

**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. 4 – 6 p.m., Monday, June 9, 2008**

ISSN 1708-6647

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Ninth Legislature**

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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD**

**Monday, June 9, 2008**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Nevakshonoff (Interlake)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Ms. Brick (St. Norbert)**

**ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6**

*Members of the Committee present:*

Hon. Messrs. Lemieux, Struthers, Hon. Mses. Allan, McGifford.

Messrs. Borotsik, Briese, Eichler, Jennissen, Nevakshonoff, Pedersen, Ms. Brick.

**APPEARING:**

Hon. Ms. Wowchuk, MLA for Swan River  
 Mr. Derkach, MLA for Russell  
 Mrs. Stefanson, MLA for Tuxedo  
 Mr. Graydon, MLA for Emerson  
 Mrs. Taillieu, MLA for Morris  
 Mr. Fauschou, MLA for Portage la Prairie  
 Hon. Mr. Gerrard, MLA for River Heights  
 Mr. Maguire, MLA for Arthur-Virden

**WITNESSES:**

Mr. Dave Hunter, Private Citizen  
 Mr. John Allen, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Dennis Thiessen, Private Citizen  
 Mr. James Hofer, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Olayinka Brimoh, Private Citizen,  
 Mr. Nathan Baer, Airport Colony  
 Mr. Lyle Peters, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Glen Koroluk, Beyond Factory Farming  
 Mr. Arian deBekker, Morris Piglets Ltd.  
 Mr. Garry Verhoog, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Joel Grenier, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Gordon Siemens, Castlewood Farms  
 Mr. Stan Siemens, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Bennett Hofer, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Steve Hofer, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Ken Rempel, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Leonard Maendel, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Ron Johnston, Paradigm Farms Ltd.  
 Mr. Lyle Loewen, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Henry Holtman, Private Citizen

Ms. Christine Waddell, Private Citizen  
 Ms. Lara Forchuk, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Harvey Dann, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Dennis Stevenson, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Ted Neufeld, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Brendan Penner, Border Rock Farms  
 Mr. Paul Wurtz, Private Citizen  
 Mr. David Hofer, Private Citizen  
 Ms. Rena Hop, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Marinus Hop, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Don Winnicky, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Rickey Maendel, Private Citizen  
 Ms. Kathy Neufeld, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Dwayne Friesen, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Peter de Jong, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Shane Sadorski, Private Citizen

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:**

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

Mr. Randy Tkachyk, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Mack Waldner, Private Citizen  
 Mr. Peter de Jong, Private Citizen

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

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

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. 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?

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** I nominate Ms. Marilyn Brick.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, Ms. Brick, you are the duly elected Vice-Chairperson.

This meeting has been called to consider Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban

on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities). We have a number of presenters registered to speak to this bill, as noted on the lists before you on the table and posted at the entrance of the room. As was previously announced, this committee will sit again tomorrow night, Tuesday, June 10, at 6 p.m., as well as this Wednesday, June 11, at 6 p.m.

How late does the committee wish to sit tonight?

**An Honourable Member:** No time limit.

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** Mr. Chairperson, I think, in fairness to those people that have travelled so far and fuel at a \$1.30 a litre, we should sit until such time all the presenters who are here and have registered be heard.

**Ms. Marilyn Brick (St. Norbert):** I would suggest that we sit until midnight and, at that time, we review to see where we are. I think that would be a great way to proceed.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Counter proposal.

**Mr. Eichler:** In all fairness, I think it's a great suggestion, but people have travelled from quite afar and they need some sense of direction. To wait till midnight and then be turned away would be unfair, in my opinion. I think the committee should hear anybody that wants to make a presentation, whether it's midnight or after. They need a clear indication where they want to go.

**An Honourable Member:** Agreed.

**Ms. Brick:** Our committee would agree to that, keeping in mind that it's also on Friday night. We decided not to see the clock and that we did have an extra two or three—I think it was three presenters we heard beyond midnight. So I think we've been very flexible and I just wanted to make sure that that's noted, that we've been very flexible on this committee.

**An Honourable Member:** You've been very flexible, thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, we will sit to midnight. That goes without saying, as long as there are people here. I think it's only fair that, if there are still people here after midnight that have travelled afar and still want to present, then it's incumbent upon us, as the committee, to hear them out.

That's the purpose here. This is a public hearing and we're here to hear the people so, if they're willing to sit past midnight, so are we.

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]* I think that was a compromise.

Order. I have a request for the committee's consideration. Presenter No. 91, Mr. Dave Hunter, is here tonight with his wife and young children. He has asked for the committee's permission to speak first tonight, rather than having to wait or come back to another meeting. What is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

\* (18:10)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Agreed to that? *[Agreed]*

Before we proceed with presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider. First of all, if there is anyone else in the audience who would like to make a presentation this evening, please register with staff at the entrance of the room.

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

As well, I would like to inform presenters that in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations with another five minutes allowed for questions from 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 have to say that person's name to signal *Hansard* recorders to turn microphones on and off. Thank you for your patience. We will now proceed with public presentations.

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Chairman, as you know, the World Pork Congress has been on for the past week. I got a call this morning from a presenter that did not know Bill 17 had been called. He was calling to see how things were going. I told him that committee had

been called and he had not even received notice yet because he was not in town.

I would seek leave of the committee not to move presenters that are not here to the bottom of the list for one more night in order to allow for those that are travelling in order to receive proper notice. I know the Clerk has done an outstanding job in trying to attempt to reach each of those presenters, but when they're not home, at a function that's so important as the World Pork Congress, and through no fault of their own, they haven't been able to be notified. So I'd ask leave of the committee that presenters called tonight not be moved to the bottom of the list for one more night.

**Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives):** I appreciate the comments that the member is making but I think that we agreed when we first started on Friday night, that we would maintain people's names on the lists for Friday and Saturday because it was on the weekend. Now there will be one more round and then they will start dropping to the bottom of the list. That doesn't mean they can't present tomorrow because they are still on the list. They are not being removed from the list. I think by still being maintained on the list, they will have that opportunity. So I think we should proceed as has been the practice.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to the minister, some of these people may be from her very area and may not even be back into the Swan River area, then to be expected to turn around, be back in Winnipeg in such short notice. I mean, for heaven's sakes, this is a bill that is a family bill; it affects each and every Manitoban within the province of Manitoba. I think the minister should reconsider and make sure that every voice is heard, make sure that every presenter has that opportunity. To deny that opportunity for the sake of a day is not a big deal. We are here to serve the people the best way that we can and one more day, one more day out of our lives—we're talking about a bill that is so significant as Bill 17—to deny that request, I believe is shameful.

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation):** Well, in actual fact, this could have been the rule we had in place as of Friday night or Saturday night. We've co-operated to make sure we get as many people heard as we can. All we're doing is returning to the normal rules and normal practices of this committee. I think it has worked very well to get as many people as we can here and help with that. I

believe the time has come that we have to revert to the normal rules of this committee so that we can ensure people who are here in the audience tonight will have a chance to speak with us and give us advice on Bill 17. I do not think, Mr. Chairperson, that we can agree to the request.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. On that basis, I call Mr. Dave Hunter. Good evening, Mr. Hunter. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. David Hunter (Private Citizen):** I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. The Clerk will distribute them. You may begin when you are ready.

**Mr. Hunter:** There are 15,000 Manitobans employed in the hog industry and I am one of them. I'm not going to ramble on about scientific research or recite statistics. That has already been presented. What I am going to do is tell you my story and what the future of agriculture means to us and show you that I'm not just a number.

The Hunter family has a long history of farming in Manitoba. In 1876, my great grandfather homesteaded at Green Ridge in the R.M. of Franklin. Today my parents, Cliff and Irene Hunter, are still farming the original homestead.

It is a 1,320-acre mixed farm with 80 head cow-calf operation. Although no longer large enough to support multiple families, it has afforded three generations of the Hunter family a reasonable standard of living.

Leaving the farm in 1989 to pursue an adequate income for my family, I have always been employed in agriculture. In 1996 I received a diploma in agriculture from the University of Manitoba. Currently I am about 10 months away from completing a CPP designation with the Purchasing Management Association of Canada.

I am the store manager for East-Man Feeds in Winnipeg, where I combine my education and professional experience to tackle global supply chain management. The early focus of my career was crop inputs during which time I was employed as an agronomist with TerraFlex, based in Niverville and Steinbach. One of the main crop production challenges is nutrient management on land where manure has been deposited. TerraFlex has been at the forefront of adopting and developing innovative agricultural practices. In the late '90s, they were involved in developing variable rate fertilizer application technology using grid soil samples to

generate a cross section of nutrient requirements for a field combined with nutrient profiles and application rates to determine remaining macro nutrient requirements which were then variably applied on each section of the field.

Now I see the other side of the nutrient cycle, working in the feed industry. I find it interesting to see that the same nutrients we focussed on to produce good crops are the same ones to raise good animals. The building blocks of life are the same. I see how hog producers are managing their manure and the procedures and regulations they have to follow to apply it in a safe manner. I also see others who voluntarily exceed regulations. A large percentage of our customer bases are independent producers and Hutterite colonies. These people have an even greater vested interest in protecting the land.

They live on the same land where the barns are and farm the land where the manure is applied. These people are good agronomists and good stewards of the land. In order for Hutterites to maintain their way of life and religion, they must work where they live and cannot send their children elsewhere for schooling or jobs. It is imperative that they are able to grow at the locations in which they live. It is my understanding that a lot of this issue is surrounding surface water quality. This is a complex issue concerning all levels of government and land users, from the homeowner to the municipalities to the farmer feeding the world.

The hog producer is only one of the players. Hog manure application has been a point of controversy because it is seen as a toxic waste by the general public. They do not understand its benefits to the soil when properly applied. This is not a manure management issue. It's a nutrient issue. The nutrients in hog manure are no different than from those of other animals, plants or artificial fertilizers. We need to adopt nutrient management practices, balancing plant nutrient requirements and applications with crop nutrient removal rates. We should encourage farmers to use manure as a primary source of fertilizer. Most artificial fertilizer requires a large amount of petrochemicals to manufacture and transport.

\* (18:20)

Technological improvements are being made in livestock production reducing the amount of nutrients contained in manure. Developments in nutritional science enable feeding of rations specific to the requirements of animals' genetics and stage of

life. Enzymes are being used which improve the utilization of feed and genetic improvements of animals are resulting in better feed conversions.

Over the last 20 years the agriculture industry has taken a proactive approach to the environmental issues, significantly improving the management of manure, and has developed sophisticated technologies to manage and capture its nutrient value to optimize crop production.

In my opinion, the best way to ensure that producers increase nutrient management practices is to stop treating it as a by-product and give it economic value as a fertilizer source.

I believe that the statistics are that agriculture only contributes about 14 percent of the phosphates found in Lake Winnipeg, of which the hog industry only generates 1.5 percent.

An Italian economist, Vilfredo Pareto, developed the 80-20 rule to analyse economic problems. For example, 80 percent of the wealth is held by 20 percent of the people. When we apply Pareto's law to this situation, if 14 percent of the phosphates originate from agriculture, then we have a larger issue to focus on: the other 86 percent. Where is it coming from?

Development of regulatory framework must be on the basis of scientific consensus and not one of public perception. We can trust the integrity and judgement of the Clean Environment Commission, and their recommendations are reasonable and based on factual merit.

Our government is made up of elected officials from urban or northern ridings who do not represent agricultural regions of the province. They are being influenced by a small, vocal minority who philosophically oppose the hog industry.

Unfortunately, most Manitobans are generations removed from the family farm. Ask most people where their Sunday morning breakfast came from, and often you will hear the answer, Safeway. The average consumer does not know where their food comes from or how it is produced. When they venture outside the city limits, they are annoyed by the farmer on the road with his tractor, or they gasp in disgust of the smell of a hog barn they pass.

Are these issues of agriculture? Yes, but they are only symptoms which can be treated. They don't need to be eradicated. Are environmental concerns

legitimate? Absolutely. Did these issues happen overnight? No.

The hog industry is subject to more public scrutiny, media attention and environmental monitoring and enforcement than any other land use in Manitoba. The Environment Act already includes a mandatory review of the manure regulations every five years and enforcement is being done as required. What we need is time to deal with all the new rules and regulations just introduced and time to develop sustainable innovative solutions, not further regulations.

The hog industry has a billion-dollar impact on our provincial economy. We have huge investment in facilities which will provide strong economic growth, activity and stimulated growth in rural communities for many years. A moratorium is not sustainable, preventing innovation and replacement of old facilities. It threatens our economic viability, encouraging producers to build facilities elsewhere, resulting in the loss of value-added processing, jobs and eliminates potential tax revenues.

Forty-six percent of all the meat consumed in the world is pork. Our hog industry is recognized worldwide for its quality of product and competitive price. World demand for pork is growing by two percent each year and there are only a few countries capable of providing this additional pork.

Manitoba has a world-class industry, the land base and the sow herd to take advantage of this increase in demand. We should be proud of our success and encourage growth and development of our hog industry for the benefit of all Manitobans.

Today, it's a moratorium on hog barns. What's next? You can only buy a John Deere tractor? Farmers should have the right to farm. When the government decides who can farm and who cannot, there is no future left in farming. See my kids, they are the future of farming. Do you want to tell them that this is Manitoba and that there is no future for farming here? I don't have the heart. We're more than just a number.

On behalf of my family, the Manitoba hog industry and all of Manitoba's agriculture sectors, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak about Bill 17.

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

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you, David, for your presentation. We've heard it from a number of farm families throughout the province of Manitoba, and it is a serious question about the future and the next generation. My question to you is if Bill 17 passes, will you be looking to move outside the area in order to see that your family would have an opportunity to take on a new venture or expand your venture into another province?

**Mr. Hunter:** If my employment is affected enough that our incomes are reduced, we would have to look at alternative opportunities. I certainly want to stay in the agriculture sector and would most likely be looking outside the province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell):** I'm wondering whether the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) would like to hear the presentation again since she's been very busy on her BlackBerry.

Mr. Chair, I have to tell you that this is the kind of presentation that we need to hear more often, and I thank the presenter for his presentation and for his thoughtfulness in presenting it.

But I'd like to ask the presenter, with regard to the bill that's before us, the Premier (Mr. Doer) of our province said in the House that his party was interested in cleaning up Lake Winnipeg; our party, that is, the opposition, was interested in hog barns in hog alley.

I'd like to know how you feel about that kind of a comment, and whether or not the moratorium on hog production in Manitoba is going to do anything to improve the quality of Lake Winnipeg.

**Mr. Hunter:** In its present form, I don't feel it will accommodate the goal of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg. The issue at hand, I believe, is nutrient management. Putting a ban on future barns or expansion doesn't do anything to address nutrient management. All it does is put a cap on expansion of the industry. Now, with proper development and new technology, we should be able to sustainably expand the industry. We've made huge changes in the way manure is managed in the last 20 years. I don't believe that there's any of the boil-water advisories that are coming from hog barns, and 1.5 percent of the pollution found in Lake Winnipeg coming from hogs, where's the rest of it come from? What's coming over the border? What's coming from the cities? The landowner that's watering his grass? Hogs, yes, we contribute a little bit. Can we do better? Yes. Give us the opportunity. Don't put

regulations and tell us we can't do it. We'll find ways to work around it. Show us a way to make some money and protect the economy and we're going to run with it.

**Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo):** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I just noted one part of your presentation, where it says: if 14 percent of the phosphates originate from agriculture, then we have larger issues to focus on. The other 86 percent, where is it coming from? Certainly we know some of that is coming from the need for an upgrade to the waste-water treatment facilities in the city of Winnipeg. Certainly the government has not yet agreed to put their full one-third funding up towards that, but do you feel, based on everything that's going on here with this moratorium, that this NDP government is unfairly singling out the hog industry, given the fact that there's 86 percent of the problem elsewhere out there?

**Mr. Hunter:** Yes, I do. I've taken various accounting classes and inventory management, et cetera, and it's always been part of case study and problem analysis that when you have a problem that you need to solve, you focus on the big picture of the problem. The 80 percent, not the little 20 percent. You're going to get the biggest bang for your buck focussing on that. The number is 14 percent from agriculture. The hog industry is only 1.5 percent, so we're wasting our time working on that.

Do we need to improve? Yes. We can find some ways to improve it and make it better, but there's a lot bigger fish to fry in the pan there before we look at the hog industry.

\*(18:30)

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

For the information of all in attendance, this committee had previously agreed to hear out-of-town presenters first. Accordingly, I will now call Mr. George Wipf, No. 7 on the list. Mr. Wipf? George Wipf? Mr. Wipf's name to the bottom of the list. George Wipf. His name will now be dropped to the bottom of the list.

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

**Mr. John Allen (Private Citizen):** I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, the Clerk will take them. You may begin when ready.

**Mr. Allen:** Good evening. My name is John Allen. I live at 107 Clarke Road in the R.M. of St. Clements, about 20 kilometres north of Winnipeg and about a kilometre east of the Red River. I am here today as a private citizen to speak in opposition to the proposed Bill 17, and I thank you for that opportunity.

As I have learned and thought about Bill 17, I've considered how it might affect some of my personal values if it were passed into law. I concluded that there are a number of important parts of my identity which are, in one or several ways, offended by this proposed legislation. Those include my identity as a capitalist, an agriculturalist, an environmentalist, an optimist and an opportunist, an ethical person and a citizen. So, I'd like for you to join me in thinking about the ways that I am puzzled and put off by my government introducing Bill 17.

First and foremost, as an ethical democratic citizen, I find it outrageous that our Conservation Minister chose to hand out the conclusions of our Clean Environment Commission report on environmental sustainability and hog production in Manitoba on the same day as he announced the permanent moratorium on hog development in all or parts of 35 municipalities, seemingly linking them. I submit that this was a disingenuous move by the minister to say in paragraph three of his news release of March 3 that he accepted in principle the CEC report and its 48 recommendations, and then one sentence later to say that he would now halt industry expansion in three regions of the province.

The clear message to the casual listener, which I was on that day, was that the CEC report concluded this was necessary. Upon thoughtful reading and rereading, I have found no such connection. Indeed, I found the conclusions of the CEC report to be positive and forward looking, offering, in their words, that environmental sustainability is achievable and then, also in their words, the challenge for the government will be to develop an implementation strategy that works with producers and other members of society to ensure the industry's social and economic sustainability.

I found the CEC work to be thorough, thoughtful and balanced. I found the government's conclusions incomprehensible. The commission report said essentially, yes, we, together, can make this work. We can have a healthy sustainable pork production sector and a robust livable environment in Manitoba.

and I heard the government instead concluding essentially, no, we're not even going to try. The commission gave us the blueprint of a win-win situation, one from which some improvements to our water quality might be expected and in which we could continue to develop the very successful pork production industry which has built up in Manitoba. The government, instead, seems to be saying, no. No win-win for us. They seem to be saying, we need someone to lose, someone we can blame for our environmental misfortunes, and we choose as our losers, the hog farmers of Manitoba and their neighbours.

I don't see this as an honest, forthright conclusion by the government. I don't see their decision as making any common sense contrasted to the CEC report which they commissioned to guide them. My sense of fair play is frankly pricked by the choice to put hog farmers at disadvantage, but to ignore all others who contribute to the nutrient load in Lake Winnipeg and region. They're making it look like something big is being done for the environment by putting the boots to hog farmers while ignoring the vastly larger impact of others including the city of Winnipeg, other kinds of farmers, the many villages and towns, commercial enterprises, homes and cottages sitting alongside the waterways of this catchment.

Recall that I'm also an optimist and an opportunist. I believe we can secure the advantages of value-added pork production in Manitoba to hog farmers, their employees, suppliers and neighbours, to the packing industry and its myriad of business associates and so on, and I believe crop farmers can continue to achieve cost savings and enhanced field performance from accessing and properly using this wonderful fertilizer called manure rather than buying additional huge tonnage of very expensive and often imported chemical fertilizers.

I know the government holds to similar points of view. When I googled for recent Manitoba government news releases in support of these beliefs, I found a long list. Now, as the University of Manitoba research report, which formed a major input to the CEC report, revealed, there are excellent options available to use hog and other manures responsibly, effectively, and efficiently for the good of all. As the CEC report itself concluded, there is considerable evidence that the parties affected can come up with reasonable environmental information, plans, and actions to protect our waterways even as we utilize hog manure on our farms.

The opportunist in me agrees that we can win economically and environmentally at the same time, and the optimist in me abhors the notion that we must have losers here. The optimist in me thinks that this move by the government to permanently ban the expansion of hog farms in much of southern Manitoba is misguided and abhorrent to our spirit and history of balanced achievement here. Indeed, having voted NDP in a recent provincial election because of the government's balanced approach to many thorny issues, the optimist in me is now confused and disappointed. My optimist wonders why are we not seeking to make losers of hog farmers and why hog farmers and their families and neighbours alone.

Now, recall that I am an agriculturalist and a capitalist. The pioneers who opened up Manitoba were mostly the same. They came here, took risks, achieved great successes, had failures, rebounded from them, made this a great place of opportunity. I daresay none of them had in mind to make a business that wrecks the environment for me and my family or my fellow citizens. From talking to lots of farmers recently, I have found that most of them are willing to comply with even tough environmental standards knowing that their success cannot be bought at the expense of our land, water, and air, which is also their land, water, and air.

The capitalist in me is also concerned that in this case the government proposes to win a small battle in a great environmental war by use of tools tantamount to a nuclear bomb. Start by taking the word "moratorium," a word which usually means delay. Recall that the pork industry was told by government several times in recent months that the moratorium was indeed a delay, one which would soon be removed. Now, in the minister's word of March 3, a halt has been proposed to any pork production expansion in parts or all of 35 municipalities. "Halt" is a word which rather certainly means stop.

The weapons of the battle got enriched, and I see by the decision to make what could have been a regulatory change into an act to amend our environment act, that the government intends to make this halt as permanent as can possibly be assured. They're saying to hog farmers, the way I see it, that without much data to support their position, you're at fault for much of our environmental woe in Lake Winnipeg and surrounding waters so we're going to nuke you. We're going to stop you cold from adding to that damage.

The capitalist in me knows that as soon as hog farmers or any other group of business people get told by the government, we prohibit you changing your business in a way that might make it even 1 percent larger, then those owners will become discouraged. Over time, they will move on. They will find other ways to make a living here or elsewhere costing us made-in-Manitoba hogs and manure and hams and pork chops and all the benefits that go with making those products.

I wonder how the people who build new neighbourhoods in Winnipeg would feel if they were prohibited from expanding the city. After all, the environmental impact of the big city by the Red River is quite large, or what about our crop farmers? How would they take prohibiting the use of additional fertilizer on their lands, irrespective of weather, soil conditions, crop plans, and so on. I submit that neither our city builders nor our farmers fail to appreciate the impact of their actions on our environment. Neither do they stand in the way of reasonable regulations to protect our natural heritage. Instead, they generally seek to be partners in planning to find win-win solutions for their well-being in their enterprises and for the greater good of our environment.

\* (18:40)

I'm distressed that our hog farmers are being stonewalled instead of consulted, that they're confronted with a government that has seemingly left the balanced solutions I voted for behind, intent instead in making one small group of farmers today's losers. I wonder how many other Manitobans are thinking, if they can stifle hog farming, with their record of high achievement and regulatory compliance and with their modest environmental impact, who will our government choose to stifle next?

The environmentalist in me finally asks: If this kind of response is what is needed to protect our waterways from a very small percentage of the nutrient load affecting them, then what can we do with the very large percent that remains? Will the city, which contributes so much to pollution of our waters, be advised that growth is now forbidden? How about the dairy farmers or the Canola growers or anybody else in the country? Must all of our agriculturists—

**Mr. Chairperson:** You're at 10 minutes now, sir. You have an option. You can continue, and we'll take the time off your Q & A time.

**Mr. Allen:** I'd like to do that, please.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We can have your presentation completed or inserted into *Hansard* in its entirety. It's up to you.

**Mr. Allen:** I would like to conclude, if I may.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please do so.

**Mr. Allen:** Let me go on to the last page. You, in government, have a clear opportunity to follow the advice of the report from CEC to secure the best of both worlds, to have a dynamic, sustainable, value-added, pork-production sector in Manitoba and to enjoy improved outcomes in our physical environment.

As I see it, you're on the wrong track. Instead of finding win-win conditions, you appear to have developed a strategy, with the proposal of Bill 17, which is anti-farm and -rural community, making losers of many folks in the countryside; anti-business, sending a chilling message about the impact of capricious government intrusion to creative entrepreneurs, managers and investors; unfair to hog farmers, which is a terrible label for an NDP government ostensibly committed to justice and fair dealing; close-minded and, in my view, slippery.

You, in government, promised consultation; then you broke that promise. The minister, in bringing this bill proposal forward, turned spin-doctoring into something many of us see as obfuscation at best, deception at worst. I expect better of my government.

From all this carnage, all these losers, named or anticipated, what gain will come to our environment, I ask? You propose to fix a small manageable problem with a large blunt attack, leaving us to wonder what you will do to fix the larger less-manageable aspects of the same problem.

I beseech you, as members of my government, to rise above your proposed lose-lose solution and find the win-win path recommended by the CEC and many people and organizations who contributed to their work. I urge you to be wise, responsive and courageous enough to withdraw Bill 17 now.

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

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Allen. As you may or may not know, we, on the opposition side of the House, have made it very clear

that, if this bill passes, we will veto this bill in the next election if we form government.

I do want to ask a question of you, though, Mr. Allen, in regard to the disconnect between this government and what's happening.

Do you feel that Bill 17 has had an opportunity to actually be seen by the other populous, rather than just the people that are in tune with it? Do you think there's been enough information out there, in order for the government really to make a decision on this Bill 17?

**Mr. Allen:** It's hard for me to answer for sure, because I became interested as a result of other people making me aware of it early on, and I followed it closely. But I am certainly disappointed in the communications that I have seen because, as I said in my presentation, it appears that there is a clear connection that has been established, or attempted to be established, between what the CEC report said and this action.

For all of us who have looked at this, I don't see it. It's not there.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon West):** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, through you to Mr. Allen. First of all, thank you for that very articulate presentation. I do thank you for it, and I know a lot of energy and a lot effort went into it.

You talk about a number of things. You talk about being a capitalist. Today, in question, the Premier (Mr. Doer) had indicated that this was only a small part of the industry that was being affected. It was only some 35 municipalities. There are other municipalities, he said, that, in fact, can expand their hog operations.

As a businessman or capitalist or entrepreneur, do you see other businesses investing substantial millions of dollars in the industry with the understanding that, at the stroke of a pen and certainly no science behind it, that the government could, in fact, at some point in time, pick on other areas in the province. Do you think people would be investing into this industry in other areas of the province?

**Mr. Allen:** No, in a word. I used the word "capricious" at one point because that's the way it looks to me. There was a lot of talk about how we're going to work together and fix things and solve problems and so on. Then one day, bolt out of the blue, slam the door goes. If people in any business

were looking at that risk to their enterprise, I doubt they'd invest anything, I doubt they would hire anybody new.

**Mr. Borotsik:** One further question, if I can. You also had indicated that the hog industry particularly is being put upon somewhat unfairly. There are other industries—you mentioned other agriculture, you mentioned cattle, you mentioned poultry and also you mentioned the city of Winnipeg.

Are you aware, Mr. Allen, that today, the City of Winnipeg actually dumped raw sewage into the Red River? I don't see any moratorium being placed on the citizens of the city of Winnipeg with respect to that kind of effluent discharge into the river.

Do you have any suggestions to the government as to how maybe they could deal with those issues as well, that perhaps a greater part of the problem than simply 1.5 percent being put into the river by agriculture and certainly by the hog industry?

**Mr. Allen:** I think the last speaker was quite effective when he said, if you got a problem with nutrient loads in Lake Winnipeg or in our waterways, why do we attack it by going after the tiniest morsel that we can get our hands on? Is it because people don't like the smell of hog barns, or what?

The real issue here should be attacked where the real problem is coming from. If the City of Winnipeg is a major offender, then whatever needs to be done to help them to overcome that should happen.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Allen. Time for this presentation has expired.

I call Clarence Froese. Clarence Froese, private citizen. Mr. Froese's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Dennis Thiessen, private citizen. Dennis Thiessen, do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

**Mr. Dennis Thiessen (Private Citizen):** Yes

**Mr. Chairperson:** You do. The Clerk will take them and distribute them. You may begin when ready.

**Mr. Thiessen:** Thank you for this opportunity to address the committee.

Good day, my name is Dennis Thiessen. I own a hog and grain farm just east of the city of Steinbach in the R.M. of Hanover. I'll give you a little bit of brief information about myself. I graduated from the diploma of agriculture in 1976. In 1978, I joined my

father on the farm full time. For 30 years I've been farming there. My dad has long since retired. My wife and I, we've raised three sons on the farm. My oldest graduated from university and he is presently employed in Alberta. The middle one graduated from university with a degree in agriculture and is employed in the hog industry. Our youngest is entering engineering this fall.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my position on a number of topics. I will give a brief history of the hog industry in Manitoba and how it has evolved to this point, my opinion on a sustainable, environmental and economic model for hog farming, how animal agriculture and people are successfully co-existing and also how the moratorium will affect agriculture and the economy.

The history of the hog industry. The hog industry, up to the 1980s, consisted primarily of varying sizes of family hog farms. In the early 1990s, agriculture in Manitoba had a bit of a crisis. The federal subsidy, the Crow benefit on grain transportation was removed and feed grain could not be transported from Manitoba economically because of the distance to ocean ports and the cost of transporting that grain. The solution, add value. Get farmers to build barns to convert the feed grain into pork and export the pork. This proved to be tremendously successful. A recent rise in the Canadian dollar and sharp increases in feed costs due to, in part, the increased ethanol production has caused significant losses to occur in the hog industry.

\*(18:50)

Next, economic and environmental model. We are losing producers and some of production has shifted to producing more weanlings to ship to the U.S. to finish to market. This is increasing our dependence on the U.S. markets to finish our hogs, and most of you will have heard or read the current repercussions with COOL, country of origin labelling. I fear the combined effect of the financial hit and permanent moratorium will, in time, result in much of the industry to be lost. While the industry probably grew too quickly, it deserves a better fate than this. Future barn construction, provided new regulations are met, is needed to ensure that the industry is able to survive. Priority should be given to existing hog producers to ensure that what has been established can be protected and used as a base to expand.

While I introduce my own personal bias here, I feel this deserves consideration. I believe a 500-sow

farrow-to-finish operation, or multiples of it, with sufficient land base to use the manure as fertilizer that, in turn, produces feed grain to feed the hogs is economical, and also an environmental model for sustainable hog production. This would provide sufficient production to fill a large semi load to Brandon each week and employment for three people in the barn. With the rising cost of transportation and fertilizer, this model has environmental and economic merit.

How animal agriculture and people are successfully co-existing. When I see how the R.M.s of Hanover, La Broquerie and the city of Steinbach have grown in population while seeing the animal agriculture—not just hog farming—grown in the area in the last 20 years, I marvel at the success. People know farming is occurring around them and yet they continue to move in the area in droves. Schools are overflowing and related people services are stretched to the limit. Compare that with rural Saskatchewan where communities have died off or are dying because they rely only on grain farming. I know animal agriculture is only one of the many drivers of the economy in the southeast part of Manitoba, but it's part of it, and it works.

How the moratorium will affect—oh, pardon me, a little on the side: I was here this morning and there was a comment made about R.M. of Hanover having a moratorium of their own. I checked with my councillor and he says that there are certain areas where no further production is allowed, but there are areas in the municipality where hog barns can be built.

If the moratorium becomes permanent, more farms will be shut down over time. Small family farms will have difficulty adjusting and be forced to close. The next generation will abandon hog farming; other parts of the industry will pull up stakes and move on. The whole region will eventually note the loss. This does not need to be this way.

Our economy requires the industry to pay for health care, education, roads, highways, recreation, et cetera. The hog industry has added value to grain produced by farmers to create many jobs—vets, trucks, feed mill workers, hydro workers, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, accountants, packing plant employees, bankers, et cetera—and created wealth for Manitoba. Hog prices are expected to return to more profitable prices within the next 12 months with the supply of hogs having shrunk. Others will tell you

that Manitoba is the best province in Canada to produce pork. Placing a permanent moratorium on the industry will undo the positives that have resulted. We, as a province, will all be worse off if you do.

I want to make a little comment on the side, and that is, within six miles of my place some years ago, 3,000 cattle were finished every year and we had a thriving beef processing industry in our province. In the Howard Pawley administration, for some reason, that whole industry left. I sympathize with our current Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) how hard she worked to try and get a cow slaughter plant built in Dauphin. It is so hard to do something and so easy to undo.

Thank you for your time and consider this a matter of importance to all Manitobans, not just farmers. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you, Dennis, for your presentation.

You make some really interesting points. The thing that I'm concerned about, we've heard a number of different presentations. One is you referred to in yours and that's on the country-of-origin labelling that will be coming into effect in September. We're not exactly sure how that will impact us here in Manitoba in particular. But we have heard that a number of the operations may have to change the way they do their business.

With Bill 17 you won't be allowed to make those necessary changes. How is that going to impact your operation, Mr. Thiessen?

**Mr. Thiessen:** Well, my operation is a small farrow-to-finish operation. I'm not here really to speak about my farm in particular. I'm concerned about the industry, ladies and gentlemen. This is not just about me. This is about Hutterite colonies that rely heavily on agriculture. This is about farms of all sizes, and it's not about me. This is about everybody. It will affect the business community, and it will affect the city eventually too.

When you lose an industry, the economy will feel it, and we need all the industry in this province we can possibly muster to pay for all the programs, the health care, the schools and everything.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Thiessen, for your presentation today. You

mentioned you have one son who's living in Alberta now and another who's working in the hog industry here with you, I believe, and another who is entering engineering, I guess here in Manitoba. I know there's lots of other families who are affected by this type of a decision out there.

Are you concerned, with this type of legislation going through, that not only maybe your sons will have to consider moving to other provinces, but there will be many other families affected by this as well in such a negative way?

**Mr. Thiessen:** Yes, I agree with that.

**Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson):** Thank you for your presentation tonight, Mr. Thiessen. You brought up a good point about the Pawley government and the slaughter industry in Manitoba back in the day when it left here and went to Alberta. Also, the current Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) worked real hard at trying to get a slaughter plant established in Dauphin. I would venture to say the reason that she had no support is because the cattle people remembered the Pawley days. They remembered those very clearly, and they weren't about to put their money in something that could just be yanked away from them.

However, Mr. Thiessen, do you hear the Minister of Agriculture saying, look, I'm there for you guys. I'm going to throw this moratorium out. Do you hear her saying that?

**Mr. Thiessen:** No, I don't, and what dismays me is, even if this bill doesn't get passed, the fact that it was considered is sending such a lack of confidence in agriculture, not just hog farmers. It's grain farmers, everybody is shaking in their boots. Who's next? How is this going to affect me? It's serious. That's all I can say.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Pedersen.

**Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman):** No, I'll defer.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you. You took the words right out of my mouth, Mr. Thiessen. Thank you very much for your presentation. My question here is that if they can do this to the hog industry—and they can do it with the stroke of a pen, with Bill 17, the man at the end of the table can put forward a piece of legislation without even thinking about the ramifications and with the CEC not supporting this, but he can do it with the stroke of a pen.

My question is, what is the feeling in the industry? What's the feeling with the cattle industry

right now and the feedlot operators. What's the feeling with, and I'll say factory operation, poultry operations at the present time. What is next? What do you see as being next and when? If they get away with this and using the excuse of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg, is it going to be Canola producers next because they're putting too much input or fertilizer into the crop? In your opinion, what do you see as being next, Mr. Thiessen?

\* (19:00)

**Mr. Thiessen:** I'm afraid for the cropping people because if the hog industry is shut down, if we lose a lot of our hog farmers, we're going to have feed grain in our province that will have no place to go again. I mean, this is history; this is history. If we have no place to go, with the cost of freight, ladies and gentlemen, it will affect all of agriculture with time. So that would be my biggest worry.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Pedersen, there are still a few moments remaining if you still want to put your question.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I'm just going to refer back. You mentioned you had a son in Alberta. What is the message in Alberta? You must be talking to him. Is there any incentive? Are you telling him to stay there? How would you encourage him to come back to Manitoba right now? What would it take? We know what it would take, but what could you use right now to encourage him to come back to Manitoba?

**Mr. Thiessen:** My son, in Alberta, he graduated with a computer science degree. He went to work in the oil industry. He worked in R&D for five or six years. He has presently changed jobs. He's going to work for Siemens in business development for western Canada. He will not need to come back to farm.

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

I call Hugh Arklie, Springfield Hogwatch. Hugh Arklie? Mr. Arklie's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

James Hofer, private citizen. Mr. Hofer, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. James Hofer:** No, sir.

**Mr. Chairperson:** No? You may proceed.

**Mr. James Hofer:** Good afternoon or good evening, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, committee members. I want to express my thanks for your

indulgence that you've had with working around the scheduling of hearing the presenters and making concessions to accommodate us. Thank you very much. I was one of the people that was at World Pork Expo and couldn't be here when my name was called the first time.

The first question that I would pose is: Why are we here? Well, the reason that I am here is I'm desperate. If I was to answer, sitting in the government's shoes, I would say we're here because of Lake Winnipeg, and the question that really begs an answer is: Does government really think that it has accomplished or solved the issues of Lake Winnipeg by putting a moratorium on the hog industry? That is a question that has been repeated and is still not answered.

There are two ways of hitting a target. There was a king, many years ago, walking through the woods, and he spotted a tree with an arrow in it hitting the bull's-eye dead centre, and he was amazed. He says, how does one shoot so accurately? He walked along the path and there was another tree with another arrow right in the bull's-eye. He says, this is amazing. I have never seen this before. He instructed his troops to seek out the individual that has the ability to hit the bull's-eye time after time. So the person was found. It was a young lad, 12 years old. The king asked him, how do you do it at such a young age to master an art that allows you to hit the bull's-eye every time? He says, that is easy. I go to a tree and I stick in the arrow and I paint the bull's-eye around it.

Mr. Chairman, committee members, I hope that is not what government did with Bill 17. On the desperate side, what makes us desperate? When we're pressured, we become desperate. Randy Travis, I'll quote one of his songs:

There's a point when you cannot walk away. / When you have to stand up straight and tall and mean the words you say. / There is a point you must decide to do it 'cuz it's right. / That is when you become the point of light.

Government is always accountable; they're accountable to, first, the people that have paid for their campaigns to run in an election. Then they are accountable to the people that actually vote them in. Then they're accountable to themselves to lead, to govern in such a way that will take the country down a road of prosperity or growth. Then, last but not least, each and every one of us, committee members, the ministers, the Premier, we are all accountable to

God. Our actions some day are going to be scrutinized and we will have to answer why we did the things we did.

Another story I'm going to share with you is, in 1960, there was a person by the name of Percy Moggey. He was a convict; he was a feared man. He was jailed in Stony Mountain Penitentiary. He was a smart person too and what his desire was was to be the first man to physically escape Stony Mountain. The walls of Stony Mountain Penitentiary are over 30 feet high. Other people had escaped, but nobody had physically scaled the walls. So he formulated a plan to escape. He had to go through three doors that were locked.

He did escape. The first night, he spent in a culvert. The next day, he made his way into a bush. The search was on; helicopters were out. The police were out. He's sitting in the bush.

He looks up and he says, why are they doing this? Do they think that I would be out here, in the middle of a field, where they could see me? The conclusion that he came to was it is government; it is the police. They have to be seen as they're doing something, even though they know it will not make a difference. He also watched a roadblock on No. 6 highway. He says, do they think I'd be in a car?

I think we can learn something from that analogy. On a production site, when one asks the question: why do we need to build barns? Why do we need to expand? If we turn back the time of 10, 20 years, people were achieving less than 20 pigs per sow per year. Production units were built according to those standards.

Now, some farms are exceeding 30. The sow crates are there; the farrowing house is there, but they can't finish the pigs because they can't add onto the barn.

Another quick quote from a song by Conway Twitty: We can make it legal, but we can't make it right. That is one question that I hope government is always asking themselves. Is it right? If one asks the question, what are we doing to conserve the water in Manitoba? The question might be, what aren't we doing? What we're not doing is, we're not dumping any sewage, any raw manure into any river and into any lake. We live right on the La Salle River. I go there fishing with my sons, and we eat the fish that we catch.

\* (19:10)

If government wants answers, I've had the privilege to be on the Lake Winnipeg Research Consortium's research vessel, the *Namao*, and the people on that boat have a huge amount of information that does not support what government is saying in terms of who is jeopardizing Lake Winnipeg.

Another quote, Johann Goethe: If we all clean in front of our own doors, we would have a cleaner world, and I'll add to this quote, and not just a cleaner Lake Winnipeg. We are all involved in this game here, rural and urban, and I do not know or understand why government appears to me to be driving the wedge between urban and rural deeper and deeper. In the *Free Press*, a few weeks ago, there was a letter to the editor, and as one person quoted Waylon Jennings, he says, you can burn down the cities and leave the farms, and the cities will grow again, but if you burn down the farms, grass will grow on the streets of the city.

I would encourage the government to rethink its position on Bill 17. The Canadian Hutterites came to Canada in 1918—

**Mr. Chairperson:** You're at 10 minutes, sir. Just for your information.

**Mr. James Hofer:** Yes, I'll make a few more comments.

They left Russia in 1874. In the last century and a half, we have moved twice, and Russia is calling us back. If we look at what happened to Russia, when 50-some thousand Hutterite and Mennonite people left, in my mind, they still have not recovered. We have always trusted God to lead us into a land where we can practise our religious freedoms and our right to farm agriculture. Thank you very much.

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

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** Thank you, James, for a very moving presentation. I know we spoke earlier, but I just wanted to say that this morning at seven o'clock, your father, Jacob, called me, and he asked me if I would read the Hutterite church prayer for government in the House today. I did that this afternoon.

As well, he said to me: Why is it that the people that sit on the south side of the table, which is that side, don't ask any questions? Only your side asks questions. I explained, and I want to explain again that it's the government side that has brought in this

piece of legislation, and I don't think they want to hear any more from people like yourself. We, on this side, are the opposition, and we do want to hear what you have to say, and we do ask you questions.

I want to ask you the question: If this takes away your livelihood and you are forced to move away, where will you go? How many colonies will leave the province? What will it do to the communities that you support that are nearby, and what will it do to the greater economy of our province?

**Mr. James Hofer:** Good question, Mavis. As I stated earlier, Russia has still not recovered. They are a country with the largest land mass in the world and yet cannot produce enough food to feed themselves. We are a net exporting province, and I think we should take advantage of what we can do and what we do best.

To answer your question, where will we go? I don't know at this point. Russia, Brazil, but one thing I know is that if we cannot practise our fundamental rights and freedoms here, then we are forced to leave. Let me be clear. We didn't move in the last century and a half just to move.

**Mr. Stuart Briese (Ste. Rose):** Thank you, James. That was a very good presentation. I want to go a little different direction. A conversation I had with you a couple of weeks ago was about you trying to do what was best for the environment with a cover for your lagoon system, and there was about a \$10,000-permit fee to install it from the Province when you're doing the best environmental practices. Would you expand on that a little bit?

**Mr. James Hofer:** At the colony, we've spent large amounts of money to accommodate regulations and legislation, starting with we had manure storages that were meeting our needs. The government decided we needed to go to 400 days. We accommodated government in doing so. We have earthen manure storages. We have redone them once. The first cell is not just an earthen storage; it's a cement-lined manure storage. Neighbours are, at times, smelling our facilities and we have tried to accommodate their needs in reducing the smell or eliminating it. So now we want to put a synthetic cover on that storage, and we're being stonewalled by Conservation saying that we need a \$10,000-engineering permit to do so. The question we ask is why.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Well, the time for this presentation has expired so regrets to people who are still on the list. We're at over 15 minutes. On that

note, Mr. Hofer, I do thank you for your presentation. We have to move on.

Mr. Jacob Waldner, Private Citizen. Jacob Waldner. Mr. Waldner's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list. Olayinka Brimoh. Good evening, Mr. Brimoh. Is that the correct pronunciation of your name?

**Mr. Olayinka Brimoh (Private Citizen):** Yes.

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

**Mr. Brimoh:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed, sir.

**Mr. Brimoh:** Good evening everyone. As you may tell, I'm not originally from this country. I emigrated here because I thought it's a land of opportunity. When I first came to Manitoba, I came with two masters degrees from my country of origin. When I came here, I realized that I can't speak English and I'm not even speaking English now. I realized that I have accents. I realize that I cannot find the kind of employment that I had back at home and that made me to work in the hog industry. After working for like a year, I had to move out of this province and I moved to Edmonton, Alberta. I was there for about two years, and I was able to raise enough money to buy a hog barn.

\* (19:20)

Looking at the price of a hog barn in Alberta, I thought it was reasonable for me to locate back to Manitoba where the price of land is cheaper. I bought a barn in Manitoba, in Aubigny, Manitoba, so actually I'm from Aubigny. It's about 25 minutes south of Winnipeg in the R.M. of Morris. After buying this barn, we are still weathering the storm of the economic reality in the industry, and coupled with that, Bill 17 came into focus. I just have some couple of questions that kind of boggling my mind and I need to ask those questions.

I kind of looked at it like people have pets in the city. Family, we kind of know about pets we have in the city. It may be more than the number of hogs. I'm talking per head. These pets go to the riverside. They play in the parks. They defecate everywhere. Hog controls. Hog control. We have cattle farmers and their cattle, they defecate right there on the surface, but we, as hog farmers, we have our manure stored away for a year and spread at a time the Province allows to spread. Why are we the ones who are losing the river? About two years ago it was in the

news. I was out of this province then, but it was in the news that a state in the U.S. is going to open their lake, whatever, into Lake Winnipeg. Pollution and stuff like that comes from this lake. What would the government do to that? Would they place a moratorium on that? Why are we being targeted for this unfair moratorium? That is my question.

I just want to appeal to the government to please stand by justice and mercy. To please consider ourselves business people first and foremost. To please consider that our means of life we would eat from the farm. We live out there at night to be able to sustain our family and to be able to have a voice in this community without going on welfare. I want to appeal to the government to treat us like they treat the people in the whole industry. We have times and times where we have pollution in the whole industry. The government did not place a moratorium on the whole sector. All the industries, too, discharge from time to time into the river. There has never been a moratorium of this nature in this land.

Also, I want the government to please treat each farm individually, not to lump us together. There are some farms that are so small, say, my own farm now. I have less than 300 farrowing hogs. How may we be allowed to expand up to certain capacity? Depending on the land size, we are out to spread my manure. I'm the only hog farmer right now in Aubigny. I have enough land for expansion. Some other farmers are in my position. Why some places when we have too many hogs in the jurisdiction? I want the government to please treat us as individuals, and also I would just want the government to realize the facts that placing the moratorium, ruining us, it's killing the industry, and to clean the industry, it's affecting our lives. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Brimoh. I open the floor to questions. I have Mr. Graydon.

**Mr. Graydon:** Welcome to our country, Mr. Brimoh, and your English is fine. We're thankful that you chose Manitoba over Alberta. However, the pork industry—and my question, I'll lead into it—the pork industry has developed a lot of new technology to deal with the natural fertilizer from the hogs. We've heard repeatedly at this hearing now from over 100 people that it needs time to show that that technology is working in favour of lowering the phosphate levels, lowering the nitrates levels and that it's being managed properly. Would you say to the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers), would he better use his energy and his finances to harvest the algae from the

lake in the form of a biomass instead of killing an industry that's already booming? Would he start another industry?

**Mr. Brimoh:** Thank you very much. I would like to, if I may say, I would like the minister to respond to this, please, to the last question, because the question was—it was to him, not to me. Why are we here?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sir, this committee is structured in a way that people make presentations to the committee, and then it's up to the committee to ask questions of the presenters. So there was a question or comment put by Mr. Graydon to you.

**Mr. Brimoh:** Okay, if the minister will not say anything, I have to talk. The truth is, I would like to advise the minister and the government generally, to please focus their energy on the ways and manner we can all work together; as stakeholders of the lake, as stakeholders of our environment, and develop some policies and technology that will secure the future of these resources. But banning or placing a moratorium on our industry, I think is unfair. We can all stick together and work out a good solution to this issue.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation and, again, welcome to Manitoba and thank you for picking Manitoba to come. I'm sure you're probably second-guessing yourself right now as you look into Bill 17.

The Minister of Conservation is the lead man on this bill. The Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) is also involved in this and not doing a great job standing up for Manitoba farmers. We have the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Lemieux) at the table, the Member for St. Norbert (Ms. Brick), the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin), the Advanced Education Minister (Ms. McGifford), Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen), and also the Minister of Labour (Ms. Allan).

We feel that there hasn't been enough consultation on this. We've had the Manitoba Pork Council tell us they're more than prepared to meet with the government; talk about consultation, talk about the regulations, talk about the CEC report. Yet, that hasn't been done. What's your advice to this government?

**Mr. Brimoh:** I actually regret my move back to Manitoba. If I had a way of turning the hand of the clock back, I would like to revise that decision. If I could sell my barn today, I would leave this province today because there is no future for my family in this

place. I'm not wanted; I've been told in different ways but this is final.

Like I said earlier, I appeal to the government to please work with the Manitoba Pork Council and other stakeholders. They invest in Winnipeg, they invest in Manitoba especially. We have the CEC, too, coming out with a report. They should please consider the CEC report. They should look at the science behind this action and not the politics behind it. Thank you, sir.

**Mrs. Taillieu:** Thank you very much for your presentation. It's very sad that the government may be forcing you to move away from Manitoba and Aubigny.

I noted from your presentation that you felt that this should be an individual basis. It sort of reminds me, I think, that if there was one car speeding down the road, would the government then stop all traffic on that road for ever and ever? It really doesn't make sense.

I'm just going to ask you, do you think that with the present regulations in place—and I know that you all have to adhere to those—that using those regulations and guidelines to work with, on an individual basis would not be achievable and sustainable for your industry?

**Mr. Brimoh:** I believe it should be achievable. I believe with the government's assistance and help, we can process our manure further and make it more useful. Like people before me said, we know the advantage of hog manure as fertilizer over the inorganic fertilizer. The people producing inorganic fertilizer, they burn so much of greenhouse gases. We're talking about going green. If we have to reduce the amount of inorganic fertilizer we use and choose organic fertilizer over inorganic fertilizer, it will improve the structure of our soil. It will improve not only the structure, even the chemistry of the soil. We all know this. Nutrients are more readily available even to the plants for use. People in the rural area will benefit, even from the processing, further processing of the organic fertilizer. So I would just, like, as I've been saying, appeal to the government to please, not only treat each case as individual, but treat it as people in business.

Like last month or so, I think Suncor—that's an oil company in Alberta, in the oil sands—they killed some birds, because it discharged something into the lake and some birds died. There was so much noise on this, and the government did not say they are

placing a moratorium on the entire oil industry over there. Never did the government say that.

\* (19:30)

We heard what the Prime Minister said; it was on the news. They asked to talk to the company in question. In case people are not complying with the regulations that we have in place, I think they can be talked to and probably charged, brought to book.

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

I call Mr. Menno Bergen, private citizen. Menno Bergen? Mr. Bergen's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Nathan Baer, Airport Colony. Mr. Baer, do you have any written materials for the committee? No? You may proceed.

**Mr. Nathan Baer (Airport Colony):** Good evening, honourable members of this committee. My name is Nathan Baer. I am a member of the Airport Hutterite Colony. I am 28 years old and have been married for three years; my wife and I have one boy, aged two.

As I start here today, I ask you to consider that it is the future of this little boy. You guys here, with this bill, are trying, are damaging—it is his future. It is not mine. This bill might not impact the industry soon enough for me to see it, but it most certainly will for him.

Also, the other 87 people at Airport Colony, ranging from two months to 88 years of age—it also impacts their future. These are real people; they're not just numbers.

We are hog producers but that is not the only industry we have. We are a mixed farm, both grain and livestock, across various other industries: chickens, turkeys, dairy. The hog industry has sustained our way of life and seen us through the last 30 years, since the establishment of the colony in 1971.

Bill 17 will affect our colony, because it will devastate the industry. While we are not inside the restricted zone, the industry will take such a beating that it would be not economically viable to stay in hog production.

As companies leave the province and this industry and go elsewhere, it will add to the cost of production. Sure, some will argue that Maple Leaf Foods is here and they won't leave, so the industry will stay viable, but this bill does not even allow for

renovation or replacement in the restricted area which, by the way, contains two-thirds of Manitoba hog production. As a number of producers shrink, so will Maple Leaf Foods' desire to stay here.

As our colony grows, so do our needs. We have to be able to expand all our operations in order to stay profitable and viable. This includes our hog operation. As a colony grows and exceeds 120 to 150 people, we usually split off. The building of a new place to this day is estimated about \$20 million.

Honourable members of this committee, we need to put food on our tables; we need to pay bills, and this bill is making this so much harder. It is the future of our children. It is the future of real people we are talking about, the freedoms and choices to sustain and provide for our children as we grow.

It is my personal opinion that Bill 17 is illegal. Why, you ask. Because it violates certain rights granted to every Canadian citizen under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

First and foremost, it discriminates against us. Under section 15(1), every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability. We, as hog farmers, are being discriminated against.

Section 6(2) states, every citizen of Canada and every person who has the status of permanent resident of Canada has the right to move and take up residence in any province and to pursue the gaining of livelihood in any province.

I also believe that that point is being violated. This bill is discriminatory against hog farmers and unfairly singles them out as the cause of too high pollution in our rivers, lakes and waterways when, in fact, we have a proven number of instances from a number of experts that we contributed only 1.5 percent of the problem. What is the government doing to fix the other 99? Not enough.

This is another one of this government's Band-Aid fixes. This will fix the phosphate and nutrient loading problems into the lakes exactly like this governing party has fixed hallway medicine. It won't happen and it hasn't happened.

Also, this bill infringes on our right, as I have said earlier, to pursue the gaining of livelihood as it

takes away our right to be hog farmers and does so unfairly and unjustly. As a vast majority of people affected by this bill are Hutterite and Mennonite, we could also argue that we're being discriminated against based on religious beliefs or ethnic origin.

This bill will do nothing to fix the issues at hand as long as the City of Winnipeg and other jurisdictions are allowed to dump raw sewage into the river. There is a major problem that this government should address if it is concerned about the environment. In an article that I will now quote that I found at [CBC.ca/Manitoba](http://CBC.ca/Manitoba) which is entitled, "A Sea of Trouble: Lake Winnipeg in Crisis," I do not remember the exact date, but it was on around May 12 that I found this on their Web site—this interview, the City waste-water manager for the City of Winnipeg told this CBC interview, I quote him now, Bill Borlase, manager of waste-water services for the City of Winnipeg admits that the treatment process doesn't remove the nitrogen or phosphate that is causing the algae problems in Lake Winnipeg.

Excuse me. If the City is not taking out phos or nitrogen, what exactly are they doing at these treatment plants? If we, the hog industry were caught admitting this to you, the government, the media and the government would be in a tremendous uproar. We as hog farmers are not polluters that this government makes us out to be. We have families just like you. We like clean water just like you. We do not want our families and our children to get sick, just like you.

Furthermore, in the article, they quote a Winnipeg city councillor saying that Winnipeg is only 6 percent of the problem and that they don't see the need to spend \$300 million just to fix that 6 percent.

Excuse me, again. Why is Winnipeg being left to ignore its contribution to the problem and the hog industry is being threatened to be shut down over 1.5 percent of its problem? Where exactly did this government go to school? Six is bigger than 1.5. Shutting us down will do nothing for Lake Winnipeg. It will not fix anything. Honourable members of this government, you, along with the rest of Manitobans are being bamboozled by this bill. It has nothing to do with the environment. If it would, the government will be tackling the City of Winnipeg.

I plead with you that if at all possible, do not let this bill pass out of this room. For the sake of the future of Manitoba, for our sake, for your sake,

please, if you can, shut it down right here. This government needs to work with farmers and producers to clean up their practices if they think that is the case. If the government expects us to have this done yesterday, they are going to have to kick in funding to help.

\* (19:40)

The City of Winnipeg has been given until 2013 to clean up its act. Why are we being treated different? Why the blatant discrimination when human waste is so much more toxic and deadly than any animal manure? You can get sick from another infected person's bodily fluids, but, though it is possible from another species, it doesn't happen too much in Canada.

I am a member of the hog production team at Airport. Do I look sick to you? I ask you. I work in and around hog manure every day. It is not toxic. Yet it seems that the City of Winnipeg and other jurisdictions handling human waste are by far not under regulations the hog industry is.

This government and province could have a chance to be at the forefront of green practices. Farmers and producers are willing to work with you. There are so many options from producing heat to electricity to powering cars and vehicles on methane gas. The options are endless, gentlemen. The options are endless. If you are truly serious about being environmentally friendly, let's work down that option and that road.

It can be used to replace synthetic fertilizers. We at Airport Colony are doing just that. The fields we apply are not fertilized the next spring, replacing the synthetic fertilizers. We normally apply in late summer when it is very dry so there will be no run-off into ditches and for ease of application. This is considered an organic approach. The hog industry is able to put its waste products into an environmentally friendly use which a lot of other industries—

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

**Mr. Baer:** Can I quickly finish?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yes, and for the information of all the people in the audience, as I said at the beginning, you have 10 minutes for presentation, five minutes for Q and A. But if people wish to continue, I am allowing them to continue to speak into the additional five minutes, but that time is subtracted

from the question and answer period. Whoever goes beyond 10 minutes, they are free to do so, bearing in mind the impact on the Q and A session. Continue.

**Mr. Baer:** The hog industry contributes \$2 billion to the economy of this province per year, not a million, not \$500 million but \$2 billion and this is out of the CEC report. That is more than any of the Crown corporations. Pass Bill 17 into law and this will hurt our provincial economy, and this will hurt this government in votes in the next election as people will most assuredly lose their jobs over this hit.

We are a world food supplier of pork. We don't just supply Manitoba or Canada. We literally supply the world with pork. Food is in the news so much these days. Not a day goes by when we do not hear of the food crisis in the rest of the world. If you pass this bill you will be contributing to that crisis. You will be guilty of starving some poor little child.

If that is what you want on your conscience, then go ahead. If we run short on food in this province, you know what? It will be the cities that starve. The farmers won't starve because they'll keep food back for themselves. We are in a precarious situation right now. These crop emergencies in Canada and the U.S. are the slowest it's ever been. If we take any kind of natural disaster hit over a substantial amount of acres in North America, a lot of people are going to go hungry.

In closing, I ask this committee to drop this bill. There is no reason for it. Frankly, the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) assured the farmers this would not happen. I stand before you today and say that they both lied to the public and to hog producers.

A promise is a promise, Mr. Premier. You promised that once the CEC delivered its report, the pause would be lifted. That has not happened. That is not a misrepresentation of the truth. That is a lie, Mr. Premier. Thank you for your time, and I ask you to seriously consider the request and information I have presented here today. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Baer. Questions? I have Mr. Derkach.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Baer, thank you for a very compelling and somewhat heart-wrenching presentation this evening. I am a farmer. We produce livestock. I'm well aware of some of the regulations that have come down by this government since it's taken office. As a matter of fact, I'm one of those people who, if I spill a five-gallon pail of manure

when I'm hauling my cattle manure to the field and I spill it on the road, I could be fined \$5,000 for an environmental spill.

I understand what your industry is going through today. I have been angered by this bill because of what it's doing to an industry that has been, in my view, one of the cleaner agricultural industries in our province. When the Premier was questioned in the House regarding the hog industry and Bill 17, he accused us in the opposition of being in favour of hogs while his government was in favour of cleaning up Lake Winnipeg, and that our party was in favour of hog alley. I stand before you today to say—*[interjection]* He said that in the House and it's on *Hansard*. I stand before you today to say, I live on a farm. Water to me is the most critical and important element on my farm as it is on yours, I'm sure. Without clean water, I don't live on my farm and neither would you. So we on this side of the House are also as interested in clean water as you people are and any Manitoban is.

I'd like you to tell the Premier, who is here with us this evening, about the fact that the hog industry is, indeed, also interested in saving Lake Winnipeg, ensuring that we have an environmentally sustainable source of water for our future generations in our province.

**Mr. Nathan Baer:** Well, of course. Like I said in my presentation, we have families too. Without clean water we can't live. Our animals can't live. They die off, too, and with that would go our viability. What more can I say.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much, Nathan. I appreciate your advice. I was especially impressed with your argument that everybody should contribute to the solution, including the City of Winnipeg, including all sources of nitrogen and phosphorus. That is a statement that we on this side of the House agree with. To that end, in 1992, a Clean Environment Commission report was commissioned and ignored by the previous government until we moved forward on it dealing with the City of Winnipeg and its waste water. We have seen progress already with the City of Winnipeg in terms of upgrades to its sewage treatment facilities. More progress in '08 and then some more in a third category, and we are at the table with our third of the funding on that.

The only argument that exists now, I believe, is whether or not we should be withdrawing both the

phosphorus and nitrogen. There are some who think we should just do half the job.

What's your advice to me on that? Should we be withdrawing both phosphorus and nitrogen, much like Regina and other cities, within the watershed?

**Mr. Nathan Baer:** Mr. Minister, I believe the hog industry is being watched on both phos and nitrogen. I think for the sake of fairness, for the City of Winnipeg and all other jurisdictions, the same should be applied—*[interjection]* Not in 2013, today.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. Have you completed your answer, sir?

**Mr. Nathan Baer:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Time has now expired.

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Derkach:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairperson.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Derkach, on a point of order.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairperson, the arguments that Mr. Baer presented tonight are very compelling. I know there are still more questions on our side, at least, of the House. I don't know about the government side of the House. But I am asking this committee for leave to allow for some questions to be asked of this presenter because of the nature of the presentation and, I think, the compelling nature would at least allow us the latitude to ask one or two more questions of him.

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

**Ms. Brick:** On the same point of order. I just wanted to make it known that the committee had an agreement. I understood that we would be staying with the time line that we have put forward, and that we would be trying to give the opportunity to all the people who are here, who have come to speak, to have the opportunity to speak. I think that's what we're trying to do by saying that we will go past the midnight deadline. So, I think, in all fairness to the large number of presenters who are here waiting to present, we need to move on to other presenters.

**Mr. Eichler:** To the same point of order. I asked leave of the committee earlier if they would agree that the presenters that are called not be moved to the bottom of the list. A number of those people, as I've said, were at the World Pork Congress. We are prepared on this side of the House to listen to each and every presenter, and if a couple of seconds or a

couple of minutes of questioning for any presenter, we'd be more than happy to hear them.

\* (19:50)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. I've heard enough, I think, to rule.

First of all, what Mr. Derkach should have requested was leave to extend questioning. I assume that's what he meant. So, technically, he does not have a point of order. Ms. Brick responded, I think, denying leave. I do have to point out that we were already at 16.5 minutes, that Mr. Derkach, you put the first question and your preamble was rather lengthy. So, you have to bear that in mind when putting questions, that we only have so much time [*interjection*] and, as I was saying—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. As I was saying, we were at 16.5 minutes, that was 1.5 minutes over the time. We have literally hundreds of people to present and a lot of them are waiting.

So, I'm going to rule, first of all, there was no point of order, and say that we're going to move on to the next presentation. So, I thank you, Mr. Baer, for your presentation.

\* \* \*

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

**Mr. Lyle Peters (Private Citizen):** No, sir.

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

**Mr. Peters:** Well, good evening everybody. Thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to speak to you.

My name is Lyle Peters, and I was born and raised on a farm. I wasn't born on a farm. I was born in a hospital, but grew up on a farm, and now I'm farming with my dad and his three brothers. So, there are four uncles, and there are now four of us cousins in the process of purchasing this farm from our uncles. We're trying to do it a piece at a time because of the economics. Our farm, as a family, is 3,500 sows, farrow to finish, except that we are short one feeder barn, and that's an issue that I will address later. We also crop approximately 4,000 acres, and all of our land is within the distance of our barns that we can pump manure there. We, at the present time, use all of our manure for our own use on the fields as a cover-up for synthetic fertilizer.

In April of 2005, I graduated from the University of Manitoba with a degree in agri-business and chose to move back to the farm. I chose to move back to the farm because there were opportunities, and because I enjoyed working on the farm. I enjoyed getting my hands dirty, and I enjoyed watching pigs grow, and I enjoyed watching grain grow. Those are some of the things that drew me back home.

In June of 2007, I was married and my wife and I chose, again, to move to the farm. I married Maneesha Manuel who grew up in Winnipeg. She chose to move with me onto the farm and that is also again because of the opportunity, and for her, she really wanted the space that the country provided and some of the other opportunities that we were able to have on the farm.

This past April, my wife and I were nominated as Manitoba's Outstanding Young Farmer. We finished as runners-up, and it was a very wonderful experience knowing that some of us younger farmers can still be recognized for some of the work that we try to do in all aspects—production, environment, and all the other things that come with running a fairly large hog operation.

We, as young farmers, always grow up with hopes and dreams. I have always wanted to live on the farm and work on the farm and have always also wanted to expand the farm. At one point, also, to buy from my dad and his uncles, but also to maybe get larger and grow together as a family so that we can also have opportunities for our own children. Part of this Bill 17 takes that away from us, especially some of us young farmers.

I realize that where we grew up or where I am from, there probably are a few too many pig barns. The CEC report does say that where our barns are located is in Hanover, and we have one that is almost in La Broquerie, but it is in Hanover and in that particular spot of the province, there probably are too many pig barns. But in the rest of the province, I don't know if there are. There is still lots of land in western Manitoba and in other areas that would be able to support pig barns.

I realize that today there is a huge irony between the hog farmers demanding money because of the incredibly bad environment, but also the need to reduce the moratorium. We are hoping that, in the long run, pig farming can be successful if the economy stays here, if Maple Leaf keeps their killing plant, that we can, in fact, expand—well, maybe not expand but continue to grow as a group.

I believe it is unfair that the hog farmers are getting singled out on this. I'm not suggesting this Bill 17 should have a 17A that lumps dairy farmers or beef farmers in as well. That is not the point, but it seems that pig farmers are not the only problem with the phosphorus levels in Lake Winnipeg.

I am very, very concerned with water quality. We get our water from a well; we spread manure on the field that the well is beside. We don't spread right on top but, if there would be an issue with too much manure, it would end up in our water first, not in Lake Winnipeg.

We know that, with our injection of manure and the timeliness of our application, there is incredibly little run-off. I drink from our well and I don't want E. coli. I don't want phosphorus and I don't want salmonella or whatever else we can all get in our water from our manure.

It seems unfair that there is also no phosphorus regulation in city expansion. You don't hear that Waverley West is not allowed to have dishwashers, or that they're not allowed to use phosphorus in their dishwashers. Yet, pig farmers have to now start spreading manure by phosphorus regulations; it doesn't make sense. We do use phosphorus in our dishwashers as well, but there is no regulation on that, and there is no talk of banning phosphorus in dishwasher detergent or laundry detergent. Maybe, that is a possible idea to get rid of some of the phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg.

We, as a farm, are doing our best to do what we can for the environment. We live close to our pig barns and we do not want manure in the ditch. We do not want anything to go wrong. We want Lake Winnipeg to be successful and now, with the increase in regulations, we have been forced to spread our manure further distances, which is a higher cost to us, of course.

We have also been forced to spread very close to the town of Mitchell. We own the land right around the town and, last fall, we spread manure just, basically, across the road from the town. That was because we were running a little short on the—were high on our phosphorus levels on some of our fields closer to home.

Our applicator did a very good job and we heard no complaints, because there was no smell, because the manure was injected very properly.

So I ask this committee to please help us, the young farmers, be successful in this environment. If

we can keep the economy so that farmers, like myself and others in this room, can expand and also continue growing the operations, we can have access for our kids to farm, not just end it with our generation.

I came back to the farm because there were opportunities, and I don't want the government to take those opportunities out of our hands. Thank you very much.

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

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. Congratulations on your nomination and a job well-done.

My question for you is—nowhere in the CEC report did it refer to a moratorium. That was imposed directly by the minister and the Premier of this province. The guidelines were outlined in that CEC report and the nutrient management regulations.

If the minister would sit down with your organization, your lead organization—Manitoba Pork Council—could you live with those regulations, if the minister would sit down and draft new regulations in order to adhere to the CEC report?

**Mr. Peters:** As far as I know, we do have the land base to sustain a phosphorus-based, even one-time crop-removal system that has been talked about in the CEC.

From an economic standpoint, two-times phosphorus removal would be very nice, that you could go every other year with the manure, but the outline in the CEC report would be livable. The moratorium seems a little bit too much.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much, Lyle. I think that one of the reasons you've probably done so well in that competition is your ability to express what you do on your farm, so thank you very much for your advice.

\* (20:00)

I was very impressed with your across-the-board approach that you've outlined for us. Dishwashing detergent is something that we've made announcements on and have put in place a moratorium, a ban as of 2009. We have said no to in excess of 6,000 city lots that have not got a plan to take care of its sewage, as opposed to the old days when there was just development, at no cost, with no end.

What I was really impressed with is your assertion that there is lots of land outside of the moratorium area within the province of Manitoba that is still available for agriculture and, in this case, hog barns. We have heard from some across the way that this would be a total shutdown of the industry in Manitoba and that people would be going to the States or to Alberta. Do you agree that in your area there may be people that might take up hog barns in other parts of the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Peters:** As far as we know, it seems to be very difficult to build a pig barn in western Manitoba. Lots of the municipalities seem to be very anti-hog barn even though they are outside of the, maybe, moratorium area, so that doesn't necessarily help at all, and I know that you maybe can't twist arms to get some of the western part of the province to open up their pig barns, but moving into the United States is definitely a possibility for lots of farms in our area because you can't—and it might be more economical in the States than in western Manitoba, but, yes.

**Mr. Graydon:** Congratulations, Lyle, on your nomination. It seems like a lot of young hog farmers get nominated throughout the area. There's Mr. Boggs and Mr. Wiebe and yourself. You make our area proud.

They talk about the moratorium and you yourself said that, in some places, there's a lot of hog barns and maybe too many, and maybe there aren't, but I think they're all adhering to the rules that are in place today. Your municipality, for example, has some pretty strict rules as well. Do you think it was necessary to put a moratorium on when, firstly, you have the government rules and regulations that have to be followed and then the municipality looks at it and says, we also want to have input into this. And you, because you want to be a farmer but perhaps your brother wants to be a CEO of the municipality, and so we put a moratorium on and your brother has no decisions to make.

Is that something that we should look forward to?

**Mr. Peters:** It's definitely a situation that could arise. I know R.M. of Hanover is in the special zone or the high agriculture zone where we did actually have approval just before the moratorium came on to build another pig barn. We had enough land at the one time, crop removal at the municipal level, but when it came to the federal level for the lagoon permit, that's where it fell through for us, and so we actually had the approval before the moratorium started 18

months ago, or however long it was, and so it's interesting that the municipality could say, yes, that you have lots of land base for it, but then the provincial government says, no, you don't anymore.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry. Order. Was that a supplemental question, Mr. Graydon?

**Mr. Graydon:** No, that's fine.

**Mr. Chairperson:** That's all right? Mr. Pedersen.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Thank you, Mr. Peters. You have a 3,500-sow operation. You're involved in a 3,500-sow operation. That's a pretty good-sized operation for Manitoba. You have a university education, so you have some smarts about you. The Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) and the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) like to say that you can pick up and move out to western Manitoba no problem. Do you think a financial institution, given how Bill 17 is being introduced overnight, do you think there would be any problem convincing a bank to finance that operation in western Manitoba?

**Mr. Peters:** For our family, I think that it would probably be a bit of a tougher sell because one of the assets that we as a family have is that our management is very close by. How would you sell a bank on having management three hours away? We wouldn't be able to have nearly the hands-on contact that we have now with our employees, and I think it would be a very tough sell, as well as getting a barn approved in many of those municipalities is also a tough sell, but even to the financial institutions, I think that it would be a very tough sell for us as a family.

**Mr. Borotsik:** I'll go just a little bit further than that. Not even just dealing with the financials, because certainly I think it would be difficult to get financial backing, but, Mr. Struthers, the honourable minister, has indicated that there is other opportunity for expansion in western Manitoba. It's only a certain small area that's going to be affected.

I guess, in my opinion, it boils down not only to attitude but to what this government can do at a whim. Now, do you think that a lot of people your age would like to go to western Manitoba now, go through all the process, deal with the municipalities, knowing full well that in a year or five years, or for that matter, in six months after you develop, by the stroke of a pen, they can say you can't expand, you can't do anything more than what you have right now? Would you be prepared to spend that kind of energy, that kind of effort and that kind of money,

knowing full well that this government, this minister and this Premier (Mr. Doer), on a whim, can just shut you down anytime they want? Would you like to invest that kind of money in this province?

**Mr. Peters:** That is obviously of concern. No, I would not want to move to the western part of the province just because I grew up in the eastern part. It's got nothing to do with the western part. But it also puts on questions about expansion into other areas. Do we really want to buy a chicken barn now because six months down the road are they going to shut down chicken barns? Or do we want to buy a dairy farm or do we want to—are they going to stop us from spreading manure on land at all and then we have to go to synthetic fertilizer? It's a concern that—because the CEC does not say, no hog barns in Manitoba or no more hog barns in Manitoba. I mean it says be careful, but that's completely different than what this bill is outlining.

So, no, I don't think so. It's very concerning to even know what to do in the future in all aspects of agriculture.

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

Okay, I have a request from a city presenter that has a flight to catch at 6 a.m., Tuesday morning. This individual has been here on a previous evening. This has been confirmed by the Clerk and he seeks leave of the committee to present at this point in time. *[Agreed]*

I call Mr. Glen Koroluk, No. 1.

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

**Mr. Glen Koroluk (Beyond Factory Farming):** Mr. Chair, I have pictures.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Pictures? Okay.

Okay, Mr. Koroluk, you can begin when you're ready to do so.

**Mr. Koroluk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Usually when I come to these committee meetings, I have a wise quote to start it off, but today I don't because I'm sort of mixed in my feelings as to what's happened over the years with the hog industry.

As many of you may know, you know, I was part of the Hogwatch coalition that formed back in 1999. I've worked on environmental issues now for about 20 years and what I've gained from that is a great respect and knowledge for a lot of different

environmental issues that confront us. I've seen the battles in the communities from the hog expansion over the years, both with the previous government and with this government. I've seen families break apart. I've seen people move out of the province or get bought out by the industry. My own family has suffered from this particular industry.

\* (20:10)

I want to tell you that I do come from a farming background. Both my parents are from the farm. My grandparents on my mother's side homesteaded near Sarto, in between Steinbach and Grunthal. They had the quarter section, and I spent my childhood youth on that farm until age 16. It was a subsistence farm. It was a different time and a different era.

A lot of people tell me, well, we can't turn back the clock. But, what I do tell you is that we need a new clock. That's for sure. My family on both sides are Ukrainian and they were hardworking people. They were very respectful of coming into this country. Much like the Hutterite people, they're hardworking people and so are the Mennonite people. I have a great respect for people who put in their work in their livelihood.

So I want to get back to why we need a new clock. The reason why is the Canadian pork industry, right now, it's restructuring and consolidating. My opinion is it will never be able to compete in the global international market in the future and within the next generation. We've heard the obvious reasons, the high price of feed grain partly driven by the global biofuels industry; the low value of the U.S. dollar; overproduction and the new country-of-origin legislation in the U.S.

There are other reasons that you don't hear. One is, you know, global industrial pork production is moving to other parts of the world such as China, Brazil, Mexico and Russia. As we track the industry over the last generation, we've seen it move from Europe and then it moved into North America, into the U.S., places like—I mean, Iowa has always had a hog industry, but we're talking about the industrial model—Iowa, North Carolina, it moved into Québec, and it keeps moving, and then it came to western Manitoba.

So what happens is everyone's, you know, enthusiastic about this new industry. We're going to make money. You know, we're going to sell pork across the globe. Well, what really happens is a different story.

Now, I just want to remind the committee and the audience, too, what Bill 17 actually is. It covers less than a third of agri-Manitoba. It doesn't affect existing operations with current technology in the moratorium zone and that could be a production of up to six million hogs per year. It only applies to confined hog operations that utilize a liquid slurry system. So it does not impact over 95 percent of other farm operations in the other agricultural sectors. Just to make it clear, the amendment says an operator can expand in the moratorium zone if they use environmentally better production systems such as straw-based systems, poop barns, or if they treat their liquid waste through solid liquid separation, or install anaerobic digesters. So even though there's a perception that there's a moratorium, there isn't. What it is, it's a bill that sort of gives the industry a push to change their production method.

Now, eight years ago, we had a review much like the CEC review we had last year. It was called Finding Common Ground, and back then we said basically the same stuff that we said last year through the CEC. Back then, eight years ago, they said we had to regulate phosphorus. So, you know, I'd like to say that with Bill 17, Lake Winnipeg will still be in jeopardy. The reason for that is that the outbreaks will still continue in the years to come. You know, through the hearing we witnessed with the CEC, all they did was provide circumstantial evidence, and they say they couldn't provide a definite answer to the issue because of lack of local soil test data and limited evidence on local watershed studies which, unfortunately, these same recommendations were made eight years ago and nothing was acted upon them.

But what we do know is that some of these scientists at the U of M are saying that we need to find four to six times more land base to apply the liquid slurry, and that's because of the production system. It's a slurry, it's liquid, liquefied, and the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus makes it that we over-apply the phosphorus. Not enough of the nutrient is up-taken by the crops that are grown so we get an overload of phosphorus on the land. We have rainfall events and spring run-off events.

If you look at your photographs that I handed out to you—these are just a few of them—we've got hundreds of these. We go up in the air and take pictures of the hog industry in the province. You can see the size, scale and magnitude of some of these operations. Now, you get a heavy rainfall, you get

lots of manure ending up into the surface water. Some of that goes down below too.

I also want to say that Lake Winnipeg will still be in jeopardy because we're not reducing the phosphorus load in this province. We're trying to in different sectors; the City of Winnipeg is doing its best; the soap detergent industry is phasing out phosphates; the cattle producers are doing best management practices now. So everyone is doing their fair share.

I want to tell you that we're actually having an expansion of the slaughterhouse sector in this province. Maple Leaf is going to a second shift. Hytek, which bought out the Neepawa plant, is expanding their yearly kill capacity. What we're going to get actually is more finishing barns built mostly in western Manitoba. Some of them will go in northern North Dakota, some of them in eastern Saskatchewan, but we're going to get an increase of phosphorus loading because western Manitoba still drains into Lake Winnipeg.

Can someone tell me how much time I've got left? One minute; holy smokes.

What I want to sort of conclude here is that while we're focussed on the phosphorus issue, what we really have to do is look at the production system, the liquid slurry confined system. That's the real issue. As well as impacting our surface waters, we also know that the liquid slurry system contributes to global warming. We know that from measurements we have from other places in the world. We know that it causes ground-water contamination, and we've got the proof in Manitoba through freedom of information requests and all the ground-water monitoring wells that the lagoons, the manure storage facilities have installed. We also know that there are impacts to the health of those living near these facilities and also for the people who work in them.

So I guess in closing—I have enough stuff here for a day myself—in closing, what we should really do is amend Bill 17 so that there is this moratorium on liquid confined systems throughout the province. Really, we should be working with our hardworking farmers in this province to make a just transition to sustainable farming. That's what we've really got to do. I thank you for your time.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you Mr. Koroluk. You have four minutes and four questioners.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Koroluk, you made a statement that it wasn't really a moratorium that's on; it's just a push for better farming practices, but it's really not a moratorium. I'm of the opinion, I would suggest to you, that this is the beginning of an assault on agriculture, that it could be better described in my view as a genocide.

The slurry systems that you speak of, that you refer to in the hog industry as not really what we should be doing, is used in the feather industry and is used in a dairy industry. Are you suggesting that they should also be limited to production?

\* (20:20)

**Mr. Koroluk:** No, I'm not, actually. I'm just talking about the confined hog system.

In fact, if you look at our agricultural sector right now across the country, the biggest growth in the industry is organic food and organic food production systems. I mean, the public is dying for organic food produced locally, and if we look at the other agricultural sectors that you allude to, dairy and the poultry sector, I mean, that's where you have to invest your resources because that's the global trend. We're in an energy crisis right now and industrial food production is very energy intensive. Either way, we have to change because we're not only in an energy crisis, we're in a food crisis too.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Koroluk. You mentioned during your presentation that you didn't feel that this bill in itself would make much of a difference in terms of the water quality in Lake Winnipeg. Having said that, I know that the government has, time and time again, tried to sell this bill as one that will be the bill to clean up Lake Winnipeg.

Don't you think that's a bit dishonest?

**Mr. Koroluk:** Over my years of working on this particular industry, I've seen a lot of dishonesty. I would prefer not to fingerpoint anymore, and I think there's a lot of work that all of us have to do together. What I'm saying is that we're actually going to get an increase of phosphorus loading in this province with the expansion of the slaughter capacity. So that's why we're asking for a province-wide moratorium on the confined liquid-slurry system. Not on the other types of production systems that are more environmentally better.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Very quickly, because you don't have a lot of time. I have gone through the Maple Leaf

plant. I did hear you say that we don't have any world markets. I should tell you that I did see product that was destined for Korea. I saw product that was destined for Japan. I then heard you say that if they do more of the feeder barns, then obviously it's going to add to the load and Maple Leaf is part of the problem.

Are you opposed to value-added production, such as Maple Leaf, Mr. Koroluk, and are you also opposed to free trade, where in fact we can trade our commodities throughout the world?

**Mr. Koroluk:** I'm for fair trade and I'm for increasing domestic and local supply. As I mentioned, with the energy crisis, the global energy crisis that we do have, the global market will have some difficulties in the next generation.

My understanding is that Maple Leaf is consolidating. They've sold off a lot of their assets, and they want to concentrate and focus on the Canadian domestic market in order to be competitive in the continent. It's unfortunate because, while we had our hearing, our CEC hearing, and while we have debate on Bill 17, it's really the Maple Leafs and the Hyteks that have been given the financial taxpayer opportunities to expand on the shoulders of other farmers.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Last question to Mr. Eichler.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you, Mr. Koroluk, for your presentation. I have two questions, mainly boiled into one, though. When we look at the new techniques that we've heard about here in the committee about feeding, lowering phosphorus levels, and also the treatment of storage facilities.

What is your impression of what Bill 17 would do to those initiatives?

**Mr. Koroluk:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairperson. I don't understand the question exactly.

**Mr. Eichler:** We've heard a number of presentations in the ways that feeding will be changing, the way they manufacture feed, and also the treatment of storage facilities to lower the phosphorus levels. Do you think that technology will, in fact, go ahead if Bill 17 passes?

**Mr. Koroluk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. You're talking about adding phytase to the feed and changing the diet, and technology, You know, when we rely on technologies that aren't proven, sometimes that creates other problems. The phytase, my understanding is that's a genetically modified

organism. From my understanding, what you might gain from changing the diets, you might lose somewhere else.

For instance, there's a strategy to feed livestock more distillers grain from the ethanol industry. Feeding distillers grain amplifies, concentrates the phosphorus in the waste. So, one small gain here, you get a loss somewhere else.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Koroluk, for your presentation.

**Mr. Koroluk:** Thank you for allowing me to make the presentation.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You're welcome.

**Mr. Eichler:** Just a point of clarification. As of right now, we have 55 presenters—you might want to hear this. We have five in-town presenters. We know that we sat 14 hours on Saturday; we sat 15 hours on Friday. We only heard 51 presenters on Friday, 52 on Saturday, and we know we can't sit past 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. A number of these people's voices will not be heard tonight.

Now, in fairness to those people, we either need to cut off registration or we need to do some type of a management here that's fair to these people. A lot of them have to go home and do chores; the animals need to be fed.

I ask the guidance of the committee on what they would like to do with those presenters because, according to the registration that is on the Clerk's desk at the back, we have 55 out-of-town which we'll be hearing first and five in-town. I ask the committee for their advice.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Eichler has spoken. Does anybody have any additional advice?

**Ms. Wowchuk:** The member, Mr. Eichler, raises a very important point. There are many presenters here. We have agreed that we will sit beyond 12 o'clock, I believe, or we'll reassess at 12 o'clock. We have more time tonight.

There'll be another committee on Tuesday and then another one on Wednesday. I think we should be a little bit conscious—maybe we should be letting people make their presentations and, if we don't have to ask questions, don't ask questions, just so we hear.

I think we have to look at those options. Maybe we can shorten it up some way, but I think we do have to look at how we can hear as many as possible.

**Mr. Eichler:** Just to make it clear, for those people that have travelled so far, and we know that, in the past, we only had the maximum of 52 in that 14-hour period, we will agree to sit then as long as we possibly can, till the committee rises tomorrow morning.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I think the normal rules are, at midnight, we assess it again, but we should just keep going right now. Let as many people speak as possible and then assess it at that time. Let's get people moving through this, so we can hear them.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. That's all the advice from the table, so there was nothing really definitive decided between the two of you, other than we'll proceed and, at 12 o'clock, perhaps we can have further discussion.

**Mr. Eichler:** Just to let the record show then, we're prepared to hear every presenter until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Order.

Well, we're in here for a long night, so we're going to try and make things a little more accommodating for the public here. I have an announcement in that regard.

Due to the number of people in the room, we have made some quick arrangements. We're going to open up the other committee room, room 254, which is just down the hallway from here, as an overflow room for those in attendance, so more people will be able to sit and listen, as opposed to standing. As I said, this room is just down the hall and the sound from this room will be broadcast into that room, so you can hear the proceedings. We will wait a few moments. When calling names, in case someone from that room is called and is making their way back here, our gallery attendant in this room will head down there now to open up the room.

\* (20:30)

**Ms. Brick:** I just wanted to say thank you very much on behalf of the people who are here in the room. I congratulate the committee on putting forward a solution that will allow people to have a place to be able to be comfortable while they are waiting for their turn to be heard.

**Mr. Chairperson:** If I could have order, please. I would like to call Mr. Darcy Pauls to the microphone. Darcy Pauls. We will check to see if he's gone to the other room and if so, we will call

him next. I will move on to Arian deBekker, Morris Piglets Ltd. Arian deBekker. Are you Arian?

**Mr. Arian deBekker (Morris Piglets Ltd.):** Yes, I am.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, sir. Do you have any written materials? I see you do. The Clerk will distribute them and you may begin when you are ready.

**Mr. deBekker:** Good evening, members of the committee. Also, good evening to everybody else here. I think that's well worth seeing so many people here. It means that it's definitely a very interesting topic near to everybody's heart.

My name is Arian deBekker, and I'll speak on behalf of Morris Piglets Ltd., a company I work for, a company that has two sow operations. We have a total of 5,400 sows near Lowe Farm. This company has been in operation since 2001.

We've often heard comments that corporate farms are not really the desirable farm. I'd like to add we employ 19 employees, and I know that 12 of them have families. I really would like to say that whatever we do is done with regard to not just the company, but also the people who work for the company. We'd like to provide them with a good living and also we'd like to support the businesses that are close to where we farm.

I've given an example in my summary there where, for labour, for example, as a company we spend \$750,000 per year and then there is several million dollars that will each year go into local economies that are close to the farm. There is more money that goes to sources further afield. We've gone about our business in a manner in which we honour and respect people, animals and the environment and we hope to continue to do so for as long as we can. Like any business, we would like to seek opportunities to grow if we can, though at the moment our focus is on economic survival as we try to cope with the difficulties in the weanling export market. Our company, it produces isoweans and the majority of the pigs that we produce are going to the United States.

Bill 17 does not allow anyone within the designated area any flexibilities relating to pig farming in the future. Earlier on, one of the honourable committee members here talked about country-of-origin labelling. If we look at country-of-origin labelling as an example, if it works so that we need to seek an alternative way of continuing our

business and have to do that in the confinements of Bill 17, we stand to either stop where we are and move somewhere else or stop completely.

Another thing that's not really looked at, although it was mentioned earlier on in a discussion, is that it really restricts provincial and municipal government. This policy, when it comes into effect, will leave a legacy of problems. So, if we focus on one of them by not allowing within the designated areas any new hog facilities to be developed or existing operations to expand as described in Bill 17, it becomes impossible to create transfer policies to relieve certain densely populated areas of pig-farming activities without making major moves to acceptable locations. Hopefully, they will still be acceptable by that time outside the designated area.

This Bill 17 should never go ahead, but instead, provincial and municipal governments should develop a long-term strategic vision on municipal planning in which municipalities can designate areas in which various types of farming and agricultural development can take place. Such decisions should be based on a multitude of factors, resulting in improved and sustainable agriculture and environmental developments.

I came here from the Netherlands in 1999. It's a little bit ironic that I used to work in the Netherlands in the early '90s to later '90s as an agricultural adviser and I helped farmers to look for solutions to move from problem areas to areas where new opportunities were available. At the time, and this must be on record here somewhere, I even contracted with your government to bring Dutch farmers out here. Mrs. Wowchuk, you remember that. We met, and you were very much in favour of this at the time too. We looked around and people were excited about what they saw, about the opportunities to come to an area where, as an entrepreneur, you could develop into the area of expertise that you could bring, and you, as a government, stood there welcoming everybody with open arms, especially those who could bring large investments to Manitoba.

At the moment, with Morris Piglets Ltd., as I have said, we employ local people, although I have to say that I've also brought some people in, staff from other areas. They're happy to live where they are. If Bill 17 goes ahead, it will force entrepreneurial farming families, hog-farm employees and affiliated businesses out of areas where they currently live, where often they've grown

up and where their social contacts are. Such an evacuation is indeed very unfriendly. Don't do it.

\* (20:40)

It furthermore impacts the revenue side of many rural municipalities. If we look at Lowe Farm alone, if the hog farms weren't there, I'm sure that the school would already be closed. The Co-op may not be there. There will be many other facilities which are currently there, which are offered to all of the people that live there, because of the presence of pig farms in these areas. If you change that, if you bring in Bill 17, you will close not just the farms, but you will close all the businesses as well.

Bill 17 is an easy way out for government, with a total disregard for the swine sector and a complete disrespect for its viability and health. There is no need for Bill 17 to be used as a regulatory form of legislation. Instead, other measures which deal with real problems and encourage adjustments, based on economic and environmental realities, should continue to be developed. Many of those are in place already. You just have to use them.

We talked about nitrogen; we talked about phosphate. We've got rural municipalities which will have a big say in what is possible and what is not possible.

You don't need a Bill 17. You have everything you need to govern, to work with everybody in your jurisdictions. Thank you for your attention.

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

**Mr. Pedersen:** Thank you, Mr. deBekker, for your presentation. I know where your operation is located.

First of all, I should say that the Minister of Agriculture's (Ms. Wowchuk) schedule has probably been freed up a whole lot because she won't be encouraging any similar operations, like you, back into the province now, so she'll have more time.

You're located in the Red River special management area. For those across the table who don't know this, this is the heavy clay land, ideally suited for crop production, for hog production. Actually, potable water is a bit of a scarce commodity out there. You have to have storage for that potable water.

You've heard us say it all along, Bill 17's all wrong. What could be the absolute rationale or why should they—maybe I'll put it differently. Why should

the Red River special management area not be included in this area on this moratorium, should they insist on pushing it through?

**Mr. deBekker:** In relation to manure management, there are many rules and regulations in place. If you use proper techniques of incorporation of manure, the run-off of manure will be very, very little.

Even if you talk about areas where we are today, I have farmers who come to me and say, can we have your manure next year? I don't have enough manure to accommodate all the acres around where we are, and there are many hog barns where we are. Together, there's still land left where we can put manure on in that area.

You talked about water, Mr. Pedersen. Our barns use run-off water in water ponds to feed our pigs. I just showered in that this afternoon. We work with that water every day and have been since 2001. It is not a problem.

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Mr. deBekker. In your presentation, you referred to provincial and municipal governments and that they should develop long-term strategic vision for municipal planning.

I'd like to point out that the Minister of Agriculture worked diligently since 2003 to have the municipalities throughout the province develop their development plans. I recall having a conversation with her in the fall of 2003, and she said, 2005, Clifford, they will be there. Every municipality has to be done by 2005. In 2005, she said 2006; 2007 came, they couldn't do it. So she says to the Minister of Conservation, I can't get it done. Will you please put a moratorium on and, of course, he did that.

But, I'm going to say to you, Mr. deBekker, that in your area there is land to spread. In other areas, there isn't land to expand, however, with the technology that's coming down the pipe, the technology that we have, and necessity being the mother of invention, can you foresee in the future where we would be able to expand even where we have more pigs? Knowing the country that you came from, would you say that we would be able to expand even where, now, there isn't a land base with the technology that's coming?

**Mr. deBekker:** Exactly. You mentioned the country where I came from and the question has been a problem there for many years. It's not new. As a matter of fact, we don't have to invent the wheel twice. We can look at examples of Denmark, of the Netherlands, of western Europe as a whole. We can

learn from that. There are techniques. There are techniques that have been developed already. There are techniques that have been tried. As a matter of fact, there are, even in Canada, currently at the University of Guelph, today, has a system which is in operation today where they convert manure into energy.

What it comes down to is economics. These techniques often still need to be refined and once the refinement has taken place and the economics are there, we're not just looking at manure as a fertilizer, but we're looking at manure as a resource for lots of things. Then the problem will not be there anymore.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry, Mr. Borotsik. I will allow one more question, but it's not to you, it's to Mr. Briese.

**Mr. Briese:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. deBekker. I noticed as Mr. Graydon did, that you mentioned the municipal planning and designated areas. I was the chair of a planning district for 12 years in a past life, and I was involved in all the development of the new amendments to The Planning Act that called for the livestock policies to go into our development plans. We had several extensions on that. We were the first planning district that actually put it in place and I might add that the Department of Agriculture fought us tooth and nail all the way on when we tried to do something environmentally responsible in our own planning district. They fought us every step of the way.

I was pleased to hear you say that the planning district model is the way to go on these. I truly believe it is. It's local people with local knowledge making the decisions on what happens in that area. It's not a bunch of people sitting on Broadway in Winnipeg.

I don't know. Is there anything else you could add on your views on the local decision-making?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Briefly, Mr. deBekker.

**Mr. deBekker:** I think it'll add a lot of value, as you've already alluded to, if the discussion on how development can take place can happen from within the rural municipalities where it's possible to listen to people who are experts in that area who know the soils, who know what happens with the water run-offs, how it all works, where the problems are, where to avoid the problems and where the opportunities are. If you can give somebody a chance by telling the person, look, you know, don't do it here, but we have another opportunity within our same area, then you

don't have to dislocate families. You don't have to dislocate businesses. It'll all happen within the same area. As a municipality, you'll have your municipal taxes coming to you as a resource, as a revenue.

\* (20:50)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. DeBekker, for your presentation.

I previously said we would call Mr. Darcy Pauls a second time. We did check the other committee room and he wasn't in there so his name will be moved to the bottom of the list.

I call Gary Verhoog.

**Ms. Brick:** Mr. Chair, I just wanted to ask if there were any people in the audience who had young children if we could give leave for them to identify themselves to the Clerk at the table so then those individuals would be allowed to go at this time, thereby allowing them to go home with their children. If there is anyone who has young children, or even older children here in the audience.

Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Ms. Brick's suggestion has been agreed to by the committee. So, anyone in the crowd that has children here or even to attend to, by all means approach the Clerk in the back and he'll bring it to our attention and we'll try and facilitate that for you.

Mr. Verhoog, do you have any written materials?

**Mr. Garry Verhoog (Private Citizen):** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You do not. You may proceed then, sir.

**Mr. Verhoog:** Great. My family has been dairy farming for as many generations as we can remember and it's—my family just came over from Holland 50 years before our last speaker, I guess, and are now farming in several countries on different continents. We have survived and prospered because we've been willing to take risks and uproot our families to move to better places in Canada or the world to grow our businesses. Farmers are not unique to this. Every successful business owner knows that if its business doesn't grow, it will die. Imagine if Manitoba Hydro were told it could never build another dam or Buhler industries was told it cannot build any new equipment than it—any more

equipment than it did last year. These successful companies would slowly wither away or remove. If Bill 17 comes into effect this is what will happen to the hog industry in Manitoba. The laws are already in place to prevent excess nutrients from being applied to the soil and with the huge increases in the price of fertilizer, economics will dictate that manure is utilized effectively.

On our farm we use the manure from two 2,000-hog finishing barns and the manure from 500 dairy cows to grow a thousand acres of corn, 300 acres of oats and 500 acres of alfalfa this year, all for feed for our dairy herd. It's still required an additional 46 tonnes of commercial fertilizer this year to balance the nutrients for our crops. Without the manure, an additional 100 tonnes of commercial fertilizer would have been required. For us, we just wish our neighbours would build another 2,000-hog feeder barn so we wouldn't have to buy this additional fertilizer.

My wife and I currently farm with our seven sons and have been consistently expanding our farming operation for close to 30 years, now. While Bill 17 doesn't identify cattle, we know that the dairy industry is just as confined as the hog industry is in Manitoba, especially in the southeast. We are very concerned that the next time the NDP wants to achieve some political points it will target our industry and probably the cattle industry also. It always seems much easier for people to accuse someone else than to come up with a solution to the real problems.

It's a rainy day outside today and the sewage system in Winnipeg is overflowing into the river. If our manure systems were running into the river, we'd be immediately shut down. If a better sewage system is built you'd still end up with all the phosphorus and nitrogen, and you've just pretty much banned spreading additional nutrients anywhere but within, I don't know, probably a hundred miles of Winnipeg now. Where are you going to take that? Where are you going to take the sludge?

To me, our farm is about exciting my kids about the opportunity to farm. You know, and with seven sons at home it's just such a great source of pride, to watch them take the reins of the farm and let me come here and spend the day at the Legislature. They're doing a great job at it, but they're only going to be excited about the farm if they can grow the farm. If they know that, five years down the road, they're going to be doing the same thing they're

doing today, they're going to go out and find other opportunities.

My sons are all well educated. The oldest few are all through university already, and they have all kinds of opportunities to avail themselves of. They've chosen to be farmers because they enjoy the challenge of it.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. My question to you is, you alluded to the manure being a great product for you and saving having to buy the synthetic fertilizers. With Bill 17, what is this going to do to that opportunity down the road and what do you see Bill 17 having to do with the future of your seven sons, the way they'll be farming, the way you expanded in the past 30 years?

**Mr. Verhoog:** I think, at this point, further expansion of our farm is certainly questionable in our area because, you know, our farms are only viable if they can keep expanding into the future, and that's why we chose the area to move in that we did. There was lots of land available and we'd be able to successfully continually expanding our farm. The more immediate effect, I would assume, is that we will not get any more hog manure to spread on our land, and so, as we grow our land base on our farm, we'll have to buy more commercial fertilizer.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Verhoog, I've got a number of questions, but the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) is responsible for Agriculture, obviously. I mean, they wouldn't call her the Minister of Agriculture or Madam Minister of Agriculture if she wasn't responsible for Agriculture.

So the question No. 1 is, have you heard her coming out and saying: We support the hog industry. We do not want a moratorium. Do you hear her coming out and saying, we support the dairy industry and their slurry stores? Or are you afraid that perhaps your dairy industry will be next on the list to be in a moratorium?

**Mr. Verhoog:** For sure. We're concerned that we won't be able to expand our dairy farm in the future, and I have no interest in doing the same thing five or 10 years down the road that I'm doing today. We'll close up our farm and we'll go elsewhere.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Verhoog—I won't have to holler, thank you—Mr. Verhoog, you came to Manitoba from where, and who runs the family farm and why did you come here, and who runs the family farm where you came from?

**Mr. Verhoog:** Yeah. I started farming in the U.S. I moved to Ontario, and 10 years ago we came to Manitoba. I grew up in the city. I wasn't a dairy farmer. My father was a farmer years and years ago but sold it when I was very young; learned to farm with my uncles. We came to Manitoba because there was lots of low-priced land and I had lots of room to expand.

**Mr. Graydon:** The land that you currently farm today, the production of that land prior to the application of natural fertilizer, was it very productive?

\* (21:00)

**Mr. Verhoog:** It's remarkable to see the change in our farm over the last 10 years, you know. We've cleared the bush, made the fields square. Got rid of the stone piles, picked the stones, added millions and millions of gallons of dairy manure and hog manure to the land. Now we have fertile soil. Now we grow crops that no one thought were possible to grow in our area. We grow grain, corn, we get well over a hundred bushels to the acre on land that crop insurance won't even let us get insurance on. It's just amazing what'll happen when the soil fertility is fixed. There's no comparison from farming with fertilizer comparing it to farming with manure. Manure's just increased the capacity of the soil so much more.

**Mr. Briese:** Thank you for your presentation. I know you've heard a couple of others touch on it earlier today but, in your view, are the regulations, such as the manure handling and mortalities, the regulations that are in the planning act, and the local municipal by-laws sufficient to fit the needs that are out there, at the present time, on the planning in the agricultural area?

**Mr. Verhoog:** Unfortunately, our R.M. still doesn't have a development plan. That is still a bone of contention in our area. We worked on development plans for years and years. I still don't know where that's heading for.

Our farm has done an environmental farm plan. We've done several programs under that to control nutrient management on the farm. We take care of our manure. We look in our lagoon; we look at that

and say, there are a million gallons of manure there; we can grow 200 acres of corn with that. That's how we look at it. It's just another valuable resource on the farm.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Verhoog.

Is it the will of the committee to allow Mr. Joel Grenier, No. 47, to present at this time as he and Mr. Verhoog travelled here together and that would allow them to leave? *[Agreed]*

I call Mr. Joel Grenier. Mr. Grenier, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Joel Grenier (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Give them to the Clerk. They will distribute them and you may begin when ready

**Mr. Joel Grenier:** My name is Joel Grenier. I'm 24 and I'm from the southeast corner of the province, in the shrinking community of St. Labre. I volunteer and coach at École St. Joachim in La Broquerie which is 55 kilometres away. I own a house in St. Labre; I pay taxes on that house and in general. High-speed Internet and full cell phone reception is a myth where I'm from. It's awful.

*Madam Vice-Chairperson in the Chair*

I work part time on the family hog operation and I'm employed full time on the neighbouring dairy operation. I make my living in direct relation to agriculture.

I've travelled throughout western Canada, participating and organizing mock parliaments and have taken on several different roles in the process. I do this to try to get younger people involved in politics but, also, to help them develop public speaking skills. We usually develop far-fetched and extreme bills to create debate and get opinions stirring. One of the bills we had passed was kicking out Newfoundland from Canada, because some of them seemed to be the butt end of most jokes and high precipitation.

To me, Bill 17 is just as far-fetched as some of the mock bills we've debated before. The difference now is that this real. Now I'm not expecting that my presentation will change anyone's opinion here, but I might as well try.

Farming has changed. White picket fences are a thing of the past, and family operations have gotten bigger or disappeared, purely based on economics. Bill 17 singles out the hog industry in an unfair

manner. I would imagine the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) will speak up against Bill 17, because it should be her duty and mandate to stick up and defend any form of agriculture in Manitoba, including hog operations.

I don't see the relevance of passing this bill. It strips away faith from all the Manitoba farmers and also removes any credibility which used to be given out to the technical review committees. Technical review committees take a long process at evaluating land mass—and I stress the long process part—animal units, soil types, water densities and locations. This is already in place to ensure a co-existence between agriculture and the environment. This committee has access to the knowledge and information necessary to make proper decisions concerning any form of agriculture.

I don't understand why hogs are getting unfairly singled out. This seems like a stepping stone to eventually ban any other form of agriculture in all of Manitoba. All of a sudden, Saskatchewan does not seem that far away or even such a bad idea. They even have a Grey Cup right now. The whole idea of outright banning hogs in certain areas based on media-created public fears is ridiculous and ignorant. Manure is manure is manure. Whether it's from hogs, dairy, broilers, dogs or even cats, it's still natural and is easily returnable to the land. The difference between our hogs and most dogs and cats is that, whenever they defecate, we do not put it in a plastic bag and throw it at the dump. Managed properly, the whole of idea of manure being used as a fertilizer works and is safe. This bill does not work in conjunction with the results of the lengthy and thorough report by the CEC.

If this bill passes, I don't think there is much of a future for agriculture in the province of Manitoba. The blame game only goes so far, and right now the hog sector is being blamed unfairly. Which industry will get targeted next? It's a scary question.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Grenier, thank you very much for your presentation. I chided you earlier today, when I bought you dinner, that your brother was better than you, but I don't think he is.

You are a fifth-generation farmer on the same land. Would you say that agriculture today is still a family farm as it was when your ancestors came here and is run as a sustainable business today, the same as your father and your grandfather and the

grandfather before him did to feed and educate their families? Is it still as sustainable today as it was then?

**Mr. Grenier:** Sustainable in the sense that we are not causing effect on the land. We are only promoting growth into the land, where whatever we take out, we put back in, which includes the manure. So I would say for now it is sustainable.

I learned from my father that whatever we do to the land, we have to make sure that it's there for the next generation to come up. But if this bill passes, I definitely see that it will affect the future in our farm.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Thank you for the presentation, Mr. Grenier. You're a pretty political astute guy. I liked your motion about Newfoundland, but I don't want you to give these guys any more ideas here.

Minister Struthers is a pretty good guy when we get him away from Bill 17, and he does listen to reason. I was even at an event one time where he actually said I was a pretty good guy, too. So I had to balance it off here.

But the Premier (Mr. Doer) came in and made his cameo appearance here tonight to show that he has listened to producers. But I think the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) needs an out on this. He needs an exit strategy to get out of this. Do you have some suggestions as to what he could do to extricate himself out of Bill 17?

Everybody knows you can't lose face. This was done to placate a sector that knows nothing about farming. Can you offer some suggestions to the Minister of Conservation as to how he can extricate himself out of this mess that he's dug himself into?

**Mr. Grenier:** In a political manner? After watching question period today, anything goes, it seems. But, overall, I would suggest just to remove this bill entirely. It would be the easiest way for anyone. I believe farmers—well, I would hope farmers would be ready to move on.

We already have so many regulations in place to worry about to begin with. It's scary that this bill is already proposed, but if we could get rid of it instantaneously, then perhaps we could continue.

\* (21:10)

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. I do have a question for you. The nutrient management regulations have just been passed and are starting to be implemented throughout the province. In the CEC

report, nowhere did it say anything about a moratorium. However, if the minister was to sit down with the Manitoba Pork Council, adapt the changes and put them into regulation, could your operation meet those regulations if they were negotiated in good faith with the minister through the Manitoba Pork Council?

**Mr. Grenier:** I'm sure after we follow through with our mandatory manure management plan which we've been following for the past, I believe, five years if not more, that we're already matching regulations and that we could adapt to the phosphorus regulations easily and we could move on. We're always opening up land every year just to try to accommodate for everything, add value to our land that we already own and add value in the crops. I believe we can adapt. Well, we will adapt, obviously, but we have to; it's part of the business. I believe we're not causing any damage already, but if that's the next stepping stone that we have to take to be allowed to farm in Manitoba—which has been a rough, rough ride lately—it is doable.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Grenier.

Mr. Siemens is here and he has two children with him—No. 257. So, in keeping with what we had put on the record before, the committee calls Gordon Siemens to make his presentation. Mr. Siemens also rode in together with his brother, who is also named Mr. Siemens, who is No. 123 on your presenters list, Stan Siemens.

Is there leave from the committee for Stan Siemens to follow Gordon Siemens for presentations so they can both head back to their farm or wherever it is, I'm assuming it's a farm. So they can both go back out of town. *[Agreed]*

Thank you.

Mr. Siemens you can proceed. Do you have any written materials you wanted to circulate?

**Mr. Gordon Siemens (Castlewood Farms):** No, I don't.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Mr. Gordon Siemens, please proceed.

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** Good evening. I'm Gordon Siemens. I'm the managing shareholder of our family hog operation. We started it 10 years ago on the advice of government to diversify since at that point we were six brothers and one sister. Six brothers were farming land together. We had a total of 6,000

acres. At that time, grain farming wasn't doing that well. So we got into hogs to feed our grain. We continued on with that. The manure was a definite bonus that we got out of the hogs. Currently, we are running 8,000 feeders and 4,400 nursery, which is the new, I would say, generation of what a family farm looks like. The 20 hogs and 20 chickens, that unfortunately doesn't pay the bills anymore.

We have also applied for a permit to expand our operation because we are looking for more manure in our neighbourhood. We are in the Red River district, just 10 miles east of Morris. We actually are trying to produce as much manure and phosphates, nitrogen as we can because we've got 2,500 to 3,000 acres around our barns, which, at the current fertilizer prices, gets very costly.

Along with that, we have started a manure pumping business, BMG Nutrient Management. The reason for that was we were not satisfied as grain farmers how the manure was being applied. So we went out and bought our equipment to apply it evenly, accurately, fully mapped, fully GPS'd so that we know what we're getting on the land so that we can grow crops correctly and better.

Along with the operation, which still includes five brothers and a sister, we have encouraged a water line to come to supply rural residents with water. If it wasn't for our operation and for the local colony, there would be some local residents that would still not have proper water supply, so there is a benefit with that.

So far as Bill 17 goes, it just doesn't make any sense. The regulations already are more than enough. As the manager of the barn, I'm getting dizzy with all the rules and regulations. I have enough of a challenge with the day-to-day operation. I don't need to deal with the manure management plan. Now, if the employment regulations with all that we need to expand so that we can hire a paper pusher to keep track of all the government regulations. We cannot justify paying for somebody just to sit in the office at the size that we're running, and I don't think we're a small operation any more.

Also, with the bill coming through, just like in Québec, is that what we want? That's a dying industry in that province. Killing plants are all moving out. There was comment earlier today that with Maple Leaf expanding, oh, now there'll be so many more feeder barns built. Well, our pigs are going south. We have no room in Manitoba for our pigs. They're going south. We were waiting for more

killing plant capacity in Manitoba. When the bill was announced, my understanding is there was a killing plant wanting to set up in Winnipeg, the second try in Winnipeg. Not going to happen. There was a shortage of space. Why do we want to be dependent on the U.S.? Why can we not be self-supportive? It makes no sense, exporting jobs. It just only makes sense to be as self-sufficient as possible and to encourage the kids to stay on the land, stay in the country. If we're not allowed to farm, unfortunately, again, we're almost forced to keep expanding with the regulations to try to justify the people in the office. Thank you very much.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. My question is in regard to your application for increase in your animal units, the permit that you applied for. How long ago did you apply for that? Was that before the pause or was it after the pause?

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** Yes.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you and what response have you received back from the Province on that application?

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** I was told just over a year ago that it would take three weeks to get our lagoon permit.

**Mr. Eichler:** Obviously, three weeks leads into a long time. We heard a similar story in one of the other presentations and obviously the department has dropped the ball on this. As a result of that, we have an operation such as yours who will now not be allowed to move forward if Bill 17 passes. What kind of signal does that send to the rest of the industry and other industries, in your opinion, within the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** Well, basically, the message is I'm checking my mailbox on a daily event waiting for the government to send me a letter to just shut the doors, get out, and go someplace else. It's just a slow death is what we're working on here. It's quite apparent that they're not really interested in business, free enterprise. They all believe that we're just a bunch of hick farmer polluters that should get off the face of the earth.

We're faming the land. We're living in the country. We've been there for years. We're improving our land. Our yields are going up and it's because of how we're maintaining. I mean, we've been soil testing our land for 15 years already making sure that we're not over-applying. With

fertilizer costs where they are and now, in turn, the manure to offset the fertilizer costs, you don't go dump a pile of money in a corner of your field. You want it applied properly and correctly.

\* (21:20)

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you, Mr. Siemens. I've listened to a lot of these presentations, and each and every one of you who've made the presentations stand at the podium and are recognized as true entrepreneurs and businessmen. I don't think the people across this table, or for that matter in this government, just realize what the ramifications are of this bill. You're a business that is being forced out of business. I learned a long time ago if you don't grow, you stagnate. If you stagnate, you decline. It sort of sounds like nine years of this government, to be perfectly honest, but I won't get into politics.

If you can't grow, your business is effectively in danger. You've got five brothers and a sister who depend on expansion of your operation in order to make a livelihood and I'm fearful for you. I really am.

What are you going to do if you can't expand your operation within the next five to 10 years? How are you going to be able to support your operation?

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** I am not sure what I am going to do to support my operation, but you want my honest feelings, what I've thought of? I'm thinking I should just go on welfare. Just get handouts and go from there. It seems like that's the route we're supposed to be going here because every time we try to do some business decisions, try to get ahead in life, we get legislated to death. So finally you get tired of it, and I'm not that old yet and I'm ready to give up.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Don't give up. There's going to be another government. Don't give up.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Mr. Borotsik, I'll recognize you so you can speak into the mike.

**Mr. Borotsik:** I'm sorry, Madam Vice-Chair. I'm getting excited here.

Don't give up. There will be a new government at some time if you can last another three years. If you can use your nutrient-spreading business that you've got going right now—hang in there, would you please? Because we need people like you, we need people like we have out there in the audience right here. So hang in there. Thank you.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Mr. Siemens, did you want to respond?

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** I got no comment.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Siemens.

**Mr. Gordon Siemens:** Thank you.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** The committee calls Stan Siemens. Mr. Siemens, did you have written material you wanted to circulate?

**Mr. Stan Siemens (Private Citizen):** No.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** No. Please proceed, Mr. Siemens.

**Mr. Stan Siemens:** Thanks.

My name is Stan Siemens. I guess you know some of my history now. I'm a farmer and I'm a councillor in the R.M. of Morris. You've heard all the points that I was going to give you, but I'll repeat a few of them, I guess. It'll be short.

The reason we need to allow expansion in our municipality, I believe that our grain farmers would be at a disadvantage to the other areas where expansion is allowed because of the cost of fertilizer. We have found out first-hand the value of the nutrients instead of having to go buy chemical fertilizer.

Another reason, I think this bill is not needed because you already can't build where nutrients are not required. If you don't have spreading land available, you already can't build so this wouldn't change anything where there is enough already.

As a councillor, obviously the additional assessment would be great. It would sure take a load off the existing taxpayers. So whenever we spend too much, I guess it always helps to have a higher assessment.

The other thing that this bill is, it's unfriendly to the industry; driving away packing plants which the existing producers need to be profitable and for the jobs they provide. I think that's a bigger—I think we underestimate that. That's important if we're not seen as a province that's friendly to the industry. Also, the bill, if it were pushed through, I believe it's politically motivated and not environmentally motivated, and that the hog industry has been made a scapegoat so bigger polluters can have more time to solve their problems. I don't think this will help with Lake Winnipeg.

That's basically all I've got. You've heard the rest. Thanks.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

Are there questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Eichler:** I have to ask you a question. In regard to your operation, you talked about expansion—and I know you came with your brother and you want to get going, but I do want to have it on the record about your feelings about how Bill 17 will impact the next generation.

**Mr. Stan Siemens:** Well, just for the fact that, on a family farm, if we're treated like we've got one operation now, when our kids—I mean, our kids aren't going to be able to each have an operation or even if they would like to share one, they're not going to be able to expand the one that we have now. Even as we also grain farm, we're going to have to keep buying more and more chemical fertilizer if they decide to expand in that direction because we've only got so much manure. We've got more grain land than we have manure for.

**Mr. Eichler:** Further to that, with the current Bill 17, the way it's laid out, is that even though you can justify that you have the land base in order to apply more manure to, you will still not be allowed to expand your operation. How does that sit with your organization?

**Mr. Stan Siemens:** Well, it's, I mean it's—

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** I have to recognize you. Just one second, Mr. Siemens.

**Mr. Stan Siemens:** Yeah, I think it's unfortunate. Like, specifically, our area, it puts us at a disadvantage, not only the hog farmers, but also, like I said, the grain farmers. I know what it's like on your fertilizer bill. The grain land that we have near the barn has quite an advantage because we're just topping up with a little bit of fertilizer instead of buying it all.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much your presentation, Mr. Siemens.

For the information of the committee, I'm at the will of the committee, we have a couple of presenters who have come in with another presenter who has already spoken. Mr. James Hofer has already spoken, No. 13, and No. 76, Bennett Hofer and No. 107, Stephen Hofer apparently came together and they would like to present at this time. What is the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

So, the committee calls Bennett Hofer, No. 76 on the list. Mr. Hofer. Did you have written information you wanted to circulate?

**Mr. Bennett Hofer (Private Citizen):** Yes.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Okay. Just one moment.

Mr. Hofer, you can proceed.

**Mr. Bennett Hofer:** Well, good evening. I never thought I'd make it here on such an important issue to be in the Legislature. But hopefully, this will all clear out and we'll have some brighter skies ahead of us. Like, outside, it's actually clearing up. Maybe that's a sign.

My name is Bennett Hofer. I live at Starlite Colony. I'm blessed with two daughters, a loving wife. Farming, raising hogs is the only way of life for me. I can't actually believe that I'm here, that we who have registered to fight Bill 17 are here, have been here. Look at us. We are not government people. We don't belong here. It's almost like what we're doing is crazy. Fighting, arguing with intelligent, knowledgeable people, people that are supposed to look out and prevent these things from happening. Just think about it. You all know that it's wrong, unjust and foolish to accuse an industry for doing something that it is not at fault for doing.

\* (21:30)

I want to bring something to your attention. Have you ever thought it through, the kind of people you actually are? I want to bring you back in time a little. I thought about this for quite some time. Our government. That word is key. I looked up the word "government," but before I did, I thought to myself, "govern" and "ment." It is this word doing and the people—are the people governing the mentality of a nation? I can't see it. So, in my office, as a feed mill manager, I have one of those old red-orange dictionaries. It's called the *Winston Canadian Dictionary for Schools*. Maybe we have to go back to school. I looked up the word "government." It says control or management. I'll repeat that: control or management, as the government of a nation. School. Learn. Teach the people. The system is governing. Method of ruling is a democratic government. Person or persons who govern. A territory or a country governed.

The word says it all. The first meaning in the dictionary, control or management—not ban or freeze, but control.

Look at this from the end to the beginning, not from the beginning to the end. You will see that it will never work, or is this not crossing your mind? Will you not be around to have to worry about this? Is this all about pleasing a certain type of people in a certain area, getting what you want?

The numbers to stay in government—again, think about that word, government of a nation—not a city or a town or a busload of governors. Bring yourself back to reality; stand up for what is right. Stand up for the kind of people we respect you for.

Look at this. Find out where the problem is and tell those people who are causing this high level of phosphorus to stop doing what they are doing.

It's a like a song that comes to mind now: Don't judge your neighbour, / You're not the one to say he's wrong, / Clean out your own house, / Sweep out your own house.

We are doing everything to minimize this problem of phosphorus in the lake. What is the city doing? Look at your own studies, the work your own universities have done, your own people. I cannot imagine working for you people and having my work go so unnoticed and out in the blue. You are the government, one who governs as a board of governors, the head of a British colony.

While we're talking about water, God said, let the water below be separate from the water above. What is the problem? Are the fish dying? Are people getting skin cancer from the sun, or the water?

We also had somebody here that was talking about the energy crisis and all this. He's flying around in a plane, taking pictures. I wrote down here, it does not matter what it looks like on the pictures taken. There's an old saying: Looks are only skin-deep. You talk about an energy crisis—park the plane and let's take a walk.

As my brother, James, stated, \$10,000 for a permit by Conservation. Do we look like we have \$10,000 bills hanging somewhere? Do you need money for research? Ask for it. Don't make these ridiculous requests. On a \$130,000 cover that we told you, as good neighbours, we'll put on to eliminate the smell for our neighbours, for ourselves, now you want us to spend another \$10,000 to do that.

I guess the next commercial on that one we'll hear, folks, going to the lake this evening or this weekend? Slap on some phos-screen. I guess it's the phosphorus that's killing them, not the sunscreen.

Leave the sunscreen at home and take the phos-screen. Maybe we should start manufacturing that stuff.

To elaborate a bit, does an oil well ever start pumping water or a water well, oil? I don't think so. Our wells have not been so recording yet; maybe they'll kick in soon.

Then I want to say, let's take marriage, as an example. When you ban two people from talking to each other and when they don't talk any more, then you have divorce, and it's ugly, and the children don't want to go through it.

We feel that this was done just to do something. Someone once told me, if you have nothing to do, then don't do it here. We are a heart-and-soul industry. This just did not happen overnight. Think about it. Do you think it's a pleasure working in a barn 365 days of the year in these circumstances, not knowing where the road leads and who is supporting you? Burgers, pizza, hot dogs, steak, pasta and beer does not fall from the sky. This is serious. This is agriculture. It is all we know. It is what we do best. We are not doing this just to do something. It's all for a good cause, for food to feed a nation and beyond.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

Please reconsider this. Take it to heart so that we can look back and you can look back and say, we made the right decision, a sound decision. Please reconsider this bill and be a true north strong and free. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Hofer. I'll open the floor to questions. I have Mr. Eichler.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. Well done, and I want to congratulate your colony on your recent award in regard to education and the efforts that you do to try and help bring urban and rural together.

My question for you is, why would the Department of Conservation levy a \$10,000 permit for you to put your cover on? Did they give you any written explanation in regard to that permit?

**Mr. Bennett Hofer:** No, I have not seen it.

**Mr. Eichler:** So what you are telling me is we have a government, where you're trying to help the environment, be a good neighbour, be a good steward of the land, and yet the government wants to turn around and give you a \$10,000-permit fee in

order to be that role model that you're trying to establish.

**Mr. Bennett Hofer:** Yes.

**Mr. Briese:** I didn't hear your presentation, but I heard a couple here before that mentioned their payrolls. I know that's done a little differently on a Hutterite colony, but I don't think the members opposite are really getting the whole ripple effect of this industry.

I don't know whether you would know, but I'm just wondering what your hydro bill is on your colony, what your Autopac is on your colony, because that ripple effect goes out there and goes a heck of a lot further than just the hog industry. I was wondering if you had a rough idea of those figures.

**Mr. Bennett Hofer:** Well, I obviously don't use more hydro than you would in your home, if you have that number. I'm not in charge of the financials of the colony. If you have that number, you can easily quadruple it, I guess, because there's 25, 30 families there.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much, Ben, for your presentation. I want to get a little clarification in terms of this \$10,000 that you've talked about, and others.

My understanding is that's not a fee payable to the Department of Conservation. My understanding is that's a charge levied by the environmental consultant that you're working with because this is a major alteration to a primary cell. Is that the case? Are you paying this to the government or to a consultant?

\* (21:40)

**Mr. Bennett Hofer:** It's to my understanding that we've had several hearings in Winnipeg here with our neighbours pertaining to this odour that they're getting, and one of their suggestions was, cover your lagoon. We couldn't come up with the money and, finally, we found somebody that's willing to install this tarp at no charge to burn off the carbon, what's the word, methane. It's at that time when they came and said, oh, now we want \$10,000. It was never mentioned before that, to my understanding. Why has it never been mentioned before?

**Mr. Struthers:** Well, it's a long-standing practice. Our government, the government before us that we're talking about here—and I need you to be clear on just who's getting the \$10,000 because it's my contention that it's not the provincial government that's getting

that money. It's a private consulting engineer that charges the \$10,000, not the Department of Conservation.

**Mr. Bennett Hofer:** You have a very valid statement, and I often wonder who's getting a lot of money and where is it going.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. No further questions. I thank you for your presentation, sir.

As agreed, I will call presenter No. 107, Steven Hofer. Mr. Hofer, do you have any written documentation— *[interjection]* Pardon me, you do. Okay.

**Mr. Steve Hofer (Private Citizen):** One page, yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. We'll have Mr. Hofer's presentation. You may begin, sir.

**Mr. Steve Hofer:** It is my pleasure to—not my pleasure but my great dishonour to be here, to do this. I'll read this and then I'll stop and add on to whatever comes out. We don't do this every day. Might be a little bit scared here, but we're going to do her. Okay.

So, hi, I'm Steve Hofer. I live at Starlite Colony farm with my wife and five children, four boys and one girl, Rodney, 15, Aaron, 12, Curtis, 10, Joel, seven, and Stephanie, two. Farming is our life. A ban on new hog barns is what brings me here today to tell you what this means to me and the future of my family.

Yesterday I discussed this with my family that I had to be here today to speak to this bill. The look on my boys' faces was sad. They said: Dad, what will we do in the future if they stop the building of new hog barns?; that's stupid. That's the statement from my boys. That comes from their heart. Those kids were shaking.

I've had two phone calls here today. Dad, how is it going? Have you spoken? The whole colony, there are 60 kids there, they're all totally broken, scared of their future: What is my dad or our dads going to do in the future? It's a very serious condition here.

My oldest boy, Rodney, said, dad, I wish I could come with you, but I have to get ready for exams. Hog farming has been our source of income all our lives. I worked in a hog farm when I—or in the barns when I was 15 years old for many years. Now I'm currently the boss of our turkey operation. My brother, James, spoke here. He's the manager of our hog operation at home. My brother, Ben, last

speaker, he runs a feed mill. It is in our family. It's in our blood. It's what we do.

To grow food for the world is what we do best. Studies show that Manitoba is one of the cheapest places in the world to grow food. A ban on hog barns is the wrong thing to do for Manitoba. With all the people starving in the world, we should grow more food not less. That would help our local economy and our government.

Government has put in place a lot of new rules. We have complied with all of them. Example, longer or bigger manure storage tanks; amount of phosphorus applied; days to spread manure, like not in the winter and things like that; testing of land where manure will be applied; and many more. All of these changes have cost us and the hog farmers in Manitoba a lot of money. Just for an example, these adjustments that we've made—larger hog storage, testing manure—in the last five years, it's cost us a half million dollars. New ploughs to apply manure, new monitors to see how much manure we're adding, a lot of this is not all bad. There's some good behind it. But, now we need to expand and get some money back from these expansions and further costs. It can't stop there.

Let's take a look at the city of Winnipeg. New homes are being built daily, population growing daily. I'm sure the hospitals—there's work there. Would it be right to say, no more growth for the city? No, absolutely not. Stopping growth has never been the answer in anything.

Studies done have shown that hog farms are not all the cause of phosphorus levels in Lake Winnipeg. I talked to a farmer in North Dakota. He said that there are many farms that have their cattle on rivers and creeks in the winter, when the ice is frozen, on the ice. They brag that they don't have to clean out their pens from manure; the spring flood does a great job at that. All the water ends up in Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba farmers get the blame. That is happening, people.

We are at a stage where we are building a new colony for our children. We cannot build pig barns where we bought land. That is a real financial downfall for us. If you think it is so easy to just—you say, move, there's lots of space available. Out of this room today, there's people in the back that live on the outside of the moratorium. There's people that own land. Do you think—just say, here, buy my land; it's for sale. People think twice. The map is full of places, but not everything is available. It cannot be

done as easy as saying, oh, go outside the moratorium. It just doesn't happen that way.

Rosann, we've had the honour to have you at many turkey meetings speaking to us, saying, go ahead guys, get out there and grow food for the rest of the world. Where did that message stay? I plead with you. I am totally serious.

I had the honour—I went out to a washroom break—and I met the Premier (Mr. Doer) as he walked into his office. I knocked on the door and went in. I says, can I have a word with you. He says, yes. I says, you know what? You should be in there listening. This all—you should be the hub, you're the hub. You should hear every single word that we're saying in there and he says, yes, but I have to be at different committee meetings. Maybe so, I says, but you know what? You're taking away a life and a business of many, many families in Manitoba. Many people are affected by this. It's not just the people working there, not just the people owning the farms; it is the ripple effect—the implement dealers, the local town schools. It just goes way beyond the farm.

I had a good discussion with him and I says, it is really—it is sad to come here today to argue for our livelihood or the longevity of our industry, that government has pulled that on us. I says, where's the research? Because every time you get up and speak at meetings, you promise us, go and feed the world—those are your words, Rosann. How can you feed the world with a ban? Don't give me this crap about get outside the ban and build. Okay. You would be the first to say, don't buy a car from North Dakota; spend your money here, support local economy. What you're saying, well, get out. That is not right, absolutely not right.

I'm getting a little excited here. But, I have reasons. Okay.

Please reconsider Bill 17 for the future of our children. This bill is very important to us, and it's our children, meaning anybody that is totally involved in the hog industry, not even in the hog industry, in a ripple effect—the feed industry, the implement, the gas dealer, the grocery store. It just goes so far. And you—what you ate today comes from our farms. I hope you people eat food or like meat, vegetables, it doesn't matter. It comes from these farms, people.

Our people, talking about Hutterite people, have moved away from government rules before. From the old country, we moved out because of persecution. We will do this again, if you force it

upon us, and this will go down in history as a sad, sad situation.

We have spent a lot of money to stay on top with technology, trying to stay on top with all the rules coming down. You people have put in place some good rules, but this one is not a good one.

\* (21:50)

I had a chance to talk with Doer, like I said earlier. I said, Mr. Doer, I'm a turkey producer. I sit on the Manitoba turkey board. I said, who are you going target next? We want to get ready for this. He says, I promise we're not targeting anybody after this. I said, let's shake on it. He shook on it. I said, please drop this one. Let's just get on with it. Let's go home. Why spend all this time staying up late every night arguing like kids? It's just not right.

Another point here—the Red River never freezes solid in winter. I wonder why?

I remember as a kid coming to Winnipeg with my dad, hauling a load of hogs. I was proud as punch. I got food on my truck, I'm hauling it to Winnipeg. There's no more killing pens in Winnipeg. You would have never told me that this industry is going to shut down in Winnipeg. No hog killing facility, it's just unbelievable.

The river never freezes. Why? You can go north, people are just—solid creek, they're on the river, they're Ski-Dooing. You can go south, they're Ski-Dooing. The message here is, there is so much whatever you call it, water, sewage, something warm is leaking into that river all winter long, it is preventing it from freezing. It is not the farmers' fault. We're not spreading manure all winter long but yet that river doesn't freeze in 30, 40 below. It could be winter for years, that sucker still wouldn't freeze.

If you put in this bill I suggest that your government take a pay—does not take a pay increase this year. If you put in this bill, everybody every year—

**Mr. Chairperson:** You're at 10 minutes, Mr. Hofer.

**Mr. Steve Hofer:** Everybody, every year, needs a pay increase or wants one. I suggest you don't take one because that's what you're putting on us farmers. You guys are not getting a pay increase. You can't stay up with the Joneses, okay?

If you're saying that we have maintained—okay, where am I here—if you're saying that we have to maintain our life with no increases—example, can you

still fill a car with gas for 20 bucks? Nobody. Can you buy a car for \$10,000? Nobody can. Can you build a house for \$50,000? Those days are all past. Now you're saying to us guys, whatever you got is what you got. You cannot expand, you can't build, you can't grow. That is a serious situation.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Mr. Hofer, for an excellent presentation. It was a genuine, from-the-heart presentation and you don't ever have to apologize for being passionate about how you feel.

Mr. Hofer, we have heard presenters come to this table in the last few days, some for and many, many, many against this moratorium, but some that came in favour of the moratorium. They spoke out and said that Manitoba Pork was perhaps paying the Hutterite colonies to come and speak against the moratorium. They also—we heard the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) say that she was meeting with the Hutterite brethren to address their concerns.

Now, I'm going to ask you two questions. Is Manitoba Pork paying you to make presentations? And if the Minister of Agriculture was to offer you a deal for the Hutterite brethren, only for the Hutterite brethren, not for the rest of Manitoba, would you accept it?

**Mr. Steve Hofer:** What a bunch of crap, where'd you get that? Absolutely false. No Manitoba hog board or council has paid us to come here. This comes from the heart. I'm telling you people, okay?

Rosann, if you had a talk with somebody, you didn't do it openly if you did. To congregate us, you'd have to probably rent the MTS Centre over there because that would surely fill up. I guarantee you, you would have a lot of people saying a lot of things. It is serious. We are just totally blown away by this. We are hurt by this.

Let me tell you, if this goes through, we're going down swinging, we're going down swinging. We're talking against the U.S., what they're doing to us with this free trade stuff, chances of putting that out. Our own government is doing this to us. Let's get home and clean up our own house here. It's just not right.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you and certainly appreciate your comments that you had with the Premier. Is this

the same Premier that misled you not once but twice and now he's shaking his hand with you saying there's no other industry that's going to be impacted? I would say you better be very careful.

**Mr. Steve Hofer:** I'm prepared. I will go out and meet him again. He shook on it. A man holds his word with a handshake. If he doesn't hold that and he says we're working with this hog and he just didn't say we're going to throw it out. We're going to go through the ripples here. I will be extremely disappointed and so will a lot of people, and if we want a civil war, you know it's happening.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Mr. Hofer, when you had your fireside chat with the Premier tonight, do you believe him?

**Mr. Steve Hofer:** I have always put full respect in government. Like Mavis said, my dad earlier. My dad's a minister. I guess she read the prayer. We pray for government every day. It's very important to us. Government and government rules are what let us into this country. It's very important to us, and it's a very touching situation here.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much for your presentation. You seem like the kind of guy that'll give me some straight up advice so I want to learn more about the Starlite Colony. When you get to a certain size, you make a decision that you will set up another colony split out from—[interjection] You might want more than just water. At a certain size, you have a spinoff of a part of your colony from the Starlite Colony. Is that done because you've reached a certain size and the land that you have won't sustain bigger numbers so you need to move to another part of the province where that split off colony can begin?

**Mr. Steve Hofer:** That is correct. It works the same way as in your home. Your kids don't stay there till they're old and married. They move on because of space, employment and just plain—what's the word? Anyway, a Hutterite colony, when they reach a certain number of around 150 to 160, they do split up because of employment. We only intend to get so and so big to employ let's say 15 families and that's all our intentions to be. Then we branch off and start another community. Our life is usually focussed around land farming and the livestock industry. It has been all my life. For many, many years, the livestock has been our main focus.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Time has expired. I thank you for your presentation, sir.

I call Mr. Ken Rempel, No. 29. Mr. Rempel, do you have any written materials for the committee?

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

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

**Mr. Rempel:** My name is Ken Rempel and I farm at Elm Creek, Manitoba. As well, I work off the farm in agribusiness. I would like to give you my history, as well as tell you how Bill 17 could affect the lives of my three sons.

\* (22:00)

I am presently running a 500-acre grain farm as well as working at a full-time job. My wife is also working at a full-time job. I bought my present farm in 1971, a year after I got married. To help pay for the farm and support my family, I converted an old dairy barn and an old chicken barn into an 85-sow farrow-to-finish operation. This seems small by today's standards, but let me assure you it was a lot of work without the modern equipment used today. I used a wheelbarrow and a shovel.

I shipped between 1,500 and 2,000 pigs per year for a number of years till my barns were getting run-down. My brother was also in hogs and actually built a new barn on his yard. The reason I feel committed to help stop Bill 17 is that I have three sons that might want to come back to the farm. My brother is 64 years old and ready to retire. He would like to see my sons take over his farm as he has no children of his own. Even though he has a nice conditioned hog barn on his yard, it is much too small by today's standards and would need some renovations to bring it up-to-date for hog production. The way I understand Bill 17, they would not be able to improve—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. It's getting difficult to hear the presenter. Continue, sir.

**Mr. Rempel:** The way I understand Bill 17, they would not be able to improve the barn and increase the size of it for it to be a viable, profitable enterprise. Young farmers starting out cannot afford to buy a large grain farm. For my sons to have any chance of survival, they would have to find a way to supplement their income. What better way of doing this than to use something already on the farm? The barns have no value if you can't put pigs in them and my brother needs some payment for his barns if my sons would buy the farm. The outcome of this situation is that my brother is stuck with a hog farm

with no value. My sons can't afford to buy the farm if they can't use the barn. They also have no way to supplement their income on the farm. The only recourse for them would be to compete for jobs in the city and commute back and forth from the farm to the city. With the price of gas moving up at an alarming rate and our farm located 90 kilometres from Winnipeg, this option seems doomed as well.

My family has been farming for many generations, going back to Russia, before that in Prussia, and even further back to Holland in the 1700s. It's sad to think that 400-plus years of farming will come to an end because the best place in North America to raise hogs cannot be used. The clay in the Red River Valley basin is the most suited soil for hog lagoons that I know of. With the price of fertilizer going up and the waste of resources mining it, I think it's criminal not to grow this industry in the safe, well-managed way that Manitoba has been so proud of in recent years. People are starving in every part of the world, and we have the land to grow better crops with natural fertilizers. We are forced to pay ridiculous prices—up to \$1,500 a tonne for phosphorus last time I checked—for chemical fertilizers that will do nothing to rebuild our soil, where manure is known for its organic qualities. If I seem to be a bit frustrated, you are right. My wife and I raised four wonderful children on our farm. My grandchildren will never have the chance to grow up in the country and play and learn to work as their parents did. Somehow it just doesn't seem right, and as a side note, I had my fifth grandson born this morning.

I would ask your committee to really consider the implications of Bill 17 before it's too late. The future farmers of Manitoba need to have options, and if they don't get them, we could lose a whole generation of young people to agriculture.

Thank you for your time to speak today and please don't allow politics to spoil a wonderful province.

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

**Mr. Pedersen:** Ken, for those on the committee that don't know, we actually farmed side by side for many years and I'm sort of dating myself because—dating. Maybe I'm dating Ken because it was his kids that babysat our kids once upon a time, too. But you've got extensive experience with Puratone Corporation, a major feed company in Manitoba. What are the implications to Puratone, not only what

you have seen right now—we've seen a downturn in the hog industry. It's caused a lot of rationalization, but if Bill 17 goes through, what's the effect to Puratone Corporation and possibly your own employment there?

**Mr. Rempel:** The effects, I think, probably are similar to every hog operation in the province because it's like somebody had said before: When you stop, you start to roll backwards, and for a company like the company I work for, that would be just as true as anything else. Unfortunately, a lot of companies as well as private farms have branched out in the U.S. They've tried to find ways to expand where they're allowed to in a sustainable way.

It's difficult for anybody to talk to bankers if there's any hint that what they're financing—nowadays to finance a hog operation, you're looking at 30 or 40 years, just like a farm or a house or anything large like that. It's a huge investment and I don't know of any bankers that are very comfortable with the situation we have right now.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. I do want to ask you a question. It's actually twofold, one with your business hat and one with your farming hat.

What kind of signal does Bill 17 send out to the business industry the way you see it? Also, what signal is it sending to the next generation of agricultural people that's going to be trying to take over the family farm or get into agriculture at the next level?

**Mr. Rempel:** I think the business community is puzzled because we've conformed, and I've been working very closely with livestock all my life. As Blaine knows, I've been in purebred cattle for 25 years. I have a lot of farming experience. I bought my first farm when I was 19 years old.

I've also had fairly extensive experience in business. I've managed feed mills in Arborg and Winkler, and I'm director of feed production for Puratone overall. So I have some experience behind my belt, both in agriculture, farming, and also on the other side. I've raised hogs personally and I've attended to the business side of raising hogs.

It's a balance. Anytime you work in agriculture, it's a balance between profitability—which we all have to have; I don't think any of us in this room can operate without showing a profit—and sustainability in the field that we're working in.

I think we have to remember that, and I urge the government to be very careful in what they do, because private farms, companies like ours, have always been very willing to accommodate anything that comes along, any new changes, legislation for the betterment of the environment.

The closest neighbour to a hog farm is the people working there. They have to drink the water. They have to shower in it every day, and so the last people that would even think of wanting to pollute the groundwater or farmland would be the people involved.

**Mr. Graydon:** The sustainability of agriculture, Mr. Rempel, you've been in agriculture for a number of years in a number of different sectors. The sustainability of, first of all, natural fertilizer for growing barley and feeding pigs versus the sustainability of anhydrous ammonia. Now, we understand with the natural fertilizer from livestock is registered. You have to register a plan. It's regulated by the government. The sustainability of the anhydrous ammonia, however, you can put on as much as you want.

Can you tell this committee what happens, first of all, the sustainability of either one, but what happens when you put anhydrous ammonia on the worms in the soil?

**Mr. Rempel:** Can I answer that on behalf of my own farm? I haven't used anhydrous. I used to use a lot of it. I haven't used it in years because of the fact that it does kill off a lot of the organisms in the soil. I'm not saying it's bad, I'm just saying that's my personal preference. I would welcome any kind of organic fertilizer. It's interesting that if you're organic farming, you can't put organic fertilizer—well, you can't put chemical fertilizer down, but a lot of the people that talk about how organic is good, the food in the cities and complain about the organic fertilizer, it's organic fertilizer that could be used to grow that food, not chemical fertilizer. But, my preference is not to use it, and I haven't for many years, but I'd love to. I wish I had a hog farm right next door that I could get the manure from.

**Mr. Struthers:** Yes, thank you very much, Ken.

I want your help with something. In the CEC report, they have a table which shows that, in 1990, there were 3,150 hog farms in Manitoba with 388 as an average per farm for a total of 3.2 million. That was in 1990. In '07—you've talked about growing the industry, and the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler)

just talked about sending signals to the business to grow the industry. Now, there's an environmental sustainability side to that in that how big can the industry grow before we do damage to the environment. I wanted to concentrate on the economic side of this.

It seems to me that the more we grow in the industry, the fewer people we have working in it. We've gone from 3,150 farms producing 3 million pigs to 1,280 farms, maybe with employees, but we've displaced about 1,800 farms, average size to each farm is 2,596 hogs for a total of 8.8 million. So we've gone from a lot of farmers at 3 million to not nearly as many farmers at 8.8 million and yet we talk about we want to grow the industry. Can you help me out on that?

\*(22:10)

**Mr. Rempel:** Oh, I'd love to. Thank you very much. I have this discussion with my brother every other day. My brother had a hog barn that I just talked about, 200, 300 pigs and he always came down on me about these big corporate farms. I said to him one day, you know, Fred, how many farmyards are in your farm? He said, well, I guess about five. I said, well, those were all profitable little farms at some point. What happened to these grain farms? Well, I guess they couldn't sustain themselves at their size. Oh, I said, how come your barn is empty? Well, I guess my hog barn couldn't sustain itself either.

So you get the message? Any farm in Canada—and you can look at grain farms, you can look at cattle farms, the percentage probably is very similar in all of that. Very similar. So it's not a question of what's sustainable. It's a question of that's just the way it goes. Why is Superstore out there when the corner grocery store can't make it anymore?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Supplemental, Mr. Struthers.

**Mr. Struthers:** So given that answer then, the more we grow the hog industry, the fewer people we're going to have working in it because that's what's economically sustainable. Is that right?

**Mr. Rempel:** No, because every time you got another farm, you're adding more people. It's a question of if you don't add the farms, your numbers will drop.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Well, first of all, Mr. Rempel, I want to thank you for being here tonight and congratulate you on the birth of your grandson. What a wonderful thing it is, and I'm sure you'd much

rather be with your family tonight rather than here, but obviously, this is a very important issue for you to be here.

I'm not sure what planet the minister's on with his last question, but you know, growing industry does not reduce jobs. What does reduce jobs and kill industry are things like moratoriums. I think that, you know, from that sort of line of thinking on his part, I just sort of wonder where we're going this evening.

You've had a long family history with respect to farming all over the world. You've also heard other presentations tonight. With respect to other people who are having similar concerns of your own, I'm just wondering if you could answer for us today, do you honestly believe that a moratorium will have any effect on the water quality in Lake Winnipeg, the moratorium on the hog industry?

If not—that's obviously where the government is going with this bill—if it doesn't, should they not then just pull the bill?

**Mr. Rempel:** I've never openly talked about any of the issues I'm going to just make a few comments on right now, but I think we're at 10:15 on probably the third day of this. I need to make a few comments.

I have a cottage on Lake Winnipeg. I'm just as concerned about Lake Winnipeg water as anybody else. Moratoriums in areas where there's very good control isn't the answer. I have a few questions. I'll just put a few comments out there and allow people to answer them, maybe whatever way they can, at some point.

I'm puzzled that the City of Winnipeg sludge can be put on farmland at 600 pounds of actual nitrogen per acre. Farmers have to sign that they're not going to put other fertilizer down for five years, but they are allowed to put on 600 pounds of actual N from city sludge. It puzzles me because, on any kind of a hog farm, you'd be—I shouldn't say crucified for it—but you'd be fined very heavily for it.

A City worker told me a few years ago that they're not allowed to put raw sewage in the river, unless some equipment breaks down, but he said, somehow, by the 27th or so of every month, their equipment breaks down because they're out of money to treat the sewage. I'll stop there. No, I won't; I'll make one more comment.

A few years ago, I was driving on the highway and I saw a lagoon, liquid from a lagoon running

down the ditch, five feet deep. The lagoon is a quarter of a mile from the river. I quickly phoned the local municipality and I said, what's going on here? Your lagoon must have sprung a leak.

He said, no, twice a year, we're allowed to—all the towns along Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipeg—Gimli is very environmentally clean; they have a pipe that goes out a mile from the shore, but are allowed twice a year to empty their waste into the—but it's clean; it's just clear water, running off the lagoon.

So when I talked to Environment about it, they said that it's human need. We can't afford to do the things we should do for humans, because it's human need. Farmers—it doesn't matter if we're losing money, like we are now so badly, we still follow the rules. I'm going to end it there.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Rempel.

I have, with leave of the committee, according to an elder—Mr. Eichler—we have a young man here who has an exam tomorrow and it's unknown if he will be able to return. He's looking for leave to present right now. Agreeable? *[Agreed]*

Okay, I call presenter No. 112, Leonard Maendel. Mr. Maendel, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Leonard Maendel (Private Citizen):** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You do? Okay, the Clerk will distribute them and you may begin when ready.

**Mr. Leonard Maendel:** Good evening. My name is Leonard Maendel. I am 16 years old. I'm reading this speech for Jonathan Kleinsasser, because he could not attend. He's on the way home from the World Expo in Iowa.

We farm south of Winnipeg in Ste. Agathe. I want to thank our honourable members, MLAs, for listening to our concerns and taking the time to try and come out with a fair reasonable solution for Bill 17 and the moratorium that has been the cause of a lot of frustration and ill will to all our hog producers in this province.

As a citizen of this world on a global level, an important point I would like to make is that the hog industry is a major food producer for our county and many other hungry places in the world. I truly believe that our real values are at stake and have been reversed. As food producers, we are very important to this world in general. We produce food.

But we are being painted as culprits by the masses of people that eat this food and also carry the majority votes in political decisions. We can do without many material things in our lives and many people do, but we will always need food.

\* (22:20)

Instead of the appreciation and praise for doing a great job we are named and picked out as polluters and as people who don't care about the clear water supply and environment. We are being intimidated to the point where many farmers are not the proud farmers they truly should be. How many young Canadian farmers consider this a noble and respectful way to make a living to serve our country?

As a Manitoba citizen, in my humble opinion this whole moratorium is premature and out of order. I believe that it's contrary to our valuable justice system in this country. In our justice system you are innocent until proven guilty. With this moratorium you are guilty at first count and now have to prove yourself innocent. While you are busy doing this there shall be no more expansions of this industry. Is this morally correct?

As a Hutterite I want to make this statement. Generations before and after us live on the same farms. We absolutely do not want to pollute the water we drink, the land we farm nor the water in our lakes. We pass our farms on to our children with a good conscience as good stewards of our land and water. We love our families, our children and grandchildren. My grandchildren will always remember the wonderful times they had fishing in the Red River with their grandfather.

My grandparents, parents and I were born on a farm in close proximity to a hog barn and I've always made a living, primarily from raising grain and livestock. From a health perspective, we would never have traded living on a farm versus living in a city. Even though not everybody likes the smell of pigs, we live with it and do not know of anyone that ever got sick or suffered severe symptoms from that environment. Many of us spent years working in pig barns and are none the worse for having done that. Having said that, I also know that the environment in the barns have improved a lot since I worked there because of technological advances in heating and ventilation.

I want to add here that I am 66 years old, and I have no serious health problems. Crystal Spring Colony, where I live, was established in 1954. We

have 33 families and a 500-sow farrow-to-finish hog facility literally within a stone's throw from where most of us live. Hutterite colonies depend on hog farms to make a living. For most of them it is their largest single income and to restrict this industry is to restrict their livelihood.

So why is this happening? We are by far the easiest target. First of all, we cannot and do not go on strike like workers in other industries. Our products are perishable. They cannot be stored and stockpiled like dry goods. This makes us very vulnerable, helpless and defenceless. We depend on the elected government for support and survival.

In all of this I am not trying to defend careless and senseless pollution on a hog farm, if that's where it comes from. We know and you know that there is much higher percentage of pollution coming from our towns, other provinces, U.S.A. and especially our city of Winnipeg. That should be tackled first and foremost, regardless of the cost and votes; 1.5 percent of the total amount of phosphorus entering Lake Winnipeg has been tested as coming from our farms. Even this amount can be reduced in the future. That leaves over 90 percent from other sources.

It is terribly unfair and unjust to treat us so harshly as to take away our livelihood for less than two percent of phosphorus that has been proven to come from our farms when 30 percent comes from the city of Winnipeg.

I cannot understand why we are not concentrating on reducing phosphate levels coming from Winnipeg. Just to make a few suggestions: We could outlaw using certain detergents in car and truck washes; outlawing washing cars in the streets and backyards that drain directly into the storm sewers and into the Red River; regulate the detergents used in thousands of laundry machines used in hospitals, homes, laundromats and factories. If we vote with our conscience and our hearts we would probably save 10 percent of the total and still improve on two percent. Better yet, apply these rules to all of Manitoba and achieve a much higher goal.

Is this all about popular among the majority of votes that obviously live in Winnipeg and therefore we cannot touch them?

We have the strictest rules and regulations that exist in this world when it comes to spreading manure, building lagoons or just building new facilities. If they are not strict enough then let's find a way to make it even better. If science and research

prove better ways to manage this industry, let's go for it. This industry has never resisted change. This industry has changed almost beyond description in the last 30 years. This includes old and new farms. Why shut it down to solve its problems?

We have developed excellent ways to spread hog manure. We know it is a great organic fertilizer that builds up and improves our soil. It replaces chemical fertilizers that use up non-renewable energy to manufacture. If hog manure is properly handled, stored and applied it does not need to be a liability. These days we take valuable food products like corn and turn them into fuel and ignore the true value of our natural fertilizer produced on our own farms and used to produce food.

This industry has created thousands of jobs on the farms besides the spinoffs of building contractors, equipment manufacturers, abattoirs, feed suppliers and genetic companies, and many others.

The genetics we produce and the production levels we achieve in Canada are the envy of many other countries in the world. In other words, this industry has been a large contributor to our and the world's economy. Let's keep it growing in a suitable manner.

I have travelled extensively to other countries and I have yet to visit a country that handles manure and farms as responsible and as suitable as ours.

We plead with you to protect a peaceful minority population that desperately needs your support to continue a suitable growth in this industry. The future of our lifestyle, which is our religious background, is at stake here.

Our new daughter colonies can no longer make a living. By Manitoba law, a new colony is restricted to raising 99 turkeys, 499 laying hens and 999 broiler chickens per year, and now come the new restrictions for hog barns. We cannot even raise enough food legally to feed our families and yet we are farmers who traditionally raised food for ourselves and many other parts of the hungry world.

If we choose to start up a manufacturing plant as another means to make a living, we face new zoning issues because we want to live in a community and on a farm. Our back is really against the wall. Must we again move out of the country we love, a nation we respect and honour? We will pay a big price rather than compromise our religion and culture.

We sincerely plead for your help and understanding. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Maendel.

Questions?

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Leonard. You did an excellent job of presenting this. You're a brave young man to walk up in front of the vultures here at this table tonight, including the ones on this side.

Mr. Maendel, at 15 years old, what do you think you want to do when you grow up? What do you want to do, yourself, not what your father or your grandfather says, but what do you want to do? Tell me in your own words.

**Mr. Leonard Maendel:** Get my hands dirty and work with pigs.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation, and, wonderful job. It's nice to hear from the youth. I know you read your prepared speech from Jonathan and, unfortunately, I brought this point up earlier, I know he would like to have been here himself, but, as you pointed out, he was at the World Pork Congress and was not able to attend. But he certainly has done a fantastic job and your colony has done a fantastic job about putting Manitoba on the world map. In fact, I had a conversation with him in regard to a trade mission. He went with the Premier of this province and on that trade mission, the Premier (Mr. Doer) assured him that the Manitoba pause would be lifted and they'd be able to get back into business and selling equipment here in Manitoba. I would like for you to pass on to your leader of your colony that we, on this side of the House, have pledged that we will lift this moratorium, if the Province puts it through, we will put a lift on this and hoist it from the government in three years if in fact it does pass.

**Floor Comments:** Oh, oh.

\* (22:30)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. I have to inform the crowd here that there's to be no participation from the audience. If you want to participate, you're welcome to come up to the microphone and we'll give you 10 minutes to make a speech, but the same rules that apply in the Legislative Chamber also apply in the committee. So I ask you for your indulgence in that regard.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much. Good job, Leonard. Stay where you are. Just stay there. You look comfortable. That's okay. Stay there, Leonard.

All I want to say is that I'm jealous. You're 66 with no grey hair; I'm 48 with lots of grey hair. Good luck with your exam tomorrow.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions, I go to Ron Johnston, Paradigm Farms Ltd., No. 30. Mr. Johnston, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Ron Johnston (Paradigm Farms Ltd.):** Mr. Chairman—

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

**Mr. Johnston:** Mr. Chairman, my name is Ron Johnston. I'm born and raised in the Arborg area and currently farm there along with my brother to supplement our small 1,100-acre farm. I also work off-farm as the plant manager of one of the feed mills in Arborg.

I am speaking to you today on behalf of Paradigm Farms Ltd. Paradigm Farms is a 2,800-sow farrow-to-finish operation operating in the Interlake region. We have a sow farm in the Petersfield region, four finisher farms, one in Narcisse, Skylake and north of Arborg. I might add, the one north of Arborg, the minister, I believe that was one of the first modern barns she went through and shower-in and shower-out.

We currently employ over 20 staff directly in this operation. The company was started in 1998 with a group of over 40 investors from throughout the Interlake wanting to diversify their farm operations by getting involved in swine production. As you know, at the time, grain prices were very low and many grain companies were consolidating their operations by closing down local elevators and building larger terminals throughout the province. These investors wanted a secure market for the feed grain they produced and purchased a large share in the Puratone feed mill located in Arborg.

Each of these facilities went through a lengthy technical-review process and were closely scrutinized by all levels of government. The environment department ensured that we had over three times the spread-field requirements, and we by far surpassed that requirement. We have watched over the past 10 years how the manure from these operations has become more and more valuable to the surrounding fields in the region and are now at the point where farmers are paying for this natural fertilizer. We have also welcomed the introduction of manure management plans and worked closely with

the government and local neighbouring farmers to ensure this manure was applied safely to their fields with the proper rates to ensure a healthy crop.

As I'm sure you're aware, the way these plans work, the field the manure is to be applied to is soil tested to know what the nutrient levels are, then the crop to be grown is identified to factor in what the nutrient requirements are to grow an average crop. The appropriate amount of manure is metered onto the field. Each year the same analysis is done to monitor the movement and uptake of the nutrients in the soil. I know this is far more closely monitored than any other application of fertilizer and safe for the environment.

We are continuing to work to lower the amount of phosphate in this manure by using a phytase feed additive in our feed and experimenting with manure separation devices. However, all of this spirit of co-operation with your government seems to be unnoticed in favour of bowing to political pressure to single out only one of the livestock sectors and blaming it for all of the issues concerning Lake Winnipeg. Not only is this unfair, it is arrogant on the government's part as they have just finished funding the Clean Environment Commission reports on Lake Winnipeg, only to ignore the findings and recommendations found in the report. And I say, shame on you.

This decision to ban all expansion and new construction in the Interlake region affects our operation, as when we originally designed and located these facilities, we did so by building them for expansion. The land base surrounding these facilities is large and many tons of commercial fertilizer are being imported onto these fields. All the local landowners are asking us to expand our operation.

As I mentioned earlier, we purchased a large share in the Puratone feed mill in Arborg, upwards of \$1.5 million, and it will see no new volume added. This means no new capital will be spent on this mill, and as we all know, if you do not grow, eventually you will close down. This would be a huge economic loss to the region. Arborg has always prided itself by having not only one but two feed mills in town, a rarity and envy of many rural towns struggling to survive.

Bill 17 does nothing to save Lake Winnipeg, but only appeases the government of the day with a false sense that they are saving Lake Winnipeg. As the report concluded, the health of Lake Winnipeg

belongs to everybody, and no one industry is to blame for its condition. The government was encouraged to work together with all the stakeholders to improve the loading on Lake Winnipeg. They were not told to impose this ban on the hog industry.

I have not heard of a ban on all new housing starts within the Perimeter Highway until the City of Winnipeg has cleaned up their sewage waste facilities. I have not heard of a ban on all cattle operations in the Interlake region from expanding. I've not heard of a freeze on all commercial fertilizer rates applied to farmland in the Interlake region. I have not heard of a ban on all new or expanding poultry operations in the Interlake region. I have not heard of an order to all rural municipalities to stop discharging their municipal lagoons into the rivers and lakes of Manitoba. So I ask you, why hogs?

In closing, I've lived in the Interlake for over 50 years and was born and raised on a mixed farm just outside of Arborg. We currently still farm over a thousand acres of grain and special crops. I have observed how Arborg has grown from having a small fertilizer plant back in the late sixties selling a few bags of fertilizer a year to farmers who do not even have a fertilizer box on their seed drill, to today where hundreds of thousands of tons of fertilizer are trucked into Arborg to service two major retailers.

I have watched as quarter sections of land that each had a few cows, pigs, and chickens have gone vacant only to just produce grain. And, yes, I have also watched citizens oppose hog barn developments at conditional-use hearings and instil fear in people's minds. These people are so far removed from agriculture they have no idea what current practices are taking place.

The bottom line is crops need nutrients to grow. These crops are used to feed either humans or livestock. They both produce manure which is returned to the land to provide nutrients to the soil to grow a crop or to be productive again. Like it or not, this is a cycle that is necessary. Our choices are do we continue to use natural, organic fertilizer to do so or do we continue to import huge amounts of commercial fertilizer from Saskatchewan and burn up thousands of gallons of fuel producing and transporting it in doing so. The natural form seems to be the greener solution to me.

I ask you to do the right thing and withdraw Bill 17 immediately and continue to work with the hog

industry and all other stakeholders to improve the environmental conditions in Manitoba. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Johnston.

Questions? Mr. Eichler.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you, Ron, for your presentation. My question to you is that you're a fairly new corporation, I guess, in the hog business but long in experience. I ask you a pretty simple question, and that's in regard to the next step. In your organization, Bill 17, where do you see your organization being 10 years from now if Bill 17 passes?

\* (22:40)

**Mr. Johnston:** Where I see Paradigm Farms is at a stalemate with barns that are deteriorating. We have no money or no new investment to upgrade the facilities. We'll be left with assets of no value.

**Mr. Eichler:** I look at Bill 17 like a cancer. Nobody really dies overnight from cancer. Very seldom do you see that. I see it as a deteriorated form of the government slowly killing off the hog industry. Do you have a response to that?

**Mr. Johnston:** I agree with you.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you, Mr. Johnston, for your presentation. I appreciate it. Paradigm Farms, it employs 20 staff directly just in the hog operation, not the Puratone feed operation, just in the hog operation. Can you tell me what your payroll would be, approximately, for the 20 people?

**Mr. Johnston:** I would say close to a million dollars.

**Mr. Borotsik:** A million dollars in a town like Arborg is an awful lot of money. It's a big business. There're families, 20 families living in the area.

As business—and you're a businessperson—it's a huge business. It's a large business that sometimes these people don't recognize. We're talking a substantial investment, a substantial capital investment. When you're in a business, you have to generate more revenues. The way you generate revenues is either to grow more product or to get a better price for the product that you are growing.

Well, we know that the price for the product that you're generating right now is perhaps limited, so, really, in order to cover the costs—this government decided that they needed 6.2 percent more this year to spend because of costs that have been increasing. I would expect that your costs are in a similar area. In

order to generate that 6.2 percent, you have to generate more.

With a moratorium, there is nothing to generate. There is no more product to develop. How are you going to keep that operation going at the level it is now with the costs of it going up? Do you cut back on staff? You can't raise more pigs because they said you can't do that. How are you going to keep the operation going the way it is?

**Mr. Johnston:** Basically our operation will just be in a hold mode. What's unfortunate is we've always prided ourselves with keeping up with the newest technology in the environment. Unfortunately, as things deteriorate, it'll be tougher and tougher to find the money to put into those without expansion.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Really, there is no hold mode. You can't hold. If your costs are going up—and we know they are. Gas is going up. Labour costs are going up. Insurance costs are going up. Hydro's going up. There is no hold. With those costs going up and the generation of revenue that you have right now, it's my opinion that there won't be a hold. It will be a deterioration, if you will, or it will be a backsliding of that particular business.

You said that you had a \$1.5-million capital investment into the Puratone feed mill. The same is true. That feed mill has to have volume in order to operate. Businesses like to have increase in volume. You look at 10 percent a year or 15 percent a year in order to cover off the costs and the other.

If the hog operations in your area are put on hold, as you say, or have a backslide, how are you going to generate more volume in the feed mill?

**Mr. Johnston:** Well, we don't generate more volume. We start to cut shifts and we start to lay off people.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, Mr. Borotsik, you may cut into your compatriot's time here.

**Mr. Borotsik:** All right, just a comment. If you start cutting people, you start going down, that's going to be the reality of the effect of this bill. I think it's necessary that we get that message across.

This isn't something that just stays and stops the way it is now. What it does is it, in fact, becomes less than what it is now with a moratorium, and that's my point.

Thank you very much, Mr. Johnston, for a wonderful presentation.

**Mr. David Faurschou (Portage la Prairie):** Thanks very much, Ron, for your presentation. The minister is interested in pluses and minuses as far as people in the rural areas, and asked the question of an earlier presenter.

Your own business here, can you relate at how it's impacted Arborg and the surrounding areas as to a plus and minus to residents in and about the area?

**Mr. Johnston:** Absolutely. When Paradigm started, we knew we were going to be producing over 1,000 pigs a week. One of the exciting parts about doing that was, we would not hit a high or low in the market. We would be selling hogs every week. Obviously, we'd get the average price of the day by doing so. In order to do that, every Monday two trailer loads of 500 pigs would have to come out of the sow barn and be trucked to one of our finisher farms. By the end of the week, 1,000 pigs would have had to been shipped out of those farms and again, to a slaughter house.

We chose to create a new trucking company based out of that area called Rosewood Trucking which has grown to—when they started with us, they had three trucks and, I believe, they're running eight or nine currently today. That's just one example of the spinoff that was created when this facility started.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I'm going to go to Mr. Graydon unless he gives you leave to put another question.

**An Honourable Member:** No, that's good.

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Johnston, you made an excellent presentation tonight. We've covered a lot about the economics of the business and the spinoffs.

I have some knowledge of the Arborg area as my son is still in Arborg and my daughter-in-law was the veterinarian there up until a couple of weeks ago. So I have a little bit of knowledge about that area.

You just mentioned a trucking company that expanded from three trucks to nine trucks and that's to haul the produce out of the area. If you weren't producing natural fertilizer, there would be many, many more trucks hauling fertilizer in. The infrastructure to bring the products in or to haul the grain out would take a beating, a lot more than it does today, wouldn't you say?

**Mr. Johnston:** I would agree.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I'm sorry, Mrs. Stefanson, but we've run out of time for this presentation. Thank

Mr. Borotsik; he had four questions there. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Johnston.

With leave of the committee, Mr. Randy Tkachyk has chosen to leave and he asks that his presentation be accepted in writing. Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]* And will be included in *Hansard*.

No. 45—so we'll move on to Lyle Loewen, No. 34. Good evening Mr. Loewen. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Lyle Loewen (Private Citizen):** No, I do not.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You do not, you may proceed.

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you for hearing myself along with the other presenters. My name is Lyle Loewen, third generation hog farmer in the Interlake. My parents actually originally moved to the Interlake because of the government promotion to give away land in the northern Interlake. I'm not sure that was a wise choice; they had many struggles back there. That was the reason they actually moved from the Steinbach area to the Interlake.

Hog farming has always been a part of what we've done. My dad always said that if you want to be successful, hogs are the best way because every week you get a paycheque because sows always produce piglets.

We have survived and been sustainable because of our innovation. We've survived because of the economies of scale—we've been able to build and expand. I think it was Mr. Borotsik who was just referring to the increase in costs and there certainly has been a lot of increase in costs as we've gone along.

I was happy to see Mr. Doer on the news—I think it was a couple of weeks ago. He was—I don't know where he was—off selling, promoting Canadian products and we certainly need that. It's a great thing to do. We need to promote the pork industry around the world as well. We live in a global economy. It's great to promote the products but we also have to compete price-wise with that and economies of scale are certainly a way to do that. It may be the only way to do it in many situations and certainly has been for us.

\* (22:50)

When I started, I built a 200-sow operation. Then we went 400 and now we've ended up at 900. We're doing okay today. We don't know what five

years brings for us, whether we'll be able to survive at that number or not. Bill 17 will not allow me to have the confidence that we'll still be in business in five years when those costs continue to increase and the margins continue to decrease because of the global economy.

Part of the reason we've been able to be successful and financially sustainable is because we've been able to fund the cost of the increase in costs, but also the regulations that we have—stringent regulations which have certainly increased our costs. We're going to bear that, but there's only one way to bear that, it's either to get more money for our product, which, I'm sure as everybody knows, we don't dictate the price. That's set someplace in Chicago. So we don't dictate the price, so we can only work on the cost side. The regulations increase that and certainly, Bill 17 is going to increase that even further because we have no further economy of scales to combat that with.

Farmers are caretakers of the land. My family will certainly be the first to suffer if we were to be negligent. Certainly, the science today—we used to do things that we wouldn't do today because we're educated. We understand more. Five years from now, we'll understand even more, for sure. As I said earlier, we're innovative and we certainly are willing to bear the costs of doing the right thing, but we also need to have the economies of scale to fund those costs.

This bill unfairly targets the hog industry. I grew up on Lake Winnipeg in Arborg. Ron Johnston just spoke. He spoke of the feed mills in Arborg. So the one mill that Puratone actually bought was bought from my dad. He started it there and he built that mill sort of on the—I was going to say the backs, but that's negative—he built the mill because of the swine industry in the Interlake. That was really the bread and butter of the feed mill at the time.

We grew up on the lake. That was our family recreation, was water skiing. That was the one thing my dad had time to do with us. When I hear of the major sewage dispersion or sewage that's dumped into the lake, it's very troubling to me. Winnipeg, whether mechanical failures—and we've heard jokes about that today—and, well, for whatever the reason, when the sewage is dumped in the lake, that's not a good thing. That was something I'd never be in favour of and I'm certainly willing to do my share to ensure that that doesn't happen and if there's a cost burden with that, I'm willing to accept that as well.

My perception of the bill is that we sell ourselves short. Where's the innovation of our province? Where is the looking for partnerships, working together to solve problems? We're better than just putting a ban out there. We can work together to solve problems. It's been shown in the past that the hog industry is willing to do that. The easy way out is just to throw a ban out there. Let's not sell ourselves short.

Bill 17 will eventually—and we had this discussion with the last presenter—will eventually force us out of business. My son is 13 now and he hopes to farm some day as well. That would also be my hope because it's a noble, noble profession. So, I ask you, please do withdraw this bill.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Loewen.

Questions? Mr. Pedersen.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Loewen. You mentioned your son coming up and you have no idea right now whether he will be interested in it or able to. The Minister of Conservation and the Minister of Agriculture quite often ask presenters, well, why not just move out to a different area that's not within the moratorium area? But is that an option for you to actually move out? Do you think the financial—do you have the confidence to take on that financial risk outside the moratorium area if it was an option for you?

**Mr. Loewen:** I think if the government was willing to give the land away like it did to my father about 50 years ago; if they could find some land for me in that prime crop area in the west, certainly, that would be an encouragement, although my family is in the Interlake area and we certainly prefer to stay together as roots and family are very important.

So, there's certainly the financial part. In life you make tough financial decisions. If that was an option, certainly, it would be considered, but I can't see anybody giving us land today. And at a thousand dollars an acre on prime grain land, I don't know. My bank book's not going to allow that.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** You talked about innovation, you talked about the economies of scale and you're farming in the Interlake area. I'm interested in a short perspective on the kinds of innovation, where you see the sort of optimum economies of scale. Are we going to continue to see hog barns increasing in size, and lastly, what's your

perspective on the needs and future in the Interlake? Why was the Interlake included in the zone that's in the hog moratorium?

**Mr. Loewen:** I won't speak to your last question because I think I'd be speaking in ignorance as to why exactly it was included.

But we—sorry, can you just repeat your first question. That was the one I really—

**Mr. Gerrard:** Just give us a little bit of a perspective on the innovation and the economies-of-scale issues.

**Mr. Loewen:** Yes, the innovations—I remember the first time we pumped out our lagoon. We used one of these guns, sprinkler system, and we actually had neighbours on the road come for the spectacle, and I don't blame them for being a little upset. You know, we didn't know any better. I mean, nowadays it's all incorporated right into the ground. You know, I often say that if our neighbours didn't know we were there, if they didn't have former knowledge of that, they wouldn't even know we were there.

You know, we're surrounded by bush completely. There's just next to no smell that gets out and certainly we've always—our manure has always been spread on our own land or else on the neighbour's land just beside us, and certainly we've come to rely on that for pasture land. We then leased out the pasture land for extra money on the side as well, so it's helped us as well.

Innovation, so I too just came back from the World Pork Expo. I'm a big believer in staying up on the technologies. The innovations of manure handling systems; the innovation of environmental control systems; the innovation of nutrition and how we feed the hogs today; the innovation of feed conversions going from four or 3.8 down to 2.8 to one, the less feed that we use for pigs nowadays a huge innovation. The idea of how we market hogs; how hogs get scaled; how we hit prime markets, just some of the innovations that we've had and the innovation is great. The downside of innovation, inevitably somebody's making money off innovation and selling it to us and we need to fund that somehow.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Loewen, for your presentation this evening. I'm not sure if you're aware or not but I know for a fact, today alone for more than eight hours raw sewage was being dumped into the Red River from the overflow from the combined sewer systems in the city of Winnipeg. That's at least eight hours because

I brought this up in question period. It was around 1:30 this afternoon. We knew it was about eight hours to that time, and I brought it up with members opposite, so they're fully aware of this. Yet they've really done nothing towards, you know, focussing in on that area of what's happening with respect to the lake, and you mentioned the lake earlier.

Do you think it's fair, given all of this happening and transpiring at the time that the government singles out and penalizes the hog industry?

**Mr. Loewen:** It's very disconcerting that the hog industry has been singled out for this, and of course it's very ironic your comments right now about what's been going on this afternoon, so I didn't have any former knowledge of that, but that's very ironic.

The hog industry has been unfairly targeted, and I think there've been lots of figures thrown around here today about what the farming industry and in particular the hog industry contributes to the phosphorus level in Lake Winnipeg.

\* (23:00)

For the hours the people have travelled in here, the time and the energy and the resources, the fuel cost and this group sitting around the table here, we should be looking at a bigger picture than we're looking at today. It's been said over and over, and I would agree, and I said it earlier, that we'll take our share of that and we'll pay the cost of our share of that. But we can't bear that burden alone. It's not fair to just put it on the backs of the hog farmers. When I would say that, going along with your comments right now, that we're maybe one of the better environmental stewards in the province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Struthers:** Yes, thanks, Lyle. Two things. First of all, I certainly agree with you in terms of it being ironic. In 1992, the government that Ms. Stefanson represents here was given a report from the CEC saying that they should get moving on that issue. They did nothing except they brought in some regulations having to do with nitrogen that affected farmers. Their choice was to move on the city of Winnipeg or move on farmers, and they moved on farmers.

Having said that, though, Mr. Loewen, I want to address what Mr. Pedersen brought up earlier because I think Blaine actually got part of it right. There was an earlier presenter that I asked a question of, and that was there's area outside of the moratorium area that can be open for building hog barns. I wasn't so much interested in having people

from the moratorium area move, because I know there's going to be a lot of problems with that. What I was getting at was that there's—this doesn't kill the whole industry insofar as there is land that is available for somebody new coming in to move into those areas. Would you agree with that?

**Mr. Loewen:** Yeah. So you've created an area in the western part of the province where there will be no moratorium on hog expansion, and that's wonderful. I applaud you for that. Great idea. But what has it done to address, you know, the 90 or 110 people before me, and that we've—or our investment and our families are, you know, where we are? So, you know, if you want a congratulations, congratulations. You know, good job. But, unfortunately, I'm in the Interlake. We have people in, you know, the southeastern part of the province here who aren't going to move. So I'm not sure what other comments to make to it besides that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Time for this presentation has expired. Thank you very much, Mr. Loewen.

Neil Cutler. Is Neil Cutler here? He's No. 35. Okay, Mr. Cutler will go to the bottom of the list. Mr. Fergus Hand, private citizen, No. 38. Fergus Hand. Mr. Henry Holtman.

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

**Mr. Henry Holtman (Private Citizen):** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You do. The Clerk will distribute them. You may begin when ready.

**Mr. Holtman:** Honourable Chair, honourable committee members, my name is Henry Holtman and I'm a dairy farmer from Rosser, Manitoba in the R.M. of Rosser. I am here to express my concerns with Bill 17 and in my handout I have lots of things that you can read, but I want to speak about things that are happening on my farm, and why I'm kind of concerned about Bill 17. I think that'd be of probably more interest to the committee members so I'll get right into that.

I would like you to reconsider Bill 17, and I'm going to talk a little bit about my operation. Back in 1999 we decided to—we live in the hamlet of Rosser which is about 15 people, or 15 homes, and my brother and I decided we want to expand our dairy operation. We went through the whole process of the technical review committee and looking at expanding it to 200 animals, to milk. We went through a process where we wanted to actually

expand right where we are, right in the town of Rosser. We learned something about the whole process of going through a technical review committee, eventually agreeing with the community and talking with the community to move about a mile away from that community. We were pretty upset about that.

Time after time, we realized that was probably one of the best decisions, going through that process. That whole process of going through the municipal council, then the planning board and the technical review committee really were things that were set in place, that looked after all interests of all parties.

It was a process that worked very, very well. We went through soil testing. Is that the right place to put a lagoon? Is that the right place to put all those animal units and so on and so forth? We learned a lot through going through that process.

We expanded again back in 2005; we're milking 400 cows, and we have room to expand. Now, here we are and I'm concerned this is only for the hog industry. What is it going to do with the dairy in the future? Are we going to have our hands tied also?

We're in the R.M. of Rosser. There are only six dairy farms of various sizes, of which I'm the largest, and one large hog operation on a Hutterite colony; the rest are grain farms. So there's lots of area where manure could be applied in the R.M. of Rosser. It's just that we're in the capital region, or maybe we're in the Interlake, or the Red River Valley. I'm not sure which one we are, but we're covered by all three it seems.

So what have we done on our farm? Lots of presenters have talked what we're doing on farms. We've been using manure management plans since 1999, and it was based on nitrogen. Last year, we actually did do some on phosphorus. The interesting part is the 40 acres that are behind the farmyard or the old farmyard were traditionally where dad and grandpa used to always haul the manure, because it was so close.

We realized those phosphate levels were creeping up. So we changed a little bit and said we're not going to put as much manure down, based on the nitrogen level, but pull back and then look at phosphorus.

So that regulation that's out there—the new nutrient management plan and basing it on phosphorus—made farmers look, and it's just a step in the direction. I congratulate you on putting that out

there. Farmers will do their part as far as protecting the lake and being sustainable. As we move in technology, our practices are changing. This is one of those things that are in place today, the tools that you have and that farmers will use and comply, to do their part as far as Lake Winnipeg.

We moved to spreading everyday, in the snow and everything, to 400-day storage. We used environmental farm plans to identify different risk areas on our farm, whether it's capping wells, whether it's going towards 400-day storage, putting ramps in to make sure those lagoons aren't going to be damaged by pumps and so on. We put those in place.

We applaud the Province in participating with environmental farm plans and programs that, I think, really highlighted which areas farmers should target as far as what's the first thing we should fix on our farms, which is the highest risk. Those are excellent programs that are in place.

We're doing annual soil testing which we never used to do. It's interesting, when I talk with my neighbours, how many of them do it and how many don't. It's a real eye-opener. Where your farm is, testing your manure and what the nutrients are in that manure is also something that we use quite extensively.

I think you should withdraw Bill 17. I'm not sure how you're going to do it and save face in doing so. I guess that's the practical part of this; that's the position that you've put out and that's the way you want to go, but I think you have a lot of tools out there already. You have conservation districts, right now, that are looking at surface water; we should have more of those looking at the water quality, going in and going out, and measuring that and putting programs into place, by people participating together, educating together and working together. It's not as fast as maybe some people want, but it's something that grassroots builds and improves upon.

I'm also part of the southeast regional water management plan, looking at the aquifer and what's happening underneath. That's instituted also by Water Stewardship, trying to look at how can we link possibly the two, but also what is happening out there as far as aquifer management. I applaud that. That's something we're looking at and putting a management plan into place, as far as the water quality underneath the surface.

\* (23:10)

We have a manure management plan and provincial farm practices. We all want to work together to try to solve this problem. Farmers will do exactly their part to also help but, the moratorium, I don't see, does this. I think we have lots of tools in our chest already as far as moving towards that and reducing what farmers do in practices and so on to reduce the level of phosphate that's entering Lake Winnipeg. Farmers also will participate as a group together working with the cities and the municipalities. We don't want to pit one against the other, and we understand that we're working all together in this, but Bill 17 does have the appearance that that's the first place that you're going to start.

I understand monies are going towards treatment plants and so on and so forth. I also understand, like, in our municipality, we're putting a lagoon in also and discharge is allowed, but is it tested for nutrients discharge? It certainly is for bacteria, and I have a policy on my farm, or it's been regulated through manure management plans, that I should have a zero discharge on nutrients from my farm. The challenge is how are we going to do that with municipalities in the future. It's going to take money. It's going to take working together but it's not as glorious, you know, to have Bill 17 stand out there and say this is what we're doing. I mean to talk about livestock mortalities or manure management plans or aquifer management plan or conservation districts, people in the rural areas understand that because we're working with that, but it's not as glorious to write that in a 10-second sound bite in the paper.

Bill 17 sounds more like something is happening and we're doing something, but it's not really going to drop the load in Lake Winnipeg as some of the programs that you have out there already. I can't address that for you people as far as trying to get that 10-second sound bite and winning on that, but what I want you to focus on is steady the pace wins the race. The programs we have in place, work with them. Make them better, and at the end of the day it'll get to the goal that we all want, either side of this table, whether rural or urban, to make sure that our lakes are safe, our water quality is safe and that we're all working together with the information that we gain over time.

In conclusion, please withdraw Bill 17. I think you will get a lot of respect for doing so because you've not only heard from all the people behind me and for how many days, but it's incredible. I've never been to a function where I've seen Hutterites come and speak publicly. Believe it or not, I'm not sure this

happened in standing committees before, but my wife works on a colony teaching and you rarely ever see that so that's quite an incredible sight. It's not something rural people see very often so it's quite incredible.

Municipal councils and so on, they rarely see them. You know, they don't vote too often. I may be speaking a little bit out of turn, maybe they do, you never know, but you rarely see them go outside to this sort of level, so I think that's quite incredible. They are excellent neighbours as far as I'm concerned, so please withdraw Bill 17. Use the tools that you have out there, and you will gain a lot of respect from rural areas and also from our city cousins too because I think they understand what's going on and what you're trying to do. Thank you very much.

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

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much, Henry. This is like a two-for-one deal. We get your words verbally and we also get to put onto the record, and I move that we add to the record, your actual written document. It was a very good presentation that you made.

I was particularly interested in what you had to say about the TRCs, these technical review committees. I've been asked by the CEC to review the technical review committees and restructure if we need to. What's your advice to me on the technical review committees? What kinds of changes can we make to improve them?

**Mr. Holtman:** Thank you for the question. You know, the process that I went through with the technical review committee, at the time, you know, I thought, oh, my goodness. Like, what are these people going to ask me to go through? To be frank about it, there were people on the technical review committee with different points of view and some I thought were not for me. When I really sat back and thought about it, maybe from the planning side, Henry, you shouldn't do this. And I could understand their point of view. Or MAFRI would come along and say, you know, these guys are great guys, great farmers, great stewards, let's put it through.

So I enjoyed the process probably more so now thinking back about that, the technical review process, in the sense that it contributed. I know lots of problems occur, you know, when citing and the municipal issues and so on, but I think the technical

review process changes something like Bill 17. It doesn't allow a moratorium to happen. It looks at special situations where maybe the soil type is not right to expand that farm or to locate it. Maybe it's the best spot for it.

So those things can come into play, and I think that's more important to look at. Maybe that operator, can he deliver what he promises? Like, you have a history with me since 1999. Maybe it's not the best spot to put it, but if anybody can do a good job, this guy can do it.

The technical reviewers do the positives and the negatives. It's hard to measure which has more value and so on, but after I've done a technical review—and I think the person in the crowd was on that, gave me lots of advice on that issue. I think that I would say it was a good process.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation, Henry, good job. I take to heart what you said about the withdrawal of Bill 17, the suggestions of which you would be able to do that and still save face. It's not about saving face as far as I'm concerned. It's about doing the right thing.

We've heard a number of presenters talk about how they're prepared to work with the government in order to meet the regulation changes that need to be made that's been part of the recommendations from the CEC report.

Having said that, in regard to the dairy operation that you said may be next in the possible realm of your presentation—now, we know what it'll do to the hog industry if Bill 17 was to pass. What do you see happening from a supply management point of view if they were to impose that same regulation on a supply management industry?

**Mr. Holtman:** I'll explain it the best way—I'm always long-winded when I speak, so I'm sorry about that. If I took my farm, for instance, if I was under a moratorium situation, what can I do? It's pretty hard to run a two-site dairy operation if I wasn't allowed to expand my herd and maybe only have 200 cows in Rosser and 200 on the other side of the province. Dairies tend to work better if they're all in one operation, young animals all the way up to milking cows.

The other issue is dairies are concentrating because of lifestyle issues, in order to get the economies of scale and lifestyles. So if you put a moratorium on dairies, all of a sudden it becomes a challenge. What am I going to do? How am I going

to involve the next generation? Or my margins tighten up. Yes, even in supply-managed commodities, margins tighten up because we only get price changes once or twice a year. So how am I going to improve my efficiency?

The other thing is if demand increases in the province and they give me 10 percent more to produce, I'm limited because of a moratorium. So I lose all that flexibility and the ability that I'm having right now. That's probably one of the biggest reasons.

*Madam Vice-Chairperson in the Chair*

**Mr. Gerrard:** Thank you, Henry. You're doing a number of things now to reduce the potential for phosphorus getting into the waterways from the farm operations. You are taking and collecting the run-off from where you've got animals, putting that water in a lagoon and then putting that from the lagoon back on the fields. I don't know whether that's injected or just sprayed or exactly how you manage that. You also have some manure that you take from I presume the livestock-holding pens that you put directly on the fields.

Tell us a little bit more about, in your operation, the likelihood of phosphorus getting from the fields into the waterways, given everything that you are doing.

**Mr. Holtman:** First off, most of our animals now are inside, so we're a little bit different. We don't have outside pens, and the biggest reason, with rains like we get, we have to re-bed the pens and so on. So we've really moved away from outside moisture running off these pens, and that's one good thing as far as controlling run-off off our farm. We're also collecting the run-off from our silage piles and putting them in the lagoons and so on.

\* (23:20)

When we go to spread, of course it's injected, and we also keep a 15-metre buffer around the fields because it's not grassed in. Finally, when we do the solid manure piling in the fields, we also have setbacks from the edge. We compost it as field storage for the one year and then apply it in that same year and spread it and incorporate it. This is all done in conditions where it's dry. It's done once a year and not on top of the snow or when the soil is frozen. It gives us the ability to keep everything in our heavy clay soils and try to bond up those nutrients.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Holtman.

The committee calls Christine Waddell. For information of the committee, we're on No. 40 of your presenters list. Mrs. Waddell, do you have a written submission for the committee?

**Mrs. Christine Waddell (Private Citizen):** This is an oral presentation, Madam Vice-Chair.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Please proceed, Mrs. Waddell.

**Mrs. Waddell:** I daresay that I have been in this committee room almost as many hours, not as many hours, but almost as many hours as our honourable members sitting here. I know that the members are here to listen carefully and not just do their homework for the House for tomorrow as they work on bills that don't relate to agriculture and the future of many communities in this province.

I won't take long. There are people who have driven because they care. There are city people who I have seen sit in this committee room for 14 hours to stand alongside their agricultural partners in the country. I salute them and thank them. There are people, and one of them has just left the room, who knows what it is that when an emergency arises and something has to be done—a doctor doesn't leave the hospital when there's a job to be done. During tax season, an accountant is up all night.

I want to encourage the people—I wasn't going to speak tonight because I didn't want to take time from the people who are even more directly affected by this bill than I personally am. I am from a community that has hog barns. I am from a community of Neepawa which is expanding our hog slaughter facilities since Hytek has bought Springhill Farms. We are having people move from other countries because they have entry level jobs at a hog-slaughtering facility, and they will have jobs and have an opportunity to come to a new land. It directly affects my community. My business is a newspaper. The ads, the real estates ads, it all works together.

No, I don't plant crops anymore; no I don't calve out cows anymore; no, I don't milk. I have. I have. I know what it is to be up all night because a cow needs assistance in birthing, and you don't just walk away from her or go read a book because you don't feel like mucking in the muck. Or maybe that calf's dead, so why bother? Let the cow die too. No, there's people in this room know, that when there is a job to

do, you do it. There are people who are sitting, waiting to present behind me, who know that if this committee meets all night, they have harvested all night. It's Friday night, the moon is clear, the crop is dry and you go out into the field and you keep on combining. You don't say, well, the ballgame's on, I'm going to go.

Now, these people are people with faith and I stand alongside them because if it's Saturday night and it comes to midnight, they tool down and they prepare for their day of rest and worship. They know how to work hard and they know how to rest.

We have on record in *Hansard*, if a person from another area were to come and read it, record of best practices in agriculture. Not subsistence farming, not a few chickens running free range out in a yard, not a few pigs so that you've got a little bit of meat to eat. As has been said already tonight, some of these daughter colonies cannot even have enough chickens legally through our quota system to feed their own village, their own community, because it is a controlled commodity.

Hogs are something where they can make a living and they can do the—and they have to go through all the procedures. A new daughter colony in the Assiniboine aquifer is in manufacturing. They didn't go into hogs. They're in manufacturing. They've recognized the planning districts, all of the things, all of the regulations, all of the recommendations, that governments in the past and in the present have put into place to make things run smoothly. We have a moratorium. Do we need a law? Do we really need a law? We have had examples of people who are doing things right. They're doing things right. I am asking our government to do the right thing and find a way to table and set aside Bill 17.

Thank you for your time. I encourage those who are behind me. I would ask the indulgence of the members of the House on the opposition, I don't think you need to ask me any questions. You know where I stand. I don't think we need any more on the record. If the government has a question, fine. I'm finished.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** I thank the presenter. Are there any questions for the presenter? Thanks. Seeing no questions, thank you, Mrs. Waddell.

The committee calls Lara Forchuk, No. 41 on the committee.

Did you have a written presentation you want to circulate?

**Ms. Lara Forchuk (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** You can proceed, Ms. Forchuk.

**Ms. Forchuk:** Thank you. First of all, I'd just like to say I apologize. The synapses aren't firing quite as quickly as they were about five and a half hours ago. It's been—*[interjection]* Yeah, okay.

Madam Vice-Chair and committee members, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to be here. My name is Lara Forchuk. I live in the R.M. of Woodlands. I have lived in Ontario. I've lived in Alberta. I've lived in western Manitoba. More recently, the hog industry has brought my family and I to eastern Manitoba. We have derived our personal household income for the last 10 years from the hog industry. I currently work closely within the hog industry for a pharmaceutical company.

In Manitoba, hog farming is the largest agricultural endeavour that there is. Depending on the year, hog farming can be as much as two times greater than the next farming effort. In terms of industry economic contributions and based on Statistics Canada, 7,500 jobs were generated by the hog and pork-packing industry; \$610 million in wages, contracts, benefits and other income within Manitoba; and \$2 billion in total economic activity were generated by the hog industry. A record pork export of 192 million kilograms was valued at \$491 million in 2002 while beef exports were valued at \$4.4 million.

The hog industry in Manitoba is huge. Approximately two-thirds of this economic impacting industry resides in the area where the moratorium has been placed. One of my greatest concerns with this permanent moratorium is the impact that it's going to have on the family farm. Looking at the age of farm operators into three categories: under 35 years, 35 to 54, and over 55 years old, the number of operators under 35 years old decreased by 25 percent between 2001 and 2006 and, inversely, the 55-and-over age group increased by 10.2 percent. The average age of a farm operator continues to increase. In 2001, it was 49.9 years of age. In 2006, it was 52 years old. That's the average age of the farmer.

\* (23:30)

So what does this have to do with the moratorium? Well, ultimately, if today's aging hog producer wants to have his family come on and join him and support two incomes they need to be able to expand. They're not going to be able to have their young ones come on and take over the farm but the way it is right now how can they support an additional income? They can't. So what's going to happen? That young farmer, he's not going to stay on the farm, he's going to leave the rural community. He may leave the province. Or she.

With the unlikelihood of the offspring joining the family farm the age of the farm operator is only going to increase. He has nowhere else to go. And it's ironic that many people think that the moratorium will hurt only the corporate farms and that's who we're out to get here. Mr. Struthers, I'm not sure what you were getting at when you were asking Mr. Rempel about all the jobs that were lost in relationship to the corporate farms. The family farm is at stake here. It's not just the corporate farm that's being targeted. The family farms are extremely vulnerable to this.

Now, on a different note, with the way our industry is changing in regards to COOL, how—we have so many people that are producing isoweans in this province. Where are they left? What are they to do? How can they finish their hogs? They can't expand so what are they going to do? Leave the industry entirely.

Another twist of irony regarding animal husbandry, there's a huge push, you know, whether it be antibiotics or just general animal husbandry—and I find it ironic that as much as we're looking at moving to better ways for the animal, moving to loose housing, this is ultimately going to, again, punish the people that are within the moratorium. The reality is that in order to maintain the same number of animal units a producer would have to expand if going from loose housing—or from gestational stalls to loose housing. So what you're asking is, a producer, by simply being more conscientious of the animal husbandry, to actually go down and go backwards. Somebody asked earlier, would you guys take a pay cut or a maintain this year? How about a pay cut, because that's what you're asking for from the producers that live within the area of the moratorium.

As I mentioned, I live in the R.M. of Woodlands which, of course, is within one of the areas in the moratorium. My forefathers came and left the Ukraine 80 years ago to come to western Canada,

leaving a communist country to a place where they had freedom and choices. I cannot imagine my children growing up in a region where such arbitrary judgment that has been shown by Bill 17 exists. I would expect my children to be living in an area where they can pursue a form of agriculture, as long as it is responsible to the environment, and I cannot imagine living here or living in an area that doesn't offer you that opportunity.

The CEC said that there is 1.5 percent of the phosphorus problems come from the hog industry. Granted. The people behind me, the people that have been here all night, no one is saying they aren't willing to implement changes. There were recommendations put into account. There was no time that it was said that it's unsustainable. Where did we go wrong? We have the opportunity, we have the knowledge, the funding, the Manitoba Pork Council funded a fair bit of this work. You know, when arbitrary judgments are cloaked behind science, it becomes scary. What happens? You lose the credibility that the research puts out. What do we believe next or what don't we believe next?

Ultimately, I'll leave you with this question and, again, this is to Mr. Struthers. You talked to Mr. Peters, that young producer that was up here, and you said to him that you turned down 6,000 permits for septic based on the fact that they didn't have a plan. Why weren't we offered the same opportunity? I bet you, everybody here—give us a plan, don't ban it. Let us give you a plan. Thank you.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Questions.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much, Lara, for your presentation.

Some of the statistics that you quote here are actually part of what my concern is. I'm thinking back to the questions I had for Mr. Rempel, earlier. Actually, your numbers and specific about the youngest, you go back to 1991 through to 2006 and you have a 25.1 percent drop in young farmers. That, I think, should concern all of us. That's the exact same time frame the industry was expanding at its most rapid. It's fallen off a little bit in '07 because of some other factors, but this is all before the moratorium and before the pause, and we've seen a big drop in the amount of young farmers. I see this happening on the grain side too. I live in Dauphin and I see it all around me all the time. I am as open to be educated as anybody else. So when I see these numbers that the CEC puts out saying that the industry is doing this, and I see the number of young

farmers doing that, these don't add up to me and I question this. I don't just accept the assertions and the assumptions out there about the economics on this. I want to know.

How does that make sense? If the industry is simply allowed to grow unfettered aren't we just going to see a continuation of these kinds of numbers and a decrease in the economic output, a decrease in the GDP for the province?

**Ms. Forchuk:** You're saying that you also said the grain industry had this same trend, so how can you blame it on the hog in the corporate farms? It's probably an epidemic within the agricultural industry, and that's my point. You can't point a finger at one specific industry. It is a problem and by putting this moratorium on you're actually adding fuel to the fire for that to increase. It is throughout the whole agricultural community that we have an aging management problem.

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Lara, for your presentation and the passion that you put into your presentation.

I don't think Mr. Struthers understands the economy of scale and he doesn't understand what regulations cost. He doesn't understand what it takes to pay for that technology. You can't pay for that with 20 sows. He doesn't understand that and so sometime I will take him out for dinner and try and explain that to him.

However, you did say, and it's been said many, many times now, 1.5 percent phosphate is from the hogs, 1.5, 1.5. How will we be able to know—when 98.5 percent of the phosphate comes from other sources—how will we know the technology that we have in place today is having any impact on the lake? How will we know that?

**Ms. Forchuk:** Currently, the way it is today, I don't think we will know that. Do we know how much is coming down from the U.S.? So how can we know that 1.5 percent is actually a true number? Do we know this? So, no, how can we measure a number that we don't know is accurate to begin with?

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Mr. Graydon, for one supplemental. Short one. Many members have questions.

**Mr. Graydon:** So there is some doubt in your mind that that is a true number, 1.5 percent.

**Ms. Forchuk:** Again, do we know what the number coming in from the States is?

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you.

**Mr. Briese:** I do have a question, but I'm a little confused over what the minister is saying. He's suggesting that the expanding hog industry has caused the loss of people on the farms and I'm trying to figure how he feels that a moratorium would cure that, cause more jobs to be out there with putting a moratorium in place.

What I want to ask you is with all the rules that are out there right now, we've got mortalities of manure management regulations; we got the technical review committees; we got the local development plans of the by-laws, do you think most of the tools are there that we really need to handle what's going on in these industries right now?

\* (23:40)

**Ms. Forchuk:** I think that, from what I am hearing from the producers, there is technology out there. They're willing to change. They're willing to implement. They're willing to better the environment. They are the stewards of the land. I think that they can make a difference. I think there's room for improvement, and I don't think anybody would dispute that, but I think they're willing to do that and put the effort in.

**Mr. Gerrard:** You have made, I think, an important comment in terms of the COOL regulations, that the moratorium will actually make it much, much harder to deal with the country-of-origin labelling, particularly because what you have to do is you have to be able to finish the hogs here.

I just wondered if you, maybe, want to expand on that a little bit.

**Ms. Forchuk:** If, as I said, with COOL, we have a significant number of producers that strictly only produce isoweans. Currently, we have contracts being broken daily by the Americans because of an apprehension over what may or may not come when the new government gets in, in the U.S., what may actually happen. As a result, within Canada we need to be able to finish the pigs rather than ship them. We need to be doing it within the province. To do it within the province, for a producer in one of the areas where the moratorium is being enforced, they cannot expand.

The isowean producer, as we see him today, likely will not exist if there is this permanent moratorium put on. He cannot compete within the industry the way it will be.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you for your presentation. I appreciate that. I still don't understand where Mr. Struthers is going because it's not just this data and these statistics with regard to the hog industry. But if you want to look at the teaching profession, if you want to look at nurses, if you want to look at mechanics for that matter, the population in our country is growing older, and there are a lot of people who are getting to that retirement age, and it happens in the hog industry. I don't think that Mr. Struthers believes, honestly, that a moratorium is going to fix that issue with respect to the age group. We do know that a lot of the operations, just because of economies of scale, have to expand. They have to expand. They can't stay the way they are right now. They have to expand because of economies of scale. They have fixed costs and, in order to recover some of the operating costs—

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Mr. Borotsik, we're running out of time.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Okay. In order to recover some of the operating costs, they have to, in fact, generate more revenue. With a moratorium, can you see any operation, in that moratorium zone, generating more revenue and being able to maintain their operation the way they are today?

**Ms. Forchuk:** I'll keep it short. No.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you very much. The committee calls Marielle Wiebe, reeve of the R.M. of La Broquerie. Once again, the committee calls Marielle Wiebe, reeve of the R.M. of La Broquerie.

Order. I just want to make sure people can hear their names being called. Miss Wiebe's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list. The committee calls Geoffrey Downey, private citizen. Once again, the committee calls Geoffrey Downey, private citizen. Mr. Downey's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list. The committee calls Kent Ledingham, Steinbach Auto Dealers' Association. Once again, Kent Ledingham, Steinbach Auto Dealers' Association. Mr. Ledingham's name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Randy Tkachyk gave us a written submission that we have put into *Hansard*, a reminder for committee members.

**Mr. Eichler:** Just for clarification for the committee, will Randy's presentation be considered as a presentation?

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Yes.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Yes, it has already happened.

The committee calls Keith Rogers, No. 46 on the list, private citizen. Once again, Keith Rogers, private citizen. Mr. Rogers' name will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

The committee calls Harvey Dann, No. 48, private citizen. Good evening, Mr. Dann. Do you have a written submission for the committee members? No?

**Mr. Harvey Dann (Private Citizen):** No, I don't.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Please proceed.

**Mr. Dann:** Madam Vice-Chairperson, committee members, thank you for the opportunity to speak on Bill 17, what I consider the worst piece of legislation put forward by any government of Manitoba in my memory. Only once, in the 1970s, was the government proposing to diaper all cattle. Economics sorted that mess out.

This bill is not about just hogs; this is about agriculture. This government is attempting to split a minority by attacking the hog industry which has done more than any other segment to deal with the by-product from their operations, in my opinion.

What segment will be next? Poultry? Dairy? Potatoes? Grain farmers? I tell you what segment will be next—the industry that has the fewest voters and one that government can muscle into submission.

Every person in agriculture should be presenting their thoughts on this bill. Unfortunately, unless one's own ox is getting gored, the majority do nothing. The governments of the day know this and thus pick us off one at a time. At no time in my life has a discussion of food shortages been talked about like it has been this last little while.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a man-made famine, created by educated individuals throughout the world, who rely on politics, rather than science or common sense, to make decisions about the future of this province, country and the world, in my opinion, borderlining on being criminal. In this case, we have a provincial government trying to ram through legislation that is so full of the by-product they're wanting to put a moratorium on, making political

decisions that will permanently affect the environmental, economic future of our province.

The government has competent, technical, professional people in agriculture, environment and the universities, et cetera, as resources. The refusal to listen or misrepresent statements made by these parties is nothing short of ridiculous and an insult to their intelligence. It is obvious to me that the people advising the minister and government carry no credentials that qualify them to contribute to decisions required in agriculture or, for that matter, in any other segment of the province when it comes to environment.

Perhaps, in a hurry to try and impress urban people, both here and abroad, some environmental groups, with impractical agendas, that they are tackling a perceived problem, this government has forgotten to tell these same folks where food comes from; it's to sustain life as well as the economic well-being of the province.

I believe in a well-thought-out environmental management where all parts of society are responsible for their contribution to the problem. Example: towns and cities that dispose of effluent. I attempted to work with our own municipality when I was out in Rosser there; they wanted to put a lagoon in. On one hand, we want to stop pollution and, the next minute, we want to put another lagoon in. So, I suggested to the people, in part, why not put a pivot up on one of the present lagoons to see how much water we could get in there through a good biologically active soil, what we could grow and what we could do, to no avail.

I was involved and built two feed yards, one in the '70s. At that time, we had people from the agriculture engineering department, sitting on our committee for input and approval of what we're doing, so we weren't doing a project and having to back around. We got their input and it was really much appreciated.

\* (23:50)

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

Everyone in agriculture, industry and society has a responsibility to put safeguards in place to minimize and/or avoid damaging the environment. Appropriate penalties need to be in place for individuals, corporations and all levels of government who knowingly pollute the environment.

Taking away the authority of local municipalities to regulate land use is an insult to the intelligence of all Manitobans. In spite of what you might believe, all the intelligence in this province does not exist within the governing party, the province or its advisors who they called upon to draft this regressive, imbecilic piece of legislation. It's always easy to criticize. The real work comes up with solutions to address the problems in agriculture and society by-products.

Suggestions I have as follows: We continue to use the most up-to-date technological advantages to operate a sustainable agriculture. Utilize the present legislation in handling of all hog by-products and the by-products of other segments of agriculture. With the increase of fertilizer costs, the by-products become even more valuable or more acres can be fertilized by an industry that's been and will be an economic driver in our rural communities. We need to provide research money and an environment to assist companies in bringing new products to market from both agriculture and society by-products. In my opinion, biologicals and enzymes are the new frontier in handling society and agriculture by-products as well as for farm inputs.

Stop the all-or-nothing approach. It seems to me sometimes all governments get to thinking we've got to put something in concrete so we can't change it. I would suggest, for instance, if we're doing a watershed, do one small watershed in a three-year project. They had a cows-and-fish project in an area I know in Alberta, and what they were able to do within three years to the water in that watershed, it amazed me, and how, just by sitting down with people, how they would improve it. So we did that, and if it works, continue on it. If something needs to be changed, we tweak it.

The irrigation of town by-product and a biologically active soil, as I mentioned earlier. In my opinion, there should be no town that's allowed to let the water drain through a man-made ditch, to a little stream, to a big stream, to a creek, to a river and on into the lake. So many years, as you people well know in government, it's either too dry or it's too wet—more often dry. Why don't we try and utilize this resource? If only hay could be grown. I keep hearing it back from some of these old [*inaudible*] Well, it was 25 years ago, for one thing, and the second thing, the people today didn't buy the lands so the farmer had control of it whether they were going to irrigate it. That's my understanding.

So, I think if you were going to put a new moratorium on anything—no more lagoons, and then assist the community in getting going, see what we can do, and then from there branch on it. The city, there's light land within 30, 40 miles of the city we could do the same thing on. So much could be done to reuse the water, in my opinion.

I would suggest you put a moratorium on any new development in any city or town unless professional, technical people determine the proper handling of society by-products is in place. The minute you put a stop on something—that's why we're here tonight—some good will come out of this because if you listen, some good will come out. The same if you put a moratorium on houses being built. Now, if you went to the town of Stonewall and said no more houses being built till you get a processing plant because we're tired of seeing the effluent going over the top of the dike, there'd be some action, wouldn't there? I guarantee it.

Encourage individuals or organizations that want to put a moratorium on any industry to come up with practical, new ideas instead of sitting in the back of the boat and whining. You know, you never hit a boater in the back of the boat. It's a lot easier in front, but not in the back. I know, I've been there in a few.

Or, if all else fails, what we should do is transfer the whole province into a provincial park and then the government gives us all jobs as forest rangers, and we'd bring our food and products from China. Not practical, but just a thought, just in case we really want to go goofy.

I would encourage the minister to look at this legislation as if he was driving home from his office and there was a green light on the road for him to continue; however, he sees a semi approaching from the left side that can't possibly stop. Remember, of course, he has the green light. If he continues he'll be broadsided and possibly killed—

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

**Mr. Dann:** I've just got one more minute—you might say he's dead right. Mr. Minister, you're dead wrong on this legislation, and I encourage you to withdraw this legislation, bring forward new legislation with the assistance of your professional people, technical people and producer groups, progressive legislation that will improve the handling of both agriculture and society by-products to the benefit of all Manitobans.

At the same time, I would encourage the opposition to help the minister rather than gloat because of his actions. His saying, I was wrong; let's move forward together and do better, would make my day. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Dann. Questions.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you, Harvey, for your presentation. I know you pride yourself with being a pioneer in trying to find new products, new ways of technology, and you've demonstrated that through travelling throughout the United States and Canada.

My question for you is, if Bill 17 was to go forward, do you feel that that will hamper the new technologies, the new sciences, that will come into the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Dann:** Well, when there's no market—it's bad enough now to try and get something done between the CFIA and Health Canada. But if there's no market, there are many products, I understand, that they're bypassed because the market's not big enough to bear it.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Dann, in 10 words or less, can you tell this minister what to do with this bill?

**Mr. Dann:** My last 10 words, Mr. Minister, is that there's nothing wrong with saying you're wrong. You're a bigger man for doing it. Say, look it, I screwed up. We've all done it. As I said, you never hit a boulder when you're in the back of the boat.

You're in the front of the boat. In fact, you're so far over the front, you're getting wet when there's no need to.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Harvey, why is this government so afraid of new technology and new innovations? The easy route for them right now is a moratorium, stop everything.

They've heard from a hundred-and-some presenters telling them that there's technology out there, and yet their easy route out is a moratorium. Why are they so afraid of technology?

**Mr. Dann:** Well, you're closer to them than I am. I've only spent a couple of days here. I think it's maybe a lack of knowledge, or we maybe haven't done a good enough job of presenting ourselves on the alternatives. There's certainly enough of them here tonight.

I don't know why. If you're scared of something, it tells me you're hiding something. I don't know. I hope not.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thanks, Harvey. Just before we get too carried away with Mr. Pedersen's assumption, as I said before, I like to question assumptions.

There's nothing to be scared of in terms of accepting new technology that helps the environment, and we recognize that in 40.1(2) of none other than Bill 17, where we provide exemptions for exactly those sorts of things that Mr. Pedersen is putting forward. Were you aware of that?

**Mr. Dann:** Yes, I was aware of that, but the thing is, it's got to be practical or economically feasible to do those assumptions. Maybe if we could convince Manitoba Hydro to buy power, methane projects could come into use and all these different little things that need to be put the pencil to.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Dann, for your presentation.

\* (00:00)

**Mr. Dann:** Mr. Chairperson, I have one short statement. When I was here a week ago speaking, I made a suggestion to the chairman of the day that there's technology available, so we all don't have to sit here six hours, seven hours, to make a presentation. I thought maybe—I didn't know it needed an act of Parliament to put it through, like, where you have a calculator and there's four people per hour, and you give some sort of a general idea to put in. So, with your permission, I'd like to present the group with a calculator so that they'll have it to do that, and I don't care which party, because I did ask Ralph. I says, was it like this when the Conservatives were in power? He says, yes, it was worse. I said, by God, when you get in the next time, if you don't change it, you know who's going to eat it. So I think that our time is worth something. Your time is worth quite a bit too.

Pass it to Sherman. He's the one who needs it. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I don't quite follow the logic there. There are all these people listed to speak and, yes, each one of them has their 15 minutes. So there's no shortcuts around that unless, of course, they want to submit written submissions, and we will enter them into the record. That's fine with me.

**Mr. Dann:** I was told to be here at 6 o'clock. That's the point. If it's six to eight—I can understand you can't pin it to the minute because between parking and everything. But a couple of hours is not unreasonable. Six hours is unreasonable.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All right. Thank you, sir. I got a calculator out of the deal. All right.

Mr. Eric Klassen. Eric Klassen. Mr. Klassen's name will drop to the bottom of the list. Mr. Timothy Hofer, Willow Creek Colony. Timothy Hofer.

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Chairman, before the next presenter comes to the microphone, I would ask the committee what their plans are. I'd asked at the onset at 6 o'clock what the intentions were in order for the presenters to have some type of a guideline. We said again at 8:30. At that time we had 51 presenters registered, with five in town. An hour ago, at 11 o'clock, we had 54 presenters that were still in the building, one of which I know has left a written presentation. But, in fairness to those presenters that are left, I was wondering if we could ask leave of the committee for those presenters who want to be heard, that they in fact do be heard, and the ones that have to leave, whether it be for family matters or go home to do the chores, that their name would not be struck from the list.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Well, their names will not be stricken from the list. They will drop to the bottom of the list, and they will have another opportunity to be called yet. So that's just a clarification.

**Mr. Eichler:** I'm asking for their name not to be dropped to the bottom of the list.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay.

**Hon. Diane McGifford (Minister of Advanced Education and Literacy):** Mr. Chair, I understand what Mr. Eichler is saying, but since we have already dropped individuals to the bottom of the list, some of whom may have gone home to do the chores or be with their families, to change that practice in midstream seems to me not quite fair.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Chairperson, I would suggest that, even though we have done this with some, I think it's time to use some common sense. There are people that've been here for six hours, seven hours. They're phoned, all of them are phoned to come at the same time. If we can't organize it, as Harvey said, then we should be at least as accommodating as possible.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Now, Mr. Eichler, you have asked for leave for us to consider from this point forward not dropping people to the bottom of the list. We've had some people speak on it already.

It's a simple matter of you having asked for leave, and I put it to the committee: Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** So, leave has been denied.

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Chair, let's think about what we're doing here. We have 54 presenters. We know that they're allowed 10 minutes. It is midnight. There is no way this committee is going to hear 51 presenters in 9.5 hours. Now, I'm going to ask the Clerk what time we have to rise tomorrow, do the math so the rest of the people can go home. In some orderly fashion, we have to be fair to the general populace that's here tonight that wants to be heard.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I think that we've addressed this already and we've said that the people whose names are called will fall to the bottom of the list. Their name is not being removed, so people can make their decision based on that, whether or not, if they want to stay tonight, we're here to listen to them. If they don't want to be here tonight, their name will fall to the bottom of the list and then they will be called tomorrow. They are not losing their right to present. I think that instead of us arguing back and forth over this, let's just move on and get to the next presenter.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chair, this is not a very humane process. I think these are respected Manitobans, hard-working Manitobans who have come to make their views known to this committee. I think we have to use reason when we address this. Now, these are people who have families at home. Some of them have children at home who have to probably go to school tomorrow. The other thing is that many of them have responsibilities, like we do, in terms of morning work that has to be done.

There is no reason for us not to at least acknowledge that we show a little bit of respect to the people who are here and allow those who want to present tonight to be able to present tonight, but those who have been sitting here for six hours or more who have responsibilities at home, who need to get home, I don't think we should be holding them here because if they aren't here, they're going to drop to the bottom of the list. It's not hard to take a canvass of this and to be able to ascertain some reasonable approach in how we deal with this.

What we're doing here is inhumane and it's absolutely against all principles that all of us, I think,

ascribe to in terms of reasonable efforts to allow people to express their views in a democracy.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Following on Mr. Derkach, it is a very difficult process but this is the process that's in place that we have been operating under for years, and it has always been that people—and we agreed at the beginning of the committee that we would drop people to the bottom of the list. I guess what I would suggest to committee members is to see how late are we going to stay. Are we staying here for another two or three hours, and if we're staying for three or if we're staying till morning, people can judge accordingly about four people per hour. Then we can figure out how many will stay. I think that might be a way to do it. We have to decide how long we're staying. If we're staying for several hours, then we can judge accordingly with about four people per hour.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Well, I thank the minister for her suggestion but it doesn't work. As she's well aware, we're going to call names off. We don't know who's here, who's in the gallery, who's not in the gallery. There are individuals out there who may well be 300 on the list and they don't know whether they're going to be called or not.

All Mr. Eichler is suggesting is for these individuals who do not want to wait for the next two hours, they can go home. The ones that remain, it would be just simply asking leave of an individual who shows themselves at the podium, to give leave to have them make a presentation without having to go through 100 names to get to him or her. That's all. And by the way, that's a much more humane process because the process we have in front of us, quite frankly, right now, is asinine. To go through a hundred names to find the next presenter—and they don't know who that presenter is on the list—is absolutely ridiculous.

\* (00:10)

So why don't we let the people go home who want to go home, ask for leave of the ones who remain so they can make their presentations? It may well be 10. It may well be 15. It may well be 20. If it's 20 that want to stay, then we'll sit here for three hours to listen to those 20. That's a pretty simple request. It's a pretty reasonable request, I think, and not to follow that request by this committee, I think, is putting Manitobans at a disservice who want to make their opinions known but perhaps not at six o'clock in the morning.

In fact, one of the speakers just said, I'm not working quite as well as I should be right now at midnight. How well is it going to work at six o'clock?

**Mr. Struthers:** Mr. Chairperson, I think I can agree with much of what has been said on both sides of this table. What I find frustrating is that we went all through this last year and we went all through this the year before that and we've been through this the 13 years—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Struthers:** Can I finish?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. Mr. Struthers has the floor.

**Mr. Struthers:** These are the same rules that have been in place year after year, and we tie ourselves up in front of people of Manitoba squabbling over these kinds of rules when we should be having our House leaders meet in between now and the next round of these meetings. We should have had them meet before so we don't get into these kinds of squabbles in front of the people of Manitoba. We should have done that. The fact is we didn't do that and now we're taking up time of presenters from Manitoba who would like to come and tell me what they think of Bill 17.

So I think we've got to stick with the rules that we've got, as imperfect as they are. I don't want to start changing midstream when we've already put people to the bottom of the list. That would not be fair to those people. Based on fairness, I think we have to follow what the Chair has ruled and denied leave to have people not be bumped to the bottom of the list.

So, Mr. Chairperson, I think we've made this decision. I think we all understand we don't have much choice in this matter and it isn't a good process, but it's not fair to change midstream.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We'll have Mr. Maguire and then Ms. Allan.

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden):** Mr. Chair, everybody around this table knows that, by leave, we can agree to do anything we want at this table without the House leaders making any kind of definition. I just want the people that are sitting behind me to know that. That is the historic rule that's been going on in the Legislature for many, many years, that with leave and between the two parties, all members of the table, committee, they can

determine their own process as far as how to handle speakers that come forward.

So I guess, I mean, I think what Mr. Eichler has asked for is, if we're going to sit till 2, then let the next eight people stand up. The rest can go home. They can determine they're going to be here and you don't have to stroke anybody's name to the bottom of the list tonight. Your House leaders will determine tomorrow what they want to do with that, if that's the case, but we can determine, if the minister would just agree to that, that we could move forward with hearing eight, ten. If he wants to stay here till seven in the morning and hear 28, well then we'll be here, but let the other 28 go home because I understand there's 54 still here, which would take you, by the way, until 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon to do. If that's what the minister wants to do, well I guess that's what we're doing, but he'd have to see how many are still—just to let them know how many—how they've handled it.

**Hon. Nancy Allan (Minister of Labour and Immigration):** Mr. Chair, I find that quite interesting because that's actually what I was going to suggest.

I was going to suggest that what we do is we make a decision as the politicians around this table in regard to whether or not we're going to sit here for one more hour or two more hours. I would agree with two hours, if my colleagues are in agreement, and then I would ask the Chair to take a few moments to—we know that in two hours we can hear eight presenters, so I would ask the Chair to go through the list, quickly, and identify whether or not there are eight presenters in the audience on the list that would be prepared to present. Then we can actually be humane here tonight and those individuals that want to go home can go home and attend to the duties that they have to attend to at home.

We have another meeting on Wednesday night—no, today's Monday, we have another meeting on Tuesday. We have another meeting on Wednesday and then those individuals will have some idea in regard to when they should be back and we can try to manage it that way. I don't know if that will work in regard to the rules that have been laid out previously before, but I think we need to try to manage this over the next couple of hours.

**Mr. Eichler:** I think the minister had a great idea. I think that's one of the best ideas that she's come up

with tonight. We'd certainly be prepared to accept that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. Okay, leave was asked and denied.

There was another suggestion put forward, but I guess the conclusion is that this is a decision which should be discussed between House leaders, that it's going to be business as usual, that we've already established a precedent where people who are not here are being dropped to the bottom of the list—*[interjection]*—and so forth. So now, if you want to, is the time.

The second question is: How long do we sit here?

**Ms. Brick:** I have a suggestion, Mr. Chairperson, that we move until 2 o'clock and, at 2 o'clock, we revisit this.

**Mr. Eichler:** I ask leave of the committee to go from—the next presenter is No. 49. Is that correct, Mr. Chairperson?

\* (00:20)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yes, that is correct. Oh, 49 is gone already. Sorry. Number 50 would be the next name to be called here.

**Mr. Eichler:** Could we get leave of the committee to go up to presenter No. 75? Hear those that are present up until that point in time, and then those presenters after that would know that they will not be called tonight. So I ask leave to go just to No. 75 for the purposes of the committee, and then 75 and on would be called at the next committee level, starting at the beginning again. After 75 would be tomorrow.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You're suggesting that we start at 50. For clarity's sake, you're suggesting, Mr. Eichler, that we start at 50, which is the next name, and call names till we hit 75, and that's it. If that's at 1 o'clock or at 3 o'clock, the meeting ends at the 75th name. That's your suggestion?

**Mr. Eichler:** That is my request.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Commentary? Order, please.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I'm fine with that suggestion, to go to No. 75. But if we get to 75 and there's nobody in that list in the next 10 minutes, if there's nobody in that list in the next 10 minutes as we read through them, then we should go to 100, okay? If there's nobody here. Let's get going.

**Ms. McGifford:** Mr. Chairperson, I think we're making progress. Perhaps we could set not only a number but a time limit at the same time.

**Mr. Eichler:** I amend my request to go from presenter 50 to 75, or two hours, or whichever happens first.

**Ms. Brick:** Mr. Chair, would it be possible for you to read those names, please, and find out who is here so that we would know who is here. That would not count as dropping from the bottom. That would just give us an indication of how many people there are in the crowd from 50 to 75, as a show of hands, then we would know whether we're talking about quite a few people or very few people.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, it's proposed that we read the names 50 to 75, just as a bit of a head count, to see what number of people we have, and I have Mr. Graydon also on an exception, but let's settle this first, okay? We're still working on No. 75 as a maximum for tonight, right? Okay, let's do a little head count from 50 to 75. I will read the names. You call your name out if you're present. All right, are you ready?

Timothy Hofer, Tom Crockatt, Gordie Dehnn, Cindy Vandenbossche, Michael Hofer, Edward Stahl, Kelvin Waldner, Claudette Taillefer, Wally Driedger, Carol Martens, Dennis Stevenson,

**Floor Comment:** Present.

**An Honourable Member:** There we go. One.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ted Neufeld.

**Floor Comment:** Yes.

**An Honourable Member:** Two.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mike Van Schepdael. George Dyck. Raymond Funk.

**Floor Comment:** Present.

**An Honourable Member:** Three.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Dave Mendel.

**Floor Comment:** Present.

**An Honourable Member:** Four.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Darren Bates. Jason Hofer. Paul Wurtz.

**Floor Comment:** Present.

**An Honourable Member:** Five.

**Mr. Chairperson:** David Hofer.

**Floor Comment:** Present.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, that's up to 75.

**An Honourable Member:** Six presenters. That's going to get you to 2 o'clock.

**An Honourable Member:** Let's get going, guys.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Six? Mr. Graydon?

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Chairperson, there's an individual that has to be away for two days at a meeting—

**Some Honourable Members:** Cliff, your mic.

**Mr. Graydon:** Oh, I'm sorry, I knew that. Mr. Chair, there's an individual that has two days of meetings and he'll be leaving shortly, won't be able to get back. He would like to present as well.

**Mr. Chairperson:** What's his name?

**Mr. Graydon:** Don Winnicky.

**Mr. Chairperson:** What number is he?

**Mr. Graydon:** I have no idea. My sheet's outdated, Mr. Chair. *[interjection]* No. 100.

How many does that give us, Mr. Chair?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seven, I believe.

**Mr. Graydon:** I beg your pardon?

**An Honourable Member:** Seven.

**Mr. Graydon:** Seven?

**An Honourable Member:** I think we should ask if there is anybody else that wants to present tonight. *[interjection]* Yeah, ask.

**Mr. Chairperson:** In addition to the names that I've read off, is there anybody else here who would like to present tonight, bearing in mind it'll be another three or four hours?

Okay, I've got one, two, three, about another eight. Okay?

**An Honourable Member:** Yeah. Get 'em done.

**An Honourable Member:** That's another two hours past. That's four. That's 4 o'clock.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yeah? Okay. *[interjection]*

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we have a list of roughly seven names. We'll also hear Don Winnicky. We had another eight or so individuals that had their hands up. You can list your names with the Clerk. We will hear you, too. Those individuals

between 50 and 75 that I called that are not here, those names dropped to the bottom of the list, and we should have a number of presenters and we'll compile that list and we'll hear them tonight. At the conclusion of that list, the committee rises.

\* (00:30)

Okay. Order. Will the committee please come back to the table. We're going to begin calling names while the Clerk and our assistant at the back get the list of the additional eight people in addition to the six we've identified, plus Mr. Winnicky who will speak seventh.

So I begin by calling Dennis Stevenson, No. 63.

**Floor Comment:** Good morning, Dennis.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Stevenson, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Dennis Stevenson (Private Citizen):** No, I do not, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Stevenson:** I did have good evening written down but you're right; it is good morning.

Mr. Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Dennis Stevenson. I'm 35 years old, married with two sons, currently employed by a company called Genesis Genetics. We reside in Morris, Manitoba. My wife is a school teacher in Morris. My wife, Angela, and I moved to Manitoba seven years ago from Saskatchewan.

When we told people that we were moving from Saskatchewan to Manitoba, we were the brunt of a few jokes because most young people when they were leaving Saskatchewan, which many were, headed west to Alberta, and Manitoba was not a destination of choice, but we felt that the hog industry had such promise out here that this was the direction we wanted to travel. People were leaving Saskatchewan at an alarming rate, mostly for the oil industry, but Manitoba was our choice.

I hope I haven't made a mistake by bringing my family to this province. In the past seven years of living and working in Manitoba, I've had the challenge of filing manure management plans and nutrient management plans. I'm very proud of the fact that I spend a great deal of my time and effort making sure that I followed the nutrient management guidelines in Manitoba.

I have family in Saskatchewan who also are in animal production but are not required to live to the standards that we in Manitoba hold ourselves to. I am proud to be a good steward of the land. In 2003 we moved to a farm south of Brunkild, Manitoba, working for a family operation. During that time I lived on that farm, two miles north of us the City of Winnipeg spread human sludge waste on a field during the dead of winter. I took photos to keep record of it. If any hog farmer was to attempt this practice, they would be persecuted financially and socially. Somehow, the city is exempt from this.

The reason that we do not spread in the winter is logical. The ground is frozen and in the spring anything that is on the surface in this country goes to the rivers. I went back in the spring to see what had happened while the spring run-off was going. Being from Saskatchewan, we don't get to see this kind of water out in the fields in the springtime so this was a big deal for me. I was making a video and I happened to go back to that field and there must have been six inches of water all over that field, draining into the drainage system and along with it all the sludge from the City of Winnipeg. No good steward of the land would do this.

If the government is truly interested in protecting the lakes and rivers, they should deal with things in a logical fact-based way. If I was to apply this government's logic to another situation, you might say because people die in car accidents, we should ban automobiles. It doesn't make any sense to do it this way. Instead we put The Highway Traffic Act in place; we put speed limits on; we do driver training with our students; and we have police officers to enforce the law.

I support protecting the lakes and rivers. I do not support Bill 17 as it does not protect the lakes and rivers. I ask you to show the people of this province that you really care and go back to the drawing board to help all of us create a sustainable hog industry. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Stevenson. Questions?

**Mr. Maguire:** Thanks, Mr. Stevenson. It's very clear you want the bill withdrawn. What kind of a program do you think the government should put together to work with the industry to find a solution to this dilemma?

**Mr. Stevenson:** If the government is really interested in protecting lakes and rivers, there were

recommendations from the CEC. There are many people in this province who work towards improving. We, as hog farmers, want to have a sustainable industry. We are willing to work together with whatever comes, be a part of the process if need be, to continue to improve.

I heard people state numbers, tonight, of 1.5 percent. We contribute 1.5 percent to the problem. If that's the case and something can be done about it, we're all for working towards it.

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

I call presenter No. 65, Ted Neufeld. Come on up, Ted. I'm going to do a little housekeeping before I ask you to present. I'm going to list off the names that were called that weren't here that are dropping to the bottom of the list, from 50 to 75, as per our agreement.

That would be No. 50, Timothy Hofer, Willowcreek Colony, to the bottom of the list; Tom Crockatt, No. 51, to the bottom of the list; 52, Gordie Dehnn, to the bottom of the list; 54, Cindy Vandembosche, to the bottom of the list; 53 is from the city; No. 55, Michael Hofer, to the bottom of the list; 57, Edward Stahl, to the bottom of the list; 58, Kelvin Waldner, to the bottom of the list; No. 60, Claudette Taillefer, to the bottom of the list; 61, Wally Driedger, to the bottom of the list; 62, Carol Martens, to the bottom of the list.

That brings us to 65, Mr. Ted Neufeld. Mr. Neufeld, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Ted Neufeld (Private Citizen):** No, I do not. I was trying to get environmentally friendly.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. How commendable of you. You may begin. Don't waste your breath either. Just joking. Take no offence.

**Mr. Neufeld:** You're lucky, I can't see you. I took my glasses off or I can't see my page.

Ted Neufeld, T.M. Neufeld Farms. I'm from Niverville, Manitoba. I'm here today to protest the passing of Bill 17. I'm currently farming a 1,600-sow early-wean operation, one mile east of Niverville. In 1983 my brother and I started farming with 250 sows. We expanded to 400 in '85 and, again, in '97 to 800. In 1999 my wife bought my brother's shares in the operation and in 2003 we again expanded to 1,600 sows, where we're at today. Each of these expansions was done as a result of a demand for the

product. In each case, these expansions were done following all the regulations set out by both the provincial, as well as the federal and municipal governments.

When I went into farming, it was not a religious or moral decision. My father, I believe, had a spiritual bond to the land and the animals that he raised, but my decision was based financial. I did, however, believe that it was an honourable occupation to get into, and I still believe that raising food for the people of this world is an honourable business.

\* (00:40)

However, when I walk around my community and I'm questioned on why I run a factory farm and, unlike other factories like Kitchen Craft or Palliser or Spectus, it is said in a very negative and condescending way. This government has done nothing to encourage this negative misconception.

I also get asked why we farmers are polluting lakes and rivers in this province. When I try to explain how little of this pollution is actually caused by the hog farmer, they are initially shocked and then disbelieving, because this government says otherwise.

A few days ago, a Cabinet minister was asked why the moratorium was so important. He said it was to stop the pollution of Lake Winnipeg, leaving me with the impression that the moratorium will stop the pollution of this lake.

Small-town Manitoba's idea of sewage treatment plant is a two-cell lagoon. The first cell settles out most of the solids, the second, a little bit more of the solids. Then, when the second cell is full, they drain it into the ditch which empties into the Red River and then into the lake.

Big-city Manitoba has, shall we say, controlled spills. We found one today, apparently, which sent raw sewage directly into the waterways of this province. The solids from the sewage treatment plants are either top spread on farmland or they are buried in landfills.

In the 25 years that I have been farming, I have not received one complaint from the people of Niverville about my operation. Starting in 1990, we have injected all liquid manure directly into the land, according to the crops that we were going to seed. We do not over fertilize, because we know what that does to the crops.

Since provincial regulations came into effect, we have always followed these regulations. The value of manure, as fertilizer, is well-documented. If this fertilizer is not available, it will force another 100 acres a year to be spread with chemicals from my own farm, which has a far greater impact on the environment than manure has.

This moratorium is not based on science; it is not based on evidence and it is not based on observation of what is happening in the industry. It is based, solely, on a political agenda to appear green.

George W. Bush started a war based on political agenda—no evidence, no observation. So he had to come up with his WMDs, his weapons of mass destruction, a figment of his political imagination. This government has come up with its own WMDs, weanlings of mass defecation. This too is in the government's political imagination—no evidence, no science.

What will this do to the industries? We have heard from presenters how the hog companies are saying they'll move the business out of the province. I don't think this will happen immediately, but it will happen eventually.

I was hoping that, someday, my operation would be of some interest to someone; however, if the big companies move out of the province, I think my operation will become useless. If, in the future, the big companies move out of the province, I will have nothing, my operation worthless.

In the meantime, the municipality's charging taxes on an assumed value of the operation. Today those taxes are approximately \$10,000 a year, half of that going to school taxes. If the moratorium is put in place, can I stop paying those taxes for the next 10 years, until I find what the value of my farm might be? I don't think they'll allow me to do that.

At this time, I employ five people in my operation; together with wives and children, my wife and I, it comes to 22 people that this operation supports. On average, I'm paying them \$33,000 a year plus benefits. In the province, this industry employs 15,000 people at the farm gate.

If this industry goes down, I suppose we could put up about another 1,000 Starbucks or Tim Hortons or maybe a few malls to put them all on minimum wage, but I would rather that this industry remain strong and viable in this province.

This government, when asked if it would legislate the use of phosphates in soap, declined to move, saying that they would rather the federal government take this action first and, yet, on this moratorium, they feel they have to move now and they have to move fast.

The cottage industry in Manitoba as well as Ontario is a huge contributor to the pollution problem. Raw sewage is regularly being pumped directly into the lake, wash and laundry water pumped into the lake. Some place rain water and sewage into holding tanks, then they permanently alter these holding tanks to allow leakage so that they don't have to spend the money cleaning them out. Nothing has been done to slow or stop the cottage industry. In fact, it's just the opposite. New lots are opening up every year with little or no planning and no inspection of what is happening.

The NDP has the word "democratic" in their name. This process so far has been anything but democratic. The people of this province have the right to decide on a bill of this magnitude, and when they do, they should be given the truth. They should be given the facts, and these facts should be based on good science and good evidence and not the political rhetoric we have heard so far.

This government commissioned a committee to study the problem of lake pollution and then ignored the report completely, wasting \$750,000 of taxpayer money. This is not democratic. It is dictatorial. Perhaps democratic should be changed to dictatorship in the NDP name.

I saw the federal NDP leader on stage in Oshawa cheering on the GM workers who had blockaded GM headquarters. He was praising the efforts of the workers who were fighting for their jobs. My next statement is not a threat, but it is a promise. If this bill passes reading, and all legal avenues are closed down to resolve this issue fairly, this is my promise. You will see the people and the farmers of this promise ban together and rise up against this injustice, and we will make that rally in Oshawa look like the Teddy Bears' Picnic.

Of all the people in the government, this committee will more than likely have the most influence on the outcome of this bill. I therefore ask you to throw off the ignorance of party politics and get rid of Bill 17. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Maguire:** Mr. Neufeld, I appreciate your frankness. You've also indicated that you've been using good stewardship management 19 years, 18 years, I believe. You've been injecting your manure and I've asked many a persons—you've made it very clear what the government should do with this bill. I've asked others and I'll ask you: What kind of a process do you think they should go through to try to come to a more amenable solution to this dilemma they're in?

**Mr. Neufeld:** I think that we already have a lot of these issues resolved in all of the regulations that we are put through with our manure spreading, with our mortality clean-up, et cetera. I do believe that there is way more that can be done, but to just outrightly throw a moratorium at us, not allowing us to—even the will, to improve from where we are. If the economics is gone, so is the ability to move forward with the pollution problem.

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

Okay. No.67, Mike Van Schepdael of Genesis Inc. drops to the bottom of the list. Number 68, George Dyck drops to the bottom of the list.

Now, No. 69, Raymond Funk. He had a request up here prior to all of this negotiation, and his request was that he exchange places with No. 99, Mr. Brendan Penner. So Mr. Funk is no longer with us and Mr. Penner is prepared to—are you Mr. Penner? You're prepared to present in his stead? Is that agreeable to the committee? *[Agreed]*

**Ms. Brick:** So then the presenter who was previously listed, Mr. Funk, would then appear as No. 99, correct?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yes.

**Ms. Brick:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All right. Mr. Brendan Penner, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Brendan Penner (Border Rock Farms):** No, I don't.

\* (00:50)

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed.

**Mr. Penner:** I guess, good morning. Thank you for this opportunity to speak about Bill 17. As you know, I'm Brendan Penner. I'm from Border Rock Farms. I've been farming for the last seven years with my brother-in-law Gaelen *[phonetic]*, his wife

Sherry and my wife Janna [*phonetic*]. Our farm is located three miles south of Grunthal in the R.M. of Hanover. We are a sow and nursery operation that has two sites. We are proud to be a part of a third-generation family farm. This privilege of farming has been given to us by our wives' family. We are very proud of our farm, our management and our husbandry. We also have one full-time employee and a part-time student for summer.

Bill 17 would greatly affect how we're going to be hog farming in the future. How can we change with the challenges that have arisen and what will come? We cannot change with the improvements of genetics as litters increase in size and the demands that are needed on those animals. How can we change with improvement of husbandry? How can we change with management skills as we improve in the care of these animals? We'll not be able to change to meet these needs because we can't change our barns. We can't change with the rise of the need for increasing in days on the farrowing crate. This would not increase the animal units on our farm but just increase our production and our profitability that we have. We need the tools and the ability to change as time goes by.

I take great pride and care in how we apply our manure. It is a renewable resource that improves the land, as we've heard already. Today of increasing petroleum prices and the growing organic concerns, it is a far better way to fertilize the land. With the growing concern of the environment and Lake Winnipeg, we all need to take care in what we can do. But why are we picking on the industry that has a very small factor in Lake Winnipeg?

The hog industry is a very highly regulated industry. We need to look at each farm on its own merit and what it needs to grow in the future. Let science and common sense affect the hog industry, not what people think. There is a lack of understanding on what the hog industry already has to do. The CEC report has done their job. Why must Manitoba government look like they're doing something by picking on the hog industry?

I grew up in Winnipeg and have joined the hog industry by choice. Taking an environment stand, I'm very proud of the hog industry and its role. On this problem, they might have invested in researching it and knowing how we can improve. As a former Winnipegger, I'm saddened by the role Winnipeg has played in the increase of nitrates in Lake Winnipeg. Winnipeg, as we've already heard, has a major

history of spills and errors in the way they treat waste.

As I said, we need to take our part in taking care of the environment. Why has this single industry paid for the government of Manitoba looking like they're doing something. The NDP government seems only to be concerned with the urban public opinion. People are forgetting where their food comes from. It doesn't all come from Safeway. The city is growing with little or no planning, and other industries continue to grow with little or no government involvement or regulation.

As I told you, we are a family farm. My six-year-old son comes into the barn because he wants to come and work and spend time with his father. One Saturday afternoon, he looked at me, and said, when I grow up, I'd like to join your team at the barn with you and Uncle Gaelen [*phonetic*]. I would like to make this happen for my son, my daughter, my niece, my nephew if they choose to be involved in the hog industry.

Can you please help in making this possible by not passing Bill 17. If Bill 17 passes, it will be of great difficulty to make this wish come true, a fourth generation on a family farm. Can you help by making this happen for my family and also other families. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Penner. Questions?

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you, Mr. Penner, for putting up with this process and being here and waiting this late to make your presentation.

Mr. Penner, would you say that your operation is a fairly small operation or a mid-size operation?

**Mr. Penner:** We're 800 sows in nursery.

**Mr. Borotsik:** That's a smaller operation. You talk—you have two barns and I don't want you to give me too much personal information but approximately what would be the capital cost of the barns and the operation that you have currently right now? If I were to go out and set up your operation with the two barns and 800—

**Mr. Penner:** It'll be close to two million.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you. That's an awful lot of money. Two million dollars is a lot of money and certainly it's your life's investment and I go back to the return on investment, the return on that \$2 million. There are two families that are being fed—

well, more than two families. You have hired help as well, so there are a number of families being fed out of this operation.

Again, with this moratorium and a \$2 million investment, you have fixed costs: the cost of amortization, the cost of mortgages, the cost of insurance and lights and heat and all the rest of this stuff. With this moratorium—and I know you talked genetics, and I know you talked increased production—can you honestly—can you tell me, and I know it will be honestly, can you tell me over the next three to five years with this moratorium in place, do you see the opportunity to generate enough revenue off of that to fulfil your obligations with respect to those fixed costs?

**Mr. Penner:** At present, it would be great difficulty in that we may have to grow into the finishing end and that by renting farms and getting larger and that employs more people. It is hard but it's more than just the capital return. It's a lifestyle. It's spending time with the family with hard work and that becomes very difficult with this moratorium.

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

Before we continue with leave, Mr. Mack Waldner, presenter No. 132, has asked that his written presentation be placed into the record and that his name be stricken from the list. Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]*

Next on the list is No. 70, Mr. David Mendel. David Mendel? Mr. Mendel will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

**An Honourable Member:** Unless he's gone to the washroom or something We can check.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I will call him once after the next presentation and if he's not here—

**An Honourable Member:** Yes, okay. That's a good idea.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, Mr. Darren Bates, 71, will be dropped to the bottom of the list. Mr.—72, Jason Hofer, will be dropped to the bottom of the list. Number 73, I call Mr. Paul Wurtz.

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

**Mr. Paul Wurtz (Private Citizen):** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed.

**Mr. Paul Wurtz:** Good morning. Since nobody's here today to speak for Starlite Colony, you haven't heard that name. I want to thank you for letting me speak against—if I don't get my point across, I'm not into public speaking—I'm against Bill 17.

\* (01:00)

Starlite bought a hog farm—I'm sure you heard about it—that's seven miles south of Lowe farm. I'm the guy managing it for now and as manager last fall, something came to my attention. There's pond water there for the pigs to drink and the ponds were getting low so I wanted—there's a big drainage going by—so I wanted to pump water in. I asked the previous owners about it; they said we shouldn't do it. I asked, why? They said, we tried it a few years ago and the water was so full of phosphate, our pigs were sick all winter. I asked them, where does it come from? They said it comes from the city of Winkler. Winkler dumps their lagoons into there and it comes by there.

Having said that, every year they pumped from the fields the snow run-off from around the barns, and they never had any problems. We did the same thing this year. We injected the manure on the fields around the barns and that's the water that was pumped into the pond. We have no problems. They said they have never had problems before by doing that.

I've tried to describe how every hog farmer feels in this province and put you in our position. If you were driving down the Trans-Canada Highway, you know the speed limit is 100 kilometres an hour, and you were going 90 kilometres an hour. The police stop you and give you a speeding ticket. Then he takes your driver's licence away, and then everybody calls you a drunk driver.

I think that's a very good way to describe the moratorium. Our lines are taken away; we can't expand and, in the public eye, we're accused of being a major contributor to algae growth.

In grade school, we learned to solve problems. We were taught that, to solve our problem, you have to deal with the problem. Bill 17 is not dealing with the problem. The government study proves that every culture only contributes to 1.5 percent. Nobody has come up here, representing the hog farmers, or hog farmers themselves, asking for special treatment or special privileges. All we ask for is to be treated equally.

As Hutterites, we are taught at an early age to respect our government and authority. Everyday we

pray for our government and everyday we pray for our enemy. I hope and pray our government does not become our enemy. Today, I'm here because I owe it to my children and their children to stand up and talk against this bill. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Wurtz, for your presentation. Questions? Seeing none, sir, I thank you for your presentation.

I'm going to call David Mendel a second time. We had called him a moment ago. No. 70, Mr. Mendel will be dropped to the bottom of the list. No. 75, Mr. David Hofer.

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

**Mr. David Hofer (Private Citizen):** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You do? The Clerk will distribute them. You may begin when ready.

**Mr. David Hofer:** Good morning. My name is David Hofer and I live in Keystone Colony. The last 12 years, I've managed our hog barn. I am also the secretary of Keystone Colony.

At Keystone Colony, there are 53 adults, 22 children and 13 families. We do not only work for ourselves, but for the benefit of all in the colony. We live off our land. We provide food, clothing, medical and shelter for the young and old. We are self-sufficient, raising much of the food that is consumed through the colony.

Keystone Colony sustains its livelihood through agriculture. Like most colonies, we are crop producers and have fair-sized farms. We farm on 1,800 acres. We also have 1,000 sows farrow-to-finish. We use the resources of the hog production in the form of liquid manure to supplement the cost of purchasing necessary fertilizer to farm our cropland.

We have adapted to changing and challenging farming conditions over the past many years, implementing state-of-the-art agriculture technology such as computers, GPS and computerized feed milling. Rules and regulations are not new to us, and we follow strict guidelines from the Clean Environment Commission and/or whatever other government regulatory body has implemented.

We left Russia and the Ukraine because of increasingly unfriendly governments who suppressed our way of life. We came to Canada because we were focussed on farming and we want our children to be farmers.

Keystone Colony has also set up a meat processing and meat store in our community to employ our young people and add value to our hog production. We want to work where we live. We must work where we live and 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're able to grow at the locations in which they live.

Bill 17 will impact the lives of all the people that are directly involved or indirectly involved in our hog barn, and Bill 17 will eliminate our chance to grow and expand our community.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Hofer. Questions? I have Mr. Eichler.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. I know that your colony, I've been there several times, is very progressive when it comes to looking for new and innovative ways to stay in existence. I know that the product that you put out, your finished product is just top quality. You provide a number of stores with that, and what is the feeling of your colony in regard to that business? Do you feel it is now being threatened, as well, as a result of Bill 17?

**Mr. David Hofer:** How am I going to answer this. It could be in the future, but right now we can still do what we want.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Mr. Hofer, it says, you stroked it out, it was the financial boss of the secretary of the colony. It's a fairly reasonable size operation, 1,100 sows. You have, obviously, a couple of barns I suspect. You have a finishing barn and you have a farrowing barn. Do you recall, as the financial boss, approximately what you would spend on hydro in a year?

**Mr. David Hofer:** Oh, I would say \$120,000 a year.

**Mr. Borotsik:** So \$120,000 worth of hydro in a year. You have vehicles, I know that. Can you tell me approximately, just approximately and I don't want to put you on the spot, what would it cost you approximately to license the vehicles that you have in your operation?

**Mr. David Hofer:** Twelve thousand.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Twelve thousand, the reason I ask the question is it's not just the local businesses that are affected certainly by any moratorium or any reduction in production that you might have but obviously there are certain dollars that generate to the Province as well through the Crown corporations

that sometimes we forget about. Can you give me some indication as to what the, just the hog operation, what the capital cost would be in something of that nature?

**Mr. David Hofer:** You're talking about the whole operation.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Yes, specifically the hog operation, your barns, your equipment, the inventory. The numbers of sows, you've got 1,100 sows, what would it cost if I was going to go out and buy that kind of an operation? What would it cost me to get into that business?

**Mr. David Hofer:** Well if you started building one today, 1,000 sows, I would say you would have to spend about \$7 million before you put the first hog to market.

\* (01:10)

**Mr. Borotsik:** That's an awful lot of money, and it's a lot of money and a lot of investment that's put in jeopardy by a simple piece of legislation. One piece of legislation which isn't that big actually, it's only a few pages, really is putting a \$7 million operation and a fairly large operating cost in jeopardy.

I know, Mr. Hofer, that you still have the opportunity of processing or producing a number of units. Did you or was your colony looking at any expansion of the hog operation in the future? Have you been looking at expansion?

**Mr. David Hofer:** Right now we're not finishing all our pigs. We'd like to finish them all.

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

**Mr. David Hofer:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I'm going to call 77, Rena Hop, and they would like leave for Marinus Hop, her husband—

**Floor Comment:** Brother.

**Mr. Chairperson:** —her brother to present right after her since they've travelled together. What's the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Hop, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Ms. Rena Hop (Private Citizen):** I do.

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

**Ms. Hop:** If I look exhausted, it's because I am. I've had a very long day, and I'm going to make this short and sweet. I just want to get it over with.

I am 20 years old and I recently graduated from the University of Manitoba with my diploma in agriculture in the hopes of coming home to have a career in agriculture working on the farm, only to find out that we might not be able to continue if we cannot diversify further in our farm.

I always was told by my mom that you needed to hear everything at least seven times before you would remember it, and I'm hoping by the end of this you guys will remember and see that the family farm needs the hog industry to survive.

I would like to see proof on paper telling me that the hog industry is the main cause of this. Like, where is your research? The University of Manitoba has done research, but I have seen no research from the government. I'd like to see some, just so that I know what we're dealing with.

As I said, family farms are the ones that are really going to be hurt by this, not the big industry. They will, but not as much as the family farms. Family farms are small. They run with the people that are in the area, and if you put this moratorium in and do not allow expansion, do not allow new barns to be put up, it's going to hurt everyone, especially rural life.

I grew up in the country. I know the ins and outs of what goes on in my town and the towns around me. You guys live in the city you may not know the same things that we do. I just feel that everyone in Winnipeg is uninformed with what's going on in the country and that you're taking a highly regulated industry and pretty much telling it to stop when there are so many regulations that it makes no sense. That's pretty much all I have to say.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Ms. Hop. Questions. Mr. Graydon and then Mr. Borotsik.

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Ms. Hop, you said you had just graduated from the university so you've had a lot of exposure to kids your age from both the city and the country. What was your experience there with the people when this moratorium was announced?

**Ms. Hop:** It was a main discussion in a lot of our classrooms, especially my swine class that I took. It just shows you what the government is able to do to us. Like, if they can take away this industry, what's

going to stop them from demolishing another industry? I've had many arguments with my friends about it, and in the end, we all come to the same conclusion that this is not good for agriculture.

**Mr. Graydon:** Ms. Hop, I happen to know your dad and mom and their operation, and so it's not just hogs. You're also involved in the dairy. Is there some concern that they could do this to the dairy, and you and your brothers would be in Alberta or somewhere else?

**Ms. Hop:** Yeah, you know, I grew up in Manitoba my whole life, and if they take away the hog industry that is the source of income for us, and then if they decide to take away the dairy industry, well, that's my life; that's my joy. Personally, I don't want to have to leave this province, but if it comes down to it, I might just have to.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Thank you, Ms. Hop. I appreciate your waiting around this length of time to make your presentation. We always prefer to have the young, vibrant, individuals make their presentation late at night because it sort of wakes us up.

Your hog operation, how large is it?

**Ms. Hop:** We have two 2,000-head barns, feeders.

**Mr. Borotsik:** Now, you had indicated that if you couldn't diversify, I think is what you said initially. You've got the dairy farm and you've got the two barns, 2,000 head.

Two questions: First of all, about diversification, were there any thoughts of how you would diversify the operation from continuing with the hogs and the dairy? How would you diversify that operation?

**Ms. Hop:** Well, we have our dairy; we have our hogs, which we just have shares in. Then we have our beef as well. I want to diversify into some sort of special crops, but, I mean, I like using the pig manure as fertilizer rather than buying a chemical fertilizer, and with these regulations coming into play and the moratorium and stuff, if we wanted to expand our pig barns or, you know, maybe create a farrowing barn, that might not be possible now, and that might just hurt us in the long run. I mean, if we all want to come home, are we going to be able to live financially off of it?

**Mr. Borotsik:** Last question: Would you consider yourself—you keep talking about the family farm. A lot of the people on the other side think of a family farm as 50 chickens, a couple of pigs and 80 acres of grain.

Now, would you consider yours a typical family farm? It's not an industrial operation. Would you consider yourselves a fairly typical family farm?

**Ms. Hop:** Yes, I would. It's what I've always known as a family farm. We're not in it to make big bucks. We're just in it for the farming.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further—oh, Mr. Briese, I'm sorry.

**Mr. Briese:** Ms. Hop, what were you taking in university?

**Ms. Hop:** I took my diploma in Agriculture. It was a general diploma, so I got a little bit of the grain and a little bit of the livestock portion.

**Mr. Briese:** Did you take any courses related to land-use planning and things like that, like the technical review committees? Where I'm going here is some of the legislation that's already out there and the development plans of municipalities, have you some knowledge on them, and what do you think of all the other regulations that are there?

**Ms. Hop:** No, actually, there are no courses available to us that are that specific. I did take an agricultural law course that helped me with some of those things, but there was no actual—like, it would be nice to have a course on government regulations and specifics like that.

They had the environmental farm plan, but they couldn't find a teacher this year, so that course was not made available to us.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for staying and waiting. I think you did a fantastic job, looking forward to your brother's presentation as well.

My question for you is: At the university level, when Bill 17 was presented, you had mentioned that it was an item for some quite heated discussion. At the general consensus, what kind of message is that sending to the University of Manitoba? The people that are wanting to study agriculture and get into agriculture, what signal is that sending to them?

**Ms. Hop:** For me it shows that the interest in agriculture is fading. As I grew up it was always, there's always going to be jobs for you in agriculture, always, always, always. Now it's starting to seem like that's supposed to be less of an interest for you, when really it should be increasing and not decreasing.

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

I call 117, Marinus Hop. My apologies to Mr. Winnicky who was supposed to come prior to the Hops. He will come next.

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

\* (01:20)

**Mr. Marinus Hop (Private Citizen):** No, sir, I don't.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed.

**Mr. Hop:** I honestly wish I could come up here and tell you something you haven't heard a couple of dozen times. The hog industry needs to modify itself and expand just so it can make ends meet. It is having one of its poorer years and it honestly needs all the help it can get and this is not helping.

I recently, actually as of Saturday, graduated from college in Alberta where I studied livestock production. I did not take the swine course because it is not my forte. I specialized in dairy and beef cattle production. However, a lot of those courses I took relate to this topic here.

We had a class in college called facilities, and facilities dealt with housing issues, regulations, laws for pig barns of all types and all sizes. It also involved, with a large percent of our final mark, making a manure management plan. The part I got a kick out of, being from Manitoba, is that the model they used was, as the teacher described it, the best one in the country was the computer program from the Department of Agriculture here in Manitoba.

It took into consideration the nutrient values of the manure, the available nutrients in the soil and the nutrient requirements of the crop being put in. The teacher explained that this was not law in Saskatchewan or Alberta but Manitoba had set the precedent and soon it would be making its way farther west. So me and the other fellow from Manitoba already kind of got a head start from this and we're done in 15 minutes because we knew where to find the numbers because we've seen soil sample sheets before. We've seen manure analysis sheets before. We came from the industry, and we knew how to manage the information a lot better and we were a lot more comfortable with the situation.

As I said before, this is not new information. These regulations have been in place for quite a while and, suffice to say, our industry, all agriculture in the province of Manitoba is extremely progressive when it comes to the environmental aspect. The

environmental farm plan was also part of this facilities course and was twice as big as B.C.'s, bigger than Alberta's and about the same size as Saskatchewan's but it covered a lot more in depth the fertilizer aspect as compared to the other management plans.

I am speaking against Bill 17 because it's a detriment. It reduces farmer confidence in the government which is severely unfortunate and it's based on misconceptions of not necessarily the people in this room but the people in the city surrounding this room. I hope against all hope that this bill does not pass because if it does my sister, she's a lot more articulate than me, and she'll get the farm and I'll have to move to Saskatchewan because that's the only place I'll be able to afford land to build a new farm. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hop. I call Mr. Eichler.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your presentation. Certainly I know the universities do a fantastic job in their training. It's good to hear that Manitoba is in fact the role model of which some other provinces want to follow.

I'm interested in your comments in regard to the moratorium. As you said, it will definitely impact your family and your livelihood and your ability to make a living. Do you feel that the regulations as they're set out now and the report of the CEC report were combined into legislation through rules and regulations, rather than through a moratorium—would that be something that the next generation would be able to live with, as far as regulations were concerned?

**Mr. Hop:** The moratorium is a shotgun approach to a sharpshooter problem. You can't just slam the whole industry for a small fraction of ne'er-do-wells.

We understand that the regulations are necessary and we all do our best to comply by them. If the regulations need to be stricter, or innovations need to be made, I'm sure you will find a very large part of the industry more than willing to adapt their practices to these potential benefits but, as it stands right now, I do not believe that the CEC and the current regulations were taken into consideration with the decision to have a moratorium.

**An Honourable Member:** Thank you very much. Good job.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Hop, you grew up on a family farm and your father was involved with a lot of research with hog manure and forage. I'm sure, from that, you gleaned quite a bit which you got due to baling and a lot of other things.

My question is: Was there any type of an increase in production on the marginal land that you live on?

**Mr. Hop:** About five, six years ago, my parents purchased by grandparents' farm which was half a mile down the road. They always had a hay meadow that was cut once a year. It never received hog manure until my parents picked it up and gradually increased the rate, following provincial regulations, increased production to such a—I can't think of an appropriate word to use in this Chamber—an absurd proportion that it made harvesting the forage—it took two days to make 60 acres' worth of feed.

We were dropping a bale of five by six, a net-wrapped round bale every 48 seconds, and that's opening the gate to closing the gate.

**Mr. Graydon:** Would you agree that was marginal land when you started to do that? What does that do to the assessment for the municipality when it sees that type of production?

**Mr. Hop:** The land was potentially under-managed, but it was not spectacular land by anybody's standards. The hog manure definitely increased the root growth. This year, it drained phenomenally better. It absorbed a lot more moisture and, as for assessment by the municipality, I wouldn't be able to comment on that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation. I call Mr. Don Winnicky, presenter No. 100.

Mr. Winnicky, you have some written materials for us, I see. The Clerk will distribute them. You may begin.

**Mr. Don Winnicky (Private Citizen):** My name is Don Winnicky. I'm a director with the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association, representing district 4 which takes in the southeast corner of the province, between the Red River and the Ontario border and from the TransCanada Highway down to the U.S. border.

I farm with my family near Piney, Manitoba. Thank you for this opportunity to express the concerns that cattle producers in my district have

with Bill 17 and how this bill will hurt the real communities in my area of the province.

Everyone here knows how important the hog industry is in my region. I know that other people like to call our area hog alley because of the size of our hog industry, but they also forget that the hog industry is practically everywhere in this province. There just happens to be a larger number of hogs raised in my corner of Manitoba, so Bill 17 is going to affect all of us and my area even more.

\* (01:30)

I want to begin by saying just how important farm expansion is when it comes to keeping young people farming in Manitoba. I think too many urban people have the idea in their head that it is somehow possible for a young person who wants to be a farmer to just go out, buy up some land, and just start farming for a living. Well, you can't do that these days. The conditions we face today don't allow for a young person to buy out an existing farm and then bring in enough income to survive. Partnering up with one's parents and expanding the family farm is probably the last way left for young people to start farming.

By putting a freeze on the hog farm expansion in my area Bill 17 all but guarantees that the sons and daughters of hog farmers in my area are going to be doing something else, and it sure won't be back at home on the family farm, or any other farm for that matter. So we are very worried about the future of our communities in rural Manitoba. We should be raising our livestock for export, not our children.

Bill 17 singles out farmers in my area for some very special treatment when it comes to managing waste. This special treatment under Bill 17 is going to cost thousands of rural jobs, close countless rural businesses, and drive more of our young people to Alberta. And for what? There is no hard evidence in the CEC report saying we need this type of permanent ban on hogs to protect Lake Winnipeg. There are almost 50 detailed recommendations in the CEC report, and a permanent ban is not one of them. As far as I'm concerned, farm families in Manitoba have been blamed far too long and far too much for what is really everybody's problem, and our farms' shoulders are getting pretty sore from having to carry the burden of protecting our environment for all these years while major urban centres get away with doing very little.

I know you have already heard this from many other presenters, but I will say it again: hogs are not the only ones who produce waste in Manitoba. So I'm not here today to just answer these questions. I have a few questions of my own that I want to ask of you folks here at the Leg. Farm families in my area want to know, where is the permanent ban on housing expansion in the city of Winnipeg? When it winter spreads the sludge containing all kinds of human waste, heavy metals, and biomedical waste. At least the hog manure is still pretty natural stuff. I hate to think what is in that municipal sludge they spread all around in winter and then gets into the spring run-off. Maybe it's that weird Winnipeg biomedical soup in the form of prescriptions dumped down city toilets that is the making of the fish in Lake Winnipeg so strangely big these days.

Farm families in my area want to know, where is the moratorium on the new Waverley West neighbourhood in Winnipeg? There's a lot of new housing and that means a lot more people putting in a lot of waste into Lake Winnipeg. Why is there no special treatment on that expansion, the way there is on the hog farms? Farm families in my area also want to know, where is the permanent ban on the Winnipeg population growth when it allows a valve at one of its treatment plants to sit open for two days, dumping raw sewage into the Red River in 2002, and then almost getting charged under the Federal Fisheries Act? If any farmer in my area did something like that, they would end up in jail.

At an individual level, nobody else but the hog farmers in Manitoba are being told, we have to save the lake so you can't expand your business anymore to make a living. No one else is having their job or their business capped or frozen to protect the lake the way the hog farmer is. No one is saying, gee, Winnipeg, Brandon, or Portage, they all put out a lot of nutrients into the Assiniboine and Red; we need to put a cap on their populations. So we will put a moratorium on expansion of the insurance industry because we don't want any more of their insurance brokers moving into Winnipeg and adding any more of their nutrients to the rivers.

It's that ridiculous. Then it's even more ridiculous to put a permanent ban on the expansion of the number of hogs when a hog farmer has some of the toughest regulations, technical reviews and scrutiny for waste management in the entire province. It is ridiculous when you consider that not one of the recommendations of the CEC says there needs to be that sort of a ban. It's even more

ridiculous when it is the City of Winnipeg who on average dumps untreated sewage into the Red River about 18 times a year whenever there is a heavy rainfall like today, and the storm drains overflow. Anyone living in my area knows just how much operations like Hytek have invested in waste management. They put the City of Winnipeg to shame when it comes to handling nutrients.

Yes, we farmers are again the ones being made to pay the price because government won't do anything about the cities. Winnipeg gets four more years to clean up its act and provincial taxpayers will be footing a big chunk of the bill. Hog producers, on the other hand, get no warning, no leeway, and no help. We see Bill 17 as nothing more than an attempt by the Province to unload on our shoulders what is mostly an urban problem and not a rural one. This has got to stop because Lake Winnipeg can't take any more of this kind of foolishness. We need to stop wasting time and energy with things like Bill 17 and start dealing with the real source of the problem or it's going to be too late for the lake.

I hope that when all the city folk drive up to their cottages this summer and see a lake full of algae they remember what every farmer knows: shit runs downhill, and in Manitoba, it is the waste from all those urban communities.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Winnicky, please refrain from using profanity at the committee, please.

**Mr. Winnicky:** I got a little carried away.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You did.

**Mr. Winnicky:** Sorry. Where was I here? Okay, I'll start over here. I hope that when all the city folk drive up to their cottage lots this summer and see a lake full of algae they remember what every farmer knows: manure runs downhill, and in Manitoba, it is the waste from all those urban communities along the Red and along the rivers that feed into the Red, that are more of a problem than anything that runs off farmland.

Finally, for all this talk about how everyone has to pitch in, you just can't compare things like banning cosmetic lawn fertilizer in the cities and putting a moratorium on somebody's livelihood. Bill 17 not only kills the future expansion in my district, it kills the hog industry, period. It's going to shut down farm supplies, dealership community stores and all the spinoff jobs that come with a healthy hog industry. Bill 17 means that many more young people are going to leave the farm for the city, and

rural communities are going to end up boarded up. Bill 17 is the strongest signal you can send that there is no future in farming or in Manitoba. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Winnicky. Questions?

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Winnicky, I know that you run a lot of cattle, and we all know that there's no winter spreading of manure. You see that with all the high-tech operations that are in your area and can contribute a lot to the assessment and to the economy. They're not allowed to spread manure in the wintertime. How do you feed your cattle in the winter?

**Mr. Winnicky:** We feed them on the pasture all winter. We unroll bales and every day they eat on the pasture.

**Mr. Graydon:** Do you get them to come back in their corral for a crap?

**Mr. Winnicky:** No. The only time they come into the corral is for calving time. They're on a quarter section of pasture all winter, spreading the manure throughout the whole quarter.

**Mr. Graydon:** Mr. Winnicky, then, do you foresee in the near future that you'll not be able to do that?

**Mr. Winnicky:** Yes, I do. I see that coming. If they're going to stop winter spreading from one livestock business down the line, they're going to stop the rest. And the only reason they haven't touched the cattlemen yet is we've had BSE. Nobody can afford to upgrade of any kind. We're still reeling from that.

**Mr. Eichler:** Don, the practice you just talked about with feeding your cows on pasture, is this not a recommendation that came from the Department of Agriculture?

\* (01:40)

**Mr. Winnicky:** Yes, yes it is. Manitoba Agriculture's recommended that for years.

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

Okay, I call number 81, Rickey Maendel.

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

**Mr. Rickey Maendel (Private Citizen):** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed.

**Mr. Rickey Maendel:** Good morning, I guess, by now.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am here today to ask you to reconsider the action you are about to take against the hog industry. We are subject to enough challenges already. In 1874, 50,000 Hutterites and Mennonites left Russia and came to America. Russia, to this day, has not recovered from this loss. We could very well be headed in that direction with this legislation. Russia is not self-sufficient when it comes to agriculture. They have to import grain and protein. This is a sad situation coming from the largest land-mass country in the world. It did not take long for them to realize what they lost. In Russia we were as much leaders in agriculture as we are here today, only less modernized.

*Madam Chairperson in the Chair*

Each sector in our industry has to work together. We are only as strong as the weakest link. If the hog industry weakens and contracts by being limited with government intervention for their own political gain, other industries that thrive with the hog industry, such as manufacturing, grain farming, transportation, and equipment suppliers, will follow in this decline, causing a loss in city and rural jobs.

It is without question that the city population controls the political vote here in this province. But they also consume the most produce. If farms contract, who will the people rely on for food? The government? As supply becomes tighter and imports increase to the point where you spend 30 to 40 percent of your income on food instead of 10, it will be too late.

Is the current government policy for food-fuel issue not clear enough to open our eyes to elevated food costs and increased starvation worldwide? Agriculture needs to be policed by laws that are scientifically based and researched, not politically tempered for appeasing voters. This bill shows government acting in vanity.

With ever-changing economies and currencies we need to change our operations to adapt. This can be done by value-adding or increasing the size of our operations. Twenty years ago we had a 400-sow farrow-to-finish operation with 30 percent less productivity than we have now. We now have an 800-sow farrow-to-finish operation and raise breeding stock and profit less per sow than 20 years ago. This bill will tie many hands and the freedom of

adapting to a change. Diversification is the only way we can stay afloat financially.

In the years when we have lost money farming, our livestock operations made up for the losses by having a low feed cost. Now with high grain prices we again adapted by value-adding with genetic line changes, raising breeding stock, and finishing almost half our pigs in the moratorium zone. We are employing and helping support three families with this endeavour. Not all are cut out for this change. Our farm is outside the moratorium zone. But how long is it until it isn't anymore? As you have heard from a previous speaker, burn down our cities and they will rise out of the ashes, but burn down the farms and grass will grow in the streets of our cities.

There are many risks involved in agriculture: weather, markets, input costs, currency. It now appears that we have to start factoring government as part of our management. Government may well become the biggest risk of all. With the signals we get from government, we are not sure. It throws us for a loop.

Basic problem solving teaches us to identify the issues and then look at all the issues to solve the problem. And honourable members of Parliament, in this instance, there are more than one issue and contributing factors. Why is government driving the wedge between rural and urban deeper and deeper? Where are the leaders of yesterday, leaders that stood up for what is right? If something is legal and becomes law, it does not make it right. In our life, works, toils and religion, we are taught that we will be held accountable for everything we do.

The United States of America is working and negotiating on a farm bill. We are lobbying on Bill 17. When we grow up and go through life, we all want to be remembered by our friends and future generations having made a difference that makes this world a better place. Abraham Lincoln, Winston Churchill and Theodore Roosevelt, to name a few, these people left behind their legacy and will be remembered for generations to come.

Mr. Doer, if this bill is to be your legacy, I pity your short-sightedness.

Thank you for the opportunity and the freedom to voice my views.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Maendel. That glass of water is for you, if you wish, that the Clerk—the glass of water that we put down there is for you, if you wish.

**Mr. Pedersen:** I want to thank you for persisting into the early morning hours with us. It takes a great deal of courage for you to come out here and present your views.

I didn't catch which colony you're from and what is your job on the colony, currently, right now?

**Mr. Rickey Maendel:** I am the manager—

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Mr. Maendel, I have to recognize you.

**Mr. Rickey Maendel:** I am the manager of our hog facility.

**Mr. Pedersen:** So when you look at Bill 17 and what it's going to do, it must create a lot of uncertainty within your immediate family and within the colony itself. Have you done any scenarios as to what you're going to do when your hog business inevitably is shut down by Bill 17?

**Mr. Rickey Maendel:** I guess you consider us amongst the lucky ones. We have a smaller colony with only 72 individuals. So it may be a long time for us to expand or need another place. But, as I have said before, we have to support the rest of the communities that are in the zone, even though we do raise pigs down in the Grunthal area. We are supporting three families down there. It's something we had to do to stay competitive, keep all our pigs and finish them ourselves, instead of selling 50-pounders. It may not take long and we'll be in the moratorium zone; we don't know.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Are there any other questions from committee members? Seeing no other questions, we thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Maendel.

The committee calls Kathy Neufeld, private citizen. Ms. Neufeld, do you have a written submission you wanted to circulate to committee members?

**Ms. Kathy Neufeld (Private Citizen):** No, I also was protecting the environment.

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Okay. Please proceed.

**Ms. Neufeld:** My name is Kathy Neufeld—

**Madam Vice-Chairperson:** Just one second. Sorry. For committee members, Ms. Neufeld is No. 83 on your presenters list. You can proceed, Ms. Neufeld.

\* (01:50)

**Ms. Neufeld:** My name is Kathy Neufeld, and I thank you for this opportunity to speak in protesting Bill 17 from becoming law.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

My husband and I farm a 1,600-sow, early-wean barn near Niverville, Manitoba. Although times have been tough this past year, due to hog prices plummeting, we feel somewhat confident that, if we can weather this storm, there will be a turnaround in pricing as demand for pork around the world is increasing in developing countries.

We have five employees who are counting on us to support them and their families. Some of these employees are immigrants who speak little or no English, have little education beyond grade school, but are very loyal to us as their employers. Our greatest concern has been to ensure that they are able to keep their jobs during these extremely difficult times.

Although we have tried to remain optimistic, we are now faced with a government trying to pass a draconian legislation that would drastically reduce the value of a farm that we have spent our lifetime building up to what it is today.

We began this operation in 1983, building a 250-sow operation under the optimism of a government that said Manitoba would be a lead supplier to the world. The location of southern Manitoba is central to shipping pork to the U.S. which was and still is demanding our product. We worked hard and slowly increased the size of our operation to what it is today.

Our premise in farming has always been to love the work we do. The attitude was instilled in us by our fathers and forefathers who were also farmers. We were creating an industry that fed the people in our community and around the world. What other job out there can boast such a sense of accomplishment? Our fathers taught us integrity and a passion for what we create.

However, this is also a business, and it's our only business. We have always been good stewards of the land. When science—which I have to say that Bill 17 is not based on—stated that nutrient and manure management regulations needed to be in place in order for the hog industry, or any livestock industry for that matter, to be sustainable and comply with environmental issues, we stepped up to the plate and made sure that we measured up. No other industry, be it farm or corporate, is more rigidly regulated or monitored than the hog industry.

Since 1990, we have always injected the manure from our farm directly into the ground for many farmers in our area, and that soil is regularly tested for its nutrient value. All our dead stock is disposed of in a composting unit. Our farm is located one and a half miles outside the town of Niverville, and we have never heard one complaint about smell or water quality. The Hanover municipality has always had strict regulations regarding the building of new or expansion of existing farms.

The hog industry has always been a huge economic boost to the province of Manitoba; however, if Bill 17 becomes law, it will be the end of an industry that supports rural and urban Manitoba. Farms will drastically drop in value, leaving thousands of people without jobs, including those in feed mills and the trucking industry.

Small towns, like Niverville, which rely on farmers to shop locally, will find businesses shutting their doors as people leave to find work elsewhere. Our children will not have the option of staying and raising a family in the community that they grew up in and learned to love.

Some of the most successful credit unions and banks are located in farming communities because of a working relationship that believes in each other. If we are good stewards of our money, we will be treated with respect when times are tough.

A few years ago, my father who lives in Saskatchewan and is a Conservative in every sense of the word—so a lot of times we don't agree on federal politics—asked me how the NDP was treating our province. I said, at that time, I couldn't really voice any real complaint, and it may have been because I was too busy to care.

However, I now look at Saskatchewan's new leadership and think that Mr. Doer should beware, because Brad Wall will put Saskatchewan on the map. Right now, you have sorely disappointed us in arbitrarily choosing the hog industry as your scapegoat. In case you have a question, I am not ready to move back to Saskatchewan, although I may be a closet Rider fan.

Bill 17 screams of a socialist government, bent on creating an urban-based province, but without any foresight as to how this province will sustain itself and its people without such a large rural economy. There is a Manitoba beyond Manitoba Hydro, MTS, MPIC and the Manitoba Liquor Commission.

How many people is this government willing to lose to Saskatchewan, which is eagerly waiting in the wings and doing everything in its power to lure people to its can do province?

Farmers have always been the most giving and charitable in our province. We have given millions of dollars to rural Manitoba to assist in building facilities for our seniors, so they can live out their lifetime in a community that they grew up and worked hard in. We are committed to keeping our rural hospitals open and building sports complexes for our youth. We all pay school taxes on our farm buildings in order to maintain the best school divisions in the province, and when tragedy strikes, we will work together to help one another out.

The Hutterite colonies were out in full force during the floods of '96 and '97. We commit crops for the world food bank. Winnipeg Harvest depends on us for grains, poultry, and pork, and MCC began with a passion to help others. Be it a fire which destroys someone's home or a personal tragedy such as illness or death which leaves someone unable to cope, farmers are there with their hands and their wallets available to help.

But this is our retirement investment. We do not have the pleasure of looking at the magic number of freedom 55, at which time we call in the chips of a corporate or government pension plan. We must rely on this investment to see us through our old age. My retirement is dependent on my business being viable to someone else in the future, be it my children or someone else who also sees it as a viable and sustainable future for them.

Freezing it in time leaves it stagnant and non-competitive with the rest of the world. To single out one industry with the pollution of Lake Winnipeg without the science to prove it is abominable. The City of Winnipeg has dumped millions of gallons of sewage into the rivers and streams or on snow-covered, frozen fields with little consequences. What measures are in place to ensure the City is doing everything in its power to clean up the waterways?

Are the cottagers around the lake acting as responsible stewards of the lake? Is the hog industry really responsible for the pollution of Lake Winnipeg, or is this a pacifier for the public because this government has done nothing to improve waste management in the city of Winnipeg, as it has promised. Is this legislation really about improving the natural environment, or is it a symbolic gesture

that seeks to garner favour with special interest groups?

We understand the science behind the CEC. You understand the science. The NDP understands the science. Stop lying to the people of Manitoba. When the water gets tested this August and beaches are shut down this summer, next summer, four summers from now, what will be the next step in this eco-fascist ideal?

Farmers have always been passive and a go-about-your-business group of people. However, when government steps in and tells them, without any concrete evidence, that their business is no longer viable, it's time for us to stand up and say, you are wrong. We will not leave quietly, and that brings to mind an uprising of disgruntled farmers in France. Manitoba needs us and they need us to be able to sustain our industry to secure our future as individuals and as a province, and this is my future.

You, the committee in front of me, will have the most influence of anyone regarding the outcome of this bill. I ask that you review the scientific analysis, believe it for what it is, and vote against the passing of Bill 17. My legacy depends on it and definitely your legacy as an NDP government depends on it. Don't let the history books state that your government created a stagnant, have-not province that, through legislation, forced people out of business and out of the province. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Neufeld. Questions.

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you very much for your presentation. It was an excellent presentation.

Manitoba Pork has a checkoff in the pork industry, and through that checkoff, they do make donations to research and development as well as advertising and promoting their product. They do the donations to the university for research and development of different techniques and whatever. They also, the pork industry or the pork producers, spend a lot of money on technology as per injecting the manure and so forth. They pay for that technology when they buy the equipment because that's the price of the equipment. They pay for the technologies in the barn to try and control and be environmentally friendly. Would you say that the people in the city of Winnipeg should pay equally as much?

**Ms. Neufeld:** I'm not quite sure I get what you're—

\* (02:00)

**Mr. Graydon:** You're dealing with your waste material, and you deal with it in an environmentally friendly way, but you pay for every step of the way. You pay for the research. You pay for donations to the university through a checkoff. If you wanted to make a donation to the university privately, you can do that, but through your checkoff, you do that type of donations all the way along the road. You pay for the technology to handle the waste material from your production, and you use it in a sustainable fashion.

In the city of Winnipeg, the residents in Winnipeg don't have the same opportunity to use their waste in a sustainable fashion. Do you think that they should pay to dispose of it? That's the question.

**Ms. Neufeld:** Yes, I think they should.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Derkach, was it? [*interjection*] Okay, let's go to Mr. Borotsik—or, Mr. Graydon, supplemental.

**Mr. Graydon:** Do you believe that they should have four or five or six or whatever—I mean, it's four years. It's after the next election, so it could go on forever before we get these drains and sewers stopped from running into the river.

Do you think they should have that option when you are not afforded the same option on your operation?

**Ms. Neufeld:** I see now what you're getting at. I think when people move into the city of Winnipeg, they expect that whatever waste that they emit is taken care of and is taken care of in a sustainable and environmentally friendly manner. I don't know of anybody who doesn't think that—well, unless we tell them. The people of Winnipeg, I don't think they know that their sewage gets dumped into the rivers and streams.

I met a friend at the Relay for Life which I participated in on Friday. She had bought a house, an older home on the Red River, and happened one day to be doing her make-up and lost her eyebrow pencil down the drain of the sink. Two days later, she took a walk along the river and saw her eyebrow pencil and the soup that she had the night before.

There are homes everywhere that aren't monitored in the environmental fashion, and yet before we can even begin, we have requirements and regulations that we have to abide by.

**Mr. Borotsik:** I just came up with kind of a neat analogy, I think, and maybe I'd like to have your opinion on it, whether you agree or not. We're told, wrongfully, but we are told that the hog industry is a major polluter of Lake Winnipeg—that's what we're told—and therefore there's a moratorium.

We know that the Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting is the largest air polluter in the province of Manitoba. Would you suggest that they put a moratorium on HudBay, that they should not be able to produce any more product than what they're producing right now, because they are a major polluter in this area. Would you suggest a moratorium being placed on HudBay?

**Ms. Neufeld:** Sure, why not.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your patience and for staying so long to make your presentation. It's a very good presentation.

My question for you: Do you have the land base to expand your operation if and when you decide to expand your operation without Bill 17 passing?

**Ms. Neufeld:** Yes, we do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions, ma'am, I thank you for your presentation.

Move on to No. 84, Dwayne Friesen. Mr. Friesen, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Dwayne Friesen (Private Citizen):** No, I do not.

Good morning. My name is Dwayne Friesen. I'm a 38-year-old father of three. I started farming in 1993. Since that time, through hog revenues, my farm has invested \$2 million in building costs, approximately \$150,000 to Manitoba Hydro, \$100,000 to MTS, \$450,000 to insurance companies, approximately \$150,000 to natural gas, \$3.2 million in feed, as well as 1.4 in direct wages, not to mention indirect. When our barn was built in '93, we were considered average to big. Now we are considered small.

Why do I give you this information? My 11-year-old asked, why are you going to these meetings? I, in turn, asked her, what happens when you try and stop something from growing? Without a moment's hesitation, she answered, you kill it.

This bill and this government needs to know, you are not just stopping growth. You're killing an industry, a way of life. You're hurting families.

You're bringing down an economy. You're destroying your own tax base. In the southeast, we've seen a lot of growth in the last 15 years. Our schools can hardly keep up.

Just as a side note, I was in our school the other day. They were teaching kids in the entrance. Yet the immigrants keep coming. Why? Because there were too many rules and no opportunity for growth where they came from. How do we say welcome to Manitoba? We give them more rules and start cutting out their opportunities and ability to grow.

The Hutterites, Mennonites, Holdemans and others came to this province because of opportunity to grow. What do you think will happen when that's gone? They will start to leave, and they will take their wealth with them, not just their money but their knowledge, their drive, their commitment, integrity, persistence, resourcefulness will be lost with them. In 10 years, I may not have any parents left and my children may have moved away. Then what will keep me in Manitoba, not the policies of this government, of that I'm sure.

Let me give you this example. Which one of you would go into a restaurant and tell a waitress she is ugly and you have no use for her? When she brings you your food, you tell her she will not be getting a tip. You order dessert and expect that she won't spit in it or worse. You do that to farmers and expect us to smile back at you. We spend a lot more time with your food than most others. Some have called this time in the hog industry a perfect storm. We have high feed prices, COOL, high dollar compared to our major trading partner. It really gets me down to think that I might make it through the perfect storm only to have my own government drown me when I come home.

I did something last month that I've never done before. I went to the States and I bought everything I needed. I used to support local shops, shop local in Winnipeg, but I can no longer support those who do not support me. The people of Winnipeg have voted you in and seem to think you're doing a good job. I voted in the elections. Now I am going to start voting at the till.

Some think this is about the health of Lake Winnipeg and if it is, and if this bill comes through, it will solve that problem. I have been on the research vessel *Namao*. I'm not quite sure of the pronunciation; I always have a hard time with that. I know the numbers. I was saddened to hear that my own R.M. voted to dump their waste water into the

ditch, which is legal, instead of paying \$50,000 to have it pumped to their new facility where they could treat it.

It infuriated me when I heard that the City of Winnipeg several years back, due to mechanical failure, pumped thousands of cubic metres into the Red River without being treated. I did some calculations at the time and figured it was approximately the equivalent of 20 hog farms my size emptying their entire year's worth of manure into the river. To my knowledge, the City of Winnipeg, under federal jurisdiction, has never been fined. If I and 19 of my hog farming friends would simply do that, we would be shut down, fined, sued and possibly imprisoned.

My brother went to Cambodia. When they found out he grew up on a farm, they were genuinely sorry for him. Farmers there are poor, illiterate people who can't do anything else. Is that how you see us? Is that how you want to see us? I do most of my electrical work, plumbing, carpentry, some concrete, mechanical repair and maintenance. I repair electronics on my farm on a regular basis. All three of my children are on the honour roll and have regularly won academic achievement awards in their grades. I see farmers needing to be multi-talented and well educated in a variety of areas to succeed.

\* (02:10)

We import food from all over the world, from Brazil, chicken; California, vegetables; Australia, beef; New Zealand, mutton; not to mention all the other goods from the U.S. in general. We compete in the marketplace for your right to have food grown in Canada, inspected in Canada, produced under Canadian standards for safety, labour, quality, standards of labelling. The more strain you put on Canadian producers, the more your food will come from outside this country, until you sit down one day and have a meal where nothing you eat will have been grown close to where you are.

If you think this will slow down the corporate farms and encourage small family farms, I think history does not support that. My father farmed approximately double that of his father and I, in turn, farm on a scale about two times larger, just to keep an average standard of living. The more rules and regulations you put on agricultural activities, the harder it is to have your traditional family farms.

As an example, to have the same number of sows my father did would now cost me about

\$20,000 to \$50,000 just to get the paperwork approved, before I could even start. This is the kind of up-front cost that does not assist the family farm in starting up and requires much deeper pockets to get money from to reach, which requires bigger farms to repay the debt.

I've read the entire Clean Environment Commission report. This government knew exactly what it wanted to do, long before that report came out. You asked for reports and studies, held public consultations and ignored them and did you own thing anyway.

Is this a democracy, or simply a mockery of democracy? I'd like to say I think you guys are very fortunate that this group of people who were here today is before you because, in other countries, things would be very different. Your yard would be flooded with what you're talking about. Thank you. Sorry for my nervousness, it's 2 in the morning.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Friesen. Questions?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Friesen, thank you for your thoughtful presentation.

You talked about the City of Winnipeg dumping raw sewage a number of years ago. Are you aware that, as of yesterday morning, the City of Winnipeg—*[interjection]*—hundreds of thousands of gallons of raw sewage were dumped into the Red River in the city of Winnipeg. No one is being fined for that; no one is putting a moratorium on that. The government sits by and watches it and continues to watch because what else can they do with a situation that's out of control.

Yet, they seem to feel very comfortable in putting a moratorium on an industry that has never had a spill into a river that I know of. I've asked the minister and I've asked the government to identify when there was a spill from a hog lagoon into a water stream or a river, and nobody can give me an answer.

You have a young family. What would you rather see the government do, in place of this legislation, to assist in cleaning up Lake Winnipeg?

**Mr. Friesen:** I think a balanced educational approach to the people living within the city of Winnipeg. Perhaps, the question should be posed to them: Do you want to take responsibility for what the City is doing on your behalf, or would you like the Manitoba farmers to pay for it for you? We have the

expertise; we have the knowledge, and, apparently, we have the money. Maybe they'd like a free ride.

**Mr. Eichler:** Thank you for your patience. Thank you for staying for your presentation. The last two presentations, I think that the Premier (Mr. Doer) of this province, certainly reading *Hansard* first thing tomorrow morning or whenever they're available out there at the earliest possible opportunity—very thoughtful, very thought-out.

I do have a question for you in regard to your next generation of farming. If Bill 17 passes, what are you going to be telling your children about the future of farming in the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Friesen:** If it passes, I'm going to tell them I tried and, hopefully, I won't be doing it from the other side of bankruptcy.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions—Sorry, thank you for your presentation.

I call No. 206, Peter de Jong. Is it de Yong or de Jong or—how do you say it? *[interjection]*

Order.

**Mr. Peter de Jong (Private Citizen):** I'm sorry. You can spell it as—

**Mr. Chairperson:** How do you say it, sorry?

**Mr. Peter de Jong:** de Jong.

**Mr. Chairperson:** de Jong. Okay. Thank you, sir.

Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. de Jong:** Yes, sir.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The Clerk will distribute them.

You may begin when you're ready.

**Mr. de Jong:** Thank you, committee, for letting me speak. Sorry, my voice is gone, early in the morning.

I can tell something about my family farm. I farm in the R.M. of Ste. Anne. That's Honourable Ron Lemieux's riding. I'm just on the border of the R.M. of La Broquerie, and I can see from my house—is it 200 metres, to the town of La Broquerie. Fortunately, after many years, we get, finally, a new school for our children, because our schools are really double the space they built for due to a large amount of new immigrants coming in to southeast Manitoba.

I can tell you something about the farm. We milk about—we have a dairy farm. We've milked

about 500 cows. We do that in two shifts, like, basically milk 24-7. We employ 12 people, all from our town, and we have also 1,000 feeder hogs.

I'm very fortunate to move in to Canada about 12 years ago from Holland, or, officially, the Netherlands, but most people say Holland. I don't know why. That's the saying.

When I looked in '94 and '95 and '96 in this, in Canada, I always ending up in southeast Manitoba, and, in every corner, saw an opportunity, but what, I'm surprised, is the drive of the real estate areas—and this is serious—in my country, the raw sewage from municipalities, lagoons or treatment plants, they're not allowed to put on any land the last 15 or 20 years anymore due to heavy metals and oil and all the residue that people flush through the toilet. I was surprised that they even do in the winter here in Winnipeg, put it outside. I thought, man, they don't know what's really in there, because we all have a headache one day, or we feel not so good, take an Advil. You count a million people taking once a year or twice a year an Advil up, that's a couple of thousand pounds of Advil. You put it in Lake Winnipeg, there's a lot of fish with no headache there anymore. But if you put all the stuff that you throw through your toilet, or changing the car and some oil go in the sewer in the city, it goes, all, through the treatment plant.

I'm serious. In my country, absolutely, the treatment plants are tested on phosphate and nitrogen. The sludge of this whatever, the stuff that's left over, that goes to special dumps that totally are bound down with concrete and steel pillars in the ground so that it doesn't go in the groundwater. While, here, everybody just—locals in La Broquerie, they built, just, a new lagoon. Well, all of the sewer trucks drive there. So they're picking up all the sewer pits from the people and they drive to the lagoon and they dump it. A month later, they just open the tap and it goes into the Seine River. Well, I know why there's no fish there anymore, because nobody wants to swim in there.

Now you implement Bill 17, going after the hog farmers. I think you should see the basic problems of Lake Winnipeg. That's not the 1.5 percent of the hog farmers. It's the overall problem of the legislation. We should not do any phosphate in our detergents. Absolutely not. Just put a total ban on it, or put a 15 percent extra tax on it. People will stop buying it immediately.

\* (02:20)

My old country, we have so many regulations of what we did on the environment. We live with 17 million in a smaller area than the southeast, and we have about 30 million hogs. Our government have been dedicated areas where hog farmers can expand and no area other. If they don't have the land to spread manure, there's no possibility for expansion, and the hog industry adapt themselves. Also, they had a kind of rule for people who have older facilities. The guys who want to expand can buy out the hog numbers and then the old facilities have to sign off. So they clean up the old facilities so there were no environmental hassles. Because when I came here, I saw many small old hog barns, like 200 hogs, 300 hogs. They were standing empty, but still the old concrete pits or the old manure facility. This is, in the future, really a problem here, but nobody tried to care here. I see, also, in the future, a problem for this.

I know there's a mistake made by the previous government. I think we should all learn from our mistakes and work with industry, but not put in a moratorium, because that's really not going to help, personally, I think. We should really just look over all the big problems, why the algae in the Lake Winnipeg. Because I remember when I was kid, we had lots of algae, too. It was not fun swimming there. My mom said, you better clean first because you're going in the house again.

The government put regulation in on the sewer plants, and manure management plans were in place, run-off plans were in place, old facilities were cleaned up, and I was surprised when, five years ago, I went back to Holland and the water was clean and they all swim back in the water. It's amazing what good regulations can do, but don't put it in, I say, a kind of bill that kills an industry that is only part of the small problem. Try to work together to solve it and not make it a political agenda to do this and kill an industry where the school taxes are coming from and the whole rural area comes from.

I know a lot of people from Winnipeg don't understand, really, what the problem is on the Bill 17. But if I explain it, like, they go to the washroom and they flush the stuff and it goes to the sewer plant and runs straight in the river, then they understand, yes, we have do something here. Then they get more questions.

I thank you for your time and, sorry, I'm not that focussed anymore at this time of the day.

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

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Peter, for your presentation tonight and, being as patient and, could I say, fiercely determined to make the presentation.

Over the last couple of days, the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) has made the observation that 24 or 28 percent of the hog production in Manitoba is in two municipalities. We also know that 65 percent of the dairy production is in the same two municipalities. Now, you being in the dairy business and knowing what the regulations are for the hog people and knowing what the regulations are for yourself, are you concerned that your dairy might be next to be in a moratorium?

**Mr. de Jong:** Thank you, sir. First of all, we are management supply, and until 1993, I think, the Manitoba hog industry had a management supply, and then they took it away. I was not at that time in this country, so I don't know. Management supply didn't really increase the cow numbers, they only increased production per cow. Actually, it went down in the cow numbers in the last five years. We went up with production from 6,000 to 9,000, so was able to bring our cow numbers down.

I think a good scientist, good scientist-base can do the work, personally. This is my personal vision. Mr. Honourable Ron Lemieux was a teacher before, and it's learned at school that scientists—one and one is two. I feel here a little bit that our government wants to say one and one is three, and we put it in a class and if you don't believe it, then you go out of class.

I personally think there is a solution to find between the south side of the table and the other side of the table not to go after the Hutterite colonies and other people, family living. I'm against investor barns, totally against it. I'm for real living. It's lots of people. It's not the money. It's the living, the type of living they make. If I have to force my way of living, I'm going to move right away, immediately. This is my way to raise up my kids in a small community, and, personally, I fight very hard for La Broquerie to get a new school. I'm really thankful to Mr. Ron Lemieux for helping us in that, and also Mr. Penner, before.

But it seems that one side of the table cannot work with the other side of the table. Maybe you see my name on the e-mail. I'm really P.C. de Jong.

That's the problem. That's my real name, so I'm very sorry for this.

**Mr. Struthers:** Thank you very much, Peter. I'm afraid my friend from Emerson was engaging in a little good old-fashioned fearmongering just now. We've had this discussion before, and I was really glad that you answered the question the way you did, because maybe he'll believe you. I gave him that answer and he doesn't seem to believe me.

So you have very clearly indicated that because of the supply management, because of the quota system, there are limits on the dairy side and other supply-managed sectors, as opposed to the hog side where there has been unfettered development for a whole number of years. There's a very big difference between the two.

As I read through the document that you've sent around, you seem to be offering up something that nobody else has, as of yet, and that is a supply management system for pork, if I read this right. Now, I may not be reading it right and I want you to clarify that if I'm not. But what you're saying is a quota system on hogs instead of the moratorium would provide a kind of rope around the unfettered growth of the hog industry. Am I reading that correctly?

**Mr. de Jong:** Yes, sir. My second name is C from Canta [*phonetic*], and I'm not Santa Claus. But, yes, indeed. You don't increase the total hog numbers in Manitoba, what is good for I think the industry at the moment, because, first of all, the bad marketing price and given, also, overhaul the new technical review committees, what I think is necessary. Put some clean environment advice in the technical review committees and that keeps the government—and it doesn't matter who is in power and that certainly holds in the next couple of years—to work on this deal.

But implement Bill 17, we hear stories from people coming from Russia, Ukraine, and we just had the visit of the president of Ukraine and he's orange, and our country is orange, so I feel really happy. And, today, our soccer team wins also from Italy, and was orange.

\* (02:30)

But, yes, make a quota on the hog numbers. So this is compromise between the industry and south of Winnipeg. Here we have a solution and I hope really—I don't know the vision of Manitoba Pork, but I think this gives also the Hutterite colonies an

opportunity to still expand if another guy want to leave the industry. If they have enough land, if they have to do complete on all the regulations, yes, and meanwhile, we're cleaning up right away the old facilities and is not an environmental hazard.

I think—I'm not in politics, I'm just a farmer. I remember Mr. Ron Lemieux coming one time on my door with the flood, and that's why I really appreciated it. When we had 13 inches of water, all our land was under water, Mr. Lemieux came in our door. It was not to scoop the water off the land, but show support. That's what our MLA is for, of some rural, or from the Winnipeg area, or from the north, you know, I think that's what people are in politics for, for the people who vote them in. Thank you, sir.

**Mr. Struthers:** We got two for the price of one again. Your verbal comments and the e-mail that you've sent around in hard copy. Can we agree that the hard copy will be entered as part of the record of this committee? *[Agreed]*

**Mr. Eichler:** One quick question. Thank you for your presentations and your patience. You wrote the e-mail to the Honourable Mr. Lemieux on April 11. Can you tell us the outcome of that letter and was he supportive of your e-mail?

**Mr. de Jong:** I got a call from his office, and at that time I was in Brandon, not on the NDP conference, but I was in Brandon for my other job so I can't make the appointment, and we agreed to make later another appointment.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Final question to Mr. Derkach.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. de Jong, how did you get your quota for your dairy industry in Canada?

**Mr. de Jong:** I was very fortunate that I met, when I start here, I start with 55 cows and I was always very fortunate. I met Mr. Louis Balcaen, from La Broquerie. He told me I was the only person he know that can take over his farm. He want to retire, so, suddenly, I was family for him and he make the retirement agreement, and I was able to take over his farm.

**Mr. Derkach:** So you believe that the hog industry should be managed under a supply-managed system like the quotas for the dairy quota. Is that correct? Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. de Jong:** No, sir. I think we should management the hog numbers. The hog numbers.

**Mr. Derkach:** As opposed to—

**An Honourable Member:** Litres.

**Mr. Derkach:**—litres in milk?

**Mr. de Jong:** I think you misunderstand this. This is a compromise between Bill 17 to put a total stop. I'm a young farmer. I have three kids. I want to expand my thousand-feeder barn. I can't. Now, my neighbour want to stop. I can still not expand. In my solution, I can take over his 200 feeder hogs with the conditions that that person sign off that his barn get demolished and cleaned up and I have the right amount of land to spread manure and all the facilities in place to take his numbers.

**Mr. Derkach:** So that we can better understand, you would freeze the number of hogs at 8 million or 6 million or whatever it is, and the only way that anyone can increase their operation is by buying out an existing operation, just like you have in the poultry industry or the dairy industry?

**Mr. de Jong:** Indeed. But it gives the farmers who want to leave the industry now—at the moment, there is no value on their property anymore. If they want to leave the family business or they get sick, there's no value at all. This gives them value and gives the other families a chance to expand, as a compromise to look in the future how we can solve the Lake Winnipeg problem. It's not 28 percent; it's not 1.5 percent. The University of Winnipeg has the numbers. Let's go with scientists and not only with politics, here. Let's not destroy the families from all the Hutterite colonies and all those little family farms.

Family farms are not five chickens. That time is over. Everybody knows that. What is a family farm? I understand, my family farm, I have 12 employees. Yes, I'm a family. We are a family. We have family barbeques. We have Christmas parties. I'm the share leader of the farm, they call me. That's, these days, a family farm.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, thank you very much, Mr. de Jong, for a very informative presentation. Thank you very much, sir.

That concludes the list that I have, but I have to ask if there's anybody in the audience remaining that would like to make a presentation this evening.

Yes, sir? Your name is?

**Mr. Shane Sadorski (Private Citizen):** Shane Sadorski. I'm No. 4 on the list.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Mr. Sadorski, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Sadorski:** I do, indeed.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The Clerk will distribute them.

You can begin when you are ready.

**Mr. Sadorski:** It's really good to see some familiar faces again. There we go, just so *Hansard* can pick me up fairly well. I toyed with the idea of actually just reading this as being deemed to have been read into the record—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry. Order, please. I can't hear you, sir.

**Mr. Sadorski:** I was toying with the idea of having this deemed having been read into the record, but, seeing as I was here since 5:30 in the afternoon, I decided, well, I'm going to let you sit through the presentation, as I sat through a number of hours waiting for you folks.

My name is Shane Sadorski and I am a policy analyst with the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association. I want to thank you for this opportunity to express some concerns regarding Bill 17 and offer some reasons why I think you should not proceed with it.

I know you've already heard from our association's president, Mr. Martin Unrau, and one of our district directors, Don Winnicky, from District 4, about some of the economic implications of Bill 17 for cattle producers and for rural communities, but I want to share with you—I guess it's now this morning—some additional concerns that MCPA has with Bill 17 as they relate to environmental policy in general.

I want to suggest to you that, while Bill 17 might look on the surface like an attractive piece of legislation from an environmental perspective, some reflection on the long-term implications of Bill 17 suggests that this is, in actual fact, bad environmental policy and a bad environmental move on the part of the government. In essence, I'm going to argue that it opens the door to a method of policymaking in which the environment is going to end up on the losing end.

Before making that point, I just want to first reaffirm the environmental qualifications of Manitoba's cattle producers, because it is as much out of their concern for the environment that cattle producers object to Bill 17 as it is out of their

concern for the future of farming families and for rural communities in Manitoba.

Environmental stewardship is something that cattle producers do all the time. They have to, not because any government tells them to, because you will not find another group of people so dependent on the natural landscape for their livelihood as cattle producers are. Probably no other type of economic interaction with the immediate environment comes as close these days to the concept of living off the land as your average cow-calf operation in Manitoba. This is a non-industrial form of agriculture, as much as you can get.

Today, your typical family owned and operated cow-calf operation in Manitoba is, in fact, a model of ecological sustainability and socially responsible holistic farm practices. Those extensive spaces of perennial green cover, nurtured by Manitoba's cattle producers, those are the lungs of our planet, a carbon sink extracting carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere every second of the day, sequestering carbon into the soil. That's greenhouse gas mitigation, a very real and tangible contribution that cattle producers make in holding back the process of climate change.

It's also probably fair to say that no other area of agriculture has done more to help protect and enhance biodiversity than cattle producers. What you might see as just another grazing area is an extremely valuable reserve of biodiversity in this province, natural landscapes providing the habitats necessary for all manners of creatures from nesting eagles to the waterfowl that you find on farm wetlands. Cattle operations are the very antithesis of the word monoculture.

\* (02:40)

As our provincial Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) said only a few weeks ago in her news release of May 22, quote: Manitoba's farmers actively enhance biodiversity as part of sustainable agriculture in Manitoba. Fostering biodiversity goes hand in hand with sustainable agricultural practices, and in Manitoba, we are leaders in sustainable farming.

The minister's absolutely right about that. The cattle business has been farming sustainably in Manitoba for generations. Ask the folks at Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation, which is your own Crown corporation, about the importance of cattle producers in donating parcels of their land and signing conservation agreements. You can look to

the leadership that cattle producers have provided through the Riparian Health Council, the Farm Stewardship Association of Manitoba and other conservation and environmental organizations.

The land is everything in agriculture, and the land used in cattle production plays a critical role in tackling the problem of soil erosion in Manitoba. That same extensive deep-rooted perennial green cover that cattle producers maintain as part of their farm operation also represents improved filtration of nutrient, reduction in phosphorus loading from the decay of non-grazed landscape, a reduction in nutrient loading from run-off from heavy snow and heavy rainfalls. It's exactly because of this multi-faceted range of ecological goods and services that Manitoba's cattle producers provide to our province that makes cattle producers so concerned about any legislation relating to the environment.

As family farmers, cattle producers put a huge effort into their role of stewards of the land, and they absolutely do not want to see any of that hard work undone by anyone. This is exactly why cattle producers in this province are opposed to Bill 17. MCPA's opposition stems in large part from the need for government to adhere to the findings of an independent environmental review process and the importance of basing policy on sound science and not on managing perceptions. The MCPA engaged the CEC process in good faith because cattle producers, being both farmers and conservationists, are able to see the value of making public policy using such a process. MCPA does not want environmental decisions being made in this province based on managing public perceptions that have been created by those opposed to a particular industry any more than they want to see those decisions being made or based on public opinion influenced by a PR campaign launched by some big oil or forest conglomerate wanting to turn a fast buck at the cost of our environment.

Environmental decisions in Manitoba should not be based on who can get to public opinion first, loudest or slickest and then be able to leverage that perception into political influence. That, unfortunately, is exactly the door that Bill 17 opens up in undermining the integrity of the CEC process. By going so far afield from the findings of the actual CEC report which makes no call for the type of permanent ban being proposed under Bill 17, this bill takes environmental decisions out of the realm of an independent review of sound science and puts it squarely into opinion marketing.

Bill 17 essentially tells farmers that in order to shape environmental policy in this province, they no longer have to convince the CEC of any scientific facts at all. They just need to put pressure on whichever minister is responsible at the time. To do that, all you need is a big enough PR budget, the right marketing firm and to get to the public mind first, and not necessarily with fact or with science.

With Bill 17, it's perception that matters and not fact. As stewards of the land, that worries cattle producers tremendously, because while it may be the case that those opposed to the hog industry today may have successfully convinced government and bureaucracy of the need to appease public perceptions around Lake Winnipeg by putting a permanent ban on hog expansion, it is not hard to imagine a future government with a different outlook altering environmental policy to appease what may be a more economically sensitive public influenced by a corporate PR blitz whose only concern is the pursuit of the almighty dollar.

That is what Bill 17 fundamentally is. It is a bad precedent that future governments can point to that takes environmental policymaking out of the hands of science and an independent review process and puts it into the realm of political marketing.

Cattle producers want no part of either scenario. Cattle producers, through their checkoff contributions, invest a good deal of their money in projects with the University of Manitoba in soil science, in nutrient management, in forage multi-functionality, all with an eye to continually finding the very best beneficial management practices to incorporate on their farms. Individual producers make significant investments in activities, such as environmental farm plans, because they know the value of a healthy environment and a sustainable farm.

But if all that science, all that research, the BMPs, the environmental farm plans are in the end not going to count for anything because policy decisions are from now on going to be based on managing misperceptions and public opinion instead of following the independent findings of the CEC, then why bother with them? Why fund research? Why go through the environmental farm plans? Why not just put all your checkoff dollars and money into PR and marketing instead? The environment is what's going to be lost here.

Is the CEC process perfect? Of course not. No review process is. Is MCPA happy with everything

contained in the CEC report? Absolutely not, not by a long shot. MCPA takes issue with a number of the recommendations in the report, but despite any of the disagreements we may have on points of detail, MCPA nonetheless accepts the outcome of an independent review process based on sound science. MCPA does so because CEC's process represents the best impartial judgment on the impact of the hog industry in Manitoba that we have today. The commission made its determination. The permanent ban proposed under Bill 17 is nowhere to be found as a recommendation of the CEC.

MCPA therefore especially asks you to protect the integrity of the CEC review process and not to open the floodgates to turning environmental policy to something based on managing perception instead of sound science. We say this because if it happens, ultimately it's going to be the environment that loses. So do not proceed with Bill 17.

I want to thank you, and before I get into Q and A—and this could go into my Q and A time—I actually want to start by responding to a question that the minister put to another producer. I believe it was on Saturday. The question was framed such, if I remember what Minister Struthers said: Where would you draw the line between having the status quo and doing nothing on the one hand and Bill 17 on the other?

With due respect, Minister, it's right here, the 48 specific recommendations of the Clean Environment report. Forty-eight. There's just 48 of them. What would you like to see? Where's the line drawn? Forty-eight specific recommendations, no more and no less.

And I say that with some hesitancy, because there are a number of specific recommendations in there that we do not very much care for and some that I'm not even sure really relate to the mission of saving Lake Winnipeg. I call your attention to 10.3: The Farm Practices Protection Board cease requiring complainants to place a \$50 deposit—

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

**Mr. Sadorski:** —when they file a complaint. Well, how's that going to save Lake Winnipeg? I'm not sure I see the relevancy there except, you know, it might increase the number of frivolous complaints of city folk who drive through the winter on a nice brisk winter day, see a cow who maybe wandered away from the herd and think there are cows abandoned

and file a complaint, by some city dweller who has no concept of winter grazing.

That's exactly what that kind of a recommendation leads to, but yet we're going to accept that recommendation. Even though at an individual level that might not be the best thing for our industry, we accept the integrity of the full process.

So I just wanted to answer that one question that the minister posed because I think that's a more fulsome answer.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Sadorski. Questions.

**Mr. Graydon:** Thank you, Mr. Sadorski, for your well-thought-out and well-presented presentation tonight. The presenter before you indicated that a hog marketing board would be the way to go, and he seemed to get a big response from the minister.

Do you see that as a solution to the hog moratorium or an alternative to the hog moratorium?

**Mr. Sadorski:** I don't think supply management is actually the route that the hog industry as producers would like to go in, as individual producers.

It's something that we actually investigated recently because of the stress that's on our industry. Having crunched the numbers and having had a somewhat fierce debate with representatives of the National Farmers Union on the point, there is an incredible loss to the industry by moving into supply management, whether that supply management system be provincially based or nationally based.

I crunched the numbers. It depends on whether or not you're nationally or provincially based, but if you moved to a provincially supply-managed system, you will lose approximately 75 percent of the size of Manitoba's cattle herd.

Now, I imagine similar numbers would probably exist with hog. I don't think that's exactly the direction that hog producers in this province really would like to go. Although somebody from dairy, that might be a very interesting perspective to bring to the table, I'm not so sure that those producers in the hog industry would necessarily agree with him.

\* (02:50)

**Mr. Graydon:** In your opinion, would that lead to much larger operations and less small family farms?

**Mr. Sadorski:** I think it has the potential to do so. I don't think it's a necessary outcome. It will depend on how that type of marketing board system would actually be administered at a policy and a technical level. So it's a hypothetical question. Again, it might not necessarily be an outcome, but it is a likely outcome, I think, that there will be some kind of concentration at the level of the industry.

**Mr. Struthers:** Yes, thank you, Shane, very much.

I was very glad that you picked up a copy of the Clean Environment report and waved it around to help answer that question that you took on. In this report, it very clearly says that the framework that we have in place now is not strong enough, and that the government must move ahead with something that's stronger.

Now you don't like Bill 17. That's fine. But when I answered that question the other day I said somewhere between what is out there now in regulation and the moratorium, and that's within the CEC.

What system would you recommend to this minister that's stronger than the framework we have now, because you did reference the CEC, but maybe isn't as strong as a moratorium?

**Mr. Sadorski:** The current system plus the 48 specific recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission report. No more, no less. The fact of the matter is, if the Clean Environment Commission actually firmly believed that a moratorium of the nature of Bill 17 was a must in order to bring the industry into sustainability, it would be one of the 48 recommendations. It would be recommendation 49. It is not recommendation 49. It is nowhere to be found as a specific recommendation.

I take the Clean Environment Commission at its face value. I believe that this was a neutral, impartial review of an industry. It made 48 specific recommendations to build upon an existing framework. Yes, it did recognize the existing framework minus the 48 specific recommendations was not sufficient in its mind. Add the 48 recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission report, you get yourself to sustainability. Anything beyond that seems to be overkill.

I would just refer to it, because my president actually slipped up the other day when he cutely referred to Bill 17 as B-17. Well, that's sort of the inside joke that we've got going on at our office. We

refer to Bill 17 as the B-17 model of doing policymaking, carpet bombing an industry, when in fact you can actually have targeted surgical strikes of the nature of the 48 individual reports. There's no need to go so hard and so firm into a Bill 17 model. It violates at least three or four precepts of public policymaking that I actually studied and taught at Queens University. I mean, it's just that simple.

**An Honourable Member:** Just read page 10 and then come back and tell me—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Time for questions has expired. That concludes your presentation. Thank you very much, Mr. Sadorski.

**Mr. Sadorski:** Can I make one closing comment of 30 seconds?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Pardon me?

**Mr. Sadorski:** Can I make one closing comment of 30 seconds?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. I can't hear the presenter. Please. Sir?

**Mr. Sadorski:** Yes. My closing comment is this: by profession, I'm a political scientist. I have never in my life seen a Legislature in the country of Canada—I have worked at this building for two years, I've worked on Parliament Hill for four, I've taught at Queens University, Canadian politics—I don't know of any Legislature left that uses legislation by exhaustion as a method of dealing with the public business. I'm speaking personally on behalf of all the other presenters who had to wait for so long. You've got to change this.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for that.

Any further presentations? Seeing none, the hour being 2:55, committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 2:55 a.m.**

#### **WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ**

Re: Bill 17

Cattle producer and employed with Grunthal Auction Mart.

I'm a beef producer in southeastern Manitoba. Before the hog industry was introduced in my area, there was no reason to stay around. No available jobs

for farm kids. This had transpired to young people finding work in neighbouring towns or going to the city and usually not returning back to their rural roots to creating a depopulating rural landscape.

With an aging community now, folks had found it difficult to sell their land at a competitive price. The amount of money they could get for their operation would not be enough to buy a house in Steinbach for these people to be closer for resources such as groceries and medical services.

I've seen a positive change with the hog industry coming into the Sundown area. Jobs that were established at wages that were not there before.

In this area the past farmers would use granular fertilizer to help the crops meet their yields. Having hog barns in the area, the manure could be applied to meet the same requirements to grow crops at a lower cost. The point is if manure is being used the same effect would be accomplished with granular fertilizer.

The farm has been in our family over 100 years. My ancestors came out to Canada for a better living, raised children, grew their own food, and had their struggles and made a living off the land.

I've taken full responsibility of taking care of our land as did my prior generation. Participated in the environmental farm plan to make improvements. We need to file a manure management plan, take soil samples, and feed the crop with the appropriate nutrients. We don't buy bottled water because we drink it from our tap, the same well as our cattle drink from. We've been told to produce more and we've followed the rules. Placing this moratorium will devastate the rural landscape. Why are we being blamed, and is this our fault? Now what do we do?

The uncertainty to farmers that I speak to every week makes me feel that I have the right to speak up and ask, now what? What do we do? You've told us to expand. We've followed your recommendation on rules and now we are being pushed out of something we love to do.

You've had a clean bill of health from the Clean Environment Commission. Why are you placing a moratorium? You are focussing on the hog operations now. Will the cattle or sheep industry be next?

Civilization began with agriculture. People grew their own food. Towns and cities were generated.

I feel that agriculture is being recognized with a bad image and that we as farmers are the criminals.

Now what?

Randy Tkachyk

\* \* \*

Good afternoon everyone. My name is Mack Waldner and I am the farm manager for Baker community near MacGregor, Manitoba. We also have several acres where we organically raise our own fruits and vegetables. We have no livestock on our community except for a few pet horses, sheep and chickens in a little red barn.

In recent months the price of chemical fertilizer has skyrocketed causing us to rethink our crop fertilizer applications practices. We have found controlled applications of manure to be a sustainable method of building topsoil components and soils overall health. We also utilize this process in our vegetable and fruit plots which provides food for our families.

If parliament passes Bill 17 and it becomes law, it will affect all Hutterite colonies, as all of them are directly or indirectly linked to the hog industry, as well as the already struggling rural farm life. Hutterites have been in Manitoba since the early 1900s and have been able to preserve our communal lifestyle by developing rural communities. As an agricultural-based society this would have a devastating effect on our livelihood.

Farmers face a gamble every day; we are on a roller coaster ride with the elements, nature and now our own government. We only have to look to countries like Russia, Poland and East Romania where seed plants, livestock processing plants and farms are standing empty because of decisions the government of that time made. Is this the future of the hog industry and eventually all rural development?

As farmers we believe we are being unscientifically targeted as polluters of Lake Winnipeg. Bill 17 does not make any economical or environmental or common sense. If manure was the issue, wouldn't it make much more sense to look at cattle feed lots, chicken and turkey barns and human waste disposal? If we just pause for a minute and think, human waste is much more harmful to the environment than hog manure.

Talking to several people who have also been following the moratorium through this weave of bureaucracy, I mentioned to them I would be presenting my case before the panel. I was met with a lot of scepticism, why take the time? Because as a minority group in Manitoba we need the protection and assistance from our local government. Not to abolish our way of life but rather to work with us to create more urban sustainable methods to produce food for the people of Canada.

What do we have to do to have our own government listen to us? We teach our children to respect leadership, but we are having a hard time explaining Bill 17 to them. One of my sons recently participated in the Manitoba Envirothon and was part of the team that won first place. The Envirothon tests students at trail tests and provides them with a question for which they have to prepare an oral presentation. The students had two hours to come up with a 10 minute presentation about an environmentally sustainable plan for a northern community that wants to develop economic and recreation activities to attract tourists. With the limited resources that they are given, I think they did a wonderful job of coming up with a solution that was balanced economically, socially and environmental.

If we teach our own children and students of Manitoba, the leaders of tomorrow, to think, research and improvise better and more sustainable methods, what will they think of a leadership that promptly states: why find a solution, let's just abolish the problem!

Lake Winnipeg is ever Manitoban's problem, and thus we must all be part of the solution!

Thank you.

Mack Waldner

\* \* \*

Hon. Mr. Lemieux,

Yesterday, I visited the Legislature and followed the debate over the livestock crisis situation in the

beef and hog sector. I need to tell you that our producers are very concerned about the livestock crisis situation, especially the announcement of the hog moratorium, and that the government steps over all science recommendations from the CEC, Clean Environment Commission, especially the legislation about the hog moratorium.

I think there is another solution possible. For example, the producers who like to go out of business, their hog numbers should be transferable to a producer who wants to expand and has enough acres to spread manure for this. For example, a producer with 1,000 feeder hogs space can put this in a quota exchange. Another producer who wants to expand can bid on these hog numbers. The producer who goes out of business has to sign off that the barns get demolished and that the old manure storage get cleaned up, so that there is later no environmental hazard. The costs for this can be collected by Manitoba Pork by a levy for every slaughtered or exported pig; for example, \$1 per pig.

This system doesn't bring any larger hog numbers in the southeast or Red River and helps the young farmers who want to expand and have the land for it to spread manure. It also cleans up the old hog barns that are going to be, in the future, environmental hazards because they are empty and there is no money to clean it up. I am more than willing to explain this to the minister in charge of this.

I hope you take this solution very serious. This maybe avoids large lawsuits against your government. As a dairy producer, I am really concerned that your government also is going to implement these rules on other livestock industries. As our political representative from my district, I ask you to please bring this concern over to the Cabinet.

Personally, I know that you do a great job for our producers in my district and I hope we can make an appointment with you soon.

P.C. de Jong

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>**