

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. 5 – 6 p.m., Tuesday, June 10, 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 & FOOD

Tuesday, June 10, 2008

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Ms. Jennifer Howard (Fort Rouge); Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley) at 22:53

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Lathlin, Struthers, Hon. Ms. Wowchuk

Ms. Blady, Messrs. Caldwell, Derkach, Eichler, Graydon, Ms. Howard, Messrs. Maguire, Nevakshonoff

Substitutions:

Hon. Ms. Oswald for Hon. Mr. Lathlin at 22:18
 Mr. Altemeyer for Ms. Blady at 22:18
 Ms. Marcelino for Mr. Caldwell at 22:18
 Mr. Martindale for Ms. Howard at 22:53

APPEARING:

Mr. Larry Maguire, MLA for Arthur-Virden
 Mr. Kelvin Goertzen, MLA for Steinbach
 Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights
 Mr. Hugh McFadyen, MLA for Fort Whyte
 Mr. Blaine Pedersen, MLA for Carman
 Ms. Flor Marcelino, MLA for Wellington

WITNESSES:

Mr. Evan Penner, Private Citizen
 Mr. David Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Steven Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Steve Penner, Pioneer Meat
 Ms. Laura Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Adrian Gross, Private Citizen
 Ms. Marie Hofer, Private Citizen
 Mr. Kelvin Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Sheldon Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Doug Martin, South Interlake Land Management Association
 Mr. Gerry Martin, Private Citizen
 Mr. Raymond Funk, Private Citizen
 Mr. John Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Melvin Penner, Private Citizen

Mr. Dave Van Walleghem, Private Citizen
 Mr. Christopher Tokaruk, Designed Genetics Inc.
 Mr. Curt Plaitin, Private Citizen
 Mr. Paul Maendel, Prairie Blossom Colony
 Mr. Reuben Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Titus Baer, Private Citizen
 Mr. Dwayne Wollman, Private Citizen
 Mr. Jack Penner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Jonathan Maendel, Private Citizen
 Mr. Blair Cressman, Private Citizen
 Mr. Edwin Hofer, Miami Colony Farms Ltd.
 Mr. Jeremy Maendel, Private Citizen
 Mr. Tom Leppelmann, Private Citizen
 Mr. Martin Gross, Iberville Colony
 Mr. Brad Schnell, Private Citizen
 Mrs. Rika Koelstra, Private Citizen
 Mrs. Christine Kynoch, Private Citizen
 Mr. Michael Sykes, Private Citizen
 Mr. Raymond Cherniak, Private Citizen
 Ms. Julie Baird, Private Citizen
 Mr. Jim Peters, Silverfield Farms Inc.
 Mr. Edward Hofer, Private Citizen
 Mrs. Judith Hamilton, Private Citizen
 Mr. Michael Sheridan, Private Citizen
 Mr. Dan Klippenstein, Private Citizen
 Mr. Philip Hofer, Private Citizen
 Ms. Julianna Klippenstein, Private Citizen
 Mr. Menno Bergen, Private Citizen
 Mr. Darcy Pauls, Private Citizen
 Mr. Neil Cutler, Private Citizen
 Mr. Fergus Hand, Private Citizen
 Mr. Matthew Klippenstein, Private Citizen
 Mr. Jason McNaughton, Standard Nutrition Canada

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Mr. Alvin Gross, Private Citizen
 Mr. Paul Gross, Private Citizen
 Mr. Kevin Toles, Private Citizen
 Mr. Richard Sukkau, Private Citizen

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

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

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Good evening. Will the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Food please come to order.

Our first item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

Ms. Sharon Blady (Kirkfield Park): I nominate Jennifer Howard.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Howard has been nominated. Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, Ms. Howard is our duly elected Vice-Chairperson.

This meeting has been called to consider Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities). 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.

As was previously announced, the committee will sit again tomorrow night, Wednesday, June 11, at 6 p.m., and Thursday night, June 12, at 6 p.m., to hear the first 200 people on this speakers' list.

How late does the committee wish to sit tonight?

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I'd ask leave of the committee to sit till 2 and hear the presenters, going through the list in numerical order, starting with the out-of-town presenters first, which would be No. 22, and then hear the in-town presenters after that. If anybody else wants to make a presentation after that time, then we would hear them as they register with the Clerk.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler has spoken.

What is the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

Written submissions on Bill 17 have been received from the following and have been distributed to committee members: Alvin Gross, Paul Gross, Kevin Toles, Richard Sukkau. Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the *Hansard* transcript of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

Due to the number of people in attendance tonight, we have made arrangements to use our other committee room, Room 254, as an overflow room for those in attendance. The room is just down the hall, and the sound from this room is being broadcast in that room now. You will be able to hear the proceedings from this room, but you will also be able to take a seat. We will wait a few moments when calling names in case someone from that room is called and is making their way back here.

For the information of all in attendance, this committee had previously agreed to hear out-of-town presenters first.

* (18:10)

Before we proceed with presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider. First of all, 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 for questions from committee members. Also, in accordance with our rules, if a presenter is not in attendance when their name is called, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If the presenter is not in attendance when their name is called a second time, they will be removed from the presenters' list.

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 first have to say that person's name to signal the *Hansard* recorders to turn microphones on and off. Thank you for your patience.

We will now proceed with public presentations.

Last night, we left off on our list just before calling presenter Jacob Waldner, No. 22 on our revised list. So I will now pick up where we left off, calling No. 22, Mr. Jacob Waldner. Mr. Jacob Waldner. Jacob Waldner. Mr. Waldner's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Bob Waldner. Bob Waldner. His name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mark Waldner. Mark Waldner. Mr. Waldner's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Rita Caya. Rita Caya. Rita Caya's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

John Doerksen. John Doerksen. Mr. Doerksen's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Michael Sheridan. Michael Sheridan. Mr. Sheridan's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Joseph Hofer. Joseph Hofer. Mr. Hofer's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Garry Hofer, Elm River Colony. Garry Hofer. Mr. Hofer's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Evan Penner. Evan Penner.

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

Mr. Evan Penner (Private Citizen): No, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. You may begin.

Mr. Evan Penner: Good evening, my name is Evan Penner. Place born, born in Winkler, Manitoba; born and raised there on a small family farm; currently, do not work on the farm; work outside the farm within the industry.

I was born into this industry. I love this industry, the people that I work with and the animals that we care for. It absolutely baffles me to be here speaking about a crazy bill like this. I would really like to know who is responsible for bringing this bill to this level. It doesn't make sense. I actually find it stupid when every bit of science shows and tells us that the hog industry is not solely responsible for the problems we have with our lakes. We are very little responsible. And, then, to target one industry, why? Why are we doing this? Please tell us. Work together with us. That's all we want; just work with us, the same as you work with everybody else. Can you work with us?

I have a quote here from the George Morris Centre report that I'm sure most of you have read: Manitoba producers will not escape the coming difficulties, but they are in a good position to endure it, compared to others across Canada. Furthermore, when the difficulties pass, Manitoba's model has proven to be the best place to grow and move forward. Jobs generated: 7,500. Total wages, contracts, benefits and other income: \$610 million. Total income activity: \$2 billion.

Is that a number we can just look at and throw away? We have to ask ourselves here today, are we trying to create the largest have-not province in Canada? A lot of young people that I have talked to are bound to leave this province when they're done school.

This industry has a lot to do with where this province is today. There should really be some sort of thanks. Instead, it feels as though this whole

industry is getting nailed to the cross. Furthermore, Ms. Wowchuk, at the last Manitoba Pork Council banquet, you said that this moratorium would be gone. All I hear is broken promises, much like Mr. Doer's promises. I did speak to him in the hallway. I have personally spoke to Mr. Doer, I guess, three times now, twice on the radio, regarding this. The first time, he said, this is only temporary. It's only temporary. The second time, I invited him to go to see a modern-day facility with me and tour that facility. He said he would do that. As to date, I have received no calls. I have phoned his representatives, the one girl's name I don't care to mention, probably, and it seems as though I'm fairly far down that list of things to do for Mr. Doer.

Needless to say, but I will, I guess we know where the NDP government stands on this issue. It would appear to me that we have a government that only listens to a few thousand people in the city here and a couple of Hog Wwatch psychos. I don't understand that. Maybe the NDP should spend some time in educating these people. Do these people really think that this meat just shows up in the grocery store ready to barbecue? Do they really believe that?

This really doesn't make sense to me when all the reports that the NDP has gotten from the George Morris Centre say that this industry is quite sustainable. I've given Mr. Doer ideas about zoning the province. This, I believe, would have to be reviewed every five years. There are areas of this province that need help, absolutely, there are. But this is not rocket science here. It's pretty easy to figure out. Let's work together and figure this out.

I'm not speaking here today for me because we'll still have barns 40 years and then I'll go to an old folks home and be sitting in my diaper again. I'm speaking on behalf of, really, the whole industry, and young children like my nephew, Brayden^[phonetic], who, hopefully, one day will want to farm. If he doesn't, that's fine. We can deal with that, but I would like it if he had the opportunity.

Bill 17 is wrong, people. It is absolutely wrong. There is no doubt in my mind. I have been in this industry since the day I was born. We must get rid of this.

That is all I have to say.

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

Questions from the committee?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation.

I just have one quick question. You made reference to the George Morris Centre several times in your presentation. Why did you pick that reference in your presentation, rather than the CEC report?

* (18:20)

Mr. Evan Penner: I have both. I believe that the CEC report came from the George Morris Centre report. So I read both, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, sir—another question?

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Mr. Penner, you made reference to broken promises. How do you think the rest of the agricultural industry feels? If they'll break their promise to the hog industry, how do you think the rest of the agricultural industry must feel at this point?

Mr. Evan Penner: They will feel as they're next, because they will be.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, no further questions? Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Penner.

Mr. Evan Penner: Thank you.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): Mr. Chairperson, last night there was agreement from the committee that if there were people with young children who were lower down the list and if they wanted to present earlier, they could go to the clerk at the back of the room and let him know. I would wonder if there'd be agreement from the committee to make that same exception this evening.

Mr. Chairperson: What is the will? *[Agreed]* Okay. Did everybody in the audience hear that? If there's somebody with children who are presenting tonight and would like to present early so that they can leave, go to the back of the room and talk to the staff back there, and they will bring a message up to the front here, all right?

I move on to Isaac Hofer. Isaac Hofer? Mr. Hofer's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

John Fjeldsted, Manitoba Environmental Industries Association. *[interjection]* He's what? *[interjection]* Oh, he's in town, I'm sorry.

Mr. David Waldner. David Waldner?

Mr. David Waldner (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: How do you do, sir. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. David Waldner: No.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not? You may proceed.

Mr. David Waldner: Hi, I'm David Waldner. I'm from the Norquay Colony. I manage an 850-farrow-to-finish operation. I've worked in this industry for over 20 years. I've got three of my children working in the barn with me, and looking at this bill and listening to what was said all day and night till 1:30 or something last night, I don't think this government knows what it's doing with this bill, because I've looked at it. I've looked at everything it's done and it says—it doesn't say anything. It does not say one word about the environment, nothing.

I've asked a few questions and there've been a lot of questions asked here, and I haven't heard one explanation, not one sensible explanation from this government or an environment reason or explanation for this bill. Could this government please give us a reason why you put this bill in, because it does nothing for the environment.

So the easiest thing, the only humane thing, the only sensible thing for this government to do is to withdraw this bill because it's not legal. I don't think it's legal, but apparently the government like this, who has all the power, can do what they want. Apparently they do what they want. They break their promises. Don't you guys have any concern about the people of this province and about doing the right thing?

So go out and do the right thing. Withdraw this bill. Just scrap it because it does not do what it says and what you guys say it does. I'm sure you cannot give us an explanation and you haven't. I've listened now for two days at these hearings, and nobody has given me one explanation why you're doing this.

If this bill is passed, this industry will definitely go down the drain, slowly, but it will disappear, and for what? There's no reason for it and if there is, please tell me.

It should be completely withdrawn. Have you ever heard of a garage bin? Throw it in the garbage. Actually, put it through the shredder, so you can't bring it back in again.

If you want advice, come to the producers, come to the pork marketing council, or pork producers council. We'll give you advice, and I guarantee it would be a lot better, whoever advised you on Bill

17, because he sure as heck didn't know what he was doing, whoever wrote that bill.

A few days ago on CJOB there was a guest there who said, by the year 2015, 50 percent of the world's population will be hungry and go hungry. Here, you're helping along in this situation. You're cutting down the food supply in this world, not helping it. Again, we could ask why. What are you guys thinking?

In conclusion, I would say scrap it, because anything that comes from the hogs, which concerns this government, which is the manure, is the best fertilizer you can put on your land. So let's not cut it off. Let's not stop it. Let's enable the farmer to actually produce more, because this is what we need. We need more of this granular—or organic fertilizer. We don't need less. We need more, because fertilizer prices are going out to lunch.

Let's be proactive and scrap this bill, and let's move on and not waste everybody's time. A lot of people say this bill is about votes. That's probably what it is, but I don't think the city of Winnipeg people care about this. None of them care, and that's where your votes come from. So, if you scrap it and admit that it's a booboo, we made a mistake, I don't think anybody would care. So do the right thing and scrap it.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Again, thank you for your presentation.

Do you use the injection system for applying your manure on your colony?

Mr. David Waldner: Yes, we've built our barn in '93, and we had to agree with the municipality in order to get our permit that we have to inject it, and you have to file land-usage, manure-usage plans every time.

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Waldner, you said to scrap this bill. Are you insinuating, then, that there are enough rules and regulations to protect the water, and also that they can be, that they are controlled by the municipalities, so they can control the growth in each municipality? Do you believe that these rules are there to do that?

Mr. David Waldner: Yes. There was some talk here last night all the time that we can work with the government and make better regulations, more regulations. I don't think we need more regulations.

The regulations are there. Enforce them. If we enforce the regulations we have, I don't think we need any more. They are strong. They are to the point, and they do everything to save Lake Winnipeg.

Lake Winnipeg will not be helped at all with this bill, not a bit.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

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

Now we have a few people with children here. Presenter No. 116, Stephanie Stahl.

Stephen Waldner is going to speak in her stead. Stephen Waldner, 116.

* (18:30)

Mr. Steven Waldner (Private Citizen): Good evening, ladies—

Mr. Chairperson: One moment, sir.

I assume there is leave of the committee that Stephen speak in—*[Agreed]*. All right, then.

Okay, Stephen, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Steven Waldner: No.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. You may proceed.

Mr. Steven Waldner: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Steven Waldner. I am 16 years old and I'm a member of Grand Colony near Oakville, Manitoba.

I'm here today to inform you that I, along with all the other 115 members of the colony, are both shocked and worried about Bill 17. There is no purpose to Bill 17 that actually has common sense.

I've worked in a hog barn for four years, and I would like to say it's an interesting experience. A lot of people take for granted what it actually means to raise pigs and the amount of work required. People might think of pork as coming from the supermarkets and other stores, but they don't really know what's required in getting it to the various stores.

If this Bill 17 will pass, then Manitoba will no longer sustain hog barns. Who will produce pork? Why does Manitoba want to import pork if we are perfectly capable of producing it? Why spend money on importing pork if we can produce it? Why does

Manitoba want to stop the hog industry if it is running smoothly?

There are so many questions left unanswered. I think there needs to be a little more thought and consideration put into this bill. China is in an immense food crisis and Manitoba is banned from producing food. Why ban food production if people are in need?

Another problem with Bill 17 is that we will have no more natural fertilizers to fertilize the land. Chemical fertilizers will have to be used which damage the land, lots more than natural fertilizers would.

Hutterite colonies might even decrease the amount of land they farm if they don't have hog barns because there will be no more need for all the commodities. With less farming, more manufacturing and industries will rise up in Hutterite colonies which would most likely produce more pollution and environmental damage.

It's been said that Bill 17 is to clean up Lake Winnipeg. Why not stop the City from dumping raw sewage into the lake instead of banning food production?

With no hog barns on the colony, members of the colony will be out of jobs. The days of getting together and killing pigs, making sausage and other various meats will be over. Getting together for a day or two and working enthusiastically as a team will be greatly missed on the colonies. It's always a wonderful experience, and it gives people an opportunity to learn how to work together as a team. This is an important phase of our culture.

All the businesses that produce pork in Manitoba would be shut down with this Bill 17, not only hog barns but also killing plants like Maple Leaf Foods and businesses involved in hog medications. Millions of people in Manitoba would lose their jobs. Where will these people who lose their jobs all get jobs soon enough to support themselves and their families? Will Manitoba be able to provide these people with jobs?

In closing, I'd like to say I strongly disagree with Bill 17. I think Bill 17 is more political than economical. I feel that Hutterites are discriminated against with Bill 17. Why does the Hutterites most profitable income have to be shut down? I'm hoping that the government will alter or totally eliminate Bill 17.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Waldner. Questions from the committee?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Steven, for your presentation. It's good to see the youth involved, and you certainly have a sense of pride in your colony. There's no doubt about that.

What signal does Bill 17 send to the youth in your colony and neighbouring colonies whenever they look at Bill 17?

Mr. Steven Waldner: I don't quite get what you're saying.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler, clarification?

Mr. Eichler: How do you feel Bill 17—what signal does that send, message, to your other brothers and sisters in the colony that want to take over farming in the next generation?

Mr. Steven Waldner: Well, it would be a nice experience for them and to learn different things, to get the different kinds of experience.

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

I call 127, Steve Penner.

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

Mr. Steve Penner (Pioneer Meat): No, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may proceed.

Mr. Steve Penner: I come from a different background. We didn't raise hogs, but we had a lot to do with hogs. I am second generation of Pioneer Meat, which is an abattoir in Altona, Manitoba. Five years ago, we could get all the pigs we needed within a 10-mile radius. That's changed. We're looking further and further away. It costs us more.

There are so many things affecting the hog industry now, it baffles my mind why the government doesn't want to work together with the hog industry and the farmers. There's a high Canadian dollar. There're high feed costs. Now we are introduced—soon, the U.S. is going to introduce COOL labelling, which is going to shut the border on these pigs that we want to ship south. So, not only are you guys, the government, looking at—if they think this is a proactive way to take care of us being affected by COOL labelling, to just shut it down before that affects us, that's ridiculous.

My dad started Pioneer Meat 40 years ago. This is our 40th year, and we're very proud. I didn't bring these kids here today for you to see them. I brought these kids here today for them to see you, that if this business isn't around in 30 years it won't be because I didn't work my butt to the bone. It'll be because people in suits decided that it was not right and that there were some things more important than a family business.

When we took over from my dad three years ago, there were three brothers and a brother-in-law involved. So there were four of us. Working for family isn't always easy. I think you can ask a lot of guys here, whether they work with their dads, or they work with their brothers, or they work with their mothers, there are a lot of tension. So the one thing that we decided when we took over is that some things will be different. One of the things that will be different is I don't want my kids—and I know this is tough to say, but maybe I'm living a fantasy. I don't want them to be teenagers and say, I'm never going to work there. Because I was like every other teenager. I said that. I'm never going to work here, dad. There's got to be greener pastures. So, when I left, I came back because the greenest pasture was at home.

When we decided, when we took over Pioneer Meat, the biggest thing we wanted, I don't want to have a wallet so fat that it wrecks my head. What I want is that when my kids are old enough to take over that there's still a place for them to take over. I don't lie awake at night anymore thinking about where we can sell more sausage or what we can do differently. I lie awake at night thinking about how these things got out of our hands. I can't just hand the key over to somebody, because it's not in my control anymore. The future scares me. These are the faces that scare me. On the drive in today, I'm explaining to them what we're going to do today and what this is all about. It's not about me. I can go get another job. It's about them. I want them to have the opportunity to work there.

My dad taught us to work hard and that, if time is tough, you just pull up your socks a little bit. We have employee shortages. Who doesn't? You pull up your socks a little bit. But I can't pull my socks up on this one.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Penner.

Questions.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Penner, for your presentation.

First, it's gratifying to see a young man like you with a young family taking over a business from your father and working with your brothers. That's very gratifying.

I guess one of the things that goes through my mind is, when did government think that they know more than what the science knows? That's basically what's been said in Bill 17.

*(18:40)

What I'd like to ask you is: First of all, you've explained that you came back home. That was important. You're back in your community. You're comfortable in your community. It's a nice place to raise kids. However, if you're not able to do that, would you still be in Manitoba?

Mr. Steve Penner: I don't think so. I think that the work ethic that my father gave me, I could get a job anywhere. That being said, I know that I could go work west and make the money that I could make. I don't believe I would still be here, no.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation. Mr. Maguire, did you have a question? I'm sorry.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): If I could, just one. Thank you, Mr. Penner. You're obviously well-skilled and, as you say, you're obviously in this for the passion of your industry, not for, as you say, a fat wallet down the road. You care about your business and your family, obviously.

How would you see the government coming together with the industry to try to find a better solution to this? Of course, you're saying that the bill should be scrapped, but what advice could you give the government on how to settle this in a more amiable manner?

Mr. Steve Penner: Possibly following some of the recommendations made by the CEC. One of the other gentlemen that was up here before me said, too, why don't you ask the producers, because it seems to me that they're willing to do something about it.

If there are changes that need to be made, we're willing to change. Rather than locking the door, who wouldn't change?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

I call No. 150, Laura Waldner.

Ms. Waldner, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Ms. Laura Waldner (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Ms. Waldner: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Laura Waldner. I am a member of Aspenheim Colony which is located west of Portage la Prairie. I appreciate this opportunity to speak on behalf of my community here today.

First of all, I want to say a few words about our community. Aspenheim Colony is one of the smaller Hutterite colonies in Manitoba. It consists of 10 families or 60 members. For our livelihood, we farm 5,500 acres of land, have a small broiler quota which allows us to produce chicken for the meat industry and, finally, a 600-sow hog operation that we are currently upgrading. We also produce most of the fruits and vegetables we need.

The reason I am here today is to talk about Bill 17 and how unfair it is to my community. Not being able to increase hog production because of Bill 17 puts us in a tough spot with hardly any opportunities to increase. Land is not available to increase our land base and broiler quota is not just expensive, there is none to be had. Our growing community needs growing opportunities.

Critics claim that hog barns cause lots of pollution and are not good for the environment, but the Clean Environment Commission report clearly states that the hog industry is sustainable with appropriate regulatory implementations. Nowhere in the report does the Clean Environment Commission say that the hog industry is significantly polluting Lake Winnipeg. This ban can't be based on real science, but political science.

Research done by independent third parties, such as the University of Manitoba, has shown no hard evidence of any significant nutrient loading from the hog industry in Lake Winnipeg. So our existing hog production will have zero effect on nutrient loading in Lake Winnipeg.

It surprised me to hear that some people liken manure to nuclear waste. It is far from it. Manure is a natural fertilizer. It contains phosphorus, nitrogen and potassium. To me, instead of trying to stop us from using manure for fertilizer, they should restrict all the dangerous and harmful chemicals that are being applied to our land, forests and lawns. Manure

is environmentally friendly, whereas chemicals are not.

Manure is not waste. It is a natural and valuable by-product of livestock operations. Manure has been used for thousands of years to build up soil and fertilize crops. If farmers can't use manure, they will have to replace it with expensive and harmful chemicals.

The Clean Environment Commission report states that manure should replace synthetic fertilizers as much as possible. Human waste is a major cause of ground water pollution, not manure. The smell that hog barns give off seems to be another issue for some people, but it is only a smell, and it comes and goes.

Restricting pork production is not a good idea with the world crying for food. The shortage could affect Manitoba before we know it. Manitoba is greater than capable to produce food for the growing demand. Let's take advantage of it. Can't the government find peace in working as a team with farmers and hog producers in researching and implementing methods to solve the perceived problems they complain about so they become a part of the solution and not a part of the problem.

These opposition groups are very impressed with this moratorium, but do they know what they are wishing for when they say to do away with hog barns? They envision a perfect world, and a perfect world has no sickness, pain and war in it, and, in their case, no hog barns, but we must realize that a perfect world is often unattainable, and, in trying to attain a perfect world, we often wreak more havoc in trying to attain a perfect world than we intend. While we try to push things in our direction, we often don't think about the other individuals who depend on the ideas we are trying to abolish.

Farming and raising livestock is a huge part of who we are and what we do for a living. It's what our forefathers did in many generations before us, and we are not ready to let that go. We want to be able to look back and see our children carry on with this fulfilling way of life. We don't want them to go out into manufacturing businesses and stuff like that. We want them to enjoy living on the prairies and to work hard for what they need. We want them to have the satisfaction when they see their crops thrive and animals flourish.

So, please, for our sake and for all the other farmers out there that are affected by this bill, let it

drop so we can get things back to normal and keep living our lives farming our land and raising our livestock. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Waldner.

Questions.

Mr. Maguire: Well, thank you very much, Laura. You exemplify the reason why we have young people to come forward in the world to put forth their case. You did a very exceptional job of making your presentation, and I know it didn't fall on deaf ears. I certainly hope not. You were very well spoken, and I commend you for representing your people and your family very well.

One of the things that you also provided us with was a bit of a lesson in science. Your comments about: manure is not a waste; it's a valuable resource. I wrote that down. Having farmed all my life, I certainly know that as well. A perfect world often escapes us as well.

But you've indicated, your presentation was certainly an indication of the passion that many people have in rural Manitoba for the type of lifestyle that they have. I would ask you if you have advice for a more co-operative manner from the government as to how they could come to a better solution in this whole process. Would you be able to—do you think we should have a more co-operative manner bringing people together more to discuss the issue further this summer before a final decision is made on this bill?

Ms. Waldner: Yes.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

I call No. 153, Adrian Gross.

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

Mr. Adrian Gross (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Adrian Gross: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Adrian Gross, and I am here today on behalf of Bloomfield Colony and all the hog farmers in Manitoba. We live on a Hutterite colony approximately 27 miles northwest of Portage la Prairie. We farm 8,500 acres of land and have a 29,000-litre ag production operation. Then we have another one of our major incomes, our hog operation,

750 sows from farrow to finish, and are currently remodelling it.

* (18:50)

If Bill 17 goes through, one of our main incomes will go down the drain. People living on our colony will be unemployed, and our community pork supply will be cut off. What about the younger generations? They will have no future in the hog industry. I think it would be a nice experience for them, and they will not be able to do it if this bill passes.

Our way of life is focussed on agriculture and raising livestock. If that is changed a whole new system will have to be figured out. If the hog farmers here in Manitoba will not be able to make a living off raising hogs, they will move to a place where they can. This will cause the Manitoba population to go down. A bunch of land will be for sale, because, if they don't have any hogs, how will they utilize their own grain?

Another issue is that we Manitobans will stop raising hogs. The public food supply will lack. People will start importing pork from other countries. What is more trustworthy than our own pork supply?

Raising crops is another issue. The cost of raising crops will also rise dramatically. Right now we can efficiently use our own pig waste as a very natural source of fertilizer, but some people claim that's the cause of air and water pollution, like in Lake Winnipeg, and that is not good for the environment. I don't think that is true. I think it's all the harmful chemicals that are put on the land.

Some people also think that manure is like nuclear waste, but where is there a natural fertilizer than hog waste? Farmers have been using it as a fertilizer for many years and continue to do so. If we don't use hog waste we will have to buy expensive fertilizers that are very harmful to the environment. So, instead of banning hog barns, you should ban the expensive, harmful fertilizer they want to put on the land.

If this bill passes, plenty of jobs will go down the drain because of all the big killing plants that will have to be shut down, and also all the feed companies that supply our feed. Where will our people turn to for food and income? Plenty of people will be unemployed and millions of jobs will be lost.

We also have to take all the crop farmers into consideration. If the demand for grain and other hog

feeds will drop, so would the prices of the grain farmers. That means the grain farmers will suffer as well because they will be getting a lot less for their grain.

Last, but not least, people also think that you do not have total proof that the hog barns are causing all the damage to Lake Winnipeg.

I would like to finish off by saying that we hope you will take all points we brought up into consideration, and thank you for your time.

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

Questions from the committee.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Thank you, Adrian, for presenting here this evening.

The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) has said, they said last week, that people who are opposed to Bill 17 are opposed to clean water. We disagree with that statement, and I think you and other people who have presented have shown that's incorrect, and it was an unfair statement for him to make. Perhaps he has changed his mind, hearing the number of presenters who've come forward.

That being said, you had some good suggestions, perhaps, that the government could take. Do you think it would be a good idea for the government to stop this bill from moving forward and to take the summer months to meet with some of the people from the colony, and, really, all the groups that have presented, from a variety of different opinions here over the last couple of days, and try to come up with something that isn't a ban on the hog industry but that might be workable for everybody involved?

Mr. Adrian Gross: That would be a very good idea. Yep, that would be a good idea.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Calling No. 175, Mary—or Marie Hofer.

Ms. Hofer, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Ms. Marie Hofer (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You do? Okay. The Clerk will take them from you. You may begin when you're ready.

Ms. Hofer: Hi, my name is Marie Hofer and I live on Sommerfield Colony.

Living on a colony is the only life I've ever known, and I'd like to keep it that way. If I'm ever lucky enough to get married and have children of my own, I want to be able to raise them on a colony, too. I want them to be able to grow up the same way I did.

I guess you're wondering what that has to do with Bill 17. You see, our pig barns are our main source of income, and, if we can't grow pigs anymore, what are we supposed to do to make a living? Some people seem to think that colonies are some sort of cult. They're not. I admit we're not one big happy family either, because we're all individuals with our own opinion on how things should be run, but, in general, we all get along okay. As long as everyone has their own work to do, we're all happy. Most of our boys work in the pig barn, and we really don't have anywhere else where we could keep them out of mischief if it was shut down.

Do you realize that we are the only large group of people that has successfully stayed together, lived communally and even branched out? None of our people are forced to stay. They all know that anytime they want to leave, they can. They have a choice and the vast majority chooses to stay. That fact alone should tell you something about our way of life.

Another issue is probably not many people have considered is that when Hutterites can't make a living somewhere, they move to somewhere where the prospects look better. Where they can sustain their way of life. Of course, I'm not saying that's going to happen. Let's say maybe five or ten people decide that life in Saskatchewan looks better and where they can continue to grow crops, raise pigs and do whatever else they do to survive. Each colony owns a couple thousand acres of land. If all that land suddenly went up for sale, what do you think would happen to the price of land? Plus whether you realize it or not, Hutterites contribute something to your life, too.

Hutterites are known for supporting their local businesses and communities as much as they can. I asked my dad if we could survive without pigs and he told me it depends how many perks you want. You'd have to cut back on travelling a lot more and there would be no more extras. Now we don't exactly have many extras to start with. It's not as if we are living in the lap of luxury or anything. We work hard to make a living. It takes a lot to feed and clothe approximately 110 people, and that money has to

come from somewhere. It's just not possible to survive on agriculture anymore.

For one thing, you have to realize that the price of grain has stayed low while the price of machinery and chemicals has steadily increased. Adding the gas and the cost of fertilizers, herb and pesticide and whatnot, and you see why so many small farmers are being forced out of agriculture. Colonies are able to continue farming although they suffer too because they have other sources of income like our pig barns. In effect, although we are obviously not wearing pigskins, the pigs clothe us, to pay for our shelter and pay our bills.

Have you ever wondered whether those nicely wrapped packages of pork that you buy in the store come from? Probably not but you most likely will notice when the price goes up. If you shut down all the pig barns in Manitoba, who is going to raise pigs and produce the pork you eat? Obviously you'd have to buy pork from other provinces and maybe even other countries if the other provinces can't produce enough. Then your prices will go up because they have to be shipped.

Why send your money to other provinces when you can grow the same thing here for a lower price? Also how do you know if you'll be able to get pork from other countries? There are food shortages around the world and are you certain they won't need it for their own people? Why make a bill banning food production when you should be trying to increase it?

You know, I heard lately that some people think manure's equal to nuclear waste. Why? Of course, I'll be the first to admit it doesn't smell all that good. But isn't it just something that pigs produce that has to be tucked away somewhere. It has a use. It's a needed and important part of farming. We use it as a natural fertilizer. When plants grow they take the nutrients they need out of the soil. Those nutrients have to be replaced somehow, and that's why you use fertilizers.

Manure replaces the nutrients taken out of the soil and if you didn't inject anything into your land, it won't take all that long before the land won't give you the maximum yield any more. Organic fertilizers are much better for your land, not to mention much less expensive than chemicals.

Another thing is that our life is dependent on keeping our land and water clean. Why would we intentionally pollute our water supply? When you inject the manure into your land it ensures there is no

run-off into your water stream. I know that the reason Bill 17 is being introduced is they're blaming the manure for the pollution in Lake Winnipeg.

Now, if those people had actually thought about and done some research, they would realize how wrong they are. You see the problem in Lake Winnipeg is caused by phosphorus. Manure is only as phosphorus by 1 or 2 percent of the phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg and in the Red River. The raw sewage that's dumped into Lake Winnipeg each year from the Selkirk area is quite high in phosphorus. Now that's something that should be looked into and remedied. Blaming the hogs for it won't help either.

I guess for some people manure is something foreign, something really, really bad, but to us it's just the daily part of our life. It usually takes a week or so to empty out our lagoon which happens about once a year. During that week my two brothers come home for lunch or just to grab a cup of coffee. Naturally they don't smell all that good and when we complain about the smell, they just laugh and tease us, oh, but you should like it. It's the smell of money. Of course, we don't exactly agree with him so that usually calls for some good-natured arguing.

* (19:00)

Yesterday, I explained what Bill 17 is and what would it mean to us as hog farmers to one of my nine-year-old cousins. She just looked at me and said, they can't do that. Why would they? She actually got really mad. You see, even a nine-year-old kid understands what the loss of our pigs would mean to us, and I didn't even go into details.

In conclusion, I'd like to ask something of you. It is something important, but it's not something you'll have to commit to. All I want is to ask you to consider the effect this bill will have on the hundreds of people who depend on hogs to survive, and whether you want to be responsible for taking away the means for them to survive.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Questions.

Ms. Wowchuk: First of all, thank you very much, Marie, for your presentation, and for sharing with us life on the colony and what hog production means to you. I really, really appreciate your thoughts.

I wanted to, again, thank you, because this is a process here where people, government—we're one of the only provinces that has it, where the public can

come and tell us what they think about a bill. I'm pleased that you shared your thoughts.

Can you tell me, do you know whether it's—Sommerfield Colony, is it? I didn't quite hear the name of your colony. Is there discussion on the colony about raising more hogs, or finishing more, or doing some expansion on the colony? Would you know that?

Ms. Hofer: Are you asking if we were planning to expand or build any more in the future?

Ms. Wowchuk: No plans?

Ms. Hofer: Probably—I don't know. Well, let's say somebody comes out with something new that could help us raise our pigs. We wouldn't be able to use it.

Mr. Eichler: Marie, thank you for your presentation. Well done.

I've been to your colony, very well managed, very well operated.

My question for you is in regard to education. You talked about that in your first page in your last paragraph. Do you think we do enough to educate the urban people where food comes from?

Ms. Hofer: Most people probably don't know that their pork comes from pigs. I don't know.

Mr. Graydon: Marie, you did an excellent job with your presentation. You should be proud of that, and so should your family and your colony.

You were asked a question by the Minister of Agriculture whether you thought there might be expansion on your colony. Now, if I understand right from other presentations from the other couple of nights, whenever a colony is going to split, when it gets to a certain size, the colony splits. Then they move on. Would that be part of the answer that Ms. Wowchuk was asking, her question?

Ms. Hofer: Yes, usually when a new colony is built, they usually build another hog barn on that colony. That would be their source of income, then, too.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Hofer.

Calling No. 151, Kelvin Waldner.

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

Mr. Kelvin Waldner (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Kelvin Waldner: Hi. My name is Kelvin Waldner. I live on a farm called Norquay farms. I'm here because I'm a concerned citizen that is concerned what our government is doing. I believe that if this bill is passed our life as we know it will change.

The purpose of this bill is to try to reduce the pollution in Lake Winnipeg. The problem is that only 1 percent of the pollution or phosphate levels in Lake Winnipeg have been linked to the hog industry. Where is at least the question: Where does the rest of the 99 percent of the phosphate levels or pollution in Lake Winnipeg come from? We don't know.

What I believe, it's just me, that we can change this bill. We can change what it states that, instead of banning a major industry that feeds people and supports, supplies a number of jobs in Manitoba, that we can change the way we spread manure. For example, we here have a farm that operates an 800-sow operation, farrow to finish. We need approximately 800 acres to spread our manure, which we, with the municipality, have. In order to build our barn in '93, we had to sign, with the municipality, an agreement that we're going to hire somebody with strict regulations to spread our manure.

Manure is a natural fertilizer and is safe for wildlife, that the chemical fertilizer isn't. Chemical fertilizer, wildlife can't safely go on, and ladybugs and worms, they can safely live on there with manure fertilizer, which, with chemicals, they die.

We can change the way we do things. It's totally preposterous that this bill is doing. It affects us all, even the consumer, even me and you. We buy the pork off the shelf. If we ban a major industry, it's going to cost us, the consumer. It's just stupid. Thank you.

That's all I have to say. Thanks.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Questions.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Kelvin. You did an excellent job. You summed it up well at the end. It is stupid. I know that there're many people who would agree with you. Certainly, members of the Progressive Conservative caucus do agree with you. This is a stupid bill brought in for stupid reasons.

You might be interested to know that over the last couple of days, because of the rain that we've had here in Manitoba, the sewer system in Winnipeg

has been overflowing for hours. Over the last couple of days, raw sewage has been pouring out of the Winnipeg sewer system right directly into the river, because over the last number of years the government hasn't fixed the sewer system in Winnipeg.

Do you think it would be a better idea if the government focussed on fixing the sewer system in Winnipeg, which dumps hundreds of tonnes of raw sewage into the lake every year, as opposed to going after the hog farmers?

Mr. Kelvin Waldner: Yes, I believe that would be a very good—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Waldner.

Mr. Kelvin Waldner: Sorry. I said I believe that would be a very good idea.

Mr. Chairperson: No further questions. Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

We'll now return to the list. In order, I have No. 34, Lyndon Waldner. Lyndon Waldner? Mr. Waldner will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Jacob Waldner. Jacob Waldner? Jacob will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

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

Mr. Sheldon Waldner (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not.

You may proceed.

Mr. Sheldon Waldner: Hello. My name is Sheldon Waldner. I reside in Norquay Colony, located near Oakville, Manitoba. I am 20 years old. Of those 20 years, I've worked in a hog barn for close to seven years.

We built our barn in 1993 after a long discussion with our local municipality in order to build it. We had to agree to very strict regulations. For example, we had to agree to hire professional injectors to inject our manure on our land. We have done that, and we have done this over the last 15 years. We also had to agree the first few years to hire engineers to personally check to ensure that we are meeting all the regulations that the municipality applied to us. We have followed these regulations, even though it has cost us quite a bit more money than it would have if we had just followed the local provincial regulations.

* (19:10)

We also, in our day-to-day operation of our hog barns, try to ensure that our phosphate levels—to reduce the phosphate levels in our manure. We apply phytase to our liquid feed in order that the phosphate is more available to our pigs. We also steep our grain in water for a few hours beforehand so that it breaks, it's more easy for the pig to break down. We have successfully done that to the point that we have dropped the phosphate levels in our premixes to the limit that the Canada feed act allows us to.

I give these examples to show that we as farmers are willing to follow new regulations and even to work with the government, that we are willing to work on this, that we shouldn't have this ban. Our colony falls into that area, if we, in the future, when our manure facilities break down and we wanted to replace them, or even add a few more finishing spaces, as we do need them, because right now we have to finish a few hundred hogs every year off-site.

Also, I'd like to make this statement, that we, as Hutterites, are known for our work ethic. If we can't build any more barns, we are going to find work for our people elsewhere. If we have to move into the manufacturing sector, we will, and we have done this very successfully. If we are moving into the manufacturing sector, we will add competition to the local economy in that manufacturing sector, possibly taking jobs from urban Manitobans.

Thank you. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Questions.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Sheldon, for your excellent presentation and putting things in perspective, putting things in perspective that if you weren't working on the farm, weren't working in agriculture, that you do have the ability to diversify and displace urban workers.

But I did hear you make a comment, when you spoke about meeting regulations. The regulations, you said, were much stricter. Municipal regulations were much stricter, that you had to meet, than what the provincial ones were. Yet the municipality never put a moratorium on you. Do you wonder why the Province would then put a moratorium on?

Mr. Sheldon Waldner: Yes.

Mr. Graydon: Do you think that was necessary?

Mr. Sheldon Waldner: No, I don't think it was necessary.

Mr. Graydon: Do you have any advice for the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers)?

Mr. Sheldon Waldner: My advice would be that he withdraw this bill, as it is his right, since he introduced it.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation): Thanks for that advice.

I was impressed by what you had to say about the premix. That is something I think is very practical, that, I think, saves a lot of phosphorus from ending up in Lake Winnipeg in the end. Is that a standard practice? Is that not just in your community but other communities as well?

Mr. Sheldon Waldner: Adding physate is slowly becoming a more standard procedure, but it's not as much use, as we can't drop them off too far, the levels, because of the Canada feed act only allows us to drop it to a certain limit. But, as we have a liquid feed system, we are allowed, we can soak our grain, which I've known only around five or six hog barns that actually run a liquid feed system.

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

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maguire, on a point of order was it?

Mr. Maguire: Yeah, just a quick point of order, Mr. Chairman. I heard the minister ask the young gentleman about the premix and the use of it. He indicated that the use of premix would stop phosphates from getting into the river and the lakes. He has no science to make that statement. So I just wanted to point that out to the committee. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maguire does not have a point of order. It's a dispute over the facts, I believe.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. We call Mr. Doug Martin, South Interlake Land Management Association. Doug Martin?

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

Mr. Doug Martin (South Interlake Land Management Association): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not?

You may begin.

Mr. Doug Martin: Thanks for seeing me today.

My name is Doug Martin. I'm a farmer from east Selkirk, and I'm president of the South Interlake Land Management Association. I'll be speaking about that association and all the work we've done in the last 25 years, some as a soil and water conservation group that is running, for 25 years in the south Interlake. It's producer-driven, and has a board of directors which consists of farmers, councillors, in the R.M. of south Interlake—or in the south Interlake—and Manitoba Agriculture staff.

We were funded in the past through federal and provincial programs. One project—I'm just going to go through a few projects that we have run that we've identified for water quality issues, sort of things. One project we ran through the SILMA area was a study that took water samples from a random sampling of farms in the south Interlake. Water samples were tested for nutrients and bacteria. A cross-section of hog, cattle, dairy and grain farms were sampled. The general findings were, overall, water quality was good. There were some red flags that were raised on certain wells, which were not on hog farms. Once farmers were made aware, corrective issues were taken to improve the water quality.

Another study was done to measure the movement of nitrates—of nutrients into the soil zones. Deep nutrient sampling was done on a wide section of farms in the south Interlake. Fields were sampled to a depth of 12 feet. Hog, dairy, beef and grain farms were sampled. There were fields that were identified at early stages of the problem. The second part of the study had producers plant a crop that could put roots down and draw the nutrients that had moved into lower soil zones. Lowering the deep soil nutrients was done successfully by a lot of farmers with this project. Our group has done water quality testing on Netley Creek, with results being within provincial standards for water quality.

A study which is more related to nutrient loading in Lake Winnipeg wasn't done by our soil conservation group, but it was done by a group on the Whitemouth River for the last six years. The Whitemouth River runs through an agriculture area which has a large amount of livestock and crop production. The results from a six-year study, which were conducted from 2001 to 2006, indicated the river had very good water quality, and all levels of

nutrients were well below government guidelines. Activities of the local people and livestock have not had a negative effect on the water quality in the river, and are not contributing to the excessive phosphorus levels in Lake Winnipeg.

The action of this government to try to totally ban new expansion of hog operations is not based on scientific research. So much of what we do in agriculture is based on science. Research advises on best management practices in all of agriculture. We use research right to the limit.

SILMA has taken research to the farms and based it on local needs and concerns of area residents and farmers. Groups like SILMA have identified areas of environmental concern. We have studied the areas of risk, and if there're identical problems, producers are willing to solve the problem. Producers are very aware of the environment and how it affects their quality of life, and they need quality water for their families and for their livestock.

With government making an issue, not based on science, it leaves SILMA wondering: Is it worth continuing the research when the government doesn't acknowledge the results? Will the general population be happy? No research has continued on water quality in the south Interlake.

* (19:20)

If the government pushes through Bill 17, groups like SILMA will feel the research we do is not important to the government or the general public if the research information I've presented is obtained through projects that have funded through the Manitoba government. They have all this information and, either are not knowledgeable about it, or have chosen not to inform the general public on these findings. Instead, the general public is misled to believe that hog farms and other farmers are causing the problems of water quality. In reality, there are many factors causing the problem, many not related to agriculture.

This government has to have a second look at this research and all the work that is done into nutrient management and the effects on Lake Winnipeg. Passing Bill 17 is not an option. Relook at it.

Thank you.

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

Questions?

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Martin, thank you very much for your presentation.

Because of your intimate knowledge with the lake and the length of the time that you've been involved, would you say that, instead of causing a lot of people a lot of stress, stop this assault on agriculture, and perhaps initiate some R&D in harvesting a biomass out of the lake? Would that be an option that you would see?

Mr. Doug Martin: Well, reality is algae blooms are here and there, and not consistent. You want something that you can produce consistently so it's economically feasible. Harvesting algae would be like farming. There're economics involved. That's something that maybe science has to look at.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you for your presentation.

You indicated and I know you've done a lot of work on data and research through your organization. The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) has indicated that he's basing his decision based on the Clean Environment Commission report. You obviously have a lot of expertise in information gathering. Did you read the report differently than he did, or is he just simply mistaken in terms of his interpretation of the report?

Mr. Doug Martin: I did read it differently. The Clean Environment report identified areas of concern, and we've had people at this committee hearing say there are areas, and they admit it, there are, but not the whole southeast of Manitoba. People realize—we've had producers here yesterday; I was here for six hours last night—there are areas of concern, but it's easy to monitor. You watch the phosphate, the nutrients in the soil. If there is not adequate room in that soil for nutrients, they have to haul that manure further, or shut down.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much, Mr. Martin, Doug.

If we don't use research in making decisions when it is available to us, we wouldn't have things like GRASS status for Canola today, generally regarded as safe in our U.S. markets, and used that for expanding market opportunities.

Hogs are the same way. We've increased genetics tremendously because of research. If we don't use research for making decisions like this, can you suggest what other things, what else you would use?

Mr. Doug Martin: I really don't know. Agriculture is so based on research. It's just, everything I do. You pick up a magazine on hogs; it's all research. You pick up *The Cooperator*, a farm magazine, there's so much research data. This is what we do.

I can't understand a government—you are all educated people. Ms. Wowchuk, you've been involved with agriculture, probably, close to all your life. Why are you not listening to the research? This is research. We have to listen to it. If you throw that out, what do we have to hook onto? So, please, grab onto the research and use it, use it wisely.

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

Gerry Martin.

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

Mr. Gerry Martin (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. You may proceed.

Mr. Gerry Martin: Thank you for having me today.

My name is Gerry Martin. I am a Canadian citizen and a hog farmer in East Selkirk, in partnership with Doug Martin, who has also spoken as president of SILMA.

Our families have farmed in East Selkirk for over 100 years, and we are the fourth generation. Both my father's and mother's families lived in the Selkirk area for over 100 years. My great-grandfather, Captain Barker, [*phonetic*] was one of the captains of the S.S. Kenora, which sailed Lake Winnipeg, and today is the main attraction at the Selkirk marine museum. My family spent time swimming at Lake Winnipeg at its beautiful beaches, and the last thing I'd like to see is the lake destroyed. I feel we are good stewards of the land and follow all rules and regulations.

I am speaking against Bill 17. Our operation is a 1,200-sow farrow-to-wean operation. We have been running at this size since 1997. We also grain farm 1,800 acres. Our hog operation has been very good to us financially for the last 10 years and has allowed me to farm full time. I feel that Bill 17 is restricting our ability to expand in our future. When we started our hog operation in '97 we were achieving 23 pigs per sow, per year. With the improvements in genetics and management, we are now achieving 27 pigs per sow, per year, and our barn is getting crowded. So, with this technology, we soon will have to expand.

Our hog biz has been very rough financially in the last year. There is likely to be very little expansion in the near term.

We cannot predict the future. The demands for food from the growing population may allow opportunity for the next generation of farmers for expansion. We must not restrict opportunities for the next generation. In farming, economies of scale are very important. In the past, my father, in partnership with his brother, raised a family with an 80-sow, farrow-to-finish operation. Now, with the increase in costs, tight margins, we have to be a large operation to provide adequate income to raise our families. This is also the case with grain farmers in all areas of agriculture. Farms keep getting bigger because it's necessary.

The government has said there has been unprecedented growth in the hog industry in Manitoba. Farmers saw an opportunity because low grain prices added value to building barns and investing in company barns. The action of the government is a slap in the face of all hog producers who are doing a good job managing their manure on agricultural land.

Hog producers are highly regulated. We have to soil test, test our manure, apply manure as we would apply chemical fertilizer. We also are required to have manure management plans which are sent into Manitoba Conservation. We inject the manure so smell is minimal and emissions into the environment are limited. We feel hog producers are doing a great job managing manure. This government came along and tells us we are ruining the environment and they are placing a moratorium on all our expansions.

Current studies into water quality that have been completed by South Interlake Land Management Association indicate that hog farms are not the cause of water quality concerns. A study of the Whitemouth River states results indicate the river has very good water quality, and levels are below government guidelines. Activities of the local people and livestock are not having a negative effect on the water in the river and are not contributing to excessive phosphorus levels in Lake Winnipeg.

You, as a government, obviously have no idea what is happening on the farms and are listening to a group of environmentalists who want to shut down the hog industry in Manitoba. Listening to a group of environmentalists who have no specific data to support their actions gives your government no credibility. A government with credibility would use

scientific data that has been developed to make decisions and would implement the recommendations equally and fairly to all Manitobans, not one sector.

Bill 17 should not be passed. Thank you.

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

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

I want to come back to a statement you made in regard to expansion, and your terms were, because it's necessary. I think we on this side of the House understand that, but would you explain to the committee why your business would have to expand?

* (19:30)

Mr. Gerry Martin: Well, our current barn is designed for 23-pigs-per-sow space, space wise in the barn, and, now, we are achieving, with the technical advances, 27 pigs per sow, which we have to, soon, have more space for each animal.

With this moratorium, we cannot expand, so what we might have to do is cut back on our sow production. I don't think that's fair. We're just being more efficient.

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

I call Raymond Funk.

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

Mr. Raymond Funk (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Mr. Funk: Thank you for your opportunity. What I'm going to do is read a letter that I wrote to Mr. Doer and Struthers and Wowchuk when they first talked about putting the moratorium on, which, incidentally, I got no response to or acknowledgement that they had received the letter. So I'll read it now and I'll add a few comments at the end.

I'm writing to draw your attention to the situation involving two issues very dear to my heart. Firstly, I'm a Winnipeg resident who enjoys the outdoors and fishing more than any other pastime. I'm concerned about the health of Lake Winnipeg and other waterways in our province. Secondly, I'm also very concerned about Minister Struthers' rash or

emotional decision to arbitrarily ban any development of hog facilities under the guise of phosphate reduction to the lake.

According to your own government research, only 1 percent of the phosphate entering the lake comes from Manitoba farms who apply manure. Would it not serve us, the public, who you represent, better to put more effort into homeowners, golf courses, et cetera, which are densely situated along the Manitoba waterways, including our city. Manitoba farmers have always followed and even exceeded all the guidelines and regulations our government has put before them, which you've heard all day long. There seems to me to be no logical reason to be proposing this ban on one of our most regulated and safe industries in the province.

What would people say if you announced tomorrow that all golf courses in the province will be closed and no lawn fertilization to be done until the CEC report is in, which basically is what you've done to the hog industry? The repercussions to our provincial economy would be totally insignificant even though the outcry would be unbearable by Minister Struthers and your government. For some reason, farmers tend to not act that way. They're proud and they're solution seekers, but I'd also say, don't push them too far.

Mr. Doer, you must certainly be aware of the enviable situation Manitoba hog farmers have in the world marketplace with the lower cost of production mostly due to feeding their own grains. This situation is poised to be even better for Manitoba in the future, to be the breadbasket of North America and possibly the world.

With the trend to offshore manufactured goods, I can't imagine that our province will be competitive in that field anytime soon. How many farm families can survive on wind power? The hog industry currently is one of our largest industries putting millions of dollars directly into our coffers, employing directly over 15,000 people and contributing \$1.8 billion to our GDP in '01. Moreover, 97 percent of the operating costs of the farms are spent in Manitoba, and almost 35 percent of these expenses were paid within the farms' municipalities. I'm not suggesting that the hog farms carry the whole provincial economy, but I most certainly know that manufacturing, natural resources and other industries also cannot support the economics of rural Manitoba.

How do you propose to fund the spending initiatives that have been announced recently while

also stifling our most vibrant provincial industry? Have you and your ministers considered the implications of making Manitoba farmers uncompetitive and having all the future growth and development move out of our province? I, for one, would hate to see that happen. The most logical move for them would be to Saskatchewan, which, incidentally, also happens to be in the Lake Winnipeg watershed. What is to be gained?

The more my friends and I discuss the proposed ban on hog facility development, the more it reeks of politics and emotion. I believe in protecting our lake, but to do it at the expense of an industry that is so vital to our economy, whose health is critical to our future, which is one of the smallest phosphate contributors to the lake, would probably be the most counterintuitive and imprudent thing we've witnessed by any government of this province. There must be a more worthwhile focal point.

I would suggest that you keep the industry healthy and situated where it's controllable, which is right here, the way we're doing it right now and putting the money into our economy. I urge you to reconsider your strategy regarding this situation for the good of our province and not to implement the proposed ban. With the regulations already in place, there's no need for a moratorium. There's no need for this bill. The regulations are already all in place.

I support a wife and two children in Winnipeg by providing equipment not only to hog facilities but to dairy and poultry as well. Given the blatant disregard to the science and the CEC reports with respect to this legislation, I'm deeply concerned that there will be no future for me and my family and hundreds of other Manitobans in the field of agriculture in this province.

Why legislate a stop to development of technologies such as biogas and solids separations? Why stifle an industry that contributes \$2 billion to our economy for the possibility of a fractional change in phosphate input into the lake?

It is your responsibility as my government to look after my best interests. Let's embrace the industry and make it stronger rather than weaker. Let's capitalize on its potential. Thanks.

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

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

You made a comment in your presentation about how you and your colleagues or friends around the city of Winnipeg were discussing Bill 17. One thing we haven't heard from was from very many people within the city of Winnipeg. Why do you think that is? Is it because of lack of concern, lack of support, or just not tuned in to what's going on down here in this beautiful building the province of Manitoba has?

Mr. Funk: The reason there's a lack of interest is a lack of understanding of agriculture. There's been no training, no teaching of agriculture or food in our schools. It needs to start there. You really don't teach an old dog new tricks. I don't expect any people at this table to learn anything new. You got to spend time out there understanding. We got to start when they're younger. The friends that I talked to or business associates, when you explain what farmers do, understand it. I don't think any of those questions have been asked by most of the people involved in this committee.

Mr. Eichler: I want to come back to the letter that you had said you wrote also to the Premier (Mr. Doer), the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) and the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers). How long ago was that letter that you wrote and what was your request?

Mr. Funk: The request was to withdraw the proposed moratorium. I don't have the date here. I just have my handwritten letter. It was when they originally proposed the temporary pause.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Perhaps we have a few minutes yet, and I know that the questions that our committee may ask are open to also the government side. Perhaps, rather than a question, maybe Ms. Wowchuk or Mr. Struthers could explain to Mr. Funk why they didn't respond to his letter. Was it poorly written? Was the address not included, the return address? Perhaps they could explain.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Derkach, the purpose of the standing committee hearings is to offer members of the public an opportunity to make presentations. Then there are questions, possibly from committee members of that presenter. That's been our practice.

* (19:40)

Mr. Derkach: I'm quite well aware of what the process has been. I've been around here a little longer than you have, so I understand what the process is. All I'm saying to the people who are present here today and to Mr. Funk, is that we have the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), the Minister of

Conservation (Mr. Struthers) with us today. Mr. Funk wrote them a letter, didn't get a response. Perhaps they could explain why they didn't respond to his letter, simple as that.

If they don't want to do it, that's up to them. I just suggest it to them.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions of you from the committee, Mr. Funk, I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Funk: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call John Gross. John Gross. Mr. Gross will be—his name will fall to the bottom of the list.

John Waldner.

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

Mr. John Waldner (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The clerk will distribute them. You may begin when ready.

Mr. John Waldner: Good evening. My name is John Waldner and I live at the Baker Hutterite Colony in MacGregor, Manitoba. I would like to thank the honourable members of the Legislature for listening to my comments and concerns about Bill 17.

Baker Colony does not have hogs, but the implications of Bill 17 to us as a community are large. We operate Better Air Manufacturing, a major ventilation equipment company, primarily for the livestock industry. Around 75 percent of our sales are generated from the hog industry in Manitoba, so a ban on this industry would cripple us as a company.

Now, one could make the argument that there will be no expansion in the hog industry because of economic conditions, but we feel things will change for the better and that is already happening. But Bill 17 will also greatly affect existing facilities very negatively.

Hog farmers with existing facilities are always improving their barns with better technology to improve production, air quality, animal welfare and working conditions, among other things. Bill 17 will effectively kill any investment in improvements on existing facilities because of the restrictions it places on expansion, even very small expansion, so facilities will become old and inefficient. Animals

and workers will suffer as a result. This will also make it difficult to sell hog facilities within the ban area. Who would want to buy a hog facility under these conditions? Bill 17 will probably also decrease the value of most hog farms within the area.

Bill 17 will not only affect us as a company but also our local suppliers. We also have several large material suppliers in Winnipeg who will lose a good portion of their business because we will no longer be needing their services. Let me point out that we are not the only company that I know of. There are many others in Manitoba in the same situation we're in.

We have many neighbours and acquaintances in the hog industry, and I have to say they practise good environmental stewardship. This is especially the case with our Hutterian brethren. The manure produced in their hog barns is not considered a pollutant; it is a valuable fertilizer that is applied at a regulated rate, so as not to harm the soil but to enrich it.

There's more than enough land for the safe application of manure. As a matter of fact, only a small fraction is used. All farmers have to buy additional chemical fertilizer that is made from non-renewable energy, which brings the question to mind: Which one is worse for the environment, chemical fertilizer or naturally produced manure? Maybe we should rename hog barns to organic fertilizer production facility.

We have heard this sentence being repeated over and over again, and I quote: We are placing a moratorium on the hog industry to save Lake Winnipeg. How can a Conservation Minister keep repeating this sentence when he knows very well only 1.5 percent of the pollution problem in Lake Winnipeg can be blamed on the hog industry? This is unfairly targeting one industry. How about the other 98.5 percent?

I would probably support Bill 17 if there was any evidence that the hog industry causes considerable pollution to Lake Winnipeg or any other parts of our environment, but there has been study after study done, the latest being the CEC report released in March of '08, that reports the opposite. The conclusion of all these reports is that the industry is sustainable, environmentally sound, and does not pose a threat to our environment or to Lake Winnipeg.

So why is this bill being proposed when the CEC has not called for it? It seems to me the Conservation Minister has a personal vendetta against the hog industry, and the long-term goal of Bill 17 seems to be to destroy this industry. This is being done with no regard for the hardworking farm families and Hutterian communities who will be devastated by this. This is especially heartbreaking when the end result will be no different with the so-called cause to save Lake Winnipeg.

This should make many other businesses in Manitoba very, very nervous, even if they are not related to the hog industry. If this government can make such a political move in one industry—and it is political; we all know that—there is no industry safe in this province. This is why so many other organizations denounce Bill 17 including the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, Keystone Agricultural Producers, the University of Manitoba, and several others.

I want to talk a little bit about the Hutterian communities which I am part of and who'll be very negatively affected by Bill 17. The Hutterites came to Canada in early 1900s after enduring much discrimination and persecution in the previous countries where our people lived. Canada and Manitoba welcomed our forefathers with open arms, and I think the Hutterites contributed much to this province in agriculture development and generally being good citizens.

There's a reason I'm talking about our history as a minority in relation to Bill 17. Discrimination always starts in some small way when government starts denying rights to minorities, and while it may seem innocent enough initially, it will lead to more and more privileges being taken away. It starts exactly like this Bill 17, where we have to come before this government to defend our rights and privileges.

There are countries where Hutterites previously lived that have some very unpopular legacies in regard to discriminating against minorities. Is this the legacy this government wants to leave behind? I hope the government in this community will do the right thing and permanently withdraw Bill 17. I plead this on behalf of all hardworking rural communities and Hutterian communities that will be so negatively affected by this bill. Thank you.

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

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Thank you, John. I've been out to your colony, was very, very impressed with the ventilation equipment that you manufacture and the process, and how well you're doing. Just for people here, I think people would be interested to have a better understanding of the sophistication of the equipment and the importance that the hog industry in Manitoba has been to the development of the manufacturing process which you have.

Mr. John Waldner: Thank you very much, Mr. Gerrard. Ventilating was developed in 1982 with a ventilating company, and we had our own pigs in that time. The business did so well, we decided to get rid of our own pigs and rather get into the ventilation business. We're now an international company with exports to other countries, to Asia, to Europe, to Russia, but the home base has to be a strong—has to be our main business, to develop the product and to get the funding to do it and all that so that's why it's so important to have a strong home base so that the technologies of other countries will follow us.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation. You talked in your presentation about taking the rights away of minorities and the responsibilities of this Minister of Conservation with respect to areas that impact on the environment, yet he's also the same minister who has allowed for three or four new cottage developments along Lake of the Prairies. In each case, there are at least 50 lots or more that have been taken up by Manitobans and others, and yet, if it was a private developer that developed on Lake of the Prairies, they would be required to file an agreement with the local municipality for effluent disposal, and they would have to contribute financially to that.

* (19:50)

To date, there is no agreement between the government and the municipalities. The lagoons in the area are full to capacity, so there isn't any room for the effluent.

Residents in the area who are building cottages along Lake of the Prairie know that there's no agreement between the developer, the Province and the municipalities. They are wondering what they are to do with their sewage, or whether they're just supposed to let it go into the lake, which is the Assiniboine River, which simply drains through Winnipeg and into Lake Winnipeg.

Do you know what measures have been taken with regard to developments like that, along the entire breadth of this Assiniboine River, or has the government just singled out the hog industry and has forgotten about everyone else?

Mr. John Waldner: I do not know of any others. No.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Waldner, for your presentation.

Mr. Waldner, I just walked down the hall for personal reasons, and I met a number of people out in there in the hall. They asked me—first they said, we're very nervous when we make a presentation. We're not educated like the rest of the people we're talking to.

Firstly, I want to make sure that you understand that everyone out there is more educated than what we are here. In your business, you all know your business way better than we do, way better than we ever will know, and you don't have to be nervous when you're making a presentation. However, one young man said, but how many times do we have to tell them?

I want to ask you, Mr. Waldner, do you think that the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) and the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) are hearing anything tonight, or last night, or the night before?

Mr. John Waldner: I have utmost respect for our government. I only hope that they take to heart what they heard here, and we'd hope for the fruits to come after. That's my comment on that.

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

Before we move on to the next presenter, I've heard a few cell phones go off. I would ask that people either turn their cell phones off, as they are disruptive to the process, or put them on vibrate mode so that we don't have to hear them. Okay?

Now, I call Mr. Victor Hofer. Victor Hofer. Mr. Hofer's name will drop to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Melvin Penner.

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

Mr. Melvin Penner (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Melvin Penner: I'm Melvin Penner from Altona, Manitoba. I run a 2,500-head sow operation there, shipping our isoweans into the U.S. I also have a fair-sized grain farm. I farm together with my nephew and a number of hired men.

First of all, I'd like to ask the question: What was the conclusion of the Clean Environment Commission report? It's my understanding that the hog farmers are not contributing phosphate nutrients into Lake Winnipeg as much as any other industries are, or individuals. I can't quite get my head around the problem here.

On the farm, we got Manitoba Conservation which looks after all our permitting. We have to submit manure management applications; we've got monitoring wells in our lagoon systems. We've put straw cover on our manures. There are all kinds of rules and regulations that we have to follow. I don't see that manure management is a problem.

Also, on our grain farm, we utilize the phosphate fertilizers that come from our sow barn and, with the commercial fertilizers approaching the \$1,500-a-ton mark, I really don't think that we're going to be wasting any fertilizer that we can possibly keep on our farm, and we're not going to send it down the river, definitely.

The other question I have: Is it the intent of Bill 17 to clean up the water system, or is the intent tend to shut down the hog industry? Which is more politically correct? I don't know. I think we've got a real good industry going here. I think there are some financial hardships right now, but I think when we lost the Crow we were led to believe that we were supposed to diversify. We did that. Now, it's too much. I don't quite get it.

On our sow farm we employ 10 full-time people. On our hog barn we also employ another 30 people down in Iowa. Those hogs were supposed to go down there temporarily when we started our operation. We were going to move those barns back here, when the killing plants were up and running here. The reason we have them down there, there are lots of killing plants. The killing plant that came up here was killed. Consequently, those jobs are all being down in Iowa. The corn's being fed down in Iowa. Our local market is gone. We sell our corn to other hog farmers but I'm not sure what we're going to do with our corn once all the hog barns are gone.

In conclusion, I just don't understand what this Bill 17, what you're trying to accomplish with it. We,

as hog producers, I think we're doing a really good job of controlling our waste. I definitely think that we're just not the main contributor to the problem in the lakes. That's my presentation this evening.

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

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Penner, for that presentation. Now, when you said that you farmed a fair amount of grain land and that all the weanlings are going south, you had the intentions of finishing those weanlings in Canada and that you employ 30 people in your barns in Iowa. The fact that you have the extra land, and if this moratorium wasn't on and you could meet the regulations of your municipality, is your intention to do the finishing in Canada?

Mr. Melvin Penner: It's most definitely a lot easier to manage an operation when you are right next door and at home. But at this time the killing plants aren't here and with the moratorium, there doesn't look like there are any killing plants coming here for the capacity to kill the pigs up here. That's another big problem.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Penner. I think there's something we need to never forget here and that is that other levels of government can make decisions that force us to do things in agriculture that we don't know about today. One of those decisions was made on August 1, 1995, when the federal Liberal government took away the Crow benefit from western Canada, and you reminded me of it in your presentation. That led farmers to have to make a change to raise more livestock in this area because of our distance from ports and the cheaper feed value that they've put on our feed grains.

I see a parallel today to another decision being made by a government to slap a moratorium on the expansion of the hog industry that was basically expanded because of another government decision earlier, 13 years ago. To say that there won't be another such decision that would impact us down the road is something we can't foresee, any of us in this room at this point, but it could happen.

I would only say that your reasonings for making the decisions that you've had were very soundly based at the time of making those decisions. Your advice to the government then, I'm assuming, would be to lift the ban and lift the moratorium and proceed with some kind of a format to, with the industry, end this deadlock and allow people to continue to expand their operations not only now but

for whatever unforeseen decisions might be made down the road.

Mr. Melvin Penner: That's correct. I definitely think that the solution is never to knock things down. I think you got to build it up. I think there's a lot of potential out there. I think we, as entrepreneurs, we'll take advantage of it. We'll make things happen. But you can't throw a surprise at us like this. We do things. We've got the program and we got the game plan going and all of a sudden, we're out. What do you expect us to do? We can't plan ahead. In our business we don't work for tomorrow. We work for 10, 15, 20, 30 years from now. Everybody loses confidence in a thing like this.

* (20:00)

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you, Mr. Penner. You make a pretty important point about having a consistent and reliable regulatory framework so that the industry can prosper.

Two points that I'd like, maybe, you could address. One is the measures that you take at a moment to make sure that all the manure is on the land and into the corn, and that none goes down the streams. Second, because you have operations on both sides of the border, tell us a little bit about the country-of-origin labelling, its impact and what should be happening here.

Mr. Melvin Penner: Firstly, the manure management plan. We have new soil tests on the fields that we intend to apply. Manitoba Conservation has some guidelines that we have to meet. So we're only allowed to apply X number of gallons per acre based on the nutrient value of the crop. That's what we need to do, but what we want to do as producers, we don't want to waste that. We grow about 3,000 acres of corn a year. We have a substantial fertilizer bill on it. We want to use it to the best of the crop's ability.

We've got monitoring wells in our lagoons. We've got to sample them every year. We've got to submit them to Manitoba Conservation. If there's any leakage—we've never had a problem like that, but, if there is, they analyse it on a regular basis, so, if there is a variance, we've got to deal with it before it gets to be a problem.

Water quality samples are taken in our drinking water every year that we feed ourselves. So we have to submit that every year. There are a number of different regulations that we have to follow.

The country-of-origin labelling, secondly, at this time, I'm not sure where it's at. The way it looks, it's going to be in the killing plant's hands. If they want our pigs today, there's a good export market for them. The way I understand it right now, it looks like they're going to keep wanting them. If not, then we've got to shut down our barns, and I'm not sure where we're going to go. At this time, it's up in the air. Nobody really knows, but I think it's in the packers' hands right now. If we would have killing plants here in Manitoba, that's one problem we wouldn't have to deal with.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you. I appreciate your presentation and certainly your compassion and feeling for your operation. My question for you is the current nutrient management regulations that have just been put into place not that long ago, some of them haven't been in place yet. Do you feel that you've had an opportunity to see the significant value that they have and if Bill 17 is premature?

Mr. Melvin Penner: I most definitely think that Bill 17 is premature. The regulations that are in place at this time, as far as I can see, and I'm not saying I know exactly how it all works, but, as far as I can see, there is virtually no, on our operation at least and that's the one I'm familiar with, there's no nourish escaping out of the field without being injected. We inject everything that we've got. We use only the soil test analysis by an accredited soil test lab. So it's important to us, and we don't want to waste it.

If there are better ways that we can retain more of it—I think we retain all of it now, but if there are better ways, we want to keep it. We don't want to send it down the river.

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

I call Dave Van Walleghem.

Mr. Van Walleghem, do you have any written materials?

Mr. Dave Van Walleghem: No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Dave Van Walleghem: First of all, I'd like to thank the committee for allowing me to speak. I was called earlier, and I couldn't make it, so I'm glad they put me back on the docket to talk at this time.

My name is Dave Van Walleghem. I live just north of Sanford, Manitoba, and I work in the

support industry for the hogs. I work with a veterinarian group where I do biosecurity issues, which I'll talk about a little later.

But first thing I want to mention is that it's very impressive to see so many young people out here today and how concerned they are. It's very important to me because I, myself, have a family. I have a daughter and two sons. My daughter is very interested in becoming a veterinarian when she gets to university in her university studies. I hope that with this Bill 17 she has the chance to actually become a veterinarian because she wants to work with production animals.

So I'm very against this Bill 17. I have been born and raised on the dairy farm just inside Winnipeg Perimeter. I've worked with production animals all my life. I've seen a huge amount of change from when I was a young boy to what it is now today.

One point that was brought up earlier about the city people not knowing exactly where their meat or milk or whatever comes from, I have a personal experience. Myself, being inside the Perimeter of Winnipeg, we did a lot of farm tours to elementary school children and what really amazed me was the parents that came along with the children, how much they didn't know about where milk came from. We would demonstrate the milk coming out of the cow and they'd be very surprised, especially that brown cows don't make chocolate milk. So it does amaze me how many adults do not know where actually stuff comes from, so that means our children are in the same boat.

I have worked in the hog industry for approximately 12 years now. I've worked actually in the barn, and I work in the support industry helping the farmers along in the new way to help make the barns more efficient. My job is to go to the barns and actually show them how to wash and disinfect with the new disinfectants and new detergents that are out today so they wash efficiently and don't misuse products. Nowadays, a lot of farms are extremely interested for me to come in. The soaps that we are using now are phosphate-free. They are very impressed about that and they're jumping on board as soon as they hear something like that. So we are very hardworking. I try to control the industry or help the industry, and every farm I go into is very interested in hearing what I have to say in how I can help them to use the products properly and not misuse the products.

Now, I'm not going to talk about the CEC report and stuff because many, many people have talked about it and we totally understand it. But, I think, with my experiences in the barns right now, the people are very concerned about using chemicals properly, and not just chemicals, insecticides and rodenticides also. You can see that the farmers nowadays are very concerned about the environment for their children just like I am, that I want environment left for my children.

So I highly recommend you guys to stop this bill. I thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Van Wallegghem.

Mr. Eichler: Dave, thanks for your presentation. You bring up an interesting point, and that's about education with the use of products of which you're talking about that you represent.

How can we take that to the next level? I'm certainly one that's opposed to regulating the heck out of everything, and the last thing we need is more regulations. How do we help through the education system or, what are your thoughts to the next step rather than just yourself? Maybe there's not enough out there, people like yourself out there, that actually have the opportunity to go out and do the training. Because, actually, I think that's probably where we need to be focussed a little more of our thoughts.

Mr. Van Wallegghem: I believe you're talking about the actual farmers and not the school children.

Mr. Eichler: Right.

Mr. Van Wallegghem: If you're talking about the actual farmers, I do many presentations by feed companies and other hog companies that have asked me to come in. Whenever I do come in to speak there is a lot of people that actually come to attend it and actually are very interested about it. So the more we have of those the better. I wish that more, actually some city people, so we can do some presentations to city people to see how effective we are and how people are very conscious about the environment and conscious about how they use the products.

* (20:10)

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for your presentation, Dave.

It's interesting to see that you're using phosphate-free cleaning products, because that's something that I've pushed for for a while.

Tell us a little bit about when you made the transition and how the products work, compared with the previous products.

Mr. Van Wallegghem: I have been working with this specific program for the last three years, and they've had phosphorus-free soaps for a little bit longer than that. Since I've known that there are phosphorus-frees, I've been very much promoting it in the barns. They're not only phosphorus-free; they're also biodegradable.

These are extremely important for the environment and people are excited about using them. So how can I say—every barn I've gone to, I've never had a person resist me on using any kind of biodegradable or phosphorous-free chemicals at all.

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

Mr. Van Wallegghem: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Mr. Gary Hofer. Mr. Gary Hofer of Elm River Colony. Mr. Hofer's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

I call Mr. Christopher Tokaruk, Designed Genetics Inc.

Mr. Tokaruk, do you have any written materials? You do, I see. You may begin.

Mr. Christopher Tokaruk (Designed Genetics Inc.): I'd like just first to thank you all for taking some time to listen to our concerns. I know that the government's busy, but this is important not just to us but, I think, to all Manitobans and Canadians in general. I wanted to give you a little bit of perspective of where I'm coming from, by telling you a little bit about me.

I'm a 33-year-old Winnipegger, born and raised in Winnipeg. I live in Dr. Gerrard's riding—who just stepped out—but I'm an urban Winnipegger. I definitely consider myself, since birth, as environmentally and socially conscious, so these are all things that I hold dear, that are important to me. Although I do work in the agricultural business, my educational background is in business. I have a degree in marketing and international business and, I think, you'll see that will influence my presentation.

Although I share a lot of the concerns that were brought up today by a lot of people whom I've heard speaking, I'd like to take a little bit of a different approach and look at, instead, the opportunities that

we could have, instead of going the route of Bill 17. If we had an open mind and if we decided to be progressive thinking, we might look at some opportunities, instead of this sort of reaction that has come into place.

One more thing before I continue, I will point out that, prior to working for the company that I'm now with, I was working for a large pharmaceutical company. One of the motivations for me to return to work for a Manitoba-based company was the fact that my two brothers were graduating from university in Ontario—they live in Manitoba, but they went to university in Ontario—with business degrees and they were planning on coming back to work for their family farm. A little bit complicated story, but they're my brothers. They lived on the farm; I didn't.

I wanted to be there with them and wanted to help them in this business. So I was invited to come to work for this business and I decided to do that. I thought it was really interesting that two young men, my brothers, with all the opportunity in the world, coming from a prestigious business school in Ontario, made the decision to come back to work for a small Manitoba-based farm. With so many different opportunities, they chose to come back to Manitoba. I thought that was really important and I wanted to be a part of that as well.

Just before I get started on my points, I wanted to reiterate a couple of points that have already been made, I'm sure, by many people today and that is that farmers rely on and have great respect for water and the environment. Farmers drink water from wells on the land that they farm. So, if anyone is to be concerned with the quality of water, it's very likely to be a farmer because they're drinking it, their families are drinking it and it's being drunk in their communities. So I think that farmers are very conscientious about the quality of water. I think if you were to approach a farmer and point out to them that there were ways to follow and complete their livelihood in a way that was environmentally responsible and that protected water quality, the environment, and the land that they live on and work on, I think that they would be very receptive to that.

So some of the things I'd like to talk about today are looking at regulations that are already in place and whether or not those regulations may be better used instead of Bill 17—those are livestock manure and mortalities management regulations. I'd like to talk about the role of regulation and innovation. I'd like to talk a little bit about green ham—and that

might come up a little bit later, you'll understand a little bit better. Finally I'd like to talk a little bit about food safety.

My question is, if the protection of water and the environment from hog manure is the objective of Bill 17, could we not update the livestock manure and mortalities management regulations to better effect? What I see as an opportunity for us is to provide farmers with regulations that would result in the desired environmental outcome. As I mentioned earlier, I think we're all very interested and we all believe that the environment and water quality are very important things and we're all behind you on that.

But then, I think, what we do next is we give the universities, we give post-secondary education and we give the industry opportunities to innovate and meet these new regulations that you put into place. We stimulate research at these post-secondary levels. We stimulate r&d in the local industry and by doing that we create more jobs. We create more reasons for young Manitobans to stay in the province because there are good jobs for them to do. Instead of working in a call centre, they have an opportunity to maybe do research and development that could, in effect, help Manitoba become a world leader in manure management.

I already believe that Manitobans are respected worldwide for their leadership in pork production. I think that we could expand on that and also become recognized as world leaders in manure management. Certainly, as world populations grow, this is going to be something that people all over the world are looking for leadership in because as populations grow and there's an increase in demand for animal protein, certainly manure is going to continue to be an issue. We have an opportunity now to help Manitoba become a world leader in this and we can share that expertise with the rest of the world.

Now, what I'm recommending here would not only benefit Manitoba pork producers, but I think would also benefit those in the beef, dairy, poultry and other livestock production industries in Manitoba, in Canada and, as I mentioned earlier, globally. I truly believe that innovation is something that's worth investing in.

An additional benefit to taking this approach instead of Bill 17, as I see it, is that European and North American markets are increasing their demand for gourmet spec, or organic, free range and environmentally friendly pork. I think with the right

stimulus package offered by the government, we have an opportunity to become a world leader in green ham, or environmentally friendly ham, environmentally friendly pork. I think that would open new markets for pork produced in Manitoba.

I think that a nice added benefit to that is that we could displace pork produced in countries with weaker environmental regulations. That might even potentially reduce phosphorus coming into Manitoba from other sources. So, if we stimulate a well-regulated, well-running and environmentally conscientious, environmentally friendly industry in Manitoba, there's certainly market demand for it, we may actually end up encouraging either other regions to rise to our level, or we would be able to grow and take some of that business away from them, further cleaning our waterways and our environment.

*(20:20)

I think that as well as innovations being something worth investing in, I think the environment is also something worth investing in. So I think, again, this is something we have in common. It's just a matter of how are we going to get there.

Another point I'd like to make is that there's an increasing concern about the safety of food being produced in other countries. I'm certain you're all aware of recent incidences of food safety issues from food coming from China and other parts of Asia with respect to contamination, residues, mislabelling, et cetera. I think that it's also well recognized that the federal inspection services really don't have the resources to adequately monitor the safety of all food coming into our borders. So I think we need to encourage responsible production of food in Manitoba and not restrict it, and I think that food safety is also something worth investing in.

So, to summarize my points, I think that updating our regulations is a better option than Bill 17. I think regulation, innovation and development leading to the production of green ham to provide safe food for all is the direction that we should be going in. Then, alternatively, we could just continue with Bill 17 and we could throw in the towel, but I don't believe that's a good example of Spirited Energy. I think that we should continue along that path, and I think we should maybe not do what's easy but do what's right. I think that we should keep an open mind, and I think that we should try to innovate and solve our problems that way instead of just a knee-jerk reaction and say, well, we better just shut her down. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Tokaruk. Questions? I have Mr. Struthers.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Christopher. The first thing I want to say is that my six-year-old would point out that it's green eggs and ham. I want to key in on the green ham part of this. Very clearly, you made the statement that you'd see Bill 17 as throwing in the towel on moving towards any kind of organic or environmentally friendly produce, but having said that, you also said that we would need to stimulate the industry. In what form? How would we go about doing that, if that was the outcome we wanted? What's your advice on that?

Mr. Tokaruk: I think you may have misunderstood. I don't believe that Bill 17 is an example of throwing in the towel on organic or some of these other porks. I believe that it's throwing in the towel on the hog industry as a whole in Manitoba, and I think that's a problem.

Sorry, the second part of the question was how do I—

Mr. Struthers: How would you stimulate the industry to produce green-friendly ham?

Mr. Tokaruk: Well, I think that the first step is to take a good, strong look at the science that's been submitted by the CEC, look at some of those recommendations, and, then, instead of immediately trying to bring everything to a halt, we take a time frame where some of these recommendations can be put in place. Maybe it's over five years; maybe it's over 10 years. There are better people than me to decide what the appropriate time frame is or what a realistic or reasonable time frame is.

But once we sit down and determine that, I think we set goals for the industry to meet. We then encourage academia and we encourage the industry to help producers meet those goals. Something that the government might do to help stimulate that is invest in centres of excellence at universities or post-secondary community colleges where they may be able to bring in or develop research capability to meet some of these goals that are being set for us.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. It's nice to be challenged to think outside the box once in a while, and you certainly have done that in your presentation.

I couldn't help but notice you talked about innovation, and that's the exciting part about any industry, whether it be the hog industry or the cattle

industry, whatever one you want to pick, but I guess my concern is that with innovation comes dollars. Bill 17, will that kill that initiative, in your opinion?

Mr. Tokaruk: Well, I think that, as a community and as an industry, innovation is in our blood and it would be difficult to totally kill it. I do think that it will probably take incentive away from some of the larger multinational corporations to invest in Manitoba. I think that innovation will continue to roll on but probably not at the rate that we have had here in Manitoba and that we've been very fortunate to have. We've had an industry that has encouraged innovation and growth, and I believe responsible growth as well. I think that it's just important that we continue to try to stimulate that and that we are all under the understanding that it must be done in an environmentally-conscious manner. I would never suggest that we just grow for the sake of growth. It needs to be environmentally sustainable. Absolutely.

So, as long as we can meet that criteria, I think we need to be able to continue to grow. Like I said earlier, if we're able to grow and we're able to produce pork in an environmentally-friendly manner and we're able to displace pork being produced in other parts of the world where possibly it's not being produced in an environmentally-friendly manner, where there is major pollution being done to produce this pork, we have an opportunity not just to improve water and land quality and air quality in Manitoba, but that can extend worldwide.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you, Chris. Help me a little bit in understanding the swine genetics because I have a sense that Manitoba's been a fair leader, at least in recent years, in swine genetics. Tell us a little bit about some of the advances that have occurred in swine genetics and why Designed Genetics is such an important company to the whole industry.

Mr. Tokaruk: I certainly appreciate the question, and I can't say I was prepared to talk too much about my company. I really was here primarily to speak about this issue. What I will say is that there are certainly tremendous advancements being made in genetics in Manitoba. Like most of the rest of the pork industry, we're seen as world leaders in not only genetics, but also in animal nutrition and veterinary medicine and equipment manufacture. Our company, like the gentleman who was here previously from the ventilation company, we also sell our products globally. So things that are produced here in Manitoba to support our local industry are respected and sought-after worldwide.

To your question, you were asking about some of the advancements made in genetics and how they benefit the industry. Well, on the maternal side or the sow side, the mother's side of the equation, a couple of gentlemen have been up here, I believe it was Mr. Martin who had indicated that his sow productivity or in terms of the number of pigs per sow per year has increased from 23 to 27 pigs per sow per year.

So, on the maternal side, we are seeing great increases in the number of pigs that are coming from a single female, a single mating, which is significant certainly for producers from an economic standpoint. It definitely brings an important concern. If these farmers are not allowed to expand their facilities to accommodate these advancements in genetics that are occurring, we are going to have some serious animal welfare issues with respect to crowding in these barns.

* (20:30)

I'm not looking forward to seeing that in the news when farmers who are forced to crowd the pigs in their facility because they are not allowed to expand their facility. There was some discussion of country-of-origin labelling, but there are also other real situations where—and, unfortunately, things that we should be prepared for, where the borders may close to our weanlings. For instance, for an animal disease. If we're unfortunate enough to have a foreign animal disease occur in Manitoba and the borders were shut to the United States, we'd have to do mass euthanization if we couldn't somehow otherwise raise those pigs and have them into the food chain, because no country would accept those animals if we had a foot-and-mouth disease for instance, or something like that. I mean, we're all very pretty familiar with foreign animal disease from the BSE situation that we're still dealing with.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Tokaruk. Time for this presentation has expired. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Tokaruk: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Call Mr. Peter Waldner. Peter Waldner. Mr. Waldner's name will drop to the bottom of the list.

Paul Maendel, Prairie Blossom Colony. Paul Maendel. Mr. Maendel, is he present? Mr. Paul Maendel will be dropped—[interjection]

Pardon me? Does anybody know if he's present?

Floor Comment: He was here.

Mr. Chairperson: Pardon me?

Floor Comment: He was here a minute ago.

Ms. Wowchuk: Let's go to the next one, and then we'll come back to that one.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. We'll go to the next presenter, and we'll call him next.

The next presenter is Jack Penner. Is he here yet?

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Chairman, I know I got a call just a little bit ago from Mr. Penner. He's on his way; he'll be here shortly. I ask leave of the committee that his name not be dropped from the list. He should be here just momentarily.

You've heard Mr. Eichler. What is the will?
[Agreed]

You can maybe call the other name again, though, Tom. I think some people just came so you might want to call that other name again.

Mr. Chairperson: Paul Maendel, is he in the room now? Not yet.

Okay. Todd Hacault. Todd Hacault. Okay, Mr. Hacault will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Levi Hofer. Levi Hofer? Mr. Hofer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Curt Plaitin.

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

Mr. Curt Plaitin (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. You may proceed.

Mr. Plaitin: My name is Curt Plaitin. I'm speaking as a private citizen. I'm a small hog producer and I also work in the feed supply industry. I live in a small rural town with my wife and three boys aged 4, 7 and 10.

I came here today to voice my concerns for the future life of my family and others living in the rural area. It seems like the government of Manitoba is acting directly against the economic growth and sustainability of the rural areas by shoving Bill 17 down the throat of the hog industry.

Many small towns like the one I live in are looking for ways to create jobs and keep our young people employed in the rural communities. The hog industry is one of the major employers of the rural areas. An example of this is the small town of Notre

Dame, where close to 20 families have employment directly in hog operations.

Several years ago, I was involved in building a hog barn, along with several other farmers. Before we started, we went through a technical review which addressed various environmental concerns. These farmers have done things like plant shelterbelts, apply straw cover, and soil testing. Even though there was a lot of clay when constructing a lagoon, they still put a PVC liner in. They have several test wells drilled around the lagoon, and the water in these wells is tested every year to ensure there is no leakage. These producers are very protective of their water and soil because they are the ones who live there. Prior to injecting the hog manure, the soil is tested to ensure that it is not over-applied. This manure goes on land that is very good for crop production, which ensures that all the nutrients from the manure are absorbed by the grain being produced. This barn is a sow barn and the farmers who built it get weanlings which supply their own finisher barns at home. This barn employs five people who live in the rural area and three of these have families.

Several of these farmers have sons working with them on the farm, and hog operations give these young entrepreneurs the opportunity to launch a career in farming. When constructing this barn, the majority of the companies, materials and labour were supplied within 40 miles of where the barn is located. This provided many people with work in the local area. I'd like to point out that many of these suppliers continue to provide services to this barn every year. Some of these regular suppliers are people like plumbers, electricians, truckers, veterinarians, well-drillers, gravel supplies, insurance agents, financial institutions, lumber and hardware suppliers, lawyers, accountants, and people like myself who work in the feed industry. There are several other suppliers who are involved in the construction phase. This brings many people to the rural area and they eat at the local restaurants, stay at hotels, and fuel up their vehicles.

These hog operations will help to provide for many young families and future generations. The people who own all these businesses where we purchase goods and services also have families, and it provides income of which a lot of it will be spent locally. The children of these families need an education, which provides employment for teachers, secretaries, librarians, janitors and others. These families need health care, financing, vehicles,

mechanics, groceries, fuel. Having the hog industry has many spinoffs to the entire local communities, and there's a snowball effect to the growth and sustainability of the economy.

Imagine what can become of a community if our farming families decided to go elsewhere. Many of the careers and businesses I mentioned would not survive. Where would we be? Perhaps in the lineup at the unemployment office. And don't kid yourself. There are many businesses in Winnipeg which also benefit from the hog industry. By implementing Bill 17, the effect on the economy will be extremely detrimental, and eventually, existing barns will close with none to replace them. Bill 17 will create a slow death to the rural area. The schools will close. Businesses will close. Local arenas and recreation facilities will no longer have enough participants to stay open. There will be a negative multiplier effect to many of these small towns.

A good example of the benefit of the hog industry was to the town of Leroy, Saskatchewan. About 10 years ago, its population was down 420 people. Then some hog operations were constructed in the area. The village has grown 20 percent to over 500 people. Many new faces have come to town with most of them in their 20s in age, many of them swine workers or people who work for companies who supply the hog operations. Many small towns in Manitoba have decreased in population just like Leroy, and the Leroy school had been threatened with closure because of declining enrolment. Students would have to be bused 32 kilometres away. Instead, they've done a \$500,000 renovation. If you look at municipalities with the most growth, it's due to the livestock industry.

The Manitoba government appears to be doing this solely for its own benefits and not to the benefit of the Manitoba economy. We all know the majority of the population of Manitoba is in Winnipeg. This is where it appears the government sees to try to gain votes by implementing something like Bill 17. Even though there have been many studies showing the hog industry has a very small effect on the water quality in Lake Winnipeg, the government still tries to lay blame on the hog industry, thus making themselves look good to the people of Winnipeg.

* (20:40)

There was a two-year study done by the Clean Environment Commission, which showed the hog industry is environmentally sustainable. The government seemed to ignore the study and go for

votes by making it look like they're doing something environmentally friendly to help Manitobans.

How much of our tax money was spent on this environmental review by the CEC, which the government seems to ignore? There are many regulations and rules already being enforced on the hog industry which make it safe and sustainable environmentally.

We, in the rural communities, have been abandoned and our livelihood threatened by our government today. My family and neighbours do not want to see school closures; the same goes for hospitals and other services and businesses. What value do you put on keeping our young people near home and contributing to fill our rural schools and being a part of the community? If we refuse livestock operations, we will kill many rural communities and eventually cause major damage to the entire Manitoba economy.

I want to stay living in Manitoba. It's a good place to live and raise a family. I want my children to have the opportunity to live and work in the rural area. Please don't destroy the opportunities that I have today and that my children may have in the future by implementing Bill 17. Thank you.

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

Mr. Maguire: Thank you for your presentation, Curt. It's compelling, I think, your discussion about small communities. I've got several in the southwest corner of the province where I live that have grown in population as well, since pork barns or hog barns were built near their community, the proximity to their communities. A lot of young people have been able to stay and work there.

Do you feel—with your comment about that we, in rural communities, have been abandoned by our government—do you feel that the present government is attacking rural agriculture with Bill 17?

Mr. Plaitin: Yes, I feel that the bill is just going to be so negative to the rural areas that we're going to see depopulation in the rural areas, that you'll see people move out of Manitoba, people like myself who have been in the hog industry for 20 years. That's where my training is and that's what I've done. If there's no hog industry here, then I'll have to look elsewhere.

Mr. Maguire: The last presenter—I know you were in the room to hear Mr. Tokaruk's presentation where

the minister in his first question to him said that it wasn't just green ham which, I believe, we would have a great opportunity to market, given the quality of the product that we could have in this province, but he kind of alluded that it was green eggs and ham.

I know the story that the minister is referring to but, when the whole thing started about a moratorium on the hog industry, the pork industry couldn't believe that this would ever come about. So, for the minister to include eggs in this discussion, is exactly why people are nervous.

Do you believe that poultry could be the next pork in the moratorium?

Mr. Plaitin: I think all the livestock industries, including the beef, dairy and poultry, should be nervous and be watching what's going on here today.

Mr. Maguire: And the last one: Do you believe that the research, education and innovation that you talked about here would be a great opportunity to provide a quality product to market around the world and work with the government to find out how they could enhance research, education and innovation, which would be much more positive and help expand and grow, not only the industry, but the quality of our product which is already world-famous for quality, be a much more proactive approach than a moratorium going on?

Mr. Plaitin: Yes, we're one of the most regulated industries in the world and Manitoba, having these regulations, should be able to show that to other countries and show that we have safe food here and promote that.

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

Mr. Plaitin: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I'll call Paul Maendel a second time, Prairie Blossom Colony. Mr. Maendel back yet?

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

Mr. Paul Maendel (Prairie Blossom Colony): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may proceed.

Mr. Paul Maendel: I'm Paul Maendel from Prairie Blossom Colony and this moratorium has—it's actually a fact that I was already, like, right when it

came out a year or so ago, we're in the truss manufacturing and we've already had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on different equipment just so that we can manufacture trusses for houses instead of hog barns. Right from day one, it's affected us. I mean, there are lots of guys here saying it's going to affect them months, years, or whatever it may be from now, but right from day one we've had to invest big money and go elsewhere for business.

It's really a direct attack on our livelihood. First of all, the government's supposed to help us, not be against us. I just don't see any point in this moratorium when we as taxpayers, we pay for the studies and you don't even listen to those studies. I don't know, two ministers, how they can look in their kids' eyes and teach them not to lie. They teach them to tell the truth, but they constantly lied to us about this moratorium is just temporary, and it's going to go away, wait for the study, and then it's permanent. Now you're trying to pass a bill on it. It's ridiculous.

And they can sit here and look me straight in the eye, knowing that they've lied to hundreds and thousands of people. What kind of government is that? It's very simple. I asked my ten-year-old kid. I drew him up a pipe. I says, where do you think there's more water going through, a garden hose or a sewer pipe? He says, well, that's easy; the bigger pipe. So the little effect that the pigs or manure has on Lake Winnipeg is basically a garden hose compared to a big sewer pipe. I just don't see the point in what you guys are trying to pass here with this bill.

I could go on and on here, but everything has probably been covered over and over again. Like the young guy out in the hallway says, what's it going to take to convince these people? How do you convince a person that thinks he's right and that's not telling the truth? I say kill the bill. Get rid of it. It's stupid. It doesn't even make sense. What are you guys thinking? You're supposed to help the people, not try and make them move out of town or out of Manitoba. Just think about it for a second before you guys go ahead with this bill.

If you can look in your kids' eyes and convince them that that bill makes sense, that you've tried honestly to talk to hog producers or professionals in the industry, that, yes, we made a right decision, then I don't know what planet you guys are from. Kill it. It's got to go. That's all I got to say.

* (20:50)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel. I have Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Paul, for your presentation. You brought up a good point that there was a pause, they called it a pause. It wasn't a moratorium, but it was a pause to assess the industry and that pause was, for well over a year it was in place.

The point you brought up was that that affected your business. That affected your business before the moratorium came on. You had to re-adapt to keep your truss business going, to keep the boys with something to work and to bring money into the colony to help support the colony. We've heard the minister often say in the last few days: How would you address this issue of the phosphate? How would you change the bill to make it a better situation?

It took a year to do the study, over a year to do the study. They promised you that, once that was over, you would be able to go ahead and do business, and then they slapped the moratorium on. So, now, if they're going to adapt and change that, you've been 18 months, almost 20 months tied up, how many months longer do you think this industry has to wait for any changes that the minister might undertake, if he has heard anything that you people have said today and yesterday and the day before?

Mr. Paul Maendel: That's a really good question. I don't know if a person that thinks he's right, and that he's really not telling the truth to begin with, ever can understand what devastating effect he's already caused on kids, wife, brother, sister, like, complete colony. The whole colony is like—totally had to readapt.

We had to invest hundreds of thousand of dollars in different lines to manufacture different equipment. Like we were in the manufacturing of trusses and supply of building hog barns and we basically had to park a whole line and reinvest in a totally different line and we don't know why. It doesn't make sense why. Like, just a small, tiny bit of manure they're worried about, but how many hours has the city of Winnipeg sewer line run over just yesterday and today? Probably 10 to 15 hours. Nobody can do anything about it. It's ridiculous, and they can sit with a smile and they can just tell you, they promise you one thing and they do the next. No responsibility, nothing. This has to stop. People are sick of it.

Mr. Derkach: Well, thank you for your presentation. I don't think you can put it much more clearly than you have in terms of how bad this bill really is. I was present in the House when the Minister of Agriculture, who's here today, Mrs. Wowchuk, stood in the House, and when we questioned her about the moratorium in the beginning, when she put it on a year ago or so, she said that it was a pause. She did not call it a moratorium. She called it a pause. The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) reiterated that, calling it a pause as well, and that the Clean Environment Commission would be asked to report quickly so that the pause could be lifted then and the industry could be back at work.

Well, we've seen the reality of the pause and we've seen the reality of the Clean Environment Commission whose recommendations were not followed in their intent. I want to ask you—I think we've had enough presentations to convince anyone, if they were listening—is your industry going to continue with your presentations until you have a response from the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Conservation? Is that what you're waiting for, for them to give you some signal from this table that, indeed, they're prepared to amend the bill or prepared to withdraw it, or take some action? Because, to date, both sit here hour after hour with expressionless faces and give you no response of any kind. They don't even ask you a question.

Mr. Paul Maendel: Well, that's very typical. They can just sit and smile at you, knowing all the damage that they're causing. No, I don't see that they're even thinking of doing anything different or even trying to help. I mean, we've just gotten over the BSE. Well, lots of people aren't over it yet. Many people, their lives are destroyed.

They go and, basically, do the same thing, even worse. They want to shut us down. BSE, there was a disease, at least, that shut the borders down, but our own government wants to shut us down instead of helping us, and they're telling us they did the best they could in the BSE. It doesn't end. I honestly don't see them really caring enough.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you, Paul, for coming in. Certainly, your story is a pretty distressing one. That original pause or moratorium, depending on which way you want to call it, I think started in about November of 2006. Tell us how quickly it took before you were starting to feel an effect and had to make a decision that you had no option but to switch.

Mr. Paul Maendel: Well, there were a lot of guys that were going to expand and build big barns. Right away, guys cancelled. They just said, well, we have to wait for this bill or which direction it's going to go.

We have a tight operation there. I mean, we're not big into land. Our land base is very small, no cows, no chickens. We've got a sow-farrow to 50 pounds that we've temporarily decided to depopulate because of the grain, the price of pigs. There's still a lot of work to be done in our piggery, but I don't see any hope with this moratorium.

Yeah, right from day one on, we got nervous, and that's why I said we had to go and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on different lines in our shop to target housing, maybe cattle barns, chicken barns. It's not easy just to park a complete line on manufacturing and focus on other issues. Sure, we could have waited, but they promised us, it's temporary, and now it looks like it will be permanent. They even want to make a bill with it. How can you believe, how can you trust them? It just never ends with this government, never. We have to kill that bill.

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

Mr. Paul Maendel: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Mr. Reuben Waldner.

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

Mr. Reuben Waldner (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Reuben Waldner: Hello. As you can see, we have lots of upset people here. As a minister in the Hutterite church, we always seek peaceful solutions to problems. Sometimes a problem seems insurmountable, but if we sit down, all parties concerned, there are ways to find solutions. I appeal to both members of the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party and the farmers to sit down.

As you can see, there are a lot of effects here. It affects a lot of people. It's not only the farmers; it's not only the Hutterites; it's the whole rural farming economy it affects. It's a fact. We can't say it doesn't.

* (21:00)

I've listened to people that are for the bill, and they have very little that it affects. It's just a few

small interest groups. As you know, the facts from the Clean Environment Commission and all those, we all know the hog industry is not at fault.

So a wise man changes his mind and the New Democratic Party can change their mind. I believe they can. I believe they're here, the environment minister and Agriculture Minister and a few others here. I believe they can change their mind if we sit down, we got a democratic process, and we're very thankful that we can come up here and voice our opinions and to respect the government. The government is here and all governments are not from themselves here, they're all from God. All governments are of God, and we have to respect the government. But we can appeal to a government, and we want to appeal to the government today, that the bill they have, the Bill 17 they have is a bill that is hard, will be hard on rural Manitoba. It will be. There's no doubt about it. It will affect us, it will affect lots of farm families and people in Winnipeg too.

So it's never a bad thing to say I'm sorry, I was wrong. It's easier and it's better when we recognize that we are wrong, we can say I'm sorry I was wrong. Let's find a solution. That's why I appeal to the New Democratic Party here as the governing party and, with the Conservative Party here, work together. Work together with us. Listen and maybe we can find a solution that makes Manitoba a better place to live. Not for only today, but for our future. So this is a direct appeal to the environment minister and to Mrs. Wowchuk to consider it. All we can do is present our case, and we just plead you to listen to us, consider us, and that's all we can say.

Any questions?

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

Questions? I have Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Waldner, and, being a minister that you are, and speaking to two ministers here at the table, I would suggest that you're the one with the common-sense approach to the issue that's at hand.

However, when we say that we want—or what you said was, we should all get together and discuss this.

Mr. Reuben Waldner: Yes.

Mr. Graydon: I would say to you, Mr. Waldner, that for over a year, the producers of this province got

together with the government-appointed people and they assessed the situation in the province. The Clean Environment Commission made recommendations, 48 of those recommendations, and I would say that the Conservative Party is willing to work with the NDP party to implement those 48 recommendations.

Once those are implemented and we could have time to see if the results from those recommendations had any effect, would you say that that would be a reasonable negotiation for the farmers, for the NDP and for the Conservative Party?

Mr. Reuben Waldner: For everybody. For the whole province of Manitoba.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Waldner.

You know, we've heard a lot of presentations in this committee over four days and you've struck a first, I think, with your comment that a wise man can change his mind. I appreciate the fact that you've offered a way here for the ministers, who, I have some doubt, had a great deal of input into this bill coming forward. There's been an awful lot of education provided for backbenchers in all areas that may not have had as much of an agricultural background on some of these issues as others.

I appreciate the fact that, being a minister, you know what it's like to lead. Maybe, if the backbenchers and the ministers here can convince the Premier (Mr. Doer) to make a change in this bill, I think that's the only way it's going to be changed.

I wondered if you could elaborate a little bit in regard to the impact that you think you might be able to have, if you were to meet the Premier, one-on-one, with your comment about a wise man can change his mind.

Mr. Reuben Waldner: I'd like to meet Mr. Doer; I've met him before. I still remember Ed Schreyer coming to Miltown Colony when there still was a Miltown Colony, a few times. Before he was even elected Premier, he came to visit us. We had a very high respect for Mr. Schreyer; he was very good to the Hutterite people. It's still in my mind what Mr. Schreyer did.

The NDP government can not afford to alienate us, because it has far-reaching effects. It's not only today. I still have good feelings of the NDP Party 30 years ago, when Ed Schreyer was in power. It is not easy only for today. You can alienate the people; you can alienate people from ever voting NDP or

Conservative, with policies and issues. So let's try and find a solution, a peaceful solution.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you, Mr. Waldner. I've visited Miltown Colony but, maybe, it was after when you were there. I don't know—

Mr. Reuben Waldner: I think maybe—I still remember it. We had a meeting in the dining room.

Mr. Gerrard: I know first-hand the effort that you've put in and the variety of the colonies and visited a number.

I'm a member of the Liberal Party. There are three parties here. I've been a champion of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg, but I've had a very careful look and don't believe that this moratorium is the way to go at all. It would be far better to adapt and make sure we're looking after the environment and helping develop the various industries, including the hog industries, in a sensible way at the same time.

Mr. Reuben Waldner: The hog industry has come a long way and it has cleaned itself up. It's not like 20 years ago or 30 years ago. It's regulated and it's a good industry. So we have to change the city folk's minds that it's not bad, even if it smells bad.

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Waldner, for your presentation and the very wise advice contained within it.

I've had the pleasure of visiting some of the colonies as well, with hog operations. I know there are some friends here from Baker Colony. I've had a chance to see the operation there as well, which does a lot to supply the industry. I was impressed by the great work they're doing there and the impact that Bill 17 has on them.

I want to thank you for the sage advice and share with you, perhaps, something that will give you cause for optimism. You made the comment about a wise person can change their mind.

In our system, we operate, as you know, based on if the majority wants something, then the majority can do something. There are 57 members of the Legislature; 21 of them support your position—all of the Progressive Conservatives and, I believe, both members of the Liberal Party, so there are 21. You only need eight more votes. That means, of the 36 NDP MLAs, you don't need all 36; you just need eight of them. Mr. Doer has only one of those votes.

I know members of NDP have never, ever voted against Mr. Doer, but they have that opportunity any time they like. I hope that we'll find eight of them who will have the courage to change their minds and do the right thing, even if Mr. Doer is bent on destroying your industry. Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Reuben Waldner: Thank you.

* (21:10)

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

Mr. Titus Baer? Titus Baer.

Mr. Baer. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Titus Baer (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Order, gentlemen.

Mr. Titus Baer: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Titus Baer. I live and work on a farm 60 miles west of Winnipeg. We do have a hog barn on our farm and are depending on its profits to make a prosperous living for me and our other 86 members currently residing on our community. I'd like to tell you that we're not directly affected by the moratorium as, where we live, the area has not been banned. But I'm here to tell you and to warn you, the NDP, that if you go ahead with the ban, you are basically destroying the hog industry in Manitoba.

We're currently going through some very tough economic times with the high Canadian dollar, COOL and the high price of oil which affects everybody, so the last thing we need is you guys making it even harder for us by giving us another blow over the head with this ban. I've always thought that Manitoba is one of the greatest places to live and to make a living for us farmers, and I've always been so proud of our licence plate that reads friendly Manitoba. But now my mind has changed, and I feel we ought to change that to no farmers welcome, instead.

In 1998, I was living and working in Alberta, and I couldn't believe how prosperous that province was when compared to my home province. I know your response is, that's all oil money. But remember, oil only started to spike in '05 after Hurricane Katrina. The point I'm trying to make is that the government of this province appears ready to let the market dictate how things should and will work in

this province, whereas the Manitoba government, under the NDP, is bent on regulating everything to death.

What you're doing is taking away our freedoms that have been given us under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We are known all over the world as a free and democratic country, but look what you're doing. Shame on you for taking our rights away. I'll tell you, if you pass this ban, you will suffer tremendously along with all other Manitobans.

Hey. It's barbecue season now. We all love our pork chops, hot dogs and our ribs, right? Well, let me assure you that if you push this ban, then eventually we'll lose our hog farmers, and then guess what comes along? Higher pork prices at the local grocery store. Who'd be complaining the most then?

I would also like to add about the OlyWest issue. I believe that deciding that the plant be not allowed to be built, this, too, has created a negative stigma for Winnipeg and Manitoba from which it will take a long time to recover, if ever.

It's been told, time and time again, the reason for the hog barn ban is because of the algae blooms in Lake Winnipeg. Having done some research, we are responsible for only 1.5 percent of the nutrients, whereas the city of Winnipeg is responsible for 6 percent, and I don't understand the rationale behind that. Like, where are we going with that?

What I can't believe is that they are crying that they will have to spend \$300 million to upgrade their facilities when the punishment for the hog industry's 1.5 percent is the complete destruction of our life. Seeing nutrients are such a problem, why doesn't the government work together with farmers to work out technologies to be better managers of animal by-products?

In closing, I would like to say that, if you attack an important part of your economy like the hog industry, which brings in close to \$2 billion a year, everybody will suffer in the line of lost jobs, food shortages and lost tax revenues. People will start to move to areas of the country that are more prosperous. It would probably not happen overnight. It will take 10 years or more.

My main point is if one member of the body suffers, then all members of the body will eventually suffer, which means farmers and city folks alike. Thanks for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Baer. Questions.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Mr. Baer. I appreciate your presentation tonight and the fact that you took the time to come in when you don't live within the moratorium distance. That would lead me to believe that you're nervous about that moratorium area stretching. However, if, and you mentioned something and I'm not sure that if your numbers are correct or not correct and I'm certainly questioning them. You mentioned \$300 million to fix the sewer system in Winnipeg and that might well be the number. I really don't know what it is.

However, if we would take the Hutterite colonies, for instance, that have hog lagoons and I would suggest there are how many—150 lagoons and hog barns? I know the cost of the barns. The barns will cost, for four finishing barns of 2,500 head, will cost about \$1.2 to \$1.4 million. The lagoon will cost another, depending on what it is, could cost up to half a million dollars. If we take all of that out of the economy in Manitoba, that would be much, much more than what it would take to address the problem in Winnipeg.

You have spent the money. Your brethren have spent the money. Other people in the hog business have spent their money, up-front money. They have spent that to keep the lake clean. Do you think it's reasonable to ask the City of Winnipeg to spend their money?

Mr. Baer: That's my point. I can't understand why people in the city of Winnipeg are upset that they have to spend this money, and we are only responsible for 1.5 percent of the nutrient load in Lake Winnipeg. Right? Our punishment is basically the cancellation of our industry. I don't know where we are going with that. Is this a Communist country or what?

Mr. Chairperson: Further questions? Seeing none, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Baer: Thanks.

Mr. Chairperson: We call Brent Manning. Brent Manning. Mr. Manning's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. David Hofer. David Hofer. Mr. Hofer will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Dwayne Wollman. Mr. Wollman is speaking in place of Mr. Leonard Waldner.

Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Dwayne Wollman (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Dwayne Wollman: I'm taking a bit different view here today. I'm talking from an educator's point of view. I'm a teacher on my colony. I've gone through university. I'm now working in our colony as a teacher and that's kind of the point. I'm going to try and bring across a few points that I see every day in my classroom and of the different curriculums that the government of Manitoba is trying to implement and how this reflects on what we teach our students.

The Manitoba government, they are spending large amounts of money to redesign curriculums in the hope to reach more students, build more accepting and smarter Manitoba. Teachers, educators are spending huge amounts of time implementing this new curriculum. The main tools we use to bring our points across are historical and present examples like what do the governments do now, what do our people do now to concrete these points that we try and make. We try and teach them to be understanding and smart human beings.

* (21:20)

Like in social studies, for example, we teach students to become accepting citizens—we try—and to understand the world around them and make decisions based on what they observe and what they do. In grade 8, it deals with ancient societies, past and present, in hopes—and we look at those to try and see how past decisions have had effects and how past civilizations have exploited their resources to make a better society.

In grade 7, well, we deal with Third World countries and how their world differs from ours; also mistakes that have been made there and how we can learn from those. In grade 5 and 6, I'm proud to say, we deal with Canada and we deal with Manitoba, and friendly Manitoba, and we all proudly refer to it and we want to continue referring to it. We know that in Manitoba, we accommodate people. We're friendly and we welcome them. As a Hutterite educator, we need to take examples that are related; like for myself to bring a point in curriculum across, I have to be very creative. I have to go and see and look for examples that my students will understand now, how, and that are related to us and Bill 17. I have a tough time, tough time teaching our students that our government is actually taking into account

the curriculum that they're bringing out and making us teach.

For example, ancient societies, ancient and present societies, they realize the skills of their people like the Romans, the ancient Romans, and they supported them and they strengthened them and this resulted in them flourishing. Though Manitoba has done a great job in encouraging the hog industry, our government now tries to suppress the main source, one of the main sources of income in our province and 10 percent of employment opportunities. We teach our children to be friendly, accepting other people in different cultures and understanding the world around us. Yet, if there's a problem in our midst like this problem with Lake Winnipeg, we start pointing fingers; oh, that's a problem; we're going to ban that.

In science we teach to come up with a—in every grade we teach to come up with a concrete solution, with a concrete—with evidence enough to make a decision. We have to first form a question and the question that we have today is: Does the hog industry produce all or does it have a significant impact on the phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg? Then we come up with a hypothesis and we say, yes, we think it does, okay. We think this tremendous increase in hog production has resulted in extreme phosphorous pollution in Lake Winnipeg. That's our hypothesis. That's what we play but now we have to find proof of that and this does not exist. Although it's been requested, it's—we can't—the University of Manitoba has even published articles and findings that there are other causes that could be pointed out for the algae growth in Lake Winnipeg.

Now the question that why we are here today—why are we discussing Bill 17? What examples are we setting for our future Manitobans? This is, I think, I feel this is unacceptable and a shame to all Manitobans that we are actually even here today and considering this with the limited amount of proof that is available to us.

I'd just like to say that I also play a role in our manure. When we empty our lagoon and our tank, I play a role and I have quite a good understanding of what the process is. We spend huge amounts of money to ensure that we can applicate this stuff to the best of what we can use. Like I know a couple of, like 10 to 15 years ago when we first started we—I was a young kid, I was 15, I thought, well, the slower we can go with this tractor, the better off we are, the faster we're done, right? But now with education and

with these new regulations, the more land we can cover, the less manure we put on. We just need this much. The more we can cover, the more money we save, the more money we're making. We have GPS. We know exactly where we're pumping. We know exactly what we're putting on. We have certified people checking our soils to see what's there.

Now, another point. We apply a natural manure and a government-approved rate and take certified soil samples to get that rate. We know, we understand the manure; we know that any excess phosphorus will be gone in three years. It's sure—like, when manure goes through the hog, it—some of the phosphorus that goes through can be broken down by the livestock, but it will still disappear. It will go away, but what about this artificial fertilizer that's being mined?

I've seen metal objects. Metal's a mined mineral. I've seen it 50 years after, it's still lying there in the dirt. Sure it rusts, but does it ever go away? Yet, we, we're putting a natural manure, and it's going to go away. I feel very concerned. I, too, am very concerned about the pollution in Lake Winnipeg. As a matter of fact, right now, I'm teaching a unit on the water cycle, and we're really studying the water cycle in Manitoba and what we can do and how it affects us and what happens. Why do our things go empty where we take water from? Why do they go empty? Where does the water come from? How can we work to preserve that? There are many articles speaking of municipalities and cities draining their human waste into waterways. It's been discussed over and over again today about the city of Winnipeg. I don't want to point fingers. I want to educate and I want to solve problems.

There's also evidence that I've heard that some soaps, they have phosphorus in them, and we talked about that already, lots of hand soaps, lots of soaps, and educated people are already taking that and they're wanting to change that. Why can't we encourage those instead of discouraging it?

From an educative standpoint, considering everything that has been brought forward by Bill 17, the issues, the theories, the concerns and the decisions, I must say that I must be missing something, and if Bill 17 gets approved, this is not something I would willingly—I will still have to share it with my students, but willingly, as a positive and as a contribution to friendly Manitoba, I would have a problem finding a way to bring that across because I am a proud Manitoban. I am.

I'd like to really ask my government and the leaders of our province and our country, I ask them for the sake of our children and their future to amend Bill 17 or drop it because this would be the responsible thing to do. That's all.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wollman. Questions. I have Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Wollman, for your presentation. You're very clear on what good stewards of the land the farmers are and your colony as well. It's just added to the confidence that you give me as far as the ability of farmers to comply with the rules that have been established already by this government, and it's no shock that there's consternation as to why we're here.

My question to you is, if the government withdrew Bill 17 tonight, do you think that the 95 percent of the people that have spoken against this bill would bother making the rest of their presentations?

Mr. Wollman: I would hope. I don't know if they would, but I would hope they would because I think personally we are going through a very good education process here today. Even like what I mentioned before with the ideas that have changed us and have brought us to be more efficient, should I say, and invest more into our environment, I think that's a good thing. I do. I really do, but Bill 17 is a totally different ballgame.

Mr. Maguire: I agree with you, and I believe that people can change their minds and presentations like yours are what's going to help the government clearly make the decision to change this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Wollman: That's why I'm here.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Wollman, thank you for coming in. As you've said, there's a lot of education and learning here and the tremendous changes in the hog industry and what has happened over the last 10, 20, 30 years in terms of the improvement in the way that we're sensitive to the environment and so on. It's quite a story, and I think there are a lot of lessons for your students.

Tell us a little bit about your school, how many students you have in the class and the grades. They have a love of learning and, one of the things that I have learned, I don't know about your community, but there is an increasing number of young people from Hutterite colonies who are now starting to go to

universities, probably, particularly, Brandon University. Tell us about it.

* (21:30)

Mr. Wollman: My school, there're about 30 students. I teach from grades 5 through 8, and I oversee the high school, which is delivered via television from a neighbouring town.

I look at education as an experience, right, and the best thing to teach kids is that this stuff that they're learning is taking place in the world. Like I said about the curriculum, basically the science is new. Math, social studies, these are all new curricula, physical education, that the Manitoba government has brought in and are working hard to implement, and some of them already have been implemented.

A lot of this stuff, we don't have the resources for it yet, so it's a very resource-based teaching process, where we have to go as educators and look for ways that we can kind of concrete these new concepts. For example, in science, the main thing that you teach in science, every grade, is what I said, the prediction, the hypothesis, to prove and be able to reproduce the same results.

I don't see that with this bill. I absolutely don't see it. I don't see any evidence that would even make somebody think that a hog moratorium would actually help it. If it would, hey, let's discuss it, but the amazing change that has taken place in the hog industry where so much has gone on, like with GPS, with AutoSteer, like, it's such an efficient operation.

But they're not helping. The government is not helping with that. They're not. It's costing us. It's costing us, as the farmer, huge amounts of money to bring in this new technology, to learn about this stuff, yet we turn around, we've done all these things, and where's the help? There is no help. Our government is our leader. Like somebody said, the government is from God. They should be leading us. There's a special responsibility on them.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you very much for your presentation, sir.

Mr. Wollman: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: As per leave granted earlier by the committee, I go back to presenter No. 51 and call the Honourable Jack Penner to the microphone.

Welcome back to the Legislature, Jack.

Mr. Jack Penner (Private Citizen): Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Jack Penner: I have written material, but not for distribution.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. You may proceed.

Mr. Jack Penner: Mr. Chairperson, it is, indeed, a pleasure. I respect that you have given me this time and that you're allowing me to appear, even though I was a bit late.

I have a document before me that is not of my own writing, but it is a paper that was distributed to the Minister of Water Stewardship (Ms. Melnick), among others in this building. I would like to read part of that presentation that was made by a former scientist at the Freshwater Institute.

He says: My remarks are from the perspective of one of those who participated in the limnological studies of Lake Winnipeg carried out by the Freshwater Institute in the late '60s and the early '70s. At that time, I was also involved in the International Joint Commission study to predict potential impacts of the Garrison Diversion on receiving waters including in Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba. I was a member of the water quality committee.

Supply of nutrients to Lake Winnipeg is hydrologically driven. It is my opinion that over the last three to four decades, external inputs of nitrogen, N, and phosphate to Lake Winnipeg have not increased as a consequence of large increases in utilization and disposal of N and P that occurred on the terrestrial watershed. I do not believe, he says, that the current nutrient loading reduction strategy, minus 10 percent for N and P, if achieved, will be discernable in a system as nutrient rich and highly variable as Lake Winnipeg, nor is there reason to expect corresponding improvement in algal species composition and/or reduction in algal productivity.

That was a covering letter. I will now quote from part of his presentation: I suspect that the small increase in loading rates and this is a repetition, of Lake Winnipeg reported to have occurred over the past three decades plus 13 for N and plus 10 for P are not real and/or significant. I am doubtful for two reasons: first, because 1994-2000, average loads of N and P to Lake Winnipeg, despite an exceptional loading year—and we all know what '97 was, fell well within the ranges reported in the period of 1969-1974—and I think that's important to note and the minister should make note of that.

Secondly, because it would be very difficult, if not impossible to detect a precision, precision implied such small 10-13 percent changes in hydraulically driven system that exhibits huge hundredths of percent inter-annual variable in the nutrient supply. Recall that from 1969-74 on a whole-lake basis, year to year differences in loading were up to two times for nitrogen and up to 3 to 4 times for phosphate.

And I will go to page 6 where he questions, he said, the preceding gives rise to an important question, likely different from those asked up to now: why have the substantial changes in anthropogenically driven utilization and delivery of the nutrients that have taken place on this terrestrial watershed over the last three to four decades not translated into corresponding large, discernible increase in rates of supply of N and P to Lake Winnipeg?

This next statement is the reason I came here and wanted to come here because I think it's important. Because much of what you have heard here, heard farmers tell you of the great changes they have made in practices, and this underlines that: Perhaps the answer, he says, to this question is that nutrient consumption, utilization and disposal practices since 1970 have, overall, been at least adequate to have prevented realization of the anticipated response, at least a doubling in supply of N and P to Lake Winnipeg via its tributaries. As examples, I offer two cursory observations that perhaps lend some credence to the hypothesis. The Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board report presented data showing that, from 1965 to 2005, the bulk of fertilizer P added to the agricultural lands of Manitoba was either retained in the harvested crops or cultivated back into the soil. I think that's extremely important for you, the minister, to note. Since 1970, the loads of N and P attributable to the city of Winnipeg may have declined significantly—and I think that's also important for all of us to recognize—by 30 to 60 percent respectively.

Recall that Brunskill, in 1973, reported annual N and P inputs from the city of Winnipeg effluent were 5,300 tonnes of nitrogen to 1,000 tonnes of phosphate. According to the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board report, today's yearly contribution by the city are 3,700 tonnes of N and 400 tonnes of P, a very significant reduction.

I would suspect, Mr. Minister, if you would really do your homework and have your people do

the proper research, I think you would find today that the flow of nutrients into our water system from our farms would correspond with that kind of reduction because of the huge and immense changes that have been made by the farm community and the billions of dollars that they have invested to ensure that the nutrients that they apply to the soil will, indeed, remain in the soil and not run downstream into your lakes and your rivers.

* (21:40)

We parked our mouldboard ploughs; we parked our double-disk drills. We are now incorporating and utilizing the straw material to keep our soil at home. Remember 1988 when I first ran for election, there was a dust storm where you couldn't see your hand in front of your face. Since then, on our farm, there is no equipment left that we used at that time. It has all changed. It is either minimum till or zero till and it injects every nutrient into the soil. We don't spread on top of soil anymore. If we would apply some of the methods of livestock production that had been promoted before this table by some people that know very little about livestock production and nutrient management, I would suspect that the increases would be dramatic and phenomenal.

If you would just use straw-based manure collection and then spread that out on the land, how else are you going to get that nutrient back on the land? You're going to have to spread it out on the land, and what's going to happen? The rains are going to come and the manures or the nutrients out of that will be soaked and run into your rivers and your streams instead of, as these people behind me have told you time and time again, they now inject their manure, one of the most organically safe materials that you'll ever buy. If you want organic production, the only material you can use for organic production is manure. All chemically or all manufactured chemicals and fertility products are banned from organic production, and surely you know that. But yet now we are being told that organic production will no longer be allowed on our farms because we will not be allowed to implement a manure management strategy that's relevant to what we need to—for the nutrients that we need to add to our soil in order to keep it healthy.

Remember the early '80s when the scientists told us, as farmers, if you keep on farming the way you do today, you're mining your soil to such an extent, within 20 or 30, 40 years you will have no soil to farm on. So what did we do? We changed our ways.

We applied nutrients to balance. We started—the university started soil testing. Our farm had soil tested from the first day that the university offered soil testing. I tell you, sir, that our nutrient levels in our soil today are better than they were 40 or 50 years ago. They lead to a better balance of crop rotation and, I should say, has led to better balance of crop rotation. The scientific evidence that we have seen and the scientific information that we have been given, we have applied and it has made farming better and safer. The products that you eat are much better than they were 30 or 40 or 50 years ago. Indeed, I believe the livestock that eat the very grain that we produce—

Mr. Chairperson: Ten minutes, Mr. Penner.

Mr. Jack Penner: —is an important aspect of making sure that we, as farmers, have the right to produce the kind of food that will be needed during the next decade or two to satisfy the hunger of the world. That's all we're asking, sir. Give us—let us use the tools that we've been given. Let us use the methods that the scientific community has okayed for us, that have been taught to our young people, and let us use them to prove that we can, indeed, stop hunger.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. Okay. I have four questions, starting with Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Thanks, Jack, nice seeing you again.

My question is pretty simple and pretty straightforward. As a former minister of the Crown and Minister of Conservation, how would you advise the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) to get rid of Bill 17?

Mr. Jack Penner: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's a good question. I would suspect if the minister really did his homework, he would set aside the intent that he's on now, the intent of what he's attempting to do now. He would surround himself with those people that have the knowledge and that are the operators on the land these days and that deal with water management and water nutrition and deal with—ask that scientific community for the advice. But ask the primary producers, as well, to sit side by side with those scientists to give you the kind of information that you need to do what's right that we can continue the food production cycle.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Jack. I want to first note that you haven't missed a beat. You can still rile up a crowd on an agricultural issue. It's good to see.

I think you're in a unique position to give advice to this committee. You talked about technology, and you talked about how advances in technology and agriculture and, in particular, the hog industry, have been very useful in controlling the amount of nutrients that eventually end up in Lake Winnipeg. The reason I say I think you're in a unique spot is that you have the experience that you've brought from your farm and through this Legislature to tell us what you think the most significant improvement in technology has been. But I also think that you're in a position where you can look forward to advising this minister on what you see as the next horizon, the next level of technology that can get us to where we want to go in the future.

Look back for me on what the technology was that has the biggest significance and project a little bit ahead for me, would you?

Mr. Jack Penner: Well, Mr. Chairperson, Mr. Minister, I haven't got the wisdom of Methuselah. I do, however, know that there are two very significant events that occurred over the last decade and a half, and that is that we lost our Crow rate, which increased our cost of transportation dramatically on the farm.

I don't know whether you know this, Mr. Minister, but it costs me now, and I just checked this out this afternoon, it costs me now just over \$1.50 a bushel to unload my grain at an elevator and ship it to Vancouver to export position. If we do away with our livestock industry or even if we tinker with it to reduce the numbers of livestock, that will increase my cost because today I sell all my corn locally. The cost of transporting that corn this past crop year has cost me an average of 18 cents a bushel, and I do my own storage, which we have to do anyway, and it's right off the farm to point of use. There are people sitting in this room that utilize our corn. Now, if that is taken away from us, you will increase my per acre cost at better than \$125 to \$150 an acre just by the action that you're contemplating because I will no longer be able to sell the amount of grain that we have sold to the local economy.

Remember we said that if the Crow disappeared, we will have a different Manitoba. I've said this many times, and it will turn into a livestock province. We have tons of room in the Red River Valley to expand the hog industry or the other livestock industry dramatically.

Just look around my backyard. We operate 5,000 acres with my three sons. I was very fortunate. All

three of my boys wanted to stay on the farm. But we operate 5,000 acres. There are four barns next to our farm. They utilize some of our land. We could use another eight barns right adjacent to our farm, and that wouldn't even be enough to supply the nutrient levels that we need to produce a crop year after year. We still have to go out and buy fertilizer.

We need organically produced materials, which was said at this committee just last night, that we needed to increase organic production. It was said by one of your CEC board members. We needed to do that. How can we do that if we haven't got the material to be able to do it? How can we do that effectively?

Let us show you, Minister, what kind of economy you can have, what kind of government you can be if you allow us the freedom to do what's needed to be done on the farms and the rural communities, and watch the growth.

* (21:50)

Mr. McFadyen: Thanks, Jack, for the presentation. The minister is right, you haven't missed a beat, and it's great to hear from you tonight, again.

You have made a couple of arguments tonight that are strong arguments that haven't been a major focus today, and there have been a lot of very strong presentations prior to yours. But you have highlighted the way that Bill 17 has an anti-organic farming element or effect to it, whether intended or not. The effect is anti-organic farming.

Secondly, the need for exporting grain, a higher degree of pressure to export rather than consume locally, which is also an anti-environmental impact of this bill when you consider that transporting goods over any large distance has a footprint environmentally and has a cost to those who need to transport. So I want to thank you for highlighting two of the anti-environment elements of the bill that I think haven't been really fully explored to date.

Finally, I want to just ask you to highlight one of the points that you referred to in the report about the impact of the overland flooding in 1997 because you touched on it, then you kept going, but I think it's an important point. The 1997 flood of the century resulted in tremendous levels of overland flooding and a high amount of nutrients then making their way back into the waterways and into Lake Winnipeg, which seems to have created a significant spike from the scientific evidence, temporarily at least. I wonder if you can just expand on what that

scientific report says. I'm not a scientist. But I've heard it from other scientists that maybe we should be looking back at the '97 flood if we're looking for something to consider when we look at the causes of the current issues.

Mr. Jack Penner: The report—I should say this is not a report. This is a paper written by a former scientist because he was concerned about what he was seeing and what was happening. He makes the argument, even though there was a high level of nutrient transfer in the Red River Valley down the Red River to the lake, during that one year, the overall average increase has not been more than what the CEC said of 10-13 percent. That's the point he makes. He said, even though we had a very large, inordinate—and then he goes on to say that he believes that because of the farming practices that have been implemented from the time that he and Brunskill and one other person did the work on Lake Winnipeg, he makes the point that he believes that there's a lot of credit due to the operators of the land, to the city of Winnipeg. I've heard finger pointing from time to time at this committee. I think that's unfortunate because I think we all want to work together to solve this problem, and I think it can be solved.

But I also want to make note that another scientist has said to me, be very careful how you mess with the waters in Lake Winnipeg. He said, if you create the imbalance, that could have very detrimental effects on Lake Winnipeg. He said, be very careful what you do.

I think this minister needs to stop, put this bill aside and sit down with those people that have the expertise and have shown that they have the will to make the changes in rural Manitoba that will stop the flow of nutrients into that lake. But let's maybe not stop it too much because that lake, in order to remain healthy and provide the kind of fishery that lake provides today, should be recognized. There's a higher level of fish come out of that lake, commercially, than I believe ever before, and that is in spite of the fact that we dump a whole bunch of rough fish aside, which I believe is unfortunate because there's huge hunger in the world and if we got those fish to those people, they would love to eat them.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this—[*interjection*] Pardon me?

The Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) asks leave to put a question. [*Agreed*]

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I heard part of your presentation, Jack, but I was out talking to some people so I didn't hear it all. So I don't know if you said—you're referring to a report. Could you tell us whose report that is or which scientist that is? I'm interested to know.

Mr. Jack Penner: I will tell you that your Minister of Water Stewardship (Ms. Melnick) has a copy in her possession of this report. So does your Water Science Management Branch, Dwight Williamson, So does Gerry Berezuk, the deputy minister. They all have copies of this document that I'm just seeing.

This document, by the way, was written by a good friend of mine who's a scientist, and his name is Paul Campbell. He wrote this document.

Mr. Chairperson: We are now at 12 minutes for Q & A, which is seven minutes over, which I've allowed out of my great respect for Mr. Penner and all that I've learned from him over the years when he was a member, but I do have to draw this presentation to a close. So I thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Jack Penner: And thank you for the opportunity of allowing me to appear even though I was late. We were raising money for children that need help in another country, and we raised quite a bit of money this afternoon.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Jack.

Okay we will move on to Mr. Jack Waldner. Mr. Jack Waldner. Mr. Waldner will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Guy Labossiere. Guy Labossiere. Mr. Labossiere will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Mike Hofer. Mike Hofer. Mr. Hofer will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Felix Boileau. Felix Boileau. Mr. Boileau will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Rick Fast. Rick Fast. Mr. Fast will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Miles Beaudin. Miles Beaudin. Mr. Beaudin will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

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

Mr. Jonathan Maendel (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Jonathan Maendel: I am here today to try and protect my future because the way things are going now I don't think I have a future in Manitoba. It's a shame. The government is doing things like that, and it is not only my future, it's the future of all the children amongst the colonies. I think this is a direct impact to the colonies and all it is is pure politics.

Madam Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

The hog industry has nothing to do with the phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg. Only 1.5 percent of phosphorous levels in Lake Winnipeg come from farms and that's not only hog barns. It's all the other farms, too, the cattle industry, the poultry industry and probably even the small towns. How do you know how much comes from the hog industry? It could come from the small towns too. Most of them dump their raw sewage into ditches, and you think that doesn't come into Lake Winnipeg? That figure of 1.5 percent is probably exaggerated because I think it came from the government.

* (22:00)

You should be out trying to stop all those bad guys in Winnipeg from stealing cars, but, instead, what you're doing is you're convincing me to go out and wreck a bunch of cars. Us farmers try to stay out of the city and control our farm, not the city, and that's what you should be doing. Stay in the city and control the city. We don't tell you guys what to do and you shouldn't tell us what to do. Has one of you guys ever seen a pig by any chance? You probably don't even know what a pig looks like. That's it.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Are you finished your presentation, sir? Are you finished or are you—

Mr. Jonathan Maendel: Yeah.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Maendel?

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): Yes, I know what a pig looks like and I've handled my share of them over the years. I just want to thank you for your presentation. It takes a lot of courage for you to come and do this, and we appreciate your input.

Can you tell us what your job is? You're still going to school but your job is on the colony and what you hope to be doing as you grow up, what you would like to do within the colony?

Mr. Jonathan Maendel: My job is to—I work in the broiler breeder barn. I don't work in the hog barn, but our colony would be affected if the hog ban is passed

in the future. I haven't decided what I would like to do.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Maendel. Thank you.

Okay, moving down the list. Next, I have Stanley Hofer. Stanley Hofer? Mr. Hofer will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Adam Waldner. Adam Waldner? Adam Waldner will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Blair Cressman?

Do you have written copies of your presentation.

Mr. Blair Cressman (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

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

Mr. Cressman: I'm going to just comment on two things before I get into my written presentation.

The first thing, I was hoping Minister Struthers would be here for, so I'm going to the next thing first.

How many people here of the MLAs present have heard of a carcass competition? And I figured it would probably be the people on this side and I've—yeah. Rosann.

An Honourable Member: The guy from Brandon, too.

Mr. Cressman: This is an event that's held every year here in Winnipeg and it's involving a lot of the people here in this room. It's a pork quality carcass competition and it's to ultimately win the best conformation hog in Manitoba. I think if you're not aware of this, I just wanted to highlight it because we had a planning meeting this afternoon for the 2008 show and there's a lot of involvement. This is a big event for the guys. Primarily the colonies are involved in this program, and the thing that you need to know about the carcass competition is that it directly impacts the people in your ridings.

How that works is that these carcasses are actually distributed through Winnipeg Harvest to the food banks across Manitoba and primarily in Winnipeg. That's out of the goodness of these producers' hearts and as well all of the industries—all the industry companies sponsor this event and sponsor prize money that is then donated to charities across Manitoba. In the last number of years, the Winnipeg show has donated over a quarter of a million dollars to charities across Manitoba. This is a

great news story because not only is this right before Christmas when food banks are looking for meat, but we've got hospitals that have pieces of hospital equipment that have been donated by the colonies here that have plaques on them thanking those colonies, so I just wanted to highlight that.

Stan is not back yet, but I would like to maybe just address what Minister Struthers had asked to Mr. Penner, just in regard to maybe some future things that the committee might not be aware of that are affecting phosphorus.

The first one that I was introduced to when I was going through university at the University of Guelph in Animal Science, is quite a unique thing. It's called the Enviropig. Has anyone heard of the Enviropig?

I was surprised when we talked about phytase here earlier. That was probably the first time a lot of the committee members had heard about phytase. That's the enzyme that allows a pig to readily digest the actual phosphorus in corn-based rations or in wheat-based rations.

The Enviropig is a genetically modified pig that was developed at the University of Guelph that has the ability to naturally produce phytase to allow it to digest more of that phosphorus in its ration. Especially when a lot of these producers have switched to corn-based rations, this is a technology that's coming down the pipeline. It has not been implemented. The actual genetic line has been held at the University of Guelph in their facilities and those pigs have been destroyed. They have not entered the food chain, but they are ready that when they get to that point they could be entering into the food chain.

The second thing that I would like to—I work for a large company that is developing a new product that's being right now registered by CFIA. We have a technical veterinarian who's launching that product. He's actually from Manitoba. That product is going to improve the feed efficiency of male pigs by up to 10 percent. Essentially, that's going to be reducing the phosphorous output, the nutrient output because those animals are more efficient with the food they consume and essentially are producing less waste. That's another technology that I wanted to make you aware of.

I'd like to start by thanking Ms. Wowchuk, Mr. Struthers, the other MLAs here present for giving me the time to speak.

Commitment. The government keeps talking about the commitment that they've made to water quality in this province and more specifically, Lake Winnipeg. So I'd like to tell you a few things about commitment.

My name is Blair Cressman, and I work as a pharmaceutical salesman in the hog industry in Manitoba. I directly work with veterinarians, feed companies and the hog producers of Manitoba. My company continues to invest millions of dollars in R&D to provide our customers with innovative products to improve the health and welfare of livestock. I'm committed to the hog producers in Manitoba who pay my salary by purchasing my company's products, the same producers that Bill 17 will affect.

Almost three years ago, my wife Kate, made a lifelong commitment to me. Only eight months after tying the knot, Kate and I made another big commitment. We left our native province and our friends and family in Ontario to settle into Manitoba after I was offered a job as a salesman in the hog industry.

If you remember back to June of 2006, I was moving into a province with a strong hog industry. It's funny how quickly things can change. Since then, the Canadian dollar has climbed to par, grain prices have reached record highs and U.S. mandatory country-of-origin labelling is threatening isowean markets. Let's not forget that the Manitoba government and the City of Winnipeg were also committed to the proposed OlyWest hog slaughter facility that eventually fell through. But, more to this point, since moving into the province in 2006, the Manitoba government has turned their back on the hog industry during these challenging times by implementing this moratorium.

I grew up on a family farm in southern Ontario with my parents and three brothers. My father operates a large hog finishing and cattle feedlot situated on a 1,000 acres west of Kitchener. My father continues to adopt the best management practices on the farm to ensure the environmental sustainability of the land and water. These are the same practices that many of the hog producers have explained to you during these presentations.

Both of my parents have taught me and my brothers the value of making logical, well-researched decisions. It baffles me that the provincial government cannot do the same thing, especially when your decisions could affect the entire industry

and the thousands of people that make their livelihood from it, including myself.

I work for a science-based company that makes rational and logical decisions based on research. I could tell you about the lack of science behind this bill and how it will unfairly discriminate against hog farmers, but, as I know, and I'm sure you know, that's been thoroughly covered. What this government needs to hear is how this moratorium will affect me, Premier Doer, Minister Wowchuk and all of the Manitobans across this province.

* (22:10)

Bill 17 will have no impact on the water quality in Lake Winnipeg. What Bill 17 will do is limit the sustainability and succession of hog farming in Manitoba and, ultimately, kill the family farm. These smaller operations are competing in a world hog market that continues to consolidate and rely on efficiencies of scale with the inflation of input costs. These producers need the ability to continually adapt and grow their operations as we feed a growing population. When you kill the family farm, you will kill our Canadian food supply, the food that I eat, the food that Premier Doer eats and the food that feeds our nation.

With world grain banks at the lowest point in roughly 50 years, nothing scares me more than relying on other countries for our food supply. We are walking down a slippery slope towards relying on countries like China and Brazil for our food supply. These are countries that don't have the same food safety regulations that we do in Canada, let alone the same nutrient management regulations.

If we cut through the BS of Bill 17 it's easy to see a government grasping for green votes by unjustly diverting the eyes of Winnipeg to the hog industry as the culprit for the phosphorus loading in Lake Winnipeg. If this government is in the business of making commitments, make a commitment to me and the partners in this hog industry and in Manitoba. We've invested taxpayers' dollars in the Clean Environment Commission, and it is being ignored. The hog industry in Manitoba is committed to water quality in this province through their investment of millions of dollars to ensure we are continually improving our environmental sustainability and complying with phosphorus nutrient management regulations.

Nutrient management plans have been readily adopted by the farmers of Manitoba to ensure animal

density and manure output matches the land base. I stand before you today and request that you withdraw Bill 17 and work together in partnership with the Manitoba hog industry to adopt the recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission.

If I were in your seats right now I would be making a commitment to ensuring there will be a strong agricultural industry in this province to feed my children and grandchildren. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I'm intrigued and always enjoyed research and development, and you talked about that a bit in your presentation. What kind of message is that sending to our corporate world, in your opinion, when we look at Bill 17?

Mr. Cressman: It doesn't mean anything. What does science have to do with it? Listen to what Mr. Penner presented. Is any of that being evaluated? We've got loads of science. I come from Ontario, and my dad has sat on the Grand River Conservation Authority board for a number of years. He farms on land that is directly associated with the wellheads for the city of Kitchener. Over 30 percent of the water is drawn from an aquifer that my dad farms on. He sits on that and they readily accept him on that to contribute his thoughts. He's an educated guy. He has his Master's in Animal Science and he's extremely educated in this.

Again, sitting around the table, bringing all the opinions to the table, bringing all the research that is available to the table, it's just logic. You guys go through it every day.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for that presentation. I'm like Mr. Penner. I'm one of the lucky ones in Manitoba because I have three sons who are also engaged in agriculture in this province and I'm extremely proud of that.

You are working in a different level, one which looks at the efficiencies and the best practices in agriculture, and that is your job. What will happen to the work that you have done and that companies have invested in to try to extract greater efficiencies out of the livestock industry, if, in fact, there's a moratorium put on the industry where the industry

can't expand and doesn't see any hope in the future? How does that impact on your type of business and your type of industry?

Mr. Cressman: I think it's pretty obvious. We need producers to use our products. We are investing a lot of dollars not only in the research but launching these products, working with the producers to learn how to use them properly. Working with the veterinarians so that they're able to use the best management practices when implementing these programs with these producers.

We've already, with the consolidation in this industry that's happened due to the challenging market conditions, we've had the reality that you've probably heard. There are a lot more pigs going to the U.S., and that means fewer doses of vaccine and fewer pigs available for us to work with in this province. If we're killing off smaller producers, I guess they can try launching these products in other countries that don't have the same regulations. We won't have pigs here to work with. We won't have a livestock industry. Where does it stop? Liquid manure runs downhill.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Maguire: Mr. Cressman, thanks.

You work in an industry, the pharmaceutical side of the industry. A number of other areas of the world have dealt with manure management in many ways.

Can you enlighten us as to some of the areas that you're familiar with, other areas of the world—Denmark, Holland, Belgium, to name a few—that have gone through a lot of these types of discussions, I think, that we're presently involved in? Are you familiar with any of those, and can you enlighten us on any, if you are?

Mr. Cressman: Yes, the European Union has extremely tough guidelines and it's just the matter of—we've got a growing population that needs land. Coming from Ontario, look at that—half of the best agricultural land is under pavement in Toronto.

If you're looking at Europe specifically, they're trucking their manure from those facilities into water treatment facilities, such as the ones around the city of Winnipeg, to handle that. Again, they're going through the process of treating that and the same thing happens. Those facilities can get overloaded, and what do you do? If the City of Winnipeg can't even invest to maintain their own control of their

own sewage, how are we going to walk down that line?

We're already doing some of the best things in Canada and the world, as far as controlling those nutrients. If we're going to try to make steps towards what Europe's doing, let's get Winnipeg in line, first of all. If they can't even handle the cost of improving the facilities, then how are we going to put facilities in place to handle the treatment?

Just like Mr. Penner said, that's organic fertilizer. It's a great source. Maybe some of you haven't heard, but there's huge expansion in the midwest in the hog industry. You know why they're expanding and putting hog barns on fields? For the manure. The by-product of corn production for the ethanol industry is pigs.

They want that hog manure, because it's a lot cheaper than chemical fertilizer. That chemical fertilizer, it starts in the Middle East, turns into corn that goes into your Coca-Cola and you're sipping oil. You're sipping oil that comes from the Middle East. Wouldn't you rather be sipping something that's organically produced?

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

Mr. Cressman: Thank you very much.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: To continue down the list, calling—

Committee Substitutions

Madam Vice-Chairperson: I have substitutions first. First, I'm going to make some substitutions: Honourable Ms. Oswald for Honourable Mr. Lathlin; Mr. Altemeyer for Ms. Blady; and Ms. Marcelino for Mr. Caldwell.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Next, we have Edwin Hofer. Is Edwin Hofer here?

Mr. Hofer, welcome. Do you have copies of your presentation? Okay, the Clerk will take them from you and distribute those to the committee. You can start whenever you're ready, sir.

Mr. Edwin Hofer (Miami Colony Farms Ltd.): Thanks for letting me be here.

My name is Edwin Hofer, manager and representative of Miami Colony Farms. We have a population of 110 people and are located six miles north and four west of Morden, Manitoba. Hogs have

been our livelihood since 1964, which is 44 years or more than two generations of producing food for us and other people in this world.

Bill 17 is pulling the rug out from under our feet and our children financially. Bill 17 is ignoring the fact that Manitoba has the strictest environment rules which we all follow for our own benefit and the province. Bill 17 will not affect hog farms; it will affect all of Manitoba. Would we call it, Unfriendly Banitoba?

Bill 17 will effect trucking, tire shops, feed grain companies, feed mills, hog equipment companies, grain handling equipment companies; the list goes on and on.

Since the early '90s, Manitoba hog producers and breeders have produced better breeding stock than the United States and other countries. Bill 17 is throwing all the work and research into the trash can. We're not buying breeding stock from the U.S. anymore; we are producing it right in Manitoba and we should be proud.

* (22:20)

Bill 17 will do nothing to keep Lake Winnipeg from changing. There is no scientific reason to blame it on the hogs. Fishermen are catching more fish than ever before. We as hog producers feel like we're slowly being strangled by our own government, which should really be helping the country's producers instead of discouraging them.

What are our leaders really thinking of? What will be next? Dairy farms, the beef feedlots. Two years ago the hog industry in Manitoba had everything going for it, a brand new killing plant in Brandon, plans for a brand new plant in Winnipeg. Politicians have turned an industry away from the city of Winnipeg. After the gold is gone, the booming gold town or city turns to a ghost town. Marion Street is already a ghost street.

We need smarter bureaucrats to teach politicians. Hindsight is always clearer than foresight. It boggles my mind why our government would put a ban on an enterprise that generates more revenue than Manitoba Hydro. We know that the industry has been a big help in building this province to what we have today.

Miami Colony has been on the Canadian quality insurance program since 2001 where all medication is government inspected and monitored and government veterinarians regularly inspect all

livestock and barns. We have been good stewardships of our land and practice up-to-date farm technology. We follow all environmental rules and regulations. Miami Colony has been on the manure management plan since 2003. We hire Agricore United to do all our soil testing so that it's done professionally. We also analyze our liquid hog manure for nitrogen and phosphate and apply it to the farmland for one crop for as much as the crop needs. After all this control, hogs are still the scapegoat of Lake Winnipeg. If Bill 17 goes through, it will leave an odour behind far greater than the smell of pigs.

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

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Hofer. I want to just take you on a little bit different tack. I was at your colony last summer, and your colony was in the process of trying to get a leather tanning plant set up. You were running into all kinds of obstacles from various government departments, including Conservation. Have you ever managed to get through those regulations or at least get an answer to the—at that time, you were having trouble getting your questions answered as to what specifically they wanted in terms of regulations. Did you ever get an answer? Did you ever get your leather tanning plant set up?

Mr. Edwin Hofer: Yes, they gave us a draft for the time being which we're still bench testing, and they want to know how much chrome we put through, and they can't find anything else to really shut us down. Seeing it's a deer-hide tanning, there are game wardens in the yard every two weeks. Hides have to have a tag. So far, we've passed all inspections, and we're also hiring professionals to help us.

Mr. Eichler: My question for you, Edwin, is in regard to your own operation. Do you have the current land base to expand if you decided to put an application in and Bill 17 wasn't there to inhibit you from applying for a permit?

Mr. Edwin Hofer: The permit for tannery?

Mr. Eichler: No, a permit for your hog operation.

Mr. Edwin Hofer: Yes, we have enough land base, more than we need.

Mr. Eichler: Then, nowhere in the CEC report does it say anything about a moratorium on the hog industry. Now, it was very clear in the recommendations and we've heard from a number of presenters that if, in fact, the minister withdraws Bill

17 and brings in regulations, they would deal with that. Would your colony be able to meet those requirements and be able to accept what has been going on now with the industry with the changes that have been recommended by the CEC report?

Mr. Edwin Hofer: Yes, we have. Up until now, we've passed all regulations. If they come up with new ones, we'll try very hard to follow it.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Hofer, for your presentation. I think I know where you were coming from when you made the comment, and I quote it, do we need smarter bureaucrats to teach our politicians?

I guess I look at it and I say that our leader, per yesterday, as opposed to the unfriendly Manitoba slogan in question period, indicated that, if elected in the next election, we would revoke Bill 17 and support areas that Mr. Flaten from the university put forward in his presentation on Saturday night of research, education, innovation and environmental sustainability for the industry.

I guess I beg to differ with you on your statement. I think what we need is to elect more common-sense politicians and deal with an industry that wants to expand, can help expand, and as presenter after presenter, and you, tonight, have indicated, where there are fellow farmers quite supporting the tight regulations, the best regulations, you could say, from an environmental standpoint, that have been put in place anywhere in North America, in this province.

We have a great opportunity. One speaker spoke tonight about the green opportunity for the environmentally friendly pork production, that sort of thing. Can you indicate that you believe that you, other colonies and other fellow farmers in Manitoba, can live with that and that there is an opportunity to promote an even better quality product than what we've got today?

Mr. Edwin Hofer: Well, we already have the best product in the world. If they want it better, we'll try.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you. I think that shows a very great openness on behalf of yourself and your fellow farmers. I know the government is listening to that. I just hope they act. Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you. Seeing no more questions, I thank you for your presentation tonight, sir.

We're going to keep going down the list.

Next I've William Hoffman. Is William Hoffman here? Okay, William Hoffman will drop to the bottom of the list.

Robert Krentz. Robert Krentz? Robert Krentz will drop to the bottom of the list.

Jeremy Maendel. Mr. Maendel, welcome. Do you have copies of your presentation for the committee?

Mr. Jeremy Maendel (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

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

Mr. Jeremy Maendel: Hi. My name is Jeremy Maendel. I work in a 550-farrow-to-finish hog operation on a Hutterite colony. I have been working there for a year and a half. My dad is the hog manager at our colony. I want to either take over or still work there in the future.

I am writing this letter in response to Bill 17. I'm a concerned hog producer in rural Manitoba and I want to let our government know that what they're trying to do to our hog industry is just because of political reasons.

Why does the hog farmer get blamed for dumping waste into Lake Winnipeg if we only produce 1.5 percent of it versus 6 percent that the City of Winnipeg produces? Are we living in a communist country that the government controls everything we do, don't do, or want to do? Am I looking at this correctly that the government is trying to kill the hog industry in Manitoba?

Anyway, that's exactly what it looks like. The bill will not only affect hog producers but other industry personnel also, like genetic companies, breeding companies, trucking companies, feed companies, pork-processing companies, veterinarian supplies, plus a lot of other people that work in this industry. In my books, this Bill 17 is illegal and it's discrimination against our rights of freedom.

Another issue I want to touch is on the pork-processing plants in Winnipeg. Close to 10 years ago, there were six hog-killing plants. As of today, there are none in Winnipeg just because of our government that thinks if they can avoid having to support a killing plant in Winnipeg, then it is good news to them.

Please, Gary Doer and Stan Struthers, open your eyes and get that garbage out of your head that Manitoba hog producers pollute Lake Winnipeg, if it's actually the City of Winnipeg that's doing it. Now, if our government thinks that the hog manure is not worth working for, think again. Our land cannot be better fertilized than by natural fertilizer, and manure is worth \$100 an acre, as I understand, with the fertilizer prices these days. Only our government does not realize the economic reality of proper manure utilization. More than that, it's part of the natural cycle of life and forces our society from using \$130-a-barrel of oil to make fertilizer. Nothing is greater or greener than natural fertilizer. How long will it take for our government to put a ban on the cattle industry, on the dairy industry, on the turkey industry, chicken and pullet industries?

*(22:30)

Our government is wrecking our young people's future. They're trying to stop hog production in Manitoba, but I hope and pray that it won't work into government favour. Please, Gary Doer, and company, our younger generation that's in this hog industry is in jeopardy and by the looks of things, you don't really care if this bill gets passed. We want to pass this farm on to generations to come yet, but by the looks of things we won't be able to if we listen to our corrupted government.

So I would touch on one more issue before closing about the OlyWest plant that was supposed to be built in Winnipeg a couple of years ago. The location of it was not planned out correctly, but our government didn't even look at supporting this OlyWest plant. So that just tells you how much interest our government had in this project.

The government can stop these three regions from expanding or rebuilding their hog operations, and eventually it will stop the rest of the province from expanding or rebuilding. What if we, at our colony, want to ever expand or build a new facility. This would even affect us in the long run if we're not in the three zones that can build. They will even ban us from building in the future.

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

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Jeremy, for your presentation. You focussed an awful lot on processing plants and my question for you is: Based on Bill 17, if it is to pass, what message is that going to send out there for people and investors and

companies wanting to come into Winnipeg or outside Winnipeg and build a processing plant, in your opinion?

Mr. Jeremy Maendel: They'll look at other provinces. They won't even consider Winnipeg or Manitoba to even come here.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I want to thank you for your presentation here tonight, sir.

So we're going to call next on the list James Waldner. Is James Waldner here? James Waldner will drop to the bottom of the list.

Tom Leppelmann. Tom Leppelmann. Do you have copies of your presentation?

Mr. Tom Leppelmann (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

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

Mr. Leppelmann: Members of the panel, my name's Tom Leppelmann. I farm in the Steinbach area in a family farming operation. I graduated with a diploma in agriculture from the U of M in 1989. After several years in agribusiness, I decided to go back to the family farm because I saw opportunity. I realize that we are producing a commodity where global supply and demand set the price for our product. We invested heavily so we could produce pork at the lowest cost possible. We invested in capacity. We invested in genetics. We invested in feed milling, consultants and marketing, agrology, business and production.

Bill 17 will take away the opportunity to invest and run our business and keep it competitively in a global market. This takes away the opportunity of any future generations to farm for the land we have that instead of manure as a fertilizer we will have to buy synthetic fertilizer to supply it with fertility needs for the crops that we grow.

Our municipality will receive fewer tax dollars, have fewer jobs, have less economic activity. People that contribute socially through volunteerism, donations and community support will be fewer. We are already a tightly regulated industry. We are regulated as to how we store manure. We are regulated as to how we apply manure. On our farm, we use an agrologist to help us with our manure management. We take soil samples on every field. We then apply manure according to the needs of the crop, the level of nutrients left in the soil and the

level of nutrients in the manure. The manure is injected into the soil. The manure is tested for nitrogen as it is pumped. The rate applied is changed according to the nitrogen content of the manure.

We have a two-cell lagoon system. The phosphorus content is different in the two cells. Cell 1 would be predominantly more solid with a higher phosphorus content. We try to apply the higher-phosphorus-content manure to fields with lower soil phosphorus content.

We minimize phosphorus content in the manure by adding the enzyme phytase which helps the pigs extract phosphorus from the grain it eats, thereby minimizing the additional phosphorus required. We try to apply as much manure in spring as possible so plants can immediately use it during the upcoming growing season.

If Bill 17 passes, the industry, over time, will become less competitive as it loses its ability to invest and stay competitive on a global stage. As production is eliminated, more phosphorus and other fertilizers are brought in synthetically. The net benefit of Bill 17, therefore, will be zero.

Picking on one sector that is already tightly regulated will not achieve anything. Working with other phosphorus emitters to reduce phosphorus pollution would achieve something. I challenge the government to do what is right and not what is politically popular. Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Leppelmann. We'll start with Mr. Derkach.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation. As you were speaking, I was thinking about the phosphorus that is in the organic fertilizer and the phosphorus that is in the synthetic fertilizer that is applied to the land. From all the presentations we've heard, it appears that everyone who is in the hog industry does soil testing and applies the fertilizer, the organic fertilizer, in accordance with the soil tests that have been done professionally.

How is the government going to achieve less phosphorus in the streams if, in fact, the phosphorus that the hog industry applies is used by the plants and yet there are other sources of phosphorus that come from lands that don't have hogs on it. How is the government going to achieve any level of reduction in phosphorus in that way?

Mr. Leppelmann: As I stated in the presentation, it won't achieve anything. I guess if the hog operation

on our farm is eliminated and we're strictly a grain operation, that means we are no longer regulated. There's nothing to say we need to continue to soil test. We can do whatever we want with the fertility on our land.

Mr. Derkach: So, in essence, even if the moratorium goes on and you close your operation because you can't compete, it's not going to do anything in terms of reducing the amount of phosphorus that goes into Lake Winnipeg off the land, because you will still be growing crops on that land and you will still be using fertilizer, perhaps of a different form.

Mr. Leppelmann: Correct.

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Leppelmann, in your presentation you didn't mention about your family and your type of operation, and I'm assuming that you consider yourself a family farm operation. I'm always disappointed when the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) and the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) don't ask you any questions about how this affects your family, so I'll ask it for them. How will Bill 17 affect your family?

* (22:40)

Mr. Leppelmann: The hog operation is the driver in our farm. It has provided bread and butter on our table, and it has given me the ability to buy out my parents' equity as I came along. As I continue, my wife and I have one child now, one son, and, if he is interested in our area, I can tell you we don't have the ability to expand our land base to 5,000 or 10,000 acres, which seems to be the level that's needed nowadays to be sustainable. So, if our hog operation disappears, my son loses any opportunity to continue with the farm.

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

Okay, next on the list I have Albert Maendel. Is Albert Maendel here? Albert Maendel will drop to the bottom of the list.

Patrick Hague. Is Patrick Hague here? Patrick Hague will drop to the bottom of the list.

Kevin Kurbis from New Standard Ag. Is Kevin Kurbis here? Kevin Kurbis will drop to the bottom of the list.

Christine Hofer. Is Christine Hofer here? Christine Hofer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Martin Sharpe from Little Saskatchewan Feed Yard Group. Is Martin Sharpe here? Martin Sharpe will drop to the bottom of the list.

Mark Gauvin. Mark Gauvin. Mr. Gauvin will drop to the bottom of the list.

Mark Hofer. Is Mark Hofer here? Mark Hofer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Levi Waldner. Levi Waldner. Levi Waldner will drop to the bottom of the list.

George Hofer. George Hofer. George Hofer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Fred Hofer. Fred Hofer. Fred Hofer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Alvin Hofer. Alvin Hofer. Alvin Hofer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Martin Gross from Iberville Colony.

Welcome, Mr. Gross. Do you have copies of your presentation?

Mr. Martin Gross (Iberville Colony): No, I don't.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Go ahead whenever you're ready, sir.

Mr. Martin Gross: First, I'd like to thank the committee for allowing me the opportunity to voice my opinion and to be here and be recognized as a person and not a number.

I am here to speak out against Bill 17 because I feel it is an unjust attack on farming. I grew up and spent most of my life living on a Hutterite colony around Elie, Manitoba.

I'd like to add that I've been managing our hog operation for about two and a half years now. I'm fairly new to the industry. We're a community of people that for generations have devoted our lives to agriculture. Our colony was established in 1919, and since that time we have been farming the same land that we farmed when our ancestors came here.

If you take an overall look at our farm it is well taken care of, not only because the rules and regulations by our government but because we want to leave a way of use for future generations for our children. We live right beside the Assiniboine River and on each direction, to the extent of my knowledge, every acre is covered by farmland. We all use the water. We drink it. Our farm consists of about 3,300 acres of cropland, a 480-sow operation, farrow-to-finish, a small layer quota, a small dairy

quota, a few odds and ends and we're currently trying to get into manufacturing.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

We're a diversified community and, therefore, depend on each little business to get by. Bill 17 is a wrongful act by the government to make it look like you're trying to fix a problem with Lake Winnipeg, to act like you look busy, to look busy and to look like you're doing something, but we can sit here and point fingers at each other all day about the problems in Lake Winnipeg and still get nowhere. But, blaming the hog industry, especially without science, makes it a wrongful act and not only will the moratorium not fix the problem, it would also kill an industry. I'm sure we all know that any hog manure being used will simply be replaced by synthetic fertilizer, which has the same amount of nitrogen and phosphorus, but we don't need to go over all that.

The CEC hearings told us and proved to all of us that there is no science to directly blame the hog industry and that hog farmers are good stewards of the land.

Bill 17 takes our rights, as Canadians, to practice agriculture. As Canadians, we are free people with the right to be in an industry following government regulations. All codes, by-laws and safety procedures are all followed. Some of the strictest practices are followed by the hog producers in Manitoba. With following all these procedures and doing all that is asked of us, how can he justify taking our rights to raise hogs? To increase the productivity of an industry?

In this global industry, there is no better place to raise hogs. We have the ideal economy for it; we produce the required crops right here at home. Where the government should be a support in a global market, they are tearing down an escalating industry.

Here, in Manitoba, we have some of the best producers in the world. We are probably the most advanced producer when it comes to raising and processing pork. If you skipped the whole import-export factor, we are still left with the long-term effects of this issue.

From a farmer's point of view, I feel that there will be a chain of events to follow. I don't have any facts or research to prove my point in any of this; I just think of it as a matter of fact. First off, think of all the unemployment that will slowly spread itself, all the companies and industries that are directly related to the hog industry, such as nutrition

companies, agri-supply companies, hog equipment suppliers, veterinarians, feed and injective medication companies, livestock hauling, processors, genetic companies—all people, real people with real lives, that have educated themselves and devoted themselves to the economy.

All of these companies don't necessarily have to be shut down or closed out. However, everyone will have to cut jobs, because their businesses will have to be downsized. Keep in mind all these events would only happen over the span of a number of years. What will we do with all the unemployed? Don't we have enough?

All these companies create a chain of taxes which, in the long run, goes to the government to build our economy. In my eyes, just the disruption of the unemployment sector should be enough to keep this industry going. Manitoba, especially Winnipeg, has a bad reputation of quitting or getting booted out of an industry. Every time, no matter what the business, there are always unemployment concerns.

Shouldn't the government be concerned, not only about taxes and unemployment, but also for our future? What are we going to leave behind for generations to come? With a farming-type economy, don't you want to leave behind such knowledge that would help our future grow? Can you actually sit there and be so blind and not see the possible consequences of such a decision? Shutting down the hog industry in Manitoba would be like shutting down the fisheries on the coast, or quit growing fruit in the Okanogan Valley.

If not in North America, where in the world would anybody want to invest in the hog industry? If you phase out the hog industry and, as you know, nothing will change in the situation with Lake Winnipeg, tell me—who is the next victim? Who are you going to attack next?

I'm sure we all know hog farmers can't go on strike and can't store their products over a period of time. This leaves the question: Which sector will be next? There are countries around the world that would love to have the knowledge we have obtained in the past, just to be more self-sufficient.

So is going forward with Bill 17 the right thing to do? Can you truthfully be here and feel that, with all confidence, that decision in hand is the right one to make? Can you in all honesty say that the problems will be solved by destroying our industry that we have worked so hard to get where it is today?

There are a lot of unanswered questions and they leave a lot of blank spaces, but I believe that, if this decision is to be made truthfully, you will not make the mistake of slowly killing a booming industry.

May God bless the future of our industry.

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

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you for your presentation. You're certainly out of your realm to come here tonight to come and give a presentation, so I thank you for doing that.

You mentioned that your colony is looking at manufacturing. Are they in manufacturing now, or what kind of manufacturing are you looking at?

* (22:50)

Mr. Martin Gross: Well, that's also part of the problem. See, we're looking into the metal industry a little bit, and part of the metal industry has based itself on making hog equipment. With no new production of new facilities, it already makes a dent into that idea.

Mr. Maguire: Again, as well, Mr. Gross, the presentation was great. On top of the number of people that you mentioned that are impacted by the industry if it were to disappear, I want to make sure that I add food distributors, packing plant employees, and retail employment onto that list as well, because it's never-ending.

You also laid out some great analogies in regard to taking fruit out of the Okanogan and that sort of thing. It's tremendous. As well, I want to thank you for outlining what you do in your colony and how important this industry is to Manitoba, because I do believe that helps educate the backbenchers on the government side of the House, some of the ministers as well, who may not be as familiar with agriculture.

That's what the ministers, Wowchuk and Struthers, are going to need in order to convince Premier Doer that this bill should be changed, as this caucus moves forward, the government side of the House.

I just want to congratulate you on your presentation and the impact that it could have and should have in regard to making changes to this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Martin Gross: Thank you very much. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gross, one moment, sir. I have one more question for you here.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Gross, I'm listening to your presentation and thinking about what the effect of this bill might be if it, in fact, is passed.

Could you foresee that a bill like this may have the reverse effect on the amount of phosphorus that enters the water streams in that if, in fact, the hog industry declines and some go out of the hog industry and then just go back to straight grain cropping, the care and the soil testing that goes on today may, in fact, not happen because there won't be the resources to do that and this bill may have the reverse effect of what the government's intentions are?

Mr. Martin Gross: That's what totally makes the whole concept of this bill irrelevant, because farming's going to continue. Even if you eliminate the hog sector, farming's still going to continue and the spreading of phosphorus is still going to continue.

If that's supposed to be the problem, which we all know isn't, then we're still going to have amounts of phosphorus going into Lake Winnipeg. I don't see that as fixing the problem.

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

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: I have a substitution: Mr. Martindale in for Ms. Howard.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Since Ms. Howard is no longer with us, we now need to choose a new Vice-Chairperson.

Ms. Wowchuk: I nominate Mr. Altemeyer.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Altemeyer has been nominated. Are there any other nominations? Seeing none, Mr. Altemeyer, you have the honour of being the Vice-Chair.

I have a matter for the committee to decide, if I could have your attention please, gentlemen.

Two presenters, No. 286 and 287, are in attendance this evening. Their names have been called once already last night and they went to the bottom of the list. They're concerned that, if they leave, their names may be called later and they could

be dropped from the list, which would be according to process. Do we have any advice in this regard?

Mr. Maguire: I would ask leave to hear those two presentations, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further advice?

Ms. Howard: I would suggest that—we have a process that has been followed. I think we agreed to hear 200 or go through 200 names. Then, at the end of the night, if there are people left, I'm sure the committee could talk about who they want to hear, but I think we should stick to that process and be careful how many exceptions we make at this point in time. I don't think it's fair to other people who have been waiting here all evening.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, I'll recognize Mr. Derkach right away here, but I think we've agreed on roughly 2 a.m. as a time that we're going to rise, but I think that we've also agreed that, if after 2 a.m., there's anybody still in the audience that is willing and wants to make a presentation, that we will remain here until everybody in the room that wants to present will present. So that option is out there.

Mr. Derkach: I think it's a good policy to follow our process as closely as we can unless there are extenuating circumstances. We as a committee have always allowed for exception if there is extenuating circumstances where there could be smaller children at home or other issues that have to be pointed out to us. I think if anybody wants to make that known to us, we'd certainly make that exception but short of that, I think we should try to follow the process as closely as possible.

Mr. Eichler: That's exactly why we discussed this this afternoon the ministers and I. We had this very clear, I believe, at 6 o'clock when I asked for leave. We will sit here until 2. Nobody, and I mean absolutely nobody, will be turned away from this committee, is what we agreed to. Those members that were a part of that discussion—I think it was very clear that—maybe they just haven't had a chance—just came on the committee—that's what we agreed to. I think we need to stick to our policy so it's very simple.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, then, in conclusion, we will be here until 2. Anybody here that hasn't presented at that point—we will remain until all presenters who wish to make—presenters have been heard. We will consider moving people up the list if there are extenuating circumstances. So, if anybody in the audience feels they're in that position, they're

free to make their case to the staff at the back of the room who will bring it to our attention here. Alright.

Move on. I will call Mr. Brad Schnell.

Mr. Schnell, do you have any written materials for the committee? You do not. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Brad Schnell (Private Citizen): My name is Brad Schnell. I live in the Sanford area and we have had a family farm in the Sanford, Brunkild area. I've been to the University of Manitoba and took Agriculture. I worked in the Landmark Steinbach area as an agronomist for, well, a few days already, since I came out of university, so that's a little while back.

I got to see the development of southeastern Manitoba. I lived on the other side of the river and it was kind of interesting when you watch what happens. The livestock sector in southeastern Manitoba is one of the sort of phenomenons of growth and why Steinbach and that whole area does as well as it does. Yet, I was on the other side. That's where I think somebody said earlier, they need 5,000 acres to make things go but in that Landmark Steinbach area, there are lots of guys that have 300 acres, 500 acres, some livestock and they're doing quite well, thank you.

They all live on that land. They all drink the water because there is wells on that side of the province. There are not many wells that are in my area; you have to haul water in, that type of thing. I guess it's the same thing with Winnipeg here, we have to bring our water in.

I guess just watching that develop—it's interesting that now we got a ban put on to a real wide region where if you drive around the countryside and you try and look for barns—you know, you drive down the No. 3 highway, drive down the No. 2 highway, down the No. 1 highway, boy, you got a pretty hard time to find any barns. True? So it's kind of interesting where this ban is going on, how it's being implemented.

There's a lot of time and effort spent by the government putting this together, right? If you go to the recommendations—the recommendation 9.7 says, that the Manitoba government amend the livestock manure and mortalities management regulations to require that new and expanding operations be required to demonstrate that they have a sufficient cropland base available to balance phosphorous application rates with removal rates over the long

term. If that was followed, then we don't need this Bill-C17. Pretty simple isn't it? Interesting, after that was written, Bill C-17 comes out. I don't know why. Political.

* (23:00)

Anyhow, my background is—we've developed some hog operations on our land. I do manure nutrient management planning for a number of people in the valley, so I have a little bit of knowledge on what the, you know, we do soil testing for, you know, I guess you've heard of how the manure nutrient management plans are all formulated and done and that, and there are some really good rules and regulations in place. All we have to do is follow those. It's pretty simple.

When we developed our barns that we had on our property we had to go to the municipality, get a technical review done on the land. You've got to drill pilot holes and see what kind of land or what's underneath there. You've got to go through quite an exhaustive process to make sure you're not going to do anything that's going to harm the environment. Once you've got that done then you've got to go to the municipality and do a development agreement which basically ties sort of the whole thing right across the board in terms of what you need to do to develop this to be in conjunction with, or in harmony with, the Province, with the municipality, and they make the rules and regulations.

When we were developing one of them we actually had to wait a year until our municipality took and did a really good development agreement plan that now, if you don't fit into that, you just can't build a barn, and that's fair, I think. But to just take and ban that you can't develop something, that doesn't make sense. If we just follow the rules that are there. Now, we're doing this because of phosphorus and when we did the development agreements, there isn't a lot of phosphorus in those agreements yet, or in the past. Now they're saying put them in there, and let's put them in there. That makes sense.

If we look at the land agreements or the development agreements that the municipalities can put in place, they can basically say that we need so many acres. When we developed ours we basically had to put in so many acres and we had to caveat them into the barn, okay, which means, I think—does everybody know what a caveat means? You know, you have to put that on the title and it's there for all time.

So, again, if you go to 9.7, you follow that, you get your development agreements going. Where there is some heavier densely populated livestock like in southeastern Manitoba, okay, so there are some rules in place but now says, okay, if you're going to develop your operation you've got to be able to do the right things and put enough land into that operation, and I think that makes sense. But, just to ban them, that doesn't make sense, because there's a lot of land that's still out there and you've heard lots of arguments but people still have to—they still have to be able to expand their operation to stay with what's happening today in order, you know, to be able to go forward. So I think that's important that you look at that, that there are rules in place. You've even got a document here telling you what to do and you're not following it. You know, there's just a real simple thing to do there.

In my travels as a manure nutrient management planner there's what's called a feed model, it's like a little land-based calculator and—do you guys know about that? A little bit? You know, basically you just have to go through the calculation so you can—there are lots of tools out there that we can use that are there for us to regulate ourselves already. So I just don't understand why we have to all of a sudden ban an industry, you know, again, it just doesn't make sense. If you just follow what your recommendations are in here and put those in place that are coming forward I think that's really all that's necessary.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. You bring up some interesting comments and all of them are very valid. My question for you is with the injection-type system that we're using to apply our manure, to incorporate into our land. That's a very valuable commodity as we've very seriously taken into account when we do our cost analysis on our crops. Now, you assist the producers in doing that. Can you outline for the committee just a little bit of what takes place in grasping the science around how much phosphorus to put on through that injection process?

Mr. Schnell: I'm not quite sure of the question, but, basically, you're asking how do we go about deciding how much phosphorus goes on and how that works. I think Tom Leppelmann and a few other speakers basically sort of covered that already, to some degree, that we basically have to do a soil test. Find

out what's in the soil and we're governed, you know, we'll be governed with new regulations coming in up to 60 parts per million when they come into effect in November. We'll be governed at 60 parts per million, where before that, we can basically apply it based on nitrogen rules that are in place. Then after we get above 60 parts per million, then we're going to be governed at two times crop removal.

It's interesting. Again, I work with guys in the Landmark, Steinbach area and actually work with Tom Leppelmann. We kind of joke that his son Jack just got born and it's going to be Jack, when he takes over the farm, that's probably going to have to put a separator on his farm to take, you know, the phosphorus out of the manure and haul it where, you know, sort of out of that region, or on to a land base that he can do that. It's not going to happen right away. Like the phosphate levels, there's going to be a little bit of land that's going to have some trouble, like usually the home quarter, or whatever, but usually there's still enough land even in that southeastern Manitoba that we can still operate for quite a while with the rules that are going to come into play.

Mr. Derkach: You do manure nutrient management for farms in the region. Do you find many farms that don't comply with the regulations that are in place today? I'm sorry. Do you find many farms that don't comply with the regulations that we have currently before us today?

Mr. Schnell: Boy. It's interesting. You have to comply with the—I shouldn't say comply, but you have to register with the government when you're over 300 animal units. I deal with a number of people in the Holdemans in the Landmark, you know, Greenland area, if you know where that is, that are under 300 animal units and have a small sow operation or chicken operation. So I do their stuff too. We still look at their operation and still, you know, say, okay, what do we have to do? You know, what are the phosphate levels at?

You know, in that area, too, the smaller guys, the bigger guys, basically all want to comply because they live on the land, they drink their own water because, you know, they've got the wells underneath especially in that area, where the majority of the livestock is, all have wells and they're all living on the land. They want to watch that, they want to—you know, so, if you—and I guess that's more the nitrogen you sort of worry about for the wells, but when you're watching that, doing that, you right away

watch the phosphorus as well. You know, the two go hand in hand. The guys want to do a good job.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler had a supplemental question. I'll put it to him.

Mr. Eichler: Yeah, I want to come back. In your professional opinion then, the nutrient management regulations that—some of them haven't been implemented yet—do you feel that they've had an opportunity to actually be tested for what their reliability will be?

Mr. Schnell: What you're asking is, are the rules being tested? Say that—can I just ask you—?

Mr. Eichler: Do you feel they've had an opportunity to be tested for what their intent was?

Mr. Schnell: The question as I hear it are the rules—do we—have the rules been tested out yet? Really, again, in here, it says we should—the government's suggesting after five years of the rules being in place, then we should monitor them and put like rules—or take a look at it after five years of running with the rules of the new phosphate and then take a look and see what has happened.

The new phosphate rules as they're stated, I think in most cases, especially outside of southeastern Manitoba, there won't be any problem, you know, the guys won't have a problem. A lot of the guys have 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 acres inside the southeastern region. I don't see problems right off the bat, but again, it's just like other countries like Denmark, Holland, you know, all the countries that have intensive livestock operation with a small land base. They've been able to work with it. You know, they get separators in place and they basically, you know, once they hit the ceilings of what rules and regulations are in place, then they export it. That can be done. That's all to be there.

To say that we already understand the rules and have done that, you know, they're just coming at us right now. So to say everybody understands them fully and can comprehend them, I've been watching and went through a few of these feed models with a couple of the guys. When you go through the feed models, I try to go to the guys that had the most concerns, you know, smallest land base, and have had manure for a long time, and, yeah, we're going to have to change down the road. But you know, most of the guys have done a pretty good job already, and we'll just have to keep working within the system. You know, not everybody wants these rules to come in place because it's going to mean some hardships

and some things they have to work with and do, but, at the end of the day, if that's what is good for the industry, good for the environment and that, then, yes, we'll do that. But, again, just don't ban our industry. You know, like that still just doesn't make sense.

* (23:10)

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Schnell, you have a lot of knowledge in the manure management portfolio and you've read the CEC report. You're intricately familiar with the Red River Valley, and you particularly talked No. 2, No. 3 highways out to that heavy clay land east of Elm Creek, Carman, and in towards Winnipeg here, and yet under Bill 17 that's in the moratorium area too.

I'd just like to have your opinion—and my understanding is their reasoning, although reason is a bit of a stretch at any point in here on this bill, but their reasoning for that is because of flood plain. Would you care to put some comments on the record as to what your opinion of the sustainability of hog operations, the potential for new hog operations in that heavy clay land between here and the escarpment?

Mr. Schnell: I guess the potential for new hog operations in this Red River flood zone, I guess per se, you know, we went through a bit of a period of expansion because our dollar was low and the prices were good and everything went and there was a lot of optimism in the system. Today, nobody really wants to build a barn anyhow because the price and the economics aren't really good. But if you look at where a barn should go and that a lot of it should go, you know, or if we look at the land basin where barns can go, there are still lots and lots of areas in this, what's called a so-called flood plain that, you know, does it all flood or not. There's maybe a narrow band that comes right down because of the floodway that sort of backs up to Emerson and through there. You know, that has, I guess, potentially some more concerns, but boy, there's a huge, huge big area that has hardly any hog barns that would welcome to have the nutrient base that goes in there.

Phosphate, if you look at a lot of the little plants out there these days are turning purple because they're low on phosphate because it's cool and wet and damp out there and they're saying, oh, boy, this isn't good. If we have a little higher phosphate values in our soil that's actually a good thing except there are other concerns for the water that runs off and has

to carry the soil particle into the lake and away it goes. But most guys are doing minimum till or conservation tillage and we're minimizing that. So, in that whole flood plain area, boy, the risk I think is the concern for the 1.5 percent that it is and the amount of fields that actually get covered with manure aren't very many fields that get covered with manure out of that whole big area.

Mr. Chairperson: Last question to Mrs. Wowchuk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Schnell. You do nutrient management plans and we're talking about phosphorous regulations. I wonder if you could help me. If a farmer was going to be putting the full amount of phosphorus on his land by applying manure, what would you estimate the amount of water that would go onto a quarter of land, and how would that equate to an inch of rain or half an inch? You have to estimate because I know that all manure isn't the same level but approximately.

Mr. Schnell: So you're saying if a person applies manure on to his land, how much rain does that equate back to?

Ms. Wowchuk: In order to get the amount of phosphorus that you are allowed in your plan, how would that work out if you were applying manure? How could you equate it to the amount—how much water would be going on?

Mr. Schnell: Got the answer right here. Basically, 5,000 gallons of manure is about a quarter inch of rain or water or however you want to put that. I don't know if that's answering what you're—

Ms. Wowchuk: That's what—so would there be about—two questions—

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Wowchuk, sorry.

Ms. Wowchuk: Sorry. Would it be about 5,000 acres per quarter that would equate—

Mr. Schnell: Gallons.

Ms. Wowchuk: Five thousand gallons, yes, 5,000 gallons per quarter and that would then equate to about a quarter of an inch of rain. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Schnell: When people are putting on manure, we basically test the manure and find out—up until now, we've been governed by nitrogen recommendations, so this is not necessarily phosphorus. But, up until now, we basically are governed by phosphorus or nitrogen recommendations. Most manure, pig manure has

probably 15 to 20 pounds of N, on average about 20 pounds. So, if people want to put 100, 120 pounds of N down, they're probably putting 5,000, 6,000 gallons on per acre. That would be about a quarter inch of moisture.

When you do inject it, basically, it goes nicely into the soil and the odour is reduced. The phosphorus and the nitrogen, people want to inject it because, not so much for the phosphorus because the phosphorus ties up quickly with the calcium and magnesium in the soil, but your nitrogen, they want to inject it so that the nitrogen isn't lost. So people want to do a good job because that's a very expensive commodity.

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

I call Mr. Robert Toews. Robert Toews. Mr. Toews will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Rika Koelstra. Ms. Koelstra. I see you have a written presentation for the committee.

Mrs. Rika Koelstra (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mrs. Koelstra: Okay. Good evening. My name is Rika Koelstra. I live in southern Manitoba where I have been making a living for my family by working in the hog industry.

Coming from the Netherlands about 14 years ago, I made a choice of leaving my family and home country behind, just boarded a plane and started from scratch in the agricultural industry in Canada, as this way of living is in my blood and always will be. It being virtually impossible to work your way into a farm-related job in the Netherlands if you are not raised on a farm, makes very many people like myself make this choice.

When I met and married my husband 13 years ago, we had the dream of one day owning our own dairy. As we lived in Alberta at the time, that is where we started up our own relief milking business, working ourselves into the farms of dairy board members and 4H leaders—if you are not familiar with this rural youth organization, I strongly suggest you educate yourself on it; it's a very important program, in my opinion—learning all the time how well these people take care of their surroundings, their land, their livestock, their environment and teaching their children to be very careful, too, with the resources given to them to grow crops, produce milk, produce eggs, meat, et cetera, et cetera.

Then we moved to Manitoba four years ago and started to work in the hog industry where we found the same level of caring for the environment, the same caring attitude when it comes to being ready for the future in ways of preserving the quality of the resources needed for agricultural produce. How can these good people not, as they know that there is only one way of staying in business, and that is by making sure that you make and keep the available resources reusable.

I am convinced that 95 percent of hog or any farmers for that matter is fully aware of the facts of pollution nowadays and that they will do their part as much as it lies in their possibility to reduce this.

Why is it, then, that the hog farmers are being picked on because in your eyes they might pollute Lake Winnipeg a bit more than you like to see?

Just a personal question: How did you get to work this morning, by train, by bus, car pool or, maybe even better, you walked, or did you travel all by yourself in a fancy SUV where there is room for at least six or eight? What did you have for food today, all locally produced from local ingredients or maybe out-of-season vegetables, fruits and meat produced possibly in the U.S. or even further away, all being shipped in from other countries with big trucks, et cetera, all putting a strain on the environment?

* (23:20)

It's just so extremely disappointing to see such a viable industry being put on hold, being dragged into a downward spiral, if Bill 17 would be put in place.

There is so much to learn from the owners themselves, how they preserve the quality of their environment, therefore, their livelihood and, therefore, many livelihoods of the families who are working on those farms.

As I became a proud Canadian in 2002, I dare to fight for the rights of my fellow farming Canadians and myself and regret very much to see such a shallow bill possibly being put in place. That's my presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation. I'll open the floor to questions.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you, Rika, for that presentation.

In your presentation, you indicated that, 14 years ago, you left the Netherlands. We've known from

other presentations which have been presented to us in the past couple of days that, in the Netherlands, they have a large, large dairy population. It's a small land base, and they manage it very well. Some of these farms in the Netherlands have been in the family for 450 years, one individual told us.

Do you see, in the Netherlands, anybody with sickness, constant sickness, or pollution in their lakes? Do you see that there?

Mrs. Koelstra: Very little, because they know how to manage it—

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Koelstra, sorry. I have to recognize you.

Mrs. Koelstra: Sorry. I see very little; they dealt with the problem. They had the same problems coming up, as in any country; they dealt with it. As was being said before, they manage it very well. I don't think there are any major problems there, like farm-related problems in the environment.

Mr. Graydon: In Canada, you've said you have lived in Alberta and now in Manitoba. I know you live in one of the better constituencies of Manitoba, I might add.

Do you think that the rules and regulations that were in the CEC report are adequate to deal with the issues that are being proposed to be dealt with by the moratorium? The CEC outlined 48 recommendations. If they were implemented, do you see that they would take care of the issue which bothers the minister so much that he would bring this draconian legislation forward?

Mrs. Koelstra: You mean, like the output from the hog industry will be taken care of, like on the environment, by putting Bill 17 in place?

Mr. Graydon: No, the Clean Environment Commission did a report. They were commissioned by the government to do a report, and that was a pause. They put a pause on the industry. They came back; they made 48 recommendations. Those recommendations—none of them said to have a moratorium. They identified some issues that needed to be dealt with.

Do you believe that we should deal with the 48 recommendations and give them an opportunity to see if they have a positive effect on our environment or on our lake?

Mrs. Koelstra: Not yet—

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Koelstra.

Mrs. Koelstra: Sorry, doing that again.

So, in other words, you have to educate yourself a whole lot better before this bill comes in place. Is that, basically, what you're asking?

Mr. Graydon: That would be part of the question, yes.

Mrs. Koelstra: Yes, of course.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Koelstra. I want to welcome you to Manitoba, and congratulations on becoming a Canadian citizen.

You've certainly defined this bill extremely well; shallow, I think, is a pretty fitting term for this bill. I know the intent, I think, at least. I'm not going to try and pretend that I'm inside either of these ministers' heads, or the Minister of Environment who brought this forward. I do believe that there has been a lot of external pressure on these ministers to carry this bill.

I appreciate people like yourself coming forward to inform backbench members of the government as to the responsibility that you see, even as a new Manitoban, and the responsible agricultural producers that we have in place in this province and in many other areas as well, but we're talking about Manitoba's jurisdiction.

Thank you for issuing that. I wanted to just say, do you feel that there's another process, or what better process of co-operation do you think the government could use in the next few months before this bill passes or before they pass the bill? What process do you think they should use to provide changes that would be more acceptable to the industry?

Mrs. Koelstra: We dealt with that in Holland, like, just as much. Like, when I left, that was very strongly in place. That was the government dealt with the rules, right, and very often this government had no background on the issues. They would listen to so-called specialists. Sometimes they were specialists, but there was very little involvement, like personal involvement with the whole industry and that's when you get shallow comments, shallow bills. That's where they come from. I think it is so important that people who make those kinds of bills that they get into that industry like what has been said many times now.

Very many city people, Winnipeg, maybe, I don't know how—Winnipeg's a fairly small city. With many bigger cities, bigger urban communities, they

have not a single clue about agriculture, what it is all about. A farmer is only a true farmer if he understands the environment, like the surroundings, and that's what I want to try to get into my presentation. Very many people who are making those bills just have to educate themselves in being out there, not just like books, not just like listening to specialists, but go out there. Listen to the people, like what is happening those couple of days, those couple of nights. Then go out there again, then reconsider what you're trying to put in this bill, and that is what I think is really important.

Mr. Maguire: My father had a saying that, if you look after the land, it'll look after you. Do you believe that?

Mrs. Koelstra: Very much so. I think that is one of my comments in there. If a farmer does not care of his surroundings, the surroundings will fail him. Very much so.

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

I call Kees Vanittersum, Micro Fan Canada Inc. Kees Vanittersum. Okay, that individual drops to the bottom of the list.

Madisson Stott. Madisson Stott. Goes to the bottom of the list.

David Waldner. David Waldner. To the bottom of the list.

Darrin Warkentin. Darrin Warkentin.

Jeroen VenBoekel. Jeroen VenBoekel, to the bottom of the list.

William Tschatter. William Tschatter, to the bottom of the list.

Rick Friesen. Rick Friesen, to the bottom of the list.

Amos Stahl. Amos Stahl, to the bottom of the list.

Christine Kynoch. Good evening, Ms. Kynoch, do you have a written presentation for the committee?

* (23:30)

Mrs. Christine Kynoch (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk will distribute it. You may begin when you're ready.

Mrs. Kynoch: Thank you for the opportunity to make a brief presentation on Bill 17.

My name is Christine Kynoch. My husband and I have been farming in the Baldur district for the last 30 years. Like our parents, grandparents and great-grandparents, we chose to follow family tradition to become farmers to produce quality food to feed the world. Our main source of income was hog farming. For the first 20 years, in order to meet our financial commitments, my husband and I held a job off the farm, 16- to 18-hour days, seven days a week, 365 days a year and spending many Sundays loading hogs and trucking them to the Neepawa hog plant because we gained another \$1 a hog bonus for delivering them on Sundays. Nevertheless, we were determined all this extra effort would add more profit to the bottom line and hopefully, at some point, the extra jobs off the farm would no longer be a necessity.

I would like to point out that all farm producers, whether it be hogs, beef, dairy, chickens, grains and so on, depend on each other to manage their operations. In our particular case we did not grow enough grain to supply our hog operation. We relied on local grain producers to supply our wheat, barley and corn to make our hog rations, and, in turn, the grain producers would rely on us to purchase their grains. In the unfortunate case of frost, hail, drought and whatever else Mother Nature had in store for us, the grains might not meet premium quality for the elevator; however, it still remains excellent value to the livestock sector. However, Bill 17 will reduce the amount of livestock in this province and therefore will reduce markets for grain producers.

Our manure, which I cannot emphasize enough is a valuable natural, organic fertilizer, was applied to our land to grow our crops. Just to give you an idea of its value, last year it cost us \$60 an acre for our synthetic fertilizer. Today, the same fertilizer cost us \$120 an acre. Applying manure meant less cost per acre, therefore increasing our profit margin. Every fall our local co-op agronomists took random soil tests on our land to determine what levels of nutrients were needed to grow next year's crop. This data was extremely beneficial to make these decisions. How it was encouraging to see the CEC report state farmers should use more manure. In fact, synthetic chemicals should be replaced by manure. I would like to point out, we never, and I repeat never, had any manure run into any waterway, and I find it highly offensive that you, Minister Struthers, on June the 5th's news broadcast interview, indicated with

today's increase in hog production, the hog industry's manure runs off into Manitoba's waterways, thus polluting Lake Winnipeg. Such comments are absolutely false and misleading the general public. Has this government been so focussed on political gain that it must resort to outright lies?

Where is your evidence or science that we are harming Lake Winnipeg? Are you referring to the mere 1.5 percent?

What are your comments on the aging septic systems of cottage owners along Lake Winnipeg? What regulations are expected for them?

How do you justify the city of Winnipeg and its ever-increasing new developments at a time when it already dumps raw sewage into the Red River on a regular basis? Are you intending to put a ban on any new developments in the city of Winnipeg till it meets regulatory approval?

Is this government willing to explain how they allow municipalities, such as the town of Stonewall, to discharge its sun-treated, but nutrient-rich human waste to run into the Grassmere Drain, then into the Red River and into Lake Winnipeg? Are they required to install expensive, anaerobic digesters or equivalent technology to remove nutrients from their raw sewage?

This legislation is highly discriminatory and singles out hog producers. Bill 17 has labelled the hog producers of Manitoba as polluters. After all, who needs polluting hog farmers when you can buy all the bacon and pork chops from your local Safeway?

Is this government's intent to import meat from foreign countries that do not follow the same levels of standards as our producers? Is this what government supports?

Our sons and daughters are leaving this province in droves. This has to stop. Hog producers deserve to be treated in the same way as any other industry. How can you turn a blind eye with your own CEC report that clearly states the hog industry is sustainable with appropriate regulatory implementations?

Our industry leaders have devoted countless time and effort in representing its producers. Their dedication relies on their spouses, partners and children to take care of their own operations. Why does this government continue to ignore industry leaders and the science?

The hog industry has always been the first to adapt to new technology; however, hog producers are expected to absorb the extra cost these regulations create, without ever being able to recover them. On numerous occasions, our representatives have met, in good faith and with an open mind, to negotiate with your government.

During our 2007 annual meeting banquet, Minister Wowchuk assured approximately 600 hog producers and industry stakeholders that it would lift the temporary pause on the hog industry after the CEC report. Here we are today, facing a moratorium.

Premier Doer assured industry leaders and hog producers they had nothing to worry about, surely words of encouragement from our leader. Where are we now? We have travelled from afar for the fourth consecutive day. Where is he now? This worries me immensely.

To the hog industry's shock, without warning or consultations, this government has placed a moratorium on two-thirds of Manitoba's hog industry. Bill 17 will destroy a billion-dollar hog industry in Manitoba and the spin-offs it creates. Is this government willing to accept responsibility for the financial ruin of family farms?

In closing, my plea to this government is to have the moral obligation to end this permanent moratorium, which is not based on science, as soon as possible. You have been provided with valuable data from the University of Manitoba. Your own CEC report states, the hog industry is sustainable. Our industry leaders have met with you in good faith to negotiate regulations. This hog industry is one of the great successes of Manitoba's agriculture. This industry generates \$1 billion in annual revenues; it employs 15,000 people here in Manitoba and foreign immigrants.

The tax revenue to municipalities is substantial. Hog producers follow strict regulations to produce quality food to feed the world. As a mother, wife and grandmother, I am confident that Manitoba's pork is a safe, quality product to feed my family.

* (23:40)

It's your obligation to support its producers and stop labelling hog producers as polluters. This is wrong and this has to stop. Every man or woman, father or mother, son or daughter stands here before you, united with the same message. This government must remove this moratorium immediately and our voices must be heard. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Kynoch. Questions.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Christine. That was well done. I believe you've farmed in the Glenboro area.

Mrs. Kynoch: In the Baldur area.

Mr. Struthers: In the Baldur area. The years that you spent at the farm at Baldur raising your children, what were the values? What was passed on to your children that wouldn't have been passed on to your children if you had raised them in a larger urban centre? What was the advantage to raising your children in that setting?

Mrs. Kynoch: We taught them how to produce food. They worked along with us. We showed them the beginning of life. We had a 200-sow farrow-finish operation so there was birthing going on every day on our farm. They were by my side. As babies I took them into the barn in a bassinet. They worked along with me and they saw the birthing, how we fed them and the end product. They understood where our food comes from.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Struthers, supplemental.

Mr. Struthers: I would assume that you believe that your family, your grandkids, are much more worldly, more community-oriented, more ready to take on the world because of that kind of a solid upbringing.

Mrs. Kynoch: Absolutely. I talk to my grandchildren on the phone. They ask me different questions. What am I doing? I share those experiences with them. They live in the city. They enjoy to come out on the farm, and I enjoy explaining how life develops.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much, Christine, for your very clear presentation. They also learned the values of business in that operation that many of our young people can learn in the city as well. That's just a plus.

From your presentation, you've indicated that two-thirds of Manitoba's hog production is taking place in the moratorium area. In answers during question period the other day, the Premier (Mr. Doer) indicated that, well, it's only 39 municipalities in the province of Manitoba and there are nearly 200 R.M.s in the province so there's lots of room to build more hog barns in the area that's not impacted.

I want to make it clear that my experience, I know the Member for Carman (Mr. Pedersen) is the

Intergovernmental Affairs critic now, but I was a while back. I used to go to all the AMM meetings. There are 196 or 197 municipalities in the province of Manitoba. About 80 of those are towns. I would assume that the Premier doesn't want any hog operations being built within the town borders of any of these communities. Common sense would say that. A number of them are located in wooded areas and lands that are not suited to livestock production either. You do narrow down quite quickly to the areas that can be impacted.

Do you think it's a fair assessment to say that there are lots of other area in Manitoba to build when the people that have the expertise and the families are located within that area, the people that have the expertise on how to manage hogs in this particular case? Others would be in dairy, poultry and cattle. How important is it to you as a livestock producer, to have your family want to be able to carry on the operation in the location where you've already made your major investment for life?

Mrs. Kynoch: We have two sons. One son chose not to farm. Our oldest son had full intentions of farming and taking over our farming operations. He had his diploma in agri-business, went to Brandon, came back home and went in the work force selling swine genetics and feed products for hogs. He has left this province. He does not see a future in hog farming, nor can he afford to start as well.

So, when I state that our sons and daughters are leaving this province, one of those sons is mine and he is not coming back. It's heartwrenching for any mother to see one of their children leave.

Mr. Graydon: Thank you for your presentation, Christine. You did an excellent job of outlining how people start and the convictions you have and the determination to succeed in the industry when both you and your husband worked at it for so many years. I know what that's like because I've been through that, not in the hog business, because hogs stink. However, I did that in the cattle business. Cattle business has no odour, of course. You understand that.

At any rate, today, if this moratorium was on, if this moratorium is to stay on, can you envision, not your sons and daughters, can you envision any sons and daughters putting in that type of sacrifice 365 days of the year, not going to the lake with their neighbours and their friends, working two full-time jobs. And putting that into the hog industry, they

would have to buy an existing operation to begin with and know that they could never expand it. Can you see anybody doing that?

Mrs. Kynoch: No, I can't, not at this moment. This bill, to me, is negative for our young people to take over any farming operation.

Mr. Graydon: I just have one comment. I made a comment about pigs stinking and I need to qualify that. When I was a young man, we had to go to church every Sunday morning. That was what we did. There were hog people at the church and there were cattle people. When we were 10 and 11 years old, we always argued who stunk the worst. As we got older, we understood the hog people made more money than the cattle people. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Graydon, and thank you, Ms. Kynoch for your presentation. *[interjection]* Well, time—we're over a couple of minutes. You would need leave to put an additional question. Does he have leave or—*[interjection]* I'm sorry, Mr. Derkach, we must move on.

I call Mr. Josh Waldner. Josh Waldner.

Mr. Edward Maendel. Mr. Waldner goes to the bottom. Edward Maendel to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Russell Paetkau. Russell Paetkau to the bottom of the list.

David Waldner. David Waldner to the bottom of the list.

James Siemens. James Siemens to the bottom of the list.

Leonard John Friesen. Leonard John Friesen to the bottom of the list.

Wendy Friesen. Wendy Friesen to the bottom of the list.

Zack Waldner. Zack Waldner to the bottom.

* (23:50)

Les Routledge. Les Routledge, bottom.

Rick Bergmann. Rick Bergmann, to the bottom.

Heinz Reimer. Heinz Reimer, to the bottom.

Lee Perreault. Lee Perreault, to the bottom.

Irvin Waldner. Irvin Waldner, to the bottom.

Donald Friesen. Donald Friesen, to the bottom.

Susanne Friesen. Susanne Friesen, to the bottom.

Michael Sykes. Hello, Mr. Sykes. Do you have any written documentation for the committee? You do? I ask the Clerk's assistants to distribute them. You may begin at your leisure, sir.

Mr. Michael Sykes (Private Citizen): Thank you. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, members of the committee. I'd first off like to say that I am not affiliated with anybody. I think I'm a little bit of rare bird here tonight because I'm an independent citizen who, at the moment, is not involved in agriculture and I do live in a city area, north of the big city here.

My name is Michael Sykes and I wish to proffer the following comments on Bill 17 for your consideration.

Currently, I'm a private citizen who has recently retired, however, as a member of the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists, I continue to maintain an interest in the well-being of Manitoba's agriculture community.

I am a recent past chairperson of the Manitoba Livestock Manure Management Initiative, a position I held for 14 months. Prior to that, I was employed by the Province of Manitoba, MAFRI, and, for a period of 27.5 years, as an agriculture representative for the areas of Somerset, Morris, Portage la Prairie and Selkirk. I also served as a business development specialist for the South Interlake GO Team. You can say that I was on the cold face of extension. I worked very closely with farmers. I might also add that I was also staff co-ordinator for the BSE task force.

In my capacity with MAFRI, I had the privilege of taking a leadership role in a number of livestock and environment events and organizations. In my time there I twice co-chaired the tour component of the Western Canadian Manure Symposium, served as a director on the Triple S manure management initiative board and the manure expo and tour. I also served as a MAFRI co-ordinator for the South Interlake Land Management Association.

I have a short presentation, so I'll jump right to the point. I'm amazed that the Province sees fit to limit hog production within the moratorium area. When you consider the effort that the hog industry has put into meeting all provincial rules and regulations you simply have to be impressed. They have borne the cost of complying with those regulations by both adopting and implementing new technologies. Some of these technologies include soil injection of nutrients, storage covers, composting, shelterbelts, vent stacking, solid-liquid separation

units, deep nutrient testing, groundwater monitoring, surface water monitoring, manipulation of phosphorus in swine rations, et cetera, et cetera, it goes on.

They are also required by law to submit detailed annual manure management plans. Rather than single out and victimize pork producers, government should hold them up as an example of an industry group that is making genuine contributions to the reduction of phosphorus loading in Lake Winnipeg.

All activity affecting the environment should be considered on the whole Lake Winnipeg watershed basis, not just hog production within the moratorium area. Believing that you can reduce the level of phosphorus loading on Lake Winnipeg by restricting swine production in the proposed area is akin to trying to remove dissolved soap from the bath water at the drain.

The reality is that phosphorus should be removed at the point source, or as far up the watershed as possible. The current state of pollution of Lake Winnipeg is the responsibilities of all residents who live, work and play within the confines of the basin. To place the blame for P loading on a small number of swine producers and impose a moratorium on their expansion completely misses the mark. Appropriate legislation should be science-based and developed in consultation with the requisite government departments in Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, the Government of Canada, North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota and the U.S. government. In my view, Bill 17 has not satisfied those requirements and should be tabled and let die on the order paper.

Studies suggested that hog production contributes approximately 2 percent of the P loading to Lake Winnipeg. What is truly galling about the proposed amendment is that it ignores the contribution of major P sources. The Red River alone, which is about 10 percent of the flow into Lake Winnipeg, is shown to contribute up to 50 percent of the P into the lake. The City of Winnipeg is in the process of reducing its P contributions to 16 percent, and they feel that is an achievement. There are many other major and minor sources of P within the proposed moratorium area. When you consider that, you begin to understand how inappropriate this legislation is. In the interest of justice, you should either get rid of the moratorium or place a moratorium on all P contributors to the lake.

Could you place a moratorium on the City of Winnipeg? Could you place a moratorium on the small rural residences in the countryside and all the subdivisions? That list would go on and on.

The Clean Environment Commission hearings and subsequent report, at a cost of \$1 million, has attested to the sustainability of Manitoba's hog industry. The authors of Bill 17 have chosen to selectively ignore some of its finding. As a private citizen this greatly concerns me. I am left to wonder if special interest groups have pressured the government into this legislation. If that is the case, I would encourage the government to re-examine its findings and recommendations of its own Clean Environment Commission.

One of the fallouts of this unfortunate process is the imposition of a funding moratorium placed by the Manitoba Pork Council into much-needed livestock and environmental research. This research, such things as biodigesters, solid-liquid separation, phosphorus removal, barn air quality. That last one is kind of ironic because the government recently passed legislation for Workplace Safety and Health for farm related and some of the funding that's been pulled by Manitoba Pork was going towards that. So, in other words, you're self-defeating here. While this is regrettable, it is entirely understandable. The Manitoba Pork Council most likely needs all the resources at its disposal to fight Bill 17.

Groups such as the MLMMI, the U of M NCLE, as well as private researchers and other universities, are left with reduced funding or no funding altogether. While this bill purports to protect the environment, it is actually limiting dollars into vital livestock and environmental research. Who will fill this funding gap?

The implementation of this legislation goes well beyond a number of hog producers targeted within the moratorium area. If this injustice can happen to a group as undeserving as hog producers, then I fear for other Manitoba residents who become the target of special interest groups. Thank you.

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

Mr. McFadyen: Thank you, Mr. Sykes, for the presentation. You've captured a lot of the arguments within this presentation, the scientific points as well as the political implications of Bill 17 when you sound the warning about the potential impact on others. We've seen through a variety of presentations

the impact that Bill 17 has on not just hog farmers but those involved in a variety of ancillary industries.

So I want to thank you for the content of the presentation. I also want to let you know, as well, that you may not be aware that you've just made history tonight, and I'm going to tell you why. The Member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen), a colleague of ours, has done some research, and it was just pointed out to me by Mr. Eichler, the Member for Lakeside, that there was a debate about 12 years ago over a decision which was controversial at the time over the ownership of the telephone system. The government of the day believed it was better off in private ownership, and the opposition at the time believed it should be government controlled. In the course of the legislative hearings, there were 195 people who showed up in person to present with respect to that bill, and, at the time, was a record.

* (00:00)

I want you to know that tonight you are 196th on Bill 17 and have broken a record in terms of legislative committee hearings. There are some 200 people who remain on the list after you to present against this bill. This is a Manitoba record in terms of the number of people who have lined up at legislative committee hearings to present against a single piece of legislation.

If that doesn't send a message to the government, then I don't know what will. So thank you both for the content of your presentation and for the fact that you've made history tonight.

Mr. Sykes: Thank you. It's nice to be recognized.

Mr. Maguire: Mr. Sykes, I really appreciate the frankness and honesty of your presentation tonight. I think the four most important words in your whole presentation are in the second paragraph which says, I am recently retired.

I appreciate you coming forward with your experience that you've had in the industry and making these statements so succinctly and so committedly to this industry. You are to be commended. Your experiences, bar none, on all of the issues that you've dealt with—western Canadian manure symposium; South Interlake Land Management Association; MAFRI co-ordinator. You've looked after manure expos.

I think that, rather than singling out your statement which says, rather than single out and victimize pork producers, government should hold

them up as an example of an industry group that is making genuine contributions to the reduction of phosphorus loading in Lake Winnipeg, would you mind if the government used your statements in this presentation, to make them more public, to try to educate the public as to the responsible action that this industry takes today in Manitoba?

Floor Comment: Feel free.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sykes, I have to recognize you.

Mr. Sykes: Sorry about that. Feel free.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you, Mr. Sykes, for your presentation. Don't be discouraged by what you just heard from the Leader of the Opposition because, despite 195 presentations, they still didn't listen and sold the Manitoba Telephone System. Don't let that cast any kind of pessimism over your approach to this hearing tonight.

I am concerned about a statement that you make in here. You talk about that it's regretful, but understandable that Manitoba Pork has made the decision not to fund the research that they were funding at the U of M NCLE. I understand that statement. What concerns me is you've linked that statement to the political campaign that seems to be under way in the *Free Press*, on billboards and different things.

Are you contending that Manitoba Pork took the money from the research and used it to run a political campaign?

Mr. Sykes: No, I think that the Manitoba Pork Council has to look after the well-being and welfare of its membership. That's primary. When you have a crisis situation and you're—they have reduced marketings, reduced checkoffs coming in. Somewhere along the line, they have to cut back in order to balance their budgets.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I just have a question for you.

You have a wealth of experience and knowledge in regard to the nutrient management regulations and manure management regulations. Do you feel they've had an opportunity to really be tested for their full impact on the industry, and Bill 17 is actually premature?

Mr. Sykes: I feel that we had a system that was working, lots of checks and balances. I am concerned

that this is onerous with pedantic, extra hoop-jumping for the industry. I do believe what was there at the time was working well enough.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions—oh, Mr. Maguire?

Mr. Maguire: In your experience, Michael, those regulations that we have in place in Manitoba today without the moratorium, where would they rank in the realm of North American rules for being friendly to the environment in relation to the livestock industry?

You've indicated that the livestock industry's already had to pick up all the costs themselves for this. They're stringent rules. Are they the toughest in North America in your estimation and what else would we need to make them better?

Mr. Sykes: You know what? I don't have enough experience to answer that question, but I do believe that they have done a good job, and they should have left well enough alone. We would have been better off to leave well enough alone.

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

Mr. Sykes: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Mr. Ed Dornn. Ed Dornn will drop to the bottom.

Ingrid Penner of Penner Farm Services. Ms. Penner will drop to the bottom.

Henry Rosolowski. See how good I am on the Slavic names? Mr. Rosolowski will drop to the bottom of the list.

Sandra Klassen. Sandra Klassen will drop to the bottom of the list.

David Sutherland. David Sutherland will drop to the bottom of the list.

Robert Kleinsasser. Robert Kleinsasser will drop to the bottom of the list.

Richard Peters. Richard Peters will drop to the bottom of the list.

Tim Friesen. Tim Friesen will drop to the bottom of the list.

Marvin Waldner. Marvin Waldner will drop to the bottom of the list.

Peter Wollmann. Peter Wollmann will drop to the bottom of the list.

David Wollmann. David Wollmann will drop to the bottom of the list.

Reg Penner. Reg Penner will drop to the bottom of the list.

Michael Andres. Michael Andres will drop to the bottom of the list.

Tim Baer. Tim Baer will drop to the bottom of the list.

Galen Peters. Galen Peters will drop to the bottom of the list.

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

Mr. Raymond Cherniak (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Raymond Cherniak: Just before I start, I would like to make a comment. I have travelled in my years in the feed industry to many Hutterite colonies, and I've always recognized the Hutterites as not a bunch of people who like to get out, and I can certainly see that this is not their element. I stayed here yesterday for six hours, tonight, again, for six hours, and from young and old, these Hutterites have come in here, obviously with grave concern about this Bill 17. I want to applaud them for showing up here and sticking up for their rights.

Good evening, Mr. Chairperson, and ladies and gentlemen of the committee. My name is Raymond Cherniak. I work for a major feed company in Manitoba. It's based here in Winnipeg. Being a nutrition and management consultant has allowed me to travel to many farm locations including Hutterite colonies over most of southern, central and the Interlake parts of Manitoba. When I started travelling on the road in the early '80s, I used to see cattle being fed on rivers, river banks, on creeks. I've seen feedlots on hillsides that drained into landlocked lakes and some that drained into ditches and creeks. Feedlots like those slopey lands for the natural drainage that they get.

* (00:10)

During those years, I had seen many hog farmers and other layer and poultry operations that spread manure close to ditches, rivers, creeks, spread manure all year-round. By the '90s, however, most of this type of water contamination had stopped. Why? Awareness. Our new-generation farmers are more concerned over the environment than some of the

older farmers used to be. Governments even before this one have introduced and put pieces of legislation into place to restrict water contamination because of manure.

The Manitoba hog industry today has some of the most strictest rules that must be followed for both manure storage and field application. Before any manure can be applied, soil tests must be done and manure application plans must be filed. Nutrient management plans must be okayed by the governing body and then they must be followed.

It sounds to me like the hog industry is doing, and has been doing, its part to prevent contamination of our lakes, streams, and water aquifers. However, it is interesting that in some municipalities, they are allowed to continue to discharge raw sewage into drainage ditches. Winnipeg itself at least has had two so-called incidents where the wrong valves were allegedly turned on by mistake, spilling several thousand cubic metres of raw sewage into the Red River. Now we understand it's been going on all day and all night yesterday. I wonder how many such accidents happen in other towns along the Red River and the Assiniboine River that are not even reported. Grand Forks and Fargo sewage cannot even be controlled by our government.

I live in the Selkirk area. In the Selkirk area, just out of town, Mapleton area, into East Selkirk, all these households are in a boil-water zone. These wells have been contaminated not by hog barns but by septic fields. Septic fields today continue to overflow and fill up ditches all summer and all winter. Some people in my area allow grey water to be pumped directly into the ditch. This grey water is obviously full of laundry soap, and it's from the grey part of the—I'm not saying that it is the raw sewage, but it is the grey water. From Lockport to Middlechurch, huge developments have been built and continue to be built with septic fields. After heavy rains, these areas have probably more putrid odours than any hog barn I've ever smelled. These wells are also on a boil-only order. These aquifer contaminations occurred from their own septic fields. Where are the regulations for these developments?

Back in the early '80s, I went to visit a hog producer in the East Selkirk area. He had recently purchased a manure wagon with injector systems. I went for a ride on the tractor with him. There were no odours, and the manure was being applied under the soil. It was locked in and it was not going to run off. That farmer had remarked that many neighbours

came to see him and show their appreciation for this new piece of equipment. There had been no complaints by the neighbours to this farmer but they all came by to appreciate how well this farmer was looking after their area.

Therefore, I see hog producers as good neighbours. I see them as good managers of a good resource and good tenants of our farmlands. With by-laws in place and a lot of common sense, these farmers are passing their farms to future generations with good practices, sustainability, as a top priority. I cannot see why a hog farmer or a Hutterite colony would deprive his or her children with poor, unsafe environment and poor water. Yet I see industry and human development continue to pollute our environment without any or very few restrictions. Is our government scared to tackle some of these problems? Obviously, it's easier to single out the hog farmer.

According to the scientific community, about 14 percent of nutritional load into Lake Winnipeg comes from agriculture. Of that, 1.5 percent, as has been talked about for the last few days, is attributed to the hog industry. Where's the other 86 percent coming from? It seems logical to me that, if the government is going to help Lake Winnipeg, it should focus on the 86 percent of the majority of the polluters. If these polluters would drop their nutrient load by only 1.7 percent, and I think that's doable, doesn't this government not see that this would drop their nutrient load to Lake Winnipeg by more than all of agriculture's contribution now? This would drop the nutrient load to Lake Winnipeg over 10 times more than the hog industry is being accused of.

With new rules and regulations that have been put in by this government in the last several years, allow the farmers to manage and put these regulations into practice. This will bring down the nutrient loading of our waterways. Give the hog farmers a chance to implement these measures. Bottom line, the main polluters continue to load our aquifers and lakes and streams unrestricted.

I have enjoyed 30 years in the feed industry. I have seen advances in technology that's truly amazing. Broiler chickens in 1979 had feed conversions of two and a half to one. Now they're 1.5 to one. Hogs in 1970 converted as four to one; now they're down to three to one. These livestock operations use less feed and therefore less nutrients left in the manure because there is less manure. Phytase enzymes have allowed us to decrease phos-

phorus levels by about 50 percent. These and other enzymes will allow for more complete digestion of animals by animals, not only of phosphorus but of nitrogen, causing the—or should I say the protein, causing the nitrogen problems.

Therefore, using less feed and having less nutrients left in the manure, these new technologies will greatly help their negative impacts on our environment. Farmers today regard manure as a valuable resource, natural fertilizer for their crops. Banning hog barns will force farmers to use chemical fertilizers that depend on fossil fuels for their production. Manure in many countries is sold for natural organic requirements. Environmentalists probably have organic food on their other agenda. Well, organic foods must be grown with manure as a natural organic fertilizer, not chemical fertilizer.

Will banning hog barn expansion in Manitoba save Lake Winnipeg? No. The science community has proven that. The Clean Environment Commission report stated that the hog industry is sustainable as the new regulations are brought into practice. In our feed industry we rely on hog expansion to support our expansion. If hog barns cannot be rebuilt, updated, or new barns built, these barns will fall back and eventually close down. One by one, each time a barn closes it is one less customer for us to depend on for our production.

The quota system in a dairy and poultry have allowed for little or no expansion in the last 38 years. This leaves only the hog and beef industries that can expand. This Bill 17 essentially puts a quota restriction on the production of hogs. This restriction will depress the hog industry, and the feed industry will also suffer.

I hope this government realizes that family farms must expand also. If children want to join the farm, hogs make a sustainable diversified farm income most of the time. Many family farms even employ workers in their operation. Purchasing land is often difficult and livestock has been their only option.

Will this Bill 17—

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

Mr. Raymond Cherniak: Will this Bill 17 save Lake Winnipeg? No. What it will do, however, is put in place the slow demise of a vibrant industry that brings many direct and indirect jobs to municipalities in our province. This ban will not force expansion to western Manitoba. It will, however, drive expansion into Saskatchewan. Those people say, we are open

for business, some attitude that this province has forgotten about. In Manitoba we have been looking for more killing plants for feeder barn production. This would help the industry be less dependent on U.S. exports of weanlings. Which company would build a killing plant in this province if Bill 17 goes into place?

No other jurisdiction in Canada has or has planned with such a restriction on an industry like this Bill 17. At least if it would remotely accomplish some of its goal, but I guess this government is just anti-farming. This suggests to me very strongly that our government motives with Bill 17 are political in scope and not science-based as they should be.

* (00:20)

During the debate with the North Dakota Devils Lake issue, Premier Doer kept telling us that decisions and policy should be based on the science and not be politically motivated. Bill 17 is not based on science. It is solely based on political rhetoric. My suggestion to Premier Doer and his government is to practice what they preach. Thank you.

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

Mr. Maguire: When I put my hand up to ask a question, Mr. Cherniak, I didn't know that you'd have such a succinct ending sentence. It's whenever it's convenient, the Premier will pull out this business of whatever he wants, science or no science, just depends on how he feels that day. What he forgets is how it impacts on individual Manitobans. I think that's what the members across the way have to take into consideration as they sit here and seriously consider what they're going to do with this bill and how they're going to get around the Premier in making that decision and how they're going to convince him to do that.

I really appreciate a person coming forward like yourself that lists all of the things that a person has to go through today, as you did, to be able to build a barn in Manitoba, or to be able to raise hogs in Manitoba in the first place. I think that any thinking human being would have to take that into consideration and look at the fact that these regulations are well in place, put in place for the purpose of protecting the environment in Manitoba. So would you agree that they do protect the environment in Manitoba, those rules? And what way would you suggest that the government go about making this bill acceptable to the hog industry?

Mr. Cherniak: I think it'll be regulations that we have in place now. Some of them were put in by the previous government, and a lot of them were put in by this government. I think they were all put in with great intentions of helping the hog industry and other livestock sectors to be more sustainable and to provide a better environment and cleaner water for all our province.

How are we going to convince the government what we should do with this bill? I think the bill can be scrapped. I think at least what we should do, Minister Struthers, is at least look at the bill, revamp it, remodify it, and make it a lot easier for hog farmers to exist, to expand like we need to. I think the rules and regulations are in place, maybe we have to tweak them a little bit, but I think that the greater good is to make sure that this ban on hog barn buildings cannot go through.

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

Mr. Cherniak: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Glen Maendel. Mr. Maendel to the bottom.

Beverley Pachal. Beverley. To the bottom.

Julie Baird. Ms. Baird, do you have written documents? I see you do. You may begin.

Ms. Julie Baird (Private Citizen): My name is Julie Baird, and I'm a resident of the R.M. of St. Andrews. I live a half mile from a hog farm and I have lived a half mile from a hog farm for the past 27 years. I'm here today because I want to give you my personal and brief perspective on this issue.

You have heard many people before me who are far closer to the issue, more knowledgeable, and more directly affected by it, namely the hog producers. They are the Manitobans whose livelihoods are going to be changed by your actions. However, I do have an opinion on what you, as my government, are doing to my province.

As mentioned, I live a half mile from a hog farm. Two families live and work on the farm. They have a sizeable operation that has expanded in the last 10 years. They are responsible, honest and caring members of the community. Not for a second would I worry that they are not following the regulations required of them as hog producers in Manitoba. Although they face perennial financial difficulties and daily challenges associated with farming, they take pride in their operation and face head on all

these challenges, including more and more regulations, and increased negative comment and public ridicule that they are not doing enough to protect the environment.

Sure I get the smell occasionally from the manure storage. Sure I comment that it smells, but I choose to live in the country and I can appreciate the particular farming practices, including disposal of manure, come with the territory.

The manure is injected into the soil and my neighbours use fields within a hundred feet of my property. I have on occasion, several occasions, come home from work and had to be told that they cleaned out their storage that day. I literally did not smell—notice any foul smell when I drove into my driveway. I appreciate the efforts they go to in mitigating the smell, and I appreciate that they consult with me if there might be anything that they do on the farm that may affect me or my family. The exception? I don't think so.

I have my well water tested regularly. It's the responsible thing to do when you have a well for drinking water. I would venture to say that I might be doing water testing if I lived in the city of Winnipeg too. I truly believe and I have come to expect that my neighbours would not jeopardize the health and safety of their own children and grandchildren.

My father was a farmer. He raised hogs and cattle and grain. My brother is a hog farmer. My brother's son, Jordan, has just completed a business degree. Jordan's brother, Ryan, is in his final year of a business degree both at the University of Western Ontario. These two intelligent young people have chosen to return to the farm. They have chosen to return to Manitoba. These two young Manitobans have many and varied career choices available to them but what have they chosen to do? Return to the farm and work in agriculture. A hog farm no less; go figure. Is there a future? They think so; they hope so. But are there choices here in Manitoba in agriculture for these two young university graduates? Is there support for them here in Manitoba in their chosen career? It doesn't appear to be the case right now.

These two young Manitobans should be given the opportunity to consider a future in hog farming in their home province but do you know what they have to consider now in making their career choice? A permanent moratorium on the industry they have chosen that will affect their future and ability to prosper in Manitoba. Is there a future in agriculture for Jordan and Ryan here in Manitoba or is there a

brighter future in agriculture in Saskatchewan or Alberta?

Those are not the choices we as Manitobans should be placing before our youth, our future farmers, but that is the message that this government is sending to these young people. Further, and maybe just as important, Bill 17 targeting hog producers and limiting their economic viability in specific geographic areas of Manitoba is not going to reserve its impact on only those specific geographic areas. Bill 17 will have a wider and more detrimental effect on agriculture overall in this province.

Hog farmers are being painted with a broad reaching brush stroke. They are being blamed for a pollution problem that is everyone's problem, yours and mine included. We all contribute to the pollution in our communities and our cities and our province but isn't it easier to blame someone else. Today it's the hog farmer, tomorrow it's the cattle farmer, next it's the chicken farmer. It's easier to point the finger and put the blame on someone else and in this particular case it's the hog farmers.

I believe this situation has arisen, in part, because more and more people are unfamiliar with what actually happens on the farms in our province. A divide exists in our province today and Bill 17, under the guise of saving Lake Winnipeg, is just feeding into that divide. More and more Manitobans, particularly those living in Winnipeg, are disconnected from the land and the people responsible for their food and along with this disconnect more and more Manitobans hold strong opinions on what farmers should and shouldn't be doing on their farms. They feel that they have a right to demand how and what a farmer should be doing on his land. In spite of their urban backgrounds and limited knowledge of what happens outside the Perimeter Highway they maintain strong opinions on how farmers should farm and how agriculture should be practised. I would venture to say that these opinions do not come from knowledge or science; they come from television, newspapers, misinformation and half truths.

As a rural resident and as a Manitoba citizen, I firmly believe that this bill is not the answer. Hog farming in Manitoba does not need a permanent moratorium. Placing a permanent moratorium on one segment of the population is not justified. Ask any Manitoban if he or she would appreciate a permanent moratorium placed on their livelihood. I ask you as a Manitoban citizen, how would you feel about a

moratorium placed on your livelihood? Is it fair? Is it just? Is it right? Definitely not.

* (00:30)

Yes, we need regulations. Do we have effective regulations in place now? I can't speak on that. If we don't, put new and better regulations in place. Focus on the recommendations of the recent Clean Environment Commission report, but, please, do not target one industry and one segment of the population for problems that are everyone's responsibility—yours, mine, and every other person living in this province. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Baird. Questions?

Mr. Graydon: Thank you very much for your presentation. As an agricultural producer myself, I really appreciate the fact that you gave this an unbiased and impartial assessment and taken the time to be here at somewhat after midnight with no promise of breakfast and made a presentation like this. I really appreciate it.

What I would ask you is, as there are many, many people you pointed out that are unfamiliar with what actually happens on a farm, we have a Minister of Agriculture who, I believe, that would be part of her responsibility, first of all, to stand up for agriculture, and to educate those that are unfamiliar with it. Do you believe that that's being done at this point?

Ms. Baird: I believe there are a lot of efforts being made. I believe probably that a large segment of the population just has no interest in it. Maybe it's apathy, I don't know. I think probably more efforts could be made in telling the story of agriculture to the population and telling also the real value of agriculture, maybe that's it, to really stress that this is where your food is coming from, and these producers are valuable to our province and to our country. I think probably more effort, maybe, if somehow that could be sort of relayed to the general population.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Ms. Baird, for coming out and, again, at this late hour to sit through this and give your presentation. I appreciate your presentation because it gives a much different perspective. You're not actively involved in farming. You're closely connected to the farm through your relatives, but you yourself are not directly. I'll just ask you for your opinion because you're here and you've given your opinion, but do you think that the Premier and his inner circle would have introduced Bill 17 if the

people living inside Winnipeg had your type of knowledge about the farming industry? Do you think they would have introduced Bill 17?

Ms. Baird: I don't think so because I think probably there wouldn't be that maybe general perceived support of it. No, I think if people really do know what is happening out there, what is really happening on the farm, how producers are taking care of the land, I think they would see that this bill is not necessary, and that this bill infringes on the producers' rights and likewise would infringe on their rights also if they were put in that same situation.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Baird, and I appreciate it because it's kind of a breath of fresh air in terms of someone who is not directly involved in agriculture coming out and speaking about this bill and the potential impact it may have on our province. It's not just on the hog industry, not just on the agriculture industry, but indeed on the province as a whole.

My question has to do with—you talked about the young people, and if we close this opportunity down to the hog industry, not only will your next door neighbour's family be looking for opportunities outside of this province perhaps, or elsewhere, but the values of properties are going to start declining because the industry itself is going to be deteriorating. What do you think the government could do instead of Bill 17 to help either protect Lake Winnipeg in a more positive way or address some of the issues they have regarding the nutrients that are flowing into the Lake?

Ms. Baird: Well, I really do believe that—obviously, I have not read the Clean Environment Commission, but I understand there are 48 regulations in there. I would suggest that—look at those regulations. Put in more regulations, as I mentioned. Focus it on that.

I'm basically really against the idea of a moratorium and the whole principle of restricting an individual's right to improve their lot in life, to really give value to what they are doing in life. I would not want that put on me. I would feel very angry at that and I don't think it's necessary. Maybe somewhere down the line, in 50-odd years, it might be necessary. I don't think we're at the point now where it is necessary. I think you can take a look at the regulations we have, enforce them, improve them. I think that would go a long way.

I mentioned my two nephews in my presentation. I really feel strongly that, if they want

to be in agriculture, they should be given that right. There aren't that many young people anymore in society, who do want to farm.

I think it's an honourable profession and I really feel strongly that they should be given that opportunity, every opportunity to do that.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Baird.

Ms. Baird: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Randy Rutherford. Mr. Rutherford, to the bottom.

Richard Prejet of Porcheria Lac du Onze. I won't try that again. Mr. Prejet, to the bottom of the list.

Andrew Curry, to the bottom of the list.

David Hildebrand. Dave Hildebrand, to the bottom of the list.

Kevin Waldner.

Gordon Gross, to the bottom.

Jonathan Gross, to the bottom.

Len Desilets, to the bottom.

Adam Gross, to the bottom.

Thomas Thiessen, bottom.

Andy Hofer, to the bottom—*[interjection]*—Oh, he is. Okay—*[interjection]*—no, all right.

Scott Penner, to the bottom.

Clifford Wollman. Clifford Wollman, to the bottom.

Karen Wollman, to the bottom.

William Alford, to the bottom.

Jordan Riese, to the bottom.

Aaron Gross, to the bottom.

Ben Ginter, to the bottom.

George Vis, to the bottom.

Jim Peters. Mr. Peters?

Mr. Jim Peters (Silverfield Farms Inc.): Good evening.

Mr. Chairperson: Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Peters: No. I did send letters to the Premier, Mr. Struthers and Ms. Wowchuk.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. You may begin.

Mr. Peters: Thank you.

My name is Jim Peters. I own Silverfield Farms, which is located in the Rural Municipality of Taché. We, my wife and three children, run a mixed farm that has been in the family for three generations. I am hoping to leave a viable farm as an option for our children.

* (00:40)

I am here, of course, in opposition to the bill as it stands. I believe the bill is too encompassing or general in nature. I feel that where soil types and cropping practices make full use of the nutrients that are found in hog manure, a ban like Bill 17 is wrong.

You see, I soil-test annually and apply manure according to the crop use. I test the manure for its nutrient value and hire a company to apply the manure accordingly. It is re-injected four to six inches deep across the entire field according to the use the crop can make of it. I believe that if I have a land base that can accommodate the manure produced and grow crops on those lands, I feel that we should be allowed to expand and therefore remain viable as a farm.

I don't believe that we are major polluters of the water. Rather, I feel towns, cities, R.M.s, cottagers even, are the main contributors to the water pollution in our rivers and lakes. I feel the NDP government is using us hog farms as scapegoats so that they can appear to be doing something to win over some gullible votes.

In conclusion, I'd like the NDP to amend Bill 17 to allow those farms that can accommodate the manure to expand accordingly. That way, hopefully, my children can have a viable farm for the future. That is all.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Peters.

Mr. Eichler: Interesting presentation on your amendment there. I would just like to take it to a step further. Do you feel that that amendment the way it's presented will allow for the next generation and the generation after that? Is that what you're intending with your proposed amendment?

Mr. Peters: Yes. I believe, if farmed according to the regulations that are in place, if the manure is applied according to the amount that the crop uses on a regular basis, there is no danger of pollution. I believe that would be viable.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Peters. Your comment was that you're against the bill as it stands, I think I quote you correctly. I'm assuming then that you're hoping that the bill is either withdrawn or it has amendments?

Mr. Peters: You're correct.

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

Mr. Peters: You're welcome. Thank you. Good night.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Trevor Speirs. Mr. Speirs to the bottom of the list.

Lloyd Wiebe. Mr. Wiebe to the bottom of the list.

Peter Hofer. Mr. Hofer to the bottom of the list.

Paul Beauchamp. Mr. Beauchamp to the bottom of the list.

Ryan Riese. Mr. Riese to the bottom of the list.

Daniel Wyrich, to the bottom of the list.

Elston Solberg, to the bottom of the list.

Brad Chappell, to the bottom of the list.

Leonard Wiebe, to the bottom of the list.

Joey Maendel, to the bottom of the list.

Jeff Toews, to the bottom of the list.

Levi Bergen, to the bottom of the list.

Michael Maendel, to the bottom of the list.

Steven Denault, to the bottom of the list.

Hans Kjeaar, to the bottom of the list.

Wilfred Chabot to the bottom of the list.

Rudy Dyck to the bottom of the list.

Clayton Block to the bottom of the list.

Lauren Wiebe to the bottom of the list.

Mike Maendel to the bottom of the list.

Ed Oswald to the bottom of the list.

Wes Martens to the bottom of the list.

Walter Hofer to the bottom of the list.

Susanne Richter to the bottom of the list.

Mike Gauthier to the bottom of the list.

James Gross to the bottom of the list.

Fred Fast to the bottom of the list.

Rolph Penner to the bottom of the list.

Elie Hofer to the bottom of the list.

Edward Hofer. Mr. Hofer, do you have some written materials for the committee?

Mr. Edward Hofer (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, the clerk will distribute them, and you may begin when ready.

Mr. Edward Hofer: My presentation, it's two parts. It has a manure management plan in it. That's the second part. It's stapled together, and my presentation is the first part.

I'll go through the manure management plan if you want me to later on, but the last four pages are actually our last year's manure management plan because somebody told me nobody knew what a manure management plan was.

Thanks for giving me an opportunity to speak about my concerns about Bill 17. I am our water plant manager and, as required, I am classified for that position. I'm also the plumber on our farm. For the last 10 years, I've also been in charge of our manure pumping and injection.

For a number of years I submitted our manure management plans myself, but for the last three years we hired a company called Agritrend to help us out with our manure management, not only with our manure management but also with the soil testing and the crop rotation. Brad Schnell that did a speech earlier, he is actually our agent that does that work for us.

I was one of the people who made a presentation at the Clean Environment Commission hearing in St. Claude last year where we tried to tell how we handle our manure at our farm, how everything is tested and that we put a lot of effort into manure management, but it appears that the presentation didn't mean very much. Based on Bill 17, it appears, instead, that some people in our government have chosen to brand the hog industry and the livestock industry as big polluters. It looks to us that all of a sudden livestock producers and farms have been pushed to the forefront of this whole issue and that we are being made into scapegoats, and we don't understand why.

The Clean Environment Commission did a very thorough review of the hog industry. The report that the commission put forth was in my opinion very

good as it had lots of excellent recommendations for both government and livestock producers to follow up on and improve. The commission spent a whole year reviewing the industry. It involved travelling all over Manitoba holding hearings where everybody had a chance to voice their concerns. This must have cost a lot of money, time and effort. The Clean Environment Commission did not recommend a permanent ban be put on any zone in Manitoba, so it is more than a little surprising that some people in our government have pushed ahead with Bill 17.

*(00:50)

If Bill 17's main purpose is to reduce phosphate loading to the lake, then I say it's not worth the paper that it's written on. A point-source study done by the University of Manitoba shows that the ag industry is responsible for only 15 percent of the nutrients flowing into Lake Winnipeg. Of that, the hog industry is responsible for only 1.5 percent of the load. It's totally shocking to see that the industry that only contributes 1.5 percent of the nutrients to the lake is first put on hold, and now a permanent ban is being considered. Or is it simply a poor attempt by some politicians to try and make a green name for themselves amongst city voters? Bill 17 will do nothing to help clean up the algae bloom in Lake Winnipeg.

Up until about three years ago, phosphate was almost a non-issue. Manure plans were based on nitrogen inputs and loads. Since phosphate is now the new enemy please give the hog industry time to adapt. On our farm, we have reduced levels of phosphate by changing the diets of our hogs. We also supplement our diet with an enzyme called phytase, which helps our hogs break down phosphate a lot better. Manure management plans now take into account phosphate loads and crop removal rates. If phosphate levels are too high, no more manure or fertilizer can be applied.

I'm confident that farmers and livestock producers will continue to find ways to deal with this challenge in a professional manner. People who don't know better seem to think that hog farmers are allowed to pump all the manure directly into rivers and lakes and pollute the environment but, in reality, manure management here in Manitoba is tightly managed.

I added the manure management plan on the back pages. It's a four-page document that every farmer has to fill out. The first is just your address and everything; the second page, section B and C,

are more—how much livestock you have on your farm, and the animal units are calculated on the first chart. The second chart is your storage facility, what kind of storage facility you have, where it's located, whatever. Section D tells you what kind of manure you have, how much of it, how strong it is. Like, how much content is in that manure, like, this manure here has 31 pounds per thousand gallons of nitrogen, and phosphate is only five, which is typical, although this is pretty strong manure. It's actually chicken. The chicken manure brings it up. At our farm we mix the dairy, the chicken, and the hogs together in the same storage, so it's kind of a cocktail here of all kinds of manures.

Section E, the third page, would be the section where we list the fields that we want to apply on. We always put on a few extra fields because here you can see the first two fields are—the reason why, because this report has to be in by July 10, 30 days before application, and at that time there's no soil test. You just have to let the government know what you want to do. Then, as soon as the crop is harvested, we go in and take soil tests, when the crop's off. Then, when the results are back from those soil tests, that's when we really determine which fields we're going to go on with the manure and where it's needed the most and then we kind of finish this page off, like we'll put in the content or what we're applying with. And those soil tests have to be faxed off to Conservation before you apply, and your results and everything. You cannot apply manure till you have the soil tests in your hand.

Then I have, the two back pages are my confirmation sheets, the ones I'm going to apply. An application is a hard job because the weather, things can happen. Sometimes it doesn't happen the way you planned it. You either run out of manure or you have a little too much or—so, when you're done applying, you have to file these confirmation sheets in of what you actually did. Like, if things changed—first you tell the government, Conservation, what you want to do, and then when you're done applying, you file in what you actually did. And then it's over. But they can come the following spring and audit you. They audit about 20 percent of the producers every year and, if they catch you being too high or whatever, you get fined. I know a couple farms in our area that have been fined for having fields that have too much nutrient on them, but we have actually never been checked, but we've got a pretty clean record. It appears that the farms that are sloppy with their stuff are checked more, you know.

Okay, I'll go on with my—my main point I want to make is that the hog industry is very regulated already. Every gallon of nutrient is accounted for. Manitoba Conservation staff do a very good job of working with producers and making sure that this happens. Producers that break the rules are fined.

Growing up in a Hutterite colony, I've been taught to choose carefully between right and wrong when making decisions, both spiritually and materially. When we make decisions, we should always consider all the facts involved: how it might affect our neighbours and if it's right before God and our conscience. As members of parliament, when you vote for Bill 17, I hope you consider all the issues involved and all the rural people it will affect. I hope that you will consider the true meaning of Bill 17, or will you ask yourself why it goes against the report of the Clean Environment Commission if it is based on science and facts.

I know that, if Bill 17 is passed, it will have major negative impacts on both Hutterite and non-Hutterite farms, the hog industry and the livestock industry in the future. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Struthers: Yes, thank you very much, Edward. I appreciate both the conversation we had out in the hallway and your presentation here.

I think it's a very good idea to speak from your plan that you have in front of us. Thank you for that.

I'm looking at section E, field application summary, under manure application rate, 7,400 gallons per acre is that—this is for '08. Is that a normal number for those three sections of land? Is that an average that you would put on there?

Mr. Edward Hofer: Yes it is—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Edward Hofer: Sorry.

I see rates between 9,000. I have two cells in the lagoon. The second one is always weaker, the contents. So, when we open the valve, the first cell is always very strong, so we can only do about four to 6,000 gallons an acre, but then, when we open our second cell, we can sometimes go up to 12,000 an acre. Like, our cultivator has a flow meter and the operator in the cab sees how many gallons a minute he's getting. He's got a chart. So, even if the pump stops, he will know and I tell the boys how many

gallons an acre I want. He just has a printout and he goes according to that speed.

So it depends on the nutrient. It depends on what we're trying to apply for. Like, usually the rotation is we'd grow Canola on manure. That's when we get our best results because it really flourishes and you can really load it up and it'll use that nutrient. So we're shooting sometimes for up to 160 pounds of nitrogen per acre to grow a good crop, so that's what we shoot for. We pump on as much manure as needed to get that. So you're applying manure based on your fertilizer that you need to grow the next year's crop. You're not applying manure on anything else really—based on anything else.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Struthers, supplemental.

Mr. Struthers: That 7,400, that's not the cocktail that you talked about before—

Mr. Edward Hofer: Yes.

Mr. Struthers: Oh, this is.

Mr. Edward Hofer: Yes, it is, it is, but I think last year—like, manure can be touchy. When we submit the plan 30 days before that, we had the previous year's results, so it was 31. Once we tested it—we have an onside tester—it showed up only being about 27 pounds per 1,000 gallons. Like, it was weaker so we kind of—with manure it's tough to do a perfect job because it fluctuates on you and it's kind of—you can have the best technology and you're still guessing a little, you know, but I think we're pretty much dead on with this.

Mr. Struthers: Yes, that's where I was going. There must be challenges because if you can have the cocktail on one side and you've got different levels of nitrogen and phosphorus mixed in, as opposed to this straight pig manure that must be a—you must have to be on top of that to make that calculation or the 7,400 means different things, right?

Mr. Edward Hofer: Its—as long as that—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer.

* (01:00)

Mr. Edward Hofer: As long as it's—sorry, I did it again. As long as it's consistent through the whole pump out, but that cocktail, I like it because the nitrogen ratio to the phosphate is better. Like, if it's just pure hog manure or—like our nitrogen, our ratio of nitrogen to phosphate is almost perfect. We apply for the pounds of nitrogen we need; we almost get

the perfect pounds of phosphorus on our land, so I'm not complaining.

Mr. Eichler: Very good presentation. I noticed the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) listened very intently. I know that she's a very educated woman and a teacher background, so I know that it certainly would be helping her in making the decision about what she wants to do with Bill 17 as well.

Just further to that, she also is the Minister of Health who has a way of dealing with mismanagement; that's really what this boils down to, I think. There are some people out there, who have mismanaged their operations, who should be held accountable. You talked about some of those being caught.

Do you think that the people who are mismanaging the system are really the culprits, that what we're talking about, rather than having Bill 17 even being talked about, is it the enforcement, rather than Bill 17, we should be looking at?

Mr. Edward Hofer: I know the staff at Manitoba Conservation quite well, Mark Stephens and those guys. They had the approach over the last 12 years where all the nutrient regularly started being phased in. They got the producers together once a year, explained things, tried to educate people and bring them along. They actually were very reluctant to go around handing out fines. They'd even let you go once or twice, because people get resentful and then you don't get anything done. They start fighting you.

I think that—plus fertilizer costs are going up; it's become a resource, all of a sudden. Ten years ago, it was a waste; people thought, this is a bunch of garbage. So the whole aspect of manure has changed dramatically, and fertilizer costs have almost doubled in the last year. So now, this year, it will be even better, I think.

Back when I started pumping, manure was worth about 30 bucks a gallon—30 bucks an acre. Right now, if you figure the phosphate, the potash, I think it's worth at least 150 bucks an acre, value put in that we have on our farm already.

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

Andy Cardy, to the bottom of the list.

Jake Hofer, to the bottom of the list.

Garry Funk, to the bottom of the list.

Jacob Rempel, to the bottom of the list.

Wayne Hofer, to the bottom of the list.

Keith Waldner, to the bottom of the list.

Ken Rempel, to the bottom of the list.

Jerome Waldner, to the bottom of the list.

Denis Tetreault, to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Eichler: We agreed to go to 222—[interjection]—yes, the first 200.

Mr. Pedersen: I believe, if we sent the Clerk down there, he'd find that there are approximately 10 people sitting out there waiting to present. So, if you'd just get to them and get them up here. If I may ask, there's an elderly lady who would really like to present so she can go home. So you can get her name so we could call her.

Mr. Chairperson: What's her name? Do you know it?

Mr. Pedersen: In the purple. I didn't get her name.

Mr. Chairperson: Order. We have here, Mrs. Judith Hamilton. No. 240 for the information of the committee. Do you have any written materials for the—

Mrs. Judith Hamilton (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. Are you prepared to proceed?

Mrs. Hamilton: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Please do so.

Mrs. Hamilton: Okay. I'm not a hog producer. I'm a cattle producer and I've already been devastated. All we need to survive in this world as humans is food, clothing, shelter, fuel and clean water. We don't need big boats on Lake Winnipeg or cottages along the lake that, over the past 70 years, had backhouses that polluted. We don't need sewer systems in our cities that, when there is a rainfall of four centimetres, overflow into the rivers. Oh, that was the University of Manitoba that was putting human excrement into the river system in the '90s. What about the human manure that has spread on top of the land in the fields near Winnipeg? I have seen it myself when I was doing the election. I was going around, you know, getting the personal data.

My personal story is that I am a cattle farmer who has lost approximately \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year since the 2003 mad cow incident in Alberta. It was reported that that farmer was from the United

States that owned the original cow that started all the trouble.

My father came to Canada with two brothers from Britain. He was one of 13 children in the 1920s and he eventually had to give up farming due to the drought in southern Saskatchewan. He farmed around Oxbow. He came to Winnipeg and he was a frustrated farmer all his life. He always said—like, he had a great big, huge garden. He rented land in Winnipeg by Polo Park, where there are houses now. He came to Winnipeg and he always had a huge garden. He always said that all the land needed was manure—His name was Morris. His last name was Morris, my maiden name—and that manure was gold, and that's what manure is. Along with, he always had plenty of trees bordering the fields when he was—he said that we needed plenty of trees bordering the fields. Besides the manure, we needed the trees so that the land wouldn't turn into the desert that Saskatchewan was.

* (01:10)

My maternal grandparents farmed in Carman. My grandmother, her ancestors came from Britain in the 1700s, and she came from a dairy farm in Ontario. My maternal grandfather came from Scotland when he was a child. My great-grandfather farmed around Carman. Although I grew up in Winnipeg, I married a Lord Selkirk settler descendant, one of the last four farmers that are still farming. You've heard of George Matheson—he's farming; and Bob Monroe, *[phonetic]* who was trying to get the packing house into Manitoba; the MacNairs of Carman—he's quitting farming because his wife is very ill and they're retiring; and my late husband.

My two sons are Lord Selkirk settler descendants. My one son has a law degree, and he is with Gerry Ritz, in Ottawa. He makes policies, and he's the adviser to the Agriculture Minister in Ottawa. My other son is farming with me, and he also works for Feed-Rite. He has to work full-time to support our losing operation which has been devastated. The reason that we are devastated is because there are no packing houses in Manitoba and because the Americans were blockading our cattle and all this stuff about Lake Winnipeg.

I grew up going to Victoria Beach—my dad built cottages there—and Wanasing Beach, and we had a backhouse like everybody along Lake Winnipeg. They didn't get rid of the human manure properly, and that was for the last—I'm 67—for the last 67 years.

My dad was in the Second World War with the Air Force with the Ateahs that started Victoria Beach; they're a Syrian family. They had started the beach, which is a lovely cottage area on Lake Winnipeg, and I have friends along Lake Winnipeg at Winnipeg Beach and all those cottages. It's only in the last few years that they've been having holding tanks for the human manure, which is actually worse than the cattle manure or the hog manure.

I'm here to speak my piece on the fact that I don't think you should have this bill and be exterminating business. I have a degree in Business, I have a Bachelor of Education, and I'm getting a Master's of Divinity now at my old age, and I really feel that we're having trouble, like the cattle business has been going through this crisis for the last five years. I'm almost glad that my husband isn't alive to see this because the main problem, as I said, is that we do not have packing houses.

I know we tried to get the packing house, the Minister of—Rosann tried to get the one to go through, and my neighbour Bob Monroe *[phonetic]* was a director. The reason that it didn't go through was because the farmers were expected to put the money in and, you know, every farmer is unique, and they are independent. They're the last independent businesspeople, the cattle farmers especially, I think, and they couldn't agree on putting the money in and having a co-operative. Another reason I think why packing houses aren't in Manitoba to the extent that they should be is because, if I had \$32 million to build a packing house, I would expect to be making a profit, and there's too low a margin of profit. That's the exact reason.

I'm sorry, I'm so tired. I had tests all day at the hospital.

Anyway, you know you're expected to put up the cash for the packing houses. Most of us cattle farmers, most of them—I go to the auction mart at Winnipeg and Inwood and Ashern and the guys I hear, you know, you could cut the depression with a knife. They didn't have the money to put into it and that was the problem. Most of us do not have the money to put into an outside business besides the farming.

The hog people have been successful but they need more packing houses and they need to be allowed to expand. What other business does the government step in and tell you that you can't run the business the way you want to? That's what we're doing if we let this Bill 17 go through. Never mind

all the pollution and all that. We've heard all these presentations. I wasn't here on Saturday and Sunday, I was running a thing at The Forks. On Friday I was here, and yesterday and today.

I really believe that all these hog people are good farmers. I wish that I could be as good as that, I really do. I have this bad habit like all of us do; we need to eat food. As I said at the beginning, food is one of the most important things. Pure water is important. We all need clothes. In this country we need fuel and you can't run around naked in the winter. You need to have all these things but we don't need expensive recreation. I didn't get to take my five kids to Disneyworld. I never had holidays with them.

I really think I brought up good kids. I stayed at home, I didn't go to teach. My oldest daughter is running a construction company and she does interior designing and renovates homes with her husband. They have a business. My second daughter is a Mountie and my third daughter has a business, too. She had a day care and now she is an esthetician. I never can say that word. My one son, as I told you, is a lawyer, although he's not a lawyer in Canada yet. He's still paying his student loans off working for the government. Hopefully, my two boys will be able to buy the farm from me someday, or at least keep me in my old age because I've gone through all the money trying to save the farm.

You know, we sent our kids to university and, as a lot of the Hutterite guys have been saying, on a farm you learn the work ethic. Your kids do the chores when they're six and seven. I tried to give my kids music lessons, basketball, volleyball and track and field. I figure I brought up good kids. In fact, I've been told that by teachers in the high school. I still go out to substitute if I get asked.

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Hamilton, you're at 11 minutes.

Mrs. Hamilton: Okay. I just think that the hog farmers have been putting in millions of dollars. They're environmentally responsible and with the new methods that they were speaking about, injecting the manure and so on. My son has a degree in agriculture but I don't. But I know that they do good—we just heard of a young fellow talk about the good methods. I don't think we should be chasing farmers out of the hog industry and I don't think all the other industries. Nobody is making a lot of money, but we need farmers. Where are we going to

get the young guys from if they cannot make a living? That's about all I have to say.

* (01:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Hamilton.

Mr. Pedersen: Mrs. Hamilton, thank you for your persistence in staying with us here so you can present. Of course, I have to mention that your relatives, the MacNair's at Graysville, are in my constituency, and they're terrific people. So I had to put that in there.

Mrs. Hamilton, you sound like a pretty practical person. You've brought up your kids on your farm. Is there a better way for this government to do this than Bill 17? What would you suggest to the government rather than Bill 17?

Mrs. Hamilton: Well, it's a billion-dollar industry, as I understand it. It's not good business to chase this business out of Manitoba. We need it. We need the livestock industry. We need food. When I was substituting in Winnipeg, there are little kids come to school and they haven't had food, no breakfast. They come to school in January with no socks on their feet and no boots, just shoes. I couldn't believe it when I first saw that. I was brought up in a good home where I had clothes and food. But it boggled my mind when I saw that.

We want to be able to have people have viable businesses. We need these businesses. The NDP government is supposed to be caring about all people. They're socialists, isn't that? One of my Morris relatives was a famous socialist. There are books written about him. But I really think that we need these hog farmers, especially, and we don't want to deter them. Farming is hard enough as it is without these extra problems.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Hamilton, very much for your presentation.

Michael Sheridan. Mr. Sheridan, do you have any written documentation for the committee?

Mr. Michael Sheridan (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. You may proceed.

Mr. Sheridan: First of all, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to this group this evening. A couple of points, as I look at the clock, I realize why I'm a swine practitioner and no longer a cattle practitioner. Earlier on, someone said that you can't teach an old dog new tricks, but an old dog has to do

its own sniffing so, hopefully, that's what's happening tonight.

My name is Mike Sheridan. I'm a veterinarian. I'm a 1977 grad from the University of Guelph. I came to practise in Manitoba right after graduation at one of the provincially-sponsored practices in Selkirk. After three years there, I moved to the provincially-sponsored practice in Steinbach and then, in 1988, I joined with another veterinarian to perform a swine-only practice. Since then, we've practised in southern Manitoba, Alberta, and other places like that.

I'm here today to speak against the Bill 17. I'd like to go at it from a number of different directions. Certainly, we've heard some of the social ramifications tonight with the colony presentations. Also, I'll stay away from some of my emotional feelings because that was already delivered to Minister Struthers back when the initial pause came on.

I want to outline what we do as veterinarians in swine practice and try to, I think, sort of lay some of my concerns out for what could happen with Bill 17 as a precedent for other future for food, animal, medicine in Manitoba. As a swine practitioner, my day-to-day duties involve clinical exams of herds, herd-health visits, if you will, post-mortems, looking at dead animals for causes of diseases. One of the big ones that the practitioners in Manitoba are involved with now is the quality assurance programs where we're validating the herds to make sure that they are following the food safety programs of that program. We also are very instrumental in surveillance, looking for new diseases, re-emerging diseases and, perish the thought, some day, perhaps, a foreign animal disease.

Then the final area that we are involved with is training. As a matter of fact, I missed my number by about five minutes today because I was involved with training down in Morris with 10 people who have just entered the industry, anywhere from two weeks to seven months teaching them how sows farrow.

My concern with Bill 17, among other things, is the message that it's going to send to the rural communities and, more importantly, from my perspective, it's going to send to veterinarians, especially food-animal veterinarians. I am a food-animal veterinarian. I'm involved with looking at not only animal health, animal welfare, but also food

safety. As a result, then, we are involved with the public good.

Bill 17, I think, is going to send a chill through the veterinary community. I think it's been alluded to here earlier and in earlier discussions that I've had is that first it will be the swine—and I'll come back to why I think that that's sort of foolish in some ways—but then if we go to the swine, what will happen with poultry? What will happen with dairy? What will happen with beef? You rarely see a pig standing in a river anymore doing its business, but every day I can find cattle standing in creeks and cattle dairy yards on the edge of streams. After rainstorms like today, you have to wonder whether—if this is a serious attempt to control pollution, one has to believe that those other industries are also going to come under the same form of moratorium. Pig farmers may get ugly, but cowboys, I think, get really ugly. So beware.

^ If the chill goes through the veterinary community and young grads decide they don't want to come, then the communities that are in more of the outlying areas—I'm in Steinbach. We've got vets coming out of our ears right now, so I'm not worried about the Steinbach area as much. But Bill 17 sets the stage, I think, for people saying, do I go to Saskatchewan, do I go to Alberta or do I go to Manitoba? If I go to Manitoba, can I actually, in the future, be a food-animal practitioner?

There is not enough small-animal, companion-animal work in the outer towns to support a veterinarian and they do need food-animal medicine. You need them to be doing food-animal medicine. They need to be there for exactly the same reasons I am there. It's for diagnostics, surveillance and food safety. They need to support their families just as the producers have talked about today, and I think it's very, very incumbent on all of us to try and make food-animal practice as friendly as possible.

Our CVO, through MAFRI, and I have had many discussions on how do we get more veterinarians out into the rural areas, and I know it's a mandate of theirs to try and do that through accreditation and in a number of different ways. But. If we take the pig industry out of the equation, we've taken one leg off the chair. If the other species follow through with the same protocols, which they probably should—in fairness, if our industry gets branded, then, in fairness, the other ones do need to go into the same kind of control mode—you may find

that those veterinarians do not want to go out to those towns and regions.

Manitoba swine are probably second to none—if you include Alberta and Saskatchewan with us—in health. We have a tremendous health status. We sell internationally, not just to the United States, but we sell to China and Japan and Korea. We have a very good health status. We also have an extremely good reputation. If you look at the animals being drawn down into the United States from southern Manitoba, where the ban is going to be implemented, those animals are being drawn down. Yes, the barns are being built, but the buyers in the States recognize the high-health status of our animals and the quality of our animals. As a result of that, they are a very desirable commodity compared to what the Americans can get in some of the other areas.

* (01:30)

Contrary to some of the comments that I have heard—not tonight, but at other times—we're not all that crowded. If you look at a municipality like the La Broquerie municipality, if you really and truly go and look at those pig farms, they have got separation. As a swine practitioner, I've always looked at bio security and the protection of that health status and that ability, therefore, to export by controlling a number of things. One is looking at the genetic material that come in. We've had some references tonight to seed stock producers and how high quality and healthy their animals are, the control of people, of movement and products. We shower. I'll do 12 showers a day, sometimes, going in and out of farms.

The other one is location. If you go in the La Broquerie area, I think you'll find that the barns are set out in actually a somewhat strategic pattern so that they are not cheek to jowl, even though one may think they are if you read the press. There certainly are areas in Hanover where you will see where things have maybe gotten a little out of control with a number of farms, but they intend to be farms that are owned by the same owner and that they know what the potentials for spread of diseases are.

One of the comments that I saw in the Bill 17 recommendations was this whole concept of anaerobic digestion which, as a veterinarian, I know nothing more about other than that's what comes out of the back end of the pig, is anaerobic digestion. But anaerobic digestion, what I do know about it is it's extremely expensive and the pilot projects are very expensive to set up, which means that the real projects, when they go to anaerobic digestion, are

going to be very, very expensive. That then, I think, is going to lead to concentration of animals within a very small area, something that we really don't want within our province, the reason being then, that, you know, disease transfer will occur and our health status will change. So, hopefully, and I've heard some comments about alternatives that—I like the sound of that because that will still allow us on an economical basis to keep our farms somewhat segregated and therefore healthy.

One final point is with our market is about 40 percent—or about 4 million of our pigs go stateside every year and, unfortunately, as the industry's changed—we heard earlier about the changing industry in the United States, the size of the industry and the needs. We need to be producing larger batches of pigs, more from single or two sources to meet that export market. By curtailing your ability—

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

Mr. Sheridan:—by curtailing these farms to expand, you're really curtailing their future.

I would like to leave just one more point if I would, and more of a poll or a question, is that I sometimes wonder how big is this industry, and if you take all the pigs in Manitoba, give them 10 square feet of space—now, we don't do that. We give piglets—a sow and litter gets 35 square feet; a nursery pig gets three; grower pig gets six; a feeder pig gets nine; but, if you give every pig in the province at this moment 10 square feet, I'll ask you, maybe through questions or comments, how many square miles of pigs we really do have in this province.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sheridan. I have Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Goertzen: I got the hazard of going first. I'm not going to venture a guess at that. I'll leave this to my colleagues and the minister might know.

Mr. Sheridan, thank you for staying with us at this late hour. Living in the city of Steinbach, you have a good reputation in the industry and I appreciate the work that you're doing. I'm glad that you mentioned the health of the pigs themselves compared to other jurisdictions here and I think that speaks well of the producers that we have in the province. I'm glad you mention that 'cause there have been some presenters earlier on who maybe questioned the industry on that level.

The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) himself last week questioned producers, and, really, anybody opposed to Bill 17, by saying that anybody who was opposed to this bill was opposed to the protection of water. I found that insulting. I know a number of producers found that insulting, but perhaps you could tell us, because you interact with so many producers on a daily or weekly basis, your general impression about what—how producers feel about the protection of the environment.

Mr. Sheridan: I promised I wasn't going to forget to do that and I did. Sorry.

It's a conversation, certainly, in the last several months, as one that we'll have every week, if not every day. Producers are very conscientious. You've heard tonight about all of the plans that they have to file. You know, I'm not privy to that but I hear about it, and the regulations are just getting more and more restrictive. We live in flat lands. We just had two inches of rain. You can't even see it. It's gone so I don't see in our area, which is in the moratorium area, the risks and the concerns. I don't see manure in ditches at all.

I have a cottage on the Winnipeg River. My dog I don't allow to pee in the river because that gets into Lake Winnipeg, but we get algae blooms up there, and my understanding is that we're somewhere over 10 percent. The Winnipeg River system is over 10 percent of the nutrients that get into the lake. There's a pig barn in Emo. But, going back to your question, we hear that every day about the constraints that they must follow.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Michael. Thank you very much for your presentation and staying this hour to give it. You've made the comment that there's a chill through the veterinarian community. I have a young person in my constituency, at least one that I'm aware of, who wants to be a veterinarian, wants to come back to Manitoba and be a veterinarian. Your indication, if this bill goes through, we will be discouraging young veterinarians or practising veterinarians from other provinces to come to Manitoba. Is that correct?

Mr. Sheridan: That is my opinion. Yes, I think that it'll be seen as unfriendly. There are plenty of opportunities for veterinary medicine, but in food animals, especially in the rural areas where we need them.

Mr. Maguire: You made the comment that Canada has a high health status in our hog industry. I know

what that means in regard to the quality of the pigs that we have that the Americans want because of the concentration of hogs that they have, but can you just explain that to some of our members who might not be as familiar with that term?

Mr. Sheridan: Yes, the high health status of the herd means that if you look at our swine population, the disease levels that we have are very low. The structure of our farms with the—We hear about industrial farming, factory farming, drives me nuts. What it is is specialized farming, so you've got specialized farrowing units which you can control the health on. You have specialized nurseries which you can control the health in.

The importance of high health is twofold. One is it opens us up to the export market and the movement of animals to other jurisdictions. The other more important thing about that if you think it from a food safety is a lot less medications are required and many of the diseases that we do have are controlled through vaccinations. As a result, that mitigates the need for excessive medications, et cetera.

Mr. Graydon: I just want to add to thank you, Mr. Sheridan, for your patience tonight. I just add that the high health also requires—high-health pigs require a lot less feed than sick pigs do, which would actually take care of some of the excess manure.

One of the things that you had talked about was if the moratorium was to go through, it would be difficult to attract veterinarians to different parts of our province because of that, but you said you weren't worried about the Steinbach area as there were many vets there. However, if you were a young veterinarian today, as my daughter-in-law is, would you consider Steinbach or that area as a place to begin a large animal practice?

Mr. Sheridan: I think the answer from me would be no. In order to run a large animal practice, you need to have a wide range of food animals, dairy cattle, beef cattle and swine. Poultry is sort of on its own. It's more of a specialty, so I would say, probably not, if it was my daughter, I wouldn't, especially if the pig industry is going to collapse the way it is potentially going to.

Mr. Chairperson: Last question, Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Graydon: I'll let you tell her that. She's in Steinbach.

* (01:40)

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

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Goertzen, on a point of order.

Mr. Goertzen: I don't think we got the answer to the question that the presenter posed. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sheridan, I'm sorry, the mike wasn't on, so I recognize you now for the answer to the question. Proceed.

* * *

Mr. Sheridan: The answer to the question is 1.05 square miles of pigs. Most people when you ask would think 50, 100; some people say 500. Putting that in perspective, 90-foot-wide strip from Highway 16 to Springhill would hold all the pigs at 10 square feet, and we don't give them 10 square feet. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Dan Klippenstein. Mr. Klippenstein, do you have any written materials? I see you do. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Dan Klippenstein (Private Citizen): Good morning. Opposition to Bill 17.

I was born in Winnipeg, grew up in the Municipality of Hanover on a small family farm in a largely Mennonite community. I went to the University of Manitoba, from which I received my degree in agriculture in 1979. My ancestors came to Manitoba in 1874 with a promise of religious freedom, land to farm on and the freedom to make a living farming.

Many more came in 1926 to get away from the persecution of the socialists that were raiding Mennonite villages and executing the men of the village at will. They came to Manitoba because of the opportunities that were being touted by the early Mennonite settlers. While many have left the farm for other pursuits, many Mennonites still farm and have a deep conviction of providing food for a hungry world. Mennonites have been very successful with hog farming and make up a large part of the industry along with Hutterite colonies.

The impact that this bill will have on Manitoba will be significant. This is a bill that is riddled by partisan ideology with no science or rational thought put into it. It is a bill that is designed to persecute

certain religious groups that have traditionally made their living hog farming, namely the Hutterite and Mennonite people. This bill is touted as being based on science when it's definitely not, because the science on phosphorus in Manitoba has not even been developed and people have no clear idea of how phosphorus moves to the lakes or why. It is a large area problem, not a hog production problem. However, we do know that only 1 percent of land receives hog manure and that manure is mostly being utilized by crop production. Cattle production produces more manure in Manitoba than hog production and very few Hutterites and Mennonites raise cattle. Targeting hog production is targeting Hutterites and Mennonites very clearly.

I could provide a recent discussion on the sustainability of the industry and its viability, but it hardly seems worth the effort since to date the government has not listened to any of the work that Manitoba Pork and the industry has done on the issue, or any issue with regard to the industry. However, I will provide some comparisons to illustrate that this ban is in fact a case of persecution not environmental protection.

Compare Manitoba to other areas of the world that are considered intensive hog production areas. First, consider the area of Manitoba that has agricultural land, without considering the north. This is the area that is approximately 160 miles north of the U.S. border, by the width of the province, approximately 310 miles in width. The total area of this land is 49,000 square miles. Compared to other countries such as Denmark and the Netherlands, Manitoba has 49,000 square miles, Denmark has 16,600 square miles; the Netherlands has 16,000. Manitoba has a population of 1.2 million. Denmark has a population of 5.5 million, people that is, and the Netherlands has a population of 16 million people. The number of sows that Manitoba has is 380,000 sows. Denmark has 1.15 million sows and the Netherlands has 1.1 million sows. Manitoba has 2.89 million pigs on the farms. The reason it's so low is because we export a lot of isoweans. Denmark has 11.5 million pigs on the farms; the Netherlands has an inventory of 11 million pigs.

To break this down into smaller numbers, Manitoba has a population of 24.8 people per square mile; Denmark has 330 people per square mile. The Netherlands has 998 people per square mile.

Manitoba has 7.5 sows per square mile. Denmark has 69 sows and the Netherlands has 68

sows. Manitoba has 58.9 pigs per square mile, whereas Denmark has 691 and the Netherlands, 686. Thus, the total production in Manitoba could go to over 3 million sows and an inventory of over 33 million pigs and still be only equal in intensity to Denmark and the Netherlands. This is a 10-fold increase of current production.

So to say that the science supports a ban because we are too densely populated in hog production is not supported by the experience of other countries in the world. It is not supported by the CEC report and is blatant persecution of certain religious groups.

Consider some of the economic impacts this bill will have on the future in Manitoba. It will hurt the family farm. The impact of this bill will have on the small, Mennonite, family hog farmer is that his farm will become worth zero dollars for his barn. Since he cannot expand it to make it more efficient, or expand it for family members to join and, likewise, a purchaser of the farm would not be able to expand or increase its production, there will be no opportunity for this farmer to sell his farm when he wants to retire.

So Bill 17 targets small family farms foremost and takes away retirement money for a farmer who has worked all his life and thought he would be able to sell his farm to cover his retirement income.

It takes away the opportunities of colonies to continue their way of life by splitting the colony, when they get too large, into another group. To support the new colony, they would build a hog farm to provide employment for the group. This ban, again, forces them to look for other areas in the world where they can move to, to continue their way of life.

Consider service industries. Manitoba has developed a reputation of innovation and quality in serving the hog industry in Manitoba. As the industry declines, these jobs will be lost. The human capital that the province has enjoyed, because of the dynamics of the industry, will be lost to other areas. This is true for the trucking industry, the banking industry, the packing industry, the feed industry, local municipality, et cetera. Everyone will be affected.

Consider the grain industry. As the hog industry declines, less feed will be used in Manitoba and more grain will need to be exported, instead of used to develop higher-margin product from feeding hogs. Grain farmers will get less for their grain and will

have to ship it further to market, decreasing economic performance and opportunity for Manitoba.

Consider the packing industry. Winnipeg has already lost all its packing industry. While they had an opportunity to revive this in the last few years, the actions of this government has ensured that there will be no expansion of the packing industry in Winnipeg. However, this ban will ensure that there will never be a packing industry in Winnipeg again. This seems incomprehensible since Winnipeg used to be a major packing city. However, the current Manitoba packing industry could disappear as well, as less hogs go to market and it becomes more difficult to raise hogs efficiently.

Larger hog companies: Larger hog companies over time will relocate their assets when they need a replacement. They will move to more friendly areas when their current assets are used up. The value of these farms will also decrease, since there will be less buyers interested in investing in Manitoba.

Industry competitiveness: Manitoba used to be a low-cost producer; it is no longer a low-cost producer. The government has increased regulating costs significantly and, with the change in the dollar, there are many areas in the world where pork can be produced at a lower cost. Being a commodity, the world will buy its pork from the lowest-cost producer.

* (01:50)

The Manitoba economy has gained billions of dollars over the last 20 years as the industry expanded. Once this industry is downsized, it will be very difficult to bring back that technology. Areas that are not traditional hog areas, where people have not grown up with hogs, have a difficult time developing unless a large company comes in and sets up a system. The economic impact to Manitoba has not been considered, but it will be significant.

This bill will force Hutterite colonies to find new homes in other areas of the world to split their colonies, possibly south of the border in North Dakota where they could build farms and raise hogs still in Lake Winnipeg watershed. The same may be true for Mennonite families that want to have sons join the farm and develop a livelihood farming. This bill is a way of persecuting religious groups that largely would be opposed to some of the liberal policies this government has promoted, which is

contrary to the religious beliefs of Mennonites and Hutterites.

This government under the guise of a CEC report which, incidentally, does not recommend a ban on hog farming, is presenting this bill as an emergency environmental protection issue when all it is, is a cover to persecute religious groups that don't agree with many of the government policies. The question is, how far this government will go to produce its liberal agenda while trampling on the rights of the people, many who have been here for generations and whose forefathers built this province.

In conclusion, in the 1970s, when the Pawley government decided to create a capital tax on banks which had their western head offices in Winnipeg, the banks moved their western head offices to Alberta. It was like Bill 17, a poorly-thought-out law of trying to get the big company. Likewise, Bill 17 will have impacts that cannot be known, just like the capital tax on Manitoba corporations.

Likewise, this ban will not only stop expansion of the hog industry,—

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

Mr. Dan Klippenstein: —it will cause it to disappear. This government touts local production of food as a good thing. Hog farmers produce hogs locally. If there are not enough hogs, this packing plant will not stay in business and we could end up importing our pork. Hutterite colonies have to relocate to other jurisdictions where they can practise their faith and way of life, and small family farms will not be able to survive.

If this bill passes and becomes law, I see no hope for the hog industry in Manitoba and the family farm. The small family hog farmer will not have a retirement income since he will not be able to sell his hog farm and will just have to close it down when he can't continue anymore. This bill targets these groups while the government says it supports family farmers. Do not pass this bill.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Dan, for your presentation and for your persistence being here today, and I noticed your family as well have spent some long hours here.

You started off your presentation in one of your earlier statements saying that you could describe the

sustainability of the industry, but it hardly seems worth the effort because it doesn't seem like the government is listening. Then you did—not surprising with your academic credentials—you did a very good job of outlining the sustainability of the industry. But I want to hone in on that comment that it hardly seems worth the effort. You're here, it's 5 to 2 in the morning. Do you think that the government's listening? Do you have a feeling that they're just going to plough ahead with this legislation? I just want to ask you personally: Do you think that there is a chance they're going to listen to what you and others are saying?

Mr. Dan Klippenstein: The first part of the question is, if they're listening. I guess, going back to the Manitoba Pork Council working with the environment department and working very hard on developing regulations that could be sustainable and developed over time, and the next thing we know, we have a moratorium.

The second question is: Are they going to listen? I doubt it. Because they didn't listen with phosphorus; they didn't listen with labour; they don't listen.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Mr. Goertzen?

Mr. Goertzen: Yeah. Let me just say, Dan, I just want to say to you personally, I know you've spent a lot of time here and I might share some of the same sentiments you have, but I hope we're both wrong.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein, excellent presentation.

Number 7 in your issues here: Manitoba used to be a low-cost producer. You're very right. In '95 when the Crow changed, southern Manitoba was the low-cost producer of pork in North America. That quickly moved with the farm bill changes in the U.S. to southern Minnesota. I want my colleagues on the opposite side of the House to realize that that's just a natural—that was another government decision, like the BSE closed border to beef, that basically moved the low-cost production area of North America to southern Minnesota for pork. Then—you have to understand that was tough enough in itself, and then they go and put the regulatory costs all on top of the individual farmers that are here in Manitoba, who had already made the decision to build because it was the low-cost area in 1995, in the middle of the last decade.

Do you believe that the government is concerned about that, No. 1, or that they even took into

consideration that we weren't the low-cost producer in North America anymore, and do you really believe that they are trying to drive the pork industry out of Manitoba?

Mr. Dan Klippenstein: I believe they're trying to drive the pork industry out of Manitoba because if they weren't they wouldn't pass a bill like this. If this bill passes, the hog industry is unsustainable. The other issue—excuse me, I forgot the first part of the question.

Mr. Maguire: Just the low-cost producer—

Mr. Dan Klippenstein: The low-cost producer side—we're low-cost producers. The exchange rate became a big factor. Regulatory costs have become a factor. Our costs have gone up significantly. It used to be it cost about 75 cents a pig to do manure handling. It's now \$2.25, \$2.50, \$3, somewhere in that range. The costs just have gone up. That's a lot of money because \$2—sometimes that's the profit margin. Those costs have driven the costs up. Whether it's sustainable with these costs, it's tough, but if Bill 17 comes in, it's not sustainable.

Mr. Chairperson: Last brief question, Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Maguire: I think you just pointed out that \$2 can sometimes be the profit. I couldn't let that go by. I think our members on the government side have to realize that obviously means you've got to expand your operation from what you had to do 10, 15 or 30 years ago. If you're only getting a \$2 profit on a hog and a lot of time that's it; you've got to have obviously many, many thousands of hogs to make a living in Manitoba. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein.

Phillip Hofer? Do you have some written materials for us, Mr. Hofer?

Mr. Phillip Hofer (Private Citizen): I was going to bring you some, but I couldn't find 15 books for the CEC hearings. I couldn't find 15 of those.

Mr. Chairperson: In other words, you have no written materials to present to this committee. You may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Phillip Hofer: I was going to have a speech, but listening for two hours, I'm confused to what I want to say. So I'm going to tell a couple of stories.

I had the opportunity to take a load of 750-pound pigs to Iowa about six weeks ago. We unloaded the pigs in Iowa and finished unloading them. The guy tells us he's going to lose 30 bucks a pig, per pig

raised on those pigs and its custom-fed pigs. So I say to him, you got to be crazy to buy pigs from Canada if you're going to lose 30 bucks a pig. He starts smiling and I say, where's the catch here, where's the corner that I'm missing. He says, I built those two barns here on an investment. I got four people bidding on the manure every fall, and it's a gold mine, the money I get for that manure. I'm losing money on pigs, but the barns are almost paid for because the shit they produce is a gold mine. So this guy, his investing fund is coming out of the shit.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I'm sorry Mr. Hofer, I appreciate the passion of your presentation, but we do need to keep our language urban.

Mr. Phillip Hofer: Farmers call manure shit. So that's one story.

Thank you for the opportunity to let me make a presentation on Bill 17. We, the future of Canada, manage the earth's most productive farmland. Our activities provide raising food needed to feed people and animals but using the best environment practices.

* (02:00)

Reading the book, *Environmental Sustainability and Hog Production in Manitoba*, it is hard to find a clue or idea where Bill 17 came from. Or was it not started by the government? What it should need, it should need round two for farmers to educate, explain and prove that we are not to blame. CEC advice recommended and gave sound advice and ideas on how the government can work with farmers and agree to keep our country clean, environmentally friendly and productive and affordable in a suitable way.

New manure storage facilities have greatly improved and are environmentally friendly and efficient, but still, farmers have to fight and spend a pile of money to get the permit for one. What I mean by this is one of our clients, a Hutterite colony, applied to cover their manure before the 48 recommendations come into place. So the guy giving them the permit only had to give them the rights to cover it. He charged them \$9,000 for a piece of paper giving them the right to go cover the lagoon because the 48 recommendations said we will have to cover lagoons.

So we're scared that, if the 48 recommendations come, they will have another hundred rules that have

to be followed, and we are human, so we know that the first guy who puts it through the engineering process only has to photocopy it for the next 150 producers, but charges \$10,000. We have to get over those stumbling blocks. How do we improve the country if there are all those charge increases attached to us?

When hog farmers found out how huge the nitrogen loss was by spreading manure in the winter months, they were the first to change and build storage facilities for 400-day storage of manure. We lost lots of farmers because they were too small and couldn't afford to buy equipment such as injecting pipes and computerized injecting systems. Those computerized injecting systems on the back of the tractor are probably a one-year salary for every family in Winnipeg. They're expensive.

Farmers are interested in joining investors' groups and building big barns so they can manage them more efficient and so they can compete in the world market because we cannot compete with 100-sow units. You have to have a minimum group of 700 pigs to come into the Iowa market where they fill one barn, one load, same day of pigs, pigs born within six days. So the public sees those as factory farms. The reason why we had to go to 1,200- to 1,500-sow units is to be more efficient and create the big groups, but the step we're missing is it doesn't matter how big a barn is, we're creating the same animal units and employing more people than family farms.

The Hutterites of Manitoba are looked at as key hog producers or big producers, but we look at it as too small to survive the fast changes if we do not improve our barns and update older facilities. An average colony of 25 families which means if they divide by the spaces of pig units housed on the farm, it is actually too small to survive. We cannot make rules based on animal units as much as land-based or acres of injectable land uses.

Canada is one of the last countries to see manure as valuable organic or natural fertilizer or nitrogen. If manure is not used in agriculture, it will be replaced with chemicals which will be called nitrogen or phosphate and are not organic.

There are a couple of other issues I want to cover. A couple of years ago, we had some visitors over from Japan touring our goose farm. We raise geese. So first thing they do is—there are about six could fit into the backseat of a car—put them out. They'd walk 50 feet on the side and just stand there.

We figured, well, they either passed out, something wrong here. After a while, I asked them, what's the meditation all about? So they say, well, the fresh air. They can't believe the fresh air, and we're here in the business to pollute it Manitoba.

They were just standing there meditating with the fresh air and, actually, the whole tour was on our quality of feathers from the geese. So then they were focussed on the white geese, like they couldn't believe how white the geese were, like the feather quality. After a while they wandered over to the feed we feed them, and they couldn't believe it. They smelled it; they tasted it; they did everything. After a while we asked them, so what's the scoop here? First of all, you meditate on the air, then the whiteness and then the feed, and he says, the air and the quality of Manitoba, the quality of the birds. Then they asked us, why do you feed human feed to birds? Our people in Japan do not eat food like that. Why do you feed them human feed? That's how high quality Canada uses for agriculture and livestock.

Is my presentation over? Can I make comments once we're done, or what?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Hofer, you have almost exactly three minutes left. You can say whatever you want.

Mr. Phillip Hofer: If I can say what I want, I came here today, and I learned—

Mr. Chairperson: I suspect that was a dangerous thing to say, but it is true. Mr. Hofer, the floor is yours.

Mr. Phillip Hofer: I came here, and I learned a lot today, but I am embarrassed by the left side of this table at the percent of questions they've asked this evening. I personally think most of the key people on the left side were told to not talk one word and shut, because this is not human, to sit all evening and not say one word. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer. I have Mr. Pedersen—[interjection]

Mr. Pedersen: I would certainly defer to the other side of the table if they actually had a question, but dead airspace is kind of like radio, you don't want to have that.

Mr. Hofer, I've been in Iowa too, and I want to go back to when you were in Iowa. I really like Iowa, and I always think that Manitoba could be the Iowa of the north. I've been in Iowa in the spring when the

air has been pretty rank down there from that liquid gold that they're spreading.

What do you think would happen in Iowa if the Iowa state government tried to put in a Bill 17 in Iowa? What do you think would happen down there?

Mr. Phillip Hofer: Americans respect farmers. It's amazing how they respect farmers. Like their seats in Parliament or in the White House, the farmer has rights to those seats, and they are very busy seats. We've been inviting Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota up every year on our annual meetings, and they just laugh at us. They can't believe on the subjects that we're working on because down there, the farmer union, or whoever it is, they send people right to the White House on their opinion, on that animal bill last month, and this guy stays there. He doesn't come home unless he comes home for weekends. He stays there. He's there to support the farmers.

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Wellington): It's not a question, but is a comment. I felt offended that people would impute bad motives on people who are not asking questions, but intently listening, trying to learn, appreciate and respect the patience of the people of the public who came here to present. I'm intently listening. I've been here for this week. Just this time I chose to be here in this wee hour of the morning to listen to what the public has to say. I'll make my decision afterwards, and I'll put my two cents of worth in my caucus.

But to tell us and these people, too, to tell us why we're not asking questions, it's not for them to know. But I'm here to listen personally, and if I don't ask questions, it doesn't mean I'm not interested in what you have to say.

* (02:10)

Mr. Phillip Hofer: I did not say you're not listening. I would have lots of questions, so I can learn more, and it just strikes me funny that nobody asks questions, not nobody, but the amount of questions—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Order. The folks in *Hansard* will need to hear Mr. Hofer at the microphone. Order.

Mr. Hofer, have you concluded your comments?

Mr. Phillip Hofer: Yes, I'm done.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I'm going to ask all members of the committee, take it down a notch. I don't have anyone on the speakers' list. Is there

anyone else who would like to ask a question of Mr. Hofer?

Mr. Goertzen: I want to just thank you for coming out. I know it's been late. It's difficult. I won't impute motives to the members opposite. I'm glad that Ms. Marcelino asked a question. I'm glad she's—*[interjection]*—pardon me? I'm glad she made a comment; I'm glad she's listening intently. I'm glad she has an open mind. I'm sure that will be reflected in the vote that she puts forward on this bill, so thank you.

Mr. Phillip Hofer: Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

Seeing no further questions, we now call on Julianna Klippenstein. Thanks very much for your patience with us this evening. Do you have a written presentation for us?

Ms. Julianna Klippenstein (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Then you go right ahead.

Ms. Klippenstein: My name is Julianna Klippenstein and I am the daughter of a hog farmer. I am currently working on my uncle's hog farm. I really like working on the hog farm; it's made me a hard worker. I would personally like to have a family farm when I grow up and raise my kids there, so they can experience what I've experienced.

I'm speaking on behalf of my generation when I say that, if Bill 17 goes through, there's no chance of my generation to even get that chance to have their own family farm or raise their kids the way that we, perhaps, we're raised.

I may not know everything about the industry and what's going on but, is there a point in us even learning about it, if there's no chance in us going further with it?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Goertzen, do you have point of order or something?

Okay, I'm sorry, ma'am, but there were some distractions here. Please continue.

Ms. Klippenstein: Okay, good, thanks. Yes, so, on behalf of my generation, the young people and our future in this, our future is in your guys' hands, really. You guys can stop things for us, but you guys can help us succeed in things too. If Bill 17 goes through, these will have to, maybe, go elsewhere for jobs, out of the province, in the hog industry.

I did not come here today because my family told me to. I came here because I wanted you guys to know that this will affect generations to come, the generations now, the families that have hog farms. I'm concerned for my future and my family's future. I just wanted to speak on behalf of the next generation, and that's all.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation. As a youth in Manitoba, you want to be able to express to friends across the country, I'm sure, that Manitoba is a great province to live in. You want to also know that there is a future for you here in this province. You've been involved in the ag industry, especially, in the hog industry.

What advice can you give members of the government, perhaps, in terms of what would be a better approach to addressing our environmental concerns or water quality concerns in this province rather than Bill 17?

Ms. Klippenstein: I would say that maybe not just shutting it right off, maybe having, like, you know, limits in certain areas. Like I said, I don't really know everything that's going on but I just know that stopping something can—I just don't see what's the point. Why would you just stop something from people who want to get into the industry, you know?

Mr. Chairperson: Further questions?

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Julianna, for coming out this late hour—I guess this early hour. I know that your family didn't make you come but you did them proud with your presentation, and I know you do them proud in everything that you're doing in life.

We do talk about the environment in relation to this bill often because the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers), who sits at the end of the table, has told us in the House that people who oppose Bill 17 are opposed to the protection of water. He said that last Monday in the Legislature, which I think is disappointing for a lot of us who heard that comment, but when we talk about young people—and the Premier (Mr. Doer) mentioned it today in the House—that young people get it when it comes to the environment. You are the generation that are probably more attuned to environmental concerns than any generation that's alive right now. How do you square those two? I mean, you want to be a hog

producer and yet the Minister of Conservation says if you oppose this bill, you're opposed to the environment. Why don't you tell us a little bit about how you feel about the protection of the environment and how you want to do that as a hog producer in the future?

Ms. Klippenstein: Well, you know, everything nowadays is green, and this generation, we're really trying to have better, you know, green atmosphere, I guess. I don't know. So, like, I think that kids—or like my generation nowadays, they're really taking that into consideration that we need to start thinking about even our kids 'cause this littering and polluting the waters and stuff, it's going to damage our further generations as well.

Mr. Goertzen: Just a comment. I want you to know at this late hour that you very much exemplify why members of the Conservative Party are fighting against this bill because you are the future of the province, the future of farming, and we appreciate you coming out for your presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maguire, do you want to put a question?

Mr. Maguire: Well, only to say that, Julianna, don't despair. You can continue to study agriculture. Heck, there might be an opportunity in some other province.

Ms. Klippenstein: That's true.

Mr. Chairperson: Comments?

Ms. Klippenstein: I just want to thank you guys for sitting here and listening to us all and fighting for us as well 'cause my generation really thanks you guys for that.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Klippenstein, for your presentation.

An Honourable Member: Get home safely.

Ms. Klippenstein: Thank you. I'll try.

Mr. Chairperson: Menno Bergen. Do you have any written documentation for the committee, sir?

Mr. Menno Bergen (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Bergen: I'm Menno Bergen from Plum Coulee. I farm together with my brother Bernie, who's sitting back there. I'm a third-generation farmer and we've been taught well at home to love our animals and to take care of them. My father was—and who's still

enjoying life—he really loved animals, and it took great pain for him if his animals got hurt, and he took care of the land.

We run a mixed farm. We have a 5,000-acre grain farm and, in the last couple of years, we expanded our grain—our hog operation, and so we farm at Plum Coulee, a finishing operation with a feed mill and an isowean to finish. We acquired for our sons—we each had a son that went to university—that took ag to start a degree—and came back. They are 29 and 30 years old, and we acquired a sow operation in Austin, Manitoba, and an isowean operation in MacGregor. So, in the last couple of years, we moved out about 50,000 hogs, so it's been kind of intensive and it's been a lot of fun. I've really enjoyed the hog industry, going to Brandon—I mean to Banff—to learn the latest techniques, come to the Winnipeg swine seminar.

* (02:20)

As a farm operation and as a smaller group of farmers, we have lately formed a group called the independents. Together, we are as big as Hytek. We are 30,000 sows. We realize that if we were going to be competitive, we had to be the same size so we could buy our ingredients at the price they're buying, plus we can inform each other of what the industry needs and to take care of us. One of the fellows there, too, explained the other time that they had a propane leak, and it happened that the eavestrough, the air vent froze up and there were seven guys. They had fallen over already. The mice in the building were dead. Those are the things that we're doing within that group.

Needless to say, we're against Bill 17 and, like I say, our young fellows, they looked at it this year and said, you know, dad, I'm getting out. He says, when I look at Bill 17 and what's happening, it's not worth it. What you put up, we're not going to put up. If it does turn around, we can come back. Our fellows have decided, and they're 28 and 29. They helped through high school. They drove combines, everything. They are gone. They took a different industry.

What you guys are putting forward, they could see through it, and they don't want to live that way because the thing is, when we built that barn at Plum Coulee, we started off with finishing. We had to make changes on the way. We had to build in—the industry went to buying feeder pigs. We were buying 50 pounds at that time and raising them to finish. Then the industry changed to an isowean. We had to

buy isoweans on account of the American market. So you went from isowean to feeder to finish.

The thing is that your bill will not allow us to do any changes to expand the industry. We added a feed mill there, and bless it, we paid the last payment last month. Now we're ready to shut it down because we don't see a future in it. That is what is happening on our farm. The thing is, we've learned a lot about the industry, and at the Plum Coulee, we have heavy clay soils. I tell you, we've got a lagoon there, and when you pump off the water, you could walk on that manure. You could not stick a pitchfork into that manure. That's how solid that stuff is. If you want to pump it out, you've got to agitate it for two days to make a good job, and that's on clay soil.

You guys have stopped expansion on clay soil. Meanwhile, at MacGregor and Austin, that is sand. We take all our water from the well. That is dangerous, and there's always a negative in any industry. We had one of the biggest environmental spills at MacGregor. Before, when we took over that site, the pit there, the above-ground tank, split open. The manure hit the building five feet high. There is an area that is about half an acre, there are no trees there. The trees have died, but you know what, those piglets, and we have 5,000 piglets in that barn, they're from 21 days till about six weeks, and they are drinking the water that is there.

The government comes and tests every year that water, and it's well water. It's good enough for those pigs even after that spill. They moved the lagoon tank way back but the spill is there. They check it every year. The neighbour who's just a hundred yards away from this, his cattle are still drinking that water. Nature has a way of fixing it.

I appreciate all the stuff that we have done in the regulations, and I think that regulations for manure management is tremendous. You've done a great job with that, but we have some other problems and issues and they are not required by the environment. It's something else. Like I say, in Austin, there too, we have a well. We take all the water there from the well so we have to protect that, and it's very sandy soil. It's so sandy there last fall I drove with my pickup and it was dry there. I had to put it in four-wheel drive to move. That's how sandy it is, so we've got to protect that soil.

Through this bill, you know, you guys are protecting the area strictly for the lakes, and it's just ridiculous. I live close to Plum Coulee, and the town there, the lagoons, in fall, they empty them. I asked

the guy at Plum Coulee. He also said, man, I just can't get it quite right, to drop the water out of the lagoon. I said, where does it go? Every town drops it close to a river. Even Altona. They're building three new cells. It was away from Buffalo Creek. I said, where do you guys leave the water? He explained how the water went through different drainages and then went into the Buffalo Creek after all. The thing is, has any town ever been denied fall drainage? Plum Coulee wasn't. It wasn't ready to go. Then I see in Winkler, out of Winkler, there's a drop structure there. There is foam 12 feet high off of the drop structure. That is let through in the fall.

When we built one of our lagoons, the same contractor built Morden lagoon. He laughed at us. He said, boy, you guys, for what you do for your lagoon and the way you have to line that clay stuff, what the town does, it is ridiculous. They do nothing. You dig a hole, that's it. Our stuff, they dug the lagoon and it was two days before freeze-up. They had to go in there with a double-disc and break little chips of dirt. Then it would seal. This was purely clay. Like, you couldn't put a spade in there. It's just ridiculous the ruling between what the towns and what the farmers do. The towns build their lagoons four feet deep, six feet deep. You can never stir them. I'd like to buy that manure from the town and put it on my field. No, it can't be done, because they're not constructed the right way. They're just that low, and then they siphon off the water. They treat it, siphon it off. It goes down to the Red River.

I was at the Manitoba swine thing here in Winnipeg two years ago when we had all the reports. I caught the guy in the hallway, and I said to him: Have you checked what my loss is after I incorporate the manure half a mile downstream compared to upstream? He looked at me, and he said: No, that was not part of the question. I have no idea. You know, it was not science. Then I asked him, when I put incorporating manure, would I be able to block off the water from running excessively over my land? I wasn't granted that.

There are many things, but, like, the way the town is treated. A town in spring, if they have a water problem, well, those guys can take a pump, put it down into their water system, and pump the brown bars down the street. We and my neighbour dropped 800 gallons in a flood zone when the water was flooding and had a thousand-dollar fine, but the towns are allowed to pump the raw manure just down the street, if it has to be. Those are the regulations.

You know, it's quite something—I got ahead of my notes here—to sum a lot of these things up, if Bill 17 passes, for myself and my brother, our pension plan is gone. The equity that we have in buildings, we own approximately \$5-million worth of buildings, they're two-thirds paid, it was supposed to our pension plan, and our sons would take over, and we could see our way through. Well, if this bill passes, we will be in the poorhouse. The debt load that we've taken on is just incredible, and the Ag Minister has passed us, given us loans to survive the hog industry, yet, on the other hand, the environment minister forces us to shut down.

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

Mr. Bergen: Okay. So, like I say, we are very, very disappointed in what we can do and where we're at.

One story I'd like to close with, a friend of mine, they had a Christmas gathering, and there was a brother and sister. The sister lived in Winnipeg, and she happened to have a cottage on Lake Winnipeg. She challenged him on his hog manure management. Well, he went out and got our good regulations book and explained it all to her. She said, man, that's pretty good, and thought it was the end of the discussion. No, he turned around and said, you have a cottage; what do you do with your waste? Oh, we have a holding tank, and she smiled. Okay, so now what? So you have a holding tank. Well, the truck comes and empties it. Okay, fine. Where does it go? On the north end of Lake Winnipeg, there's a holding pond, and it dumps it in there. Okay, he said, what happens if the holding pond gets full? Do you have grass? Do you have a field there to incorporate? Who knows? Do you know, Mr. Environment Minister? Where do they put the water at the north end, the lagoon stuff? It's the same thing as this contractor. He did work at Falcon Lake, and he said, man, what we built there, compared to hog farms, it's a joke. It seeps right back through.

* (02:30)

That's all I have, thank you.

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

Questions.

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

My question for you is about fairness. You talked an awful lot about comparisons between your lagoons and other lagoons. Do you feel the

Agriculture Minister is standing up and fighting for farmers on this Bill 17?

Mr. Bergen: No, I don't. I don't think she's fighting fairly on this one.

One other comment I had in my minutes was, at the pork annual meeting, she stood up and congratulated the graduates that took the pork courses. I feel sorry for those guys, those people who took the course, because there will never be management jobs if Bill 17 passes. It was fruitless.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Bergen, thank you very much for your presentation.

I happened to be at the site where the slurry tank split and spilt the day following the cleanup, and I couldn't believe how quickly and effectively you folks cleaned the entire area up. If I hadn't known that there was a spill, there was no way that I could've identified that there had been a lagoon spill, if you like, or a slurry spill on the ground. So congratulations for taking the quick action. I know that the people from the Department of Conservation were there and were involved in the cleanup. They, too, were impressed at how well you folks moved to clean it up so quickly.

There's a lot of expertise in Manitoba in people like yourself who have vested, not only large sums of money, but indeed have gone through an education process that is probably equivalent to a degree or more in terms of how to manage effluent from lagoons. You're quite right. I was Minister of Rural Development in the Filmon years and was responsible for Water Services Board. We built lots of lagoons in communities, and I can tell you that 80 percent of them are leaching and leaking into the surrounding soils. That's why you have the salt beds around these lagoons. Yet that's not a targeted area of concern.

So my question to you is: What's going to happen to the expertise that has been developed in this province in the farmers who have, not only invested money, but they've invested their time to gain this expertise, if, indeed, the hog industry in this province is going to diminish and eventually close, I guess?

Mr. Bergen: It's an interesting question. It's the first time in my life that I have ever considered relocating. I've been doing some trucking of hogs to Iowa and South Dakota, and I enjoy driving, and I enjoy country, and I enjoy meeting people. As a comment, in Iowa, they buy the hogs just for the

manure. We have two sites where we don't even farm the land, and the people take the manure, no problem. The thing is I have found myself thinking, if my son wanted to farm, I would move to Russia. They play hockey there and there's opportunity there. The thing is, if I can't do it here, and I love to do it, we will move, and people will move.

There are Hutterites, they put up a colony close to Altona, and it's not viable. If they can't make money in it, how can anybody else? Our people, too, that we've hired now, our staff, they are so frustrated with this. They've seen me on TV. My manager quit on me. It's just incredible.

The people who really enjoy the industry will move with the industry, and there are tremendous opportunities elsewhere. It's just unbelievable. We have the expertise. We have the people, but if we can't expand our business and have some choices in it, it's like one other speaker says, it's not that easy to set up at MacGregor and get it going, or at Austin, when there isn't a hog community, because you don't have the expertise. So it's done if we can't continue.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this presentation has expired. Sorry.

Thank you very much, sir, for your presentation.

I call Mr. Darcy Pauls. Mr. Pauls, do you have any written documentation for the committee?

Mr. Darcy Pauls (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk's assistant will distribute it.

You may proceed.

Mr. Pauls: Thanks.

First of all, I do want to thank you for sticking around this late and hearing me out. At the same time, I recognize that you set the rules, not me.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the issue of Bill 17. I must admit that, even though the opportunity to speak has been provided, I am deeply saddened by my sense that what I say really doesn't make a difference. If government has spent \$750,000 on a CEC report that has been in process for greater than a year and a half now and that doesn't recommend a ban on hog production, and the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce opposes the ban, and respectable academics have spoken against the ban, how can I make a difference? However, even if

I'm just doing this to ensure that I know I've stood up for what I believe is right, not just politically popular, then there is merit in that as well.

Let me tell you a story. I grew up on a family farm where it was easy for my father and mother to teach the values of hard work and the rewards of doing a good job. That farm supported two families, my grandfather and grandmother's and my father's. It put agriculture in mine and my siblings' blood.

My dad sold that farm, but, as a young adult, some 18 years after, leaving the farm with our father's support, my brother and brother-in-law built a new hog operation. This venture created jobs for ourselves, used locals' trades, and put money into our economy. The industry changed its production practices about five years after we built the barn, and to remain relevant we needed to change from a two-site production to a three-site production model, which meant we needed to expand our farm to enable all the families to continue to earn a living from the operation.

What I'd like to point out from that is, if it hasn't been obvious to you already, family farmers do contribute to the society through hog production. The industry, including family farms, needs the opportunity to be able to build new operations as older facilities need to shut down or are sold for other purposes. These facilities won't always be exactly in the same place. Bill 17 does nothing to address the changing dynamics of animal units in any area.

Bill 17 will have the following effect. It will mean the shrinking of our industry as older facilities cannot be replaced by new operations when necessary. It limits the opportunity to keep families on the farm. Expanding an operation to allow a son or daughter to participate in the operation will not be allowed, regardless of the available land base and how many other operations have shut down around it.

It eliminates the opportunity for producers to find efficiencies within operations, you've heard earlier, such as expanding a finishing barn in a farrow-to-finish operation as sow productivity has increased, versus needing to move those pigs off the farm into a different area or different country. It eliminates the opportunity for someone to close down an old facility and create a new, improved operation.

* (02:40)

When the industry is made less efficient due to Bill 17, there will be more requirements for government to support it. It begs the question as to what industry could be next, if a government can just shut down an industry by ignoring science and the opportunity to use further regulation to enhance the sustainability for all stakeholders. It sets up hog farmers to be the scapegoat for environmental issues and the punching bag into the future.

It will mean even fewer young people will consider hog production as a viable career option. Even the last speaker mentioned someone leaving his operation. I know of two people similar in age to myself who—regardless who you are, you'll still consider yourself young—who have left the industry and won't return and won't add value to it in the future.

It gets producers second-guessing why they try to make decisions on science and data behind an issue when the government does not, which may lead itself to the industry supporting less and less research to create improvements. It addresses only one form of technology that can be used to further limit the environmental foothold and allows no room for new technologies and future development.

It saddens me that my two daughters and their future families—I'm a very emotional person, but especially at 2:30—will not be provided the same opportunities my grandfather and father were afforded through agriculture.

I know I don't have a long presentation, so I can take some time to regroup.

I realize that things change, but Bill 17 does nothing to address that change, but rather tries to lock us in a point in time, and that is just wrong. No one in government has been able to provide me the science they have used to justify in their minds why Bill 17 is good legislation. I urge you to deal with recommendations laid out before you in the CEC report as you promised and not go beyond the report until better information is provided to suggest you should.

I apologize.

Mr. Chairperson: Are you finished, sir? Have some water there. There's—

Mr. Pauls: I don't need more liquid in these eyes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, well, I thank you for that.

We'll open the floor to questions. I have Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Goertzen: Thanks, Darcy, for staying. I know you were away, you told me, in Alberta yesterday. So you've been busy. You're away from your wife tonight, and we appreciate you being here, and a very good presentation.

You mention in there that hog farmers are being set up as a scapegoat for environmental issues. We've heard that throughout the last couple of days. I just looked on the City of Winnipeg Web site three or four hours ago, and it mentioned on there that it looks as though the city of Winnipeg sewers have been overflowing for about 24 hours in the last two days. So, about half the time that we've been sitting here, the sewers in Winnipeg have been overflowing with raw sewage. It's no wonder people are a little bit sceptical.

But I'm going to put my scepticism aside at this time. I heard the Member for Wellington (Ms. Marcelino) and the Agriculture Minister not long ago say that they're open-minded, that they're listening, that they haven't made up their minds, and they're taking notes. I'm going to believe that because I want to believe it. But, at some point, they're going to have to go into their caucus, and the Premier's (Mr. Doer) going to be on one side, and I expect the Premier probably is the driving force behind this legislation. He's going to be saying, well, I don't want to—well, I hope I'm wrong, but let's assume he is, because I think he is—he's going to say, well, how do we withdraw this legislation and not look bad; we need to sort of save face. On the other side, hopefully, will be the Member for Wellington and the Agriculture Minister trying to convince him to do it.

What would you say? What would you want the Member for Wellington and the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), who say that they're open-minded and they're listening, what should they be saying to their Premier when they go into that caucus meeting in two months or three months to try to convince him to do the right thing on this bill?

Mr. Pauls: I hope that what everybody has seen is how many people are willing to come out and speak to this issue. I'm sure you're all smart enough to realize that, you will know the stats more than I, as to, for every one person that came out, how many people have similar beliefs and, for whatever reason, just aren't motivated to the point that they would be sitting here at a quarter to three speaking to you.

I think if there are some 400 people that presented, and, I don't know, I wasn't here the earlier days, but it's my understanding maybe there are only—actually, I understood there wasn't anyone who spoke in favour of the bill. So I would hope they would go back and tell the rest of the caucus what they heard, that there was nobody in favour of the bill, and that there were at least 400 people that spoke to this bill, even though—sorry, I have to deal with perceptions because I don't get all the information—even though you tried to make it as hard as possible for people to speak out by forcing us to come on weekends, not giving us any idea when we were going to speak, and yet we're still all here. That should mean something to you.

I feel like this is a political game, so I don't know how you have to spin it politically to get a win out of this. I hope you can say you heard. I appreciate someone's earlier comments that wise men can change their minds. I thought this was funny, and I hope people understand the humour in it, when I heard that comment, I also thought, well, you know, it takes a wise man to change, but the average woman can change her mind relatively quickly, and I think that's because they're a lot wiser than men. So I hope there are some people that say, hey, we had a position, and we can change it, because we heard, and we now understand.

It's a little bit scary how you'll have to figure out why you didn't listen to the CEC report in the first place, but I will let you try to figure out how you spin that.

Mr. Eichler: Darcy, thanks for your patience and for your presentation. I know you spoke from your heart, and that's what this is all about, telling people exactly how you feel, who are on the committee.

Nothing makes us prouder as a parent, when we can have the next generation take over operations. So I know, when my father who was a farmer, who took over from his father who was a farmer, and I decided to go into business with him, he was about 10 feet tall when I decided to do that. So I know the feeling about pride when it comes to getting into another operation, or the next generation taking it over. So I know your passion.

My question for you: With the country-of-origin labelling coming in and those changes, sometimes, through no fault of our own, we have to make changes to our operation. With Bill 17, the way it is structured won't allow you to make those changes

either. That concerns me as well. So do you have any comments in regard to that?

Mr. Pauls: Yes, I mean, I touched on it in my presentation. I've been involved directly in the industry for seven years, then I had a gap when my father sold the farm, and then for the next 17 years, so some 24 years, I guess. I've seen changes along that way that have forced us to change. I mentioned the one in my presentation, going from two-site to three-site production. COOL is going to have a similar impact. People talk about the next generation. I've seen changes in my existing lifetime and it's not that long yet, so I'll see more changes before this is done. Bill 17 won't allow us to adapt to those things appropriately. So, yeah, it concerns me. COOL is another one of those that can impact us as well, and it won't be the last one.

Ms. Wowchuk: Darcy, thank you for making the presentation, for persevering and making your presentation tonight.

* (02:50)

You talked about feeling that we were trying to keep you from presenting, and getting people to present on the weekend. Well, I share with you that the opposite is true. The reason that we were putting those extra hearings in was so that people could get their time in. In fact, in the normal process, in all other committees, you only get your name called twice and then you would drop off the list. If we were following that process, people would have fallen off on Friday, or last Saturday, but those two days stayed on. People won't start falling off the list until they're called tomorrow of the next day. We have tried to be very accommodating because this is a very large group of people that are presenting. In fact, we tried to have a committee hearing Thursday morning to accommodate more people, but the opposition refused to let that sitting happen Thursday morning.

I say to you, I just want to share with you those comments, because we are trying to be as accommodating as we can, and we want as many people to be able to be heard as possible.

I certainly thank you, and we do take your comments seriously. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pauls: Thanks.

Mr. Chairperson: Any response to that, Mr. Pauls?

Mr. Pauls: I have to take her at her face value, as I have before. I trust she, then, really is listening, too.

Mr. Goertzen: But, Darcy, I want you to know that your comments are well taken. We have had discussions with the government about going to a system more like they have federally, where, you know, somebody phones up and says, I'd like to make a presentation in the evening, and they get scheduled into a timeslot.

We're going to use some of your comments to continue to press for that, because this isn't a very, it's not a good system. No matter how long the system's been in there, you're young enough, I'm young enough to know I don't care if it's been there for 30 or 40 years, the system has to change.

An Honourable Member: And filibustering has to stop, too.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, the minister doesn't want to let me speak, but I do think it's—I'm glad you said it, I'm glad you said it because it does need to change, no matter how long it's been there.

So thanks for coming, okay? Thanks, Darcy.

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

Mr. Pauls: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Neil Cutler—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. Let's try and get through this last hour in relative peace.

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

Mr. Neil Cutler (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Cutler: I'd like to give a little bit of background on myself. I was born and raised in the United Kingdom, moved to Canada in, actually, '99. I've worked in the hog industry for nearly 23 years. The reason to move was really to further my career within hogs, and Canada was the best place to do that in terms of actually buying as well, if that ever happened. So, in September '99, my family, my wife and two sons, we moved house and moved to Canada. For me, Bill 17 is pretty close to the heart, because I've come quite a distance to pursue a career in hogs, and it's looking like it's going to get finished here.

Firstly, I believe the hog industry in Manitoba is sustainable. The government spent \$750,000 on the

CEC report, and nowhere in this report does it say that the hog industry is responsible for the pollution in Lake Winnipeg. I'm like a lot of others because I'm puzzled at where the lack of science is coming in here.

Therefore, I have to believe that the government is using the hog industry as a scapegoat with this. I struggle to believe how it cannot be the case. What scares me the most is how long—I have friends in the province who, you know, they farm chickens, turkeys, grain. How long before, again, they are targeted? I talk to them and they laugh it off because they don't think they'll ever get targeted, but I'm sure if they were a pig farm they would be, obviously, sat here with me. They're not.

Also, it has been said a lot of times tonight, you know, I've been here and a lot of people have said, if the hog industry declines, or, dare I say, is eliminated, these grain farmers are still going to need fertilizer. Unfortunately, they're going to have to go to chemical fertilizers. I don't think any of us realize or believe that is the way to go.

On a bigger note for myself—as I said, I moved to Canada—if everything goes correctly in my life, I do have aspirations to own a hog barn in the future. As I've also said, actually, my wife works in the industry. My two sons actually work in the industry. I will be forced either to move to a more friendly province or, dare I say, another country.

Really and truly, that's really all I have to add. That's my big case here. I feel if this does get passed I may as well look to where else I'm going to go, like a lot of other people have said tonight.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Cutler.

I have Mr. Pedersen.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Cutler, for coming and sharing your story with us.

If we go back to 1999, I believe it was, you said you came here, and if the scenario was that, in 1999, you were looking to move to Canada to get involved in the hog industry and you knew that Bill 17 had been dropped on Manitoba, would you have come to Manitoba?

Mr. Cutler: Definitely not. Definitely not.

Mr. Pedersen: Where would the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) and the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) be, how could they even

try to, even possibly, remotely, entice you to come to Manitoba, then?

Mr. Cutler: Well, if that was the case, you know, that they were saying Bill 17 is coming in, well, I don't know what they could do to persuade me. They couldn't persuade me.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Neil, for your presentation.

On page 10 of the preface of the Clean Environment Commission's report, they talk about regional imbalances. They've spoken at different points about flooding and the special management area of the Red River Valley, and those sorts of things. Many people have come before us here and have acknowledged that, have acknowledged that, whether it's 1.5 percent, as many claim, or a different number, there are some decisions that need to be made in terms of regulation. On the basis of those, we've put forward Bill 17, the moratorium, and you have indicated that's not the approach that you would take.

The Clean Environment Commission said that we had to have a stronger regulatory framework in place, so somewhere between an all-out moratorium, which is what we have here, and the regulations that exist. What would your advice be to me to move the goal sticks along, to move the goal posts along, in terms of regulation?

An Honourable Member: It's all 48 of them.

Mr. Struthers: I'd prefer him to answer that.

Mr. Cutler: Yeah, like the gentleman says here, you have the 48. But I think, also, there are a huge number of hog farmers in Manitoba. We all have the environment on our minds. None of us don't care for the environment. We all want to have clean water, and so on.

Work with the hog farmers, because that's exactly what's not happening. They want to produce hogs cheaply, efficiently, and environmentally friendly.

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much, Neil, for your presentation.

If you wouldn't have come if Bill 17 had been in place in 1999 in Manitoba, and you don't think that there's a future for you here now if the bill comes in, so we exclude a number of people who might have come here to continue to expand the operation, make our packing plants more viable than they already are,

provide an opportunity for our pork industry if the U.S. border was to close or become tougher with COOL legislation, if all of those people didn't come to Manitoba, and the bill was put in place, who do you think the government is trying to entice into Manitoba with that ruling to replace those who will leave this industry?

* (03:00)

Mr. Cutler: Good question. I don't think I can answer. I don't know who they're trying to entice into the province. It certainly isn't hog farmers.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Cutler, I know it's very hard for government to back down once they've put a piece of legislation in front of the public, and it takes a lot of effort on the part of the opposition, on the part of Manitobans, to convince the government that perhaps, in this instance and whatever other instances, sometimes they move in the wrong direction.

If the government were to listen to the public who have been presenting before them, in a fairly compelling way, I would say, what would your reaction be to not just the government backing down on this legislation but, indeed, to the opportunities and the future that you would see for yourself and your family?

Mr. Cutler: I think that would be great. I would be extremely pleased if this was resolved and the government, I wouldn't say admitted they were wrong, but, you know, agreed that the report was, as outlined, the industry is sustainable and can continue to grow. Yeah, I would dearly love to stay within the province and continue.

An Honourable Member: And it's worth fighting for.

Mr. Cutler: Definitely.

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

Mr. Cutler: Thank you.

Some Honourable Members: Thank you.

An Honourable Member: Drive safe.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Fergus Hand? Mr. Hand, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Fergus Hand (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Hand: Thank you. Thank you for the time, also.

Just a little background about myself, I grew up in Ireland on a family farm, a mixed farm: pigs, dairy and sheep. I had the opportunity to come to Manitoba in 1991 on an agricultural exchange program. At that point, I took the opportunity to come back to Manitoba to work in the hog industry. So I've basically worked in the hog industry for 20 years, 17 years in Canada, 15 years in Manitoba.

Acceptance of Bill 17 will impact me personally in the following manner. I think the hog industry will continue, except it won't continue in Manitoba. It will continue elsewhere in Canada, in North America, internationally. The hog industry, along with its support industries, will cease to exist. In other words, it is going to be a slow bleed. It may take two years, it may take five years, it may take 10 years, but it will be a slow bleed out of the province.

This is going to force me and other people like me who've chosen a long-term career in the industry to look elsewhere to further their career, to get work and to support their families. Like I say, I've lived in Canada now for 17 years. I actually call Manitoba home. This is going to force me to look for a new home. I'd like you to be aware of that. It's going to force my family to look for a new home.

I'm opposed to Bill 17 because I do believe we have a sustainable industry here. It was one of the major factors when I came to Manitoba on the exchange program. I came to work on a brand-new sow farm that had their own grain farm. I saw the sustainability of it, growing grain, feeding pigs, producing food, the perfect scenario, something we didn't have in Europe.

We care about our environment. Without the basics of clean water and clear air, we cannot survive. Our animals cannot survive. Our communities cannot survive. Everyone plays a role in environmental protection. Our industry is unfairly targeted, and it's not based on science.

Our industry provides many direct benefits to other industries, including grain growers, which a lot of people are familiar with in the prairies, grain handling. One of the first culture changes I saw in Manitoba were the grain elevators. It's something you see in a postcard, but when you actually come to see it first-hand and see how that system works and the logistics of it, it is something else. It is something that is a big industry in Manitoba.

There's also the grain handling, the transport, the feed transport, livestock transport, supplies,

construction, food processing, the food industry. Also, what's going to happen is the price of food is going to go one way, and that's up. If I may, when everybody in this room, there's not many left, but when you're having your pork ribs, barbecued pork ribs on the weekend, enjoy it, because the price is going to go up and you're not going to enjoy them as much going into the future. We've seen this happen worldwide. We've seen this happen in Europe. It's going to happen here. Other speakers talked about food crisis. It's going to happen in one form or other.

Bill 17 will have a detrimental effect on these industries, possibly including significant job loss in the province of Manitoba. I would like the government to take the time to consider the detrimental impact that Bill 17 will have on the people of Manitoba who are associated directly and indirectly in the industry.

I ask the government to withdraw Bill 17. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hand.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you for your presentation and for staying with us this late, Mr. Hand.

Just like Mr. Cutler before you, you've come to Manitoba, you've made it your home. I just wanted to give you this small word of encouragement, to hang in there. Don't abandon us yet. We're doing our best to have this bill killed.

I'm just amazed, when we talk across the table here and the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) says, you guys sold MTS. So now, apparently, this is a vendetta.

An Honourable Member: Oh, no, he didn't say that.

An Honourable Member: I heard him.

Mr. Pedersen: That's unbelievable.

But don't lose faith in us yet. We're going to try and kill this bill. We're going to try and have this government come to their senses. They've given you no reason at all for this. We know they haven't got the science. All I'm saying to you is hang in there. We're going to try and kill—and we call it "B-17," as in the bomber, carpet bombing bill; it's going to carpet bomb the hog industry. We're going to do our best to have it withdrawn.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hand, response?

Mr. Hand: Yeah, I think, like I said, I now call Manitoba home. I'm not prepared to take it lightly.

However, I do have to look at my own best interests and aspirations going forward, and, if Bill 17 is accepted, I will be looking elsewhere.

Ms. Marcelino: Mr. Chair, I was the first one who mentioned about MTS being sold, and my colleague affirmed it, but there was no intent whatsoever, as the member opposite imputed, that this bill is a vendetta for them selling the MTS. I didn't even think about it. I just mentioned that they sold MTS. So I am appalled at the imputing of motives for that statement.

An Honourable Member: You should be appalled at Bill 17.

Ms. Marcelino: I'm appalled at—

An Honourable Member: Bill 17.

Ms. Marcelino: —the member imputing motives. He didn't even say vendetta or anything like that.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. All right, then. I don't think that was a question, Ms. Marcelino, but your comments are duly noted. Thank you for that.

Are there any other questions?

Seeing none, Mr. Hand, I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Hand: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Matthew Klippenstein.

Mr. Matthew Klippenstein (Private Citizen): Morning.

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

Mr. Matthew Klippenstein: No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: Please proceed.

Mr. Matthew Klippenstein: My name's Matthew Klippenstein and I work here in the city. I'm a youth pastor here in the city. I mentor the youth of this province. I give them advice, many youth of all different faiths, all different walks of life.

* (03:10)

You and I aren't very different. We both govern a body of people. For you, it's a province; for me, it's a church. We're the same in that there's a group of people who have chosen us to govern over them and, without them, we both have no power. You may think you're better than, or more important than, each person that comes up here, or maybe I'm wrong in that assumption, and maybe you do care about each

person, as a person in your positions and my position should. The reason I make this comment is because when people are in leadership it is their actions that people see, and it is their actions that speak to their true character. So, if you truly do care about each Manitoban in this province then you would hear the concerns of the people here. You'd realize the devastation that would be caused by one of the largest exports in the Manitoban economy, the loss of thousands of jobs and the loss of family farms putting many people out of work and sending them to other provinces where their expertises are appreciated.

All of this, for what? Because of an unclear and poorly supported claim of the effect of hog manure on the environment, when the city itself is more to blame for those environmental problems. Or is it religious discrimination? Or industry discrimination? Or do you have another reason?

But, really, these aren't the issues. Yes, my father and my father's father, as well as uncles on both sides of my family, are involved in the hog industry, but the issue with this government extends beyond Bill 17. The issue is with the integrity of this government. If the NDP Party governed this province with integrity we would not be here tonight discussing this bill.

Dwight Eisenhower once said, In order to be a leader a man must have followers. And to have followers, a man must have their confidence. Hence, the supreme quality for a leader is—unquestionable, it is—unquestionably integrity. Without it, no real success is possible, no matter whether it is on a section gang, a football field, in an army, or in an office. If a man's associates find him guilty of being phony, if they find that he lacks forthright integrity, he will fail. His teachings and actions must square with each other. The first great need, therefore, is integrity and high purpose.

There is no question that the government has the power to pass this bill, but the question I have is: Does this government have the integrity to not pass this bill? It takes no more than common sense to see that this is a morally unfair and wrong bill, not to mention the economic consequences and the damage in the tearing apart of families being forced to close down the farms, and so much more. We cannot even conceive the damage that a bill like Bill 17 will do to our province and the people of this province.

So I ask each of you: Are you a leader worth following? Do you truly lead with integrity?

Remember this, you and I are no different. It is the people who give us power. It is the people we serve, not rule over but serve, and without the people you have no power. If you want real power, lead with integrity; if you want real success, lead with integrity, because what you're telling the rest of the people in this province by passing this bill is that the people don't matter. They'll be asking, who is next, the cattle farmers, the chicken farmers, or the grain farmers and chemical pesticides? What about other industries? The steel mills or lumber yards? Which industry and which families are next?

The message that you're sending them is that you're not afraid to abuse your power to shut them down. Why should they believe that you won't? Because, obviously, it doesn't matter if it does not make economic sense, or if it would be immoral or discriminatory, your actions here speak louder than any words you can say.

I checked out the NDP's Web site today, and I saw many quotes talking about how great a place this province is to live, and how the population is growing, but what will people say when they find out they are moving to a province that shuts down industry growth for no solid or reasonable or even logical reason? Who wants to move to a province that chooses to kill economic and industry growth? What happens when a large part of the hog industry moves to other provinces, or builds there instead of here, as well as the feed mills, meat cutting plants, even trucking companies? We are an agricultural province. Why are you shooting us in the foot?

But, most importantly, who wants to move to a province whose government does not govern with integrity? Why would people want to live under a government who lacks integrity, who is untrustworthy? Who wants to live under a government that they fear? Who wants to live under a government who does not care about their people? So I ask each of you as leaders, is integrity important to you?

Who are the best leaders in our world today? They are leaders of integrity. Jesus led in this way. He's an example of integrity and servant leadership. You might not care about who Jesus is, but what you cannot ignore is the countless books and leadership manuals, not only in the Christian, but, more importantly, in the secular market, teaching people Christ's model for leadership. What about the very successful leaders in secular businesses, companies and governments following his model, a model made

known in the secular business world by Robert K. Greenleaf?

As leaders, you and I are called to a higher road in life. We must live with the utmost integrity and serve our people, not ourselves, serve our people with humility and a servant's heart, because, after all, it is the people we serve who trust us and give us our power and our authority. Let us not abuse it.

It is my prayer that this governing body would be integral in their decision and listen to the people, to hear their cries, for it is these people and their families who you are responsible for and who you have promised to take care of. So I ask you to take care of them.

As in the parable found in the Book of Luke of one of the lost sheep, the Good Shepherd risks his own life, spending the whole night searching for even one lost sheep until He found it, because He loved even that one lamb as much as the other 99 that were not lost. So I ask you, the shepherds of the people of Manitoba, to do the same for your sheep. Serve with integrity, even just the one person, or the one industry, because when you do they will follow you wholeheartedly. Just as a herd of sheep will blindly follow its shepherd, I ask you to please govern this province with a servant's heart and integrity, just as the Good Shepherd shepherds his sheep.

May the will of the Sovereign Lord, the one true God, be done. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein.

I have Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Matthew, for your presentation, at a quarter after three in the morning. I put that on the record so that *Hansard* will record it, and that you'll have it as a keepsake for the years to come.

I appreciated the testament that you gave was inspiring. I know it meant something to many of us around the table, and it is appreciated at this time of the morning.

I also thank you for the work that you do with young people. Another great American leader said that it's never the wrong time to do the right thing. I hope that this government recognizes that it is now time to do the right thing when it comes to Bill 17. But I suspect some of them find themselves in a difficult position, and that they don't know exactly

how to get themselves out of the mistake that they've put themselves in.

You probably have some young people who come to you who've made mistakes and need to find a way back and to do the right thing after they've made a mistake. What kind of advice do you give those young people when they come to you and they say, you know what? My initial impression was wrong. I did something I shouldn't have done, but now I've got to make it right. How do you have that fortitude, and how might it help government make the right decision now?

Mr. Matthew Klippenstein: Yes, something I speak on quite often and share with young people and people who come to me is the lesson of humility. If we walk with humility in our lives, that is one of the best things we can do. It is one of the best character traits we can have.

When people see a humble leader, they will follow. I know some people at this table may be offended by some of my comments. I want to assure you that it's not that I do not believe in your ability to lead this province, but, at the same time, we all need accountability sometimes. That's what it is.

I believe that you guys can make the right decision and take a step of humility and reverse this bill. I believe that you are people of integrity, and that you can do that.

* (03:20)

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

Mr. Matthew Klippenstein: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Jason McNaughton. Mr. McNaughton, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Jason McNaughton (Standard Nutrition Canada): I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. McNaughton: My name, obviously, is Jason McNaughton. I am the president and general manager of Standard Nutrition Canada.

Standard Nutrition Canada is headquartered here in Winnipeg, Manitoba. We operate a nutrition consulting and supply company across the western Canadian prairie provinces that serves the hog industry exclusively. The livelihood of our company and its employees is 100 percent reliant on the

success and the growth of the hog industry. Our company directly employees 27 full-time professionals, of which 16 are residents and work here in the province of Manitoba.

I come down here today to voice my opinion of Bill 17 in an attempt to urge this government to withdraw this anti-farm bill, as it serves only to stifle an economic power. It creates no benefit for our environment. It leaves talented Manitobans abroad without an option to return home. It steals opportunity for Manitoba's existing producers, and it simply hands over a billion dollars of potential growth to the U.S. pork industry.

As each of you know, the pork industry has provided much opportunity for the province and its citizens for the past 30 years. It has provided prosperity for so many citizens of Manitoba, including the 15,000 currently employed throughout the industry.

The industry has also been a stepping stone for so many others who now reside in different parts of North America, utilizing the skills and knowledge they obtained from their time in the pork industry here in Manitoba. Many of these people abroad would return to Manitoba for the twilight of their careers and the expertise they've amassed would be invaluable to our province producing the next generation of industry experts.

We've seen a migration like this occurring in Saskatchewan, as so many people who began their lives in Saskatchewan and had left to work in the Alberta oil and gas industry, or the mining industries around the world, are returning to areas like Saskatoon. These home-grown talents return to Saskatchewan armed with the knowledge that it will spawn the opportunity for the young people of that province. They also return as financially secure individuals who create local economic growth for their region. Let the recent unprecedented growth of property values in that region be proof enough of this trend. Manitoba will never witness this homeward migration if Bill 17 passes your Assembly.

Bill 17 has altered the trajectory of continued wealth that our industry has set for future Manitobans. Bill 17 stifles the opportunities for the pork industry in Manitoba to ever experience growth. In order for our industry here in the province to grow, we must first attract another pork packer. With permanent moratoriums on hog barn expansion covering much of the province's agricultural area, this will never happen. An industry that cannot grow

through new infrastructure will soon perish, as existing infrastructure ages or needs modifications to accommodate new production systems, in our case, open sow housing.

Manitoba's pork industry has been a leading region in North America over the past 15 years, spawning much of the genetics, nutrition and equipment technologies that have put North America on the map in the global pork community. We have been leaders on this continent and the world, in part, from support we've received from both federal and provincial legislators. They have, until recently, sent us a very strong message that they want us to be the very best in the world. I've sat in our office with government representatives who have listened to our innovative ideas. They've given quality advice, and we've moved forward with speed to develop new products to feed the markets of the world. Through our company, we've spent millions toward these initiatives, but now we'll have no opportunity to raise that pork in Manitoba.

The opportunities for our clients here will leave with the passing of Bill 17. It's the producers here that need your government's support. Our staff, who are the best in the world at what they do, and they want to live here in Manitoba, they need your support.

The world needs food. Our ability to locally convert our feedstuffs into meat protein is the most efficient way for us to supply the world the nutrition that humans need to survive. Just exporting these feedstuffs to other parts of the world will only promote greater stress on our environment due to the resources required to move greater quantities of less dense nutritional products and will only equate to a smaller return for the producers of those products here in this region.

The kind of support we need is for our governments to allow the industry to do what we do best, and that is raise food for the world. Programs that halt responsible expansion, or the ones that entice our industry to reduce our breeding herd, only serve to hand this industry over submissively to the United States of America. Is this what we want to do?

How much control will we have on that phosphorus coming up the river and over the border at Emerson if we do that? With our Province and our federal government, that is exactly what we're doing right now. Believe me, the USA will be more than happy to take the next billion dollars a growing

industry here in Manitoba could produce. When this occurs, your administration will have no say on how the by-products of pork production are handled. I can tell you that the U.S. pork industry is currently looking into the Dakotas, especially North Dakota, as destinations for possible expansion. They're building barns there as we speak. I believe, with competition from Manitoba, this U.S. expansion will be curtailed.

As our government, we need you to stand up with us and help us face other threats that exist in our industry. COOL legislation in the U.S. has been the only factor that has prevented Manitoba from continuing to be a power region in the North American industry. COOL's a blatant violation of NAFTA.

We as a region here have overcome the effects of a weak U.S. currency on our businesses, we have overcome the rise in costs associated with the use of corn for ethanol production, and we have overcome the closing of numerous outdated packing plants in western Canada. But, today, we still remain strong. We're poised and we're ready to grow our businesses.

We ask your Assembly to help us fight COOL. Allow our industry's transplanted Manitobans to come home and guide us to new prosperity. Give us an incentive to grow our breeding herd. Stand with us as we compete against the U.S., and allow us to be the very best in the world. Nobody wins with Bill 17, including Lake Winnipeg. Stand up with us and fight as Manitobans.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. McNaughton.

Questions.

Mr. Graydon: Jason, it was an excellent presentation, and I thank you for your persistence and your stubbornness for staying this late, or this early.

However, in your presentation, what I gathered was, and you said it many times, help us. Help us bring back our youth. You know, in a couple of days past now, we have seen a number of youth come forward and make some excellent presentations. I know that, of the, say, 20-odd young people that came through, I'm talking about people who are just out of university, or still in university, out of those 20-odd people, there must be hundreds more of them. Where are they? Why would they stay in this province if there's a moratorium? Did we just see the people that are either stubborn, dedicated, or they are

being offered something from their family to stay here that others don't have?

* (03:30)

Mr. McNaughton: You're asking me where the young people are. It's very difficult—and I know many who have spoken here today will testify to this—as we go out, we really try and be, I said it a number of times, the very best in the world at what we do. The only way for us to continue to do that or to strive to do that is to be able to find people like some of the people that spoke here today, that stayed till the late hours, that are really passionate about raising pork, producing pork, and everything that goes with it. You know, the province has them. I mean, I really believe that anybody that's passionate about animals and providing what it takes to raise a healthy animal that would go for food are the types of people that we need to target.

We don't do a very good job of it. I don't have your answer. We're trying to figure that out ourselves, obviously, is how do we produce the next generation. But we certainly can't do it if everybody that is passionate about it leaves. People that are passionate about the business don't stay around when they can't grow. We're not going to stay around and kick around in the dirt and scrap over what's left, if you will. Passionate people want to be part of something growing, something vigorous, and that's usually what's going to happen. I really think that's what we're headed towards.

Mr. Pedersen: I'll defer to Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Goertzen: Mr. Chairperson, I have a motion for this committee. I move

THAT this committee recommend to the House that Bill 17 be withdrawn.

Mr. Chairperson: Are we finished with this presenter before we can deal with this motion? *[interjection]* Thank you very much, Mr. McNaughton.

Mr. McNaughton: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Goertzen

THAT the committee recommend to the House that Bill 17 be withdrawn.

The motion is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Goertzen: Not a question–debate, Mr. Chairperson. I brought forward this motion at this hour because I think it's important at this stage of the debates that we've had—we've heard from nearly 200 presenters, more presenters than we heard for the MTS debate, close to the presenters that were registered for Meech Lake. It's clear that this is one of the most important issues that this Province has ever seen.

There's only been a handful, and perhaps less, of presenters who have spoken in favour of Bill 17. By far, the vast majority have spoken against this bill for a variety of different reasons and from a variety of different backgrounds. We've heard family farmers; we've heard scientists; we've heard researchers; we've heard professors; we've heard veterinarians; we've heard immigrants; we've heard long-term Canadians come forward and express their concern about this ban that this NDP government has decided to bring in.

I look around the table and I don't actually think that the person who brought this legislation forward—I know whose name is on the legislation—whose idea it was, whose desk it came from, is actually at this table. I believe, probably tucked into his bed at home, the Premier (Mr. Doer) sleeps while we debate the legislation that he initiated, that came from his desire to see the pork industry driven out of the province of Manitoba. The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers), the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) have been asked to carry the water on this particular bill, to try to get it through, I would hope despite their best wishes.

But they have a responsibility, not just simply to their caucus and to their Premier—and I understand fully in our parliamentary system the reasons and the rationale for having Cabinet unified and for having its, sometimes, caucus vote as one. But, in the parliamentary system, we have things called confidence votes, usually monetary bills, where the whip is on and that individuals are supposed to vote in one particular way.

I listened intently as ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), the Member for Wellington (Ms. Marcelino)—and I've heard the Member for Wellington speak before about having an open mind about pieces of legislation. I know she indicated, regarding Bill 37, that she didn't necessarily support the bill and, perhaps, she was one of those who went into caucus—when she said it on the record—who went into caucus and indicated that

the bill needed to be changed. There were some changes that came from 37, not far enough, but, certainly, some steps were taken to amend that bill.

Perhaps she'll also go into caucus now with her Minister of Agriculture and others who've sat on this committee and said, we've heard enough. We've heard enough from Manitobans to know that this is bad legislation. We'll hear from other presenters before this is through if the government doesn't withdraw the bill, and I'm sure they'll be very similar to the 200 presenters that we've heard so far, but I don't think that there's a presenter—I might be going out on a limb, but I would say 95 percent of the presenters who have yet to speak wouldn't be offended if they didn't get the opportunity to speak if this government withdrew Bill 17.

I think that they would come to this committee room and say, we happily give up our opportunity to speak at 3 or 4 in the morning if this government decides to withdraw this bill. We've heard some passionate, some passionate arguments from young farmers. We've heard from some who've been in the industry for a long time, some who have retired, some who used to work for the Department of Conservation, some who used to work for the Department of Agriculture, from across the fields, who don't believe that the science exists, because it doesn't exist, to show that it's the hog industry who's causing significant problems to Lake Winnipeg.

They know that this is nothing but a political decision by a government who's trying to make political points with certain residents in certain areas of the province. It's punishment politics. It's political politics. It doesn't have a long-term view to the economic viability of an industry, the economic importance of the hog industry, which is bigger than the hydro industry in the province of Manitoba. If somebody was trying to shut down the hydro industry—I know that the NDP government have tried to drive it into debt, but, if somebody was trying to shut the industry down, we know we would passionately fight for hydro.

I don't know anymore if the members opposite would passionately fight in the same way because they're trying to drive this industry out of Manitoba. History will record, if they're successful with this moratorium—and I appreciate the fact that our leader, the leader of the PC Party (Mr. McFadyen), has put it on the record in this committee and in the Legislature that he'll repeal this legislation if we're fortunate enough to win the next election. I appreciate that

commitment from the leader because, you know, others have said that, maybe, this is a politically dangerous thing to be done, but I think it's the right thing, a person to stand up, despite what the political winds might say.

I don't think it's always good for politicians to look at the most recent polls or to put their hand up in the wind and try to see which way the wind is blowing. You try to do the right thing for the province. Each of us is elected to do that, and I appreciate Mr. McFadyen saying we will repeal this bill if we're elected in the next election. Now's the time, because I don't want to wait three years. Now is the time for the members opposite, whether you represent a city riding or whether you're one of the few NDP members who come from a rural riding, to say, enough.

We don't have to bend to the will of the Premier on this one. We've heard from Manitobans, from all regions, from all walks of life, and we don't simply have to stand by while the Premier rams through another piece of legislation that we don't agree with. I believe, I believe in my heart that there are members in the NDP caucus who truly don't believe in this legislation, who wouldn't have supported the legislation, who wouldn't have wanted it to come forward. Now's the time to be counted because history will record who voted for and who voted against this legislation.

If the industry is driven out of Manitoba, Manitobans will look back in the years to come, and they'll review this *Hansard* and they'll review the discussion that we're having now and they'll wonder why it is that we've lost such an important industry and why it's gone to Saskatchewan and why it's gone to Iowa and why it's gone to other northern or Midwestern states in the U.S. They'll look at these debates and they'll recognize who were the members, and you will be accounted for. You will have to answer at some point, whether it's to future generations of Manitobans or whether it's to your constituents why you were part of driving out an industry so important to Manitoba,

I would say, also, Mr. Chairperson, that it's a shame that the pork industry, or agriculture, generally, has to suffer through these sorts of allegations and accusations from the government opposite. You know, if I were an environmentalist, I would be very concerned—paid environmentalist—I'd be very, very concerned that the government has tried to put the blame on a particular industry that

really has nothing to do with the pollution that's going on in Lake Winnipeg. I'd be offended because, even if this bill passes, nothing is going to change in Lake Winnipeg because no real action will have been taken.

* (03:40)

The perception might be there. The government may have put out the perception to say, yes, we've done something to try to save Lake Winnipeg, but it will only be perception. It won't be reality. Some day those same environmentalists will look back and say, shame on the government because when there was an opportunity to take real steps, they took political actions that had nothing to do with Lake Winnipeg.

So this is an opportunity here at 20 to 4 in the morning, while the government wonders what they can do to shut down the motion. At 20 to 4 in the morning, we as Conservatives are willing to say, we're ready to fight, we want this bill withdrawn, you can do the right thing. We can all hold our heads high tomorrow when we walk into the Legislature knowing that the right thing was done.

The Premier (Mr. Doer) might be concerned, but he can look around and he can talk to Manitobans and Manitobans will tell him, you didn't do the right thing.

We can listen to the young man who was here, who is a youth pastor, who said, with humility, we can all say that we did the right thing as leaders and history will record that we were there to be counted, we were there to stand up for Manitobans when it was time to be counted.

I ask all the members opposite to support this motion and let's do the right thing for Manitobans. We'll all hold our heads proud tomorrow, and we'll go forward with knowing that we did the right thing. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Goertzen. I call on Mr. Derkach.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chair, I'm more than pleased to speak to this motion because I think it's the sensible thing to do when we've heard all of the presentations that have come before us.

I've been sitting here—this will be the third day—to listen to the presenters. Yes, I've heard a couple of presentations that were in favour of what the government was doing. As a matter of fact, one individual who we all know well thought that this legislation doesn't go far enough, but we understand

where that individual is coming from and everybody recognizes that. I think, by and large, the people who are engaged in the industry, the people who are making a difference in this province, the people who are creating wealth in this province and their families spoke out very strongly to this point and will continue to speak out.

I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) has some concerns about us bringing this motion forward at this time, because she feels there's an agreement that was reached between the House leaders that said that there will 200 people called today and we will go at it at 200 people a night, which we'll hold the government committed to, to try and get through these presentations.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

The government is trying to get through these presentations in a hurry. I understand that because they would like to see this legislation put over until the fall, which the agreement is. Then they would not like to see any presentations come before the fall so they can ram it through the House. Well, Mr. Vice-Chair, I think that Manitobans deserve to have consideration of this bill in terms of having it withdrawn.

The hog industry in this province has been a very important one. It's one that has sustained not only families but communities and, indeed, the economy of our province. Why is the government targeting this industry alone? We have seen lots of evidence.

As we sit in this Chamber right now, we are seeing hundreds of thousands of gallons of raw sewage being disposed of from the city of Winnipeg into the Red River which goes directly into Lake Winnipeg. Now, Mr. Vice-Chair, you cannot say that we are taking a balanced approach to how we address this because we are not. You know, there are penalties that are supposed to be imposed on people when they do things like that, when they dump raw sewage into a water stream.

I know that this government has a fixation on the hog industry. It has never liked the hog industry. I'll go back to the 1990s, when we were in government and we were promoting the development of a hog industry in Manitoba. It was the current Minister of Agriculture and her colleagues who fought us all the way as we tried to develop a sustainable industry in this province. So I'm not surprised that they are taking the attitude, the action and the stance that they

are with regard to the hog industry. Mr. Vice-Chair, we have had some people even go as far as to question whether or not this is a directed attempt to discriminate against these people because of their religion, and that was said at the table. I'm not saying that, but we heard it at the table. I know that that's not the motivation behind this. I would never accuse this government, or the minister, of doing this kind of legislation as a means to discriminate against any particular religious group, because I don't think that's fair.

I think this government has another motivation. The motivation is purely politically-driven, and that is to give the impression to the environmentalists and some of the interest groups that they are doing something about cleaning up Lake Winnipeg. When the assessment is done, at the end of the day, we know that there will not be any measurable difference in terms of the quality of Lake Winnipeg as a result of this legislation.

So, Mr. Vice-Chair, I support what the Member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen) has put forward. I support the notion that this bill should be withdrawn. I know the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) and the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) listened quietly. They didn't pose any large questions; they didn't pose any difficult questions to the presenters. They simply listened and, as the Member for Wellington (Ms. Marcelino) said, she listened in silence. She listened intently, and she will then be able to put her two cents, as she said, into the discussion that will ensue in their caucus.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

I would encourage the members opposite, the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald), the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Conservation and the other members who have sat around this table to really seriously take into account what the ordinary people of this province have said.

Don't look at us as the opposition who are trying to drive a position against this bill, and perhaps you think we're doing it because it's politically motivated. Members of this committee, I say to you that what we are trying to do is impress upon you how important it is for us, as legislators, to listen to Manitobans, to listen to what they've come forward with before this committee.

I don't know how much more compelling information you need, and for the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) to imply that they're

taking the position here because of the position that we took when we were in government, to MTS, is petty. It certainly doesn't reflect what the nature of this is, and I know the Member for Wellington says that this is impugning motive, but it's only a suggestion that was made by the Member for Burrows, and it wasn't us who said it, it was the Member for Burrows who said it. So, therefore, you have to be accountable for what you say.

Mr. Chairperson, I strongly believe that, around this table, I think we have the will on this side of the House to vote on this motion, to encourage the government to withdraw this bill so that it doesn't see the light of day. I think cooler heads can prevail. I think by working with the hog industry there is a real opportunity, there is a tremendous opportunity, to address some of the issues that were given to this government in the Clean Environment Commission's report. There are 48 recommendations. Each of those recommendations was given considerable thought and was given consideration as the Clean Environment Commission did its work in assessing what needs to be done in the hog industry and in the livestock industry.

One can never say we have arrived, we are perfect in what we do. Mr. Chair, I believe that you have to allow for time. Now, if we're prepared to give the City of Winnipeg until 2014 to get their house in order and to get their effluent to a position where they're not dumping raw sewage into the Red River, their nitrogen is in check, and so is the phosphate that is in their effluent in check, then we have to give other industries that same kind of consideration. We know that communities, small communities, that are along the Assiniboine River, and along the river basin that flows into the Red River and into Lake Winnipeg also have sewage problems. Every community that you can go to in rural Manitoba has some sort of a lagoon system, and that lagoon system is not perfect. It's leaking; it's leaching. It's causing salt flats around it. The effluent that is pumped into the river system finds its way into Lake Winnipeg.

I have to tell this committee that, in about 1996—

* (03:50)

Mr. Chairperson: Order. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Derkach, but we have a technical difficulty here. Mr. Goertzen, technically, is not a member of this committee and, therefore, is not eligible to move motions. The Conservative membership of the

committee is as follows: Mr. Derkach, yourself, Mr. Eichler, Mr. Graydon or Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairperson, I think I do still have the floor.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, you do.

Mr. Derkach: Therefore, I will move the very same motion that was moved by the non-member of this committee, Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Chairperson, I move

THAT the committee recommend to the House that Bill 17 be withdrawn.

Mr. Chairperson: It's been moved by Mr. Derkach, a member of this committee,

THAT this committee recommend to the House that Bill 17 be withdrawn. This motion is in order.

I open the floor to questions, debate, and recognize Mr. Derkach for a maximum of 10 minutes.

Mr. Derkach: I have 10 minutes left, right? Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I will continue with the remarks that I was making.

I was just in the process of explaining to the committee that, about 1998, a department that I was minister of decided to do something different about lagoon development in our communities, because we could see what was coming down the pipe. We knew that we had to change our approach in terms of how we were constructing lagoons.

So we travelled to Spokane, Washington, where an innovative approach to lagoon disposal of waste was working very successfully. What they were doing was using cattails and bulrushes to remove the nutrients from effluent; then the water from that was used to water poplar trees for the future.

Mr. Chairperson, I know that the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) is now responsible for that area of Roblin where this lagoon is situated. It has to be one of the best examples of treating effluent from a community where water, which actually goes through the different stages, comes out pure in terms of the fecal count in the water and is used to water poplar trees.

In the community of Roblin, there is another issue because of the excess of water that is very close to the surface which finds its way into the lagoon and overloads the lagoon. Therefore, they have to combine that with an irrigation system that is used on

alfalfa. Not one drop of that effluent water reaches the Shell River.

Years ago, there was a committee in place in that community called, Save the Shell. That committee was led by a group of young people who said that we should not be allowing water from lagoons to enter a river system. Save the Shell committee has actually prevailed for more than 20 years. It is for this reason that effluent from lagoons along the Shell River is not allowed to enter the Shell River. That was the motivation for finding a different system for effluent treatment in the Roblin community.

I think we can use that as a model. It probably needs some tweaking; it probably needs some adjusting and can be duplicated in all of our smaller communities across the province. If we want to do something positive for the environment, something positive for Lake Winnipeg, we should be addressing how we dispose of our effluent in all our communities.

In this last year, the government has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars, I'll say—probably millions of dollars—into the reconstruction of lagoons where they need to be either expanded or reconstructed. I know that the Minister of Water Stewardship (Ms. Melnick) was involved in the Russell project where they rebuilt their lagoon. But, once again, it was rebuilt to the old standard, and the water and the effluent out of that lagoon is still dumped into a small stream, and about a week after it is dumped into the small stream that stream just turns a green colour and then it goes through a marsh, and the entire marsh area, the water in the marsh area, is absolutely green. Now you can't tell me that there isn't a lot of nutrient in that water that comes out of that lagoon, and it is not healthy for neither the lake, or the slough that it drains into, nor the downstream and into the Assiniboine River.

So, Mr. Chairperson, there's a lot we can do and Bill 17 doesn't address those real issues. Bill 17 is simply a smoke-and-mirrors bill and it doesn't provide any comfort for anyone. I mean, why would we target all of those people who work in the pork industry, and why would we put a moratorium on an industry that has helped to, in a sustainable way, drive the economic engine of our province?

And, Mr. Chair, yes, two-thirds of the industry is located in southeast Manitoba, but there is a reason. That's where the expertise is in raising hogs. That's where the expertise is in managing the manure. That's where the expertise is in terms of feeding

those hogs efficiently, effectively, and that's where the industry should be located.

Now, yes, the industry can grow into other parts of the province, and it should, but I do believe that if we really are serious about doing something positive for the environment and, indeed, for the people of Manitoba, we will seriously consider withdrawing this bill.

I don't blame the minister for bringing the bill forward. I mean, it's one of those things that governments do from time to time, but I think after you've heard the compelling evidence provided by ordinary Manitobans, it is time now to reconsider, and I thank you for the time for me to put this case forward.

Mr. Goertzen: Just a couple of seconds, a couple of minutes, I just want to make the point—you know, here we are at 4 o'clock in the morning. We have politicians talking to ourselves essentially. We have 13 politicians, making a combined salary of about a million dollars at this table, at four in the morning, having listened to presenters almost through the night. I mean this sincerely, this is a bad system. It's a system that needs to be changed. I know we're not going to make that decision here. I know that this system has gone on prior to me being here. I just don't want to see it, you know, going on after I'm gone.

But I was looking through *Hansard* and I want to read a quote. I want to read a quote from 1997. There was a presenter who made a presentation at 1:30 in the morning and the presenter said: I have appeared twice to get on here and it is 1:30 in the morning. My children are going to be up at 6:30 a.m. I find this really an interesting way to go about business in government. This is not what I read in a democracy.

That private citizen who made the presenters was named Marilyn Brick, and it was made in 1997. Mr. Burrows indicates that it was the last presenter on the MTS bill. Whether it was or not, I don't know. I'll take his word for it that Ms. Brick was presenting.

But, you know, it doesn't matter if the previous government did it or this government did it. This system has to change. It's not respectful to the public. It's not respectful to staff. I'm less concerned about us as politicians, but I would just encourage all of us as members to go back to our respective caucuses and say that there is a better way to do it, and if it means striking our Rules Committee, as the Member

for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) says, I would support that.

So that's the only point I want to make. It's a non-partisan point. This is not a good system. It needs to change and I look forward to that debate happening. Thank you very much.

Mr. Maguire: Mr. Chair, I only want to say that I agree with this motion at this hour of the morning, just to be a few minutes before 4 o'clock. I think that it would be a good motion to withdraw Bill 17. I know the government is looking for ways of trying to make amendments to this bill, trying to make it more amenable to people, but my fear is that they are using this as a vendetta to appease their union friends. Their Premier (Mr. Doer) is the biggest union boss in Manitoba according to their—if that's the case, and I really would hope that that's not the case, he could do the right thing. His party did the right thing last week and made some changes to a bill, Bill 37.

* (04:00)

I think that they will, obviously, come to their senses and make some changes on this particular bill as well. Just because one speaker came forward tonight and said that we were in unfriendly "banitoba"—I think there are a number of areas that we need to just make some changes in. I appreciate the minister's questions, the tenor of them tonight. I take them at their word that they're trying to look for some changes to this bill.

So I speak in favour of the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: That concludes my list of speakers to this motion.

Seeing no other speakers, is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: The question before the committee is as follows: It's been moved by Mr. Derkach

THAT this committee recommend to the House that Bill 17 be withdrawn. Shall the motion pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: Well, I'm not sure on that, so all those in favour of this motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Formal Vote

Mr. Maguire: A recorded vote, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

All those in favour of the motion, please raise their hands. I don't believe Mr. Pedersen is on—better check the list there. Mr. Pedersen, you're not a member of this committee.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6.

Mr. Chairperson: The motion is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Well, that concludes the entertainment for the morning here, so, on that note, being 4:03, committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 4:03 a.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

I am against Bill 17, as I believe farming is a vital part of Manitoba's economy, and Bill 17 attacks this. I have talked to people across Manitoba and am finding it hard to find people who support Bill 17, both in the city and outside. It seems like it is a bill that is threatening to shut down a vital part of Manitoba's economy without any scientific proof behind it. Research has shown that the lakes are being polluted by many sources, and instead of a ban, you should consider a more rigorous application process.

A lot of people have put a lot of hard work into their hog operations and for them to be attacked like this, without research showing that it will help, is upsetting. Farming is the backbone of our community and way of life, and Bill 17 threatens to undermine our way of life.

I think we need to educate the people of Manitoba where food comes from and the challenges faced by farmers, instead of attacking them through a political ban like this. Hog manure works well as

fertilizer, and if it's not hog manure being applied, it will only be artificial fertilizer that is more expensive.

Alvin Gross, Secretary, Iberville Colony

* * *

Good day, my name is Paul Gross and I feel that it is my duty as a farmer to speak against Bill 17, not just because I worry about our future as hog producers but also because I am seriously concerned about how far this issue will go concerning people losing their jobs, no more pork on the market, and numerous other things. Bill 17 will take away countless people's main source of income.

I'd like to ask a question. Why is it that farmers get every possible blame for pollution in Manitoba? They get blamed for water pollution, air pollution, and everything else. But have you ever seriously considered how the big businesses in Winnipeg are polluting the air and the water? Pass factories, you can see thick, dense smoke coming out of smoke stacks. Stand on the side of the street and you will almost choke on exhaust fumes. Then go visit a farm and see if the air there doesn't smell a lot fresher and cleaner.

So why are the farmers getting criticized for causing pollution? Is it because they are an easier target than major businesses or because you don't want to lose those businesses and you don't care about what happens to the farmers?

Now let's move on to my next point. How many of you here love bacon for breakfast, a hamburger for lunch and a pork chop for supper? Have you even considered that with the hog barn ban, these things will be no more? Where do you expect to get any of the pork you eat? It doesn't simply come from the supermarket. It all started in a hog barn.

I've also heard of complaints from anti-farmers saying that when they report hog farmers doing something not right, they get really small fines. In most cases not even the price of one hog. That fine must really be small considering what hog farmers are actually being paid for a hog nowadays.

It seems as if no one is taking into consideration the many problems Bill 17 would cause. All everybody is thinking is hog production is polluting

our water when in reality, it really isn't. I think more thought should be put into Bill 17 and everyone should really contemplate more about where pollution actually is coming from. Thank you.

Paul Gross, Iberville Farm

* * *

Opposition to Bill 17

WLT Distributors has grown a company in Winnipeg in the last 30 years. Bill 17 is discriminatory and has no scientific basis. Should expansion in the hog industry be stifled WLT Distributors will look at moving our office elsewhere to supply the base ingredients to the hog industry. Actions suggested by Bill 17 would implore us and our 14 staff members and families to look to other areas of Canada for opportunities for growth.

A study was done known as the CEC Report, nowhere in this report does the committee suggest the actions taken by Bill 17 would be warranted. The spin off ramifications and the affect on families and other businesses in Winnipeg and the surrounding area would be substantial.

Hog producers are stewards to the environment scientifically spreading manure as fertilizer. The impact of restricted manure will force grain farmers to bring in other sources of phosphorus anyway which could in turn go ungoverned, as granular fertilizer phosphorus is ungoverned today.

Kevin L. Toles, B. Sc. (Ag. Bus.) P. Ag. Chief Executive Officer, WLT Distributors

* * *

RE: BILL 17

Regarding Bill 17, I can barely find the words to describe that someone could actually get people to listen to this idea, never mind support it. It's a sad day to discover that the people leading our Province of Manitoba would even let this get started, never mind get it to this level. Discretion must be used. Moratoriums for a specific period of time (eg. 1 year) are indeed not going meet everyone's approval but can be lived with and understood, but a permanent one? Permanent is a long time.

Have all the people involved in supporting this been out in the field, working hands on in

agriculture? Do you have any idea of the people, families, friends, relatives, children that you are affecting? I work in the agriculture industry and understand the big picture. More specifically, I work in the feed industry and this negatively affects myself, family and friends. Please think of the big

picture, remain open minded, and understand the negative effects this will have.

Thank you,

Richard Sukkau,
Winnipeg, Manitoba

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>