concern. We milk just over 100 cows and rear all own replacement heifers, and run the operation with just the family and custom operators for slurry spreading and combining. We all live on the property. That is six adults and five grandchildren and like to think that these grandchildren will inherit a farm in a better environmental state than when we took it over 14 years ago.

In the last five years, we've made the following improvements to make the farm more environmentally friendly. A new barn has been built for the cows so that all nutrients from cow slurry can be collected to use on the crops grown on the farm. The young stock are housed all the year round and any run-off from the facility is collected in a retention pond.

We've also purchased a tractor-tracking device so we don't have any overlap when spraying fertilizer, so there's no over-application of nutrients, coupled with an annual soil test on the farm. And lastly, we have taken part in the environmental farm plan workshop which has pinpointed areas where there's still room for improvement.

As dairy farmers, we have subscribed to a five-year commitment of \$250,000 for environmental research at the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment at the Glenlea Research Station in Manitoba. This research, we hope, will go a long way towards showing what can be done in agriculture to scientifically show that sustainable livestock farming and environmental protection in the province of Manitoba go hand in hand.

Once again, I say that I have concern with Bill 17. If it is still the government's wish not to reconsider it, this bill would be a very disturbing piece of legislation in the urban communities as it will pick one section of agriculture against the other. People who have been neighbours for many years will scratch their heads and say, why me?

An article in the *Manitoba Co-operator* reports the case of two brothers farming the same piece of ground but had two different yard sites, one in hogs, one in cattle. The one in hogs will have a ban, the one in cattle can expand. A stream taking run-off from Stonewall also added to the difficulty of the farm against general public syndrome. This is not scientific and will lead to confusion and resentment.

In conclusion, I hope the government will reconsider Bill 17 and move forward to ensure the sustainability of the hog industry and the protection of the environment through creating environmental regulation based on science rather than perception so we can all live and work together in this great province of ours.

Thank you for your time and allowing me to give this presentation.

One last thing. Coming from Europe, I hate saying, in Europe they do it this way. But I have a concern that we can't do anything in Manitoba about this environment, because all of England and Wales, which has a population roughly 75 million, and the whole of Canada is 33 million, and all that will fit the size of Lake Winnipeg. And yet, they've no moratoriums on agriculture of any kind and they have rainfall of 72 inches in places, and rainfall of 20 inches, but these are sustained by the regulations they have in place. Also, in Holland, they have the same scenario, where a lot of the land is below sea level, but they seem to get along with it with the regulations that they have. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bannister. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, John, for your presentation. This morning we had a presentation in regard to a livestock producer as well, a cattle producer, and he reminded us that we need to base our decisions back like we did when BSE first broke out in 2003 and stay consistent when we ask to be based on science.

With the hog sector, do you feel we need to do the same thing and keep our stories the same and consistent and base this on good science rather than politics?

Mr. Bannister: It's got to be based on science as, sort of, go and tell us no, back in, and farmers can't go along with it. Because, if it's not based on science, all agriculture, where do you go? We live by science. We live by science telling us how much fertilizer a crop will take into the ground. We live by science on the soil test. We live by science on what cows to

breed from the dairy industry's point of view, and the hog industry, I suppose, lives on science on which boar to mate with their sows. So everything is based on science, and, if there's no science, it's got to be consistent.

Mr. Faurshou: Thank you for your observation. Coming from Europe, that experience is much greater than my own personal understanding, but, having visited, I just marvelled at exactly that, the regulations. Mind you, we're talking major regulations, the almost phone-book-size booklet where all lands are registered and prescribed in area and cropping and nutrient application.

But there is no ban, as you mentioned. People are getting along and it's not like there is much distance between urban dwellers and farming. Maybe you might want to say a little bit more about that issue because I think we heard a couple of presentations from last night that that was a significant issue, someone, an urbanite, saying, because across the road my farming neighbour was doing such and such, this made it unpalatable for me to live here. Maybe you could, perhaps, elaborate on that.

Mr. Bannister: We farmed in Scotland, but before that we farmed in England, and when we were in England there were bans on. You couldn't spread it at certain times of the year. You couldn't spread it certain days of the year.

But, to get along with the public, I went around to my neighbours who were non-farmers, and I said, if you have a birthday party, if you have a wedding going on or anything like that, I won't spread any slurry. I won't make a smell. Just tell me well ahead, I said. But I said, report me and I will spread because I'm allowed to spread. So a new person came into the area and got the municipality to come down and said I was spreading slurry, you see, and it smelled. So immediately I went out and spread the slurry, but the general public then found out who it was and made their own regulations, and that's how I got on with the public roundabout. You know, you've got to give and you've got to take.

Mr. Faurshou: I think you made a great case for communication. Earlier this day, I've been asking whether the government has come and asked you, you know, before implementing rules and regulations, before implementation, has there been any communication from government officials that have asked your opinion before this legislation's come forward?

Mr. Bannister: The only difference, I think, is when we came here, somebody in England asked me what was the advantage of living in Manitoba. I said, there are no people. I said, we can do what we want. They said what are the disadvantages. I said, there are no people. I said, because there's nobody there to pay you for these environment regulations and things like that, and there aren't as many people to sell your produce to. I said it's like a two-way thing that goes on, but you do learn to live with these regulations.

Like I say, 20 years ago, I think, not to put too fine a point on it, the regulations in Europe were equivalent to what we have here now, but when they put the regulations in place and you abided by the regulations, there was money to do the improvements for that from the European fund, not from the English fund or the Scotch fund or whatever. It came out of Europe, and that was the case when they put a nitrogen level on all streams, rivers and beaches running into the sea.

* (20:20)

But to get back to science, science showed that there was nitrogen going into the rivers, but one thing it didn't show was that they thought it was coming from hog barns and dairy barns and other things, but where it was coming from, the most nitrogen was coming from fields that had been down to clover for a long time and were ploughed up. The run-off from these places. The least likely place to see nitrogen leach into the rivers was from the newly ploughed up layers. That was science that proved that.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks John. It's very interesting. I'm intrigued by what you said about England and Wales and that being the size of Lake Winnipeg and the amount of regulation. The only other factor that I can think of, and I don't have a clue on this but, what's the size of their herd compared to the size of our herd, whether you're talking pigs or cows? I think we'd need to know that to learn from that kind of a comparison.

Mr. Bannister: Both the livestock units in the U.K. are greater than the livestock units in Canada when you take the total number of livestock units on cattle, sheep, hogs and chickens. There are an awful lot of chickens there as well.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, thank you Mr. Bannister.

Okay, we're going to go back to the beginning of the list and start calling people from the city here.

I begin with Mr. Glen Koroluk, Beyond Factory Farming. Lindy Clubb, Wolfe Creek Conservation. Bill Ross, Manitoba Canola Growers Association. Shane Sadorski. William Vis, Envirotech Ag Systems. Harold Froese.

Stuart Peter Manness. Cam McGavin, Genetically Advanced Pigs of Canada Ltd. Vicki Burns. David Smith, J & R Livestock Consultants Ltd.

Alan Bell, Superior Agri-Systems.

Mr. Bell, do you have any written documentation for the committee?

Mr. Alan Bell (Superior Agri-Systems Ltd): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, you do, okay. You're free to begin whenever you're ready.

Mr. Bell: I thank you for this opportunity. This is the first time I've ever done something like this myself so I'm going to read it, just so I don't get into trouble here.

Basically, I guess I feel that what we've got to do is let's make Manitoba green, not black and blue. Let's not get into too serious a thing about this. Let's make it work.

My name is Alan Bell, I have a company call Superior Agri-Systems in Winnipeg. I'm not a hog producer. I don't own a cottage on Lake Winnipeg. I am a professional agrologist and a year-round resident of a home on the Red River north of Winnipeg. My wife and I have four children and have owned our home for 31 years. I am a constant observer of the waters that flow down the Red River. I can observe the Red River every day of the year. I am also a small business owner servicing livestock and grain producers in Manitoba. I've been involved in the livestock industry and known many hog producers and their families for 35 years. Many hog producers are my good friends. I feel qualified to speak to this committee.

I went through a lot of emotions in the last few weeks trying to focus on this presentation. I've been angry, sad, frustrated and, finally, totally disillusioned. This is probably the reason that this presentation seems a lot disjointed. I started it five different times.

I read a good portion of the CEC report on this topic and I'm very puzzled. Causes of pollution in the southern basin of Lake Winnipeg are every Manitoban's concern, and Manitobans should be involved in the reduction according to the contribution problems.

The provincial government, on such topics as BSE export ban on cattle, Devils Lake water drainage, has pushed the premise that the science should prevail over political considerations. I'm not sure that science was even a slight consideration in Bill 17. This science-should-prevail position was successful with the U.S. government regarding the BSE situation. The jury's still out on the Devils Lake issue because of stubborn, insensitive state legislature.

In the CEC report, the science does not single out swine production as a major contributor to the pollution in the Lake Winnipeg lower basin. There are a multitude of contributors to the pollution. The U.S.A., the city of Winnipeg, are the major Manitoba sources of pollution in the Red River and Lake Winnipeg.

The Red River stays open by our home basically year-round unless the weather is below minus 30 for several days in a row. There are the small rapids and warm water discharges from the city of Winnipeg keep the river open. I cannot imagine in my wildest dreams that pollution from a hog barn coming across frozen country for a long distance can cause a river to stay open by my house in the winter. Obviously, while most of the river is covered with ice in the winter, some people may feel that the pollution problem is not occurring. It's kind of like "see no evil."

The point of serious concern to me is the admission by a representative of the City of Winnipeg—and this was last night on the radio with the City of Winnipeg sewer and water department on CJOB at suppertime, June 6—that 40 percent of the city's sewer system is combined water and waste runoff. Whenever there's a substantial rainfall in Winnipeg such as yesterday, combined sewers were diverted directly into the Red River to prevent sewer backup in flooding and flooding basements. This process begins when the rain starts and can continue for a long time after the rain ceases till the threat of sewer backup is gone. I have serious concerns as this dumping of raw sewage happens an average, they said, 18 times a summer. Can you imagine the millions of litres of raw sewage that are allowed to

flow in this amount of time? I would suggest that this happens with the blessing of at least the minister of the environment and the rest of the government of this province. I'm sure they don't have their head in the sand.

I made a comment: it's amazing what a good magician can do with a little smoke and mirrors. A mirror can be used for reflection or deflection of what it receives. This Bill 17 is trying to deflect responsibility for the problems in Lake Winnipeg onto hog producers, instead of reflecting it back onto the city of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

I guess that I'm naive and do not fully understand the political process. I have believed that elected governments in Manitoba, regardless of their political stripes, would put the welfare of the whole province ahead of their own political agendas. The government should tweak and adjust things to lead the way, not slaughter industries. I do not understand why any government would actually forbid families from earning honest livings running totally legal businesses.

Hog farmers are very hardworking people who often live right on their hog production units with their families. They drink the water, work in the barns, play in the yard. Why would they pollute it? Hog producers have always been able to work within the rules and regulations that have been imposed on their industry. They've followed current rules and regulations with regard to manure that are set out by the federal-provincial-municipal governments and have built a great industry. Hog producers are told how many pigs they can have; how large the manure storage must be; how much land must be available to spread manure; when they can spread; how much manure can be applied per acre; how close to the ditches and waterways they can spread manure; what method can be used to apply manure; and they must monitor their fields and storage facilities.

Hog producers should play by the rules, and if the individuals do not, prosecute the guilty. Do not find the whole industry guilty.

Bill 17 is an outright attack on the rights and freedoms of some residents of this province who have invested their lives, sweat, emotion, and the futures of their families into an industry that's totally legal, abides by a vast variety of rules, regulations imposed on them by various levels of government. This industry creates large export dollars and contributes huge numbers of jobs for people in rural and urban Manitoba. Hog producers and people

serving the hog industry use many country facilities such as stores, gas stations, restaurants, hotels, truck dealers, truckers, parts and repair, maintenance services, houses, schools, churches, halls and arenas.

* (20:30)

The people employed by these businesses will be very seriously affected by these business slowdowns. Great, all the above benefits in, as science says, an environmentally sustainable way. The number of people whose jobs depend totally on hog production in this province must be considered by the people who are pushing this legislation unless there is a move to destroy rural Manitoba.

If new facilities cannot be built, old facilities will not be replaced as quickly as they should and the industry will shrink. I've owned a small business that provides, designs and installs feed processing equipment on livestock farms since 1980. Hog producers are a large portion of our business and many producers and their families are good friends of mine.

Our business, Superior Agri-Systems, is located in St. Boniface and has gone through the same ups and downs over the years as hog producers from a series of negative events. Some of these events brought on by market forces and others have been politically motivated. A consolidation of the packing industry, lack of new facilities, temporary moratorium, low hog prices, high feed prices, U.S. COOL legislation have slowed business significantly.

Since the temporary moratorium started, the number of full-time persons that I employ has dropped from seven to five, and it would have been less if we didn't get some work to do outside of Manitoba. I know these employee numbers may not sound like a big deal to a lot of people, but it matters to me and it matters to those employees. They all have families, pay taxes, and live in Winnipeg or in around Winnipeg. These employees are friends of many hog producers in Manitoba and they are concerned about their jobs and livelihoods.

Hog farmers are being set up as villains when all they are trying to do is raise their families, encourage them to be good citizens, and carry on the farm if they desire. Hog producers are unbelievably resilient as their families rely on their hard work and dedication. If hog producers and their families are given a chance, they'll contribute a great deal more to the welfare of this province in a sustainable way.

None of the farm sectors or even commercial sectors is so highly regulated as to what they can and cannot do. Are they next? Did you eat today? Thank a farmer. I don't know if I got through in time. I hope I did.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bell. Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, Alan. I want to go back to a comment you made in regard to the prosecution of the guilty and not find the whole industry guilty. That's kind of along the same thinking that I am. We have heard a number of presentations over the past two days, and we've heard some great operators, great stewards of the land.

Of course, we know the guilty are not going to come to us so what tools do we need to give, or do you think the tools are there, in order to process the ones that are, in fact, destroying the environment while the others are doing a great job protecting the environment?

Mr. Bell: Well, I feel that, I mean, you have the mechanism in place. You have the people that are doing, you know, the manure management plans. You have that kind of thing. Unless they're blind, they should recognize that these kinds of things are happening, and when they do, they should have the permission and the backing to do something about it, not put their head in the sand. I mean, a toothless tiger's no good. Right?

Mr. Faurchou: I thank you ever so much, Mr. Bell. I'd like you to, for the record, continue with the example that you have here as an attachment to your presentation, if you will, just to get this into the record because I think it's important to know about what is the current state of our governments, both municipal and provincial, when it comes to an environmental concern raised by a citizen.

Mr. Bell: Okay, on pages 5 and 6 and 7, what I did is, it was very ironic, our office and our shop are right across from the hog commission on Marion, right in front of the Union Stockyards building. On May 8, at 3:30 in the afternoon, there was a fellow came driving up with a car, and he took some pallets and he drove up on the pallets, and he was monkeying around under the car. We watched for awhile and thought, jeez, you know, he's—well, I'll read it: Ironic that this picture was taken on the pavement area in front of the old Union Stockyards building by myself next to the Manitoba Pork property on Marion Street, May 8, 2008, at 3:30 in the afternoon. I saw someone driving their car onto

some pallets and thought he was checking the front end or looking for a leak. As he took a long time, I walked over. Just then, he started driving away and I saw the mess. Immediately, I wrote down his licence number and make of car. He had changed his oil and left it running all over the parking lot. Nine phone calls and three days later, after talking to what seemed every environmental person in the City and the Province, I was asked to send the pictures to a lady in the City. I've got a couple of pictures here that show the oil spread on the parking lot.

I couldn't believe that. I was in the provincial three times and five times in the City talking to people about whose department: Well, it's not my department. Oh, that's in the City. Oh, that's an environmental person one. Is that private property or is that public property?

It doesn't matter. It's oil dumped all over the bloody road. Do you think any got in the sewer? You know, like, I'm not supposed to make that call. I just reported the situation and I still haven't heard back from them, from May 8. So I don't know what they did. But, I mean, before anybody even said, okay, yes, send me something, I'll look into it, I went through all these people. Everybody seems to walk around and, well, that's somebody else's problem. Like, oh, well, I don't want to get involved; it's after 4 o'clock, you know.

Mr. Faurchou: Well, obviously, we've had rainfall since May 8, including last night. The close proximity to your office must give you some observation as to whether it was cleaned up or whether it ended up in the sewer.

Mr. Bell: Last night when I was driving home, I didn't look, actually.

Mr. Struthers: Upon conferring with my department, I'm going to step up to the plate and not push you on to another department. This is something that our department would be following up on. It occurred on May 8. If you've got that response from our department, let me apologize on behalf of us. I want to follow up with this. You've passed on the licence plate and everything that's necessary.

Mr. Bell: I did pass the information on to somebody at the City, but I still have the licence number and everything of the vehicle.

Mr. Struthers: I'd like to follow up on that because that is our department. It has been responsible for

that legislation. We have officers that do that. We try as much as we can to catch the bad guys.

I do know that we have caught bad guys and we have levied fines and we have done enforcement. Quite often we depend on citizens like yourself to make sure that we get that information, so I'm going to try to see that we get that done. Thanks.

Mr. Bell: That's gratifying. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: John Ostermann, Precision Feed. Paul Deprez, Nordevco. Shany Silinski, Manitoba Farm Animal Council. Shany Silinski.

Don Kroeker.

You have a written presentation, I see.

Mr. Don Kroeker (Private Citizen): I do.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

* (20:40)

Mr. Kroeker: My name is Don Kroeker. I live two blocks from here in the Colonnade on Edmonton, and I really feel discriminated against as a resident of Winnipeg. I was not informed when Rick phoned me and told me I was No. 72 that out-of-town speakers would always get priority. On the other hand, my seven and a half hours in this room in the last two days, mainly today, have been very educational and interesting. So I don't really regret them.

I would like to stipulate immediately, Mr. Struthers, Minister Struthers, I forgot to say, Mr. Chairperson, Minister Struthers, committee members, I am delighted to have the opportunity to appear before you, and I would like to stipulate that I favour good stewardship of the water of Lake Winnipeg. I strongly favour that.

I would also like to just let you know that I'm speaking as a private citizen. I do not represent our family farming business. In fact, my boss—I didn't even inform him that I was coming here. So, strictly, these are my opinions that I'm giving.

I've been involved in hog production almost all of my adult life and that's quite awhile. I've always enjoyed the hog industry. I feel that it's one in which there's a rapid response to good management, and I like that ability to see things change. For many years, the hog business has been good for us as well.

At this point, our family farm is no longer directly operating a hog business, but I have invested a significant portion of my net worth in hog production facilities. So that's from where I am coming. So I expect the Manitoba government to govern with justice, integrity, fairness. Largely, that's been my experience. I've had interaction with agriculture, and I have a lot of respect for the Agriculture Minister.

I believe that Bill 17 is out of character for this government. I was really impressed with the way Mr. Struthers apologized to the previous speaker that his department hadn't done something. Whenever people can see the error of their ways or their government's ways and make changes, I am greatly impressed and that elevates them a lot in my opinion. *[interjection]*

I'm also deaf and didn't hear that comment.

It is unfair to penalize an operation within the prescribed area, and my investments are mainly within the prescribed area, that is more environmentally friendly and in a more suitable location than many that are licensed—I'm stopping because of what you're doing.

An Honourable Member: Oh, no. Not for you. I'm looking at the Chair down there.

Mr. Kroeker: —that are licensed or might be licensed in the future in other parts of Manitoba. The government in the past has shown itself to be fair and reasonable and should not depart from this important principle of fairness and reasonableness.

An operation I've invested in within the Red River Valley special management area, Capital Region, was built to accommodate expansion and could expand more efficiently than starting an operation from scratch. Speaking more generally about producer facilities, often they need to be upgraded from time to time, responding to changing markets, environments and technologies. This is not a static industry. Opportunity for economic and environmental response should not be arbitrarily withheld, but facilitated within a well-regulated industry.

Sometimes, through improvements in production, especially with rapidly improving genetics that we're getting now or changing markets, possibly COOL or regulations, a sow barn may need expansion of a certain segment of the operation in order to be in balance.

The operation I've invested in wasn't planned to produce the almost 27 pigs per mated female that it is now producing. So some very slight adjustments in the facilities would be helpful. So Bill 17 makes such business-oriented adjustments impossible even if all factors favour such an action. I just commented already on the next sentence.

But, another example, if a weanling producer loses its U.S. customer, and some have recently lost their U.S. customers, and there are quite a few barns in Manitoba that buy 50-pounders, but this producer only produced weanlings at 21 days, 12-or-13 pounders, and now is faced with having to bring those 12-or-13 pounders up to 50 pounds in order to get a new market, having lost the old market, this is impossible, as I read Bill 17, anywhere within the prescribed area.

Now this next one, I think, is really interesting. Should a producer wish to change from stalls to pens for sows, this would require more space and a differently shaped building. Bill 17 would not allow such animal-friendly adjustments to happen.

Can you imagine stopping that from occurring? If I'm wrong, please correct me but, as I read it, the extra space required, even if there were no extra animal units, would not allow such a building to be built or modified in order to accommodate this kind of a situation.

I'm going to leave out the first part of No. 4 there. A lot of people have already addressed that and go to the—I think it's the sixth line there. In the R.M. of Morris, manure storages are covered. The Rural Municipality of Morris recently sent out reminders to all hog barns, explaining that they will be inspecting all sites. There will be two flyovers, one in the first week of June, one at a later date. Their motto is, let's keep Morris as the most-attractive agricultural community in Manitoba.

We, as hog producers, want to co-operate and help to make that happen. Modern commercial hog production facilities are already very well-regulated, as probably a hundred people have reminded you and explained to you in the last two days. I cannot see any legitimate reasons for Bill 17.

I did hear yesterday, as I was listening, that Minister Struthers feels that some producers are putting excessive manure on their land. That was in response to the corn producers. In discussion with the Chamber of Commerce, comments about Lake Winnipeg—there is a feeling that, in fact, Bill 17

could make a significant difference in the amount of pollution in Lake Winnipeg. I would hope somebody would ask me in the question time what my opinion is about that difference, if any specific further environmental protection is needed, provided very specifically to all Manitobans as needed.

I have recommendations. One is, please, please, do not approve Bill 17. Withdraw it. I think that could be a very astute move, given all the new information that has come to light in the last two days. Actually, I am going to digress a moment.

Last night, I got a call which I didn't receive and the number was Rick's number, the guy who called me in the first place. One minute. Oh, I shouldn't look at all these other people—*[interjection]*—oh, that's Rick. Hi, Rick. I think you responded to a message that I left. I thought, well, maybe there's a faint hope that the phone call was to say, you don't need to bother to appear; the bill has been withdrawn, but I tend to be an incurable optimist.

I am not assuming that the bill will be withdrawn, in spite of my and other peoples' pleading but, if it isn't withdrawn, I have a couple of amendments to suggest. These are made by a layperson, may not be right on, but I think the ideas of them—

Mr. Chairperson: One minute, sir.

Mr. Kroeker: —have merit. One is allow, in principle, alterations and additions which do not increase animal units by more than 10 percent, subject to adequate manure storage already being available and subject to meeting all regulations which apply to other areas where expansion is allowed—minor modifications to keep us in business.

(b) Make provision for an appeal procedure where a permit could be granted if a proposed facility addition or a new facility would not pose any more danger to the environment than it would if licensed elsewhere in the province and that would reasonably be expected to be approved elsewhere in the province of Manitoba.

* (20:50)

The last one's a little more general. Make any further revisions needed to treat citizens fairly and equitably, whether rural or urban, pig producers, cattle producers, whatever, with regulations based on science, furthering the well-being of all Manitobans and of Lake Winnipeg.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kroeker. I have Mr. Faurschou.

Mr. Faurschou: Well, thank you ever so much, Mr. Kroeker, Don. I appreciate your disclaimer that the rest of the family members know not what you speak this evening, but I really truly want to express my respect for you and your family and the operations that you have carried on here in the province of Manitoba. You've truly shown leadership with the adoption of innovation and technology throughout your farming career, and for you to take time to come to the committee this evening I truly feel honoured.

I will ask you: Do you see that Bill 17 would ever make a difference, if implemented, on the health of the water in Lake Winnipeg?

Mr. Kroeker: Yes, I think it would make a difference. Take a long time perhaps, and the difference would be that by putting—if we stipulate that 1 percent or 2 percent or some damage is occurring to the lake through hog production then, to the extent that it causes hog producers to go broke and stop their operations, there would be this minute improvement happening.

I think the industry changes enough that if people can't adjust their operations to the new environment by and large they won't be able to continue. We had a hog operation which did well for us in late '70s, early '80s which we later entirely put aside and started from scratch. It no longer had the ability to do what we wanted it to do and then this new one we modified. Other people have talked about modification and changes and so, if a person's not allowed to make any changes whatsoever, sooner or later many of these enterprises, I think, will go under. Their saleability will be really affected negatively, and so, yes, there could be a tiny difference.

On the other hand, I would guess, and this is just an opinion that if in fact pollution is happening, a lot of it may happen from grandfathered portions where people do winter spreading and surface spreading and yesterday I heard, I think, two people talk about that, as long as that opportunity was there, there was no way particularly with the negative attitude that they now had that they would just voluntarily quit doing that. So I suspect that there would be no immediate improvement at all, and I would suspect

that the operations that maybe do go under might be those which are doing their injection and the kind of operations that people are proud of, but these people also make economic decisions, and when it's no longer viable, they will cease their operations.

So, in summary, very little, a lot of negative results, but if in fact some pollution is occurring, eventually it has got to reduce as hog producers are put out of business.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much for your presentation. You not so subtly hinted that there was a question that you wanted us to ask. Was that the question that David just—

Floor Comment: That was the one.

Mr. Struthers: Okay. Good. Because if he hadn't asked it, I was going to.

I've often thought that one of the things that really has happened over the last number of years, and this across the board in agriculture and particularly in hog farming, is the way that the technology has grown. Is it your opinion that that technology has grown in proportion to the rate at which the population of hogs has grown? Can we have some, I don't want to say absolute guarantee, but can we have a level of comfort that that technology being part of the big picture has almost, or nearly, or has kept pace with the rate of growth in the industry?

Mr. Kroeker: You know, I really don't know. I don't know how rapidly it's improved or how rapidly—I know we've grown a lot. I know technology has changed an awful lot. From the barn that we had in the '80s to what I'm involved with right now, you know, there's no comparison. I used to be delighted when we got 20 pigs per mated female and now, as I've said, we're doing just under 27. So that suggests there have been a lot of improvements that have happened. I think we had committed people back then, when we got 20 as well. So the technology has changed a lot.

I'm not quite sure what you're getting at here, but I must confess ignorance.

Mr. Chairperson: Briefly, Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Yes, very quickly, you bring up a very good point in your presentation in regard to market changes. We may be looking at a significant market change in September when we look at COOL, when it comes into effect, the country-of-origin labelling. You make a very interesting comment when you talk

about market changes, and unless Bill 17 is withdrawn, you're not going to be able to make those changes or, in fact, be able to proceed with some of those. So we may see an exodus of the operations, just as a result of not being able to make those—because of the COOL itself.

Do you have any comments on that?

Mr. Kroeker: Well, in the portion where no changes can be made, obviously, if specific businesses have to find new markets for a different kind of a product, they're going to be in deep trouble. There will be many, I think, that are still going to be able to export to the U.S. and won't be dramatically affected immediately, but that's an opinion. One doesn't know exactly how these regulations are going to play out, but COOL has been approved and the regulations are still in the process of being made, so I would just be speculating.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kroeker, for your patience and for your presentation this evening.

Mr. Kroeker: Well, thank you very much for giving me a hearing. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairperson: Peter Vis, Precision Feeds.

Don Flaten, professor, chair of the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment at the University of Manitoba.

Mr. Flaten, do you have a written presentation or any documentation for the committee?

Mr. Don Flaten (The National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, University of Manitoba): Yes. I'm a university professor and there're always handouts. There's probably even some form of exam.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Flaten: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, and the rest of the members of the committee for investing the time on a Saturday evening to listen to my presentation.

My purpose in participating in today's discussion is to discuss with you some of the basic scientific principles for sustainable livestock production practices, so that whatever policies you develop here in the Legislature have a reasonable chance of succeeding in protecting our environment.

I will not be expressing my own personal opinions about the political, economic or social

fairness of these policies. That's not my area of technical expertise, and, also, that's more your job than mine. But the proposal of a permanent moratorium on expansion of Manitoba's pig industry throughout a large portion of agricultural Manitoba is a very serious policy measure that implies that most of our existing policies for the establishment and operation of pig farms are not acceptable from an environmental perspective. Most of the justification for this legislation seems rooted in the notion that nutrients from pig farms present an extraordinary threat to water quality in the province of Manitoba. Therefore I would like to share with you some of the principles of environmentally sustainable management of nutrients in general and some of the challenges and opportunities in managing pig manure nutrients in particular.

It's a well-documented fact that nutrient loading, especially phosphorus, from land to water contributes significantly to the risk of algae growth and eutrophication of water bodies such as Lake Winnipeg. What many people don't want to admit is that the risk is equally large whether that tonne of nitrogen or phosphorus is coming from eroded soil or lawns around a cottage development, a sewage lagoon from a small town, inadequately treated waste-water discharge from our cities, or crop and livestock farms as well. Therefore each of us needs to be doing a better job of nutrient management, and if we're going to make progress on improving water quality in this province, we've got to stop blaming others in what I call the blame game for the problem and each of us do our share to reduce nutrient losses.

* (21:00)

So, within the agricultural community, what can we do? Well, I'm going to focus my comments on four basic principles of nutrient management on agricultural land, matching the right combination of rate, placement, timing to the source of nutrient that we're working with. These are the principles that I would build a policy on if I were in your shoes, keeping in mind that I'm not in your shoes. I'm just a university professor in an ivory tower someplace. But these are the four basic principles that are more or less universal, regardless of the form of nutrient.

Let's start off with nutrient sources. Different types of livestock manures, synthetic fertilizers and municipal biosolids all have different chemical forms of nutrients and are agronomically and environmentally suited to different forms, rates and placement from an agronomic and environmental

perspective. The nutrients in liquid pig manure, for example, are more available to crops or environmental losses than from solid manure, but they're also less available than from synthetic fertilizers. We still need to be careful with pig manure, whatever type we're working with though.

Placement is a very important issue because of the many nutrients in liquid pig manure that are readily available. We recommend that farmers inject liquid pig manure wherever possible. This is a practice that is mechanically practical for liquid manures and not for solid manures, but it's also a practice which is both agronomically and environmentally beneficial because injecting the liquid manure under the soil surface reduces nutrient losses to the air, to the water and also helps to reduce odour emissions.

Timing is the third principle. It's fairly obvious that manure application onto frozen soil or onto snow is not a good idea, especially in a region like the Canadian prairies where 80 percent of our run-off occurs during snow melt. Therefore, we recommend that all farmers, not just pig producers, avoid winter application of any form of nutrient and apply their nutrients in the form of fertilizers or manures in spring, summer or fall. Furthermore, I agree with the regulations that all livestock operations in Manitoba have been required to do so by law for many years.

The fourth issue, which is, in some ways, the most important, is the rate of nutrient application because, over the long term, the rate of applying nutrients needs to be matched with the rate at which the nutrients are removed when we harvest our crops and send them to consumers, most of whom live in the cities. If the rate of application of nutrients is less than what we remove, the fertility and productivity of the soil will decline. That's why farmers in Manitoba spent approximately half a billion dollars this year alone on synthetic fertilizers to replenish those nutrients which they've removed with last year's crop. However, from an environmental perspective, and also an economic perspective, the rate of nutrient application should not exceed crop removal over the long term either.

In general, livestock manures, regardless of the type of livestock, don't have the exact ratios of nutrients required to supply the right balance of nutrients for a given crop or field. For example, all major types of livestock manures that we deal with here in the province have a lower ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus than what crops require or remove.

Therefore, if we apply livestock manure on an annual basis to make crop N requirements, phosphorus concentrations are a surplus and will build up in the soil and will increase the risk of losing that phosphorus to surface water. Therefore, we as scientists recommend that farmers periodically rotate their lands used for manure application so they don't overload their soils with phosphorus. It's also the reason why the province introduced phosphorus-based regulations for the rate of manure application for all types of livestock operations, based on, for example, the Phosphorus Expert Committee recommendations, which Al Beck and I worked on several years ago.

In summary, sustainable nutrient management requires that we use the right combination of rate, placement and timing practices that are matched to the nutrient source regardless of what that source is. These principles of sustainable nutrient management should form the basis for public policies governing the development of or operation of any potential source of nutrients, regardless of whether it's livestock-based or crop-based or city- or town-based. Following these principles is essential for developing real solutions to the real challenges of managing our nutrients in a manner that will improve agricultural and environmental sustainability.

Lastly, I'd like to personally invite you to contact me or any of my colleagues at the University of Manitoba as you continue to proceed with this effort in your committee. You have a very complex set of issues to deal with and you're challenged to deal with a variety of different aspects of these issues. Some are science-based, some are social, economic or politically based, but all of us at the University of Manitoba are eager to ensure that this debate is as informed as possible. So thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Flaten.

open the floor to Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: First of all, thanks for coming. Thanks for being so patient with our presenters that were ahead of you. Sometimes, it seems like we'll never get to you, and I know you were here early this morning and actually took time off to go to a soccer game and then came back again. So thank you for that.

My question is specific. If Bill 17 was to pass, do you think that will actually clean up Lake Winnipeg as a result of that? I know it's a political decision, and I'm not trying to get you caught in the

middle, but based upon your recommendations, most of these are in place. There's only a couple that are not, and we could do those through regulation rather than through legislation through a bill. Any comments on that?

Mr. Flaten: I think that the most important thing about nutrient management is to deal with these four principles, and if new livestock operations of whatever livestock species you care to select followed these principles carefully, I think that they'd have minimal impact on Lake Winnipeg. However, if we don't pay attention to these principles and instead focus on something else, that's when we're going to put Lake Winnipeg in peril. These are the key principles to focus on, and we've got to avoid getting too distracted with other stuff.

Mr. Struthers: Yes, thanks, Dr. Flaten. I want to focus in on something that I think is very important, essential to our discussion. You kind of referred to it a little bit with the quip that you made about the ivory tower, and that's where you're at. Well, we depend sometimes, as much as we don't like to admit it as politicians, we depend on those of you who exist in ivory towers for advice and for science and for the kind of data that we need to make good decisions.

I'm a little bit worried. I made a call to the University of Manitoba because I saw in the media, and I saw with some of my colleagues in the Legislature, and I saw with some of the stuff that Manitoba Pork has put out, that the claim is that the University of Manitoba opposes Bill 17. When I phoned the University of Manitoba they said, no. We would not take a position for or against. Now, some of the scientists at the University of Manitoba do have those positions, and some have positions on the other side of the issue. Am I correct in assuming that you here tonight as Dr. Don Flaten. You're not representing the University of Manitoba or—I think I have that right.

Mr. Flaten: I'm not speaking on behalf of the Board of Governors for the University of Manitoba. No, I'm not. I'm not speaking on behalf of the president's office, but I am speaking, I think, on behalf of our group of scientists that is working on the sustainable use of livestock nutrients in the environment. We have—you know, my bosses, my department head, and my associate deans and my dean, fully support the position that I'm bringing to you today. But it's a position that is focussed, as you can see, on the technical issues of importance, not necessarily saying whether Bill 17 is right or wrong.

I have personal opinions on that like 999,999 other Manitobans, but I would venture to say that there are few other Manitobans that have more expertise than I do in this particular area. That's where I might have something to offer that's above and beyond the ordinary, but that's the limit of my perspective. There are other reasons to be concerned about livestock development other than nutrients. What I presented to you tonight is really focussed on the technical sides of nutrient management alone.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Mr. Struthers?

Mr. Struthers: You know, I'm very happy to hear that answer. I think that people need to be absolutely honest in the representations that they make because the universities, whether it be Manitoba or Brandon or Winnipeg, the colleges, I think need to be portrayed in an honest fashion because they are very important as institutions, as bodies of higher learning, critical thinking, and have an important role to play in giving us unbiased and objective data. So I'm very happy with the answer that you've given me.

* (21:10)

The only other question I have is Manitoba Pork has announced a freeze or a withdrawal of the funding, I believe, for the livestock and environment. How much of a negative impact is that going to have on your ability to continue with that kind of research?

Mr. Flaten: I believe the term is pause in funding. I don't think it's a permanent moratorium. Sometimes pauses can turn into permanent moratoriums though. So, if it's only a pause, I don't think it will be a major detraction from our ability to do research. We do research using a variety of funding sources including from your department, the Sustainable Development Innovations Fund. We have support from the Manitoba Egg Producers, Manitoba Cattle Producers Association, the Dairy Farmers of Manitoba and from a variety of different sources. We'll continue to proceed with that work, but the longer that the pause on research funding is in place, the less able we are to continue our work with, let's say, sustainable management of pig manure, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: For the committee's information, four minutes remain.

Mr. Faurchou: I think, perhaps, you have it in error, that it is we that are fortunate that you took time out of your busy schedule to come here this evening. Your expertise in this area speaks volumes. Thank you very much.

The presentations that you heard this afternoon must have warmed your heart in many occasions when producers spoke of their rotational application of their effluent from their livestock operations. Your thought patterns in regard to actually communicating the research and results thereof to the farming community. Perhaps this is an opportunity to enlighten government as to how better that might be done rather than to legislate and regulate would be better to communicate.

Mr. Flaten: I have experience working for government. I worked for Alberta Agriculture and Saskatchewan Agriculture before coming here to become the director of the School of Agriculture back when you were a student, David. I'm familiar with some of policy instruments. *[interjection]* We can talk about that later.

Out of that experience, I see four main tools that government can employ to effect change. One, of course, is investment in research to acquire the knowledge that's necessary for informed and intelligent policies in other areas. Those three policy initiatives involve education and extension. They involve incentives to help accelerate adoption of new technology and, in my opinion, last resort, but sometimes necessary, is regulation.

I think the government's role in research, education, incentives and regulation is very important, but research and knowledge is the basis for those other three. If you don't know for sure what you're doing, then be very careful about regulating because you may end up with the opposite result to what you intended. It's important to make sure that we are using science as a base. On top of that base though, you have to build the economic, social and political sort of perspectives that politicians, like we have on both sides of the House, have to work with. I fully respect the political process that goes beyond the science and technical. It's a good thing that the world is not run completely by geeks like me.

Mr. McFadyen: You responded to the question I was going to ask in response to the question from Mr. Faurschou, who clearly was in the right faculty versus the faculty I was in, which was law. So I'm going to defer.

Mr. Goertzen: I've been saving this quote for the right moment and I think I've found it.

I was reading in *Mclean's* magazine, the most recent edition, and there was a professor in that magazine named Keith Solomon. He's the director of

the Centre for Toxicology at the University of Guelph. He was commenting on bans and moratoriums. He said that bans and moratoriums are random activity by governments keen to make political hay out of claiming to protect the public. To ban things on the basis of a health risk when the data doesn't support it is not being honest.

Can you indicate quickly if you think the data supports the moratorium at this point?

Dr. Flaten: Personally, I don't see the justification because, when I look out my ivory-tower window, I look at nutrients and I don't see special phosphorous molecules that come from hog operations versus cattle versus dairy, or from manure versus synthetic fertilizers, or from the Legislative Building that might be on the combined sewer system of the city during yesterday's rain.

I just see phosphorus, okay? If the moratorium is the way to go, then you folks at the Legislature have a lot more moratoriums to work on, because there are a lot of sources to deal with, and you're going to be busy with moratoriums.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, thank you, Dr. Flaten, for your presentation.

I call Joel Gosselin. Bill McDonald, Winnipeg Humane Society. Jason Care. Bonnie Nay. Paul Howarth. Carl Dornn.

Peter Hombach, President, ETIA.

Mr. Hombach, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Peter Hombach (ETIA): I can only repeat what Dr. Flaten said. Having been a university professor for 15 years, I should have end notes.

Mr. Chairperson: For the record, sir, would you tell us what ETIA stands for?

Mr. Hombach: Yes. I am Dr. Peter Hombach, president of the Osorno Group, Winnipeg, an environmental company or environmental company group, representing today the Environmental Technologies and Export Initiatives Association, ETEIA, a federally incorporated, non-profit, industry association. I have the pleasure of currently serving as ETEIA's president.

Among the goals of ETEIA are the promotion of environmental standards, sustainable development and the development of Canada's and Manitoba's environmental industries' sector to a world-class level, so that we, as Canadians and Manitobans, can

play a more significant role in one of the world's most rapidly expanding markets in the future—the environmental technology market.

For us as environmental industries, it is of crucial importance that we are able to demonstrate the application and acceptance of our treatment processes and technologies in our home country but, more importantly, our home provinces.

One of our members is in the final stages of commissioning a waste treatment system for a hog barn in Manitoba, that will not leave any waste behind. Air emissions—we are talking about smell—are already largely being eliminated and will be totally eliminated, once the treatment facility is fully up and running in the coming weeks.

The manure does not go into a storage tank but rather goes into a lift station, very much like any lift station in a city that has a municipal sewer system. In a continuous operation, this manure is converted within 12 days into non-smelling compost that qualifies under the rules of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as class A compost—no odour, no pathogens, no vector attraction.

* (21:20)

This was demonstrated in a two-year pilot project in the United States, 10 years ago, with the very technology now being used in Manitoba for the first time. Should there be any excess liquid throughout the manure treatment process, this liquid will be treated like municipal sewage in two sewage treatment plants that are an integral part of the manure treatment facility. The resulting product is clear, colourless and odourless water. This water is, in fact, sufficiently clean that it could be processed farther into drinking water, but, in this location, it will feed a duck pond.

The treatment plant itself is built in such a way that it is fully self-contained so that even if a spill should occur, no manure could leave the building. Envision this: there is no way that manure or any environmentally undesirable product could possibly leave the treatment plant.

What this project demonstrates is that by using Manitoba-derived technologies, hog barns can be made environmentally sustainable. Because of its cleanliness and sustainability, this first hog manure treatment plant in Manitoba has already been shown on local television news twice in recent days. However, the legal framework in Manitoba, as it stands, is in the way of environmental progress.

Despite the reality and feasibility of manure treatment, The Environment Act does not provide for, or even envision manure treatment and as a result, no standard permitting process has been established yet.

The Environment Act only envisions manure storage permits when manure treatment is, in fact, a very feasible proposition, one whose time has clearly come. Regrettably, Bill 17 does nothing to improve the situation. Instead of encouraging sustainability in agriculture by mandating or even legitimizing proper manure treatment technology, it essentially shuts down the hog industry in Manitoba. To provide an analogy to this approach, it is akin to ban motor vehicle transportation rather than legitimizing fuel efficiency and emission standards. If this had been done, there would be no hybrid engines or auto low-emission vehicles today.

Regulation works. Technology improves. I urge this committee to apply common sense and encourage environmental progress rather than cutting down those who most need this progress.

Home-grown manure treatment technology already exists in Canada and has the potential to make the hog industry much more sustainable. Bill 17, as it stands, is a lose-lose proposition. The environment loses because existing hog barns have no incentive to clean up their act and the overall economy loses because an entire area of industry, one of central importance to rural Manitoba, is essentially shut down and taken out of commission.

There's a better way. Proper regulation, not a blunt ban is what is called for. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Dr. Hombach. I have Mr. Pedersen.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Dr. Hombach. If you actually stay here for the rest of the night like the rest of us, you will have been here as long as the rest of us, so I certainly thank you for your patience. You were here all day yesterday and all day today.

So I did get a chance to talk to you and I found it very interesting, your project, where you're setting up an aerobic treatment system versus an anaerobic with a colony in Manitoba, and my understanding is it turns this hog manure into a compost-like material, odourless dry material and the difference with this, if I understand and you correct me, that the phosphorus is actually bound in the compost, so it's not leachable into the water or surface water and can actually be stored above ground.

So, a couple of questions. I'm going to roll them into one. Are there any research dollars available for this project and have you been able to access any? Has Minister Struthers or Minister Wowchuk ever met with you to discuss this project, or where is this?

Mr. Hombach: Well, by the way, this waiting here today was nothing compared to the six years that I'm waiting for a response from this government after I've met with the ADM of Infrastructure six years ago in the presence of the ADM of Conservation, where I suggested that the environmental industries, which is only a handful in Manitoba to begin with, would certainly volunteer time to advise the government on what is environmentally doable.

That being said, here in research dollars—and I do not want to put here any feathers into my hat that don't belong to me—this project is a project of EAS Manure Management Technologies, a company operating out of Brandon and not of my company group.

The technology that they use is a technology that I influenced a little bit, however. It uses an aerobic treatment process—we have and I have, in part, a company at this research—uses oxygen that is introduced early on so that this manure does not release greenhouse gases any longer. This research has been costly. The cost has been totally borne by industry because the Manitoba government was apparently unwilling to contribute any funds. This is where we stand today. We have tried.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Peter. To begin with, I very much enjoyed speaking to your group or at least the Manitoba Environmental Industries Association, which your group is part of. I've spoken with them, I believe, at least three times at breakfast. I've enjoyed meeting with that group on a regular basis and I very much have a great deal of faith in my Assistant Deputy Minister Serge Scrafield here, who at one point was a regular member of the MEIA which your group is part of. I'm very pleased that we continue to have that presence through, I believe, Tammy Gibson from our department.

So I'm really very happy with the connections that we've made, and I would encourage that we continue to get together on these sorts of things because that was the impetus for section 40.1(2)(ii) which provides for an exemption to allow for these kind of technologies to be utilized whether that's within the moratorium area or outside of the moratorium area.

So, if there is a problem through The Environment Act, then we need to connect on that, but I want to say specifically that that section in Bill 17 is there to provide an exception for a hog farmer, say in the R.M. of Hanover, to incorporate and then on the basis of that grow his operation. So we're trying to make sure that we cover those bases, anaerobic digestion or comparable level of technology, and I've really appreciated the input that you've had on that.

Can I ask, if there's a problem in changes that we need to make on the environmental act side, would you be willing to meet with my staff to look at the clauses there that are actually tripping us up in getting to a point where we can get this technology out there for the use of the farmer?

Mr. Hombach: To answer the last portion of your question first, I indicated six years ago that I would be willing to volunteer my time and I certainly can say that this also applies to other members. Now coming back to your first part—first comments that you made, over the years I have certainly enjoyed working with Mr. Scrafield as I have enjoyed working with Mr. Berg [*phonetic*], and I know that the discretion that the director has, has been used to allow this project.

What, however, frustrated me is that there was—for a project of this significance, that there was no grant money available, that it was turned down, and the client of EAS Manure Management Technologies advised by me applied for the SDIF funding, Sustainable Development Innovation Fund, and got a letter back indicating that manure treatment does not contribute to sustainability. That leaves me really questioning what's going on.

* (21:30)

Mr. Eichler: Thank you. I just checked the battery on my cell phone. I haven't had it out today, but I will loan it to the minister so he can give you a call, because six years is quite awhile. Maybe his battery just needs recharging. Certainly, I say that with a sense of humour, but I hope he takes you up on your offer, six years is a long time to wait. I know the Saskatchewan government has been very aggressive in trying to lure our businesses over there, so I certainly hope that the call comes out very quickly.

Further to your studies, in fact, this is the type of thing we've been looking for. This is what we need in our province in order to move it forward, and I just can't visualize why any government wouldn't want to

have a look at this. So, whatever you've been doing in order to get these changes made, anything we can do on this side of the House, we'd be happy to try and help you move those forward.

Mr. Hombach: Thank you for this comment of support.

Mr. McFadyen: The minister has correctly pointed to section 40.1(2), which allows for exceptions in certain circumstances for modifications to the pig manure storage facilities. There's another section that he didn't point out, and that's 40.1(5) which says that they'll allow modifications, but only if there's no increase in the number of animal units capable of being handled by the operation.

I just want to ask you, in your scientific opinion, whether there's any logic to limiting the number of animal units when you've got technology potentially available to greatly reduce or eliminate the environmental impact.

Mr. Hombach: Well, it is my opinion that the animal-unit count was put in place for a good reason. However, if animals do not have an environmental footprint, why count them? That is exactly where I see an incentive to hog barns to use environmental-friendly technologies.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you, Doctor, for your presentation and your patience.

Call Chris Latimer, Nutrition Partners. Louise Hedman. Andy Waddell. Greg Muench. Peter Provis, Sheridan Hauser Provis Swine Health Services Ltd. Blaine Tully. Dave Hunter. Mark Peters. Tracey Bryksa.

Mike Teillet. Is he here?

Good evening, Mr. Teillet. Do you have any written documentation for the committee?

Mr. Mike Teillet (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Teillet: I should mention that I actually did have a written presentation, but I've actually discarded it because what I had written has been stated dozens of times by dozens of different people here. So what I thought I would do instead is throughout the last two days of meeting, I've been jotting down some notes as I've heard various things that I thought either weren't maybe properly addressed or where maybe there were some misstatements, at least in my opinion, were made or weren't addressed at all.

So what I thought I would do is start off, perhaps, by talking about the lack of consultation on this bill. As you probably are aware, I work for the Manitoba Pork Council. I think I should really be up front about that just in case there's somebody here who isn't aware of that. But we were quite taken aback by this bill and how it was sprung upon us. We've sort of prided ourselves, at the Pork Council, of being extremely co-operative with the government, having a very good working relationship with the government, bending over backwards to go on any committee and deal with the government anytime, anywhere, to deal with regulations, implementation, policy. You name it, we're willing to sit down with the government.

So, to have this sprung upon us like this, with zero consultation was just, quite frankly, shocking. It totally took us aback. I think when we sat in the minister's office and he told us that, we were so stunned we couldn't even speak. I think that Minister Struthers will remember that. We could hardly even speak we were so stunned by this. So that's one thing I wanted to mention, that the lack of consultation, we were very upset about that.

Now, the rest of my presentation—well, this part, actually, was—it's going to be a little bit disjointed because of the nature of what I've done here. I'm going to be jumping around a bit. So, if it sounds a little bit disjointed, that's because it is, and it's kind of my nature anyway. Anyone who's seen my office would know that.

There's been discussion about a stronger framework, and I put that in quotation marks because it's the phrase that's been used, that the CEC report talked about a lack of regulation or weakness in the regulations and that there was the necessity to have a stronger framework. I guess our view of that is that the current rules in place—and this has been stated by several people already—have not had a chance to work.

While the pause was on, four sets of regulations, new regulations, have been brought down by this government, while the pause was on. It's hard to understand how the government can expect the industry to show any improvement when they haven't even had a chance to even deal with the regulations that are in place. I'll give you a couple of examples.

One of them, for example, is the livestock operations policies that are required under the 2006 Planning Act. That Planning Act required that every municipality in Manitoba have a development plan in

place and that that development plan contain a livestock operation policy. Less than a third of the municipalities of Manitoba have those livestock operation policies in place. Each one of those policies would go municipality by municipality, planning district by planning district, do a detailed review of that municipality and determine where it's appropriate to have livestock and where it's not. This hasn't happened yet, so I don't know how the government can say that we need a moratorium when we haven't even had a chance to let those laws and regulations have any impact yet.

Watershed management plans: This was something under the new Water Protection Act. Again, there's only, what, I don't know, two or three watershed management plans in place. How are we ever going to know what the impact of these things are when they haven't had a chance to work yet? The LMMMR phosphorus regulations have only been out for two years. The nutrient management regulations were just brought in this spring. I mean, these things just keep coming at the industry all the time. It has no chance to react to them, and I don't see how this moratorium can make anything better when we haven't had a chance to react to all the regulations that keep coming at us.

There have been improvements to the TRC process, and let's not forget that municipalities at any time have a chance to say no, anytime, with no reason. A municipality on a conditional use application can say no to any livestock operation. In their livestock operation policies, they can limit the number of livestock operations, and that's not even talking about the Clean Environment Commission recommendations which we have said, time and time again, that we're willing to work with and work with the government to implement.

* (21:40)

There has been discussion about over-concentration of hog barns, regional imbalances. I think it's pretty clear. I read that CEC report four times from cover to cover. It's very clear in that CEC report, when they talk about regional imbalances and over-concentration, they are talking about two municipalities. I guess, we would ask, why is there a ban on the other 33 municipalities, 6.7 million acres of land in southern Manitoba with this ban. It just makes no sense to us.

There have been questions asked about what the limits are. I've heard that question asked several times that there's been significant growth in the hog

industry, and there has been significant growth in the hog industry. So what are the limits? Well, I mean, that's almost an impossible question to answer. It's like saying, what are the limits to Tim Hortons? There's been a huge increase in the number of Tim Hortons' restaurants. What are the limits there? The limits really are that there are no hard limits, or there should be no hard limits, that it's set by the land. What the capability of the land is to accept these things. And that would be a sliding scale in the first place because it would depend on how technology impacts these things. So as technology improves, you probably could have a larger and larger industry all the time.

There has been discussion about the R.M. of De Salaberry, that it came out in favour of the ban. Well, I guess, if that's going to be mentioned on the one hand, then there should be mention of all the other municipalities that have lined up here today that are not in favour of the ban and are opposed to the ban, if we're going to be fair about this.

By the way, the reference to the University of Manitoba, I think it's important to—and I am jumping around, I apologize for that, it's just because of the way I have my notes written, it's the order in which I've written them. The reference to the University of Manitoba, I think when the dean of a world-renowned Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba comes out and says, if you took every pig out of Manitoba, it would have no appreciable impact on Lake Winnipeg, the government should sit up and take notice. Whether that comes from the University of Manitoba or merely the Faculty of Agriculture, I think is irrelevant.

I would like to just mention a couple of other things. This bill impacts everyone. I think there's been kind of a sense of misinterpretation that somehow this just applies to the big guys. This applies to everybody. If I had nine sows, I can't buy a tenth. This applies to the little people. This hits the little guys. This hits the organic farmers. I don't think the organic people realize that they are impacted by this. To be an organic farmer you have to use manure, you can't use chemicals or you can't be organic. So they're impacted, too. They're limited, too.

By the way, the Pork Council represents all of those groups. We don't just represent the big guys. We represent anybody who sells a pig in Manitoba. By the way, while I'm speaking about the Pork Council, just for the record, the Pork Council did not

pay the Hutterites, as was said earlier. We didn't drag them out here or stir them up. They've done this on their own because they're very, very concerned about this. I think you could tell by the presentations coming here today and yesterday, they were speaking from the heart. This wasn't anything—we didn't prepare any of their presentations. That rally in Morris where 400 farmers showed up, that was organized by the Hutterites. I was at a rally at Poplar Point where it was all Hutterites. They did that. We had nothing to do with that, the Pork Council. I just want to make that clear. We're not out there stirring—well, maybe, we are stirring the pot. I mean, it's our job to stir the pot, but the Hutterite community is extremely concerned and I don't have to say much more about that because I think it was pretty clear here, pretty evident.

I also wanted to mention a couple of quick things about the ban area itself, and that is that the areas that were chosen, it strikes us there is no rationale for choosing those areas. The Red River Valley Special Management Area, for example, the boundaries of that area were not chosen for this reason. If the rationale for choosing that area was flooding or spring run-off, first of all, flooding shouldn't be an issue because, I believe, since 1994, all barns and all manure storage structures are required to be built above flood level. So they're not going to flood. If run-off of manure is the issue, you deal with that through management, you deal with that through winter spreading.

Mr. Chairperson: Four minutes remain in your presentation, sir, just for your information.

Mr. Teillet: Four minutes?

Mr. Chairperson: Out of 15, you're at 11 minutes now.

Mr. Teillet: All right. I'll wind it up. I have a bunch of other notes here scribbled in the margin and everything else, but I'll just wind it up.

We have natural advantages here in Manitoba that have made us a leader around the world in hog production. We grow the best pigs in the world. People come from all over the world to see what we're doing, we've done it so well. Everything you buy in Manitoba or North America practically comes from China, but we can beat the Chinese at this. This is something we can beat them at is growing pigs.

Just to end it, I guess, I would just say we would respectfully request the government to withdraw the

bill. Just to end it, I would just say, put pork on your fork. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Teillet. Thank you, sir. I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Mike.

Your organization and our government have had some tough meetings. We've had some disagreements on some pretty, I think, major issues. I want to repeat to you what I said to Karl Kynoch yesterday, that through all of the discussions and all of the tough meetings we've had, I've never doubted the professionalism of your group. You've always had a straightforward approach to us and I appreciate that. That goes for Karl, your executive director, you and your staff. Our door is always open and I know that your door is always open to us, and I appreciate that. You stole a little bit of my thunder because the only other thing I was going to do was give you an opportunity to respond to what I thought yesterday was a very unfair attack by one of the presenters in terms of writing speeches on behalf of other farmers. The only other issue that was part of that, and I tried to address, was whether the government was paying you to do it, which is another one of the attacks. I'll just leave that for you to comment on. Thanks for your presentation tonight.

Mr. Teillet: Certainly, the government doesn't pay us. We have to say that all of our money comes from levies, and you're well aware of that.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Teillet, I got my cell phone out again. The minister made you an offer that he's prepared to sit down and meet with you and that's probably to withdraw Bill 17. I think you should take him up on it and make that call just as soon as you possibly can.

I know, in all seriousness, that you were blindsided, not once, but twice. We need to make sure your voice is heard. You speak for thousands of producers, thousands of people that are employed here in the province of Manitoba. The part that concerns me the most is that there wasn't the consultation that I felt that you needed with the ministers in order to make Bill 17 even become a reality, never mind, even the consultation part, before it was even drafted. Do you care to comment on that?

Mr. Teillet: We have a lot of expertise at the Pork Council. We have people like Andrew who've been involved in this business for 30 years. Obviously, we represent 1,200 producers across the province. We

have, really, almost no end to the expertise that we have. That's why we were so taken aback when this bill was announced without prior consultation. Absolutely, anytime, we're willing to sit down with the government to work out reasonable regulations, policies and reasonable implementation of the CEC recommendations.

* (21:50)

Mr. Chairperson: We are out of time. I was going to allow Mr. Faurschou a brief question if he wants to defer to Mr. McFadyen. Briefly, briefly, Mr. Faurschou.

Mr. Faurschou: Mr. Chair, I do appreciate—now you made me forget my question—no, I recall. You made a statement earlier in your presentation that this legislation actually puts the restrictions, not only on the large farming operations, but also on the small-production bio-tech barns as well. I want to make sure that I was clear in hearing that as well.

Mr. Teillet: Yes, it restricts everyone, everyone, I believe, over 10 animal units. I think that's the cutoff.

I think a sow's about—what is it, Andrew, about 1.3 animal units or something like that? That would allow you about eight, something like that. Then you're subject to the ban.

Yes, it doesn't matter what you're treatment system is; you're subject to the ban.

Mr. Chairperson: Time is up. Thank you very much, Mr. Teillet, for your presentation.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: I have a substitution: Mr. Dewar (Selkirk) in for Ms. Howard (Fort Rouge), which means we have lost our sub-chairperson for this committee, which we means have to elect a new one.

Any nominations for Vice-Chair?

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Chair, I nominate Mr. Caldwell.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Caldwell has been nominated. Any further nominations? Seeing none, congratulations, Mr. Caldwell.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: We will move on. Karin Wittenberg, Associate Dean, Research for the Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Sciences.

Jeff Mah, Envirotech Ag Systems Ltd. Harry J. Toner. David Hedman.

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Chair, it's 10 o'clock on a Saturday night, and I think these presenters—*[interjection]*—yes, whatever. I was wondering if there's leave of the committee just to ask who is still here, who would like to present. We can get through this that much faster. Come on, we can be—aw, geez.

Mr. Chairperson: I see about 15 names on this list that I could call off in about 30 seconds. Any other comments in that regard to Mr. Pedersen's suggestion?

An Honourable Member: Let's keep going through this.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, where was I? I lost myself now.

Milan Hajzler. Forgive me for the pronunciation.

Clint Miller. Order. Clint Miller?

Xavier Temple. Janet Honey. Ian Halket. Ryan Buchanan. Jessie Lazo. Jason Dufahl. Melodie Malmquist.

Diana Ludwick of Occupational Health Centre.

Diana, Ms. Ludwick, do you have any written materials? I see you do. Good evening Ms. Ludwick, you may begin at your leisure here.

Ms. Diana Ludwick (Occupational Health Centre): I'm one of the nurses at the Occupational Health Centre, and I won't be speaking to the entire document that you have before you. I'll just be touching on the points that we felt, as a centre, were the most important to share with you today.

We believe that our centre has a respected track record of addressing occupational health and safety issues. We have presented at public hearings and also submitted written documents as part of the public consultative process that the Clean Environment Commission had earlier on a range of workplace health and safety issues, but today we will focus solely on the topic of the overuse of antibiotics in hog production and its impact on farm workers, their families and their communities.

Hog production has undergone rapid transformation from family-owned operations to large scale industrial enterprises. An increasing percentage of pigs are being raised in large, industrial hog barns. Size matters. When something goes wrong in a large hog barn, the potential risk for occupational and environmental damage is correspondingly large.

Published studies have documented that communicable diseases can be transmitted to workers as part of their work. The risk to acquire communicable diseases from pigs increases if workers work with large numbers of pigs. Some workers come into contact with thousands of hogs each day. It is often difficult to assess the risk because workers may not know which pigs have infections. Pigs can often appear to be healthy but may still be carrying disease.

So I want to focus particularly on the overuse of antibiotics in the hog production. Animal producers use the same antibiotics for hogs that are used for people. The mass application of antimicrobials to hogs has greatly increased over the years in industrial hog barns. It is estimated, and this is a really important point, that 90 percent of all antibiotics used in Canada are fed to pigs, poultry and cattle merely to promote growth.

Animals living in crowded, stressful conditions of industrial hog barns grow faster if given low doses of antibiotics. However, for pigs raised in less crowded conditions, antibiotics do not affect growth rate. This indicates that feeding antibiotics is to compensate for unhealthy living conditions. Therapeutic antibiotic administration at high levels for the duration of an illness for sick pigs is obviously an important aspect of veterinary care. However, most antibiotics are now used just for growth promotion. Prolonged use of antibiotics at low levels in the form of medicated feed in hog production presents the risk of not killing the bacteria while promoting resistant strains.

Workers in hog barns can become colonized with the resistant organisms from the pigs, pass these organisms to coworkers, family and the community. There are many ways that antibiotic-resistant organisms move from the industrialized hog barns into the community. Scientists have compared medicated feed in industrial hog barns with barns not using medicated feed and observed a three-fold higher concentration of resistant bacteria in the exhaust air from those barns that used medicated feed.

* (22:00)

Tetracycline-resistant genes within industrial hog barns were also present in an adjacent manure lagoon as well as ground water downstream from the lagoon, but, really, recently in the mid U.S. they reported that antibiotic-resistant bacteria in both surface and ground water was higher downstream

from industrial hog barns and that was a consistent finding. That was just not a one isolated kind of thing.

Locally here in Winnipeg, public concern about community-acquired antibiotic resistance is becoming mainstream in part due to recent headlines in Winnipeg newspapers. Just a few months ago the *Free Press* reported that hundreds of Winnipeggers admitted to hospital to get better are picking up hard-to-treat bacteria that caused everything from boils to pneumonia to severe diarrhea and even death. People are actually bringing it into the hospital from outside.

This newspaper article further reported that many Winnipeg hospitals have a higher rate of antibiotic-resistant superbugs than other hospitals in Canada. Of note, in one Winnipeg hospital the superbug infection rate was more than triple the Canadian mean. Recently, under another press headline, Superbug found in Ontario pigs, reporters cited that Canadian researchers have found two major strains of the superbug methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus, which many of you know as MRSA, in the newspaper articles on pigs and pig farmers and one strain seems to have originated in pigs and moved to people.

This 2007 study examined 285 pigs on 20 Ontario farms, 45 percent of farms and almost one-quarter of the pigs and one-fifth of the pig farmers—no, yes, one in five, the one-fifth of the pig farmers carried MRSA strain that caused human infection. This is a much higher rate than in the general North American population. Currently in the U.S. MRSA accounts for more than twice as many deaths as the complications of AIDS.

Researchers point to big pig farms as a possible source of some of the resistant infections that have also occurred in European studies. The same pig strain that was detected in Canada has been associated in Europe with serious human disease. In 2003, Voss and some colleagues found two infants and a veterinarian carrying a new strain of MRSA bacteria. The investigation traced the source to pigs and later uncovered that 25 percent of Dutch pig farmers were carrying the strain. A follow-up three years later found the carriage rate had risen to 50 percent.

Multiresistant pathogens pose serious challenges to human health. In 2005 air samples from industrial hog barns were examined. Several types of bacteria were analysed for resistance to five antibiotics. Of note, 98 percent of the samples displayed resistance

to two or more of the four antibiotics that are commonly used as growth promotants in hogs, but it is really important to note that 37 of the 124 samples were resistant to all four of the main antibiotics used. None of the samples were resistant to the fifth drug that has not yet been used in hog production as a growth promoter.

Escalating resistance has raised concern that we are entering a post-antibiotic area. We may be entering a period where there will be no effective antibiotics available for treating many life-threatening infections in humans.

A veterinarian who specializes in antibiotic resistance says: The big public health concern in my mind is that there is a reservoir in pigs, and it is spreading to people that work with pigs and now is being spread into the general population, and it can become an important community pathogen.

So what can be done? In 2001 the Union of Concerned Scientists estimated that 87 percent of all antibiotic use is used for animals and the remainder for human use.

I'm going to go right into what the World Health Organization has said. They are calling for a rapid phase-out of the use of antimicrobials as growth promotants and for prudent-use guidelines for veterinary use.

We know that this approach can work. Dealing with the source of the problem usually results in solutions that make the most meaningful difference over time. Sweden banned the use of antibiotics as feed additives for growth in 1985. Its research demonstrates that the banning of growth stimulants does not lead to an increased use of antibiotics when needed for treating sick hogs in the subsequent 18 years. More recently, in 1999, Denmark banned the use of sub-therapeutic use of antibiotics.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Ludwick, you're at 10 minutes now. We have three people who want to put questions to you. So, just for your information.

Ms. Ludwick: Okay. Denmark banned the use of sub-therapeutic use of antibiotics and significantly reduced antibiotic resistance without losing product capacity. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Diana. I note your recommendation No. 6 is that we continue with

a province-wide moratorium on the basis of the precautionary principle.

This isn't a question of protocols that individual hog farmers put in place to gain access to their facilities. Anytime I've visited a hog barn, I've felt a little bit like Neil Armstrong setting foot on the moon, with the kind of things that I was wrapped in to keep—[interjection] One small step for Stan. In my case it'd be a giant trip for man.

But this isn't about that, is it? We've been talking, and I've been encouraged by people to base everything on science. You're telling us that the science says there's a problem with what we put into the pigs, and that it's a problem that could be on the level of the debate that took place about the growth hormone that produced more milk in cows. Have I got that right?

Ms. Ludwick: What I'm suggesting is that there is a growing body of evidence that is saying that when you have large numbers of pigs housed closely together, you're going to have a problem with disease and that it has, in many countries now, been passed—those pathogens have been passed on to the workers. The workers have passed it on to their families. They've gone to hospitals. They've been treated, and, as they were treated, they passed it on to the health-care givers, and it went further than that. So then it becomes a community pathogen.

It's not science fiction. It has happened already, and the scientists in the world, including those with the World Health Organization—it's hard to dispute that we're going to have more renowned names than that—say this is serious. We really need to look at this issue, and we have to look at it very, very carefully, and this is one issue that has to go to the precautionary principle. The stakes are too high not to be very cautious.

Mr. Chairperson: A very quick supplemental, Mr. Struthers.

Ms. Ludwick: I don't know if that answers your question.

Mr. Struthers: Yes, it did.

Ms. Ludwick: Because oftentimes—

Mr. Chairperson: Order. Ms. Ludwick, I have to recognize you to speak. I passed the mike over to Mr. Struthers, who is putting another question to you.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you, Diana. The Clean Environment Commission, clearly, in one of its recommendations, said to us that we have to follow up on this and that we have to work with the federal government on this because of Health Canada's role in all of the licensing and that sort of thing. So we will be doing that.

* (22:10)

What is the outcome? What could happen if we don't take this seriously? You were talking about consequences. What could those be?

Ms. Ludwick: The consequences could be that it becomes a community pathogen. Once it becomes a community pathogen, it is spread within families, it is spread between families, it is spread in schools, it is spread in workplaces. A community pathogen is a community pathogen, and if it doesn't have antibiotics that are effective in treating it, then the outbreak could have dire consequences, dire.

Mr. Gerrard: Could you address two points: if there's any Manitoba science directly linking the source of multi staphylococcal-resistant organisms to hog barns in Manitoba; secondly, Sweden and Denmark have changed practices. What other changes did they make? Did they include a moratorium, for example, or did they change the regulations other than the antibiotics, or was it just the antibiotic change in Sweden and Denmark?

Ms. Ludwick: They have always been very precautionary in their approach, generally speaking. They have the ban. They completely prohibit the use of antibiotics other than for animals that are sick. But, in addition to that, they have taken many measures that we feel are proactive, and we've kind of touched on them in other parts of this particular document. I think that they really honour the principle of having small farms and diversified farms, so that there is just less chance of pathogens being spread that way as well. So it's not a simple solution, but the growth-promotant aspect of it was by far the most important piece of it in terms of the antibiotic resistance. That was by far, and the World Health Organization recognized that, and that is why it is recommending that it not be used in that particular way.

Mr. Chairperson: We are overtime, but, since I gave the minister a supplemental, I will give Mr. Faurschou one question.

Mr. Faurschou: Just to follow up on this, are you current with the present technology and practices in a

modern-day hog farm because I will state emphatically that there are no hog barns in my constituency that even use antibiotics at this point in time?

Ms. Ludwick: Pardon me?

Mr. Faurschou: When was the last time you were out in a hog barn?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Faurschou, I'm sorry.

Ms. Ludwick, I'm sorry. We're getting this back and forth here.

Ms. Ludwick: We would love to go into the industrial hog barns. We have never been invited even though we have said that we have an interest to do so. So, if invited, we'd be delighted to go.

The second part of your question was—*[interjection]* Oh, in the feed. My understanding is that we really don't know. I have asked that question, and because there is no way of documenting what is or is not in that feed, we don't know in Manitoba to what degree it is used. Veterinarians, though, have told me that it is being used.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Ludwick.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Struthers, on a point of order.

Mr. Struthers: Yes. As we've done with other presenters who haven't had a chance to get their whole document in, we've put on record that we accept the document that the presenter has brought forward on record.

Mr. Chairperson: The minister has spoken.

What is the will of the committee? *[Agreed]* It is agreed that the written presentation in its entirety will be included in the *Hansard* in addition to the oral presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: I'll continue.

Marie Ottenbreit. Debbie Klassen. George Camara. David Grant. Kelli-Ann Fostey. Dennis Robles. Dennis Kozier. Dr. Laurie Connor. Brent Hanson.

Dave Wall. Brian White. James Linaker. Mike Radcliffe. Starlite Colony. Matt Einarson. Kevin Toles. Jason McNaughton, Standard Nutrition Canada. Gordon Gillies. Greg McIvor.

That concludes the list of in-town presenters.

It's come to my attention that there are still four–five, actually—individuals still in attendance, who would like to present this evening. We've gone through the list, of course, but is it the will of the committee that we give these people an opportunity? *[Agreed]*

On that basis, I call No. 138, Mr. Brian Siemens.

Mr. Siemens, do you have any written documentation for the committee?

Mr. Brian Siemens (Private Citizen): No, I just have a couple little notes here and that's it.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed.

Mr. Brian Siemens: All right. I've been a grain farmer for 25 years. I've lived on the banks of the Red River, south of Winnipeg about 35 miles, close to Morris. I have diversified into hog operations and have invested somewhat, primarily for the purpose of the manure as fertilizer for the land. I'm basically a land farmer.

That's been a very big thing for us. We've been working with agronomists for the last few years to get our maximum utilization out of the fertilizers, out of the manure and making sure it's put on properly. I see a lot of potential in that. We're relatively new at it, as we've been working with it mostly for—not a lot.

We've had chickens forever, practically, but with the hogs, it's been more of something we can actually cover more acres with. The chickens have been a smaller amount, and it hasn't really paid to take care of it that well. So now, the hogs, we're working with that a lot more significantly and finding a huge benefit to that.

We are also doing some with chickens as well, from some major barns close to the dew/frost area, probably the biggest chicken barns in the province; so we spread all that manure as well. We have managed to cover most of our acres of close to 4,000 with manure on occasion. We put it on at such a rate that we can apply almost every year and then supplement with commercial fertilizers. We work very extensively with that and have found real benefits.

We work with Agri-Trend Agrology. I don't know if any of you are familiar with them. They're based out of Alberta and they work with the land end of it mostly. Most of them are retired government employees or they've done their time at the universities and that, so they really love their work.

* (22:20)

I'm definitely not in favour of the moratorium. It's something I see—with technology, the way it's improved, the advancements we've had in the last few years, I don't know if there's any industry that has advanced as aggressively as the hog industry has in utilizing the fertilizer. In our area, it's gone from zero-value manure to worth \$40-50 an acre within two years, so it's changing very fast right now. A lot of the information you're probably working with over the last 10, 15 years is totally outdated and I think the hog industry has a long ways to go still. They're going fast and they're—I think there's a lot of potential there still. As a grain farmer, we need the hogs out there, we need that fertilizer and we also need the market for the grain. It's been a huge benefit.

Over this last year now, the prices are getting better but we've had some very slow times a few years back and without the hogs we would have been in very tough shape there. It's been a real benefit and I would really hate for that benefit to disappear. I think the technology can easily keep up with whatever environmental issues there could be, and living on the river, the water has always been an issue for us and we're not going to pollute the water. That's just not the way we operate. It doesn't work that way. It's not sustainable that way and we've just—it doesn't happen.

And the moratorium, I live in this area so I can't move. If you're worried about the big hog operations, the big companies, they can move across the line. They can move to places where there is no moratorium so it's really—you're hurting the local people, the actual residents of the area. You're hurting them. You're not hurting the big companies, the big mega farms and that, even though as residents we do have shares in bigger farms, but if you're worried about the real big operations, those will continue, just on somebody else's doorstep. We will lose the benefits of that. There's a lot of employment from it and there's a lot of industry that's—it's changed an awful lot in our area and it's—I think it's a real benefit.

I guess that's it.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Siemens. Questions?

Mr. Faurshou: You just mentioned the large corporate entities that would move out of the province. Just in your own observations of those operations, have they been as environmentally

sensitive and good stewards of the land as has been the practices by those that are—that farm the land?

Mr. Brian Siemens: In general, they have been, and, in fact, they have also helped with the technology and that 'cause they're working with it, and they've often worked with the smaller farmers and there's often been contracts between that, so the—so, yeah, I think they have been. I don't see that as a problem at all as far as that goes with the big companies, but it seems like that's kind of the thing that's getting slammed, is the bigger operations. They have been very helpful in technology and they have had the clout to make things happen to change environmentally and go with the technologies and that. They can make that happen. They can help the individual farmers to work with that.

Mr. Struthers: Yeah, thank you, Brian. Given the size of your operation, what would be the one piece of technology that you would love to add to your operation that would improve your environmental capacity? And I understand that there's a difference between the size of your operation being able to purchase that kind of technology as opposed to somebody bigger, but what would it be?

Mr. Brian Siemens: I guess we're at a size that I think we're doing whatever it takes already. We already have started our own application business and we work with agronomists. We test all the manure. We test all the land. We've done soil tests on our land for the last 10, 15 years already before we ever started with the manure. So the—and the hog barns are situated kind of centrally in our land base and so as far as improvements right now that I can see, we are doing our best to be right at the top of the game. Like, our application business is—it's a very expensive operation, but it works very well and we want to keep the manure applied evenly across the whole field 'cause there's no grain farmer that likes the strips in there and likes uneven application. It doesn't work.

Mr. Pedersen: You mentioned that you were putting on chicken—or, you know, poultry manure, chicken manure and hog manure. Is there much difference in the fertilizer value between the two of them?

Mr. Brian Siemens: The chicken manure is hotter, or it has more nitrogen in it so it would burn a little easier. So it has to be put in at a lighter rate than the hog manure would be. Hog manure is much more forgiving that way, but the hog manure is all liquid. It's easier to apply. The chicken manure we put on

with dry spreaders. We're working with that technology as well.

Mr. Pedersen: That was a rhetorical question because I knew what the answer was anyway. But—and I guess I know what the answer is to this one too, and another rhetorical question to you: Why don't we have a moratorium, then, on chickens?

Mr. Brian Siemens: I think everybody knows that answer, but we're working with that too. We're doing a good job with that manure, but it has been sloppy, and, of course, the will hasn't been there and the push hasn't been there from the general public. But the value of the manure, we're going to make it happen. It's going to work. We need that manure.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation, sir.

Call Mr. David Gsell, No. 105. Is that the correct pronunciation, sir? How do you say your last name?

Mr. David Gsell (Private Citizen): Good evening. My name is David Gsell.

Mr. Chairperson: Gesell?

Mr. Gsell: Gsell.

Floor Comment: Coming from a guy named Nevakshonoff.

Mr. Chairperson: I like to have surnames correct, because mine so seldom is. But, anyway, do you have any written documentation for the committee?

Mr. Gsell: No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: Then please proceed.

Mr. Gsell: My name is Dave Gsell. I'm a resident from the R.M. of Morris, and I'm an active hog farmer. I'm originally from Switzerland. I started farming in November 2005. I have bought a small hog farm. It has 650 sows, farrow to isowean. When I was coming to Manitoba, I had a different business plan. Basically, my idea was to use the sow farm as a base; then, later on I wanted to add a feed mill; then, later on, when money allows, I wanted to build a nursery to feed up my weanling pigs to 50 pounds. In a later step I wanted to build market hog barns so that I'm possibly able to finish half of my pigs, and, in the next step, build another barn to finish all of them.

Now, when that Bill 17 comes in place, you forget about it. There's no possibility to grow your business at all. Even minor changes to the operation, like building a quarantine barn that I could isolate the

new gilts that I can reduce the risk of bringing diseases in my herd, as when Bill 17 is in place, there's no way that you can build this quarantine barn.

Also, I wanted to add on some farrowing crates that I can increase the nursing time for my sows from 20 days to 25 days. That would need one room more for the sows, like just for 32 crates to extend lactation. When Bill 17 is in place, you can't do it.

*(22:30)

Even when I say, okay, forget about everything with finishing your own pigs to market weight, just stay as an isowean producer. When I started in 2005, we were seven farmers loading one truck with pigs once a week. One truckload of pigs holds 2,000 isowean pigs. Now, the buyers in the U.S. were coming and say, well, seven farms, so pigs of seven origins on the same truck. We don't want to have that any more. They're coming from different farms. They have different health status, and that causes us too many problems. We are buying these pigs but no more than five farms on one truck.

Well, the company that I was with was buying my pigs. They just dumped the two smallest producers and the other five could still ship. We were able to increase productivity and now we are able to fill this truck, just the five of us. To try and go with the market I can already see in the near future that the buyers come back and say, well, five farms on the same truck, that's too much. We want to have no more than three.

Now, in my case, I'm shipping on average 300 pigs a week. To do that, I would have to go to 650 to 700 pigs a week. To do that you would have to increase your herd and probably to be on the safe side, including the gilts, you would need to have another thousand sows just to be competitive on today's marketplace or the marketing the next few years. We've talking probably five years; we're not talking 20, 30 years.

When Bill 17 is in place, you can't do that responding to the market demands. The only way I could respond to it is moving away from weekly farrowings to batch farrowing. That means you are not farrowing every week, so then maybe only once every two weeks or once every three weeks or in an extreme case, only once every four weeks. Then you would be able to increase your pig load by two-week farrowing to 600 pigs, by three-week farrowing to

900, or by four-week farrowing to 1,200 pigs per shipment.

Now, when I would want to change over to the new system, just the way I want to run this farm with exactly the same amount of livestock, with no increase in animals, I still need to change my barn because I can't house it, because it just runs different. When Bill 17 is in place, I can't do it. Even when I would come and say, well, forget about everything with this conventional farming, which is basically you have to be bigger to produce cheaper, I go completely a different way. I go to animal welfare pigs, gourmet pigs, whatever, and I want to change it over to that niche market. When I want to do that, with the regulations what we have in Switzerland now with animal welfare regulations, everything needs to be loose housed and not just the dry sows, even the farrowing sows, need to be loose housing. The space that is required to have my herd is double the size what I have now with conventional housing. When Bill 17 is in place, you can't even change over to different production systems.

Where does that leave me now? That leaves me with the only option to do what I did before. There's probably still somebody that is willing to buy these pigs for a discounted price. What does that mean long term to my investment? Well, you know, for the feeding it makes no difference if you have a small farm or a big farm. There is still the sows eat the same amount of feed. There will be no savings.

The same is for replacing your herd. The cost per sow, you still need to replace them for breeding. There are no big savings. From a cost wise, on the straight cost of production, the big difference will be in revenue. You get a lot less for pigs.

What that means in real life, the margin that you have—what is left to pay wages including your own wage, and the money that you have left to pay principle and interest on the mortgage on your investment—is a lot smaller. What that means when you want to sell your farm, there's not much margin left in that business. You basically only can sell it for next to nothing. That means all your equity, what you have invested in the farm, has basically gone down the drain, because you are not capable to respond to new demands of the market whatsoever.

When I was coming from Switzerland, we were very heavily regulated by government for—

Mr. Chairperson: You're at nine minutes, sir.

Mr. Gsell: Okay, I try to keep it short. You were very heavily regulated by government.

When I was coming to Manitoba, I didn't have much money to spend on land. My farm has only 80 acres of land; 60 acres is in crop production; the other 20 acres are yard. You don't need to be a rocket scientist to find out that 60 acres of land for 650 sows never, ever is going to work with nutrition. That's the reason why I have chosen the Red River Valley, because all the land around my farm is crop land.

There is no other livestock close to my farm. I don't talk about whole quarters surrounding my barn; I talk about whole sections around my barn. There is no other livestock; there are no hogs, no dairy, no chicken, no horses, nothing. There is absolutely nothing. That was the reason why I went out there; I have lots of land to spread all the manure in an environmentally friendly way.

I have a lagoon that is large enough to hold—I have a capacity for more than one year. I use phytase to be able to reduce the phosphorus amount in my feed. A custom manure applicator is applicating the manure to my neighbour's field. He has a GPS on his equipment; he can spread it out very evenly. We test the manure, before we spread it out, for nitrogen.

Because it's a small farm that I have, I don't produce that much manure. We are spreading between five and a half and 6,000 gallons an acre. The amount that we actually spread with the nutrients on the land is not enough to cover up the production level that they are doing in the Red River already. Basically, I'm using phytase to reduce the phosphorus amount in manure. My neighbours with the grain farmers—they're going and topping it up with chemical fertilizers by seeding, because it's actually not even enough for the requirements of the crops.

That ban—what the government tries to do—is, for me, really hard to understand, especially when you see the area where I am and especially when you look at the R.M. of Morris.

* (22:40)

I just want to make a quick comparison. The R.M. of Morris is the same size, like the canton—it's the same, like the province here in Canada, where I come from. The R.M. of Morris is 2,650 people; the town of Morris is 1,660 people. The area where I come from, which is the same land area like Morris has, the R.M. of Morris, one-quarter is forest and has

a population of 230,000 people. We have in the same area also 45,000 dairy cows plus replacement heifers. We have 220,000 market hogs. I don't know how many chickens and chicks and everything else who's running around, but, when you look the density of livestock and the density of people where I come from compared to Manitoba, it's unbelievable to find such a piece of legislation even on the table. It's—sorry, but I think it's the complete wrong way to do the—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gsell, you don't have much time left and there are three people that want to put questions to you. Would you consider taking those questions?

Mr. Gsell: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You would. Okay, and I'm going to ask the participants to be very quick because time is short, starting with Mr. Struthers.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, David. Can you—there are only a couple more presenters. I'd like to talk—hook you up with some of my officials because I'm not sure we have a problem with—first I'm going to say I'm not sure I understand this, so I'll be honest enough to say that, but if I could hook you up with some of my officials I'd like to be able to see if this could be done.

Can you meet with us after? If not, can you put it in writing and send it to me and then we can have something to go on and follow up on it?

Mr. Gsell: I'm not quite sure if I understood from which part.

Mr. Struthers: I don't know if you're talking about an increase in animal units. What we're concerned with is the amount of manure that comes from those animal units, so if I can get a better understanding of the proposal I think then we can work with you to see if we can actually pull it off, should this moratorium come into place.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. The minister is offering the services of his most senior staff to you to help you possibly work out the details of your operation so I will leave you with that and I will move on to Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: In your proposal you were talking about leaving your operation in animal units the same, and that's the same proposal that we had talked about earlier with Mr. Kroeker and we know very clearly because we asked the minister this question, and if he is going to allow the deputy to make that

decision with you that changes this bill significantly. Would your lagoon have to be expanded if you stay with the same animal units, changing your operation the way you want to do it?

Mr. Gsell: No, because lagoon is already big enough. There would be no need to increase the size of the lagoon when you have the same amount of livestock what you have now.

Mr. Gerrard: I think what you're saying, which we've heard in slightly different ways from a number of other hog producers, is that one of the major problems with this bill is it drastically reduces the flexibility of farmers to adjust to changing market conditions and that is one of the reasons why Bill 17 is such a bad bill and will have such a terrible impact on the industry.

Mr. Gsell: Yes, I agree with it, because I grew up on a dairy farm in Switzerland and the Swiss government was putting dairy quotas in '76. They used just the base here of '72, '73. They tied it down to the land. There was no quota exchange, no—you couldn't buy nothing. My grandfathers built a new barn in '67 for 23 cows. In the beginning of the '70s this was a viable option for a whole family to live. My family was living for over 300 years on that farm but because we had that stupid regulations that you weren't able to increase the milk quota, but, on the other hand, our cows got better and better. Like, they went from 3,800 kilos per cow in 1967 to 8,500 in 2000. We had to reduce the herd every year, basically.

When we quit farming it was 10 cows. Well, what's the point? Nobody could make a living on 10 cows. That's why I actually walked off our family farm even when it was over 300 years in our family. I'm afraid the same will happen here now when Bill 17 comes in place, that I'm stuck with no operation now. Now, well, times are bad, but, normally, you should have been able to make a living of it, but then you are just tied down what you have now for the next 10, 20 years. I'm 38 years old now, so it will be gone.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you very much, sir, for your presentation.

Mr. Joe Marshall, No. 209. Mr. Marshall, do you have any written documentation for the committee? You do? You may begin, sir.

Mr. Joe Marshall (Private Citizen): Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Joe Marshall. I've been working in the construction of hog barns for the last

20 years. Since I started I've seen a lot of changes in the hog industry, good and bad. In making this speech, I had the option of saying bad things about the government, but what's the use? It's easy to pick apart any line of thought. So, with that in mind, I've chosen not to trash, but instead talk positive. I've chosen to say thanks to the hog industry in general for the last 20 interesting years in which my wife and I raised two wonderful girls and spent wonderful times travelling and boating. I would like to say thanks to all the wonderful people I've met along the way from all the general contractors to the awesome meals at the colonies. Thanks.

We've learned a lot about how to build a barn that will last a lifetime. Trials and errors have slowly improved the building over the years. Different construction materials and hog barn designs have improved over time to where the air quality is good. You don't even know you're in a barn with all the improvements in feed, dust control, quality lighting, tenderfoot—the pigs never had it so good. We have gone from barns with pigs that squeal all the time to quite laid-back pigs that you'd swear were on holidays. We have learned how even mice invasion can affect air quality. I've even seen a barn that has rusted away because of mice. Yes, we've made a lot of improvements over the years from learning that Galvalume metal doesn't last long on barns to barns that can't burn down.

It has been an interesting trip. The barn I'm presently working on would make even the hardest critic blush—sows in open pens and everything computerized. I'm amazed how advanced farms are now, all run like a factory. Every pig is monitored. The same sow can be fed all the right nutrients at certain times through her pregnancy. Before, if you let a sow into a pen with others after she is weaned, she'd be picked on and maybe killed, but now they let them in in groups so they stick together and not picked on.

The barn I'm working on has something incorporated into it that surprised the heck out of me, and that's a school. Imagine that when new sows are introduced to this barn, they have to go to a mini-school set up in the barn so they learn how to feed themselves, automated feeding. There are so many small but important features to this barn, it's mind boggling. It seems like all the problems associated with pig barns are being worked out. Even the Humane Society could learn from this one. From planning a shelterbelt to manage smell, having gravel surround the barn to keep rodents away, Manitoba is

unique in its ability to freeze out a barn. I'm not sure if this is an advantage or a curse, but we have that ability.

* (22:50)

Always remember, food has to be produced somewhere in the world. Why not here? Why can't we set a standard for the world to manage hog production and have clear water at the same time? By adding things to the feed, we have shrunk the amount of phosphorus in the manure. We've come a long ways. The rest is easy. Maybe someday we'll have underground heating, sky-lighted barns with solar panel roofs, someday a super lagoon that will set an example for towns. Speaking of super lagoons, something new is being tried out in Manitoba that will lift everyone's spirits. They have tried similar things, but this one works. It's called a slurry buster. It's a biological ball that, when mixed with manure, starts a mixing process that doesn't smell. Some neighbours even comment on whether they have gone out of pigs. It doesn't form a crust so flies don't lay their eggs, so no flies. By mixing it internally, it holds the nitrogen and it captures ammonia and reduces odours. Some have even started using it in holding tanks beneath the hogs so the crust doesn't form, causing less smell in the barn also.

I talked to the owner about it, and it's like God's gift to all lagoons. No more agitating the lagoons to mix up the manure, so less damage to liners, and no smell. It deletes the smell by 80 percent and the sulphuric smell by 100 percent. It cuts the phosphates by 40 percent and it's broken down enough that plant life can use all the nutrients right away, so less chance to build up in the field. They have used it in human and animal lagoons with great success. They even have used it in ponds that have been filled with algae to the point no wildlife would use them, but a short while after treated, the ducks and wildlife have returned. Another great thing to come our way, so, with time, hog barns just might teach everyone how to manage their lagoon.

One such operation Bill 17 will affect is the one at Blooming Prairie Colony just by Homewood, Manitoba. We built a mechanical building about four years ago. Then we built a sow barn about three years ago. Last year they built their houses and bought up the amount of land they need for a sow and finisher barn. Now they're looking at building the last piece of the puzzle for their operation, which is a finisher barn. They have done all of the right things leading up to this and managed their spreading

according to the rules, but now they can't build the one thing that is needed for them to operate at peak performance. I ask you why. Thinking positive and working towards making hog production work is my frame of mind.

In conclusion, I'd like to say all of us here today should take a really good look at ourselves and ask ourselves, why are we here? We have learned so much and can learn so much more by moving forward. Bill 17 is a backwards move. Successful governments and businesses don't practise going backwards. They work through their problems and work towards a better tomorrow, one filled with fine food and water. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Marshall, for a very informative presentation. I open the floor to Mr. Gerrard.

Mr. Gerrard: I'm just, first of all, interested in the finisher barn. Was the problem started with the pause, and the pause and now the moratorium have meant that they've not been able to proceed with the finisher barn?

Mr. Marshall: With Bill 17, they won't be able to do their finisher barn. They've got their sow barn and they've built all the other buildings. Now the finisher barn is what they need to—was that the question?

Mr. Gerrard: Since the pause was put on, they've not been able to build the finisher barn.

Mr. Marshall: Yeah.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. Indeed, it was very interesting, as the Chairperson pointed out. My question to you is, what impact is this going to have on your business? Where are you going to be if Bill 17 passes?

Mr. Marshall: I'm thinking of phasing out. Like, I'm mainly in the roofing business. I've been doing all the big barns. I've done, I don't know, maybe 4 million square feet, something like that, over the years. Yes, even, like, a couple of years ago, it started to slow down with just the bad times with hogs. I go up and down with the hog production, but this is making me think of phasing out.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further questions? Seeing none, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

I now call Ms. Betty Siemens? Ms. Siemens, do you have a written presentation or anything for us?

Mrs. Betty Siemens (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Proceed, please.

Mrs. Siemens: My name is Betty Siemens. I'm from Morris, Manitoba. I'm speaking out against Bill 17. My husband I lived on our family farm for almost 40 years. We both grew up on a farm and chose to make a living that way. We also believe the farm is a good place to teach our children a good work ethic and responsibility. We worked together through the ups and downs of our business. We built our first hog barn in 1978 and decided to build a new, bigger, better one in 2002. The outlook for our industry then looked so good. We had no idea what tough times lay ahead. My husband and I now are just over 65 and recently retired, though still on the farm with our youngest son, his wife and four young children. We all love the farm. We love to work, and we love to share our material blessings with others. We also employ 15 workers. We now are facing bankruptcy and rather than support from our government we feel they work against us. Please reconsider Bill 17 and let honest, hardworking people feel the support we need during these critical times. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Siemens. Questions from the committee? Seeing none, ma'am, I thank you for your presentation.

I call Mr. Ernie Siemens. Mr. Siemens, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ernie Siemens (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: Please proceed.

Mr. Siemens: I'll make it short. It's getting late. My name is Ernie Siemens. That was my wife, Betty. Explaining one little thing there, the 15 employees, that is actually on two farms. We have another 1,200 plus a 3,100-acre farm. We grew up on the farm. We were glad to be able to establish our sons, we have two sons, on the farm. Today I feel like the speaker here just a few hours ago said: It's actually child abuse putting a kid on a farm because of what is happening.

We're exporting our pigs, we're shipping them to the U.S. with complications that we have with COOL and so many other things. That is difficult enough without Bill 17. Sometimes I wonder, you know, will Bill 17 make a big difference. We haven't gotten paid for 20 weeks now for our pigs going across the States. We have to keep them; we can't sell them there; we have to raise them. So that magnifies the problem.

Whatever difference Bill 17 will make, it feels like somebody's kicking the dog while he's down. Somebody asked me, how does Bill 17 make you feel? I say, it feels like it hurts, that hurt that is upon us, that's around us and another worry that we have as hog farmers. I would very much encourage that we use common sense and science, use consideration, we leave politics out of this and go ahead with planning our farms, making it possible for our farmers that want to farm so they can be able to farm.

*(23:00)

I think I can give some advice to all politicians here this evening. That is, do a little less politicking and care for the people that you are working for. That is, looking after that free trade agreement that we had with the U.S. With that in mind, we built our barns, and we contracted with producers in the States. Now, somehow, the U.S. government can come up and change a lot of things so that—well, that COOL thing which makes it so uncertain. That is why we cannot get our payments from the States. Now, the buyer that is buying our pigs I believe is a sound, honest buyer, but it simply makes it impossible for him to sell our weanlings there. So I would very much ask that our provincial government, our federal government, work on this, that the COOL thing be straightened out.

The other thing that I was going to touch on was all those regulations that we're getting, and they are just simply too many. Now, we want to do what is best for our farm. We want to do what is best for the environment, but it just seems regulation upon regulation coming from you people here, I think it is too much. Every one of them costs money and every time there's a regulation, there should be an increase in the price of hogs, which doesn't happen. We are hoping that it will, or else we'll be out of business very shortly anyway.

Another thing, as far as what Bill 17 would do for us, we also, because of our exporting, people are asking us out there to bring our pigs up at least four days in age so we need more farrowing rooms. Well, with this moratorium on there, that will not be possible. We will have to farrow fewer sows in order to satisfy the customers out there. It's not impossible but it's inefficient, and today, our weanling production has to be efficient. We have this 1,200-sow barn and we have a 3,000-sow barn. The 3,000-sow barn can produce weanlings a fair amount cheaper, something like \$2 to \$3 a piece cheaper, so

if we have to cut down on weanlings produced, yeah, it will just not be as efficient.

I don't have to tell you what the cost of transportation is today. It is huge, so we are very fortunate that we can almost fill up a truck every week. We're getting by, but again, I would just like to emphasize that let's scrap Bill 17. It's going to be a real, real inconvenience, and for some, it'll be—simply have to quit the business. A lot of people will not be able to handle that and it'll become less efficient. The other thing that I want to repeat and emphasize is that I realize that politicians have to be politicians, but please look after your people and make sure that they are looked after first. As far as relationship with the U.S., as far as their COOL thing, which we feel is totally just not right. They're taking advantage of something because we are one-tenth the size of them. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir, for your presentation.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Ernie and Betty. Thanks for hanging in there. I guess the two of you are our last presenters tonight, as far as I know. That takes a lot of perseverance. You probably learned that over a number of years in farming.

Whether or not we agree on Bill 17, whether or not we agree or disagree on other things, I think it needs to be put on the record, and I'm sure others will join with me around the table in saying that your generation of farmer deserves a lot of credit for the building that they've done in our province and the leadership for the next generation of farmer.

Politicians may be politicians but I think sometimes we have to just give credit where credit is due and you and Betty and your generation deserve a lot of credit for the work you've done. I also want to honestly say that you may not be real happy with the provincial government and Bill 17, but I think your community of Morris understands the commitment that you've made and the building you've done there. Thank you very much for coming and seeing us tonight.

Mr. Chairperson: Comment, Mr. Siemens? We'll move on to Mr. Swan.

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Competitiveness, Training and Trade): Thank you, Mr. Siemens. I'm the Minister responsible for Trade so I just want to speak briefly about your comments on COOL

You've asked the politicians to do a little bit less politicking, and I can assure you that all of the prairie provinces, whatever their political stripe, are united on this. There was a letter that went jointly from the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba calling on the federal government to deal with this. I can tell you that, together with my counterparts from the other prairie provinces, I did deliver that message to Minister Emerson and to Ambassador Wilson at a meeting in Ottawa at the end of March.

I had to spend a bit of time educating some other provinces across the country on the importance of this, but when you're talking about COOL, I saw a lot of heads on both sides of the table nodding. I don't know what we can do at this point, but the Province of Manitoba, not the democrats or conservatives, the Province of Manitoba understands that concern and we'll do whatever we can to try and reverse what I think is a very damaging policy that the American government tells us they intend to bring in.

Mr. Chairperson: Response, Mr. Siemens?

Mr. Ernie Siemens: Well, I'd just like to thank you for that. I believe that and somehow we're maybe not hearing enough of it out on the farm, but, yeah, I'm sure this will be a concern for all of you. I'm thanking you for it.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Ernie and Betty, for staying and being so patient.

Two things that you talked about were with NAFTA, and mostly in reference, I'm sure, to COOL. But if there's ever a time for an industry to be able to pull together, it's now, and I know Bill 17 couldn't come at a worse time. When you put uncertainty in the marketplace, uncertainty on an industry, it puts so much more stress on that industry as a result of that. One little simple thing that you mentioned in regard to—which will have an impact on COOL and NAFTA—and that's changes in adapting. You're the third person that brought this up today: changes in the marketplace in order to be able to adapt. Yes. One or two or three days seems like eternity no matter whatever business you're in where if you can't get those animals out, and what Bill 17 does, is lock you into where you can't do anything.

So that's why we've got to get rid of this bill and work together on a common ground where we can make those necessary changes and work with your organization, and work with the provincial

government and the federal government, in order to ensure that this business is viable long-term.

So thank you very much for your presentation. I think it was bang on.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for your presentation.

I think you will find that all three parties are very strongly against the country-of-origin labelling, and would very much like to do everything we can to make sure it doesn't have the impact that it could have.

I mean there are really two strategies. One is to fight it for all you're worth, which is what we're trying at the moment. The other, I know, is that some hog producers made the decision that they were going to try and finish the hogs here, and in some cases, that effort has been thwarted by the pause and now by Bill 17. So the ability to adjust, should country-of-origin labelling come in, is dramatically affected by Bill 17 because, well, the strategy of finishing the animals here, and then marketing them in Asia means it makes it impossible if you can't make the changes that are needed in the industry, to adapt to the changes in market.

Maybe you could comment on that.

Mr. Ernie Siemens: Well, our experience was that just before the pause came in, we were able to squeeze in a holding barn for our weanlings, and if we would not have been able to do that at that time, we would be really, really suffering. Let's say, now, we couldn't keep our weanlings till, you know, the truck was full. We'd have to, you know, maybe ship them twice a week or whatever, or for sure every week. Now, in emergency we can hold them on, hold those weanlings till the buyers at the other end have a place for them. So, yes. As far as building feeder barns and everything else, no, that is out of the question. We don't consider that at this point.

* (23:10)

Mr. McFadyen: Thank you, Mr. and Mrs. Siemens, for the presentations tonight and for being so patient in sitting through lots of other presentations. I hope, as we did, that you found value in listening to some of the other presentations as well. We've certainly benefited from your comments too, and just the call to all of us to be focussed on results, representing very well the people that we are meant to represent.

I just wanted to make an observation on the issue of COOL, that there is unanimous opposition within our country and among the parties here to COOL.

We don't have direct control over it, obviously. It's going through the United States system, but we have to do everything in our power to try to influence policy south of the border. Obviously, it's much easier to influence policy south of the border when we show leadership on this side of the border, in terms of the things that are within the direct control of the government.

Part of our concern about the NDP's promotion of Bill 17 is that it certainly weakens our position when we want to talk to the United States about reasonable regulations, free trade and adopting a pro-industry attitude. It's hard to take that position and be taken seriously when you are doing things, within your own jurisdiction, to punish the very producers that you purport to be standing up for.

I would say that more as a message to the members opposite than to you, that we hope they will consider how Bill 17 hurts their position.

I want you to just take note of the fact that, as discouraged as you may feel right now about Bill 17 and the general economic conditions and challenges, the good news here is there was an attempt on the part of the NDP to have this bill passed by June 12.

We're pleased that, in part because of pressure which we applied, they agreed to delay that until October to allow for more time for people like you, and others, to come forward and speak and for all legislators to hear those comments.

I'm going to make a statement, based on speculation that the origin of this bill was, in our view and based on what we understand the Premier's (Mr. Doer) office and not particularly any of the people who are sitting at the table tonight, even though the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) is valiantly defending it at this stage—what I can say is that, even if this bill passes in October, there will be an election two and a half years after that. There will be an opportunity for the people to have a say at that stage.

We hope that whether it's our party or one of the other parties, whatever happens, there will be leadership in the province that will come to their senses and repeal Bill 17 at that stage. I would just say, don't give up hope. I'm going to make a prediction that, at worst, you are going to have to deal with it for two and a half years, and no longer than that.

Mr. Chairperson: Comment, Mr. Siemens.

Mr. Ernie Siemens: We hope that bill will be dropped, especially my youngest son, James. He has the newer barn, the smaller barn, a little less efficient; he is at the point of giving up. I try to encourage him to keep on going and he says, yes, but what's the use? Bill 17 is next. It's tough. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir.

That concludes all of my lists. Is there anybody in the crowd this evening that hasn't yet presented, that wants to present? Now is your opportunity.

Mr. Eichler: Would the committee be prepared to call it 12 o'clock?

Mr. Chairperson: That's a yes. I have just a few closing remarks here.

As was announced in the House on June 4, the committee will sit again on the following occasions: Monday, June 9, 10 a.m. to noon, and again at 6 p.m.; Tuesday, June 10, at 6 p.m.

For the purpose of conserving paper, it would be appreciated if committee members could leave behind any unused copies of the bill.

The hour being 12 o'clock, committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 11:14 p.m.

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED
BUT NOT READ**

Re: Bill 17

I am in favour of passing Bill 17 – banning the expansion of hog bans in Manitoba. In my opinion it is NOT a good scenario to have large uncontrolled concentrations of ANY animal project. All the money in the world will not help us if we allow our water supplies to become contaminated.

"A stitch in time saves nine" – not to mention the billions of dollars required to rectify a polluted water system. Just consider Lake Winnipeg. Clean water is a necessity. Now is the time to take appropriate action.

Thank you.

Elaine Henrotte, Lundar, Manitoba

* * *

Re: Bill 17

As a concerned affected citizen, mother and family-community member of an area that has had massive expansion in the hog industry for the past two decades, I am writing to you to express my

extreme concern over the unclear direction, the lack of strict regulations and the necessary funding in order to get a control over this environmental and animal welfare harming intensified confined hog industry.

No other industry has ever abused the people's resources, energies, relationships, environment and well-being than that of the hog industry. The Clean Environment Commission, the Auditor General, the International Institute for Sustainable Development, Water Stewardship, your own department, non-governmental organizations and the general public for the past ten years plus have all been saying and documenting that this intensified hog industry is out of control and leaving in its wake a path of adverse effects that only time shall be able to cure.

Time is what it has all come down to, Time.

Full ban on still means nine million hogs in our province.

Time can no longer be a part of this game of economy versus environmental sustainability because, as we all know, everything starts to double every seven years or less. We cannot afford to lose more water, land or air resources to an industry that does not even have as many regulating resources as even one local school.

The past ban on the hog industry served society and the industry well, as will a continued future ban on the hog industry for the whole province and for all intensified confined livestock operators.

If you are the small family farmer then all other restrictions and regulations apply to you.

The proposed changes to the amendment of the LMMMR are far too broad and once again leave healthy future of our sacred environment up to the power of one. This is unacceptable to the people and the long-term health of our children's future and environment.

Agriculture is changing as fast these days as technology has in our past. But Manitoba with her suffering skin (land), breath (air) and her blood (water) as the world knows can no longer sustain any more overloading or even the continued rate of application of toxins and nutrients to her body.

The CEC report, the ISSD report and the Auditor General's report all reflect this growing concern of a need for a pause, study, regulations, enforcement, funding, better communication and systems put into place to effectively deal with the agriculture

industry. A barn of 1,000 animals does not equal our heritage farmers of 100 animals who raised their animals on straw outside with shelter.

One hog equals 10 people's waste. So nine million hogs waste is way too much manure for hog alley or all of southern Manitoba to try and use up. We all know it is running off the land. We literally see and smell it. Of course, we do, nine million hogs would be like dumping all of Canada's human waste into our tiny little southern Manitoba and expecting the crops to use up every drop of phosphate, nitrate, drugs and pathogens, NOT, and hence we have unsafe water and an abused environment.

The fact that our agriculture lands drain straight to the waterways and every R.M. has tripled their drainage capacity in order to allow for more industry and to aid Manitoba Hydro in providing every possible drop of water to run their dams, has assisted in the sad results of seeing our lakes and rivers turn toxic blue green right before our very eyes.

It does not make any sense to step back and to remove the province wide ban when there has not been one environmental sign of improvement anywhere.

The financial industry has undergone regulatory processes and strict enforcement that has put some of the industry out of business. That, too, includes the family operators and corporations but these moves are necessary due to the changing face of the financial global industry. Do we hear them singing the blues? No, they take the changes in stride with an evolving global sustainable society.

We, the people, expect the same straightforwardness and accountability of the government to regulate the agriculture industry. The studies and decades of reports have been done, the locals know and live in the negative environmental effects of this new type of intensified confined livestock operations daily. We are definitely getting sick and tired of living with the very scary side effects of this overloading of the nutrients of the agriculture industry.

The science is there that links the lightning, hail, winds, rain, tornadoes, disease and disease pathogens, antibiotics and floods to the overloading of nutrients to the landscape of Manitoba. Gimli's scary tornado event last year was a fine example of this stress and the unsustainable agriculture practices that society and the environment can no longer have inflicted upon us.

We are not reinventing the wheel here. All other hog alleys worldwide have gone through these negative effects and necessary banning of further development of an industry!

Environmentalists' studies demonstrate as shown in detail in the Clean Environment Commission hog hearings reports that the Hog Industry is responsible for around 8 percent of the nutrient loading to Lake Winnipeg. The 1 percent myth is the pork industry not taking full responsibility for the actual waste they produce. They are fooling no one.

Interesting enough, as I talk to the local farmers and community members of the R.M.s of Ritchot, Hanover and Tache, hog alley, many of the senior farmers, business people and local citizens state right out that it was and is high time the government put a ban on the hogs and it really should have been done five years ago, as the signs were already there then.

Signs of the falling apart of the hog industry, how the big guy was getting richer and the little guy was losing his shirt and being pushed out of farming altogether. How the water was being over consumed and contaminated. And most important how the past and existing regulations means nothing to the ILOs, colonies and big players. They know the regulators and their schedules of making their rounds to inspect and they just make sure things are cleaned up for that time and then they go back to spreading, over spilling, dumping, burying, unloading like they always have done since the beginning of time. That they shall just spread right before or during the rain or snow and Mother Nature will do her thing and spread it about. That no one really monitors the soil testing, that they can take a sample from anywhere, anytime and send it in.

The locals say that the government should take a much closer look at the big players in the pork industry and what they are dictating for these smaller farmers to do in order to meet the hog capacity. That absolutely this industry does not have the quality, integrity and sustainability that it once had even 15 years ago and it is going to hit the fan and way sooner than they think.

It is time for our leaders to stand behind these truths and not give into this hog industry and or we can collectively further kiss our natural environment's health goodbye.

What amazes me is that all other polluting industries or industries who do not meet regulations, stories-truths get told publicly and properly dealt

with but this industry gets a whole dose of procrastination, finger shaking and subsidies.

The industry claims they are not being treated fairly. However, society reflects the intolerance of over abuse of any and every kind right now, including the hog industry and especially when it comes to the overall health of the people, animals and environment.

In conclusion, the ban for the three designated areas stays on and gets extended to include the whole province immediately.

Please amend Bill 17 to reinstitute a province-wide moratorium on the construction or expansion of confined livestock operations for pigs until such time as;

a) all the recommendations contained in the Office of the Auditor General of Manitoba's 2007 Report on the Audit of the Department of Conservation's Management of the Environmental Livestock Program are implemented;

b) the regulation of phosphorus application to land is limited to marginally more than what growing crops required as a fertilizer each year, and;

c) a public consultation process on each of the December 2007 Clean Environment Commission's Report, "Environmental Sustainability and Hog Production in Manitoba" recommendations has been completed.

The hog industry has had the last 20 years and now the people, animals and environment have to have the next ten plus years in order to set up the systems, have time to heal and clean up the damage that has been done by these confined mega industrial operations. Province-wide hog ban on, please!

I know you all know this information to be true. It is not meant to be personal.

We have no choice but to do better for our children and to protect and restore our natural resources and water energy.

You, our leaders and committee members can do this. We do believe in you. You can make our beaches a safe place for our children to play again! For those of us who live in the south, hog alley, we look forward to our families and pets to be able to safely drink from our wells again. We look forward to the day when we can open our house windows or play outside without needing to gag from the stench

of liquid manure overwhelming our personal spaces! It never used to be like this.

We want our natural safe environment back. It is our right!

"It's time to put the friendly back into Manitoba farming" <http://www.friendlymanitoba.org>

Thank you for your time and attention for regulating this changing face of industrial agriculture versus family farming.

Gratefully yours,

Cheryl Kennedy Courcelles

P. S. Please take the time to look at these attached photos, movies, stories and official reports about the truths of the mega-hog industry.

Full Ban ON!

* * *

Re: Bill 17

John H. Morrison is a farmer residing in the Rural Municipality of Rosser. Mr. Morrison is a past president of the Rockwood Agricultural Society, a past member of the Angus Reid Focus Group for the implementation of the farms support programs (AIDA) formed to assist the provincial government. He has served in several capacities as a farm leader and is currently the vice-president of the Concerned Citizens of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed (CCSCW).

Concerned Citizens of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed (CCSCW) was formed some two years ago to address the failure of the Provincial Government to limit the inflow of water into the Sturgeon Creek Watershed and to alleviate overland flooding of agricultural lands due to that inflow and the restrictions in the outflow used to protect Winnipeg from flooding.

Bill 17 is an inappropriate and unreasonable attempt to Limit or Ban Hog Facilities that is not supported by science, the findings of the Clean Environment Commission nor the studies funded and directed by the Conservation Department nor the Department of Agriculture and Rural Initiatives. Further, a substantial number of the noted areas included in Section 40.1 are not at any substantive risk environmentally from a concentration of hog operations or considered expansions of hog operations due to current legislation, planning requirements and the Livestock Manure Management

and Mortalities Act (LMMMA). The publication of proposed Bill 17 has led to the tightening of review on applications of all types of confined livestock operations in the noted areas and has led to further negative economical pressures to all producers in those areas. A common voice in the rural communities is that all confined livestock operations in these areas are now prevented or limited in development at the stroke of a pen even without the implementation of this bill.

LMMMA outlines the operation size and restrictions of operations based on the area afforded for manure operations and MAFRI has the ability under that Act to review and place limitations and recommendations on proposed operations or expansions. It is accepted as the standard and is based on recognized science and support by the lower levels of municipal government and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and its farm development and support department PFRA. Farmers also support this by consensus as to the necessity to limit the density of large producers of manure to the available acres for dispersal of nitrates and phosphates.

In making this presentation I will now go on to show that the focus and direction of this government in putting forward the proposed changes to the Environment Act is neither appropriate nor reasonable and to raise the core issue that should be addressed.

As it rained a substantial amount on Friday and the forecast is for continuing rain for Saturday. "The Government of the Province of Manitoba is 'one inch' away from being recognized as legally responsible for the largest intake of phosphates and nitrates into Lake Winnipeg for the 2008 year and one step closer to an irreversible environmental disaster. The cause of this environmental disaster is the overland flooding of agricultural lands due to the failure of government to properly manage the Provincial Drainage System." Further, it appears that the Province of Manitoba is attempting to cover up their responsibilities and their previous actions in this matter. I base this statement on the following information relating to the Sturgeon Creek Watershed, the actions of government relating to the information they have received and the failure of the government to address these issues.

I will also refer to the basis science provided by Don Flaten and others as they have attempted to provide guidance and understanding to those not directly involved in agriculture and in attempting to address

Bill 17. I will underscore the following information on my personal knowledge and supported facts.

Almost all living matter gives off phosphates and nitrates in its plant growth, feces and decomposition. Frozen land and controlled drainage from agricultural land have a natural limiting of nitrates and phosphates uptake into spring runoff and subsequently into Lake Winnipeg. Land, however, once free of frost and inundated with water, as with overland flooding after the spring thaw, is very susceptible to uptake of these nutrients by dissolving into the water and by the "floating away" of plant matter and its subsequent decay in the water body. The decay of organic matter in water has the additional negative impact of removing oxygen from the water body and has caused "fish to drown."

The Province of Manitoba, through its drainage mismanagement, expansion of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed beyond its original boundaries and attempts to maintain restrictions to prevent Winnipeg flooding during times of summer rains, have caused and will cause overland flooding of agricultural lands and subsequent substantial environmental and economic damage to the lands and to Lake Winnipeg. This substantially exceeds any risk from hog operations in the area.

In referring to Bill 17 and Section 40.1 and the Sturgeon Creek Watershed and the indications provided by Conservation that the Interlake was included in Bill 17 as it was "wetlands" and to debunk that position taken by the department, I am able to provide the following supported information:

1. As the current owner-operator of a family farm in the Municipality of Rosser that has been in our family since 1892, past records and available information show that following drainage projects in the 1930's and 1940's to drain lower lying areas that our land is prime agricultural land and could not be considered in any way as wetland. The majority (over 75%) of the agricultural lands in the municipalities of Rockwood, Rosser and Woodlands would meet that same standard. The Colony Creek, Omand and Sturgeon Creek drained watersheds commanded a watershed area of approximately 115 square miles in 1945.
2. In the 1960's a diversion using funds from the Province and a F.R.E.D. agreement with the federal government led to a diversion of East, West and Central Colony Creeks and Omand Creeks into Sturgeon Creek, effectively

- diverting all water flow from Omand and Colony Creeks into Sturgeon and the loss of the flow capacity and volumes in Omand Creek through Winnipeg into the Assiniboine.
3. Following this diversion my farm and many others suffered from overland flooding when the water flow exceeds the capacity of Sturgeon Creek and the restrictions in place that effectively protect Winnipeg from flooding further downstream--+- caused backup and overland flooding.
 4. The Diversion and subsequent increased in drained areas of poor quality agricultural lands by the Province have expanded the watershed to currently over 200 square miles and the addition of Shoal Lake overflows that originally would have entered Lake Manitoba are now diffusing into the Sturgeon Creek Watershed and Lake Winnipeg and specifically increasing flow volumes and intensity of overland flooding in the lower Interlake area.
 5. The province was aware of these problems and design defects and, still in the 1960's, partly diked our farmland to attempt to protect our land from some of that flooding. (This was not successful).
 6. Each year we see over 80 acres (of a half section) under water due to water back from Colony Creek at least once a year after spring thaw. The Province has been well aware of this and when area surveys were completed by Rosser Agri-Business and South Interlake Agricultural Society on area flooding problems Premier Doer responded to the information provided to his office at a media scrum following the budget announcement. A copy of the letter reminding the Premier of this commitment to fix the problems is included in this presentation and is clear on details.
 7. I made a presentation to the Capital Regions Review Commission on behalf of the South Interlake Agricultural Society that is included in their reference materials and led to recommendations by the Commission that the Province and City of Winnipeg in conjunction with the rural municipalities address the drainage concerns to protect the investments of the agricultural communities. While Premier Doer has cited the report and the recommendations as an instrument of partnership for the future, to date his office, Conservation and Agriculture have not provided a resolution nor moved one shovel of dirt to alleviate the limitations of flow from Sturgeon Creek into the Assiniboine River. In that presentation I cited the losses of organic material and applied fertilizers and the economic losses suffered by farmers due to this water backup and overland flooding with supporting information.
 8. Approximately two years ago area farmers, still suffering substantial losses, formed the group, which I now represent (CCSCW). Almost at the same time the Province chose to fund a study of Sturgeon Creek Watershed with UMA Consulting. Of which a copy of a page of substantive importance is provided that depicts the overland flood damage area of approximately what happened a short four years ago. This document does however underestimate the flooded area as in that year over 160 acres of my home site was under water as well as substantial of my neighbours who went boating in their fields but this is not depicted in the map. Amazing as it may sound it appears that Conservation will not allow the study to see the light of day. What I believe is the reason I will raise shortly. I am aware of only one other party beside myself that has a copy of the study noted.
 9. Most importantly to you as the Standing Committee to consider is that only following that wet year was Lake Winnipeg identified as at environmental risk with high nitrate and phosphate levels. Testing and evaluation of fish stocks and levels in Lake Winnipeg graphically support that overland flooding in Manitoba is a substantial contributor to the environmental risk to Lake Winnipeg and that this relationship places the environmental issue directly on the shoulders of government and not the agricultural producers.
 10. Last year I filed an application with the Manitoba Farm Stewardship Program for funds to move my cattle operations further from the overland flood-prone area only to find out that this would not be a funded project as it was not a wetland according to the Province of Manitoba, though it met all other criteria. MAFRI is now closing down that program and in my mind putting the environment at risk by not affording funds to farmers to address environmental risk.
 11. There are logical and scientific studies and presentations that support the preceding

information and include those by the often-referred-to Don Flaten, as well as other presenters, as well as the crop production records held by MAFRI and MASC.

I, and many of my peers are left with the opinion that the government in Manitoba wishes to currently place the majority of the blame for the environmental issues at the feet of the hog producers. I am not one, but am seriously concerned that the mislabelling and accusations against hog producers will very soon be directed against other livestock producers and will now cite the real issue that his committee must consider in changing the Environment Act rather than placing unreasonable and unsupported demands or restrictions on any agricultural producers or sector.

1. The Province of Manitoba, as well as several Municipalities, has successfully been taken to court to pay damages for ditch backup or overland flooding. The basis and legal precedence are based on Trespass. In short order and which any legal authority may confirm is, should water leave the confines of your land or your vessel (ditch) and cause damages or financial losses to another party you are responsible for those losses and globally for the damages to the environment. The Province of Manitoba was involved in an appeal of one of those decisions and the legal basis is now considered as solid legal foundation.

2. The legal decisions also show that requirements were placed on the parties found at fault in these actions to correct the underlying problem that caused the backup of water onto the adjoining land. In the example of the Sturgeon Creek Watershed this could lead to the requirement for the removal of the restrictions to flow that now protect Winnipeg from flooding and the reopening of Omand Creek to flow through Winnipeg (a flood risk based on the current condition of that drain) as well as a requirement for a diversion from Sturgeon Creek directly to the Assiniboine west of Winnipeg to handle the increased watershed and flow volumes created by past drainage projects by the province to the watershed.

3. The Province was made aware of this issue but did not act immediately and the Municipality involved insisted that the Province approved the drainage of water body and fish habitat into the Sturgeon Creek Watershed. This was done while the federal Fisheries Act specifically outlawed any such damage to fish habitat or fish stocks. Fisheries and Oceans have

indicated that the Province is under investigation for this action. The Fisheries Act identifies that such damage is liable for a \$300,000.00 fine for those responsible.

4. As well as the Fisheries Act, the Province of Manitoba could face a requirement to provide remedial action to the water flow into Lake Winnipeg now that a health warning has been issued for water consumption from that lake. Ironically the Minister of Conservation took the position that the lands adjacent to Colony Creek were contaminated in the "Rosser Tire Fire" and went to the extent that an advisement those agricultural crops grown adjacent to the site were not to be sold or consumed. After several years of overland flooding at this site due to Sturgeon Creek backup I would expect that the contamination has now been moved into Lake Winnipeg. Also of interest is that Mr. Struthers nor the Premier has ever provided any neither scientific results nor compensation for the losses to the agricultural producers over the actions of the department. As well as any contamination, organic material, applied fertilizers and agricultural inputs have been lost and, most importantly, at what environmental risk?

5. The Province is currently replacing high capacity bridges in Sturgeon Creek Drain with smaller capacity culverts in highly productive agricultural lands. While it appears that this is being done to protect Winnipeg should the Province be required to remove the current flow restrictions in Winnipeg it would appear that this would substantially increase the overland flooding in some areas and the subsequent increase in nutrient loading in Lake Winnipeg. This underscores that the Province of Manitoba is effectively disregarding the environmental risks and damage they may cause.

Recommendations

There needs to be appropriate legislation to protect and provide remedial actions for environmental and agricultural production issues. However the proposed changes to the Environment Act must be nullified. Appropriate changes and requirements to be included in the Act should be:

1. That any party, including government identified as causing environmental risk or damage must be responsible for providing reparations and payment of identified losses.
2. That changes to legislation affecting environmental protection be based on scientific and

logical information and be addressed on the basis of ranking of risk.

3. That as the environmental risk based on livestock production is hand in hand with the nitrate and phosphate levels of all types of agriculture or of simple grasslands that a consideration of effective drainage control to prevent overland flooding of agricultural properties be a priority.

4. Using the expected one-in-ten-year model produced for the Province and shown here and understanding the principles of nitrates and phosphates in all organic organisms sometime in the next ten years there is likely to be an environmental calamity for Lake Winnipeg based on the overland flooding and uptake of nutrients that would be transported into Lake Winnipeg and an economic calamity for agriculture. There is no depiction of any such environmental risk of hog production nor any other livestock development with legislation that is already in effect.

While the Province may take issue with the costs and responsibilities outlined in this presentation there are economic opportunities to cover those costs:

1. It appears that when the Colony Creek Diversion was completed in the 1960's with federal money under a FRED grant Winnipeg was not in an area that was available for those funds and that the diversion's major benefit was to prevent flooding in Winnipeg and the project was actually detrimental for the intended FRED district. However this places the responsibility for remediation also on the shoulders of the federal government. An opportunity for joint funding for remedial work is therefore possible specifically in light of the environmental impact.
2. Funding by the federal government has been allocated for the remediation or protection of Lake Winnipeg. Those funds can be used to correct the cause of overland flooding based on the scientific information available. There is no scientific information to support that hog operations are at fault for the loading of Lake Winnipeg that I have been able to locate.
3. In a discussion with Steven Fletcher's office it was indicated that Building Canada funds are available for projects like an extra diversion project for Sturgeon Creek west of Winnipeg and Mr. Fletcher's assistant indicated a willingness to support funding due to the

positive effect on his constituents as well as the Manitoba rural economy and the environment.

4. As any diversion of water from within Winnipeg's boundary is beneficial to Winnipeg it is very reasonable to have Winnipeg assist in funding for the protection of its residents.
5. Reduction in crop insurance costs and expenditures under the farm support programs for agriculture.
6. The opportunity to retain a sustainable rural economy with opportunity for economic enhancements as the agricultural commodities allow.

Thank you.

John H. Morrison,
on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Sturgeon
Creek Watershed

* * *

Re: Bill 17

My name is Joe Dolecki and, in real life, I am an associate professor in, and chairperson of, the Economics Department of Brandon University. I would like to thank the committee for granting me this opportunity to offer a submission on Bill 17 for your consideration.

If you were to ask me today if I support the passage of this bill, my answer would be, "Yes, but..." In particular, it is my view that the principal strength of this bill is that it places a moratorium on new and expanding hog production facilities in certain areas of Manitoba. Its principal weakness is that it does not place such a moratorium on the rest of the province, which, in my view, is minimally necessary in order to achieve the stated objectives of the bill.

At the outset, I would like to say that my appearance before you today is in part inspired by the Manitoba Pork Council (MPC) and, in particular, the material it has posted on its "unfriendly Manitoba" Web site.

While reading through this material, I was reminded of something my father, who recently turned 90, told me many years ago. He said, "It is always easier to repeat a lie than it is to seek the truth." The MPC's unfriendly Manitoba campaign confirms, in my view, the wisdom of my father's words.

In the time I have remaining, I would like to briefly discuss six propositions advanced by the MPC on their site, and consider them in relation to Bill 17.¹ My comments primarily concern the ILO form of swine production.

1. The MPC consistently and falsely identifies ILO hog production as an agricultural activity, not unlike the traditional family farm. The clear suggestion here is that the environmental problems which, objectively, are actually specific to this form of production are problems ingredient in agricultural activity generally. This proposition is simply false. As Bill Weida, a resource economist from Colorado, notes, swine ILOs "are industries, not agriculture. They create industrial sized pollution and waste problems. They masquerade as agriculture because pollution and monitoring and pollution regulation are weaker in the agriculture sector."
2. The MPC consistently and falsely portrays ILO hog production as a significant engine of economic growth (\$1 billion/year) and job creation (15,000) for the Manitoba economy, particularly in rural areas. In fact, the alleged billion-dollar contribution is a gross figure, which is not based on "full-cost accounting," i.e. it does not include the attending health, social, and environmental costs. As well, the industry-friendly George Morris Center reports that in 2006 (the hog sector's last "good year"), the actual direct and indirect jobs attributed to hog production total only 4,776, which is hardly sufficient to inspire rural repopulation. Another 3,713 jobs are attributable to the packing component, making the industry total (8,489) a little over half that claimed by the MPC.
3. The MPC consistently and falsely claims that the industry is operating under the most stringent regulations in the country. In fact, as a posting on the MAFRI Web site states, "Government and industry continue to work together to ensure the success of the pork industry in Manitoba."

Among other things, this collaboration has resulted in the regulatory subsidization of the industry whose extent is not only significant, it is breathtaking. Indeed, the government's regulatory subsidy package has involved: (a) changes to the statutory framework (e.g. the adoption of the new Planning Act intended to facilitate the proliferation of swine ILOs as a matter of right); (b) changes to the regulatory structure within the Planning and Environment Acts (e.g. the new phosphorus regulation, which accommodates existing practices and constitutes a licence to pollute); (c) direct and indirect interference with decision-making in respect of swine ILOs at the municipal level (e.g. conditional use hearings and livestock operating policy development); (d) regulatory non-enforcement; and (e) public information accession impedance (e.g. the use of the FIPPA process and the Ombudsman to prevent public access to industry and government performance information, strengthened by the current proposed changes to FIPPA). All of these elements have facilitated the cost-shifting and cost avoidance from the hog industry and on to the public at large.

4. The MPC consistently and falsely claim that hog manure is a valuable, organic, natural by-product of its operations. In fact, in ILO hog operations, the livestock/land base ratio too large to permit it to be used exclusively as fertilizer. Indeed, the volume generated presents industrial livestock producers with a waste disposal problem, arguably a toxic waste disposal problem. Consequently, these producers systematically over-apply manure relative to crop requirements. Among other things, livestock waste applied in excess of agronomic rates becomes available for transport to surface waterways, with deleterious consequences.
5. The MPC consistently and falsely claims that ILO hog production is environmentally sustainable and that ILO hog producers are good environmental stewards. In fact, the hog industry's utilization of the environment—particularly for the disposal of livestock waste—is an industrial polluting practice, one that results in the degradation of our environmental resources, notably land and water. This practice conveys a considerable economic benefit to the industry, substantially reducing the ledger costs of production. Objectively, these costs of

¹ For a detailed background discussion of many of these points, see my submission to the CEC, "On the Sustainability of the Hog Industry in Manitoba" (2007), available on the CEC and Beyond Factory Farming Web sites.

production are shifted to the environment in the form of degradation, and to the users of the environment whose utilization of it is impaired by this degradation. In my submission to the CEC, I provided an estimate of the dollar value of this pollution subsidy to the industry in 2005 based on the estimate of the cost of industry compliance with the new phosphorus regulation, provided in a study by Salvino, Flaten, Grant and Johnson of the University of Manitoba. Applying this study's estimates to regulatory threshold of 60ppm (the "environmental" or "efficiency" threshold based on nutrient application equal to crop utilization rates), the magnitude of the industry's pollution subsidy worked out to be between \$111.44 million and \$128 million (minimum), depending upon the extent of phytase use. These subsidy amounts represent 111 and 125 percent of industry net income for 2005, and clearly suggest that, in the absence of this pollution subsidy alone, ILO hog production in Manitoba is neither economically viable nor sustainable within the meaning of The Sustainable Development Act.

Incidentally, the point was confirmed in the CEC report. At page 90, the CEC provides a MAFRI estimate of the compliance cost for 118 operations in two municipalities (Hanover and Labroquerie) of \$50.4 million. As well, in a submission to this committee yesterday, Mr. Bergman (Maple Leaf Foods) indicated that the cost of compliance with the P regulation would be between \$5.50-\$11/hog. Interestingly enough, if one applies this estimate to the environmental threshold of 60ppm, it would appear that my estimate of the pollution subsidy is low, out by a factor of two (2).

6. The MPC consistently and falsely claims that the hog industry has been willing to "partner" with government to see "solutions" to the environmental problems it creates, based on what is termed "sound science." In fact, what the industry is really saying is: "Let us continue with business as usual and if there is any environmental harm that results, the government should assume liability and the taxpayer should pay the costs of adjustment. Anything else is unfair." In other words, the precautionary principle and the polluter pay principle should not apply to the hog industry lest hog producers leave for more friendly jurisdictions.

It is the duty of government to protect the public interest. The protection of the environment is a fundamental public interest matter. Our land and water resources are essential components of this environment and demand protection from industrial-scale impairment. Bill 17, while significant, is insufficient to provide this protection. What is needed, I would submit, is something more. Indeed, as I recommended to the CEC, the moratorium on hog expansion should be extended to the entire province. Anything less would signal the government's acceptance of the manifestly false proposition that polluting industries can become environmentally sustainable simply by changing location. Indeed, the government ought to be considering and developing "exit strategies" that will provide for an efficient and orderly downsizing and decommissioning of the industry. Thank you.

J.F. Dolecki

Associate Professor and Chairperson
Department of Economics

Brandon University

* * *

Re: Bill 17

As a member of the Hutterian brethren I am extremely concerned with Bill 17. Bill 17 may be well intended, but it poses a serious threat to the Hutterian way of life. Hutterite communities in Canada have always relied heavily upon the hog industry to help supply the needs of their people. Should the proposed moratorium come into effect, it would seriously hinder the further expansion of the Hutterite communities. I hesitate to believe that this in any way reflected the intentions of the proponents of Bill 17.

However, in 1969 the government of Alberta passed a similar "well-intentioned" law known as the Communal Property Act. The Communal Property Act restricted Hutterite communities from any further development in that province. Instead of restricting the colonies' growth, it made it impossible for the colonies to exist or expand in Alberta. As a result, some of the colonies chose to move to the United States. Thankfully, the Communal Property Act was repealed in 1972. I urge the government of Manitoba to exercise caution in regards to the passage of Bill 17 as it might inadvertently have the same effect on the existence of the Hutterian communities in Manitoba.

As a third-generation Canadian, I have grown to love this country and this province. I also understand that we live in a time and era when we have to be concerned about the environment. Our land, our water and our air are precious commodities that we must not take for granted. As Kofi Annan, the former secretary-general to the United Nations so eloquently stated, "Let us be good stewards of the Earth we inherited from our parents. And let us preserve it for our children and their children after them."

Merriam-Webster's on-line dictionary defines stewardship as "conducting, supervising or managing of something entrusted to one's care." I honestly feel that Bill 17 is a step backward from "stewardship." Bill 17 does not concern itself with "supervising or managing" of our land. Instead, it simply freezes any further progress in either direction. In the last couple of years, various Hutterite communities have begun to experiment with alternative methods of handling waste from hog barns. This has included the harvesting of methane for purposes of reheating to various liquid and solid separation methods, which aim at reducing the pollution and nutrient contents of the manure. However, these colonies have received little help or support for their efforts.

Honourable members of the Parliament, we humbly ask that you work with us, not against us! For, as they say in Tibet, "With a stout heart, a mouse can life an elephant." Please let us work together to create a prosperous and healthier province, country and world. Thank you for your time.

Ian Kleinsasser

* * *

Re: Bill 17

Industrial Hog Barns - Overuse of Antibiotics
Occupational Health Considerations

Introduction

Workers in industrial hog barns will most directly and probably most profoundly be affected by the environmental impacts of the hog industry. The Environment Act should be a valuable legislative tool to help protect the health of workers.

The hog industry needs to be placed within the context of a sustainable development strategy to ensure the long-term health of workers and the affected communities. A comprehensive review of the potential environmental impacts would not be

complete without consideration of the occupational health risks related to the industry. The hog industry poses health risks to farm workers that must be addressed.

The MFL Occupational Health Centre (OHC) has established itself as an important community-based resource on occupational health and safety for workers and communities in Manitoba. The OHC is grounded in the belief that those people who share common health concerns must play an active role in addressing those concerns. Further, the community working together is better able to promote the health and well-being of its individual members and the community as a whole.

Our centre has a respected track record of addressing occupational health and safety issues. We presented at public hearings and also submitted written documents as part of the public consultative process at the Clean Environment Commission (CEC) hearings on a range of workplace health and safety issues (April 2007). However, today we will focus solely on the topic of the overuse of antibiotics in hog production and its impact on farm workers, their families and their community.

Context

Hog production has undergone rapid transformation from family-owned operations to large-scale industrial enterprises. An increasing percentage of pigs are being raised in large industrial hog barns. Size matters. When something goes wrong in a large hog barn, the potential risk for occupational and environmental damage is correspondingly large.

As a general principle, the concentration of humans or animals close to each other enhances potential spread of micro-organisms among members of the group. It also creates greater potential for infesting surrounding life forms, even those of different species. The conditions created also may become a breeding ground for new, more infectious or more resistant micro-organisms.

Published studies have documented that communicable diseases can be transmitted to workers as part of their work. The risk to acquire communicable disease from pigs increases if workers work with large numbers of hogs. Some workers come into contact with thousands of hogs each day. It is often difficult to assess the risk because workers may not know which hogs have infections. Pigs can

appear to be healthy, but may still be carrying disease.

The evolution of industrial hog barns increases animal contact by workers when compared to small-scale operations. Animal wastes (manure, urine, carcasses and reproductive tissues) can contain micro-organisms that pose health risks to workers from infection and microbial toxins.

Pen cleaning, solid and liquid waste handling, and land application of wastes can result in worker contact with animal feces that can be harmful. Carcass disposal, feeding, assistance with birthing and animal slaughter can also expose workers to infected animal tissues.

Overuse of antibiotics in hog production

Animal producers use the same antibiotics for hogs that are used for people. The mass application of antimicrobials to hogs has greatly increased over the years in industrial hog barns. It is estimated that 90 percent of all antibiotics used in Canada are fed to pigs, poultry and cattle merely to promote growth. Animals living in crowded, stressful conditions of industrial hog barns grow faster if given low doses of antibiotics. However, for pigs raised in less-crowded conditions, antibiotics do not affect growth rate. This indicates that feeding antibiotics is to compensate for unhealthy living conditions.

Therapeutic antibiotic administration at high levels for the duration of an illness for sick pigs is obviously an important aspect of veterinary care. However, most antibiotic in use now is intended to promote growth. Prolonged use of antibiotics, at low levels in the form of medicated feed in hog production, presents a risk of not killing the bacteria while promoting resistant strains.

Mounting evidence is confirming the view long held in the public health community that this non-therapeutic use of antibiotics has increased the risk for the emergence of new or more virulent strains and has been identified as a key factor in the development of antibiotic resistance. Workers in hog barns can become colonized with resistant organisms from the pigs and then pass on resistant organisms to coworkers, family and the community.

There are many ways that antibiotic resistant organism can move from industrialized hog barns into the community. Scientists have compared medicated feed in industrial hog barns with barns not using medicated feed and observed a three-fold higher concentration of resistant bacteria in the

exhaust air from those barns using medicated feed. Tetracycline-resistant genes within industrial hog barn were also present in the adjacent manure lagoon as well as the ground water downstream of the lagoon. More recently, researchers (2007) in the mid Atlantic U.S. also reported that antibiotic-resistant bacteria in both surface and ground water was higher downstream from an industrial hog barn.

Several recent studies clearly demonstrate the transmission of multi-drug-resistant pathogens from hogs to humans. During 2005, in the Netherlands, a drug-resistant bacteria was spread from pigs to workers to family, including transmission from a hospitalized patient to a nurse. And their authors conclude that the transmission of some drug-resistant organisms from hogs to hog farmers may be frequent.

Locally, public concern about community-acquired antibiotic resistance is becoming mainstream in part due to recent headlines in Winnipeg newspapers a few months ago. *The Free Press* reported that hundreds of Winnipeggers admitted to hospital to get better are picking up hard-to-treat bacteria that cause everything from boils and pneumonia to severe diarrhoea and death...people are actually bringing it into the hospital from outside.

This newspaper article further reports that many Winnipeg hospitals have higher rates of antibiotic-resistant superbugs than other hospitals in Canada. Of note, in one Winnipeg hospital the superbug infection rate is more than triple the Canadian mean.

Recently, under another press headline. Superbug Found in Ontario Pigs, reporters cited that Canadian researchers have found two major strains of the superbug methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* (MRSA) on pigs and pig farmers, and one strain seems to have originated in pigs and move into people.

This 2007 study examined 285 pigs on 20 Ontario farms; 45 percent of farms and almost one in four pigs as well as one-in-five-pig farmers carried a MRSA strain that causes human infections. This is a much higher rate than in the general North American population. Currently, in the United States, MRSA accounts for more the twice as many deaths as compared to the complications of AIDS.

Researchers point to pig farms as a possible source of some of the resistant infections as have earlier European studies. The same pig strain that was detected in Canada has been associated in

Europe with serious human illness. In 2003, Voss and some colleagues found two infants and a veterinarian carrying a new strain of MRSA bacteria. The investigation traced the source to pigs and later uncovered that 25 percent of Dutch pig farmers were carrying the strain. A follow up three years later found the carriage rate had risen to 50 percent.

Multi-resistant pathogens pose serious challenges to human health. In 2005, air samples from an industrial hog barn were examined. Several types of bacteria were analysed for resistance to five antibiotics. Of note, 98 percent of the samples displayed resistance to two or more of the other four antibiotics that were commonly used as growth promotants in hogs. It is also important to note 37 of the 124 samples were resistant to all four of the antibiotics. None of the samples were resistant to the fifth drug that has not yet been used in hog production as a growth promoter.

Resistant micro-organisms have already reduced the effectiveness of several classes of antibiotics for treating infections in humans and hogs. In some cases there are few or no antibiotics available to treat resistant pathogens. Escalating resistance has raised concern that we are entering the "post antibiotic era." We may be entering a period where there would be no effective antibiotics available for treating many life-threatening infections in humans. Antibiotic resistance is increasing among most human pathogens and can be traced to use and overuse of antibiotics.

A veterinarian who specializes in antibiotic resistance says, The big public health concern in my mind is that this reservoir in pigs is spreading to people that work with pigs and now its being spread into the general population and can become an important community pathogen.

Corrective action

In 2001, the Union of Concerned Scientists estimated that 87 percent of all antibiotic use is for animals while the remainder is for human use. Many bacteria are now resistant to multiple antibiotics and this has heightened international concern and many are questioning the wisdom and scrutinizing the self-governing use of antibiotics by the industry. In 2003, the National Academy of Sciences concluded: clearly, a decrease in antimicrobial use in human medicine alone will have little effect. Substantial efforts must be made to decrease the inappropriate overuse in animals as well. The European Union

banned the use of antibiotics for growth promotion in January 2006.

Antibiotics resistance is an important challenge to both human and animal health. The Union of Concerned Scientists, Health Canada and the American Medical Association all endorse that changes are warranted to the ways that antimicrobials are regulated, distributed and used in animals.

The World Health Organization has called for human and veterinary antimicrobials be sold only under prescription. This organization has also called for a rapid phase out of the use of antimicrobials as growth promotants and for prudent use guidelines for veterinary care.

This approach can work. Dealing with the source of the problem usually results in solutions that make the most meaningful difference over time. Sweden banned the use of antibiotics as feed additives for growth promotion in 1985. Its research demonstrates that the banning of growth promotants did not lead to an increased use of antibiotics when needed for treating sick hogs in the subsequent 18 years. In 1999, Denmark banned the use of sub therapeutic use of antibiotics and significantly reduced antibiotic resistance without losing production capacity.

Times are changing. Consumer awareness and discernment about healthy food choices are growing and the market is responding. Kentucky Fried Chicken, KFC Canada, has reportedly promised to phase use of growth promoting drugs in their purchased chickens. Other KFC restaurants in Canada, owned by other franchisees or independent operators, have all also made the same pledge.

In 2007, the Bon Appetit Management Company announced that under a new policy it will only buy beef that has never been exposed to antibiotics or growth hormones. The company is now looking for natural pork producers.

A small but thriving segment of the American fast-food market, Chipotle Mexican Grill Inc., with almost 800 eateries and restaurants, is offering naturally-raised meats to the masses including hogs raised in outdoor pens. They acknowledge that fast food prepared with such meat is bound to keep expanding as consumers grow increasingly disenchanted with the industrial model of food production. The natural offerings have helped them post 10 consecutive years of same store sales growth.

Recommendations

Hog producers have expanded in Manitoba just as environmental scrutiny and public disfavour begin to stunt hog expansion in some other parts of Canada and globally.

We recommend that legislators reviewing Bill 17 carefully consider the current and future ecological footprint that will be left by the hog industry in Manitoba. Protecting our workers, communities and our environmental heritage up front is in the best interests of Manitobans in the long run. If the hog industry limits itself to only the short sightedness of the business bottom line then eventually the costs will catch up in some other way. Later most of the health, social and economic burdens of occupational and environmental illnesses are more likely to be unjustly carried by workers, families, communities and taxpayers rather than at the source of the problem. We need to embrace and plan for a just and sustainable economy.

The CEC needs to abide within the spirit of the precautionary principle that is embedded in both the provincial Environment Act and the Sustainable Development Act. Within this context, our recommendations reflect our centre's broad perspective of healthy workplaces, healthy workers and healthy communities. We recommend:

1. Prohibit the overuse of antibiotics in hog production.

- Support a shift in current thinking about the value of antibiotic-free meat products. Product labelling should be made more comprehensive and explicit so that consumers can identify the product and make selections according to their value system.
- Create a mentoring system for sharing proven successful practices that promote healthy workplaces, healthy workers, and healthy communities. Network and learn from countries, Sweden and Denmark, that have experienced successful transitions to antibiotic free meat production.
- Phase out of the non-therapeutic use of antimicrobials as growth promoters in the hog industry.
- Adopt a prescription-only availability of antimicrobials in the hog industry.

2. Mandate environmental impact statements for proposed hog barns that includes occupational/environmental health, social justice and socioeconomic issues. Manure from industrial hog barns becomes a toxic soup of chemicals, sediments and antibiotic resistant pathogens that can quickly pollute surface and ground water, endangering workers, the community and the whole environment.

Move hog production further towards environmental sustainability.

- Limit hog density per watershed.
 - Restrict the co-location of industrial hog and poultry operations on the same site and set appropriate separation distances.
 - Regulate water contamination by hog waste and manure. Solid tanks or reservoirs rather than earthen waste lagoons are needed to prevent manure contamination of surface and ground water with infectious agents or antibiotic resistant genes. Pharmaceuticals can remain present in manure and leachates for long period of time.
 - Hold corporate owners financially responsible for spills of waste into surface water especially if they contaminate drinking water. Require bonding of manure storage basins for performance and remediation to ensure restoration a vacated manure lagoons.
3. Ensure current laws, regulations, policies are enforced to protect workers, families, communities and the environment.

Both CEC and Workplace Health and Safety Division, Manitoba Labour, should dedicate sufficient resources and develop expertise to prevent communicable diseases for workers in hog barns and adjacent community residents.

Ensure that employers of hog barns:

- Involve workers in identifying and addressing workplace risks to their health
- Select waste management processes and equipment in the barns, lagoons and spray fields that minimizes direct contact of animal wastes by workers and the community.
- Ensure well-planned cleaning routines to reduce exposures to hog waste and fluids
- Provide convenient and accessible hand-washing facilities

- Provide appropriate and accessible protective wear for workers, such as masks, gloves, protective eye wear and rubber boots. All fecal and reproductive wastes and animal carcasses are potentially bio-hazardous materials and should be handled appropriately
 - Train workers about potential diseases and how to prevent exposure. Ensure that occupational health and safety information and training is relevant and accessible to all Manitoba workers in hog barns. Access to information and training must not be limited in any way by language, racial or cultural barriers.
4. Initiate independent research that gather local knowledge from workers in hog barns, community residents, as well as expertise from occupations, community health and environmental specialists based on the Manitoba context. Complex interconnectedness of both the problems and the potential solutions requires an understanding of the overall picture and a corresponding holistic approach.
5. Aim for food sovereignty in Manitoba, democratic citizen control of our food and agricultural system in Manitoba.
- Endorse ethically responsible ways of hog farming that is safe, fair and healthy for farm workers, communities and the environment.
 - Support small-scale farming operation. The trend toward large-scale livestock operations increases the risk of a number of health problems. By supporting opportunities for smaller-scale livestock farms in Manitoba, we can minimize some of the health impacts on workers and the wider community.
 - Promote diversity. A diversified livestock strategy in Manitoba can also minimize the negative impacts from any one stock on community and worker health.
 - Decisions to issue permits for industrial hog barns should be considered in public meetings and decided by the community. Acting locally makes sense.
6. Continue with a province-wide moratorium on the expansion of the hog industry until we know that workers, communities and the environment are protected.
- Diana Ludwick
MFL Occupational Health Centre Inc.

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/index.html>