

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. 7 – 6 p.m., Thursday, June 12, 2008

ISSN 1708-6647

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Ninth Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Thursday, June 12, 2008

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Ms. Marilyn Brick (St. Norbert); Ms. Erna Braun (Rossmere) at 22:17

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Mr. Ashton, Hon. Ms. Melnick, Hon. Mr. Struthers

Mses. Blady, Brick, Mrs. Driedger, Messrs. Eichler, Fauruschou, Maloway, Nevakshonoff, Pedersen

Substitutions:

Mr. Derkach for Mr. Fauruschou
 Mr. Reid for Ms. Blady at 21:37
 Ms. Braun for Ms. Brick at 22:16
 Mr. Saran for Mr. Maloway at 22:47
 Hon. Mr. Bjornson for Hon. Mr. Ashton at 22:57

APPEARING:

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk, MLA for Swan River
 Mr. Cliff Graydon, MLA for Emerson
 Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson, MLA for River East
 Mr. Larry Maguire, MLA for Arthur-Virden
 Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights
 Mr. Kelvin Goertzen, MLA for Steinbach

WITNESSES:

Ms. Madisson Stott, Private Citizen
 Mr. Mike Van Schepdael, Genesis Inc.
 Mr. Jacob Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Isaac Hofer, Private Citizen
 Mr. Lyndon Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Peter Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Miles Beaudin, Private Citizen
 Mr. Kevin Kurbis, New Standard Ag
 Mr. Martin Sharpe, Little Saskatchewan Feedyard Group
 Mr. Rick Friesen, Private Citizen
 Mr. Les Routledge, Private Citizen
 Mr. Edward Maendel, Private Citizen
 Mr. Rick Bergmann, Private Citizen

Mr. David Sutherland, Private Citizen
 Mr. Levi Bergen, Private Citizen
 Ms. Susanne Richter, Private Citizen
 Mr. Dave Hildebrandt, Private Citizen
 Mr. Fred Fast, Private Citizen
 Mr. Jacob Rempel, Private Citizen
 Mr. Matthew Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Larry Friesen, Devon Ridge Farms
 Mr. Norm Paisley, Pro-Ag Products Ltd.
 Mr. Dickson Gould, Private Citizen
 Ms. Vicki Burns, Private Citizen
 Mr. Blaine Tully, Private Citizen
 Mr. Bill McDonald, Winnipeg Humane Society
 Mr. Greg Muench, Private Citizen
 Ms. Tracey Bryksa, Private Citizen
 Mr. Xavier Temple, Private Citizen
 Mr. David Grant, Private Citizen
 Mr. Brian White, Private Citizen
 Mr. Mike Radcliffe, Starlight Colony
 Mr. Peter Mah, Private Citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Ms. Sandra Klassen, Private Citizen
 Mr. Josh Waldner, Private Citizen
 Mr. Brent Manning, GJ Chemical Co. Ltd.
 Mr. Ernie Sirski, Manitoba Canola Growers
 Mr. Conrad Gross, Private Citizen
 Mr. Clint Miller, Private Citizen
 Mr. Andy Cardy, Private Citizen
 Ms. Denise Trafford, Private Citizen
 Mr. Joshua Waldner, Private Citizen
 Dr. Colleen Marion and Dr. Brad Chappell, Private Citizens
 Mr. Andrew Waddell, Private Citizen
 Mr. David Hedman, Private Citizen
 Ms. Janet Honey, Private Citizen
 Ms. Louise Hedman, Private Citizen
 Mr. Dickson Gould, Private Citizen
 Mr. Michael Andres, Private Citizen
 Mr. and Mrs. Jake and Lorraine Wiebe, NeWest Poultry Farms Inc.
 Ms. Lydia Falk, Private Citizen
 Mr. Ben Ginter, Private Citizen
 Ms. Estelle Thomson, Rural Municipality of Rosser
 Mr. Randy Rutherford, Private Citizen
 Mr. Irvin Funk, Private Citizens

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?

Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Water Stewardship): Yes, I'd like to nominate Ms. Brick.

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

Seeing none, congratulations, Ms. Brick, on your election.

Committee Substitution

Mr. Chairperson: I have a substitution: Mr. Derkach in for Mr. Faurschou.

* * *

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

How long does the committee wish to sit this evening?

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): No, I can't. I'm not on the committee.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): We'll leave it open for now and see how the presentations come in.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Leave it open. Is that the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

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

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

Written submissions on Bill 17 have been received from the following and have been distributed to committee members: Sandra Klassen, Josh Waldner, Brent Manning, Ernie Sirski, Conrad Gross, Clint Miller, Andy Cardy, Denise Trafford,

Joshua Waldner, Dr. Colleen Marion and Dr. Brad Chappell, Andrew Waddell, David Hedman, Janet Honey, and Louise Hedman. Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the *Hansard* transcript of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

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

As well, I would like to inform presenters that, in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes—and we will stick to 10 minutes tonight with very little wiggle room—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 the *Hansard* recorders to turn microphones on and off. Thank you for your patience.

We will now proceed with public presentations. To begin, we have a special request from a presenter, Madisson Stott, No. 40 on the list. Madisson is 15 years old. She has school tomorrow and she is an out-of-town presenter. Her grandfather has asked if she could be heard early this evening.

What is the will of the committee? Agreed that she will be heard first? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Eichler: Just before Ms. Stott comes to the microphone, I would ask leave of the committee that the families with children and people that have to catch a plane—same rules we've had for the previous two nights or three nights in committee—be allowed to be heard first, as well, register with the Clerk and register as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairperson: Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]* So, just for the crowd's information, anybody with children or other extenuating circumstances, speak to our staff at the back and they will bring your circumstances to our attention up at the front here, and we'll make arrangements accordingly.

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

Mr. Chairperson: I will now call on presenter No. 40, Madisson Stott. Ms. Stott, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Ms. Madisson Stott (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk and staff will distribute them. You may begin.

Ms. Stott: Good evening. My name is Madisson Stott. I'm 15 years old and just finishing grade 10. I live in Niverville with my parents and my younger sister.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight about Bill 17. I've been very involved in hog farming and I want to speak out against this very anti-farm bill.

*(18:10)

I've grown up being very involved in my grandfather's farm. I've been involved in this farm, a small hog operation, ever since I can remember. My parents managed the farm for my grandpa, so my sister and I have always been part of it. As a young child, I was out there with my dad in my pink rubber boots and coveralls lending a hand. My father taught me all about raising pigs.

Not only have I gotten a great education about agriculture and raising pigs, it has also funded my future education. All the money that my parents have earned managing the farm has been put into a savings account for my education and my sister's education. We are both going to university because of hog farming. My grandfather's small hobby farm is the reason I will be able to go to school and pursue my dreams for the future.

I am always learning more about agriculture and the important role it plays in Manitoba. There are countless people in this province who rely on agriculture for their families' future. Bill 17 will have a very negative impact on all of those people and will hurt future generations. My younger cousins may not be able to have this same opportunity to earn money from the farm to put towards their own education like I have.

My grandfather has always ensured that the farm is continuously modernized and upgraded to keep up with new production and environmental practices. If

Bill 17 goes through, why would he continue to invest in an industry that has no future?

What about the many groups of people who rely on hog farming for their way of life? I have a very diverse ethnic background which includes Anglo-Saxon, Métis and Mennonite, a true representation of a diverse Canadian culture. I am all too aware of the oppression and difficulties some groups have faced just to be able to live the way they want. This bill, Bill 17, will especially hurt the Hutterite people whose small communities revolve around their hog barns. This will ultimately eliminate their way of life. The same holds true for many of my fellow Mennonites.

Bill 17 is wrong. There is no basis for it, and it discriminates against a large group of people; Hutterites, Mennonites and all hog farmers, whether they have large or small operations. It also sends a strong message to young people like me, who have grown up proud to be involved in agriculture, that there is no future in Manitoba. Is that the message you want us to hear?

I ask you to withdraw Bill 17 and celebrate agriculture in this province instead of squashing it. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Stott.

Questions.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I don't have a question, but I have a comment. It's a great way to start off our evening tonight in this committee, and I certainly want to thank you for your presentation. It's good to see the youth involved, I think I speak for all the committee, anytime we hear somebody of your age and your calibre of presentation we certainly thank you very much.

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

Okay, from the top of the list, No. 1, Mike Van Schepdael, Genesis Inc. Mr. Van Schepdael, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Mike Van Schepdael (Genesis Inc.): Yes, I do.

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

Mr. Van Schepdael: My name is Mike Van Schepdael. I am speaking on behalf of Genesis Incorporated. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to Bill 17.

Genesis is a Manitoba-based swine genetics company with offices in Oakville, Manitoba, and London, Ontario. I'm a partner and I'm vice-president. We started here in Manitoba in 1995 and since then we've grown into a company with over 30 employees and \$30 million in sales. We regularly export to several countries including Korea, Mexico, Russia, Ukraine, and, of course, the United States, and we have representation in all those countries. We have over \$6 million invested in barns here in Manitoba. In 2006 we donated over \$300,000 to the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, NCLE, in support of the hog industry, the University of Manitoba and the Province of Manitoba. We are a science-based company with three geneticists on staff and other consulting scientists as well.

Now why am I telling you this? Well, being a Canadian-based company has been an advantage for us when exporting to other parts of the world, plus Manitoba is the logical place in Canada for pig production. In the past, we have not been politically active. We've had better things to do, quite frankly, but now it seems as though we need to get involved and stop Bill 17 or we risk an erosion of our clients, our equity, and we will eventually have to move out of this province taking with us jobs, infrastructure, technology and, of course, a tax base.

Bill 17 will limit our clients and our own future. It is, in my opinion, a very unfair bill. It is not based on science. All our barns and all our clients' barns meet all guidelines for manure handling. In fact, it seems as though the hog industry meets a lot higher standard than probably all other sectors of agriculture and certainly the city of Winnipeg, cottages and many private residences. So why is this industry constantly cited as the reason for our lakes' problems? I am personally very frustrated by this. I live in Winnipeg, and I often hear other Winnipeggers surmising that hog barns are polluting our province. This is a myth perpetuated by our provincial government. I suppose that in five years from now, if Bill 17 passes and when the lakes are no cleaner, the solution will be to expand the ban to the entire province. This government needs to tackle the real problems and not just dump this on hog producers, who are, unfortunately, at this point convenient scapegoats.

Bill 17 will hurt a lot of people with investments in hog barns in the affected municipalities. Anyone who needs to expand to be viable in this industry in the long term, anyone who needs to adapt with the industry as it evolves, will be left with assets worth a

lot less than the investment they have in them now. This will cost a lot of people hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars. I wonder if you guys want to step up and cover that bill? Who should we turn to for damages? The NDP? Mr Doer? Who do we talk to about that? Of the three barns Genesis owns, two of them would be candidates for expansion and one of those two barns is in the restricted municipality. The replacement cost on that barn is \$5 million.

Bill 17 is about more than a business restriction. It will tremendously hamper Hutterite colonies in Manitoba and a way of life. Why would Genesis care about that? Besides the fact that it is just not right, Genesis deals with approximately 100 Hutterite colonies across the prairies, the Dakotas and Montana. Roughly one-third of our Hutterite clients are in Manitoba. They are among the very best producers in the entire world. This bill will very unfairly limit their future expansion.

As my partner, Jim Long, says in his weekly hog commentary, draconian legislation. Since we all know that Bill 17 is not based on science, it has to be asked what the real mission here is anyway. Since no self-respecting Hutterite and very, very few hog farmers vote NDP anyway, you will not lose any votes. A large percentage of hog farmers in Manitoba and indeed successful farmers in all ag sectors, do not vote NDP. This is pure politics.

I have included an article dated January 17, 2003, about a 427,000 cubic meter sewage spill by the City of Winnipeg into the Red River. That is 427 million litres or about 94 million gallons of untreated sewage spilling into the river because of, and I quote, a result of inadequate operating and maintenance procedures.

Interestingly, if you assume that the average Hutterite colony with a Harvestore for manure storage has about 2.5 million gallons of manure on hand, the spill would be similar to about 39 Hutterite colonies' hog manure ending up in the Red River at once, roughly all the Genesis Colony clients in Manitoba. This, of course, would not happen as we as an industry are excellent stewards of the land. But it makes me wonder how much manure the Legislature can hold. It sure produces a lot.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak. I've attached the article at the back. You've probably heard those numbers before.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Questions.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): Thank you, Mr. Van Schepdael, for your presentation. I know that the small town of Oakville—you have an office there. Just a quick question there. How many people are employed through the Oakville office?

Mr. Van Schepdael: There are five people who live in Oakville employed in the office directly.

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

I call Mr. George Dyck. Mr. George Dyck will be dropped from the list.

David Mendel. David Mendel will be dropped from the list.

Jacob Waldner? Good evening, Mr. Waldner. Do you have any written materials for the committee? You do.

You may begin, sir.

* (18:20)

Mr. Jacob Waldner (Private Citizen): I'm Jacob Waldner from Rose Valley Colony in Graysville, Manitoba. We are building a new colony and we rely very much on the hog industry. I've been living all my life with the colony and livestock, that was our main interest. Since we started that new colony, we spent millions of dollars already, invested in it. Now comes the ban.

Where shall we go? Who's going to pay for the loss? It is with great sadness that I find myself standing here to speak against Bill 17. I'm 100 percent against it, because it's going to ruin Manitoba.

My people came to this country because of its democratic freedoms and rights; now I am here trying to defend them. Our colony, Blooming Prairie, is a new colony which began in 2001. Over the last few years, we have worked hard to establish this new home and business. We have met and, in many cases, exceeded any and all regulations governing the establishment of the hog operation on our colony.

The R.M. of Dufferin has specific requirements as well. We are constantly in contact with our R.M. councillor, trying to make sure that we stay on top of all situations and make sure we are good neighbours. In our colonies, we work very hard to exceed environmental requirements, cleanness and odour concerns, because we actually live in the same yard.

We do our best on our lagoon; we cover it with straw to keep the odour down. That costs us lots of money to do it, but we do this to be a good neighbour. Everything our council asked from us, we did. We treed everything; we fenced everything and we did everything to the specs. We, therefore, have a vested interest and need to follow solid farming practices.

We are now entering into the final stage of building our operation and find ourselves in a situation where this government has decided, without forethought or consideration of consequences, to stop our work. This, we do not understand. We have been unable to access any solid reasoning for this purpose—legislation—and hope that you will consider what it is you are planning.

I'd like to tell you in a nice way. Anybody who studies the Bible and reads the Bible, they will find in there that our creator created hogs, just as he did anything else. How much pork is fed all around the world and why would Manitoba want to spoil everything that's for the farmers?

I wonder if a lot of people know where eggs come from. They probably think they'll go to the store and grab the eggs; that's where they come from. The pork chops, the beef steaks, everything grows on the farm and still they want to push us down in the earth.

What happened to common sense? I'd like to say that anybody with common sense wouldn't even try to stop a farmer from making a living and trying to feed all you guys. Your pork chops—they come from the farm as my pork chops come from the farm.

I was a young lad of 14; I can still remember the hard work I put into feeding pigs, all by hand, not by a button, all with the fork and shovel. When I went to bed at night, I fell in my bed with a backache from trying to make a living. That's the way I was raised from my dad and I appreciate my dad. My dad and all my forefathers left that behind for us. What will our children have?

I have a family of nine children and I am very, very sad this is coming to Manitoba, trying to spoil what our forefathers earned for us and what we earned up to now. The politics seem to be on the way of right and wrong. I think we are all old enough to know what is right and what is wrong.

Bill 17 is wrong. I'm a hundred percent against it. The government gave our tax money to two packing plants for expansion but in the same action,

took away the hog barn growth needed to fill the plants. Where is their common sense? The millions, the grant they gave to packing plants to expand and now what they're trying to do is destroy the piggeries, the pig operations. Where is the common sense? There's none there.

Efficiency—we try our best. We have the absolute best technology at our farm to make sure we don't overlap with manure because the manure is very valuable. We do as our municipality, R.M., asked to do. When we put the manure on our fields, it's gone in less than 24 hours and most of it is knifed in right away, just to be a good neighbour and just to do what we have to do and we should do.

Farmers are the bread and butter at Manitoba. One thing I want to tell you and ask you: Where would all you people go for a steak or for a pork chop if it wouldn't be for the farmers? It comes into the store through the farmer. So why would anybody want to hurt the farmer's feelings and stop him from making a living? We work very hard. It's like I told you. We spent millions of dollars already and we're only half done with our barn and now comes the ban. Where shall we go? Who's going to help us?

Thank you for giving me time to speak. I am very sad about Bill 17. It's wrong.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

I just want to share something with you. It happened today in the Legislature here and it was the right thing to do. An apology was made to Aboriginal people for residential schools and the young children being placed in residential schools. It was an apology that was a long time coming. I just want to tell you what the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Doer) said today in regard to this specific issue. He said: I pledge to never deny people a culture and way of life. I just wanted you to know that that's what he said as a person today in our Legislature and that's our Premier.

Mr. Jacob Waldner: I still feel very disturbed about Bill—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Waldner.

Mr. Jacob Waldner: Bill—

Mr. Chairperson: No, I have to recognize you, if you want to respond to that, which I did.

Mr. Waldner.

An Honourable Member: Go ahead now.

Mr. Jacob Waldner: Yes.

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

Mr. Jacob Waldner: You're welcome. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bob Waldner? Bob Waldner will be dropped.

Mr. Mark Waldner? Mark Waldner will be dropped from the list.

Rita Caya? Rita Caya will be dropped from the list.

John Doerksen? John Doerksen will be dropped from the list.

Joseph Hofer? Joseph Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Garry Hofer, Elm River Colony? Garry Hofer will be dropped from the list.

* (18:30)

Isaac Hofer. Mr. Hofer, I see you have no written materials for the committee. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Isaac Hofer (Private Citizen): I'm Isaac Hofer. I work for Econny [*phonetic*] Farms. We employ 12 employees. I'm production manager. We always have immigrants working for us. They come here, the government emigrates them. They buy homes. They think they're going into a better life, but this Bill 17—they always ask me, where's this going? Where's our livelihood going to go? Like the Hutterites, it just doesn't make any sense. There is no real evidence why they are bringing it in. There's no proof, and it's not right. We've got to remember whoever eats is involved in agriculture, and I'm totally against Bill 17. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

Questions?

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Mr. Hofer, would you say that the rules and regulations that are in place today are adequate to protect the lake?

Mr. Hofer: Yes, they are, and we try hard to follow them, too. I've been involved in the hog industry as manager and production manager for 20 years. There have been a lot of changes. You got to get used to it, be as friendly as you can and on you go. But, like I say,

there's no proof of what they are doing now. It just kills everybody. Thank you.

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

Lyndon Waldner. Mr. Waldner, you have no written materials for the committee?

Mr. Lyndon Waldner (Private Citizen): I do not, no.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Lyndon Waldner: Thank you.

My name is Lyndon Waldner. I'm from Norquay Colony. We live, I guess, about an hour west of Winnipeg. I work in a hog production facility. It's about an 800-sow operation, and we run a nucleus unit. We supply the hogs that most barns will be using. Most barns are commercial units. They basically raise pigs to sell to market, and we'd be the ones that we raise breeding stock for those barns to use.

So Bill 17 will affect us as there will be no new barns opening in, what is this, two-thirds of Manitoba? That will affect us by simply—there'll be a lot less sales for us in that area. Also we have now, I guess, a decade of experience with—our barn is over a decade old, probably about 13, 14 years. Since the existence of our barn, we have been using engineers to inject all of our manure. We have been doing soil samples. I think all of the protocols that Bill 17 will put into place we've been following for over a decade. All of that won't be anything new to us and shouldn't be a problem to do.

But I guess the problem will be the no new barns and no expansion of barns. I guess that will affect us in limiting the place where we can sell our hogs and limiting our income. I'd like to say that I am not in favour of the bill. I guess if it would include, okay you can expand if you do this and this for environment; put in digesters or limit where you put the manure and how you handle it, I guess it would be a lot easier to support and be more in favour of it.

As our community or for us we've always tried to be very conscious of the environment when handling our manure and our dead livestock. We've tried to stay away from the ditches, any major waterways, anything like that. I don't know if there's much more that we can do, but any regulations that do get passed we'll follow to the best of our ability. That's all I have.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I do appreciate what you've said tonight and have borne witness to all of your farming activities. Your operation has indeed been scrutinized by neighbours. I wonder if you can comment in that regard. Because of that scrutiny, extensive ground water testing has been done in and around the colony. Maybe you can share with the committee the results of that.

Mr. Lyndon Waldner: Over the course of the last 10 to 15 years, our barn has come under a lot of scrutiny from our neighbours. They haven't been in favour of it—we haven't had much trouble the last few years, but, the preceding 10 years, there was a lot of scrutiny and a lot of opposition to it.

Because of that, we've quite often had to—we've been to the Portage City Council; we've had two discussions with the reeve, but we had to do a lot of ground-water testing, soil sampling. Everything has always come up negative. There have been no adverse effects from our barn on the soil and the ground water in our area.

Mr. Faurshou: I just want to thank you for your presentation and, indeed, you have been exemplary. It took a lot of time and effort on your behalf to win over the neighbours, but I think your activities have been stellar. I hope the government has listened to your presentation tonight.

Mr. Lyndon Waldner: Thank you.

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

Mr. Lyndon Waldner: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call John Gross. John Gross will be dropped from the list.

Victor Hofer. Victor Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Garry Hofer, Elm River Colony. Garry Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Peter Waldner. Good evening, Mr. Waldner. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Peter Waldner (Private Citizen): Oral presentation, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Peter Waldner: I'm Peter Waldner of the Grand Colony Farms near Oakville, Manitoba. I've been farming all my life so far. My dad was a farmer all

his life; he's still alive. My grandpa also, farming all his life.

It's sort of a perfection. It's putting food on the table—food for me, my family, food for all of us that need to eat, food for the needy. Who are the needy, you may ask. I am needy; you are needy. Is that enough? No, it's not enough. Over 90 percent of the food at Safeway, Sobeys and other superstores—Loblaw's—and all grocery stores in Manitoba is produced by farmers, farmers in Canada, in Manitoba.

My grandpa left me acreage. He said to my father, I left this behind; our forefathers left this behind for you and your coming children. The smell of food, the taste of food, its wholesome nutrients, the food that we need to eat, so as not to starve—it begs me to ask, what's wrong with Canada, especially Manitoba? More so, what is wrong with Manitoba? Why did this even come up, this Bill 17?

Personally, I don't think it has merit—the bill, I mean, conceived by the government backbenchers. Direct chaos and havoc on what? Irrational thinking. Someone, I think, is trying to brainwash the people into making Manitoba an import market. Communism? It makes me wonder—farmers in Manitoba, a huge part of the breadbasket of Canada.

Let's step back a bit. Bill 17 is about the phosphorus level in our lakes. It's overwhelmed by the hog industry, or so we've been forced to believe.

* (18:40)

A hundred years ago, there were close to 10 million buffalo, roaming our prairies. What happened to their manure? How about the millions and millions of water fowl that immigrate into our country, as we speak? Why not stop the City of Winnipeg for dumping raw sewage into Lake Winnipeg, instead of banning food production?

Phosphorus or high phosphorous levels in the lakes are blamed on the hog industry. There is no scientific backup to verify the conclusion how manure from hog farms gets incorporated back into the land, back to where it is taken from to create food, to repeat the cycle, the cycle from life, you may add. There is no run-off, and if there is, it's the government's backbenchers or condemn them. They're probably the same people who have a cottage along the shoreline whose sewer lines flood directly into the lake instead of having a septic tank. I'm just going to say that they should give their head

a shake. They may not even be so far gone as to not hear the rattle.

Thanks for letting me speak tonight.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Questions.

Mr. Faursehou: Peter, thank you very much for your presentation.

I am familiar with your operation, and it is indeed one that you can be very proud of and that your forefathers would be proud of you for maintaining.

Your observation in and around the cottage owners: There was a previous presenter here, Mr. Ian Wishart, that gave example of the Delta cottage area and adjacent farming where, in fact, the phosphates were higher in and around the cottage areas than they were closer to the farms.

So your observation and your statement here tonight does indeed have documentation of support. Is there anything further you'd like to add?

I do want to thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Waldner.

Todd Hacault. Todd Hacault will be dropped from the list.

Levi Hofer. Levi Hofer will be dropped from the list.

David Hofer. David Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Jack Waldner. Jack Waldner will be dropped from the list.

Mike Hofer. Mike Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Felix Boileau. Felix Boileau will be dropped from the list.

Rick Fast. Rick Fast will be dropped from the list.

Miles Beaudin. Is that Beau-din or Beaudin?

Mr. Miles Beaudin (Private Citizen): Beaudin.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Beaudin, do you have any written materials? I see you do. The Clerk's assistant will distribute them.

You may proceed.

Mr. Beaudin: My name is Miles Beaudin. I work for the Manitoba Pork Council, but I'm here tonight as a private citizen. First of all, I do have a degree in agriculture and I just finished an M.B.A. in agribusiness so I do have an education background. Little more about me. I grew up on a family farm, a 250-sow farrow-to-finish operation near St. Eustache, Manitoba. I have five years' experience working for Maple Leaf, and while at Maple Leaf I was consulting for family farms in which the feed was sold and livestock was sold.

One thing I'd like to comment is that when we refer to Maple Leaf and Puratone, yes, they do own a lot of sow barns, but from every sow barn there are approximately 3,000 sows. There's approximately 30 barns and a great deal, I would say 90 percent, of those 30 barns are all family farms under some type of contractual agreement. So there's a very small amount of actual corporate farms. A lot of them are family farms just under some type of obligation.

As far as the Pork Council, my job duties are I manage all the food safety in Manitoba for pork. I manage all the animal welfare on the pig side, also manage the human resources for the pork industry and manage the health and safety for the province for the pork industry.

When thinking about what I should talk about, I thought of I'd talk about public policy, just a review of public policy and how I've seen it rolled out for Bill 17. So I pulled out the notes from the M.B.A. and here I go.

There are a number of factors that may be considered during public policy development. In the end there are several factors that will be used to judge whether the resulting Bill 17 is good for public policy.

First of all, I'd like to talk about public interest. The hearing for this bill has grown interest for about 450 speakers. About 450 speakers have registered. From what I know, this bill breaks all records for interest and beats any bill in history for creating this type of interest. Interestingly enough from the people I've heard, there's been in comparison to the total amount of people speaking, there's been a few people that have been opposed.

As a whole, does Bill 17 really solve Lake Winnipeg's problems? As has been mentioned many times, that when farmers apply manure according to new rules and regulations, they will soil-test, and when they soil-test they'll know how much

phosphorus is in the soil and how much they will put in. So if you were to eliminate hog production and manure, if you take manure out, the farmers are just going to put chemical phosphorus into the soil. So this is a zero-sum game, nothing to be gained, nothing to be lost. The same phosphorus is going to be in the soil for what that crop needs to put in.

Effectiveness, this is a critical part of public policy: How well does this policy achieve its stated goals? The goal is to improve the quality of Lake Winnipeg. As mentioned, Bill 17 does nothing to improve this. Therefore, Bill 17 is a poorly thought out bill. Bill 17 does nothing that would incorporate management and science together that would help out Lake Winnipeg. Manitoba already has the toughest regulations for agriculture. Why can't we use that management to apply the right amount of phosphorus? The rules are there; we've just got to follow them.

Efficiency, another part of public policy: How well are resources used to achieve the goals, to put public policy in place? The resources used to put Bill 17 together, in my opinion, are appalling. The Minister of Agriculture, Honourable Rosann Wowchuk, has provided zero consultative effort with the pork industry to come up with this bill; in addition, has mentioned several times that Bill 17 was based on science. The pork industry has asked Honourable Wowchuk several times to submit, as she promised, what was used as science in the creation of this bill. The Honourable Rosann Wowchuk has provided no such scientific evidence. The combination of zero consultative efforts and zero scientific evidence creates extremely poor efficiency of resources to achieve the goals of Bill 17.

I'd also like to comment about the use of time of the hearings. In my times working with the federal government, with CFIA, I think they do a good job to listen to farmers. They have numerous town hall meetings throughout the country. There, people are able to submit comments. Farmers don't have to drive very far and are able to take part in the processes. From here, I heard people have been up till 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning. They are tired and cannot really get a great sense—contribute to their fullest to these hearings. So the next time I think there are some things to be learned about this process, and for due respect of all people in the province, we've got to learn from the federal government a little bit how to do some good public policy.

Consistency, another part of good public policy creation: What is the degree of alignment with broader goals and strategies of the government with regulatory regimes? As mentioned by many, environmental regulation is very high for Manitoba farmers. Unfortunately, Bill 17 does not line up with any other type of agricultural segment. No other farming activity has been banned from growth. Neither has construction been banned. The lack of alignment of other commodity segments makes Bill 17 extremely discriminatory. Why has the NDP government singled out hog producers? Does the NDP government understand that crop-farming land also applies phosphorus in the Red River Valley and contributes to Lake Winnipeg's problems on an equal basis, as described as my zero-sum game. Why haven't chicken producers, dairy producers, cow producers, grain farmers been targeted.

*(18:50)

Bill 17 has unfair written all over it. As mentioned before, grain farmers and other animal commodity segments are untouched by Bill 17. Also, there are many disadvantages for hog farmers within the ban area. Hog farmers within the ban area will not be able to expand because of welfare and new standards.

We just had a person sitting here that talked about they're in the genetic business providing livestock. Every year the genetic trend has produced more and more animals from the sows. We need more room to house these animals. We want to give them more room. We give more room to our animals than people in China. We need to increase the barns to meet the genetic trends, and we can't do that. That is a big welfare issue.

Also, farmers like to reposition themselves with family and we're unable to expand because of that.

Reflection on public policy. What other values of society such as freedom, community and choice are reflected in this policy? The key words: freedom, society and community.

Banning the ability to farm is the highest act to restrict freedom. Freedom, key word. That is what Bill 17 does for families living in a proposed ban area. Also, for Hutterite colonies, the inability to be able to get into hog farming or ability to expand will result in members of their community to leave the colony. Again, this Bill 17 destroys communities.

Sustainability, another part of public policy. There was \$750,000 spent by all Manitobans on the

Clean Environment Commission, and that has proved that Manitoba hog industry is sustainable. No one in this room or province can dispute the claim because hundreds of Manitoba professionals, citizens and scientists have come up with these findings. Anyone that disputes goes against the hundreds of Manitobans, professionals and scientists that have contributed to this report.

Is there a balanced and mutual supported relationship between environment, health, society and the economy? The answer is no. How can the NDP government ban hog farming in Manitoba when hog farmers do not apply a drop of manure in the Red River? In 2006, the City of Winnipeg dumped more than 67 million gallons of raw sewage into the Red River. Hog farmers do not dump a single gallon into the Red River.

Mr. Chairperson: Sir, you have one minute to conclude your remarks.

Mr. Beaudin: Yes.

The NDP government, why hasn't it banned new house construction? Wouldn't that provide better control of pollution to Lake Winnipeg?

Because Bill 17 violates all the points of good public policy, here is a wrap-up, socially acceptable. Because Bill 17 is a bill that reflects the farming community, it is unanimously viewed that the public policy does not reflect the values of the farming community, and because this bill does nothing to help Lake Winnipeg nor does it reflect the values of other residents.

Bill 17 is highly discriminatory. The bill shows no equity to Manitoba in whole. Bill 17 shows absolutely no consistency by targeting the excess of 50 million gallons of sewage dumped into Winnipeg every year by Winnipeg. Nor does Bill 17 show any consistency against other livestock and plant-based commodities and how they contribute phosphorus to Lake Winnipeg.

Technically correct. Is this policy technically correct? Without any NDP consultative process with industry, academia or farming community, Bill 17 has ignored scientific and technical criteria that was supposed to guide the decision process making for this regulation. Because of this deficiency in technical advice, Bill 17 is highly flawed.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Questions?

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Beaudin, for your presentation.

Looking at it from a technical point of view, you have a very strong case here. I noticed that you're responsible for human resources with Manitoba Pork, I'm assuming. You've obviously, with such a technical report, presentation here, you've given some thought to what's going to happen to the human resources within Manitoba and the hog industry.

Would you like to give us what your vision of where the human resources are going to go?

Mr. Beaudin: Yes, I could comment on that. Yes, I'm very involved. The human resources is—again there's private farms, family farms and larger farms. Again, as mentioned before, Canada—a lot of people come in Canada to start off their lives, which is huge for many people. We're highly regulated. We've got employment standards coming up. Looks like we're going to be nailed on WCB. I guess I wrote against it because a lot of people have private insurance and it sure beats the heck out of WCB. I could tell you that people are extremely well paid in our industry; they get bonuses, trucks; they get houses. Again, because we're highly regulated, we have no troubles. It's a great place to work, and so on.

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

Stanley Hofer. Stanley Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Adam Waldner. Adam Waldner will be dropped from the list.

William Hoffman. William Hoffman will be dropped from the list.

Robert Krentz. Robert Krentz will be dropped from the list.

James Waldner. James Waldner will be dropped from the list.

Kevin Kurbis, New Standard Ag. Good evening Mr. Kurbis. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Kevin Kurbis (New Standard Ag): No, sir, just notes to keep myself from losing my temper.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Kurbis: Rather than repeat what many experts have already told you and apparently fallen on some

deaf ears, I want to give you my personal story and let you know how this bill would affect me.

I grew up on a farm in the R.M. of St. Clements as the youngest of four brothers. I knew from a young age that I wanted to work in agriculture but that our family farm was unable to support my future.

I was fortunate enough to be able to find a job that allowed me not only to stay in touch with my farming background but also provide me and my family with a living. I have now been working in the hog industry for over 10 years and together with my brother, we run our own business. This has allowed us both to provide for our families as well as generating income for several of our friends and family that we've been able to hire on a part-time basis to supplement their farming incomes.

Although we have both worked in the hog industry for several years, we've only been in business together for two. In that time, we have generated over \$1 million of revenue from equipment that has been sold to the U.S. and other markets outside of Manitoba. This money has been brought into our economy and taxes have been paid on it right here. We have purchased vehicles here. I have purchased land and built a house.

I have a wife and two kids that I support. All of this disappears without the hog industry. We are headquartered here and wish to remain so but we've only been able to do this because of the industry that is in place here that supports us. Without the support from Manitoba, there is no point to being here. That same revenue will be generated but the tax dollars will go to someplace else. If this ban is placed on further hog expansion in this province, we will both have to explore other options for employment. In order to continue in business, we would both look at moving.

I know I am not alone in this. Countless rural-raised young people have stayed in this province simply because of the hog industry and its spinoff businesses. Whether it is working at a feed mill or for a trucking company that transports hogs or a construction crew that builds barns or in a barn directly, these people are finding employment because of hogs.

Because moving to Winnipeg is not an option that many are willing to explore, they will either find work that allows them to remain tied to agriculture and their rural communities or leave. That is the

bottom line. If forced to make the choice, many will opt for leaving the province. Even the ones that do choose to stay and move to the cities are hurting our rural economies. What needs to be understood is that without our rural economies, Winnipeg will not matter or exist.

I've spoken with many hog producers and not one of them has a problem with being regulated. Many have realized that the regulations that are in place have helped them become better farmers as well. When they can use the same manure to fertilize more of their acres, they have saved money.

That is what is being ignored in this so-called debate. No matter what is done to eliminate the hog industry, the same number of acres will be farmed. These acres will continue to be fertilized. The only difference is that it will be done with chemicals and then we will have to contend with synthetic forms of the same nutrients.

Protecting the environment has been used as an excuse to attack our farm families. To put it bluntly, that is complete bull. We all know that the NDP has been elected by the urban people, and attacking the farmer who has not supported them is too easy.

This bill will do nothing to protect the environment, nothing. If the government wants to make progress, they should listen to the recommendations of the CEC, which, if I remember correctly, was the original idea behind spending three-quarters of a million dollars of taxpayer money to examine the hog industry. The least we should expect is that the recommendations would be followed. Nowhere in that report did I see the suggestion to shut down the hog industry entirely.

* (19:00)

I would like to ask for this government to use some common sense and not make this decision based on the votes they think they can win by such a measure. It has occurred to me that all politicians are concerned with is how history will remember them. If this is any example of the type of government we currently have, the legacy left behind will have this government remembered as the reason that Manitoba became a have-not province, and all for a law that did absolutely nothing to save our lakes but did manage to line the pockets of the pharmaceutical and chemical companies.

This bill will hurt Manitoba's economy in ways that will compare to Alberta deciding to stop all oil drilling, and the environment will not be protected at

all. I am not suggesting that we sell out our environment for the sake of making money. In fact, I believe that is exactly what this bill would do. I would rather we take a balanced look at what can be done not only to protect what we have for natural resources but also allow people to make a living. We really can have both our lakes and our pigs. Smart sustainable growth can be achieved, and it is much more desirable than a dictatorship-style government that will decide on its own whim who can exist and who cannot.

I love this province and I do not want to leave, but if this bill is passed an entire work force, including myself, will need to look at other options. Pigs are our oil. Do not kill this industry. Regulate, improve and monitor, of course, but shutting it down is not the answer. Give us the chance to work together for the future.

I'd also like to add that since I wrote this, a few things had happened. I'd been out of the province for about a week. One of the reasons I left is I had to go meet with one of our investors. We had an offer on some land in the R.M. of Rosser, just outside of Winnipeg. We were buying a couple of acres and going to be putting up a storefront. Since then, we've had to pull back on this project because our investors have pulled out directly because of this bill.

I went to meet with them to try to convince them to continue on but I was told, and I quote, why would I invest in a province that clearly has no plans to allow business to survive? Now that is a sad state of affairs when people outside this country and this province are looking at us that way. Economy in general is based on faith, we all know that, faith that the money I have in my pocket when I hand it to somebody else, he'll give me something in return. That is an economy. Faith. Nobody has faith in this province. Nobody has faith in this government if they are going to continue down this route.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kurbis.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): Thanks, Mr. Kurbis, for that presentation. I know that you speak from knowing what it's like to start a business, to grow and then to sort of be cut down by a government that hasn't really listened.

Just from the presentations I've heard tonight, it appears to me that a common-sense approach might be to withdraw this bill and to sit down with those that are going to be impacted by Bill 17 and see

whether we couldn't work out a balanced approach to meet the needs of government and to meet the needs of those that depend on the hog industry for their livelihood.

Do you think that might be a good compromise?

Mr. Kurbis: I would love to see this government take this bill off the table, go back, have meetings. I'm not saying that we don't have room for improvement. There's always room for improvement. New technologies are coming on line. This is a huge part of what I do is supplying equipment for manure management, helping farmers to become more efficient and not damage. Not one of them wants to damage the environment. This isn't what they're out to do.

It is fairly frustrating though when these already tightly regulated producers are now being told that you're out of business completely. Miles who had spoken before me had suggested that we also look at other agricultural producers. I say let's not stop there. I say we move right into here, right into Winnipeg, where Mr. Stan Struthers, last week was quoted as saying, the reason for this was the Red River runs through the heart of the hog country.

Well, I checked a map on my way in. It runs through Winnipeg, too. Let's look at Winnipeg. Let's stop people from being able to buy as much as they want and green up their lawns and let that leach off into the rivers. There are more problems than the hogs.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thanks very much, Mr. Kurbis, for that.

It may be interesting for those that are in the room to know that just earlier this week, with the heavy downpour of rain that we had, again, raw sewage running into our river from the city of Winnipeg. When questioned, the government has no plans to deal with raw sewage until after the year 2012 in the city of Winnipeg.

So we're looking at another four years of the kind of raw sewage running into the river from Winnipeg, and we have a government that, on the one hand, is coming down very heavy on one industry and, on the other hand, is sitting on their hands and doing absolutely nothing to try to control the raw sewage in the city of Winnipeg. So it's important that presenters know that and just maybe we could look for some balance from the government that's in power today.

Thanks for your presentation.

Mr. Kurbis: I would just like to say, directly to some of these people playing with their PDAs right now, a lot of these people have taken time out of their day to come this far. Pay attention, pay attention. Thank you. *[interjection]* No. Pay attention. These people are hard workers. They're taking time out of their day. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kurbis.

Okay. For the attention of the crowd, the rules of the Legislature, which also apply to the committee, are that the public is not to participate in the debate, from the crowd, which includes applause. So I ask you to restrain yourselves. All of you have the opportunity to make your feelings known at the microphone there, so that's the venue for you.

I call Mr. Martin Sharpe, Little Saskatchewan Feedyard Group. Martin Sharpe. Good evening, Mr. Sharpe. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Martin Sharpe (Little Saskatchewan Feedyard Group): Yes, I do.

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

Mr. Sharpe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

My name is Martin Sharpe. I'm a cattle farmer and hog farmer from the R.M. of Odanah near Minnedosa. I am an elected delegate for district 3 of the Manitoba Pork Council, I am a voting delegate for district 8 of the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association, and I am a member of the Keystone Ag Producers Association.

My farm in the R.M. of Odanah, thankfully, is beyond the scope of Bill 17. I am not threatened by the shutdown of growth. I can expand my hog operation. I can expand my cattle operation. I can expand my grain operation. So that is not why I'm here tonight. I'm here tonight to speak against Bill 17 because I am a member of a loose group of producers in the Minnedosa area who have formed the Little Saskatchewan Feed Yard Group.

As you know, as many of you were out in Minnedosa in the last year, an ethanol plant has opened. Husky Oil has opened the Minnedosa plant. Yet we'll use feed wheat and corn to produce ethanol and its by-products. The plant will produce 130 million litres a year of ethanol. As a by-product, it

will produce distillers grains, either dried or in the liquid form. It will produce enough to feed 125,000 cattle every day, year-round. Now, I'll let that number sink in for a minute—125,000 head of cattle per year, per day, every day, year-round.

* (19:10)

At this point, Husky is drying all that material and shipping it out, either by truck or by rail. It is our concern, as the price of transport, of fuel, of labour, of trucks, of rail transportation becomes higher and higher and higher, as will happen in the future, that plans must be made for using this material closer to Minnedosa. As we have done the planning, right now it would be more efficient for Husky to pump that material underground through plastic pipe than to truck it as a liquid product. When that map on page 2 was done two and a half years ago, that circle on the map is a circle 15 miles out from Minnedosa. Everything inside that you could put right now, pumping liquid DDG to feedlots, underground cheaper than you could truck dry product to them.

That map includes portions of 11 different municipalities. I have been going around to the municipalities now presenting this. The majority of municipalities have agreed with the idea and have written into their zoning by-laws now—the first number I bounced off them and they figured was too high was 25,000-head feedlots, the equivalent of what Alberta does. An economic feedlot in Alberta is 25,000 head. That would be five feedlots within that circle.

The municipalities get scared when you start talking like that, so we have reached a compromise of half that size, 12,500, 10 of them. I'm a regionalist. If there are 11 municipalities inside that circle, I'm more than willing to let each one of them have a feedlot. That would spread them out. That would give you lots of land in between the feedlots for manure spreading, for silage production, for crop production, to feed them.

The problem, as we have now, is when I go to investors and bounce this off them, they tell me, okay, 10 feedlots at a price today between \$12 million and \$15 million a feedlot comes to \$120 million to \$150 million. I say, yes, that's roughly what'll it take right now to do it.

But you want us to put money into Manitoba. Yes, this area is in Manitoba. It's around Minnedosa. But doesn't the government ban things in Manitoba?

So, therefore, that's my reason for being here tonight. My area has the potential to feed an awful lot of cattle with a product that is being produced there now, but my area might have to forgo that opportunity because of an investment climate, that with Bill 17 hanging over Manitoba, even though we are not in Bill 17 at this point, as a local newspaper article stated, it would simply take a stroke of a pen to change hog barn construction to feedlot construction to dairy barn construction to chicken barn construction, et cetera.

I want Manitoba to prosper. I want my area of Manitoba to prosper. Bill 17 stands in the way of both. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sharpe.

Questions?

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Thanks, Mr. Sharpe. You've made it very clear that your present stand in regard to investment, you've got a tremendous opportunity there in the Minnedosa region to expand the livestock industry just like we did in Manitoba after the Crow benefit was taken away in 1995.

Can you expound again as to—I don't know if you can make it any clearer, but can you help me out with just exactly what people are telling you, that might want to invest in Manitoba, with this bill?

Mr. Sharpe: When you go to Alberta and get on the phone or e-mail the potential investor, because it's not—as it was told by many of my local farmers—there's not enough money in that circle to build the infrastructure that we need in the circle. There is not enough money in Minnedosa, in Neepawa, in Erickson, in Oak River, in Rivers, to do it. We're going to have to get outside money.

So, in western Canada, when you want to get outside money, there's one phone call you make and you phone Alberta. The investors in Alberta know the cattle industry; they know the livestock industry. They already have the plant—the Husky plant at Lloydminster—that many of them are already feeding the soup from.

It's happening in Lloydminster; Minnedosa is number two. Are we going to go? Will you be prepared to put money into the Minnedosa circle to get these feedlots going? I'm being told, eh, not right now, not with this bill.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maguire, supplemental question?

Mr. Maguire: I just want to thank you for your presentation.

We've always talked about wanting to have people come back to Manitoba. It looks like we don't want their money.

Mr. Sharpe: People who may want to come back with their money are wondering whether they should, or what they should do with it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sharpe.

Mark Gauvin. Mark Gauvin will be dropped from the list.

Mark Hofer. Mark Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Levi Waldner. Levi Waldner will be dropped from the list.

George Hofer. George Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Fred Hofer. Fred Hofer is dropped from the list.

Alvin Hofer. Alvin Hofer is dropped from the list.

Robert Toews. Robert Toews is dropped from the list.

Kees Vanittersum, Micro Fan Canada Inc. Mr. Vanittersum will be dropped from the list.

Darrin Warkentin. Mr. Warkentin is dropped from the list.

Jerome Van Boekel. Mr. Van Boekel is dropped from the list.

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

Mr. Rick Friesen (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. Rick Friesen: Thank you for the chance to speak against Bill 17 today.

My name is Rick Friesen, as you announced me, and I'm here on behalf of my family, my employees—I have 12 employees—their families and our industry.

I don't have anything written out in point form, but I thought I might just talk about our family, our farm, our situation, how we planned our farm from earlier on and how this affects us and many families like us.

I brought this along just to introduce my family; I don't know if you'd like to pass that along. That is a promotional—we're also ag farmers—that was done two years ago. The family members now have grown up a little taller and look a little better, except for me. I kind of missed out on that part.

* (19:20)

We are a family farm that truly loves farming. That's what we've done. I'm the third generation on our farm. We thought we've planned our way through. I didn't go to university, but I spent a lot of time in meetings, especially, you know, some of the governmental meetings that, you know, Manitoba Agriculture might offer to give us some direction on what to do. So what we do is we farm about 1,200 acres of land. We've got a small chicken quota of layers of 9,000. In 1987, we expanded into the hog business with a sow barn, a 500-head sow barn. In '90, we expanded another sow barn, 600, and then later on in 2000 a 1,500-head sow barn. We did that without any investors. Our model is we use our equity and we try to grow, try to keep up with economic times. These operations have to work. They have to stay viable. So our plan isn't a one-year or two-year plan. Many of the large industry, like, players around us in the pork industry have investors and they can build up their barns very fast. In our case, we built up our farms with our equity. So it's a 30-year plan to try to stay viable. That's what we do.

Now, in this case with Bill 17, that has short-circuited our plan. We cannot be viable anymore in some of our operations. Just to give you an idea, because we have these different sizes of barns, let's say a 500-head sow barn, like many people have and have built in that time and have worked hard families to pay off, is probably about 10 percent less efficient than our 1,500-head sow barn. Now we cannot continue running those barns with that reduction in efficiency. We and many other families in Manitoba have to expand or make them more efficient for them to stay viable and stay in business. So, you know, that's one thing that I thought was maybe important to pass to people. These operations will finally be closed down and so will ours eventually if we cannot make them viable.

Also, you know, just looking at the industry and kind of comparing it to our supply manage industry. It kind of looks like what we're doing here with Bill 17 is we're stopping any expansion or anything that the industry can do to become more economically viable, or whatever it is. Just like supply

management, you can't expand, there is a certain amount of quota. But with supply management there is protection at the border. You know, pork products have no protection at the border. There's no tariffication there, so we're stuck. We are open to product flooding in to our country. Well, that is the business that we've always been in and that's the business that we've chosen, in the pork industry. But what we didn't realize is it would stop here.

So, you know, with that, I probably would just like to say we work hard with the regulations that were given us and we've spent a fair bit of money to invest in manure handling equipment, injection equipment and that kind of thing because I thought that was important. Not only was it the regulations, but it was a responsible thing to do, and I thought our industry was doing that. So I'm surprised to hear that we haven't done enough. If we can do more, I think that it's important for us to look at that. But just to stop these things, to derail, you know, good farm families in Manitoba is not fair.

So, you know, I ask you to please reconsider this bill, and I'd entertain any questions that you might have.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Friesen.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Mr. Friesen, for your presentation. You did a great job. On your farm, we're sure that you follow all the best practices.

Would you care to comment on, nowhere in the CEC report did it talk about a permanent moratorium. A lot of your presentation was formed around that. Why do you think the government would go to the next step, even though there was no call for a moratorium?

Mr. Rick Friesen: Well, that's a good question. I mean, I have a lot of theories why they would do that. I understand the science isn't very solid for them to take this kind of action that they've taken. I don't know.

Is it an issue of, maybe, public perception? Do they feel that they can gain votes by taking this action? I don't want to point fingers of what the reasons are. I just want to come here and try to explain that the situation they're putting good people in is devastating, and it will be devastating for generations, actually.

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

I call Amos Stahl. Amos Stahl will be dropped from the list.

Edward Maendel. Edward Maendel will be dropped from the list.

Russell Paetkau. Russell Paetkau is dropped from the list.

James Siemens. James Siemens is dropped from the list.

Zack Waldner. Zack Waldner is dropped from the list.

Les Routledge.

Floor Comment: Here.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Mr. Maguire, you had your hand up? Sorry.

Mr. Routledge, do you have any—I see you do. You may proceed.

Mr. Les Routledge (Private Citizen): Thank you.

I'm happy to have this opportunity to perhaps shed a little bit different light on concerns about Bill 17 that I have.

First off, I want to introduce who am I. Today, I'm a small goat and sheep farmer in Killarney. This year I'm actually getting into some ducks and geese as well. On a personal basis, I'm a passionate recreational fisher and an ardent beach bum. You'll find me on the beach at Killarney Lake every hot day, and I'll be out there fishing a lot. So I take water quality very seriously because of that recreational side of it.

About three to four years ago, I was part of a group that was founded, the Manitoba Sustainable Energy Association. I was one of the founding directors. But I'm not just that. For 20 years, I worked across Canada as a consultant, where I worked on accelerating the research, development, commercialization, and ramp up of new technology based enterprises and industries. I roughly estimate that over that 20 years I was part of raising over \$10 billion of financing for new technology based ventures in Canada and around the world. So I do have a pretty good understanding of what it takes to get ventures financed.

What's my concern with Bill 17? Well, it's coming from the sustainable and renewable energy side of things. My concern is this bill risks locking in the current production practices of the industry, instead of creating an environment of constant

improvement. Now, you've heard about that from an economic perspective, particularly from the last presenter, but it also sits there from an environmental perspective. What you're doing with Bill 17 is you're freezing the current environmental practices in place. Is that really what we want to do? I would suggest no.

* (19:30)

There are technologies that we know are out there, some of them are in the experimental development phase right here in Manitoba. Some of those experiments have even been funded by the Manitoba government to demonstrate how we can improve environmental sustainability of intensive livestock production.

The Clean Environment Commission report identified a need to constantly improve production practices that improve environmental sustainability. That's the direction that was given to the government by that report, not to freeze the industry in place today. The proposed legislation and the ban on expansion does not meet the test of what the Clean Environment Commission recommended.

Now, I've been sitting around these hearings for some time, and it's easy to be a critic. I've heard a lot of criticism, so I'm going to try a different path. I'm going to try some constructive improvements. What I would suggest is looking at using regulatory instruments, as opposed to the legislation, that will permit expansion or replacement of older hog barns provided that the expansion or replacement meets some tests on a before-and-after basis. This should be done on a site-by-site basis.

First, I believe that if this was done, you could look at an expansion being required to produce a net reduction of the density of phosphorus application on the spread lands. Dr. Flaten would say, let's look for a reduction in the content of phosphorus in the land, but even if we wanted to look at it on an input basis, let's look at it that way. I would say that the limits are already defined in existing regulations. So there isn't a lot new; it's just implementing it.

Second, I believe that expansion should be allowed provided that they reproduce a net reduction total greenhouse gas emissions from that enterprise.

Thirdly is that there should be a net reduction in total water consumption for that enterprise.

To me, putting those tests around the privilege or the right to expand or create a new enterprise would

lead to constant improvement in environmental parameters, not locking in current practice.

Now, what are the potential implications of that? This alternative approach could significantly stimulate the adoption of biogas capture and the use of that biogas to produce renewable heat and electrical energy. What does that mean from a qualitative perspective? It means reduced odour emissions right off the bat, and maybe that's one of the things that's behind this whole Bill 17 situation. At the end of the day, yes, some hog barns smell. I happen to live beside some that don't, and I'm very glad of that, but I know others do. So let's remove the irritant that's out there called odour, and biogas capture does that.

We could reduce greenhouse gas emissions by doing this, significantly, and that is a stated priority of this government. As a matter of fact, I believe there is legislation passed in this last session that talked specifically to the goals and objectives of the government. By capturing the methane, we reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but, in addition, by allowing increased use of manure as a nutrient, we're displacing greenhouse gas emissions that are required to produce inorganic fertilizers. So the hog expansion could, if properly designed, reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

We should try to decrease fresh water consumption. To me, that's one of the biggest elephants that's on our policy agenda coming up, and that is something that we could look at as part of the framework of how to look at expansion. We should be looking at increasing energy security. Again, I've heard several members of the government speak eloquently about the amount of money that we're shipping down the road to Alberta every year on fossil fuels. Let's stop that. Let's start producing more of our own energy.

The biogas would create more rural employment, and finally, and this is something that, coming from the town of Killarney where we do have hog barns and I personally see it, removing the irritants would reduce social conflict. It would enable us to get back to some harmony in our community.

So that's—I'm not going to go on and on. I'm just saying here's an alternative way of looking at things. Don't lock the industry into its current state of performance. Create a framework that encourages continuous improvement, and from my perspective, part of continuous improvement is a framework that encourages the adoption of modern technologies that

will produce renewable energy and reduce environmental impacts.

I have one additional idea that I just want to leave with the members and I think this has already been communicated to the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk). This is why I asked leave not to present last night is that I'm working with our local conservation district to see if we can't get a composting project going in our region, part of which we need the equipment to do that. This is something I've worked with researchers from Ag Canada and the University of Manitoba as well as Alberta researchers and one of the things that really comes out of the research that we've been doing is that you have to add two things to compost to make it work: nitrogen and water.

Where do I find nitrogen and where do I find water? Well, it's just one mile across my field. So if I can spread that onto my compost piles I'll have one heck of a good commercial product. So, there are some ideas. I'm more than happy to take some questions.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Routledge.

Questions?

Mr. Maguire: Thanks, Mr. Routledge.

You know, one of the previous presenters in this some days ago said a wise person can change his or her mind, and the reason we hold these committees is obviously to listen to people. So I have a new renewed invigoration in regard to the government's ability to change their mind and this after your presentation because you have brought a bit of a new twist to this.

After 250 presenters, you've provided a few more solid ideas and concrete ideas that the government could take into consideration as to reasons to pull this bill, and it follows Don Flaten's presentation from the university that talked about innovation, research, and initiative and ways that we can, you know, just set this moratorium aside and get the government involved with promoting more of those items. You've given them examples here of what to promote. I never thought of this locking things in.

We've had people say they'd leave but as far as research even goes, you're saying that we will stagnate at the level that we're at today and we will lose the opportunity to continue with valuable research in the future because nobody wants to make

the investment in the industry here, when we could actually be even further leaders in the industry than we already are, if we can convince them to continue to invest here.

You've got a great experience here; your résumé indicates that—and you talked about \$10 billion, that was billion dollars, I repeat, investment around the world in regard to sustainability of agriculture. I know a bit about some of your—I haven't met you that many times but I certainly know how good stewards of the land your brothers are. They live in my constituency, and I appreciate all the work they do and the advice they give me, but I was unaware of some of your background here as well and I appreciate you bringing it forward tonight.

I just want to ask you: What are your thoughts in regard to other people then investing in Manitoba with this bill?

Mr. Routledge: Well, I have had the opportunity to attempt to raise tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars for projects in a variety of countries around the world. I can tell you that the uncertainty created by Bill 17 is freezing investment interest not just in the hog industry, I would say, and maybe not just the agricultural industry. I dare to say that, based on my experience with the wind-energy developers, it's causing a concern there to.

I'll kind of go over the top here. At one point I was working in what would be called a banana republic down in the Caribbean called the Commonwealth Dominica. I had more ability to raise money for that almost Third World nation to put in a technology project there than I think that I could today in Manitoba.

* (19:40)

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

Okay, we have a situation here. We had just struck Mr. Edward Maendel from the list, No. 45, just a few moments ago, and some of you may have noticed he just arrived. He has how many sons, four sons or five sons with him? So I'm asking if we have leave of the committee to go back and allow Mr. Maendel to present. Leave? *[Agreed]*

I will call Mr. Maendel to the microphone, then. Mr. Maendel, do you have any—

Mr. Edward Maendel (Private Citizen): They're not my sons. Some of them are my nephews. That's about it.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, I thought they were your children.

Mr. Maendel: No.

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

Mr. Maendel: No, I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Maendel: Okay. I've got something written down for me that I'll read some of it, and then I'll comment on some of it, and we'll go like that.

Hi, my name is Edward Maendel. I live in a Hutterite colony just northwest of Portage la Prairie.

My Hutterite colony is not directly affected by this moratorium, but my concern is for the entire hog industry and all agriculture in the province of Manitoba. I believe that this Manitoba government has entirely forgotten that they're supposed to represent the people of Manitoba. In the news these days, we keep hearing them say that no matter what we have to say, they're still going to keep pushing this through. By all means, we're here at your mercy and you have to listen to the people. You cannot close your mind and say you're not going to listen to the people, because the farmers are the backbone of Manitoba.

We, as combination hog, chicken, turkey, dairy and grain farmers, have invested a lot of money, time and effort to manage our manure efficiently and safely. Back in 1995, when fertilizer prices started climbing, we put more thoughts into utilizing the resource we had. We built a manure storage facility, spending \$250,000 to enable us to spread manure only during the summer months so there was no run-off.

Back in 1995, I was hauling manure, and I pulled it out of a tank or a kit in the ground pit, and we went once a week, twice a week, and spread it right on top of the snow; I can see that being very much a problem there because when spring came around, where did it go to? Into the ditch, down into the lake.

In 1995, we built a big holding tank that was going to hold six months of supplies to enable us to spread manure only during the summer months so there was no run-off. Also, we invested \$100,000 in equipment to knife in the manure instead of spreading it on top. Then we bought equipment to

inject it. Instead of spreading it on top, we started injecting it just in the summer months.

Nine years later, in 2003, the R.M. of Portage la Prairie required that we have 400-days manure storage where we only had 200-days storage. We went along with the new requirements, building a tank costing us \$500,000. Presently we empty our holding tank once a year on newly threshed land using precise GPS and auto-steer to assure no overlapping. We hired an agronomist to soil-test our land to make sure that our manure and fertilizer amounts are safe for the soil and for the environment.

In terms of the environmental impact of manure, I feel that the manure is much safer than fertilizer and chemicals. I can't understand why the Manitoba government wouldn't want to invest more time and money in searching out the benefits and using them rather than trying to destroy one of Manitoba's most important industries.

We have heard quite a few times during these sessions that the hog industry accounts for merely 1.5 percent of the phosphate level in Lake Winnipeg. Environmentally, this has such a minimal impact, one can't but wonder why the government is choosing to target hog barns. I'm not quite sure; 1.5 percent out of 100 percent, there's 98.5 percent left that we have to work with. I hope there's a plan there. I just hope people don't go and just target the hog industry.

I was here a couple of days ago and somebody made a statement that, in 1990, the farmers were encouraged to increase, increase, increase. Somebody had a statement there and said they went out and increased. They went from something like a million hogs to seven million hogs in a short period of time. Now, the hog producers went from, I think, 3,000 hog producers to 1,500 hog producers—I'm not quite sure.

When I look around at home, going back 15 years, we used to have a neighbour on every mile in Portage municipality. Today, you can look around—you can't see a neighbour that has life there for miles. What are we going to do? Go out and shut down the agriculture and stop farming, all in all?

First, most of the people affected by this moratorium are Hutterites and Mennonite farmers who traditionally are Conservative voters. Targeting these, the NDP does not risk much publicly. Secondly, most of the area the moratorium covers is

also traditionally Conservative ridings. Again, they don't lose much ground.

I also wonder if the government has a plan for the other 98.5 percent of the phosphate levels. Where does it come from? Why aren't we hearing about the impact of the City of Winnipeg on our lakes and rivers? Why is the government afraid to tackle the real issues? Are they really concerned about the environment?

The way I understand this thing, if we go out and burn every hog barn in Manitoba today and get rid of every hog, we will have solved 1.5 percent of the problem and we'll lose millions and billions of dollars in the economy.

As well, I wonder about the viability of other livestock industries in the province of Manitoba. If hog manure is supposedly so bad for our environment, what about cows, chickens, turkeys and other animals? Is the government going to bring a bill tackling those next?

And what about humans? Do we all have to move to other places to save Lake Winnipeg? I would focus on more positive ideas to manage sewage responsibly, instead of banning everything in sight.

If this Bill 17 passes, what comes next? Manitoba farmers might soon be an existing group and I strongly say that, because we're into every livestock there is. If this goes through—we're planning on doing an expansion. Does it actually make sense? If we're going to shut all this down, for us to go out and invest that money in an expansion, I wonder if we'd have a packing plant in Brandon to haul the hogs, if this happens.

I'm just concerned because we're into all kinds of livestock and, if this goes through, what's up next? That's everything I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel.

Mr. Faurichou: Thanks very much, neighbour. I appreciate you driving a couple of hours to make presentation here this evening. I want to say that I can personally attest to the investment that you've made most recently in your livestock operations.

I hope the members opposite did hear the cost of that investment. It's not small change. I know that you are looking to expand but, in your expansions, you employ engineers. Maybe you can tell the committee a little bit about how you seek out

experts, before you can go ahead with your expansions.

* (19:50)

Mr. Maendel: Right now, to manage manure, we want to put in a pipeline for two miles, to pump the manure across the road where we have more land that we can apply manure on. We have an engineer working on that, to make sure that everything is going to be good, get it through environment and all that.

Back in 1998, we did an expansion there. We applied for the permit, and the R.M. of Portage came out. They had a few regulations for us. There's a sand ridge, coming from the north from Lake Manitoba, that travels into Portage, and it's running right through our yard. We had to guarantee him that we're not going to spread manure there anymore, and we were more than willing to. We're taking water out of the same well and everything and we just thought, hey, we're only saving our own self. It's our own water. If we don't have clean water, we'd have to pipe it in from Portage and we don't want to do that. We want to use our own water. So that's why we try to save our own water.

Mr. Faurichou: I just want to thank you for your presentation. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maendel.

Rick Bergmann. Mr. Bergmann, do you have written materials for the committee?

Mr. Rick Bergmann (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Bergmann: My name is Rick Bergmann. I live and farm in the Steinbach area.

Many of the thoughts that have been mentioned over the last days are similar to the ones that I have as well, but I wanted to have my say in the future of the hog industry in Manitoba.

Ask yourself when the last time you have been on a hog farm. On a farm or on a hog farm you need to know the industry very well in order to make wise decisions. I've been in the feed industry for numerous years. Most recently, I've seen a very unhealthy shift both on the farms and the people who live on these farms. The domino affect of this proposed bill will crush not only these producers but so many who have depended and thrived on this industry. This includes not only people outside of the Perimeter, but many who live within the good city of Winnipeg. If

this bill goes through, the unemployment challenge that this will create will go directly onto the NDP government.

As you are aware, there's a very negative economic environment in the hog industry these days and that's a known fact. Over the years there have been cycles, and we're in a very negative cycle right now. On top of all of this, there is a very large emotional toll that farm owners and their families have had. I've numerous examples of producers who have shared with me the strain that they're under. Many of them, and I say many, are on antidepressants to try to overcome the negative impacts of an industry that is in turmoil and a government that seems to dictate to our industry based on emotions versus proper science.

The industry is on its knees and now the government, our provincial leaders, kick us when we're down. If this government proceeds to shackle the hog industry and prevents sustainable growth, the landscape of a very valuable industry will continue to erode to the point of no return. You will see families leaving farms and communities to find work elsewhere. You will see allied industry businesses closing their doors as their services are no longer needed and move to other provinces.

Manitoba's fortunate to have a high quality assurance program that guarantees a quality product with no residue in the meat. If this bill passes, you can see pork being imported from other areas into our province, areas that don't have these quality assurances. Is this what we as a province really want?

There is no moratorium on housing in the city of Winnipeg. There's no moratorium on the use of phosphorus in the water lines in the city of Winnipeg. There's no moratorium on city lagoons being flushed into the Red River, yet a strong dictatorship approach to hardworking family farms that are trying to make a living and are trying in an industry that has given so much to this province, many of them that I've spoken with feel betrayed.

So why are we here? Is it because of scientific information or is it about emotion? Ask yourselves that. The industry recently went through a democratic process in the Clean Environment Commission. The final report never once suggested what is being suggested and pushed on the industry right now. That is not democracy at all.

What negative environmental impacts has the hog industry brought? Really, ask yourselves. There's never been a bill that has caused so much groundswell, so much push back.

Now the government is here to keep Manitobans in line. Sometimes Manitobans have to push back to keep the government in line, and your seeing that and witnessing that in the last several weeks. I hope you recognize that. You've been called to government, God bless you on that, but don't dictate. Be democratic in leading our province. That's all.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bergmann.

Questions.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Bergmann, for your presentation. We are listening. Your voice does count, and I'm glad that you took the time to come here. We, at least, on this side of the House, are listening.

Today was the last day of session. A number of bills passed. However, this bill has been put off till fall. It's our pledge to you that we will continue to work on this government to rethink this legislation, drop it, and get on with the science of this industry.

Thank you for coming tonight.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bergmann.

I call Heinz Reimer. Heinz Reimer will be dropped from the list.

Lee Perreault, Prairie Abattoir. Mr. Perreault will be dropped from the list.

Irvin Waldner. Mr. Waldner is dropped from the list.

Donald Friesen. Mr. Friesen is dropped from the list.

Susanne Friesen. Ms. Friesen is dropped from the list.

Ed Dornn. Mr. Dornn is dropped from the list.

David Sutherland. Mr. Sutherland.

Mr. David Sutherland (Private Citizen): Yes.

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

Mr. Sutherland: No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Sutherland: Thank you.

Who am I? I'm David Sutherland. I own and operate a sign business. It has not an awful lot to do with this particular bill, does it? It sure as heck does.

What this bill represents is an attack on business as a whole. Oh, today, it's the hog industry because it's convenient to go after somebody who traditionally votes Conservative. But what about tomorrow when you have another problem, when you have another upswelling? Which business gets targeted then? Is it outside the farming business? Or is it me, who took the time to cut a trip to the north short? I came 600 kilometres to be here today. I cut a trip short because I feel so strongly about this.

I live in a small town, Landmark, halfway to Steinbach. I was around when we first started having these issues. We had a neighbour whose barn burned down. He was one mile west of my town. He was raising hogs there. Did you know I lived there for six years and did not know he was raising hogs there? He wanted to get a new barn. He moved to another municipality to do that because people came from all over the place. People came from Winnipeg to protest this strong smell, this stench, this stench that I smelled three days out of a year.

I grew up in St. Vital, so, for you urban people, I'm familiar with the urban environment. I know the smells. Guess what? St. Vital smelled an awful lot more when Swifts and Burns were emitting their odours than any hog barn.

After that, being on town council at the time, I did a little review. I found that within one mile of our community we had in the neighbourhood of 20,000 head of different types of livestock, within one mile. Most of these people that came to the meeting huffing and puffing and trying to cow the councillors were totally unaware of that. But they weren't concerned. Oh, no. They've got an agenda. That agenda is, oh, let's protect all the animals and save them from the hog farming.

Well, not that long ago, and this will always happen, farmers have up and down cycles, and they were in down cycles. They were encouraged to go out and expand. Go into new lines. This is what they were doing. In business, you either go forward or you go reverse. There is no stop button. This is what you're proposing to these farmers. You're proposing to stop, go find something else to do.

We've had people say, take your hog barns out of the Red River Valley and move them up over into Richer. Well, guess what Richer is? Richer's east of

Winnipeg. That is the water recharge area for our drinking water. I do believe that anything that is coming off of these fields is a whole lot safer sitting in the surface water than it is in our ground water.

* (20:00)

This whole proposal just reeks of nothing more than cheap politics. The Province has abandoned all of its own regulations that it spent taxpayers' money assembling, to turn around and say to the farmers, no, you can't do this anymore.

Well, I live in a different type of industry that's fearing the same thing. What investment is going to come to this province? This is anti-business entirely. Most of the farmers I know were very considerate. We had one that actually sold us land to expand our town lagoon. The town turned around and said, we don't want your hog barn expansion. So he took it from where he proposed it to 2.5 miles away. Keep everybody happy. Was anybody thankful that he turned around and allowed us to expand our lagoon, which allowed us to build more homes in our community? No.

Have any of your scientists turned around and looked in Lake Winnipeg, and said, oh, we've got a little bit of outcome from some of these sewage lagoons. Hey, there are only hundreds of towns that are discharging twice a year into the water. Oh, but that's safe. Really? Why were they proposing to ban water softener salt at one point in time because the salt was going to affect Lake Winnipeg?

Lake Winnipeg, a rather big lake. I was up north in The Pas, as I said. Do you know where the single largest contribution of water to Lake Winnipeg comes from? The Saskatchewan River. What do you propose to tell Saskatchewan and Alberta? Are we to build a dam and have a checkpoint at the border for North Dakota? This is not realistic. The farmers have proven time and time again that they're willing to spend money and work with the government to improve, and those people who are improving are the best darned farmers that I know anywhere.

I live along the Seine River. I go along the Seine River, and I can tell you, the mom and pop farms are probably amongst the worst offenders. In the wintertime, it's very easy to see where their waste goes, straight down into the river. I'd rather see a guy build a big hog barn, with all the current regulations, and inject or spread in the winter, as they do, than mom and pop farms, because mom and pop farms don't look after it the same way.

If I was the farmers, I'd be in here protesting when the Province of Manitoba, the City of Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba decide to build homes for another 52,000 people in the farm area. You're now creating a war between the urban people and the farmers. Well, this was based on farming here. These farmers have rights, and they have rights to expect to pass on to their own children, which is what most of these farmers are intending on doing. Their children are going to farm. They're not going to wreck the land because they don't want their children to starve to death.

This, in my opinion, is the Hugo Chávez way of doing business. I've got two words for the NDP government: spirited energy, which translates to a government that's drunk on power. I am finished.

Mr. Chairperson: Finished, sir. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sutherland.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you for that refreshing presentation, Mr. Sutherland.

We're all directly involved in agriculture, but your business is non-agricultural and yet you feel very passionately about this. How do we get this message out to more of the non-direct agriculture people, i.e. the urban people?

Mr. Sutherland: First of all, to allow small minority groups to come and bully our elected representatives and turning around and just passing it off into this was a huge mistake in the first place. As we know, when we raise our own children, the ones that are bouncing up and down and crying and screaming are only quieted by an ice-cream cone for a very short period of time. Such was done here when we had this whole fiasco about the hog processing plant, OlyWest. The city turned around, and says, hey, let's send two of your most vocal opponents down to Kansas City and see how they operate. They came back and they said, wow, you know what? We were wrong. What did they do? They ate their own young.

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

Mr. Sutherland: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we have another individual, No. 42 presenter, who's arrived late and requests leave of the committee to present. What is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: No? Leave has been denied. No. 58—oh, Mr. Derkach.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Mr. Chairperson, I think there was some confusion here. I just heard the Water Stewardship Minister say, of course, they'll give leave.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there leave? Mr. Derkach has spoken. Is there leave of the committee to go back to presenter No. 42?

Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Water Stewardship): I think we need to have an agreement on this. If folks are struck off the list, they've been called twice and haven't been here. That's the rule of the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Well, I interpret that as leave has been denied.

So we will move on to presenter No. 58, Richard Peters. Richard Peters. Richard Peters will be removed from the list.

Tim Friesen. Mr. Friesen will be struck from the list.

Marvin Waldner. Marvin Waldner. Mr. Waldner will be struck from the list.

Just for the information of the committee and members of the public who are here, these people who are being stricken from the list now have been called four times to present and have failed to show up on four occasions. Twice this committee has given leave not to drop people to the bottom of the list, and we've called them again yesterday, the day before, and today is the fourth time. So that's the explanation why the names are being dropped.

Presenter No. 61, David Wollmann. David Wollmann. Mr. Wollmann's name will be dropped from the list.

Michael Andres. Michael Andres. Mr. Andres will be dropped from the list.

Tim Baer. Tim Baer will be dropped from the list.

Glen Maendel. Glen Maendel will be dropped from the list.

Beverley Pachal. Beverley Pachal will be dropped from the list.

Randy Rutherford. Mr. Rutherford will be dropped from the list.

Richard Prejet, Porcheria Lac du Onze. Forgivez-moi, because my French is not very good. Mr. Prejet will be dropped from the list.

Andrew Curry. Andrew Curry will be struck from the list.

David Hildebrand, Operation HOG Wash. David Hildebrand?

Floor Comment: Yes, but not Operation HOG Wash.

Mr. Chairperson: That's what I have on my list, sir, as organization.

Floor Comment: I think I'm getting judged before I even get to this.

I have some handouts, Mr. Chairperson.

*(20:10)

Mr. Chairperson: Order. One second, sir, please.

Let's get started here. So your name is David Hildebrand, is it?

Floor Comment: Yes, with a d-t. Does that make a difference?

Mr. Chairperson: All right. Okay, there's some confusion over this name. The Clerk is going to look into it.

In the meantime, we will move on to the next presenter, Mr. Gordon Gross. Gordon Gross will be dropped from the list.

Adam Gross, will be dropped from the list.

Len Desilets. Mr. Desilets, will be dropped from the list.

Thomas Thiessen. Thomas Thiessen, will be dropped from the list.

Andy Hofer. Andy Hofer, will be dropped from the list.

Clifford Wollman. Clifford Wollman, will be dropped from the list.

Karen Wollman. Karen Wollman, will be dropped from the list.

William Alford. William Alford, will be dropped from the list.

Jordan Riese. Jordan Riese, will be dropped from the list.

Ben Ginter. Ben Ginter, will be dropped from the list.

George Vis, GJ Vis Enterprises Inc. George Vis, will be struck from the list.

Trevor Speirs. Trevor Speirs, will be struck from the list.

Lloyd Wiebe. Lloyd Wiebe, will be struck from the list.

Peter Hofer, Skyview Farms. Mr. Hofer, will be struck from the list.

Paul Beauchamp. Paul Beauchamp, will be struck from the list.

Ryan Riese. Ryan Riese, will be struck from the list.

Elston Solberg, Agri-Trend. Elston Solberg, will be struck from the list.

Leonard Wiebe. Leonard Wiebe, will be struck from the list.

Joey Maendel. Joey Maendel, will be struck from the list.

Jeff Toews. Jeff Toews, will be struck from the list.

Levi Bergen. Levi Bergen?

Mr. Levi Bergen (Private Citizen): Yes, sir.

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

Mr. Bergen: I do.

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

Mr. Bergen: Excuse my nerves. I'm much more comfortable planting corn or feeding the hogs in a hog barn. My name is Levi Bergen. I live and farm west of Altona, Manitoba, just inside the so-called Red River management area, Special Management Area, I should add, and I drove out today to speak against Bill 17.

I see Bill 17 as an outright attack on my way of life as well as taking away my ability to continue to farm in the future due to not being able to expand or make necessary changes due to changing market conditions. I also see Bill 17 negatively affecting my ability to provide for my family by not being able to expand and also by essentially making our existing hog operation worthless.

I presently have three teenaged sons who have not yet decided to farm but this bill could effectively kill any possibility of taking on a career in farming.

The area we live and farm in has always been heavily populated by rural standards, and for that reason, many farmers in our area have turned to livestock to supplement their income because there generally was not enough income generated on the land to raise a family on.

My family has been farming in this area for over a century, and livestock, specifically hogs, have always been a huge part of our lives. My father built his first confinement barn in 1966 to diversify his grain and special crop operation and provide income when grain prices were low. Over the years, he expanded his land base and subsequently increased his hog-finishing operation to 600 pig spaces in '74. At this time, he also put in a deep concrete manure storage so as not to have to winter-spread and be able to spread all the barn's manure in the spring to achieve maximum nutrient benefit for his crops. This was being done years before manure management plans were mandatory. At this time, he also put up a feed mill to grind on farm the on-farm grains that he was producing.

In my mind, this was a sustainable model utilizing the latest technologies of the day. In 1998, I joined the family farm, and we expanded the hog operation to approximately 1,400 pig spaces. At that time, we constructed an earthen lagoon to provide us with 400-day storage so we could continue to apply or inject our manure once a year and avoid winter spreading. At this time, we were again proactive and began a straw-spreading program on our lagoon to reduce odours and retain nutrients for field injection.

Our last expansion on this farm was done in 1998 to approximately 2,300 pig spaces. At this time, we purchased our own straw blower and we also purchased manure injection equipment, together along with another eight farmers, our neighbours, so we could fine-tune our nutrient program.

I hope by giving you somewhat of a history of our farm and my own experiences, that you will realize that there are many farms out there that are doing a good job, are sustainable, and should not be included in a permanent ban or expansion. We know the value of hog manure and have always treated it as a valuable resource. We have grown our land base, as well as our hog operation, in stages as we saw fit and would like to continue to do so under today's livestock regulations.

I ask the government of the day to reconsider this bill and continue to give existing regulations a chance to work. Do not penalize the majority of us

that are doing a good job environmentally. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bergen.

Questions?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Bergen, you said you have three sons who have not yet decided what they will do. But if, in fact, this bill becomes law, that will curtail any ability for you to grow your operation and to bring your sons into the operation. Have you any idea what the impact of this bill might do for families that are around you who have young people growing up and who perhaps have an aspiration to farm?

* (20:20)

Mr. Bergen: Well, I definitely believe that it will definitely thin out the farming population. The rural landscape is definitely going to change. There's only so much land to go around, and I believe as long as there's enough land to sustain the livestock units, I think we should be able to keep growing our livestock units.

In our area we have very productive land. We grow good corn crops. We grow, you know, good crops. We're pulling a lot of nutrients out of the ground and, by soil testing and doing these things, I don't see why it shouldn't work.

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

I call Michael Maendel. Michael Maendel will be struck from the list.

Steven Denault, Agri-Mart Livestock and Poultry Products Limited. Steven Denault will be struck from the list.

Hans Kjeaar. Hans Kjeaar will be struck from the list.

Wilfred Chabot, councillor, R.M. of La Broquerie. Mr. Chabot will be struck from the list.

Rudy Dyck. Rudy Dyck will be struck from the list.

Clayton Block. Clayton Block will be struck from the list.

James Friesen. James Friesen is struck from the list.

Wes Martens. Wes Martens will be struck from the list.

Walter Hofer. Walter Hofer is struck from the list.

Susanne Richter. Ms. Richter, I see you have no written materials for the committee.

Ms. Susanne Richter (Private Citizen): No, I don't, sorry. I thought you were going to say that I didn't have my visitor pass on, or something like that.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Ms. Richter: I was a little scared when I heard that you guys were going till 3 o'clock in the morning, and I imagine that's why you're striking a lot of names from the list.

Little bit of my background. I'm a veterinary technician. I started with pigs about 11 years ago. I worked for two large corporations managing a farm and then training people right across Canada in Alberta and Ontario. At the present time my husband and I own a hog operation up in Eriksdale in the Interlake, and, really, I look at Bill 17 from three perspectives.

First of all, I look at it as a wife and mother and a Canadian citizen, particularly a Manitoban in the fact that, you know, we care about the environment. I care about what's going to happen for my kids. I take a little bit of offence to the hog industry being singled out as the major pollutant. In all of my experience working with the corporations and then again owning my own farm, we do everything we can to meet the regulations. We have our soil tested every year and repeatedly I've been told that our levels are just so low and that is because we are following those practices.

I guess, as a businesswoman, I look at it as, in this market and in particularly in the last six months, we've been forced to change the way that we are operating our farm. Because of the moratorium we cannot in any way build or expand our operation when we actually need to do that. So we're forced to look around for other alternatives, and maybe they're a lot farther away from where our existing barn is. Maybe the costs of that are going to outweigh the benefits that we can—or the profits that we can make.

I guess, I look at it as a wife and mother, I look at it as a businesswoman, and I also look at it as a farmer. A lot of times people say, you know, oh, these big farms, you know, it's not farming. Yes, it is. We work every day with the livestock. I was up at 5:30 this morning. Up there the sows are giving birth in the farrowing room. You have to care about the

animals, to look after them. It's not just a business. It's not production-line farming. Not to me, it isn't anyways.

I have four children. We'd like to be able to expand or pass on our business to our children. Will we do that? I don't know. It's bad enough that the market is hurting us but when, all of a sudden, you say, we're going to put a ban on this, we'll have no options. If we survive the market, I don't know if we're going to be able to survive the government.

That's really all I have to say. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Richter.

Questions?

Mr. Derkach: You indicated that you worked for several, large, hog operations as a veterinarian assistant?

Ms. Richter: I'm a veterinary—[interjection]—technician.

Mr. Derkach: So you have been in and out of many facilities. Having been in and out of many facilities, you have watched and observed whether or not the folks who run these farms are, indeed, conscious of the environment that they raise the hogs in.

Can you tell us a little bit about that?

Ms. Richter: The two corporations that I work for, they are a large—I've worked for Puratone and Elite Swine. Actually, I worked at Puratone as a manager of a 3,000-sow unit; that was my first introduction to the industry.

I know that, as a manager—pretty green—I had a lot of animal experience, but they definitely made sure that I was taught everything about what went on in that farm: manure management, everything we had to do for that. So, in that aspect, yes, the training that the people who run these operations are given is amazing.

When I worked for Elite Swine, I was a trainer. Part of the course I delivered for that company was to explain to people what we did to make sure that we were environmentally friendly and good stewards of the environment. They put a lot of time and effort into that.

That's helped me, owning my own farm. It actually has spoken volumes for what I do. My experience with those companies is that they are very

conscientious in terms of animal care and in terms of the environment.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you very much.

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

There was a little bit of a mix-up with the list here. We'd called Dave Hildebrandt earlier and identified him as being—what? Spelled wrong. I'm going to call Mr. Hildebrandt to present.

You're presenting as a private citizen, I assume. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Dave Hildebrandt (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

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

Mr. Hildebrandt: I thank you, Mr. Chairperson and committee, for this opportunity to speak and communicate with the government of Manitoba in this way.

With a written report that I've distributed, I'll go through it and then comment on each of the points as we go through, if that's all right.

I would like to discuss four points in regard to Bill 17. I would like to discuss, first of all, the problem, the solutions, the action taken, and the desired impact versus the actual impact of Bill 17.

The problem. The problem appears to be high phosphorous levels causing high algae bloom in Lake Winnipeg. Some of the sources of the problem are major events, such as the flood of the century that overflowed many lagoon storage facilities, both agriculture and rural, and on both sides of the border.

Another major event would be the accidental dumping of raw sewage into the Red River by the City of Winnipeg. Other sources of the problem may be: (a) the U.S., (b) the City of Winnipeg, (c) rural lagoons, (d) the Red River watershed, which would include Saskatchewan and the U.S., and (e) agriculture as a whole. Bill 17 does not address all of the sources of the problem. It addresses only one presumed source of the problem.

* (20:30)

Possible solutions would be to work with the U.S., but that is not something we're probably going to discuss today. One solution is it has been suggested to set up anaerobic digesters for handling raw waste. I believe that if the City of Winnipeg

would lead by example in this regard, it would have more impact on the problem at hand and that more progressive minded hog producers may follow suit.

Expand the land base required to apply raw waste. If I understand correctly this is already underway and the University of Manitoba estimates this could cost the hog industry \$20 million.

Further regulate all aspects of contamination. The hog industry is already heavily regulated in comparison to all other contributors to the problem. Control the areas that have the most impact on correcting the problem. Okay? As hog producers, we are interested in solutions.

The action taken has been as follows: the government realized there was a problem. November 8, 2008, the government enacted a moratorium on hog industry and asked the CEC to examine the sustainability of the industry. If the moratorium was put on without facts then there is an impression that the hog industry is responsible. On March 3, the CEC report is released and its recommendations do not suggest extending the moratorium or making it permanent in certain areas. On March 3, the same day, Minister Stan Struthers announced a three-region moratorium. Even with a \$750,000 report that does not support the action, the action was taken regardless. Minister Struthers is quoted as saying, the environment first. I believe that is in the *Winnipeg Free Press*. This is not what we're disputing, but this action, which would be enforced by Bill 17 would, at best, address 1.5 percent of the problem. That's from Dr. Trevan, a dean at the University of Manitoba.

I'm asking the government to please use sound judgment. Lake Winnipeg is like a large basin of water and there are several taps that may be adding contaminants to this basin of water as mentioned before. The hog industry is estimated to add 1.5 percent of the phosphorus in total. All of the hog industry, of all of the phosphorus, 1.5 percent. We are regulated and at 1.5 percent we may be adding drops to this basin of water. Bill 17 is squeezing that tap and yet others are not even being addressed.

Will Bill 17 accomplish the desired impact and what will be the actual impact of this legislation? The desire is to control and reduce the contaminants going into Lake Winnipeg and improve the environment. Dr. Trevan is quoted that, if you actually took all of the hog barns out of production, you wouldn't actually make any sensible dent into the amount of phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg. A second desire would possibly be to solve an

environmental threat if the border closes, the U.S. border. That's citing Minister Struthers' press release. Bill 17 would not solve this problem either. In case of a border closure, we would need additional housing and additional slaughter capacity. Bill 17 would have a negative impact on both possibilities. A border closure would put the industry between a rock and a hard place, but with Bill 17, it would be a bigger rock and a harder place.

As a sole income provider for my household, this bill would have a negative impact on myself as a voting resident of Manitoba. Capping an industry's growth in the future causes that industry to eventually die or move. Can you imagine if 1,400 hog producers moved into North Dakota from Manitoba? Can you imagine? You would have more expensive bacon on your plate and no control over the environmental impacts coming through the Red River, in addition to losing 15,000 rural jobs. Imagine. By this government's rationale, they would subject the citizens of Manitoba to the worst of both worlds. Capping the industry caps my potential to earn an income and provide for my family and pay my taxes to this government.

Bill 17 contradicts the facts revealed by the CEC report and in presenting it, gives the public image that the hog producers are responsible for this problem. It leads the public to believe that hog producers will sacrifice the environment to make more money. Damaging the reputation of hog producers damages my reputation in my community, all right?

Bill 17 does not accomplish the desired impact. Bill 17 will not help the environment and damage the hog industry. Capping the industry caps my earning potential. I urge the Democratic government to listen to the people. Canadians in general are a pretty soft-spoken group. Over 420 people signed up to comment on this bill and I was one of them. In this room, the people have been quiet and respectful. There are only 1,400 hog producers and a total of 400 people, more than 400 people, are stirring up a fuss over this bill. These people are speaking quietly, but they are speaking loud and clear.

In conclusion, in my opinion, Bill 17 will not accomplish the good intentions and the desires behind it. Bill 17 is flawed in its attempt to correct a problem. Bill 17 unfairly singles out a perceived cause of the problem and is not based on the facts from the CEC report. Bill 17 will have a negative impact on myself as a citizen of Manitoba. Bill 17 is

a poor piece of legislation that is uncharacteristic of this government and should be withdrawn.

As a citizen of Manitoba, I would welcome an opportunity to work with the government and assist in finding any solution. That is all I have to present, and I will welcome questions from both sides of the table.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Hildebrandt.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thanks very much, Mr. Hildebrandt, for your presentation, a lot of common sense and a lot of good arguments in your presentation.

How does it make you feel, Mr. Hildebrandt, when you hear the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) for the Province of Manitoba—and he stood up in the House many times in answers to our questions on Bill 17 and said: You're going to have to choose between hogs and clean water.

How does it make you feel when you hear our Minister of Conservation say that, based on the information from the Clean Environment Commission and the information that's in your presentation.

Mr. Hildebrandt: Personally, I feel that that's an insult because the more progressive hog producers are actually very environmentally friendly, and we're abiding by all of the laws and conservation laws set out by the Department of Conservation. Like you've heard earlier, we're doing GPS. We're testing the manure to find the phosphorus and the nitrogen levels. When the government puts forward that we need to broaden our land base in order to spread the manure, we're accommodating to the tune of \$20 million for the industry, okay?

Hog producers, they tend to—they're a strange group, I have to admit, and I'm involved in it. When they stop losing a lot of money, they're optimistic and want to expand. Now, that's strange. It's not just when they're making money. When they're losing a lot of money, they kind of hang on, and when they're not losing as much money, now it's time to expand. I challenge the committee to find me another industry that is ready to expand while they are losing money.

Manitoba in the past has been a friendly province for hog production. Right now, North Dakota is a friendly state for hog production.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thanks, again, Mr. Hildebrandt, and I would just want to say thank you to you for offering to work with government to find some

positive solutions. I hope that your request isn't falling on deaf ears. Thank you.

Mr. Hildebrandt: They have all of my numbers right now.

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

Just for clarity's sake, there are no other David Hildebrandts in the audience, are there? Okay, we can now safely strike Mr. Hildebrand off the list here.

Mr. Mike Gauthier. Mike Gauthier will be struck from the list.

Fred Fast. Mr. Fast? Do you have any written materials for the committee, sir?

Mr. Fred Fast (Private Citizen): I don't.

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

* (20:40)

Mr. Fast: Okay, thank you.

This bill currently under discussion I think is more about politics than addressing environmental concerns. We chase out a process here that could have created a thousand jobs, direct jobs. We ignore the CEC report regarding hog farming sustainability. We set down hog moratoriums. We just really have hog farmers with targets on their backs right now.

I have heard comments that everybody should be doing their part to have a sustainable, healthy environment in Manitoba, which I agree with, but these measures are clearly meant to create a perception that something is being done to clean up the Lake Winnipeg watershed by implying hog producers as the main part of the problem.

By the way, does anybody know how many litres of sewage were leaked out during the last rainfall, or does anybody know what impact of the nutrient load is happening due to increased housing in Winnipeg? We know there is a certain percentage already between the floodway gates, but are there any numbers?

We have been told hog producers are not being singled out. I think you just need to follow the trail. This just doesn't wash. Why does our government not trust the science? We have good information that speaks to issues of nutrient management, nitrogen and phosphorus specifically, plant uptakes, what is and isn't sustainable, how nutrients should be applied

and what limits, more specifically, nitrogen and phosphorus, should be allowed in different soil types.

There are alternatives to working with hog manure, i.e. solids separation or digesters. In my case, we often move solids with the higher phosphate content to neighbours that need it that normally would be purchasing phosphorus. So we'll move it. We also use enzymes in the feed to reduce phosphorus output. We are currently taking land out of pasture and moving to annual cropping and hay production. This will make it easier for us to work within current regulations and potential changes to these limits.

Our industry is extremely regulated, and hog farmers are continually adapting to different changes to nutrient management, animal welfare and human resources issues.

I want to just tell you how this bill specifically affects my farm. I'm concerned about the whole industry. We have two sow barns. Half our production is contracted out at 10 pounds, which is called an early wean. We sell it to a larger company, they're gone. The other half we move across the road. We've got nurseries there where we grow them out to 40 pounds or 50 pounds, and then they move to finishing operations.

Well, our plan all along is, because our contract is up next year, our plan has always been to move these weanlings, the half that were already contracted, across to the road; we would facilitate that by adding nursery space. We've already invested in hydro. We've spent \$15,000 to get some infrastructure in. We upgraded the generators. We did all kinds of things to do this. So, next year when our contract is up, the nurseries that we wanted to flow the weanlings to cannot be built.

Oh, and I should have added, I'm sorry I didn't when I started, we are farming in the La Broquerie-Marchand area.

So I'm concerned about the whole industry, but this is just one part of it that affects me directly. We just can't do it. Even though we have a large land base, and even though we're doing all kinds of things to try to work with the nutrient management, it's just not something we can do.

This bill will stagnate a dynamic industry. Our government needs to follow good science. Good science will regulate growth, and, hopefully, new technologies will allow us to foster growth. We have done an extremely good job on our farms in adapting

to new and stricter policies on nutrient management. This bill completely ignores our good farming practices and our willingness to participate collectively to improve our watershed.

It is very disheartening, especially when market conditions are so poor, to have our Manitoba government ignore all the positives we provide for communities, and use us for whatever the motivation is. I think we just need to call this what it is. This is politics at its worst, and I'm sorry that it's working.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Fast.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation, and we certainly appreciate you taking time to come in. I really don't have a question, but I want to thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Fast: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing no questions, I thank you.

Mr. Eichler: I have a request for leave from the committee. We have two individuals who travelled in together; they were on the road, they tell me, for about two and a half hours trying to get here: No. 62, Michael Andres, and No. 89, Jeff Toews. They just got here; 89 we just called about five minutes ago. I ask leave of the committee to hear their presentations.

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Chairperson: Any other speakers?

Leave has been denied.

I call No. 103, Elie Hofer—Mrs. Driedger.

Mrs. Driedger: Mr. Chair, I heard the minister, who's leaving the table right now, just deny leave for these people that have travelled for a couple of hours. I would ask him to reconsider this. They came—for two and a half hours they were on the road, to be here, and I'm a little bit surprised that we're seeing this kind of behaviour from the minister. I would ask him to reconsider, please.

Mr. Chairperson: Leave has been requested and denied. This is the fourth time that these names have been called. The committee was scheduled to begin at 6 p.m., which must have been when they decided to leave home.

An Honourable Member: They're a farm community. Come on.

Mr. Chairperson: So this is—as I said, I am pointing out that this is the fourth time the names have been called.

The process is a request for leave, and then, if leave has been denied, it's my understanding that the case is closed.

I call Elie Hofer. Elie Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Jake Hofer. Jake Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Garry Funk. Garry Funk. Mr. Funk will be dropped from the list.

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

Mr. Jacob Rempel (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

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

Mr. Rempel: Hi. Thank you for allowing me to speak against Bill 17.

As a concerned citizen of Manitoba, I disagree with Bill 17. I was raised on a mixed grain farm—

An Honourable Member: We can't hear you.

Mr. Rempel: Okay.

Hi. As a concerned citizen of Manitoba, I disagree with Bill 17. I was raised on a mixed grain farm, and I am proud of it. I decided to make my living by going and working in the hog industry 14 years ago. I have enjoyed it immensely. I am concerned for my family because, up till now, I have been able to support them by the opportunity I got working in the hog industry, enjoying my job and my way of living.

If this moratorium goes through, I cannot see the hog owners afford to give any wage increases in the future. If the hog farms deteriorate because of the moratorium, there will be a lot of jobs lost. As a middle-aged individual, it will not only be difficult but virtually impossible to find a job with the wage I am currently receiving. To start with a minimum wage job, I will not be able to support my family, and I am sure you can understand, I was not planning to look for a new career, but this might force me to do so.

Yes, I can move on to the kind of work where the moratorium has not yet been talked about, but if it goes through here I am sure it will not stop in Manitoba. I also have to think about my family and

my children's education. I can see that the welfare line will increase, and I don't know where you guys plan to get the funds from to support them all.

I feel for the barn owners, as they have created a lot of jobs in Manitoba, and by working with the government as all the new stipulations came into place. I think they deserve a big round of applause. I hope what they are doing here tells you something, and I hope you're listening.

So let's support them, be constructive, not destructive. Thanks for listening.

*(20:50)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Rempel.

Questions.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation. I really don't have a question, but thank you for taking time to come in.

Mr. Derkach: I just want to thank the presenter for taking the time to come and present before this committee. I'm hoping that, through presentations like yours, even though some are denied by the government, we will at least make some impact and, hopefully, some changes will occur. Thank you, sir.

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

Call Wayne Hofer. Wayne Hofer will be struck from the list.

Keith Waldner. Keith Waldner will be struck from the list.

Denis Tetreault. Denis Tetreault will be struck from the list.

We go to presenter 141, Karen Tjaden. Karen Tjaden will be struck from the list.

Maurice Gagnon. Maurice Gagnon of Gagnon Brothers Ltd. Maurice Gagnon will be struck from the list.

James Cotton. James Cotton, presenter No. 144, will be dropped from the list.

Mike Waddell. Mike Waddell will be struck from the list.

Calvin Ginter. Calvin Ginter will be struck from the list.

Trevor Cowieson. Trevor Cowieson will be struck from the list.

Irvin Funk. Irvin Funk will be struck from the list.

Andrew MacKenzie. Andrew MacKenzie will be struck from the list.

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

Mr. Matthew Waldner (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

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

Mr. Matthew Waldner: My name is Matthew Waldner. I'm a farm barn manager at a Hutterite colony.

We built our hog barn in 1993. To get a permit, we had to agree with the municipality to hire a private company to spread the manure, and the company we hired had to follow strict regulations as to how much they could spread. We also had to allow soil samples to be collected whenever they wanted.

We have an 800 to 850-sow farrow-to-finish operation. We need about 800 acres of land to spread manure from this operation; that is about an acre per sow. Instead of a bill that bans all expansion, the government should only allow expansion when the person who is expanding has the proper amount of acres for the operation they want. If he doesn't have the acres, he shouldn't be allowed to build. That seems right.

In our barn, we started soaking our wheat and barley in water for about 12 hours, before we feed it to the pigs. This makes the grain softer and makes the phosphorus in the grain more available to the pigs. Research from Europe shows that, when soaking grain for a few hours before feeding it to the pigs, it increases the availability of phosphorus in the grains from 20 to 25 percent, up to 80 percent. This has decreased the phosphorus balance in our manure which means we can spread more manure on fewer acres than we did till now. Innovations like these are available, but they often cost more money than it is worth so what the government should do is make money available to hog farms to help implement innovations like these.

I have a graph here from the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board which shows that 41 percent of estimated nutrient loading to Lake Winnipeg comes from the United States. What is being done about that? Only 1 percent of estimated nutrient loading to Lake Winnipeg can be contributed to pigs, and 11

percent is contributed to city of Winnipeg and other municipalities. Why isn't the government going after Winnipeg, who dumps raw sewage into the Red River all the time? I have overflow times and duration here from City of Winnipeg Web site. On June 11, 2008, from 10:54 p.m. to June 12, 2008, till 2:48 p.m. sewage and drainage was pumped into the Red River. That is 15 hours of sewage being pumped into the Red River.

Why are we being singled out? Maybe the NDP has a hidden agenda here. Seeing as the vast majority of hog farmers in Manitoba are Hutterites or Mennonites, it seems they are singling us out. Why would they single us out? Is it because we are self-sufficient and prosper without any government input or maybe it's because of our religious beliefs? It's a charade by the socialist government of Manitoba to drive conservative church folks, hardworking people of our society out of the province or into its fringes.

The environment has become a method for social engineering. This is not environmental legislation but a direct attack that is an affront to human rights. It's prejudice. It's anti-religious. It's offensive to any person who believes in freedom and the right to commerce. If ever there was an issue that needs fighting, this is it. It appears the socialist government of Manitoba wants to drive the Mennonite and Hutterite communities from the province. It's the worst kind of social engineering. That's it.

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

Mr. Maguire: Thank you, Matthew, for your presentation. It's pretty clear what your vision is of this bill, and I appreciate a young person like yourself coming forward and showing, not only interest in agriculture, but interest in the politics of the situation, and making it very clear that you want to have the right to continue to farm in Manitoba and that you think this bill is detrimental to that future.

Do you think there's a better way of co-operating with the industry than what the government has done by bringing a wall up essentially by bringing this bill in, the moratorium. We've heard it referred to as a stake in the ground for the industry. What would your vision be? Can you make any recommendations to the minister as to how you would comply with other regulations or that sort of thing? Do you think you should have that ability rather than just saying you can't expand your operations?

Mr. Matthew Waldner: The minister should scrap the bill and meet with the Manitoba Pork Council, which will give him a lot better advice than he has right now.

* (21:00)

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

I call Jerry Esau. Jerry Esau will be struck from the list.

Cindy Murray. Cindy Murray will be dropped from the list.

Janine Gibson, the Organic Food Council of Manitoba. Janine Gibson will be dropped from the list.

Susan Hofer. Susan Hofer will be dropped from the list.

Calvin Patrick, oops, sorry, sorry, forgive me.

Jake Wiebe? Jake Wiebe will be dropped from the list.

Larry Friesen, Devon Ridge Farms. Mr. Friesen, no written materials?

Mr. Larry Friesen (Devon Ridge Farms): No, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed.

Mr. Larry Friesen: I want to give a little message about my experience in the hog industry. I started as a—my grandfather was a pig farmer. He had five sows, farrow to finish, in Osterwick, Manitoba, near New Bothwell. My father said, get the hell off the farm; you'll never make any money. So I did that. For a few years I took agriculture at the University of Manitoba. In 1974, I bought a co-op farm that was in financial trouble up at Poplar Point. I employed—it was 150 sows, farrow to finish. I sold that and I moved to south of Winnipeg, down near St. Malo. I employed about 30 people for about three years, building the largest hog operation in Manitoba. Then I sold that and moved on out to the wild, wild west of Manitoba. I built the largest hog operation in the free world, in fact, any world, 12,000 sows. I employed a ton of people. I've paid a ton of taxes. I've paid lots of contributions, this and that and everything else.

How did we get here? Why am I contemplating moving out of this country back to the land of my forefathers? It's been a long, hard road. I've got four daughters and two grandsons and one little granddaughter. We have now—we're at a little crossroads. The great-great-grandfather of those girls

was Cornelius F. Toews. He negotiated all of this land. Go to the Steinbach Museum and you can see his picture on the wall. His story is there. I don't have time to repeat it all. But there were all kinds of guarantees about freedom, about freedom of religion, freedom of practising your lifestyle as you choose, and all kinds of things in this great, great land. And they were leaving czarist Russia, much like most of the people here. They were leaving, not for persecution, completely, at that particular moment. They were moving for opportunity.

Guys like Rick Bergmann, his grandfather comes from Russia. He's a real Russian Mennonite. But the point I'm making is, today, we've got so many rules and regulations, and we can't build this and we can't do that, and when we want to, all we have to do is comply with the rules, then we would like to be able to build and stuff. That's what Bill 17 is about. But it's really more about freedom and opportunity and how did we get to this place.

A year ago, I made my first trip back to Russia. I'm selling a lot of breeding stock over there. I'm looking at an exciting opportunity of industry, of a government that says, Larry Petrovich Friesen, we don't want your money. We want your technology; we want your entrepreneurial spirit; and we want you to show us how to rebuild our pork industry because we're importing a million tonnes of pork a year. We're sorry. We know you're a great-great-grandson of a Russian immigrant and we would like to repatriate you. We will give you all the land you want. If you want to build a 2,400-sow operation, come and build it. We'll give you an interest-free loan. We'll give you 25,000 hectares of free land. You employ 40 or 60 people, and we'll pave the way. You can go to any bank in Russia, borrow the money, and the state government pays half your interest and the federal government pays the other half.

But what a retarded thing to do after all our years of growing up here thinking about what we thought about Russia.

Today, actually, the colonies would be welcome back in Russia. They would be given free land. They would be given all the opportunity, and of course, there are rules. There's planning committees. There's not near as many as here, but they have planning committees. They have environmental things. They know that the land is starving for organic fertilizer. They know the people need to eat pork. They are collective farms, and they are looking for help.

By golly, at first I thought it was a joke but after Bill 17 and labour laws and this and that. By golly, I'm starting to think maybe I should sell everything and move back there. I just had one clear little message that was completely alien to science. I know all the science. I've been through it. I've planned methane digesters. I know there are more bloody leaves falling into the river, decomposing and creating phosphate into that river than any pig barn is even dreaming of going to. This isn't based on science. This is nonsense. I don't know where it comes from.

It certainly isn't the dream of Ed Schreyer. It certainly isn't Rosann Wowchuk, I can't believe for one second. I love her dearly. She supported the hog industry. She's gone to bat for us over and over again. She's had three delegations of Russians. She's famous all over Russia. I can't believe for one second—I haven't even had a chance to talk to her about this bill, but I'm sure she doesn't believe that they're going to stifle somebody who wants to help develop, be part of a moving, growing industry. I can't believe it for a second. Certainly Ed Schreyer wouldn't. So, anyway, go ahead. Have you got any questions? I'd be glad to answer them.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Friesen.

I do have questions.

Mr. Derkach: Hello, Mr. Friesen, it's been a little while since we've talked. I remember very well the years when we were in government, and you were a very key individual in the development of the hog industry in this province in its current state. Indeed, I want to thank you on behalf of my colleagues for that.

I just listened to you give Ms. Wowchuk a pat on her back and rightly so, perhaps, for the things that she's done in other areas, but this is a bill that she has to have some input on. It seems to me that if Ms. Wowchuk doesn't like this bill, she's certainly not speaking up around the Cabinet table. She's certainly not speaking up for the farmers that have come here to present or Manitoba Pork because that is her responsibility. She is supposed to be the advocate for agriculture, and her voice has not been heard around this table.

So, Mr. Friesen, I take a little bit of exception to that comment because I feel that she could do so much in ensuring that this bill gets trashed into the garbage can, and I don't think it will.

But, Mr. Friesen, I hope you don't leave Manitoba. I think you have contributed a great deal to our economy, and we hope that you will continue to do that along with the many other farmers in this area. So I didn't have a question of you. All I wanted to do was make a comment and thank you for appearing here this evening.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you like to respond, Mr. Friesen?

Mr. Larry Friesen: I think that you're wrong about Ms. Wowchuk. I think that down deep—I mean, we're all a little bit of politicians, but if you'd get her alone, one on one, she would definitely not agree to stopping somebody who wants to develop or round out their hog operation. How can she talk out of both sides of her mouth at the same time? I don't believe it.

* (21:10)

You know, I haven't heard her. She's been so supportive over the years of our industry. I think she's tired of going to that Cabinet and getting beat up by these guys about, like this whole ag loan she's come across with. I mean it was a saviour to a lot of people. There are a lot of guys that were ready to throw in the towel, and I know she had trouble at that Cabinet. She saved a lot of farmers. I just can't believe that she isn't being beat up on this one too, and she's tired of fighting with all these guys. She's actually a hero.

Anyway, anything else?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for that.

Mr. Maguire has a question, I believe.

Mr. Maguire: Thanks, Larry. We certainly appreciated you moving to western Manitoba. I'd just like to add that Ms. Wowchuk may be a hero in Russia, but she's certainly not here.

I would like to say that I think the department people, as well in Agriculture, haven't had a lot to say on this particular one, if I could give the Department of Agriculture a little bit of a bouquet on this. They're being walked on by the Premier (Mr. Doer) on this issue. I think that's very obvious. I've made that public statement before.

Both these ministers are not taking into account the detriment that it would do. There are 450 people who have signed up for this. You're getting awfully close to being the 300th one whom we've heard from. There's probably a handful, maybe five or six,

who have spoke out against it. Even some of the people who lend themselves to not supporting the hog industry have said the bill doesn't go far enough in relation to what should be done, and so they're not supportive of the bill either.

There was no consultation—that's my point—before this moratorium came in, even though there was a 15-month Clean Environment Commission hearing brought about—\$750,000. Everybody was waiting with bated breath, feeling that they could comply with anything that could be thrown at them, but not a moratorium.

I appreciate the fact that what you're saying is, with a moratorium, people will locate elsewhere. Thank you.

Mr. Larry Friesen: I basically agree with you, except I'm not sure what more the minister can do. You just get tired. You just get tired.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thanks, Mr. Friesen, for your comments.

I know the Minister of Agriculture's just walking in behind you, and so my comment—*[interjection]*—anyway, I just wanted to comment and I hear what you're saying about the Minister of Agriculture, that it's very hard for her to be an advocate around the Cabinet table and she's probably getting a little tired of trying that.

I want you to know and I want people in this room to know that I have never heard the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) stand up, in answer to a question from us on Bill 17, and say, you've got to choose between hogs and clean water.

But I have heard the Premier and the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) give that answer when we've asked serious questions about Bill 17. When the Minister of Conservation says, the members opposite are going to have to decide whether they're for hogs or they're for clean water, he gets rounds of applause from his colleagues.

I haven't watched closely but, probably, the Minister of Agriculture isn't applauding that. I just wanted to say that I haven't heard her say that either but, I think, she has a difficult time defending agriculture and the hog industry around the Cabinet table. So thanks for those comments, for being so frank and honest.

Mr. Larry Friesen: I'm glad that somebody shares my opinion that Rosann can both support the hog industry and still be a member of Cabinet and, in her

heart, she doesn't agree with Bill 17, even though she has to be part of the government. Like I said, Ed Schreyer certainly wouldn't be sitting here and agreeing to this bill. Somewhere down the line, they've lost the mission.

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

The next presenter, 161, was initially listed as city but, apparently, he's from Steinbach, so I will call Norm Paisley, Pro-Ag Products Ltd.

Mr. Paisley, are you here? You're here. Do you have any written materials, sir? You do.

The floor is yours.

Mr. Norm Paisley (Pro-Ag Products Ltd.): Thank you for chance No. 2 to speak. My name was called last night, somewhere between sundown and sunup this morning; so I'm here to talk to you tonight.

I'm going to cover three things: a little bit about me, a little background on my company and a little bit of discussion on Bill 17.

As I was introduced, my name is Norm Paisley. I'm the president and co-owner of Pro-Ag Products in Winnipeg, Manitoba. I reside in Steinbach, Manitoba, with my wife and three children, and I've spent my entire career in the hog industry, which is about 12 years, and I'm here today to voice my opposition to Bill 17.

I feel I represent a balanced opinion on the current issues facing the hog industry and Bill 17 specifically. I'm originally from Winnipeg but have spent the last half of my life in rural Manitoba and have come to realize that a vibrant local economy is very much dependent on a healthy livestock production sector. The local Ford dealer, the local GM dealer, the local sporting goods store, the local Canadian Tire, whether they realize it or not, they're all in the agribusiness.

I'm here today to represent my family, my company, my employees and their families as well as the hog industry. I pay taxes in Winnipeg, property, business and corporate. I pay taxes in Steinbach, property, school and personal. Being a business owner has given our family the opportunity to have one parent stay at home to care for our young children and volunteer in the community. It has also allowed myself some time and flexibility to volunteer as a board member with the Manitoba

division of ANAC as well as coaching hockey and baseball.

Pro-Ag Products has its roots here in Manitoba. We are a Manitoba-based company and a leading supplier to the hog production sector. Our company was founded in 1986 and has completed a successful transition from the founding ownership to the current ownership. Pro-Ag remains privately held and a Manitoba-based company. We exist because of the hog industry. Our company has been able to grow over the past decade because of Manitoba's world-class hog production sector.

As a new business owner it is extremely difficult to plan for the future when factors beyond our control are at play. Our company has grown and moved around over the years to our present location on Marion Street. We are close to needing larger facilities but remain cautious on land acquisition, plans for a new building and adding staff due to this uncertainty that Bill 17 brings.

There are over 30 people, including staff, spouses and children, who rely on our ability to remain in business. Many of our staff are raising their families in Winnipeg and the surrounding area and have enjoyed working for our company. Most of our team has been with us for more than five years and have chosen to stay in Manitoba and make a career for themselves. This is a responsibility that we do not take lightly and is very much at the heart of all of our decisions, present and future.

Pro-Ag has always been in favour of and participated in hog production practices that are environmentally sustainable. We are currently in the second year of a five-year monetary commitment to the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment at the University of Manitoba research station in Glenlea. We participate in and sponsor initiatives like the Manitoba swine seminar on an annual basis, as well as other symposiums and trade shows.

All of these industry functions and commitments will be compromised without an industry that can grow. I think we can all agree that if an industry isn't able to grow, it's going to be in decline, and over time you'll see that the calibre of people that visit Manitoba from around the world to attend things like the Manitoba swine seminar and our Manitoba Hog Days and even investment into new projects like the Glenlea Research Station cannot happen.

I've got three key points to oppose this Bill 17. Bill 17 does not outline or provide a solution to a problem that is large in scope. It singles out the hog industry. It deflects the current phosphorus issue for Lake Winnipeg by making voters and the public feel something is being done and you're dealing with a perception, the hog industry.

I came here tonight to talk about sewage going into the Red River. I'm not going to beat that one to death. I had a few questions on that, and they've been suitably answered by Bonnie Mitchelson and also by some presenters. Raw sewage going into the Red River is just one example of many factors that affect our lake. Our families are cabin owners, and I can tell you that there are a lot of antiquated sewage disposal systems working in Manitoba right now, and that's one area that needs improvement, as well as other things like no phosphates in detergent. The list can go on and on.

* (21:20)

Ms. Marilyn Brick, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

But, basically, my main point is let's get up-to-date on our waste water treatment facilities in Winnipeg before we start cutting industries that put large amounts of money into the government budget each year to pay for such infrastructure.

Point No. 2 on our points against Bill 17. After all the consultation, debate and expense, the CEC does not make the recommendation that new and future hog expansion be banned. The CEC outlines and suggests more regulations, regulations that our industry has adapted to and adopted over the years to grow our industry to where it is today.

Manitoba is a leader among hog-producing provinces in sustainable animal agriculture, and the research at Glenlea is an example of our forward thinking and our responsible stewardship.

We also oppose Bill 17 simply out of principle. This bill is not friendly to business and other industry. It begs the question, what and who is next? We will be turning away major future investment into Manitoba if we send this message. Between 2003 and 2007, Canada has more than doubled its imports of finished pork products from the U.S.A. This is a recent USDA report that I received in the spring of '08. I think Manitoba should be at the forefront of further processing, job creation and facilitating value-added opportunities for our pork producers as well as other industries.

As a citizen, business owner, yourselves as government, I don't think that you want our food in the hands of another country where we have no control over quality, we have no control over safety, and if our dollar eventually changes to where it was, you know, in the '90s, in the early part of the decade, we'll have no control over price on food and as we know there's increased food pricing all over the world.

Those are my three main points.

If I can conclude, I'd like to say that if a handful of organized and vocal citizens in St. Boniface and Transcona were able to derail a world-class pork processing facility because it was inconvenient to them, then I think that the 450-plus people that have registered to speak and many of the people we've heard tonight and previous nights, this should be enough to determine that livelihoods are at stake and that Bill 17 should be cancelled.

Thank you.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Thank you.

Are there questions for the presenter? Seeing no question—Mr. Maguire?

Mr. Maguire: Well, Norm, I'd just like to thank you for your presentation. You're very clear on what should be done with it. The examples of why this bill should be killed and the detriment that it would do to the industry, appreciate a person of your experience coming forward and looking at a presentation on this, taking the time out of your busy schedule, as well.

I perhaps don't have a question so much as just a thank you because it's very clear from your succinct presentation how you feel about this bill and what should be done, and you've given the government some good advice. Thank you.

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

The committee calls Randy Wolgemuth. Once again, Randy Wolgemuth. Mr. Wolgemuth's name will be dropped to the bottom of the—*[interjection]*—dropped from the list.

The committee calls Monty Thompson. Once again, Monty Thompson. Mr. Thompson's name will be dropped from the list.

The committee calls Dickson Gould from Progressive Livestock Management. Mr. Gould, do you have written information you wanted to circulate?

Mr. Dickson Gould (Private Citizen): Yes, I sure do.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Please proceed, Mr. Gould.

Mr. Gould: Thanks very much. My name's Dickson Gould. I've been involved in and associated with the swine industry for over 25 years. I presently have swine operations and poultry operations in the proposed zone of Bill 17, and I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak about it to the members here today.

I'm deeply concerned about the effects Bill 17 will have on the short- and long-term viability of the livestock industry for the province of Manitoba. Bill 17 is essentially telling the industry to stand still.

The Red River Valley is an extremely unique area. Some of the best soil types for earthen storage in western Canada are in the Red River Valley. It also has an excellent source of water, through wells on the east side of the Red River. On the west side, we have a very dependable canal system and a very dependable snow melt for our dugouts.

The vast majority of locations in western Canada—in western Manitoba in particular, if we were going to build hog operations and force everything out to the Westman area, we've got two major problems: No. 1 is the soil type. We've done a lot of project development work out in the Westman area, and you run into a lot of difficulty in finding the proper soil type to actually site a location. Then, if you do find the right soil type, you can't find water. One example is the operation that we put up around sewers. We had to dig 26, 27 holes before we actually found water. Then that water wasn't acceptable. We actually had to witch water. We found the aquifer. Then that actually became the aquifer for the town of Souris. But finding water and finding good soil types to build in western Manitoba is a big job.

The other thing is, if you get into the southwest corner, the very southwest corner, you get down into Melita, you get into these areas, you can't depend on actually having moisture every year. So how are you going to have livestock? You're going to stock your barns, and then you're going to hope that you're going to get snow melt, or you're going to get run-off. That doesn't always happen. It's not like it is in the Red River Valley.

Bill 17, I really feel, eliminates most of the economic viable area, and also the most viable

environmental area in the province of Manitoba from further production. Bill 17 is essentially messaging to the financial institutions that smaller and mid-size operations aren't bankable because these operations won't be able to have the economy as a scale, or have the opportunity to change with the changing environment in production, and also with changing regulations on environment, changing regulations when it comes to CQA. These operations will eventually either have a slow death or be shut down. They won't be economically viable.

The worst part of this is that farms don't have a choice. Bill 17 has taken that right away. Bill 17 isn't based on science, and doesn't take into account the nutrient holding capacity of the land, or the acres available to each operation. Present regulations don't allow your operation to expand, or to build haphazardly. Applicants have to ensure they have the adequate number of acres for their nutrient management plan. In some of the livestock intensive areas of southwestern Manitoba—or southeastern Manitoba, they can't expand unless they buy-out a neighbour's operation, shut it down, so that they can actually utilize his waste units.

Science-based legislation deals with these situations on individual site basis. When we go in and we apply, we take a look at the nutrient capabilities of that soil, we take a look at the slope of the land, and we take a look at the type of soil that we're dealing with. So the existing regulations we have are very, very site specific.

The proposed legislation draws lines on the map without any specific type of capabilities or recognition of each quarter of land. Yet we have information like GPS maps, GIS maps that are available to us that can take a look at each quarter of land and give us a really good recommendation of what can be done.

It's interesting to know, if you look at the proposed map of the ban area, that original map that was used by the Conservation Department was designed for small operations, poultry operations, dairy operations, and cattle operations, that winter-spread, to prevent spring run-off. It was never presented or implied to be anything more than that.

If I own land between Sperling and Carman, Manitoba, I could have my hog operation on one side of the road, and then I wouldn't be able to build on the other side of the road because it wasn't environmentally safe, but I would be able to spread my manure on that land. It's interesting that you can

build on the west side of Lake Manitoba but you can't build on the east side of Lake Manitoba.

* (21:30)

The existing legislation is actually better legislation than the permanent ban legislation of Bill 17. Bill 17 legislation is not well thought out. It is not site-specific and it isn't science-based.

Bill 17 doesn't give confidence to the agriculture community. Not only will hog producers not have the incentive to become engaged, but all industries fearing reprimand and similar fates will be standing still. Financial institutions will not be willing to invest with Manitoba farmers because of the uncertain environment regardless of whether it's poultry or livestock.

As a member of the fundraising team for the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, we've talked to financial institutions, national and international industries, local suppliers and Hutterite colonies. In fact, the Hutterite colonies of Manitoba put in \$400,000 to this project to get it up and going, the first time that they ever made that type of contribution to the University of Manitoba.

The award that we got for the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, that was one of the largest awards ever given out by the Canadian Foundation for Innovation. One of the things that you also have to keep in mind is that we've been able to attract world-class scientists to the national centre, and one of the scientists that we were able to attract was actually a model, a person that does environmental modelling, Dr. Ermias Kebeab. He was recruited out of the U.K. In fact, he's such a talented individual that basically the Agriculture Department in Ontario is utilizing his environmental modelling for doing all their nutrient management plans. One of the questions I want to ask and really ask the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) is, we have these resources in the province; let's utilize them.

I know I'm on a limited time budget. I've got a couple of minutes here, and I'll try to quickly go through. In reviewing the recommendations that we saw in the various reportings, Finding Common Ground, the Lake Winnipeg Water Stewardship report and the Clean Environment Commission, over and over again they refer to needing a long-term vision, co-ordination and collaboration in dealing with environmental issues; and to develop a framework that supports collaborative movement on

the issues through research, education and support for the adoption of innovation that improves our environment. Nowhere was there mention of a ban.

I have four recommendations that I'd like to present. I think we need to do a full review of all the existing impacts of our 20-plus legislations and regulations that we have in the hog industry and the livestock industry that already deal with our siting and manure management. It would be nice to do a full review. Point No. 2, I think we need to utilize the resources of the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, as well as the federal ag research station in Brandon that specializes in soil science. Point No. 3, if changes are required, ensure that they are based on science, that they are site-specific and that they take into account changes in technology. Point No. 4, rural Manitoba doesn't need to suffer any further equity drain in the livestock industry. We need to ensure that operations can be bought or sold or traded and subject to their site-specific land availability. This would allow farmers the opportunity to transfer animal units to different locations, so that they can expand or salvage some equity from their operation to repay the bank loans that they have.

Thanks very much.

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

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much, Dickson, Mr. Gould, for your presentation. I appreciate the investment you have made in southwest Manitoba and you have described it very well. It is part of the Palliser Triangle. I think that's something we should always remember, and up until two weeks ago, it was one of the driest springs they'd ever had out there.

You've outlined what Dr. Wittenberg from the University of Manitoba the other night indicated, a couple of nights ago here in this very chamber, that we have some of the best research scientists in agriculture and in the environment here in the province and that they are located at the University of Manitoba. You've also outlined here that the National Centre for Livestock and Environment chair is there dealing with the same issues. She threw out a challenge for the government to come to their door any time, it's always open, and I'm assuming that you're saying the same thing here. It is open, the research council. I had the opportunity of dealing with Grant Pierce at the St. Boniface facilities at one point to tie agriculture and health together. That's why we ended up with a nutraceutical foundation

over there to look at some of the issues in research there. All of these things are available to us to try and find a better solution than what's been presented here.

Do you believe that we can find a solution to this in the next three or four months before this bill comes back in the House in September? How would you recommend that the government go about doing that?

Mr. Gould: I can talk now? Okay.

I guess No. 1 is I think a three-or-four-month serious review would be very positive for everybody on both sides of the House. I think that probably the best way to take a look at it is we've got some excellent resources that other areas are utilizing because of their expertise. Yet we don't utilize them here.

Point No. 2 is I think that we had that phosphorus committee that took a look at the winter-spreading issue, which is really the winter-spread map that we've had kind of forced upon us. I think that really needs to be totally reviewed and really to commission that group to come back in and go to a science-based decision.

I think the other thing is there's no way that we can have a good legislation unless we get into site specifics because you can't say one piece of land is better than another. I guess you can say that, but you can't sort of come in and sort of paint a whole area as being off-site.

I agree with your comment on the Palliser Triangle. If we're going to be building barns out there, we're going to need a back-up plan to move those pigs back into the southeast on years when we don't have moisture.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you for your presentation.

I would ask leave of the committee to accept his written presentation, as well as his oral presentation. There's information there that you didn't touch on that I certainly would like to have on the record. So I ask leave of the committee for that to be so added.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Is there leave from the committee to also add the written presentation? *[Agreed]*

Thank you very much, Mr. Gould.

Committee Substitutions

Madam Vice-Chairperson: For the information of the committee, we have a substitution: Mr. Reid will be substituting for Ms. Blady.

* * *

Madam Vice-Chairperson: The committee calls Victor Kopecky. Once again, the committee calls Victor Kopecky. Seeing that Mr. Kopecky is not here, his name will be dropped from the list.

The committee calls Edna Kopecky. Once again, the committee calls Edna Kopecky. Seeing that Edna Kopecky is not here, here name will be dropped from the list.

The committee calls Guy Lesage, private citizen. Once again, is Guy Lesage, private citizen, here? Mr. Lesage's name will now be dropped from the list.

This is the end of the list for people who are here from the rural areas. We are now going to be moving into people who are here from the city, and the committee will be starting on 110, Stuart Peter Manness, private citizen. Is Stuart Peter Manness, private citizen, here? Mr. Manness' name will be dropped from the list.

The committee calls Vicki Burns, private citizen. You can proceed, Ms. Burns.

* (21:40)

Ms. Vicki Burns (Private Citizen): Good evening, and thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak with you for a few minutes.

First of all, I do have to commend all of you for staying awake, though. This is an amazingly lengthy process, so I appreciate your attention.

I am making this presentation in support of Bill 17, to legislate a moratorium on the construction of new hog barns in certain areas of Manitoba. I think it's very important to note that this is not a ban on new barn construction throughout the whole province, but only on certain specific areas that already have a very high density of pigs per square mile, in fact, some of the highest density anywhere in North America.

Much of the area that the moratorium is proposed in is also within the drainage basin of the Red River which contributes a very significant portion of phosphorus to Lake Winnipeg. The Red River supplies 54 percent of the phosphorus to the lake, even though it only supplies 11 percent of the

flow. I've got a little chart; this is from the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship report. A little over half of the phosphorus which enters Lake Winnipeg is from sources outside Manitoba, and the rest is from within our province.

I want to make it very clear that I'm not stressing this point because I want to blame the hog industry for the entire problems of Lake Winnipeg—absolutely not. I know there are a multitude of sources. However, I feel that the hog industry needs to take its part in accepting responsibility, as do every single one of us who lives within the lake's watershed—all of us around the table, all of us, I presume, within this room and many millions of other people.

The next point I want to make is that this is a moratorium on new construction. It says nothing about the current barns that are operating. In other words, those barns are allowed to continue in their current state of operations.

I'm going to just jump ahead a little bit to the middle of my presentation, because I really feel it's important to talk about something which I have heard nobody talk about in the hours that I've been sitting here and that is I cannot understand why the hog industry is prepared to continue the way they are, with this type of a business model.

There was a report which appeared in the *Manitoba Co-operator* several months ago, which demonstrated that hog farmers are receiving less today per pound than they were receiving 20 years ago, even though the price that we are paying for pork chops has gone up approximately 38 percent.

I would ask every one of you, who are sitting around the table, whether you would find it satisfactory if the salary you were earning today was 5 percent less than what you were earning 20 years ago.

The reason I am bringing this point up is I think the whole industry needs to take a very serious look at how it's conducting itself. I have a tremendous sympathy for hog farmers, being fearful that they're not allowed to increase their operations. No wonder they want to raise more animals, when they're getting paid so much less than what they should be paid, but the answer is not more animals.

Our environment, in certain areas of this province, cannot sustain that. So I really challenge the industry to start taking a very serious look at why they continue to be price-takers, instead of price-setters. I think this is an important question that I

don't have the answer for but, really, if I was in the business, I would ask it.

Now, I'm going to jump back to a couple of other things. The whole industry across Canada is in a terrible state of decline, which has prompted our federal government to commit \$50 million to encourage hog producers to decrease the size of their herds. I haven't really heard anybody else talk about this during these hearings.

To me, this is the first time in the history that I've been involved—now that is only 15 years—but it's the first time I've heard the federal government willing to put our taxpayers' money to pay hog producers to downsize their herd. This is a very big red flag to our industry, and we should be paying attention to it.

Another big red flag, of course, is the country-of-origin labelling which is, very potentially, going to really put a big dent in the market. Another flag is our own provincial government being willing to give very low interest loans to help hog farmers out right now, which I don't object to, but I think, really, the industry has got to take a hard look at how they're conducting themselves, so that we can ensure sustainability in this industry for Manitoba.

Agriculture and the hog industry are important to this province. I agree with that 100 percent, but let's do it properly, in a manner that is sustainable, because we cannot expect taxpayers to continue subsidizing over the years as things go up and down, and we all are going to have to make changes on our own behaviour related to what we're doing with water and what's going into Lake Winnipeg.

I'm just going to give a little brief information about really in my estimation why this has happened in the hog industry. Back around after the Second World War, agriculture all over the world started to become industrialized when they discovered that putting a small bit of antibiotics into the animals' feed would help them grow so much faster. So then the whole idea of mass producing animals for our food just like we mass produce cars, it took off. We all loved that because we all wanted to have cheaper food, but what's happening now is we discovered there are a whole bunch of problems in trying to raise animals in this mass way, not the least of which is one that I'm very familiar with and that is animal welfare.

We simply cannot continue to be having intensive livestock operations where animals are so

confined that they can't even turn around. This is an important point for the hog industry to pay attention to as well because consumers all over the world are starting to pay attention to that. Consumers are starting to say, we don't want to buy a product if we know it's coming from animals that were raised in a way that really constricted their movement and so on.

Now this is not just me. I know I'm not particularly popular in this room, but this is Smithfield Foods, the largest pork producer in the world, Maple Leaf Foods, the largest pork producer in Canada, Cargill, one of the largest meat producers in North America. Those three companies last year made the statement they are going to phase out using gestation stalls, the intensive confinement systems that you've heard the Humane Society speak of over the last decade.

It's important for our hog industry here to hear that and not to be caught blindsided 10 years from now when their product is no longer going to be bought because they haven't switched systems. Not only have those meat producers, you know, the Maple Leafs and so on, but Canada Safeway down in the United States has recently announced that they're going to start buying more and more pork from the loose housing systems. McDonald's, Burger King, those big companies that buy lots of meat down in the States, they've made those kinds of announcements.

So these are the things that our Manitoba hog industry, with the help of our government needs to move toward. If we really want this to be a sustainable industry in 25 years from now, have lots of the people who are here have their sons and daughters working in this industry, we need to make sure that they're paying attention to these things. These are not the whims of a few people. There are serious red flags happening around the world. All of you sitting here, you're the leaders in our province, it's up to you to make sure that you're listening to that and paying attention for the sake of our hog industry and for the sake of our environment. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Burns.

Questions?

Mr. Maguire: Thank you very much, Ms. Burns, for your presentation. I just had a couple of questions.

You supported the ban, obviously. Do you support the fact that—you mentioned the present existing barns you would support, and you said many of them are old. If that barn itself had to be replaced within the zone, do you think that should be allowed?

Ms. Burns: Yes, I do think that should be allowed. I'm confused. Is that not allowed? I presumed it was. If an old barn was going to be torn down, a new one could be put up.

Mr. Maguire: No, I believe you can work with the present situation, but, you know, you cannot build a new barn outside of that or another barn on your operation.

One other thing that I was looking at is the ban is on 39 municipalities at the present time. I wonder what mechanism or what justification, I don't know if science is the right word or not, but what did you use to come to the consensus that you feel all 39 of those should be staying within the moratorium like the government has brought forward, because there was nothing to that effect in the Clean Environment Commission? Or are there some municipalities that you think shouldn't be in this and how many do you think should remain? Too many questions maybe.

* (21:50)

Ms. Burns: In the interests of time and so on, I'll just be completely honest. I don't have the answer to whether all 39 should be. I'll admit that. I'm looking primarily at the area that I perceive to have the highest incidence of pigs.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Burns.

Like all of us, you have your opinions and you have your biases, and we accept that. That's part of democracy. That kind of dialogue and that kind of debate is good for all of us, because I think each one of us learns from day to day as to how to improve things in our society.

But I want to ask you whether or not you believe that this decision—now we can support a decision on the basis of whether it's good for society, but any decision that is made has to be backed up with something. Right now, my problem with Bill 17 is that it appears to have been simply a political decision rather than one that was based on any information that has come through studies that were launched into the hog industry, into the river basin, or any science that would support it. Indeed, some of

our academics, who are well respected in this province, have said the same.

Do you not think that Bill 17 should perhaps be re-looked at and have some science applied to it before it becomes law?

Ms. Burns: Well, I certainly do agree with the concept that we should be using whatever science we have available to us, absolutely.

One of the reasons why I say I support Bill 17 is because I feel that we need a more very, very serious look at this issue from a science perspective, and that, even if Bill 17 passes, there's nothing to say that five years from now, with further progress having been made at the university with research, and so on, that the bill can't be amended. I mean, we have all kinds of examples, don't we, where things are put in place and, five or ten years later, they're changed?

So, to me, this is just an indication that right now we need to slow down in those particular areas, really understand what's going on, and then, as things change, then, we could consider changing the bill.

Mr. Maguire: Just a comment. In Manitoba we're usually innocent until proven guilty. Thank you.

Ms. Burns: Okay, my only final comment, really, is that we have to recognize that, humans and animals alike, we all produce phosphorus in our waste, and the human population in Manitoba has only gone up a very, very small percentage in the last 10 years. I think it might be, it certainly is less than 5 percent. I used to have those figures at my finger tips and I don't anymore, I'm sorry. However, the pig population has gone from about, let's say two and a half million, up to eight and a half million. So, in some ways, it has quadrupled. The amount of phosphorus coming from pigs has definitely increased very substantially over the last 10 years, which may be one reason why the government has decided to focus on that.

In conclusion, though, I do want to say I personally believe there are many other things that you may hear me speak about and push this government to do in relation to decreasing the nutrients going into Lake Winnipeg. There are a lot of other areas that need attention, including the city of Winnipeg's waste water. So I hope that my presentation on this cannot be misinterpreted. I am not at all focussing entirely on the hog industry.

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

Presenter No. 120, Blaine Tully, is here with his young son. Is it the will of the committee that we hear his presentation at this point in time? *[Agreed]*

I call Mr. Blaine Tully. Mr. Tully, do you have any written materials for the committee.

Mr. Blaine Tully (Private Citizen): I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin, sir.

Mr. Tully: Thank you. Good evening. I guess we all have our agendas, and that's pretty clear, so I have mine, and I'm going to try and give some perspective from a swine veterinarian's stance in the industry.

My name is Blaine Tully. I live in Winnipeg. I live with my wife and four children. I am a veterinarian specializing in swine health, production, and welfare, and I'm a partner in a swine practice based in Steinbach, Manitoba. We employ eight veterinarians all specializing in swine. We have eight to 10 production and support staff behind us as well, and we have a wide variety of clients in many, if not all, of the municipalities listed in the proposed bill.

Most people enter vet school because they have a passion and a desire to work with animals, and certainly that was me. I think most people graduate from vet school and quickly learn that the practice of veterinary medicine is more than just disease and animals. Actually, it's people and building relationships. I've had the opportunity to work with many hardworking swine producers in Manitoba and build relationships with them. Currently, Manitoba has some of the highest health and performing herds in the world. We really are the envy of many of my veterinary colleagues around North America.

Many of my clients have started and will continue to feel the squeeze of the economy of scale. Buyers of weaned pigs and growing pigs are needing larger groups, 500, 1,000 or more to fill some of their nursery and finisher barns. In addition, the industry has really moved towards larger facilities. Pharmaceutical companies supply product in larger packaging that makes it difficult for smaller producers to use the entire bottle of a vaccine once it's opened. Another example is just with the increasing price of fuel, larger batches of feed and larger batches of pigs need to be moved just to make the cost of transport lower.

The smaller producers, which we would typically consider the family farmer, will really need to start looking at expanding their operations and changing the pig flow within their operations to

make sizable packages of pigs that become attractive to buyers. That would be buyers in Manitoba, across Canada, or down in the United States as well.

The trend in the industry has been to wean an older, heavier piglet. The wean age has many and large benefits to animal health, actually, making a stronger pig with a more robust immune system, less likely needing any kind of medical intervention, and performing closer to its genetic potential. In order to wean older pigs, again, farmers need to really think about adding farrowing space to keep those piglets on their mothers' milk longer.

The technologies outlined in the proposed bill like anaerobic digestion are, I think, probably typically expensive to implement, and with current market downturns and not having an attractive marketable package of larger numbers of pigs, these family farms are not going to be the farms able to afford those technologies which would allow them to expand under the proposed bill.

So, in my view, Bill 17 seems to be anti-family farm. I believe with such a bleak future, many hog farms, from small family operations to the larger corporate operations, will find it more and more difficult to attract young people to enter or stay within the industry. Bill 17, as it currently stands, will create an older and a stagnant hog industry in Manitoba.

* (22:00)

This has many ramifications. We've heard about many of them over the last four or five days. In my opinion, there's also collateral damage to the veterinary field, food supply and food safety. Our practice has been looking to hire a food animal veterinarian for quite some time. We find it difficult to actually attract interested applicants. As glamorous as swine practice sounds—and I love my work and I'm passionate about it—there aren't a lot of young people graduating from veterinary schools interested in swine practice or food animal practice. Actually, the last two veterinarians at our practice, who were hired just to get the day-to-day work done, have been semi-retired veterinarians, looking for a few days of work per week.

I think they would be the first to admit that they will not be the ones leading the food animal veterinary medicine into the future. As the industry becomes stagnant and older practitioners leave or retire from our food animal practices, it will become very difficult to replace them within Manitoba.

As many of you know, veterinarians on the farm are one of the first lines of defence, really, against foreign animal diseases and emerging diseases, playing an integral role in disease surveillance and protecting the health of our food chain. In the big picture, I think Bill 17 will have widespread impact, not only on the producers' lives but also those dependent on a safe supply of food.

Thank you and I would like to entertain any questions there might be.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Tully.

Questions?

Mr. Pedersen: It's been a while since I've said anything. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's been a long number of days and I know you were in here a couple of other nights, if I remember correctly. Thank you for your persistence in staying here. This is important to your industry.

You were involved in a rather large veterinary care operation and, like any other business, you're making long-term plans all the time. You talk about difficulty in hiring veterinarians and food technicians. Where do you see your business going, if you were to believe that Bill 17 is going to lead to the demise of the hog industry in Manitoba, or severe curtailing of it? Where does that leave your business, and what do you put in your long-range plans right now?

Mr. Tully: It's a good question. Our practice—although there are eight veterinarians, there are four partners. One of the senior partners is within five years of retiring and, as I've mentioned, we've been looking to hire a younger veterinarian to bring into the ranks. We struggle with finding a person to do that.

Our practice, although situated in Steinbach, is not very regional. We cover a lot of territory across the province, so in my view, if Bill 17 is pushed through, we'll do a lot more driving and have to start looking out of the province to keep ourselves busy. If that's not enough to keep eight veterinarians busy, then there won't be eight veterinarians in our practice. That would be the same for production and support staff as well.

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

Peter Vis, Precision Feeds. Peter Vis. Peter Vis will be dropped from the list.

Joel Gosselin. Joel Gosselin will be dropped from the list.

Bill McDonald, Winnipeg Humane Society. Mr. McDonald, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Bill McDonald (Winnipeg Humane Society): I do.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, sir.

Mr. McDonald: Good evening, Mr. Chair, ministers, members. I'd also like to commend you for putting in the long hours and hearing the many citizens of the province. Well done.

As you know my name is Bill McDonald. I'm the current executive director of the Winnipeg Humane Society. I replaced Vicki Burns in February of this year, so I'm fairly new at the job.

I do want to point out that the Winnipeg Humane Society also deals with a large number of animals. We received 8,804 dogs, cats and various other critters through our doors in 2007. Our budget is \$4.6 million a year; we have 126 employees.

I'm going to speak tonight in support of Bill 17, and I'm going to make my comments on a very narrow focus. Some in the audience may think it's too simplistic, but our mandate is a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. We started in 1894. Our original name was the Winnipeg Humane Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Women, Children and Animals. Over the decades, we lost the women and the children and deal with the animals.

So our organization is viewing, somewhat with alarm, the treatment of farm animals under what we term in the industrial farm animal protection. That is the concentration of larger and larger numbers of animals in one location in very confining proximity to one another.

Now, many of you know here about the WHS Quit Stalling Campaign concerning the use of sow crates in hog barns. We have suggested, for many years, that these sow crates are inhumane and must be banned, as they are in many other jurisdictions. Having said that, we consider any piece of legislation that will restrict the number of sow crates being used as good legislation and the WHS supports Bill 17 for this reason. Its passing will mean fewer pigs will be confined in sow crates.

I could cite many organizations that endorse the phasing out of sow crates, but I will only quote from

one of the most recent studies produced by the Pew Commission. The report was produced by the former United States Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and former Kansas Governor John Carlin and published in April of 2008. They stated in their report, and I quote: The current industrial farm animal production system often poses unacceptable risk to public health, the environment and the welfare of the animals themselves. One of the commission's key recommendations was item No. 4, which stated: Phase out the most intensive and inhumane production practices within a decade to reduce the risk of IFAP to public health and improve animal well-being.

It's simple: Fewer hog barns means fewer sow crates, and Bill 17 will help achieve this lower number.

The second reason we are in support of Bill 17 is the risk associated with hog barn fires. Recently, Manitoba has seen some horrific hog barn fires, with animals being killed by the thousands. Any witness to these fires will be able to describe the suffering endured by the animals when these fires are raging out of control, with absolutely no escape provided for the pigs. Anyone who believes in the humane treatment of animals will, I am sure, acknowledge that any effort that is made to stop any future fires is an effort well done. Bill 17 is an effort to control the number of hog barns being built. This is, again, a simple way of saying less barns means less possibility of another horrific fire that kills thousands of animals.

In conclusion, the WHS is first and foremost concerned about the treatment and welfare of animals, pigs included. This is an ethical question that must be addressed as we raise these animals for food. When raising food animals, we have to ask ourselves: What is really a reasonable life for these animals? It is this question of the quality of life that we have to answer, and I would respectfully put to you that we have not answered that question here in Manitoba. Any effort to slow this expansion down is reasonable and just.

Let us all pause a moment and really look at the questions I have posed. The passage of Bill 17 gives us all the time to question past practices and look to the future, and that is why the WHS supports Bill 17.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. McDonald.

I open the floor to questions.

Mr. Eichler: I have two questions for you, Bill. I know you're new to your position, and I was wondering, have you had an opportunity to be in a new facility of a hog operation since you've taken this position, or when was the last time you were in a facility to see how it actually worked?

Mr. McDonald: No, I have not. Part of my experience and duties as the executive director is I sit on the University of Manitoba panel for the ethical treatment of animals at the university, and we deal with the hog barns there. A tour is being arranged for that panel to go down to Glenlea. I have also talked with one of the profs from Glenlea who will provide a personal tour for me as well. They do have what we call the open-sow arrangements at the university and also the sow crates.

Mr. Chairperson: Supplemental, Mr. Eichler.

*(22:10)

Mr. Eichler: I think you'll have your eyes opened up immensely.

My other question for you in regard to the number of pets that you carry, and you say you have a number of those, what regulations are involved for waste from the animals? Also, animals that are euthanized, what are the regulations and where do those waste products go? What are you under as far as regulations?

Mr. McDonald: In regard to the waste, it's a city by-law and it's quite simple, Brady Road Landfill. In regard to animals that we euthanize, we have a private contractor that cremates the animals that we euthanize. We euthanize approximately 2,500 animals per year. So, do the math, 52 weeks a year.

By comparison, in regard to the cremation of animals, you might be stunned to know that the City has their animal control facility on Logan. They dispose of their animals intact in the Brady Road Landfill.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Thank you for your presentation, Bill.

I'm interested in terms of your thoughts on what is appropriate humane treatment of hogs, and whether you believe that there should be a shift from where we are now to a different type of hog production.

Mr. McDonald: Thank you, Dr. Gerrard.

For many years the Humane Society has pushed both this government and the previous government in

regard to an outright ban on sow crates in the hog operations. The European Union has banned them outright. In the United States the latest state to do that was Colorado. Others, like Arizona, Florida, et cetera, have banned them.

What we look at when we take a position like that is we're looking at the quality of life and the natural instincts of that animal. It's not natural to be confined in a crate for the duration of your natural life where you can only take two steps forward and two steps back and can't turn around, and only get out of the crate to be moved to another crate to have your piglets. The quality of life is what we look at, and what the quality of life is for a pig—and every animal is different—pigs like to roam, they like to root, they like to make nests in hay bales and so on and such forth. Now we're not saying that we want all the pigs in Manitoba to be out running through the fields. We understand our climate and the number of hogs that are being produced in this province we need to go to enclosed structures, and we have no problem with that in regard to new facilities, new barns with the open sow conditions.

What's going to drive the hog producers that are all behind me is what Vicki said, this is not being mandated by this government or the past government. This is being mandated now by the consumers and the consumers are the people who pressure Burger King, McDonalds and Safeway and all the other food chains to make these changes so that they are buying a product that they think has been ethically treated. We have no problem with the production of food animals for society. It's how they're raised and how they're treated and how they're slaughtered. It all has to be humane.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you for your presentation.

I would like to ask you, you just said that your animals are incinerated. Your dead animals are incinerated. That is a practice that's not allowed in Manitoba farms. I don't know if you're aware of that or not, but farmers who produce hogs have to compost their dead stock. They can't incinerate them.

Number 2, where do you keep your livestock, your animals, your pets?

Mr. McDonald: Our new facility is at 45 Hurst Way, and it's a 42,000-square-foot facility. It's brand new. It cost \$14.9 million to build. It was all basically donations except for the good graces of the federal government gave us a million and the provincial government gave us a million. The City

gave us nothing. In that facility it's split between dogs and cats. At full capacity, we can hold 350 cats in the building and 110 dogs. We've been at full capacity in cats once since we moved in last November and twice with dogs. So at any given time under our control with the animals, if we're full with the 350 and the 110 we're at 460 and then, at any given time, we have approximately 130 to 150 cats out at foster and 30 to 50 dogs. I have a little broken leg dog at home myself right now.

Mr. Derkach: So are your animals kept in crates, or where are they kept?

Mr. McDonald: Our dogs that are in adoption are actually in a room that's about the size from me to Mrs. Mitchelson, a little wider than the table. It's got a dog bed, dog house. There's usually a table and some chairs, pictures on the wall, and that's where the people looking for a new family member would visit the dogs. The animals that are in the holding, what we call back-stage holding, the dogs are in a double-dog run which would be—again, it's got a pop door for cleaning purposes. It'd be the width of the table and from here to Mrs. Mitchelson's elbow for the dogs.

Cats are in a 12-tier cage that's probably about that wide and about that deep per cat.

Mr. Derkach: So they're crates.

Mr. McDonald: For the cats, they are. The cats.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you.

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

Paul Howarth. Paul Howarth will be dropped from the list.

Jason Care. Jason Care will be dropped from the list.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: I have a substitution: Ms. Braun in for Ms. Brick.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: As a result of that, we'll need a new Vice-Chair. Any nominations?

Ms. Melnick: I'll nominate Ms. Braun.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Braun has been nominated. Any further nominations?

Seeing none, Ms. Braun is elected Vice-Chair.

I call Mr. Carl Dornn. Carl Dornn. Carl Dornn will be struck from the list.

Louise Hedman has already given us a written submission. She's not here. Okay. So we will strike her from the list.

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

Mr. Greg Muench (Private Citizen): No.

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

Mr. Muench: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Unfortunately, or fortunately, I guess, a couple of speakers ago was Blaine Tully, who I work with, so instead of being able to refresh your memories a day later or so with the information he was presenting, I think it would be a little redundant to review some of what he went over.

My name is Greg Muench. I'm a veterinarian as well, working with Dr. Tully in the exclusive swine veterinary practice based in Steinbach. Based on the response that Dr. Tully gave to one of the questions as far as the future of the practice, being the second-last veterinarian in and an associate, I'm potentially a little concerned for my potential employment down the road, I guess, if things move on as they do, potentially.

I'm living in Winnipeg myself. I came here five years ago to work in this practice specifically, changing a shift from a mixed-animal practitioner to a swine practitioner, and selected the practice I did based on its reputation nationally and internationally as a very high-quality swine veterinary practice.

During the five years that I've been practising in Manitoba, I've gotten to know quite a number of the producers. Most of my clients would be considered conventional family farms, in which I include the Hutterite colonies as well as some of their larger operations that, although may not be considered a conventional family farm, are still locally owned by Manitobans. They are some of the most efficient and progressive farmers and are leaders in the industry in innovation with regard to production and facility management.

* (22:20)

As has been made clearly evident with the recent changes in the hog-farming sector, remaining able to adapt to changing industry conditions is essential for survival, especially for the smaller and mid-sized operations. Many of the producers I work with have

changed and expanded their facilities over the years to adapt and will remain viable as a result.

Bill 17 will essentially, as it appears, cripple these farmers' abilities to continue to evolve and adapt in order to survive in an agricultural industry that continues to rapidly change.

I'd just like to speak, I guess, in a broader picture as well. I see this as yet another potential blow on a national level to secure our own food production capabilities. In light of the recent concerns with imported food products, Canada's reputation and ability to produce safe, high-quality food both for domestic and international markets needs to be protected and supported. I'm sure, as has been pointed out with many of the other speakers, Manitoba hog farmers are an integral part of this component of the Canadian agricultural industry and deserve fair consideration and support.

Being involved in food-animal production, as well, in Saskatchewan for a number of years prior to moving to Manitoba, I've had some experience with similar types of processes in permitting for hog barns and feedlots and stuff like that. It continues to frustrate me that over the years it seems that emotion and often what seems to be political expediency tend to override the scientific facts in the cases which deal with agricultural production practices. I see this as yet another example to add to that growing list.

I am in support of addressing all the factors contributing to the concerns in Lake Winnipeg but feel that the livestock sectors, and the swine farmers in particular, are being unjustly targeted to this end with this legislation.

Hog farming and livestock production in general are currently well-regulated and sustainable industries that are important to Manitoba's future. As a swine veterinarian, I belong to one of the many locally based businesses that will be affected negatively in the long run if hog farming in Manitoba is not allowed to remain a viable and competitive industry. Those are all my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Muench.

Questions.

Mr. Faurschou: I want to thank you very much for your presentation. Again, it comes from the heart and, as well, the head. In your presentation you have facts as well as the definite passion for the industry which all of us, as farmers, do.

I want to thank you ever so much for your presentation here this evening and I hope members opposite were listening.

Mr. Muench: Thank you.

Mr. Gerrard: You're a vet, and you obviously are very concerned about animal health. Do you want to make a comment on the condition of the animals, their health and the quality of the facilities that the hogs are living in?

Mr. Muench: I think the producers are certainly having the best interest of the animals in mind. I guess I wonder, as the previous speaker was commenting on the housing facility styles, changes and regulations with that, if Bill 17 is passed, if that in itself will restrict the ability for hog units to change and modify existing hog units to—you know, if there's legislation banning crates or if there's other hog housing facilities that are required, will this legislation hinder the ability of producers to adapt to those new legislations and new regulations. I'm not sure if that's the case. From what I understand, it is, I guess. I don't know.

Mr. Gerrard: What you're saying is, address the issues of animal health and housing separately, but don't take away the potential for the industry to grow and people to be able to invest in change as it may be needed in the future depending on what conditions or markets or other things need. Is that right?

Mr. Muench: Yes. As I mentioned, the industry changes a lot, especially as—as was pointed out—there are potentially some regulations that will be changing, as far as housing goes, and how this legislation will restrict producers' abilities to adapt and utilize those.

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

Mr. Muench: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I call John Fjeldsted, Manitoba Environmental Industries Association Inc. John Fjeldsted will be dropped from the list.

Tracey Bryksa. Ms. Bryksa, do you have any written materials? I see you do. The Clerk's assistants will distribute them.

Proceed, please.

Ms. Tracey Bryksa (Private Citizen): Good evening, Mr. Chairperson and members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Food. I'd

like to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight about Bill 17.

My name is Tracey Bryksa. I'm here as a private citizen, but I also work for Manitoba Pork Council as the public affairs and marketing manager, and I have been in many, many hog barns.

I'm here tonight to join the hundreds of people who have already spoken out against Bill 17, the anti-farm bill. Bill 17 will do absolutely nothing to protect Lake Winnipeg, but it will have a huge impact on a successful agriculture industry that we, as Manitobans, should be proud of.

The effects of Bill 17 may not be felt immediately, but it will have a long-term effect. As farmers and their families look ahead and plan for the future, they will be prevented from restructuring and growing their businesses forever.

I ask you, as have many others already, what other businesses or sectors of the economy have been frozen in such a way?

Hog farmers are not evil polluters. They live here, work on the land and raise their families in Manitoba, just like you and I. Just like you and I, they want to ensure a safe, healthy environment for their families and future generations.

Hog farmers already follow some of the toughest environmental regulations in North America and are fully prepared to do more to improve production practices and the impact of hog farming on the environment. Unfortunately, hog farmers have been given a bad rap. For some reason, the government has chosen hog farmers as scapegoats for the problems of Lake Winnipeg.

Pigs smell. There's no way around that but, at the other end of the spectrum, how many of you wake up to bacon and eggs on a Saturday morning, or can't wait to barbecue some nice, juicy, pork ribs on a hot summer day?

The hog industry has been given a bad rap. When I came to work for Manitoba Pork Council about two years ago, several people warned me not to take a job in this industry, especially a PR job. Admittedly, it has been challenging and it's been an uphill battle since I started, but I am very glad to be here today. I am proud to work in the hog industry and I think there's a very good story to tell. We just need to convince you to listen.

When I joined Manitoba Pork Council, I had no idea of the scope of the hog industry in Manitoba. I

didn't know that we are the largest pig-producing and pig-exporting province in Canada. I didn't know that the hog sector contributes about a billion dollars to the provincial economy each year. I didn't know that, dollar for dollar, the pig sector contributes more money to the provincial economy from exports than Manitoba Hydro generates, on average, through exports of electricity. I didn't know that hog farming has created more than 15,000 jobs in this province—more than Standard Aero, Bristol Aerospace and New Flyer Industries combined.

Hog farming is a key contributor to Manitoba's economy; yet, it is not recognized as such. Manitoba Hydro is heralded as one of our shining stars; so are the aerospace and transportation-manufacturing players, but not the hog industry.

In fact, agriculture as a whole goes largely unrecognized in this province. The urban population has very little awareness of the agriculture industry in Manitoba, and the gap between the rural and urban population is growing.

I am a city girl, through and through. I was born and raised in Winnipeg and have spent most of my life here, save for a few years away at university. I did not study agriculture at university, but I have made a career of working in agriculture in Manitoba. I've worked at the Canadian Wheat Board, Agricore, Agricore United and now Manitoba Pork Council.

Agriculture plays a huge role in Manitoba and we should be proud of our heritage and protect and promote this critical sector. Instead, we are watching it slip away, sector by sector.

My grandfather was the general manager of Canada Packers for many, many years. He finally retired at age 60, when he was asked to move to head office in Toronto, but did not want leave Manitoba. I grew up hearing endless stories about the meat business and the successful industry here in Manitoba.

* (22:30)

In my grandfather's day, the southeast corner of Winnipeg was a meat industry hub, with Canada Packers, Swifts, and Burns Meats all being big players. Today, more than 30 years later, I drive home down Marion Street each day. Instead of the hustle and bustle that my grandfather saw, all I see now is a ghost town and empty fields. There is no primary processing left here anymore, even though Winnipeg was once touted as a packing centre. Are my children going to grow up one day to see no more

hog farming in this province? If Bill 17 is implemented it's a good possibility, and what is that going to do for Manitoba?

I also want to correct something that I heard the other night. Minister Struthers asked one of the presenters, Michael Sykes, of the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists, if he thought that Manitoba Pork Council was using its research money, which we placed a temporary pause on, to fund a political campaign. For the record, the answer is, unequivocally, no.

Manitoba Pork Council has an annual advertising budget to run a campaign or series of ads. Each year, we determine how and where to spend that money to promote the hog industry, promote pork consumption, or address an issue. The overwhelming issue that has concerned hog farmers this year is obviously Bill 17. There was absolutely no question where we would spend our advertising budget.

We developed a series of print and radio ads, billboards, and a special Web site, www.unfriendlymanitoba.ca, to encourage people to speak up and share their views on the bill. The response has been overwhelming and the support wholehearted. As we've seen, over 450 people registered to speak to this committee. We've already heard well over 200 presentations, setting a new record in Manitoba. I think that speaks volumes about the concern that is out there. The vast majority of people are speaking against this bill and imploring the government to withdraw it or make very necessary changes.

Over the past week, I have sat here for hours on end listening to people speak from the heart and plead with this committee to rethink Bill 17. These are hardworking, committed, good people, people of all ages, races, religions, backgrounds, and education. Yet there is one common thread. They are all concerned, very concerned, about Bill 17.

Night after night, we've had hundreds of people waiting for their turn to speak. Despite the fact that people are often waiting six or eight hours to speak at ungodly times, they wait. They wait to speak up and be heard. While I am appalled at the fact that people are even being asked to sit and wait for hours and be expected to make a presentation at these hours, their passion and conviction have been quite moving. People who would normally never speak up publicly have spoken before this committee and said

their piece, and I want to commend each and every one of them.

I also want to thank all of you for taking the time to listen to everyone, and I hope you are listening. I know many of you are listening, but are you really hearing what they are saying? Are you taking these stories to heart and really listening, and, will it make a difference? Countless presenters have asked me over the week if I think this will have any impact. My answer has been, I hope so. You've heard from hundreds of people already. I really hope you will do something about this bill before it's too late.

I am proud to work in this industry and work on behalf of such passionate, hardworking people like hog farmers. Let's celebrate the successes in this province and celebrate the people who help put food on our table, not punish them. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Bryksa.

Mr. Gerrard: You can help me out on a couple of issues. One is the number of people involved in the industry. Rough calculation, I think there's a little bit more than a hundred Hutterite colonies, and each one would have about a hundred people, so that's about 10,000 people there. So where do we get the 15,000 number from? That's the first question.

The second would be, there have been some presenters who've talked about the tax money that goes to support the hog industry. Can you give us an idea of, you know, the taxes paid by the industry, and what subsidies the industries get from provincial and federal governments?

Ms. Bryksa: First of all, the jobs. There are about 1,200 hog farmers in Manitoba, and 15,000 jobs is the number we've arrived at that have been created by the hog industry. It's not just hog farmers. It's the truckers, the veterinarians, the feed manufacturers, the construction companies that build these hog barns. It's a huge widespread impact. So it's about 15,000 jobs.

In terms of taxes and tax monies, the industry is certainly suffering right now. We're going through what people have called the perfect storm, very low hog prices as we all know and very high feed costs. People are still paying their taxes. There's a huge land base out there that the Province and all the municipalities are reaping from taxes. Farmers are buying things. They have to buy equipment, they have to buy feed, they have to live like everyone else.

In terms of support, I would say that if we look down south to our neighbours and the support that American farmers get, it's a far cry from what we get here in Canada. We are going through a crisis and the government support has been made available to a degree, but it's still not enough to sustain many, many people out there.

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

I noted a number of places you've worked, and I've had an opportunity to be involved with some of them myself: the Canadian Wheat Board, fewer farmers are using it by choice; Agricore and Agricore United, they're both gone now. I'm hoping the same doesn't happen to Manitoba Pork with this presentation of this bill.

So I just wanted to say thank you for your presentation, and it's easy to see why you're a communications person. Thank you.

Mr. Pedersen: Ms. Bryksa, you're in public relations. We've heard almost hundreds of farmers coming in here and telling us how they drink their own well water. Yet in this building, I would doubt that there's one person that does not drink bottled water. Doesn't that strike you as somewhat ironic?

Ms. Bryksa: Yes, it's very ironic. Farmers care about the land. They care about the water and they live here, eat, breathe and drink the water. Just like you and I care about our families and the water, they do, too. And you're right, city people drink bottled water, by far. So it's very interesting.

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

Jeff Mah, Envirotech Ag Systems Ltd. Jeff Mah will be dropped from the list.

Harry J. Toner. Harry J. Toner falls from the list.

Milan Hajzler. Milan Hajzler will be dropped from the list.

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

Mr. Xavier Temple (Private Citizen): I do.

Mr. Chairperson: You do. You may proceed.

Mr. Temple: Thank you very much.

Good evening, everybody. I thank you for having us here tonight and I will try to make this brief. I've been here for the last three days and I've

changed my notes about a hundred times. So bear with me, please, I'll try to get through them. Not to show where I'm at, right now, but I'll try.

My name is Xavier Temple. I've been involved in the industry for the last 14 years. I play a role as director of sales and marketing for a company called Designed Genetics. Today, I am here to support the hog producers and give you my one vote to encourage you in taking a different approach and/or a positive effort to make this work and to work together. I'd like to address at this point that I know we have different opinions all the time and we have all levels of government. I think this is an interesting case where I'm hoping that in some of our efforts to bring this together, this will, in fact, is what will take place here instead of political digs.

This is about the people. This is about farming. This is about people's lives, and it's more than just looking at each other around the table and insulting each other. It's very important that we take this very, very serious and therefore, one more time, I'm definitely opposing this bill. I like to call my presentation based on facts that have been found in other provinces and so I like to call my presentation an alternate approach, little bit different, a bit of a twist.

* (22:40)

The government of Saskatchewan and the Spirit Creek Watershed Monitoring Committee undertook a project that took five years, it was a five-year project, and this project, unfortunately, is gone in time, but it was finished in 2005, and I'm sure, maybe, some of you people have heard about that project that took place in Saskatchewan.

You have to understand my position here today in trying to encourage. I mean, I'm sure you've heard it all today. Until now it's been a long process, but you have to understand that my presentation here again is only a comparison in order to try to make one more effort to have another way of presenting ourselves and understanding what is really taking place, and therefore it's the same but different. Why I say that, because I'm now trying to compare Saskatchewan to Manitoba and, therefore, what I'm presenting here today is—it's granted, it's different soil, waters and intensity. However, it's the same issue.

Example of different approach, collaborative and unilateral. I have a couple of quotes here that, here again: Working together—the work done by the Spirit

Creek Watershed Monitoring Committee provides quantifiable proof of the effectiveness of our livestock development environmental regulations and the stewardship of our livestock producers, that's quote No. 1. Quote No. 2: Our livestock producers are good stewards of the environment and this report confirms this fact.

I'm not sure if you know who made these quotations or not. You might be, as I said, aware of who quoted this working together. It was the NDP Agriculture and Food Minister for the Province of Saskatchewan. Back then it was Mark Wartman. That was when he was quoted for that.

Working together: The Spirit Creek Watershed Monitoring Committee presented the Province of Saskatchewan with the findings of a five-year report on the environmental impact of intensive livestock operations in the Good Spirit Lake and Spirit Creek watershed areas.

Working together on odour: The study included odour monitoring by local residents and two specialists trained to detect and rate the intensity of odours. During the two years of monitoring, local residents—local people actually took part in this, which is very rarely, I would think, based on the reputation that the pig farmer seems to get. During the two years of monitoring, local residents reported odour-free conditions represented 98 percent of the time was odour free.

Working together on soil: The committee sampled area soils to establish benchmark nutrient values prior to manure application. Soil tested indicated a general improvement in soil fertility and no evidence of increased risks for the environment. So, therefore, we strongly believe that organic manure has value.

Working together on water: Water sites, including wells, dugout sites, reservoirs and run-off sites, were tested before and after liquid hog manure was injected into the land. Tests show no apparent additional stress on the quality of the water within the Spirit Creek watershed.

Working together: The committee included, of course, the hog industry people, cottage owners, cattle and grain farmers, two mayors and a reeve, interesting enough, all appointed by the ministers Serby and Wartman. Funded, supported and the resources provided by the Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food, Saskatchewan Environment and Saskatchewan Watershed Authority.

Working together: No. 1, again, we understand that there are differences in the details. What is important in this multiple level of government, the industry and the community all work together toward a common goal. No. 3, they didn't simply close the door. No. 4, we should learn from this example. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Temple.

Questions?

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you, Mr. Temple.

In the study, you talk about the monitoring of the quality of the water in the Spirit Creek Watershed and the concern that people are particularly worried about is the level of phosphorus run-off into the water. Can you tell us whether the phosphorus levels were monitored in the water and whether there were any changes in the phosphorus levels?

Mr. Temple: Yes, sir, I believe that they were tested and I have a report here that anybody—if I could give you a Web site where you could possibly retrieve some of this for your own use.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thanks very much for your presentation.

It just seems to make common sense, I think, to look at partnering and working together to try to find solutions if there are problems. I would hope that members of government are listening and listening carefully to that. It seems that rather than having one side pitted against the other, if we could all come together and try to find the solutions, it would serve Manitoba and our economy well, so thank you.

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

Mr. Temple: Thank you very much.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: Substitutions: Mr. Saran in for Mr. Maloway.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Also, we've received written submissions on Bill 17 from the following individuals, and they will be distributed to the committee members: Michael Andres, Jake and Lorraine Wiebe, Lydia Falk, Ben Ginter, Estelle Thomson, Randy Rutherford, and Irvin Funk. Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the *Hansard* transcript of this meeting? [*Agreed*]

I call Ian Halket. Ian Halket. Mr. Halket's name will be dropped from the list.

Ryan Buchanan. Ryan Buchanan will be dropped from the list.

Jessie Lazo. Jessie Lazo will be dropped from the list.

Jason Dufahl, Norampac. Jason Dufahl will be dropped from the list.

Melodie Malmquist. Melodie Malmquist will be dropped from the list.

Marie Ottenbreit. Marie Ottenbreit will be dropped from the list.

Debbie Klassen. Debbie Klassen will be dropped from the list.

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

Mr. David Grant (Private Citizen): Sorry, no.

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

Mr. Grant: Thank you. Anyway, glad you're all still here. At least somebody'll ask questions.

If I'd known I was going to be here, whatever it's been since 5, I might not have been in this much rush. I missed one earlier and I wanted to make sure I was here, so I was here a few minutes after 5 to make sure. I should have stopped for something to eat on the way, anyway.

First the bio. I'm a professional engineer, chemical engineer. I've been working in this field for 44 years. I carried out the first published research in the area of combined and storm sewers in Windsor, Ontario. I experimented with POD reduction and interceptor design changes. I published this in 1972 and now, tonight, we're talking about failures to keep the domestic sewage out of the rivers so we're still working on that and it's almost 40 years, anyway.

* (22:50)

I worked in dried spent grains for Hiram Walker in '68 in their new facility. I worked in wet spent grains for Strauss Brewery in Michigan in '71. The prior speaker, hours ago when I was rewriting this, made reference to the new spent-grains issue out of Minnedosa.

Third point: We should tax phosphate rock-based fertilizer. Most of the fertilizer we use, they excavate it—I guess Florida's the biggest centre—blast it out of the ground in Florida, grind it up, dissolve it

with acid and precipitate it and send it to us in trains. If we didn't do this, we would have more market for manure-based stuff. If we do not import phosphate into Manitoba, we'll have less of it in our lakes. We should recycle it. The problem is right now rock stuff is so cheap. Chemically produced phosphate fertilizer is so cheap that you consider manure a waste product, but really it is a resource, and it's not so much that we're ever going to run out of phosphate; it's just that we're getting too much in the lakes. I think that's something that's fairly straightforward.

I would like to make the point, I think it's very important to withdraw this bill and to spend 2008 writing an integrated lake bill, because there's stuff we can do. Make the City of Winnipeg fix their interceptor systems; the spent-grains issue and what you do with that to make sure that stuff is used as feed and displaces other kinds of feed. Anyway, so that's page one.

When I heard of this bill, I tried to figure out why it's here. It's obviously intended to reduce nutrient loading on surface waters. I guess I noticed that there are people around who would like to send all farm animals squealing into the woods. I guess that's sort of an exaggeration. Bill 17 will score points with those people. Maybe they'd like to go even farther. I have friends in this community, and when we were dealing with other issues, they were my best buddies because we were sharing the cause and CEC hearings, but I don't support what they do in this case.

It's the first time I've ever had to do a presentation, in the last 20 years, with handwriting. I'm so used to doing it on the computer and having a screen in front of me and laser-printed stuff. Now I'm reading my own scratchings. My handwriting's gotten worse over the decades.

Anyway, as a chemical process engineer, I'm used to rational decision making. If I'd been asked to, quote, save the lake, I would have listed the inputs to the lake. Each input would have had a list of remedial actions possible. Each of these actions has a cost and a benefit. So you'd build a dendritic structure and figure out what you would work on first and what's not attainable. If you look at the dollars per tonne of phosphorus removed from our surface waters, wetland construction is far better than anything proposed in recent years, in my opinion.

When the Clean Environment Commission was studying the floodway proposal a number of years

back, I made a presentation which I feel is very relevant to all of us tonight. In that PowerPoint, which I can send to anybody that's interested, because the CEC—you guys keep *Hansard* and that's lovely. The CEC, you make a presentation, PowerPoint and everything, and all that's recorded for posterity is my name, presenter, lost to posterity. Anyway, that is available. In that PowerPoint, I showed that for a modest price many wetlands can be re-established. Manitoba had wetlands everywhere 200 years ago, and when you only owned five acres of land and you wanted to feed your family, you'd drain the wetland. We can afford to re-establish them.

When they're in place again, they do some good stuff. They put water back in the soil. They replenish the water table. They protect all Manitobans from flooding, not just the ones within the Perimeter, and they remove nutrients from the water passing through the wetland. That's the most important thing for us tonight, is if we spent a tenth of the floodway money on wetland re-creation, we'd be taking out far more nutrient from the surface waters of Manitoba and from the lake than you could ever do by shutting down all of agriculture. So that's important.

Anyway, if Manitoba were to abandon this bill and buy up a lot of former wetland, the lake would thank us. Former wetland is bad farmland. It's the last to drain after a storm. It's stuff your machinery gets stuck in. It's just not good. We can buy that stuff cheaply. For the price of a small weir which is basically a crude dam, timbers and a bit of concrete, we can recreate a wetland environment to be proud of. In that newly recreated wetland, you're going to have ducks and frogs and cranes and owls, and if we had a thousand of those, we could boast about it. That's a PR thing.

Anyway, since the other issue is that the Floodway Authority work will only handle a thing about the size of the '97 flood, once they get more cash and they build more bridges, there will be some upgrading needed over, perhaps, not for 20 or 50 years, but we will need some upgrading. If, instead of waiting that long, we do the wetland thing, then we clean up our lake right away and we protect Manitobans because the floodway, as it now sits, will protect us from most flooding. If we did the wetland thing, then we are protected for a very long time and we have all the other pluses.

So I think there is a very strong engineering case to integrate these issues, fertilizers, spent grains,

nutrient removal, and flood protection and replace Bill 17. I'm not really hating Bill 17. I just think there's so much more that we could achieve if we looked at a bunch of these issues. If the CEC people had actually listened to me when I said, build wetlands instead of bulldozer work, we would have a much cleaner lake. Well, we'd be on our way to it because we'd only have half of them built by now, but I still think, I'm not just whining about being ignored, but I think it really has impact here and there's potential for bills that you're going to come up with. The next few bills could address these issues. If they work at it in an integrated fashion, I think there's a lot of merit in that.

So, thank you. I'm open to questions and maybe deal with you people, even, later.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Grant.

Questions? No questions.

Mr. Eichler: I certainly what to thank you for coming out.

I really don't have a questions, but you definitely touched on a number of issues that have been very important to you and to a number of the presenters, so I just want to thank you for staying and being patient with the committee to get your presentation heard. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I see no further questions. Thank you for your presentation, sir.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: Substitution: Mr. Bjornson in for Mr. Ashton.

Mr. Chairperson: I call Kelli-Ann Fostey. Kelli-Ann Fostey will be dropped from the list.

Brent Hanson. Brent Hanson will be dropped from the list.

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

Mr. Brian White (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

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

Mr. White: My name is Brian White. I hail from Winnipeg. I come before you today not to speak pro or con about the hog industry but rather pro-equality for all the people of Manitoba. In that regard, I must thank the government of today for their part in

bringing forth some of the problems facing our lakes and streams. I applaud your use of science to further understand the problems we face in that regard, but honourable members, you can't be selective by only using some of the available scientific data and only that which suits your agenda, ignoring other available scientific data because it proves your policy and position wrong.

There is no available scientific data that proves you are justified in destroying the local industry, this home-grown industry, the hog industry. On the contrary, science proves, here in Manitoba, we have a well-managed sustainable industry. This industry has been regulated for many years with minimal environmental impact. To imply anything else is simply fearmongering.

With one report that explains we have a problem, you make a giant leap to blame the hog industry and regulate it out of existence. Please, do I understand you that you want to regulate \$500-million worth of exports out of this province? As a resident of Winnipeg, I want to export product, not industry.

* (23:00)

Other available scientific data specific to the hog industry shows with certainty very minimal impact on the lake.

As the elected government of this province, you have a responsibility to all the citizens of this province, not just those that live in Winnipeg. For this government to deny the positive scientific data available shows contempt, on your part, to industry and, more importantly, to a small rural minority.

Any system of government that does not respect its minorities is destined to fail. This type of legislation is simply brought about by a slim majority, forcing massive change on the rural minority. By your actions, you are usurping the right of regulation from rural municipal governments, the local governments that best understand the local problems associated with drainage, run-off, livestock smell pollution. This is nothing short of punitive action, directed at rural industry.

As a business person within the city of Winnipeg, I must ask you what industry is next on your hit list?

I believe all business is the same: years of hard work, building, huge investment, huge risk. What security do any of us have within this jurisdiction to

invest, to expand, when we see how arbitrarily you assassinate one of our own? It seems the only way to be secure in any business is to move to another province. Is that what you really want?

We must ask ourselves, do we want this type of government, with very slim majority, which can impose its will so unjustly on a minority?

With this type of legislation, you will force producers to relocate to other less-regulated jurisdictions within this watershed, causing more pollution from those less-regulated jurisdictions. The reality is we are dealing with a watershed that stretches west to the Rocky Mountains, east within 20 miles of Lake Superior, south to very near the headwaters of the Mississippi River, then west to the Dakotas and parts of Montana.

Your attention should be directed to those governments, working with those governments to solve this very complex issue but, instead, you choose the easy path—attack a minority; make it look like we're doing something. After all, that industry has had a very hard time of late, locked in a classic price squeeze. They won't be able to afford much of a defence.

This type of political gamesmanship really angers me. Shame on you. You use your government of slim popular majority as tyranny of slim majority, quality for some and tyranny for others. We only need look back to Germany's experiment with national socialism. You can easily see the path of tyranny this type of legislative majority can vest on its minorities.

With a stroke of a pen, you plan to destroy a farm lifestyle that goes back well over 100 years. I caution you; your action will destroy the faith in your government, our government, and no longer be a fair and just society. It's heartfelt.

I thank you for your time, and I caution you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. White.

Questions from the committee?

Seeing none, I thank you for your presentation.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you very much, Mr. White. We could tell it was a heartfelt presentation and you feel very strongly, I think, with some just cause. So I want to say thank you—just a comment, not a question—but thanks for staying here.

Mr. White: Part of it is I have four children; I'd like to see them working. We need jobs here. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. White.

James Linaker, Ridley Incorporated. James Linaker will be dropped from the list.

Mike Radcliffe, Starlite Colony. Mr. Radcliffe, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Mike Radcliffe (Starlite Colony): I certainly do. I just wanted to have a glass water, water supplied by the building, rather than bottled water.

Mr. Chairperson: Feel free. You may proceed when you're prepared.

Mr. Radcliffe: I would, perhaps, more properly be described as a private citizen. I'm a lawyer in Winnipeg and I've had the opportunity to serve the Hutterite communities for the last 35 years. As such, I bring a little perspective to the committee tonight from what I've seen and learned from the communities.

First of all, I think that this government has brought this bill not because they were fearful of animals being penned up or that they were inhumanely treated, but rather because there is a pollution problem on Lake Winnipeg. I think we all agree that we must address that problem sooner than later.

My first point is that there was a Clean Environment Commission that did an extensive review of the industry over the last year, and there was not one iota of a recommendation in that report to say shut down—or, not to shut down, but to freeze the hog industry growth in the valley. There is no science that I have heard yet tonight to say that the nitrogen or the phosphates that are being introduced into the environment from hog waste is actually finding its way into the water courses and into the lake. In fact, my particular knowledge of having travelled many, many colonies in this province—and, in fact, I was on a colony two days ago—is that the colonies employ and do not hesitate to employ the best of engineering, the best of technical advice for their manure storage and for their disposal system. We heard tonight heartfelt, eloquent discussion from many, many members of the communities on how they go about disposing of their hog waste.

One of the particular significant issues for the hog industry and for the Hutterite colonies is that our Hutterite communities, 115-odd of them in the province, are family-based farms, congregational societies, and they are agriculturally based. Because of our supply side economics there is a limitation as

to how many colonies can become involved with egg production, with milk production, with layer production, and the hog industry has been traditionally and historically over the last 50 years a way that they have been able to expand and grow and maintain their communities that has been a cash supply for them.

One thing I noted tonight, which I would urge the honourable minister to take note, is that with all the passion, with all the fear, with all the threats that were being felt and voiced tonight, there was not a hog producer from the Hutterite communities who was saying, I don't want to co-operate with Conservation, with regulation. To a person, they said, we are prepared, we have been prepared, we have a track record of working with Conservation; we have a track record of co-operating and spending and putting our money where our mouth is. I think that government must take that into account. I think that's very important. I would echo the sentiments that Mrs. Mitchelson has been voicing all evening as I have been sitting here listening to the presentations, and asking each presenter, do you think this bill should be withdrawn and should there not be a dialogue with the participants, should there not be a pursuit of science to determine where the pollution is coming from and how can it be remedied. I would suggest, with the greatest of respect, that that would be a far more sensible, humane, democratic process than using the blunt instrument of the ban which this bill represents.

It is a very complex issue, and there's no doubt about it, but the ban itself, I would suggest, is a crude and blunt instrument which is a piece-off to, I would suggest, a particular—and I will tread on toes on this, but I want to speak bluntly. I think that this government has probably been captured emotionally or intellectually by a small vocal group of urban environmentalists, who have said a quick fix is to point and blame the hog farmer.

*(23:10)

Now, I seldom quote the honourable Member for River Heights, but I must on this occasion do this. Dr. Gerrard noted, and has been published to this effect of saying, well, if you're going to impose a ban then this has got to be an admission that your regulations, your regulatory scheme that you put in place over the last number of years, is ineffective. I don't think anybody on the government side would say that. I would suggest that they would say it has been very effective. I think that Dr. Gerrard's

argument is a very cogent argument of saying, therefore, you can only conclude that the ban itself is ill-founded.

I cite in my material, Dr. Trevan, the dean of the U of M Agriculture—and this figure has been quoted tonight that only 1.5 percent of the phosphate problem in the lake comes from the hog industry. His conclusion was that if the hog industry were shut down there would be a minimal impact, curative impact on the problem in the lake.

We have heard from any number of people, the ripple effect through the community of restricting this vibrant business in Manitoba. This is a leading producer of capital. This not only impacts on contractors, the hog farmers, it impacts on lawyers. I've worked for the communities for, as I say, 20-odd-years and I have an overview of how these communities would suffer if this source of capital would disappear. You are victimizing, I would suggest with the greatest of respect, you're victimizing a very responsible, a very caring and a very sensitive group in the community.

The Hutterite communities, and one of my last arguments, you must note, that their women and children live on those communities and they want their environment just as clean and just as pure as any of the rest of us, if not more so, and they have a first-hand confrontation or opportunity to see what's going on on their farms. You can see from the presentations tonight from these individuals how sophisticated this industry has become. This is not a mom and pop, with a couple of hogs wallowing around in the local stream.

Now another point that I would bring to this committee's attention and present for consideration is this seems to be pointing only to the hog industry. So, yes, we know there is a concentration of hogs, but there is a whole plethora of other livestock in the province that all produce animal waste.

I don't know how many of you have walked a chicken barn. I can tell you personally, being the lawyer going out on tour and you're invited to go through all the facilities, hogs are a piece of cake. Cows are a little rough. The killer is walking through the chicken barns. I got to tell you that gets you right there, right in your sinuses, but we're not speaking about those. Minister Wowchuk is nodding her head in approval of saying how accurate this can be and that this is, in fact, another source of concern. Yet, farmers today are looking on animal waste as a

resource. They're using this in lieu of fertilizer because of the cost of rising fertilizer.

Mr. Chairperson: You have one minute, sir.

Mr. Radcliffe: I would suggest, with the greatest of respect, that here is a classic opportunity for government to reach out, put this bill on hold and say let's solve this problem together, and this would be a win-win. Opposition parties, with the greatest of respect, don't win government. Governments lose by crossing the sympathies and the support of their people, and they lose by alienating groups one by one by one. So I would suggest that this is a great opportunity for this government for a win. Thank you.

Mr. Derkach: Thank you, Mr. Radcliffe, for your very compelling and interesting presentation and very informative, as I've always known you to be. Colourful at times, too.

Mr. Radcliffe, you were present, you were a member of the Legislature and I think a minister during the Meech Lake debate. Is that right or was that before your time? *[interjection]* That was a little before your time. Well, I have to tell you that this issue has brought out more presenters to present on Bill 17 than Meech Lake did. At Meech Lake, we were at 300 presenters; this bill has brought out 315 to this point. I think that speaks to the concern that people have about this bill, and your presentation certainly adds to that.

I know that in your presentation you hinted at it, and I was wondering whether you could perhaps give the government an option as to how they could deal with this issue rather than the blunt instrument that you spoke about.

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Minister, I would suggest, in response to the honourable member's question, is that this bill be set aside for the time being, that the conservation skills that we have at hand in your department be consulted, that they work with the communities, with all the hog producers in the province and some of the academicians that we have already heard tonight. There is a great body of knowledge which I think can lead to the solution to our problem, the problem being the pollution of our lake, and we all want to go there. We all want our lakes purified and cleansed, but I think that we have, at our fingertips, the opportunity to work together, to come to a conclusion that everybody can live with instead of alienating one group of the community

and potentially threatening to put them out of business.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Conservation): Thank you very much, Mike. It's good to welcome back a fellow classmate of the class of 1995. I just want to say that, yes, colourful and all the rest of it, it's good to see that some things don't change.

I just want to thank you for your presentation, and your verbal presentation was somewhat different than the one that you handed me, so I want to assure that it's noted that it's on the record. Thanks, Mike.

Mrs. Driedger: Thank you, Mr. Radcliffe, for being here.

I was mentioning earlier to another presenter about some comments that the Premier (Mr. Doer) had made today as he was making a speech in the House apologizing to Aboriginal people for what happened to Aboriginal kids who were taken into residential schools. He said at the time, I pledge to never deny people a culture and way of life.

Now, it's sort of ironic, I'm thinking, after hearing him speak in the House, and then I come here this evening, and I've been in this committee for almost 20 hours in total over the several days, and I've heard a number of Hutterite people speak about what this is going to do to their culture and to their way of life, to their livelihood. It seems to me that in fact he's saying this on one hand, and, on the other hand, there is an actual attack on a culture and a way of life.

Do you support those comments? Do you agree that it seems ironic that he's saying one thing with one group and now is allowing this attack on another group?

Mr. Radcliffe: In response to the honourable member's comments, I would suggest that very possibly the government has not thought through and seen the impact that this bill would have. I do not believe that this government is deliberately going out to destroy, or alienate, or drive the Hutterian brethren out of Manitoba at all. They are a very valuable part of our community and part of the ethnic mosaic which make up the richness of our lives.

I think that in fact this was an oversight on the part of the government. I think that this is an opportunity for the honourable minister to say that we can set this bill aside, and we can work with all the different groups who are involved in the

livestock industry in Manitoba to come up with the appropriate solution.

In response to the honourable minister, it's delightful to be back amongst old friends and familiar faces. I thank you very, very much for the opportunity to be here and present to you.

* (23:20)

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

Mr. Matt Einarson. Matt Einarson. You guys are hard to control. Mr. Einarson will be dropped from the list.

Gordon Gillies. Gordon Gillies will be dropped from the list.

Kim Lee Wong. No. 146, Kim Lee Wong will be dropped from the list.

Shelly Hays. Shelly Hays will be dropped from the list.

Calvin Patrick. Calvin Patrick will be dropped from the list.

Al Mackling. Al Mackling will be dropped from the list.

Dan Ki-eegee.

Floor Comment: Kay-gee.

Mr. Chairperson: Kay-gee. My apologies to Mr. Kaegi, who's not here, and will be dropped from the list.

Mr. Peter Mah is here. Mr. Mah, do you have any written materials for the committee?

Mr. Peter Mah (Private Citizen): I do, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk's assistant will distribute them. You may proceed.

Mr. Mah: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson and committee members, for this opportunity to speak on Bill 17 to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Food.

For the record, my name is Peter Mah. I'm here because I'm a concerned citizen of this great province. In actuality, I'm supposed to be retired. I retired from public service after many years in the Manitoba government and also retired from the Manitoba Pork Council, so I've seen policy development from, basically, all sides within government and also within industry.

I'm compelled to speak today for no other reason than to provide thoughtful and reasoned comment on Bill 17. When I first read the bill, I was actually very astonished that the government would come up with such a bill.

My hope is that government will rescind Bill 17 altogether and rely on the multitude of other legislation, regulations, program initiatives and tools at its disposal, which will collectively assure a fair and balanced approach to farming, livestock development and environmental and water stewardship.

First of all, what I would like to do is just outline very briefly—and I just alluded to that—my qualifications and experience. My hope is that you will understand where I'm coming from, in terms of my remarks.

Ms. Erna Braun, Vice-Chairperson, in the Chair

I have a Bachelor of Environmental Studies (Honours) degree in urban regional planning and I'm a full and practising member of the Canadian Institute of Planners in the Manitoba Professional Planners Institute. My career in the public service and private industry span some 35 years in the areas of community and land use planning, rural economic development and livestock stewardship.

Twenty of those years have been with the Manitoba government, from 1981 to 2001, where I was called upon on many occasions to provide senior policy advice to ministers on legislation. Many of you are around the table today—former minister Len Derkach, Minister Wowchuk, Minister Struthers, former minister Jean Friesen, former minister Jack Penner, all in the areas of community economic development, land use planning and livestock stewardship.

As the director of the Rural Economic Development Initiative, REDI for short, and as Manitoba's director of Community Planning Services, I was accountable for the design, delivery and evaluation of key programs dealing with land use planning and planning for livestock.

I was also the key departmental advisor for Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs to the 1999 Livestock Stewardship Panel review. As I mentioned before, I was also the former director of sustainable development for Manitoba Pork Council and, during my six years in that tenure, took great pride in developing many collaborative relationships and livestock partnership initiatives amongst senior

governments, industry, and the academic research community. But then, that was then and now is now.

Today, I'm sorry to see that much of what has been achieved in terms of collegial and collaborative relations has been strained and jeopardized by Bill 17. I, personally, strongly object to Bill 17 for the following reasons, and there are four of them.

Firstly, it is grossly unfair and discriminatory and we've already heard time and time again how that would be. Bill 17 perpetuates the myth that hog producers are principally, principally to blame for the water-quality problems of Lake Winnipeg. Why else is the hog producer and the industry being singled out for punitive moratorium on development? No other sector.

Bill 17 ignores the great strides that the pork industry has made over the last 10 years to be environmentally sustainable such as producer-funded environmental research, technology transfer, and the adaptation in investment by pork producers themselves to new best practices.

So I ask myself: Why just hog farmers? No other persons other than a pork producer are targeted for a moratorium on future development or expansion. Bill 17 outright removes the right of a pork producer to even apply and to be able to prove that a proposed operation would meet all of the environmental and land use requirements for approval removes that right outright.

Now, I'm going to give you two analogies, if I may, that would hopefully amplify why this is unfair and discriminatory. The first is in relation to a government that might purport to try and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and what it proposes to do is ban only pork producers from getting Manitoba licences to own and operate trucks and SUVs in most of rural Manitoba and irrespective of whether that vehicle, the SUV and the truck, was completely roadworthy and the operator had a safe, clean driving record. Ludicrous, of course.

The second analogy really reflects upon what's in the proposed Bill 17 and it's contained in section 40.1(2) with reference to the use of higher technology and anaerobic digestion and allowing only those cases to be allowed to get an environmental permit. An analogy is this, is that the Province proposes a law that would prohibit only Manitobans, in this case, myself, a visible minority from obtaining a Manitoba class 5 driver's licence except and unless I did one of two things: one is I

could drive a small compact car or a hybrid vehicle, again using new technology. Of course, that is ludicrous. It would be seen to be ridiculous and blatantly discriminatory and I would suggest to you that Bill 17, with all due respect, purports to ban hog barns in much the same manner in 50 municipalities including 28 R.M.s covering over 6.7 million acres in total of agricultural land. It is offensive and it is grossly unfair.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

My second point is it goes way beyond the Clean Environment hog industry review recommendations, and we've already said that there is no basis in science here. In short, the government is moving way beyond those well-reasoned, well-researched recommendations submitted by the Clean Environment Commission.

My third point: it minimizes and mocks all the environmental livestock initiatives and regulations of both government and industry over the years. This is a point that Mr. Radcliffe had made and I just want to amplify the point. This includes all the provincial government and industry's past livestock stewardship legislative processes, regulations, and programs, voluntary programs. These measures, and I've got a list here, it says these measures include the 1999 Livestock Review Panel, the livestock manure research and development initiatives through the University of Manitoba, the Prairie Swine Centre, and most recently, the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment.

The hog producers themselves were the very first commodity group, agricultural commodity group, that committed a multi-year, million-dollar commitment to that National Centre for Livestock and the Environment. Now that's commitment.

* (23:30)

The Manitoba Livestock Manure Management Initiative is funded by pork producers principally over the years. The Conservation Districts programs which, again, we could look at as models, but again, many pork producers, farmers, have been instrumental in those programs. The Livestock Stewardship programs themselves which have been in government for many, many years, both through a number of administrations, and pork producers have been engaged in environmental farm plans and have been required diligently to register annual manure management plans with the Province.

There's been the Tri-provincial Manure Management conferences. There's been the Water Stewardship seminars and conferences. There's been the many Planning Act livestock amendments and the development of that whole new approach of the new livestock operations policies and zoning. My goodness, we've just gotten into that, and most of the municipalities are working through that, and we have really yet to test that in terms of the approval system.

There is The Water Stewardship Act and the water management planning, and all of the planning that's gone into that. The Environment Act, including the major amendments to perhaps the most significant piece of legislation for livestock, and that's the livestock manure and mortalities management regulation No. 42/98, as amended four times between the years 2004 to 2006. Each time the regulations had been notched up, getting more restrictive, more complex, and yet the farming industry in general and the pork producers in particular have lived through that and they've adapted.

There's been the increased environmental monitoring and enforcement resources that have been put in place over the years; the extensive agricultural industry and public consultation on proposed major legislation, all of those acts and legislation that people have come out and spoken about. And, then, of course, most recently, the 2007 Clean Environment Commission's sustainability review on the hog industry, its complete report, analysis and recommendations, very, very thorough.

Over the past 10 years, stakeholders and the public on both sides of the livestock issue were extensively consulted and were repeatedly assured by government after each incremental step of new provincial legislation that, in fact, the environment was protected. The environment was protected. We were assured of that. Now we are told by government that a permanent moratorium—

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

Mr. Mah: —is required, despite all strengthened measures.

Number four, this is bad public policy. Bill 17 is not well thought out in terms of scientific basis or its consideration of its devastating social and economic consequences. Again, the ban will achieve no measurable difference to Lake Winnipeg. Instead, I would suggest it panders to the wishes of a relatively small group of environmental activists and the very

ones who are always in the news and at local hearings and that this is at the expense of the farmer, related hog sectors and the rural economy. It also takes advantage of largely ambivalent Winnipeg constituencies that either do not care or, at best, do not fully appreciate today's challenges of food production and the environmental stewardship efforts of farmers on the land.

So what are the alternatives to Bill 17? I would suggest here, very quickly, there are five points, the first of which is to rescind Bill 17. I would suggest to you that it takes a proud man, a proud person and a good government to recognize the weaknesses in proposed legislation, to understand the serious consequences and to look for alternatives.

In its place I would recommend that you do four things, five things: Spend less time, money and effort fighting each other, and that's all of us. That's the Cabinet, provincial policy advisors, farmers, the hog industry and related businesses. We all have to work together on this thing. Let's not be so divisive. Let's work together and collaborate on the things that we can work on.

Two, provide incentives to producers to accelerate the adoption of new best management practices, the BMPs, and that is, in fact, one of the recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission. Has that come across in any great extent?

Thirdly, implement the implementations of the CEC report.

Fourthly, and this is a key point, rely on the relatively new and yet comprehensive provincial and local land-use livestock operations policies, the zoning, the land-use development permit and environmental approvals processes for livestock applications. There is just a multitude of these and we need to understand how well they work, particularly since many of them are new. We have yet to test that out. The new livestock review and approval process should be given a chance to work without a moratorium on new or expanding hog barns.

And the last recommendation, of course, goes along with any new legislation, and it has been a long-standing practice to be able to review legislation five years down the road, assess how effective it has been, make the changes if they're necessary, but, for goodness sake, in the very first instance of lawmaking, make sure it is good public

policy. This is not good public policy and I would ask that the government look at rescinding this and making the changes.

In closing, thank you for your valuable time and the opportunity to present my views and recommendations to this committee. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Mah.

Mr. Eichler: Thank you, Peter, for your presentation. It's good to see you again and welcome back in the building.

I do have a short question for you, though. I know you worked extremely hard in rural development. In fact, the minister that you worked for is at the table here. I do want to ask you how you see Bill 17 impacting rural Manitoba. We have heard from a number of towns and villages and municipalities. They talk about the lumber yards, the golf courses and that. That has been a significant reason why they're able to achieve those milestones within rural development. If you have any questions on that.

Mr. Mah: Thank you. I will answer that question by saying, from my background, everything is interrelated, and this industry is a pork industry and this bill in particular, while it targets hog producers, the consequences are far reaching. It will far reach into the rural communities. It will impact the communities' growth and all of the related agricultural sector industries and all of the service industries.

I mean, if you remove that element, that one key element that has been a stimulus in rural Manitoba for many, many years and still continues to be, although it's in a downturn right now, it will spring back. It will rebound most likely at the end of this year after COOL comes in and the rules are known. That will continue to be an economic engine, but you remove that now, you provide the ability to stagnate this industry and there will be serious consequences.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Derkach, briefly.

Mr. Derkach: Very quickly, thank you very much for that thoughtful presentation, Peter.

I know that, having worked in the REDI program and rural development you always pointed to the strengths of various areas of this province in that we should in fact be building on the strengths that we have as natural strengths, of human strengths and our economic strengths.

Can you say something about why the hog industry has developed where it has in Manitoba and what the strengths of those regions are?

Mr. Mah: Yes, absolutely. Actually, Manitoba has been well positioned for many years to become a leader in the hog industry in a sustainable way. We have a very significant land base and still lots of land that's still available. We have the rules and regulations in place, by the way, and we used to have a feed advantage here far better than we do today, but it has grown over a period of time, and we have a work force that traditionally has worked very, very hard in furthering themselves as a family, as an industry and as a province.

We have all of those aspects here in Manitoba, and regrettably, if we have this Bill 17 go through, we remove a lot of the stimulus and we remove the outright ability for people to move ahead in an industry to be able to forge ahead and innovate.

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

Mr. Mah: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: William Vis, Envirotech Ag Systems. William Vis will be struck from the list.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you all for your presentations. That concludes our list of registered presenters. We will now proceed to clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

* (23:40)

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Chair, I move

THAT this committee recommend to the House that a working group consisting of livestock producers, industry stakeholders, researchers, and other Manitobans, as advisable, be established to examine the Manitoba pork industry and suitable regulations, and that Bill 17 be withdrawn.

Motion presented.

Mr. Chairperson: The motion is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Derkach: I think Mr. Eichler had his hand up.

Mr. Eichler: We've obviously found out through almost 500 registered presenters—just under 500 registered presenters have made it very clear that we don't have a guarantee on good ideas. We've heard from very many Manitobans their commitment to clean water, their commitment to ensuring that the CEC report be followed, that the number of

recommendations, some 48, would be more than acceptable to work with. I think it's very prudent that we as legislators listen to these people.

We've had 64 hours here in this committee, which has broken every record, and I know the minister has never had a presenter on any of his other bills, at least I don't think he has, is what he told me earlier, but certainly outdid his turn this time. We've had 315 oral and written presentations, which MTS had 195 and Meech Lake had 300. We heard from organizations like Manitoba pork producers, Manitoba cattle producers, KAP, the chicken board, dairy producers, the egg producers.

Farmers have asked and agreed that there's lots of work that has been done and there's a lot more work that will be done. We're certainly prepared to roll up our sleeves and see that that be done. We heard from scientists like Don Flaten, Dr. Karin Wittenberg. We know that the science is out there. We're asking that the government listen to that science, base it on good science, and move forward in a way that's going to be sustainable for the industry, that's going to be long lasting.

We also heard from the Mennonite and Hutterian way of life, their culture, and how that will be affected. Certainly, we heard that the nutrient management regulations have far-reaching effects. They've not had a chance to work and certainly ask the government that they sit down and work with those producers, with those stakeholders. In fact, see that they will put an end to Bill 17 and, in fact, withdraw it so that they can work together with government.

If we put the moratorium on the car industry, we'd have no innovation. Our world would soon collapse. I know that if we look at just the fact of the fuel shortage that's out there now, we'll have less-energy cars. We'll have ways of pollutions that we certainly would see that would skyrocket throughout the country. So certainly, in comparison, it would be just a slow death through attrition with the hog industry. So I'd ask the members opposite to support this motion. Let's do the right thing for all Manitobans and withdraw Bill 17. Let's roll up our sleeves, work with industry leaders, stakeholders, researchers, and let's clean up Manitoba waterways together in unity.

Thank you for that, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Eichler.

Mr. Derkach: I'd like to put a few brief comments on the record on this bill and on the motion that Mr. Eichler has moved.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think we've had a very patient audience and participatory group in the presentations that have been made to this committee. I think that congratulations have to go out to the hardworking Manitobans who have come before this committee to present their views, their professional opinions, and indeed the expertise that they have gained in the field of hog production and water protection and environmental protection, and have put those comments on the record for this committee to consider and make recommendations to the government with regard to how we should proceed with this bill.

I think the overwhelming message that has been given to us is that this bill is bad policy. This bill will do nothing to help protect Lake Winnipeg or any of our waterways. This bill is only going to hurt the economic viability of many of our entrepreneurs and also the economy of our province. This bill will also hurt the related industries that work with the hog industry people.

Mr. Chair, through you to the minister, I appeal to him to look at what has happened here in the last six days or so to take into account all of those presentations that have been made.

Now, I have watched from this side of the table the body language in this committee, and there appears to be a resentment from some—to some of the presentations that have been made. I have to say that, regardless of whether those presentations were made pro the bill or against the bill, I think those were expressions of and opinions of Manitobans who have the right to come before a committee and express their views in a democratic society. If we are to represent the people that have put us here, the people who voted us to take the leadership roles, whether we're in opposition or in government, and when we present legislation that hurts a part of our economy and our population and, indeed, the future of this province, we must, Mr. Chair and Mr. Minister, take another hard look at what it is we are doing.

Mr. Minister, I know that your intentions are to try to improve and leave a better legacy or a better province than what you found it in, in terms of the portfolio that you have before you, but this is not the way. A government is supposed to help its citizens. A government is supposed to be there to lend a helping hand and to guide because it has the ability

to surround itself with experts. Let's use those experts. Let's use the scientists. Let's use the bureaucracy that works for this province in a very hard way because I can't believe that anybody, any civil servant, any academic person would recommend this kind of legislation to try to clean up a lake or the water streams in this province.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to conclude by simply putting on the table and appeal to you from this side of the House and on behalf of the colleagues that I represent, and indeed, I think on behalf of the people who have presented here, that you very seriously take back to the Cabinet table this bill to be reworked, work with the industry, work with the scientific community, work with the environmentalists, the true environmentalists, who have an earnest desire to make this a better province.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Derkach.

I have Mr. Goertzen.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Chairperson, I want to also thank my colleague from Lakeside for the work that he's done here on committee and also in working with the industry over the last few weeks and few months to make sure that their voices were heard, that they would have an opportunity to come here before the committee and express their concerns about the attack on their culture and on their way of life. He's done great work and I appreciate all the effort that he's put in.

I also want to thank the many presenters, some of whom are still here tonight and some of whom will be on to other parts of their lives this evening, but who've been with us for the last number of days, made presentations and spoke from their hearts. Many of them were uncomfortable coming before a government committee. Many of them probably never thought they would come before a government committee and make a presentation, but because of the serious impact this will have, this bill if it passes in its current form on their life, they felt that if there was ever a time to stand up this would be the time, and so they left their comfort zone, left their families, many of them for several days, and came here and did things that we might think are ordinary because we're legislators here every day, but for them were extraordinary because they came here and expressed themselves in a way that was something they're not comfortable with.

* (23:50)

I do think it's important to recognize that this is, in many ways, a historic decision we're going to be looking at. I can't remember many times in the province of Manitoba or any other Legislature across the country that's debated putting an industry, essentially, out of business.

Make no mistake. In the long run, that's what this legislation would do. It wouldn't be immediate. It wouldn't be tomorrow but, certainly over time, not allowing a business to grow or to develop is essentially putting it out of business.

We have to recognize that we are elected by people. We talk about an industry. It's important to recognize the size of the pork industry—the 15,000 people, the billion dollar industry that it is.

Ultimately—we've seen it more clearly than we ever could over the last few days—it is people whom we are talking about: individuals, families that represent new farmers and historical farmers' families that are three or four generations of farmers, who've come here and talked about their way of life and their hopes for the future. We've had some who are on the tail end of their farming career and some very young people who have come and made impassioned pleas to the government—they want to have a future in farming—asking them to withdraw this bill.

I think that we have a responsibility, as legislators, regardless of which party we represent or which riding we represent, to remember that we are all elected by individuals, by people who carry with them their own hopes and dreams for their family. They elect us here with good will, assuming that we're going to come here with good intentions for them as people and individuals.

We need to remember that, that it's not the cold face of an industry. It's the real face of people who are going to be affected by any decision regarding Bill 17. We also need to remember that it has to evidence-based decision-making. Any decision by government, whether it's environment or any other issue, needs to be based purely on evidence.

This morning, I had the opportunity to be on CJOB radio with a member of the New Democratic Party, the Member for Fort Rouge (Ms. Howard). I was concerned; in many ways I was alarmed. When I asked the Member for Fort Rouge to provide any scientific evidence that the pork industry is significantly contributing to the problems in Lake Winnipeg, her response to me—and it's recorded on

CJOB—was that it's common sense, that it must be harming Lake Winnipeg. She couldn't cite the evidence; she cited a notion of common sense.

Many years ago, it was common sense for the people to believe that the world was flat, because they looked out upon the prairies, wherever they lived, and they didn't see any curvature, so they assumed it must be common sense that the world is flat. They didn't have any scientific evidence until some time later that the world wasn't flat; there was something that they couldn't see.

We need to make sure that all of our decisions are based on evidence, based on science, because we make these decisions not just for those who will be affected today, but those who will be impacted tomorrow and in future generations.

A great American scholar said that it's never the wrong time to do the right thing. I believe that's true here tonight. It isn't the wrong time. I recognize that the government has put a lot of political capital in this particular bill. It would take some amount of humility to withdraw the bill now and to go another course. I recognize that and I'm not insensitive to that fact. The cold reality is that, if you want to have true leadership, you sometimes have to exercise humility.

We had a presenter here, a couple of nights ago, at 3:30 a.m. He was one of the last presenters; he was a youth pastor in the city of Winnipeg, who came to present. He said that great leaders show humility in times of great decision-making.

I think it's important that all of us in the Legislature exercise that same amount of humility, to say, this was a mistake, this bill coming forward. It doesn't mean that other things can't be done. The motion speaks to having a committee put together to have some other ideas come forward, other than a moratorium.

I know that will take some humility. I know that's going to take some difficult decisions from the government but, if we remember that it's never the wrong time to do the right thing, if we remember that science has to trump politics, if we remember that each of us were elected to represent individuals and to remember the faces of individuals who've come to this committee over the last numbers of nights, I believe that humility will be an easy thing to reach for and an easy thing to exercise.

I ask all members of this committee: Let's do the right thing. Let's remember this is an historic time

and let's withdraw Bill 17 and come up with a better solution. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson.

Mrs. Driedger: I just have a small comment to make but, I think, one that we should heed.

I'm very concerned about the message we are going to send out to Manitobans. If this bill passes, after we have heard 99 percent of 350 presenters speak against a bill—and I have to be seriously concerned about the message we send out to Manitobans on all future bills. Like, what does it say to Manitobans about coming here and making presentations to government if government doesn't listen? I'm very concerned that in the future, it becomes a sham. Nobody's going to want to show up. People are going to say, what's the point; government doesn't listen.

So, if the government rams this bill through after listening to all these speakers, I have huge concerns as to what this does in terms of the reputation of public hearings in this province in the future, because I think you've tainted it in a very significant and long-lasting way. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mrs. Driedger.

Mr. Struthers: First of all, I want to say, just to pick up on what the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler) was saying in terms of the numbers of presenters that we've had, he pointed out that the first person that presented here at this hearing was the first person that I've had to deal with, as a minister, in terms of presentations. I've had bills come before the House before, but I haven't had a presenter on any of those other bills; so nothing like getting right into it up to your neck with a very—I was going to say popular, but that wouldn't be the right word—contentious bill with a lot of interest from a lot of presenters.

I want to say that I have felt proud participating in the democratic process, just as I know members of the opposition have and just as I know the presenters have as well. I think it's a great thing that we have this opportunity between second and third reading to do so. I think it helps us all, as legislators, to put together better legislation.

I also want to say to Rick, the pages, *Hansard*, translators, my staff and all of those people who have been putting in long hours, who get up real early the next morning to keep us all going through question period and through the day, just the yeoman's job they've done in terms of keeping us going here.

I also want to say that I was glad that we've had an ongoing discussion about our process itself, because I think we can make it better. I appreciate the co-operation of the critic, Mr. Eichler, and others who have worked to work with us, to accommodate as much as we could the members of the public. When you get 315 or so, it presents certain challenges to all of us and to staff. So I appreciate that co-operation.

My goal was to hear all. I tried my best to make sure I was here for as many as I could, because we are dealing with people who work hard—I know that; our government knows that—whether they raise chickens or beef or hogs or sheep or grain, all the way down the list, business people who came to our committee, who also work hard, who contribute. I was very interested to learn more about the Hutterite colonies and was very impressed with many of the presentations that they made to us.

From 1990 to 2007, we've seen unprecedented growth in the hog industry: In 1990, 3,150 sites; today 1,280. That's a decrease in the number, but the number of hogs has gone from 3.2 million to 8.8 million. We can't ignore that. We can't ignore that kind of growth. And that kind of growth hasn't been seen in other sectors of agriculture.

So we asked the Clean Environment Commission—first we put that pause on the industry and then we asked the Clean Environment Commission to study the hog industry because of that unprecedented growth. They came back to us and said: There are regional imbalances that have developed in this province and, Mr. Minister, you have to deal with that. You can't stick your head in the sand and ignore that. You also need a stronger framework. You're on the right track with the approach that you've been taking, but it needs to be stronger to protect Manitoba's water.

As a result of that, I accepted the entire report. The body of the literature—there were 48 recommendations, I did not ignore any part of this report. I accepted it in its entirety, our government did.

* (00:00)

We put together—just thinking about Mr. Eichler's resolution he's put forward, he's asking for a working group. We have a working group that is composed right now of people from my department of Conservation, Agriculture, Water Stewardship and Intergovernmental Affairs. They've been tasked with

coming back to us as government, saying here's how you can implement the 48 recommendations. That's what I announced when we accepted the CEC report. Obviously, tonight, I can't accept the recommendation that recommends the withdrawal of Bill 17. It's part of our comprehensive approach to dealing with protecting Manitoba's water. One of the things that I've really been impressed with is a number of people who came to us and said, we have to have a comprehensive approach, we have to include everybody. Everybody who contributes to the problem contributes to the solution. Everybody. So we can't accept this motion that's been put forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Struthers.

Seeing no further speakers, is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: The question before the committee is as follows: it has been moved by Mr. Eichler,

THAT this committee recommend to the House that a working group consisting of livestock producers, industry stakeholders, researchers, and other Manitobans, as advisable, be established to examine the Manitoba pork industry and suitable regulations, and that Bill 17 be withdrawn.

Shall the motion pass?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Formal Vote

Mr. Eichler: Recorded vote.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested. All those in favour of the motion, please raise their hands—all those who are officially on the committee, just those, please raise their hands.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6.

Mr. Chairperson: The motion is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: We will now proceed to clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 17 have an opening statement? The minister does not.

Does the critic from the official opposition, Mr. Eichler, have an opening statement?

Mr. Eichler: I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler does not.

During the consideration of a bill, the schedule, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order. Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose. Is this agreed? *[Agreed]*

Shall clauses 1 and 2 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall clause 1 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: No. Okay. All those in favour of clause 1 passing, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 1—pass, on division.

Shall clause 2 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clause 2, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 2 is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall clauses 3 through 5 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall clause 3 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clause 3, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 3—pass, on division.

Shall clause 4 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clause 4, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 4 is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall Clause 5 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clause 5, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 5 is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall Clause 6 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clause 6, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 6 is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall Clause 7 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clause 7, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 7 is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall the enacting clause pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing the enacting clause, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: The enacting clause is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall the schedule pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing the schedule, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: The schedule is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall the title pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour in passing the title, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: The title is accordingly passed, on division.

Shall the bill be reported?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of reporting the bill, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Formal Vote

An Honourable Member: A recorded vote.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 6, Nays 4.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: It is agreed, on recorded vote, that the bill shall be reported.

The hour being 12:07 a.m., committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 12:07 a.m.

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED
BUT NOT READ**

All re: Bill 17

I attended the hearings twice, sitting in for a total of nine hours. Thank you for allowing me to fax this presentation to you.

I am Sandra Klassen, from Morris, Manitoba. We have five children, all living in Manitoba, all voting age.

My husband and I are in the liquid manure application business. Brian used to be in the autobody business, but closed his autobody shop because the industry was becoming so regulated. After 25 years in the business, he was being required to pay for and take courses in autobody work, which weren't any more informative than experience on the job had always been. Not taking the courses resulted in lower pay than accredited shops received.

He dreamed of getting into agriculture, maybe farm an acreage. Instead, he and our two sons, aged 13 and 15, that year bought tractors, built two tanker/cultivator units, did the research into legal requirements for agricultural equipment and the accepted method of applying liquid hog manure. Our sons were home-educated from grade four and six on to graduation. This was a perfect venue to teach them welding, driving tractors, calculating application rates and the communication skills required for relating to farmers and hog barn owners, as well as government representatives in the industry.

Most of the farmers were impressed to see father and sons working together in a business they built together. I am so thankful the three of them had those opportunities. Our sons saw their father deal with a few anti-hog neighbours in some areas. Once a particular anti-hog neighbour to a hog barn discovered Brian was a real person running a family business, who cared about him and his family, he did an about-face and asked for the manure for his fields.

In a few years, Brian and our two sons felt a change to drag hose system would be much more efficient and less damaging to public relations and rural infrastructure. They researched that and built their own reel carts, cultivator and camper for their new outfit. An improvement Brian made to the cultivator/applicator was used by a manufacturer of manure application equipment in the U.S., namely, Hydro Engineering Inc. in Minnesota. We now run two drag hose application outfits and employ eight

people, six of whom support families. Yet, Brian was required to take a course and be licensed to do the work he has built the equipment for and done for 11 years. Manitoba Research Council has been a great help for technical information.

Would you believe all this was accomplished by a man who is dyslexic, who did not finish high school? His inborn mechanical ability and ability to learn from his experiences and do research, along with his drive to improve equipment efficiency and get the job done to the customer's satisfaction, has brought him to this point. What a wonderful country we live in, a country in which a man can build his own business and work hard and support his family.

Profit from this business comes in a few packages. Our sons, now 23 and 25 years of age, have moved on to welding and mechanics jobs. They can relate to their employers more respectfully, understand a lot of business dynamics and get along with many character types. They are also confident in their talents. Since there is a shortage of skilled labourers in our province, their contribution to society is sure.

It was because of the need for liquid manure application that all of this was possible. However, our lives and the lives of countless Manitobans are about to be completely changed by Bill 17 and its consequences. Hundreds of hardworking people who have invested time, money and their lives in something they believed would support their families for more than 10 years. Something they could pass on to their children or sell as a viable business.

What will all of those hardworking people do post Bill 17? I have to conclude that the government which is supposed to represent the people, cares little or nothing for those who fill the stores with food, grain and hog farmers in particular. Where will all the folks who depend on farmers to provide all types of sustenance get their meat and potatoes, their bread, fruit, vegetables? Safeway depends on them and so do you.

In conclusion, I have a proposal. Every legislator who feels a need to impose yet another regulation on the hog industry should be required to gain work experience in the industry from start to finish. In other words, they should be certified before teaching the hog industry how it should be run. I believe in regulations to protect both producer and consumer. I do not believe in regulating an industry and everything related to it to death. Especially when so many families and friends will be adversely affected

by something such as the moratorium Bill 17 would put into effect.

Please use common sense in governing our province.

Sandra Klassen

* * *

To Clerk of Committee Regarding Bill 17

Hello, my name is Josh Waldner from Somerset, MB. I would like to know what happened to our government. Mr. Schreyer used to work hard for the farmers. And now everything is going down the drain. I've been working on a farm for all my life, and I have been with pigs for 23 years, every year it's harder to make a living. You always have something new for the poor hog farmers. You make it harder and harder with new rules and regulations and still you are not satisfied. And now you want to ban building new barns and expanding. What will you try to do next to us? Becoming a communist country, or what are you trying to do? And does anybody remember the big flood of '97? Look how all the farmers helped out everywhere with heavy equipment and lots of man power. Now it seems like they want to take everything away from us.

Josh Waldner

* * *

First off, I want to let you know that I disagree and am against Bill 17, The Environment Amendment Act (Permanent Ban on Building or Expanding Hog Facilities), as along with the majority of southern Manitoba from what I am hearing.

I will give you a bit of background about myself; I have been working in the Agriculture Retail Industry for the past 15 years, and deal with producers of both grain and livestock on a daily basis. These producers are both environmental stewards and environmental conscientious. It is the land they use and work with everyday that ensures their livelihood. With the rising costs of inputs for agriculture these days, these producers are not wanting to waste any extra phosphate or fertilizer that comes out of the manure produced by the hogs in the hog barns. Contrary to popular belief, or public belief, these producers do not "splash on" or Dump Manure onto the land just for the sake of getting rid of it. They inject it into the soil, only

after a proper soil sample has been done to get a reading on the phosphate levels. If the levels are too high, they don't put the manure onto the land that year. Why waste expensive fertilizer? Put it where it's needed most. Bring up the levels of the soil on other fields so that the crops that producers plant there can utilize the fertilizer efficiently.

We are looking at 1500 dollar per Metric tonne of Granular phosphate, which we usually see around 500 dollar per metric tonne traditionally in the agriculture sector. This is a 3 fold increase in just the phosphate pricing this year alone, never mind the huge increase in fuel and other crop inputs. With this increase in costs, it regulates or dictates that producers are wanting to get every ounce of fertilizer out of the manure that is being used from these hog barns. Not only is it a valuable resource of where these growers get nutrients from, it is an excellent source for which to grow these crops that the public eats.

Furthermore, in reference to that matter... If you continue to limit or ban the hog barns being built or expanded, we limit the amount of food we can supply to the cities, and surrounding communities. And last time I looked, those cities and towns aren't getting any less populated. People have to eat, both pork and grains. The hog industries supplies both of these. The hogs for meat, and the waste for fertilizing crops. This is one waste product that can actually be used, and is very beneficial to the land.

I believe that the Manitoba government should be more concerned with the major contributors to the rising phosphate levels in the lakes than the hog industry and agriculture sector... Every time you point a finger at someone, there is three pointing back to you. Take a look at what you are doing in your homes, your phosphate detergents, your phosphate laundry soaps, the constant dumping of raw sewage into the red river from the city of Winnipeg. If you want to blame someone, then blame the city of Winnipeg. I know the government doesn't want to hear that, cause that's where the votes come from, but it is the biggest contributing factor to the rising levels in the lakes.

The agriculture sector or hog barns in a whole are not the biggest part that is contributing to the phosphate levels. Farmers put phosphate fertilizer in the ground, where it gets tied up by the soil, and is not leached out, or drained out, or run off. It is used up by the crops that are grown on the land. The hog industry use the waste to fertilize these crops. The

don't dump manure down the ditch where it can run into our streams and lakes. They inject it into the land where it is tied up until the crops can use it. If they dump it, then it would be like throwing thousands of dollars into the wind. No one wants to waste money or manure.

Thank you for your time, and again I apologize for not being there in person to express my concerns.

Brent Manning
GJ Chemical Co. Ltd.

* * *

The Manitoba Canola Growers Association (MCGA) is made up of 9,000 Canola producers. MCGA is grower funded organization.

From 2001 to 2005 Manitoba Canola productions were approximately 1.48 million tonnes per year. Canadian Canola production averaged 7.74 million tonnes per year from 2001 to 2005.

Manitoba Canola production is estimated at 1.83 million tonnes in 2006, which equates to approximately 20 percent of the Canadian Canola crop. Canola is Canada's second most valuable field crop, at times surpassing wheat.

Canola is an important crop for Canadian and Manitoba farmers contributing more than \$3 billion annually to farm proceeds. The infrastructure that supports Canola production and processing created more than 3,000 jobs directly and it's worth more than \$11 billion.

Canola has the ability to mitigate concerns regarding nutrition loading. Canola is a high-nutrient usage crop that responds well to land that has had hog manure applied. It is also a cost-effective fertilizer source for our Canola producers.

Canola meal is a very cost-effective ingredient in pig diets almost everywhere in the world. Current data clearly shows that Canola meal, when properly formulated in pig diets, will support high levels of feed intake and efficient performance (Canola Meal Feed Industry Guide, 2001). With the development of the crushing industry in Manitoba, hogs have the ability to be the local market for Canola meal. Hogs are a natural fit for Manitoba Canola meal.

Canola was developed through science-based principles here in Manitoba. MCGA supports science-based rules and regulations. The Manitoba government, through the commissioning of the Clean Environment Commission report, attempted to put

forward science-based recommendations for the hog industry. The government chose to ignore the report.

Hogs and Canola are both success stories in the province of Manitoba. Both contribute billions of dollars to economy, and have developed value-added processing in the province and can meet the needs of local consumers. MCGA feels that this moratorium has the potential to cast a dark cloud over the future development of agriculture in the province, the economy, and the ability for consumers to purchase local products.

Manitoba Canola Growers does not support Bill 17 and strongly urges that it be overturned.

Sincerely,

Ernie Sirski

President, Manitoba Canola Growers

* * *

I live at a farm. We have hogs, cattle and chickens. I am totally against Bill 17 because I feel hogs are not polluting the lake with phosphorus as high a percent as being said. Yes, hogs could be part of the problem, but I feel it is by far not the only one. Even if the lake has a bit of phosphorus, there could be thousands of other causes. In my opinion, it is unfair that hogs get all the blame of the cause and that hog producers all over the province are being robbed of something they love to work with and their futures.

Manure is important to us farmers for using as fertilizer on our fields. Manure is deficient in three important nutrients: nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium where a commercial fertilizer has about 20 times as much nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium as an equally massive amount of manure. How can it be that hogs and manure are the cause of the phosphorus then? The way we are following rules and regulations with injecting manure it almost seems impossible. What if we didn't have manure? Next thing we know it could be all the other chemicals and fertilizers on the fields that are the cause of the phosphorus in the lake.

We need the hog industry in Manitoba to export pork to other countries, feed people all over the country and the world and the manure to help farmers fertilize fields. All in all, manure has been around for a longer period of time than fertilizer. I think we should be proud of what we have in

Manitoba to employ our people to produce the world's best pork.

Conrad Gross

* * *

As an individual employed in the Hog Industry and as a Manitoba taxpayer I oppose Bill 17 based on the following:

1. Why does this legislation only deal with hog farms? What about other forms of livestock production? What about the raw sewage from the City of Winnipeg Waste Stations that gets pumped in the Red River every time we have significant rain? What are we doing about these issues?

2. The government spent \$700,000 for the Clean Environment Commission to create a report on the Environmental Sustainability and the Hog Production in Manitoba. No where in the report does it suggest a ban on expanding or building new hog operations. My concern is the current government already had decided what they were going to do before the CEC report but thought that the CEC would give them the justification for their decision. It didn't, so why the decision?

3. Where is the scientific evidence that supports your decision to place a permanent ban on building or expansion of hog facilities? I believe the only documented or credible evidence indicates that the land that hog manure is spread contributes 1.5 percent of the total phosphorous to Lake Winnipeg. What makes up the other 98.5 percent? Why are we not focusing on this?

4. If the current government decided to eradicate the entire hog industry in Manitoba the impact to Lake Winnipeg would be minimal. Producers who currently use hog manure to fertilize their crops would now be forced to purchase chemical fertilizer to replace the nutrients that they normally get from the hog manure. So there would be no difference to the effect on Lake Winnipeg. If the bill is about manure management then make it about manure management.

5. Why won't the government simply work with the hog industry to continually improve environmental management instead of imposing this permanent ban on an industry that employs over 15,000 people directly and indirectly in this province and generates over \$1 billion in farm cash receipts?

6. In conclusion, I too am concerned about the quality of the water in Lake Winnipeg; in fact all of Manitoba, but to single out one industry is unfair. I am asking that the current government reconsider Bill 17 and work with the hog industry to implement the recommendations from the Clean Environment Commission report.

Thank You
Clint Miller

* * *

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak against Bill 17. I am from out of town and would have liked the opportunity to have addressed the panel; however I couldn't and have asked for someone to have this read. Although I work full time off the farm, I am speaking as someone who is directly related to the hog industry as well as having been a hog farmer for 25 plus years.

Since I left the farm eight years ago, the Manitoba hog industry has experienced unprecedented growth; while we have had a downsizing of the packing industry. We have seen an industry poised to take off like never before; only to be pulled back down due to increasing environmental pressures. The farmers that help make this economic wheel hum are a small but important part of a greater intertwined machine that was oiled and ready to help feed the world. This is a network of grain farmers, feed companies, financial institutions, breeding companies, veterinarians, employees of killing plants—killing, cutting, processing and packaging—and an even bigger number marketing, transporting and distributing this clean, healthy and indeed wanted commodity to millions of hungry people all over the world. The pork, that our Manitoba farmers, both big and small, produce is in high demand and is some of the best, if not the best pork in all of the world.

In the past number of years these farmers have experienced many different hurdles and they have learned how to make the appropriate changes to ensure they are around for tomorrow. This is what has made our Manitoba farmer who he is, and he has held his head up proud, as he should. A farmer in Manitoba is a dying breed and has scratched his head many times I am sure when he hears comments from his city cousins that more money is being channeled to the farmers. Yet some of these farmers go without, themselves. We make up such a small part of this population yet contribute to the very economic fibre

of this great country, and if agriculture was to become non-existent tomorrow, not only would the world starve but our city cousins would probably not have jobs.

Some of the curve balls that have been thrown at hog farmers recently have ranged from disease issues, the rising of our Canadian dollar or the deflating of the American dollar, high input costs, high energy costs, regulations, low hog prices and now Bill 17.

Farmers at this time are not considering expanding, but feel that this bill is unfair and targeting them for something that has been scientifically proven they are a very small part of. They do not want their hands tied for a time when they may want to become more active again in an industry they once felt proud to be a part of.

This bill virtually stops almost all hog development in Manitoba, because in western Manitoba, where I live, the municipalities themselves are not friendly to hogs, consequently where do we expand the hog industry to meet the demands of a growing population? These municipalities have had their own challenges. They are walking a fine line trying to balance a farming community dealing with expansion issues and special interest groups repeatedly spreading negative propaganda about hog farmers to an unknowledgeable public.

It is too bad that there wasn't a way to be held accountable for making remarks to the public which are untrue. We do not nor could we do some of the outrageous claims of polluting rivers or injecting toxic chemicals into our soils. We follow some of the most stringent rules as hog farmers. Most of the hog farmers actually drink the same water as their hogs do. The rations that hogs are fed today are some of the most nutritious balanced diets, formulated by nutritionists that have spent a lot of time and money researching the needs of today's hogs. They are always looking at ways to increase productivity and maximize the investments made by farmers in this industry.

Ironically on the news in the past day or two, the City of Winnipeg has dumped huge volumes of raw waste from their lagoons directly into the Red River in order to make room for the rain we are currently receiving. Where should most of the blame be laid? Will the city be painted with the same brush as our hog farmers and will they be made to jump the same rope? Will the cottagers in Manitoba still be able to

build their cottages, burying septic tanks and fields along the tributaries of Lake Winnipeg?

We were also told by the media only days ago that if the world keeps growing at the rate it is currently growing that we will be out of food for that population by the year 2035. We have the land base in Manitoba to grow the crops and inject all natural by products back into the soil as an extremely fertile, natural form of fertilizer; further sustaining a very natural ecosystem. We owe it to other countries that cannot produce their own food to help feed them with technologies and the abundances we have.

A naturalist in Riding Mountain National Park has stated that biologists are seeing huge increases in phosphorus coming down the streams in the past few years. Is this naturally occurring from time to time? If so, Lake Winnipeg may be experiencing huge algae blooms naturally. In the early 20th century it is documented that the early explorers travelling Lake Winnipeg looking for the North West Passage came across these huge blooms and had to go around them, they were so thick they couldn't paddle through them. It is also worthy to note as well, that this past winter the fishing on Lake Winnipeg was some of the best reported by the commercial fishermen.

We have seen phenomenal growth in the hog industry in this province and it was the government of the day that at one time wanted to show off to the world, a success story that it felt proud was on the horizon of our prairie province. It was also this same government that brought in a temporary ban on hog barns and publicly stated this was a temporary pause. They publicly stated after the completion of their study, they would use these recommendations to make an informed decision. This decision would be based on these findings and if favorable, the ban would be then be lifted. Their study did not find any reason why the ban should stay in place, however they have decided to ignore the findings and have implemented this permanent moratorium with ignoring all the science behind it.

In closing: Manitoba farmers have been adapting to change now for over 100 years.

The changes he is seeing today are quite different than what he has ever had to experience before. We have been told by this government and others that we should expand, yet diversify—get bigger yet become more efficient. It does become challenging at times. The hog industry in Manitoba has changed over the last 30 years since I have been directly involved with it as a farmer and now a

representative for the farmers I work for. These changes have seen smaller family farms diminish and bigger family farms flourish. The colonies in Manitoba represent some of the bigger family farms. They work together with upwards of 100 individuals; from kids to grandparents all participating in one thing and that is farming. All farmers love farming; you can see it in their eyes and this is why this Bill 17 is so exasperating. It takes away their right to farm and their way of life. If there is no future expansion, our next generation farmers will exit the industry for greener pastures and we will see a way of life for all farmers come to an end. Who will feed the people that are fighting us now? Safeway may not have enough food for their shelves....

Thank you for this opportunity.

Respectfully
Andy Cardy

* * *

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Committee:

My name is Denise Trafford. I am speaking as a private citizen who owns property and grew up in Turtle Mountain municipality in southwestern Manitoba.

We need a province-wide moratorium on new construction of confined livestock operations for pigs. Southwestern communities are very depressed by the invasion of the intensive hog industry which takes so much and gives back so little.

Southeastern Manitoba has the unfortunate distinction of being called "a toilet for the hog operations". Can you tell me what would be accomplished by moving this problem to the southwestern side of the province? Why would the government want to make the same mistake twice?

It is clear that this government is trying to appease the hog industry by giving them the south western side of the province to expand in. As we all know from history appeasement does not work but merely displaces and prolongs the problem.

The majority of neighbours and friends that live in our community are completely against factory hog operations. When an application was made by Hytek (a Manitoba hog company) to construct a mega 10,000 hog operation, near the hamlet of Ninga, close to 90 percent of residents were opposed to it. But because of a very pro-hog municipal council, with questionable ability to make unbiased decisions

because of their involvement in the hog industry, it was given the green light. Despite major errors in the Technical Review and information that demonstrated that the water table and soil types of this area cannot support such an operation it was allowed to proceed.

This municipality cannot handle any more hogs. Killarney Lake is ruined from eutrophication. I remember when the beach at Killarney Lake was covered with people from end to end. Now you only see a few brave souls swimming in the paint-green water. Once the tourists leave it is hard to convince them to come back.

The rivers and streams in this area run from west to east through Killarney Lake, Pelican Lake, Lorne Lake and Rock Lake and on into the Pembina River where converging water enters the Red River; ultimately this water flows into Lake Winnipeg. This is all part of the Red River Drainage Basin. There are vast areas of wetlands in southwestern Manitoba and the water table is very high. An example of the high water table became evident when Hytec was digging their EARTHEN lagoon near Ninga for their 10,000-factory-hog operation. Water kept seeping into the hole until they were forced to put a liner in it.

Many of us have been fighting for years to save our community in Turtle Mountain municipality from the hog invasion. We have fought to bring attention to the dire condition of Lake Winnipeg and explained how we are all connected by our waterways and common concerns. We deserve the same consideration as the rest of the province in Bill 17. This bill should not segregate us from the rest of the province. It must be uniform and fair to all.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Denise Trafford

* * *

My name is Joshua Waldner. I'm writing on behalf of Evergreen Colony. I've been hog manager on this colony for 24 years. Had a lot of challenging years in the hog barn, but none like the ones we're facing now.

It seems to me every time I go to a meeting nowadays, there are new things about the environment and, every time I go, it's far more confusing. We try to do the best we can, but still no satisfaction. With all the new rules out there today, now this Bill 17 is really going to hurt a lot of people. We are not in one of those municipal areas,

but I have a feeling for them. Who knows, are we going to be next? To me, it's pretty scary. As of now, we're building a new state-of-the-art hog operation—European loose-housing, dry sow barn, as a lot of producers are going to be forced into it. That's what we're building now.

Have spent multi-million dollars already, everything we have to loan from the bank and all, by far, not done yet. Are we going to lose everything after a few years? That's a lot on the back of our minds. Lucky we had the permit in place before the moratorium was in place, but then maybe not so lucky with the way things are going.

I wish the government would spend more time on the farms to see how much effort is put in to build and produce food for our families, not only for ours, but for yours as well. So please don't let us down. I'm getting pretty worried. We have a big family and I'm getting pretty worried for their future as well.

Joshua Waldner

* * *

Re: Statement from the veterinary profession regarding Bill 17

Dear Members:

The Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association wishes to make its position known regarding Bill 17, the proposed hog barn ban. Veterinarians work closely with Manitoba's swine producers and we feel a responsibility to speak on this pressing issue.

Our position on Bill 17 is as follows:

1. The purpose of good government is to facilitate the optimum prosperity of its citizenry. In modern usage, democracy denotes a social state in which all citizens have equal rights, without hereditary or arbitrary differences of rank or privilege or geographic location.

2. Democracy is also characterized by participation in government, viz., involving members of the community in governmental decisions, allowing minorities to take part in anything at all which amounts to a public demonstration of popular opinion. I am honoured to be chosen to speak on this very important issue of Bill 17 by my veterinary colleagues on behalf of the Veterinary Medical Association.

3. Over the last several years the Manitoba government has promoted the hog industry as one

avenue to assure prosperity in the rural areas of this province. Bill 17 proposes a change in provincial agricultural policy that is to ban any new hog production facilities over a wide area of the province.

4. This action, if supported, will severely restrict the ability of a certain minority of the Manitoba citizenry from a possibility of free choice and prosperity. The claim inherent in Bill 17 is that other citizens will gain disproportional benefit from this use of force on the rural minority. The veterinary profession is not convinced that that imagined benefit either exists or is based on more than wishful thinking. There is certainly limited objective or scientific evidence to quantify the net social value of this proposed law.

5. A certain sense of unfairness felt by rural residents can be understood when raw human sewage enters the Red River every time a heavy rain falls on the city of Winnipeg, and due to the political power of urban residents that environmental risk is ignored, while responsible use of hog manure for fertilizer is criticized.

6. This bill specifically targets hog producers providing for the threat of a slippery slope. Are other areas of livestock production going to follow? Keeping things fair amongst all animal agriculture and urban centres should be considered. This bill proposed not only to use coercive force against rural citizens as compared to urban citizens but to also discriminate against a certain class of rural livestock producer compared to other livestock producers.

7. Furthermore, the Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association would like to note that there is no compelling scientific evidence demonstrating that a moratorium on hog barn expansion or construction would offer any environmental benefits to the province of Manitoba. We encourage the Assembly to construct its decision on a foundation of sound science, and not the shifting sands of majority opinion.

8. The request of the Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association is to not support Bill 17.

Thank you.

Dr. Colleen Marion, BSA, DVM
President
Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association

Dr. Brad Chappell, BSA, DVM
Executive Council Member
Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association

* * *

Due to some pre-existing scheduling conflicts, I have been unable to attend the past couple of sessions in order to speak. In place, I have submitted this short summary of my statement.

First off, I would like to say that I oppose this bill for several reasons that I will get into. I grew up in the city of Winnipeg, and my father made his living in feed manufacturing, one of the supporting businesses of the hog industry. As the industry grew, so did his business and it provided our family with a great opportunity to not only stay in Manitoba, but also to thrive here.

As I completed my Agriculture degree at the University of Manitoba, I was quick to jump into the industry and learn more about what it had to offer. Now I have started my career in a diverse industry that is not just about hog production, but also about numerous professions that rely on the hog industry. Transportation, construction, veterinary services, accounting, legal etc. are all tied to this industry, and as long as the hog industry stays healthy, so will these other sectors.

By placing this moratorium on the industry, you are hurting it and its future growth potential. Economics will start to change, and we will see a shift in production to our neighboring provinces and states, which will directly impact our Manitoba economy. Demand for protein grows every year as our world population continues to increase. Someone will capitalize on this, so why not keep in here in Manitoba?

Now some will argue that several areas in Manitoba are not sustainable and cannot support growth. With current legislation, producers CANNOT BUILD in these areas without a proper management plan. So these projects will not be supported, and no growth will occur in these areas because of the current legislation on spreading regulations. The hog industry has worked very hard with government to ensure a long-term sustainable industry, and today this is one of the heaviest regulated industries in the agriculture sector. The industry wants to be sustainable, and it wants to provide a future for others to thrive in.

Bill 17 is aimed at hurting the long-term economics of the industry, and is based solely on a political decision to "blame hog farmers". There is no science that supports Bill 17. There is no threat of over

expansion with current regulations. Please say no to Bill 17.

Thanks.

Andrew Waddell

* * *

The following is my submission to the Bill 17 committee.

My name is David Hedman and I am a resident of Winnipeg. I am in no way associated with the hog industry and have no financial stake that may be impacted one way or another upon the outcome of this debate. I do not state that the following points are fact, but only my personal opinions & observations.

First of all based on the points raised by the Pork Council in their recent advertising campaign, my interpretation of their arguments against this bill are as follows:

"Without continued expansion the entire industry is in jeopardy of collapse" If I try to think of this in terms of my own business, I cannot understand this logic. My business has remained the same size for several years now and I am quite content if it stayed this way. Of course everyone wants to make more money, but I make a decent living and this suits me fine.

As far as creating uncertainty in the industry, I would say this bill would have the opposite effect in that it would limit competition in the marketplace for those already in the business. Again if the possibility of new competition in my industry were eliminated, I would be happy.

I believe this need for continual expansion and ever increasing profits is due to the prevalence of corporate ownership and thinking in today's hog industry. The impression I get from hearing quarterly reports on the news from various corporations where they say "Earnings were flat from last quarter" is that not increasing profits is the second worst report only to of course a loss situation.

Secondly, I cannot understand how the hog industry can deny that the amount of hogs that can safely and unobtrusively be raised in a given area within a defined boundary and should never be limited. It seems they are saying that it makes no

matter whether an RM already has 5 barns or 500 there is always room for more.

With regards to the potential for damage to our waterways, in what may be my overly simplistic way of thinking, cannot the province conduct water tests in the ditches, subdivisions, creeks and streams bordering the spread fields immediately after heavy rains like we had this week and during spring run-off? If tests such as this were conducted in areas currently under the moratorium and high levels of pollutants weren't found, I for one would be convinced that the industry is not a threat to the environment as is the claim.

Aside from direct environmental impacts from this industry if I were to play Devil's advocate here and agree that the hog industry has such an infinitely small environmental footprint so as to be of no consequence, the government should still have the obligation to protect residents from having to live with the odour problems these operations produce. It wasn't long ago that the government decided that smokers have the right to smoke as long as the right doesn't infringe on non smokers right to fresh air. To use the example of a family that had been living on their family's homestead for 50 plus years and enjoying the fresh country air and then to become surrounded in the last decade with hog barns and in the process lost the enjoyment of their property, the inability to leave windows open in summer or to dry clothes on the line. This problem currently exists throughout Manitoba but past legislators have taken away the individuals right to sue over this claiming it is "Normal farming practice". This practice may be normal now but 50 years ago it was unheard of. Arguably the changes to farming have been made in the name of progress unfortunately the way we breathe has remained the same.

It also seems that, if a person's only complaint is odour no one takes them seriously. I am sure there are some people out here that right or wrong care more about the odour than environmental impacts but believe the only hope for relief is to attack the industry on environmental grounds. Once again my opinion of this industry is anything that smells that bad can't be good. All of the committee members owe it to the public to tour hog production areas while manure is being spread for full appreciation of how bad this smell really is. Anywhere that there are large concentrations of hog operations there is always social discord whether it be Quebec, North Carolina or Manitoba.

Now I would like to make comments about what I see as a complete abandonment of logic in modern factory farming. I was unpleasantly surprised to find out during the Olywest debate that slaughter house remnants are routinely cooked and processed into feed and fed back to pigs. This is done in rendering plants or as the industry now refers to them "protein recycling facilities" I don't need a scientist to tell me that the forced cannibalism of non carnivorous animals is wrong on so many levels. Of course this same practice has been going on in cows which as everyone knows spawned the BSE crisis. Incredibly the "brains" (no pun intended) and the regulators of this industry have decided that it is still okay to feed cows back to cows as long as it's not their Brains!

In regards to the routine, non therapeutic use of antibiotics which allows mortality rates to remain at a profitable level in animal confinement operations, everyone should know this is wrong and with every increasing prevalence of "super bugs" the practice needs to be stopped with no regard to the financial impact on an industry that shouldn't be promoting this practice in the first place. If my doctor told me that even though I was healthy, I should take antibiotics everyday for the rest of my life I would get a new doctor.

In regards to the issue of animal welfare in the confined feeding operations, the industry claims that this practice is not cruel and the pigs actually like it. When I think of this in terms of our own species, the worst punishment our society can give the human animal is confinement. (Although I am getting off topic, maybe 5 months of hog style confinement standing over an open pit of their own waste would cure the crime problem in this country??)

Lastly, I do not want my tax dollars being used to artificially sustain this industry. No more Sow Cull program, no more long term low interest loans, no more incentives for slaughterhouse expansions. This industry should be made to stand on their own feet and deal with the free market economy like the rest of us. If times get tough in my business I am sure the government would not subsidize me nor would I have the nerve to ask much less demand.

Thank you for allowing me to share my opinions with you.

Yours truly,
David Hedman

Comments regarding the Manitoba Pig Industry and Bill 17

I apologize for not being able to attend the hearing this evening when/if my name gets to the top of the list.

I have a few comments for your consideration:

1. There is concern about excessive phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg caused by phosphates draining into the Red River. The Province needs to reduce the phosphorus (about 1,700 tonnes) draining from various sources into the Manitoba portion of Red River. One of the sources is said to be manure from pig production. However, to my knowledge, no accurate measurement has been made of the amount of phosphorus leached from pig manure into the Red River or Lake Winnipeg.
2. If there is phosphorus leaching from manure into the Red, large pig producers probably do not contribute to the perceived problem to any extent as Manitoba pig producers with over 300 AU have to manage the manure according to the most stringent manure management regulations in North America. However, if these regulations are not considered sufficient to protect excess phosphorus from leaching into Lake Winnipeg, then the Province should consider changing the regulations. Perhaps more pig producers should be included in the regulations if smaller producers are found to be part of the problem or also manure from other livestock types should also be included. According to Statistics Canada data, only 31.2 percent of all Manitoba farms with more than 300 animal units (AU) were pig farms in 2006, while 881 Manitoba pig farms had 300 (AU) or less and would not have to file manure management plans. Of all farms with sows, 208 or 37.2 percent had more than 300 AU in 2006.
3. Another possible solution to reduce phosphorus in manure would be regulations to ensure that all pigs fed to slaughter weight would have phytase in their diets (by about 20 percent or more).
4. Manure is a valuable natural (organic) fertilizer, which is replacing expensive commercial fertilizer on some fields. A conservative estimate of the value of manure is \$30-40 million.
5. The province expanded its pig industry in the early 1990s, utilizing feed grains produced in the province as well as providing new jobs in pig production, pork processing and other value-added activities, such as construction and transportation. Total Manitoba farm cash receipts, and as a result, many rural communities, were sustained during periods of low crop prices during most of the 1990s and in 2000, 2001, 2004 and 2005 by the success of the pig industry expansion.
6. The pig industry is the most important livestock sector in the province with production value of almost \$1 billion in 2004 and 2005 (about 30 percent of total production value). In 2007, the value had declined to \$835 million due to low pig prices.
7. The Manitoba pig industry is well managed and very efficient. It is not composed of "inners and outers" as are some other provinces, whose industries thrive only in times of poor crop prices. The quality of Manitoba pigs is among the best in Canada. Manitoba sows are also the most efficient producers of pork in Canada, producing an annual average of 2.4 tonnes per sow in 2007 compared to the Canadian average of 1.8 tonnes of pork per sow.
8. During the 1970s and 1980s, when many rural communities were losing population, particularly young people due to lack of employment, the Province tried various initiatives to add value to agricultural products and provide rural employment. In the 1990s and during the past seven years, the pig industry has provided economic opportunities to communities throughout rural Manitoba, many of which are booming with new development. (e.g. Niverville, La Broquerie and others in the Eastern Region)
9. Employment on pig farms in 2007 exceeded 2,850 people. The pork processing sector produced about \$1.1 billion of product in 2007 and provided close to 4,500 direct and indirect jobs. The pork processing industry is expected to require at least 5 million finished hogs this year with plans for further expansion to 6 million hogs in 2009. It is estimated that suppliers to the pig and pork industry and employment as a result of money spent by all those directly involved in the industry totaled 8,100 jobs in 2007. (using Manitoba Bureau of Statistics factors for induced employment) More than 15,000 jobs in Manitoba are a result of the pig industry.

10. It would be a shame to single out and curtail Manitoba's most successful agricultural sector by preventing all producers in the Eastern, Central and Interlake regions from expanding their operations if it is in their best interests to do so. Why blame the innocent for the transgressions of those producers who may be allowing manure to pollute? (Perhaps more inspectors are needed?) Obviously most of the excess phosphorus in Lake Winnipeg is not coming from pig manure. What about other sources of pollution? Why are we allowed to use detergents containing phosphates? What about cottage septic fields? What about fertilizer run-off from farms? What about industrial pollution?
11. The costly CEC report does not advise preventing new and expanded pig barns in any particular area. Hanover and La Broquerie are the only two R.M.s with large numbers of pigs relative to the crop, hay and pasture area.
12. It is easy for the Province to blame the pig industry and be seen to be doing something for Lake Winnipeg pollution by preventing expansion of the industry. But it is not fair!

Janet Honey,
Pig Industry Statistician and Analyst

* * *

Please consider this written submission to the committee of Bill 17 in place of an oral presentation.

My name is Louise Hedman and am a resident in the city of Winnipeg. I felt compelled to submit something to the committee in support of Bill 17 as the hog industry has had a negative impact on my life over the past 3 years.

I am in favor of the Bill, but I strongly feel it should be amended to put a province wide moratorium on future expansion of existing barns and construction of any new hog barns.

Let's talk about the definition of a farmer. They plead for special circumstances because they are "farmers". The factory hog barns I have seen, typically are run by managers, employees and technicians and are located without the owners farmhouse anywhere in sight. This description sounds more like a factory than a farm. I would also like to see a law to force the way these corporate hog factories define themselves. This would stop any further confusion about the public being against farmers, as they like to say. The public is unhappy

with the rich, pushy corporate hog producers who try and evoke sympathy by saying they are poor farmers who are being driven out of business. When in fact, they are greedy business's who do not care about anything other than profit.

Crying? If you want to see some real tears, I can accommodate. There were plenty over the past 3 years. Andrew Diskson talks about democratic process, and how there isn't any in relation to Bill 17. It wasn't that long ago that 3 large, rich corporations tried to eliminate the democratic process from the citizens of Winnipeg by making basement and back door deals with the province and the city of Winnipeg with the Olywest deal. How does it feel now? What goes around, comes around is always a good thing to remember.

Please don't be fooled by the tactics taken by the hog industry. They have a lot of money and know how to use it. From persuading 12 year olds to cry in front of committees, to paying actors to fill galleries and gatherings, to threatening and bribing people. Not nice.

The pork industry in one of the few that receives and EXPECTS taxpayers dollars to operate. Why do we continue to pour our tax dollars into this industry? Especially if they are claiming they are losing so much money? It is obvious to those who stay tuned, that the large corporate farms have been thriving for many years. Along the way, they have polluted our air, water, land and communities. They will NEVER take responsibility for any of it. I say stop giving them our tax dollars and see how it all plays out. If they are doing so badly then the logical thing to do is close down the business. Any other self-employed business person would do the same. Does anyone find it unusual that MB is the only province to have the least amount of participation in the sow cull program? Are they being untruthful again?

I am utterly opposed to my tax dollars at every level funding the pork industry. My tax dollars are going to raise the pigs, who in turn pollute my air and water, which in turns costs me more money to clean up. The cleanest and most cost effective solution is to feed the corn and grain to the people and eliminate the pigs altogether.

Thank you for your time.

Louise Hedman

* * *

Hi, my name is Dickson Gould. I have been involved or associated with the swine and livestock industry for over 25 years. I presently have swine operations in the proposed banned zone of Bill 17. I appreciate the opportunity to speak about the proposed Bill 17 legislation.

I am deeply concerned about the effects of Bill 17 will have on the short- and long-term viability of the livestock industry for the province of Manitoba.

Bill 17 is essentially telling industry to stand still. The Red River Valley is extremely unique in that this area has some of the best soil types for earthen storage of manure in Western Canada. It also has an excellent source of water through wells on the east side of the Red River, or has very dependable water source via canals or deep ditches for dugouts on the west side of the Red River. In the vast majority of locations in western Manitoba, close to the Maple Leaf plant in Brandon, you have a great difficulty in finding locations that have suitable soil structures for building operations and, if you do, then you can't find a cost-effective or suitable water source. In southwestern Manitoba, you can't totally depend on snow melt to be able to supply a dependable water supply for intensive livestock operations. It is extremely difficult to find suitable building sites in the Westman region. Bill 17 eliminates some of the most economically viable and environmentally sustainable areas in the province of Manitoba from swine production.

Bill 17 is essentially messaging the financial institutions that smaller and mid-size operations aren't bankable because these operations will have no way to adapt to changing economies of scale and as the legislation proposed will have limited resale value. These operations will not have the financial capability to maintain their operations to the environmental standards and CQA that will be required. These operations will basically shut down, because they will not be economically viable. The worst part of this is these farms don't have a choice. Bill 17 has taken their right to compete away.

Bill 17 isn't based on science, doesn't take into account nutrient-holding capacity of the land or the acres available to each operation. Present regulations don't allow operations to expand or build haphazardly. Applicants have to ensure adequate number of acres for their nutrient management plan. In some of the livestock intensive areas of southeastern Manitoba, they can't expand unless they incorporate new technologies or buy out a

neighbouring operation and shut it down. Science-based legislation deals with these situations one operation at a time, because soil type and nutrient-holding capacity and slopes of the land for run off are very site specific. This proposed legislation, Bill 17, draws lines on the map without any thought into the specifics of each quarter of land; yet, this information is readily available through GPS maps. It's interesting to know that the proposed map of the ban area was designated as non-winter-spreading map for small hog operations, poultry operations, dairy operations and cattle operations that winter spread to prevent spring run off. It was never presented or implied to be anything other than that. If I owned land between Sperling, Manitoba, and Carman, I could have a swine operation on one side of the road and can't build on the other side, because it is allegedly environmentally unsafe. It is interesting that you can build on the west side of Lake Manitoba, but Bill 17 bans building swine operations on the east side. Existing legislation is actually better legislation than the permanent ban legislation of Bill 17. Bill 17 legislation is not well-thought-out. It isn't site specific; it isn't science based.

Bill 17 doesn't give confidence to agriculture community. Not only will hog producers not have the incentive to become engaged, but all industries fearing reprimand and similar fates will be standing still. Financial institutions will not be willing to invest with Manitoba farmers because of this uncertain environment, regardless of the poultry/livestock sector. Rural communities will be further compromised, relative to the City of Winnipeg.

As a member of the fundraising team for the National Centre for Livestock and the Environment, we have talked to financial institutions, national and international ag industries, local suppliers, Hutterite colonies and other producers about the merits of a co-ordinated effort to find long-term solutions for the current and potential issues facing animal agriculture, not only in Manitoba, but Canada as a whole. The fact that this is the largest "Canadian Foundation of Innovation" award, made to the University of Manitoba, of \$7.1M for infrastructure; that MAFRI has provided \$0.9M for the outreach effort related to NCLE; and that the fund raising team has raised almost \$6 million from alumni, producers, Hutterite communities (\$400,000 first time they had ever made donation to U of M), various marketing boards and industry players. This

suggests to me that Manitoba does have a way forward and that people are committed to working together. Bill 17 flies in the face of this effort to bring industry, government and scientists together. It flies in the face of this effort to bring industry, government and scientists together. It flies in the face of our collective efforts to attract the experts to come to or work with NCLE in Manitoba and diminishes a significant investment into a better future. Recently, NCLE has attracted several world-class scientists and one in particular—Dr. Ermias Kebreab, who was recruited out of the U.K., is one of the world leaders in environmental modeling interactions. As a side note, the Province of Ontario is presently using one of his models for their nutrient planning.

The question I would like to ask is why do we not utilize the scientific resources that we have invested in.

In reviewing the recommendations of reports, such as Finding Common Ground, the Lake Winnipeg Water Stewardship Report and the Clean Environment Commission report, over and over again, they refer to the need for long-term vision, co-ordination and collaboration in dealing with environmental issues.

Develop a framework that supports collaborative movement on the issues, through research, education and support for adoption of innovation that improves our environment.

The future for cities, towns and farms is about recycling and replacing nutrients, energy conservation, and water use and water quality. Good policy that encourages stakeholders in a region to work together (towns and farmers, or different sectors within industry) to address an issue. Good policy also encourages stakeholders to consider issues as a whole, as opposed to targeting individual industries without concern for the whole.

I have four recommendations:

- 1) Do full review of the existing impacts of the other 20+ legislation and regulations that the hog and the livestock industry already deal with and see if further regulations are actually required . . .
- 2) Utilize the resources of the National Centre of the Livestock Environment at University of Manitoba and the Federal Ag Research Station at Brandon, Manitoba.

- 3) If changes are required, ensure that they are based on science and they are site-specific and they take into account changes in technology.
- 4) Rural Manitoba doesn't need to suffer any further equity drain in the livestock industry. Ensure that operations can be bought or sold and/or traded and subject to their site-specific land availability. This would also farmers the opportunity to transfer those animal units to different locations, so that they can expand or salvage some equity from their operations to pay back their bank loans.

Dickson Gould

* * *

My name is Michael Andres, a third generation dairy farmer.

My grandfather started our farm with 20 cows and a small land base. My father increased the herd to 60 cows and added land to keep up with increased costs. When I took over along with my younger brother, we had to increase our herd to 120 cows and have grown the land base to 1,200 acres.

Our industry stands beside the hog industry to oppose Bill 17. It is proof that our current government is unable to manage the current system in place right now.

Currently, when you apply to expand your operation, it gives communities an opportunity to speak for or against. There is a technical review process which, if run properly, approves sound expansions or denies unsound expansion. It in itself is a small brother to moratoriums because you can control critical growth of towns, cities and agriculture. Currently, you can work things out intelligently and carefully. A moratorium is not intelligent or careful.

Please do not support Bill 17.

Sincerely
Michael Andres

* * *

History:

My parents started farming in the New Bothwell area in 1952. My dad, at the age of 40 and a newcomer to farming contacted the U of M to find out what he could do with 40 relatively unproductive acres of land. The University of Manitoba Agriculture Department suggested he try the poultry

business. As a result, he was a pioneer in intensive poultry production.

Out of my seven siblings, five entered the business of farming after getting a hands-on start on the family farm. My wife and I purchased the family farm in 1981, and expanded it since. We produce approximately half a million kg of chicken per year as well as approximately 40,000 pullets for table egg producers of Manitoba. In 1997, together with other family farming members, we entered the hog industry and are currently producing approximately 700-800 weanlings per week.

The Science of Agriculture:

My dad relied heavily on the science of agriculture then, as we do today. Unfortunately, today the science of agriculture gives way to politics. In the early to mid 1990s, expansion in the hog industry occurred at a faster pace than the government could scientifically keep up with appropriate rules and guidelines. Since then, the government has brought out many regulations pertaining, among other things, to lagoons that require engineering, annual inspection and licensing, regulations that dictate the time of the year that manure spreading can take place, regulations that require soil sampling in order to determine the appropriate amount of manure to be applied, regulations that dictate how mortalities are to be disposed of, and many others. Most of these regulations were based on science and mostly were necessary. Beside the requirements, many producers like ourselves inject the manure into the soil after soil testing in order to minimize odour and increase value. This at considerable extra cost. Many of our critics still base their criticisms on opinions formed before science caught up to the expanding hog industry. Today most farmers meet or exceed the requirements that the government imposed on the industry. Science is satisfied, but lobby groups are never satisfied. If the government wishes to retain any credibility, it needs to move back to science and support farmers in the food chain.

Farmers here are the best in the world, and produce the best and safest food in the world.

We produce safe and quality food for Manitobans and the world, and we do it as efficiently and humanely as we can. We have on-farm food safety programs, environmental farm plans, yearly manure management plans, we test our water annually. We run bio-secure farms to keep diseases

at bay. We take care of the environment. We live in the same communities that we farm in.

Concerns for the future:

Even family farms are large. While we may long for the scale of farming of the past, economics will never allow us to go back. It is difficult at best to keep up with all the environment, food safety, and animal welfare requirements not to mention financial viability and investment.

Farming, like any business, requires both short-term and long-term planning. We have a son and a daughter who are both interested in the business of farming, and we want to bring them into our family farm. This Bill 17 is causing us some doubt about our family's future. Today it is focussed on the hog industry without the backing of science, tomorrow possibly poultry, beef, even commercial fertilizer? This government needs to support those who put food on the table.

The process of these hearings:

It is deeply disturbing that those wanting to speak to this issue need to leave their farms and families and spend days and nights waiting without having a designated time slot. It brings into question both the government's sincerity in these hearings, as well as the government's opinion of those who are affected. Would these hours be kept by any other public group?

Thank you for your attention.

NeWest Poultry Farms Inc.
Jake and Lorraine Wiebe and family

The moratorium you want to place on hog barns in our area concerns us very much.

First you tell us you need time to do research to find out how much pollution the hogs create. Research showed that the damage wasn't coming from hog farms. It came from the city of Winnipeg. You ignored those results and now want to place a permanent moratorium onto hog farms. The hog industry is a billion dollar industry. It employs 15,000 people. What about the raw sewage the city of Winnipeg puts into the lakes and rivers? Which commodity will you attack next?

If our father was still living he would be very concerned. He came from Russia where some

industries were stopped and others were taken over by the government. Soon everybody was poor.

When you put a stop to a big industry like the hogs, many areas of work will be affected. Some examples are hog farm workers, truckers, mechanics, construction crews, electricians, plumbers and the list goes on. You will have lots of unemployment.

No income means no money which income tax needs to be paid and before long our NDP government won't have money for handouts. We will be in Russia's situation—poor.

Do we need to leave the province of Manitoba to a province where family farms can continue to grow?

To us it looks like pure political reasons for a moratorium. The areas that haven't voted NDP are being hit with the moratorium. There are reasons why our areas don't vote NDP. You don't work for the farmer. You work for the workers. Now you're trying to kill us.

Rather than destroying the hog industry, please help find markets for hog meat. Also, do something about Winnipeg's raw sewage going into the rivers and lakes. We know that this will cost money but on the other the results will be cleaner water. The hog industry can bring in money for you and your people.

Please reconsider your bills before you make them laws.

Sincerely,
Lydia Falk

* * *

I am here to formally register my objection to Bill 17 for the following reasons:

1. The economic effects to our province.

What will the long-term effect be to our economic base in this province and especially in the southeast region? How will such a ban affect our future economy? What effect will this ban have on farms that are set up for hog farming once they are abandoned because they could not expand or replace old deteriorating barns? This ban may not affect the large mega farms to such a degree because they can always set up out of province, but it's virtually impossible for the traditional family farm to do so. The family farm is also cut off from the opportunity of bringing on another family member such as a son or daughter because they can't expand to make it feasible to support another family.

How will it affect the retail economy when those affected by the ban cannot buy new farm equipment, automobiles, upgrade their homes, buy new ones or are forced to cut back on other expenditures that would keep our vibrant economy going, et cetera?

I have lived and worked in southeastern Manitoba for over 30 years, and I believe that one of the reasons why this area of the province has been so vibrant and successful is its diversification in the farming industry. Is this government going to start removing or limiting certain sectors of these economic contributors? Where does it expect to get its tax base from to maintain our infrastructure or make our province more inviting for immigrants and others seeking to make their homes here?

2. Farming is not just a job or even a career, it's a lifestyle.

Let me explain. My son-in-law (who is in the farming industry or should I say lifestyle) wanted to propose to my daughter. He shared with me that before he proposed he and my daughter had many lengthy discussions about their possible future together. He said that he had told my daughter that he is a third generation farmer and that to him farming is not just a job or a career, it's a lifestyle. It was very important to him that his future soulmate would be able to buy into the farming lifestyle.

Does this government not take into consideration the many older farmers that may be forcefully driven to trade their lifestyle for just a job or a career? Does this government know how difficult it could be to find work with little or no formal training or education for anything else? How many lifestyles does the government want to destroy before they realize that the spin-off from farming is a large part of the economic foundation of this province? Does this government have a compensation plan in place for those who are past the age of entering the regular job force?

How will this affect the rest of us when our taxes need to be increased in order to establish a social network so that people driven out of their lifestyles can still survive? Would the government rather have them leave Manitoba and move to a province that will give them the opportunity of free enterprise?

3. Who's next?

If this ban is passed, then who will be targeted next? Will it be the poultry farmer, the dairy farmer, or the beef farmer? (As if he hasn't been hit hard enough yet with B.S.E.) Who will be next?

I am afraid that the government may even go as far as putting bans and/or restrictions on the manufacturing or production industries that they want to get rid of or restrict. Would it not be in the best interest of the government to work together with farmers and help them in the development of better manure management?

Having personally spoken to a number of farmers in the southeast region, and according to various farm magazines, I have found that our farmers are very concerned about the environment and are continuously working on processing manure so that it will be more environmentally safe to use than most of the chemical substitutes that are used on our farmers' fields to replace nutrients.

With more and more medical issues arising that can be linked to use of artificial and chemically driven products in our fruits, vegetables, and meats, would it not make more sense to go back to the future with the use of more organic fertilizers?

4. What is the government basing this ban on?

After studies like the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board interim report, the Clean Environment Commission and who knows what other studies that have been done (at the expense of our tax dollars) the government has not found enough evidence that the hog industry is affecting our water system to any significant level. According to the attached document, which indicates the fact that the hog industry only represents approximately 1 percent of the phosphorus entering Lake Winnipeg, the government is still accusing this industry of being a major contributor to the pollution of Lake Winnipeg. The facts are

The ban does nothing to address water quality concerns in our province;

Only 1 percent of the phosphorus entering Lake Winnipeg can be attributed to hog farms;

The remaining 99 percent comes from other industries and sources, such as downriver contamination from the United States and the provinces, sewage dumping from the city of Winnipeg and other municipalities, et cetera;

No ban has been imposed on any of those groups—it's business as usual;

Producers want to work with all Manitobans to protect water quality and the environment for future generations;

Water quality is our collective responsibility.

Is this what the government wants to base this permanent ban on?

5. What is the government already doing?

Before a new hog barn can be built or an existing one can be expanded, the current government is already encouraging production efficiencies, is implementing environmental studies, and has put stringent regulations and limitations into place. I think the government is doing plenty enough to make it difficult or at the very least discouraging for farmers to consider expanding. Please don't get me wrong. I think it is great that proper restrictions, environmental studies, and limitations are in place, but I don't think it is necessary to resort to a complete and permanent ban and make growth impossible for the farmers who are already facing many struggles and hardships.

I believe that if the government would focus on implementing what they already have in place, help and encourage farmers in developing better and more environmentally friendly manure management systems instead of going the extreme, they would have a lot less people downright afraid of what this ban will do for the overall health and well-being of our province.

6. Conclusion:

In light of the above cited reasons and those of the many other presenters, I hope that the government and this review committee will take a close look at what's been presented and drop the decision of pushing Bill 17 through with such haste. Please let the recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission be put in place and allow them to work before making a decision that could have an irreversible effect on all Manitobans. I believe it will put this government in a much more favourable position with its voters.

Thank you for the opportunity to have my voice heard.

Ben Ginter

Re: Moratorium Placed on Hog Operations

Further to the report prepared and presented by the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission, dated December 2007, the council of the Rural

Municipality of Rosser would like to provide the following comments:

The CEC has completed an extensive study on the Environmental Sustainability and Hog Production in Manitoba and provided 48 recommendations for the protection of the environment as it relates to the hog industry in Manitoba. The 48 recommendations do not include a moratorium as the Province announced recently.

Council is concerned that, while only hog production has currently been identified, will any future announcements extend to other agricultural activities? What industry will be targeted next?

Councils have been directed to complete livestock production guidelines for their respective municipalities and/or planning districts. What will be the purpose of this document if the Province imposes measures that will override the decisions that municipalities should be able to make based on individual applications for livestock operations?

The farming industry is constantly facing challenges. The ability for farmers to diversify their operation is often required in order to be economically viable. The moratorium placed provides another obstacle that may be the cause of a demise of an existing or a proposed operation.

Council would appreciate the government to, once again, carefully consider the implications of moratoriums and continue to keep municipalities apprised of policies affecting land-use issues.

Yours truly,
Estelle Thomson
Chief Administrative Officer
Rural Municipality of Rosser

* * *

Thank you as a committee for sacrificing your time and your family time and all the hog producers sitting patiently waiting for their time to speak who are also sacrificing family time.

It has cost the people thousands of hours to raise their concerns on Bill 17. I do have a safety concern when the presentations are done in the wee hours and everyone has to drive home. When I was six years old helping my dad out in the barns, my passion started then, and I knew I wanted to be part of the hog industry.

The quality of life was unbelievable. What the industry means to me is professionalism, friendship

and a sense of family. People in the hog industry truly respect and trust one another. Hog producers care for the animals, care for the water they drink and the air they breathe.

I have been involved in the hog industry for close to 35 years.

It has been an honour for me to have served and I hope to continue to serve for many more years in the hog industry. Bill 17 is one of the challenges facing the hog producers of Manitoba who are serving in one of the best industries that Manitoba has to offer.

The hog industry is a very large industry but at the same time it is a very close-knit industry where people come together to share the same common goal to raise wholesome quality pork and to be a global leader on all aspects of raising hogs.

A lot of what we are presenting is a common theme to ensure that this industry is proactive and a sustainable industry for many generations to come.

Bill 17 is going to limit the growth of the hog industry for our next generations.

Hog producers are very passionate people when it comes to raising hogs in a sustainable way, including protecting water quality and air quality.

Manitoba lakes are a very important part of Manitoba life with people living in cottages and fishing on the lakes. Some of the cottage owners are hog producers, beef producers, grain producers and they really care about how they raise animals and grow grain with clean water and fresh air.

I urge the government to reconsider Bill 17 because not only will it impact a lot of rural areas, but it will also impact the urban areas as well because of the growing population of Winnipeg that needs more economical growth and spin-offs.

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to voice our concerns about Bill 17.

Randy Rutherford

* * *

Dear Sir or Madam:

I would like to address the concern we have with Bill 17.

1) Environmental Sustainability

Our family farm has been in business since 1987. We have grown our land base, and our hog

base in an environmentally friendly way, adhering to the rules and guidelines set forth by Manitoba Conservation. In the recent past we acquired enough land base to allow us to expand our sow base to a level that would be economically sustainable in the long run, and environmentally sustainable using new phosphorus removal technology, while adhering to the manure management guidelines.

We need to be able to utilize our land base to its fullest potential, using organic fertilizer rather than synthetic fertilizer (nitrogen), while decreasing our phosphorus levels. This would require the ability to expand the farm. At this point we are running at about 50 percent capacity on organic fertilizer needs, which forces us to purchase and use synthetic nitrogen which makes no sense at all as these fertilizers are derived from fossil fuels. We could be using 100 percent organic and be environmentally sustainable at the same time. This is win/win.

2) World Hunger

We are at a time in history where global food shortages are imminent, actual people like you and I are going hungry, and we are proposing to cut food production? This is a shameful act and incredibly socially irresponsible on our part to do this.

There is a better way. Rather than a complete ban on hog barns, why not allow the manure management plans decide what is sustainable according to the science we currently have? Together with the new technology that is available, we can have both an environmentally sustainable industry and meet the growing demands of a hungry world in need. At the same time we are feeding a hungry world, the agriculture industry would be driving forward economic growth in rural Manitoba, in an environmentally friendly way. This would look good on the current government.

3) Personally

Our family is personally caught in a catch-22 situation. We truly do need to expand our barn to remain economically viable. We currently operate on two sites, due to the fact the moratorium was placed as we were moving to maximize our farmland and increase our sow base. We are now in a situation where our costs are much too high operating the way we are, so we will be in financial trouble if we can't build and take advantage of economies of scale. The other problem is that our farm is not saleable the way it is as it is too costly to operate on 2 sites, and not utilizing the full potential of our farm.

As farmers we do not invest in RRSP investments as we rely on the equity built into our farms to provide for our retirement. Picture yourself in a position where you are 65 years of age and have a large RRSP for retirement. The government changes the rules and ALL of YOUR RRSP money is gone....bank account = \$0.

This is the position we find ourselves in because of the moratorium. A farm that is not saleable. Period. RRSP (our equity), gone.

Recommendation:

We would like to recommend that the government reconsider their stand and allow farms to be evaluated based on their own individual merit and ability to be long term sustainable, rather than a blanket ban. This would be a socially responsible move on behalf of all Manitobans. Thank you for allowing us to participate in the process.

Sincerely,
Irvin Funk

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>