

MANITOBA CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

HOG PRODUCTION INDUSTRY REVIEW

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

\* \* \* \* \*

Held at the Morden Friendship Centre

Morden, Manitoba

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

\* \* \* \* \*

-----  
APPEARANCES:

## Clean Environment Commission:

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

Presentations:	PAGE
Herm Martens, Reeve of RM Morris	471
Miriam Sweetnam, Dairy farmer	488
Les McEwan and	
Gordon Orchard, Deerwood Soil & Water	508
Sieg Neumann, RM Morris councillor	537
Edwin Hofer, Miami Colony	548
Robert McLean and	
Don McLean, R&D McLean Farms	552
Wendy Friesen, Farmer	570

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

NO EXHIBITS MARKED

1 MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

2 UPON COMMENCING AT 1:20 P.M.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies  
4 and gentlemen. I would like to come to order. I  
5 apologize for the delay in starting. However, we  
6 had a bit of an unfortunate incident this morning.  
7 Cathy Johnson, our Commission secretary, slipped  
8 on the ice and broke her leg and, obviously,  
9 wasn't able to come out with us. So the rest of  
10 us have to figure out some of this technical stuff  
11 that we're not too familiar with. It just  
12 reinforces the value of good staff. So we're  
13 ready to go now.

14 I have a few opening comments to make  
15 and then we will proceed. We have a handful of  
16 people who have indicated they wish to make  
17 presentations this afternoon.

18 Just by way of introduction, my name  
19 is Terry Sargeant. I'm the Chair of the Manitoba  
20 Clean Environment Commission, as well as the Chair  
21 of this panel in the hog review. With me on the  
22 panel are Edwin Yee, and also somebody that many  
23 of you here in Morden will know well, Wayne  
24 Motheral.

25 The Clean Environment Commission has

1 been requested by the Minister of Conservation to  
2 conduct an investigation into the environmental  
3 sustainability of the hog industry in Manitoba.  
4 The Terms of Reference from the Minister direct us  
5 to review the current environmental protection  
6 measures in place relating to hog production in  
7 this province, in order to determine their  
8 effectiveness for the purpose of managing the  
9 industry in an environmentally sustainable manner.

10 Our investigation is to include a  
11 public component to gain advice and feedback from  
12 Manitobans. This will be by way of public  
13 meetings in the various regions of the province to  
14 ensure broad participation from the general public  
15 and affected stakeholders.

16 We have been asked also to take into  
17 account efforts underway in other jurisdictions to  
18 manage hog production sustainably.

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

23 At the end of our investigation, we  
24 will consider various options and make  
25 recommendations in a report to the Minister on any

1 improvements that we feel may be necessary to  
2 provide for the environmental sustainability of  
3 hog production.

4 To ensure that our review includes  
5 issues of importance to all Manitobans, the panel  
6 has undertaken to hold 17 days of meetings in 14  
7 communities throughout the agricultural part of  
8 Manitoba. These meetings are to continue through  
9 March and April, with the final public meeting  
10 currently scheduled for April 27th in Winnipeg.

11 It is open to any groups or  
12 individuals to make a presentation to this panel  
13 on issues related to hog production in Manitoba.  
14 For the most part, presentations are to be limited  
15 to 15 minutes. Exceptions will be made in some  
16 cases where a presenter needs more time, but this  
17 must be arranged with us prior to the  
18 presentation.

19 Presenters will also be required to  
20 take an oath promising to tell the truth.  
21 Presentations should be relevant to the mandate  
22 given to the Commission by the Minister, and to  
23 the issues described in the Guide to Public  
24 Participation in this Review. If a presentation  
25 is clearly not relevant, I may rule it out of

1 order. And if a presentation is clearly  
2 representative, I may also rule that out of order.

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

7 In addition to the public meetings,  
8 the Clean Environment Commission is engaging  
9 consultants to assist us in this review. The  
10 results of those research endeavours will be  
11 posted on our website upon receipt, which will  
12 likely, for the most part, be at the end of June.  
13 Anybody will be invited, parties or others, will  
14 be invited to provide comment on any of those  
15 research reports if they so wish. A reasonable,  
16 albeit brief period of time, will be allowed for  
17 this.

18 Written submissions will also be  
19 accepted. Information as to how to submit written  
20 suggestions is available on our website. The  
21 deadline for receipt of written submissions is  
22 May 7th.

23 We also realize that many people may  
24 be reluctant to make presentations in public for a  
25 variety of reasons. To that end, we have engaged

1 a graduate student from the University of Manitoba  
2 to meet with or talk with people on the phone,  
3 those who would rather not speak at public  
4 meetings. These meetings will be kept in  
5 confidence. Information as to how to contact her  
6 is available at our website, as well as at the  
7 back of this room.

8                   Some administrative matters. If you  
9 wish to make a presentation today, and haven't  
10 already indicated to the staff, please register at  
11 the table at the back of the room. As is our  
12 normal practice, we are recording these sessions.  
13 Transcripts, verbatim transcripts, will be  
14 available online in a day or so. You can find the  
15 link from our website.

16                   And, finally, in respect of cell  
17 phones, I would ask that they be turned off or at  
18 least that the ring tone be turned off. And if  
19 you must take a call, I would ask that you please  
20 leave the room.

21                   That's all I have by way of opening  
22 comments. The first person we have who has  
23 registered for this afternoon is Mr. Herm Martens.  
24 Mr. Martens. Mr. Martens, would you please state  
25 your name for the record?

1 MR. MARTENS: Herm Martens.

2 HERM MARTENS, having been sworn, presents as  
3 follows:

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may  
5 proceed.

6 MR. MARTENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
7 panel members, ladies and gentlemen. And I would  
8 like to extend my best wishes to Cathy Johnson and  
9 a speedy recovery. How inconvenient. It never  
10 comes at the right time.

11 Thank you for the opportunity to  
12 address the Clean Environment Commission hearing  
13 regarding the hog production industry review. As  
14 reeve of the R.M. of Morris, I would like to  
15 expand on a few of the things that we, as a  
16 municipality, have been involved with regarding  
17 hog production.

18 The R.M. of Morris has tried very hard  
19 to regulate the hog industry in a responsible  
20 fashion in our municipality.

21 The R.M. of Morris zoning by-law  
22 insists on a one mile set-back from the Red River  
23 and the Morris River for any hog production units.

24 The R.M. of Morris zoning by-law also  
25 insists on a two mile set-back from built up

1 communities.

2 The R.M. of Morris has insisted that  
3 all manure be incorporated within 24 hours of  
4 spreading for all hog operations.

5 The R.M. of Morris believes that  
6 incorporating the manure will result in less  
7 run-off and less harm to waterways.

8 The R.M. of Morris has experienced  
9 great frustration in dealing with the Province of  
10 Manitoba.

11 Manitoba Agriculture has stated  
12 publicly at hearings that the one mile buffer from  
13 waterways and the two mile buffer from communities  
14 is too great and should be reduced.

15 The Manitoba Environment feels that  
16 the one mile and the two mile buffers are not  
17 sufficient.

18 The Province of Manitoba has now  
19 amended the Planning Act, and will no longer allow  
20 the R.M. of Morris to regulate incorporation of  
21 manure.

22 The Province of Manitoba, under their  
23 regulations, does not insist that the manure be  
24 incorporated.

25 The R.M. of Morris is very concerned

1 and aware of the environment.

2 The R.M. of Morris finds it difficult  
3 to regulate hog operations when different  
4 provincial government departments are pulling the  
5 council in different directions.

6 The R.M. of Morris believes that they  
7 have been very conscientious and that the Morris  
8 guidelines are considerably stricter than the  
9 provincial guidelines.

10 The R.M. of Morris also insists that  
11 an intensive livestock operation must provide a  
12 performance bond to ensure that they will comply  
13 with all conditions in their conditional use.

14 All livestock operations' conditional  
15 use permits also require that there be at least  
16 three rows of trees, of two different varieties,  
17 around every site. This is to control the wind  
18 movement on the lagoons and control the smell.

19 The R.M. of Morris believes that the  
20 hog industry is beneficial to the Province of  
21 Manitoba, both through employment and other  
22 economic development advantages.

23 These advantages would include major  
24 payments towards school taxes and municipal  
25 infrastructures, and there is spin-off effect that

1 comes from that.

2 Council of the R.M. of Morris would  
3 also like to point out that, up until just  
4 recently, the Province of Manitoba has been the  
5 number one promoter of the hog industry.

6 This causes great frustration to the  
7 council.

8 The R.M. of Morris is aware of  
9 numerous cases where wells have been contaminated,  
10 from human waste, and saturated through septic  
11 fields.

12 The R.M. of Morris is not aware of any  
13 hog barns that have caused contamination of  
14 drinking water supplies.

15 The R.M. of Morris believes that human  
16 waste is causing a lot more damage to the  
17 waterways than animal waste.

18 Now, if you would allow, I would like  
19 to take off my hat as a reeve and put my hat on as  
20 a hog farmer.

21 I am saddened that I have to come here  
22 to defend the most regulated industry, the most  
23 closely watched, the most monitored, and the  
24 industry that went "green" more than any other  
25 industry in Canada.

1 I believe this hearing is a case of  
2 deception and bullying. If we, as a province,  
3 truly were concerned about water quality, we would  
4 be looking at the whole issue, instead of picking  
5 on the one percent, the hog industry.

6 According to a government research  
7 project done over the last 21 years along the Red  
8 River, it shows the phosphorus levels south of  
9 Winnipeg declined slightly, but basically remained  
10 constant in the 21 years, while north of Winnipeg  
11 the phosphorus level has almost doubled. My  
12 question is: Is the hog industry what we should  
13 be concentrating on or is it somewhere else?

14 Of all of the hog barn lagoons in  
15 Manitoba, I don't know of any that have pipes  
16 directly into the rivers, but I know that the City  
17 of Winnipeg has a number of them. Just take a  
18 look at the Red and Assiniboine Rivers on a very  
19 cold winter day and count the many open waters  
20 close to the shore. I don't believe this is  
21 caused by water current of the river, but could it  
22 be the affluent being discharged directly into the  
23 river? No, of course not.

24 Being involved in the hog industry, I  
25 have personally spent a lot of money to make my

1 farm "green." In 1973, there were 17 hog barns in  
2 my area. Mine was number 18. I built it that  
3 year. This is within a three mile radius of my  
4 barn. Now there are only four left. All four are  
5 well over -- have well over 400 day manure  
6 storage, and all manure is incorporated into the  
7 ground as fertilizer, according to tested nutrient  
8 levels and according to what the crop can utilize.  
9 The phosphorus is not allowed to be eroded with  
10 this method of application. Firstly, it is a good  
11 source of fertilizer for crop production and,  
12 secondly, we are good stewards of the environment.

13           However, my closest neighbour that  
14 does winter spreading is a mere five to six miles  
15 to the north of my farm in the neighbouring  
16 municipality. The spreading is done unevenly,  
17 some even left in some piles, thus allowing the  
18 run-off to drain into the water system in the  
19 spring. It also creates an awful smell. This  
20 good neighbour of mine doing the spreading is none  
21 other than the City of Winnipeg emptying their  
22 sludge from their lagoons. The hog industry gets  
23 the blame for the smell and the run-off. How  
24 totally unfair!

25           As you can hear from my presentation

1 as a farmer, I find this whole exercise extremely  
2 ludicrous and, as a reeve, I find it very  
3 frustrating.

4 Thank you for the opportunity to  
5 express my concerns about this injustice and thank  
6 you for listening.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Martens.  
8 Mr. Martens, some of the regulations that the R.M.  
9 has in place, you have noted that you have these  
10 one and two mile set-backs, but one department of  
11 the government says they are too much and the  
12 other says they are too little. Do you still have  
13 them in place? They haven't overruled your  
14 municipal decision?

15 MR. MARTENS: Yes. When we did the  
16 Development Plan, we had that. And the Department  
17 of Agriculture came in with a number of farmers  
18 trying to change that. But we believed we were on  
19 the right track, and it was finally passed, giving  
20 us that kind of restrictions.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, you have also  
22 noted that under the new Planning Act Morris will  
23 not be able to regulate the incorporation of  
24 manure?

25 MR. MARTENS: We will not be able to

1 insist on new permits to have the manure  
2 incorporated.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: And what does the new  
4 phosphorus regulation say about that? Does it say  
5 anything about incorporation?

6 MR. MARTENS: You're catching me on  
7 something that I don't know.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's  
9 fair enough. Now, you also talk about a  
10 performance bond. Do you have that in place?

11 MR. MARTENS: Yes, we do.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: A municipal performance  
13 bond?

14 MR. MARTENS: That is a municipal  
15 performance bond.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: And how many  
17 municipalities are you aware of that have  
18 performance bonds? Are there others?

19 MR. MARTENS: Yes, I believe there are  
20 some others. Yes, there are. But I couldn't name  
21 them right now because, at the time that we did  
22 this, we went and did some research on it, and  
23 there were some others doing it in different  
24 fashions.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: And how are these -- I

1 am just quite curious about this performance bond.  
2 Is it large?

3 MR. MARTENS: One percent of -- it is  
4 one percent of the actual building cost of the  
5 building, not the other stuff. And the 50 percent  
6 of the performance bond is returned after the  
7 first year that they have adhered to all of the --  
8 all of the requirements for the performance bond  
9 or for the conditional use. And the other one  
10 is -- the other half is returned three years  
11 after, or a session of three years of adhering to  
12 doing all of the -- you know, the trees and the  
13 manure incorporation and all of those kinds of  
14 things.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: So within a reasonably  
16 short period of time, they are able to get  
17 100 percent of the performance bond back?

18 MR. MARTENS: Within a three-year  
19 period, approximately, it takes, if he does the  
20 things that he promises to do when he takes the  
21 permit.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, you are obviously  
23 frustrated as a municipal politician, as a reeve,  
24 with how this process works vis-a-vis the  
25 Provincial Government?

1 MR. MARTENS: Right.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: What would you like to  
3 see? I mean, if you were -- if you were drafting  
4 the laws or regulations, or even just the  
5 protocols between the municipality and the  
6 province, what would you like to see?

7 MR. MARTENS: That's a loaded  
8 question. What I would like to see is some of the  
9 regulations we, as the R.M. of Morris, have put  
10 into place. And we have done that with people  
11 that are not -- are anti-hog farmers, and with  
12 myself sitting on it as a hog farmer, so we have  
13 the whole -- and it was acceptable to both sides,  
14 and I think that's what we were listening to.

15 In the province, we are listening  
16 today to Agriculture, which was more restricted  
17 than we were. The next day we are listening to  
18 Environment, who is saying we are not restrictive  
19 enough. Get together and have something that's  
20 acceptable both ways. And I'm sure in this  
21 country of ours, we can have a very good hog  
22 industry, in this province we can have a very good  
23 hog industry that's acceptable to both groups of  
24 people.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, when the province

1 was going through the revisions to the Planning  
2 Act, the AMM was quite involved in that process,  
3 were they not?

4 MR. MARTENS: I don't believe the AMM  
5 got involved in that one at all.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

7 MR. MARTENS: The government  
8 departments, they all had a look at it. And then  
9 there is a board, I believe, that passes it,  
10 because it is a board matter at the municipal.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I am asking you all of  
12 these questions, and we may want to talk to you  
13 about this again, because it is certainly open to  
14 us to make suggestions or recommendations on how  
15 this process might be improved if we hear enough  
16 similar concerns as you've expressed here today.

17 MR. MARTENS: I certainly would be  
18 open to that.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, with your other  
20 hat on, how large is your hog operation?

21 MR. MARTENS: Mine is about 196 animal  
22 units.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Farrow to finish?

24 MR. MARTENS: Farrow to weanlings. I  
25 sell weanlings. I sell my weanlings at 17,

1 18 pounds.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: And the spreading, the  
3 City of Winnipeg spreading.

4 MR. MARTENS: Yes.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: They spread during the  
6 winter?

7 MR. MARTENS: That's right.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: They truly leave it in  
9 piles?

10 MR. MARTENS: Well, not necessarily  
11 intentionally leave it in piles.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: No.

13 MR. MARTENS: But they certainly --  
14 when you do this hauling of manure with box trucks  
15 instead of a slurry, some of the slurry, some of  
16 it will be in piles when the last bunch is dumped,  
17 and that kind of stuff, so there have been piles  
18 left. Not huge piles, but piles that cause a  
19 concern.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. And do they  
21 spread year-round?

22 MR. MARTENS: They just spread in  
23 winter.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Just in winter?

25 MR. MARTENS: M'hm.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: So, obviously, it is  
2 not able to be incorporated when the ground is  
3 frozen?

4 MR. MARTENS: At least that's to my  
5 knowledge, because I am not aware of what else  
6 they do. They approached the R.M. of Morris to  
7 see if they could spread there. And, obviously,  
8 we do not want that kind of spreading.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know, are they  
10 bound by the same regulations as you or your  
11 neighbours, as far as the amount of phosphorus or  
12 nitrogen that can go on the soil?

13 MR. MARTENS: I do not know what they  
14 are restricted to. I was very surprised when I  
15 found out that they were allowed to do the winter  
16 spreading, when we had been asked to curtail that,  
17 and we have. We spent big dollars to curtail  
18 that. So we do only summer spreading and make the  
19 fertilizer useful, you know. And you've got  
20 nitrogen at 50 cents a pound, and phosphorus  
21 nearly that. We can't afford to put that into the  
22 river. We need to have that on the fields so we  
23 don't want leaching.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Martens.  
25 Wayne?

1                   MR. MOTHERAL: Yes, Mr. Martens, you  
2 mentioned the performance bond. And you -- that  
3 in your plan you have the one percent, and you  
4 return 50 percent, or something, after one year.  
5 Has any of the proponents -- are the proponents  
6 accepting this?

7                   MR. MARTENS: Yes, I would say so.  
8 Because one of the reasons that they are accepting  
9 this is because everybody has to do it. It is not  
10 a choice for anybody. And that's part of the  
11 privilege of being a hog farmer in the R.M. of  
12 Morris.

13                  MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. May I rephrase  
14 it, then? Has anybody turned down their  
15 application because they had to put up a  
16 performance bond?

17                  MR. MARTENS: Not one.

18                  MR. MOTHERAL: You said all operations  
19 with conditional use have to have three rows of  
20 trees, two different varieties, et cetera. Was  
21 this around the whole site or just around the  
22 manure lagoon?

23                  MR. MARTENS: Around the whole site.

24                  MR. MOTHERAL: The whole site?

25                  MR. MARTENS: The whole site. And, of

1 course, there is always the driveways that will  
2 not have it. But other than that, it is around  
3 the whole site.

4 MR. MOTHERAL: And I was curious to  
5 know a little bit more. The municipality has the  
6 final say in your own zoning, whether or not you  
7 allow the one mile or the two mile. I mean, you  
8 do have that right. You have some minimum  
9 requirements set out in the Act.

10 MR. MARTENS: Which is considerably  
11 less.

12 MR. MOTHERAL: Considerably less. But  
13 you realize, though, that the municipality does  
14 have the final say? And were whether that's -- do  
15 you agree with that, or do you disagree with that  
16 that the municipality has the final say, or do you  
17 think that should be something else?

18 MR. MARTENS: I disagree with the  
19 statement of "the final say", because we still  
20 have to get it passed by the government body that  
21 okays the plan. And it was up for debate, and I  
22 was pleased they did accept it, because we had  
23 both sides fighting us from both directions. One  
24 said we were too restrictive and one said we were  
25 not restrictive enough. So I think they saw that

1 that was a happy medium and acceptable.

2 And one reason is in five years we  
3 have to revisit the plan. And if some new  
4 technology has come along, or the rest of the R.M.  
5 has filled up, which we have a lot of space for  
6 other hog barns, if people so desire, we will look  
7 at this at that time. But we have this five-year  
8 plan. In five years, from when we made the plan,  
9 we have to revisit it.

10 MR. MOTHERAL: Just one more question.  
11 Normally the province has the final say on the  
12 environment, and you have the final say on your  
13 land use. Would you say, when it comes to winter  
14 spreading, you would like to be able to say that  
15 it has to be injected?

16 MR. MARTENS: I certainly would. And  
17 you hit on an interesting one. The environment --  
18 the smell is not an environmental issue, according  
19 to the standards. Smell is a different issue.  
20 But 95 percent of the phone calls that we get on  
21 any hog issue that is negative is smell.  
22 Everybody that came in to speak against a hog barn  
23 that was proposed, the number one issue was smell.  
24 And so if we cannot regulate that, we're going to  
25 lose that industry in the area. Because other

1 people are saying, you know, just because I'm a  
2 hog farmer doesn't say I have to smell like one.  
3 And I hope my neighbours that are hog farmers will  
4 say the same.

5 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. That's all  
6 I have, Mr. Chairman. But I think I will talk to  
7 him afterwards about a couple of things.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Martens, your  
9 regulations, the performance bonds, the set-back,  
10 does that apply to all hog barns or just the over  
11 300?

12 MR. MARTENS: That applies to all hog  
13 barns.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. YEE: Just one question, just a  
16 follow-up to Mr. Motheral's question of  
17 incorporation. You indicated in the past that all  
18 manure is incorporated within 24 hours. Is that a  
19 by-law in this municipality?

20 MR. MARTENS: That is a condition of  
21 the conditional use. And, in fact, any condition  
22 that we did in the last couple of years, we asked  
23 them to incorporate it as they apply it and bring  
24 it to the field, so it is not even 24 hours. It  
25 is as it's brought in, it is incorporated.

1 MR. YEE: So was this in place as part  
2 of the conditional use?

3 MR. MARTENS: It has been for the last  
4 number, say, five years.

5 MR. YEE: Okay. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
7 Mr. Martens.

8 MR. MARTENS: Thank you. Next is  
9 Miriam Sweetnam. Would you please state your name  
10 for the record?

11 MS. SWEETNAM: Miriam Sweetnam.

12 MIRIAM SWEETNAM, having been sworn, presents as  
13 follows:

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may  
15 proceed.

16 MS. SWEETNAM: I have a -- I'm a dairy  
17 farmer.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you bring the mike  
19 just a little closer to you, please?

20 MS. SWEETNAM: I'm a dairy farmer,  
21 recently moved to Osterwick, Manitoba. You are  
22 probably wondering why a dairy farmer is speaking  
23 at a hog hearing? And the reason is we have been  
24 affected dramatically by the hearings or by the  
25 rules that have come to place.

1                   In front of you, gentlemen, are some  
2 papers. The first being my family, and the title  
3 being: Where is our future? And I would like to  
4 direct your attention to the next photographs,  
5 which are of a fire. We had two farms in La  
6 Broquerie. And we experienced a horrific fire on  
7 the 16th of May. We were dairying in both barns,  
8 110 cows in each. And we lost that barn, not with  
9 loss of animals, thank goodness, but with a lot of  
10 loss of -- our barn was lost and our cows  
11 displaced. They went off to our first farm.

12                   And I will now direct your attention  
13 to the "timeframe" sheet. And please bear with  
14 me. I am going to give you a chronological order  
15 of our events because your understanding of why I  
16 am here will become clear.

17                   In June 2000, we emigrated to Canada  
18 and bought a farm with 772 acres and 100 kgs of  
19 quota. We had in our minds: Double it in five  
20 years or you are not survive to get to 100 kgs.

21                   The following year, August 2001, we  
22 bought an empty dairy two miles down from the  
23 other farm, called it farm number two, and it  
24 looked good to go. That is the one that we lost  
25 subsequently in 2006.

1                   Between 2002 and 2004, we bought 92  
2 kgs of quota. We moved down to that second farm.  
3 We calved all of our cows down there. We milked  
4 the cows three times a day on that farm. And the  
5 first farm, which we milked the cows twice a day  
6 on that farm, so it was five milkings a day. We  
7 worked hard.

8                   In 2004, 2005 we did our accounts, as  
9 everybody else does, and found out that there were  
10 large benefits per year to consolidation, and we  
11 started the process.

12                  July 2005, we contacted Manitoba  
13 Conservation in Steinbach and said: How do we  
14 proceed with a lagoon application? They told us  
15 to get PFRA down to sonic the land. That's what  
16 we did. They produced a map, found the clay and  
17 everything looked good.

18                  In October 2005, we asked Aski  
19 Geosciences & Unger Excavating to do preliminary  
20 investigation. And we were very happy with the  
21 backhoe to find everything that we required.

22                  In January 2006, the drill rig and the  
23 reports were produced, and everything looked good.

24                  And on the 5th of May, we submitted  
25 our application. Because we had the two farms, we

1 were under the magic number of 150 cows on each,  
2 so when we consolidated, it required a technical  
3 review, and that's where we hit our problems.

4 We submitted it in May, the 5th of  
5 May. Three or four days later, Gary Plohman of  
6 MAFRI rang. The soil samples were a year old.  
7 They are only meant to be six months old. It  
8 wasn't written anywhere, to my knowledge, in the  
9 rules, but we said: Okay, we will do it again.  
10 The fire happened and that created its own  
11 problems.

12 The application for the lagoon to  
13 Mr. Tessier, in Conservation, got thrown back at  
14 us very quickly. He was very displeased with the  
15 design. He wanted an above-ground with a liner,  
16 simply because of the location we were in, and  
17 didn't want to acknowledge that this clay that we  
18 had found was acceptable. He wanted an extra 10  
19 percent, on top of the 30 percent that we had  
20 already put on. And we had taken the guidelines  
21 from Manitoba Agriculture, increased it by  
22 30 percent, and he wanted an extra 10 percent top  
23 of that. The font size of our drawings was also  
24 incorrect. He wanted an extra two extra ramps as  
25 well.

1                   And we go on. The faxes got very  
2 dirty. We had a meeting with Conservation in  
3 Winnipeg and thought we had it sorted. Not so.  
4 We were also waiting on our technical review.  
5 This was going on. It was kind of a two-pronged  
6 thing. One was the lagoon and the other was the  
7 technical review. We were waiting and waiting.

8                   And I submitted the new Manure  
9 Management Plans to Gary Plohman of MAFRI on the  
10 14th of June, and he assured us of an August 1st  
11 start. Oh, you should be good to go by  
12 August 1st. We had our finance approved. We had  
13 our barn design completely signed, subject to  
14 permit. Everything was good to go, as we thought.

15                   All through June and July, and into  
16 August, constant phone calls to MAFRI: Well,  
17 what's the story? We are waiting. We are  
18 waiting. We are waiting. Summer was good. It  
19 was too good, actually, because the cows were  
20 outside and it was coming to be an animal rights  
21 issue, which we had no control over.

22                   It ended up in September. At the 8th  
23 of September, Gary Plohman rang and said: I want  
24 a meeting in your house today. You don't have  
25 enough land. Now, we had already rented an extra

1 470 acres in the area, on top of what we had  
2 already, which was ample. And Conservation came  
3 down that day with Gary Plohman and they would not  
4 agree to let us build. You can consolidate, but  
5 you can't expand.

6           Where were we to go? Their answer to  
7 that was: You can build back up the fire barn and  
8 put 150 cows there, and you can put 150 cows on  
9 the first farm, but you cannot consolidate them  
10 all on the one farm. It didn't make one screed of  
11 sense.

12           Just before they had come down, our  
13 production was so low with the summer weather that  
14 we bought 20 heifers from Ontario at a cost of  
15 \$31,800, just to keep filling our quota, just to  
16 keep filling it because we had bills to pay.

17           The comment by Conservation at that  
18 meeting at our house, where my husband was  
19 absolutely irate, her superiors would not allow  
20 her -- for the expansion. And they wouldn't allow  
21 us to -- when you are building a house, you might  
22 build an extra bedroom. We wouldn't go to the 300  
23 cows straight away. It was just have it there.  
24 We have a son of 11 and a daughter of 7. If  
25 they -- when you are building, you build once. To

1 go back a second time, it costs too much, so it  
2 was a financial consideration.

3 And what concerned us most was that  
4 the R.M. of La Broquerie and Steinbach and Hanover  
5 are intense, proposed intensive livestock areas.  
6 If we wanted to go up by five cows, or five  
7 percent, we needed 600 more acres of spreadable  
8 land. Now, the farmers among you here will know  
9 that cultivation seed costs all remain the same,  
10 and you are only going to get that amount of  
11 produce off. And what about this amount? You are  
12 meant to buy it. It is a financial disaster.

13 I won't bore you with the following.  
14 You can read that at your own discretion. We had  
15 to buy another farm. These cows were outside.  
16 What do we do? We sold the fire farm and took a  
17 hit on that. And we moved and had to buy a farm.  
18 The first one we saw was in Osterwick. The soils  
19 were 1 and 3 soils and buildings used, that was  
20 our decision process, pure and simple.

21 When you buy a farm and you need a  
22 close take-over date, you have to buy lock, stock  
23 and barrel. So in order to finance that, we had  
24 to sell 127 kgs of hard-worked earned quota.

25 We bought his 80 cows and other stock,

1 with 80 cows at \$1,000 each. We shipped 60 of  
2 them out at \$220 each for culls, along with many  
3 of our own. Own culled many of our own who had  
4 frostbite and injuries from being outside.

5 Our life since. Our life since has  
6 been -- we have 100 cows now in La Broquerie.  
7 Just before Christmas, we managed to get them all  
8 inside, or we had them culled, or whatever. I  
9 travel with my children to La Broquerie for  
10 weekends, and have done so since November 15th. I  
11 have removed them from a full French school. I  
12 was extremely happy, and being an ex-teacher from  
13 Ireland, I was so thrilled they were in that  
14 school. They are now in French immersion in  
15 Morden, which is good, but it's not the same.

16 I couldn't -- my son is very fond of  
17 hockey. I couldn't bring him to hockey practice  
18 in Morden to get to know the children down here  
19 because my husband was maybe three or four days on  
20 the road with the truck and trailer to La  
21 Broquerie. I couldn't bring him to matches at  
22 weekend in Morden because I wasn't here. I was La  
23 Broquerie milking.

24 We would leave on a Friday night, or a  
25 Friday afternoon, pick them up from school, go up

1 and milk the weekend. He would play his hockey  
2 matches there. With consent from the coach with  
3 no practices, but just matches. We would leave La  
4 Broquerie after milking at 9 on a Sunday night,  
5 get a takeaway from A & W and arrive back down at  
6 11 or 11:15 in Osterwick and expect them to go to  
7 school and do well the next day. We have had  
8 tears. We have had anger. We have had the lot.  
9 We have had neighbours in La Broquerie crying:  
10 Why have these progressive farmers been forced to  
11 move and sell 25 percent of their quota in order  
12 to stay in Manitoba?

13 Our bills at the moment, because of  
14 the two farms, and having to buy extra machinery  
15 and our losses, and whatever, are coming to date  
16 to \$306,300. And that does not include the loss  
17 that we took on the cows we bought for the new  
18 farm.

19 The Dairy Farmers of Manitoba have  
20 been an excellent organization. And with them I  
21 went to the Ministers in the Legislative Building  
22 on December 1st. There I met Minister Struthers,  
23 Minister Wowchuk, Mr. Al Beck, Dr. Allan Preston  
24 of MAFRI, Brian Yusishen of Land Planning, and  
25 executive members of the Board of Dairy

1 accompanied me there. The reaction I got: "We  
2 didn't know this was happening." "I wouldn't have  
3 believed it if we hadn't heard it," and other such  
4 comments that really didn't comfort me or my  
5 family.

6 My conclusions in all of this affair:  
7 I am concerned about the members of the Commission  
8 and your ties to agriculture. To be a farmer, you  
9 will have to have a great understanding, because  
10 it's your reality, you have a fluctuating income  
11 due to unstable weather and unsure markets. I  
12 would like you men, gentlemen, to imagine that and  
13 then deal with the unreasonable pressure of these  
14 current regulations without the realistic grounds  
15 to support these changes.

16 In our case, our lagoon was costing us  
17 \$200,000. And then when we applied, it was a  
18 \$30,000 grant and we couldn't stack. They have  
19 since changed that to \$50 and my husband and I can  
20 stack. But that lagoon, as you will see, is not  
21 going to happen in our lifetime.

22 What I have termed as the next  
23 conclusion is the racialism of Manitoba. Areas  
24 were blanketed and municipalities were called  
25 intensive livestock areas, like La Broquerie and

1 Hanover. It is very unfair when each farmer, who  
2 is a steward of the land for the next generation,  
3 uses manure as a resource. It cuts his fertilizer  
4 bill. Can a person who doesn't belong to the  
5 agricultural sector really understand that? I  
6 don't think so. These bills come in and they're  
7 huge. And if you can utilize your fertilizer, or  
8 your manure as a fertilizer, it is a huge savings.  
9 We value it, not the other way around.

10 With phosphorus as a one-time crop  
11 removal, being in the intensive livestock area,  
12 you cultivate seed and harvest crops to take off a  
13 third and a half, and then you have to purchase  
14 the remainder, as I have said already, or you have  
15 to rent the land. We are being forced to decrease  
16 efficiency, and that's a worrying fact. Is this  
17 review recommending replacement of this lost  
18 revenue, is a very big question?

19 An economic viability study must be  
20 done in line with this environment review because,  
21 in our case, it has affected us dramatically.

22 Next we are on to the lagoon  
23 directives and requirements, where we had a major  
24 headache. The lagoon directives and storage  
25 requirements, as produced by Manitoba Agriculture,

1 are not being accepted by Mr. Tessier. This is  
2 not Ireland for us, nor is this Quebec for him.  
3 Whatever moratoriums they have in Quebec, they  
4 have to be left there. We are less populated  
5 here. We are a different environment. And we  
6 don't need to copy-cat them.

7 And the guidelines need to be set out  
8 very clearly so that farmers don't waste their  
9 time and money, like we have.

10 This Commission, and I agree with the  
11 previous speaker, it's a delay tactic, pure and  
12 simple, just like the font size on our lagoon  
13 drawings. How effective is that in keeping the  
14 manure in a hole in the ground? The government  
15 copied the EU regulations. We have been there on  
16 the phosphorus levels. They began this process  
17 without proper planning. They targeted  
18 agriculture for city voter support, when  
19 60 percent of the problem is imported from the  
20 U.S.

21 This government has sabotaged the  
22 agricultural industry, and at what cost?

23 I would ask you gentlemen to be fair.  
24 We are only a lesser part of the problem. Be  
25 aware. Be aware of the financial risks food

1 producers take to provide a quality product for  
2 consumers.

3 Be consistent. Be consistent in the  
4 way you deal with all offenders of the algae  
5 problem at the same time.

6 To use the government policy of  
7 racialism will create a scenario. We'll call  
8 Winnipeg the intensive people area and implement a  
9 one-time crop removal rate on all lawns and golf  
10 courses. Within the city, all washing powders and  
11 anti-bacterial soaps are rationed in the stores.  
12 Perhaps this needs to happen for the politicians  
13 to realize the error of their ways in relation to  
14 these policies.

15 Let agricultural personnel form  
16 agricultural policies, and likewise for urban  
17 people for urban policies. Each sector's  
18 understanding is far greater than the other's.

19 To flip the coin, Winnipeg residents  
20 in certain areas should be forced out to the  
21 satellite towns without compensation. As Mr. Beck  
22 said, when questioned by Ron Friesen, who did an  
23 article on us in the Manitoba Co-operator  
24 recently: They were doing us a favour. So  
25 perhaps if they were forced out without

1 compensation, we would be doing them a favour, or  
2 would they see it like that?

3 Our experience of having to move farm  
4 and community, reduce our quota by 25 percent,  
5 take a huge financial loss in order to stay in  
6 this province as milk producers, doesn't speak  
7 well for the current set of regulations.

8 We are progressive farmers, who like  
9 to do our utmost in the treatment of our  
10 employees, our livestock and our land. We were  
11 joining our La Broquerie herds and building for  
12 300 as a fulfillment of our hard-earned dreams,  
13 with an awareness that if our son or daughter ever  
14 wanted to come into the business, the opportunity  
15 would be there.

16 In future years, an increased herd  
17 size is a must in order to stay viable. If our  
18 family chooses this industry, they will probably  
19 have to move province or go south of the border,  
20 and they will have our understanding and support.  
21 It is ironic that Manitoba has a set milk quota.  
22 And though milk production may change districts,  
23 the net amount of phosphorus remains the same.

24 The Prime Minister of England, Sir  
25 Winston Churchill said, at the end of World War

1 II:

2 "Never has so much been owed to so  
3 few."

4 To use his quotation:

5 Never has the future of agricultural  
6 development in Manitoba been in the  
7 hands of so few.

8 Thank you for listening.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
10 Mrs. Sweetnam. You suggest, at one point in your  
11 presentation, that an economic viability study  
12 must be done in line with this environmental  
13 review. Could you expand a little bit? Just what  
14 do you mean by that?

15 MS. SWEETNAM: I am taking the La  
16 Broquerie and Hanover areas, the reason why we  
17 moved. Basically, could we justify, and say to  
18 the bank: Yes, we will build for 240, instead of  
19 300. But if we want to cow up by five cows or  
20 five percent, we need another 600-acres, which is  
21 not there. Is that viable? It is not viable.  
22 And were we prepared to take less off of our land,  
23 when it is capable of so much more? We were not  
24 going to take our manure and spread it on one  
25 field.

1                   The people who came down from Manitoba  
2    Conservation had no understanding what quota was  
3    or what agriculture practices were. It was all  
4    just pure book knowledge is what they had. The  
5    implications -- and when I said to the lady: Do  
6    you realize the implications of what you are  
7    asking us with this one-time crop removal? And do  
8    you realize that you sell quota? And the answer  
9    was: Now, what's quota? Now, quota is costing us  
10   something like \$4 million just for the privilege  
11   of producing milk and having the tanker come into  
12   your yard.

13                   So a viability study in those areas is  
14   most definitely required, because you are going to  
15   strike people out of business. We couldn't build  
16   with those ceilings on our head, knowing that our  
17   son or daughter could never continue in that  
18   industry.

19                   THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I think you're  
20   suggesting that the current, or the most recent  
21   phosphorus regulation, is unreasonable?

22                   MS. SWEETNAM: Absolutely.

23                   THE CHAIRMAN: Why?

24                   MS. SWEETNAM: They are targeting you  
25   just because you come from a certain area. They

1 do not look at the land quality of your particular  
2 farm at all. Just because you are in that area,  
3 that's what you are dealt with. We have a good  
4 farm in La Broquerie. It is known as one of the  
5 better farms in the area. We would not have  
6 chosen to put a \$1.9 million building project  
7 there if we didn't think it was able to sustain  
8 it.

9 And somebody who is non-agricultural  
10 comes in and tells you, you know, you have got to  
11 reduce. Their first approach at our meeting in  
12 September when they came to our home, they said:  
13 We want you to reduce your cows. We want  
14 5.2-acres per cow. It didn't make sense.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

16 MR. MOTHERAL: By the way, I farm.

17 MS. SWEETNAM: Good. You pass.

18 MR. MOTHERAL: I would like you to  
19 know that. And I understand the frustrations you  
20 have gone through. And I do realize La Broquerie.  
21 And I am just talking about in this instance,  
22 like, we have to -- our job is to find out  
23 information about mostly the hog industry, but it  
24 is not leaving out other stuff, other industries,  
25 to see if there is anything that we can do to

1 improve or whatever, the conditions of the  
2 environment, and that's our main focus.

3 In La Broquerie and Hanover, of  
4 course, we know that it is a very intensive area  
5 of livestock, I realize that. And when the new  
6 phosphorus regulations came in, it did put them in  
7 jeopardy, because they are also maxed out as far  
8 as the regulatory framework. They are almost  
9 maxed out for manure application of land. Is that  
10 the situation where you got caught in? And I say  
11 "caught in", caught in those new regulations that  
12 you didn't have enough land then to spread your  
13 manure?

14 MS. SWEETNAM: We spent \$6,000 on a  
15 Manure Management Plan in -- the tests were done  
16 the 19th of May, and the report was produced by  
17 the 14th of June. It was produced by a  
18 professional and, obviously, that cost. And he  
19 said we had ample land and extra. And between  
20 14th of June and the 8th of September, we didn't  
21 have enough land.

22 MR. MOTHERAL: That's this year?

23 MS. SWEETNAM: Yes, 2006. Yes, this  
24 is all very recent.

25 MR. MOTHERAL: And does that coincide

1 with the new phosphorus regulations?

2 MS. SWEETNAM: No. They didn't come  
3 in until November.

4 MR. MOTHERAL: Not until November.

5 MS. SWEETNAM: But they were enforced  
6 early, you know.

7 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. We are just  
8 after information here. And I need to know more  
9 about it, and that's what I have to read your  
10 report again.

11 MS. SWEETNAM: That's why I asked if  
12 you had time to read the time frame before I spoke  
13 to you, so that it would make a lot more sense to  
14 you.

15 MR. MOTHERAL: We had other things to  
16 do beforehand.

17 MS. SWEETNAM: And I certainly  
18 understand that.

19 MR. MOTHERAL: And we will do that in  
20 time.

21 MR. YEE: It may be just another point  
22 of clarification. I think I understand your  
23 point, but I was going to give you an opportunity  
24 to say something more on it with regards to not  
25 just your operation, but agriculture, in general,

1 in terms of livestock. Do you see that in order  
2 to survive economically in this day and age, do  
3 you require a certain level of livestock  
4 operation? I think that's what you are alluding  
5 to in your presentation?

6 MS. SWEETNAM: When we left Ireland in  
7 2000, the farmers who had, at that time, 100 to  
8 115 cows were what we call very, very comfortably  
9 off. If they had their building to EU standards,  
10 they were on the pig's back, for want of a better  
11 word. Today they are selling out. That's only  
12 seven years. You know, you don't have to be a  
13 rocket scientist to realize this is coming here.  
14 It is global.

15 And that was why our unspoken drive,  
16 when we came to Canada, was: We have got to  
17 double the cows in five years. And then we were  
18 building to leave room that if we needed to, we  
19 could go to the 300 cows, and that was going to be  
20 enough for our lifestyle. And what our son or  
21 daughter may want to do, I don't know. But for  
22 now, we are six miles from the border. And do I  
23 see the future in Manitoba? For us, we have to  
24 get over this financial loss. That will require a  
25 lot more work and a lot more time. Will the banks

1 give a 50 year old a loan? Probably not. So in  
2 our lifetime, this has really affected us. In our  
3 children's lifetime, I don't see how they can do  
4 it in this province.

5 MR. YEE: Thank you.

6 MS. SWEETNAM: And I'm speaking for  
7 the future.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you familiar with  
9 similar situations in other provinces, and is it  
10 any less onerous or more onerous?

11 MS. SWEETNAM: It's a lot less  
12 onerous. My husband has just come back from the  
13 dairy seminar in Alberta and development there is  
14 a lot greater. In North Dakota right now it's 799  
15 cows before you need a technical review, or the  
16 equivalent of. And the Governor of Minnesota is  
17 looking to find ways to increase cow  
18 profitability. So there is a proactive and there  
19 is a negative. And, unfortunately, this province  
20 right now, as you can see from our end, it's very,  
21 very negative.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,  
23 Mrs. Sweetnam.

24 Les McEwan, Deerwood Soil and Water  
25 Association. Yes, would you produce introduce

1 yourselves for the record?

2 MR. McEWAN: Les McEwan.

3 MR. ORCHARD: Gordon Orchard.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

5 LES McEWAN and GORDON ORCHARD, having been sworn,  
6 present as follows:

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

8 You may proceed.

9 MR. McEWAN: We have supplied you with  
10 two documents there. The one that I will be  
11 starting with is the South Tobacco Creek document  
12 with the plastic cover.

13 Good afternoon. As stated, my name is  
14 Les McEwan. And I am here today as Chairman of  
15 the Deerwood Soil and Water Management  
16 Association. My co-presenter today is Gordon  
17 Orchard, our association Vice-President.  
18 Unfortunately, Bill Turner, who was supposed to be  
19 here, is out in the field dealing with a snow melt  
20 due to the warm weather.

21 So our presentation today is based on  
22 two inter-related components of a study conducted  
23 on the South Tobacco Creek. And since some of the  
24 questions arising from the first part of the  
25 presentation may be answered in the second, we

1 would like to run through both, and then stop for  
2 questions. However, if at any time you need  
3 clarification, certainly feel free to stop us, and  
4 we will attempt to address the situation.

5           The Deerwood Soil and Water Management  
6 Association began in the escarpment area of  
7 Manitoba, approximately 80 miles southwest of  
8 Winnipeg, in 1983, and was incorporated in 1985.  
9 Approximately 120 farmers have been involved in  
10 projects ranging from shelterbelts, conservation  
11 tillage, forage establishment on marginal lands,  
12 to the construction of small on-farm water  
13 retention dams. Apparently, my slides have gotten  
14 mixed up a bit here. All of the slides are  
15 available in the back of this book, as far as  
16 information is concerned.

17           It was the interest in the small dams  
18 that led us into a research project in 1991 to  
19 prove the hydrological value of the small dam  
20 network for flood mitigation. This project, known  
21 as the South Tobacco Creek Project, has grown to  
22 encompass not only research on the volumes of  
23 water moving through the watershed, but also on  
24 the quality of that water as well, and how it can  
25 be influenced by farming practices.

1                   In 2004, we were contracted to conduct  
2 data collection for a project known as WEBS. This  
3 is a \$5.65 million project led by Agriculture and  
4 Agri-foods Canada, and stands for the Watershed  
5 Evaluation of Beneficial Management Practices.  
6 Ducks Unlimited and Manitoba Agriculture are key  
7 partners here in Manitoba. The South Tobacco  
8 Creek site is one of seven sites across Canada,  
9 and only one of two within the prairie eco-zone.

10                   There is a range of BMPs being tested  
11 at the sites for environmental and economic  
12 impact, with the environmental component focusing  
13 on water quality. The five BMPs being tested here  
14 include zero-till, holding ponds to capture spring  
15 run-off from cattle enclosures, conversion of  
16 critical areas to forage, enhancement of riparian  
17 areas and the utilization of small dams as a  
18 nutrient sink. None of the BMPs currently being  
19 tested at any of the seven sites are specifically  
20 targeted to the hog industry. Environmentally  
21 speaking, the hog industry has containment and  
22 utilization, and is not regarded as a significant  
23 priority. As we are under contract by the  
24 respective government departments, we cannot  
25 publicize data from these sites until the final

1 reports are issued in 2008.

2 One of the issues raised at the  
3 scoping meetings was groundwater quality in rural  
4 wells, and I would like to take a minute to  
5 address that issue in our area. We conducted a  
6 survey of 30 wells that were sampled, 27 farm  
7 wells and 3 municipal wells. Also attached are  
8 results from two surveys conducted by Manitoba  
9 Agriculture staff and the Pembina Valley  
10 Conservation District. These surveys have been  
11 replicated by Conservation Districts and  
12 Provincial staff around the Province.

13 And, in general, we expect to find 40  
14 to 60 percent of the rural wells are unfit for  
15 human consumption. In our study, 39 percent of  
16 the participants were using drinking water from  
17 other sources, other than their own well.  
18 Nitrates and nitrites exceeded guidelines 43  
19 percent of the time. 57 percent exceeded  
20 guidelines for total coliforms. Of these 18  
21 percent were due to fecal coliforms. For  
22 90 percent of the wells that failed to meet  
23 Canadian Water Quality Guidelines for drinking  
24 water, the cause was either substandard  
25 construction, location or maintenance. You will

1 note that many of the wells are more than 10 years  
2 old, and that 48 percent of the wells have cribs  
3 that extend less than 12-inches above ground  
4 level. None of these surveys have indicated a  
5 cause associated with field management of  
6 fertilizers or manure.

7           The portion of our project that I  
8 would like to focus on today is the Manured  
9 Watershed Study. The objective of this study is  
10 to determine whether replacing commercial  
11 fertilizers with hog manure on cropland will have  
12 a detrimental effect on water quality within the  
13 watershed.

14           This four-year study was concluded in  
15 2001, with the lead partner being Manitoba  
16 Conservation. Additional funding was obtained  
17 from Manitoba Agriculture, Manitoba Pork, and the  
18 Manitoba Livestock Manure Management Initiative.

19           I would just like to point out that  
20 Manitoba Pork was strictly a funding partner in  
21 this process. They were not involved in data  
22 collection or in the peer review.

23           As a lead partner, Manitoba  
24 Conservation was responsible for sample and data  
25 analysis, with all of the analytical work being

1 done in a government-accredited lab. There was no  
2 run-off for the 2000 collection year due to dry  
3 weather, so the data I will be presenting is for  
4 1998 and 1999.

5           The run-off water sampling was done at  
6 10 sites in three areas during spring melt and  
7 rainfall events. There is no commercial  
8 fertilizer, livestock production, or related  
9 livestock manure disposal to the "Background"  
10 sites, and it is considered any influences to  
11 bacteria or nutrient concentrations would come  
12 from wildlife or other natural sources.

13           The Manured Watershed's annual crop  
14 rotation has all required crop nutrients supplied,  
15 based on the N requirements, by liquid hog manure  
16 application and incorporation by tillage in the  
17 fall. The Twin Watersheds' Conventional and Zero  
18 till fields produce annual crops, and all crop  
19 nutrients are supplied by commercial fertilizer  
20 application. This map represents over 18,000  
21 acres, of which 18 percent remains under natural  
22 tree cover, and the balance is under agricultural  
23 activities or rural infrastructure. Within the  
24 watershed, there are 12 cattle producers and two  
25 hog producers.

1                   The backgrounds area is sampled at two  
2 sites. The first site is a small watershed  
3 running through a natural wooded area with no  
4 livestock or agricultural activity upstream.  
5 Water in this area is typical of a small watershed  
6 in a natural state.

7                   The second site is an alfalfa/grass  
8 mixture forage field that is baled annually.  
9 There was no livestock manure or commercial  
10 fertilizers applied to this field in the four  
11 years previous to the study, or for the duration  
12 of the study.

13                   The manured watershed is sampled at  
14 four locations: A railway ditch upstream of the  
15 manured field weir site, a V-notch weir where  
16 run-off leaves the manured field, a road ditch  
17 site on the downstream side of the drainage  
18 channel from the manured field weir near a small  
19 wetland buffer zone, and a road ditch that is  
20 upstream from the wetland discharge.

21                   The hog manure was analyzed for  
22 nutrient content, and an application rate was  
23 calculated based on soil test results and the  
24 crop's N requirement. Approximate application  
25 rates were 4,600-gallons per acre in the fall of

1 1997 and 6,700-gallons per acre in the fall of  
2 1998. Although there were more gallons per acre  
3 applied in 1998, the final nitrogen values in the  
4 top six inches of soil were relatively similar  
5 between years because nitrogen, already present in  
6 the soil prior to manure application during the  
7 fall of 1998, had been lower than in 1997. Manure  
8 was broadcast and tillage incorporated within 24  
9 to 48 hours.

10           The twin watershed area is part of a  
11 larger study comparing run-off characteristics of  
12 zero tillage to conventional tillage. This  
13 watershed is also sampled at four locations. The  
14 receiving stream, upstream of the two weir field  
15 drains, two V-notch weirs in the field drains  
16 where the water leaves the two plots, and the  
17 receiving stream downstream from the two field  
18 drains.

19           Fecal coliforms are used as an  
20 indicator of potential contamination by fecal  
21 matter getting into the water. Measurements at  
22 all sites are represented as the number of fecal  
23 coliforms per 100 milliliters of water.  
24 Measurements at all sites are represented as the  
25 number of fecal coliforms per 100 milliliters of

1 water. There is no acceptable level of fecal  
2 coliforms for drinking water, but it is important  
3 to note that there are not sampling sources that  
4 would normally be used for drinking. These are  
5 edge of field run-off sites.

6 Note that the graphs represent mean  
7 values for water samples checked during the spring  
8 run-off only. There were no precipitation events  
9 during the summer or fall of 1998 or 1999 that  
10 created enough run-off to gather data for summer  
11 rainfall events.

12 You will also note that fecal coliform  
13 values from the manured watershed field were very  
14 low, and even lower than what was observed in the  
15 forage field site in 1999. Higher concentrations  
16 also occurred from upstream and downstream sample  
17 sites on the receiving channels. And these  
18 contributions were considered to have come from  
19 wildlife. Wildlife such as ducks, deer, mice, and  
20 other small animals, all appeared to have had a  
21 greater impact than the run-off from hog manure  
22 applied in the previous fall.

23 Fecal coliform counts in animal  
24 manures are usually very high, with values in the  
25 range of millions of organisms per 100

1 milliliters. The low values observed in the  
2 run-off from the field site indicated that there  
3 was considerable die-off over the winter.

4           There are two important points in the  
5 fecal coliform graphs that I would like to point  
6 out. First, evidence of off-field movement of  
7 fecal coliform contributions due to manure  
8 applications in the fall was minimal, and does not  
9 appear to be problematic within the watershed.  
10 Second, fecal coliform contributions can also  
11 occur from wildlife, and these can also cause  
12 elevated concentrations to waterways. Fecal  
13 coliform values from the Manured Watershed were  
14 within ranges of values from the twin watershed  
15 fields.

16           A moratorium on livestock expansion,  
17 or even eliminating livestock production, will not  
18 eliminate animal waste inside our watersheds.  
19 There will still continue to be a wildlife  
20 contribution. From a water quality perspective,  
21 we live in an imperfect world. In terms of our  
22 original objective, as long as the manure  
23 application was matched to the crop requirement,  
24 and the manure is properly incorporated, there  
25 does not appear to be a significant negative

1 impact on the water quality of the watershed.

2 MR. ORCHARD: My name is Gordon  
3 Orchard. I operate a mixed beef and grain farm on  
4 the Manitoba escarpment near Miami. I am  
5 vice-president of the Deerwood Soil and Water  
6 Management Association. My farm is in the South  
7 Tobacco Creek Watershed, where most of our  
8 watershed research has been conducted.

9 I will present the nutrient data from  
10 the Manured Watershed Study, first presented to  
11 the Livestock Stewardship 2000 Initiative as  
12 preliminary data. Conclusions from the Manured  
13 Watershed Study are from the final report of the  
14 South Tobacco Creek Manure and Watersheds Run-off  
15 Study, 1998 to 2001.

16 This slide shows that after a fall  
17 application in 1998, spring soil tests show almost  
18 200 pounds per acre of nitrogen. By the fall of  
19 1999, after one growing season, soil nitrates are  
20 back to the pre-application levels. And that's  
21 kind of an average of how each year was shown as  
22 the soil tests were taken through the length of  
23 the study.

24 The next slide. Throughout the study,  
25 all nutrients, manure and fertilizer, were applied

1 based on soil tests and recommended nutrient  
2 application rates to achieve the targeted crop  
3 yields. Commercial fertilizer was applied to the  
4 zero till and conventional till fields, and liquid  
5 hog manure was fall-applied and  
6 tillage-incorporated on the manured watershed  
7 field.

8 The two years, 1998 and 1999, shown on  
9 the slide, are indicative of the variability of  
10 run-off from the year to year. In 1999, the  
11 spring run-off at the manured watershed site was  
12 two percent of the 1998 run-off. In 1999, the  
13 spring run-off at the zero till and conventional  
14 till site was 25 to 60 percent of 1998.

15 MR. MOTHERAL: And I just don't want  
16 you to feel as though you have to be done in the  
17 15 minutes. It is kind of going a quickly to  
18 absorb what I want to absorb, either that or I am  
19 a little slow.

20 MR. ORCHARD: You want me to slow  
21 down?

22 MR. MOTHERAL: Just going back to the  
23 manure watershed results, that nitrate level of  
24 almost 200 in the spring of 1998, this is after  
25 the manure application or is it fertilizer

1 application?

2 MR. ORCHARD: Well, it is a manure  
3 application, a fall-applied manure application.  
4 And that spring, the soil tests showed 200 pounds  
5 per acre.

6 MR. MOTHERAL: And that was after the  
7 crop was off?

8 MR. ORCHARD: Yes. It showed the  
9 potential end that was there for the manure, how  
10 much the crop used. And then the next step is  
11 soil tests in the fall, and then application of  
12 manure again. So that was the process through the  
13 length of the study.

14 MR. MOTHERAL: And I'll have time to  
15 go through it afterwards, but I just wanted to  
16 stop and clarify that. Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. ORCHARD: The run-off here, the  
18 conclusions from the final report, and these are  
19 quotes right out of what the researchers did in  
20 concluding and looking at the data. During 1998,  
21 total nitrogen loss from the Manured Watershed,  
22 field compared to the zero till and conventional  
23 filled fields, was due to the higher nitrogen  
24 values in the upper soil profile prior to the  
25 spring run-off period.

1                   And during years of negligible  
2 run-off, the loss of nitrogen from the Manured  
3 Watershed field was also negligible. And the  
4 dissolved form of nutrients comprised the greatest  
5 proportion of the local concentrations from all  
6 sites sampled. And I will discuss that even more  
7 in the phosphorus part of our results.

8                   But that dissolved portion becomes  
9 very important all the way through our watershed  
10 research where we are getting higher levels of  
11 dissolved all the time, not particulate. Usually  
12 particulate is considered a function of erosion.  
13 And the dissolved is much more complicated. And  
14 it's an indicator of the processes that are  
15 ongoing in the field, in the watershed, and they  
16 are probably a faster track to Lake Winnipeg, too,  
17 we think.

18                   The Manure Watershed Study total  
19 phosphorus results is the next slide. As with  
20 nitrogen, total phosphate run-off from all of the  
21 fields depends on volume of spring run-off. This  
22 is probably pretty representative of most of agri  
23 Manitoba. I know that on my own farm very little  
24 spring run-off comes off a field that is  
25 fall-cultivated because the snow cover is usually

1 lower.

2                   The two years of data show differing  
3 results for phosphate, and seem to indicate there  
4 are complex mechanisms at work year to year in the  
5 watershed. In 1998, the Manured Watershed  
6 produced fairly high phosphorus levels compared to  
7 the other sample sites. However, in 1999, the  
8 mean background phosphorus concentration from the  
9 forage field was similar to the manure-applied  
10 site. This would indicate that under these types  
11 of conditions, similar contributions can come from  
12 non-manured and non-fertilized areas.

13                   And that actually shows very nicely in  
14 that slide. And you can see that the large  
15 proportion of the Manured Watershed bar at the top  
16 is dissolved phosphate. And in the 1999 year,  
17 where you go all the way across, all of the  
18 amounts are pretty similar. There's not a very  
19 significant difference between the manure to the  
20 background forage field and the zero till and  
21 conventional till fields, above and below the  
22 sampling sites as well, which is another important  
23 consideration that we will carry on with a little  
24 later.

25                   Some solutions from the final report.

1 Total phosphorus, P, in the Manured Watershed soil  
2 samples checked over four years of manure  
3 applications showed a consistent, slightly  
4 increasing trend. Hog manure is relatively high  
5 in phosphate and, when applied at nitrogen crop  
6 fertility rates, a slow build up of soil P can  
7 occur.

8 Higher P values come off the manured  
9 watershed and zero till in 1998 and 2001. Total  
10 concentrations appear to be slightly increasing  
11 each successive year from the zero till and the  
12 forage field sites.

13 The manured watershed field was too  
14 small to obtain adequate spring run-off events on  
15 a consistent basis under natural conditions. The  
16 total nutrient loss from fields during  
17 precipitation events, and the post-spring run-off  
18 period, was usually lower than during spring  
19 run-off due to less run-off volume, which kind of  
20 makes sense. You get a crop growing, and then  
21 there is just a decreased amount of run-off from  
22 that field, unless you get a real boomer of a  
23 rain.

24 To put the South Tobacco Creek total  
25 phosphorous loads into perspective, this chart,

1 taken from the overview 1994-1997 Water Quality  
2 Data for South Tobacco Creek, October 1999,  
3 compares unit area loads to South Tobacco Creek to  
4 various non-point sources. The South Tobacco  
5 Watershed, representing about 7,300-hectares of  
6 farmland and escarpment native forest, produces  
7 between 0.5 and 1.0-kilograms of phosphorus per  
8 hectare per year. The average urban residential  
9 loads range from 8 to 10-kilograms per hectare,  
10 per year.

11 The Manured Watershed Study shows that  
12 there are many sources of N and P in the South  
13 Tobacco Creek Watershed. An interesting result  
14 from sampling above and below the manured  
15 watershed, zero till and conventional till sites  
16 highlights the significance from backgrounds N and  
17 P. From the final report:

18 "This indicated that phosphorus loads  
19 from these fields were not causing  
20 significantly noticeable increases to  
21 stream concentrations. The phosphorus  
22 concentrations in receiving waterways  
23 showed similar trends for total N."

24 In other words, the study fields did not add more  
25 to the run-off than was already there.

1                   The type of N and P, that is the  
2   dissolved form, is very important in understanding  
3   the sources and quantifying what comes from where.  
4   New research now underway at the WEBS project is  
5   attempting to identify and quantify sources of  
6   agricultural and natural N and P.

7                   History tells us that poor water  
8   quality is not unknown to Lake Winnipeg or rural  
9   Manitoba. Hudson's Bay Company records tell of  
10  algae blooms on Lake Winnipeg so thick the York  
11  boats were held up until the wind shifted. As  
12  well, before settlement, potable water was  
13  available only at scattered springs. The Boundary  
14  Trail Commission had to carry all of their water  
15  with them when they surveyed our southern border.  
16  And even in the Winkler Mall, you can go to the  
17  can there, and you see that map on the wall that  
18  shows the trail for the Boundary Trail Commission.  
19  And there is a long march there. They went across  
20  where they had to carry their own water.

21                  I bring this up because the probable  
22  source of a significant amount of dissolved N and  
23  P then, as now, is decaying vegetation. The chart  
24  of non-point sources of P loadings shows that  
25  agriculture, urban, industry and natural areas are

1 all contributors of N and P to our environment.

2           The Manured Watershed Project was set  
3 up to evaluate N and P loadings from surface  
4 broadcast and incorporation of hog manure, and to  
5 compare loads from other fields and background  
6 sources in the monitored South Tobacco Creek  
7 Watershed. To determine loading rates from land  
8 uses, such as natural woodlands, pasture land and  
9 forage fields, has led us to support further  
10 research within the WEBS project.

11           In conclusion, we don't feel that  
12 there is a need for a lot of new regulations  
13 beyond what is in place. Increased regulation  
14 will further decrease the number of small  
15 operators that don't have the economy of scale to  
16 absorb more costs. Nutrient management is  
17 basically a function of matching nutrient  
18 application to nutrient uptake, for both manure  
19 and commercial fertilizers. Where the need exists  
20 to develop and evaluate Best Management Practices  
21 that will assist in the remediation of nutrient  
22 loading, without simply converting particulate  
23 phosphate loadings to dissolved.

24           We have proposed a science-based  
25 watershed laboratory where researchers can work

1 with local landowners within the Tobacco Creek  
2 Watershed that would supply information back to  
3 the government agencies involved. We need a  
4 recommendation that the Province of Manitoba moves  
5 forward with this initiative.

6 Thank you very much.

7 MR. McEWAN: The second document we  
8 supplied you with is the Tobacco Creek Model  
9 Watershed, which outlines where we would place  
10 this watershed-based laboratory. It basically  
11 starts on the Tobacco Creek, at the top of the  
12 escarpment at Altamont, and would allow us to  
13 extend our evaluation and research right through  
14 to the Morris River. It's a 400 square mile  
15 watershed.

16 If you go to the budgets, in the back  
17 of that book, you will note that we are already  
18 two years behind schedule where we wanted to be,  
19 due to budget constraints.

20 MR. ORCHARD: Another comment I would  
21 like to make about the perspective of the  
22 significance of phosphate here, I notice in the  
23 Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board report that the  
24 City of Winnipeg will be down 65 percent in their  
25 loadings by 2014. They are right now, on average,

1 about three milligrams per litre of discharge.  
2 The manured watershed slide was -- the worst year  
3 we had was 2.5 milligrams of phosphate per litre  
4 of discharge.

5           And in the years where we had low  
6 run-off, we were down at one, or were close to one  
7 on the manured watershed, as well as that was  
8 background coming off forage fields, ditch  
9 confluence, natural land area. So there is a  
10 whole issue here of: Where is all of our  
11 phosphates coming from? And if, by regulation, we  
12 are going to start assigning costs to clean up the  
13 environment, we have got to understand how much  
14 even the environment is putting in there as total  
15 loadings. And I guess everybody is going to have  
16 to carry the can on this, but we want it carried  
17 fairly.

18           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So I  
19 imagine you wouldn't object if we recommended that  
20 the Province of Manitoba move forward with this  
21 initiative?

22           MR. McEWAN: That's our plan.

23           THE CHAIRMAN: I can't make that  
24 commitment at this point, but we will certainly  
25 consider it.

1                   Just in your concluding paragraphs,  
2 Mr. Orchard, you said:

3                   "We don't feel that there is need for  
4 a lot of new regulations beyond what  
5 is in place."

6 And, now, are you speaking beyond November, with  
7 the new phosphorus regulations, or before  
8 November?

9                   MR. ORCHARD: I am really not  
10 knowledgeable enough on that. The previous  
11 speaker was talking about the impact the phosphate  
12 regulations were having in her area. And I'm in a  
13 different area, and I'm a cattle beef producer.  
14 We haven't been swept up in the same sweep of  
15 regulations as some of the other parts of our  
16 industry have, being industry, agriculture, in  
17 general. So I am very reluctant to comment until  
18 we know more of what's happening in our  
19 watersheds. This just coming up with arbitrary  
20 levels, we can have some natural areas that are in  
21 excess of these arbitrary levels. I know the City  
22 of Edmonton, Calgary, Regina and Saskatoon are at  
23 one milligram per litre of discharge. The City of  
24 Winnipeg is at three. Well, I even wonder how you  
25 come up with one, as being acceptable or not

1 acceptable, when I guess our natural areas can be  
2 there, depending on flows and the type of year  
3 we've had. So I know we have got a problem,  
4 probably, but how much of it is natural cycling  
5 and how much is others, I don't know.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

7 MR. MOTHERAL: My only comment is that  
8 you continue your research. I'm very familiar  
9 with it, I have been over the number of years. I  
10 don't know how hard we will campaign for you. It  
11 is not our job, as the Chairman says. But I think  
12 we do need to have research on the nutrient  
13 loading, et cetera, and what's coming in  
14 naturally, and all of that. So I know when I  
15 started on this committee, I did say that Deerwood  
16 Soil and Water Association would have a lot of  
17 information. And we probably won't have heard the  
18 last of you. We will see you again probably  
19 sometime. Thank you.

20 MR. MCEWAN: There is just a couple of  
21 comments that I would like to make. Like, in  
22 terms of the impact that regulation is having on  
23 the smaller producers, I was talking to a hog  
24 farmer last week who has a 50 sow unit, and his  
25 pit has been basically condemned. And he has been

1 asked to create a new holding tank for this barn.  
2 And it's a 24 x 24 foot holding bank is what he  
3 has been asked to construct. It is not a really  
4 big thing. It is probably smaller than most of  
5 your basements. For this 24 x 24 foot holding  
6 tank, it needs to be fully tiled. It has to have  
7 four inspection wells. It has to be plastic  
8 lined. And it has to have foot thick walls. And  
9 it has to be situated all on pea gravel, so that  
10 anything underneath this thing is going to get  
11 into the drainage tiles. And the cost of this 24  
12 x 24 foot holding tank for him is \$54,000.

13 And, of course, everybody says: Yeah,  
14 but you can get government money to help him out  
15 with that. And what that amounts to is through  
16 the APF, he can get 30 percent, to a maximum of  
17 \$30,000 Federally. Provincially you can get 25  
18 percent, to a maximum of \$5,000. So out of his  
19 \$54,000 of costs, he is going to get \$16,200 out  
20 of the Feds, and the full \$5,000 out of the  
21 Province, which comes to \$21,200 of benefit.  
22 Unfortunately, that's all taxable. And even at  
23 the lowest tax rate of 16 percent, he is going to  
24 lose most of his Manitoba money. He is going to  
25 lose another \$3,392 out of that. So he ends up

1 with a government contribution to this thing of  
2 \$17,808, leaving him with a cost of \$36,192.

3 Now, I didn't talk to him too much  
4 about where he is at profit-wise with his 50 sow  
5 unit. But if we multiply his 50 sows by 18 pigs a  
6 year, he has the potential to finish 900 pigs a  
7 year there. These are not high numbers. I think  
8 they are realistic numbers.

9 And if we look at the 27 months  
10 preceding January 1st, we were told by the  
11 animalists that we had been through 27 months of  
12 pure profit-taking for the pork industry. What  
13 they didn't say really loud is that profit-taking  
14 amounted to \$3 to \$5 net per pig. So if we're  
15 optimistic, and say that those 900 pigs he is  
16 going to sell are going to earn him a net profit,  
17 and that's \$4,500 a year, what this \$36,000 of  
18 cost represents is the next eight years of his  
19 profit.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McEwan.

21 MR. ORCHARD: I would like to make one  
22 more comment, if I could. And I wonder if we can  
23 put up that phosphate slide again.

24 MR. MCEWAN: 11, I think, maybe.

25 MR. ORCHARD: It has implications

1 because Deerwood have been involved in water  
2 conservation for over 20 years now. And we have  
3 seen such a landscaping change on our farm area,  
4 our small area. And one of the things that comes  
5 out of this, it is almost alarming, but what if  
6 all of that conservation effort to keep trash on  
7 the surface, to grow more forages and to move to  
8 zero till, less conventional tillage, is causing  
9 an upswing in our dissolved phosphates?

10 And when you look at that chart and  
11 look at the '98 year, the '98 year was the big  
12 run-off year, and the Manured Watershed was the  
13 one that shed the most phosphate. And all the  
14 rest is zero till, conventional till, that's the  
15 "C" and the "Z" on the right side, you know, they  
16 are there. The low run-off year, there was still  
17 run-off off the zero till. There was none off the  
18 manured water. It was 10 percent of normal. That  
19 bar on the very left is the forage field, and it's  
20 a couple miles from the manure watershed site. It  
21 had run-off, as it did the twin watershed sites,  
22 and all of them were over one milligram per litre  
23 of run-off.

24 So there is a really big picture here,  
25 especially when you consider that that manured

1 watershed wasn't even as good as the injected  
2 Manure Management Plan that these large barns are  
3 required to do. That was broadcast and cultivated  
4 in within 48 hours, but it is a little different  
5 than injecting it and knifing it into the field,  
6 so that's the Cadillac system. And I'm kind of  
7 envious as a beef producer, because I know I'm  
8 probably shedding more than that. But we have  
9 really got to understand here how we regulate.  
10 And I guess that's my final kick at the can.

11 MR. YEE: Just, I guess, I don't want  
12 to put you on the spot, or anything, but I realize  
13 that I think you said the actual report will be  
14 out in 2008?

15 MR. McEWAN: Yes, that's from the WEBS  
16 Committee's reports, but none of those reports are  
17 going to be -- have anything to do with hog  
18 nutrients.

19 MR. YEE: Well, the nutrient data  
20 looks really interesting. As a quick question,  
21 I'm assuming that both particulate nitrate and  
22 phosphate were calculated based on totals and  
23 dissolved?

24 MR. McEWAN: Yes.

25 MR. YEE: Thank you.

1                   MR. McEWAN: Just one comment I would  
2 like to make, going back to some of that well  
3 water data, we really haven't learned the lesson  
4 of Walkerton. When I look at what's going on with  
5 these rural wells, so many of these wells are  
6 located within a foot of the ground. They are  
7 susceptible to groundwater contamination. And if  
8 you go and look at the background sites, like so  
9 often, we hear that the problem of Walkerton was  
10 related to agricultural run-off.

11                   And yet when we look at those pristine  
12 sites coming out of forested or forage areas, it  
13 really doesn't matter where that run-off came  
14 from. The only thing that would have changed is  
15 which strain or which type of disease they were  
16 hit with. When we see fecal coliform coming out  
17 of railway ditches and bushlands even higher off a  
18 manured field, then it is totally irrelevant that  
19 what happened at Walkerton is as a result of  
20 run-off from a cow pasture, because the  
21 contamination was there the minute the water  
22 entered the well.

23                   THE CHAIRMAN: So the lesson to be  
24 learned is that we need better wells, better well  
25 construction?

1 MR. McEWAN: Well, construction and  
2 maintenance.

3 I will leave the disc in the machine  
4 for your records.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
6 Please state your name for the record?

7 MR. NEUMANN: Sig Neumann.

8 SIEG NEUMANN, having been sworn, presents as  
9 follows:

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may  
11 proceed.

12 MR. NEUMANN: Thank you, ladies and  
13 gentlemen. Just before I start, I will just,  
14 basically, give a little history of myself. I am  
15 with the R.M. of Morris. I am a councillor. I  
16 have been for the past eight years. I have been  
17 chair of the Livestock Committee. We have, sort  
18 of, just cancelled our Livestock Committee. But  
19 we, actually, put it under the responsibilities  
20 under Economic Development. And that is quite  
21 interesting, actually, that we actually did do  
22 that without really giving it any -- well, you  
23 know, thinking of all of the implications with  
24 these hearings proceeding when we did it at the  
25 time.

1 I also want to mention that I am a  
2 grain producer. I have no vested interest in hog  
3 barns or livestock, strictly grain. I use  
4 commercial fertilizers on my soil and my land. We  
5 soil test each field. And we have for the past 20  
6 years, at least. And we put on commercial  
7 fertilizers, according to recommendation.

8 And also, I don't have any access to  
9 manure, hog manure or livestock manure on my  
10 fields, but I would love to have access to them.

11 Thank you for the privilege of  
12 allowing me to address this Commission.

13 Our municipality has been involved in  
14 orderly hog expansion, with about 30 sites being  
15 developed within the last decade. We have always  
16 had stringent criteria to address environmental  
17 and residents' concerns. This has been  
18 accomplished by having a sound development plan,  
19 zoning by-laws and conditions within the  
20 conditional use agreements.

21 Many of our requirements are above  
22 that of the Province. And I will just list some  
23 examples. Separation distances from residences  
24 are approximately twice the minimum requirement.  
25 And for lagoons, by the way, they are a mile or

1 more. And from residences, of course, the barns  
2 themselves, it depends on the number of animal  
3 units. The more animal units, the further the  
4 separation distances.

5 Manure application has to be by direct  
6 incorporation into the soil. And I will just give  
7 a brief explanation here of what we have to know,  
8 the definition of the way our council understands  
9 incorporation. It's not necessarily just  
10 injection. It is not the airway system where you  
11 actually make -- or where you actually tend to  
12 pool the liquid onto the soil by making cups,  
13 holes, all along. It is not by the dribble bar  
14 method, which needs to be used, by the way, on  
15 grasslands. But in our municipality, we have  
16 virtually no pasture land, so all of the  
17 incorporation is done by tillage implement, which  
18 is directly injected or incorporated into the soil  
19 and covered up. And the main criteria there is  
20 that the manure all has to be covered up  
21 immediately when it goes on the soil.

22 Sites need to be surrounded by  
23 shelterbelts. Lagoons require complete straw  
24 cover or plastic covers. This consistency by  
25 council has created an atmosphere of

1 responsibility and understanding and trust by all  
2 stakeholders, and I mean all livestock producers,  
3 and also the residents that live within our  
4 municipality.

5 Leaching is not a problem because we  
6 are on heavy clay soils. Phosphorus levels in our  
7 soils are also very low, especially on the west  
8 side of the Red River. They are much lower, even  
9 as a rule of thumb, than on the east side of the  
10 Red River. Surface water is used as drinking  
11 water for the hogs in almost every year, except in  
12 some sow operations.

13 During the past year, most of the  
14 blame, because of the algae encountered in Lake  
15 Winnipeg, has been placed on the shoulders of the  
16 hog industry, culminating with the moratorium or  
17 the pause of hog expansion. This has effectively  
18 placed a dark cloud on the industry, and on the  
19 decisions of our local council made in approving  
20 hog barns in the first place.

21 It also needs to be noted that we only  
22 had one hog application in the past, roughly,  
23 three years, and that one was voluntarily  
24 withdrawn. The "rapid expansion" requests was  
25 over long before the fear of further "rapid

1 expansion".

2                   The Clean Environment Commission needs  
3 to have a much broader mandate. Some of the  
4 questions that beg answers are:

5                   Why hog production review, and why not  
6 livestock production review?

7                   Have comparisons been made and tests  
8 conducted between livestock sites built in the  
9 last decade and the many that have been  
10 grandfathered over many years when standards were  
11 much less stringent?

12                   How can all violations of existing and  
13 future regulations be effectively enforced, which  
14 is a big problem sometimes.

15                   Would the problem with algae in Lake  
16 Winnipeg exist, even if there never were any hogs  
17 in Manitoba?

18                   What is the present and future role of  
19 local municipal government?

20                   And how do we work together with all  
21 levels and departments of government in order to  
22 sustain livestock production?

23                   When it comes to the environment, each  
24 one of us has to take responsibility and make  
25 improvements within a network of support, that is

1 the full belief of our council. Let us not only  
2 single out the hog industry because the number of  
3 animals there is greater. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Neumann.  
5 I asked a similar question of Mr. Martens when he  
6 made his presentation, but I will ask you, as  
7 well. You say, in your second last paragraph,  
8 that governments should be --

9 "Local municipal governments should be  
10 able to work together with all levels  
11 and departments of government."

12 Do you have any specific ideas on what you would  
13 like to see in that regard?

14 MR. NEUMANN: Well, first of all, I  
15 think, you know, we weren't really consulted when  
16 they came out with the regulations that were  
17 passed in November. And that even though some of  
18 us went to the reviews that they had, the public  
19 hearings, I guess that's what they were called.  
20 And there was a few changes that were made because  
21 awareness was given to the different pockets of  
22 soils that could exist in the different zones that  
23 they had created. Because, like, the government  
24 likes to paint, like, basically all of Manitoba  
25 more or less with a standard brush.

1 I think there is always exceptions.  
2 Because like we know, even in our own area, that  
3 quarters vary. And one quarter cannot necessarily  
4 be compared to another quarter of land. And as  
5 you go throughout Manitoba, it becomes even more  
6 so the case.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: So would there be  
8 different regulations for different areas, or do  
9 you think there should be more authority for local  
10 municipalities?

11 MR. NEUMANN: Well, that's probably a  
12 tough question to answer. I can maybe answer it  
13 for myself as a councillor. And not from  
14 council's perspective, but personally as a  
15 councillor, on council, I would like to see our  
16 council being able to make decisions that exceed  
17 the Provincial standards. And I know we can go  
18 through the process of having a conditional use  
19 hearing, the way the regulations stand, and  
20 actually reject, but that is not totally clear,  
21 either. If it meets the criteria in your by-laws,  
22 and you develop a plan, can you actually turn down  
23 an application?

24 And yet I would think, I would hope,  
25 that you could write your by-laws and your

1 development plan to a standard that is above the  
2 Province's minimum requirement. And that is also  
3 not only -- and I'm speaking of the environmental  
4 side of things, where basically all control has  
5 been taken away from us. For instance, like, you  
6 know, the incorporation, the amount of acres you  
7 need, et cetera, that has actually been taken  
8 away, removed from us the way I understand it.  
9 Though in fall, when we went to those public  
10 meetings, it was a little bit of a gray area.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: But you do continue to  
12 have the authority to have wider set-backs, which  
13 you have in place?

14 MR. NEUMANN: Yes. Yes, that is  
15 correct.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

17 MR. MOTHERAL: My question would be  
18 on, I think I gathered from you and from your  
19 reeve, that you are a little bit displeased with  
20 government's -- I guess when you say Government  
21 Technical Review Committee, or whatever comes out  
22 in your process, having a say over your say on  
23 environment, and possibly even on land  
24 regulations. Do you think there should be a  
25 process where the Technical Review Committee would

1 come and visit council before the process of  
2 public hearings?

3 MR. NEUMANN: Well, it has been  
4 suggested that just lately, in fact, that the  
5 Technical Review Committee be a part of the  
6 conditional use hearings that local council holds.  
7 I think that is, actually, a great idea to have.  
8 Because they can, actually, provide their  
9 professional advice to the public that is asking  
10 the questions, instead of asking the individual  
11 councillors for their opinion.

12 MR. MOTHERAL: I am sure there has to  
13 be a process of better cooperation between the two  
14 groups.

15 MR. NEUMANN: Exactly. And that's all  
16 we're after. And, again, I think so much varies  
17 between different municipalities, what their  
18 expectations are. So I certainly agree with  
19 provincial standards, but they should be a minimum  
20 but council should be able to go and set the  
21 conditions that are over and above the minimum.  
22 But I still think also that they need to be  
23 reasonable. They can't be unreasonable. Now, who  
24 sets those guidelines, I'm not so sure.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1                   MR. YEE: Mr. Neumann, just one quick  
2 clarification. You asked: How can the existing  
3 regulations be effectively enforced? I guess the  
4 question I would have is: Do you find, with  
5 within your own jurisdiction, your own  
6 municipality, that there has not been effective  
7 enforcement?

8                   MR. NEUMANN: Well, probably not at  
9 the present time, but it has been. And what we  
10 expected, when I explained the differences and  
11 what we mean by incorporation, there have been  
12 people trying to short-circuit and, basically,  
13 just to either dribble it on or use the airway  
14 system, which is sort of like -- the best way to  
15 explain the airway system, if you are not familiar  
16 with it, it's sort of like a notched tandem disc  
17 with big notches, or just big spiders, actually, I  
18 should say. And it makes pockets and then the  
19 manure just flows in behind it. And some soil  
20 does fall in and cover it up, but not necessarily.  
21 It then just soaks away, but it is in  
22 concentrations there. And then they vary by  
23 about -- these pockets probably vary by six or  
24 seven inches. It depends on your implement.

25                   We like to see it totally covered up

1 immediately. And I think also from -- as we  
2 mentioned this afternoon, just from the simple  
3 cost of fertilizers, nitrogen not only can leach  
4 into the soil, it -- actually, you can lose it  
5 through the air. And the sooner you have it  
6 covered up, the more value you get there.

7 MR. YEE: And one other question  
8 maybe, you mentioned that in the last decade there  
9 has also been many grandfathered operations which  
10 have lower standards or less stringent standards.  
11 And are you suggesting that they need to be looked  
12 at?

13 MR. NEUMANN: Well, I believe so. I  
14 mean, first of all, you know, we don't have that  
15 many. Because, like I say, we used to have a  
16 number of small hog barns that had pits, actually.  
17 And, basically, there is very few of those left.  
18 And then we have had, like, expansion with  
19 lagoons. And yet, you know, we know that there is  
20 a few in our municipality. But also there is more  
21 in other municipalities where there has been  
22 lagoons around for a very long time that have  
23 never been checked, as far as even to know if  
24 there actually is leaching occurring or not. And  
25 I'm not saying it is occurring, but the

1 possibility exists. The stringents now with  
2 Environment are very strict so that when you build  
3 a lagoon, it is safe and that it is properly lined  
4 with enough soil. And we have no qualms with  
5 that, either.

6 MR. YEE: Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
8 Mr. Neumann. I am going to take a break now for  
9 about ten minutes. There is some coffee and water  
10 over on the side here.

11 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 3:04 P.M. AND RECONVENED  
12 AT 3:19 P.M.)

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we come back to  
14 order now, please? We have two more presentations  
15 for this afternoon. The first up is Mr. Edwin  
16 Hofer. Would you please state your name for the  
17 record?

18 MR. HOFER: Edwin Hofer.  
19 EDWIN HOFER, having been sworn, presents as  
20 follows:

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
22 You may proceed.

23 MR. HOFER: Hello, everyone. My name  
24 is Edwin Hofer. I represent the Miami Colony  
25 Farms Ltd. Miami Colony is five miles south and

1 four miles north of Morden, Manitoba. We started  
2 the farm 41 years ago, in 1966, and are now  
3 farming 4,800-acres and own 4,100.

4 Miami Colony have always had hogs,  
5 chickens and dairy cows. We now live together  
6 with 110 people and are planning to farm and have  
7 livestock for many generations.

8 I remember drinking the same water  
9 with my grandfather and parents. And I now have a  
10 daughter, and she has two children. And we are  
11 still drinking the same water after five  
12 generations. Why would we pollute our own water,  
13 or the neighbour's which live right beside us? We  
14 have livestock to make a living, not to turn rich  
15 and move on after polluting the whole area.

16 Miami Colony has been on the C.Q.A.,  
17 Canadian Quality Assurance Program, since 2001,  
18 where all medication is government inspected and  
19 monitored and government veterinarians regularly  
20 inspect all livestock and barns.

21 We have been good stewards to our land  
22 and practice up-to-date farm technology. We  
23 follow all of the environment rules and  
24 regulations. Miami Colony has been on the Manure  
25 Management Plan since 2003. We hire Agricore

1 United to do our soil testing, so that it's done  
2 professionally. We also analyze our liquid hog  
3 manure for nitrogen phosphate, and then apply to  
4 farmland for one crop year, for as much as that  
5 crop needs. The regulation has switched from  
6 nitrogen to phosphate that clings to the soil so  
7 tight that the only way it moves or leaches is  
8 with the soil itself.

9 If Manitoba does not produce hogs,  
10 another province will. Besides livestock, what  
11 has Manitoba got? Manitoba has no oilfields, no  
12 mines, no shore for fish. Empty barns and feed  
13 lots produce unemployment and generate no revenue.

14 Manitoba farmers should do what they  
15 do best. Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

17 MR. MOTHERAL: Mr. Hofer, in all of  
18 your latest years of handling manure, and other  
19 things related to the hog industry, do you feel as  
20 though the regulations we have are sufficient, or  
21 have they been difficult to work with, or should  
22 there be more regulations?

23 MR. HOFER: Switching to phosphate is  
24 going to not be efficient because you have to have  
25 more acres. If you go to a drag line system, you

1 actually run out of money and you run out of land.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: What kind of system was  
3 that?

4 MR. HOFER: For the drag line system  
5 for cultivating land, you have to cover too much  
6 land.

7 MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Hofer, just to get  
8 an idea, what size of hog operation does the  
9 colony have?

10 MR. HOFER: 700 sows.

11 MR. YEE: And it is just the sows? It  
12 is not farrow to finish?

13 MR. HOFER: Farrow to finish.

14 MR. YEE: And what type of manure  
15 storage do you have or does the colony employ?

16 MR. HOFER: Right now we have a  
17 storage tank, which is condemned, so we made a  
18 lagoon last fall. And they gave us the permit too  
19 late. We couldn't even dig or drag the line in  
20 yet, so it is standing empty. We are still using  
21 the condemned slurry tank, which works, and it's  
22 not leaking. And before that, we were in the  
23 process of making concrete slurry tanks. We  
24 already had the slab built. And then Environment  
25 said: We don't want tanks anymore, so that money

1 is tied up in the slab of cement.

2 MR. YEE: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
4 Mr. Hofer.

5 MR. HOFER: Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Robert and Don McLean.  
7 Would you please introduce yourselves for the  
8 record?

9 MR. R. McLEAN: I'm Robert McLean.

10 MR. D. McLEAN: Done McLean.

11 ROBERT McLEAN and DON McLEAN, having been sworn,  
12 present as follows:

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may  
14 proceed.

15 MR. R. McLEAN: Good afternoon. We  
16 would like to thank you for the opportunity to  
17 speak to you this afternoon. My name is Robert  
18 McLean, and with me is my son, Don.

19 Our farm, R & D McLean Farm Ltd., is  
20 located in south central Manitoba, near Manitou.  
21 R & D McLean Farm Ltd. is comprised of 1,800 acres  
22 of grain and oilseed crops, plus hog finishing and  
23 cow/calf enterprises. The livestock portion of  
24 the farm generates 50 percent plus of our gross  
25 receipts.

1                   As this hearing is regarding hog  
2 sustainability, we will try to keep our remarks  
3 centered on our hog enterprise. Our hog finishing  
4 enterprise is comprised of straw-based biotech  
5 hoop shelters, and we market hogs on a continuous  
6 basis.

7                   We looked at a number of options when  
8 deciding to build our finishing operation. I  
9 have, over time, worked in both straw-based and  
10 conventional barns. Both work well. Both have  
11 their good and limiting options. We chose  
12 straw-based biotech shelters for mainly financial  
13 reasons. Straw-based shelters are labour and  
14 management intensive; however, the capital costs  
15 are substantially less.

16                  The pause on hog expansion causes us  
17 great concern for a number of reasons. First, if  
18 this had happened four years ago, it would have  
19 been extremely difficult for Don to come back to  
20 the farm, as the sustainability of the farm  
21 depended on expanding our revenue source.

22                  The pause is also causing not only us,  
23 but the industry, great uncertainty. How can we  
24 plan any future expansion, not knowing what rules  
25 will be in place one or two years down the road?

1 Our margins are slim and the risks are high. We  
2 need to be able to look long-term and have faith  
3 that regulations will not put our farm in  
4 jeopardy.

5 Farm operational costs are high.  
6 Would you be willing to borrow or would your  
7 lender even lend with the uncertainty that exists  
8 today? This pause, we believe, will cause and is  
9 causing other processing facilities to have a  
10 second thought about building in Manitoba. This,  
11 again, affects us, as we have limited options for  
12 marketing our hogs, and is costing us increased  
13 trucking costs and marketing costs.

14 We hear all the time about corporate  
15 hog farms. Well, by definition, we, too, are a  
16 corporate farm. We incorporated for  
17 inter-generational transfer and financial risk  
18 reasons, but still are a family-run business, as  
19 are many others. The point is: Be very careful  
20 about people who condemn or point fingers at  
21 corporate farms, for we, too, are one.

22 Farming is a business, a business that  
23 needs to have return on investment or it will not  
24 be viable.

25 Farming, and farmers like us, depend

1 on the environment, for it is what sustains us.  
2 We need the clean water and productive soil. We  
3 live in the environment every day and our  
4 livelihood depends on it.

5 We apply the manure to the land  
6 according to the needs of the crop. We soil test  
7 every field every year. We have the soil tests  
8 from 20 years ago. The soil tests not only show  
9 what nutrients we need to grow a crop, but also,  
10 by being able to look back, it gives us a history  
11 of our fields. This is an ever-increasing cost.  
12 Not long ago \$200 covered the cost. Now it is  
13 roughly six times that cost.

14 Manure is a very important nutrient  
15 source. With the extremely high costs of chemical  
16 fertilizer, the manure produced on the farm helps  
17 to offset some of those costs. The nutrients in  
18 manure are valuable, and we do not waste this  
19 valuable resource. This was one of the reasons we  
20 decided to expand into livestock.

21 Regulations. Regulations affect us  
22 all, large or small. Regulations have costs.  
23 Many times we have heard how hog production needs  
24 to be regulated but, at the same time, ensure the  
25 family farm thrives. It's those ever-increasing

1 regulations that cause many farming families to  
2 quit. It's just not worth the extra work, time,  
3 and the cost to meet these ever-increasing  
4 regulations. The point is regulations affect us  
5 all, and the outcome of more regulations will be  
6 less diversified farms to ones of single  
7 enterprise-intensive operations. When making  
8 recommendations, remember you're not adding just  
9 one or two recommendations, you are compounding  
10 the ever-increasing list.

11           And I have here today some examples.  
12 We have the Farm Practices Guidelines for Hog  
13 Production in Manitoba, which sets out information  
14 on regulations regarding acts, manure handling,  
15 storage, land application, odour control, site  
16 selection, et cetera, et cetera.

17           Municipal by-laws, the development  
18 plan for a municipality, the zoning by-law that we  
19 need to deal with, when and if we decide to add  
20 value to our operation.

21           We have the Technical Review  
22 Application, the Proposed Nutrient Management  
23 Regulations, the Manure and Mortality Regulations.

24           Along with all of that, we have the  
25 Canadian Quality Assurance program, which we need

1 to update daily, and have a veterinarian audit  
2 yearly. This program is a food security and  
3 quality program, which we must comply with, which  
4 allows us to market our hogs.

5 We have municipal governments,  
6 Department of Conservation, Department of  
7 Agriculture, Department of Water Stewardship, and  
8 the Department of the Environment to deal with.

9 So as you can see, it's extremely  
10 time-consuming, costly and, quite honestly, it is  
11 overly burdensome. We cannot pass on these extra  
12 costs; farmers are price takers, not price makers.  
13 These regulations are only part of all of the  
14 issues which we deal with. Remember, hogs are  
15 only one part of our operation.

16 Farming has changed over the years,  
17 and will continue to change. We do far less  
18 tillage, rotate crops, seed land into forage, have  
19 grassed waterways, plant shelterbelts, et cetera,  
20 ensuring our farm continues to be environmentally  
21 sustainable. These are some of the ways to ensure  
22 nutrients applied on the land stay on the land.  
23 Again, nutrients are too valuable to waste and  
24 lose.

25 Most of these efforts come at a

1 significant cost. Costs of upgrading equipment  
2 that works in minimum tillage, costs in seed for  
3 buffer strips, and the seed costs for forages,  
4 which, by the way, help use the nutrients that  
5 have accumulated at deeper root zones. These are  
6 just some of the costs in real dollars. But there  
7 are also costs associated in value and the limited  
8 time taken to complete, as you can see, all of the  
9 paperwork.

10 Government, from time to time, has  
11 helped with programs to help offset costs. One of  
12 the programs that is working is the Environmental  
13 Farm Plan. The Environmental Farm Plan does a  
14 risk assessment of our farm, and does provide  
15 cost-share financial assistance to help cover part  
16 of those costs.

17 Many regulations are put in place  
18 without any concern of the financial burden they  
19 impose on operations. Government needs to  
20 recognize that solutions can be found without  
21 overburdening farms. The saying: Better results  
22 are found from the carrot approach, not the stick,  
23 still apply. It is extremely important, not only  
24 for existing operations to ensure their success,  
25 but to ensure that future generations have the

1 ability to succeed.

2 In summary, some of the key points:  
3 Any regulations need to be based on sound science  
4 and not for any political gain.

5 When making recommendations or  
6 regulations, remember that you're adding to that  
7 long list. Sustainable farms are in jeopardy.

8 Financial incentives, where government  
9 and industry work together, work the best.  
10 Incentives must be comprehensive. They must be  
11 broad based. They must have flexibility. And  
12 they must have substantial financial assistance.

13 Lastly, ensure agricultural  
14 sustainability and profitability is researched  
15 before implementation of regulations. Our next  
16 generation depends on it.

17 Finally, we are and will continue to  
18 do our part. We continue to strive to do the best  
19 we can, even when coming through some very tough  
20 years. Governments need to work with us, be a  
21 partner to provide an environmentally sound  
22 agricultural industry, while ensuring the  
23 sustainability and profitability now and in the  
24 future. Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McLean.

1 How big are your hog and cow/calf operations?

2 MR. D. McLEAN: We are currently  
3 running three biotech barns, so 250 finisher hogs  
4 each, a total of 750. We are also calving out  
5 approximately 40 head a cow/calf.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: I'll ask you this  
7 question I've asked a couple of people earlier:  
8 You are, obviously, very concerned about  
9 regulations and the preponderance of regulations.  
10 Have we gone passed the reasonable number of  
11 regulations, or is what is in place today  
12 reasonable, but in future any more should be very  
13 carefully considered?

14 MR. R. McLEAN: Well, as you can see,  
15 we deal with many departments. And I think it's  
16 quite burdensome with all of the different  
17 departments. It's kind of: Where do you go next,  
18 kind of show. Is there too many regulations?  
19 There's certainly enough. And like I'm saying,  
20 and I'm trying to emphasize, regulations come at a  
21 cost. If we're going to put regulations into  
22 place, then we need the government to have the  
23 incentives to go along to help offset the costs.  
24 We cannot handle on our own any more costs. We're  
25 maxed.

1                   THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, we can't get  
2 away from the growing concern worldwide about  
3 environmental issues. Can farmers continue to  
4 meet the current regulatory regime?

5                   MR. R. McLEAN: As farmers, and as  
6 society as a whole, we all contribute and need to  
7 contribute towards the environmental  
8 sustainability of our world. We all need to  
9 contribute to that. We all need to work together.  
10 And, quite honestly, society needs to help offset  
11 some of the costs. I do in some ways. And the  
12 society needs to help back in others. And so we  
13 all have to work together. We are all in this  
14 together.

15                  THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

16                  MR. MOTHERAL: Yes. Mr. McLean, I've  
17 got several questions, and I forgot which one I  
18 was going to emphasize first. But we have  
19 heard -- you are not the only presenter, and we  
20 have heard it in almost every place we've been at,  
21 and we have heard it three or four times today --  
22 that economics is a very big issue. And it may  
23 have to be reflected. I can't say what's going to  
24 be in our final report. But our job is  
25 environmental sustainability of the hog industry,

1 and I think probably economics is fitting into  
2 that. Maybe not as a higher priority, but it has  
3 to fit in there. Because if it's not in there,  
4 maybe there is no use in being an industry at all.  
5 But what is going to be reflected in the report,  
6 time will tell. Thank you for bringing that up  
7 again.

8                   How is your manure spread? You know,  
9 just familiarize me with how you are handling your  
10 manure?

11                   MR. D. McLEAN: Well, currently we are  
12 composting manure, and then we spread it with  
13 mechanical spreaders. It's a straw-based system,  
14 like we said, so it's not like the liquid manure  
15 where you can incorporate it. You spread it on  
16 top, and then you go and smooth it out and  
17 cultivate it in as soon as possible.

18                   MR. MOTHERAL: So you're not really --  
19 the regulations don't concern -- it doesn't  
20 regulate that. It's from your hog slurries, and  
21 that, that you get the regulations. You are not  
22 regulated. You can spread it on your land without  
23 incorporation?

24                   MR. R. McLEAN: We have to  
25 incorporate, as soon as possible, after we spread

1 it.

2 MR. MOTHERAL: Is that the municipal  
3 by-law?

4 MR. R. McLEAN: That's under the  
5 Manure Plan Management Act. We are under 300  
6 units, and we do not have to apply a Manure  
7 Management Program.

8 MR. MOTHERAL: But in the new act, and  
9 I am not sure of that, within the Manure Planning  
10 Act?

11 MR. R. McLEAN: We are still under the  
12 300 animal units.

13 MR. MOTHERAL: Are there any other  
14 corporate hog farms in your area?

15 MR. R. McLEAN: I would think most  
16 farms -- I would say 50 percent of the current  
17 farms are incorporated, so what do you define as a  
18 corporate hog farm?

19 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay, I rephrase that,  
20 then, that you feel are non-farm corporations?

21 MR. R. McLEAN: I think all of the  
22 farms out there are corporations. They employ  
23 local people. And they all give back to the local  
24 economy. And so I don't really separate this  
25 corporate versus family. I think we are all in

1 this.

2 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. The reason why I  
3 say that is because you did emphasize, of course,  
4 that your corporation is a family farm.

5 MR. R. McLEAN: What I am saying is  
6 that more regulations are going to push out the  
7 family farms because look what we have to go  
8 through. And this, like I said, is only part of  
9 what we go through. We also have the cattle  
10 regulations and also deal with rules with the  
11 grain farm. It forces us -- if you keep stacking  
12 this on, then we will just finally give up one of  
13 the enterprises. And then how will you bring the  
14 next generation back?

15 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. Do you feel  
16 as though -- you mentioned the different  
17 departments in the government that you -- that one  
18 has to go through the loops in order to establish.  
19 Do you think there is any other simpler process  
20 that this can be done that is more sustainably  
21 friendly?

22 MR. R. McLEAN: I personally would  
23 like to see any of the applications, or work that  
24 we have to go through, from the provincial  
25 perspective, to go through our local MAFRI office,

1 a one-stop shop. This having to deal with Water  
2 Stewardship, and a proposed application through  
3 Water Stewardship, and Conservation with another  
4 set of applications, it is just too many doors to  
5 go through.

6 MR. MOTHERAL: So you would like to  
7 see it simpler for the applicant, right?

8 MR. R. McLEAN: Yes.

9 MR. MOTHERAL: That's all for me,  
10 thanks.

11 MR. YEE: Mr. McLean, in terms of your  
12 presentation, you clearly note that hogs are just  
13 a part of your operation, in describing it. And  
14 we have heard from a number of people that the hog  
15 industry has a large number of regulations to  
16 comply with. I am just trying to get a handle,  
17 from your perspective, how much? Is it  
18 significantly more than, say, your grain operation  
19 or other things that you do? How much of your  
20 time is spent on complying with hog regulations  
21 than it is some of the other regulatory  
22 requirements that farming requires today?

23 MR. D. McLEAN: Well, right now I  
24 would say that the hogs are definitely more than  
25 the rest of them. Especially with a couple of

1 these programs, namely the C.Q.A. Program, it  
2 takes a lot of time. Every time you do something,  
3 every time you needle an animal, every time you  
4 give medication or something to a pen, you have to  
5 make records of that. Every time you make feed  
6 you have to make records. You have to tell them  
7 who made it, what time you made it, where it's  
8 going, if there is any kind of medication, if  
9 there is a medication in it, what kind of  
10 medication, where did you get it from, where do  
11 you store it? It just goes on and on and on.

12 Right now in the hog industry, every  
13 time you put something else on, like this pile,  
14 it's another thing to read. It's another thing  
15 you have to think about as you go through your  
16 day, and as you do things, it's always in the back  
17 of your head.

18 MR. YEE: Thank you.

19 MR. MOTHERAL: You mentioned the  
20 Environmental Farm Plan. Can you expand on that,  
21 for the record, here?

22 MR. D. McLEAN: Yes, the Environmental  
23 Farm Plan, which is this binder here, it's a  
24 program with different beneficial management  
25 practices, as they call them, and there are many

1 different ones.

2                   And what it's for -- I should start  
3 with what I have to do to get this, to be a part  
4 of this program, is I have to go through two  
5 two-hour training courses. I had to fill out this  
6 whole manual. And then I get a piece of paper  
7 saying that I'm allowed, from the government, to  
8 apply for these beneficial management practices.  
9 And they are supposed to be, well, obviously  
10 beneficial, but it is rated on how beneficial.

11                   There is a 50 percent rating. And  
12 that 50 percent of cash is made so it's more  
13 beneficial for, say, the public. And then there  
14 is another 30 percent, which they say is more  
15 beneficial for me if I go ahead and do stuff.  
16 Like for the hog part of it, there's -- let's say  
17 for mortalities, building composts, they help you  
18 out to 30 percent, which is more beneficial for us  
19 to build a compost and be able to keep animals  
20 out, and all of the rest of it. But it's a fairly  
21 big program.

22                   MR. MOTHERAL: I guess my question is,  
23 my final question that I would like to ask you, is  
24 it beneficial for the environment?

25                   MR. D. McLEAN: This program, yes, it

1 was beneficial.

2 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean was?  
4 Learning it?

5 MR. D. McLEAN: It is.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Learning it was a  
7 benefit?

8 MR. D. McLEAN: Well, going through  
9 this whole thing, I learned lots about our  
10 operation, which is really good. And as you go  
11 through it, it's --

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably it continues  
13 to be beneficial because you are following the  
14 plan?

15 MR. D. McLEAN: Right. And there's --  
16 like there is some programs in here that are  
17 environmentally friendly, but for us aren't  
18 economical. Like was said before, with these  
19 slurries and building, like, large lagoons, this  
20 all comes -- they will help you out with that kind  
21 of stuff. But like was said before, when it comes  
22 down to it, it's going to cost me a lot more money  
23 to go ahead with that kind of stuff than I'm going  
24 to get back out of it.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,

1 gentlemen.

2 MR. R. McLEAN: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we have no other  
4 people who have indicated that they wish to make a  
5 presentation this afternoon. Is there anybody  
6 else in the audience who would like to make a  
7 presentation now? Okay. We will adjourn. We  
8 will be here probably for about another hour. If  
9 anybody comes or decides in the interim that they  
10 would like to make a presentation, just let us  
11 know and we will reconvene.

12 We do have, so far, one person who has  
13 indicated that she wishes to make a presentation  
14 after supper, so we will reconvene at 7:00 p.m.  
15 for sure. We are adjourned right now, then.

16 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 3:48 P.M.

17 AND RECONVENED AT 7:05 P.M.)

18

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies  
20 and gentlemen. We will come to order in a moment.  
21 So far we have only one person registered to make  
22 a presentation this evening. If any others of you  
23 wish to make a presentation, would you please let  
24 Joyce at the back table know or just come forward  
25 after the one presenter has concluded her

1 comments. Wendy Friesen, would you come up to the  
2 front table, please? Yes, any of them. Could you  
3 please state your name, for the record?

4 MS. FRIESEN: Wendy Friesen.

5 WENDY FRIESEN, having been sworn, presents as  
6 follows:

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may  
8 proceed.

9 MS. FRIESEN: Thank you. Good  
10 evening. Thank you for the opportunity to present  
11 here this evening. My name is Wendy Friesen, and  
12 I would like to give you an outline of our family  
13 farm. We have a small farm by today's standards.  
14 We raise hogs, cereal grains and oilseeds. Our  
15 farm has been in the family for generations and  
16 has changed over time. We pride ourselves on hard  
17 work, family involvement and in continuing to  
18 support our family on the farm. Farming has been  
19 a good way of life for our children and us.

20 We care about the future of our hog  
21 farm and land, just as our forefathers did. They  
22 saw livestock and land as a necessary way of life,  
23 with the land providing food for the animals, and  
24 the animals replenishing the land with valuable,  
25 natural fertilizer and nutrients, which the crop

1 removed. This was a natural cycle in the past,  
2 and still is today.

3 Today we continue with the belief that  
4 livestock and land go hand in hand, giving and  
5 taking from each other. We have come a long way  
6 in manure application techniques from 100 years  
7 ago, and even from 10 years ago, but we should  
8 keep in mind that the past methods worked well,  
9 too. We, in our generation, have gone from using  
10 a vacuum wagon to spread manure, to a modern  
11 injection method. The manure is tested, the land  
12 is tested, and then the appropriate amount of  
13 manure is injected into the land. The cereal  
14 crops that are grown are fed back to the hogs.

15 We have a clay-lined lagoon, which is  
16 bottom-fed, using an underground line, which  
17 extends from the manure pump-out pit, to a  
18 concrete pit beside the lagoon. When the manure  
19 is pumped, it is lowered down to enter the lagoon  
20 well below the surface. This system was very  
21 expensive to install, but it works very well and  
22 reduces odour substantially. This bottom-fed  
23 system also allows for a crust to form on the top  
24 of the manure in the lagoon, which also reduces  
25 odour. My family and I spend many hours in the

1 summer walking on our roadway and seldom notice  
2 the lagoon's presence.

3 Our lagoon is inspected yearly to  
4 ensure that the banks are mowed, right down to the  
5 level of the manure, and that the banks of the  
6 lagoon are not showing signs of rodent problems.  
7 Each year, we receive a letter to confirm that we  
8 are doing a good job.

9 We have a large dike surrounding our  
10 yard, which includes our lagoon and pond. This  
11 protects the water supply from being flooded. The  
12 lagoon has its own dike to keep the floodwaters  
13 out. We had to construct the yard dike to keep  
14 our barn system dry from overland flooding, which  
15 was becoming a problem due to man-made draining  
16 problems in our area. This dike was also an  
17 expensive safety measure, but worth the peace of  
18 mind.

19 We are continually mindful of any  
20 possible rodent problems and take precautionary  
21 measures to ensure that the barns remain  
22 rodent-free. We have crushed rock around the  
23 perimeter of the barns, and place rodent feed  
24 stations in appropriate vet-approved places  
25 surrounding the barn and in the attic. We keep

1 the grass cut short around the barns to deter any  
2 rodents.

3           For feed quality, all of our feed  
4 recipes are designed and formulated by  
5 nutritionists, and are tweaked to provide the best  
6 possible feed quality for our particular stock.  
7 Feed is milled on farm, using homegrown grains,  
8 whenever possible, with necessary supplements of  
9 vitamins, minerals and proteins to ensure digest  
10 illegibility. We add soybean oil to our rations  
11 to raise the energy level in the feed, to prevent  
12 the finished feed ration from separating during  
13 auguring, and to reduce the dust level in the  
14 barns.

15           Our proof of success can be measured  
16 by clean, energetic animals, which make their way  
17 to market within a targeted timeframe. Our  
18 rations are customized for hogs at all stages,  
19 again to give the animals the best possible  
20 digestion and this, in turn, reduces the amount of  
21 nitrogen and phosphates in the manure and,  
22 ultimately, on the land.

23           Water: For the last 15 years or so,  
24 we have gone from an ozone water cleaning system  
25 to a chlorination system. We have spent a lot of

1 money having a pond dug, and a waterline dug to  
2 the house and back to the barns. Our reason for  
3 this method is to give us control of the amount of  
4 chlorine being added to the water to provide  
5 potable water, good enough for humans to drink,  
6 and, therefore, good enough for the animals as  
7 well.

8           This chlorine system filters out  
9 debris and sediment from the water, and then  
10 removes the chlorine through a large carbon  
11 filter. It is then pumped out to the barns. With  
12 the pumps in our house, we can easily hear if  
13 there is a sudden increase in water usage because  
14 of a water break in the barn, and tend to the  
15 problem day or night.

16           We have also had a waterline dug in  
17 recently, from the R.M., to use as a back-up when  
18 the hydro is down, because we need hydro to run  
19 our water pumps and cleaning filters. We can  
20 switch over to R.M. water quite easily, but this  
21 safety is yet another large cost for the comfort  
22 and welfare of the animals.

23           Transportation: We transport our own  
24 animals to market using a stock trailer. The  
25 trailer is designed so that it can be easily

1 adjusted to increase or decrease airflow through  
2 the hogs, depending on outside air temperature and  
3 humidity. We aim for zero frostbite in winter by  
4 having our trailer lined with plywood and bedded  
5 with straw on a wood floor.

6 We bale all our own straw, and have  
7 control over the quality. We follow the  
8 recommended loading densities, which are based on  
9 several factors, including temperature, humidity,  
10 et cetera. We scale every hog before it leaves  
11 the farm, to ensure that it is the correct  
12 shipping weight. All our animals are tattooed on  
13 farm, and this serves as proof that the hogs are  
14 ours, in transport, and also leaves a paper trail  
15 for where the hogs have been, in case of a disease  
16 outbreak. This information would be very valuable  
17 in tracking the source of any potential diseased  
18 animal and the farm on which it was raised.

19 In the summer, we can open vents for  
20 increased airflow, wet down the straw before  
21 loading animals, and spray the animals before  
22 leaving home, to help keep the animals from  
23 overheating. We aim for a quiet loading and  
24 unloading of the animals, so that there is minimal  
25 stress, and try to haul on cooler days or in the

1 coolest part of the day.

2                   Veterinarian: We have a good  
3 relationship with our vet. Programs such as  
4 C.Q.A. provide us with a guide for opening up  
5 dialect with our vet, and this regular contact  
6 acts as the public's assurance that we are  
7 treating our animals well. We use only accepted,  
8 safe medications, and only when there is a clear  
9 need for them. We have our animal health in check  
10 and test regularly for any diseases. We follow  
11 strict disease protocol, and don't allow anyone  
12 into our barns, unless they need to be there, and  
13 can prove that they are clean.

14                   We must keep records of all injections  
15 and feed or water medications that are used, and  
16 why we used them. We need prescriptions from the  
17 vet for most medications. The abattoirs need to  
18 know that the animals being marketed are drug  
19 residue free, and we also believe this is  
20 essential, since we eat pork, too.

21                   Having routine vet check-ups is like  
22 going to your doctor for a yearly check-up, not  
23 necessarily because you are sick, but because you  
24 may be at risk for an illness and could prevent  
25 some illnesses by modifying diet and/or

1 medication. The same is true for animals.  
2 Animals communicate illness in different ways,  
3 such as feed rejection, water rejection, a desire  
4 to lay down constantly, an internal fever, hair  
5 loss, sores, rashes, et cetera. And our contact  
6 with our vet gives us a heads-up on these things,  
7 and how we can vaccinate or alter diets to improve  
8 the health of the animals.

9 Another technique we practice is  
10 cross-fostering piglets from the birth mother to a  
11 surrogate mother, in an effort to reduce stress on  
12 both the mother and the piglets. This allows the  
13 birth mother to feel more relaxed, with only  
14 having to feed as many piglets as her body is  
15 geared to. This practice also allows us to  
16 support the piglets, which would die, due to  
17 malnutrition, and gives them a fighting chance at  
18 survival with the new mom.

19 Air quality: We designed our barn  
20 with ventilation being a key concern. We have a  
21 heated hallway, where cold air enters in the cold  
22 season, and the air is heated with electric heat,  
23 as well as floor heat, before entering areas where  
24 animals are kept. The smallest animals have heat  
25 lamps and mats, as well. The weaner room

1 temperature is controlled with pre-heated air  
2 entering from the heated hallway. We reduce  
3 draughts on the weaner pigs by covering the front  
4 third of the pen with a plywood lid, and hanging a  
5 heat lamp down through the middle of it.

6           The grower area has floor heat loops  
7 in the front area of the room. The feeder barn  
8 has floor heat at the front of the pens. Outside  
9 doors are sealed to prevent draughts, and ducting  
10 and inlets are strategically placed where there is  
11 the least amount of draft at cold times, and also  
12 the most quality airflow when it is hot. These  
13 air inlets can be adjusted at any time, to  
14 accommodate the best ventilation control. Each  
15 room has its own air exhaust, and most rooms have  
16 more than one exhaust fan, so that we have  
17 flexibility in the amount of airflow that we allow  
18 through for minimum and maximum ventilation.

19           In conclusion, I wanted to summarize  
20 by saying: We are environmentally friendly. Our  
21 hog barns are sustainable. Our animals are well  
22 cared for, and farming is a good way of life that  
23 should continue. Hog farmers need the ability to  
24 expand and modernize their barns, as the economy  
25 changes, in order to be able to stay competitive

1 and profitable. We are farming in times when  
2 farming operations of all kinds are striving to  
3 produce quality food for the country, as well as  
4 other parts of the world.

5 To continue with the pause on the hog  
6 barns prevents even small farms, like us, from  
7 growing and expanding to allow for the next  
8 generation of farmers to get into farming. We  
9 have less and less young farmers in our area each  
10 year because the cost of building is steep, the  
11 paperwork is endless, the codes of production are  
12 stringent, and young people need an avenue to get  
13 into hog production. They need to know that there  
14 is a long-term policy in place, which will assure  
15 them that they will be able to make economic  
16 advances on the farm as well, without the exact  
17 uncertainty that we are farming under now. We  
18 need to regain the right to get on with the  
19 business of running our hog barns to feed the  
20 increasing population. Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Miss  
22 Friesen. Where is your farm?

23 MS. FRIESEN: Near Low Farm, Manitoba.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: And how many hogs do  
25 you have?

1 MS. FRIESEN: We have 50 sows, farrow  
2 to finish.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: 50?

4 MS. FRIESEN: 50.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: So it is a fairly small  
6 operation?

7 MS. FRIESEN: Pardon me?

8 THE CHAIRMAN: So that is a fairly  
9 small operation?

10 MS. FRIESEN: Yes, it is.

11 MR. MOTHERAL: Do you feel comfortable  
12 with the present regulations or do you think they  
13 are too onerous for your operation?

14 MS. FRIESEN: They definitely make  
15 farming at a small level more difficult, in that  
16 we have to comply to the same paperwork, the same  
17 programming, that the larger barns do. I don't  
18 think it's unfair. It is just more difficult or  
19 more onerous on a small operation than it would be  
20 on a larger one, if you take into consideration  
21 that it's probably -- for the larger producer, it  
22 might be their only source of income. And for us  
23 we're diversified.

24 MR. MOTHERAL: When you speak about  
25 rodents, do you generally mean rats?

1 MS. FRIESEN: For the most part, mice.

2 MR. MOTHERAL: Oh, mice, okay.

3 MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

4 MR. MOTHERAL: I was wondering with  
5 all of the anti -- the steps you were taking. I'm  
6 a farmer myself and my problem, of course, was  
7 with rats, but they are the same family.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: But you lived closer to  
9 the border.

10 MS. FRIESEN: Well, we choose to keep  
11 the mice out of the barns for cleanliness reasons  
12 and also for longevity of the barn structure  
13 itself.

14 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. Another  
15 question, when you said you have a pond dug-out,  
16 so does that mean a dug-out for your water supply?

17 MS. FRIESEN: That's right.

18 MR. MOTHERAL: And is that groundwater  
19 or is that surface water? I mean the dug-out is  
20 fed by underground water, is it?

21 MS. FRIESEN: No.

22 MR. MOTHERAL: It is all from surface  
23 water?

24 MS. FRIESEN: It's surface water. But  
25 we have a dike that runs passed the front of our

1 property. And whatever doesn't fill naturally  
2 into the pond is replenished with a pump, in  
3 springtime before the water flows.

4 MR. MOTHERAL: And your reserve water,  
5 or whatever, it comes from the municipality at Low  
6 Farm, would that be, what, in the R.M. of Morris?

7 MS. FRIESEN: Yes, Morris.

8 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. Just as a  
9 curiosity, as a cost, what does it cost you per  
10 1,000-gallons, what is the cost of municipal  
11 water, or is there just an initial cost to hook up  
12 to it?

13 MS. FRIESEN: So far it's huge. It's  
14 \$8500 to hook up.

15 MR. MOTHERAL: And after that there is  
16 no --

17 MS. FRIESEN: And after that there is  
18 costs per month.

19 MR. MOTHERAL: Per month.

20 MS. FRIESEN: And also consumption  
21 after. I don't have that exact number with me.

22 MR. MOTHERAL: Can you give me a  
23 figure of what that would cost in your operation  
24 or do you use much? You use -- probably most of  
25 your water comes from a dug-out?

1 MS. FRIESEN: Currently, yes.

2 MR. MOTHERAL: I was just going to ask  
3 you, how do you dispose of your dead animals?

4 MS. FRIESEN: Our dead animals? We  
5 have a freezer in our barn.

6 MR. MOTHERAL: You do?

7 MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

8 MR. MOTHERAL: When I hear the word  
9 abattoir, I always think of dead animals. And you  
10 say:

11 "The abattoirs need to know that the  
12 animals being marketed are drug  
13 residue free."

14 You mean the dead animals?

15 MS. FRIESEN: No. The abattoir is  
16 where the animals are slaughtered.

17 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. I have two or  
18 three different versions of what an abattoir is.

19 MS. FRIESEN: I may be wrong on that.

20 MR. MOTHERAL: No, that's fine. I  
21 just wanted to clarify. I think that's all I  
22 have, Mr. Chairman.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: You mentioned overland  
24 flooding. Was that the '97 flood?

25 MS. FRIESEN: That was one of the

1 years, yes.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: '96 as well?

3 MS. FRIESEN: Well, we had several  
4 years in a row. And we weren't actually flooded  
5 by the river water backing up, we were flooded by  
6 water that came from the west. And the  
7 municipality was opening ditches in certain areas  
8 to facilitate the water run-off, and then not  
9 opening up at our area, and the water couldn't get  
10 through fast enough, so it just flooded over on to  
11 the field. The field was inundated. It came up  
12 to the yard.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Did it flood the  
14 lagoon?

15 MS. FRIESEN: No. The lagoon has  
16 always had its own berm.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: So it was high enough  
18 that it was always okay?

19 MS. FRIESEN: Yes. And it was never  
20 at risk. It was built so that it wouldn't be at  
21 risk. But now it is inside of the entire  
22 structure.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Right. Yes, okay.  
24 Edwin?

25 MR. YEE: I am just wondering, Miss

1 Friesen, you've got a relatively small operation,  
2 so do you voluntarily comply? You are under the  
3 300 animal units.

4 MS. FRIESEN: Right.

5 MR. YEE: You voluntarily comply? Do  
6 you file a Manure Management Plan, I guess that's  
7 what I'm asking?

8 MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

9 MR. YEE: So you are voluntarily  
10 complying with the regs where you don't  
11 necessarily have to?

12 MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

13 MR. YEE: Thanks.

14 MR. MOTHERAL: I am going to ask one  
15 more question. In your area that is prone to  
16 flooding, either from the river or from the  
17 escarpment, obviously, when I say the escarpment,  
18 I mean the run-off that comes from the west, and I  
19 know that there is probably regulations in this,  
20 but any lagoons that are built in your area  
21 probably need to be bermed, is that true?

22 MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

23 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for  
25 coming out this evening, Miss Friesen.

1 MS. FRIESEN: Thank you. Now, is  
2 there anybody else here this evening who would  
3 like to make a presentation? Going once? Yes,  
4 sir?

5 MR. SMITH: And I didn't want to make  
6 a presentation, but I do want to ask you a  
7 question.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you come up to the  
9 mike so that we get it on the record, please? Or  
10 this one right here, if you wish, the stand-up  
11 mike. Could you just give us your name?

12 MR. SMITH: My name is Dave Smith.

13 THE COURT: Go ahead.

14 MR. SMITH: My question is if someone  
15 were to speak at the hearing tonight, would it be  
16 possible for them to speak at another hearing  
17 another night? Because I was under the impression  
18 you can't. I was under the impression you can  
19 only speak at one hearing.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you are going  
21 to give the same message at more than one, then,  
22 no, you probably shouldn't speak at more than one.  
23 If you have a different message you want to  
24 present tonight and then another night, we would  
25 accept that.

1                   MR. SMITH: I just wanted  
2 clarification on that.

3                   THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

4                   MR. SMITH: Thank you.

5                   THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone else have a  
6 presentation they wish to make this evening? It  
7 is going to be a short evening for us. Well, I  
8 guess that's it. We will stick around for another  
9 few minutes. If anybody shows up, or if any of  
10 you decide that you would like to make a  
11 presentation in the next 15 or 20 minutes, let us  
12 know and we will hear you. But if nobody else  
13 does, then we will probably adjourn, well, maybe  
14 even 10 to 15 minutes. Thank you.

15 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 7:24 P.M. AND ADJOURNED  
16 AT 7:40 P.M.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

I, LISA REID, 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