

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. 6 – 6 p.m., Wednesday, June 11, 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.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARCELINO, Flor	Wellington	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McFADYEN, Hugh	Fort Whyte	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Carman	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELBY, Erin	Southdale	N.D.P.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Wednesday, June 11, 2008

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Ms. Erin Selby (Southdale); Ms. Jennifer Howard (Fort Rouge) at 23:01

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Ashton, Mackintosh, Struthers,
Hon. Ms. Wowchuk

Messrs. Eichler, Graydon, Jha, Pedersen,
Nevakshonoff, Mrs. Rowat, Ms. Selby

Substitutions:

Mrs. Stefanson for Mr. Pedersen
Mrs. Taillieu for Mr. Graydon
Hon. Mr. Lemieux for Hon. Mr. Mackintosh at
23:01
Hon. Ms. Irvin-Ross for Hon. Mr. Ashton at
23:01
Hon. Ms. McGifford for Mr. Jha at 23:01
Ms. Howard for Ms. Selby at 23:01
Mr. Derkach for Mrs. Rowat at 23:11

APPEARING:

Mr. Ron Schuler, MLA for Springfield
Mr. Stuart Briese, MLA for Ste. Rose
Mr. Cliff Graydon, MLA for Emerson
Mr. Leonard Derkach, MLA for Russell
Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights
Mr. Cliff Cullen, MLA for Turtle Mountain
Mr. Rick Borotsik, MLA for Brandon West
Mr. Blaine Pedersen, MLA for Carman
Mr. Larry Maguire, MLA for Arthur-Virden

WITNESSES:

Mr. Daniel Wyrich, Private Citizen
Ms. Justina Hop, Private Citizen
Mr. Jeff Bond, Private Citizen
Mr. Waldie Klassen, Manitoba Chicken
Producers
Mr. Doug Sisson, Private Citizen
Mr. Aaron P. Hofer, Private Citizen

Mr. Ken Foster, Private Citizen
Mr. Greg McIvor, Private Citizen
Mr. Greg Fehr, Town of Niverville
Mr. Scott Penner, Private Citizen
Mr. Gordon Dyck, Private Citizen
Mr. Harold Foster, Rural Municipality of Bifrost
Mr. Ed Peters, Private Citizen
Mr. Arnold Waldner, Private Citizen
Mr. Mark Lanouette, Private Citizen
Mr. Ian Wishart, Private Citizen
Ms. Carol Clegg, Private Citizen
Mr. Orville Schinkel, Private Citizen
Mr. Jason Hofer, Private Citizen
Mr. Leon Clegg, Private Citizen
Mr. Dave Jolicoeur, Private Citizen
Mr. Chris Latimer, Nutrition Partners
Mr. Peter Provis, Sheridan Hauser Provis Swine
Health Services Ltd.
Ms. Karin Wittenberg, Faculty of Agricultural
and Food Sciences, University of Manitoba
Mr. Mark Peters, Private Citizen
Mr. Dennis Robles, Private Citizen
Messrs. Dennis and Christopher Koziar, Private
Citizens
Dr. Laurie Connor, Private Citizen
Mr. Dave Wall, Private Citizen
Mr. Geoffrey Downey, Private Citizen
Mr. Eric Klassen, Private Citizen
Mr. Michael Hofer, Private Citizen
Mr. Wally Driedger, Private Citizen
Mr. Albert Maendel, Private Citizen
Mr. Kenneth Maendel, Private Citizen
Mr. Mike Maendel, Private Citizen
Mr. Leonard John Friesen, Private Citizen
Mrs. Wendy Friesen, Private Citizen
Mr. Robert Kleinsasser, Suncrest Colony
Mr. Reg Penner, Private Citizen
Mr. Galen Peters, Private Citizen
Mr. Lauren Wiebe, Topeaka Farm
Mr. Rolf Penner, Private Citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Ms. Lindy Clubb, Private Citizen
Ms. Bonnie Nay, Private Citizen
Mr. Aaron Gross, Private Citizen
Mr. Jonathan Gross, Iberville Colony Farms Ltd.
Ms. Claudette Taillefer, Private Citizen

Mr. Darren Bates, Hypor Inc.
 Mr. David Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Henry Rosolowski, Private Citizen
 Ms. Karin Wittenberg, Associate Dean,
 Research for the Faculty of Agricultural Food
 and Sciences,
 Mr. C. Hugh Arklie, Springfield Hogwatch

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?

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

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Selby has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

An Honourable Member: Gary Doer.

Mr. Chairperson: You're not a committee member at the moment, mister.

An Honourable Member: Thanks, to my nominator.

Mr. Chairperson: Hearing no other nominations from the table, Ms. Selby is elected Vice-Chairperson.

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

How long does the committee wish to sit this evening?

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Chairman, I think we would like to follow the same pattern that we did last night. Last night, we agreed that we would sit until 2 o'clock and, after 2, if there were still people in the room that wanted to present, we would continue on and hear those people.

Mr. Chairperson: Is that acceptable? *[Agreed]*

Written submissions on Bill 17 have been received from the following and have been distributed to committee members: Lindy Clubb, Bonnie Nay, Aaron Gross, Jonathan Gross, Claudette Taillefer, Darren Bates and David Waldner. 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 arranged to use our other committee room, Room 254, as an overflow room for those in attendance. Room 254 is just down the hall and the sound from this room is being broadcast there 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. Tonight, we will continue calling the remaining out-of-town presenters on this round of calls, then we will revert to the start of the list to call Winnipeg presenters.

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.

* (18:10)

As well, I would like to inform presenters that, in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from 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 the person's name to signal the *Hansard* recorders to turn the microphones on and off.

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

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Could you canvass the committee and see if presenter No. 227, Daniel

Wyrich, could be called forward. He is a young Manitoban who is going to be presenting on behalf of his family farm. I think it would be becoming of this committee to hear him first so that he wouldn't be forced to stay late into the night. He's a young presenter. I know normally we don't do this, but, as a young man, as a student, I would ask the committee if we could just bring him forward.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Yes, certainly be prepared to do that, but also, in the past number of days we've been sitting on this committee, we've also allowed those with families and far away to come first as well. I know, Mr. Chairman, you've asked them to register at the back for those with families to be heard first. So we just add that to it, with the leave of the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Eichler.

Anybody who has young children, who have to catch an airplane, or if there are any other extenuating circumstances which necessitate you leaving as quickly as possible, then raise it with our staff at the back of the room. They will bring it to our attention here at the table. We will very likely agree to it.

Mr. Schuler asked that presenter No. 227, Daniel Wyrich, be allowed to speak first. Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]*

Last night we left off on our list just before calling presenter Justina Hop, No. 50 on our revised list, so we will pick up where we left off, calling Ms. Hop after Mr. Wyrich.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: Before we begin, I have some substitutions: Mrs. Stefanson in for Mr. Pedersen; Mrs. Taillieu in for Mr. Graydon.

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

Mr. Chairperson: That said, I call No. 227, Daniel Wyrich to the microphone. Mr. Wyrich, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Daniel Wyrich (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Wyrich: Hi, my name is Daniel Wyrich. I'm a young farmer. Basically, I'm speaking out against this bill because it kind of ruins my future. My parents moved here from overseas to give me a

future in farming. If you pass this bill that future's gone.

When I went to university, they always taught us to diversify. With this bill, how can I diversify if I can't build a barn? It's just narrowing down my options. I don't know. What is the future in farming? I went to the University of Manitoba, took agriculture diploma, for what?

If there's no future, why would I waste two years of my life in university? This is killing the family farm. I have no other way of saying this but, it's just—if this passes—I was born to farm. There's nothing left I could do. I don't know. I guess that's all I can really say. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Daniel, it takes a lot of courage to stand up in front of this committee. Taking time out, and I'm glad the committee agreed that you wouldn't have to sit until three in the morning to be heard. Brevity has a lot going for it. Thank you very much for coming out.

Do you see yourself discouraged with this kind of legislation? Could you see yourself eventually getting out of farming and doing something different, like, abandoning the family farm?

Mr. Wyrich: I would hope not, but if there's no future, why bother?

I would never want to quit farming.

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

I now call Justina Hop. Ms. Hop, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Ms. Justina Hop (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Ms. Hop: My name is Justina Hop and I'm a farmer from the Tolstoi area. I am a farmer. I am more comfortable in rubber boots and coveralls than I am in shoes and a suit jacket, and I'm kind of concerned about the direction this Bill 17 is taking the agriculture industry in.

We are the providers of food for Manitoba. We provide, we grow, we produce food for the city of Winnipeg where a lot of people are no longer connected to farms, have no idea how difficult it is to farm and what we do on a regular basis as farmers. We make decisions that affect what we grow, when we grow it, but we also gamble on the weather, the

market prices. Basically, we are the biggest gamblers when it comes to trying to stay ahead of our bills.

We have dairy, we have beef and we have hogs because when the keyword was diversify, we diversified. We stayed in livestock because we know livestock, so we just diversified into the livestock industries. The BSE really put a damper on the beef industry, but the dairy has sort of made us stable. We maintained. Then we went into hogs because we wanted fertilizer that was readily available and that was going to give us the forage we needed to feed our cows. Now the hog industry is under attack. We really, sort of, are running out of options. Where do we go from now?

All I know is agriculture. I tried living in Winnipeg. I tried working in the city. That's not someplace I would choose to come back to, but if Bill 17 goes through, we are going to be losing the people from the rural areas because the only place left to go for a job is going to be the bigger cities. But, in the meantime, where are we going to get the food to feed the bigger cities? If we no longer can produce it in rural areas, with the price of fuel, how are we going to afford to feed everybody?

I also am one of these people—I always tell my children you need to hear something seven times before it sinks in. I'm sure you've heard all the numbers, the statistics, everything, more than seven times, but I really think we need to consider better ways of implementing regulations, so that we can go forward as an industry.

We have hogs, like I said. We have a slurry store for our manure, which gets inspected every year, and if there's even any possible little leak or anything, we have engineers out, and it has to be so many days and we have to have it fixed. We are one of the most regulated industries, and we jump through hoops all the time to stay ahead of all the regulations. I really think we are not the major culprits of the contamination of the lake.

I read the Clean Environment Commission report, and I do not see that this is the direction that it indicated we should be going in. So I would like to know from the committee or, if it's possible, see the scientific reasoning behind this bill, because I didn't get it from the environment report. I didn't see the numbers there that would justify such an extreme measure.

With one last comment, there was an old lady in our neighbourhood who always used to say—she was

a survivor of World War I from Holland—it doesn't matter how much money we have at the end; if there's no food to be bought, we will all go hungry.

If this bill goes forward, we will not have food available to be bought, regardless of the dollars available to buy it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Hop.

I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I really don't have a question but I want to thank you for your presentation and taking time to come in tonight.

* (18:20)

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): Thanks for coming, Justina.

Can you tell me, Justina, in your operation, do you have adequate land base to use all of your manure? Can you apply all of your manure to your own land, or do you use someone else's land?

Ms. Hop: We rent land to spread the rest of our manure. But we file a manure management plan and we test our soil. Our manure gets tested on a regular basis. So, if our land space is not adequate, we have space in the neighbourhood that we rent to then take up the excess of our manure.

Mr. Stuart Briese (Ste. Rose): Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Hop.

I had the pleasure of hearing two of your children speak here the other night. I wonder what your view of the ramifications of this legislation is for your children.

Ms. Hop: I was quite proud that my children chose to come back to the farm, because that was my life and they were raised there. But, when this bill came forward, I was quite concerned whether I should be encouraging them to come back, because dairy is a fairly stable industry right now, but, if Bill 17 comes in, it takes out one industry. Which is the next industry on the chopping block, and what do we have to look forward to as an industry? So, for my children, I am quite concerned, because they've just committed to, at least—we're on a five-year trial period. But are we going to be able to make the five years if the bill goes forward? I'm not sure.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Thank you for your presentation tonight, Ms. Hop.

You also have a dairy operation with your hog operation. Mr. Struthers has made many comments now, in the last few days, that 28 percent of the hog industry is situated in two of the municipalities in the moratorium. You being in the dairy industry also know that 65 percent of the dairy industry is situated within the moratorium.

Do you feel threatened in your second industry?

Ms. Hop: I feel threatened in all our industries. We have the three. I feel threatened in all of them because, if one falls, it's like the snowball effect. Then they'll just keep rolling and rolling and we're all going to get crushed in the process.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Well, thank you very much for your presentation.

Could you explain to me how it is that the government feels they're going to reduce the amount of phosphorus going into the streams as they say comes out of the hog industry, when, in fact, if you stop using the hog manure on your land to grow the crops, you're going to be using a chemical phosphate in order to be able to grow those same crops? So do you see any way in which this bill is going to reduce the amount of phosphorus entering the streams in our province?

Ms. Hop: No, I don't think this bill is the solution to that problem. The phosphates that are being put into the lakes come from many sources, not just the potential to come from the hog industry. There are the grasslands, the commercial fertilizers, the golf courses, the lawns in Winnipeg, the rivers—they all feed. The water comes from the south. Everything wants to run north. That's a big contributor, too. And how do we regulate what's coming from downstream or upstream? So, no, I don't think this is a solution to the phosphates in the lake.

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

I call Jeff Bond. Mr. Bond, do you have any written materials for the committee members?

Mr. Jeff Bond (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Bond: Thank you.

My name is Jeff Bond. I've been involved in the hog industry for 17 years. I have both a bachelor's and a master's degree in animal nutrition and have been chair of Hog Days out of Brandon to try and promote this industry in the sustainable developing

industry that it is within this province for many, many years.

The municipalities listed in Bill 17 contain approximately two-thirds of the hog production in this province. To pass a bill such as this will mean a decay in that industry. There is no such thing as stasis in any industry. It's either expanding or declining as people get in and get out. So to pass a bill to attempt to hold it still will just automatically result in decay over the years.

My family and many of my friends are involved in the hog industry. With a reduction that will come in production, it will lead to not only a change of lifestyle for myself, but for many of my friends around. With the change in lifestyle that will come, likely as a result of loss of income, people will be forced to leave the province. We'll be contributing to the rural depopulation of the province by passing a bill such as this.

We live on farmland. I'm hoping that down the road my children will choose to pursue an industry such as the hog industry. If they do at that time and I have to say to them that, sorry, we can't go into this industry because there's been a ban, very simply, I will move to somewhere where they can have a future that they want.

Myself, as I mentioned, live on farmland. There are many of the Hutterite colonies—as you see, members are here—much of their lifestyle's based on hog production and much of that is in the municipalities that are looking to be withheld. If they're not able to increase the population and divide and prosper as they have in the past, it will certainly mean a demise to their way of life and lifestyle as well.

The hog industry right now is being challenged as it has in the past. In 1998, prices were below the depression, but as every industry goes through, this one will rebound and when it does, it'd be nice to have an infrastructure that's there. There's a reason why two-thirds of the hog production is in this area. It's because the infrastructure is there, whether it's the labour, whether it's other businesses, the supporting businesses, trucking, manure hauling, the equipment builders. All that is here for a reason.

On top of all that, the Province is looking at reducing gas emissions by 150,000 tonnes. To do that, there's going to be expansion into the ethanol industry at a rate of approximately the use of 14 million bushels of wheat in a year. The process of

generating ethanol creates distillers grains. It's a by-product and I think eventually, not eventually, but this will be the opportunity for the hog industry to actually save you on another industry front.

Cattle and poultry numbers are fixed. They're common ways that distillers grains are used as a feed ingredient, but the expansion of those two industries is held by supply management. There's the possibility of the beef industry, but there's no infrastructure set up for that. There's no feed lots; there's no kill plants. There's a reason why—there's, you know, other provinces actually have that business. The hogs have an industry infrastructure that's already set up. When it comes, and I don't mean if, I mean when it comes, that the ethanol expansion comes, and there's a slump of distillers grains sitting on the doorstep, we need a method that's viable and sustainable to use it. It's not a viable food ingredient for people. The best option is to feed it to animals, and hogs are your opportunity.

What I'm asking is just to look into the future just a little bit. When the ethanol industry expands, distillers grains will be there. The hog industry is here already. That will be your opportunity to save the ethanol industry. If you get an overabundance of the distillers grains, it will collapse the ethanol industry quicker than you ever thought just by the inefficiencies of trying to deal with a waste product on that front.

Leaders lead by example and they offer solutions to help. I'm asking that we all be leaders here. Offer solutions. Offer to help people and let's lead each other into the future. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bond.

I have Mrs. Taillieu.

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Bond, for your presentation.

You mentioned the supporting industries that will be affected when this moratorium comes into effect. How long do you think that the supporting industries—how long will it take before they begin to suffer and start to move away as you suggested that you might have to do?

* (18:30)

Mr. Bond: The supporting infrastructures will rebound to a certain amount, but it will not take long. There are many, many industries that are dependent on the hog industry, whether it's the feed mills and feed consultants right through to feed manufacturers

and trucking companies. They will start to dissolve really quite quickly. As soon as the hog industry starts to decline, they'll be right behind them.

Mr. Derkach: Well, thank you for your presentation.

As we listen to the many, many presenters that come before us, one of the things that we seem to have a lack of and that is participation by the government side. Not once have I heard a challenge from any of the ministers or the Premier (Mr. Doer) himself on the information that is being put forward by individuals such as yourself who are involved in the hog industry. No one has criticized that the information that you put on the record here before this committee is wrong. Yet they sit there with a bill that will do absolutely nothing in terms of the positive impacts on Lake Winnipeg, and I can't understand that.

I'm wondering whether or not your industry has tried to get an explanation from either the minister or the Premier as to what the cause for this kind of legislation is and why they aren't listening to the people who are presenting.

Mr. Bond: I have no answers as to why we can't get answers. I, myself, have participated in the Clean Environment Commission. I was part of the presenters on that list. I e-mailed the Premier myself offering my professional help. If there are areas of opportunity or gaps of knowledge that I can help as a professional to fill in, I'm more than willing to help. But as for getting answers, I have no answers.

Mr. Derkach: So what you just said is that people in your industry have come forward directly to government and have indicated that they're prepared to work with and alongside government to provide either answers for questions that yet seem to be looming out there, and to work with government to develop a more sustainable industry.

Mr. Bond: Absolutely. I know I mentioned about myself, but I am not alone in the number of people that have come forth to offer help or assistance in any way, shape or form. If I can still help in the future, certainly I will.

Mr. Briese: You mentioned the distillers' grain, and I was fortunate enough to go through the Mohawk plant recently. They told us that there's quite a value to that distillers' grain. Now, where my question's going is I raised hogs for quite a number of years. We used soybean as the main protein supplement into the rations, and it was all coming in from the

U.S. It's my understanding that the distillers' grain can replace quite a bit of that on the protein side of the ration for hogs. Is that true?

Mr. Bond: That is true. Soybean meal contains usually about 46.5 percent crude protein. Distillers' grains, such as you're going to get out of the ethanol plant there, that's based off wheat is going to be sitting in the low 30s. There's a good proportion of soybean meal that can be replaced by the distillers' grains, and with that also it begins to help producers be a little bit less reliant on the exchange rate, or in that case, actually have a little bit more of a stable income platform.

Mr. Briese: Thank you. In a world where we're experiencing constantly increasing fuel costs and concerns about the environment, the distillers' grain is a lot closer source than the soybean is, I would take it.

Mr. Bond: Absolutely. You mentioned Minnedosa. That's very, very close as a commodity source. I would expect that will not be the only one in the future. It makes sense to use sources that are close to your livestock production. It just creates efficiencies to make industries more sustainable.

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

I call Karen Tjaden. Karen Tjaden. Okay. Ms. Tjaden's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If she's in the other room, she can bring that to the attention of the Clerk and we will include her.

Waldie Klassen, Manitoba Chicken Producers. Good evening, Mr. Klassen. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Waldie Klassen (Manitoba Chicken Producers): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Waldie Klassen: Thank you. My name is Waldie Klassen. I represent the chicken farmers of Manitoba. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to express some of my concerns on the proposed Bill 17.

Much has already been presented, but the concerns of the farmers have not been addressed. I have had the opportunity to represent the chicken farmers of Manitoba on the producer board for over 30 years, including being on the Chicken Farmers of Canada as a representative of Manitoba. Many things have changed during this period of time, but my time

would not allow me to elaborate on all the changes that have taken place.

As farmers, we have initiated many programs to address the concerns of consumers on food safety and environment on the farms. Chicken producers of Manitoba, as well as producers all across Canada, have developed programs and protocols to improve our facilities and to recognize the impact that it has on the environment. We developed an on-farm food safety program, which also had conditions as they applied to manure disposal, such as placement of manure storage and spreading conditions, including clean zones around all livestock and poultry buildings.

Appropriate nutrient and waste management is the right way to deal with perceived issues, not stop expansion of a successful industry. I'm aware that this hearing is predominantly related to the hog industry, but the legislation is from the environment minister, which could include other sectors. All livestock production must deal with waste management. As farmers, we have incorporated best management practices to deal with these issues. The government has implemented rules as it relates to winter spreading of manure, which farmers have to follow. Manure is used as a fertilizer to build soil nutrients and improve soil conditions.

I tell you this as a background to what is happening on the farm. Poultry producers deal with the same issues. Bill 17 does nothing to improve this situation, and even the Clean Environment Commission report did not suggest that a moratorium would change the situation. Only something based on good science could make any difference. This bill does not recognize good science.

I would like to tell you a story as it would relate to my personal business. My wife and I farmed for over 40 years and lived just east of Steinbach. We raised a family and built a successful poultry farm. We went through difficult times as well as good times. We lost a barn to fire, also a flock of chickens, which were depopulated due to disease. We invested in hog farms to diversify our operation, which proved to be successful. As we now prepare for retirement and have a son taking over the farm, Bill 17 makes the future of good, succession planning more difficult. Will our son be able to follow his dream in building his future on what we have started?

Young, ambitious farmers need the opportunity to expand and make the farm more efficient and to

keep it profitable. In the past, governments have been very supportive in expanding the agricultural base for Manitoba. The future for Manitoba is agriculture and agriculture related. Government lending institutions have been active in promoting young farmers in Manitoba.

Bill 17 is anti-farm, anti-business and anti-rural. Hogs today, but who's next? Bill 17 is not a moratorium; it's a permanent ban and freeze on hog farms. Bill 17 targets hog farmers, and only hog farmers. This is unfair. It discriminates against individuals, families, Hutterite colonies and rural businesses engaged and invested in producing and marketing pigs for food. Bill 17 effectively expropriates future business opportunities, which would otherwise be available to Manitoba citizens. It will have a chilling effect on anyone seeking to engage in converting grains to meat or food. Bill 17 denies Manitoba producers the opportunity to capitalize on knowledge and science as they exist today and as they will undoubtedly evolve in the future.

* (18:40)

It does not embrace science. It rejects it. Bill 17 is not aimed at environmental protection or sustainability. It is not based on real science; it is based on political science. Bill 17 has no connection to the Clean Environment Commission report, which clearly states the industry was sustainable.

Bill 17 was introduced with no consultation, resulting in broken promises by the government that said they could lift the ban after the CEC report. Bill 17 does not do what the government says it will. You could eliminate all hogs from Manitoba, and it would have zero impact on Lake Winnipeg. Farmers would simply replace natural organic manure with inorganic manufactured chemicals, besides banning new farms that have no relation to how manure is managed.

Appropriate nutrient management is the right way to deal with the perceived issue, not a ban on buildings.

I want to thank you this opportunity to express my concerns and anticipate that the government will see the problems that this will create and withdraw the proposed legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Klassen.

I open the floor to questions.

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Klassen, for your presentation today. I do appreciate you coming forward, representing Manitoba Chicken Producers.

You had indicated that there was no consultation. You had indicated that, if it's hogs today, who's next. Your presentation today, I think, should be listened to very carefully by this government and also by the general population.

You indicated that as an active member of your association, you deal with programs and protocols that apply to environmental issues. You work proactively with your producers. Obviously, your concern is that the government has not done this.

You're talking about—the future of good succession planning is in jeopardy. Could you give some examples of how you see that statement unfolding in your community?

Mr. Waldie Klassen: We have a son who is active in our farm and is slowly taking over because you can see, by the colour of my hair, that I might retire sooner or later. I think that he has ambitions to expand the farm and make it more efficient and profitable. In order to do that, we'd have to expand the industry.

We live in an area where the moratorium would be implemented, so that would eliminate the hog possibility to expand the farms that we are already involved in. It also would, I think, in time, jeopardize any expansion in the poultry industry there.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation.

We've heard many supportive groups: the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, the corn growers, the barley producers, a number of organizations that also support that the government withdraw Bill 17.

I know this is poor legislation, but it sends a signal out to the community. What kind of signal, in your feeling, does it send out to the business community and the other sectors that are out there, which may or may not, be affected by Bill 17?

Mr. Waldie Klassen: The area where I come from has a large trucking industry and a large construction industry that has built a lot of barns in the last while. The transportation industry that has developed over the last years is totally livestock-dependent. If you have fewer hogs to haul, there will be fewer trucks to drive on the road. That's the only mode of

transportation which is available to transport hogs and other cattle and livestock as well.

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

Mr. Doug Sisson. Mr. Sisson, do you have any written materials for the committee members? You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Doug Sisson (Private Citizen): My name is Sisson. You had the French pronunciation.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak on Bill 17, this so-called anti-farm bill. I'm not a hog farmer, so I'm not speaking from that perspective. I own and operate a cattle farm and a grain farm with my wife and son.

My concerns are, where is this going to stop? Just with hogs, or do you attack dairy next, or beef cattle, or grain farmers? Why are livestock farmers being singled out when we're one of the smallest contributors to Lake Winnipeg. The environmental report proved that.

Is this because we have the smallest voice, or we have the smaller representation in government? Why are you attacking new operations? Regulations are in place, and, if they aren't, they should be. That would ensure new barns are built state of the art to minimize or eliminate any chance of run-off or water pollution in our waterways. The technology is available to ensure these regulations could be put in place and to further the setbacks from rivers and waterways.

Why is our government ignoring the huge economic potential that agriculture is capable of providing for Manitoba? You can be sure, if we don't feed our hogs here in Manitoba, they'll be fed elsewhere, the United States or Saskatchewan, Alberta, and these jobs and the feed grains and the building supplies, other related businesses, will be diverted there also. In a lot of cases, the run-off, if there's any pollution in it, will end up in Lake Winnipeg anyway.

I'm very much aware of the problems your government faces over the hog issue. I served the Rural Municipality of Dufferin as a councillor and then as a reeve for 20 years. I've dealt with livestock by-laws and development plans. Public hearings brought out a lot of people. Some were very frustrated, very irritated, but there are also people who realize the huge benefit of livestock and

community and of livestock manure, their savings on fertilizer bills.

My understanding is nitrogen is nitrogen and phosphate is phosphate. They provide the same benefits whether they're commercial fertilizer or whether it's hog manure or cattle manure. They both need to be handled properly. They need to be injected or worked into the land quickly to eliminate run-off. We as municipalities and governments in power need to enact regulations to minimize odours and to protect waterways, and I believe people who ignore the regulations should have to face severe consequences.

With the increased cost of commercial fertilizer, livestock manure is becoming more valuable. With huge fuel and gasoline costs in processing and transporting commercial fertilizer, manure is beginning to look more environmentally friendly all the time. Who can afford \$1,500-a-tonne phosphate, and that's the last price I heard for commercial fertilizer.

I was aware of producers who drained their feedlots into rivers and of lagoons that got pumped improperly or run over and effluent ended up in ditches and streams. There's no excuse for this, and we as farmers should not let this happen. That needs to be dealt with, but we should not restrict well-run operations. They're a benefit; they're not a detriment to our province.

Ladies and gentlemen, livestock producers face enough problems with high input costs, U.S. border problems, country-of-origin labelling, low prices and government regulations, but we can deal with these problems and we can deal with the regulations if they're reasonable. The majority of producers run good operations and are very conscientious of our environment. We need reasonable regulations that protect our waterways and at the same time provide the economic benefit our communities need. We don't need governments dictating whether we can farm or not.

One thing we can't deal with is government telling us we can't expand or can't build a barn when the area and the setbacks suggest there's not a problem or governments telling a grain producer that he can't build a hog barn and use his grain in times of low grain prices.

In conclusion, I fear Bill 17 is mostly political and other segments of farming can expect similar

treatment if this bill goes through. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sisson.

Questions?

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much, Mr. Sisson, for your presentation.

Do you feel with the proper regulations in place, as you suggested, that just adhering to those regulations and not hurting the people that do but perhaps regulating the ones that may not, that both the industry and the environment would then be sustainable?

Mr. Sisson: Yes, I think it would.

Mr. Briese: Thank you, Doug. You're from Carman, I think, aren't you? Are you in the moratorium area?

Mr. Sisson: No, we're not.

*(18:50)

Mr. Briese: So your concern is that, even though you're not in the moratorium area, it's a big concern of yours simply because you see it expanding across other parts of the agricultural industry, or other areas of the province?

Mr. Sisson: Yes, I'm concerned about that, but I'm also concerned about the producers in other areas and, you know, they have to make a living, they have to expand and at times build new facilities. It's a concern for the province. That's the way I see it.

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

I call Aaron P. Hofer. Aaron P. Hofer? Mr. Hofer, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk's assistant will distribute them. You may begin when ready.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: I thank you, Mr. Chairperson, for giving us the opportunity, and committee, to talk.

I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to give us the time and the feelings and the fear toward Bill 17. I would briefly like to talk about our past, our current situation and our future as a Hutterite hog producer. At the start of the century, the Canadian government made Manitoba a very suitable province for Hutterite colonies. The Hutterites were invited into Manitoba to make the province more productive,

especially in agriculture and livestock production. In 1918, our colony was one of the first six colonies to settle and establish in Manitoba.

We are located 40 kilometres west of Winnipeg in the municipality of Cartier. Since we have been here, the government has supported us with our way of living and in our livelihood, that is in agriculture. We as Christian farmers have been abiding by the Manitoba government rules and regulations for 90 years. In the past, all barns, shop, houses, school, churches have been built according to the government regulations, requirements and building codes. All hog operations have been engineered and designed by engineering companies located in Manitoba, especially all manure storing facilities.

Currently, as we speak, all Hutterian hog operations in Manitoba are CQA certified, which was required and demanded from the government and packing plants such as Maple Leaf. In the past decades, there have been some issues between the government and the hog producers, but thanks to the very strong industry and support of leadership, all these issues have been dealt with as very professional and have made Manitoba a better province. We all know, every person in this room, that the hog industry in Manitoba is a very sustainable industry and that Bill 17 is a political exercise without any scientific evidence.

I myself and many other current Hutterian hog producers feel that in the past the government has been with us, supported us and helped us, for which we are very thankful, but now Bill 17 being a threat to our future and our children's future, we are looking at it with concern and are already considering some alternatives. We feel that our government is failing us. If the government can put a ban on building hog barns, it can also put a ban on building or expanding churches.

James Valley is one of the first colonies in Manitoba in 1918, and I'm not scared to tell you and the rest of our government that James Valley would be the first to leave Manitoba. Our forefathers have left provinces and countries before to make sure that our children's future is secure and our Christian culture, agriculture and livelihood spiritually and physically.

We as Hutterians have believed in taking the government to court—we don't believe in taking the government to court, or to fight with our own country, Parliament and leaders of our country. Being a hog producer is not easy, and it is most

certainly not for everyone. It's okay to work hard for a living if God grants us the health and peace to do so, but I feel it's not fair that we have to fight with the government for a hard living. The Hutterites do not come to Canada to argue and to challenge government. We came here to help develop the country, and if Manitoba doesn't need us anymore we can always move to a different place or province.

I would like to suggest that if the legislative and government that is in power in Manitoba now, if they don't have an ability, profession, capacity to keep the hog industry in Manitoba sustainable, which it already is, we, as Manitobans, would like to ask those responsible if they could kindly step aside and let somebody else take the responsibility. In biblical times we find that before every king or kingdom crumbled, the king and his administration turned from God and became weak in faith. If God has to part Lake Winnipeg the way God parted the Red Sea to allow every person in Winnipeg to walk through on dry land, would you, as the government, still think that a little algae or phosphate is something that God can't take care of? After all, God created land, water, which includes the ocean, Lake Winnipeg and all the rivers and stream. God is still the same God. I would like to recommend the government should leave the godly things up to God and make sure their actions and decisions are not accredited to them as sin.

I got one more thing I'd like to read here. It's got nothing to do with this. It's out of the book of history of Manitoba for 125 Years. Rural Canada's most famous woman, E. Cora Hind, I don't know if you know her. In 1901, she was very famous. Boots, britches and buckskin, it was the most unusual outfit for a lady in the early 1900s, but by most accounts, E. Cora Hind was the most unusual lady. She was a full participant in what was then a man's business, agriculture and journalism. Cora Hind was a *Manitoba Free Press* agriculture editor, the first woman in North America to attain such status.

She was 21 when she made the move from Ontario to Winnipeg in 1882 in search for opportunities. Cora knew that she had to earn a living, but she was loath to take on the woman's career. Instead, she dreamed of becoming a journalist. *Manitoba Free Press* editor W. F. Luxton made it clear to her the newspaper was no place for a woman. Rebuffed by the paper, Cora had to find some way to support herself. With the stubborn determination that was her definite characteristic, she rendered one of the new typewriting machines and

taught herself how to type. She set herself up first freelance typist in the west. Her typing and stenography service proved to be a stepping stone into the world of agriculture.

Many of her clients were key players in the farm community. She translated that new knowledge into freelance writing. In 1898, eastern experts predicted the western harvest would be a disaster because of an early frost. John Bayne Maclean, a prominent publishing figure asked Cora to do her own survey into western crop. She took the assignment seriously, set off in a horse and a buggy to all the corners of the prairies. Cora forecast a merrily average crop, and sure enough when the harvest came it was average, not disastrous.

*(19:00)

Her prediction impressed the new editor of the *Free Press*, John Wesley Dafoe. In 1901, he hired her as a newspaper agriculturalist editor. Twenty years after she applied, Cora continued doing crop predictions year after year. Cora Hind was right so often, markets would rise and fall depending on her prediction. *The London Morning Post* expressed amazement that was generally found. It would be strange enough to us if a man of great experience could soberly and accurately forecast a crop, but that this faculty would be centered in a woman, this, in some reason, seemed extraordinary.

Her work extended far beyond annual forecast. She became a regular in the stockyards, in the show rinks and in the west, dressed in her mannish, but practical costume. She was a tireless promoter of farming and was often acting more as a participant than an observer. Through her enthusiasm and tireless work, she was accepted in a male-dominant environment. Her contributions were formally acknowledged as an honorary degree from the University of Manitoba in 1935. The *Free Press* awarded her a trip around the world, which she used to send back reports on farming and foreign lands.

At the age of 82, Cora Hind finally submitted to a reluctant retirement. She died of a stroke on October 6, 1942. Obituaries from the *London Times* and *The New York Times* remembered her as Canada's most famous woman.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk, there is a lady that supported agriculture. I was involved in piggeries and worked in it for ten years, 1994 to year 2004, and many occasions, banquets, we heard Ms. Rosann Wowchuk talk. She encouraged us. We're doing the

right things, that there's room for growth and said all the right things. What's happening now? I haven't heard her make a speech or a comment in any of these times. So, like, right now, when we're in trouble, looks like it, she hasn't made a speech that I'm aware of. It's nice to talk when everything's going good, but where are you when things have a chance of going wrong?

Mr. Chairperson: You're at 11 minutes, sir.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: I know. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

I have questions.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thanks, Mr. Hofer, for your presentation. I know it's difficult to come here and speak before the committee, but you've made a very moving presentation. We thank you for that.

I certainly don't want to see you and your colony, or any of the other colonies in the area leave because we recognize what great community citizens that you are.

I guess I would just like you to tell the government what good stewards you are because, where you live, where you farm is also where you drink your water.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: Yeah.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: Sorry. Yes. We have seven wells in and around the yard, within a mile. We inject manure right on top of the land where our well is. My brother, Edward, who first spoke here the other day, he's got his water licence, looks after the water plant. He's in charge of that. We are putting in machines to filter, stabilize—like, who would want to drink poison? We're looking after ourselves and, as far as I can see, we don't look like a bunch of sickos, not yet.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions—oh, Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation.

I noticed your disrespect for the minister for not standing up for the farmers. I'm not sure she's all to blame. She certainly has a certain amount of responsibility when it comes to this bill, standing up for the farmers, in my opinion, but the Premier is sitting at the table. Is there anything that you'd like to say to the Premier (Mr. Doer) while he's sitting at the table? I know he's met with the Manitoba Pork

Producers and the Keystone Ag Producers and he's taken time out of his schedule tonight to be here, so now is your opportunity to address the Premier of this province.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: After listening to the effort that my brother, my two brothers—one's the hog manager; one is in charge of the waterworks and, of all the things, he's been in charge, for six years, of injecting the manure into the ground. It's his job.

Now that Bill 17 came out, we're looking at it. You could almost say, where does this stuff actually materialize from? Who makes it? Who put it on paper? It doesn't make even sense. The person who made it, has he been ever out on a cultivator when it was injecting shit? Or manure? Has he been there? Sorry about that.

Has he ever entered into a what you call a modern-day hog operation? We're building lagoons up to spec, and this is not something that happens for free. This came out of our pocket, out of our monies and everything. I know if you build a Winnipeg arena here or something like that, that's the taxpayer and very nice Izzy Asper that hands over the greenbacks. But when we build a hog operation and stuff like that, that money got earned by sweat.

Who wants to build a hog operation that's a disaster? It's engineered, and in the line of feeding pigs, it's a good profession. We try hard, and as Mr. Bond put it—I don't know if he's involved in the nutrition end of it—we seek the best, and we pay good money for the top nutritionist. This is not something that's a fly by night, fly by the seat of your pants, how to feed a hog. It doesn't work that way.

Now, how does Bill 17 get stopped? Who do I ask actually?

An Honourable Member: Right there. The Premier. He's there.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: I know. How does it get stopped?

Mr. Chairperson: Last question to Mr. Struthers.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation): Thank you very much, Aaron.

To begin with, I think everybody around the table knows that Bill 17 is a piece of legislation that's brought forward by the provincial government as a whole. It is designed to provide a level of protection for Manitoba's water.

I also want to ask you if you know that Rosann Wowchuk has been very instrumental in meeting with Manitoba Pork and working with them to provide programs to help in these times when there is a high dollar and high input costs, impending COOL legislation. Rosann has worked with Manitoba Pork and others to bring forward programs, just recently, this winter and spring. Also she's been the leader at the Agriculture Policy Framework level with the federal government in terms of programs that help farmers.

Has your colony been able to participate in those programs and receive some benefits from them?

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: I can't answer that question because I'm actually not sure. We got all kind of fields; we got a farm boss that does the agriculture of seeding. We all have divisions. Currently, three years ago, I got selected for a different job. In the hog industry, if the question would be what you're asking, like, for the hog industry, got whatever, I don't even know that 'cause I've been out of it for three years.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hofer. Time for this presentation has expired.

Mr. Aaron P. Hofer: You're welcome. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Order. There's to be no crowd participation. The members of the crowd, you will have your opportunity, if you so wish to make your feelings known, at the microphone, but the same rules that apply in the Legislative Chamber apply in the committee room, and that rule is that the crowd is not to participate. So I ask you to bear that in mind, please.

I call Mr. Ken Foster. Good evening, Mr. Foster. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ken Foster (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk's assistant will distribute them. You may begin when ready.

* (19:10)

Mr. Ken Foster: Shall I proceed?

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead.

Mr. Ken Foster: Okay. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak to this committee on a topic that is very near and dear to my heart, the hog industry. I'm not going to talk specifically about

Bill 17, but I want to make some comments about the hog industry in general.

My name is Ken Foster, and I farm at Arborg with my two sons. Our farm was designated a Century Farm in 2003. As a result, we have a gate sign with Minister Rosann Wowchuk's name on it, and I would like it to remain there for quite some time to come.

After 39 years in the hog business, we discontinued production one year ago, due to economic issues mostly. It was a tough decision to make, as you can well imagine after 39 years; however, it was felt we could start up later, if things looked better.

We are truly a family farm production unit and, in terms of size, would be considered small by today's standards. We produced about 2,500 hogs a year when we were at full production. There were a number of issues that had made us reach that decision; the closing of the plant in Winnipeg, the last kill plant, was a part of that.

I have a lot of concern about what has happened here in Manitoba. Back in '95-96, the Manitoba government promoted hog production and many producers, not just the large ones, responded by investing large sums of money into the industry. Now, our federal government has a program which is designed to reduce hog production by buying up sows. As well, we have a provincial government which wants to reduce or restrict hog production.

How is a farmer going to make long-term decisions, based on that kind of leadership?

I personally know family farms which have had to close their operations because of economic conditions facing the industry. Now, they are left with a debt that will be very difficult to service. In many cases, these production facilities have become worth very little, because of legislation which Manitoba is proposing.

Many family farms, including mine, rely on winter spreading and are not able to construct large facilities to hold manure. Our operation is a size and age that it would make little sense to construct a lagoon or a slurry storage. As a result, my barns—with the stroke of a government pen—become worthless, even if they are in reasonably good condition.

I feel this comes as a result of no fault of my own. To date, I have not seen anything to prove that

winter spreading on my farm is contributing to a pollution problem. I have done some experiments on winter spreading, although not that scientific, which would indicate there is very little or no run-off from our spread fields. If someone is interested, they can ask me about that after, in questions.

As a producer, we feel we have acted responsibly in rotating our spread fields and are not adding additional commercial fertilizer to those fields. It should be noted that, on our farm, we have about 10 inches of top soil; under that, we have 30 to 40 feet of heavy clay before we reach limestone. Any suggestion that we may contaminate the aquifer would be foolish.

Now, I am left with a facility that should be worth about \$400,000, which I will have to pay taxes and insurance on. Add to that, if I wanted to sell my farm, it would have very little appeal to a prospective buyer. Would the Manitoba government consider buying my barns?

It is so ironic that this Manitoba government, which pretends to support the family farm, would put in laws that will probably spell the end of the family farm as we know them. Critics of our industry also claim to support the small family farms and, at the same time, they are opposed to winter spreading. Unless we start getting something like \$400 for a market weight hog, this cannot work.

Back in the '90s, I was chairman of Manitoba Pork. As an industry leader, I was in conflict with the Filmon government and Harry Enns, then-Minister of Agriculture. As they moved to dismantle the single-desk selling system, they, as a government, promoted huge hog production. Anybody remember the words Manitoba Pork Advantage. At the same time, I predicted their position would lead to chaos in the industry and, unfortunately, I was right.

As a result of the decisions of the government of that time, we are at a breaking point. For the first time in history, there are no livestock slaughtered in the city of Winnipeg. Hog producers are in horrible financial condition. There is little competition for hogs in Manitoba. Production costs have gone through the roof and facilities have become worthless. Added to that, I know that exports to the U.S. are probably at an all-time high. Are we on the brink of losing the industry? I certainly hope not.

We in the Interlake rely on the livestock industry. As a grain producer, it is important to me to be able to sell my grain to feed mills in Arborg as

rail line service has been discontinued. The large production units have taken a lot of heat from critics of the industry. Whether it was right or wrong to build them, the reality is that they are here in Manitoba. They are in our area. These barns provide a market for much of the grain that we produce.

I should also add that I live within a three mile range of one of those larger production units, and I can say that they have not been bad neighbours. They've been, basically, good neighbours. We work with them and they have not caused me a lot of discomfort.

If the Manitoba government is serious about supporting the family farms, why not allow them to build new facilities? The economics should dictate whether it is feasible or not.

I want to conclude by reminding the committee that farmers have the most important job in the world. Producing food for our growing population is what will sustain life. As you know, there are people around the world starving, and we, as farmers, have a moral obligation to fill that need. Producers who are so dedicated need space to do their job, and they do not need unnecessary regulations to hamper the process.

I know that this government inherited the beginning of a mess from the previous government, but that does not let you off the hook. The Manitoba government must do the right thing and allow the industry time to mend. Farmers are trying to do their job. Please let us do it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Foster.

I open the floor to questions. I have Mr. Struthers.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Ken. Thanks for your advice.

I was interested in the second last paragraph on the first page where you invoke the name of Harry Enns. When I was a rookie, I used to look forward to come into committee and to Estimates to hear some of the things that Harry would come up with. I know you know that one time when he was talking about science and all of the progress in the hog industry, he predicted that hog manure would smell like, I believe, raspberry jam, is what he said at the time.

When the decisions were made to grow the hog industry at that unfettered, historic, unprecedented level, was there any science at the time that said that

that was sustainable? Did they point to any science to allow that kind of growth?

* (19:20)

Mr. Ken Foster: I believe there was a lot of information out there and producers were trying to adjust to the times, I guess.

But my concern at that time was that, yes, we are a suitable place for raising hogs in Manitoba, but at the same time that we were promoting the industry here, other areas of Canada and the U.S. were also doing it. My concern was so much with the independent family farm at the time. As I said, there was a bit of a leadership gap there because right now if you take our area, there are very few, if any, producers like myself left there. In my case, like I said, I have two sons, and I wouldn't have minded to reinvest in the hog industry, but there are too many negatives right now for me to want to do that on my farm.

Here I am, caught between a rock and a hard place. My facilities, if I'm going to comply with the rules that are coming down the road, I'm going to have to build a slurry store or a lagoon because winter spreading they're telling isn't going to go, right?

I can't justify building it for the size of the operation I have now. I can't do this. That's my point. It's very difficult for us. I've been around the grain business and around farming long enough to know that even if we're a little upbeat right now about the grain industry, it may not be there, who knows how long. Things happen, and I guess what is troubling to me is governments changes and governments change their minds.

It was cool around '95, '96 to promote the hog industry. That's the thing to do. We're going to create all this economic growth. Now, the thing is ethanol and biodiesel, and let's forget about the hog industry. I think that's what's happening here. This Bill 17 made me realize for the first time, I heard the news on the radio that the government was going to proceed with this. I heard the news on the radio, and for the first time, I was walking across the yard, I said, you know what? I said to myself, I don't think I'll ever use my barns again. They're worthless. In fact, I'm going through renewing my fire insurance right now. I'm saying to my insurer, I don't know if I even want to pay the premium. Why would I? This barn has become worthless. I couldn't even sell it. Does anybody here want to buy it?

Mr. Struthers: Just quickly, on your 2,500 hog a year operation, I'd like you to tell me if you'd be interested in what the federal Conservative government has come out with. You've mentioned it here about a program to reduce hog production based on economic considerations. Would you consider that any time in the near future?

Mr. Ken Foster: Well, actually, my operation doesn't include sows. It was strictly a feeder operation, so I can't participate. I went out voluntarily, so I am not receiving any benefits of any government programs anywhere.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. Foster, for your presentation.

Earlier there was a presenter who talked about working proactively with producers and looking at ways to support succession planning. Do you have children that are currently working with you, or do you have some examples that you can share from your community where good succession planning would definitely have supported maybe not only yourself, but other producers in your community?

Mr. Ken Foster: I have two sons that farm full-time with me. We have a large sized grain operation and I guess it was their will to farm, and we've made plans for my retirement some day. It will probably come from quite a ways down the road for me.

Mrs. Rowat: Your children, you say, are still in the industry, agriculture sector industry, obviously not in the swine industry any longer. Are they concerned that Bill 17 is maybe a red flag or a concern that the areas that your sons are involved in may be in jeopardy based on Bill 17?

Mr. Ken Foster: Absolutely. We may or we may not go back into hogs, but I would have liked to make that decision or my sons could have made that decision. I don't think it should be the decision of the provincial government to say that I cannot build another barn or expand our operations to help our farm.

The thing I've heard in this room, and I've heard before, is that the provincial government has said there's a large part of Manitoba where you're still welcome to build a hog barn. That's just the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard because it makes no more sense of me picking up and moving everything out of my area to go to western Manitoba. It makes no more sense than moving the Legislature to Virden.

Mr. Chairperson: On that note, thank you for your presentation, Mr. Foster.

Ms. Wowchuk: In the spirit of co-operation that we've had over the last couple of days and the large number of people, caucuses have been opened up for people to have coffee and have some food. I'd like to announce to people here tonight that Room 232 is open for those people, where you can go and have some coffee or have some food while you're waiting. I think we're going to be here for a long night.

Mr. Derkach: It's nice to see that the government has finally come on board. Our caucus room has been open for the last four nights, and we certainly welcome the NDP caucus to the real world in offering their hospitality to the people here as well.

Ms. Wowchuk: We are working in a spirit of co-operation. I don't know whether the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) can find it within him to co-operate but, yes, if he would like to have coffee, he's welcome to. Everybody's is welcome.

Mr. Chairperson: The offer is open to you, too, Mr. Derkach. Thank you. We will move on.

I call Maurice Gagnon. Maurice Gagnon. Mr. Gagnon will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Presenter No. 59, we have—the fellow is from within the city here, but he will be leaving town tomorrow and he asked that he be allowed to speak this evening. What's the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Greg McIvor? This is in order, Mr. Derkach. No. 59.

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

Mr. Greg McIvor (Private Citizen): No, I don't. It's an oral presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. McIvor: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. You have many long evenings. I've been here for a lot of them, waiting my turn.

First, I just want to say a little bit of background in terms of why I'm here presenting. As an Aboriginal person, being put in a situation where, indirectly through legislation, your natural resource harvesting or your living off the land was completely destroyed by legislation to develop electricity on Lake Winnipeg, on the Burntwood River or the Nelson River, we've lost our future. We've lost any

means of practising our traditions, our culture and our heritage.

I think Bill 17 is going to do exactly the same thing. It's no different than what has happened to us the last 30 years in the north. What's really important here is that, I think, this government needs to be honest with the people who they're affecting the most, who they're impacting the most.

I've listen to a lot of the presenters from the hog industry and from other interests. The numbers that they use—for example, there was a gentleman here the other night, talking about the hog industry contributing about \$2.5 billion to the economy—7,500 jobs. Where's the rationale behind that?

Just awhile ago, Minister Struthers said that we've got to do this to prevent pollution of Lake Winnipeg. The studies have shown that it's contributing 1.5 percent in phosphorus and nitrogen to the waterways. Where's the other 98.5 percent coming from?

* (19:30)

I can tell you that the other 98.5 percent is coming from the operation of the Lake Winnipeg Regulation project because, when you slow the water at the north end, you back that water all the way down to The Narrows, Manigotagan and Black Island. That's why you have people in Gimli screaming about shoreline erosion because the natural flow is north, south to north. So what you create is a bathtub effect, and the example I'm going to use here is, we live in Winnipeg, and you hear the Winnipeg environmental officer coming out this time of the year saying, you know, clear all your standing water because that's what's going to harvest mosquitoes. It's going to create all kinds of pollutions and bacteria, so when you slow the water in Lake Winnipeg, and you back that water up, and you artificially flood the shorelines and you push the water, the tributaries, like Belanger River, Berens River, Poplar River, Manigotagan River, Warpath River, Fisher, when you back that water up and then you open Jenpeg, you have a bathtub effect that sucks everything down the Nelson River, but in the meantime, that accelerates the growth of the algae at Lake Winnipeg. Like the old fella said here earlier, that's why you got shit at the bottom of Grand Beach and Patricia Beach.

Mr. Chairperson: Order.

Mr. McIvor: I mean, that's why it's there.

Mr. Chairperson: Sir, order. We'd like to keep profanity out of the presentations, so I ask you to be a little more selective with your choice of words.

Mr. McIvor: Well, you know what, I'd like to keep profanity out of Lake Winnipeg, too, 'cause that's what you guys are doing. You know, that lake has been proven to contain huge amounts of phosphorus and nitrogen, and it's not from hog barns. You got to look at all the contributing factors to that. You talk to those elders and those trappers along the east side. There is, I mean, they can tell you about how they lost their trapping industry to artificial flooding from the lake. They get these reports right around the lake on the west side, the east side, from Manitoba Hydro saying it's 'cause of wind and wave action. So the wind must be generating from the middle of the lake to push everything east, west, north and south, so where else is it coming from?

I think that, you know, those millions of dollars that you're committing to study Lake Winnipeg should be extended to study the cumulative effects of the Lake Winnipeg regulation project. There was a study released in 1996 where one of our scientists here in Manitoba from the Freshwater Institute, Dr. John Rudd, along with other international scientists in two studies—one in '96, one in 2000—that declared the Grand Rapids Forebay at Cedar Lake, the equivalent of a greenhouse gas or a coal-burning generating station. The same applied to the Notigi Reservoir, which is what we call the Churchill River diversion. I mean, those two studies are available. How come they haven't been included in this assessment or analysis on the impacts or what's affecting Lake Winnipeg?

I mean, you can have those guys boating all over to all 23 markers on the lake, but unless you're willing to look outside of the shorelines, you're going to be shutting down not only these folks, you'd be shutting down a lot more people, but it's not going to do any justice to Manitobans because you're contributing more in greenhouse gas emissions with the continuation of projects that aren't being given the proper due diligence.

We know what it's like to have nothing in our communities. That's why 70,000 of us live here in the city. You've taken away our economies. You've destroyed our families. We don't have any jobs. We've got no income, so how do you expect people to survive when you take away the foundation of who they are? That's what you're doing with Bill 17, is you're stripping these people of everything they've

known, why they continued up until the announcement this spring on a moratorium.

I think that's wrong because you're using information that doesn't exist. It's artificial information. It's affecting real people, real communities. You know, you've got to live in the real world. Like, this is where we are. If we don't work together on solving these issues and looking at how we can do progress that is not going to impede or affect how we live our lives because of the varying backgrounds that we have, I mean, why should we have to challenge that? Nobody's against progress. Nobody's against hydro development. So why are we against the hog industry?

There's a lot of information that exists that the minister could have used or at least reviewed before making this decision. You know, this Cabinet should have taken into consideration all of that material. It's not an easy thing to not be able to tell your son, I don't know if you're going to have a future in hog. I know my son understands that he'll never go trapping. He can go through the motions, but he's not going to go trapping. He's not going to go fishing.

You look at Lake Winnipeg right now, the fishing industry there. We were the first ones on the lake but now we hold less than 20 percent of the licences on the lake, commercial licences. How does that happen in a free and democratic society? What you guys are doing here is undemocratic, not only in the hog industry but in hydro development. A lot of what you guys are doing, you guys don't even understand, but it affects people like my family, and we've lived off this for generations. We still feel the effects today.

They change day to day. It's not, well, you destroyed this 30 years ago because you built this project. It happens today. There are still environmental impacts and effects to our community on a daily basis from decisions you made 30 years ago. The longer you ignore that, the more money you're going to be spending trying to satisfy or to at least address the justice issues, the youth issues, the gangs, the violence, the child welfare issues here in this city.

Poor Sam Katz doesn't even know which way to turn. He's spending so much money on car thefts and ankle bracelets and everything else to try and figure out what the hell's going on in this community, but it's because of legislation that has no foundation that's creating the problems. I think that there has to be some real serious consideration brought to the

table and review this bill to support this hog industry and these people—

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

Mr. McIvor: —so that we don't end up in the same situation, or they don't. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you, Mr. McIvor. Thank you for that presentation.

You know, I've been in this business for 23 years, 22 years, and there have been few times when I have heard presentations where the entire paradigm has shifted in terms of how you view a situation. It actually causes some goose bumps on your skin to realize how an issue has been ignored, whether deliberately or not. The concept that you explained here tonight about Lake Winnipeg is one that I've heard about four or five times now expressed to me by Aboriginal people who understand.

I'm not going to pretend to say that I understand the concepts, but I do understand from having talked to some elders back as far as 1988 in the floods and fires of this province in that year when we were moving people out of the north to get away from the fires. In talking to some of the elders at that time, senior residents of the north who told me that their livelihoods were basically destroyed because they couldn't get from one side of the river to the other side of the river after the dams were built to sustain their livelihoods and to trap and to continue their way of life. That just upset the entire culture of their community and their entire livelihoods, and yet we in the south really paid very little attention to that and didn't give it the kind of understanding that it should have had.

* (19:40)

Tonight you presented something here that I think has to stop each and every one of us to think about what it is we are doing and how we are impacting on people's lives. It is people like you that need to not only say this once when you're before a committee like this, but, indeed, I think, you need to repeat it to politicians when you meet them because the decisions we make, sometimes, do ignore some of the very important aspects that impact on people's lives like yours.

I'm wondering whether you have had the opportunity to talk to the government of the day and

to express this kind of sentiment that you did here tonight to them?

Mr. McIvor: I had one opportunity to—not to speak directly to this government, but I was awarded, you know, as a representative of a trapline in the north, the first ever appeal to Cabinet in the history of hydro development. That was on September 29, 2006. I received notice on August 15 of 2007 that the order was dismissed, but that presentation contained a lot of information that I just communicated to you guys today.

Mr. Derkach: Do you have that presentation in written form?

Mr. McIvor: Being a trapper and not that—like, I've created a lot of the materials, but I incorporate not only traditional knowledge through oral presentation using new satellite imagery, new technology, aerial recognizance video—I can show you the environment that exists up around the Notigi Reservoir and that area south of the proposed Wuskwatim dam or the Wuskwatim dam and other areas in the province that carry similar characteristics that this government should be aware of and the opposition should be aware of, as well, because it's going to affect the future of Manitoba.

Mr. Derkach: Well, sir, if you have it in any type of written form, or if you'd be prepared to meet with members of the Legislature, I'm one who would be more than pleased to sit down with you. I know my colleague, the Member for Minnedosa (Mrs. Rowat), would certainly appreciate that opportunity as well, because every day is an education process, and I think that we need to know more about the kinds of things that you spoke about here tonight.

Mr. McIvor: Sure, I'd be more than happy to meet with anybody in the room to view this presentation—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. McIvor, sorry.

Mr. McIvor: Yes, I'd be more than happy to meet with anybody in the room or a committee of all parties or anybody to view this presentation at their convenience.

Mr. Chairperson: Briefly, Mrs. Rowat.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. McIvor, for your presentation.

You spoke about a number of things, but one presenter earlier said the future of good succession planning is in jeopardy by presenting Bill 17. Can you give me your take on a statement such as that?

Mr. McIvor: Yes, Mrs. Rowat, you know, when we talked about—like, I grew up in the bush working on the trapline and learning how to survive. I mean, my graduation certificate was being able to survive in the bush and trapping because that's what we did; that's what we knew. But I also got an education, which was important, because my grandfather and father said it was important because they knew that this whole environment was going to change, that we could not no longer rely on our practice, our traditions, our culture to carry us forward. That's why education was promoted, and nobody believed that.

You know, what we've managed to do through succession planning, not on our part, but on government and other interest, was we separated our elders, who were the keepers of knowledge, experience, wisdom and education, traditional education. We separated them by using western scientific technology or knowledge, expertise, when it came to developing natural resources. So we lost a lot of that because our elders were not able to pass it down because people discredited them as not understanding or not being aware of—so succession planning was not something that, you know, happened in our communities, because our elders were disenfranchised, miscommunicated, basically, or whatever you call that.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this presentation has expired. I thank you, Mr. McIvor.

Mr. McIvor: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Greg Fehr, mayor, town of Niverville. Mr. Fehr, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Greg Fehr (Town of Niverville): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk's assistant will distribute them. You may begin, sir.

Mr. Fehr: Thank you, and thanks for the opportunity to speak.

I know that, as an urban mayor of Niverville, the fastest growing town in Manitoba, every one of these meetings that I have been attending has been an education, even just this hour that I have been here. So I can imagine some of the information that the committee members have gone through here and how tough some of the choices and decisions that you are going to have to make are.

The primary intent of Bill 17, as presented to us by members of government and via the press, is better stewardship of our environment. I want to take

this opportunity to congratulate members of government for the priority which they've placed on environmental issues and, specifically, our water supply. I do believe this to be important.

I believe that we can all be proud to be Manitobans and proud on the stance on sustainability that has been undertaken. We have become a leader in good stewardship and, although the rewards may not immediately be apparent, I feel that generations in the future will praise the efforts of government today.

Though, with this being said, I am somewhat discouraged by what appears to be a full stop, prior to an attempt to partner with the industry. It has been our community experience—again, as an urban community—that the agricultural friends and neighbours who we have share many of the same mandates and priorities that we do within the town.

In fact, the dependence on the environment and concern for continued sustainability is much more of a direct importance to them than it is to the urban dwellers in many cases. If I am unaware of any efforts to work with the producers and some of the issues at hand, I beg forgiveness but, if there have been none, it would only seem prudent to try to work together first and try to come to a solution.

With this in mind, speaking as both an individual and on behalf of the community and my council who considers themselves very environmentally conscious, I have concerns with a bill that would potentially drive operations beyond our jurisdiction and control and into the hands of leaders who, possibly, do not share the same priorities.

We are blessed in Manitoba with an abundance of rivers and lakes, but we're the main drain for much of western and the northern U.S. as well. Much of the water enters the province, already subject to the influence of people, business and leadership outside the borders. Whether it's the Red River from our southern neighbours or the Assiniboine from the west, waters are challenged before they pass Emerson or Elkhorn.

Bill 17 will not impact the consumption of pork within the world market. It's continuing to rise. The question we must ask ourselves then is: Who will we trust for the management of this industry?

Although some within the province consider the hog industry undesirable—and I understand why—would you prefer to trust this undesirable to a government which is accountable to you, with a

proven track record, or to a government that is unpredictable at best? We can say, Devils Lake.

Although not the best metaphor, consider nuclear waste as a case in point. We may not want it in our backyard, but would we let it lie there for global forces to pick up and utilize, without the control to speak to the priorities and the mandates?

The economic impact, I know, you've heard about from previous presenters as well. I preface this again by suggesting that this cannot be the only factor considered, but it's got to be taken into account.

Looking specifically at Niverville in the southeast region, we have a region of entrepreneurs who have carved a successful living from a region that was very difficult to settle. Through adversity, the French, Mennonites, Scottish, Ukrainian, and other groups which settled—less than choice lands in many cases—found ways to feed their families and create communities. Diversity followed adversity, and livestock became a staple, often out of necessity, to offset poor crop lands and other economic barriers that they had.

To speak to the point that had previously been raised by another presenter—I think it was also in the *Free Press* regarding farmers or industry—I think it's simple semantics. It really doesn't matter; it comes down to people at the end. That's really what we're talking about.

The southeast region has been a significant contributor to the economic and population growth of the province. The communities of Niverville, Steinbach, Hanover, La Broquerie, which do fall into this area under the moratorium, have seen in excess of 20 percent population increase from the 2001 to 2006 census period.

Looking at age demographics, you have some of the youngest population numbers and, as such, this area will be the source of future labour, entrepreneurs and leaders. The hog industry and its interdependent businesses have been dramatically impacted, not only by the actual moratorium on development, but even the mere mention of it. There has been an impact.

* (19:50)

I'm returning to the priority of environmental stewardship, as I do believe that this is the factor which must be given the heaviest weight. With this, I think we need to realize that our agricultural partners

and neighbours are not adversaries but do, indeed, share the same priorities, in most cases. While urbanites may be directly concerned about Mother Earth for their own homes, our ag neighbours, the environment affects their entire lives, their yard site, their home, their work, their family.

The honourable Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) has suggested that there are areas of the province not subject to this bill, as we know, while the producers have stated reasons why these areas are not suitable for investment. Staying on the priority of environmental protection, if we do indeed have an industry that we feel requires monitoring and regulation, would it not be easier to accomplish if this industry is collected in higher density pockets rather than spread throughout the province? Would higher density not also allow us opportunities for future technologies and testing that will reduce the environmental footprint? Currently, I'm aware of a number of biomass companies and other such technologies that are exploring ways, not only for the disposal of the agricultural discharge that's causing some of the nutrient problem, but emissions-free disposal where energy's created and harnessed, actually turning it into an environmental positive, not even just neutral. With the cost of production and testing, it's much more likely to see these technologies employed in a centralized producing area rather than attempting to draw from sources around the province.

It would be mere complaining, I think, if we stood here and just simply raised concerns without presenting a potential solution as I know many of the presenters have. With this thought, I would like to suggest a recommendation that the current legislation be tabled, at least, for a year. Keep the current one, but consult with some of the hog producers in the meantime and look at ways of addressing the 1.5 percent that they are contributing to the nutrient load there. At the same time, we can begin to implement legislation and allocate resources to continue to address the 9 percent of nutrients entering Lake Winnipeg from the city of Winnipeg itself and other municipalities that are also contributors. I feel confident, during consultation with producers, again from my experience with them as neighbours, being an urbanite, that a solution to the collective concerns—and they are collective—could be found.

To conclude, I think that there is a perception that may or may not be valid that the hog industry is low-hanging fruit on the path to better stewardship. To continue with the analogy, the bill in its current

form appears not to pick the fruit, but rather cut off the branch without regard for future harvest, and there's much that can be gained from the industry.

I state again that I believe in, and am proud of, our province's initiative on stewardship, but it's with this bill that we are taking a path that has the potential to curb us in the other direction. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Fehr.

I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Struthers: Yes, thank you very much for your presentation, Greg.

A number of presenters have come before us and while they said they don't agree with the moratorium that's part of Bill 17, they've recognized the fact that there are imbalances, regional imbalances within the province, and many of them look to the southeast part of the province where you're a municipal leader. You've recognized that in your approach here. You tell us that it gives an opportunity to look at technologies to handle those kinds of imbalances. Were you aware that section 40.1(2) of Bill 17 allows for those kinds of exemptions that allows a producer to get into something such as anaerobic digestion, which would then give them an exemption and they can actually then continue to grow their farm operation?

Mr. Fehr: I was not aware of that particular point, but I think what we're talking about here is not only the ability to do it, but also the resource delegation that's going to come with it. Let's face it, there's a ton of licensing and regulation. As I'm aware, I believe members of government have already had a look at some of these technologies. We know that it takes a long time to get through all the processes, but putting some of the energies and efforts toward that as well. I just don't know if there's been enough consultation with the producers.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Mr. Struthers.

Mr. Struthers: Yeah, I couldn't agree more. I know many of those kinds of technologies are very expensive.

We have met with Manitoba Pork over a number of times over the last couple of years to talk about transition funds. We've set aside \$2.5 million in a budget which is, the Agriculture Minister and I have described as a first step.

So, would you support us in at least that part of what we're looking at through Bill 17?

Mr. Fehr: I think that's an excellent step, putting the monies toward it again, and very much supporting the direction that we're trying to take with government here. I don't think anybody in the room, any of these producers, would disagree with that. Again, we're not adversaries here. I think that we all have the same mandate. When you sit down with two people, whether they disagree or not, but if they have the same mandate and the same goals, you're going to come to an acceptable conclusion.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): It's good to see a rural community growing.

Just two points I'd like you to comment on. One, in terms of Niverville, to what extent the growth in the community has any relation at all to the hog industry. And, second, we've had a number of producers who've been concerned about lagoons, from municipal lagoons. Maybe you can tell us a little bit about the treatment of the sewage and water from Niverville.

Mr. Fehr: Well, hoping, with the lagoon, you're not asking me to shoot myself in the foot, here. The first question regarding the growth of Niverville directly related to the hog industry. It's a community founded on agriculture, as many of the small communities are. The southeast doesn't have the market on that, for sure. Niverville, with one of its main employers being Puratone, which I believe Ab Freig was one of the presenters on Friday night, there is significant history on the building of the community and continued employment from the hog industry. Every single thing, as we know, any economist will tell you, everything is interdependent, so everything is fuelled off the growth and the success of the southeast region which does depend, to a large extent, on the hog industry. We've become one of the main centres within the southeast and, as such, we are quite dependent on that.

Now, in regard to lagoons. We were fortunate enough through partnership with this government, as well as the federal government, to see a new lagoon. That, actually, just had the proverbial tap turned on within the last month. New lagoon, seepage has disappeared. Again, because of our environmental focus, we were really, really happy about it. It did allow us to take care of some growth as well. There is still, at the end of the day, let's face it, these are passive lagoons. Is there some nutrient load coming off of them? Probably there is. I say this with a certain amount of hesitance, as a municipal councillor, knowing the cost of infrastructure. But

we all know, as well, that there are contributing factors from the people that need to be addressed, and that is on the agenda as well.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much, Mr. Fehr, for your presentation. I like your analogy on the hog industry as the low-hanging fruit.

I'll just ask you, following along with your analogy, what other branches or supporting industries will suffer in your community? What's going to happen next?

Mr. Fehr: I think we're fortunate enough, and I'm going to say this, I hate to depend on this, but I think that there's a certain amount of tenacity when you get to the rural people, in general, and especially in southeast, whether that's adversity that's followed them, again, as I mentioned. Much of southeast got into livestock, particularly, because there were adverse conditions. They tried breaking the soil, it didn't work. There were rocks every three inches. You just couldn't work it. So livestock became a natural thing. Many of the settlers, the racial groups that we see within southeast, normally didn't do livestock until they came here.

What's going to suffer? It's really hard to say. We have some advantages of a strong economy within southeast already. I just wanted to make a fair answer to your question. There will be some changes required. There will be some short-term hurt. But I believe in the people in southeast and I believe that, call it tenacity or stubbornness, whatever you want to, they will find something else to do, much like they found livestock many years ago.

Mr. Chairperson: No further questions? I thank you for your presentation, Mr. Fehr.

Mr. Fehr: Thank you.

* (20:00)

Mr. Chairperson: I have a request. Presenter No. 214 has small children out of town. Is it the will of the committee that we hear this person now? *[Agreed]*

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

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

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Scott Penner: I'm Scott Penner. I'm the president of Pioneer Meat. We work out of Altona, Manitoba. Pioneer Meat has been around for quite

some time, 40 years to be exact, and over those 40 years, Pioneer Meat has made some real solid relationships with the producers that will be negatively affected by Bill 17. With these producers, over the years we've been able to carve out a niche that has enabled us and the companies that we supply to deal with and to compete against the big food companies.

Now, by taking our supply away, I don't know what tomorrow's going to look like. I think, with Bill 17, Bill 17 tells me carve out another niche. Easy. Yet Pioneer Meat is not a big company, and we have under 20 staff, but then when we look at how many people we employ, how many mouths that feeds, we're looking at just over 50. When we look at the companies that we sell to, now we're looking at several hundred mouths that are fed.

I don't know how easy it is to carve out another niche. Maybe with Bill 17, we're looking at a porkless pork sausage. Maybe we can call it the NDP porkless pork sausage. I'm anxious to start that packaging tomorrow; I'm hoping that I don't have to.

If we look at what happens to companies, producers, anyone who's asked to stand still over a period of 10 years, I think what happens then is stagnant, redundancy, and I don't know of anyone who can profit or prosper from redundancy. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Penner.

Questions.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. Penner, and thank you for attending tonight. I have small children, and I think it's important that you do bring your family to observe and to gain an understanding of the presentations that are taking place, understanding the importance of the presenters tonight and the fight to kill Bill 17.

You spoke about the employment numbers and talking about how this benefits your community. You had indicated that you have 50 people that work with the company that you're associated with?

Mr. Scott Penner: No. Our company employs just under 20. When I look at the family members, then I'm looking at over 50.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you for clarification, Mr. Penner.

I come from the community of Souris, and I do know that we have barns in our region and our R.M.

near my community, and looking at 20 people, when we were looking at getting a feed mill in our community, we looked at employing 20 people, or 25 people. Then we looked at the families that our community would benefit from, and 20 people employed with a company would generate, I would say, one teacher within our community.

Can you give me a little bit of a perspective on what you see happening in your community, what benefit you have in your community in that aspect, the schools, the services such as the hospital and that type of thing?

Mr. Scott Penner: With any industry, with any business, we bring money into the community, and we're able to address many different situations just by bringing in—small communities die off once we get rid of those small companies.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you, Mr. Penner.

I didn't mean to put you on the spot, but what I was trying to get at is that, when you have people that are going to come into an employment opportunity, there may be the children that'll build on the schools, individuals will come, and their partners will provide expertise or professional services, so you'd be looking at having individuals, who may be a teacher, or may be a nurse.

So, I'm just wanting to know if you can give me some examples within your company how your employees have been able to offset some of the supports within a community, so that the community doesn't remain stagnant, but it does actually grow and prosper, and does grow and prosper with the enhancement of professionals within the community.

Mr. Scott Penner: Okay, well, as far as spouses connected to the employees of Pioneer Meat, we do have some teachers; we do have some that are nurses. We do have some who are employed on their own. Yes, it definitely affects many people. If our employees are no longer our employees they will either leave the community or they'll have to find employment elsewhere.

Mrs. Rowat: So, with the moratorium, are you possibly facing a situation where your company will not be able to continue to employ the 20 people?

Mr. Scott Penner: Definitely, we are. We rely on these producers very heavily, and if these producers aren't there it's not that easy to look elsewhere. Everybody's under contract. Everybody's got their own relationships that they take care of. I don't know

if I can easily look into a new region and start pulling in the numbers that we need.

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

Mr. Scott Penner: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Gordon Dyck, No. 61. Mr. Dyck, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Gordon Dyck (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Dyck: My name is Gordon Dyck. I'm a building contractor. I've worked in the ag business for 25 years, even a little bit longer. I've owned a business for 25 years. My concern here is employment. In the earlier years, when we first started off, winters were lean. We never had enough work for everybody. Guys got laid-off every four months. If we could get eight months, that was a good year.

In the mid-'90s, '94 was our turn around. We had the opportunity to keep everybody employed full time. There was still the bit odd here and there but we can thank the hog industry. Some of the people are here. They would pay the heating bills to keep the barns warm. We could work inside, pour concrete. It was fantastic.

Right now I have 15 employees. All have families, lots of kids. When they hear about the moratorium their first question is, well, what are we going to do? I said, well, you know what, luckily I'm not a farmer. I can change. I have the ability to buy different equipment, go into different fields. Unfortunately for the hog farmer, he's got millions, tens of millions invested. He doesn't have that opportunity. He cannot change. It concerns me because without change, there's no growth. Without growth, you go backwards. It's just a matter of time.

An example on employment, in 2000, I moved to Killarney. I took a couple of guys with me. We went and built a bunch of barns out there. We were sent there for three years. When we were done, we had created about 45 direct jobs in the barns which does not include any spinoff or anything like that.

The first year I was there, I'm trying to find a place. Well, everybody was old. There was no young people around and I'm going, where is everybody? Where are the young kids? Well, they move away. Where do they go? Well, they go to Winnipeg,

Brandon or Fort MacMurray and work on the rigs. I never anticipated that.

By the second year, word was out that I was hiring. I was living there, and we started with a younger crew and production picked up a little bit. We were there for three years. When I moved there, there were 60 vacant houses. When I left about four years after that, a lot of those were sold. Kids were staying there. They had jobs. They wanted to stay there. Before that they had no place to go. All the grain farmers are getting bigger. They're getting bigger tractors. They need less employees. I think it was a real good thing for the area.

* (20:10)

I know the first day I drove out there with a real estate agent. I was sitting in her car. There was myself and a couple of my employees, and she goes, so what brings you to town? I said, well, we're going to build some barns here. She gave me a scowling look, and she goes, is that good? I said, well, if we all buy a house, it probably wouldn't be a bad day for you. Needless to say, when we sold our houses, she didn't sell them. We got somebody else that was actually supporting us.

With this Bill 17, the negative effect it's going to have, you know what? Right now, we're not going to see it. The economy is booming. You can't get enough employees. Today, it's a non-issue. What's going to happen in five years from now when the commercial stuff is done? Or look at it another way. Are commercial people going to want to move to Manitoba?

At one point, we have a government that's supporting OlyWest, and then, in the next breath, they're saying no, and a breath later, they're saying no more hogs. So what kind of industry actually wants to move to Manitoba and set up shop when they don't even know if they're going to be wanted in a year or two or five from now? You know, we're not, like, I'm not—I'm just looking at common sense and I think some common sense should be used in this bill. If there was actually some evidence that it was polluting the lakes more than anybody else, okay, let's address it.

In the 25 years I've been in business, I've built barns. The first one that I ever worked on is still standing. It's not in operation right now. We build lagoons. We do flurry tanks. The specs have become huge, but we do it. The government has regulations, we do it. I think the government, if they would think

about it, set aside a standard and let people go by that standard instead of stopping it. Stopping is not the solution here.

The farmers I work for, they're all conscientious. They're environmentalists. They care about the land. The way the government makes it sound that they're all bunch of idiots. It's not the case. It just doesn't make any sense to me. Myself, I'm not concerned about myself because I can change. I'm concerned about the family farm, the corporate farm, the livelihood. That's what I have to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Dyck.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Dyck.

I notice that some of the members around the table are on their BlackBerrys, but I'm finding the presentation that you're, you know, sharing today very interesting. I think it is important to share and to put on the record exactly what you've been talking about is a concern for all of us here.

You had said you worked in Killarney putting up barns and other infrastructure, and talked about employment challenges. I live near Killarney, so I do know that they did some excellent work in employment-skill strategies in trying to identify opportunities for the youth and try to keep them in the community, worked with the schools and helped them get into the positions within the community and the region. I think that you've struck on something that is important and, I think, that people have to be aware of is that we have to break the trend of getting the kids—keeping the kids in the communities, or break the trend of them leaving the communities.

I think when you came in and provided an opportunity for those young people to stay in a community to gain employment to learn some skills, this moratorium is sending a message, because what it's doing is taking away the hard work that the community has done in trying to create employment and skill opportunities for those young people, taking away the opportunity for you to continue to do business and to create opportunities for people to stay in Manitoba and, I think, ultimately, it's destroying families and farms, et cetera.

So I think that I'd like you to comment on the importance of working with a community like Killarney who worked with you to try to find the youth to take the jobs such as you were offering, and creating a passion for them to stay in the community and having some ownership within their own

community, and how this moratorium message and Bill 17 is going to destroy that for some of the communities in Manitoba.

Mr. Dyck: Back to the employment from Killarney. Right now, I still have two people employed that live in Killarney. They work for me. I'm living in Steinbach. There isn't a lot of barn construction going on there right now. It's not that they're in that zone, but the message is out, right? So are people going to invest money into something that may not be viable, right? I know the people out there. So we have two guys right now who still work for me. I pay their room and board wherever we work because I can't get enough people out here. That will change one day, in a couple of years, when things slow down. It will all level out, and then it will go in the opposite direction. But we are dealing with today as we have to.

The people of Killarney, they were good. They helped out. I dealt with a lot of the parents. They'd call me up and try to get their kids working, and stuff like that. Some worked out. Some didn't. But that's anywhere.

Mr. Briese: Thank you, Mr. Dyck, for your presentation.

The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) has been trying, over several days of these hearings, to suggest that the advent of the large barns, the large hog operations has somehow led to the decline of rural population. Would you give me what your view was or is as an employer of several people in your company, your view of what the moratorium that's proposed in Bill 17 might do to population numbers, and, specifically, young population numbers in the areas that are under moratorium.

Mr. Dyck: Back to that. The last census showed that the biggest population growth was where there were large hog operations. That was the biggest growth area.

What's going to happen? It's going to be a slow deterioration. Hopefully—people can change. They can change their business. I think some things will continue to sustain; the hog industry, no.

The trucking that goes behind it, in Steinbach, there are two companies that are in the trucking business. I don't know how many trucks they have. They have a hundred or two hundred trucks each. It's huge. The veterinarian clinics, the spinoff is huge. Yes, that will be gone, slowly.

Keeping the kids around? I don't think it will happen. Steinbach, I think, is a little bit ahead already. They're more established. They are a bit more diversified. But, in western Manitoba, nothing against western Manitoba, it's just it is hard to get people to stay. It's hard to bring people into a community where the schools are gone, the hospitals are gone.

You bring in a couple of big barns, it employs people. Things pick up. Boissevain was one town that said no, and every time I drove through there I had to choose a different gas station because the last one was closed.

You can see it in the communities.

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

Mr. Dyck: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. James Cotton. James Cotton. Mr. Cotton's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

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

Mr. Harold Foster, the R.M. of Bifrost. Good evening, Mr. Foster. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Harold Foster (Rural Municipality of Bifrost): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Harold Foster: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to talk about economic development in our municipality and in our area and the effort that we put into it. We have two community development corporations. We have the Interlake Development Corporation and we have a Community Futures corporation. These are rural people. Most of their work is volunteer. They work very hard to keep young people in the community and keep jobs in the community. In the last census we were one of the few communities that expanded our population.

* (20:20)

By limiting livestock development, you are limiting jobs in feed mills, packing plants, which we now have one major one due to previous government interference, also transportation, farm jobs and small manufacturing. We have a local manufacturer who manufactures hog feeders, stainless steel and various other equipment for hog facilities. So, I guess, to

sum up that portion of it, we spend a lot of time, we put in a lot of effort to keep our young people in the community and stop our communities from being ghost towns. It seems that this government will destroy a lot of those efforts by passing Bill 17.

In fact, maybe I'll expand on the Lake Winnipeg basin, which consists of partial parts of five states and parts of five provinces and, actually, most of three states and most of three provinces. If in fact you stop expansion of hog barns in our area, and basically we're talking here about the larger barns like the Puratone company, the Landmark, those people, and I guess a lot of Maple Leaf, they're not going to sit on their laurels and say nothing's going to happen. They're going to move to Saskatchewan, they're going to move to North Dakota, and the jobs will go there as well, and we will get the waste because it'll come floating down the rivers into Lake Winnipeg.

Today, you talk about limiting the expansion of hog barns. Tomorrow, will it be cattle and chickens? After all, their manure is also spread upon the land, and I don't like to point fingers at other places where pollution occurs; however, today the finger is being pointed at the hog industry, so I want to address what I think is the real source of pollution in surface and ground water, and also in Lake Winnipeg. That source is human waste. While hog manure is spread upon the land, human waste is stored in lagoons and then released in rivers and streams so it can flow into Lake Winnipeg. The hog lagoons sit with their effluent in over the summer and the sun deteriorates some of it, as it does with lagoons for towns and villages and cities. Therefore, why is it that we think the hog effluent is more harmful than people effluent?

There is a fallacy, this effluent that comes from the lagoons after they've been approved for release by some inspectors, that this is clean effluent. This effluent only has to reach a minimum of 200 parts per million of bacteria and, of course, hold nutrients the same as any other effluent. When there's a storm, raw sewage is discharged into our rivers in a number of cities, towns and villages. This is basically because of the wrong design of the sewer systems where the storm water goes into the same pipe as the waste water and overflows the system.

I want to talk about some of my experience with our conservation district. I share the East Interlake Conservation District and also the Manitoba Conservation Districts Association. In our

conservation, we test the water quality in eight rivers and streams from north of Riverton to the north perimeter of Winnipeg. Six of those streams have consistently been tested with scores of 75 or better, and there's a formula for coming up with this score, 100 being absolutely clean. The closest streams of the north perimeter has a test score of 40. The next stream north of that has a test of approximately 60. These streams have large residential areas adjacent to them. The six northerly streams flow through agricultural areas. The one stream in particular that's closest to the north perimeter, we have tested it both east of No. 8 highway, where it has only another mile and a half to go to the Red River, and we have tested west of No. 8 highway. The major part of the pollution that we found there was added in east of No. 8 highway and this is where there are large residences with septic fields and holding tanks and perhaps somebody had a shotgun. I don't know, but we will find out.

We've had more and more intrusions by residences into agricultural land. Along with this intrusion comes concerns of smell, dust, traffic, noise and other things. Unfortunately, some of this is necessary in the production of food, so people have choices to make. If they want food made in Canada, some tolerance is necessary. The other choice is to pay more for imports, and if you think you won't, check the price of head lettuce in your store in January. The hog industry is the most scrutinized of all agricultural operations and therefore probably the most well managed, and we should be able to raise hogs in a sustainable manner.

This bill talks about expansion. The latest expansions have been done with building lagoons that are reaching very high standards. I guess 20 years ago some of the lagoons didn't meet those standards and that's unfortunate, but in the expansion phase where we are now, or should be, these lagoons are built to a standard. They are built with, and need and require a specific density of clay underneath them. They also have bentonite liners and everything that goes along with it. They are required to test their soil prior to spreading their manure or injecting the manure up on the land. They are also required to test that soil after to find out how close they came in their applications.

As a part of the conservation district, we are very concerned about clean water. We believe that we have to have it. We all have children. We need to leave this country in a form that they can live in. But there are ways of doing that. We are into studies on

buffer stripping and all kinds of ways to try and keep these nutrients on the land. Trust me, when you start paying \$1,380 for a tonne of fertilizer, farmers are going to find ways to keep it on the land. We are proposing that there must be—there has to be ways of making this work and keeping the industry. With that, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Foster.

Questions.

Mr. Briese: Thank you, Harold. I know a little bit of your background.

The question that I want to ask you is around the issue of the rules and regulations we have already in place, the manure storage and mortalities, the technical review committees, the development plans in our municipalities and planning districts, the zoning by-laws. With all those things in place, do you think there were enough tools there already to deal with the expanding livestock industry without putting the moratorium in place on the hog barns?

Mr. Harold Foster: I would believe that there are enough things in place. However, if there aren't, let's put the things in place that are necessary but let's allow people to keep on farming. My latest information on the content or the contribution to nutrients in Lake Winnipeg by the hog industry is 1.5 percent of the phosphorus. So, if you eliminate all the hogs in Manitoba, you drop the phosphorus by 1.5 percent. Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board says we have to drop it by 10. So what have we accomplished? As I said before, if we move these farms across the border, we only export the jobs and the profit, and we get the waste.

Mr. Gerrard: Thanks, Harold. Thanks for coming down and talking about the situation in the Interlake.

You're one of the few who've done some measurements on streams and had a look at where the pollution is coming from. I think it's very interesting that the worst areas, what I'm hearing, are in the areas where there were residential areas in the Interlake. When you were reporting the 40 and 60 and so on, is that E. coli numbers, or is that phosphorus, or what? Maybe you can continue and give us the comparative numbers for the four northern streams which are in the agricultural areas just so that we can get a picture of how they compare.

* (20:30)

Mr. Harold Foster: As I understand it, the score is derived from a formula which takes all those things into consideration. When you get up to 75, 80 percent, it's considered that that stream is fairly healthy. We also do invertebrate tests. Invertebrates are frogs and crayfish and all those things that live in the bottom of the stream, and, depending on what kind of invertebrate lives in the stream, that tells us what the problems are with that stream or the health of that stream.

We have tested the Washow river, the Icelandic River, Netley Creek, Wavy Creek. They all come out of agricultural land and they're all coming in at acceptable levels, whereas the next two south are not. It is our intention this summer, once the water comes down to a certain level, to explore those two streams to try to find out exactly where that is coming from.

Some of you may be aware that we're also working with Water Stewardship. We've closed five sinkholes in one drain; those sinkholes, there were five in a row. They were still open when the spring run-off went and it never got past the first one, because the first one managed to handle it all.

Those sinkholes are direct openings to the aquifer. They've all, since then, been sealed. It was an emergency to seal them, because one of the town lagoons had to be emptied.

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

Mr. Harold Foster: Thank you for hearing me this evening.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Ed Peters. Mr. Peters, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Ed Peters (Private Citizen): No.

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

Mr. Ed Peters: Thank you for giving us an opportunity to speak to this committee. My name's Ed Peters. I graduated from the University of Manitoba School of Agriculture in 1975 and came back to the family farm an awfully wise person. It was a time when flax had hit \$13 a bushel. My Aggie friends were buying Camaros and airplanes, and I was going back to a dairy and hog farm.

I had done the budget. If we had sold our cattle and our hogs that year, we would have made \$10,000 more and I could have been curling or something in winter. My dad said, just wait.

So I ask this Legislature also to think—there are times when we look at industries, such as biofuel and grain which are the golden jewels of today, but just wait. The hogs may be, once again, the thing that keeps the economy going in Manitoba.

I'm part of an independent family farm; we farm northwest of Steinbach. To just give you a bit of background, I'm the youngest of the old guys. That tells you how old the other guys might be. My father came from Russia in 1924. Their family had made a decision that the decisions which the government was making at that time would not allow for them to be able to live there, and they came over here and have had a really good crack at it.

In 1975, after my graduation, I joined the farm with the three brothers who were already there. At this point now in our extended farm, we have six nephews as well; so there are 10 of us. Five of us live right on our own farms and our own farmyards, so we care deeply about drinking water, the environment, et cetera.

We farm 3,600 acres. We have 4,000 sows and finish about 65,000 hogs a year. That sounds like a largish farm but, when you break it down to 10 families, there are 400 sows and 360 acres of land each. On top of that, we employ 14 full-time people; that's another 14 families. Now, we're down to 166 sows and 100 acres per family that we feed, so we have to be efficient.

We've always adopted new technology in manure application and that was the point of this Bill 17. We've been ahead of provincial guidelines in many cases and for a long time.

Just to give you a brief history of our manure application methods, when we started, we would spread with a—I guess earlier than that, before my time—was the horse and the manure sled. We did manure spreading; we did a honey wagon, like with slurry spreading. Lots of it was done in winter, because that's the way it was. It wasn't ideal; we know that.

With the opportunity to have larger, more intensive farms, it also gave us the opportunity to build facilities that allowed us to not do that. We went from the slurry wagon to the travelling gun, which sort of spreads the manure in the air sort of on different areas of the field, and the neighbours seven miles down the road smelled it. Since then, in 1995 we began injecting our manure at the four-inch level

and our neighbours have never opposed any of our hog expansion attempts since then.

We're a world apart from the days when we winter spread on snow and could see it leaving the fields in the spring run-off. This is an organic product that has improved our soil immensely. We believe that so strongly that we spent as much as \$200 an acre to move the manure four miles rather than use commercial fertilizer at half the cost. We go to great lengths not to waste it because of its value. In fact, we, this last fall made a \$65,000 renovation to one of our storage facilities in order to give us a more environmentally friendly storage and a longer storage so that we can make better use of our product on our land. The hardest part was actually getting the permit from the government to make this improvement.

We soil test our fields every year. I have records from 1988 on. We've been involved in deep soil sampling in our area to make sure that the nitrogen hasn't leached down, and so we do try. Our soil organic matter has increased from 3.5 percent to 5.5 percent. We began expanding in 1994 to give our children a chance to farm. So that's why we have concerns about a legislated moratorium for the future of the family farm. We use our manure as a resource not as a pollutant. In our area we still have 2,500 acres within two miles of our hog barns that have not had manure in the last 10 years, and substantially more if you go into a three-mile radius.

The other day one of the speakers from the Hog Watch, in his presentation, suggested that we should turn back the clock regarding livestock production to save the environment, and a romanticized albeit unrealistic way of life. I have thought about the irony of that comment, especially in light of the fact that he asked to be put on the program earlier so he could catch a plane somewhere. So the thought of turning back the clock and being so concerned about the environment is always easier if it's aimed at someone else.

I would encourage the minister to consider where he is aiming when fixing Lake Winnipeg phosphate issue. It's easy when we're sitting in front of our plasma TV and driving our Volvo to point at the farmer who should then become subsistent. As fewer of us are involved in agriculture and more people are another generation removed from the primary production, it's becoming easier to target agriculture and blame it for the problems because we

are not a large group anymore and the political fallout is minimal.

The government does not have an easy job in wading through the many presentations from many different interest groups. In this case I applaud you, the government, for having an independent group, the CEC committee, take a look at the issue of hog production, and, well, I better just keep looking down, and the effect it has on the environment. I do not understand why so much time and energy was spent on it if the recommendations, the way I read them, will not be followed.

We have adapted to new regulations regarding manure application over the years, and if we adapt to legitimate new ones that have been deemed as necessary to protect our water supplies, this can be done with regulations that would assess each individual situation rather than take the approach of a moratorium that Bill 17 would bring.

There are many small family farms in our immediate area. This moratorium is a death knell for them. These are the families that live on the land they farm, drink the water from their own wells, also have aspirations of modest expansion to be able to survive. This situation is similar to my fellow hog producers, the Hutterites. Here we have as many as 130 people living within a stone's throw of their operations, who are as concerned about water quality as anyone, and they as well are going to need to move to continue their way of life. It makes no sense if the land and the manure spread acres are available for a sustainable plan that they would also not be allowed to do this. If the land is not available, current regulations would not allow a building project. You do not need a moratorium to protect the environment.

* (20:40)

We hear about rising food costs, and many of the same people also talk about organic production. Well, if you look at a large part of the world, we in Canada spend a disproportionately small amount of our annual income on food. If the modern method of food production would be abandoned, there just would not be enough food to feed the world. So if turning back the clock, as some environmentalists want for us agriculturalists to suggest our goal, then the collateral damage would be millions of deaths in the world due to starvation. I prefer to think of these as people as having a right to eat safe food.

On the other hand, we recognize that we also need to have a sustainable system of agriculture in

order to balance the needs of the world and keep our world a place that the future generations can live. On that note, we feel that we're doing that by using a natural product for fertility on our field. We rely very little on synthetic fertilizers that require a lot of energy for their production. We do not burn our fields as that, too, is not part of our sustainable view, in my opinion. We can argue about the actual amount of phosphorus that is contributed by agriculture in the Lake Winnipeg watershed. Obviously, there is some contribution, but it's not large.

Technology is a wonderful thing, but part of the problem of it, much of it is new. So when we talk about climate change, phosphorus, nitrogen, et cetera, what are we comparing to? If the number of 1.5 percent of phosphorus issue in the lake is attributed to the hog industry, what percent would it be with these new regulations that we are now following? Has the level of contribution changed significantly since the expansion of the industry or is there a similar amount coming from regularly cropped land?

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

Mr. Ed Peters: Okay. I'll just keep going for a little bit. One of the questions is, 200 years ago when there were millions of buffalo running around, is it possible that there might have been more phosphorus being dumped in the lake than we do with our modern hog industry?

I would encourage the government to choose its words carefully when making public speeches. A clip on the news last week from the environment minister made the statement that the hog moratorium was being put in place to clean up Lake Winnipeg. Well, now, it's easy for the average person, who is removed from agriculture, to put the blame on someone else out there and no longer be responsible for their part. It would also be refreshing if, on occasion, our agriculture and environment minister would address the public to let them know of the many positive changes our industry has made to help us remain sustainable. I realize that the press may not always be fair in what they prepare in their clips, but as leaders in this province, you need to be advocates for all groups who are living within acceptable guidelines.

In the past, I've heard reports that Winnipeg had a bit of a problem with car thefts. This problem has been looked at by various levels of government. I suppose one solution would have been to put a

moratorium on owning cars. In 20 years, when all cars were disabled, the problem would be gone. Another solution could have been to impose a moratorium on having children. A large percent of the thefts were perpetrated by people under 30, and so logic would say the problem would disappear in 25 years. While the solution would create other problems, so the government came out with various incentives, such as insurance discounts for theft protection, et cetera, and the problem has become less.

Please give us hog producers the same consideration. Could some simple incentives get the same results as phosphorus reduction without the long-term consequences of a moratorium. Farmers are extremely quick to adapt new technology, and that is beneficial to them and the environment. Regulations can take care of these phosphorus issues in the soil. It doesn't need to be a moratorium.

I just want to end by saying that Bill 17 has already affected our family farm's succession plan, in that two nephews decided that—or together, as a family, we decided they would start farming on their own and they bought a 750-sow operation. Now, obviously, that's not large enough to sustain families in the long run anymore. They are in an area where they probably could have, with the regulation, kept going, and made modest expansion. We are now meeting to see what can we do. Basically, do you sell? Do you say, do something else. It is a problem.

But thank you for your time. I know we'd probably all rather be doing something else than spending good parts of our nights here. But it's extremely important and has long-term ramifications for those of us who have given heart and soul to this industry.

Please do not implement Bill 17. You can get the same results without the damage with just current regulations. Thank you so much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Peters.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you, Ed.

Now, you've been testing your soil since 1988. Is that for both nitrogen and phosphorus? Can you tell us what has happened to the soil content of the nutrients over that time? Has there been a build up, as some people have worried about?

Mr. Ed Peters: We have tested. In fact, we're one of the farmers in the area that strongly, in fact, insisted that we start testing deeper than six inches because

we found that our six-inch soil samples were causing our crops to—if we went by the six-inch sample, our crops would lodge. Knowing that there was something below there that we were missing, we implemented a two-foot sampling with our local ag supplier, so that's been happening since about 1990 or 1988.

Just to let you know, the conventional wisdom in the mid-'90s, or the early '90s, was that phosphorus building was the right thing to do so that your soils could become more productive. So, in answer to your question, yes, our phosphorus rates are higher. It's only in the last five years that we have been enlightened or misled, depends on which side of the fence you sit on, that the phosphorus is a concern. We were always told that the phosphorus was immobile in heavy, clay soils. We have up to 60 feet of clay below our soil so, when it rains, it's not that much fun, but we were led to believe that was an immobile soil for phosphorus, so we have higher phosphate levels than we did in 1988, but, in the last three years, we are now managing our manure in a completely different way.

We keep track of where the solids cells, where the majority of the phosphorus is. We've added phytase when lobbying the federal government to allow us to drop the phosphate level in the feed so that we can drop that in the feed so we keep track of which area gets the phosphate. We're now becoming a part of a pilot project where we're doing variable rate testing, where we're going to be testing 80 spots on 160 acres and do variable rate fertilization on there so that we know that there isn't a spot that is getting over fertilized.

I drink the water 50 feet from where I spread my manure, and I don't want my children or grandchildren to suffer. We realize that new science sometimes does teach us to make changes, and we have always adapted as an agricultural community. I don't think that there's any exception. Sure, there might be one or two people that need a little reminder with a fine or something, but we have adapted to new regulations and will continue to, but we can't do anything with a moratorium.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Peters. The time for this presentation has expired. We will move on.

I call Mr. Arnold Waldner. Mr. Waldner, do you have some written materials for the committee?

Mr. Arnold Waldner (Private Citizen): Do they speak German, or do they read German?

Mr. Chairperson: Not me.

Mr. Waldner: I will try my best.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, begin, please.

* (20:50)

Mr. Waldner: First of all, Mr. Doer, Honourable Doer, members, agriculture and—I'm glad and I'm shaking to be in front of you, but we have to do what we have to do, and the honourable members on both sides of the House—

I'm wondering why I'm here. I just can't grasp it. I'm wondering why so many of my Hutterite friends are here. This is unheard of. There was one time in history that the Hutterites had to come and beg or plead in front of the government, and that was back in Russia and Prussia. That time, the reason was for religion, freedom of religion.

Ms. Erin Selby, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

Today, we have to come before this government and plead for our livelihood. I've been here three nights in a row, listening very intensively. To me, between the farming community and the government, there is a disconnect.

I would like, in my humble farmer's thought, to get that disconnect back, so we can move on with life as we used to know it. I'm speaking not only for the Hutterites by far and wide, I'm speaking for the whole farming community. We have to get that community communication back.

I'm going to try to explain why we are here and why we're so in shock. The whole farming community is in shock and I don't say that lightly; I'm saying it very mildly. I'll try to explain why we're here, all hours of the night.

What does a grizzly bear, which didn't eat for a month, is being pushed in a corner and just starting to eat when along comes an army of men and tries to destroy it, do? It defends itself. It goes, wow.

This is what the farming community is trying to do. It's only trying to defend itself along with all the help it can get, even if it takes sitting until four o'clock in the morning. You think we want to do this? Anybody who is desperate and afraid for their livelihood, they go to—I have to cool myself down a little bit—they have to do anything to get on with life.

We didn't come here—and I have to make sure you are aware of that—to condemn or to slander this

government. That is the last thing we want to do, and we hope we never have to do it.

We came here to ask questions—why, why, why Bill 17? What does this government mean with Bill 17? I see a light at the end of the tunnel tonight because, the last three nights, the two ministers couldn't answer why. Tonight, we have the honourable Mr. Doer here. He's going to answer all our questions. He's going to satisfy us all that we can go home and carry on with life. Right, Mr. Doer? We want to know why.

It's a pity; there is something wrong. Young and old come up here and present, and they cry. Why should a farming community come here and cry in front of the government? When the people cry or anybody, they're very shook up and desperate. Let's think about that for a minute.

I'm going to try to illustrate the destruction that Bill 17 would do to the farming community, as we see it. I'm going to try and put it into your minds. What would happen to Winnipeg, if an earthquake measuring 15 on the Richter scale, would blow up, right in the city? What would happen? Destruction, destruction and destruction.

This is what the farming community feels Bill 17 does to the farming community, but we also have to know who's sitting in front of us. I'm going to try and do my presentation with respect, but I don't think a group of people has more respect for their government than the farming community does. Don't forget that, Mr. Doer. We know there's a lot on your agenda, on the table, on everybody's; I'm not going to pick sides. The whole government body, we need you and respect. But I always say respect has to be earned; respect cannot be bought by votes. That's short-term gain for long-term pain. My brother always tells me, say what you mean and mean what you say, but don't say it mean, and I'm trying to keep it at that level.

So, how many of you have visited a large family farm, hands-on? To get the real picture of a problem, you have to be hands-on. That always opens up eyes and avenues that were not seen before. Maybe we should invite each and every one of you out on a farm for a day and hands-on experience. Maybe that would give you a better picture as seen from behind. Who knows? At the end of the day, we could have a barbecue. We make good homemade wine. Experience has taught me a little wine gets a lot of information out of everybody. You got me a little nervous. Everyone was too wonderful right now.

It seems there is a disconnect what manure is and what manure isn't. On the governing side and rightly so, you don't use it, and you're not hands on it. That's why, in my farmer talk, I like to just bring it right out in the open. Manure, to a farming community, is not manure. It's an asset that the last thing you would do is flush it down the sewer, discard it, any which way you want. We want it there for us working for whoever puts it there. You people must know it, and if you don't, then let's educate you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Waldner, you have one minute left.

Mr. Waldner: I ask for—I only started. If I'm done, I didn't want any question period. Thank you.

It seems the average family—like through your eyes I'm now looking—does it all wrong or it seems the average family farm does it all wrong, and they get blamed for all or most of the pollution. I don't want to point fingers, but I have to say this. It looks like whoever you get your votes from, those people have no pollution. I wish you would share that pail with the farmers so they don't either, Mr. Doer, please.

* (21:00)

We as farmers may seem to the governing people dumber than we really are. We can see through more than you might be surprised. Experience teaches how to read a guy, and the city of Winnipeg and—the farming community feels the Doer government is favouring Winnipeg a little bit too much, but I stand to be corrected. It seems Bill 17 is only good for the government of today, and I don't want to accuse anybody, but it sure has that sting in it, that it only favours the Doer government.

I hope, Mr. Doer, you don't have favouritism, and I hope this government doesn't go down in history destroying the family farm, and, on top of that, making the people of Winnipeg pay more for food.

What is this cancerous Bill 17 telling the uneducated people that the farmers are knowingly, purposely killing and polluting our water and our foods? Bill 17 is belittling the average farmer. It is telling the people that farmers don't know to manage their livelihood. We feel discriminated against. Bill 17 is telling the people that farmers are—oh, I did that. I don't want to over-emphasize. I must say this is a bunch of false accusations. Let's think about that for a minute. Shame on this government for giving

out false, which don't—where will this government be if it goes ahead with Bill 17, and eternity? You will one day have to give account for misleading the people, and yet we pray for our government every day.

Last night I heard the government is from God. I'm not going to deny that. I'm not here to judge, but don't you think if you are from God that you'll have to give account for?

But, getting back to the handle at hand, I'm out of town. I just wanted to show you a little bit how we do things on our farm, how we inject manure, so that just—you've heard it and heard it and some day it'll catch on. Manure to us is worth \$30 to \$50 a gallon. That's what we figure manure to be for fertility. We have a two-million-gallon tank that's worth \$80,000. We have no reason to flush it down the river.

I'm out of time you say—we soil test. We test the manure. We apply accordingly. We follow and have manure management guidelines. I think they're in place. There's enough there if they're being followed. There is no reason that manure should be any polluter to Lake Winnipeg. We have meters on our manure injection which I'm glad to show you. We know exactly how many gallons per acre go on there. We have GPS guiding systems that we don't overlap. We try to stretch that manure out as much as possible so we don't have to go and buy expensive manure.

I challenge you, the government of the day, to come to our farm when this is done and see first-hand how and why and what is done.

So I ask you, when did this government want to be a detriment to this province? They took the killing plant away. Now they are on it with the family farms and the farming community. What's next, especially if there is little or no data to prove that the farming community has any influence on the Red River?

What I'm really shocked about, I didn't see it myself, but I've heard that our Mr. Stefanson [*phonetic*], whatever his—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Waldner, the time for this presentation has expired, with no time for questions.

Mrs. Taillieu: I would just ask leave, I just want to thank the—

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Is there leave for Mrs. Taillieu to speak? Leave has been granted.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much, Mr. Waldner, for your presentation. It was very, very moving, very well done.

I know that your people like to be left alone to your farm and your family and your faith, so I think that it is very, very, significant that you felt compelled to come here today to bring these concerns to your government. Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Taillieu.

Thank you, Mr. Waldner for your presentation.

I now called the next presenter, Calvin Ginter. Calvin Ginter. Calvin Ginter. Seeing no one answering by that name, Calvin Ginter's name drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter is Trevor Cowieson. Trevor Cowieson. Seeing no one come forward, Trevor Cowieson's name now drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter in line would be Irvin Funk. Irvin Funk. Seeing no one come forward, Irvin Funk's name drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter would be Andrew MacKenzie. Andrew MacKenzie. No one coming forward by that name, Andrew MacKenzie's name drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter is Matthew Waldner. Matthew Waldner. Seeing no one answering to that name, Matthew Waldner's name now drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter is Jerry Esau. Jerry Esau. No one coming forward by that name so Jerry Esau's name drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter in line from out of town would be Mr. David Hofer. David Hofer. I see no one coming forward with that name. David Hofer's name drops to the bottom of the list.

The next out-of-town presenter on our list is Cindy Murray. Cindy Murray. Seeing no one come forward to that name, Cindy Murray's name is now dropped to the bottom of the list.

Our next out-of-town presenter would be Janine Gibson. Janine Gibson. Seeing no one come forward by that name, Janine Gibson's name now drops to the bottom of the list.

The next out-of-town presenter on our list is Clarissa Hofer. Clarissa Hofer. Seeing no one come

forward by that name, Clarissa Hofer's name now goes to the bottom of the list.

Our next out-of-town presenter's name in line would be Susan Hofer. Susan Hofer. Seeing no one come forward by that name, Susan Hofer's name now drops to the bottom of the list.

The next out-of-town presenter in line would be Jake Wiebe. Jake Wiebe. Seeing no one by that name, Jake Wiebe's name now drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next out-of-town presenter in line is Larry Friesen. Larry Friesen. Seeing no one answering by that name, Larry Friesen's name now drops to the bottom of the list.

Our next name in line would be Mark Lanouette.

An Honourable Member: He's here.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: We'll wait for Mr. Lanouette. Mr. Lanouette, do you have a written presentation to hand out?

Mr. Mark Lanouette (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: No? With that, then, you can begin.

* (21:10)

Mr. Lanouette: Madam Vice-Chairperson, members of the Legislature, thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Agriculture is the heart of Manitoba. I myself grew up on a family farm straight east of Winnipeg off Highway 1. The reasons why I'm here concerns me greatly. For example, we see other countries with less than one-quarter of the land mass of Manitoba, but have approximately three times more sows than Manitoba. This country is Denmark. This country works together with the government, universities and research facilities to have a sustainable and environmentally friendly industry. Why can't we work together instead of against each other and giving up our growth to other provinces or even countries? We also have world-class universities, research facilities, but what's missing is the government.

I'm also not understanding another message from the government with its grants that were given to two packing houses in this province for expansion when in the same breath putting an end to hog barn expansions. How do we fill these plants? Another mixed message.

Last year the government was complaining about the people leaving our province and going to other provinces for work. Bill 17, it's a bus ticket to leave this province. As a government, you've seen the passion here tonight. As a government, I would be happy to work with passionate people willing to accept changes. And it's simple, we do care about our water. We're taking necessary measures. We're accepting new technologies and when it comes to manure management, like a lot of people said already tonight, what's the sense of putting it on twice or flushing it down the river or whatever may happen? With the price of fertilizer, synthetic fertilizers, it makes absolute total sense to use natural fertilizers. It gives life to the soil, the worms, the beetles.

So I ask you: Why Bill 17? Thank you.

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

We have time for questions.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): Well, thank you very much, Mr. Lanouette, for your presentation.

We're asking ourselves the same thing. Why Bill 17? And I think you maybe touched a nerve here when we look at countries like Denmark and their ability to work with their governments and their research people, looking at science and looking at new technologies. Is there any reason we can't be doing the same thing here in Manitoba?

Mr. Lanouette: That's a good question. I mean, we should definitely maybe consider or ask or find out what they're doing. I mean, it's almost an island surrounded by water and oceans. Hey, if those people can figure it out, why can't we? All we're asking is to work together, that's it. It's simple. I mean, we all get up in the morning, put our pants on one leg at a time, nobody's different than nobody. I mean, we're all the same people and all I ask is just to work together. That's all it is.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you.

Is your view that this bill then is all about politics and not about science and common sense?

Mr. Lanouette: It seems pretty simple doesn't it? Why are we making it so complicated? It doesn't need to be like this. Does it? I mean this room is full. It's been packed, I don't know how many nights in a row, packed house. People said it tonight again, we'd rather be doing something else. I've got a year-and-a-half daughter, she's a year-and-a-half old at home. I'd rather be there tonight.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you, Mr. Lanouette.

Mr. Lanouette: Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: The next out-of-town presenter on our list is Tim Waldner. Tim Waldner. Seeing no one answer by that name, Mr. Waldner's name goes to the bottom of the list.

Our next presenter would be Ian Wishart. Mr. Wishart, do you have a written presentation to hand out?

Mr. Ian Wishart (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay, then, please begin.

Mr. Wishart: Thank you very much, and thank you to the committee for the opportunity to participate in this part of the democratic process. It's something that we all should respect and appreciate. It gives us our opportunity to be heard, and I think that this has worked out very well in that a lot of excellent presentations have come forward.

I just wanted to talk on behalf of my own family operation. My wife and I farm in the Portage la Prairie area. We run about 2,500 acres; we have a mixed farming operation which does not include a hog operation. We have beef cows, plus a feedlot. We also grow speciality crops, including potatoes. We also do hay for exporting to the United States, and I'd highly recommend that as a way to get phosphate off the farm, by the way.

Talking a little bit about the environmental impacts, I have had the opportunity to work on environmental issues for a number of years, partly in my role as chairman of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture environment committee and have been exposed to a number of other environmental issues all across Canada.

On our own farm, we have the opportunity, of course, to participate in the environmental farm plan process, which is an excellent process in dealing with liabilities. It does have to deal with the asset side of things in the future, and I hope we move that way. On our own farm, we actually have implemented a significant number of these types of programs to deal with nutrient loading and habitat situations. We've done buffer strips, the first of them more than 20 years ago. We know that they can work to a significant degree and that they do have an impact.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

We catch spring run-off as it comes off our field and store it in reservoirs which we, in fact, use later in the season for irrigation water sources; that puts nutrients back on the field. We've also had the opportunity to work with the University of Manitoba field station in monitoring some of the nutrient levels that come out of these things. We find that we're steadily improving, in terms of nutrient loss from the field, by improving our technologies as to how we apply, so we can clearly make progress in that area.

We've also implemented composting of our cattle manure which certainly not only saved us money, but made the product much more environmentally friendly and reduced the number of complaints we got from our neighbours, as we live in an area with a lot of residences. It's certainly a win-win-win scenario, and we've moved a long ways ahead with that.

We, of course, participate in manure management plans. We've also had a chance to implement managed marshlands in relation to our feedlot operation. It's all on concrete, so the amount of water that runs off is quite significant. To deal with that, we put in a two-stage reservoir, first of which was anaerobic to deal with some of the organics at that level, and then we put in a fairly significant sized managed marshland.

Again, with the University of Manitoba field station which is located fairly close to where I live, we have monitored the nutrient and coliform levels that come through these marshlands. They are extremely effective methods of dealing with nutrient loading as well as dealing with the coliform situation that comes off feedlots.

So certainly that's been a real eye-opener. In fact, we've also worked with the University of Manitoba field station in monitoring water quality across the marsh bays, which separate us from the cottage industry at Delta, the south end of Lake Manitoba. We have found that, in fact, the farm side is in much better shape than the cottage side. That's been very revealing.

Our farm is effectively divided by your Red River Valley area, right down the middle. I can't actually explain the rationale as to why the line is where it is, in my neck of the woods, other than it would appear, if the water runs east into the Assiniboine, it is considered a risk area. If the water runs north into Lake Manitoba, it is not considered a

risk area. That appears to be roughly where the line is.

If, in fact, you're worried about flooding, as is the rationale given for the Red River basin, by the time our farmland would be flooded, Portage and Main would have approximately 50 feet of water. So I don't think that's a real significant risk.

There have been a lot of good presentations. Today, I want to talk about some different approaches. You've heard a lot of arguments, some very heartfelt arguments, as to the impact on individual farm operations. The whole principle of site-specific nutrient management, the nutrient management regs that we are currently working under, in my mind, should deal with an awful lot of these situations.

*(21:20)

They are very appropriate on our farm. We are going to have to do it on the whole farm, because we have the pleasure of being over an aquifer and, therefore, are considered a high-risk zone. It is not a great deal different than what we've been doing for a number of years anyway, in terms of managing our own nutrients on the farm. It is just another level, but what we have been doing certainly helps us manage the nutrients and get the maximum return out them. So we're certainly pleased to do that. I think it is a solution that could be applied almost anywhere in Manitoba, and I don't think Bill 17 provides that opportunity.

Now, nutrient loading is a problem not just here in North America, but it's actually a worldwide problem, and it's something—and I had the pleasure of attending the international federation of agriculture conference in Warsaw, Poland, just came home on the weekend, so I apologize if I'm a little jet lagged because I'm definitely feeling it. We pursued some discussions with a lot of the European representatives there to see how they had dealt with nutrient loading issues in their jurisdiction because they've had them for a lot longer than we have, specific to the rivers in particular, and they have made market improvements, so there is something to be learned there. Some of them are very straightforward approaches. Basically, there's been some restriction in industry, particularly if it was point-source issues, and they have had the fortune, I guess, in the meantime to have some of the industries actually naturally disappear from the landscape, some of the nutrient issues.

But when it comes to the farming industry, their approach has been extremely similar to what we've been talking about here in Manitoba, the site-specific nutrient management approach. They have some variations on it. The French, of course, are much more aggressive in their production cycle, so they are fairly lenient, I guess, if you want to look at it that way, and let people apply an awful lot of nutrients because they're really trying to push production. But, throughout most of Europe, there's been switches. The way they approach this—the Dutch is probably the easiest example to work with—they used what they called a chequebook method of managing nutrients, so every individual farmer had to account for not only what he applied, but what left the farm in terms of the grain or the livestock he produced and the nutrient content of that. That was a real revealing process because over a period of about 10 or 15 years, they found that they, in fact, couldn't account for it. The landscape actually contributes far more than people realized, and I think we're going to find the same situation here in Manitoba as it related to Lake Winnipeg, that there is a lot more nutrients coming off the basic landscape—be it farm or forest—than we can account for. So over a period of time they've actually moved away from this chequebook method to a more site-specific approach.

The Germans took a slightly different tack and they pushed organics really hard, but they still have significant nutrient loading issues even from the organics. Whether that nutrient comes from chemical fertilizers or whether it comes from manure, it's still a nutrient and still has to be dealt with. So we can draw a lot, I think, from those examples. Someone mentioned Denmark and they have done a very good job, in fact, of managing their nutrients and their river systems and water quality is amongst the best in Europe despite the fact they have probably the greatest hog population per capita of any country in Europe. So there is a great deal to be learned.

Excuse me, I'm just skipping down here.

One of the other things I think that's been mentioned here a little bit but certainly is worth touching on again: the cost of nutrients. It has risen dramatically. One of the unintended benefits, I guess, if you want to put it this way, is that we will be much more careful as to how we apply nutrients in the future. We already as an industry have adopted things like GPS and auto-steer and more accurate variable-rate application, certainly as much as is possible. The new technologies that have been applied to manure application are much more

accurate and certainly avoid overlap and over-application far better than anything we've had before. I think we need more time to see this play out in terms of the site-specific nutrient management and, honestly, given the high costs of these inputs these days, I think you're going to see a gradual decline in the rate of nutrient application with more attention being paid to how that actually works in the soil.

That brings me sort of to my third point in this process. Not only is it expensive, but the chemical fertilizers do not behave in the soil in the same way that the organic sources, the manure sources do. This is a not very well explored area of science related to agriculture, but the soil micro-organisms are extremely important. We simply don't know enough about them, but we do know from past practices and from studies that do exist that organic sources such as manure do perform quite differently and, generally speaking, give you better results.

We are actually moving in the wrong direction by forcing producers to go back to the costs of chemical fertilizers and, as I said earlier, the prices are going through the roof and they are projected to go higher yet. We have really no production of any significance here in Manitoba, and we do have a plant producing nitrogen and that's fine, but we have no phosphorus mines in the province. We are exporting dollars out of this province by forcing people to do it that way, and it's going to get to be an increasing amount.

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

Mr. Wishart: Okay, may I just wrap up then?

One particular point that seems to be forgotten is that nitrogen, phosphorus and potash are the basic building blocks of life. I think that we've overlooked that in a significant way. Those are the inputs that go into the ground. That's what plants use, that along with sunlight, and they make carbon chains. From those carbon chains, all life is grown. We certainly must remember where this comes from.

I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak, and I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Gerrard: Ian, thank you for coming and presenting. You've had a long run experience in agricultural policy issues.

I note with interest your comments about Lake Manitoba, that there's a difference between the farm

side and the cottage side. Could you expand a little bit more on that, and tell us more about what's been done to look at that difference, and why it is there?

Mr. Wishart: The cottage development on Lake Manitoba that I'm closest to is actually quite an old one. A lot of the nutrient management situations, the waste water treatments in those particular cottage developments are not up to modern standards. In fact, there's been a bit of an audit done in that particular area and six out of 10 failed even the most basic tests. I'm told that is not very uncommon, particularly in the older areas. I'm also aware that newer ones are better.

Clearly, there is a significant contribution, not only from the fact that the cottage waste water treatment is old and out of date, but that people live there a lot longer period of the year than they used to. Cottages use to be a six-week thing, now they're almost a six-month thing. So that multiples the nutrient load that comes out of the cottages by an awful lot.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you very much, Mr. Wishart, for your presentation. It's certainly an eye-opening presentation. I certainly want to recommend and applaud your environmental concerns that you've had in Manitoba and put forward on behalf of all Manitobans and Manitoba rural producers.

I'm interested in your discussions with the European countries and how things have developed there. It's pretty clear that animal production is more dense in Europe than what it is here in Manitoba. I'd kind of like your perspective on some of the rules and regulations that they're under, some of the science and some of the technology that they're looking at there, kind of in conjunction with the nutrient management programs that we have here in Manitoba and what we're undertaking to do. Could you kind of put things in perspective, how things are progressing in Europe versus where we're at here in Manitoba in terms of regulations versus, you know, the science incentive and technology side of things?

Mr. Wishart: There are a lot of things to be learned. Some are directly transferable and some you have to actually adapt to our conditions because our soil conditions are dramatically different than theirs. The approach they've taken really ultimately ends up being the same approach we're working towards here in Manitoba, the site-specific approach and keeping track of the nutrients and managing the levels, either in the soil or in some cases they've actually monitored the levels in the crops. That's actually

more variable in our circumstance than it appears to be in theirs, because their crops are a little more uniform in terms of their protein levels and that sort of thing. Not as much impacted by drought, I think, is probably the biggest factor. But there's a lot to be learned, and I think that their approach actually is very parallel to where we're going.

They have gone down some blind roads, as I pointed out with the Dutch situation, where they thought that method would prove to be even more accurate. Over time, because they couldn't account for all the increases, they found that, in fact, there is more contribution from the natural landscape, particularly in the area of phosphorus than anybody ever thought there would be. There's a margin of error built into that process and that's why they've moved away from that checkbook method because year after year producers could not account for their soil residual levels being higher than they were suppose to be.

Mr. Eichler: Welcome back. We're glad to have you back. Robert did a great job for you as a stand in.

My question for you is pretty quick, pretty simple. If Bill 17 is to go ahead and pass through the House, what do think that signal's going to be to the science industry out there that we need to work together with? Some of the examples that you gave us just a few minutes ago, what kind of signal is that going to send to our scientists that are on the edge of new technologies and new ways of farming, whatever way you see it?

* (21:30)

Mr. Wishart: That's a tough question to answer, but I think it's pretty clear that anything that's not based in science is not going to encourage science. We have a very good co-operation level among producers. In fact, according to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada surveys, Manitoba farmers are among the quickest to adopt new technology related to environments of any place in Canada and that's because we've seen good response. We've seen the right kind of response from governments past, and I suspect that anything that departs from that type of level of co-operation—and we have had a good history of co-operation related to the development of nutrient management regs in particular—anything that departs from that is going to change the level of co-operation among the farmers. It's bound to have an impact. We respond to the way we're treated. It's human nature.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, time for this presentation has expired. I thank you for your attendance, Mr. Wishart.

I've received a written submission from presenter No. 189. Is it the will of the committee to include this presentation into *Hansard*? [Agreed] The Clerk will distribute them to the members.

I call Randy Wolgemuth. Randy Wolgemuth? He will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Carol Clegg. Ms. Clegg do you have any written materials for the committee?

Ms. Carol Clegg (Private Citizen): I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The clerk will distribute them and you may begin when you're ready, Ms. Clegg.

Ms. Clegg: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

Following the Olywest imbroglio, the government declared a province-wide moratorium on expansion of hog operations and instructed the Clean Environment Commission to hold public hearings into the sustainability of the hog industry in Manitoba.

The resulting report, *Environmental Sustainability and Hog Production in Manitoba*, 2007, concluded that hog production could be environmentally sustainable if the province first found out what was really going on in the industry and then did a lot of fixing. The government's answer to this report is a moratorium on expansion in only three areas of the province, giving the industry free reign in the remainder of Manitoba.

The CEC report reveals that the lack of knowledge of every aspect of this industry is astounding. The government simply is not keeping track of the ways that intensive livestock operations impact our province. Fast-tracking hog expansion for at least 15 years has produced economic, social, health and environmental effects that will take a lifetime to ameliorate. Although its scope is limited to environmental sustainability, the commission tackles the issue with a broad view, and its recommendations provide the government with a solid foundation to begin rebuilding the hog industry which can co-exist harmoniously with people and the natural surroundings.

Eutrophication of Lake Winnipeg is the major issue which perpetrated the CEC report. Phosphorus, having been identified as the main factor in this

process, is therefore the commission's gravest concern. The report comes down hard on the livestock manure and mortalities management Regulation which will allow application of manure phosphorus at four to five times the crop removal rate. Taking this regulation as a starting point, the CEC strongly suggests that it be enforced by 2013 and reviewed thoroughly in five years with the possibility of stricter limits. It calls for sufficient spread lands to balance phosphorus application and crop removal rates. It suggests a ban on winter manure spreading by 2013. It recommends that government undertake major research that will lead to calculation of phosphorus thresholds for Manitoba soils and climate and develop beneficial management practices to reduce phosphorus loss to waterways.

The commission points out that one of the big gaps in government knowledge is the amount of water the hog industry uses. It does undertake some calculations, based on known hog numbers and estimates of water use per hog. The commission's estimate of annual water consumption by the industry is three times higher than the Pork Council's figures and also higher than Manitoba Water Stewardship's numbers.

This is not surprising, considering that a large number of operators have no water licences and Manitoba Water Stewardship has no tally of the number of hog operations which have water rights' licences and does not record reported meter readings.

It may not be well known how much water the hog industry consumes, but it's very obvious that whatever it uses, it contaminates. Clean ground or surface water is either run through the pig, or used to flush out the barns and ends up a toxic slurry, containing disinfectants, heavy metals—such as copper and zinc—antibiotics, viruses, bacteria, parasites, and phosphorus. This nasty concoction is pumped into earthen holding ponds or above-ground tanks.

The CEC recognizes all the problems related to manure storage: leaks, spills, flood hazard, contamination of surface water and aquifers, health and safety of manure storage operators, and health impacts on nearby residents. It also notes that there are probably around 800 non-permitted, manure storage facilities in Manitoba and fewer than half of the hog producers file manure management plans.

On the matter of storage, the CEC report, section 912, page 106 to 107, states: The Commission does believe that there is a need for ongoing improvement

in a number of areas: containment systems to provide protection against spills, maintenance and operation, inspection, and research into migration through soils of seepage from manure storage facilities.

I have indicated the inherent risk to water systems in storing massive volumes of manure. When the toxic brew from the lagoons is spread on the land, that's where the real contamination begins. All the dangerous components of the slurry are out of the box. Depending on the rate and method of application, soil and weather conditions and setback distances, they are free to migrate, either slowly or rapidly, into the nearest body of water.

Crops will use the phosphorus they require and the excess will be transported in the spring run-off. The CEC recognizes the threat from pathogens in manure to workers handling it, to wild and domestic animals grazing in the spread fields and to the water supply. The report even dares to mention treatment of liquid manure or composting of solid manure to remove pathogens. It recommends more research into practices and technologies which will reduce the risk to workers in the industry and reduce or eliminate the pathogen content in manure. It also calls for studies into the connection between pathogen related illnesses and the livestock sector.

Antibiotics in hog feed is another issue the report tackles. Recent headlines about methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus, MRSA, make this a timely subject. It notes that micro-organisms and antibiotics can reach the public either in food or in water. The CEC sends a message to government that it must research health concerns of antibiotic resistance, regulate the sale of drugs, document drug use in animals, monitor hog manure for antibiotics and bacteria, monitor water for microbial contaminants and study the need for antibiotic use in feed animals.

* (21:40)

The CEC also has concerns about workplace health and safety and calls for more inspections. It recognizes odour as a huge factor in conflict between rural residents and ILOs, intensive livestock operations, and a serious health concern for those affected by it. It points out the need for much research into ways to mitigate offensive odour. It also anticipates major disease outbreaks in the industry and recommends contingency planning for mass mortality and border closings. The deficiency of information about heavy metals in soils fertilized

with hog manure is cause for the CEC to call for study of this potential hazard.

The CEC asked the government to include biodiversity conservation when approving expansions in the livestock industry. It considers the impact of increased nutrient in environmentally sensitive areas such as remaining fragments of tall grass prairie and recommends buffer zones.

The CEC does not deal directly with the strife and economic loss in communities targeted by intensive livestock operations. It does, however, cover the pitfalls of the municipal planning process which involve site assessment, public input into site assessment, and approval procedures, which are crucial to maintaining harmony in communities where hog barns locate. It recognizes the necessity of much more thorough site assessment and public involvement in the process. It recommends the establishment of a provincial steering committee on agri-environmental and societal issues.

To date, the government and the hog industry have collaborated in conspiratorial secrecy to hide deleterious environmental impacts. The Pork Council has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on advertising to convince the public that all is fine with the industry, that they are good corporate citizens and being regulated by the strictest environmental regulations in the country. The Clean Environment Commission report proves otherwise.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Clegg, you're at 10 minutes.

Ms. Clegg: May I just finish the last paragraph?

You can see that the CEC has given the government and the pork industry a huge undertaking. Much time is needed to do all the research required to make this industry fit peaceably into the Manitoba landscape. How can this monumental task be accomplished if the hog industry continues to grow apace? My answer is that it cannot. That's why I'm calling on the government to scrap this legislation and retain the province-wide moratorium on expansion until the CEC's recommendations are implemented.

The CEC report proves that there is much wisdom gleaned in public consultation. It defends the right of the public to have equal and timely access to information. Let's hope a new era of openness is about to begin, and we can all work together to clean up Lake Winnipeg and restore agriculture to its once-venerated position.

For those presenters who cry that Bill 17 will deprive their grandchildren of their heritage, I say there'll be no heritage for any of us if we continue to destroy our water resources. Life on this planet cannot exist without clean water. It's as simple as that. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Clegg.

I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you, Ms. Clegg. Thanks for your advice. You did quite a thorough job of dissecting the Clean Environment Commission's report and outlining it for us here.

I want to be very clear that we accepted the whole report, the recommendations, and the body of literature that went along with the report. We did not think we should cherry-pick through it as some have. We've also got a group of people, interdepartmental people, who have been assigned each of these recommendations that you've outlined in your report to move forward on all of them. So I want you to know that we are moving forward with this.

I do want to point to, I think, a very key part of your presentation where you say the crops will use the phosphorus they require. Doesn't that mean, then, that what we're dealing with is a fertilizer to begin with—it's useful—but that we need to deal with the excess that is left behind?

Ms. Clegg: The phosphorus part of the slurry is a fertilizer. The remaining ingredients—and also nitrogen, but the other ingredients are thoroughly objectionable. There are ways of dealing with manure. I just think the liquid slurry system is a totally bad way of doing it, and if you do take the CEC report to heart, I think they do suggest other ways.

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Thank you for your presentation tonight.

I'm just wondering, one of the other issues that has come out of these hearings that we've been sitting in on the last number of evenings is the dumping of raw sewage from the waste-water treatment facilities in the inner city of Winnipeg. I'm wondering if you could maybe comment on what your thoughts are on that side of the equation. It's something we've been asking this government to deal with day in and day out as well in the Legislature, and they have refused to move forward on that file as well. I wonder if you have any comments on that.

Ms. Clegg: Well, I don't think one mistake justifies another. That's really all I can say about that. We all have to work together to clean up the environment. The City has to do it. I understand they are under orders to have better waste treatment within the next number of years. They're working on it already. I don't justify dumping raw sewage in the river, but I don't justify dumping a toxic soup onto the land either.

Mr. Struthers: Ms. Clegg, in the early 1990s, the Conservative government that Mrs. Stefanson represents had the CEC opportunity to deal with the problem.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chairperson: Order.

Mr. Struthers: Ms. Clegg, what every government needs to deal with is a comprehensive approach to a problem. I think all legislators have that responsibility to do. Do you agree that this government needs to look at all point sources of phosphorus or nitrogen nutrients and come up with a broad comprehensive plan to do so?

Ms. Clegg: Yes, you have to look at all the pollutants that are going into Lake Winnipeg, wherever they're coming from, of course.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this presentation has expired. Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Clegg.

Mr. Orville Schinkel. Good evening, sir. Do you have any written materials?

Mr. Orville Schinkel (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You do not. How do you pronounce your last name, please?

Mr. Schinkel: Schinkel.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, Mr. Schinkel.

* (21:50)

Mr. Schinkel: S-c-h-i-n-k-e-l.

I'm speaking here on behalf of customers, friends, who have supported me and my family and community for the last 45 years. My customers are mainly independent family farmers. Some of the customers, right now, need small additions because they have been able to increase the efficiency on their sow herd. In the past, when they used to be able to produce about 22 to 24 piglets per sow per year, they're up to 28 to 30 piglets per sow per year, and their facilities are getting to be overcrowded. Being

overcrowded creates stress. Stress leads to health problems. With a moratorium, they're losing instead of having the extra income when costs are continually rising.

I feel we are applying the big stick only on one sector and the rules and regulations are there to, but those that have the acreage to expand and need to expand to stay viable.

We need to look at the big picture. Where is the pollution? If the pollution between Emerson and St. Malo increases by 20 percent and then between St. Norbert and Selkirk increases by 85 percent, it seems to me we are making the farmer the scapegoat. I know the towns and city lagoons, they pull the plug and the pollution goes straight down the streams and rivers. The farmers have to spread certain distance away from streams and rivers and there certainly are pollutants in the lagoons.

The other thing that bothers me is seeing some of these big trucks that are city trucks hauling their lagoon sludge on to the field, frozen field, and what happens? It's there for spring run-off and back into the river streams. Why are we picking on one sector? Why can't they stockpile it and incorporate it in the soil like a farmer has to? Where is the justice? Why can the big cities do as they please? Let's get on and be honest and treat everyone the same.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Schinkel.

Questions? Seeing—oh, Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for taking your time to come in, and I certainly do appreciate your comments and taking the time to put your views on, so thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Schinkel.

A request to the committee, presenter No. 118 has a child who has to go to school in the morning. With the permission of the committee, I will call Mr. Jason Hofer. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Jason Hofer, 118. Mr. Hofer, do you have any written materials for the committee? *[interjection]* You may proceed.

Mr. Jason Hofer (Private Citizen): Hi. I'm Jason Hofer from Keystone Colony farm. I'm the hog manager of 800-sows operation. I speak out against Bill 17. I've been working in the barn ever since, in and out, since I was eight to 12 years old. I enjoy it. I follow all the rules and regulations of CQA program.

We also have a manure management program. We monitor our manure per gallon per acre. I work in the barn so I can feed my community and family plus people around the world. The reason I'm speaking out against Bill 17 is because farming is very important for our community and for numbers of community in Manitoba. Farming has been a part of our community for a number of years. We want to pass the farm on to our children and grandchildren so it doesn't slip out of our hands, farming. Farming has been very important to our community. We want to pass farming on for a community life for a long time. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

Questions?

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Jason, for your presentation. I don't have any questions of you. I just to thank you for feeling so passionate about the issue that you would come down here and make your presentation. So, thanks.

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

Mr. Leon Clegg. Good evening, Mr. Clegg. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Leon Clegg (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Clegg: We've heard many people speak today on this bill and many talked about the small family farms. However, the CEC report indicates that the number of hog farms has decreased from over 3,500 in 1986 to approximately 1,000 today. However, the size of each has increased dramatically from about 300 hogs per farm to over 2,600 now. I think many of these are very large corporate farms. Really, I don't think the small farmer can afford to get into that operation.

I also wanted to point out that I've experienced living close to these hog operations, and I can tell you it wasn't very pleasant. The smell was intolerable, and after enduring it for about 10 years, we finally practically gave our house away and walked away from that. We don't hear a lot about devaluation of property close to these farms, and I think that's an important issue that has been sadly neglected. That's about all I have to say right now. I really didn't have a formal presentation, so I just scribbled down a few notes. I'll take any questions.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Clegg.

Questions?

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Leon.

I come across a lot of situations where I think there's been some very poor planning. Either a hog barn or an agricultural entity has been in place, and then we allow residents to build up around it. Then the complaints start coming in, or we have residences that are already established and an agricultural entity of one sort or another is located, I think sometimes too close. Again, the complaints start to roll in.

Do you think that wise planning can solve many of the issues that you face?

Mr. Clegg: The Planning Act has tried to look at that. However, I don't think it's really completely solved the problem. I know in our case we were there, and they followed the practices of just spreading the manure. Then they switched to these earthen lagoons, and I think they should be banned, those earthen lagoons. It's just such a toxic mess. The smell can range over many miles I think. I think that would be one thing that would help alleviate the problem. That's one of my suggestions anyway.

* (22:00)

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Clegg, for coming out and making your presentation.

You had mentioned one of your issues was the size of the farms, the corporate farms I think you referred to them as where there has been a consolidation from, I believe, 3,500 to 1,000. I assume you are aware in agriculture in general there's been a consolidation.

I remember when my grandfather first came here. He farmed 160 acres. My cousins on that same farm are farming somewhere around 3,000 acres right now. Is that wrong? Should they go back to the 160 acres and the 20 pigs?

Mr. Clegg: I think it depends how you're looking at it. If you're looking at it, strictly in terms of economics, then it may be okay. If you're looking at it in terms of environmental concerns, then I think there's a big issue there.

Mr. Borotsik: If you look at it from economics, I don't believe that they could make a living on 160 acres now. That wasn't the case then. They could do 160 acres when they farmed it with horses but, unfortunately, right now with the world markets, my

cousins require 3,000 acres in order to make a living at it.

So should they not farm 3,000 acres and try to go back to those 160 acres, just because of the environment?

Mr. Clegg: I think there is something to that but, when it comes to confined animals and these very large operations, the economics are there, but the problems are also there.

Mr. Borotsik: You mentioned the large corporate farms and the hog barns. There are some fairly large cattle operations too, whether they be feed lots or just individual farmers with some 300 to 500 to 800 head.

Are you suggesting that's too large and they should go back to smaller units, as opposed to having that kind of economics?

Mr. Clegg: I think, for environmental concerns, there may be some reasons for doing that, yes. Economics—I don't know.

Mr. Borotsik: That's obvious you don't know the economics of it. There's some large investments to go—

Mr. Chairperson: Order. Sir, be respectful to the presenter, please. You may continue your question.

Mr. Borotsik: I just made a point. Mr. Clegg has already indicated that he didn't understand the economics of it and I said that that was simply obvious. I meant no disrespect; I can assure you of that.

Mr. Chairperson: Good.

Mr. Borotsik: When your wife was here, there was a question with respect to the City of Winnipeg. On Monday, they dumped literally hundreds of thousands of litres of raw sewage into the Red River, which I find deplorable, quite frankly, but there are also some major plans for expansion of housing in this area, particularly Waverley West.

Under the same kind of circumstances, do you not believe that they should put a moratorium on those types of housing units until they can deal with the sewage situation that they have currently in the city of Winnipeg?

Mr. Clegg: It's possible they should. I think they are going to do something about that situation of the overflow, when you get a large rain and the sewer cannot handle it then. I think they are doing

something and they should. I don't agree with that going into the river myself.

Mr. Borotsik: No, and I agree with you; it shouldn't go into the river. Unfortunately, the housing development will be in place before the resolution will be made of the combined sewer system. It's a huge problem, the combined sewer system, which is also a very major capital investment.

My question is, based on your environmental presentation to us today: Do you not feel that they should resolve that issue, before they put in thousands and thousands of more units that will be dumped into the Red River?

Mr. Clegg: I don't really know about that, but I still think that we are going to have to solve all these problems at some time or another. I feel that large animal operations have a serious problem. There are other problems, environmental problems, and I agree, they have to be solved, too.

That's all I can say to that.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Clegg.

Mr. Clegg: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Laura Hofer. Laura Hofer. The name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Junia is it? [*interjection*] Julia Hofer, the next presenter, has asked to be removed from the list, No. 96.

Presenter No. 97, Monty Thompson. Monty Thompson will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Presenter No. 119, Dickson Gould, Progressive Livestock Management. Dickson Gould? Mr. Gould will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Victor Kopecky. Victor Kopecky will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Edna Kopecky. Edna Kopecky will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Jacinthe Grenier. Jacinthe Grenier will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Dave Jolicure. Dave, how do you say your surname? Jolicure?

Mr. Dave Jolicoeur (Private Citizen): Jolicoeur.

Mr. Chairperson: Jolicoeur.

Mr. Jolicoeur: You bet. François.

Mr. Chairperson: Jolicoeur. Okay. Do you have any written materials for us, sir?

Mr. Jolicoeur: No, I don't, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Mr. Jolicoeur: Okay. My name is Dave Jolicoeur. I'm here today just because I want to express my concerns about the proposal of Bill 17. I'm a resident of Steinbach and I've been employed by the swine industry for 15 years now. I have seen the good, the bad in 1998, and now the ugly, due to the strong Canadian dollar, country-of-origin labelling, high input costs and now, Bill 17.

The Manitoba swine employment statistics show that 15,000 individuals are currently being employed by our industry. I find this number extremely low when you look at all the rural communities booming with homes and infrastructure, which is mostly fuelled by agriculture. If you include all the employment spin-offs that our industry has created, I would say that there are far more than 15,000 individuals directly or indirectly employed by our industry.

This whole Bill 17 is driven by politics who are not seeing the negative implications that this can have on our province. Mr. Government, let's not be hypocritical over the environmental facts. Let's continue to be strong on farming and keep our taxpayers in Manitoba while resuming with the below-average unemployment rate. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Jolicoeur.

Questions for the presenter.

Mr. Eichler: Not really a question, but a comment. I certainly thank you for your presentation. The committee has heard a number of presentations, and certainly your voice is very important to us. So thank you for taking the time to come in.

Mr. Chairperson: Response to that, sir?

Mr. Jolicoeur: No. I needed to say what I had to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you very much for coming in, Dave, and for your presentation.

Tell us a little bit about, you know, your role in the industry, and give us some examples which make you feel that it's a lot more than 15,000 people in the industry.

Mr. Jolicoeur: I'll give you a personal example. I've built a couple of houses over the last 10 years and I've hired plumbers, carpenters, electricians, guys that do drywalling, roofers; all these people that are somewhat related to the agricultural sector simply because, without generating an income from the ag business, how could I afford to hire these people to do the work? Okay. That's one example.

Now, I think I speak for a lot of people here, because I know there's lots of people that have built houses or have bought some assets in one way or another. Those things are all materialized by having an employment opportunity with the ag business.

* (22:10)

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

I call Guy Lesage. Lesage. Guy Lesage? Mr. Lesage's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Okay. Sorry for the delay. That completes the first calling of the list from a rural perspective. We're now going to call people from the city of Winnipeg.

I begin with Mr. Bill Ross, Manitoba Canola Growers Association. Mr. Ross. Mr. Ross will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mr. William Vis, Envirotech Ag Systems. Mr. Vis.

Stuart Peter Manness. Mr. Manness is dropped.

Cam McGavin, Genetically Advanced Pigs of Canada Ltd. Cam McGavin. He'll be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Vicki Burns. Vicki Burns will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

David Smith, J&R Livestock Consultants Ltd. David Smith.

John Ostermann, Precision Feed. John Ostermann will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Paul Deprez, Nordevco. Paul Deprez. Mr. Deprez will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Peter Vis, Precision Feeds. Peter Vis. Mr. Vis will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Joel Gosselin. Joel Gosselin. Mr. Gosselin will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Bill McDonald, Winnipeg Humane Society. Bill McDonald will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Jason Care. Jason Care will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Paul Howarth. Paul Howarth will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Carl Dornn. Carl Dornn. Carl Dornn will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Chris Latimer, Nutrition Partners. Chris Latimer. Mr. Latimer, do you have any written materials for the committee.

Mr. Chris Latimer (Nutrition Partners): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may begin.

Mr. Latimer: Mr. Chairperson, members of the Legislature, and also everyone in the gallery that is here in overwhelming support for this grass roots issue. My name is Chris Latimer and I work for an animal nutrition company in western Canada called Nutrition Partners. I would like to start this speech with an insert from Sunday's June 8 *Winnipeg Sun*, by the Honourable Minister Stan Struthers, section here. The quote: Water protection is the key focus of legislation that permanently stops pork industry expansion in hog alley. We need to ensure growth of the hog industry does not come at the expense of Lake Winnipeg or any other water source.

This statement made in the paper personally made me frustrated with this elected government. I normally stay out of political issues, and I've never spoken to a committee like this. I apologize; I'm not a very good public speaker, but this issue is so wrong in so many ways, I thought I had to speak.

Why does this government have to use this hog industry that contributes \$850 million directly to the provincial economy as a political football? The city of Winnipeg adds approximately 400 tonnes per year of phosphorus to Lake Winnipeg in a distance of about 16 miles. They have up to year 2014 to bring it up to environmental standards. But hog farmers in this province have had a moratorium placed on them with no science to support it. Then the CEC states also that there are no scientific reasons for this moratorium to keep it in place.

What's next? In your political wisdom, you've given the voters in this province the impression that the hog industry is to blame for all the pollution and algae bloom in Lake Winnipeg. All I've heard lately about the environment is that this government is doing something about the environment. All they've done is imposed a ban on building barns in half of the agriculturally sustainable area in Manitoba and

have preached that they are saving the whole province from all the bad environmental issues in this province.

I am just a young person with a wife and two small kids that used to come from a small town outside of Winnipeg-Treherne, Manitoba. I used to farm with my dad for many years until he passed away. I remember shaking hands with a Member of Parliament, Brian Pallister, at my dad's funeral, him saying to me, I bet you will miss farming with your dad.

I do miss farming with him. I chose to get out of farming on my own terms, not because of political football.

I feel sorry for those young farmers in this restricted area that will be forced out of the industry because they will not have the choice to expand, renovate, remodel our operations. All operations have to be replaced after a certain number of years. We all understand that as normal growth. Most young farmers who want to get into the industry want to make some changes, and they start by improving the family farm and better their family way of life. They will no longer have that choice.

Also, I feel sorry for the Hutterite colonies in Manitoba, which I counted on a map to be about 60 of them affected by this moratorium. Most colonies, as you've seen in the last few days, have a fair portion of their earnings from their farm from swine. You will be killing these colonies a slow and painful death.

Farming is a wonderful lifestyle, and I don't understand why this government wants to take that lifestyle away from us. All the phosphorus regulations and building permits that are required, currently, combined with manure management plans that are all in place, and this government still wants to impose the legislation, which is absurd.

* (22:20)

The first night I heard Mr. Struthers say that farmers can still build in the western part of the province. This is okay if you're ready to build a new barn, but what are these people to do with what they have? The average barn costs between \$2 million and \$3 million for a sow barn. What are they to do, run it into the ground as it is and then take the loss for a longer period of time? Economically, it probably would be better to put it into a holding company, refinance the current value, go bankrupt and hand the keys to the bank. Is that what you

would like Manitoba farmers to start doing? Economically, if you figure it out, it might be a smarter route than a slow painful death that will come to farmers that cannot replace their assets in the industry as needed.

This government has spent a lot of time and dollars on the CEC hearings, and they came out with a 188-page binder with recommendations that say the industry is sustainable. They disregard this report and try to push this bill through just baffles me.

I work for a company called Nutrition Partners, and we operate in Canada and the U.S. under that name. Our parent company is Premier Nutrition, which operates in 20 other countries. We, as a company, have discussed this topic, and all nutritionists and employees in the company do not see the science behind this bill. Our head nutritionist from the U.K. spoke at the CEC hearings about the science of the phosphorus and the use of phytase in animal feeds.

This Bill 17 was formed without looking at the science of the matter. If you really want to look at the science of the matter, look to table 4 of the regulations for feed act for change. Table 4 says that farmers have to add 0.5 of total phosphorus into hog diets as a minimum. This is an expensive constraint and adds environmental pollution of course. We as a nutrition company have to formulate diets to these requirements even with the addition of phytase. With a few more years, with the newer generation phytases coming on the market, this overloading of phosphorus on diets will get even worse.

The addition of phytase lowers the output of total phosphorus on average by about 35 percent. In short, if the pig can't use it, there's too much in the diet, it has to be passed through into the slurry, but we have to formulate this way due to regulations tell us we have to. I'm not a nutritionist myself, but this is what we have to tell our clients.

This industry is finding ways of reducing phosphorus levels and using lower protein diets on their own to better the environment. There is no political mandate for this. We do it for the environment and to be good stewards of the land. I wrote this section just a while ago. I wasn't going to add it but I will.

I came back from Iowa Pork last week. I was down there, and the U.S. industry is scared of the Canadian industry because of this ban. I met with a company who's looking for a 600 to 1,200 farrow-to-

finish operation somewhere in Canada. I have an order in hand. I need to find a suitable barn location for a nucleus herd. These animals will be shipped around the world. They currently have no presence in North America. In my recommendation to them, I will be putting forward is we find a barn in Saskatchewan. At least, that government wants to work with farmers. I will make no recommendation until this bill is removed. If it is not, then I will recommend Saskatchewan or the U.S. and I hate to say that.

All farmers take pride in their land so they can pass it along to future generations. This bill takes away the liberties of the farmers and only it pleases the readers of newspapers and politicians so they can say they fulfilled their political promises.

In conclusion, I will read a quote from the *Winnipeg Sun* again, under the section by Minister Stan Struthers: our government has allocated to \$200 million as a partner with the city, federal government, and the ratepayer in ensuring that wastewater treatment in Winnipeg is brought up to standards.

We as a hog industry are not looking for a \$200-million handout to solve our problems like this government. Farmers are just looking to farm the land in a sustainable manner like the CEC stated, with the appropriate rules and regulations to follow based on science and not political pressures. Thank you for your time, and I hope this speech will make a difference for future generations of young people that will be affected by this decision.

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

Questions.

Mrs. Stefanson: I don't so much have a question for you, Mr. Latimer, but I do want to thank you for bringing your perspective forward tonight from your industry. I just want to say that I think your dad would be very proud of you being here tonight, standing before committee and bringing your thoughts forward. So thank you very much for being here.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation. I took note of the point you made about moving a potential barn of hogs to Saskatchewan. New genetics?

Mr. Latimer: Yes.

Mr. Derkach: What would the value of a project like that be worth to the operator and to us, as a province? How many jobs would there be associated with that?

Mr. Latimer: I don't know exactly. I'll throw out some rough numbers, but 600 farrow-to-finish would normally employ between four and five people directly, let alone indirectly. Costs on a genetic barn like that would be \$3 million to \$4 million, or \$5 million probably, because it's grandparents' stock; it's not commercial stock.

Sorry, what was the second part of your question?

Mr. Derkach: I just wondered what the economic impact would be, besides the capital cost of that.

Mr. Latimer: Economic input of a 600-sow would be about \$3.5 million to \$4 million in sales, expenses off that. This being a genetic, everything would be flown out to around the world.

This contract would not be North American. It would be Mexico and around the world, nothing sold in Canada and the U.S. The added premiums to that would be another three quarters of a million, probably, to that gross sale number.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Derkach, a second supplemental.

Mr. Derkach: Just very quickly, how many projects of this kind might there be out there, which could potentially come to this province, and now, with this bill looming over the industry, will go to other jurisdictions?

Mr. Latimer: I've only been with the company for a little over two years. In the time that our company's been operating in Canada, I think we've done about six projects which have been handed down to us from our parent company in the U.K.—six, a lot of them larger than this one.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you very much, Mr. Latimer, for your presentation.

Sitting across the table from the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), the Minister of Agriculture is telling us that Manitoba is open for business for the hog business.

You're telling us that you're recommending your investors go somewhere else. We on this side of the House have a hard time understanding why the minister is saying they're open for business and

you're advising your investors to go somewhere else—any other province.

Can you rationalize that for us? Obviously, it must be some political motivation here. Is it pure politics that investors do not now want to invest in Manitoba?

Mr. Latimer: I used to farm myself, and it's a business. It's a way of life, but it's a business. If I sit back and if I'm going to invest money that type of money, I want a return on my investment over the life of that barn.

If I have unknown pressures before I build, there's no possible way I'm going to take that risk or my bank is probably going to let me take that risk. There's no way that I could sit with a clear conscience and then work with that customer when, in six months or a year down the road, the rug gets pulled out from underneath him, and he loses his investment. Why take the risk? It's a business; it's not play money.

*(22:30)

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

Mr. Latimer: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Louise Hedman. Louise Hedman will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Andy Waddell. Andy Waddell will be dropped to the bottom.

Greg Muench. Greg Muench to the bottom.

Peter Provis, Sheridan Hauser Provis Swine Health Services Ltd. Mr. Provis, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Peter Provis (Sheridan Hauser Provis Swine Health Services Ltd.): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Provis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and honoured committee members. I am presenting today on behalf of Sheridan Hauser Provis Swine Health Services. I speak today as a voice of our practice and as a concerned citizen.

I would like to give you some background on our business. We are a swine exclusive veterinary practice. The company was founded in 1988 with two veterinarians and one office staff. Our business has grown with the swine industry. Our company now consists of 21 employees supporting their

families and contributing to the economic and the social well-being of Manitoba, both urban and rural. Our employees are Manitobans, as well as some who have come from out of province and, indeed, internationally to join our practice. Our veterinary practice now provides for over 50 Manitobans. Our practice is well respected in the industry and has played a role in establishing and maintaining the excellent health, productivity and reputation of swine in Manitoba. These pigs have a reputation on the North American market because of their high health and their predictable supply.

We are professionals. We practice science-based veterinary medicine and our decisions are based on science. I implore the government to do likewise. While we provide traditional veterinary services that include identifying and treating sick animals, much of our work is to provide other services which are outside the traditional role of food, animal veterinarians. We work very hard at preventing disease, minimizing antibiotic usage, promoting judicious practices and promoting and advocating for the welfare of the pig. We also act as a conduit for transfer of new information in the never ending drive to produce food in a more efficient and a sustainable manner. These are all services that are provided by us because they are demanded by a progressive, responsible and a sophisticated swine industry. I'm very concerned that the industry, whose viability has been weakened by Bill 17, will not have the resources to support critical veterinary activities that are often overlooked, but that can hugely impact public safety. Our veterinarians are critical front-line players in maintaining and monitoring food safety at the farm level.

We also have a primary role in disease surveillance. We monitor for emerging syndromes and diseases that can impact the health of Canada's national livestock herd and that can pose a public health threat. This is an often overlooked function of having a healthy veterinary oversight and presence in the field.

Swine production is a business and the swine industry faces economic realities that all other businesses in our society also face today. There is a relentless drive and an economic demand to gain efficiencies and to adopt new technologies as they become available. These pressures are placed on our swine industry by society, and we accept them.

Our present global society demands a safe, wholesome product at an economic price. The

Manitoba industry has delivered and it has risen to the challenge of providing these. These market pressures will continue to challenge us, no doubt, and will require the local industry to adapt and to embrace new technologies. Many of these technologies cannot be utilized without the flexibility to adapt, to improve and alter the physical environment for the betterment of the pig and the food that it provides.

The past 20 years in swine production provide many examples of how farmers have had to change their facilities to accommodate market demands. The market has gradually demanded that pigs that used to be sold at 180 pounds be raised to 260 to 280 pounds. This has required the farmer to build more space to accommodate these extra four weeks of growth. The farmer adapted because he could, and it made sense to do so. This will not be permitted with Bill 17.

The market under pressure to be efficient demands meat from improved livestock, genetics and production practices. Today's animals produce more pigs and more meat from the same resources that were in place 20 years ago. These extra pigs need more space. Over the years, this space has been added to barns piecemeal, or in some cases, extra barns and facilities have been built as productivity has increased. The farmer adapted because he could, and it made sense to do so. This will not be permitted with Bill 17.

New technologies, such as multi-site production, where pigs are raised on different sites throughout their life cycle have improved pig health. Some farms have adapted to this technology and have grown their business or altered their production by acquiring or building barns. The farmer adapted because he could, and it made sense to do so.

The question from the uninformed is common: Why not build it somewhere else in Manitoba that is not affected by the ban? This is not a tenable solution for many reasons. The infrastructure is in place locally, such as farm management, access to skilled labour, proximity to feed mills, markets and specialized services, such as veterinarian input. Moving a small part of the farm's production will cause an increased cost that will cripple and disadvantage the farmer. With Bill 17, the farmer cannot adapt because it makes no sense to do so.

Bill 17 will not allow current producers in Manitoba to be viable. As a veterinarian practice which exists solely because of the Manitoba swine

industry, we feel strongly that Bill 17 will impact food safety and endanger public health by crippling veterinarian infrastructure in food animals. This poses a danger to Manitobans due to reduced surveillance and vigour in monitoring food safety and emerging disease syndromes. Thank you.

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

Questions.

Mr. Struthers: Thanks, Peter.

One of the recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission deals with antibiotics, and the Clean Environment Commission has suggested that we work with the federal government with this recommendation. Late on Saturday night, we had a group in who were raising some alarm bells in terms of use of antibiotics in the hog industry of Manitoba. I don't know how much use there is of antibiotics in Manitoba. I'd like you to kind of shed some light on that for me. I was interested that you said that you're into finding ways to reduce the use of antibiotics—if you can help with that as well.

Mr. Provis: The Manitoba industry and the western Canadian industry in general have an excellent reputation for the health of its hogs. They are demanded throughout much of North America because of that, and they fetch a price on the market because of that. That health has been maintained and established because there have been adequate resources and adequate profit to all the farmers to do that. I think it's clear that if you were to look at antibiotic use, you would probably find that the Manitoba swine herd uses far less antibiotics than the rest of the North American market because of the health, because the profitability has allowed them to maintain those practices to provide facilities, room and other things which allow them to get away from using antibiotics as a crutch.

Mrs. Rowat: Thank you for your presentation this evening.

I've heard on the weekend and through this evening that our product is something to be very proud of. Our product is probably the best in the world or comparable to the best in the world. So I'd like you to comment on that.

I also want to know if the 15 employees that you have are located in one community or are they spread across the province or the country.

Third, you talk about flexibility with regard to requirements, both from, obviously, provincial regulations, but also the industry and how those challenges may be affecting some of your clients. Now with the moratorium, obviously it's going to create more challenges and concerns. So if you could speak to those three points.

* (22:40)

Mr. Provis: Sure. We have offices in Winnipeg and in Steinbach, and our employees are scattered throughout those communities and surrounding Winnipeg.

Manitoba, I think, is increasingly becoming an isowean-sow province in many respects. That's because of the demand that it receives for its product from the U.S., which many typical U.S. states cannot provide, that product, high health, free of disease, excellent production, which they simply can't achieve.

Your third question?

Mrs. Rowat: The third question was regarding the flexibility and the requirements, not only from the industry, but also from the province, and how this moratorium is going to put extra pressure on your clients—what you're hearing or what your observation is with regard to that extra challenge.

Mr. Provis: The trend, not just in the swine industry but in every other industry, be it hardware stores or banks or schools, government buildings included, is to consolidate and get bigger for efficiencies. Certainly, the swine industry has had to go there too.

I think many of our clients in certain parts of the province will be really ham-strung by this Bill 17, because they will not be allowed to change. Essentially, that's going to make a lot of their operations obsolete very quickly.

Mr. Briese: Thank you for your presentation. I know the veterinarian in my own community specializes in swine and hogs, in the hog industry.

Are there other companies besides yours that—you've got some competition out there, I presume. If so, how many are there? Do you have a feel for how many are out there? What you're doing—how many people actually would be employed in that line of work?

Mr. Provis: It's a relatively small field. There are, if I had to put a number on it, there are probably about

15 veterinarians in Manitoba, who focus on swine medicine.

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

Mr. Provis: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Blaine Tully. Blaine Tully. Mr. Tully will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

John Fjeldsted, Manitoba Environmental Industries Association Inc. John Fjeldsted will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Mark Peters. Mark Peters—

Floor Comment: Mark is on his way. He's here. Mark is on his way.

Mr. Chairperson: Who, Mr. Peters?

Floor Comment: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: We'll call Mr. Peters when he comes back in the room. Bring it to our attention up here.

Tracey Bryksa. Tracey Bryksa will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Karin Wittenberg, Associate Dean, Research, for the Faculty of Agricultural Food and Sciences. Ms. Wittenberg, do you have any written materials for us?

Ms. Karin Wittenberg (Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, University of Manitoba): I do.

Mr. Chairperson: I see. The Clerk will distribute them. You may begin when you're ready.

Ms. Wittenberg: Thank you very much. I'm sure everybody's ready to rumble a little bit, after sitting for so long—[interjection]—I'm not going to do that for you.

Let me start by saying that the tone of what I want to say to you is that our future lies in our ability to collaborate, work together toward a future that meets the needs of Manitobans; that comes with understanding. Just in listening over the last couple of days to presentations, it's clear to me that a big part of the issue that we're addressing is our understanding.

The first night I was here, the committee was asked to allow a speaker in because he had his young family here, three children. Everyone that I saw here agreed that we should let that speaker come forward. Halfway through the evening, there was another

speaker who had a plane to catch at 6 in the morning. When the situation was presented to the committee, everyone agreed to let that person come forward. A little bit later on, there was a situation where a speaker asked to be able to come forward to present because they still had animals at home to feed. That presenter was not allowed to come forward and I wondered why that was. That was on Monday night.

I think that happened because we as individuals understand what it means to have young children here late at night. We as individuals have all experienced the early morning flights. But we as individuals have not all experienced the work, the role, the effort and the type of experience that goes into managing our livestock operations. So when many of the people that I talk to think about feeding animals, they think about a pail, a scoop and putting something into the dog dish. The sophistication of the equipment and the need to have experience in doing things correctly is sometimes missed.

The second thing I observed tonight is the way we dress things. Copper and zinc, which are essential nutrients to plants and animals, are now being identified as heavy metals—heavy metals which are normally associated with industrial processes. I think it's important that we're able to move to a level where there's understanding and knowledge. I just wanted to bring that forward before I start the address.

I've got three points that I'd like to make. These are points that contribute to, I think, a very healthy debate around this bill and much of what happens in our province.

The first point is that it's critical for us to understand that environmental policy can impact agriculture's ability to contribute to an improved environment, whether we're talking about cleaner air, water, healthier and more productive land, or availability of our sustainable resources. In many parts of the developed world, the approach to environmental policy has changed. It's changed from what has been a somewhat narrow focus to a much more outcome-orientated policy that allows broad and integrated approaches for issue assessment and solution finding. The type of policy imposed will influence how we as a university, how the Faculty of Agriculture and Food Sciences, namely, the province's main education and research arm for the agri-food sector, can work with other provincial stakeholders towards improved environment.

The strength in the bill and some parts of the bill are that you have a control, a level of assurance that

you can limit the number of animals. This is not the same as a development of policy to reduce nutrient loading. Innovative incentive-based regulatory tools have greater potential for environmental return through improved cost effectiveness, promotion of innovative technologies for environmental controls, stakeholder engagement through environmental management systems, best management practices, innovative technologies, community liaison, and pollution prevention planning requires a framework that is based on environmental objectives standards.

A regulatory climate that encourages further investment and adoption of new technologies will allow individuals, individual farms and communities to thrive as they individually choose to work together to meet environmental outcomes that should be set by the federal and provincial governments. Government needs to be the leader in providing a structure that supports this combined stakeholder effort to achieve the desired outcome for Lake Winnipeg and other water bodies in the province.

* (22:50)

It is in that kind of an environment, that kind of policy, that our efforts as a Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences can be most supportive through our education, research and outreach programs. I will use as an example the recent creation of a chair in water quality and the potential establishment of the watershed research institute as a mechanism to co-ordinate information, to analyze and evaluate, and bring together agencies and organizations that are interested in undertaking water quality research and watershed management activities in the province as a very positive example of policy that will help grow our future. On the other hand, there are certain portions of Bill 17 that limit our ability to bring forward that kind of growth.

The second point I want to make is that researchers in the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences can be very important contributors to the development of knowledge, science and technology, increasing the productivity and profitability of our agriculture sector. The World Commission on Environment and Development aptly defines sustainability as forms of progress that meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

We've heard that over and over again, from producers, from our colonies and from others. People get it. They work in that direction. For sustainable animal production, this concept integrates three main

things. It integrates environmental health, economic profitability, and social and economic equity. The Faculty of Ag and Food Sciences researchers work in partnership with government, industry and other stakeholders to identify and address not just global but also unique provincial and regional issues that are related to environment, rural sustainability and health. I'll give you the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment as one example of a partnership effort that in this case is designed to address sustainable animal agriculture.

We went through an effort of consultation with scientists and engineers from many disciplines to develop a vision for the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment. Today this vision represents \$16-million worth of infrastructure at the University of Manitoba providing facilities and laboratories for student training, for research and outreach toward solutions that are required for animal agriculture. The centre is designed to use a whole-farm approach. It can study energy, microbial and nutrient movement and use in and beyond the farm ecosystem. This facility is not only available to researchers in our faculty, but to the Faculties of Engineering, Science, Medicine, Environment. I'm pleased to say that they have all seen value in working with us.

The University of Manitoba scientists were awarded their initial money, \$7.1 million in infrastructure, through the Canada Foundation for Innovation and Manitoba Innovation Foundation. We got that money because an international review panel identified the value of this kind of work, not just for our region, our province, but internationally. This is, today, still—this award was in 2002—the largest award that has come to Manitoba. We have made an investment. We should use that investment to the best of our abilities.

Of the \$4.8 million that was raised from non-public funds to date, roughly 40 percent have come from individuals across Canada, but mainly in this province. The remainder has come from industry. Those industry contributions represent financial institutions, national companies, international companies. Of the industry contributions, commodity groups, the farmers of Manitoba, namely, contributed about 11 percent of the total.

The centre has many unique features to address the very issues we heard people talk about today. We have, across Manitoba, examples of that. In eastern

Manitoba we've had a research site on producer land actively looking at the—

Mr. Chairperson: You're at 10 minutes.

Ms. Wittenberg: Thank you—air, water and productivity of applying liquid hog manure on farmed land, monitoring where pathogens go in the environment and being able to provide us, what I would still call after four years, preliminary data, because environmental research is that way.

I would also like to bring to bear the fact that the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences is a major education arm for agriculture and the food sectors. Today there are more than 10,000 alumni. You've heard from some of them. They are our leaders and, with support our education programs, whether they're formal programs or short programs, can bring new information, important information, to people of Manitoba.

The third point I'd like to make is that the research undertaken by the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences undergoes review processes at many levels and is recognized for its high quality. In the course of its efforts to get good information, the Clean Environment Commission came to the University of Manitoba to access the expert opinions of our scientists. The information that was given came from research that had undergone peer review at many levels, that has been published and is worthy. I hope that this government sees trust in engaging in future research to help identify and work through to the solutions that we have in terms of agriculture and the environment.

I would like to conclude by saying that it's in the spirit of mutual respect in partnerships in this province that we can contribute as a Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences in a meaningful manner to the successful future for our province. I would certainly encourage this government to take advantage of our experts. I know you have to some extent, but we are very interested in continuing to work with you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Wittenberg.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for your presentation. It's exciting to see the investment that has come from the University of Manitoba, in part, because the industry is here and there's some important things to learn about what's happening.

I take it when you comment on important to have a climate which fosters investment if we're

going to improve the way we approach the environment that what your saying is that we need to make sure that it's possible to make investments and the moratorium is a potential problem there, and that we should make sure that we have a climate where people will invest because they will invest in the improvements in the technology, and that will give us gradual improvements in the way we look after the environment.

The second point I'd like you to just address briefly is is there any evidence from the research that you've been doing that the phosphorus put on with manure into our agricultural soils is overloading the soils so that, in other words, the soils have got a finite capacity to bind phosphorus and to hold on to it. Are we in trouble of having the soils overloaded so that we will, you know, have a lot of phosphorus going into the waterways as a result?

Ms. Wittenberg: In response to the first part of the question, yes, definitely. I think a policy that encourages industry to keep moving forward with clear standards allows choices to be made and investments to be made, and that's when technologies get picked up.

With respect to the second question, there is such a thing as overloading phosphorus on manure and some of my peers or cohorts at the faculty are phosphorus experts that would certainly be willing to address the specifics of that. At the same time, it is safe to say that we have an understanding of phosphorus management and we can avoid overloading.

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

If Bill 17 was to go through in its current impact, what impact will that have on research dollars flowing into the University of Manitoba?

* (23:00)

Ms. Wittenberg: The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences last year was the second highest in terms of research dollars that it attracted on the University of Manitoba campus which is the main research arm for this province. We are very capable of attracting funding. I think what is relevant here is that we would like to attract funding and do work that is relevant to our province. As you've heard with some other industries, we can move on, but is that the right thing to do? I, as a born and bred Manitoban who has a great sense of pride in our province, feel that it's important that our relevance to this province

is a priority. Our relevance can only come if we're engaged with our stakeholders.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this presentation has expired. Thank you, Ms. Wittenberg.

Mr. Eichler: I would just ask that her presentation be read into *Hansard*, as well her oral presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee that her written presentation, as well as her oral, be included in full in *Hansard*? [Agreed]

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: Substitutions: Mr. Lemieux in for Mr. Mackintosh; Ms. Irvin-Ross in for Mr. Ashton; Ms. McGifford in for Mr. Jha; and Ms. Howard in for Ms. Selby.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: As a result of these substitutions, we have lost our Vice-Chairperson. We need a new Vice-Chair.

Ms. Wowchuk: I nominate Ms. Howard.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Howard has been nominated. Are there any other nominations? Seeing none, Ms. Howard is appointed as Vice-Chairperson.

Order, please. Let's proceed here. I called Mr. Mark Peters a few moments ago. He wasn't in the room. Is he here now?

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

Mr. Mark Peters (Private Citizen): No, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Mark Peters: Good evening. My name is Mark Peters and I am a constituent of Fort Whyte.

I would like to thank the committee for giving me the opportunity to speak to Bill 17. I just had taken a break. This is my third night here, and I was getting a little tired. I went out to my truck to take a little break and got a phone call that you had called my name, so in I rushed. You can see I'm pretty wet because it's raining quite hard.

Civilization began with agriculture. I think it's important that we remember that. When nomadic people settled down and began growing their own food, the world was forever changed. Villages, towns and cities grew and prospered and this prosperity allowed knowledge, the arts and the technical sciences to flourish. We are able to come here today

to speak to this bill because this Legislature, here, was built by agriculture.

But today we have become so disconnected from agriculture and where our food comes from, and our provincial leaders are demonstrating that disconnect with Bill 17. We have lost, somewhere in this whole debate, that farmers produce food, food, the very stuff that keeps us alive. I'm tired. I'm tired of sitting here for three days. I'm tired of all the misinformation. I'm tired of pork producers being painted as polluters and animal abusers, and I am extremely disappointed that our Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) has done so little to stand up for our Manitoba pork producers.

We can sit here and debate the misconception that pork producers are the only reason that Lake Winnipeg is dying, but, with the passing of Bill 17, you will be effectively wiping out the majority of independent, family owned pork production units. The day the bill passes, it will mean that their farms, which, in some cases, have been nurtured for three or four generations will be worthless. I am going to say that again. The day the bill passes, it will mean that their farms, which, in some cases, have been nurtured for three or four generations will be worthless.

You've heard that numerous, numerous times over the last few days. You will be killing a viable, sustainable industry, and Lake Winnipeg will continue its slow death because you've stuck your head into the sand on the other issues which are contributing to Lake Winnipeg's demise.

I was fortunate on Sunday to listen to Dan Wiens speak. Dan is a farmer south of Winnipeg. He also works with the Mennonite Central Committee. On the Mennonite Central Committee, he's in charge of global food and water issues.

I believe it's this week MCC is having their annual general meeting in Ontario, and they have now put North American farmers on their list of people whom they have to be looking out for. He says we need more farmers; we need more farmers and more family farms in Canada. This industry is dying a slow, slow death.

Margaret Thatcher was well known for using the phrase, bring me solutions, not problems. You've heard about all the problems, so I just want to offer you a few solutions.

Do not pass Bill 17. That's the first one; it's pretty easy. Let's just not pass it. Let's make a

commitment to work with the industry to review and implement the recommendations of the CEC report. Instead of photo opportunity funding announcements, such as food banks, so they can obtain cull program meat, let's truly invest in agriculture.

Let's build and fund some world-class university research facilities and develop ways to improve the sustainability of agriculture. Let's truly invest in agriculture—maybe we should mandate Manitoba Hydro and Central Gas to invest in biogas energy development. That's a concept.

Let's truly invest in agriculture by supporting our pork producers, by producing incentives to produce world-class, nutritious, animal considerate pork. Let's truly invest in agriculture by making the commitment to have Manitoba become the place where the world comes to see a vibrant rural society, a rural society with lots of vibrant sustainable farmers.

Let's be the example for the world. We've got all the resources; we have the people. We have the technology. Let's truly invest in agriculture by filling our agriculture schools with positive, future, agricultural leaders and farmers and, yes, maybe even someday, some of our politicians.

You've heard lots about concentrating our efforts on reducing the impact of other sources. The other thing I would like you to do is—I would challenge all of you, every single one of you, to visit a hog farm in Manitoba, actually go to one of these units and see what they're like.

My grandfather, Deidric Peters, was a part of the prosperity that we enjoy in Manitoba from agriculture. He immigrated to Canada from Russia in 1924; by 1925, he had bought a farm with his brother in southern Manitoba and, in 1936, he took over his father-in-law's farm in Genodintaw, which is a small village south of Plum Coulee. My cousins are still producing pork on that land today and I truly hope that this land will continue to produce pork in the future.

In closing, I ask you to do this. As members of this Legislative Assembly, when you come to work, take a look up; look at the Golden Boy. A sheaf of wheat in his left arm represents the fruits of our labour, while the torch in his right hand represents a call to youth to join his eternal pursuit of a more prosperous future.

You need to stop this bill and you need to work with the people who work in agriculture and make sure that all Manitoba pork producers and all farmers and Manitobans have a prosperous future. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Peters.

Questions?

Mr. Derkach: I don't have a question. I simply want to thank Mr. Peters for coming out and making his presentation and thank him for waiting patiently for the three nights that he's been here, because we need to give this government a repeated message.

Although this message doesn't vary significantly from what we've heard before, it is coming from a different perspective and I want to thank you for that.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Peters, response to that?

Mr. Mark Peters: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: I see no further questions. Thank you for your presentation, sir.

Mr. Mark Peters: Thank you.

*(23:10)

Mr. Chairperson: Jeff Mah, Envirotech Ag Systems Ltd. Jeff Mah will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Harry J. Toner. Harry J. Toner, to the bottom of the list.

David Hedman. David Hedman, to the bottom of the list.

Milan Hajzler. Milan Hajzler. Okay, Milan goes to the bottom of the list.

Clint Miller. Clint Miller, to the bottom of the list.

Xavier Temple. Xavier Temple, to the bottom of the list.

Committee Substitution

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, substitutions: Mr. Derkach for Mrs. Rowat.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Janet Honey. Janet Honey.

Ian Halket. Ian Halket, to the bottom of the list.

Ryan Buchanan. Ryan Buchanan, to the bottom of the list.

Jessie Lazo. Jessie Lazo, to the bottom of the list.

Jason Dufahl, Norampac. Jason Dufahl, to the bottom of the list.

Melodie Malmquist. Melodie Malmquist, to the bottom of the list.

Marie Ottenbreit. Marie Ottenbreit, to the bottom of the list.

Debbie Klassen. Debbie Klassen, to the bottom of the list.

David Grant. David Grant, to the bottom of the list.

Kelli-Ann Fostey. Kelli-Ann Fostey, to the bottom of the list.

Dennis Robles. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Dennis Robles (Private Citizen): No, sir. I just have my notes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may proceed.

Mr. Robles: I would like to thank the committee for giving me a chance to speak here tonight.

My name is Dennis Robles, and I am speaking as a private citizen. I'm currently working as a production specialist of Sheridan Heuser Provis Swine Health Services. I have come to Manitoba with my family exactly five years ago this month. I applied for immigration under the Manitoba Provincial Nominee Program to work in the swine industry as hog barn workers are needed by the province at that time.

When we arrived, I immediately seek employment in the swine industry sector and was accepted to work in a 3,000-sow level isowean barn. That was the start of a new life for me and my family but not only for my family. Soon I found out that hundreds of other Filipino immigrants and workers have come to work in the Manitoba swine industry. We have come in hope of having a better future for our children. We believe that by being in this food production sector we are making a difference. We are part of something that we can be proud of, that our children can be proud of.

In speaking before you tonight, I'm speaking on behalf of the many people who come from my country to work in various positions in hog production. Either landed immigrant, working visa, or citizen status, we have come to help Manitoba

produce food in the most efficient way possible, to feed people. We have travelled half across the globe to be here because we believe that producing food is a noble profession. It is something we can be proud of and build our career on.

As a visible minority, I am standing here before you tonight to oppose the ban on hog barn expansion, or Bill 17. I am not an expert in livestock manure spreading or soil science or leaching, but I know one thing, if we stop or hinder the hog producers by having a permanent ban on new development, the whole industry will suffer. The people who came here and are still coming here to work in the hog barns will be affected. Their livelihood will be taken away. The opportunity for a new life here in Canada will be taken away. The opportunity to make a difference by producing food for people will be taken away.

Manitoba is a perfect place to raise and produce hogs. We have all seen the numbers. Production performance here is one of the best in the world. That is our strength. That is Manitoba's strength. Why would we eliminate that strength? Manitoba has the ability to produce pork for the world. Though I have worked with the agriculture industry most of my working career, it is here in Manitoba that I have found food producers that really care about the quality and the way they produce food. Food safety is a major concern, and I can only hope that other countries could follow our standards, because it is at par with the best in the world.

The swine producers in particular show genuine concern about the environment. Coming from a third world country like the Philippines, I have seen and appreciated the efforts done to make sure that manure is managed according to environmental regulations. This is not only because regulations are in place but because producers truly care about the well-being of the land. The most advanced technology is being utilized to ensure appropriate spraying of manure in the fields. Soil samples are taken and tested periodically to make sure that crops planted are according to the field nutrient composition, or if further manure spraying is required. Crop lands to be planted are planned way out before seeding. Comparing the manure management procedures here with the ones where I came from is like night and day. The hog producers are thinking ahead and ensuring that their children will have a future as they grow up and become food producers as well.

I have met, talked, and worked with these hog producers, and I am proud to have done so. They have shown class and professionalism, even at the most trying times of the industry. Even now, as the swine industry continues to bleed and their livelihood threatened, the hog producers have chosen a course of action that is most admirable: communication. Other people would have revolted, gone into protest, and become disruptive. I have seen that happen, people power in the streets, people getting hurt, some being killed, but, instead, look at where we are. Farmers are leaving their families behind to be heard in this committee.

* (23:20)

You have also sacrificed your time here as well. Please listen, open your minds and hearts to what has been said and is still to be said. Please sit down with the real experts, the true stewards of the land, the hog producers and hog specialists. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Robles.

I have Mr. Pedersen.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your presentation. It certainly comes from the heart, and we appreciate you taking time to be in here. This is our job to be here and to listen to you, and Bill 17, if it goes through, we believe sends a very negative message to the industry as a whole.

You've come to this country and brought your family to this country with the belief that you could work within the hog industry. What message does Bill 17 send to, you know, more of your family in the Philippines as to whether they have a job here in the hog industry in Manitoba?

Mr. Robles: Thank you very much for your comments.

Well, Bill 17 just basically says don't come here anymore, and we don't need you here. So that's how I see it.

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

Mr. Robles: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Dennis Kozier. Dennis Kozier. Mr. Kozier, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Dennis Kozier (Private Citizen): Yes, I do, and I have a request to the committee as well.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Pass on your materials to the Clerk. What is your request, sir?

Mr. Dennis Kozier: I would like to have my son read my presentation instead of me.

Mr. Chairperson: By all means, what's your son's name?

Mr. Dennis Kozier: Christopher.

Mr. Chairperson: Christopher. Is that the will of the committee that Christopher, his son, reads? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Dennis Kozier: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Hello, Christopher.

Mr. Christopher Kozier (Private Citizen): Hello. Good evening.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Mr. Christopher Kozier: I'm just going to grab a little bit of water.

Mr. Chairperson: By all means.

Mr. Christopher Kozier: I'd like to first thank the committee for their consideration in letting me speak on my father's behalf. I'd like to thank the committee for their dedication and commitment being here late into the evening. Sometimes it makes me wonder who'd want to be an MLA at times.

I'm going to read the material that my father has presented. It's a little bit awkward, I'm going to refer to my mother as my wife. That's the first time that's happened, but just to follow along with what my father has presented here.

I've chosen to make this presentation to the review committee on Bill 17 based on my association with the members of Starlite Hutterite Colony just northwest of Starbuck, Manitoba. I'm sure by now you're all very well aware of where that is.

My wife was a teacher at the colony school for nine years and over that time my family has come to respect the Hutterites for their contribution to our community, our economy and to the growth and prosperity of Manitoba. My wife knew that she would always get to work in the morning because, on several occasions when she ploughed into a snow drift in January or February, she would call from her car to the colony and soon a front-end loader would come down the road to dig her out. If she stayed at school working past suppertime the girls would bring her something to eat while she worked. My wife

often came home with fresh bread or strawberry jam or a jar of Hutterite pickle relish for hog dogs. My wife was treated like family.

The Hutterites originated in the Austrian province of Tyrol in the 16th century, but they migrated to Moravia to escape persecution because of their belief in absolute pacifism. They lived there for over a century until renewed persecution forced them to migrate to Transylvania and then to Ukraine in the early 18th century. When Russia instituted compulsory military service, the Hutterites moved to North America in the 1870s and settled in the Dakota Territory. During World War I, the pacifist Hutterites suffered persecution in the United States, and they moved to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

The Hutterites in Manitoba are hardworking, industrious, friendly and intelligent. They're experts in land use and have been working the land for many generations. A Hutterite man and woman take great pride in their land and its ability to produce in abundance. They feel their greatest sense of accomplishment when they can look at the fruits of their years of labour and see a crop ripening in the field, their children at work on the land, in the barns, the gardens, the shop or the kitchen, and their grandchildren at school learning their German culture that is their heritage and the English, math and science they will need to succeed in the modern world.

If you tried to use your nose to find Starlite Colony, you would never find it. Starlite showcases the latest in modern farm technology: disease-free pig barns that you cannot even walk into without wearing a special suit to prevent contamination to the pigs. I've seen pigs from inside a glass-windowed observation area. The colony grows the feed, raises the pigs, and then transports them to a local slaughtering plant. Pork production is a billion-dollar industry in Manitoba and our Hutterite pork is some of the best in the world.

I saw the third turkey barn under construction. It is about 30 metres wide and 130 metres long. It has a computer-controlled grain-mixing and dispensing system, a hot-water heating system, and a computer-controlled ventilation system which opens vanes and shutters on the side of the rooftop of the building to keep the barn cooler in the summer. The colony produces top-grade turkeys that go to Granny's and Northern Goose and some to the United States. The colony's chickens go to Dunn-Rite and are

considered right from the farm to be some of the best grade product in the world.

The organic agriculture waste from pork production is recycled into the soil. Starlite monitors soil nutrient and fertilizer requirements and uses direct soil injection techniques, which have revolutionized the treatment and application of agricultural wastes to farmland and turned agricultural waste into a valuable resource. The colony is achieving significant cost savings in fertilizer application by realizing the value of organic agriculture waste because it was designed to be recycled.

Our Hutterites have shown that the organic agricultural waste from pork production is a natural resource and not a problem. In fact, agricultural waste products are now being recognized as a valuable organic fertilizer and not as waste anymore. Pennsylvania farms once looked at seeping petroleum oil as a scourge on their farms in the 1850s just before the first oil well was drilled. Today, many people still think that organic agricultural waste is a danger and a threat to the environment. Nothing could be further from the truth. Organic fertilizer that is injected directly into the soil cannot run off and its natural nutrients are recycled completely into the life cycle of crops.

Manure is organic waste, natural waste. It is a resource that today is still undervalued and underutilized. Forty years ago a farmer would rot his farm manure into fertilizer and then truck it into the city and sell it to homeowners who would spread it on their lawn and gardens. Back then I guess there were no synthetic fertilizers, just the organic variety, and I think we were better off.

Today, a worker wearing rubber gloves sprays a stream of chemicals from a tank on a truck and leaves a warning sign on your lawn. My own brother has had to put his dog down because she had cancerous tumours on her paws. How much of those sprayed synthetic chemicals are leached out of the city lawns and dumped into our rivers and lakes on a day like Friday, June 6, in Winnipeg when we received 56 millimetres of rain or on an evening just like today? Could it be the increased use of concentrated synthetic commercial fertilizers today that is responsible for harming our water supply? Today in Canada more municipalities are choosing to ban synthetic chemical fertilizers. The processing and use of organic agricultural waste is the way of

the future, and our Hutterite pork producers have been leading the research in that area.

* (23:30)

It seems that our concerns about the water quality in Lake Winnipeg are quite recent, perhaps now a decade old. Well, then, what about the great flood of 1997? Has anyone figured out how many tonnes of phosphorus came from flooded storehouses in the Red River watershed in 1997? Has anyone calculated how many tonnes of phosphorus were leached from farm fields over-fertilized with synthetic fertilizers in the Red River watershed and dumped in one load into Lake Winnipeg in that single catastrophic event? Has anyone calculated how many years it will take for the lake to absorb this overload and re-establish the long-term equilibrium level for phosphorus in the lake? Is someone trying to blame our pork producers now for high phosphorus levels in Lake Winnipeg that may have actually resulted from the flood of '97? We do seem to have more questions than answers.

Plenty of research has been done on the management of agricultural waste. A report from the natural resources institute at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, states: Waste water will flow through the constructed wetland area where deep bulrush roots will deliver oxygen to the system. The constructed wetland could provide a more practical and environmental alternative to storing agricultural waste.

Now imagine agricultural waste products reduced to normal water through the use of bulrushes, an environmentally friendly alternative.

Research on how to manage and utilize our agricultural waste resources is where government attention should be focussed so that any existing problems can be solved, instead of burying this challenge under volumes of legislation hampering our pork industry.

The present government has chosen to bury its head in the sand on this issue. Bill 17 is not a solution. It is a disaster. What Manitobans need is genuine leadership to do the work necessary to solve a perception problem. Organic agricultural waste turned into organic fertilizer is the way of the past and it is the way of the future. It is recycling our organic natural resources and preserving the integrity and sustaining our environment, instead of loading our environment with less effective, more expensive and dangerous synthetic fertilizers.

Humans have been successfully managing pig manure on this planet for thousands of years, yet the best the Doer government can say today to the Hutterites of Manitoba is: No more pigs. Move on. We're not interested in your technology, your hard work, or how well you manage your agricultural resources.

This is small thanks to some of the finest people in this province who have given so much and asked for so little in return. On a Hutterite colony everyone puts in an honest day's work, and they have never asked for a handout from anybody. The Hutterites are sustainable and successful because they all work together and put their faith in God to guide their labour.

I used to think that the Doer government believed in the value of the labour of the honest folk that built this country. Well, not anymore.

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

Mr. Christopher Kozier: What if this government presented a bill that said there are enough lawyers in Manitoba. Those that are here must maintain their practices at the current size, and no new law offices may be opened. This government would find itself in court being sued for millions of dollars.

How is Bill 17 any different? Bill 17 is saying to our Hutterite communities in Manitoba, we have enough of you. Those that are already here can stay, but your children must look elsewhere for a home because your future success will not be tolerated here.

This bill will come back to haunt this government. If enacted into law, it must instigate a constitutional challenge or a class action suit on the part of pork producers. The government has no research or evidence to deny the pork producers their right to grow and develop their industry. The government has no logical reason to deny pork producers their right to contribute to the economic growth of this province, especially the Hutterites, who have worked tirelessly and raised their families here for generations in order to enjoy such bountiful growth and success.

This bill is a slap in the face and a knife to the heart for our Hutterites. Bill 17 says to our Hutterite friends, you can stay, but half of your children and most of your grandchildren must go to Saskatchewan, or Alberta, or North Dakota. Bill 17 says to the Hutterites of Manitoba, after almost 100 years of believing you found freedom for yourselves

and your families in Manitoba, the Doer government has decided that it will control your futures. Your plans for a new colony for your children cannot go ahead, no matter how hard you work, how much you make use of the best research and new techniques available. You cannot expand and grow as your cultural heritage teaches you. Welcome back to the eastern Europe of five centuries ago. This is right where they started.

Please know that our Hutterite friends refer to this bill as the fight of our lives.

Thank you. I'm happy to entertain any questions for the committee that they might have for me or my father.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kozier. I have questions.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Christopher, and be sure to pass on our regards to your wife from the committee.

Mr. Christopher Kozier: I don't even have a girlfriend yet.

Mr. Struthers: As long as you don't have both at the same—never mind.

An Honourable Member: Stay focussed.

Mr. Struthers: Okay, I'll stay focussed. Thanks, Ralph.

On Saturday, we had a presentation from a doctor of economics from Brandon University and he took a run at some of the financial, some of the economic numbers that Manitoba Pork and others have been putting out. He used the usual kinds of academic arguments and tools to make his case. At the time, I had the feeling he was missing something. I also had that reconfirmed over and over by a number of different presentations that have come forward that, I think, looked a little bit more on the human side of the economics of the industry.

Can you give me a sense of that human side of the economics, what kind of worth that is?

Mr. Christopher Kozier: Particularly in the context of the Hutterite community, this is really a question about freedom, too, freedom to use the land and the natural resources and the God-given talent and ability that the Hutterites have put to, arguably, the best use on the planet. It's been a benefit to all of us as Manitobans to have a sustainable, a very prosperous group of people contribute to our economy in that sense.

I think you'll continue to hear from people that, restricting the growth of the pork industry when it's based on more of a perception than absolute, concrete proof, that there are—irreparable damage is being done to the environment—is a shame to compromise the future and the freedom of people who have, again, some of the best ability that we've ever seen.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Kozier. You mention in your presentation the issue of the Charter challenge. I'm wondering, have you or your father talked with the members of the colonies to get a sense of whether, in fact, they have checked out whether, in fact, this could be a challenge?

Mr. Christopher Kozier: I can't speak on my father's behalf, but I have not begun that discussion. But I can tell you, having studied constitutional law and looking at the case history from the Supreme Court of Canada, that there is, arguably, some ground here. It's a question that certainly would be given more attention if such a bill were to be passed.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation, Mr. Kozier. Oh, one second. Ms. Wowchuk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Dennis, thank you for your presentation and for doing, reading it for your father. I just want to ask you, as you were making that presentation, were those your views—do you support your father's views or are these strictly his views or—so could you—

Mr. Christopher Kozier: I support them, absolutely.

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

Mr. Christopher Kozier: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Dr. Laurie Connor. Ms. Connor, do you have any written materials?

Ms. Laurie Connor (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No. You may proceed.

* (23:40)

Ms. Connor: Thank you very much, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to this committee.

I know by now, having also spent a couple of evenings here, that you have, in fact, heard the many reasons why Bill 17 should be withdrawn: that it is not supported by any factual or scientific evidence and basically ignores the well-founded

recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission; that, by implication, Bill 17 unfairly blames hog farmers for the pollution and nutrient loading of Lake Winnipeg; that it ignores the evidence that nutrient loading in Manitoba's waterways has arisen mostly from non-livestock sources, and that even totally eliminating hog farming will have an insignificant impact on water quality in Manitoba waterways; that Bill 17 basically is draconian legislation that risks devastating many farm families and rural communities.

I do applaud and will support legitimate government initiatives to protect our natural resources. Bill 17 is not one of them. I stand here tonight to request, as have many others, the withdrawal of Bill 17 and to encourage the government of Manitoba to take time to plan the type of well-informed, multifaceted approach needed to address the real issues associated with nutrient loading in our waterways, a plan that charges all Manitobans, including the non-farming majority, to take responsibility for their impact on water quality in this province. Livestock production, and hog producers in particular, should not be the scapegoats.

I grew up in rural southern Ontario and have spent the majority of my working life associated with livestock production. The vast majority of producers recognize the importance of and practise responsible stewardship of their livestock and their land. They have chosen farming, not a nine-to-five job or just a source of income, but a way of life, a way of life that provides safe, high-quality food for Manitobans and for millions worldwide. Farmers do feed cities, and we, and the government in particular, need to recognize and support their invaluable contributions and to facilitate their efforts and goals to be environmentally and economically sustainable and socially responsible.

In my professional life as a university professor, my colleagues and I are involved with research and teaching about livestock production as part of a sustainable system. This includes nutrient cycling and strategies to minimize nutrient bypass from animals into the manure and the environment, and in our courses we visit farmers and go to their farms and have farmers in to address the students about their responsibilities and practices.

The mandate of our research programs is directed toward providing information that leads to continuous improvement of the economic and environmental sustainability of Manitoba's livestock

industries and rural communities. This research is supported by livestock commodity groups as well as through federal and provincial programs.

Now, this type of effort and commitment should be expected of other economic sectors and communities in Manitoba as well. Therefore I implore this committee, as have many others, and the government of Manitoba to withdraw Bill 17, reconsider what the real issues are surrounding water quality in Lake Winnipeg and all of Manitoba waterways, reconsider the well-balanced report of the Clean Environment Commission and its recommendations, take the time and use the expertise that is necessary to develop short- and long-term plans that can serve our natural water resources, plans that include educating the public and charging them with their responsibilities, plans that facilitate responsible sewage management in the municipalities, towns and cities of Manitoba, as well as plans that help ensure environmental and economic sustainability of our rural communities and farmers. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Dr. Connor.

Questions.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Dr. Connor, for your very enlightening presentation.

My question for you is that the science that we've been talking about, we talked about it before in some of the other presentations in regard to how we used science in the BSE and tried to get the border open to our cattle. That actually worked quite well.

Do you feel that we need to do more in regard to science in regard to phosphorus levels, nitrogen levels that are actually being discharged before we go ahead with Bill 17?

Ms. Connor: Definitely, yes.

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

Ms. Connor: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Brent Hanson. Brent Hanson, to the bottom of the list.

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

Mr. Dave Wall (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Mr. Wall: Thank you committee members. Again, I didn't expect to get up here tonight so just to give you a little—but, yes, it's great to be here.

Just to give you a background. I have a business started in Brandon called Wall Grain, and we build grain bins. When you build a barn or a big barn, you need lots of grain bins. So, over the years, as my business is 25 years old, we're very proud of the diversification that we have in Manitoba. I think Manitoba agriculture, the dollars that we gain are phenomenal, and so I'm part of that industry and I'm very proud of it.

One of the proud companies we support is Westeel that builds bins right here in St. Boniface. There are three other manufacturers I also deal with, one in Niverville, one in Winkler and one in Rivers. They are all vital components of what goes into a grain bin and then we have crews that build these bins. It's not just Hutterites, you know. I thank all my Hutterite brothers because I came from a Mennonite background and so they're my cousins.

It's not just the Hutterites, the Mennonites also came from that same background and they are a vital part of that whole hog industry and it's big. I have a lot of Interlake people who are Hutterite or hog farmers as well and over the years—like there's millions of dollars that I derive from the hog industry. I see that disappearing away and that bothers me a lot because my crews don't want to drive to Saskatchewan to work. They want to work right here. I've got crews that want to work two hours from home, not drive six hours to Saskatchewan.

Over the years we always—it's amazing, yes—farmers would come from overseas and I'd take them for a ride and they'd say, wow, all this open space here. What do you do with this space? I'd say you haven't seen nothing yet. You haven't been to Saskatchewan yet. But the point is we have open spaces that can support all this. To top it all off, I have a house also in the R.M. of Macdonald and last fall I watched and they were knifing fertilizer into the field across the way, and this is in the flood plain. I'm just sitting back amazed at the technology that these guys have of how they put this fertilizer into the ground. I'm amazed at the people, the plant guys that they have that make sure that they don't overload the land. So when a flood comes, I'm not concerned about that water that floods that field across my field. That's not the problem with the water in the system.

So, you know, and so I said this bill—like as a businessman, you always go to plan B, plan C, plan

D and so here we have the government going to plan A without going to plan B, plan C. Like be innovative. That's what Manitoba's all about. So, really, like Bill 17, why?

As I go to trade shows, it bothers me even more talking to other farmers and entrepreneurs and they give me the feeling that Manitoba is going backwards in this industry. I see my business growing in Saskatchewan and Alberta. We always used to laugh at Saskatchewan being in the gap. Well, they're no longer in the gap. You know, Alberta's in the gap now. They can't find any workers or anybody to work there.

* (23:50)

Anyway, to conclude, I'm very proud. And, by the way, that stink that came from that field, I think the Bombers had a bigger stink a few years ago when they would lose all those games, so the stink isn't that bad from that field. Yes, I had to put that in because I'm a real proud Bomber fan, and they're going all the way to the cup.

To conclude, I'm proud of Manitoba and the diversification that we have. I'm part of it. The people that we employ, indirectly or directly, is probably 100 people who are involved in my industry, so I'm proud of that. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wall.

Questions?

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much. You answered my question just at the last minute. I was going to ask you, how many people do you employ in your business, and then you just said 100, I think.

Mr. Wall: To answer that question, yes. I employ a lot more than that directly or indirectly, but I would say 100 people, based on the hog industry.

Mrs. Taillieu: Do these people live in Winnipeg or outside of Winnipeg?

Mr. Wall: They live—some in Brunkild where my warehouse is, some in Winkler. The crews live in all parts of Manitoba. There is about a half a dozen here in Winnipeg. Indirectly, all the people that work in the manufacturing plants are here in Winnipeg.

Mrs. Taillieu: What will happen now, if Bill 17 goes through and we see a decline in this industry? Are you contemplating moving to Saskatchewan? Are you thinking that way at all?

Mr. Wall: I won't move, but more of our work will go to that province. There will be less people hired here.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much, Dave.

I have one correction for your presentation and I think it's a very important one. The Bombers aren't just going to the Grey Cup; they're going to win it this year. Thank you very much.

Mr. Borotsik: Thank you, Mr. Wall. I don't think everybody gets the real urgency as to how much spinoff economy there is, with respect to the hog industry. It's not just the barns itself, but there's spinoff—everything from Manitoba Hydro to, obviously, the industry that you're in.

What percentage of your manufacturing industry is actually dependent on the hog industry itself?

Mr. Wall: Percentage of the manufacturing, I'd say 10 to 15 percent.

Mr. Borotsik: Last question: If the government, at some point in time, said to you, Mr. Wall, we want to put a moratorium on your manufacturing industry and we won't let you grow any longer, how long would you stay in business, if you couldn't expand and grow and develop your business and your manufacturing enterprise?

If they said, what you have right now is all that you can do, you can't do anymore for whatever reason, how long could you stay in business?

Mr. Wall: Not very long. I'd move where I could work and do business.

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

Brian White. Brian White moves to the bottom of the list.

James Linaker, Ridley Incorporated. James Linaker, to the bottom of the list.

Mike Radcliffe, Starlite Colony. Mike Radcliffe, to the bottom of the list.

Matt Einarson. Matt Einarson.

Gordon Gillies. Gordon Gillies, to the bottom of the list.

Kim Lee Wong. Kim Lee Wong, to the bottom of the list.

Shelly Hays. Shelly Hays, No. 76, to the bottom of the list.

Calvin Patrick, No. 80. Calvin Patrick, to the bottom of the list.

Al Mackling, No. 81. Al Mackling, to the bottom of the list.

Chris Maxfield, No. 83. Chris Maxfield, to the bottom of the list.

Presenter No. 86, Norm Paisley, Pro-Ag Products Ltd. Norm Paisley, to the bottom of the list.

Dan Kaegi. Dan Kaegi, to the bottom of the list.

Presenter No. 89, Peter Mah. Peter Mah, to the bottom of the list.

Number 91 is down already.

We are now getting into a situation where people will have been called twice, actually four times. We've agreed not to see the list the first two rounds. So, if these people are not present, then their names will be dropped from the list.

Presenter No. 98, George Wipf. George Wipf will be dropped from the list.

Presenter No. 99, Clarence Froese. Clarence Froese will be dropped from the list.

Presenter No. 100, Hugh Arklie, Springfield Hogwatch. Hugh Arklie. Okay. The Clerk has informed me that Mr. Arklie has left a written submission with us. So, with the will of the committee, we'll have it distributed, and it will be included in the record. *[Agreed]*

Presenter No. 101, Jacob Waldner. Jacob Waldner will now be dropped from the list.

Presenter No. 102, Marielle Wiebe, reeve, R.M. of La Broquerie. Marielle Wiebe will now be dropped from the list.

Presenter No. 103, Geoffrey Downey. Geoffrey Downey. Mr. Downey, do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Geoffrey Downey (Private Citizen): I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for letting me speak this evening.

I've been involved in the hog industry for over 25 years, not just within Canada, but within Europe. Living in a rural community myself, I see agriculture in general and the hog industry, the part it actually plays in the countryside, bringing jobs to the area,

bringing families into rural communities, bringing economic growth by local traders, shops, gas bars, et cetera. The property taxes that come from these buildings helping to expand and to thrive the community, and bringing, hopefully, job security.

* (00:00)

The actual manure and the fertilizer that is stored and released from these hog barns professionally is a natural fertilizer that is put on the land and used by other livestock farmers, beef farmers and grassland producers. The industry is always looking to improve and change when necessary, whether it be to buildings, genetics, feed, and definitely the environment. As other speakers have said concerning soil testing being done by agricultural services so land is not over-fertilized, and this is actually—this is used as a commodity and an asset to the industry.

The moratorium is arbitrary, it's discriminatory, and it was not based on any science. Even if the current government chooses to destroy the entire hog industry, the impact on Lake Winnipeg will be minimal. The government knows that farmers use manure as fertilizer and still need to supplement it with chemical fertilizer to meet the needs of the crops. If there are no hogs in this province, farmers will be forced to purchase expensive fertilizers to substitute organic fertilizer.

In conclusion, I hope the government will consider the decision that could have a significant impact on the lives of thousands of people employed directly and indirectly in the industry. I ask the government to withdraw Bill 17 and consult with the industry to arrive at a sustainable solution. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Downey.

Questions?

Mr. Eichler: I just don't really have a question, but I want to thank you for being patient. It's midnight and we know this committee—we need to make some changes, but we do thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to come in and make your presentation.

Mr. Borotsik: One very quick question.

Thank you, Mr. Downey, I echo the sentiments. It's nice to see the interest that people have, that they're going to take their energy and their time to come and make presentations to this committee into the wee hours of the morning.

I guess the only question I have—you've got experience, obviously, in Europe as well as here in Canada. With this legislation, with this moratorium that ultimately was not consulted with the industry itself, what kind of message do you think it sends to agriculture generally or business specifically when, at the stroke of a pen, they can impact an industry so radically? What kind of a message does it send for business? Are we open for business in agriculture here in Manitoba?

Mr. Downey: I think it sends a very negative message and, no, we're not open for business.

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

Mr. Keith Rogers. Keith Rogers will be dropped from the list.

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

Mr. Eric Klassen (Private Citizen): No, I do not, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Eric Klassen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, committee members. Midnight, wow, I feel like a teenager again.

My presentation is simple, not because I am, I hope not, but I feel this issue at present is simple. Forgive me if I come across in an abrupt or blunt manner. I mean no disrespect to the committee.

As mentioned before, my name is Eric Klassen. I am 37 years old. I have a wife and three children. I live in Grunthal which is in the municipality of Hanover. I've been involved in the hog industry since 1989, almost 20 years, straight out of high school. At that time, regulations on manure application were minimal. The industry was smaller, too, at that time, obviously. However I still remember being conscious about how we applied the manure to the land and how it affected the environment. You just do that when you live on the land and drink the water. It's just, you've got to be responsible.

Fast forward to 2008, wow, manure application restrictions and regulations up the yin-yang, but as farmers, we follow them. We understand the damage that manure mismanagement can do to the environment.

So, in 2007, the government initiates the CEC, which over many months look at all the current regulations in regard to manure application, et cetera.

They come up with a report that in no way states a further moratorium on hog expansion, but the current government decides that the moratorium needs to continue indefinitely. Why the CEC then? This tells me that it's got to be political. The government needs to show the public or its NDP voters that they're doing something about Lake Winnipeg. Why not educate the public instead? Hog smell does not equal Lake Winnipeg pollution. Use the CEC report. You kiboshed the OlyWest killing plant. You gained a few seats in the last election. Granted, most farmers are not NDP, but you're hurting a billion-dollar-a-year industry. The opposition party is nowhere near mounting a challenge, no offence to those in the opposition here. You have a majority government, so what are you worried about, losing those two seats you gained in the last election? You want to kill the industry for that?

In the beginning, I mentioned my family. This bill affects my family, our well-being and future. This also affects many of my friends and extended family. My in-laws are hog producers. My brother-in-law is a hog farmer. Five out of the six of my friends from high school—we still get together twice a year 15 years later; sorry, 18 years later—are hog farmers. My brother is a mason who does cinderblock work on hog barns. He will be affected. My other brother hauls fuel to hog farmers. He would be affected. It's not just hog farmers you're hurting by Bill 17; you're hurting other local rural businesses that support the hog industry.

Finally, I end with this closing statement. The government should not be able to tell the farmer whether he can build a barn or not. Your job should be to help us regulate and manage the manure which is already currently happening. Thank you.

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

Questions?

Mr. Derkach: You mentioned that a lot of your friends and family are still employed in the agricultural sector, specifically in hogs. What do you see as a future for yourself and your friends and your family if, in fact, we cannot convince the government to either withdraw this bill or to drastically amend it?

Mr. Eric Klassen: Well, I don't need my sunglasses because the future doesn't look bright. To continue on with this bill, will there be a future for my

children in agriculture or in the hog industry? I don't see so.

Mr. Borotsik: Mr. Klassen, thank you very much for waiting this length of time to make your presentation. I appreciate it and so does the committee.

You're young. You have a young family. *[interjection]* Well, you're a lot younger than the people around this table, for the most part.

Business is business. You have to look to the future. You have to look at the expansion of that. Did you have any intentions of expanding your operation over the next five to 10 years?

Mr. Eric Klassen: Definitely. Right now it's looking—the industry is pushing us to expand in the U.S. We'd rather not do that and keep our business domestic. But definitely expansion, definitely.

* (00:10)

Mr. Borotsik: This bill obviously will kibosh any of those plans of any type of expansion in your industry. Therefore you stay exactly the way you are. You stagnate. You can't grow. You've got fixed costs, but you don't have any additional opportunity of generating revenue.

If you can't do that, if you can't expand like you wanted to within the next five or 10 years, I assume, what do you see happening to your own business, to your own hog operation? Does it stay exactly the way it is, or do you consolidate, do you ratchet back on that?

Mr. Eric Klassen: Yeah, I think you definitely consolidate, but, to remain competitive in North America, that's going to be a tremendous challenge. I just can't see it.

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

Mr. Eric Klassen: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Presenter No. 106, Timothy Hofer, Willow Creek Colony. Timothy Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Tom Crockatt. Tom Crockatt will be dropped from the list.

Gordie Dehnn. Gordie Dehnn will be dropped from the list.

Cindy Vandenbossche. Cindy Vandenbossche will be dropped from the list.

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

Mr. Michael Hofer (Private Citizen): I have not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Michael Hofer: I've hardly ever been behind a microphone, so you'll have to bear with me. I appreciate the opportunity to speak against this Bill 17.

My name is Michael Hofer. I live in the Riverbend Colony. I'm the financial boss and the secretary at the Riverbend Colony in Carberry. However, it's not the area affected by the ban, but we are very concerned that this, too, will change, because we live in a colony of 69 people: 26 young adults, 29 married couples with children.

We not only work for ourselves but for the benefit of all in the colony. It supplies all we need to live; we provide food, clothing, medical and shelter for all. We are self-sufficient, raising much of the food that is consumed. Riverbend Colony sustains its livelihood through agriculture with woodworking. We have an operation of 3,500 acres of which 700 acres are totally irrigated for potatoes.

We are very concerned about the aquifer. This is an aquifer where we have nine to ten pivots. The water is drawn from the aquifer. Don't ever kid yourselves that we are not concerned about polluting the aquifer.

We also have a 5,200-sow isowean operation, owned and operated, 25,000 turkeys, 7,200 laying hens, 11,000 pullets. They all need clean water, as we all know.

We are very concerned about maintaining our aquifer water source for use of irrigating our potato crop. Riverbend Colony is very concerned about the environment, as we are setting up a vibrating-separating operation to separate the solids from the liquids, which will then be put through an anaerobic digester for the production of biogas, in the form of methane gas, to be later used in the farm operation as a generator for electricity.

Riverbend Colony was established in 1969 and recently built a sister colony in 2002, 14 miles west of Riverbend Colony, called Acadia Colony. Their colony consists of 4,800 acres and 14 families. The colony expects to start the new farm in the next 20 years and want the opportunity to be able to have livestock and a poultry system.

Rules and regulations are not new to us. We follow strict guidelines for the Clean Environment Commission and whatever other government regulatory body has implemented on our farm is very clean. We want to work where we live. We must work where we live, and we cannot just send our children to the cities or to other locations and still maintain our way of life and religion. It is important that they are able to grow at the location at which they live.

Bill 17 will impact the lives of all the people that are directly involved or indirectly involved in our hog barn. Bill 17 will eliminate our chance to grow and expand our community. We must kill Bill 17 for our future.

Adding to this, I would like to make a comment. Bill 17 is just another form of persecution for the colonies, for the Hutterites. We have been persecuted in at least two countries in the last 200 years, one because of religion, the other because of war. In 1874 we were welcomed to this country with open arms. Today we stand here in front of a government that is just as unfriendly as the countries that we left behind to find our freedom to practice our religion and educate our children, to live our lives to which we are used to for the last 400 years. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

Mr. Borotsik: Thank you, Mr. Hofer, for making that presentation.

That's a very vibrant industry you have in your colony; you're fairly diversified. You said that you were outside of the moratorium zone. Would you consider expanding your hog operation outside of the zone right now, considering what legislation is being tabled right now by the government?

Mr. Michael Hofer: Not at the moment. At the size we are, we've got our hands full with the 5,200-sow operation but, if it wasn't that big, we would definitely consider it.

Mr. Borotsik: You have other livestock; you have, you say, turkeys. You have pullets. You have some laying hens. Do you see any danger, perhaps, of the government looking at that type of livestock when it comes to the environment? They also have unit waste. You'd have to dispose of that waste as well. If they can do it to hogs, do you have any fears that, perhaps, they can do it for other forms of livestock?

Mr. Michael Hofer: At the moment, we have a four-million gallon slurry store, which we empty twice a

year but, when all these environmental regulations came about, we decided to—we went to Ontario, looked at a re-sept system, and it's in place. It's going to be in operation in two, three weeks from now, and I hope to invite all of you so you see what an operation of that size is like and how it's being kept.

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

Mr. Michael Hofer: Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Edward Stahl. Edward Stahl will be dropped from the list.

Kelvin Waldner. Kelvin Waldner will be dropped from the list.

Wally Driedger.

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

Mr. Wally Driedger (Private Citizen): I do not, no.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Driedger: Coming up here is—I want to thank you, thank the committee for hearing us. You know, getting prepared for this was quite an ordeal. Starting out, you know, there's—how am I going to present this? There are so many—this is my career, my livelihood, affecting my family. It's really very hard to—what Bill 17 is doing. It is very hard.

* (00:20)

I grew up in the community of Grunthal. It's in the R.M. of Hanover, went to school there, graduated there. My parents had various farms growing up. We had turkey farms at one time. We moved on to a mixed hobby farm with greenhouses, and sold plants, and so on, and eventually ended up with a hog farm. We started off with 150 sows, expanded that to 300 sows, and eventually, by the time I was old enough to venture out and see what the world had to offer, my dad was ready to expand and did so to 1,100 sows. Such expansion was necessary to keep up with the times and doing so, there was always regulations, the new lagoons, the liners, the monitoring wells, everything that came up with every expansion was always done.

You know, without a doubt, and I heard this so much tonight, farmers in Manitoba, they're world-class. They do want to keep up with the technologies. They want to be ahead of the technologies. You know, they want to adapt very quickly. So I had a chance to work on the hog farm growing up and that

was good income, also taught me many things: responsibility, integrity, good work ethic. Yes, I did move away from rural life for a short time, moved to the city, quickly realized that that wasn't the pace for me. It wasn't necessarily what I wanted as a career. I moved back to the country.

Now my wife and I are raising a family in rural Manitoba. We have four children, and in our community agriculture is the backbone. It's what drives our community. Just in my family alone, my brother now operates and owns our family farm. My brother manages another farm. I have a sister who, before she started her family, worked in retail selling goods to local producers. I have brothers-in-law who are in construction, and all of this, it's all revolved around agriculture in our community, and Bill 17, which you're taking away from any growth any expansion, any producers that want to do better, that want to provide for future generations, it's not possible.

As I said, my career is in the hog industry. I thoroughly enjoy it. I work with great people. My job takes me around to different parts of the province, and I see many different communities. You know, I see communities thriving, I see communities that are not thriving. In the R.M. I live in the hog industry has been a good thing for us. There is plenty of expansion, regulations are all being adhered to, and it's been nothing but a good thing to see our community grow and flourish.

The hog industry is such a large contributor to the economy of the province. It's hard to believe the government would want to destroy those contributions. So much employment is created from hog operations and all the spinoffs that are created to the agriculture businesses and the province as a whole. It is not just agricultural businesses. Those agricultural businesses do business with other businesses and that continues down the line. It affects the whole province.

Today there is so much technology for applying manure, there is no reason why we cannot work together to come up with some sensible solution rather than just slapping a moratorium on, and absolutely no logic why, no communication. Can we learn more about manure application and handling? Yes, without a doubt. I look forward to the new technologies to everything that's to come. It's a rapidly changing industry, and it's a great industry to be a part of. Without an open mind to new ideas and

new technology, producers won't survive. I believe in Manitoba we have world-class producers.

Communication is so very important. At no time, from what I have seen, has this government worked side by side, taken an interest in hog producers to really hear their concerns till now, till now. It's been said here so many times from what I've heard. We have municipality lagoons, the City of Winnipeg dumping raw sewage into the Red River. What's coming out of our hospitals—and a rainy day when the raw sewage is just flowing—what's coming out of our hospitals and our streets and houses? It's all into the Red River, into Lake Winnipeg. I don't understand it.

I wish to keep my family in this province. I still consider myself to be a fairly young guy and would like to progress and continue a prosperous career, but this bill is equivalent to locking the door and throwing away the key. No questions asked. I do feel that if this province will continue to be relying on other provinces for payments or allowances, equalization payments, whatever you want to call it, we can be a have-not province. Why can't we be a can-do, a working-together province?

In closing, I would really like to see that this government would decide to get a work-together, can-do attitude, and we can move on. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Driedger.

Questions?

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, very informative.

Thank you for staying this late hour, and certainly have a safe trip on your way home. We appreciate it.

Mr. Borotsik: I echo Mr. Eichler's comments. Thank you for staying here and giving us your opinion, which is very valued opinion.

You talk about your operation. Mr. Driedger, are your costs going up at all on an annual basis? Do you find that it's costing you more to run the operation now than it did twelve months ago?

Mr. Driedger: Costs continue to go up just as costs of living for any family, whether you're in agriculture or not. Sometimes it feels like our costs are going up much faster than any standard of living. Day after day we need to adapt and find new technologies, new ways to become efficient.

Mr. Borotsik: That's absolutely correct. You have to become efficient in the operation. I know that you're probably doing everything in your power to do so, but if the costs are going up and you have some fixed costs, one way of covering those costs is to increase your revenue. It's either at the value of the product you're doing or more product.

If you're stopped—which you are; this bill will stop you from raising any more, expanding any more, putting any more hogs into your operation—if you can't generate more revenue from increased hog production, how are you going to cover your costs?

Mr. Driedger: Very simple. There will come a time when there will be no profit then. When there is no expansion and you don't have the room to grow, it will simply—there will be no industry.

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

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Chairman, we've had a discussion at the table here and, although we had said we will sit till 2 o'clock and then work our way through the list, I'm wondering if there is willingness at the table to have those people that are in the room now who want to present, although they may not be in sequence. We won't go through everybody else but start to have those people who are at the back of the room make their presentations. Is that agreed?

* (00:30)

Mr. Derkach: So I would take that we will stop at No. 113 for this evening—or this morning, but we will call any presenters who are here and who would like to present. We will stay here to listen to them as long as it takes, not just till 2 o'clock.

An Honourable Member: That's right.

Mr. Derkach: Is that agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Eichler: Just one more clarification. They may not be in this room. I know we have coffee on and there are bathroom duties, and other things. So whether or not they're in this room, whether or not they're in the building, I think, is the right terminology.

An Honourable Member: As long as they return and report to the Clerk.

Mr. Eichler: As long as they register at the desk.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Clerk go to the back of the room and get a list of

the people who are here, and that we hear them in sequence that they appear on the list.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chair, would you, as the Chair of this committee, please make that announcement to the public so that it's well understood.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. I think it's been agreed that we're going to stop going down the list at 113 here. The Clerk is going to canvass the room to see who is still here to present. We will take a list. Those people will present in the order that they are listed on our sheet here, and we will stay here until you have all presented.

Is that clear and is that agreeable to the committee? *[Agreed]*

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

Mr. Derkach: Madam Vice-Chair, would it be appropriate to call for a five or 10-minute recess until the names are gathered and to allow members of the committee to perhaps take a stretch and a walk down the hallway?

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Is there agreement to call for a five to 10-minute recess while we—10-minute, five-minute, five-minute recess? Do I hear 15? Do I hear 20—a five-minute recess? Excellent. We'll take a five-minute recess.

The committee recessed at 12:33 a.m.

The committee resumed at 12:44 a.m.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Chairperson: Order. Let's proceed.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): I've been asked to ask you something, or leave of the committee, I guess. The second presenter on this list that you're just getting is Mr. Ken Maendel. He is riding tonight with Mike Maendel, who is the second last one, No. 241 on the list. They have asked—and I've mentioned it to Rick, the Clerk—that Mike would like to move up to be No. 3 if that's possible, so they can go home, with leave of the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we've heard Mr. Maguire. What's the will of the committee? Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]* So, Mr. Mike Maendel will move up to the No. 3 position.

I call Albert Maendel. Albert Maendel? Are you Albert? Hello, Albert. Do you have any written

materials for the committee? Do you have any papers?

Mr. Albert Maendel (Private Citizen): My name's Albert Maendel, and I come from the Riverbend Colony in Carberry, Manitoba. I've been a hog operator now for 42 years, so I really know the trade. I've been through pretty tough times and pretty good times in the career. I know what shovelling manure is, and I know what an automatic barn is supposed to be.

Right now, I just can't take it, that Bill 17. I used to be hogman. They came out to beg me for my hogs. Now they think they're doing a favour—I'm doing them a favour to give them.

My grandchildren actually asked me today: Grandfather, where are you going? I said, I'm going to Winnipeg. And what are you doing there? I'm going to the Legislature there. Oh, yeah, the teacher told me.

My daughter is a teacher and we've been talking about it quite a while. I told her to have the children take notes that I can bring in. They had notes, but I didn't bring them in. I said, when I walk in there, I'm going to speak from my heart.

My longing is this: I know we're under the government's protection and all that, but never talk against anybody you haven't prayed for. So, the children said, yes, we will pray tonight that the government gets rid of Bill 17.

Well, I said, from the mouth of babes, if you hear a voice in the wilderness, you know that's the prayer. I just hope that we can still have a future for our children. I don't care for me anymore because I've been in hogs long enough, but if I look back at our children, what kind of future are they going to have if you are going to take out agriculture?

Anyway, last year, I had a chance. Two busloads of teachers from Winnipeg came out to my farm. They said they want to see a Hutterite farm. Most of all, they wanted to see the pig barn. I said, on one condition you can come in. You all have to shower and go by the protocol. You do not have to shower out, but shower in, you must.

So they came in and they each took their suit. I had disposable suits there for them, 40 of them. She asked if we got any masks. Yeah, I got masks. I have face masks. They put on the face masks.

So we walk into the barn. They all had a nice shower. Well, I forgot that, that our pig men are the

cleanest people on the community. We shower in; we shower out. So we sometimes do it five times a day. Who of you showers five times a day? I'm surprised I still got some hair.

* (00:50)

Anyway, those teachers, they came in to look at the hog barn. Their masks were all on top of their heads. I said, why haven't you got your masks on your faces? They said, there's no smell in here. We didn't know that a hog barn can smell like a house, they said to me.

They grabbed those little pigs. They cuddled those little pigs. They kissed those little pigs. I had a heck of a time getting them out of the barn.

So they all came into the office there. I showed them the rackets; I showed and told them what to do. Well, we have never heard anything like this; we thought we were going to walk into that barn with straw and manure that high—that's mostly what they think.

While coming into Winnipeg today, I saw those highrises and, behind every window, I figured, there must be a desk there. There must be a chair there. There must be somebody comfortable sitting in that chair, doing something. I bet you, after 5 o'clock, they are going to go home; they're going to sit on their couch or out on the veranda and have a barbecue, maybe even a pork chop and some milk. I'll bet you most of them think that it comes from Safeway.

I just wish I could get our government to change that bill. Maybe the prayers of our children will help, because we're down the tubes, if that goes through. We're trying to run it just as law-abiding as can be. You can walk into our colonies; you're all welcome to come out there for a visit. We'll take you to the kitchen; we'll take you to the hog barns.

I've gone down Jarvis Avenue; it smells more than my hog barn, I can guarantee you that. Not so long ago, I went on Logan and Main and there was a sewer bust. All the cars went through it; my truck went through it. I disinfected my truck after going through that sewer spill.

If there's a little spill in the colony, though, everybody hears; the papers are full—they had a spill out there. The colonies all come together with their fire trucks and hose everything down. There, on Logan and Main, was only road closed; nobody there. That is what gets me—why us farmers?

Thank you very much for listening to me. I could really tell you a story all evening, a little joke anyways.

God came down from Heaven and said the world is full of sin; we'll destroy it again. He told Noah to build an ark. They are so bad, Noah, build an ark. Next day, God comes down and Noah's sitting there crying. Why are you crying? Well, he said, God, it's not like it used to be, you know. I can't get a permit. The government would not give me a permit to build. Well, for goodness sakes, I tried to chop down a tree. That's a no-no. God goes back to Heaven. Next day, there's a nice rainbow. Noah said, well, aren't you going to destroy the world? He said, no, I don't need to destroy the world. The government already did it.

Well, anyways, is there any questions for me?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for that, Mr. Maendel.

Questions?

Mr. Cullen: I'm not sure of any of our questions after your statement, but very great. Thank you very much for your presentation. Obviously, this comment was right from the heart and we appreciate that.

It's clear that you and the hog farm go through protocol. You have your own protocol in terms of dealing with your industry. The government doesn't have too much protocol, it seems.

I guess the question is: What happens when this bill passes? What's the future for your family and your kids?

Mr. Albert Maendel: I can't see a future. I just cannot see a future for them. Our farm children—they are farm children, and they'd be lost in a city for sure. They wouldn't even know how to steal a car.

Does that answer your question?

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

What intrigued me a little bit was the visit that you had from the—I'm sorry, I forget about this microphone—but the visit that you had from the teachers, and you said there were 40 of them. You know, there are only 35 or 36 members of the government, and I'm wondering whether or not you would entertain a visit from the Premier (Mr. Doer), his Cabinet and the government so that they could be better apprised of what a hog barn really looks like because I don't believe that very many of them have ever been in a hog barn.

Mr. Albert Maendel: Oh, yes. I don't know if I'm going to find that many red carpets, but I would sure try my best.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Maendel.

I call Kenneth Maendel. Kenneth, do you have any written materials for us?

Mr. Kenneth Maendel (Private Citizen): No, I don't. I'm going to shoot from the hip.

Mr. Chairperson: All right. Have at 'er.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Kenneth Maendel from Suncrest Colony that is near Kleefeld, Manitoba in the municipality of De Salaberry. I happen to be one of the managers. I happen to be the minister out there. I think I'm 42 years old. I'm going against my will standing here talking to people that are probably twice as old as I am.

I was here yesterday for six hours, and I watched. My friend dragged me here; I didn't want to, I'll be blunt. I didn't know that we have politicians that are arrogant. I'll tell you what I saw. I saw people playing, ministers texting. I'll tell you what I don't allow around my kitchen table is my young son sitting back there with reading. It is a family gathering what we have. It's disrespectful. How would it look if I would—or what would the Chair say if I would take out my phone and fax my wife, which I would have to wake? How would it look? Would it look professional? Would it look that I'm interested in what I'm seeing? No. The next person was sitting and reading a paper, and we're spending how many hours? Six hours a day, seven hours a day here for presenting something if people don't even want to listen to us.

I'm a farmer. I'm a Hutterite, and I'm a Canadian, and I will not move from Manitoba. I will not move out of De Salaberry municipality. Do you hear me, sir? I do not like what I heard yesterday. Personally, I don't have a TV in my house, so I can't say that I saw you, but that one lady was very passionate. She came from Baldur. The Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) supposedly made a statement that I, as a hog farmer, am a polluter. I am not a polluter. I'm a farmer.

* (01:00)

We have 120 people on our colony. Our establishment on our hog operation was designed and built original in 1968, and for the Vicki Burns, the

fearmongering, narrow-minded, arrogant, ignorant people putting a moratorium on, how should I upgrade our facility, being a manager, which my white hair isn't for old age, it's for sleepless nights not knowing where my kids are going to stay. How will I upgrade? I am demanding an answer of you two over there. How will I upgrade? I need two-thirds more square feet.

Who's ever been in a hog barn? I have. Raise your hands. Mr. Stan, how can you make an intelligent decision on something that you've never seen? Tell me that. Tell me. I want an answer. You can answer me. I can't tell you—when I was a young lad, my dad backed you.

Winnipeg School Division came into the farm. The barns were open so we took the kids all—I don't know, they were probably 10 or 12 years old so we took them into the chicken barn. First thing they saw was a chicken laying an egg. Ouch, and you know what they said? That's where an egg comes from. I'll never eat an egg again.

I think those people are running our country. They don't know where an egg comes from. For your information, an egg comes from a chicken. A chicken will have waste. Where should I put it? How many of you ever stopped and smelled the roses? How many eggs? I eat two every morning because I go to work. So I could be overweight. I'm not scared of working.

How many eggs does the world need a day? How many pork chops does the world need a day? Who's going to produce them? I, as a farmer, we farm 9,000 acres. We have 4 million gallons of manure a year. That's a small fraction. I will not stop our field manager of going and buying the phos that he needs to produce a bushel of wheat, Canola, corn or sunflowers. If I won't get it out of the hog manures, I go to the Cardons [*phonetic*], the Patersons [*phonetic*] and buy it. So what is the big deal?

Whatever that lady's name was that was sitting here that presented, that got the NDP to talking, I can't. There are not too many that can. We can't get a reaction out of it. That's not leadership. If I was a leader of a democratic party and sitting in a chair, I would talk. I would defend myself. He's been asked numerous times. I was called and told by the opposition. Where's the science behind it? Where is it? It's a democratic country. Where is the science? Why is it hidden?

I am paying your wages. You know what my kid told me yesterday when I told that I'm going in? Well, we'll take him to court. You don't have to go. I said to him, you know, son, I'm the government. How can I take myself to court? I'd be paying my wage and theirs. Their pockets are as deep as mine.

This is unfair. We've got \$114,000 tax bill that's due on October 1. We've got \$100,000 insurance bill on the 9,000 acres that's due. That's out of pure profit. We haven't made too much money with the hogs. We like the manure. In 2002, because I did it, I was involved. It cost us \$14 an acre and fuel and wear and tear because the equipment is ours to inject manure on our fields, and we were pumping two miles. Has anybody of you people seen a system how we inject manure? I have. I've been full of hog manure from here to here. I'm not scared to walk into our lagoon.

Whatever that fearmongering, narrow minded, arrogant person had about our lagoon being a toxic sewer hole, wild geese come in from the south and have their young on our lagoons. Is that toxic? This is out of hand. If there was a conscience somewhere—and a conscience is nothing else than knowing the difference between right and wrong—if there was a conscience somewhere, all you'd have to say, gentlemen, we were wrong. I'm sorry. We're going to go home. That's all it takes. You have to humble yourself, and it's hard for me to humble myself when I'm wrong, and I'm only human.

There was only one perfect person. That was Jesus Christ. Other than that, we don't measure up.

I beg you, why didn't you talk to all those presenters? Why did the opposition have to ask the questions to get them to your ears? Is that democratic?

I don't understand these policies. I don't want to be here. I was out in the parking lot and our hog manager called me, I should come back because you are calling our name. I've got kids at home. We've got a place to manage. What should I do here? Why don't you just leave us alone? Let us be farmers. We apply to all the rules and regulations that you people have set up. We've got no problem with them.

How can manure, especially, phos—it's a binding organic matter. It doesn't move. How can I be to blame if there's no science behind it? How can you blame me as a hog farmer? You tell me, Hutterite or no Hutterite. I need an answer. Obviously, I hope I get one. I want an answer. You don't have to wait till

question period or answer and question. You can give it to me right now, and if you're going to prove it to me in common sense.

My father-in-law passed away a year and a half ago or something. He had a native friend. He lived right beside the natives at Long Plain Indian reserve—

Mr. Chairperson: You've got 10 minutes, sir.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: —and he said, sir, he said, you know what's missing these days is common sense. That's all that's missing.

Any questions for me? I would like questions and answers, please.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you very much.

It's not the common practice of the committee to be answering questions of presenters. The purpose is to get answers from presenters. But in this case, I just can't help myself.

The first time I was in a barn, my mom's uncle had the barn—and I wasn't in school yet—and I thought it was absolutely great because there were cattle, there were horses, there were pigs in this barn. I'm 48. It's got to be 40-some years ago, 43 years ago when I was doing this. My mom's uncle used to line the cats up and squirt milk in their faces and they would drink it, and we thought that was absolutely hilarious; myself and others, we thought that was great.

I've been to a hoop barn in my constituency, a constituent of mine, an entrepreneurial friend constituent of mine, with a hoop barn near Gilbert Plains. He gave me the tour. He explained his operation. He talked about the markets. He talked about Berkshire pigs. I think the reason you were asking your question was to see if anybody had been into a modern-day barn where you put on enough of an outfit that you feel like Neil Armstrong landing on the moon for the first time.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: That's not true, sir.

Mr. Struthers: When I was in the barn I went through all of the protocols, all of the protocols that we've heard from one presenter after the next, and that was my experience. You asked for my experience. I gave you my experience.

In all those cases I was treated respectfully, courteously and politely, and I learned every time. I appreciate everybody who's been here to help me, as a rural person, understand your point of view. Thank you.

*(01:10)

Mr. Chairperson: Any response to that, Mr. Maendel?

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: When I go into our hog barn—I happen to be a journeyman electrician—I go in for maintenance when he needs me. I take off my work clothes on this side, I step through a shower, I put on a pair of coveralls. I don't know which spaceship you were in, but our hog barn is a hog barn; it's an animal facility. I don't have a conglomerate of clothes on. I don't mind getting smelly. It's my bread and butter. We have to have a hog barn, and we will have a hog barn.

Mr. Derkach: I don't have a question. All I have is a comment to the presenter because, Mr. Maendel, I think that your energetic nature in which you presented the presentation to us certainly sends a message, and it's a message that I think that we've been trying to send to the government from our side of the House. All we want is an answer to what scientific data they used and what stimulated this kind of a bill. We have not received the answer.

But I want to thank you for making your presentation tonight because I do think it sends a very profound message. Thank you.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: Can I comment on that?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, you may.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: What can I do and where can I go to get my legal rights to get that answer?

Mr. Chairperson: A quick supplemental, Mr. Derkach.

Mr. Derkach: Well, the only thing I can say is the people who have the answer are the government and the Premier (Mr. Doer). They're the ones who should provide it to the public.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maendel? Very short, Mr. Borotsik.

Mr. Borotsik: Very, very short. You spent \$114,000 in taxes. Can you tell me what your hydro bill is and what your Autopac bill is?

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: Our hydro bill in the winter months we're running on the colony 14 grand per month. It's \$7,000 in the winter months. Our propane bill is another \$80,000. Our fuel bill to farm the land and haul our hogs from the Suncrest Colony facility to Brandon and all what we do, we need another

\$360,000. Then we've got another \$40,000 coal bill. Then I have to live, too.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: May I make another comment?

An Honourable Member: Yes, you can.

Mr. Kenneth Maendel: I'm sorry if I offended somebody, but that's the nature, that's how I am. I go from the heart. I'm sorry if—thank you all. I'm going home.

Mr. Chairperson: Make sure you don't leave Mike because he's up next here. Okay, Mr. Maendel, you may proceed.

Mr. Mike Maendel (Private Citizen): I have nothing to turn over to the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Mike Maendel: I speak on my notes. I don't know what to say. Everything that I had prepared to say has been repeated and repeated and repeated over and over again.

Quote, Philippians 2:1. The Apostle Paul had a clue that behind his back people were saying he is continuously repeating his sermon. Well, gosh, he said, I feel quite right about that. I have no qualms with that. There's only one thing: If you hear something often enough, it should really impress you more.

And here we go again. I have nothing new. I want to talk about the hog business. I'm not a hog operator. At the colony I've been an educator all my life. My education, I have a teacher's certificate in English, I have a Heritage Language certificate in German. [*German spoken*] This is good for me.

I've travelled pretty much in the world. I've studied in Europe a couple of times to upgrade my German, my early church history. I studied in Winnipeg for three years at Menno Simons College, University of Winnipeg. Here I am today presenting the hog industry as we see it or what's wrong with Bill C-17.

I think it's the end of the world. I'll tell you why. The reason that you see so many Hutterite people in this room here to say their few words on this hog issue, some of you people have been around in politics for a number of years. Well, I've been around a long time, too. I know this gentleman, and I've worked with this one, and I know this one, and there

are a few missing yet here that we should have. Fine, they must be in the picture somewhere. But, other than the principles from my Hutterian faith, when I got baptized and made a commitment to be a member in the Hutterian church cut me out of being a politician. That's why I'm here on the other side of the table. You are the politicians, and I'm going to be a trouble-shooter here.

I wonder if you wondered why we are so upset about this hog business, here, about the bill, that we hope this government knows by now for sure that they can't implement that? Well, it's the only investment that's open, basically, to us where we don't need to buy into quota, is hogs. Geese, well, we had geese, but, aw, shucks, who had a goose the last year? I mean, there's no market for geese. The whole consumption of Canada is 86,000 geese, and the Hutterites raised 168,000 about eight years ago. So what about with the geese, then. So we quit them. One person here said, if you don't go ahead, you stay behind. If the last car in the train unhooks and it stops, it doesn't have to back up. The train keeps going and the car stays behind. That's what you do when you spin tires, like the last six months with the hog industry. It's the only investment that we can have.

When a colony breaks or splits up, which happens, one of the main reasons for a colony to split up is employment. To split a colony and build a new one is employment. What's wrong in society today, a lot of it is unemployment. We, the colony people, are still on a six-day work week. One day of rest and that's enough. I feel, and I've been around in this world, I see what goes on, long weekends 12 times a year, Friday at four, bang, out, come back Tuesday morning. What's wrong? We used to call it a Monday morning lemon, now it's a Tuesday morning lemon, what we're trying to do.

I mean, guys, the work ethic isn't correct in this country, and the Hutterites, the work ethic in the Hutterian system is six days a week, and what are we going to work? Well, look, the guillotine went down, no hog increase, no renovations. In the last six months I became a great-grandfather, thank you very much, and all three of them are boys. What in the Sam Hill are they going to do? I'm an older person. I'm not old yet. I'm older than most of our politicians are, and I've been around a bit. Old soldiers don't die. We just slowly fade away. I'm supposed to be retired. I was a teacher for 35 years. I've retired from that position, and now I just still do, by trade I'm an electrician, like Kenneth, my son, is. He's a

journeyman and I'm the limited guy. So he went where I stopped. He kept going.

Anyways, hogs are so important to us. When a colony branches out, that's the first investment that they will make. Not too often will we put up a kitchen which is a million-dollar item, or a garage, which is maybe even more, with vehicles and everything that we need to put in. We first have to figure out our sustainings. We have to get a money thing going. The best thing in the 67 years—as our stay from 1918, it's a little bit more—in Manitoba was hogs. We're farmers. We had our fingers dirty, not only with ground that's in manure, like Kenneth said. Look, we're not afraid to get our, roll up our sleeves.

* (01:20)

Now the government of the day has proposed Bill 17. I don't know who recommended it, where the government, where you people find the recommendation, and this is the environment sustainability document put out by the Clean Environment Commission. There is not one word, to read for me, in the recommendations that specifies this government to have the audacity and call it quits with the hog barns. Not one word. Sorry, if you think my son was rough, you'll hear the rest of the story.

Look where we are today, my great-grandchildren. I don't know, and I have the same perception. I aim to stay in the De Salaberry municipality. My lifetime, since 1954 when I got married, I was in De Salaberry and I'm still there. We spend all of our money, most of our money and mortgage most of our land towards what we own there. Look, the hogs have made us good money, and here we're standing and we're begging to you people to reconsider that.

It's no wonder that people like Vicki Burns can come across 22 meetings, in two years time, and coerce or—I don't know what words; I'm supposed to be a good Englishman, here—and get people convinced that the hog industry is in bad shape. Look people. The hog industry amongst the colonies and private farmers is at such—the medical system alone, the disease control, is far, far better than anything that this provincial or the Canadian government can put out in the medical system. There are no beds in the corridors. What do you call that?

An Honourable Member: Hallway medicine.

Mr. Mike Maendel: Yeah, there is no hallway medicine in a pig barn. If one pig dies over there, there's a guy sitting there, he's waiting to get ready to

tell you the rest of the story. When that one pig dies, they find out why. That's how, not complicated, how efficient it is. Why doesn't this government let those people raise pigs that can raise pigs?

Let's consider this situation. We have three outfits that produce pigs in Manitoba: Maple Leaf, Hytek and the rest. Maple Leaf, according to this book, has 38 percent of the sows. Hytek has about that, too, a little bit over, 41 percent, and the rest of us, we have to divide: the Mennonites and the Hutterites and the Holdeman, and I don't know if there are Ukrainians, or whatever, and believe you me, there are more Ukrainians in Canada than Frenchman or German or English, not English, but that's the way it is. My forefathers lived in the Ukraine. Anyways—

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

Mr. Mike Maendel: So what are we going to do? Why have these people got all those pigs? I have to refer back to my years when I was more involved in the then-Conservative government. I would say this government of the day should go back into *Hansard* and find out, in some of the books, where the thing, vertical integration, was an issue of discussion and debate. Vertical integration, which did not mean—Maple Leaf has the killing plant, they own the barns, they own the breeding stock, they own the mills. What then? Is that the way to support that family farm? Absolutely not. These people don't need those family farms, and those family farms, according to the record, and here, are down to a minimum, and the colonies are not excluded. We are in the same boat.

So here we are; we're asking the sustainability of our system. The way we operate our hog barns has been explained by my son. We take the manure serious and we've got to stretch out. Thank you for the regulations that you people have put in. That manure is money today, and we're going to stretch that stuff out into miles of pumping it and controlling it so the least we can put on per acre, the more acres we can cover. Why should we go to those bloodsuckers and those oil companies? Fertilizer that cost \$600 last fall, costs 1,380 bucks this summer, and it's going to be maybe more next fall. I don't know. Who needs that? Fuel is the same thing. We'll try and knock out of that pig barn and the rest of the manure as much as we can.

In our history which originates in 1528, we never owned an acre of land until we set foot in the Dakota territories in 1874, and then we bought into land. I'm still questioning the decision of buying

land. We are trades people, and a good part of you people know that we're going back into industry again. We're almost on the round. We don't need you guys. We're self-sustained. We do the rafters. We do the walls. We can concrete. We manufacture stoves. We manufacture the heating system. We manufacture the best ventilation system in the world. We don't need Winnipeg.

But, look, that's not the deal. We're in Winnipeg. We're in Manitoba. We're in Canada, and we want to work together. We cannot do without this government. I mean, you're the government, not us. My principle will not allow me to be a politician. Otherwise, we would take a run for it.

But, look, this Bill 17 must not go through. It's a guillotine on my great grandchildren. The honourable Minister of Agriculture, Madam Wowchuk—I prefer to call you Rosann, but excuse me for that. Rosann, I want to give you that message to take back, what we just said here. Take it back to your caucus and for love sake, how can you get up in the morning and look into a mirror, and if you're going to vote to pass that bill—

Mr. Chairperson: You have one minute left, sir.

Mr. Mike Maendel: —look into that mirror with eyes other than with tears, and tell your kids what you did. I would like to see what goes on. I don't know how it is.

But, look, I believe my time is up. Thank you very much for having me here. I know I repeated everything that others have said 50 times already, but Paul had the same problem and yet his sermon was good. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Time for this presentation has expired.

We'll move on to Leonard John Friesen. Leonard John Friesen.

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

Mr. Leonard John Friesen (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Friesen: Thank you for listening to me this late in the evening or in the morning, I guess we should say. My name is Leonard Friesen. I live on a farm 10 miles west of Morris, Manitoba. I'm a fourth-generation farmer. The land I farm has always meant more to me than just the crop that I grow on it. I was

brought up with an understanding that you always put back into the land what you take from it to maintain good soil quality.

My forefathers cared for the land in a very natural way. They didn't need synthetic fertilizers to have fertile land. They used the manure from animals. It worked then and it works now, too. For example, when swathing across our home quarter, when you looked at the land, the height of the Canola crop changed from the area with injected manure to an area that was spread with synthetic fertilizer. The height of the Canola crop was a difference of 8 to 10 inches or taller from one side with manure to the other.

I have several bones to pick with Bill 17, some of which I want to talk about tonight. Bill 17 takes away my right to produce enough manure to replenish the land, so we have to buy fertilizer. Then the government misleads the public and tells them that Bill 17 will protect the water supply by reducing the nutrients in the lakes, which it can't because the land ultimately needs nutrients applied to grow crops. If it isn't manure, it will be synthetic fertilizer. Also, because of Bill 17, I can't expand my hog operation to match what I can produce on my land.

* (01:30)

I can't produce a sufficient amount of manure to cover the land base that I farm, and the price of synthetic is taking all the profit out of the grain farming. Since the pause was put on in the past year, the proof is in the pudding, if you will. Some of the synthetic fertilizers—manufacturers have already doubled their price and, with synthetic fertilizer being the price it is, what will I be doing to our natural resource, the land? We won't be able to afford the fertilizer requirements of the land where it should be, so we will deplete the land of the nutrients it needs.

Another problem with Bill 17 is how the perception is, on our farm, when insurance companies have been trying to remove our replacement cost to insure our barn, after Bill 17 was announced. Because of this perception from Bill 17, even insurance companies have been losing faith in this industry and are trying to distance themselves.

However, I believe the government should be helping the hog industry to restore public perception. Obviously, through Bill 17, the government does not support and would rather hinder the hog industry. There are currently enough regulations to tie our

hands behind our backs and shackle our feet. We really didn't need this.

When everything adds up, it becomes stressful to a farmer. We're talking about fuel prices, fertilizer prices, hog feed pre-mix, oil, energy costs as a whole and removal from another abattoir. We were looking for the government's support, not a government that is looking to tear down at every opportunity it sees.

I'm against Bill 17. If Bill 17 is killed, it is going to restore the integrity of the farmer and it might rebuild the faith in the very people that produce our food, like me and my family. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Friesen.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you very much and thanks for your patience. I don't know if you were here right from 6 o'clock, but it's been a long evening, and so thanks for staying.

You did mention that your insurance agent was reluctant to insure you because, when there's instability in an industry, then consumer confidence goes down, same as in any kind of market situation.

I think that's a bit of concern that other industries, of course, are looking at the whole industry as non-sustainable. Other people that you've been dealing with—your banks—are you feeling that same kind of thing?

Mr. Friesen: The general—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Friesen.

Mr. Friesen: —feeling is the same. Sorry. Yes, that would say the other areas that we are involved with are feeling the same pressures, dealing with the banks and Credit Unions. Sure they are.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thanks for your presentation, and thanks for staying this long.

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

Mr. Friesen: All right.

Mr. Chairperson: Wendy Friesen. Mrs. Friesen, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mrs. Wendy Friesen (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mrs. Friesen: Thank you. I bring a mixed perspective tonight, because I was actually born and raised in Winnipeg. I became a farmer and a wife all

in one day, so I can see this from everybody's perspective.

I feel that Bill 17 is completely unnecessary, and it's been a major contributor to the poor image that the public at large has of the hog industry in Manitoba as a whole.

We already have enough rules and regulations that we follow to ensure that we are raising hogs in a way that is responsible. We take pride in the work that we do and that includes everything from feeding the animals to incorporating the manure on the land. The animals we raise feed the hungry world and that is the image that the government should be emphasizing to the public, not the dirty smelly image that has been clouding the minds of the urban public, especially. Even in my own past backyard, that image is really clear, where I grew up.

The manure is a natural fertilizer that gives back to the land the very nutrients that grain farming takes from it. If we don't apply the natural fertilizer, you can be sure that we will have to apply synthetic fertilizer, because crops require fertilizer to grow and we need those crops to feed the world and the animals.

Bill 17 is totally unfair to the hog producers of Manitoba. The huge area of the province that will be left unable to expand or build new hog facilities is just not practical and is unreasonable. In the Red River Valley, for example, where we live, we have been told that we are in a danger zone for flooding and that is why we shouldn't be allowed to have anymore hog expansion to protect the water in case of a flood. I can tell you that our operation is no danger of flooding from the Red River or any other source. We have a dike around our entire yard that also surrounds our lagoons, our ponds, our barns. Everything's included. It makes our operation one of the many operations that I know of who don't fall within the reasoning for being included in the banned area, and I'm sure that there are many more that I don't know of.

We are prepared to ensure our water quality against flooding and we've taken the financial costs and taken the steps to make sure that we don't have that risk factor. We took those steps not because of fear of flooding from the river. We had some flooding concerns from overland flooding that were being created by our municipality that had nothing to do with river flooding but overland flooding coming from the west of us.

How can you justify including every hog producer in the entire Red River Valley in the ban when there are a good number of us who already have varied safeguards in place to prevent the possibility of disasters that Bill 17 is citing as reasons for the need to ban? I'm only referring to one area of the ban. I know that you've already heard from others about their areas.

This ban will forever change the way we make decisions on the farm. It will cause us to be limited in how we structure our farms, how we transfer our farms to the next generation. It will decide for us if there can even be a next generation on the farm. This bill effectively takes away our right to farm as we see fit even within the regulations that we follow.

I want this committee to understand that Bill 17 sends a message that hog producers haven't been doing a good enough job because the regulations haven't been good enough and, therefore, we now need Bill 17 to make sure that we've stopped producers from any future growth so that the damage will stay the same, meaning that there's already damage. That message is all wrong. The truth is that hog producers are doing an excellent job, produce high quality food, create a natural fertilizer for soil improvement and we follow scientifically-based changes as they become available. We don't need a ban to help us to continue to improve our production practices. The proof is on the farm. We already follow the current regulations and best practices and we are proud of it.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Friesen.

Mrs. Stefanson: Thank you very much for your presentation tonight.

As someone who has come from Winnipeg, you mentioned, and who now lives in rural Manitoba, do you feel that a bill like this only creates sort of further animosity between people in Winnipeg and people in rural Manitoba? Does it sort of pit people off against each other by bringing this forward?

Mrs. Friesen: I know for a fact that it does, and I could tell you that it does even within my own family because it's misunderstood. The facts that are out there aren't real facts. For example, if you talked about the slaughtering plant that was proposed, my own family thought that was going to be a barn that was going to house animals, that animals were going to go there and be raised. They've never understood that it was a slaughtering plant where the animals

were going to be killed, not going to be raised and they thought how much manure is going to come out of that. Where is that manure going to go? Into the water system, into our sewer system. They didn't understand it. That year, last year at Christmas we talked about it. I said it wasn't going to be a feeder barn. It was a slaughtering plant.

So, yes, the misconceptions are breaking apart even—you know, the communication has broken down completely.

Mrs. Stefanson: Exactly. Thank you very much for your presentation.

* (01:40)

Mr. Borotsik: Thank you. *[interjection]* That's okay. Just one question. You do bring a different perspective because, quite frankly, this is an anti-farm bill, but it has been geared by the NDP to the urban centre of Winnipeg. Make no mistake about that.

In fact, we've been told, as the opposition, by government, that we are against clean water, that they are the only ones who are out there protecting Lake Winnipeg in a pristine state, and we're opposed to clean water. That's the message they would like to get out to the urban population of Winnipeg.

Wendy, how do we get across the message that it's not hog farmers and hog producers that are causing the problem, but, in fact, the majority of the problem that's being caused is by the City of Winnipeg? They're dumping raw sewage into the Red River, but that message doesn't seem to get out. Why are we the ones, and you're the ones, that are being blamed? How do we get the message to your relatives? You're the one that has to talk to them. How do we get that message out to them, Wendy?

Mrs. Friesen: I think the lines of communication need to be made more clear and more basic. We need to let the people in this city understand that we have better waste management practices on the farm than what we have in the city, that our regulations are so stringent, and that we are monitored so stringently, far more stringently than what we are in the city, or at the lakes.

You know, we need to make that point that what you're doing in the city, what you're flushing down your toilet—for example, people in the city tend to flush pills that they don't use down the toilet. Well, they just go down the toilet. On the farm, we don't flush pills down the toilet. Why? Because it goes

back into our drinking water. Well, guess what? Wherever you flush those pills down the toilet, they go back into somebody's drinking water, but when you do it in the city that's not where it ends up, apparently.

But these are messages that are not clear when you make that cut-off between city and country, and I know it. I've heard it first-hand growing up, and I know it on the farm.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mrs. Friesen.

Robert Kleinsasser, Suncrest Colony. Do you have any written material for the committee, sir?

Mr. Robert Kleinsasser (Suncrest Colony): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Kleinsasser: I've got a curfew, but I guess we broke it, so I brought my wife with me.

I'm not going to be as loud as Kenneth was. He's my boss. I apologize if he offended anybody.

Anyway, Bill 17—I'm the hog manager at the Suncrest barn. Our barn is, like, 37 years old. I'm sick of it. I want to tear it down and build a new one. Our profit margins are so tight we have to expand. We've only got 500 sows. It's not big; 1,100, 1,200 isn't big. To expand, we cannot do it with this bill. We have to find different solutions.

Costs of production are going up every day. Grain prices are ridiculous. We are fine-tuning everything daily, our nutrition programs, and we're trying to make a go of it. We haven't made any money for a whole year, and, here, we're getting hammered with this bill.

We've got plans of expansion. Half our pigs are finished off site. We're building a new colony, in the process of it. It's in the De Salaberry municipality. We've got a finisher barn now. It's six years old. We had permits to build a sow barn; they expired. We can't get new ones. With this bill, it wouldn't work.

I myself have got five boys, and what are they going to do? They are working beside me every day, and it's going to be an issue.

We've got a land base for 25,000 sows. We need 2.5 acres for every sow. We are close to 10,000 acres. So that's absolutely not an issue. In Bill 17, the southeast corner is totally, it's polluted with hogs. Well, that's not so. There might be an area where it

is, but you've got to look at every application at the time. We've got tonnes of land, and there are tonnes, there are barns around us, there are quite a few. They've all got land. We've got guys spreading, custom, other guys spreading manure on our land. We don't have an issue with that. It's liquid gold.

I hear all kinds of questions and comments from this side of the table, but I don't hear much from this side. Have you guys decided already what you're going to do? I don't know. Are you just here to pass the time? We don't know. Please let it not be that way. We cannot afford to have Bill 17.

What's the best way to control something? Absolutely best way? If we've got flies in our barn, we spray them. We kill them. We control them. Are you going to kill the hog barns? You want to control it that way? Elimination is the best way to control anything. That's not the way to do it. That's a coward's way out.

Let's work together. Let's work something different out. We don't want different rules on Bill 17. We want Bill 17 gone. It doesn't make sense from day one and the first line—we're not allowed to swear so, we're not going to go there. That's about all I have.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation.

I have a question for you. You said you want to build a new barn, yours is outdated and antiquated. Does your lagoon need to be replaced as well?

Mr. Kleinsasser: We built a brand new lagoon four years ago. It's enough for a 1,500-sow farrow-to-finish so that's a state-of-the-art lagoon. That wouldn't be an issue. We've got the animal units there too, on both sides. We've got two sides now. We've got the outside finisher barn. There's a huge lagoon there, and then the home farm has the huge lagoon too.

Mr. Eichler: Just further to that, then, did you make application for the new structure?

Mr. Kleinsasser: Not on the home farm. On the new colony that we're going to build, we had permits but we got into some difficult times with the hog prices and all that so they expired on us and we'd have to reapply for the permits.

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

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

Mr. Reg Penner (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Good evening, or good morning, everybody. Thanks for waiting up. I think at 10 o'clock I was about done, but I saw if you guys can sit up all night, I think I can do it once as well so thank you for hanging in there and letting us get some of this stuff off our chest and hopefully, we're getting through.

Anyway, my name is Reg Penner. I live in Steinbach. I am the president and partner of Penner Farm Services and Penfor Construction, and a partner in a completely different industry, South East Forest Products, all rural Manitoba companies.

I am here to speak out against Bill 17. I'm taking a little bit of a different twist tonight. I just want to show what can happen when families are given an opportunity. We live in a fantastic community. It's been progressive. It's diversified, and it has certainly done great things for us. I'm going to tell a little bit of a story about what happens in a community of that nature.

* (01:50)

The origin of our group of companies began on a dairy and grain farm in Blumenhof. I think there's somebody in this room that knows where that is. Actually, most of our land was in the R.M. of Ste. Anne. It's five miles north of Steinbach.

In order to keep the boys busy in the wintertime, my grandfather started a winter logging operation in Kenora, in the Rush Bay area, so those of you who have cabins in that area, it was a fantastic place.

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

Originally, all the pulp was shipped to mills in Kenora, but the operation was soon expanded to include a sawmill in Blumenort, again, a sawmill in the middle of the prairies, a little unusual, but we did it to help us achieve a greater economic value for the wood. In order to get the highest value of the wood, they soon started selling lumber off the farm to local area customers. Well, customers need a lot more than wood to build something, so it wasn't long when they were selling nails, saws and hammers.

A vision was starting to form, and, in 1957, my grandfather called a meeting with his sons and said a decision needed to be made whether to farm or to pursue this new opportunity. My father, who

especially liked farming, had a tough time with the decision, but, in the end, the group opted to sell the farm and invest the resources into this new venture. A lumber yard and hardware store, which operated under the name of A.K. Penner and Sons, was created. These were certainly exciting times for them. The market was ripe and the area was ready with willing customers to buy our products. The market enlarged and the vision grew. In order to service an ever-growing customer base, they soon entered the construction business, which included residential, agricultural and commercial construction. In turn, all these areas started to grow and the company soon organized into functional operating lines that would eventually become stand-alone units.

At the time, they included a legally separate South East Forest Products and operating divisions under A.K. Penner's that were Retail Building Supplies, now E.G. Penner Building Center in Steinbach; Commercial Construction, now Penco Construction out of Blumenort; and Farm Construction, now Penner Farm Services in Blumenort. As the business units grew and the vision grew, in the end, each of the divisions became stand-alone businesses. At present, this group, along with associated Penner companies, has a direct payroll in Manitoba in excess of 400 people.

I personally got involved in the Farm Services division some 30 years ago and saw it grow from a few employees located in a small building in Blumenort to over 150 staff, of which 75 are in Manitoba; and two locations in Blumenort and Brandon; two locations in Alberta and an associated company in Ontario with two main locations.

Manitoba was the base, and it's been an absolutely great place for us. We were pulled and encouraged by our customers, and a vision was created as we attempted to service and satisfy a growing base. Manitoba's prosperity and vision, I believe, wasn't that much different, and it grew as well, as it was led by opportunity and by hardworking, enthusiastic and responsible people.

The Crow rate subsidy was eliminated by the federal Liberals in the mid-1900s, with one of the main goals being that it should help stimulate innovation, investment, opportunity and jobs in the western rural areas. The vision was clear and the impact was certainly amazing. In Manitoba, in the livestock area alone, we saw the hog industry grow threefold with a capital investment in livestock

facilities alone of over three-quarters of a billion dollars. I didn't find that information. I knew what happened to the size of herd, and I had to pull those dollars out. That's only the dollars that we were able to touch directly in capital; it does not include trucks, mills, trailers and all kinds of other stuff. So that was only a portion of the capital investment.

The vision of our leaders in Ottawa, along with the marketing support of the provincial Conservative's Manitoba advantage worked, and farmers, bankers and private citizens opened their wallets and invested in rural Manitoba's future.

Surely, we can do better than abandoning this vision and this huge investment in rural Manitoba with the passing of Bill 17. Businesses and people cannot survive without vision, and the passage of Bill 17 will destroy the vision for many rural Manitobans. Without any potential for growth, how do you keep the kids excited on the farm? You heard that information time and time again from many presenters here tonight and the past days.

I acknowledge the fact that we have used up a lot of the available land and resources in the RMs of Hanover and La Broquerie. But do we need to legislate a total construction ban on an industry to control its growth? Surely, there's a better way. Can regulation and enforcement not do the job? Is it not worth the effort to find a better way that will protect the vision and investment that Manitoba citizens have made in their province?

Over time, the investments that have been made will depreciate. Some farmers will drop out, leaving opportunity for reinvestment. Should we not try to keep this investment in Manitoba? Rural livestock investment might not seem important to our province today with everything that's going on, and we do have a vibrant economy, but the opportunity we see in other areas will also not last forever, and we will likely return to seek reinvestment in one of our largest resources, which is rural Manitoba.

Let's not abandon the vision we sought and attained, but let's rather protect what we have created. As our elected representatives, I believe it is your responsibility to set the vision and to lead our province into the future.

I would suggest that we can do better than Bill 17. Please go back to the drawing board and come up with a solution that will both protect the environment and give the livestock industry hope and a positive vision for the future. The solution should also seek to

protect and grow the long-term-investment in rural Manitoba that we all desire.

Our family was given an opportunity to attain our vision and dreams in this great province. Let's ensure that our future generations have the same opportunity. Please protect, nurture and grow a controlled vision; don't destroy it.

I think, as our elected representatives, it is your responsibility. Thank you.

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

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Reg, for your presentation. I know that your corporation runs a very significant business in the province of Manitoba, and we certainly hope that the government does see the light and withdraw Bill 17.

My question for you is: How much out-of-province business do you do? If Bill 17 passes, do you see having to relocate your business into another area, be it North Dakota or Saskatchewan?

Mr. Reg Penner: While we've been pushing all corners, I think the fact that we are in Ontario and Alberta was maybe a little bit of a fluke. Our customers, some of our larger customers were moving to Ontario and Alberta and requested us to follow them there and do work for them there.

It wasn't necessarily a strategy in advance. Right now, it looks pretty smart. If we can believe that we diversified geographically to give us that advantage, it certainly makes us feel a little better. We're probably—we're still the biggest investment still in Manitoba. Like I said, I think we have about 100 staff out-of-province right now.

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

Any other questions?

Thank you for your presentation, sir.

Next on the list, we have Galen Peters. Do you have a written presentation for the committee, sir?

Mr. Galen Peters (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

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

Mr. Galen Peters: I'm here just to tell this right to you guys, because you guys have all the facts. You guys know all the percentages. You know where everything comes from, suppose it all comes from us, but you guys know.

I married into a family which is very, very much into farming. Farming has always been part of my family too; my dad had a farm when I grew up as a kid. He ended up selling it, and we moved out of the Wawanesa area and into the Municipality of Hanover.

I'm part of a third-generation farm right now, thanks to my marriage, and I'm proud of it. I've been there now for seven years. About five years in, we were already debating on how to change our operation, how to grow it and where we should go from our current size of 800 sows. We would raise them to 50 pounds and sell them off.

We didn't have enough room, because our production kept increasing. Now, in the last few years, we haven't been able to be as productive as we want to, in regard to economically and to be able to go ahead with an expansion, but this bill completely handcuffs us.

The only thing we're forced to do is go rent a facility and put money in somebody else's pocket. It's less economic for us to do than to build our own facility, invest our money back in ourselves. It is frustrating for me; the percent is 1.5 is what I'm being told. Now, in regard to that, why are we being handcuffed?

It's just so frustrating, because these are the rules that are supposed to be put on us but, yet, 98.5 percent can just continue to function, continue to flow and continue to enter into Lake Winnipeg.

How am I supposed to reinvest back in myself, in the facility that I've had the great privilege to be given, to become part of? It doesn't make sense to me to do this.

* (02:00)

I've seen what happens when municipalities—and this is maybe a small picture and what I fear is going to happen to Manitoba. In the southeastern corner of the province, there are R.M.s there, that have fought tooth and nail to keep the hog industry out. They've gone to extreme lengths. If you drive down the No. 12 highway, south of Steinbach, you run toward the U.S. border, and you hit a big sign that says, no hog factories allowed; no hog factories in this R.M. All cell coverage kicks out right around there. Why? Because no one lives there, no one wants to be there. Why? Does that go hand in hand? I kind of would like to maybe think so.

Hanover, La Broquerie—we've been flourishing, we've been growing. I live in Kleefeld and my operation is in the Grunthal area. Those R.M.s have just been growing by leaps and bounds in the last few years. They haven't said no to hog industry, they haven't said no to farming, to agriculture. They've embraced it, they've welcomed it.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

It's allowed diversification to happen in the towns and in the communities. We're at the point now where immigrants from Germany are just coming over in flocks and they continue adding to this growth.

It's something that I just fear that it's a small picture of what happens in R.M.s when they refuse agriculture growth, and they say, forget it, we don't want it. Yes, there's still the opportunity for us to grow if we put in these phosphorus separators and manures, and all that kind of stuff. But it's such a huge economical impact for us because we're already trying to stay competitive and adjust our operation, invest in the buildings, in the animals and in our practices in regards to keeping within government regulations, never mind adding something else on to us.

To try to stay competitive in the global market when municipalities, even the city of Winnipeg, doesn't even have to abide by these laws, it is very tough. It is hard to swallow as a hog industry and being a part of it that the answer we get is that it's okay for Winnipeg to continue to grow with housing developments because the answer we get is: It's okay because we stopped the phosphorus problem in Lake Winnipeg, we got the guys, the hog farmers.

I fear that in two or three years, there's going to be absolutely no difference in Lake Winnipeg or even five years down the road because of this ban. It's not going to drop the levels there. There's no chance in that. I just fear the government's going to come back and say, whoa, we made a mistake, we should have got the cattle industry as well. It's still not going to make a difference. I just feel this is a great frustration to me and a great injustice because this isn't even fair.

I could swallow this if it was across the board in regards to everything that is going into the Red River and into Lake Winnipeg in regards to the phosphorus, if everybody had to apply by the same rules, but it's not even close. It is very, very frustrating to me. I feel that I've just been

discriminated against for whatever reason, for just the fact of I'm being a hog farmer.

This is going to affect all rural municipalities to some extent because it is definitely going to keep investment out from Manitoba on some level. The hog industry is a big level when it comes to rural Manitoba. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Peters.

Questions.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you very much, Mr. Peters, for your presentation. It's obviously a very from-the-heart presentation, and I appreciate that.

I, too, am a farm boy. There was a point in time when I had to make a decision, too, whether I was going to farm or move on. My dad said to me, you don't want to farm. That was a tough time.

Obviously, now you guys are facing very tough regulations here. There's a point in time where you want to fight things. Like you can fight governments from another point in regulation, but you don't want to fight your own government. It seems to me we've come to a point where we're actually fighting our own government here in Manitoba. Why are we fighting our own government in Manitoba? I sense there's regulations in place that deal with the bad apples, if you will, and we can deal with the bad apples, and there's management practices we can adhere to. But why should we be here tonight fighting our own government?

Mr. Galen Peters: I don't think we should be. We shouldn't have to fight our own government. The government is elected by us to do the things for us that we feel are best. They're there to help us out in regard to getting things through, and that kind of stuff.

Why are we here fighting them today? It's pretty much for the way of life that we've known. I'm here fighting for not only a way of life, but also for a big capital investment that has just disappeared on me. It's like when they said that Bill 17 was coming in and they were going to place a permanent moratorium, when they put that in, it's like if you would have opened up your financial portfolio on that day and some company has all of sudden been told they violated some environmental rule and they're going to have to be shut down, it's just complete collapse for that company, right?

That's exactly what I felt like when I woke up in the morning. My heart just jumped through because

my government said, you're not going to be able to grow the way you have in the past. I have just been handcuffed.

Why are we here? I have no idea. Should we be fighting them? No, we should be working together on this. It should be a joint effort. It should never be us versus government or government versus us. It should be something together.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Lauren Wiebe, Topeaka Farm. Do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Lauren Wiebe (Topeaka Farm): I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. You may proceed.

Mr. Wiebe: There's been a lot said tonight. I'm tired. I'm sure everybody else is tired as well, so I'm going to keep it brief. But I'm going to tell a story as well, because everything else has been said.

Topeaka Farms is a family farm. I am one of the owners, along with my wife and my two sons. We started the business in 1994 in the De Salaberry municipality. We purchased an existing operation. It was, at that time, a 1,900-sow operation. At that time, it would have been classified as one of the bad apples in the bunch. We realized that when we bought it, and we took the initiative with a sense of delight to challenge ourselves to do better than what the previous owner had done.

We went before our municipal council and we explained our situation. We introduced ourselves to them and said we live right beside St. Malo Provincial Park. There's no reason why our farm can't look as good as what the provincial park looks like. As far as agricultural and rural residents, we can live together and farm together in the same community and get along. That's back in 1994.

In 1998, we expanded that facility to 2,600 sows and purchased an additional 400 acres of land to go along with that. In 2002—actually, in 2000—we'll go back there—my oldest son passed away. I lost the drive to farm for a year, didn't do anything other than maintain what we had. At that time, there were six employees that were working with us. Then 2002 came along, and I looked at the past, and I said, you know, that's the past; we're going to move on to the future. There was a neighbouring facility that we purchased, renovated that one into the sow unit again, sheerly for the demand that was being placed upon our Canadian isoweans. We were selling into the United States, producing an excellent product for

export. In 2002, we increased our staffing from six to 15, and we bought an extra 400 acres of land. At that point in time, we were farming 1,200 acres. Some of it was pasture; some of it was grain land.

*(02:10)

The year 2002 was a turning year for us in regard to the fact that we were looking at manure management long before the government even decided to introduce manure management hog plans. In 1996, I was keeping my own journals of how much manure I was putting on the land, what kinds of crops I was growing and what my yields were. I knew what my phosphorus levels were. I knew what my nitrogen levels were.

In 2002, I was privileged to be a part of a planning committee in the municipality of De Salaberry to rezone our municipalities to allow rural residents, livestock operations to live in harmony. Unfortunately, my operation, our family operation, ends up to be in a limited agricultural zone, but unfortunately, or fortunately, it's got 5,600 sows on that particular site, on 1,200 acres of land. I take that as a challenge to do even a better job with what we've been entrusted with.

To date, we have not had complaints from our neighbours. In fact, as time has progressed, in the year 2006—actually a little prior to that, I'm going to back up a bit, Rosann, if I can—in 2002, it was a pivotal year for us. Being on a pilot planning committee, I managed to meet a lot of people that were anti-hog. We had both sides of the spectrum involved in that committee. I purposed in my heart that we were going to have an open house to all the people that were willing to come, be it from any municipality, Hog Watch, whoever wanted to come, and we would have a manure management day. I brought in speakers from our local government; I brought in feed representatives from some of the various companies. I brought in equipment suppliers to speak at this particular event. There were prizes given out. There were contests that we had. We actually demonstrated the equipment. We applied manure right beside the field, or right beside the yard where we ate. There was virtually no odour. The wind was in the right direction, thank goodness.

But, nonetheless, we were recognized for an award through the Banff Pork Seminar for, at that point in time, it was called community relations. So we went to Banff, I guess, in January of 2003, received the award, came home only to receive another award from Manitoba Pork Council for, I

guess it was classified at that time, innovative manure management.

In Banff, we had the opportunity to listen to some speakers that were talking about biogas. Hadn't heard about biogas before but at this particular conference they were talking about it. It intrigued me. I went home, spent countless nights looking at the Internet, trying to research as much as I could on it. Got very involved and then spent four years dealing with the NDP government lobbying privately and through our municipal council, some of the members of your government who help us develop the program of biogas. We got to the point where the deputy minister, Ms. Rosann Wowchuk, accepted the technology. It looked good. We were going to move forward.

The announcement was made that there was a \$50,000 grant that was going to be available to three farm units. We were one of them. The process was long and tedious, and after about six months, seven months, another announcement was made that now the federal government was seemingly having some interest and I had had a lot of dialogue with the Department of Energy out of Ottawa as well, and now they were interested in contributing to our funds. At the end of the day, it was November of '06, I believe it was, we were awarded \$175,000 to go into a facility that was supposed to cost us \$1.2 million. Manitoba Hydro would not come to the table to offer us a proper contract and make it feasible. My banks, when I showed them the financials for that type of a facility, they laughed at us. They said, what do you think we are? You think we're stupid? Like, why wouldn't you invest that kind of dollar value in hogs? Well, my heart was still very much wrapped up in the biogas, but unfortunately we listened to our banker. We allowed that \$175,000 to go by the wayside. It was supposed to be spent by March of '08. There was no way we could pull it all together at that time.

In '06 we expanded our operation once again. We bought an additional 1,800 acres of land and built an additional 3,400 sow spaces a mile and a half from our place. We've got, at this point in time, 40-plus employees. We have a payroll of a million and a half dollars annually. We pay our people well. We contribute to the local economy in our area of \$7.5 million. We're family farm people. We're not corporate, we're family.

I am absolutely fortunate to be a fourth generation farmer; my grandfather, my great-

grandfather, my dad, myself. Now my two boys that are left, they're actually the fifth generation that's coming up. Where was I going with that?

Anyway, we're fifth generation, fourth generation on this over here, and we expanded. Again, it was the demand from the United States for our isoweans, our high quality of isoweans, that pushed us to expand, and also the dollar that was starting to devalue here in Canada. We looked at that. We were warned about it back in 2005, that this dollar was going to go to par. So we were looking at a way of restructuring so that we could match the Americans dollar-for-dollar on production costs. The only way to do that, ladies and gentlemen, was to expand and to watch costs. There was no other way.

Farmers today that have expanded or built in previous years are probably financed at a 1.2 or a 1.3 exchange rate. That's not there today. We've financed at \$1-to-\$1 exchange rate. So we worked hard at controlling our costs, expanding, looking at a market that needs our pigs.

As we've gone through the perfect storm—as they've called it over this last six months—we're weathering it. It might be windy outside there tonight, but we're weathering it, and we're going to see the future. We've got contracts that have held because of the quality of pig that we have and the service that we give as Topeaka Farms. We also have contracts that were broken, and I have spent the last month and a half travelling the United States, talking to producers out there, developing new relationships—

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

Mr. Wiebe: Thank you—and, to date, it looks as if we will sign contracts in the next two to three weeks with these fellows in the United States.

I'd love to finish our animals here in Canada. That was the main goal when we started to do business as Topeaka Farms. But when the slaughter plant here in Winnipeg was kiboshed and Maple Leaf decided to take the approach of the strong arm to do business with the producers in the area, we had no choice but to continue to export. But we will be finishing hogs once we've signed our contracts in the United States. That we will do, and, hopefully, one day, we'll bring it here to Manitoba, once there are some proper guidelines for Bill 17.

I oppose Bill 17. It's not right. Are we going to weather it? Absolutely, we are going to weather Bill 17, whether it comes or whether it goes. I'm an

eternal optimist. I still believe in biogas, Rosann, and we're going to talk. There has got to be more commitment from the government to support biogas. If we can put people on the moon and we can have a space station flying around our earth, certainly we can produce biogas in Manitoba, because they're doing it in Europe, they're doing it in Russia, they're doing it in China, they're doing it around the world. We're one of the only countries that hasn't explored that area. There are a lot of naysayers out there about biogas, but it does work.

I hired a specialist from Germany when we were in the heat of our discussions with the government. It was costing me \$40,000 a year to hire him. He was on staff for two years, until finally the project fell apart on us. I had another engineer and an agronomic, a fellow that works with the microbials, whatever. He was out from Illinois. We had him on staff as well. We spent in the neighbourhood of \$150,000 to \$200,000 just in the research of the whole project, and, to date, it's still not up and running. I don't know of one that is here in Manitoba.

* (02:20)

To conclude, I want to thank you for the time that you've given me to speak. I'm proud to be a farmer in De Salaberry. I'm very proud to have a family that supports our family business. When I say our family, our employees are our family. We have people from Germany; we have people from the Philippines; we have people from Mexico; we have people from Paraguay; we have our rural people from St. Malo, from St. Pierre, from Grunthal, from Kleefeld, all working in one cultural setting. We're very diversified in culture.

It's just a great privilege to be able to do business in Manitoba. We want to continue to do that. But, with Bill 17 standing in our way, it's going to actually push a lot of the fellows, a lot of the farmers out. We'll still stay, but our finishing product will go into the United States instead of staying here in Canada.

Just to round off some numbers for you. The lost revenue to Manitoba for us pushing our isoweans into the United States, that's taking off the revenue of about \$8.5 million that we receive for our isoweans in gross revenue; \$25 million on the finished product. So you add \$25 million plus the \$8.5 million, you're looking at between \$32 million to \$34 million that that facility produces here in Manitoba. We pay taxes of close to \$80,000 a year. I mean you've heard all those kinds of stories. I don't even

want to go into all my expenses. We have \$7.5 million that goes back into the rural economy of Manitoba and I'm proud of it.

Ends my speech. One thing I would like to say, though, is any time you guys are interested in touring a facility, let me know. You're more than welcome to attend Topeaka Farm's open house anytime.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Questions?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Wiebe, you gave a tremendous—

Mr. Wiebe: Wiebe.

Mr. Cullen: Wiebe? Sorry.

Mr. Wiebe: Yeah. That's okay.

Mr. Cullen: —thorough presentation, I'll tell you. I don't even know where to start in terms of questions. I don't even know if I want to give a question, but we're talking about the greenhouse gas emissions and stuff in the hog industry. How does that play things out? Technology, there's so much more that we can do in terms of technology, in terms of the whole industry. I guess, I just want to get your input in terms of that.

Mr. Wiebe: The greenhouse gas emissions. There is a Chicago mercantile climate exchange for greenhouse gases. At this point in time, I believe our provincial government and federal government haven't set enough guidelines for what the value of greenhouse gases are supposed to be. It's a very volatile area to trade in. I like to trade in more secure things. I look at right now the manure that's produced from our hogs as being a phenomenal fertilizer value for us. One thing I failed to mention in my talk is we do farm 2,000 acres and graze another 1,200 acres besides. My sons and myself, we apply our own fertilizer. We have applied to be licensed. We did take the course. So we can be either commercial or on-farm applicators. We have our own equipment.

As far as greenhouse gas is concerned, we had a fellow by the name of Eric Bibeau, Dr. Eric Bibeau out of the University of Manitoba, do some calculations for us. Our government at one time was saying that we should try and reduce a tonne of greenhouse gas per year. The number of tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions that we would reduce by producing biogas, it was phenomenal. It was in the—I don't want to exaggerate; it's been too long—but it was 32,000 tonnes worth of greenhouse gases that would be reduced from our facilities alone.

The amount of electricity that we could produce from our facility was enough to power the entire farm and to also power up two-thirds of St. Malo. Manitoba Hydro had no interest in us. They looked at us as being a threat and not as an ally. The price that they offered us for electricity was so insulting that we never even went to the final price discovery. Like it was just—it wasn't real. I appreciate the fact that my hydro bill is only about \$17,000 a month. It could be a lot higher if I was living in Alberta, but we have the resources to produce our own, if the government would work with us.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for this presentation has expired. I thank you very much, Mr. Wiebe. It was very informative.

Mr. Wiebe: You're welcome.

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

Mr. Rolf Penner (Private Citizen): I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed.

Mr. Rolf Penner: I am the last. It's been a long night, and it's tough following a lot of great presenters, I can tell you. Reg over there—I've never met him before. He's never met me but, the last two barns I built, was thanks to his company. If he sticks around, we can talk about a feed-line issue I've got.

Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, Mr. Minister, I wish I could say it's a pleasure to be here with you today to talk to you about Bill 17 but, frankly, it's not.

My name is Rolf Penner. I raise hogs in the Red River Valley, just east of the town of Morris. It's a mixed farm which includes crop land. I'm 40 years old and, while I've done other things in my life, farming has always been my main source of income. It's the rock that my family and I use to anchor our lives. Bill 17 will smash that rock to bits.

I've learned a lot in the last 25 years about what it takes to run a successful farm. I've learned from my grandfather, my father, my professors at the University of Manitoba, such as Don Flaten, my peers, my neighbours and from my own personal experience.

I'm at the top of my game right now. I know what to do, and I know how to do it well. I'm nowhere near being done building hog barns. I'm nowhere near to using up the available spread acres that I have for manure, but you want to put a stop to

me, even though I have polluted nothing, and my farm either meets or exceeds all of the regulations.

My future, my family's future, my kids' future depends on us being able to expand our hog operation, so that it remains efficient and competitive in the global marketplace. You are destroying that future with this bill.

Let me give you a little history about our farm. My parents and grandparents moved from Europe to Manitoba after World War II, with nothing but the desire to farm. When I was growing up, we had all sorts of different livestock; we had some pigs, chickens, cows, a few ducks and some crop land. We weren't particularly well-off, but we all pitched in and we got by. Slowly, our farm grew and we started to specialize until it wound up being crop land and hogs.

First, we had about 200 feeder hogs. Then, by the late '70s, early '80s, we were up to about 350. In 1988, we built a new barn as the old one was completely worn out; that barn held 600 pigs. Ten years later, in 1998, we built onto that barn, so that our total number of pigs was 2,000. Then, in 2005, we built another two barns, three miles north of our home yard, together with some neighbours. We've got a 20 percent share in those two barns.

I'd like to point out, as a sidebar, that we don't live in town; we never have. We've always lived next to our livestock, and we always plan to. Our growth has been a slow, steady progression that has kept food on our table, clothes on our back and, among other things, has put me through university. My father only got to grade 10, because he had to work on the farm.

Hogs were supposed to do this for my kids and my grandkids as well, but Bill 17 will put a stop to that. You claim that I can continue on doing what I'm doing, that no one is shutting down my existing operation. In one sense, that's true but, when you look at this thing in its full context, it is clearly false.

One of the most important things that I do and need to do, just to survive, is to continually expand. There's no way that my farm can get by today, using the kind of barn and the number of hogs that we had in the '70s or '80s. In the same way, what I have now will be obsolete and uncompetitive in the next 10 to 20 years. There's no future in hogs in southern Manitoba for my children, my kids, because of Bill 17.

I find this legislation and the current NDP government's attitude on this issue highly offensive on many levels. I, myself, have done absolutely nothing wrong; yet, I am being punished by this government. I cover my lagoon; I test my soil. I test my manure; I file manure management plans. I use a three-year rotation on where I put my manure. I run a tight ship and a clean operation, but that means nothing to you people.

You say I can't build anymore, because I live in a flood zone. In 1997, during the flood of the century, there was not one drop of manure that made its way from my lagoon into that flood water, not one single drop. Our farm didn't even qualify for a nickel's worth of rebuilding assistance, because my grandfather had the foresight to build our farm and ground so high that the flood waters didn't even get close to it.

* (02:30)

If you want me to dike this thing up even higher, that's fine. I can live with that, but to claim that I can't build anymore because my manure is a risk because of flooding is intellectually dishonest and absolutely ridiculous.

Speaking of intellectual dishonesty, the question of phosphorus loading into our waterways is not one of how many pigs we are raising in Manitoba but one of how much phosphorus is in the soil. If we doubled the number of hogs in the moratorium area, we would not see a doubling of that 1.5 percent of phosphorus that's it's estimated all the hogs are responsible for right now. As long as all the new livestock production added manure at the rate of crop removal, followed the current regulations, we wouldn't see a change in phosphorus run-off at all.

But no, instead of enforcing those existing regulations which are more than adequate, you want to ban all new construction. This makes no sense whatsoever. If we look beyond hogs to agriculture in Manitoba as a whole, we see that 87 percent of the land that's managed by farmers only contributes about 12 percent of the total phosphorus load to the waterways, which begs the question. If the folks managing the other 13 percent of the land were as prudent with their nutrients as farmers, would there even be a problem with Lake Winnipeg in the first place? Obviously, that question answers itself.

I have the right to raise livestock on my property as long as I am not harming anyone else, and I am not harming anyone else or the environment for that

matter. You have no proof that I am guilty of anything. On the contrary, the evidence all points to the fact that I am innocent, but in your eyes, it doesn't matter. I'm guilty anyway and the truth, apparently, is no defence.

Now some of you might think that I'm the victim of unintended consequences, that maybe you didn't mean to go after responsible farmers such as myself or my family. Maybe I'm just collateral damage in all of this. To that I say hogwash. I'm not the victim of unintended consequences but of intended consequences. You people know what you're doing. You know who you're hurting and you're doing it on purpose. Consequences be damned.

You talk about the greater good and the environment with this self-righteous indignation, but that's not what this is all about, and the science has clearly shown this time and time again. You're using the environment as a smokescreen to take away people's freedom, their liberty and their property rights. You're using it to try and resurrect central planning and socialism from its 20th century grave. It used to be that the NDP justified the right to take away our property and our freedom in the name of the working class, but now you've got a new justification. You no longer do so in the name of the proletariat but in the name of the Earth itself.

What kind of a government gives its citizens the semblance or the pretence of private property but then retains total power over its use and disposal? What kind of a government allows its citizens to retain all of the responsibilities of owning property without the freedom to act and without any of the advantages of ownership? What kind of a government is it that acquires all of the advantages of ownership for itself without any of the responsibility? What kind of a government is it that simply admires leadership? Leadership without purpose, program, or direction and power for the sake of power.

You want to know what kind of a government that is? I'll tell you. It's not politically correct of me to say this, and you may very well find it offensive, but these are all hallmarks of fascism. Private, economic ownership under rigid government control is part of the standard business dictionary definition of fascism. This is a fascist bill. It's a fascist piece of legislation, and you should all be ashamed of yourselves for even thinking about moving it forward.

If you're offended by me saying this, then I say, good. You should be offended. Like I said before, I personally find this piece of legislation and this government's attitude highly offensive myself. It offends my occupation. It offends my personal record. It offends my family's history. It offends my children's future. It offends reason, logic and science, and it offends the basic idea of common decency to your fellow human beings as human beings.

I am here today to ask you to put an end to this bill that punishes people such as myself not for what we've done wrong but for what we have done right. We have worked long and hard to get where we are, and you have no right to take our future away from us. No right whatsoever. This bill will destroy people's lives, their businesses, their communities, it will put an incredible strain on their families in the coming years, and it will accomplish absolutely nothing for anyone or the environment. Is that the kind or legacy you want to leave? I don't think so. You need to kill this bill and kill it now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Penner.

Questions.

Mrs. Taillieu: Thank you, Mr. Penner. I know that it's got to be hard at 2:30 in the morning after sitting through all this, and I know you were here the other night.

Your presentation was excellent. You raised a lot of points. Many points have been raised before by other presenters, but you did a really good job. I think that, after all the presentations that have been made over the last several days, this must have an impact on the government. And I'm just going to ask you if you feel that decisions have already been made even before these consultations even started to take place.

Mr. Rolf Penner: I think the decision has already been made. I've been watching, you know, everybody, trying to ask questions, trying to listen, looking at their Blackberrys, reading magazines, all the other kinds of things. Unfortunately, it does look like the axe is coming down, and, I mean, we've tried to reason with this government time and time again. We went into the Clean Environment Committee hearings with very good faith and understanding that we would look at this thing honestly. The end results obviously don't matter. They want to put an end to the hog industry. They don't want to do it over night

but this legislation will certainly do it. I mean, 10, 20 years goes by very quickly.

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

I know that you talked to a number of producers around the province of Manitoba, in fact, throughout western Canada and northern United States. What signal is this sending to the industry and future investments here in Manitoba?

Mr. Rolf Penner: Well, the message that's being sent is very clear.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Penner.

Mr. Rolf Penner: Sorry, Mr. Chairperson, getting ahead of myself. The message is very clear. If you're going to invest in Manitoba, you're going to have to be very, very careful because you don't know what's coming next and just because the government is going to tell you that, you know, we're going to welcome you with open arms, doesn't mean it's going to be true. We have to look at the actions, and the actions of Bill 17 speak far louder than any of the rhetoric that we've been hearing.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Penner, if this bill goes through, and we're certainly going to do our utmost to try to kill it, but if it does go through, are you going to continue to expand your operation in this province or are you going to look elsewhere to expand your operation, because knowing the kind of person you are this bill is not going to deter you from pursuing your dreams and the dreams for your family. So I'm wondering whether or not you are going to continue to fight this government and this bill by continuing to try to expand your operation here in Manitoba or are you going to look at other places?

Mr. Rolf Penner: We're going to do everything we can to try and stay in Manitoba. I mean, this is our home. I've lived here my whole life. My family's history of having to pick up and move from war-torn countries is still very present with me. I've listened to those stories time and time again from my grandparents. I don't want to move, but, I mean, mainly it's my investments that I'm worried about. You talk about expanding. This bill says I can't expand my hog operation. That's 50 percent of my business. If I'm going to lose 50 percent of my business 10, 20 years down the road, I'm in a world of hurt. The mixed farm, grain and hogs, works so very well and the kind of economic crisis that we've seen this year with the high feed prices has really driven that point home to me.

There's been many, many times when the hogs have helped me out on the grain side, and this year, the grain side is helping me out on the hog side. As a consequence, I'm not going to taxpayers the way a lot of other farmers are to make ends meet. I'm self-subsidizing. I've diversified. It works very well and I would like to be able to keep that balance but at this point, if I want to expand, I guess I got to stick to land or, I mean, I'm not really in cattle country, and so one of the things I'm really thinking hard about is how do I invest my money somewhere where it's a lot safer. And that would have to be somewhere outside of Manitoba, unfortunately, at this point.

Mr. Chairperson: I see no further questions.

Mr. Penner, thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Rolf Penner: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: That concludes the presentations that I have on my list.

On that note, it's 3 or 2:40. Committee rise. Good night, everybody.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 2:40 a.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

To Whom It May Concern

Good day, my name is Lindy Clubb. I'm living in Winnipeg but spend a great deal of time in the rural area of Manitoba, the escarpments in particular. In my youth, I had a grandfather's farm by Morris. As an adult, we still have my grandmother's farm, also by Morris, on the Red River. I know my way around big barns and livestock, but we've conserved and protected our land and water instead of going into factory farming.

I'm the assistant executive director of the Mixedwood Forest Society, an environmental research group located in Brandon dealing with issues of wood, water and waste. I'm also the spokesperson for Wolfe Creek Conservation, an alliance of people by Riding Mountain devoted to protecting water sources. They formed to object to the location of a hog barn in a hilly area filled with intermittent streams flowing through the proposed spread acres. With our experiences in mind, Re: Bill 17 (an amendment to the Environment Act), we feel this amendment should go further. We should extend the moratorium on hog barn expansion to include all areas of our province, for the good of the

public, the province, the farmers and the sons and daughters of farmers. We have saturated the markets with hogs, and saturated the land with the nutrients leached from slurry waste of the hogs. And these hogs are raised in an inhumane manner, for the most part. It's time to begin getting out of this industry, and many signs are pointing to this conclusion.

Whatever we do on the land reaches our water and affects it. Although we are all responsible for doing our part to help prevent our water from pollution, factory farms are polluting on a scale as large as their operations. We know this because the current phosphorus applications to the land exceed what growing plants can take up. What's left builds up in the soil, year after year, migrating to the closest surface water supply with soil particles, or moving down to contaminate groundwater. And it has been happening since we began to raise more than two hundred hogs in one place and either spreading or injecting the manure. If everyone in the industry has nothing to hide and is doing such a good job with waste, why then are we unable to obtain soil test results that would prove that? If everyone in the industry is doing such a good job, why then did the Auditor General's recent audit of the livestock industry uncover such a quantity of infractions, violations, pollution and lack of personnel for enforcement within this industry and its barns? If we are preventing nutrients from building up in the soil, why then, are they building up in our water? And we are able to decipher the difference between hog waste, human waste, and other livestock waste.

Large farms and intensive livestock operations put smaller farms and the rural way of life in jeopardy. We support small farms and small towns, mixed farm operations, niche marketers, and organic operations. We live there, take our business to the rural area, bring people there, and invest in those communities. We want our farming operations to be at a scale that helps the land and water and is sustainable. If the hog barns were sustainable economically or environmentally why then are they requiring hefty subsidies to maintain operations and more regulations, restrictions, safeguards and guidelines for these operations? We are hastily catching up in policy to prevent further pollution to our air and water and earth from these unnatural, exporting, money losing concentrations of hogs.

I attended and presented at the Clean Environment Commission hearings into hog operations/factories. We need to go further than the commission recommendations in order to spare our

land and water and air from the waste of so many hogs. The CEC report was written without sufficient information. It is a political document rather than an objective review and assessment of the hog industry. We don't even know, as a province, where all the hog operations are located, which nicely illustrates how closely we are able to track procedure. But we do know they are located in some places way too close together, way too close for neighbor's comforts, in areas that flood, in communities where no one wants them, in areas where there isn't enough land and crop to take up the waste in a timely manner, and in a province which relies on its fish and farming stock to live. We can live without pork. We can't live without clean air, water and other kinds of food, nor should we sacrifice these for the sake of a bad investment.

Joe Dolecki reminded me that polluting practices don't change simply because the location changes. We're worried about our western areas and other municipalities like Brokenhead, which is full of sensitive areas and bogs. Our scientists tell us our land and water and air are unhealthy and we are to blame. Let's invest in industries which can weather marketplace ups and downs, which prevent or mitigate pollution, and let's do it on a scale, such as small farming, which can lead us to a better future than one with more phosphorus than profits.

Sincerely,
original signed by
Lindy Clubb

* * *

Dear Premier Doer and Honorable Ministers,

Please read the following note in my absence at the presentations re Bill 17.

I have one question. This whole issue has really boiled down to supply and demand. There are too many hogs in MANITOBA and not enough demand.

If a grain farmer does not have a market for wheat, he/she does not go out and plant acres and acres of wheat.

Why do the hog industries think they should be protected from the economics of SUPPLY and DEMAND?

Yours sincerely
Bonnie Nay

* * *

Hi, my name is Aaron Gross. I wrote a short speech to inform that I am against Bill 17. Here are two main reasons to support my opinion.

One of my reasons of concern is that Manitoba farmers are depending on the hog industries. Manitoba hog farmers have created over 15,000 jobs in our province. That's more than Manitoba's aerospace and transportation manufacturing sectors combined. In addition to our 1,400 hog farmers, the industry provides jobs for many other Manitobans. This includes everything from feed mills, barn construction, and livestock trucking, to veterinary services, researchers, food processors and retailers. That's something to be strongly concerned about.

My second reason is the water we drink. Manitoba hog farmers are responsible for 1.5 percent of the pollution in Lake Winnipeg. What we should be asking ourselves is where the other 98.5 percent comes from. My opinion against this bill is that our Legislative Assembly is blaming the hog industries with no researched evidence whatsoever. So why can't we all take the blame on the pollution of Lake Winnipeg and work on keeping it clean.

Aaron Gross

* * *

First, I would like to complain about the actual committee hearings. I believe that the hearings have to be improved so that people are not sitting and waiting for their opportunity to talk for days. Could there not be a specific appointment time made for people to come in and talk? I have chosen to send in a letter instead of attending because as a rural Manitoban, I cannot sit for hours on end and drop everything, waiting for an opportunity to talk. The process leaves out many who are unable to commit to a day in the city.

I would like to make it known that I am opposed to Bill 17. The government bill is attacking one of the backbones of Manitoba. Not only does this upset business plans and people's lives, but it happened without a recommendation for the group that was doing the research. It was a political decision made that will upset thousands of Manitobans and will cause damage to the Manitoba economy, as well as damaging the way of life of Manitobans. We already live in one of the most regulated places on earth, so it is hard to understand how a blanket ban is necessary when regulations based on science could work.

The hog industry and technology is advancing every year, and some Manitoba companies have played a key part in this technology advancing. Basically, their biggest market has just been taken away, without warning and against the recommendations of scientists and rural Manitobans. How many articles have you found that agree with the ban in the papers? I think that Manitoba is making a big mistake here and urge you to fix this bill with several amendments because this is the last chance.

Please don't destroy the hard work thousands have put into this industry and please don't make the mistake of turning on your farmers.

Jonathan Gross
Iberville Colony Farms Ltd.

* * *

I had registered to speak before the Committee, but I will not be able to attend in person. Therefore, I would like to make my presentation in writing.

I guess I should start by introducing myself. My name is Claudette Taillefer and I have been a resident of the Rural Municipality of La Broquerie for over 38 years. I grew up here and so did my husband. We also chose to raise our family here. And, we are fortunate to both work in our small town.

I am the Grocery Manager for La Broquerie CO-OP. Our store has everything from fresh meats and produce to dry goods and hardware. At the same location, we also have agriculture supplies, animal feeds, and petroleum.

The CO-OP has seen tremendous growth since its incorporation in 1939. If we look at the statistical information from the last 10 years, our sales have increased from 1.72 million to 3.25 million. And, I can honestly say that a large part is due to the support we receive from the hog industry in our area.

This past year ending January 31st, 2008 was our best year ever recorded. We are extremely proud of our achievements and we look forward to reaching new heights in the years to come.

As I understand it, Bill 17 would ban the construction of new hog operations and the expansion of existing ones. So, that all boils down to no growth. A freeze on development and restrictions in the future for the industry in specific regions. So,

that means, they will go elsewhere. This will have a major impact for a small town.

La Broquerie has many hog operations in its surroundings and if we look at the big picture; these restrictions will have a huge impact on other businesses as well. As I see it, we will all experience significant loss in one way or another if this bill is passed. Here, I just finished telling you how much pride is achieved through growth!

The Municipality will lose potential taxes and population, the construction industry will see a drop in new contracts, and the retail stores will suffer a direct blow to potential sales. Whether it be lumber, electronics, agriculture, bath tissue, coffee, hygiene products or cleaning supplies; these non-sales will create a significant freeze. This will affect the growth of our schools, our community programs, and future job opportunities.

I can honestly say that I have not read all the studies done in regards to the environment. But, I do know that you are pinpointing an industry and literally pronouncing sentencing without concrete facts. What ever happened to innocent until proven guilty? Can you provide evidence that, without a doubt, this industry is the cause?

I could go on and on, but I think the message is pretty clear. I have expressed my concern along with hundreds of others in regards to this bill. I truly hope we were heard.

Thank You for listening,
Claudette Taillefer

* * *

Against Bill 17

Good evening to everyone present and the committee sitting to review this matter.

My name is Darren Bates, I currently live in Balcarres, Saskatchewan. I am Manitoba sales rep for Hypor Inc. and speaking against Bill 17 on behalf of Hypor and also personally. Hypor is a hog genetics company based out of Saskatchewan with customers all over the world and Canada, including here in Manitoba.

Look around at today's economic conditions in the U.S. and eastern Canada, such as Ontario, and you see potential recession and job losses fueled by factors possibly out of a government's control. It seems this government is trying to bring these things into reality all on its own.

Here we have a thriving industry with potential for great things in the future. I truly believe that Manitoba is the future of the hog industry in Canada.

Unfortunately, the way I see it the current government is trying to kickstart job losses and potential rural instability by making Bill 17 into law. Through ignorance to scientific facts and figures in the lust to lure urban voters with a sick political game this is the wrong way for a government to go about business.

I am a month away from moving to Manitoba from Saskatchewan having already purchased a house here. I watched for many years in my home province the past NDP government play the same kinds of political games to attract urban votes while forgetting completely about the rural areas. This worked for quite some time but eventually backfired and one only needs to look at the economic activity today in Saskatchewan to see the difference the new government has made. Rural Saskatchewan has never been stronger! Because rural Saskatchewan is stronger you can see the benefits throughout the entire province!

Why would the Manitoba government want to begin a process that will take them back to the Stone Age and embark an exodus of young people moving out of province to find jobs taking their skills and money with them.

To pin the environmental problems on agriculture, hog farmers or other, when producers spend thousands and countless hours of extra effort to be environmentally sound is truly wrong!!

It's time to wake up and take a whiff of the hog business for what it really is. Viable, sustainable and billions of industry \$\$ for the province. I'm questioning why I'm moving to another backward province when Saskatchewan finally has been turned around for the better.

Thow the bill away and help me believe in government again!

Yours truly,
Darren Bates, Hypor Inc.

* * *

My name is David Waldner from Waldheim Colony which is near Elie.

I've near had to make a speech or a presentation before, but I want to make a small presentation

because I couldn't let this unfair bill pass without saying something to try and change your minds,

As a private citizen and a Hutterite, my concern with Bill 17 is the instability it is going to permanently inflict on the hog industry, not only the instability, but the literal extinction of the hog industry. Where are we going to get pork from when the new generation does not want to raise hogs anymore because of Bill 17? Import it and lose money, instead of producing and exporting and making money. Not only will the hog industry be affected, but the whole farming industry in general. Nobody is going to spend money on building any type of barn for fear of being targeted in the next Bill 17. Most farmers are now thinking, what's next or who's next?

For Hutterites, hog barns have always been the base of a new sister colony. It was an operation that guaranteed jobs and a steady income for the new colony but, with Bill 17, this option has been taken from us. I get the feeling Bill 17 wants to push us out of Manitoba. With this option taken from us, I guess we'll have to move out of the province, or even out of the country, to start a new colony. I am beginning to feel the same desperate feeling our forefathers felt when they were forced to leave Austria, Ukraine, Russia and even the United States, because of unfriendly governments. Will we be forced out of unfriendly Manitoba too? I hope not.

Our colony is over 70 years old. It was started in 1935. We've had hog barns for over 70 years and we've spread our manure for fertilizer for over 70 years. We started injecting our manure over 15 years ago. We were one of the first hog operations to inject manure. At that time, there was no injection equipment available in Manitoba; we had to get it out of the States. We didn't need the government to tell us what's best for our land. It just made environmental and economical sense. With injection, there's less chance for run-off and less evaporation which means more nutrition in the soil.

So after 70 years, we're still drinking well water from shallow wells about 25 feet deep. Our water is tested regularly, and we can still drink it after 70 years. So where is the manure seeping into the water? After 70 years, I think there is none.

Talking about manure run-off, our livestock is still drinking from our ponds or dugouts, and our kids still swimming in the old watering hole. So if we aren't polluting our water, how can we be

polluting Lake Winnipeg which is miles and miles away?

As we all know, the United Nations reports that the world needs to produce 50 percent more food by 2030. Is this the way Manitoba is going to contribute, by passing Bill 17 and hindering the hog industry? I know a better way—scrap Bill 17 and let farmers produce all they want to help feed the hungry world.

So if you vote on Bill 17, please vote from your heart. Think about all the lives and the futures you will be affecting with your decision. I know if you vote from the heart, you aren't going to vote for Bill 17. If you do not vote from the heart but just for political gain, that would really be a pity. The whole Hutterite community will be praying for you that you may have the courage to make the right decision for a blooming rural Manitoba, not a gloomy rural Manitoba.

Thank you.

David Waldner

* * *

Hello, my name is Henry Rosolowski

"The Permanent Ban is wrong, I could lose my job . . .!"

I grew up on the family farm in the municipality of Gilbert Plains, Manitoba. In 1969 I helped my father put up election signs for Peter Burtniak in the riding of Ethelbert/Plains. Mixed farming in those days provided a modest income. For most children that grow up on family farms then and now is something they cherish their whole lives. Freedom to work with family and neighbours. Then and now many producers still butcher their own chickens, turkeys, steers, and hogs for family's daily use. This, then and now is usually done twice a year. Once in the fall for the winter's supply, and then in early spring for the summer.

There are many people in other countries that could only wish that had the standard of living we have in Manitoba's rural communities. Of course the number of family farms has decreased dramatically since 1969. Hence, . . . progress as we know it. There are still many family farms that grow the cereal grains, oil crops, and speciality crops. There are many that grow a majority of their own feed stuffs that are fed to dairy cows, beef herds, chickens and turkeys destined for Granny's Poultry or Dunn-Rite, swine herds and speciality animals. You also have

many that grow the feed crops and market their grains to the animal industry in Western Canada.

Since the Ed Schreyer days to now the farms have grown, mostly because they needed to be much larger to be able to compete on a "global scale." It is a true reality. Manufacturing businesses needed to lay off hundreds of thousands of people in order to become mechanized and efficient. This is an ongoing process. In the agricultural sector things are not really different. Mixed farms have become very efficient and technical. In order for them to survive economically they had to adapt to low grain revenue, low beef revenue, low pork revenue, but increased fuel costs, dramatic increases in machinery that was larger, faster and mechanically much more efficient than the past. Hence . . . progress . . .!

In the sixties I used to accompany my father in his grain truck as he delivered a grain truck full of hogs and steers to Weiller & Williams in the St. Boniface stockyards. Somehow all these packers disappeared from the Manitoba scene. Right now the Winnipeg Airport Authority is expanding the airport and facilities so Manitoba can become an even more important distribution "hub" because of Winnipeg's strategic location in North America. The port of Churchill is going to see some enormous changes in the next few years because it will become a true port to the world economy. Hence . . . progress . . .!

We need to allow progress. Who is going to stop progress . . .? Who wants to limit progress in Manitoba and let Saskatchewan speed right past us . . .? A very short time ago this same thing was happening in Saskatchewan. Their previous government had "both hands" tightly bound around the neck of the Saskatchewan economy. The Saskatchewan people put together another political party of everyone except the ruling "Hunta." Let me tell you the people were heard . . . Dam straight . . . they kicked out those criminals of progress. Everyone knows how our neighbour to the west has progressed in the last two years. Hence . . . progress . . .!

Manitoba in many ways has more to offer. Water, hydro-electric potentials that are supplying power grids across North America. A substantial agricultural base that is much more diverse and can adapt much easier to wet and dry weather patterns. Water, Manitoba has water, land base agricultural technology, agricultural experience, we have visitors from different countries wanting to copy what we

have accomplished, and continue to move ahead of everyone else.

Someone wants our economy to stop progressing. Someone has their hands around the throat of my livelihood. I am not going to allow this to happen. I am talking with many, many people that are having this "wolf at their door." There are thousands of potential workers that will lose their jobs in an industry that needs to grow in a world economy that is willing to pay big time for our products and our expertise.

Two such countries are Russia and Ukraine. Not long ago they were in the grips of communism and they were going backward, toward starvation and bankruptcy. Today we are forming working relationships with them so they can progress. Our government is willing to help them progress, but hold us back.

Most government agencies in Manitoba are so far behind, they think they are ahead. Most government agencies are on a salary, a guaranteed budget. They do not take their work home. Nine to five, that is their day. Many government agencies have no idea what GPS is... they can work it on their "all-terrain vehicles." GPS was being used on tractors in Manitoba 20 years ago. Now it is cheap to buy. Twenty years ago, it wasn't. Farmers use GPS to seed grains, to cultivate fields, to apply fertilizer according to soil test results. If you need instructions, ask a farmer. The Manitoba government has not kept up to progress.

In 1969 Peter Burtiak sat at my parents' kitchen table and thanked us for supporting him and promised progress. He promised progress . . .!

Everyone and everything is moving toward progress. Grain companies, fertilizer companies, chemical companies, transportation companies, ports to foreign markets (Churchill and Winnipeg Airport Authority), Canadian feed companies, absolutely everyone has the vision to see what we need to do to be competitive in the global economy. One Manitoba government wheel has fallen off the tracks. They are not prepared. They cannot see. They have not done their homework. Do you know what teachers hear when they ask "little Johnny," have you done your homework . . .? Excuses . . . my dog ate it . . . Where is that dog . . .?

A permanent moratorium is an easy excuse . . .

Excuses are not acceptable . . .

And now hold the presses . . . Vic Toews, Treasury Board President, made the stunning announcement in Ottawa that five major organizations and agencies could consolidate into an enormous new body researching, developing and marketing grain products at the Fort Garry Campus.

A federal panel that examined 157 proposals to consolidate labs at universities across the country whittled the list down to 24, then recommended going ahead with five. But only two have the green light to develop a business case, U of M and U of Ottawa.

We are talking about a facility that would house a number of existing groups that would be a powerhouse, the only one in the world.

Progress . . . with type of clout agricultural industries around the world will look to Manitoba . . . this is an even greater opportunity to lead the world in pork production expertise and environmentally successful use of cattle, pork, and chicken manure to further grain studies and fertilizer usages.

My name is Henry Rosolowski. I live in Ste. Anne, Manitoba. My family and I have lived here for 25 years. I have been directly employed in the agricultural industry for 25 years. Southeastern Manitoba is a multi-faceted agricultural hub that drives the economy of this province.

The provincial government in Manitoba has a huge opportunity here to satisfy a lot of voters. It seems votes is the "prize." Well, we can make it work together. Pouring the foundation of a legacy, that will let this province become and stay very strong for a long time.

Fertile land base, plenty of water, people resources, strategic location in North America, access to world markets, and now the "Plan of Progress" is yet again moving forward.

And So What about the right to farm. Also Truth & Reconciliation Commission – how about 25 million for each of the 1600 MB Hog farmers.

Henry Rosolowski

* * *

Active debate on issues of concern to Manitobans is a necessary part of developing good policy in our province. This presentation will deal with three points relevant to the deliberations of Bill 17.

1. Environmental policy can impact agriculture's ability to contribute to an improved environment, namely cleaner air and water, healthier and more productive land and sustainable resources.

Environmental policy in the developed world has undergone radical change over the past few decades. Generally, there has been a shift to outcome-orientated policy that has moved away from narrow problem areas toward broader and more integrated assessments of issues and solutions. The type of policy imposed will influence how much we, as the province's main education and research arm for the agri-food sector, can work with other provincial stakeholders toward improved environment.

The key strength in Bill 17, a traditional regulatory policy is a high level of assurance that the number of pigs will not increase in many parts of our province. That is not the same as development of policy to reduce nutrient loading of Lake Winnipeg. Innovative-incentive-based regulatory tools have greater potential for environmental returns, through improved cost effectiveness, and promotion of innovative technology for environmental controls. Stakeholder engagement in environmental management systems, best management practices, innovative technologies, community liaison and pollution prevention planning requires a framework that is based on environmental objectives. A regulatory climate that encourages further investment and adoption of new technologies will allow individual farms and communities to thrive as they individually choose options to meet environmental outcomes set by the province.

Government needs to be the leader in providing a structure that will support a combined stakeholder effort to achieve the desired outcome for Lake Winnipeg and other water bodies in the province. It is in such an environment that our efforts, as a Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, can be the most supportive through our education, outreach and research programs. The creation of a Chair in Water Quality and the potential for a Watershed Research Institute to co-ordinate information collection, analysis and evaluation and to bring together agencies and organizations undertaking water quality research and watershed management in the province is a positive example.

2. Researchers in the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences (FAFS) can be important contributors to the development of knowledge, science and technology, increasing productivity and profitability

of Canada's agriculture sector. The World Commission on Environment and Development aptly defined sustainability as "forms of progress that meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs." For sustainable animal production this concept integrates three main goals: environmental health, economic profitability and social and economic equity. Our researchers work in partnership with governments, industry and other stakeholders to identify and address global, as well as unique provincial and regional issues related to environment, rural sustainability and health. The National Centre for Livestock and the Environment (NCLE) is one example of a partnership effort, in this case to address sustainable animal production.

Through consultation with scientists and engineers from many disciplines, a vision for the NCLE has emerged at the University of Manitoba. Today, this vision represents a \$16-million infrastructure project providing facilities and laboratories for student training, research and outreach toward solutions for a sustainable future for animal agriculture. The Centre is designed to use a "whole farm" approach in the study of energy, microbial and nutrient movement and use in and beyond the farm ecosystem. This facility is available to researchers from all faculties and beyond the university's community.

University of Manitoba scientists were awarded the initial \$7.1 million in infrastructure funding through the Canada Foundation for Innovation and Manitoba Innovation Foundation to tackle the complex problems facing animal agriculture. The proposal underwent scrutiny at the university, provincial and international levels before it was awarded. Only after the research plan and public monies were established did Manitoba Pork Council and other partners enter into the picture.

Of the \$4.8 million raised from non-public funds approximately 40 percent came from individuals, with the remainder from industry. Of the industry contributions, commodity groups, that are farmers of Manitoba, contributed 11 percent of the total.

The Centre has many unique features. For example, long-term field plots will be used to study the impacts of various types of manures, inorganic fertilizer or no fertility on parameters such as soil health and nutrient movement as well as the viability and movement of pathogens in fields managed under conventional and alternative cropping practices. This provides a solid basis for environmental

microbiologists, water quality experts and others to identify solutions to environmental, food safety and economic issues associated with food production. We welcome greater involvement by government experts in the research and outreach activities undertaken, so that we can learn from them, and they from us.

The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences is also a major education arm for agriculture and food sectors in the province. Today there are more than 10,000 alumni of the faculty. Many of our alumni are recognized community, provincial and national leaders within the agri-food sector and beyond. The students that graduated May 2008, and future students, will be our leaders in the future. Education is an important tool toward long-term change. Our experts in animal nutrition, agro-ecology, agronomy, biosystems engineering, food safety, animal welfare, soil science, plant science, environmental modeling, resource economics, and our many collaborators from medicine, engineering and environment are helping students in our diploma, degree and graduate programs understand the environmental, social and economic processes of a key industry in our province. Policy that encourages education at every level will facilitate our common goals by empowering our future leaders through knowledge and life-long learning skills.

3. Research undertaken by the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, University of Manitoba, undergoes review processes at many levels and is of high quality. The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences attracts more than \$10 million in research operating funds annually from public and industry sources. Public funding agencies supporting scientists in the faculty include the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, operating at a national level, and the Agri-food Research and Development Initiative and Manitoba Rural Adaptation Council at the provincial level.

Many public funding agencies encourage or require matching funds from stakeholder groups. This is done to engage stakeholders and increase the return on public investments in science. These agencies use peer review to ensure that the quality of researchers and proposals, as well as priorities of the agency, are met before a project is approved. All research operating funds received from Manitoba Pork Council have passed through this process. As well, all projects receive further scrutiny at the university level to ensure human ethics, animal care and

environmental impact standards are met. Hence, by the time a scientist has secured funding for research at the University of Manitoba, their proposals have undergone significant review.

University of Manitoba scientists deliver new knowledge and technologies through peer-reviewed scientific publications, oral presentations and workshops. The contributions of our faculty have been recognized nationally and internationally for the quality and objectivity of their research and outreach activities. It is in the spirit of mutually respectful partnerships and support that we can contribute in a meaningful manner to a successful future for the province of Manitoba.

Karin Wittenberg, Associate Dean, Research
Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences
University of Manitoba

* * *

The R.M. of Springfield is located immediately east of Winnipeg and it is included in the moratorium boundaries, as contemplated by Bill 17. It is noteworthy from another perspective. Many years ago, Springfield was the site of the original public versus factory hog barn dispute. More about that later.

Springfield Hogwatch came together in the early 1990s to raise local awareness concerning the industrialization of hog production. We objected and continue to object to the factory format of raising hogs. We categorically refute the nefarious claim that factory conditions can in any way be described as family farming. Big pig spends big money to mythologize and sanitize its behaviour under the rubric of "family farming." This is nonsense and the committee would do well to understand this deception.

Springfield Hogwatch's specific objections to the industrialization of pork include:

1. Nobody is prepared to tell us what Manitoba's capacity for hogs is. Today, we are told, 8.8 million such creatures are raised in Manitoba. Despite being asked in the scoping meetings, the Clean Environment Commission did not comment on the capacity that Manitoba offers for factory hogs. This seems fundamental. Forest companies know their available fibre supply. Grain farmers know their cultivatable averages. Manitoba Hydro knows its generating capacity. Why can the pig industry not tell us the upper

limit for hog production? Bill 17 clearly offers no hope for the measurement of Manitoba's capacity to raise hogs. It merely changes the venues.

2. That said, we reject the notion that Manitoba should raise hogs for export. Fundamentally, hogs are not amenable to an industry designed to export surplus. Holland, North Carolina and Quebec have learned this. We had the chance to learn from their mistakes and did not. Springfield Hogwatch believes that the environmental time bomb, known as intensive hog production, should have been diffused by distributing the production to wherever consumers expect to eat pork. There is no reason why 1.1 million souls in Manitoba should endure 8.8 million pigs, if it means that we consume five percent of the bacon while keeping 100 percent of the pollution.
3. Hog factories are the sites of unspeakable animal cruelty which is condoned by shameful provincial legislation. Virtually none of our 8.8 million hogs see the light of day during their lives, except for the ride in a transport truck to the slaughterhouse. What does this say about our humanity? It says that we are inhumane. And why is it that the media, the government and the civil service do not question why 8,000 pigs are under one roof when the barn burns (as it seems to do with striking regularity)? We are invariably told the cash loss to be covered by insurance, but nobody questions a population the size of Dauphin under one roof. Bill 17 will, apparently, not correct this abomination.
4. And speaking of the civil service. It is the unfortunate experience of Springfield Hogwatch that the public service is arrayed against the public when issues around factory pigs are discussed. This had led to the spectre of senior public servants becoming employees of the industry and, presumably, dealing with their successors in the civil service. How will Bill 17 change this? It won't.

Springfield Hogwatch reluctantly supports Bill 17. Our reluctance would diminish if the bill applied to the whole province. It would vanish if the bill contained provisions to downsize the industry. However, we would also support the withdrawal of Bill 17 under one simple condition. You will recall from our first paragraph of this presentation that the R.M. of Springfield was the first battleground in the

fight over factory pig production. That happened in a court case known as Lisoway versus Springfield Hog Ranch Ltd. In 1973, the Lisoway family successfully sued a hog factory for nuisance. This resulted in the NDP government of the day removing from Manitobans their historical, common-law right to sue under cause of "nuisance" when factory pig operations were causing odorous nuisances. The NDP called it The Nuisance Act. Some years later, this withdrawal of rights was elaborated by a PC government in The Farm Practices Protection Act.

Therefore, since the industrialization of pigs is clearly not farming, Springfield Hogwatch will support the complete withdrawal of Bill 17 as long as big pig agrees to be bound, for the first time in 30 years, by the ancient English common law of nuisance.

Until then, we will continue to hold our noses, but not our breath.

C. Hugh Arklie, Chair
Springfield Hogwatch

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>