MANITOBA CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

HOG PRODUCTION INDUSTRY REVIEW

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* *

Held at the Friedensfeld Community Centre

Friedensfeld, Manitoba

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2007

* *

APPEARANCES:

Clean Environment Commission:

Mr. Terry Sargeant	Chairman
Mr. Edwin Yee	Member
Mr. Wayne Motheral	Member
Ms. Cathy Johnson	Commission Secretary
Mr. Doug Smith	Report Writer

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

NO EXHIBITS MARKED

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2007
UPON COMMENCING AT 1:03 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Clean Environment Commission hearings into our Hog Production Industry Review.

My name is Terry Sargeant. I'm the Chair of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission, and I'm also the chair of this panel. With me on the panel are Wayne Motheral and Edwin Yee. I have a few opening comments, and then we will proceed to presentations by a number of people who have indicated they wish to make presentations this afternoon.

The Clean Environment Commission has been requested by the Minister of Conservation to conduct an investigation into the environmental sustainability of hog production in Manitoba. The Terms of Reference from the Minister direct us to review the current environmental protection measures in place to determine whether or not they are effective for the purpose of managing the industry in a sustainable manner.

Our investigation is to include a public component to gain advice and feedback from

Manitobans. This is to be done by way of public meetings in various regions of the province.

We have been asked, as well, to take into account efforts underway in other jurisdictions to manage hog production in those jurisdictions in a sustainable manner.

Further, we are to review the contents of the report prepared by Manitoba Conservation entitled: "An Examination of the Environmental Sustainability of the Hog Industry in Manitoba."

At the end of our investigation, we will consider various options and make recommendations in a report to the Minister on any improvements that may be necessary to provide for environmental sustainability of hog production in our Province.

To ensure that our review includes issues of importance to all Manitobans, the panel has undertaken to hold 17 meetings in 14 communities through the agricultural part of Manitoba. These meetings began in early March and will continue until April 27th, when the final meeting is scheduled to take place in Winnipeg. Today, I believe, is meeting number nine or ten. Ten, I think.

At these meetings, it is open to any group or individual to make a presentation to this panel on issues related to our mandate. For the most part, presentations are to be limited to 15 minutes. Exceptions may be made, in some cases, where a presenter needs more time, and provided that they have made provisions or made a request with the Commission Secretary prior to the presentation. Those who make presentations will be required to take an oath promising to tell the truth.

Presentations should be relevant to the mandate given the Commission by the Minister, and to the issues described in the Guide to Public Participation in this Review. If a presentation is clearly not relevant, it may be ruled out of order. As well, if a presentation is repetitive, it may also be ruled out of order.

Members of the panel may ask questions of any presenter during or after the presentation. There will be no opportunity for other presenters to question or cross-examine presenters.

In addition to the public meetings, the Clean Environment Commission is engaging consultants to assist us in this review. The

results of these research endeavours will be posted on our web site, which we expect to be in late June. Parties or individuals will be invited to provide comment on any of those reports, if they so wish. A reasonable, but brief period of time, will be allowed for such comments.

Written submissions will also be accepted. Information as to how to submit written submissions is available on our website. The deadline for these is May 7th.

We also realize that many people are reluctant to make presentations in public, for a variety of reasons. To address that, we have engaged a graduate student from the University of Manitoba to meet with, or talk on the phone with, persons who would rather not speak at a public meeting. These conversations or meetings will be kept confidential. Information as to how to contact her is available on our web site, as well as at the table by the entry door.

Finally, some administrative matters. If you wish to make a presentation today, would you please register at the table over by the entry? As is our normal practice, we are recording these sessions. Verbatim transcripts

will be available online in a day or so. You can find the link to these transcripts from our website.

Finally, in respect of cell phones, I would ask that you turn them off or, at the very least, turn the ring tone off. And if you must take a call, I would ask that you leave the room. And one final note, I would ask that you not engage in any conversation while people are making presentations. That's it for my comments.

We've had, so far, six people have indicated that they to make presentations this afternoon and another four people this evening after dinner. If any others of you in the audience wish to make a presentation this afternoon, please let Joyce know.

The first person on the afternoon agenda is Marg Remple. Please state your full name for the record?

MS. REMPLE: My name is Margaret Remple.

MARGARET REMPLE, having been affirmed, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Please go ahead, Ms. Remple.

MS. REMPLE: Commissioners, staff, fellow presenters, friends and neighbours. I am, indeed, grateful for the opportunity to participate in these province-wide hearings focusing on hog production and related practices in our province.

My name is Marg Remple. I am a farmer. I own and operate a mixed farm here in the Rural Municipality of Hanover. My farm, Rempelco Acres Ltd., consist of 500 sow, farrow to finish, hog enterprise and 1500 acres of cropland on which I grow cereal grains, oilseeds, as well as some forage crops. My late husband's family began farming where I am currently located, in 1957, making this year a 50-year mark for the Remple family. Hogs became an important part of the farm in 1967, and production has continued since that time, growing gradually to the present size. I joined the Remple family in 1975, and farmed with my husband until his passing in 2003 and, since that time, have been farming on my own.

Hog production has been a very important component in my farm's sustainability, in every aspect. It has allowed the farm to provide full-time employment to three people, in

addition to part-time employment to my three, now young, adult children. Hog production has provided a very important natural, organic source of soil fertility for our cropland. Hog production has been central to the financial sustainability of my farm, meaning, among other things, a tax contribution of well over $20,000 annually to the R.M. of Hanover, and approximately $1.5 million of direct economic activity annually here in southeastern Manitoba. In relative terms, I am a small producer. However, I feel, even as a smaller producer, my farm makes a significant contribution to my local community and to my province.

Our family farm has always been working toward doing what is best for our environment, long before "environment" became a politically expedient topic. The environment has been a priority for me and my family, not because it happens to be "politically correct" at the moment, but because our livelihood absolutely depends on taking the best care possible of the land which sustains us. That is the most basic fundamental of farming, and every farmer knows that.

One of the environmental focuses we have made a priority on our farm is that of reducing transportation, despite, I might add, the political decisions which continue to frustrate that priority, such as tearing up of rail lines. I try, as much as possible, to reduce the distance needed farm inputs must travel, as well as reducing the distance outputs must travel.

My hogs are raised from birth to market weight on one site, eliminating transportation to additional sites. As much land as possible is fertilized with hog manure, all within a one mile radius of the barns. I grow most of the feed grains my hog enterprise requires on my own land, reducing the fuel required to haul it in, as well as the impact on our roads and highways.

An on-farm mill prepares various rations daily. Grain corn is harvested and stored in a sealed silo as high moisture grain, allowing for earlier harvesting of the crop, eliminating the energy required to dry the corn to point where it can be stored in conventional bins, and moving the harvested corn only once, that is from the field to the corn silo, from where it goes

directly into the mill as needed. Using a computerized liquid feeding system allows for the use of high moisture grain in our rations.

Hog manure is stored in a three-celled earthen lagoon, and injected into the soil after harvest each year. Soils are tested, as are the manure samples, all application best practices and regulations are adhered to. Global positioning systems allow us to map manure application and are also used for greater cropping precision and a consequent reduction in fuel consumption in all areas of seeding, caring for and harvesting our crops. Crop residues are re-incorporated into our soils, constantly adding to the organic matter, an important contribution to the health of our heavy clay soils here in Manitoba.

Rempelco Acres is fully certified under the Canadian Quality Assurance Program for Hog Producers, a program which requires detailed record keep of all procedures and production practices, and includes an annual review, inspection and verification.

That is a very brief snapshot of my own farming operation. It is a descriptive snapshot, not a prescriptive one. Every farm has

its own unique advantages, as well as challenges.

I would like to use the rest of my presentation time this afternoon to address the "bigger picture," if I may. Over the thousands and thousands of years that agriculture has developed, it has only been in the past 40 or 50 years that crop production has become so reliant on petroleum-based nitrogen fertilizer. I doubt that 40 or 50 years into the future the petroleum-based option will exist for farmers. It is not an economically sustainable soil nutrient source, in the long term. Costs of nitrogen fertilizers have increased 50 to 80 percent in the past six months. And we are being warned of shortages already for this spring's seeding season, irrespective of the formidable cost.

Farmers have traditionally born the responsibility of food production. However, the focus is quickly adding on a responsibility for fuel production as well. Crops only grow well in well-nurtured soil, and I'm here to say to you that animal manure is an extremely important component in maintaining and increasing soil productivity. Manure is not a waste product. It is a vitally important resource, part of the

completely natural, organic, very holistic nutrient cycle. To curtail production of animal manure is extremely shortsighted and ill-conceived. Manitoba, and the rest of the prairies, are in a huge manure-deficit position. We need not only increased hog production, but also increases in production of cattle, sheep, goats, et cetera. The future of our food production depends on it.

Twenty years ago I told my fellow farmers that some day we would raise hogs primarily for their manure and, secondly, for their meat. That prediction is apparently a reality in some parts of the U.S. corn belt.

In our province, and in our country, at least 98 out of every 100 people live in urban centres. They have fled from the rural communities, and from farming, for a variety of reasons, which include: The hours are too long, the work is too hard, the return on investment is too small, the amenities are too few, the areas too isolated, the financial stakes are too high, and the vulnerability to weather is too stressful.

And that's fine. We live in a democracy. And each individual has the right to

choose where they wish to live and how they wish to make their living. But I am one of those minority one or two percent of the population who believes that the most important, the most fundamental component of any healthy, successful society is its food production and distribution systems. For those 98 or 99 percent of the population, who want nothing to do with the risks, exposures, and plain hard work of farming, to now turn and sit in uninformed judgment on those few people still left producing foods in the countryside; that is what is so painful for farmers. We have accepted the responsibility for producing safe, high quality food of a consistent and constant quantity for all of our urban citizens. And we accept that responsibility because we are acutely aware that our society would collapse without us, even though it feels like a rather lonely awareness at times. We have accepted all the risks and challenges that come with food production. And some of us have gone broke and died because of the willingness to sacrifice everything for the common good. That's what makes farmers who they are: very tenacious, resilient and eternally optimistic by nature.

To encourage responsible application of animal manure is appropriate. What is so discouraging for us as food producers, are "regulations", or often more accurately, "restrictions on production", born not out of good science or rational debate, but out of misguided and misinformed emotions of some urbanites, whose main value in our political system is, apparently, the number of their votes. Well-meaning though they may be, they are responsible for a significant crippling of food production in our province and in our country. The moratorium on hog production in Manitoba would fall into this category.

The attempt of this province's government, and some of its citizens, to place the responsibility of the algae blooms in Lake Winnipeg on hog producers is a travesty. Hog producers have been far ahead of all other Manitoba livestock sectors, as well as non-livestock sectors, in responsibility, and highly monitored, manure management and environmental stewardship for many years already. We continue to use vast amounts of our own money to fund research which direct us into the future

in ever more accurate application monitors and equipment, fine tuning feed rations to further reduce amounts of excreted phosphorous, and so on. We accept that we may be contributing one percent of the phosphorous entering Lake Winnipeg, and will continue to work hard to reduce that amount. However, for the government and people of this province to focus on that one percent is very shortsighted. The repercussions of putting on hold the sector of agriculture which has been the most viable sector over the past two decades will, unfortunately, be felt for a very long time.

The second greatest frustration and disappointment has been the abdication of support from our elected representatives. Publicly funded research in the area of agriculture has declined very significantly and seriously over the past 15 years. The vast majority of research is now producer funded, and is a huge financial burden which farmers cannot continue to bear over the long term. However, even more disappointing is the complete lack of public and political support for primary food producers. No one in leadership is standing up and saying anything about the crucial importance of food production in our

society.

I, and my colleagues, have every confidence that you, as Commissioners of this current set of hearings, will do your jobs with thorough diligence, equity and fairness, and complete competence, just as numerous previous Commissions have done. There are shelves piled high with reports on livestock production, especially including hog production in Manitoba.

As I stated earlier, I am indeed appreciative, and grateful, for the opportunity to make a presentation to the Commission. Unfortunately, I, and my fellow farmers, have very little confidence that those to whom you will hand your final report, will have the courage to stand up and act on the report; to speak a word of appreciation and support for those who are providing their daily food.

Every society which fails to honour the fundamental and crucial importance of primary food production is doomed to fail. History of examples.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Remple. We will probably have a question or

two. Could you tell me a little bit more about your farm? I'm sorry, you did have the numbers in there. You run a 500 sow, farrow to finish, operation?

MS. REMPLE: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And 1500 acres of cropland. Does your operation provide enough fertilizer for your 1500-acres or do you have to augment that with commercial?

MS. REMPLE: My hogs provide enough fertilizer for about one-third of the crops on an annual basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there sort of a rule of thumb as to how much acreage is fertilized? I guess they are -- I guess they are of varying ages, so they would produce varying amounts of manure?

MS. REMPLE: And because I have all ages, that would hard for me to break it apart.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was interested in your comment about -- you saying 20 years ago about raising hogs primarily for their manure. Is that the case in some parts of the Unites States or some areas of the Unites States?

MS. REMPLE: That's what I was told

this winter, that there are corn producers in Iowa, Nebraska, because of the cost, who are buying manure for -- on par cost with what petroleum-based nitrogen would cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just for the fertilizer. And I had read both about the increased prices and the impending shortage of nitrogen fertilizer. Is it as much as 40 to 50 percent?

MS. REMPLE: It is.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be particularly hard. And the Canadian Quality Assurance Program for hog farmers, you may not know this, or have any idea how many hog farmers are part of that organization or that process or subscribe to that process?

MS. REMPLE: I could only speak for Manitoba. And as far as I know, there are very, very few producers who aren't.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who are not?

MS. REMPLE: Because we need to be certified under the Quality Assurance Program to able to have our animals slaughtered.

THE CHAIRMAN: To have?

MS. REMPLE: To have our animals

slaughtered in this province.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if they are slaughtered abroad, south of the border, which I think a majority are, do they have to be Quality Assurance certified as well?

MS. REMPLE: In most cases. There may be some exceptions I am not aware of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Ms. Remple, in terms of your operation, do you have manure storage at your operation?

MS. REMPLE: Yes, earthen lagoon storage.

MR. YEE: And in terms of your incorporation into your crop fields, do you use injection?

MS. REMPLE: Yes.

MR. YEE: And do you contract this out or do it yourself?

MS. REMPLE: It's contracted out.

MR. YEE: Okay. And I gather, from your information here, that you are using the global positioning system, or the applicator uses that?

MS. REMPLE: Yes.

MR. YEE: I have heard that a few times already. I guess the only question I will ask you is that I gather you do your own feed for your hogs?

MS. REMPLE: Yes.

MR. YEE: And in doing so, are you using phytase or other enzymes for phosphate reduction?

MS. REMPLE: Yes.

MR. YEE: And I guess an ancillary question to that is, do you feel that the new regulations to the phosphate requirements will have a significant impact on your operation or the manure spreading on your fields?

MS. REMPLE: On my operation, probably not much, because I don't have enough manure land. Very little of my land ever gets manure two years in row, and so I am really not facing any phosphorous buildup on my own land.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

MS. REMPLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOTHERAL: Ms. Remple, I very much like the way you put words together, and I think I mentioned that in the scoping meetings also. I enjoyed your presentation. I am especially seeing

that I still have my fingers personally in the farming operation and I am of that one percent or two percent. And my question to you is, do you have any suggestions as to what that one or two percent can do to improve to the awareness of agriculture to our fellow urbanites?

MS. REMPLE: Wow, if I had an answer to that.

MR. MOTHERAL: I am just asking for your suggestions. And I know that it has been a problem. And I know that Keystone Agricultural Producers have been working on this and that it is an important part of this whole process, I realize that.

MS. REMPLE: Yes, definitely. As farmers, we have struggled with this. And for all of my farming career of 30 years, we have been trying very hard to continue getting our message out into the media and having opportunities where urban folks can see the operations, whether it is the heart of the Continent Fair, or whether it's demonstration sites there at the University of Manitoba, for example, that has now been constructed. But it seems that it feels like a very difficult task that we seem to be losing.

There is more disconnection between food producers and consumers, it seems, than ever, and I say that with sadness. And I also say that with one percent or two percent of us left producing the bulk of the food, it's hard to take any more time to spend dedicated to communicating our message continually. You know, take own farm, on my own farm, this is on my own time, this afternoon. And the time that I spent preparing this report is my cost, as well. And, you know, I find that there is an end to how much producers can sacrifice in terms of their time and their efforts to keep telling their story over and over again. And I know it's important, I agree with you.

MR. MOTHERAL: And it is something -- I am not saying it may or may not be in our report, but it is something that the bigger picture is certainly important in the whole situation. It comes up several times. It comes up several times, and I know we have -- our report needs to be focused on the hog industry itself because that's what the Minister asked us to do. But I think there are a lot of other things that we have to look at, too.

Thank you for these words. And I will

say, again, that it's a feather to you, or whatever it is, for the way you put words. Thank you.

MS. REMPLE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I heard you saying that this is taking a lot of time. But it sort of reminded me, while you were talking, of a couple of summers ago when, during the height of the BSE, when the beef farmers had their barbecues down on Portage and Main, that thousands of Winnipeggers realized that cows come from their backyards and not from a Safeway truck. But it does take time and it does take the commitment. Thank you very much for your presentation and for taking the time to come out here today.

Dan Klippenstein. State your name for the record.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Dan Klippenstein.

DAN KLIPPENSTEIN, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Dan Klippenstein. I am the President of Excel Playgreen Group Inc., which is

a hog production company operating a number of hog farms in Manitoba, two of which are in La Broquerie. In addition, we operate a manure application company, which works on quality manure application to farm land for our farms and commercially.

I grew up on a small hog farm in the New Bothwell, Manitoba, where my brother farmed until 2003. My career path took me in a different direction, and I left the family farm to attend the University of Manitoba where I graduated with a degree in agriculture, majoring in animal science in 1979. I then worked in the Manitoba swine industry, as a swine specialist, for a number of private companies until 1991, when I became involved in my own hog operation. In 1994 I graduated from the University of Manitoba with a Masters Degree in Business Administration.

I have been involved in hog farming since I could walk. I have seen the system develop from a loose housing system that gives little animal care, to a controlled quality animal care system, incorporating the use of stalls to house the sows, resulting in less fighting with better individual feed availability and care.

For all the people who claim that they are concerned about animal care on the farm and advocate changing the systems because they know best, I recommend they spend a year working on a hog farm and learn how to take care of pigs. As farmers, our job is to care for the animals, the environment and the protection of the water. That is why, at our farming operations, we have implemented a number of programs to help reduce the environmental impact.

I started Excel Playgreen Group, Inc. in 1994 with the help of family and friends as investors. Excel Playgreen currently employs about 50 people in Manitoba, with a payroll of over $1.5 million. In addition, we purchase over $5 million in feed to feed the pigs, plus hundreds of thousands of dollars in other services from Manitoba suppliers. This is a large impact on the local economies around the barns.

We also sell many of our hogs into the U.S., which provides additional trade dollars for Manitoba and our economy. Being able to produce a product cheaper than our competitors is what drives agricultural trade. Some of the policies the government has adopted are increasing our

costs. The government should not develop artificial barriers that create costs with very benefit.

Currently, the market in Canada is in an extremely tough situation. The market price has decreased by 15 percent, compared to the year before, with no decrease in input costs, according to Stats Canada. Farmers, other than supply managed farmers, are not able to pass on any additional cost. Hog farmers take the price the market gives them. Thus increasing regulation directly impacts the survivability of a farm enterprise. Thus, farms have to continually strive for greater efficiency to remain viable in a very competitive industry.

When we first constructed the first barn, we built a concrete manure storage tank because the soil was sandy and was not good for lagoon construction. An earthen lagoon would not have been as secure a storage system to store our manure. This was before lagoon permits were required and lagoons could be built without much thought. Concrete lagoons also help reduce odour, which benefits the neighbours.

When we expanded the first farm, we

put in a manure separation system, so that could separate some of the solids from the liquids, which gives more control over application rates, with lower phosphorous levels in the more liquid tank. This was so that we had more opportunity to manage the resources of manure for maximum environmental benefit.

I would like to talk about technological advances. With that same concern, we have adopted the use of many new technologies to help decrease costs. These technologies also improve the environment through more efficient use of nutrients and less excess. The following are some of the technologies we have adopted at our farms. And I will describe each and how it benefits the environment and reduces the nutrient load on the land.

Phytase is a product that has become more available in the last few years and has become less expensive. It is an enzyme that breaks down the phytate phosphorous stored in the grain and makes it available to the animal in its production process by way of the TCA cycle. We have used this enzyme for a number of years on a trial basis, and went to full inclusion in all of

our rations about two years ago. The enzyme can replace the inorganic phosphorous in late grower finisher rations and still maintain growth rates. This reduces the amount of phosphorous that we apply to the land.

Net energy formulation. Just recently we have gone to net energy formulation for our rations. This actually decreases the amount of protein in the ration and utilizes more synthetic amino acids, thus reducing the total nitrogen excreted by the pigs. This decreases the amount of nitrogen in the manure and reduces the amount of nitrogen that needs to be applied to the land.

Phase feeding is another management process that we have adopted at our farms. This management strategy attempts to target the right amount of nutrients available at the right time. As pigs get older, they need less protein, phosphorous and other nutrients in their diet. Therefore, by phase feeding the nutrients that they require are provided without creating excess or waste nutrients that need to be disposed of later. This practice not only saves the environment, it saves the feed costs as well.

Split sex feeding. Another practice

that is similar to phase feeding is split sex feeding, where males and females are fed differently based on their needs. This reduces excess nutrients that are not utilized properly by the one sex, since it is more than it needs, and makes sure the other sex gets adequate supply of nutrients, thus reducing excess nitrogen and phosphorous in the manure.

Soil samples. We monitor the soil so that we can determine how much nitrogen we can safely put on the soil. Now with the new regulations, we will also monitor the amount of phosphorous that is in the soil and how much can be applied.

Water conservation. One of the misconceptions is that hog barns waste a lot of water because it is free. I'll have you know that the water that is wasted is not free. It costs about three-quarters of a cent to pump every wasted gallon of water on to the field. So we have undertaken a number of measures at the farm to limit water use.

We have installed wet/dry feeders to reduce the water use and water wastage. This meter collects feeder collects all of the water in

the trough so that the pigs can drink it later, instead of letting it fall into the pit. A maintenance program has been established to repair any dripping water equipment immediately, so that the amount of water lost is reduced.

The farms also use hot water to wash, which reduces washing time and the amount of water used. Water use is less than 10 percent of the water that falls on the land where the barns are located. And when calculating the rainfall on total lands owned, water use would be less than two percent of annual rainfall.

Manure demand: In areas where farms are located, there are many farmers who very much appreciate the manure from our farms on their lands, since it improves their crops and reduces their costs. We give this manure to the farming neighbours and pay the costs of application. We do this to be good neighbours. And, in many cases, they return this favour by providing us straw or helping us with other services, as good neighbours do. Many of our neighbours would like us to build additional farms so that they could get more manure.

Manure application. There are many

technologies used to monitor the proper application of manure. Nitrogen testers, which test the manure, are used on site by our application company to monitor the amount of nitrogen that is applied to the land and the concentration of nitrogen in the manure.

The application equipment we operate has a GPS system on board which can track the application rate and provide detailed analysis of how much manure was applied to the land, as well as where it was applied.

Manure, when applied to cultivated land, is injected into the soil to maximize plant availability and crop growth. When applied to grass, it is dribbled on to the land and the grass takes up the manure.

Manure analysis is done on the manure at a recognized lab to establish the nutrient level in the manure. This is used for planning future applications in conjunction with the nitrogen tester at the site.

In conclusion, with all of the steps we have taken to be environmental stewards, the current situation is that we still have to increase our land base to meet the current

regulations, which I call the Push Bush Law. In order to meet some of the demands of the new regulations, we will have to create more grassland. This means clearing more bush to create more land, creating deforestation of the area. And while I would prefer to leave the land in bush, we, unfortunately, will have to start removing bush this year in order to meet the 2013 deadlines. We are fortunate in that we own two sections of bush, which we can turn into hay land to grow crops and fertilize with our manure.

Our current spread lands would be more than sufficient under the current nitrogen application rules. And, quite possibly, it could be adequate for the phosphorous application rules, if adequate time was given to develop and adopt new technologies that could decrease the need for additional land. It is important that the government provide significant financial assistance to the industry to help us adjust and develop new technologies.

1 percent hogs, 99 percent politics, this is the economic environment that is currently unprofitable. And even without the "pause," there would have been few new hog barns built. What the

"pause" did was create, in the mind of the population, that there is something wrong with hog production or the government would not have put on the "pause".

The new regulations will do little, if anything, to reduce the phosphorous load in Lake Winnipeg. Being that only one percent of land is manured with hog manure, I would contend that if there were no hog barns in Manitoba, there would be no change in the amount of phosphorous that would enter the lake. Since all of the land that currently receives hog manure would receive inorganic phosphate in order to grow crops, the total phosphorous on the land would stay the same.

As hog farmers, we have done a good job of adopting new technologies to reduce the environmental impact. We have always stepped up to the plate to ensure that our environment is sustainable. After all, our families live here. And we take care of our families, just like you. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein. You noted on your first page that the market price has decreased by 15 percent. Is that universal?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes. Well, that's in Manitoba, which would be universal. Well, it would be in Canada, not the U.S., necessarily, because the exchange rates impact things.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was quite interested in some of your technological advances. I think it was the first time I had heard of phase feeding and the split sex feeding. Is that a fairly common practice?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: It's relatively common. I don't know. Most of the larger companies probably do it. I am not sure about the smaller operations.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is this use of technology, whether it's these feeding practices or the use of phytase, or your water conservation practices, are they things that any hog farmer, no matter how big or small, could do, or is this something that really only bigger operations can afford to do?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Well, anybody can feed phytase, you know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: And, you know, phase feeding, it depends on the size of the

operation. But any operation that's 500 units, farrow to finish, probably could do it. Split sex feeding is a little bit more difficult, unless you're larger. But, you know, depending how much it would cost to implement all of that in the smaller operations.

THE CHAIRMAN: And just how big is your operation? How many?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: We have about 7,000 sows, finish half in Manitoba and the other half in the U.S.

THE CHAIRMAN: 7,000 sows. I was also interested in your comments about having to clear land to get more land available. We heard yesterday that hog manure provides enough to fertilize about six percent of the land in Manitoba. And you said in your report, as well, that other farmers around you, and Ms. Remple said the same thing, that other farmers, who don't necessarily have hogs, like to get their hands on this fertilizer. If there is such a demand for it, why do you need to clear more land?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: I guess it depends on the management practice of the land. Some of the land that we have grazes cattle. And cattle

grazing doesn't really uptake phosphorous. So we have to -- you know, unless the land owner starts cropping the land, or cutting the hay and baling it and pulling it off, we will have to find more land that we can do that, you know, that we can do that to use up the phosphorous. And I guess in the area where we are in, La Broquerie, that's a little bit of an issue because a lot of land there is pastured by cow.

THE CHAIRMAN: And most of your operations is in around La Broquerie? You said around La Broquerie.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Two up in La Broquerie and four up in the Fisher Branch area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: You are welcome.

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Klippenstein, I am just wondering, in terms of acreage per spread fields, I realize your operations are in different locations but, approximately, how many acres of land are using for your spread fields?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Well, I guess it varies, depending on each farm little bit. But total acreage that we have available is probably -- I have never added it up, but probably

roughly 3,000 acres or something like that.

MR. YEE: And you would need additional -- based on the new phosphate amendments?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yeah.

MR. YEE: Additional land on top of this?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes, in the La Broquerie area.

MR. YEE: In the La Broquerie area, yes, great. One point you made earlier on is that some of the policies that the government have adopted have increased your costs. And, in particular, you mentioned that government shouldn't develop artificial barriers. And I was wondering, could you explain what artificial barriers you are referring to here?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Well, by implementing regulations, like, for instance, let's say the phosphorous regulations without, you know, giving proper adoption or time or even, you know, there is a lot of technologies that can be used and stuff like that. What it does is raises your costs. You have to move your manure further or you have to do a whole bunch of things to your

land, do a whole bunch of things to take care of it, you know, without -- you know, without giving time to address and adopt, it is kind of just, boom, this is how it is, and that kind of stuff. And that creates additional costs and that creates an artificial barrier for being competitive.

MR. YEE: You have mentioned also that you use concrete storage tanks at all of your facilities?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: All of our facilities that we have constructed. We have purchased a few that have lagoons.

MR. YEE: And you also made note that you use a manure separation system. What type of manure separation system?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: It's a concrete tank with another concrete tank, where we drain off the liquids on the one unit in La Broquerie, and that's the expanded unit.

MR. YEE: So you are not using any other technology like centrifuge?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: It's just basic settling.

MR. YEE: And the only other question that I was going to ask you, because we have heard

this from various people, is about the testing of soils isn't sufficient. I was just going to ask you, I realize you test every year, but how much of this 3,000-acres is tested or how many samples are taken?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: We sample every quarter every year because we have to know what we can apply when. And then we schedule, you know, based on what the nutrient amounts are, on how much we can apply where.

MR. YEE: So how many samples would that be, one sample for a quarter section?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: I think they do 20 samples in a quarter.

MR. YEE: A composite?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes. They do an average of the manure. So the guys that we hire test it, you know, do that and make core samples, send core samples, send it for testing, and send us the results.

MR. YEE: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that once per year?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes, generally, it's once per year. Or if we have to apply a second time on a piece of land, let's say in

spring or fall after the crop is off, then it would be tested twice.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is that typical of the industry?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes, I think everybody tests, you know, once a year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, once a year. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Klippenstein. I have almost got into a different mode today after the first presentation. I guess I'm looking at the bigger picture again. I know there is a constant push for a cheaper product all the time which, of course, is harder on the margins. The margins get less and less. And yet you say that you give your fertilizer away. And I've often thought that there is value to a natural product like that. But why wouldn't you -- why would you be reluctant to charge for it?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Well, I guess, in the areas that we are, which is mostly grassland or a lot of that kind of stuff, farmers have been reluctant to pay.

MR. MOTHERAL: Are you talking mainly

in the La Broquerie area?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: La Broquerie or Fisher Branch, I guess. I mean, we rent -- where we own the land, we rent the land out and the manure gets put on to it, and this kind of stuff. But it's been hard to extract a price for it in our situation. There may be some areas that are more cultivated areas where it would be easier. But if you are not grain cropping, you know, you don't have as much value in the -- or it is tougher to extract a value, I guess, out of the manure.

MR. MOTHERAL: And I realize, of course, you did mention that you do get -- you barter with it. And from your neighbours you get other values and services and that.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Your maintenance program, you said that, like, for reducing the use of your water, you said that a maintenance program has been established. What would you say you -- what do you do to -- what does that mean?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Well, I guess it's the responsibility of the people at the farm that if they see water leaks that they fix them.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.
MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Instead of letting them leak and leak and leak to fill the lagoon.
MR. MOTHERAL: It's not something with a monitor on it.
MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: No.
MR. MOTHERAL: It has to be visually seen?
MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes. We have -- yes, it is visually seen. But we do have water metres on all of our barns and, you know, report the water usage annually.
MR. MOTHERAL: And you do mention a manure separation system. And we have heard that in a few areas in the province, too, as one of the technologies that is still being worked on, I understand.
MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Right.
MR. MOTHERAL: And right now it is quite expensive.
MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes, if you go to real separation or really where it really pulls out all of the solids, and stuff like that, then it gets very expensive. You know, in our situation we kind of separate some the solids by

settling out. And that gives us two options; one, a higher nitrogen application, which is more nitrogen and less phosphorous, and then one that is higher phosphorous, you know, more solids type of application.

MR. MOTHERAL: Do you feel that in the future, supposing there was a need to do this, to go into a separation system where, if you didn't have sufficient land and you had to do this in order to dispose of your manure, would the -- would there be a value to that product, that by-product, the solid product that comes out of that thing, would there be enough there to pay for the installation of the separation system?

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: There quite likely could be. I think that there would have to be some coordination by government to kind of get the system moving so that it could actually trade, you know, or that the value could be realized and that kind of stuff. Because, you know, it wouldn't just establish on its own because, you know, your costs of hauling could become too big a factor. There are a lot of logistical things.

MR. MOTHERAL: It's just that in areas, for instance, like Hanover, where there

is -- you know, it is probably one of the most highly populated areas in Manitoba for ILOs in the province.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Right.

MR. MOTHERAL: And there are a lot of farms in the area that wouldn't require that because they have sufficient land.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Right.

MR. MOTHERAL: And I know that we have discussed that here that with the new phosphorous regulations and the timeframe that things have to be done here, we are going to be looking more into this.

MR. KLIPPENSTEIN: Yes, it's very tight.

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, that's all I've got. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming out this afternoon, Mr. Klippenstein.

Next up on the agenda is John Kroeker. John Kroeker. Please state your full name for the record?

MR. KROEKER: John Kroeker.

JOHN KROEKER, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

MR. KROEKER: Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. I'm John Kroeker, General Manager of Penner Farm Services. Penner supplies livestock equipment to hog, dairy and poultry producers.

My presentation will focus on our relationship with the industry as a supplier of livestock equipment and as a general contractor for livestock housing facilities and relate services.

Penner Farm Services and its related companies have served the livestock industry in Manitoba since the early 1960s. During that time, we have seen many changes in the industry in new technologies and farm practices. And as our customers have expanded, our business has grown with them.

Not so long ago, a producer would decide on expanding his farm and be under construction as soon as he could arrange his financing. Last year it took nine months for a producer to get approval for building permits, manure storage permits, municipal hearings, technical reviews and Manure Management Plans.

The lengthy and onerous process alone suggests that we have an abundance of rules to ensure that the industry is expanding responsibly.

As new issues arise, more rules are expected. Our producers are just as adaptable as producers in other countries noted for hog production. Europe continues to have a sustainable industry, without banning expansion, despite higher human and livestock populations per acre.

Manitoba has more stringent rules than most jurisdictions in North America, yet only Manitoba and Quebec have taken the extraordinary political measures of targeting the hog sector with a ban on new permits. This is wrong. We should be addressing all of the sources causing the environmental concerns and applying the same rules to everybody.

When new rules need to be implemented, we need a more fair and responsible process than the one the government is putting the hog industry through today. I would suggest a notice period that allows for a graduated transition to full compliance of the new regulations, especially if new technology needs to be acquired or if

significant capital needs to be invested. The government should provide incentives to existing operations to offset the additional capital investment required to meet the new regulations. Then let the industry decide if they want to continue expansion within the new rules.

All of the industry stakeholders I know want to use sustainable environmentally responsible farm practices. The industry recognizes that we need rules to sustain their farms, as well as our environment. Sustainability of the hog industry really hasn't been in question until we started hearing about the algae blooms in Lake Winnipeg. Opponents of the hog industry have tried to link it as the culprit. The Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board would say that the problem is caused by many sources. However, only the hog industry has been banned from expanding. It's extremely unfair to blame one producer group for concerns caused by many sources, especially when over half of the phosphorous loading concerns arise outside of the province. It would make more sense, in addressing the phosphorous problem, that everybody contributing to the problem would bear a proportional share of the solution. The hog

industry should not be singled out.

Southeastern Manitoba is thriving today because of a strong mixed farming agricultural base. We have watched several generations of producers expand their farms through diversification and growth, as they have attempted to keep their children interested in farming. Our towns and cities are thriving because our producers are leveraging their cropland into prosperous livestock facilities that employ thousands. Businesses in the region have thrived supplying services to these enterprises. Our schools are full and bursting at the seams, where many other rural regions in the province are seeing continued decline in rural populations. It is no accident that Hanover and La Broquerie, with the highest densities of livestock in the province, are seeing population increases, while other rural municipalities continue to decline. I would suggest that our strong farm base is the main reason Steinbach is growing faster than Brandon.

Most of the producers in Hanover and La Broquerie would agree that the arable land base is fully utilized within these municipalities.

And I was just educated with Marg's report that that may not be the case. Paying attention to soil loading, water quality and drainage makes sense. Good farmers do that because they understand that it is essential to their long-term viability. Restricting manure application to phosphorous levels makes sense if it is causing an environmental problem. Those rule changes were already public prior to the Hog Industry Review. We don't need an industry pause to change the rules, any more than we need a ban on driving while we consider a change in speed limits.

Questioning the sustainability of the hog industry throughout the whole province because we want to change the manure application rates in one region that has a high density of livestock doesn't make any sense. We still have thousands of acres of land in Manitoba that have not seen any manure applied to it. These regions are applying chemical fertilizers to their cropland today. Using non-renewable resources to produce fertilizer surely isn't a sustainable practice. Recycling the undigested feed nutrients back to the field they came from, to be used for the next crop, is a sustainable practice that has been used

for centuries. Why are we preventing low density livestock regions from expanding into hog production today if it would make their farms more viable, create employment and build stronger rural communities?

The effect of the moratorium on new hog facilities is having a huge impact on our company. We are looking at a 50 percent reduction in sales for 2007 as a result of the pause. We are forecasting a further reduction for 2008 if this pause doesn't end soon.

We have employed over 70 people directly in Manitoba last year, and our sub-trades employed at least that many, as will. For many of our staff, this pause means they will lose their jobs. For our customers, it means they are losing a lot of experienced people that could help them with their problems. We can hire again once the pause is lifted, but the experience will be gone for many years.

On the construction side, our trades are moving to other industries. We are projecting that half of the experience that we have in our construction trades today will leave, and not return to the agricultural after they have

established themselves in a different market. We are going to face a huge skill shortage in the future grow that will limit the industry to grow for many years.

Please encourage the government to make a speedy resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kroeker. Could I ask you just to expand a little bit as to why you are predicting a 50 percent reduction in sales?

MR. KROEKER: Because nobody is building any barns.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many barns did you anticipate would be built before this pause came into effect?

MR. KROEKER: Well, not all the barns are the same size. In terms of sales, we are expecting to see a drop of at least $10 million in sales.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry?

MR. KROEKER: We are expecting to see a drop of at least $10 million in sales.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is the main part of your business providing new equipment and new barns?

MR. KROEKER: That would be a bigger chunk, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Kroeker, in terms of you mentioned, along with the downturn, the reduction in sales, the loss of skill sets. What particular skill sets would be lost, in particular, to the agricultural sector?

MR. KROEKER: Well, your service technicians, they learn something every time they fix something. You have fewer of them. You have fewer out there solving equipment problems. On the construction side, your plumbers and electricians and framers are leaving. And once they are established in residential and commercial, they won't be coming back to agriculture.

MR. YEE: And you mentioned also, in terms of the amount of -- there are thousands of acres of land in Manitoba that have not seen any manure applied to it. But we have heard from people that the other issues of looking at using other lands is the distance between where the manure is generated and where it has to be spread and that because you are increasing transportation

costs, that it may not be feasible to actually utilize those lands. Do you have any comment on that?

MR. KROEKER: Yes, I would like to build barns there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I missed some of that?

MR. KROEKER: We would like to build some barns there.

MR. YEE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kroeker.

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, I just have the one question. And you said that you have employed over 70 people directly in Manitoba last year. And with the sub-trades, it was probably that many, as well. Because of the ban, have you lost any yet?

MR. KROEKER: Sub-trades?

MR. MOTHERAL: No. Lost any employees?

MR. KROEKER: Yes. We are down about 20 employees.

MR. MOTHERAL: Does that say that in here?

MR. KROEKER: No, it doesn't say that

in here.

MR. MOTHERAL: You have lost 20. Okay, that's all I've got, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that's directly attributable to the pause?

MR. KROEKER: Some of it might be seasonable, but we are not hiring them back.

THE CHAIRMAN: But has there been a slow down in the industry? I mean, some people have suggested to us that the industry has more or less peaked in Manitoba. I am not saying that that's the case, but some have suggested that. Is some of your downturn because -- your downturn because of -- largely because of the pause?

MR. KROEKER: Well, for this year, yes. And for other years, I would say the industry may have peaked a couple of years ago. But we have still been working at a very healthy pace.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what percentage -- you said that you provide equipment to hog, dairy and poultry producers. What percentage of your business is hogs?

MR. KROEKER: Probably upwards of 60 percent.

THE COURT: 60 percent?
MR. KROEKER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that. I have no more questions. Thank you for coming out here this afternoon, Mr. Kroeker.
Next up on the agenda is Bob Schinkel. Could you introduce yourself, please, for the record?
MR. SCHINKEL: My name is Bob Schinkel.
BOB SCHINKEL, having been sworn, presents as follows:
THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.
MR. SCHINKEL: My name is Bob Schinkel. I'm a real estate agent/broker with Prudential Riverbend Realty in Steinbach. I have been in the real estate business for 30 years, 10 months, 10 months and 25 days, and let's say about six hours. You've got to keep track when you are having fun. Some people say I have one year of experience repeated 30 times, but I think of that kind of as my old school days. I don't know if it's true or not.
I have spent my career selling real estate primarily in Southeastern Manitoba. I

thought a highlight of my career would be when I had a chance at selling a large tract of land south of La Broquerie. It was about 2,000 acres. We started marketing this property in 1984 and 1985, with really no success.

The property was owned by an Italian firm that had purchased it from the Ansel brothers. The Ansel brothers had leased the property back from the Italians for 10 years with an agreement that they would clear the land and then farm it. The Ansel brothers, as they attempted to clear the property and start farming it, proceeded to go bankrupt. The land was marginal, stony, treed land. The Italians, who were attempting to dispose of it, contacted me to dispose of it. Our marketing was unsuccessful. And, as a last resort, we attempted to auction this property in 80 and 160 acre parcels. This was in the spring of 1986. We marketed this land extensively with full page ads in the Carillon News, and with advertisements in the Winnipeg Free Press, et cetera. I thought this would be a milestone in my career and propel me to ultimate success.

We had set very low reserved bids.

After the first three properties did not meet the reserved bids, the owner representative that was there, in desperation, said: "We will sell the next properties, no matter what the price, no reserve bid." As I recall, those prices at the time ranged in between $27 and $35 per acre. These properties were sold to prospective hobby farmers, farmer wannabees, and speculators. We didn't sell all the land at the auction. However, after the auction and, in the subsequent years, we ended up selling all the land.

At the time, the roads were poor and the property was basically undeveloped and had poor drainage. I saw many pig people attempt to earn a living there with beef farming and with very limited success. Over the years, we resold these properties a number of times. These properties eventually ended up in the hands of hog farmers that built new hog barns on these properties. The area was remote to developed housing and seemed to be an excellent location for hog barns.

As this area developed with hog barns, it gave the R.M. of La Broquerie a tax base and allowed them to improve the roads and the

drainage. This also improved the land value, and the manure applied to the land made this marginal land more productive. Cattle capacity was increased, and some of the land was opened up and seeded into hay. Today these land values are in the range of $500 to $600 per acre. I attribute most of this to the hog farming and the increased productivity of the land to the hog manure that was applied to it.

If you look a little further south to the Town of Zhoda, there is a rural two acre development that was developed by Jake Wall, who is commonly known as "square deal Jake". Jake had a vision for Zhoda and the area and spearheaded developing an airport there. He developed a subdivision, built the roads, and attempted to market these properties. He had very limited success. These lots, in the early 1990s, were offered at $1,000 per lot. At the time, there was very little in the way of jobs in the area. Today these lots are selling for, or in the range of, $9,000 to $12,000 per lot. A good number of the people that work in the surrounding area in the hog barns are gravitating to this area. Census Canada tells us that the RM of La Broquerie has

grown at a rate of 26.4 percent from 2001 to 2006.

Now, let's compare this to the LGD of Piney, which is immediately east of the R.M. of La Broquerie. Piney has had a net population growth of 67 people from the year of 2001 to 2006. Their total population is 1,755 people, and it's a big LGD. Myself, and I think every other real estate agent in Steinbach will attest to this, that the real estate agent's car stalls out when it hits the boundary of the LGD of Piney. The chances of selling real estate in Piney are extremely low.

The other painful thing, when you go down there to sell real estate, is that you have to tell the senior farmer, that's in his late sixties or in his seventies, that the farm that he has laboured on all of his life, and it is maybe 160 or 320 acres, is often not worth barely as much as a modest home on a small lot in Steinbach.

Much of this can be attributed to the lack of jobs available in Piney. The LGD of Piney basically has an anti-hog policy. I chuckle when I see the sign on Highway 12 going into the LGD of Piney. And it says something like this: "Welcome to Piney: No hogs, no smell." I was often tempted to add to that sign and say: "No jobs, no

schools, last person out, turn off the lights." I am not saying that every place needs hog barns to have jobs. But hog barns do create jobs, and jobs increase the value of real estate. And once you have jobs, you need schools, you need hospitals, you need infrastructure and then you have a community.

Not long ago, I met an acquaintance, a young blond lady, whose name I will not mention. The last time I talked to her, she had been working at a radio station selling advertising. The conversation led to her present employment, and she said she was working in a hog barn. And her words were: "The pay is better and the customers don't talk back." I didn't ask her which customer smelled better. I really didn't want to know.

The last point I want to make is about water, and particularly about well water. There has been a lot of discussion about hog and agricultural operations contaminating the well water. And I'm surely not an expert at it. As a course of practice in our industry, and we are required by banks, to test the water from all of the wells on the properties that we sell for

e-coli and fecal bacteria.

In the 30 years that I have been a real estate agent, neither I, nor anyone in our firm, has ever had a drilled well that was contaminated from the source. And in my experience, the modern hog farmers today are generally very good stewards of the land, and make an effort to conserve the land that they make their livelihood on.

In short, I feel the hog industry has been a real asset and a benefit to our area, and has added to real estate values and has increased local wages.

Thank you for being able to express my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Schinkel. When you were giving us the growth rates, La Broquerie was about 26 percent growth?

MR. SCHINKEL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And Piney was about 6 percent, is that what it was?

MR. SCHINKEL: No, it's actually less than that. Well, it's 67 people, so it's about 4 percent.

THE CHAIRMAN: About 4 percent.

MR. SCHINKEL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, I know from reading the media, or from the media, the press and radio, that's really both, isn't it, I mean, that this area has been very successful in a number of ways. Just today, I drove by the Layman window plant and the Barkman Concrete. And I've read about the fairly successful, not fairly, very successful immigration programs that have benefited this community, as well as others, in southern Manitoba and southeastern Manitoba. How much of this growth might be attributable to that, as opposed to the success and growth of the hog industry?

MR. SCHINKEL: Well, I mean, the hog industry has a lot of spin-off benefits besides the fact -- besides just the people working in the barns. I mean, you've got the construction. You've got the service after the fact. You've got transport. You know, there is two large transport companies; one in Steinbach, one in Blumenort that does only livestock, livestock or hogs. So there is a lot of spin-off. I surely wouldn't be capable of determining where is which. But, in my opinion, the hog industry has contributed greatly.

I mean, there is making feed, and so on and so forth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, in a different way, I mentioned to the first presenter she had a lovely way of putting words together. And you also have a very different way of putting words together. It just reminded me that just last week, I had the 40th anniversary of my 24th birthday.

MR. SCHINKEL: That's kind of like me.

MR. MOTHERAL: I don't think -- as far as any technical information here, I do know there has been a lot of growth in here. In the area that I originally came from, I would even love to have the four percent growth. And the further west you go, it is quite a bit different, even four percent growth would be phenomenal there. So you are doing well in this area, as far as that goes. Thank you very much for your presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just return to your -- I think it was your first story about the land that the Italian consortium bought and then

you marketed it. When you were describing the land, you said it was rocky and not very good land?

MR. SCHINKEL: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: But now it is?

MR. SCHINKEL: It's improved greatly. I mean, at the -- and, of course, drainage helps a lot. Removing stones improves land.

THE CHAIRMAN: So these were things that were done?

MR. SCHINKEL: These were things that were done. The Ansel brothers started it.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it took a lot of work to make the land into productive land?

MR. SCHINKEL: Yes. At the time, it probably didn't make economic sense. As it turned out, the end story was good. You know, like I would guess that the Italians lost a lot of money in that venture, to the benefit of the latter owners.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for coming out this afternoon.

MR. SCHINKEL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is Mayor Chris

Goertzen.

MR. GOERTZEN: Good afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please introduce yourself for the record.

MR. GOERTZEN: I'm Mayor Chris Goertzen from the City of Steinbach.

MAYOR CHRIS GOERTZEN, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

MR. GOERTZEN: Thank you. Well, I have an uncle, who is a preacher in my church, and whenever I saw him up at the pulpit, I always knew that this is going to be a short service. And so I take after him a little bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's rare in politics.

MR. GOERTZEN: You're right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And a couple of us up here have had some past experiences in local politics.

MR. GOERTZEN: I will have some time to learn.

In the last six years, Steinbach and the southeast region have had tremendous growth. The growth in the region is, by far, the highest

in Manitoba. And the growth in the City of Steinbach has placed it as one of the fastest growing urban centres in Canada. The change in population between the 2001 census and the census taken in May 2006 showed a staggering 19.9 percent increase in population, which translates into 1,839 additional residents. The population in our neighbouring municipalities also showed a remarkable growth, with Hanover increasing its population by over 1,000 people, while the R.M. of La Broquerie increased by 765 residents. This astounding number, like before, translates into a 26.4 percent increase in population.

The economy is strong in the Steinbach region. The diversity of our regional economy is what makes it strong. Our economy is based on three main pillars that have sustained our impressive growth numbers. They are manufacturing, the service industry and agriculture. All three of these pillars of our economy are diversified, thus creating an even stronger and more resilient economy. When one or more segments are on the decline, we have been fortunate to have others that seem to be on the upward trend.

The Hog Industry is a large part of the agricultural base in the southeast region. The effect of the industry is much more far-reaching than boar barns, farrowing barns and finishing barns. It goes much farther than the hundreds upon hundreds of people that find well paying jobs in these places of employment. The reach is much farther than the high yielding crops that many area farmers reap because they are able to effectively manage their fields with nutrients from the industry.

The Hog Industry has had, and we hope will continue to have, a positive effect on the construction service industry in our region. We have seen the benefits spread to the construction workers and companies who are able to secure the contracts for the hog housing facilities, as well as many other maintenance facilities. We have seen the lumberyards and farm equipment dealers realize large increases in their sales. All of these positive effects enable these trade companies to employ more people, thus growing our regional economy.

The transportation industry also has seen tremendous growth in our region. Virtually

every hog that is produced in our region must be transported out of the eastern half of the province to get processed. This has increased the demand for truck drivers and workers to maintain and clean the many transport vehicles.

The hog industry also provides many management and clerical job opportunities for the region's population. Hytek, Puratone, Landmark Feeds and Pro Vista Agriculture all have their corporate or head offices in the offices in the southeast. The industry does not only provide a direct "hands-on" careers for our population, but gives the opportunity for people to be involved in the administration of the industry. This diversity is welcome here in the southeast because we know that this is what makes our economy strong.

The City of Steinbach is concerned about a clean and sustainable environment. This is why, in 2004, we joined the Seine-Rat River Conservation District. Through this organization, we have seen great cooperation between the member municipalities and industries in the southeast.

The hog industry is one of those industries. We have seen consistent participation

and encouragement to improve programs and practices that will prove to be sustainable for the environment. The hog industry leaders that we have in the southeast have been a great example of good corporate citizens. They know that if the environment is sustained and improved, their industry will prosper, and their actions have consistently proven this.

The economy of the Southeastern Manitoba has been greatly improved by the hog industry. These effects have been far-reaching, creating an environment that has produced a large influx of immigrants from outside of our region, outside of Manitoba, and outside of Canada. Steinbach has seen a new ballooning Filipino community, many of which are finding good employment in the hog industry. The trucking, which is also benefiting from the industry, is finding new employees in the United Kingdom who are, in turn, making Steinbach and the region their home.

We have been fortunate in the Steinbach region. The agricultural pillar of our economy is strong. We look forward to a continued and sustainable growth of the hog industry and the

many positive economic aspects it will bring to our region.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And I suspect that you are the envy of many other mayors around the province.

MR. GOERTZEN: It is a good place to be the mayor.

THE CHAIRMAN: With a growing economy and a growing population. Edwin, do you have any questions?

MR. YEE: I guess just one question, Mayor Goertzen. In terms of development, do you have a development plan in combination with your adjacent municipalities, like a district or a regional development plan?

MR. GOERTZEN: No. What we do is we all work individually. But, of course, especially with the new councils that we have, we are meeting on a regular basis to discuss any issues that may come up.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: I just want to ask one question. It's Mayor Goertzen. Mind you, to say

Mayor Goertzen, I am so used to saying mayor Magnusson for the last number of years. It seems strange, but congratulations.

Now, in the City of Steinbach, are there any residents -- this is maybe putting you on the spot -- are there any residents who complain about the odour at times? Because, obviously, there will be odour in towns because there is in the R.M., et cetera. But are there complaints or do you think there are people who are reluctant to complain because it is the backbone of their area?

MR. GOERTZEN: Well, first of all, I don't -- very seldom do we find that there is an issue in the city. The issue is -- the issue is, if anything, our own lagoon, which is north of us. So, really, we hear very few complaints.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. I will be asking the same question this evening as the R.M. comes up.

MR. GOERTZEN: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Because it's interesting to note that that's the reason why we have this one person that you can contact in our Environment Commission if anybody is reluctant to

come up and say something, they can phone in. And no doubt there are people that don't want to squeal or don't want to report on their neighbours and stuff like that.

MR. GOERTZEN: When that smell does come about, you often hear the comment: It smells like money.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes, I know, and I've heard the same thing. I was in a community in Ontario, and everybody just took it. They say: That's the way it is, that's the way we operate. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you able -- and I asked this question of Mr. Schinkel earlier. Are you able to give an idea of how much of the growth in your community is from manufacturing and services and agriculture, the three pillars that you noted?

MR. GOERTZEN: Well, it's diverse. And so, in the end, I could make up some number numbers. And I could make them up now or earlier on. But it is very hard to tell what it is and where that level is, but it is certainly significant. Anecdotally, you know that it is significant. And, in reality, we don't have those

hard numbers because they are very hard to come by.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anecdotally, you know it is significant in each area or in the agriculture area?

MR. GOERTZEN: Anecdotally, you know that agriculture, and specifically the hog industry, plays a huge component of the -- of the success that we have seen here in the southeast in our community.

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, I can see driving through your community on the numbers of occasions we have been out here in the last few months, that this hearing and other hearings that we held in this hall, I can see just the new service development. I mean, there is that one corner where there is about 16 huge grocery stores going up.

MR. GOERTZEN: Wait a year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the manufacturing industry grown significantly? I mean, some of it is well established?

MR. GOERTZEN: They have continued to grow as well. You see Loewen, as well as Biovail and a lot of smaller companies, as well, continue

to grow. Some of the smaller ones specifically are quite connected to the hog industry, as well, such as WS Welding, and so on, who are manufacturing things for them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR. MOTHERAL: Does Steinbach have a real sustainable water supply?

MR. GOERTZEN: Yes. We have, I believe, it's three or maybe four wells right now. And they are drilled wells. And they are from the large aquifer that the southeast has.

MR. MOTHERAL: Could you see in the future Steinbach being able to process hogs?

MR. GOERTZEN: Never say never. I mean, that's a big question.

MR. MOTHERAL: That's a political question. I mean, that's not fair.

MR. GOERTZEN: Well, that's, obviously, a huge question. And in the end, that requires a lot of infrastructure. And where there is a will, there's a way.

MR. MOTHERAL: That's the reason why I asked the water question first.

MR. GOERTZEN: There is -- well, we have an abundant amount of water.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Mayor Goertzen.

Shanyn Silinski. Take care of the formalities. Could you please introduce yourself for the record?

MS. SILINSKI: Shanyn Silinski.

SHANYN SILINSKI, having been sworn, presents as follows:

MS. SILINSKI: And thank you for your time this afternoon, Commission, honoured guests. As the head of the Manitoba Farm Animal Council, I am going to take a few minutes of your time to let you know about our organization and how it ties in with these hearings.

The Manitoba Farm Animal Council has been in existence since 1991. And we have been advocating and educating for and to producers and farmers within animal agriculture within this province. Canada has four other provincial Farm Animal Councils; Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and there is a newly minted National Farm Animal Council. And all of our mandates are the same.

The foundation of our council is the agriculture industry. It is their council. This

is a short list of some of the things that we do. Three of the live animal exhibits, which answers some of your questions about educating our urban and rural non-farming friends. We have "Thru The Farm Gate" at the Brandon Fair, "Touch The Farm" at the Red River Exhibition. And we coordinate with Ag in the Classroom for the "Amazing Ag Adventure", which allows school children to go through the barn and experience agriculture firsthand.

We are supported by commodities within the province in animal agriculture. And as you can see from these photos, everyone gets to touch the farm and gain that connection back to industry, which really is the foundation industry for Western Canada, and it is Manitoba's second largest industry.

I remember hearing stories my grandpa would tell me, when he was growing up on the farm as a young man farming with horses. And this was long before the days of environmentalism or anything else. And he said: It is all about stewardship. If you take care of your land, it takes care of your animals, which takes care of you.

And in those days, you really had to be careful how you were a steward of your resources, because it was your family's true bread and butter. That was the groceries on your table is what you raised. And it was very important to take care of the land, so it could take care of you. And that's the same today. Farmers have to take care of their land, just as they have to take care of their livestock. And it becomes not just a matter of stewardship ending with the animal, but it also starts and begins with the land.

And there are some pictures of the "Amazing AG Adventure".

The Manitoba Farm Animal Council coordinates a number of training sessions and information sessions throughout the year, including one in this hall last summer dealing with the Anthrax breakout. That was a very critical workshop for us because we were able to put it together within ten days of the outbreak, give producers, rural municipalities and the public information that they needed to deal with the outbreak, prevent future outbreaks and explain what exactly an Anthrax outbreak can do, not only to producers and their livestock, but the dangers

it posed to people who were not careful. There are some pictures of the Anthrax workshop.

We also co-ordinated the Livestock Emergency Response Course, which teaches first responders, producers and the RCMP how to handle livestock in an emergency. And this goes directly to the welfare of the animals and the safety of the people, but it also becomes a stewardship issue because you want to make sure that you are taking care of the animals from the start to the finish.

Experience has taught us that being proactive is superior to being reactive. Anybody that knows me, knows that being proactive is much better than my first knee-jerk reaction, and that's the one that gets me into trouble. But we also know that reactive can be a very positive thing if it is well thought out and considered: How we are going to react to things?

Having been raised on a farm, a sixth generation western Canadian, living in the country and in a rural lifestyle, and choosing farming as a way of life, I have to say farmers are not always the best crowd at standing up and saying: We do a good job. Farmers, however, are very good

at finding ways of doing a better job. They are always looking at research. They are always trying find a better way to do things for their for their livestock, for their land and for their livelihood.

And the Manitoba Farm Animal Council plays a role in that in that because we encourage research, dialogue. And we also produce materials that educate and inform producers how to do a better job. And when they are doing a better job, we tell other people. So we work with Glenlea. We work with the University of Manitoba. The Farm Animal Council is proactive, responsive, growing in a positive organization that supports the animal agriculture industry in Manitoba and across the country.

There is strength in numbers. And there is a powerful vision and a powerful voice when agriculture stands up and speaks with one voice and says, "we are doing a good job." Let us continue doing a good job. We have a solid foundation. We have the prairies that we have settled because of farming. And we are going to continue into the future feeding our country and feeding those countries that depend on our bread

basket.

We are making sure that our voice is heard for animal agriculture. And we are making sure that animal agriculture is the moving force to set the agenda for our industry. We want to make sure that those experts who know animal agriculture are the ones that are paving the way to the future, so that our united voice and our proactive approach and our reactive responses are the ones that will meet the needs of our children and grandchildren as they honour the legacy of our grandparents and great-grandparents.

I think Dwight Eisenhower put it in a nutshell very neatly when he said:

> "Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles from the corn field."

You can insert whatever agriculture industry you want for "corn field", and it still says the same thing.

And I would like to close with a little Garfield humour from his dad.

But the main thing that I want you to take away from this little clip, and the moments we have had here today, is that the reason we are

here is because, "these things matter to farmers". And when farmers take the time to stand up and say, "it matters", then that's when people need to listen because usually farmers are busy doing their business of raising food and taking care of their land and taking care of their animals and keeping the store shelves full.

Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Silinski. Can you tell me a little bit more about your organization, and just where you are based?

MS. SILINSKI: I am based out of my home office in La Broquerie on our farm. And we do use our commodity offices in the city for meetings, and those types of things, when we need to be putting together presentations or workshops. And we do try to spread things over the province so that we do have a wide range of things for our producers.

THE CHAIRMAN: How are you funded?

MS. SILINSKI: We are funded through Farm Gate, a percentage of the Farm Gate receipts, through the commodities that have chosen to be our members.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what are those commodities?

MS. SILINSKI: Pork Council, Dairy Farmers of Manitoba, Manitoba Cattle Producers, Manitoba Sheep, Manitoba Equine Ranchers, and the Chicken Producers.

THE CHAIRMAN: So pretty well all of the animal farmers?

MS. SILINSKI: Yes. And that demographic is pretty much the same across the board for our sister organizations as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean the ones in other provinces?

MS. SILINSKI: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there full-time employees?

MS. SILINSKI: I am it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are it?

MS. SILINSKI: I am it.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you do all of these things or do you have a good volunteer base?

MS. SILINSKI: I have a really great volunteer base through our commodities. And I do have a really great volunteer through my husband. He is my unpaid staff with benefits. But we do

have a lot of resources. The commodities are very good at sharing resources. The university is another resource that we share information back and forth with. And a lot of it really is the sharing of information, and technology helps us do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: And when you put together these demonstrations at the Brandon Fair and the Red River Exhibition, who does that?

MS. SILINSKI: The commodities send volunteers and staff to do that. And, in fact, oversees all that have to ensure that, of course, animal welfare is taken care of. And we answer any inquiries from the public about the animals.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you get -- the Brandon Fair is very clearly an agricultural fair, so I'm sure you get a lot of attention there. But do you get much attention at the Red River Exhibition? I mean, it has always been an agricultural fair, but most people go there for the loopy rides, or whatever.

MS. SILINSKI: I am pleased to say that we have a lot of good response at the "Touch The Farm" at Winnipeg. And a lot of them are from the city. And many, many of them are return

visitors. We have had a lot of generational stories where the grandparents farmed. Their kids are in the city. And now they are bringing their grandchildren so that they can have that connection back to agriculture.

And we have had some people that have lived in the city their whole life and have never even seen a live farm animal in person, so to speak. And one lady identifies herself as being in her sixties. And she had never touched a baby farm animal. She didn't know how large a pig got. She didn't know the difference between a dairy cow and a beef cow until she actually saw them. And she got to hold a baby chick, which was something she had never in her life experienced. And I think she spent two hours in the barn because she just had such a great time. And she was going to bring her family and her grandchildren back for the next year.

So it is really a good opportunity to share with our urban neighbours what our rural people are doing. But there is also that second disconnect, where we have rural non-farming people living next door to rural farming people. And they don't understand why the tractor is out at

the crack of dawn, and why you are hauling silage, and why you have to move manure, and why they call it weaning and why they are milking. If we don't teach them, they can't learn.

And the Manitoba Farm Animal Council doesn't want to change minds, but we want to have people make informed decisions. The more information you have, the better decisions you will make because you have a more rounded perspective of what is going on around you, whether it be an issue, something historical or a current event.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: I don't think so. I don't think so, no. There are some things that I wonder -- and it's great for kids to touch animals and that, but do they realize that they could be my next meal?

MS. SILINSKI: We make sure that that's clear. Farm animals are not pets. You have to name show cattle because you have to call them something. And some cows get called other things that we can't repeat in polite company, but that's the nature of livestock. And we make it very clear that these are not pets, that they are

not there to be shown as pets. These animals are producing the food that these people see in the grocery store everyday. And they need to know that there is more cow to that carton of milk than just the cartoon cow on the side of the carton, for sure.

MR. MOTHERAL: And maybe that's a point where we can say that they are getting food, but that it's really cheap food. Maybe we can get that reaction somehow.

MR. YEE: Yes. Ms. Silinski, can you explain a bit more about the Livestock Emergency Response course in terms of the content and what it addresses?

MS. SILINSKI: Certainly. Jennifer Woods is the instructor for that course. And she took her training from Dr. Temple Grandin, who is a phenomenal leader in animal husbandry and farm animal welfare.

And what the course covers is how to handle livestock in an emergency. And this is especially true for emergency responders and police because most of them aren't lucky enough to come from the farm. If you have a car accident with people, that's one set of stressors. And I

was in the fire service for seven years.

If you add a liner load or a trailer load of animals to that, then you have exponentially increased the chanced for additional injury and death, danger, and the possibility that things are going to get completely out of hand. So what we try to do in that course is to teach people how to handle animals trapped in a trailer, how to get them out, how to euthanize them, how to transport them, how to do crowd control.

And we really want to make sure that the RCMP, when they get a call about a liner rollover, that their dispatcher is asking the right questions: How many animals? Are they still in the trailer? What species size are they? Does anybody know what size they are? If you have bison loose, you are not going to see them. They are going to meet you halfway back to the fire hall because they pick a direction and they go. Cattle and birds and horses like to stay close to their companions, and they will stay in a herd. If you have one animal wandering all alone by itself, all it is trying to do is get back to animals of its own kind. And there is the danger of one lone animal that the responders may not be

aware of, and so we try to increase that knowledge base.

Teach them how to cut into a trailer, to never turn over a loaded trailer. Aluminium trailers, if you try to put pressure on one side and you try to tip it up, it tends to fall out, which adds to the scene. And, of course, the biggest thing with the Emergency Livestock Response Course is to never endanger human life to save an animal's life. But we want to be aware, because that's the product of someone's farm and livelihood, to make sure that most of them can finish their journey, and those that can't are humanely destroyed. Because in Manitoba, and in Canada, it is against the law to transport animals for euthanizing them. It has to be on site. And so we have to train our RCMP and our animal protection officers to do that job well.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Silinski.

MS. SILINSKI: Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, you are welcome. And that brings us, well, just about to that time

for a coffee break. But also to the end of the list of people who had previously indicated that they wanted to make presentations. We will take a 15-minute break. And if, during that time, or in the last hour or two, any of you have decided you would like to make a presentation, please let us know that during the break and we will hear you after you the break. Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 3:18 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 7:00 P.M.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening.

Could I ask you to take your seats? I would like to reconvene. We have five presentations that have registered for this evening. The first one is the Manitoba Federation of Labour Occupational Health Centre. Could you please come up here and take seats at this front table? Would you please introduce yourselves for the record?

MS. LOVERIDGE: My name is Carol Loveridge. I'm the Executive Director of the Manitoba Federation of Labour Occupational Health Centre.

MS. LUDWIG: And my name is Diana Ludwig. And I am one of the nurses at the

Manitoba Federation of Labour Occupational Health Centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Cathy will now administer the oath.

CAROL LOVERIDGE, having been sworn, presents as follows:

DIANA LUDWIG, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, please, ladies.

MS. LOVERIDGE: Good evening.

I would like to thank the Commission for giving us this chance to make this presentation. And our presentation is about workers' health, workers who work in the industrial hog barn industry.

Workers in industrial hog barns will most directly, and probably most profoundly, be affected by the environmental impacts of the hog industry. The Environment Act should be a valuable legislative tool to help protect the health of workers.

The hog industry needs to be placed within the context of a sustainable development strategy to ensure the long-term health of workers

and the affected communities. A comprehensive review of the potential environmental impacts would not be complete without consideration of the occupational health risks related to the industry. The hog industry poses health risks to Manitoba workers that must be addressed.

The MFL Occupational Health Centre has established itself as an important community based resource on occupational health and safety for workers and communities in Manitoba. Our Centre has a respected track record of addressing health and safety issues at public hearings and through submitted written documents as part of the public consultative process when legislated changes are being considered.

The Occupational Health Centre is grounded in the belief that those people who share common health concerns must play an active role in addressing those concerns. Further, the community working together is better able to promote the health and well-being of its individual members and the community as a whole.

And, finally, the OHC believes that the workers should not bear any burden of illness or injury because of their work. We intend to

highlight some of the very real and important health considerations of workers in industrial hog barns. The occupational hazards that affect a worker's health also affect the well-being of their family and community.

And I am not going to read every part of the paper. I am just going to do the highlights, for those of you who are following along.

Respiratory problems. Hog production has undergone rapid transformation from family-owned operations to large scale industrial enterprises. An increasing percentage of pigs are being raised in large industrial hog barns. And size does matter. When something goes wrong in a large hog barn, the potential of risk for occupational and environmental damage is correspondingly large.

Large hog barns are complex environments, with a variety of gases and dusts present. And it is well documented in the international scientific literature that exposure to the air in large hog barns may cause not only short-term but long-term harmful health effects in workers.

Thousands of gases, particles and bioaerosol emissions have been documented in industrial hog barns. Industrial hog barns generate dusts, dander and gases released from the breakdown of hog feces and urine that contribute to poor air quality if the ventilation in the building is not adequate. In the summer, hot weather increases the amount of gas released from the manure.

Environmental assessments of air quality inside industrial hog barns done during research studies revealed unhealthy concentrations of hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, inhalable particulate matter and endotoxin. And it is important to keep exposure to all dust and gases as low as possible to minimize health risks to workers.

It is best to find out if there is a problem with dusts and gases in the hog barn before health problems develop. An exposure limit is the amount of a hazard that most, but not all workers, can be exposed to without harming their health.

Occupational exposure limits have several limitations and should not be solely

relied upon to protect the health of workers in hog barns. These limitations include:

The lack of appropriate occupational exposure limits for some of the air contaminants, including organic dusts.

The inability to adequately account for the health impact of exposure to multiple airborne hazards.

The reality that some workers will experience health problems at exposures that are below the exposure limits.

Although modern barns appear cleaner, the air inside these barns still carries toxic molecules which are harmful to the workers. Cleaner, modern, industrial hog barns are not less harmful than the older ones. In addition, routine spot check air analysis are not sufficient to evaluate the potential toxic effect of the barn air.

Working in barns is often a full-time occupation. The higher the levels of harmful dust and gases, and the more time that workers spend in the barn, then the greater the chance that workers will develop health problems.

And there have been more than 70

papers published on the adverse health effects on workers within the industrial hog barns in Canada, Unites States, most European countries, and Australia.

A small proportion of workers experience acute respiratory symptoms early in their work history sufficiently severe to cause immediate withdrawal from the workplace. To better understand the effects of exposure to air within industrial hog barns, many researchers have exposed healthy volunteers for several hours only once to barn air. Even a single exposure induces fever, malaise, drowsiness and thickening of the membranes of the nose and activates an inflammatory response in the lungs.

The collective body of research clearly indicates that at least 25 of workers in industrial hog barns have respiratory diseases, including bronchitis, mucous membrane irritation, asthma-like syndrome, and acute respiratory distress syndrome. And notably, organic dust toxic syndrome, related to higher concentrations of bioaerosol in industrial barns, occurs episodically in more than 30 percent of the workers.

Several studies indicate that workers in industrial hog barns have significantly more sick days than controls. Workers in industrial hog barns have a higher incidence of impaired airflow and lung inflammation.

Epidemiological studies of workers in industrial hog barns have documented increases in morning phlegm, coughing, scratchy throat, burning eyes, wheezing, shortness of breath, and chronic bronchitis, compared to that that do not work in industrial hog barns. The severity of respiratory symptoms increases during the winter due to reduced ventilation.

Several large scale studies indicate endotoxins, which are toxins that are released when organisms die. Several large scale studies indicate that endotoxin exposure for workers in industrial hog barns have been associated with both respiratory and systemic, as well as changes in lung function. There is considerable evidence that endotoxin exposure may both exacerbate pre-existing asthma and induce new asthma. Recent studies from Canada suggest that women are more prone than men to develop asthma from working in industrial hog barns.

Dusts contribute substantially to the extent and severity of respiratory symptoms for workers in industrial hog barns. Feed particles and fecal matter are the most prevalent components of dusts in industrial hog barns. Other components include dander, moulds, insect parts, and mineral ash. Asthma and hypersensitivity, pneumonitis are associated with exposure to organic dusts.

In livestock confinement environments, it is important to be aware of the risks associated with the combinations of the various gases and dusts. The combination of the variety of gases in the confined space may increase the negative health of any one type of agent or gas. For example, dust particles may absorb ammonia. Ammonia is water soluble and is usually absorbed by mucous in the upper respiratory tracts when inhaled. This process protects the lungs from the effects of exposure to moderate ammonia. Dust particles, however, and the ammonia absorbed in them, are delivered more deeply into the pulmonary system. This scenario allows ammonia to have an impact on the more sensitive deeper areas of the pulmonary system where ammonia would not typically

reach.

Exposure to dust aerosols during the cleaning inside hog barns can induce an acute inflammatory reaction in the upper airways of workers when using a high pressure cleaner for several hours. Also, the use of a mask reduces, but does not eliminate, this inflammatory response.

In colder climates, heating may be achieved with propane or other fossil fuels in large hog barns. High dust levels make it difficult to keep heaters and equipment working effectively. The amount of harmful gas in the air may be higher in the winter if less fresh air is coming into the building. And the heaters, and other equipment, can malfunction, and/or inadequate ventilation may result in a build up of carbon monoxide, thus causing carbon monoxide poisoning.

Some community environmental air quality assessments have shown concentrations of hydrogen sulfide and ammonia that exceed Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry recommendations. There is a growing body of evidence documenting excessive respiratory

symptoms in neighbours adjacent to industrial hog barns. The pattern of their symptoms is similar to those of the workers working in the barns. Increased prevalence of childhood asthma on farms with increasing numbers of hogs has also been documented.

The Clean Environment Commission needs to ensure that owners of industrial hog barns comply with Workplace Safety and Health legislation. Employers are responsible for the safety and health of all the workers. Employers should keep exposure to all dust and gases as low as possible.

Owners of industrial hog barns should include worker representatives in the process of identifying job risks and exploring ways to minimize workplace health and safety risks. A critical first step is to identify the source of the problem.

This should be done with the health and safety committee or worker representative. Workers often best understand the hazards of their particular jobs. Employers need to provide all workers with easy to understand information and training about health hazards in the barn.

Employers should involve their workers to ensure that procedures and equipment are appropriate and convenient.

Owners of hog barns should:

Control exposure to hazards at the source of the hazards by minimizing or eliminating the air contamination by using adequate ventilation systems.

Make sure that the mechanical ventilation system has enough capacity to effectively get rid of the harmful gases at all times.

Use respirators only, in addition to, but not as a substitute for adequate ventilation to protect the health of workers.

Make sure that workers have access to the right type of respirators that fit properly. Instruct workers how to use, clean and maintain the respirators.

Install gas detectors and test for harmful gases throughout the day in the barn.

Evaluate the health impact of all air contaminants on workers and do not rely solely on occupational exposure limits to determine if the air is safe.

Danger can also come quickly!

Hydrogen sulfide is an extremely toxic gas formed by the decomposition of animal waste. Workers may be exposed to hydrogen sulfide when they enter the manure storage pit or when the pit is agitated prior to being emptied. This releases large amounts of hydrogen sulfide into the barn. Workers who survive exposure to excessive amounts of hydrogen sulfide may develop adult respiratory distress syndrome.

And workers will be in immediate danger if there is not enough oxygen. Some workers and rescuers, without enough ventilation and the right kind of respirators, have become unconscious or died in Manitoba when they entered the manure pit.

The CEC needs to ensure that owners of industrial hog barns comply with Workplace Safety and Health legislation. Employers are responsible for the safety and health of all their workers. This includes preventing a dangerous exposure to hydrogen sulfide.

Owners of hog barns should:

Hire trained professionals to do the most dangerous work, such as emptying lagoons or

working inside tanks or deep pits.

Post warning signs in all areas at risk. Stand a safe distance outside the tank or building when the manure pit or tank is stirred or emptied.

Make sure that the level of gases are safe before workers re-enter the hog the hog barn, lagoon, tank or deep pit.

Now we are coming to our recommendations.

Hog producers have expanded in Manitoba just as environmental scrutiny and public disfavour begin to stunt hog expansion in some other parts of Canada and globally. We must carefully consider the current and future ecological footprint that will be left by the hog industry in Manitoba.

Protecting our workers and our environmental heritage upfront is in the best interests of all Manitobans in the long run. If the hog industry limits itself to only the shortsightedness of the business bottom line, then eventually the costs will catch up in some other way.

Later, most of the health, social and

economic burdens of occupational and environmental illnesses are more likely to be unjustly carried by the worker, families, communities and the taxpayers, rather than at the source of the problem. And we also need to both protect the health and safety of workers and concurrently embrace and plan for an ethical and sustainable economy.

In keeping with the spirit of the precautionary principle that is embedded in both the Provincial Environment Act and the Sustainable Development Act, we should:

Ensure that current laws, regulations, policies are enforced to protect workers, families, communities and the environment.

Continue with the moratorium on expansion of the hog industry until we know that workers, communities and the environment are protected.

Initiate independent research that gathers local knowledge from workers in hog barns, community residents, as well as expertise from occupational, community and environmental specialists based on the Manitoba context.

Mandate environmental impact

statements for proposed hog barns that includes occupational/environmental health, social justice, and socioeconomic issues.

Decisions to issue permits for industrial hog barns should be considered in public meetings and decided by the whole community.

And, finally, support the farming of hogs in a way that protects the health of workers and their communities, using sustainable, environmentally sound and ethical practices. Support small scale farming operations. The trend toward large scale livestock operations increases the risk of a number of health problems. By supporting opportunities for smaller scale livestock farms in Manitoba, we can minimize some of the health impacts on workers and the wider community from larger scale operations.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You included some other things, some journal articles?

MS. LOVERIDGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much of a problem is it in Manitoba?

MS. LUDWIG: I'm not sure. The fact is that our workplace goes into workplaces as invited. And so we have, actually, not been invited to any of the industrial hog barns. However, we have seen workers that have come to visit our doctors with symptoms and health problems.

MS. LOVERIDGE: I would also like to add that on our website, we also have the fact sheets that you see there. And in the last six months, we have had 350 hits alone on the website for that are particular fact sheet about dust and gases. So somewheres out there people are perceiving this as a problem. And we have no way of knowing, you know, why they want to look at that. But it is a very significant number, for a province of this size, in just a matter of six months.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have there been any complaints or concerns registered with the Occupational Health Branch of the Department of Labour, do you know?

MS. LUDWIG: I gave them a call and asked how many industrial hog barns they had been to in the last couple of years. And they said: A

few. And I said: What does that mean? And they said: A few. And so I think that the Department of Labour is starting to visit some of the industrial hog plants. But I think the numbers still are very small that have really been seen, from what I gather from that response.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I should know this, but I just don't. Are the large hog barns covered by Workers' Compensation? Farms can opt in because it is not compulsory, but how about the large hog barns?

MS. LUDWIG: I think the same rules apply as the regular agricultural sector.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's correct, but I'm not certain. Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes, just a few questions. I guess one for clarification. I think this may be somewhat redundant, as Terry has asked you this. I noticed that you have given us some statistics, and I haven't had a chance to look at it. But, again, do we have any statistics from Manitoba? And I think that your answer was that, no, we don't.

MS. LUDWIG: You know, we probably could. I think that the challenge would be for

the Workers' Compensation Board to have a way of looking at their data that actually segments that sector, and then we would have a better idea of that. But my understanding is that right now that sector, in general, isn't segued, because we have look at other issues such as the meat packing plants, and so I think that this would not be segued as well.

MR. YEE: In terms of your comment on occupational exposure limits have several limitations, can you elaborate a bit on that? What sort of limitations are you referring to in terms of the occupational exposure limits? And, I guess, are you referring to OSHA and NIOSH standards?

MS. LUDWIG: Well, for many of the dust and gases in the more finally defined ways, we actually do not have exposure limits. So you can't go measuring something that you don't have the tools to measure with. And that would be true of many of the dusts and gases, including the organic gases, which are so prevalent in the hog barns. So the fact that we don't even have a way to measure is a paramount challenge in and of itself. But even if we do measure something like

a hog barn, where there is such a great interaction probably between dusts and gases, and multiple dusts and gases, life being complicated, it is unlikely that even if isolates were able to be measured, that they may or may not be a good indicator of the predisposition or the risk to health problems.

MR. YEE: Okay, I think I understand what you are getting at. So in terms of where you have an OSHA or NIOSH limit for hydrogen sulfide or ammonia, what you are saying is that because of the mixture of the other potential contaminants, that there may be cumulative or other effects that can't be addressed?

MS. LUDWIG: Right.

MR. YEE: And I guess don't have any suggestions as to how we would go about assessing this? We would have to do research into all of this, then?

MS. LUDWIG: Well, we have always believed at the Centre that this would be no different than any other manufacturing sector, and that the key is good ventilation.

MR. YEE: Right.

MS. LUDWIG: And because you will

never really know always what goes out into the air, our knowledge is finite. And the possibilities are probably infinite. So the only way of addressing that at the source is to -- because it's an air quality issue, is to ensure the best air quality. And the best way to ensure that is to have fresh air coming in.

MR. YEE: But for guidelines, would we use existing dust parameters or, say, the hydrogen sulfide or ammonia parameters, as being level we should attain when we are using fresh air and in monitoring the hog barns?

MS. LUDWIG: Well, for the things that are known, like hydrogen sulfide and ammonia, and some of the others, yes. But I think that we have to keep in mind that the more we know, the more there is a tendency to want to be cautionary.

And I think perhaps the Netherlands lead in this example, in the fact that they were getting concerned about the health effects and decided to develop guidelines that were considerably more stringent than the previous guidelines had been. And to the point where when they said: We're comfortable at this level, and certainly more, that the technology was such that

there was no way of ensuring that that, in fact, could be met. So they have given a two-year period to help the technology come into place because they are not, in the long run, comprising on those new levels. They believe that to safeguard the health of the workers that it should not exceed those levels. And perhaps it might even need to be lower than that, but they should not be higher than that, but an interim provision has been made.

MR. YEE: And just one last question. And it's another comment in terms of guidelines. You mentioned some community environmental air quality assessments have shown concentrations. So in terms of community air quality, I guess you would use the OMNI air quality guidelines as being the objectives that you would try to attain for that?

MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was a little confused here by a couple of these statements that you made where

sometimes you say: "Owners of industrial hog barns", and then you will say just plain: "Hog barns". And so can you tell me what is your definition of an industrial hog barn, as compared to anything else?

MS. LUDWIG: It's a large scale hog operation. So we didn't necessarily think in terms of numbers. But certainly those approaching a thousand, and certainly more than that, would definitely qualify for a large scale hog barn or for an industrial hog barn. And some people would say even considerably less than that would probably qualify for that, as well. But we did not put a number on it. We just know that the larger the scale, the larger the potential of risk is for all kinds of things, including making it more difficult to protect the health of the workers.

MR. MOTHERAL: And in what way do you mean that? I mean, just because it's larger? I mean, quite often we found out that larger operations are more efficient and have more of the safeguarding stuff than a lot of the other operations.

MS. LUDWIG: Efficient in what way?

MR. MOTHERAL: Just with newer technologies.

MS. LUDWIG: Right. It is interesting, and it was a Canadian study, that took a look at the newer, what was considered the cleaner barns. And, in fact, they found that the air quality was not significantly different in the newer, cleaner, more technologically sophisticated hog barns than in the other hog barns. And I think that that really speaks to the density of the animals. I mean, the more animals that you have in a confined area, the more dusts are created. You know, animal dander as being a huge component of that. And the gases that are released from the urine and feces that gather in great concentrations in a very small space. So although there are efficiencies, there are also, I guess, laws of density, you know, in effect, as well. And I just do not know how else to say that.

MR. MOTHERAL: And one more thing here, in your recommendations, you know, like: "Owners of hog barns should" and then you've got several recommendations here, and they are very good recommendations. But it would be interesting

to know, and it is something that we, as a Commission, are going to have to find out, sooner or later, how many of these suggestions are already being implemented?

MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: And this is important for us. Because certainly safety workers is important to everybody, and also to owners of hog barns. And I would imagine that they are looking into these things all the time.

MS. LUDWIG: And, you know, I think that's a very important question. And it would be true, you know, within the hog industry, as it is in any manufacturing centre -- sector. I think you would need to know. But I think what has mostly been of concern to us, in our Centre, is that it is so hard to find out to know. And things may be, in some ways, moving forward. But we don't have a sense of that, because we have know way acquiring a sense that. And until we do, we just want to have a strong for the workers because, right now, we truly don't know, but we suspect from the people or the workers that have come to see us.

MR. MOTHERAL: It is just that you can

see the challenge that the Commission have to -- we need numbers. We need number and statistics. And when you hear statements like: "There was a growing body of evidence documenting this", well, I am hoping that some of that stuff will be in these papers that we have here.

MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Because it is easy to say that, but it has to be backed up by the numbers.

MS. LUDWIG: Yes. And I would really encourage you -- we picked the articles primarily for their overview or their insight into particularly important questions, one or the other. But we also picked a couple of them because of their eclectic representation. There is one article there that was written in February of 2007. And it has representatives from the Netherlands, from I think Sweden.

MR. YEE: Denmark and Iowa.

MS. LUDWIG: And American and two Canadian centres. And so you are getting, then, a really eclectic world approach to the issues, and some of the thoughts that I would think are very current if it is February 2007. And so we could

have lots of articles, but we chose very few. But everything in our report is substantiated in an article somewhere. We did not pick these things out of just nowhere. And so should there be a line anywhere in there that you will need additional information and it is not in the articles, don't hesitate to ask us, because we will find that for you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Certainly. And I know that I am going to have a problem. I am kind of a commoner when it comes these things. And I know that I will have to have somebody interpret these for me.

MS. LUDWIG: You know what, actually, start reading it. Because we have had folk that don't have a strong background in this area. If they took the time, it was a readable. Those documents were readable. And we chose them for that reason, not to intimidate or to have people back away from the issue. But, rather, to stimulate thoughts and to get engaged in the issues.

MR. MOTHERAL: Oh, I will certainly get to understand it. We do have some people that will be able to interpret it for me, so thank you

very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming out this evening, and thank you for this presentation.

Mike Maendel. Oh, no, he's not here yet.

Stan Toews. Please state your full name for the record, Mr. Toews?

MR. TOEWS: Stan Toews.

STAN TOEWS, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

MR. TOEWS: I own a third generation mixed farm and operate it with my son. Our farm has always had livestock on it. In recent years, the number of livestock has increased. We grow annual crops on 1,100 acres. We also raise feeder pigs. We market around 5,500 a year. We buy weanlings at 50 pounds, and we market them to about 275.

Our manure is stored in an earthen lagoon and it is straw covered every year to minimize the odour. Our lagoon is environmentally approved and was licensed in 1997. Our manure is injected every fall. Our soil and our manure is

tested for nutrients.

I have soil tests to show the phosphorous levels, as well as the nitrogen levels. They are in your packet after the first page. I have picked a field that was next to the barn. I have included tests from 1995, 2004, and 2006. We soil test every year, but we don't necessarily apply manure every year to the same field. We increased our hog production in 1997. And even with that, there seems to be no noticeable difference in the phosphorous levels. And the field closest to the barn is field number 4. And on the 1995 soil test, those are fields numbered 7 and 8. The numbers were changed later to accommodate -- to make larger fields to accommodate the larger equipment.

I also have an agreement with a neighbour, who applies manure to my land. Again, I have included the soil test.

This field is number 10. The field is tested every year, as well as the manure. And, again, I have included 1995, 2004 and 2006. You should make a note here that, prior to 1996, this field never had received any manure. And that was the first year the manure was applied. Since

1996, the field has gotten manure every year. That's 11 consecutive years. Again, the nutrient levels are up for '06 and down for '04, but still remain in the low end of the scale. In '06, we had 26 parts of phosphorous per million. In '04 we were at 12 parts. And in 1995, before manure, we were at 19 parts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that field number 10?

MR. TOEWS: That's in field number 10.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps just -- I mean, this is of interest so, perhaps, if you could just point out where these numbers are?

MR. TOEWS: Oh, right on top underneath where it says "soil test," it says "field" and then there is a number.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. TOEWS: Did you find it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. TOEWS: And then I also included field number 11, which gets no manure, just to show the nutrient levels, that they are they are comparable manure fields. Our fields that don't get manure, we apply commercial fertilizer, as per

soil tests, to maximize our yields. So, in my opinion, it doesn't really matter if you use manure or fertilizer. If it is applied properly, your crops will use it there will be no carry-over.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm still trying to figure out these soil tests. Sure, go ahead, please, Wayne.

MR. MOTHERAL: You are saying that, obviously, you soil test. Do you test your manure also?

MR. TOEWS: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes, okay. And what crops do you grow? How are you using up this phosphate?

MR. TOEWS: Well, we grow wheat, oats, barley, canola and soybeans.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. They are not really phytase users. You've never had to use, like, sunflowers, or something like that?

MR. TOEWS: No. And no alfalfa.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

MR. TOEWS: Just annual crops.

MR. MOTHERAL: You have been

fortunate.

MR. TOEWS: Pardon me?

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, you have been fortunate. I have been in some areas that are really building up pretty high in phosphorous, in some areas.

MR. YEE: Mr. Toews, you indicated in your presentation that your manure is injected. And I noticed it says broadcast or band starter in the soil test reports. Does that refer to the method of application?

MR. TOEWS: No. That is just referring to the fact that we soil test before we apply any nutrients. And the laboratory is just saying that something they call for should include this number of pounds of nutrients per acre, if you do it broadcast. If you band it in a narrow band, then it is a different rate. They usually refer to the banded part as the potassium, which is your potash.

MR. YEE: Right. So these numbers are really, in terms of what the nutrient requirement is for that particular crop, versus your analysis on the other side of the amount of nutrients within the soil?

MR. TOEWS: Yes. On the left-hand side, that's the nutrients in the soil.
MR. YEE: Right.
MR. TOEWS: And the first crop choice, second crop choice, that's for those crops is what they recommend to apply.
MR. YEE: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is that in addition to --
MR. TOEWS: No. The manure would make up those nutrients.
THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay. And so the 26 parts per million, for example, on the field 10.
MR. TOEWS: Right.
THE CHAIRMAN: In 2006, that's the residual phosphorous --
MR. TOEWS: The residual, yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: -- in the soil?
MR. TOEWS: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: So if you are going to grow canola, they are suggesting that you put another 45 pounds per acre?
MR. TOEWS: That is right. And that's of the actual product. And then that would

work out to -- on 1,155, that's about 100 pounds per acre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions, Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Since the new phosphorous regulations, have you noticed any change that you have to do with -- well, obviously, not because your phosphate levels are low, so you don't really have to worry too much about that; is that right?

MR. TOEWS: Well, that's right. So that's why I picked 1995, which is prior to us putting manure on. And since then, we have been applying manure and I don't see no rise in the levels.

MR. MOTHERAL: Would you say that's general in the area?

MR. TOEWS: I think that's general in the area where I live in because we come from heavy clay soils.

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, it is just that when the new regulations came out, our panel, of course, certainly seemed targeted for that because of the -- your concentration of the number of -- well, the concentration --

MR. TOEWS: Right.
MR. MOTHERAL: -- of hog barns or Intensive Livestock Operations, ILOs. And I am just assuming that everybody would like to be in the situation that you are.
MR. TOEWS: Right. No, there are some farmers that have fields with higher levels, definitely.
MR. MOTHERAL: And that is certainly going to affect the way that they apply fertilizers?
MR. TOEWS: Right.
THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?
MR. YEE: Mr. Toews, whereabouts are you located in terms of the spread fields in the R.M. of Hanover?
MR. TOEWS: This land is all in the R.M. of Hanover.
MR. YEE: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: So that's all good clay soil.
MR. TOEWS: Right. It's the northern part of Hanover, the heavy Red River gumbo is we call it.
MR. MOTHERAL: Do you have any

complaints from anybody?

MR. TOEWS: No. As to?

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, just for, say, odour?

MR. TOEWS: From my farm?

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes.

MR. TOEWS: From my neighbours?

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes.

MR. TOEWS: No. That's why my ponds have new straw cover every spring. And when we inject the manure, we inject it. And generally within 24 to 48 hours we make the second pass. I didn't write it down here. But that is to make sure that it is well covered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Thank you for coming out, Mr. Toews.

MR. TOEWS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Somebody from the RM of Hanover. Mr. Cavers, is that it?

MR. CAVERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Introduce yourself for the record.

MR. CAVERS: My name is Douglas Cavers. I'm the Chief Administrative Officer for the Rural Municipality of Hanover.

DOUG CAVERS, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

MR. CAVERS: Okay. Thank you for allowing me to make a presentation on behalf of the municipality of Hanover at this hearing. As was noted, my name is Doug Cavers. And I am the Chief Administrative Officer of the R.M. of Hanover.

Just as a bit of background, the Rural Municipality of Hanover is located approximately 35 kilometers southeast of Winnipeg. Hanover is bordered on the east by the City of Steinbach and on the west by the Town of Niverville. We have five large urban centres, including the communities of Blumenort, Mitchell, Grunthal, Kleefeld and New Bothwell.

The Rural Municipality of Hanover is agricultural municipality. With 115 rural municipalities in the Province of Manitoba, Hanover is definitely the grandfather of livestock production. And I will just note here that this is information from the 2001 census data that Hanover, at that point in time, had 16 percent of Manitoba's hog population, 26 of Manitoba's

poultry population, 10 percent of Manitoba's dairy population and 5 percent of Manitoba's beef population. And that's all based on the slaughter numbers.

In our 126 year history as a municipality, we have grown in population and production. They support each other. For every 1,000 hogs produced, 2.8 jobs are created in Manitoba.

Livestock production is a perfect example of sustainability. What some may view as waste, becomes an input to the next step of production. There are outputs from both sides of this equation. The farmers are managers of the production and manure management for their farms. Closing the circle of sustainability reduces farmers input costs. Farmers in Hanover have become very efficient in making this process work properly.

I would like to explain what steps the Rural Municipality of Hanover has taken in managing livestock production operation sustainability. Although this hearing is regarding sustainability of hog production in Manitoba, my comments are made on a general basis

regarding the way the R.M. of Hanover has dealt with livestock developments. And I would just like to touch on our land use planning, conditional use issuance, geographic information system, or GIS, and the general concerns that this municipality has with the recent changes to the legislation dealing with livestock production operations.

The Rural Municipality of Hanover has adopted its new or current development plan in 2003. In 2004, the Province Manitoba presented Mr. Garry Haggerty, the Rural Municipality of Hanover, Datalink Computer Technologies, and PFRA, with the 2004 Manitoba Planning Excellence Award for the Hanover Development Plan and Zoning Study. This Development Plan clearly supports agriculture and recognizes that controls must be maintained to minimize conflict between livestock development, residential development and commercial development.

There are scientifically proven ways, in dealing with odour, while allowing livestock development in agricultural areas. Hanover's Development Plan allows for livestock development in appropriate areas, while letting Council set

conditions and evaluate potential conflicts for each proposal.

Council has many items to consider when looking at new and expanding livestock operations or subdivisions involving livestock production operations.

Where the Development Plan sets out the general ideas and concepts, the Hanover Zoning bylaw gets into specifics of what is allowed, how large and where.

These criteria can provide thresholds and set limits for prohibition when necessary. Processes such as conditional uses and variations may require additional notification to the neighbouring residents.

Council's most powerful tool in dealing with livestock operations is the conditional use process. Although Hanover has adopted that the noted items should be considered, many of these items can no longer be taken into consideration by the local council due to recent changes in the Planning Act and other regulations dealing with livestock. Council can no longer deal with issues related to manure management and disposal, type of operation and livestock, land

base for spread area, or Livestock Manure and Mortalities Regulations.

Hanover Council considers a variety of information dealing with Conditional Use applications. And the use of our Geographic Information System, to monitor growth within the rural municipality, makes the decision-making easier.

When we started gathering livestock data in 2000, there were no Provincial or no Federal departments that could advise council on how livestock intense our municipality was. Hanover was criticized for supporting agriculture and livestock development without recognizing the accumulated impact and interaction with residential development in the agricultural areas. This slide shows all Livestock Operations. Not just hog barns, but all Livestock Operations, and their locations throughout the municipality. Please realize that each pink dot only represents a livestock operation, not noting the size of each operation.

When council dealt with the areas for growth or restriction, they created zones to identify areas where agricultural development

should be allowed, and areas where there is recognized potential for conflict. The green area is an area where growth could occur. The yellow area represents areas of potential conflict. The blue areas -- well, the blue and pink areas represent areas of residential or urban development.

MR. MOTHERAL: Just one second. Which one is the green and which one is the yellow area there?

MR. CAVERS: Well, the green is -- oh, just grey. Well, do you want to take a look at this?

MR. MOTHERAL: I mean, I take it, the green is just at the top?

THE CHAIRMAN: We just have varieties of gray.

MR. CAVERS: Okay. Well, I will let you take this one. It looks much better on this screen than it does up on that screen. Do you have a pointer? I can point out the areas if you had a laser pointer.

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, this is fine.

MR. CAVERS: My council has one. This area in the northern part, and this part of the

yellow area, are the parts -- or the agricultural areas, these areas were viewed by council at the time as being the most stable areas for livestock development.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you just take this hand mike or wireless mike so it is being recorded?

MR. CAVERS: I thought you guys could hear well enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we can all hear you, but the reporter needs to be able to hear you too.

MR. MOTHERAL: You have got to have back-up on this.

MR. CAVERS: Okay. What I was saying was that the areas in the very north end of the municipality, and the very south end of the municipality, at the time that we were dealing our environment plan, were viewed as being the most agriculturally sustainable and livestock sustainable areas of the municipality to support larger livestock operations. The area -- as an example, the area where Reeve Stan Toews has his farm is over in this New Bothwell area of the municipality, so it is in one of the more

sustainable areas of the municipality.

The areas that are in -- on the photograph, and on the mapping system, that is showing up as more of a yellow is this area in the in the center part. And it is an area that is a little more well populated. And it is an area that has a lot of very small livestock operations, as you can tell. And it is also an area that is of greater potential for concern of the types of soil and the types of ground concerns that council needs to take into consideration when looking at approvals of livestock development.

The areas in blue are the urban center. And these areas that are kind of showing up in gray here, they are pink on the mapping system, are what we call rural residential or two acre sized lots.

Okay. So can I proceed then?

THE CHAIRMAN: Please, yes.

MR. CAVERS: As a result of our study, council could consider buffer areas where land is currently being for spread acres, how many residents or other livestock existed in the immediate vicinity and their proximity to new or expansion proposal.

The computerized mapping system allows for a summarized analysis, giving the number of residences, other livestock operations, including the overall number of animals, an animal units produced, the quantity and types of acres used for manure spreading, and the land still available buffer zone for spreading. Although this is not completely accurate, it does provide an indication to council when areas are full or are getting full.

And if I may, we can choose our buffer size. It will show the number of residences that are in the area. It will show the number of other livestock operations that are within that area. The area that was chosen was a one mile radius. It will show the total number of animals and the number of animal units that are produced. And it will show how many acres are being claimed for annual spread, forage or pasture. It will also show the amount of acres being used in the buffer area, as well as the number of acres that are available in the buffer area that have not been claimed.

In summary, Hanover has many concerns with the recent changes in Provincial Legislation

when dealing with livestock management and agricultural sustainability. Hanover is the largest livestock producer in all of Manitoba. We recognize that proven and accepted scientific methods for measuring the soil sustainability must be considered when dealing with increasing livestock numbers in the region. However, we believe that that accepted standard should be linked to nitrogen uptake by soils, not the amount of phosphorous in Lake Winnipeg. Phosphorous has many sources, not just from livestock. Until four years ago, after Hanover adopted its development plan, linking livestock sustainability to phosphorous was not a standard. Science has still not proven that phosphorous in soils can leach into water or is detrimental to the crop production of an area. The Rural Municipality of Hanover supports local government decision-making. For those municipalities that do not want livestock production development, it should not be imposed. For those that accept it, it should be allowed. If given the opportunity to make that decision, and given the accurate scientific data, it is believed that local government can and will act responsibly and in the best interests of their

local residents.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. And so in these areas that they have taken away the authority, does mean that you can't put in stricter requirements?

MR. CAVERS: With the changes in the Planning Act, the municipality cannot make any requirement or set any requirements in the application of manure, as an example. The Rural Municipality of Hanover had, actually, more stringent requirements than the Province did or does for the application and the coverage of manure. Because, from what I understand, the Province allows for application and coverage of manure within 48 hours. Hanover had, in its by-laws, a requirement for application and coverage within 24 hours.

As well, the Rural Municipality of Hanover, as an example, set requirements in its conditional use on matters dealing with such things as livestock mortalities, where dead stock bins needed to be placed, or the setbacks of livestock bins placement and the requirement for refrigeration or coolers on site. As we

understand it, basically all of the livestock mortality stuff has been taken away from the municipality's jurisdiction. And now we no longer have a say in those kinds of issues.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know why that is?

MR. CAVERS: Well, they didn't listen to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Edwin?

MR. YEE: And just, I guess, a point of clarification. Mr. Cavers, in terms of you mentioned that slide 10:

"These criteria can provide thresholds and set limits for prohibition when necessary."

You are referring to the items listed, like the type and size of operation or compliance with Provincial guidelines, is that what you are referring to there? I wasn't sure.

MR. CAVERS: Sorry, I think that's slide 10?

MR. YEE: Yes.

MR. CAVERS: Okay. Well, slide 10 just sets out the process for conditional uses. And that's just some of the conditions that

council could apply in dealing with the conditional use process.

MR. YEE: Thank you. I was looking at the wrong slide. In terms of what you mention in the next slide, where you mentioned a Technical Review Committee Report. How much does council rely on the Technical Review Committee Report when considering a conditional land use?

MR. CAVERS: The Technical Review Committee Report is only issued on livestock operations of greater than 400 animal units. Up until now, the Rural Municipality of Hanover Zoning By-law requires that our conditional use threshold is at 250 animal units. So our council has had to deal with any livestock operations as a hearing and notification to neighbours, and so on and so forth, at the 250 or above level. So the municipality has had a lot of livestock hearings on smaller operations than what a Technical Review would be done on.

Notwithstanding that, though, Hanover has probably dealt with more Technical Reviews. And Hanover Council has probably dealt with more larger livestock operations than a lot of other rural municipalities in the province. And those

Technical Reviews, in the early years, going back probably eight or nine years ago, have come a long way from those early years. They have grown from about three pages in length to about 18 to 20 pages in length, and a lot better reporting from all of the different government departments as to the concerns that are coming from those different government departments.

MR. YEE: So for the -- for the operations that you mentioned you also look at a conditional land use for 250 animal units, which is below the threshold for the Technical Review Committee's Report?

MR. CAVERS: Right.

MR. YEE: And so do you undertake research, on behalf of your council, to look at the similar types of information and all the data to assess the approval of the conditional land use?

MR. CAVERS: It is at a much lesser degree than what the Provincial standard is. My understanding with the new legislation, as well, that 400 number has come down to 300 animal units. And, basically, with Hanover's by-laws, we are having to amend them. And we are in the process

of trying to do that, prior to January 1, 2008, to be in compliance with the Planning Act to bring it in line. But, basically, what that has done, is it has meant that the livestock operations that are under 300 animal units are, basically, in compliance with all of the necessary processes, without having to go through a conditional use hearing.

MR. YEE: In your slide presentation, I noticed that your buffer area was one mile. Is that pretty much standard or does it vary depending on the operation?

MR. CAVERS: Well, I was using the one mile buffer. Based on a lot of the calculations that are done by the Province of Manitoba when they are calculating the number of residences and setbacks from other operations and that kind of thing.

MR. YEE: And I guess one last questions that I have for you, and it is probably taking away from Wayne, I am sure he would probably ask this.

MR. MOTHERAL: I will always have a question.

MR. YEE: In your opinion, in terms of

the Planning Act, I gather that you feel that you would prefer having more powers that you once had in terms of manure management?

MR. CAVERS: I think the general feeling of our council is that the new Planning Act, as I will refer to it, has greatly restricted the capability of the municipal council to set certain conditions in a conditional use process that were open to them previously.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I commend you very much so on the attention that you have given the livestock industry in this municipality. I know I have talked to Mr. Cavers several times over. And I have always -- the reason why I am saying this is he came from my municipality where there was hardly any action at all. Did Garry Haggerty -- like he is out for hire right now, I realize that. But did he have a lot to do with all of this whole plan, this whole policy that you have?

MR. CAVERS: Garry re-wrote our -- we had a planning -- our Development Plan and Zoning By-law was completely rewritten in 2001, 2002, and it was Garry that did it.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes. And I know it must be frustrating because, as they say, with the new Planning Act, most of the municipalities have to come up with a livestock operating policy. And you already had one. And now with the new regulations, it's kind of not valid anymore.

MR. CAVERS: We have basically been told -- we were told two and a half years after our brand new development plan, that won an award for its excellence, within two and a half years of that being -- receiving an award from the Province, we were, basically, told by the Minister to rewrite our development plan because it was outdated.

MR. MOTHERAL: I would, actually, think that with the work you have done, you would be the envy of many municipalities, because they have this work to look forward to. And many of them are now reluctant to do it until our report goes to the Minister because we have lots of phosphorous things to look at. And we are still not finished with our phosphorous yet because we have to get expertise in so that we can understand more of the reasoning for all of this. As you say, phosphorous scientifically is, you know,

quite stable in the soil, and all of that, and we know that.

And so we have got a lot of work to do on that ourselves, as a Commission, to find out before we can begin our report to the Minister. I commend you for the work that you have done in this area. And as I say, again, you probably were the envy of many municipalities who accepted -- who are accepting intensive livestock operations. Right now I don't have any more questions, I don't think. Thank you.

MR. CAVERS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Next is Jonathan Kleinsasser. Would you state your name for the record?

MR. KLEINSASSER: Jonathan Kleinsasser.

JONATHAN KLEINSASSER, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

MR. KLEINSASSER : My name is Jonathan Kleinsasser. I'm from Crystal Spring Colony. I also represent Crystal Spring Hog Equipment, which is one of the largest hog equipment manufacturers

in our province.

What I am presenting is not a technical piece of paper here. It comes from a guy that turned 65 last week, who has lived all of his life on a farm. I have never lived more than a couple thousand feet away from a hog barn. Our current one is a 500 sow, farrow to finish, unit. There are days when the wind blows and my wife is a lot more unhappy than I am. She doesn't like the smell. But has it harmed our health? I would have to lie to say that it has. They are well ventilated barns. We care for the people that work there. It is our livelihood and it's our future.

I want to thank this Commission and panel for listening to our concerns and taking the time to try to come up with a fair and reasonable solution to the moratorium that has been the cause of a lot of frustration and ill-will to our hog producers in this province.

As a citizen of this world, on a global level, an important point I would like to make is that the hog industry is a major food producer for our country and many other hungry places of world. I truly believe that our real

values are at stake and have been somewhat reversed. As food producers, we are very important to this world in general, because we produce food. But we are being painted as culprits by the masses of people that eat this food and also carry the majority of votes in political decisions. We can do without many material things in our lives, and many people in this world do, but we will always need food.

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

As a Manitoba citizen, in my humble opinion, this moratorium is premature. I believe that it is contrary to our valuable justice system in this country. In our justice system, you are innocent until proven guilty. With this moratorium, you are guilty at first count and now you have to prove yourself innocent. And while

you are busy doing this, there shall be no more expansion. Is that morally correct? I don't think so.

As a Hutterite, I want to make this statement. We, and generations before and after us, live on the same farms. We don't sell our farms. Some of these colony farms are 100 years old. They have always been there, generation after generation. We absolutely do not want to pollute the water we drink, the land we farm, nor the water in our lakes. We want to pass our farms on to our children with good conscience, as good stewards of our land and watershed. We love our children and grandchildren.

You know what, I think I gave away one too many copies. This one is missing a page. Somebody has to help me out. You know what, there may be only one. I ran it through a photocopier and didn't realize that one page has copied both. Sorry about this. You got the only good copy. Thank you. Sorry about this.

Colonies depend on hog farms to make a living. For most of them, it is their largest single income and to restrict this industry is to restrict their livelihood.

So why is this happening? And this is just my opinion. We are, by far, the easiest target. First of all, we cannot go on strike like CNN, airlines, automobile manufacturers or other workers. Our products are perishable. They cannot be stored and stockpiled like dry goods. This makes us very vulnerable, helpless and defenseless, and we depend on the elected government for support and survival.

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

We have the strictest rules and regulations that exist in this world when it comes to spreading manure, building lagoons or just

building new facilities. If they are not strict enough, then let's find ways to make them even better. If science and research prove better ways to manage this industry, let's go for it!

This industry has never resisted change. This industry has changed almost beyond description in the last 30 years that I can remember. This includes old and new farms. Why shut it down to solve the problems?

We have developed excellent ways to spread manure. We know that it is a great organic fertilizer that builds up our soil. It replaces chemical fertilizers that use up non-renewable energy to manufacture. If properly handled, stored and applied, it does not need to be a liability.

This industry has created thousands of jobs on the farms besides the spin-off of all the building contractors, the equipment manufacturers, abattoirs and suppliers. The genetics we produce and the production levels we achieve are the envy of many other countries in this world. In other words, this industry has been a large contributor to our economy. Let's keep it growing in a sustainable manner.

I have travelled extensively to other countries to sell and service our equipment. Those countries include Australia, the Philippines, many Asian countries. I have been to China, to India, to European countries next month, and to Russia next month. And in those travels, I have yet to visit a country that handles manure and farms as responsibly and as sustainably as ours.

Please help us, as you do your review, to protect a minority that desperately needs your support to continue a sustainable growth in this industry.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Kleinsasser. Just out of curiosity, what type of equipment do you produce?

MR. KLEINSASSER: We produce pretty much a whole line, except ventilation equipment, from farrowing crates, to wet/dry feeders. I think we have been a large contributor to new and improved ideas in hog farms. I am currently developing a crate, since there is a lot of controversy on how to house animals, a gestation stall where a sow would be free to walk in and out

as they pace, but also to be able to back out and walk around. We are continuously developing new products.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many hogs do you run on your colony?

MR. KLEINSASSER: We have a 500 sow, farrow to finish operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wrote that, actually, on the copy that I lost. And how much land do you have?

MR. KLEINSASSER: We farm 5,500 acres. And there is a lot of land there that we would love to put on. We have a contract with a neighbour that puts his manure on some of our land. The crops we raise off of that land are fantastic. People would love to have this fertilizer. I must be just too dumb to understand why people would put chemical fertilizer on when they can put an organic product on there. Our soil in Canada has been depleted of organics over the years. If you take figures from 50 years ago, and test it today, it's gone. It has been used up. Well, this organic material puts some back again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is your colony in

Hanover?

MR. KLEINSASSER: Salisbury.

THE CHAIRMAN: In Salisbury.

MR. KLEINSASSER: Some of it is in Salisbury, some in Richot and some in Hanover.

THE CHAIRMAN: So just south of here?

MR. KLEINSASSER: Yes.

MR. YEE: Mr. Kleinsasser, what type of mechanism do you use for injecting your manure?

MR. KLEINSASSER: The manure is all knifed in.

MR. YEE: So it is an injection system?

MR. KLEINSASSER: Yes.

MR. YEE: And is there anything that you are using in the feed, for instance, phytase to reduce phosphorous?

MR. KLEINSASSER: Repeat that, please?

MR. YEE: And are you using any special technologies, including the adjustments to feed, like phytase to improve the phosphorous uptake?

MR. KLEINSASSER: Well, because we have such a large land base, phosphorous would never be a problem in our case. We rotate our

crop and, yeah, it has never been a problem. We would like to cover a lot more than we do or than we are able to.

MR. YEE: Okay. And what type of storage facility do you use for your manure management?

MR. KLEINSASSER : We have a lagoon.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. There is nothing technically I would like to say. It was a well put together presentation. Thank you very much. It brings to face again the fact of the two percent of the farm population and 98 percent of the rest of the people. And I know that the struggles we have was brought up today and this afternoon and in several other places in Manitoba where we have been. And certainly I think one of the things that we need to look at is to try and create that awareness somehow and get our story out there somewhere. And I know that the Keystone Agricultural Producers have been trying it, but somehow we are not getting some messages across to some people. And so I am hoping we are going to continue looking at that. But, anyway, thank you very much. You looked at the bigger picture here.

MR. KLEINSASSER: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for a very thoughtful presentation, Mr. Kleinsasser. This is the last opportunity for anybody else who wishes to make a presentation, going fast. Okay. Well, thank you for coming out this evening. Thank you to the presenters, in particular, who took the time and trouble to prepare their presentations. We will reconvene here tomorrow morning and we will be holding -- we will be conducting hearings tomorrow morning from nine until noon. Good evening.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 8:25 P.M.)

CERTIFICATE

I, LISA REID, duly appointed Court Reporter in the Province of Manitoba, do hereby certify the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of my Stenotype notes as taken by me at the time and place hereinbefore stated.

Lisa Reid