

MANITOBA CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

HOG PRODUCTION INDUSTRY REVIEW

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

\* \* \* \* \*

Held at the Radisson Hotel

Winnipeg, Manitoba

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 2007

\* \* \* \* \*



-----

APPEARANCES:

Clean Environment Commission:

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

Presentations:	PAGE
ANDREW NIKIFORUK	2617
AL MACKLING	2653
WANDA MCFADYEAN AND ALAN RANSOM	2665
DOUG REDEKOP	2684
KEITH THORNTON	2701
SYD BAUMEL	2723
GEORGE DERENCHUK	2735
LOUISE HEDMAN	2746
TWYLA FRANCOIS	2759
CURTIS EWACHA	2785
GLEN KOROLUK	2798
FRED TAIT	2810
MANITOBA PORK COUNCIL	2823



INDEX OF EXHIBITS

NO EXHIBITS MARKED



1 Friday, April 27, 2007

2 Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies  
4 and gentlemen, we'll come to order. We have a  
5 very busy agenda today and there's no room for  
6 extra time, so I'd like to come to order.

7 This is our final day of hearings,  
8 this is our seventeenth day of hearings. Comments  
9 before we hear the presentations, I'd ask that you  
10 turn off cell phones. If you must take a cell  
11 phone call, please leave the room. And also no  
12 conversations in the audience, please. And I will  
13 enforce the time limits pretty strictly today.

14 The first person up is Mr. Andrew  
15 Nikiforuk.

16 ANDREW NIKIFORUK, having been sworn, presented as  
17 follows:

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

19 MR. NIKIFORUK: Well, good morning  
20 Commissioners, it's a pleasure to be here. I'll  
21 just briefly state that I am here at the  
22 invitation of Springfield Hog Watch. I am a well  
23 known Canadian journalist. I have written about  
24 intensive livestock operations in Alberta, on the  
25 Prairies, since 1998, for the Calgary Herald, for





1 Canadian Business Magazine, and for a report on  
2 Business Magazine. I am also a landowner in  
3 Southern Alberta and I have lived downwind from  
4 hog operations.

5 My presentation today focuses largely  
6 on work that I have recently completed for a book  
7 entitled "Pandemonium," recently published by  
8 Penguin. All of the material I'll be presenting  
9 today is from chapter 3 of the book on livestock  
10 plagues.

11 Well, let's start briefly by saying a  
12 few words about the livestock revolution. The  
13 livestock revolution, as we know, is mainly about  
14 the massive and fundamental increase in livestock  
15 numbers around the globe in response to demand for  
16 protein. And pork, of course, is one of the  
17 central ingredients of that equation. And we can  
18 see that meat production in the world has grown  
19 exponentially.

20 Manitoba is just one of many places in  
21 the world that has responded to the livestock  
22 revolution and the demands for more protein around  
23 the world. And as we can see, the exponential  
24 growth in world demand for meat is paralleled by  
25 the exponential growth in Manitoba's hog



1 operations.

2                   So what's the story here in terms of  
3 increased livestock production around the world?  
4 Well, the story is one about unprecedented traffic  
5 in people and animals. It's about unprecedented  
6 concentration of livestock, and it's about  
7 unprecedented disease exchanges in the last 20 --  
8 since 1980, there have been more than 607 imported  
9 diseases around the world that have affected  
10 livestock operations. The incidence of avian flu  
11 and foot-and-mouth disease in the last two decades  
12 alone has been greater than that, than seen in the  
13 last century.

14                   The hog industry in particular has  
15 been affected by a soup of diseases. I am sure  
16 many of you have heard about a number of them,  
17 Circovirus, which is actually a virus that emerged  
18 in 1995 and was discovered and characterized here  
19 in Western Canada, and has been responsible for  
20 huge problems in the industry and the deaths of  
21 hundreds of thousands of pigs. We have swine  
22 influenza, we have porcine reproductive and  
23 respiratory syndrome, pseudo-rabies. And these  
24 are just diseases particular to the hog industry  
25 itself, largely associated with, again, intense



1 production.

2                   Now, what are some of the consequences  
3 of concentration and intense production. Let's  
4 look at a little bit of history here. Taiwan,  
5 1997, and the foot-and-mouth disease. Now  
6 foot-and-mouth disease is largely a trade disease.  
7 This is not a disease that poses any hazards to  
8 public health. It's not a disease that actually  
9 affects the quality of meat. It is a disease,  
10 though, that comes with 1 to 3 per cent mortality  
11 in animals and can very much affect the economic  
12 productivity of those animals. It is on the  
13 increase throughout the world, and in 1997 for the  
14 first time in this century, it hit Taiwan.

15                   Now, what did it find in Taiwan in  
16 1997? Well, Taiwan had increased its hog  
17 production, much the same way Manitoba has  
18 increased its hog production in the last 10 years,  
19 with rapid production increases, tenfold growth,  
20 largely based on imported corn. So we had up to  
21 14 million pigs or 6,500 per square mile. That's  
22 about five times the density you'll find in a  
23 place like North Carolina, 60 per cent of the  
24 domestic meat consumption, 40 per cent exported to  
25 Japan. It was the world's third largest exporter



1 of pork. Pork accounted for one-third of all  
2 agriculture production in Taiwan. Foot-and-mouth  
3 disease arrived. The industry also employed  
4 nearly a million people.

5                   There was a study in 1991 that  
6 suggested that this rapid growth and this  
7 incredible concentration of hogs would pose  
8 problems and that the industry should be downsized  
9 to protect water and health, but that study was  
10 rejected.

11                   How did foot-and-mouth disease find  
12 its way to Taiwan? Well, we live in a global  
13 village, smuggling of live pigs, smuggling of pig  
14 meat products, illegal importation of live pigs,  
15 smuggling of animal biologics, in other words,  
16 even a bad vaccine could carry this virus, legal  
17 and illegal movement of people, and/or what the  
18 Taiwanese refer to as Trojan pigs, intentional  
19 economic sabotage by China. The index farm for  
20 this plague was located near a port used for pig  
21 smuggling.

22                   This gives you a map of some of the  
23 rapid spread of foot-and-mouth disease. It is one  
24 of the world's most contagious viruses, very, very  
25 rapid spreader, and as soon as you introduce it





1 into large concentrations of animals, you find  
2 explosive growth of the virus.

3           Again, there is a graph showing just  
4 how rapid that spread was. But you see, if you  
5 look at the bottom of this chart, you see actually  
6 a very small number of animals were actually  
7 infected compared to the large numbers that were  
8 eventually slaughtered.

9           And you've got to remember, again,  
10 this is a disease that poses no public health  
11 hazards, that is simply a trade disease. So what  
12 happened?

13           Well, four million pigs ended up being  
14 killed. The military was called out to  
15 electrocute animals. The export markets to Japan  
16 closed. There were 50,000 people unemployed. The  
17 national herd has been reduced to eight million.  
18 And Canada was one of the beneficiaries of this  
19 particular epidemic in that we helped to fill the  
20 gap for Japan in terms of pork exports.

21           Let's take a look at another mass  
22 plague or epidemic. This will be Classical Swine  
23 Fever, 1997, Netherlands. What do we know about  
24 the Netherlands? Well, they too like Taiwan  
25 experienced rapid growth in hog production between



1 1970 and 1999, and in fact the Netherlands helped  
2 pioneer intense livestock production. Again, very  
3 small place with 24 million pigs, they were  
4 exporting 60 per cent of their product so, again,  
5 heavy dependence on exports, and heavy dependence  
6 on imported feed, in this case cassava and  
7 soybean-cake from Brazil. The Netherlands had the  
8 highest intensity of livestock production in the  
9 world, according to the Food Agricultural  
10 Organization, in other words, 47 pigs per hectare  
11 or 10 times the European Union average.

12                   Classical swine fever is again a  
13 disease that poses no public health risks, but it  
14 is highly contagious. Mortality can vary from  
15 almost zero to 100 per cent, and only the domestic  
16 pig and wild boar carry this disease. And it can  
17 survive for months in refrigerated meat and for  
18 years in frozen meat. So it can travel around the  
19 globe in a variety of forms, any form of animal  
20 trade or pork trade.

21                   So in 1997, it arrived, most likely on  
22 a truck from Germany. It also had contaminated a  
23 number of centres for artificial insemination and,  
24 of course, it exploded in the areas with the  
25 densest populations of pigs, in the Netherlands.



1 The pathways, as I mentioned, transport trucks,  
2 swill feeding, artificial insemination, vets and  
3 animal killers also rapidly spread this virus in  
4 their very attempt to quell this epidemic.

5                   So what happened? Well, we had more  
6 pandemonium, 12 million animals destroyed, and the  
7 majority were not infected, at a cost of  
8 \$2.3 billion. The Taiwan fiasco was in the  
9 neighbourhood of four to \$5 billion. Animal  
10 trading movements have to be reassessed says Armin  
11 Elbers of the Dutch government. The national plan  
12 to reduce herd by 25 per cent following this  
13 epidemic, there were also programs introduced to  
14 reduce water and air pollution as a result, all  
15 coming from hog industry and concentration. So we  
16 went from a situation of having at least 9,000 pig  
17 farms to as many as 4,000 today.

18                   Then the United Nations warned in  
19 1998, look, Europe may face further devastating  
20 animal disease epidemics due to long distance  
21 transport of animals and increasingly dense  
22 livestock units. So this problem is being  
23 recognized at the highest levels around the world,  
24 that you cannot concentrate animals in large  
25 density without it sooner or later inviting



1 microbial attention either from viral world or  
2 bacterial world.

3           Sure enough their prediction was bang  
4 on. Let's go to England, the foot-and-mouth  
5 disease epidemic, 2001. Again, you can see that  
6 the global distribution of foot-and-mouth disease  
7 in 2001 was much greater than it was in 1997 when  
8 Taiwan got hit.

9           So what started this epidemic? Well,  
10 amazingly similar characteristics, rising exports  
11 to the continent, one million lambs a year,  
12 unprecedented sheep and pig densities throughout  
13 rural England, decimated government veterinary  
14 services, and as one farmer put it, supermarket  
15 greed and the drive for globalization at all costs  
16 has turned this country into a cess pit for the  
17 world's cheapest meat and meat products.

18           What were the pathways? How did it  
19 get there? Imports of live animals, contaminated  
20 meat, frozen, cured, salted, smuggled meat, bad  
21 vaccines, travellers, tourists, vets, farmers,  
22 birds.

23           The epidemic began in a small farm,  
24 hog farm in Northern England. This farmer was  
25 feeding restaurant swill to his pigs. The swill





1 was probably contaminated with some frozen pork  
2 from Asia containing this particular virus. The  
3 virus then exploded, in a very, very mild form.  
4 And again, we're talking about a disease that does  
5 not cause very high mortalities in animals, but  
6 can affect their productivity over time and is  
7 very much a feared trade disease in the industry.

8           Anyway, it spread extremely rapidly  
9 throughout England as a consequence of a number of  
10 factors. One, the number of abattoirs in England  
11 has been reduced from 8,000 to approximately  
12 around 800, so too had the markets for animals.  
13 So animals were moving about England in numbers  
14 they had never moved before. They were like  
15 commuters on crowded trains, but in this case  
16 crowded trucks. And there was also the practice  
17 of, you could rent your animals out to acquire  
18 more subsidies from the European Union, and so all  
19 kinds of renting was going on. So enormous  
20 movement of animals then spread this virus very,  
21 very quickly throughout the country. So in a  
22 space of a month, it was almost everywhere,  
23 wherever you had large concentrations of animals.

24           Sometimes the virus is introduced to  
25 the farm simply on a lorry, on a truck. Other



1 times it would be delivered by birds, other times  
2 by other animal-to-animal contact. It spread  
3 rapidly. And then there was a very brief debate  
4 about what do we do?

5           The English Government said, no, we  
6 must kill these animals, we must stamp them all  
7 out if we want to defeat this virus, whereas a  
8 great many farmers and veterinarians said, no, the  
9 standard practice in Europe is ring vaccination.  
10 Why would you get involved in the mass slaughter  
11 of animals when you don't need to do this? The  
12 government won the argument and they began a mass  
13 slaughter, and they used computer, outdated  
14 computer models and mathematicians to decide how  
15 to go about to conduct this slaughter, which  
16 approached essentially almost a national emergency  
17 under Blair's government.

18           And the slaughter began. There  
19 weren't enough people to do the slaughtering,  
20 there weren't enough vets, there weren't enough  
21 technicians, the slaughtering was cruel and  
22 inhumane. Eventually the army was called out. A  
23 prominent journalist for Sunday Times said that  
24 really the whole issue was really lies, spin,  
25 incompetence, cruelty and waste. The largest



1 barbecue in European history, as another person  
2 put it.

3                   On many farms the government would  
4 arrive, they would seize even the pets belonging  
5 to children. And when they expressed horror at  
6 the fact that animals that they owned with no  
7 proof of infection were going to be murdered, they  
8 were told to grow up, this is the real world, not  
9 Disneyland.

10                   The dead: The number of blood tests,  
11 720,000; number of confirmed cases of  
12 foot-and-mouth disease found, 337. Three million  
13 sheep were culled by the government; 1.6 million  
14 were killed for what is known as welfare slaughter  
15 because of, due overcrowding conditions, there was  
16 nobody there to take care of the animals because  
17 of the quarantines in place throughout rural  
18 England. Cattle, nearly a million were culled.  
19 Pigs, 145,000 were culled. Pigs, by the way, are  
20 not carriers of foot-and-mouth disease, but they  
21 are amplifiers. You introduce foot-and-mouth  
22 disease into an intensive hog operation and the  
23 virus will explode and will go airborne and will  
24 travel for up to a hundred kilometres.

25                   So, in the end, 10 million animals



1 were slaughtered, approximately 10 per cent were  
2 infected. The military was deployed, up to  
3 15,000. Tourism was suspended throughout rural  
4 England. The rural economy is still in shatters  
5 from this event. More than 30,000 farmers left  
6 farming as a consequence of how the government  
7 handled this epidemic. It was a \$20 billion  
8 disaster, done solely to defend a trade worth less  
9 than \$500 million a year in terms of animal  
10 exports, of Rwanda for sheep for sure.

11               Two prominent lawyers put together a  
12 paper, a brilliant paper called Carnage by  
13 Computer, and this is what they said about this.

14               "It involved lawless action by the  
15 government on such a scale as to  
16 amount to a negation of the basic  
17 precepts of law. If a private  
18 business stored such a large quantity  
19 of flammable materials on its  
20 premises...",

21 in other words, they are talking about the animal  
22 densities,

23               "...that its fire control measures  
24 could not cope with the great size of  
25 a fire caused thereby, would it be





1                   excused from liability for the damage  
2                   caused?"

3                   We are headed for another disaster. A  
4                   number of veterinarians around the world now call  
5                   this disaster simply a crisis of veterinary  
6                   medicine, and here is the pattern. We have  
7                   governments and market-places encouraging  
8                   concentration, we have over-expansion for export,  
9                   we have increased trade and traffic in animals, we  
10                  then have a disease outbreak or an invasion, we  
11                  have a mass slaughter of animals, in many cases  
12                  that's totally unjustified, and then we have an  
13                  economic or biological crash. And this is the  
14                  pattern we saw in Taiwan. It's the pattern we saw  
15                  in the Netherlands. It's the pattern we saw in  
16                  England. It's the pattern, if I wanted to include  
17                  it, that we have seen in Denmark, North Carolina,  
18                  any place in the world that has concentrated  
19                  livestock in large numbers.

20                  A word or two about avian influenza.  
21                  We see similar patterns here with poultry, it is  
22                  not just pig densities, but poultry densities. In  
23                  2003, 30 million birds were killed in Netherlands.  
24                  In 2004, 19 million birds killed in Fraser Valley,  
25                  British Columbia, again in a cruel and inhumane



1 way, total chaos and pandemonium. 1996 to 2006,  
2 H5N1, more than 200 million birds have been culled  
3 around the globe. The issue of density which has  
4 been driving these epidemics is one which is  
5 largely ignored by governments in the  
6 market-place. Neither governments nor the media  
7 want to talk or hear about population densities.  
8 And that is coming from one of Canada's top viral  
9 experts at the University of Ottawa.

10                   So we have a similar tale to be told  
11 everywhere in that density, plus movement of  
12 animals, equals more diseases. This is a recent  
13 study done in France, in Brittany, and they looked  
14 at two regions, in one region where they had less  
15 than 100 pigs per square kilometre, and another  
16 region they had nearly 10 times that number, and  
17 the high density area had twice the rate of  
18 respiratory diseases among its animals that the  
19 authors attributed to not just the density but the  
20 enormous amount of traffic that was needed to go  
21 in and service those animals, provide them with  
22 feed, veterinary care, and to get them to market.  
23 So in other words, thresholds are continually  
24 being broken with the scale of these operations.

25                   Is there a problem here? Well, I



1 think that's the question that you gentlemen are  
2 going to have to ask yourselves and answer.

3                   What would pandemonium look like in  
4 Manitoba? The U.S. borders would close. For  
5 every pig infected, 400 will be killed to relieve  
6 overcrowding for welfare slaughter reasons, there  
7 would be an insufficient Canadian operational  
8 infrastructure. That's from your chief  
9 veterinarian here in the province. The public  
10 response would be to irrevocably withdraw its  
11 support for livestock production.

12                   A few other issues here on livestock  
13 plagues and health matters. MRSA,  
14 Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, this  
15 is one of the globe's major super bugs. It is  
16 responsible for an enormous amount of grief in  
17 hospitals around the world. It's a manmade  
18 pathogen. We made it, we made it by improperly  
19 using antibiotics and prescribing antibiotics. It  
20 emerged in 1961 in European hospitals. It has  
21 since gone global. And the prevalence rates in  
22 Canadian hospitals used to be 5 to 10 per cent.  
23 In many Canadian hospitals, they are now up to 50  
24 per cent. So it is a super bug largely out of  
25 control. It is a bug responsible for these kinds



1 of infections and has caused enormous amount of  
2 mortality in elderly or immuno-compromised  
3 patients in hospitals, not just in Canada, but in  
4 Europe, United States, around the world.

5           Now here's new research that suggests  
6 that large concentrations of pigs are a reservoir  
7 for the super bug. Twenty-six pig farmers had  
8 MRSA infections at a rate 760 times greater than  
9 the Dutch population. What they found was three  
10 family members, three co-workers, and eight out of  
11 10 pigs were MRSA positive. And they can easily  
12 track this in the Netherlands because they are one  
13 of the few countries in the world with a 1 per  
14 cent prevalence rate of MRSA in their hospitals.  
15 So they know exactly where MRSA is coming from,  
16 because they decided their hospitals should not be  
17 places where people come to die because they have  
18 acquired infections at the hospital.

19           Now, here's some more startling data.  
20 Twenty per cent of pig farmers carry MRSA.  
21 Thirty-nine per cent of the pigs in the  
22 Netherlands have MRSA. Five per cent of  
23 veterinarians have MRSA. So a standard practice  
24 in the Netherlands, all hog farmers are isolated  
25 upon admission to hospital in the Netherlands, and





1 they are tested to see if they have this  
2 infection. And if they have it, they are isolated  
3 and treated accordingly. And if they are not,  
4 then they will spread this infection throughout  
5 the hospital and to other patients. This is an  
6 infection, by the way, that can be, is extremely,  
7 can often be fatal.

8           On the issue of antibiotic resistance,  
9 we know that the figures for the number of drugs  
10 being used in intensive livestock feeding  
11 operations, the figures range from 40 per cent of  
12 the world's global supply of antibiotics that's  
13 used for animals, that's the low figure, the  
14 highest figure is up to 87 per cent. And the more  
15 antibiotics we give animals, the more antibiotic  
16 resistance we are creating in those animals, which  
17 can then be shared with us, thereby reducing  
18 effectiveness of antibiotics altogether.

19           Now, again, this is Dutch data. Sales  
20 of antibiotics for therapeutic use have increased  
21 faster than the number of livestock in the  
22 Netherlands from 1998 to 2004. An explanation for  
23 that is the emergence of new infectious diseases  
24 in pigs. Resistance levels in animal bacteria  
25 show a simultaneous tendency to increase. So we



1 know that the hog industry is driving bacterial  
2 resistance in a major way.

3                   Other emerging trouble, avian flu.  
4 Well, swine can be a mixing vessel for human,  
5 swine and avian influenza viruses to create new  
6 reassortments that may be dangerous to human  
7 health.

8                   The Norovirus, pigs may be reservoirs  
9 for emergence of new human Noroviruses.  
10 Noroviruses are currently responsible for, they  
11 are the number one cause of food poisoning around  
12 the world and diarrhea.

13                   THE CHAIRMAN: CDC is the Atlanta?

14                   MR. NIKIFORUK: CDC, yeah, Center for  
15 Disease Control.

16                   Now, we have unprecedented numbers of  
17 animals, we have unprecedented numbers of diseases  
18 running around the globe, but we have fewer and  
19 fewer people responsible animal health. In 2002,  
20 the Government of Canada had essentially had 670  
21 veterinarians, yet they were responsible for  
22 nearly 14 million head of cattle, 14 million pigs,  
23 four million of those animals are slaughtered, the  
24 cattle, 19 million pigs and a half a million  
25 sheep. So we have a problem, and this is an issue



1 recognized across North America, there is a  
2 shortage of veterinarian doctors. We have more  
3 animals, more diseases, and fewer people keeping a  
4 watch on what's going on.

5 A few conclusions. In 2004, there was  
6 a major meeting in Iowa where public health people  
7 met and discussed the implications of intensive  
8 livestock operations, and this was their major  
9 conclusion, something that every sector, every  
10 group could agree on.

11 "Industrialization of livestock  
12 production over the past three decades  
13 has not been accompanied by  
14 commensurate modernization of  
15 regulations to protect the health of  
16 the public or natural public trust  
17 resources such as water."

18 So Cory Brown, who is a prominent  
19 veterinarian in the United States, has essentially  
20 suggested that our strategy at the moment, we have  
21 intensified livestock production, we are being  
22 hammered left and right with incredible disease  
23 outbreaks, and our approach is simply that of,  
24 which mold we whack next?

25 Livestock revolutions invite



1 biological corrections. We have seen that in  
2 Taiwan, the Netherlands, Denmark, North Carolina.  
3 Monocultures are never secure or sustainable, they  
4 just invite disease. They are about  
5 vulnerabilities. A livestock plague in Manitoba  
6 is probably inevitable given the concentration of  
7 hogs in this province at this point in time.

8 Land use planning for livestock must  
9 be part of public health policy. Nature will  
10 restructure what politicians fail to restrain.  
11 Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
13 Mr. Nikiforuk. Don't run away yet, we're  
14 certainly going to have some questions.

15 When you were talking about the  
16 foot-and-mouth disease in Britain problem, you  
17 mentioned this practice of renting out animals.  
18 Is that really a farm management problem or is  
19 that just one of the many peculiarities of the EU  
20 agricultural policies?

21 MR. NIKIFORUK: That's just one of the  
22 many peculiarities of agricultural policies in  
23 Europe, and one that the government was largely  
24 ignorant of.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Was largely ignorant





1 of?

2 MR. NIKIFORUK: Yes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Of this practice of  
4 renting out?

5 MR. NIKIFORUK: It came as a huge  
6 surprise to the government that farmers were  
7 renting out animals. And farmers are an  
8 entrepreneurial group, and if the government is  
9 going to provide you with more money because you  
10 can rent your animals out somewhere, then you can  
11 take advantage of that particular policy.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Wasn't that fraud?

13 MR. NIKIFORUK: Of course it was  
14 flawed.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: No, fraud.

16 MR. NIKIFORUK: Fraud? Fraud on whose  
17 behalf? I mean, the subsidies were there. This  
18 was not fraud, this was just individuals taking  
19 advantage of bad policy.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You also  
21 mentioned, you used a map from France of high  
22 density areas having twice the amount of disease.

23 MR. NIKIFORUK: Respiratory disease,  
24 right.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Respiratory disease.



1 At what point does density become a problem?

2 MR. NIKIFORUK: That is an excellent  
3 question and that is the question that most  
4 virologists in this country would love to answer,  
5 provided they were given money to fund you an  
6 answer. Earl Brown, at the University of Ottawa,  
7 who is one of the top virologists in Canada, has  
8 raised this very question in terms of poultry  
9 density. He said the issue here is that we will  
10 keep on driving these epidemics unless we do some  
11 research on at what level can we maintain a flock  
12 of ducks or geese or chickens without creating the  
13 conditions necessary to heat up a virus very  
14 quickly? We have not done that research.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: His first name is Earl?

16 MR. NIKIFORUK: Earl Brown. It's a  
17 critical issue.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: You also talked about  
19 the sales of antibiotics for therapeutic use  
20 having increased faster than the number of  
21 livestock. Is that true in Manitoba, or is that a  
22 worldwide statement, or a specific to Manitoba  
23 statement, or Canada?

24 MR. NIKIFORUK: That's only true to  
25 the Netherlands, because I don't believe, I don't



1 know if you even collect that data here in  
2 Manitoba. The Netherlands collects this data.  
3 It's very vital data and it should be an essential  
4 part of any livestock program. You should know  
5 exactly how many antibiotics you are prescribing,  
6 what kind, and what effect they might have on the  
7 effectiveness of antibiotics used for humans.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: You also had the number  
9 of government vets and what they are responsible  
10 for. Is that a Federal Government figure or all  
11 governments?

12 MR. NIKIFORUK: That's a Federal  
13 Government figure, and that's from Vaclav Kouba,  
14 who is the former head of Animal Health for the  
15 United Nations Food Agricultural Organization.  
16 He's written a number of papers on this issue.  
17 The New York Times recently carried a major story  
18 on the shortage of veterinarians and the problems  
19 that it's posing.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: So what's the bottom  
21 line message you want us to take away from this?  
22 I mean, these are concerns, but how do we address  
23 these? How would the Manitoba Pork Industry  
24 address, or should they address these concerns?

25 MR. NIKIFORUK: It's not a matter for



1 the Manitoba Pork Industry to address these  
2 concerns, these are concerns that should be  
3 addressed by the Manitoban Government. And I  
4 would suggest that the Manitoba Government  
5 probably did not do its due diligence when it  
6 allowed this industry to grow at the rate it has  
7 in Manitoba. And if it had taken time to look at  
8 the history of the industry in the Netherlands,  
9 Denmark, Taiwan and North Carolina, and its impact  
10 on water, animal health and public health, it  
11 might have set up a series of regulations to  
12 address these issues.

13           Probably the most important thing the  
14 Manitoba Government can do now, at this point in  
15 time, essentially is faced with the same question  
16 Napoleon faced outside of Moscow, do I go on and  
17 prepare myself for a catastrophic livestock plague  
18 that will devastate rural Manitoba and all the  
19 people now dependent on the hog industry, or do I  
20 beat a sustainable retreat, and do I actually  
21 begin to scale down an industry that has probably  
22 been allowed to grow too fast and too large, and  
23 with huge costs in terms of its impact on water,  
24 animal health, and other aspects of the rural  
25 economy in this province.





1 THE CHAIRMAN: So it's your view that  
2 the industry is already too large in Manitoba?

3 MR. NIKIFORUK: I would suggest that  
4 with nine million head, it is probably too large.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Would you hazard a  
6 guess as to what size it should be?

7 MR. NIKIFORUK: Again, that would be  
8 an issue that I think biologists and ecologists  
9 and local communities would have to think about.  
10 But I would imagine that you are approaching  
11 densities in many parts of Manitoba similar to  
12 those that could be found in the Netherlands or  
13 Denmark or England. And those are dangerously  
14 high thresholds. In other words, you have stacked  
15 the fire, and if a virus is going to come around,  
16 it's going to burn.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: And you mentioned just  
18 a moment ago the impact on water in a number of  
19 other jurisdictions. What has that impact been?

20 MR. NIKIFORUK: The impact has been  
21 uniformly the same, a dramatic impact on  
22 groundwater in the Netherlands. So we had  
23 nitrates and phosphorus contamination of  
24 groundwater to the point now that Netherlands  
25 probably has some of the toughest groundwater



1   protections in the world. In Taiwan you had,  
2   again, gross contamination of both surface and  
3   groundwater, again with phosphates and nitrogen  
4   and copper and other heavy metals. As a  
5   consequence of the foot-and-mouth epidemic in  
6   1997, one of the first priorities of the Taiwan  
7   Government was to reduce the number of herds in  
8   important and critical watersheds throughout the  
9   island.

10                    You've had problems with, again,  
11   nitrates and phosphate contamination of  
12   groundwater in Germany, in Denmark, in North  
13   Carolina. The pattern has been the same  
14   everywhere, and governments have failed to protect  
15   those public resources.

16                    THE CHAIRMAN: All of those  
17   jurisdictions, well, Netherlands, Germany, Taiwan,  
18   Denmark, they are all considerably smaller than  
19   Manitoba. North Carolina is somewhat smaller and  
20   also a very different soil and topography. Are  
21   there parallels?

22                    MR. NIKIFORUK: Of course there are  
23   parallels. Manitoba has repeated the same  
24   pattern. As a matter of fact, many people  
25   involved in the hog industry in this province have



1 come from failed experiments in the Netherlands or  
2 England or elsewhere. And in terms of  
3 concentration, if you look, you can say Manitoba  
4 is a big place, but look at where the industry is  
5 concentrated. Okay. And that concentration has  
6 created these issues of density and animal  
7 movement and, as well, as the whole problem of  
8 industrial pollution. I mean, you have industrial  
9 piles of livestock creating industrial piles of  
10 manure. And even the Netherlands, and they are an  
11 incredibly creative and innovative people,  
12 realized at a certain point that they had  
13 15 million more pounds of nitrogen and phosphate  
14 that they were producing in the hog industry than  
15 they could correctly dispose of in their own  
16 country.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: How do they dispose of  
18 it?

19 MR. NIKIFORUK: Oh, that I am not an  
20 expert on, but they have very sophisticated rules  
21 for balancing their manure in terms of making sure  
22 that what is getting put back into the soil will  
23 not create a phosphate or nitrogen imbalance. And  
24 they have worked out all of these equations. And  
25 when their soils are maxed out, then they have to



1 take this manure elsewhere. And I'm not sure  
2 exactly where it goes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Is it possible to avoid  
4 the plague that you say is inevitable?

5 MR. NIKIFORUK: Well, we live in a  
6 global world and we have more than a billion  
7 people travelling around all the time. We have  
8 mass movements of animals and frozen meat at  
9 unprecedented scales. We have an explosion in  
10 livestock growth around the world. I mean,  
11 globalization is a fact of life. And with  
12 globalization -- globalization just doesn't mean  
13 global trade, it also means trade in all living  
14 things -- sooner or later a virus or bacteria will  
15 visit Manitoba.

16 And I would just remind you that in  
17 1951, the foot-and-mouth epidemic that exploded in  
18 Saskatchewan, which the Federal Government took  
19 about six months to deal with, was introduced by a  
20 farm worker from Europe who brought along with him  
21 some sausage that contained the virus. So it can  
22 be as simple an introduction as that.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: On a global scale then,  
24 how would you suggest this be addressed? I mean,  
25 do we just cut back on the amount of protein





1 that's produced worldwide, or do we just spread  
2 the production out far more to a lot more smaller  
3 operations?

4 MR. NIKIFORUK: First of all, taking  
5 an agricultural community and transforming it into  
6 an export oriented business on the scale that,  
7 let's say we've done with beef or with hogs,  
8 exposes that entire community to all kinds of  
9 vulnerabilities over time. Having any  
10 agricultural community dependent on the export of  
11 70 per cent of what it produces is a dangerous  
12 thing to do. I mean, the beef industry discovered  
13 that in the last five years with BSE, and the hog  
14 industry will probably experience the same sort of  
15 thing. So we have to rescale our operations, we  
16 have to think more in terms of satisfying local  
17 production and domestic consumption. This  
18 proposal that somehow, you know, one small  
19 community is going to feed the world is a very  
20 modern and probably very dangerous idea, because  
21 nobody really wants to consider the biological  
22 consequences of that. I mean, you cannot increase  
23 trade in animals without increasing trade in  
24 animal diseases, period.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin.



1                   MR. YEE: Yes, thank you.  
2 Mr. Nikiforuk, just a couple of questions for  
3 clarification. You gave us the examples of  
4 Netherlands and Taiwan. But in your slide of  
5 crisis of veterinary medicine, you also mentioned  
6 North Carolina. Was that in reference to disease  
7 outbreak or mass slaughter, or these kinds of  
8 things?

9                   MR. NIKIFORUK: North Carolina has had  
10 a number of issues, mostly the gross contamination  
11 of water systems, and disease outbreaks as a  
12 consequence of that.

13                   MR. YEE: Another question of  
14 clarification, I wonder if you could expand, in  
15 your conclusion you mentioned land use planning  
16 for livestock must be part of a public health  
17 policy. Could you just expand a bit on that for  
18 me?

19                   MR. NIKIFORUK: This is being  
20 suggested by a number of scientists, and what they  
21 are essentially saying is, look, you have to look  
22 at the full impact of a change to the landscape  
23 and what its consequences will be for local human  
24 communities and water and wildlife and the  
25 ecosystems that are there. The rapid growth of



1 the hog industry in Manitoba represents a huge  
2 change to any number of ecosystems throughout the  
3 province. And to my knowledge, nobody took the  
4 time or the energy to do a proper environmental  
5 assessment of -- to ask what will this mean in  
6 terms of, let's say, for example, the incidence of  
7 MRSA in our hospitals, if we don't monitor hog  
8 farmers and pig farmers? What will this do to the  
9 incidence of avian influenza in the province if we  
10 don't monitor people involved in this industry?  
11 What will this do to our groundwater and the state  
12 of our groundwater? What will this do to our  
13 local communities and their dependence on foreign  
14 markets, which can be extremely fickle? And what  
15 will this do in terms of nitrogen and phosphate  
16 pollution of our soils and our waterways, our  
17 overloading of our soils and our waterways? Those  
18 are the kinds of issues that really need to be  
19 asked at the beginning, so that if you -- I mean,  
20 there's nothing wrong with raising livestock, but  
21 the issue always comes down to scale and  
22 concentration and who benefits and who pays. And  
23 I might add that it's the taxpayers in the  
24 Netherlands and Taiwan and Denmark, and North  
25 Carolina who are all expected to clean up for the



1 messes created by the hog industry, because the  
2 industry, responding to market forces, decided,  
3 well, let's build, let's collect a whole bunch of  
4 fire here, or firewood, and let's build a big  
5 pile. And then when the fire got out of control,  
6 I mean, again, they called upon the public purse  
7 to put the fire out.

8 MR. YEE: Thank you.

9 MR. NIKIFORUK: Not to mention the  
10 enormous and incredible waste of animal lives.

11 MR. YEE: So I guess in terms of, in  
12 summary though, in terms of any livestock and land  
13 use planning, one should undertake environmental  
14 assessment to look at the potential impacts, both  
15 from the human health and ecological side.

16 MR. NIKIFORUK: From animal health,  
17 human health, health of your soils, health of your  
18 water, and the health of your rural communities.  
19 BSE demonstrated how vulnerable rural communities  
20 can be when they depend on one product being  
21 exported to one country, and one disease can close  
22 those borders and change the trade forever,  
23 especially when we don't have an industry -- this  
24 industry was not concerned, and I'm speaking here  
25 now of the Alberta experience, we weren't adding





1 value to our beef in Alberta, we were raising  
2 animals cheap for an American market and sending  
3 them across the border. That was a stupid  
4 economic program that benefitted the United  
5 States, added no value to producers in Alberta,  
6 and did not make our agricultural communities any  
7 more sustainable. In fact, they are now all in a  
8 perilous position and the price of beef is still  
9 perilously low. You will repeat that pattern with  
10 hogs if you are not careful.

11 MR. YEE: Thank you.

12 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you,  
13 Mr. Chairman. I was interested in your, when you  
14 give quotes on statistics as to say there's  
15 14 million pigs in Taiwan, 6,500 per square mile.

16 MR. NIKIFORUK: Um-hum.

17 MR. MOTHERAL: Then you say the  
18 Netherlands has 47 per square hectare, which to me  
19 I guess is probably about 20 per square mile.  
20 Like, there's quite a difference in that. I'm  
21 sorry, I wish you would have included in that,  
22 what is the concentration in Manitoba?

23 MR. NIKIFORUK: That's a good  
24 question. I would assume that's something that  
25 this Commission should know, should have known



1 that at the start. I don't have access to those  
2 figures. I don't know if anyone has an  
3 accurate --

4 MR. MOTHERAL: Well, we know there is  
5 eight million hogs, we know the square miles of  
6 Manitoba, it's not hard to figure out.

7 MR. NIKIFORUK: That would give you a  
8 false figure because Manitoba is a big province  
9 and your hog industry is concentrated in only a  
10 few areas.

11 MR. MOTHERAL: What are they in the  
12 Taiwan and Netherlands, is that the whole country?

13 MR. NIKIFORUK: That is the whole  
14 country, yes.

15 MR. MOTHERAL: That's what I was  
16 wanting to find out.

17 As far as, in my estimation anyway,  
18 the several statistics you give on the diseases  
19 and the antibiotic reactions and that, I think, I  
20 mean, I'm not a veterinary doctor and some of  
21 these things I don't understand, but I think I  
22 will maybe suggest to the Commission that we do  
23 have a meeting with the Veterinary Association of  
24 Manitoba, because I'd like to get more of a  
25 Manitoba example on these things, I think for use



1 in our work here.

2 MR. NIKIFORUK: I would encourage you  
3 to do that. I would also encourage you to have a  
4 meeting with Terry Whiting, who is your chief  
5 veterinarian for the province, and I would also  
6 encourage you to have a meeting with Paul  
7 Kitching, who is an expert in foreign animal  
8 diseases and who can give you firsthand experience  
9 of what a horror show the foot-and-mouth disease  
10 epidemic was in England.

11 MR. MOTHERAL: That's all I got.  
12 Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Who is Paul Kitching?

14 MR. NIKIFORUK: He is the head of  
15 foreign animal diseases for the Federal Government  
16 and he's based here in Winnipeg.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: You have raised a very  
18 provocative topic this morning. I'm sure we can  
19 come up with many more questions, but right now I  
20 think we have exhausted our questions. So thank  
21 you very much for coming out and making this  
22 presentation today.

23 MR. NIKIFORUK: Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Next up is Mr. Al  
25 Mackling. Just before Mr. Mackling starts, is



1 Wanda McFadyean here? Would you be prepared to go  
2 right after Mr. Mackling, before the break? Thank  
3 you.

4 AL MACKLING, having been sworn, presented as  
5 follows:

6 MR. MACKLING: Thank you,  
7 Mr. Chairman, members of the Environment  
8 Commission, for this opportunity to add my words  
9 to probably the many thousands you have heard.  
10 It's somewhat difficult being at this stage in the  
11 proceedings, not knowing what you have already  
12 heard, but to some extent what I'm going to say  
13 then may be just a case of underlining what you  
14 have already noted.

15 I started an interest in this whole  
16 picture as a resident of the RM of Springfield  
17 when a number of applications for intensive  
18 livestock operations occurred in the RM. And I  
19 became informed and got involved because I was  
20 concerned about the ramifications of these  
21 operations.

22 Let me say at the outset how impressed  
23 I was with the presentation by Andrew Nikiforuk.  
24 It filled the gap in my knowledge about a number  
25 of issues respecting the threat, environmental





1 threat of disease from animals.

2           At one of the applications before the  
3 RM of Springfield Council, I brought to their  
4 attention concern evidenced by scientists, world  
5 scientists as outlined in a National Geographic  
6 issue. I'm sorry that I haven't got the date for  
7 that issue for you. I looked in my files and was  
8 unable to find it. I have had far too many files  
9 that I should have re-ordered.

10           In any event, in that issue the  
11 scientists pointed out that there was no question  
12 that we would be, the world would be facing  
13 another pandemic, a pandemic that would likely be  
14 facilitated by the intensive livestock operations  
15 in the world, particularly hogs.

16           And why hogs? They pointed out that  
17 hogs, like humans, have the same digestive system,  
18 and like humans, they are subject to similar  
19 plagues and diseases. It's not unknown that pigs  
20 have been used in research because their anatomy  
21 is similar to humans. We all know that heart --  
22 organs from pigs have been used in transplants, in  
23 substitution for human organs. The pig is a  
24 relatively highly intelligent animal and it shares  
25 a characteristic of humans in shedding its skin on



1 a profuse basis.

2                   So the scientists in the world  
3 indicated that the likely threat of a pandemic --  
4 they said there was no question there would be a  
5 pandemic -- but the likely linkage for the  
6 pandemic would be through hogs, because of that  
7 relationship of hogs and humans. So that threat  
8 has been identified many years ago.

9                   And the presentation by Andrew  
10 Nikiforuk, I think should give this Commission  
11 real cause for concern about intensive livestock  
12 operations involving hogs.

13                   Hogs, like every other animal,  
14 including humans, treasure space. We all want  
15 some space. They don't get space in intensive  
16 livestock operations. They are highly confined.  
17 We even use, in Manitoba, housing conditions that  
18 have been condemned in Europe. And I'm sure you  
19 are familiar with those.

20                   What should we be doing and what has  
21 been done in the past? When I was opposing  
22 applications for intensive livestock operations in  
23 Springfield, the process involved a technical  
24 review committee. This technical review committee  
25 was composed of government officials. To my



1 surprise and chagrin, these officials did not  
2 appear to be objective, but rather appeared to be  
3 proponents of every application. Their technical  
4 reviews were skimpy, skimpy to the point where I  
5 think they were negligent. For example, they  
6 never mentioned airborne particulate, they never  
7 mentioned wind direction, velocity, and the likely  
8 distribution of the plume from these intensive  
9 livestock operations, the plume being the  
10 particulate and the gases that are released on a  
11 constant basis from these livestock operations,  
12 they have to, or the animals would suffocate.  
13 They never mentioned them. They never dealt with  
14 it.

15           In some cases they never looked at the  
16 specific regulations that were in being in the  
17 Health Act, in other acts, including the Clean  
18 Environment Commission Act, and indicated whether  
19 the proposed operation conformed to those  
20 requirements. They were highly deficient.

21           Now, where do we go from here? I'm  
22 sure this Commission has heard many, many  
23 arguments about livestock operations. One of the  
24 questions that you, Mr. Chairman, put to  
25 Mr. Nikiforuk is, what does the hog industry do



1 now? Well, one thing it should be doing is  
2 downsizing. We should be seeing a dispersment of  
3 hog production, so that more small and  
4 middle-sized farmers are raising hogs,  
5 distributing the intensity of the industry,  
6 minimizing the threat of colossal wipeouts of  
7 herds by disease, and providing a greater  
8 diversification of income to farmers.

9           Regrettably, some years ago the single  
10 desk selling of hogs was eliminated and we have a  
11 concentration now of hog production in intensive  
12 livestock operations, which is a real threat to  
13 our society.

14           I don't want to go on at length about  
15 the past. I think what you are challenged with is  
16 what do we do in the future?

17           I think that, as a minimum, this  
18 Commission should indicate to the government that  
19 livestock husbandry, particularly hogs, should be  
20 regulated to at least the extent that they do in  
21 other jurisdictions that have had a much longer  
22 history in dealing with these problems. And  
23 perhaps there would be more humane conditions  
24 developed for the housing of animals.

25           One of the things that I think is





1 necessary is that, given the fact that we have  
2 lagoons, that we have the spreading of manure,  
3 with this consequential threat to our rivers and  
4 streams and lakes, that we have to develop on an  
5 urgent basis a return to the natural filtration of  
6 water from farm runoff. Whether it be animal  
7 waste or chemical waste, it should be filtered.  
8 And it is well known that nature does provide a  
9 filtration system if we will allow for it, and  
10 that is through small marsh areas, the grasses and  
11 the reeds which have the capacity to deal with  
12 polluted water and clean it up. It's no secret.  
13 But how do you start this? What do you do?

14                   I think one of the first things the  
15 government, you should recommend to the government  
16 is that they actively engage in determining,  
17 through the assessment department, areas of  
18 agricultural land that do seem to be continuously  
19 in either a wet condition or in a condition where  
20 only with great effort can there be any reasonable  
21 crop grown.

22                   And aerial photography is available to  
23 identify areas of farmland where it is being  
24 farmed but it ought to be returned to its natural  
25 state. And if we filtered the runoff from farms,



1 we would make a significant impact on the loading  
2 of our rivers and our lakes. We know that Lake  
3 Winnipeg is under threat. A very large percentage  
4 of that runoff that goes into Lake Winnipeg, the  
5 agricultural runoff, comes from the Red River  
6 Basin. And the Red River Basin extends well into  
7 the United States. I think this Commission should  
8 recommend to the Provincial Government that  
9 negotiations, discussions be developed with the  
10 Red River Basin Authority.

11               There is an organization, I know that  
12 when I was Minister of Natural Resources I  
13 attended some of the inaugural meetings of that  
14 organization, to reinvigorate a process of  
15 developing natural filtration of farm runoff  
16 water. I think it's vital.

17               I think it's vital that there be a  
18 consideration for invigorating river or stream  
19 basin authorities throughout Manitoba, and  
20 easterly and westerly from Manitoba. Because this  
21 is a national problem, it's not singular to  
22 Manitoba.

23               One of the groups that could be called  
24 upon by the Provincial Government is the  
25 conservation districts in Manitoba who are in



1 charge of the responsibility of enhancing and  
2 protecting the rivers and streams in their areas.  
3 There should be a vigorous rejuvenation of those  
4 organizations to ensure that they have the  
5 capacity to develop and recommend areas for water  
6 filtration, and more planting of trees to buffer  
7 the runoff from agricultural production.

8                   Those things I suggest to you are  
9 things that can be recommended to the government.  
10 They are not impossible. They will take time and  
11 effort, but they will help.

12                   In the short run, it is vital that  
13 there be no further extension of industrial  
14 production of hogs in Manitoba.

15                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
16 Mr. Mackling. Edwin.

17                   MR. YEE: Yes, Mr. Mackling, thank you  
18 very much for your presentation. Just maybe don't  
19 get too extensive in your comments, but if I can  
20 just get your thoughts on, we have heard a lot of  
21 issues around the technical review committees. Do  
22 you have a suggestion on a better process, or how  
23 that can be done in terms of the technical review  
24 committees?

25                   MR. MACKLING: Well, I think the



1 technical review committees should involve an  
2 environmental review process, and there should be  
3 a whole list of questions that deal with  
4 environmental protection. And if they can be  
5 satisfied, that would be of great help.

6 MR. YEE: Thank you very much. That's  
7 all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne.

9 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you,  
10 Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mackling, I know one of your  
11 suggestions was to encourage more smaller  
12 operators and small production, and I know that we  
13 would all like to see this ideal euphoric society,  
14 whatever they call it, that you see pictures in  
15 magazines of a couple of hogs running around, and  
16 a horse and a cow and things like that. It's just  
17 not going to happen. It just cannot be  
18 economically feasible, because you can't make a  
19 living doing that. Most of the times we see that,  
20 and I'm going from farming experience, is mostly  
21 from hobby farmers who don't have to make a living  
22 at that.

23 And I say that, I'm not trying to  
24 downgrade this decision, I would love to see those  
25 kind of things come back again, and I don't really





1 know when I say it can't happen, I don't know how  
2 it's going to happen. I should rephrase that, I  
3 don't know how it's going to happen.

4           Some of your changes, you'd like to  
5 see too, you say, natural filtration, and there  
6 are some things being involved in that today.

7           MR. MACKLING: Not enough.

8           MR. MOTHERAL: I am just saying, the  
9 technology, we are working on that. Nutrient  
10 reduction, et cetera, more wetlands, one of the  
11 problems, I think we've heard this from other  
12 areas in the province, is there are programs out  
13 that land stewards can apply to, to get some  
14 funding for these kind of situations where you can  
15 get more wetlands. But the problem is, there's  
16 not enough. And I'm wondering, how high do you  
17 think society or the consumer can pay for these?  
18 Where is the point where it would make it feasible  
19 to do these things? Because five to \$10 an acre,  
20 you can't make a living on that either. Any  
21 suggestions on that way?

22           MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Motheral, to  
23 begin with, the cheap, early way, we have learned  
24 is the expensive way in the long run. We have  
25 learned that with the dumping of hazardous waste



1 in places in the world. The cheap, inexpensive  
2 way that industry often follows is the very, very  
3 expensive way in the long run. And the same sort  
4 of attitude prevails in respect to agriculture.

5           Now, you say that, you said, for  
6 example, well, you know, it's kind of a dream  
7 world to think of having animals raised in a more  
8 humane condition. You didn't use that word, but  
9 I'm using it. There are systems available. They  
10 have straw based litter for hogs, they have hoop  
11 style enclosures where hogs can run relatively  
12 freely. And they are not that expensive. But  
13 what we have is an industry now dominated by big  
14 feed companies who build these plants, and it's  
15 cheaper to operate that way, that's their scale  
16 and that's the way it's going to be. It seems to  
17 me that we as a society have to take an interest  
18 in determining these things, not leaving it to big  
19 industry to decide what they want and how they are  
20 going to do it.

21           MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. That's all  
22 I have.

23           THE CHAIRMAN: The subject of wetlands  
24 in particular for natural filtration has certainly  
25 come up before. I think it has a lot of positives



1 to it, but is it possible to put that in place on  
2 a scale that would service all of Manitoba  
3 agricultural land, or at least all of Manitoba  
4 livestock agricultural land?

5 MR. MACKLING: I believe it is  
6 possible, and I'll give you an example. In the RM  
7 of Springfield, I had a neighbour not too close  
8 by, who was a hobby farmer, but part of his land  
9 was continually wet. And he conceived of the idea  
10 of having a filtration area. He tried to develop  
11 it, he couldn't get funding for it, couldn't get  
12 funding for it. Ducks Unlimited or anyone else,  
13 any foundation wasn't interested. It would have  
14 been a natural filter, it would have been an asset  
15 for wildlife. He was prepared to give up the  
16 land. No takers, no interest. It seems to me  
17 that there has to be leadership. Government has  
18 to take leadership in finding ways to get farmers  
19 happy about redeveloping a filtration system,  
20 whether they have to buy those few acres per  
21 quarter section or what, that's something that the  
22 government has to be charged with responsibility  
23 and deal with it. It has to show leadership.

24 I'm not suggesting that overnight  
25 we're going to change this system. But the



1 government has to show leadership in making a  
2 significant beginning.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much  
4 Mr. Mackling.

5 Wanda McFadyean.

6 WANDA MCFADYEAN and ALAN RANSOM, having been  
7 sworn, presented as follows:

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

9 MR. RANSOM: Good morning, gentlemen,  
10 my name is Alan Ransom, I'm a cattle producer  
11 farmer from the Boissevain area, I'm also the  
12 chairman of the Manitoba Farm Stewardship  
13 Association. With me is Wanda McFadyean. Wanda  
14 is the Executive Director of the Farm Stewardship  
15 Association. Also in our audience is a fellow  
16 director from the board, Jimmy Hilliard is one of  
17 our directors.

18 The Farm Stewardship Association's  
19 responsibility is to deliver environmental farm  
20 plans in Manitoba, along with MAFRI, that's  
21 Manitoba Agriculture Department, and also with  
22 Agriculture Agrifood Canada. I do thank you very  
23 much for this opportunity to make a presentation  
24 here this morning.

25 And I would like to demonstrate to you





1 one example of Manitoba agriculture farmers'  
2 commitment to a healthy people and a healthy  
3 landscape. I remind you that this is an overall  
4 example of the agriculture industry, and Manitoba  
5 Pork producers make up a significant portion of  
6 our agriculture people. We'll start with our  
7 overheads.

8                   The environmental farm plan is  
9 voluntary. Producers choose whether they want to  
10 go through this process or not. It is  
11 confidential, and it also is a self-assessment,  
12 who is most capable of making a critical  
13 assessment of their individual farm? The plan  
14 also assists the producers in identifying their  
15 environmental assets and risks, and helps them to  
16 develop an action plan to address the risks on  
17 their operation. And this is the part where MAFRI  
18 and PFRA assist in helping, giving the technical  
19 support in helping us do that.

20                   The main objective of agriculture, the  
21 policy framework is to advance Canada's role as  
22 world leader in our environment responsibility,  
23 responsive agriculture production. To realize  
24 this goal, a national initiative for agriculture  
25 environmental farm planning is currently under way



1 across Canada. We are just one of the provinces  
2 that are doing this.

3                   Just a brief history, in the fall of  
4 2002, the Manitoba Rural Adaptation Council, or  
5 MRAC as we know it, became involved in the  
6 environmental farm planning process through  
7 consultation with PFRA, with MAFRI, and with  
8 Keystone Agricultural Producers, as well as a  
9 number of commodity groups, Manitoba Pork Council  
10 being one of them.

11                   THE CHAIRMAN: Sir, can you just  
12 describe for me what the Manitoba Rural Adaptation  
13 Council is?

14                   MS. MCFADYEAN: The Manitoba --  
15 perhaps we should ask Jenny to answer this, she is  
16 also involved with them. Manitoba Rural  
17 Adaptation Council is a council here in Manitoba  
18 which looks at various research projects and  
19 initiatives in relation to agriculture across  
20 Manitoba. They similarly have other sister  
21 organizations across the country as well. So they  
22 spearheaded this initiative in consultation with  
23 the key stakeholders mentioned.

24                   THE CHAIRMAN: Is it a government  
25 agency, or is it an agency of farmers or rural



1 people or --

2 MS. MCFADYEAN: It's an agency of  
3 farmers and urbanites from across Manitoba who  
4 look at various research projects. They are a not  
5 for profit organization.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne.

7 MR. MOTHERAL: I think maybe I can add  
8 a little light to this too. It was formed as a  
9 result of the demise of the Crow.

10 MS. MCFADYEAN: Right.

11 MR. MOTHERAL: I mean that was what  
12 the whole thing -- so they are alternate.

13 MS. MCFADYEAN: Alternate, yeah.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks.

15 MR. RANSOM: What you see in front of  
16 you is a list of our directors. There are  
17 predominant producers on the board of directors of  
18 the Farm Stewardship Association. All of the  
19 producers on that board have been or are involved  
20 in livestock production. There is also  
21 representation from conservation interests,  
22 representation from consumer groups. We also  
23 invite Federal/Provincial Government  
24 representation, and also conservation interests.  
25 By the way, it is a requirement of all of the



1 producers on that board to have completed an  
2 environmental farm plan.

3           As we see, the primary role of FSAM is  
4 in cooperation with our partners, and I stress  
5 this, a very strong partnership with PFRA, or  
6 Agriculture Agrifood Canada and with MAFRI, as  
7 well as stakeholder agencies such as the  
8 conservation districts, Manitoba Habitat Heritage  
9 corporation, commodity groups. It is to deliver  
10 the environmental farm plans to Manitoba producers  
11 who wish to voluntarily be involved in this  
12 process.

13           The delivery process is relatively  
14 simple. A producer voluntarily registers for a  
15 workshop and he gets his legal land description.  
16 What they do is then attend the first workshop  
17 where they receive the workbook and start being  
18 involved with starting the farm plan. They then  
19 complete the work plan at their leisure at home,  
20 come back to a second workshop where the plan is  
21 finished. Once they have done that, once they  
22 have completed it, if they wish, they may go on  
23 farther to have their plan reviewed. And once  
24 they finish their plan, they can seek further  
25 funding through the Canada Manitoba Farm





1 Stewardship Program.

2           There is, when a producer voluntarily  
3 registers for a workshop, there is no associated  
4 cost for producers. All the supplies, that sort  
5 of thing, and assistance are there at no cost.  
6 However, there is a time and a travel commitment  
7 for the producer to come, and some of these people  
8 have driven several hundred kilometres to make  
9 sure that they are at a workshop.

10           The producer must attend a workshop in  
11 order to receive an environmental farm plan  
12 workbook. However, we will make an exception for  
13 you folks this morning.

14           The workbook itself is comprised of  
15 three sections. The first section, we look at  
16 what the natural risks are on our farm. That's  
17 what mother nature gave us. We then look at the  
18 management, how we apply management, and there are  
19 assets and risks. And then the third part is how  
20 do we address it? That's our environmental farm  
21 plan.

22           A little more detail in section A, the  
23 analysis of natural risks on the land that the  
24 producer manages using a variety of tools. This  
25 includes also analyzing the farm yard site, our



1 homes, the place where we have farm, store farm  
2 products, and then also look at our fields.

3                   Section B has 19 subsections divided  
4 into farm and field site categories. Producers  
5 only complete the subsection and questions that  
6 pertain to their operation. You must realize that  
7 this book was designed to fit all Manitoba  
8 farmers, that the farmer needs to only look at the  
9 sections that involve his farm.

10                   Section B also addresses a variety of  
11 environmental concerns and asks producers how they  
12 manage these concerns on their operation. And the  
13 producer then rates whether it's a liability or a  
14 risk on his operation.

15                   There is a list of the sections, the  
16 sections in that section B, they run all the way  
17 from water source protection and management, all  
18 the way through to the last section, which is  
19 energy efficiency. So it's very, very  
20 comprehensive. We deal with everything, not only  
21 from the waste, through how we deal with manure,  
22 but also how we deal with our household items that  
23 we have. So it's the whole gamut.

24                   Section C is what we call my  
25 environmental farm plan. And this deals where we



1 develop an appropriate action plan that deals for  
2 the higher risk items, and we also put our  
3 priorities, the time lines and the financial  
4 resources.

5           Once we have completed the  
6 environmental farm plan, we may wish to move  
7 forward with a confidential review of their plan.  
8 And again, this review is voluntary, it's  
9 confidential, and it's one-on-one. And it's done  
10 with the regional coordinator. We have four  
11 coordinators in the province, and it's done in a  
12 neutral location. It's not done at the farmer's  
13 kitchen table.

14           The intent of the review is to provide  
15 a support of credible process that will assure the  
16 producer that the action plan developed by them,  
17 when implemented, will be a benefit to him or her  
18 and their family, and further contribute to a  
19 cleaner and healthier environment and enhance  
20 agriculture sustainability. It is important to  
21 note that the environmental farm plan work resides  
22 with the producer at all times. It is their  
23 document, their item, they take ownership of it.

24           Upon the completion, a successful  
25 review statement, a completion, and the Canada



1 Manitoba Farm Stewardship Program application form  
2 is then forwarded to the producers.

3           A brief note on the Canada Manitoba  
4 Farm Stewardship Program, the objective here is to  
5 accelerate the adoption of beneficial management  
6 practices, what we refer to as BMPs. Its cost  
7 incentives are available to producers to implement  
8 the BMPs to address their on-farm environmental  
9 risks. Criteria and principles for the 30 BMPs  
10 have been developed at a national level as a  
11 guide. And in Manitoba, we have customized it for  
12 the province, but all 30 are available for the  
13 producers.

14           Under that program, the maximum  
15 available to any one farm unit is \$50,000, and  
16 that goes the program goes to March 2008. It is a  
17 cost-shared program. For some of the BMPs,  
18 depending on what the producer benefit versus  
19 public benefit is, it will be a 30 per cent  
20 government contribution. And where the public  
21 benefit is higher, it will be at 50 per cent.

22           The numbers as of March 31, 2007, the  
23 total number of application projects under this  
24 program that have been approved are 3,665, which  
25 means that there will be a total commitment of





1 dollars to this program, federal dollars to this  
2 program of 17.8 million.

3 I do want you, though, to look at the  
4 next item which is extremely important. It's a  
5 producer commitment through this program, during  
6 the same time frame, is 42 and a half million  
7 dollars.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Those are Manitoba  
9 figures?

10 MR. RANSOM: This is just Manitoba,  
11 yes.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Since when, Mr. Ransom?

13 MR. RANSOM: This is the program  
14 started two years ago, this is a two year time  
15 frame all of this has occurred.

16 MS. MCFADYEAN: Actually, less than  
17 two years, it's been approximately since July of  
18 2005 that producers were eligible to access the  
19 funding.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

21 MR. RANSOM: That is in excess of  
22 \$60 million of commitment.

23 Where we are today, this is going back  
24 to our environmental farm planning, we have held  
25 702 workshops. This, again, I remind you is in



1 conjunction with MAFRI and with PFRA. Producer  
2 participation at those workshops has been over  
3 5,300, all voluntary. On a percentage basis, we  
4 have about 92 per cent of the producers come back  
5 to do the workshop two that have attended the  
6 first workshop.

7                   The overhead, the picture that you see  
8 in front of you is a picture of the province  
9 identifying, its municipal map, municipalities  
10 across the province, it is to give you some idea  
11 this has been representative right across the  
12 province, it's not one particular area of  
13 agriculture in Manitoba, it's right across the  
14 province that this has occurred.

15                   The review process, and this is where  
16 we actually review the environmental farm plans,  
17 the statement of completions, and they need to  
18 have a review before they can get a statement of  
19 completion, is over 4,100 producers in this  
20 province. We do track this. This is about 78 per  
21 cent of the producers that have gone through the  
22 program. We do track the total number, the number  
23 of acres that are covered under each of the plans,  
24 and there's no duplication in this number, that  
25 6.7 million acres of agriculture land in this



1 province is covered under an environmental farm  
2 plan.

3                   The farm types range, we track whether  
4 it's a mixed operation, grain and livestock,  
5 grains and oil seeds, livestock, and then other.  
6 And other can be horticulture, agri forestry, aqua  
7 culture. You will note that the livestock and  
8 mixed are about 60 per cent of the total number of  
9 producers have gone through it. So a significant  
10 numbers of livestock, of these people that have  
11 been reviewed are livestock producers. We do not  
12 identify specifically whether they are hog  
13 producers, cattle producers, or sheep producers.  
14 But I can say from doing reviews and being  
15 involved, a significant number of them are hog  
16 producers.

17                   Again, there's another indication of  
18 this map, municipal map of Manitoba, and the  
19 agriculture region which shows the coverage of the  
20 number of people that are involved.

21                   We have done, this is a very recent  
22 random exit survey of producers, and this is the  
23 producers that have come to the first workshop.  
24 We sent out 750 surveys. At this point, we have  
25 about 40 per cent of them returned to us. The



1 only thing we did with the survey was make sure  
2 that none of the Board of Directors, or  
3 duplication, that means more than one to a  
4 household, were sent out. But it is a random  
5 survey. This is their comments. Ninety-one per  
6 cent of the respondents recommend the  
7 environmental farm process to other producers. In  
8 other words, they found it a very, very useful  
9 exercise.

10                   And the other one is that 80 per cent  
11 of the respondents had or were in the process of  
12 implementing on farm environmental improvements  
13 outside of any incentive program. Remember, the  
14 thought workbook, it's an awareness document.  
15 Once they became aware of issues that pertain to  
16 their operation, they were ready to address them.

17                   Comments, and these were comments that  
18 were very common, "I found that we are already  
19 doing a good job with regards to the environment  
20 and where we could make further improvements. And  
21 just looking at the farm from this point of view  
22 raised my awareness about a number of issues."

23                   I just want to end my comments by  
24 saying that all of this activity has occurred  
25 within two years, \$60 million of improvements is





1 just part of our commitment to the natural  
2 resource base and people's health. The challenge  
3 to making improvements and working with the  
4 environment is in constant change. Our knowledge  
5 and technology improves, so does our working with  
6 the people and the environment.

7                   The environmental process has shown  
8 that farmers, including hog producers, are capable  
9 of making this -- meeting this challenge.

10                   Again, thank you very much, and Wanda  
11 and I will be quite prepared to answer any of your  
12 questions. Thank you.

13                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would it be  
14 possible to make this program mandatory, at least  
15 on a sectoral basis?

16                   MR. RANSOM: In some cases it is. The  
17 Manitoba Vegetable Producers -- I believe their  
18 name has now changed to Manitoba Potato Producers,  
19 that commodity does make it mandatory, in fact,  
20 they have to have it before they can get a  
21 contract. So in that case they do it mandatory  
22 That would probably occur commodity by commodity,  
23 but that's a decision that the commodity groups  
24 have to make.

25                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin.



1                   MR. YEE: Yes, Mr. Ransom, just again,  
2 for clarification, you mentioned your workbook  
3 section A deals with natural risk. This is a  
4 double question, I'm going to ask both because  
5 it's related. The very next one had a variety of  
6 tools can be used to address the natural risks.  
7 Can you just give me an idea of the natural risks  
8 you are referring to?

9                   MR. RANSOM: What they do in section  
10 A, and this pertains straight to that individual  
11 farmer. Remember that they have identified the  
12 location, so that you know what your risks are and  
13 soil type, whether it's a light soil, heavy soil,  
14 that means whether it's sandy, clay, then you  
15 start to identify what your erosion risk is, for  
16 example, or your leaching ability. So are you on  
17 a piece of land that is more at risk to leaching?  
18 That may not be a good spot to put your livestock.  
19 Again, if you're on a heavy clay soil, you will  
20 also have the concern of runoff. But that's what  
21 mother nature gave you. You can also get the wind  
22 risk erosion maps of the municipality that you're  
23 in, also for water erosion. There are a number of  
24 tools and a significant amount of information that  
25 can be contained there. And remember it's all



1 supported by Manitoba Agriculture and also PFRA.

2 MS. MCFADYEAN: Detailed soil maps are  
3 available to the producer, soil specialists are in  
4 the room. So there is a lot of comprehensive  
5 information provided to the producer at the first  
6 workshop, as well as the second. And we certainly  
7 welcome them to contact ourselves, Manitoba  
8 Agriculture, or PFRA, for further assistance as  
9 they work through the process. So they are made  
10 aware of all of those things.

11 I should also note that within the  
12 workbook in section B, when we take a look at  
13 that, if there is legislation currently in place  
14 in this province in relation to a respective  
15 question such as setbacks for the appropriate  
16 spreading of manure, et cetera, those are all  
17 highlighted and brought to the attention of the  
18 producer.

19 MR. YEE: One last question, it  
20 certainly seems to be over the short period of  
21 time since, you mentioned July of 2005, there's  
22 been 3,665 projects. I'm just wondering, what  
23 sort of projects would they be? What categories  
24 of projects are there, and is there a particularly  
25 significant category that's been funded?



1                   MS. MCFADYEAN: There's been a number  
2 of categories that producers have looked at. I  
3 would suggest in the top five there have been two  
4 categories that are representative of the  
5 livestock industry.

6                   It's important to note that Manitoba  
7 Water Stewardship has also provided a top-up of  
8 \$5,000 on initiatives such as improved manure  
9 storage. Those have been in the top ones here in  
10 the province, as well as general farm products,  
11 that's been another one that producers have looked  
12 at, how they are storing their hazardous products  
13 such as fertilizers, pesticides, fuel storage.  
14 And then the crop producers are also looking at it  
15 as well to make improvements to their equipment  
16 with respect to how they are applying fertilizers,  
17 sprays and those types of activities.

18                   MR. YEE: Thank you very much.

19                   THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne.

20                   MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you,  
21 Mr. Chairman. I've got several questions and  
22 comments. And first of all, I'd like to say how  
23 we are pleased -- that I am personally pleased  
24 with the volunteer situation. I like to see  
25 things like that done voluntarily.





1                   It's been suggested by many  
2                   associations during our travels that possibly  
3                   intensive ILOs should go through the environmental  
4                   licensing process. Do you feel as though, because  
5                   of increasing public pressure, do you think that  
6                   this may become something that in the future you  
7                   may have to have a licence to farm? That's a big  
8                   question, but it's got a lot to do with what we  
9                   are studying here.

10                   MR. RANSOM: I was going to say  
11                   Mr. Motheral, but you and I know each other too  
12                   well, I'm going to have to use Wayne.

13                   I think because of the awareness of  
14                   our neighbours and that sort of thing, we are  
15                   already part of that, we are already meeting some  
16                   of that demand. I think one of the things in our  
17                   workbook is, some of the things we do, pay  
18                   attention to the impact that may have on our  
19                   neighbours. For example, if I was to go out and  
20                   apply manure, make sure that it will not have an  
21                   impact on the people that live beside me, and that  
22                   can be an urban or another farmer. It's whoever  
23                   my neighbour is. The other thing is when we look  
24                   at the nutrient management and it pertains to  
25                   water runoff in our water systems, I mean, we



1 don't necessarily, I won't necessarily think of  
2 Lake Winnipeg, I'm going to think of my neighbour  
3 that is living beside me. I don't want to have a  
4 negative impact on his water. So I think, to some  
5 degree, we are improving how we deal with our  
6 neighbours, how we live with our neighbours. And  
7 I think that's the overall objective.

8                   By having a licence, does it make it  
9 any better? I don't know. But I would think that  
10 our objective in thinking about who we live with  
11 and who we live beside is probably more important.  
12 And working with the environment is our objective.

13                   MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. That is  
14 all.

15                   MS. MCFADYEAN: If I might add, the  
16 Environmental Farm Plan Workbook, the underlying  
17 guise of the workbook will accept at four key  
18 areas. We look at how producers are managing  
19 their soil, air, water, and biodiversity. And so  
20 those are the things that producers are looking at  
21 when they go through the process, how they are  
22 managing that, the impact to neighbours, the  
23 impact to their families, the impact to the  
24 environment, to the soil, to the air, to the  
25 water, to the biodiversity issues, they are



1 looking at all of those when they go through the  
2 process. And that has met national approval in  
3 the process.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
5 Ms. McFadyean and Mr. Ransom, for coming out this  
6 morning. Thank you.

7 We will take a ten minute break.

8 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 10:41 A.M.

9 AND RECONVENED AT 11:00 A.M.)

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Could we come back to  
11 order, please? Could you resume your seats? We  
12 are running a little behind and I don't want us to  
13 be too late here today.

14 First up is the Keystone Organic  
15 Nutrient Applicators. Is that Mr. Redekop?  
16 DOUG REDEKOP, having been sworn, presented as  
17 follows:

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

19 MR. REDEKOP: Good morning committee  
20 members. My name is Doug Redekop, and I would  
21 like to thank you for the opportunity to present  
22 here today. I'm here on behalf of the Keystone  
23 Organic Nutrient Applicators Association, or  
24 KONAA, for which I'm the acting president. I'm  
25 also the general manager of a livestock manure



1 application company that has been operating since  
2 1993.

3                   There have been a lot of changes to  
4 the industry in the last 14 years. If I look  
5 back, there were only a handful of applicators  
6 when we started back at that time. Our industry  
7 has grown along side that of the hog industry.  
8 Manure has gone from being described as a waste to  
9 that of a valuable nutrient.

10                   When the Clean Environment Hearings  
11 were announced, we felt it would be an excellent  
12 opportunity to educate the public as to the job we  
13 do and the manner we do it in.

14                   KONAA, although only formed a few  
15 months ago, represents a group of 18 individual  
16 companies that cover our province from east to  
17 west. It is estimated that our group applies  
18 approximately 50 to 60 per cent of the manure  
19 applied in the province.

20                   Our members discussed how we best  
21 illustrate our management of the manure that we  
22 apply, and it was felt that a survey would be the  
23 best option. The response rate to that survey was  
24 over 90 per cent by our membership, and in the  
25 following presentation I will highlight key areas





1 of the survey and how we compared to a recent  
2 Stats Canada survey that was conducted across  
3 three Prairie Provinces representing approximately  
4 376 farms.

5                   It was found that 94 per cent of our  
6 membership provided custom services to the  
7 livestock industry, 83 per cent of the manure  
8 handled by our membership is hog manure, and that  
9 our membership covers approximately 125,000 to  
10 360,000 acres annually.

11                   There are a variety of applicator  
12 types represented within our group. It was found  
13 that 76 per cent of the membership utilized the  
14 common drag hose system for application. The  
15 balance would be with tanker and/or other. And  
16 that three kilometres, or just over two miles, was  
17 an average hauling distance for manure in the year  
18 2006.

19                   I can speak from experience here that  
20 when we started we were probably more in -- that  
21 half to one mile was more of a common distance at  
22 that time, and it has grown steadily over the past  
23 three to five years and we anticipate that it will  
24 continue to grow.

25                   Here I have got some slides of some



1 examples of applicators types. What we see here  
2 is a tanker being pulled by a farmer's tractor  
3 with a shallow type injector airway into a minimum  
4 till application. Here is another slightly  
5 different angle of the same thing. This tanker  
6 has a Colter disk opener with a harrow section  
7 behind for closure. This unit also has a disk  
8 type opener behind and is pulled by an Agchem  
9 applicator tractor there.

10 This slide indicates, you will see the  
11 skirting around the bottom, underside of the  
12 applicator there, and that was installed by this  
13 applicator in the efforts to reduce odour and  
14 nitrogen losses. And it looks to me like he is  
15 applying in to alfalfa on this photo.

16 For those of you that aren't familiar  
17 with the drag hose type application system, that  
18 is what this represents here. You will see the  
19 swing arm off the centre of the applicator and  
20 just a section of the hose in behind it. This is  
21 a chisel type applicator going into annual crop  
22 scenario.

23 This is another photo of the drag type  
24 hose, but this is a disk opener, and it looks like  
25 he is on a demonstration parcel here in grassland.



1 You will notice the spacings on those Colters, it  
2 looks to be approximately 16 inches.

3           This slide here shows another drag  
4 hose application scenario here. It is an airway,  
5 but what is unique here is that he is applying it  
6 to standing wheat crop. And the leaf stage there  
7 is between three and five leaf stage. I know this  
8 one firsthand because I followed it right from the  
9 point of application through to harvest, and their  
10 crops advisor was there taking plant counts, and  
11 they were very impressed with the job that was  
12 done. And like I say, I followed it straight  
13 through to harvest, and the applicator, who  
14 happened also to be the landowner, was very  
15 pleased with the results and saw actually marginal  
16 improvement on yield over commercial fertilizer  
17 application.

18           THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Redekop, before you  
19 leave that slide, so that hose is bringing in the  
20 slurry from the end of a pipeline?

21           MR. REDEKOP: Yes, it is. I imagine  
22 the farm could be anywhere from across the road to  
23 two, three, four miles away. That is what we call  
24 a lay-flat hose. So there is a pump at the berm  
25 of the lagoon pumping the effluent to the



1 applicator in the field, yes.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: So how long is that  
3 hose?

4 MR. REDEKOP: It comes in 660-foot  
5 lengths. Our particular company has the ability  
6 to, and has pumped up to three and three-quarter,  
7 four miles with one unit.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Was this one hose, with  
9 an aboveground hose like that?

10 MR. REDEKOP: It is sections of hose  
11 coupled, yes.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: But you can have a  
13 joined hose three kilometres long?

14 MR. REDEKOP: Yes, we do.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. REDEKOP: The key thing to notice,  
17 and you can't really see it on these slides, but  
18 the drops are seven and a half inches on centre  
19 here. And if you compare that even to an air  
20 seeder, I believe their drops are at 12 inches.  
21 So you look at the fact that we are going with  
22 tighter spaces here, that makes for an even more  
23 uniform application of product across the  
24 applicators. So we are always trying to keep in  
25 mind what works well for the crop, because at the





1 end of the day they are the end user of the  
2 manure, and it is often a complete replacement for  
3 commercial fertilizer.

4           Application rates are based on  
5 agronomic decisions most often made by the land  
6 manager or nutrient management coordinator. I  
7 have to highlight that these rates are based on  
8 government guidelines, and that applicator  
9 equipment choice is often based on individual  
10 preference, along with due consideration given to  
11 conditions, crop type, moisture conditions and so  
12 on.

13           One hundred per cent of our members  
14 reported that rates of manure applied varied for  
15 almost every job that they did. And I guess how I  
16 want to explain that is that there is no one  
17 application rate that we go on. I mean, if you  
18 grow wheat you often hear, well, I want to put on,  
19 I want to end up with 80 to 100 pounds of N, or  
20 Canola, maybe upwards to 145 pounds. What I want  
21 to stress here, I guess, number one, I'm not a  
22 nutrient management specialist, but I guess I have  
23 got common sense on my side, and we know that we  
24 have a number of factors that we need to look at  
25 in order to make a sound economic, or a



1 responsible decision here when we figure out the  
2 rates. And that is what residual is left in the  
3 soil, what type of crop is being planted, and what  
4 nutrients is the manure bringing to the field?  
5 And so all of those factors play into it when we  
6 are told, or calculate the rates that need to be  
7 applied to the field. 88 per cent of the time,  
8 rates applied were based on nutrient requirements.  
9 So there is some room for improvement there, but  
10 that is a high number. It was also reported that  
11 94 per cent of the time, equipment was calibrated  
12 to deliver the expected rate of application.

13           Our membership has been very proactive  
14 in adopting new technology as it has come along.  
15 Our particular company that I represent was one of  
16 the first ones to adapt GPS. But the use of GPS  
17 and flow meters has become very common place, and  
18 I believe the majority of our members are already  
19 using both of those technologies.

20           Here we have got a photo of a typical  
21 flow meter installation, and what the dial is  
22 showing there is the flow, it is metering the flow  
23 of manure from the lagoon to the field. This flow  
24 meter is installed in the applicator tractor like  
25 we saw in the previous photo there. So when my



1 tractor operators, or our operators are running in  
2 the tractor, and we are running often 24 hours a  
3 day, we are constantly watching this flow meter to  
4 look at the flows coming out to the field. And if  
5 there is any drop, dramatic drop in flows, the  
6 guys are in constant communication via radio back  
7 to the lagoon to let the fellas know, hey, I'm  
8 seeing a drop, what is going on? And if it is  
9 dramatic, then we know perhaps there is a link in  
10 the pipeline coming out to the field and we have  
11 the ability to shut down the pump from the tractor  
12 in the field even distances up to three miles or  
13 greater. And so we can kill the pump at that  
14 point and then go and look to see what is causing  
15 it.

16                   If we look at the calendar year -- or  
17 sorry, if we look at the types of situations that  
18 the manure is applied in to, I would say that  
19 these numbers indicate that we are pretty much  
20 evenly applicating as a percentage on tilled land,  
21 minimum till situations, and perennials or  
22 forages. If you look to the right, the Stats  
23 Canada survey indicated that when you look at the  
24 three Prairie Provinces, most farmers reported  
25 that at least half of their manure was being



1 applied on to tilled land, with the balances going  
2 on minimum till and/or forages. I think the key  
3 thing with this slide is it indicates that we are  
4 trying, as a membership, and the farmers we are  
5 applying for, to apply the manure not only in the  
6 best fashion that we know how to, but when the  
7 crop is ideally able to use that nutrient, as in  
8 the earlier slide where I showed the farmer  
9 applying to standing wheat. So we have the full  
10 flexibility to apply when the crop can best use  
11 it.

12                   It was found also that membership  
13 restricts the application primarily to the growing  
14 season, and I should say maybe even our  
15 applicating season. Our government tells us that  
16 our season starts up on April 10th and goes until  
17 November 10th. Of course we need to keep snow,  
18 ice, moisture, all of those factors into  
19 consideration, and there hasn't been too often  
20 there has been extensions before and beyond those  
21 dates.

22                   Also, it was interesting to note that  
23 the spreading policies really did not change  
24 whether the farms that we were applying for were  
25 either below or above 300 animal units. And I





1 think that is key, because right now it is the 300  
2 animal unit threshold that dictates whether or not  
3 the farms need to file nutrient management plans.

4           The prairie survey, however, indicated  
5 that most farmers spread throughout the entire 12  
6 month calendar, but the majority still falling  
7 within that April through to November time frame.

8           It certainly has, if you drive the  
9 countryside like I do, you certainly do see a  
10 noticeable decrease in the application of  
11 nutrients on to snow and frozen fields. And I  
12 think, you know, we have to give our farms credit  
13 too. We are not dealing with individuals that are  
14 ignorant to situations, number one; but also  
15 economics really certainly plays a part in it. If  
16 you look at last fall's nitrogen costs down around  
17 29 cents a pounds, and we are currently looking at  
18 54 cents a pound, why would you want to waste a  
19 valuable nutrient like that?

20           This slide indicates the spread of  
21 liquid manure and the type of application. If I  
22 go down the left column first, broadcasting made  
23 up about 18 per cent of our membership's  
24 application. And for those of you that don't know  
25 what that means, that means spread on to the



1 surface without any incorporation. Dropped on  
2 surface was 5 per cent, and the only real  
3 deviation from the earlier type is that that  
4 indicates that it is dropped close to the surface,  
5 and therefore it is thought that it reduces the  
6 odour emissions and perhaps some volatilization of  
7 nitrogen also.

8           Shallow injection was 39 per cent,  
9 pretty much equal with the deep injection, and I  
10 showed you slides earlier, shallow injection would  
11 have been the airway with the times seven and a  
12 half inches on centre. Deep injection would be  
13 considered the shovel type applicator.

14           It is also interesting to know that  
15 none of our members irrigate manure, which is with  
16 an irrigation type gun, which is extremely  
17 positive.

18           If you look down the right-hand side,  
19 there is quite a high number of prairie farmers  
20 applying manure by broadcasting methods. If you  
21 look at, I guess, the also real differences would  
22 be the shallow type injection, they are just  
23 starting to catch on to that. Deep injection is  
24 pretty close, but there is -- there are still some  
25 individuals that are irrigating also.



1                   Does the method of application change  
2 from season to season? 76 per cent of our members  
3 responded no. When they did deviate from a  
4 standard application method, it was meant to be at  
5 the time when they broadcast on to grass. And I  
6 have to make an assumption here that there are  
7 some, I know for a fact there are some acres that  
8 receive manure that would be barriers such as  
9 stones that would not allow for the incorporation  
10 of the manure.

11                   How frequently is chemical analysis  
12 done on liquid manure? Our membership reported  
13 that 80 per cent of the time that is done, and  
14 that 94 per cent of the time our members assisted  
15 the customer in obtaining the analysis necessary.

16                   It is important to note that Nova  
17 meters, and that is a test equipment type that we  
18 use in the field for instant analysis of the  
19 manure, that along with the lab analysis results  
20 that the farmer receives back when we submit raw  
21 manure samples to the lab for testing, and  
22 historical data banks all play an important role  
23 in determining application rates. It is not one  
24 or the other, it is all really together.

25                   80 per cent of our members reported



1 that they make efforts to minimize odour emissions  
2 which often result in nutrient conservation. I  
3 showed a slide earlier with the skirting around  
4 the applicator. That would be an example of one  
5 of those. I think obviously incorporation of the  
6 manure wherever possible is also a key highlight  
7 for that. And even as far as weather conditions I  
8 think also plays a part in that.

9           Some of the future directions that we  
10 are looking for with our KONAA organization, and  
11 that we feel the Commission and public should be  
12 aware of, is that we continue to add more delivery  
13 hose to our inventory so that we can reach new  
14 spread acres further away. And that is a sizeable  
15 investment. If I look at adding 8-inch hose to my  
16 company, I'm looking at at least \$100,000,  
17 probably around \$110,000, and that is just the  
18 hose. Then I have to look at adding another, a  
19 reel to store that hose, so I'm looking at a  
20 financial commitment of \$130,000 to add one mile  
21 of 8-inch hose. If I look at the past two years,  
22 we added half a mile last year and we added a mile  
23 this year. So if I look at the two units we run  
24 only, we have almost the ability to reach five  
25 miles away from sites.





1           On the go nitrogen testing was also  
2 identified as a key issue for us, with variable  
3 rate application. And we are speculating, I mean,  
4 it could be two years from now, three years now,  
5 maybe, I think we want to be objective and say it  
6 could be upwards to five years away, but it is  
7 coming.

8           On-site phosphorous testing, currently  
9 right now we only have the ability to test for  
10 nitrogen. But we, I mean, we look at the previous  
11 year's lab analysis for the manure so we can get  
12 an indicator there, and also the historical data  
13 for those farms. So we are not crippled by not  
14 having that information on site right at present,  
15 but it certainly would be helpful.

16           The other key thing I want to  
17 highlight here is that we want to play a role,  
18 consultation role in the applicator licensing.  
19 Our government promised, I believe over two years  
20 now, that all applicators would be licensed at  
21 this point. And we still aren't, and I just want  
22 to highlight the fact that it is not because we  
23 don't want to be responsible and be licensed, and  
24 we feel there is a part that we can play in  
25 completing that process and adapting it at our



1 level.

2                   Adding dry manure applicators to our  
3 list of members I feel is key to rounding out our  
4 organization. Currently right now our members are  
5 all liquid manure applicators, and a high  
6 percentage of it is hog only. So if we could  
7 round out our membership to include more  
8 individuals it would be, I think, advantageous to  
9 us.

10                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
11 Mr. Redekop.

12                   MR. REDEKOP: I just wanted to draw  
13 one conclusion if I could?

14                   THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

15                   MR. REDEKOP: I want to highlight that  
16 our members are responsible individuals that are  
17 aware of the challenges they are faced with. They  
18 have and will continue to embrace change and adopt  
19 new technology pro-actively. We are aware that  
20 regulations will continue to evolve. If there is  
21 a confidence in these regulations that the  
22 government has put in place, I urge them to take  
23 the time to prove that the changes are indeed  
24 effective before moving on. I know that in  
25 research it is impossible to come to accurate



1 conclusions if variables are changed at will. And  
2 I want to say once again that KONAA's membership  
3 is committed to the establishment and maintenance  
4 of a sustainable environment and industry. Thank  
5 you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You  
7 indicated more or less at the outset that your  
8 membership comprises about 50 to 60 per cent of  
9 the industry. Are you working to get the others  
10 into your organization?

11 MR. REDEKOP: As I mentioned at the  
12 end of my presentation, yes, we would love to  
13 bring more members into our organization. We  
14 can't forget, though, that a large percentage of  
15 our pigs produced in Manitoba are by Hutterite  
16 colonies, so I think it would be slow to bring  
17 individual colonies into our membership, but I  
18 still think there is room to grow our  
19 organization, yes.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin.

21 MR. YEE: Yes, thank you,  
22 Mr. Chairman. Just one question, Mr. Redekop. In  
23 terms of the data that you gave us in to the type  
24 of spread liquid manure methodology, broadcast and  
25 shallow and deep injection, are those stats recent



1 stats? They are for Manitoba, right?

2 MR. REDEKOP: The statistics that I  
3 highlighted are from our survey that was done in  
4 late February, early March. I'm not sure how  
5 recent the Stats Canada survey was completed.  
6 That I would not be able to answer.

7 MR. YEE: Thank you. That is it.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne.

9 MR. MOTHERAL: Just one question, in  
10 light of the new phosphorous regulations where  
11 many operators need more spread acres, what do you  
12 think the maximum distance that manure can be  
13 pumped? Like you were talking about possibly five  
14 miles, but would that be maximum?

15 MR. REDEKOP: That would be maximum  
16 today. I think it really comes down to will and  
17 economics really.

18 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. That is all.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
20 Mr. Redekop.

21 Next is Animal Watch Manitoba, Keith  
22 Thornton and Sid Baumel.

23 KEITH THORNTON, having been sworn, presented as  
24 follows:

25 MR. THORNTON: Yes, good morning





1 Mr. Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going  
2 to present a very practical demonstration of an  
3 alternative system for pig production based on  
4 experience in the Midwest and also in Europe.

5 I'm a native of England, but have been  
6 living in the United States for two sessions.  
7 Recently seven years, before that, eight years. I  
8 have spent 50 years working in the hog industry,  
9 since 1954, have lived in China for two years  
10 working with hogs, in Bucharest, Eastern Europe  
11 for two years, and have worked in over 20  
12 countries.

13 So I'm currently a consultant with the  
14 Animal Welfare Institute, which is a New York  
15 based charity of which I will talk more later. I  
16 would just like to outline my production, some of  
17 the things that I would like to talk about,  
18 production systems, briefly, some results and  
19 costs; about straw and manure, about which we have  
20 heard this morning already; about the environment;  
21 about marketing; animal welfare; and then some  
22 conclusions.

23 There is a supply chain existing  
24 already in the United States and Europe which  
25 begins with the producer and ends with the



1 consumer, and it is a relatively new movement.  
2 Currently we have in most developed countries  
3 where pig production is taking place, we have  
4 confinement, we have got the outdoor system, we  
5 have got the straw-based alternative, and we have  
6 got organic. I'm going to go past the confinement  
7 system, you have probably heard lots of evidence  
8 already about confinement systems.

9                   The outdoor in Manitoba is clearly a  
10 non starter, as it is in the Midwest of America,  
11 from an all year round point of view. In the  
12 U.S.A. occasionally we will get pigs out of doors  
13 in the Midwest. In England, we would have a  
14 system that operates all year round outdoors, but  
15 that is specific to the climate in England, where  
16 we've applied the rules from indoor production to  
17 outdoors. So it is outdoor mating, outdoor  
18 farrowing, outdoor weaning 52 weeks in the year.  
19 Clearly impossible in this particular climate.

20                   So we must look at some of the  
21 alternatives. And one of the systems that has  
22 been developed we call the Swedish style, where  
23 the mating takes place here. This stage, the  
24 gestation for 12 weeks, the farrowing in boxes,  
25 and I will come back to that later. The weaners



1 in deep bedding, and then the finishing stage in  
2 deep straw and bedding. If we just look at that  
3 briefly, the climate in Sweden is very similar to  
4 here in Manitoba, we have the totally enclosed  
5 system here. We have got the sows in gestation,  
6 and this is very relevant at the present time, in  
7 deep bedding systems with individual feeders, and  
8 the decision by Smithfield and Maple Leaf to move  
9 from gestation stalls is very relevant. The  
10 alternative already exists.

11                   And the straw system in Sweden is  
12 highly mechanized. The round bale is used and  
13 brought inside mechanically and used for bedding  
14 the pigs. The farrowing can take place in  
15 individual pens, voluntary farrowing crates, no  
16 restriction, and there are two systems that work.  
17 In both cases the total farrowing system can be  
18 dismantled to leave the sow and litters running  
19 together in a straw-based system. And so at the  
20 end of the day we have a group of pigs, perhaps  
21 six or eight sows, up to ten sows and 50 or of 60  
22 pigs running together in deep straw, who then  
23 continue in deep straw to the point of slaughter,  
24 to 50 to 60 pounds.

25                   So that is the Swedish system, the



1 technology exists, and the performance is very  
2 similar to that that is obtained in confinement  
3 units, say in Manitoba and the Midwest.

4           The other alternative to that is to  
5 use a -- just look at some results here from that  
6 farm that we looked at in Sweden. We will get  
7 this right here. Just last year when I visited,  
8 along with some of the academic staff from the  
9 University of Minnesota and Iowa, the number of  
10 sows in this particular herd, 135; live born per  
11 litter, 12.6; weaned per litter, 10.4; lactation  
12 period, six weeks; non productive sow days, 10;  
13 and piglet weight at 69 days, 30 kilos. So a very  
14 similar performance and in some cases better than  
15 we get in intensive systems. So that is the  
16 Swedish systems.

17           As an alternative to that we look at  
18 what I call, it is a mixed Midwest/European  
19 system, where we have small pens in the mating,  
20 straw yards with groups of individual feeding, we  
21 have individual farrowing pens, and then we have  
22 large groups which may be in straw yards, may be  
23 in deep bedding, may be in hoop buildings, which  
24 were mentioned earlier today. And hoop buildings  
25 again have been widely used in Canada. It looks





1 something like this with, again, the deep bedding,  
2 the individual feeding of the sow, the individual  
3 farrowing of the sow. This is just an alternative  
4 to stall systems -- you can't see that -- an  
5 alternative to stall systems here, based on straw.  
6 This is the electronic sow feeding system here  
7 with the feed stations, the deep bedding, the  
8 straw, and the sow feeding stations. The  
9 individual sow feeding here, which I call the  
10 voluntary farrowing crate, widely used in England  
11 certainly until 40 years ago, and then in the  
12 interests of confinement was abandoned, is now  
13 coming full circle back into use. So it is  
14 interesting to see how this has developed.

15           The sows are then often, as in the  
16 Swedish system, grouped together, and grouped  
17 together with deep straw bedding and straw  
18 available, and then in the final stages may be  
19 housed in buildings. This is from Denmark, the  
20 use of big bales here to produce a hoop building,  
21 or the more traditional hoop building which we see  
22 in the Midwest, the hoop building again.

23           And this week there has been a report  
24 from the University of Iowa, Iowa State actually,  
25 a three-year experiment with hoop buildings, and



1 the cost for the gestating sow was one-third below  
2 the cost of confinement systems, the productivity  
3 was higher, and the end result was that there was  
4 an 11 per cent reduction in the cost of the pig,  
5 of the weaner pig. So that stopped press, the  
6 report produced this week. This is the pig again  
7 in the hoop building.

8                   So from there, just let's have a look  
9 briefly at the use of straw, in Canada widely  
10 available, not so widely available in the U.S.A.  
11 The U.S.A. has corn stalks. We have a choice of  
12 wheat, barley, oats, tricaly. It is essential  
13 that it is dust free and weed free. We have  
14 mechanical systems in the field and in the barn,  
15 and we have the Hesston bale, the round bale, or  
16 the conventional bale.

17                   The point about straw, of course, is  
18 that it is a buffer against environmental  
19 conditions, especially thermal. For instance, the  
20 critical temperature for a sow in a gestation  
21 stall would be 20 degrees C. If you have a group  
22 of sows in straw, that temperature requirement  
23 would drop to 15 or 16 degrees, energy saving at  
24 every point here. The straw of course can be  
25 eaten, excellent source of fiber. We have the



1 natural nesting activity of the sow before  
2 farrowing, and it is a material that can help in  
3 the reduction of stereotypical behaviour, for  
4 instance, tail biting. So from that point of  
5 view, very good from an animal welfare point of  
6 view.

7                   Some considerations on straw: Of  
8 course here, I think widely available, especially  
9 wheat straw. We have got the cost, the transport,  
10 the mechanical handling, the removal from  
11 buildings, and its use as a solid manure. And  
12 here we have got a picture of a solid manure. So  
13 this is the typical product at the end of the day.

14                   We can do several things with what I  
15 call farmyard manure. We can spread direct from  
16 the barn, or we can have field storage, we can  
17 storage on a concrete pad, we need to have cover,  
18 and prevent runoff. We have enormous compost  
19 potential. The spreading rate would be 5 to 20  
20 tonnes per acre. It improves soil structure with  
21 the humus and the organic incorporation of  
22 material with the humus buildup. We have reduced  
23 odour, and NPK value varies very widely, but would  
24 be in the range NPK 15-7-15. That is the soil  
25 order we have. So that is the benefit of the



1 straw system.

2                   Now the alternative systems that I  
3 have described are really one chain in the link  
4 from producer through to the end consumer. What  
5 we are looking at here is a marketing system from  
6 producers. You see, I'm referring to what is  
7 known in the United States as the niche market,  
8 which spills over to farmers markets. I want to  
9 talk about Niman Ranch, and Whole Foods and the  
10 Iowa experience with several organizations that  
11 they have at the present time that help in this  
12 matter. If I speak for a minute about the Niman  
13 Ranch Pork Company, California headquarters, but  
14 the pork ranch is based in Iowa, standards for  
15 pigs, over 400 family pork producers in the  
16 Midwest. We were talking earlier about the family  
17 farm. And they have a set of regulations which  
18 must be followed and are best followed through the  
19 straw-based system. Each farm must sign an  
20 affidavit that the pigs have never been given  
21 antibiotics, there have not been any form of  
22 growth promoting hormones or steroids, raised on  
23 pasture or deeply bedded pens, have not been fed  
24 meat or meat byproducts or any kind of animal fat.  
25 So those are the basic outlines for Niman Ranch.





1 As I said, there are 400 farms spread from  
2 Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota. Niman Ranch began 10  
3 years ago, the pork arm of Niman Ranch. It acts  
4 as a buyer of the pigs. It is a very loose  
5 cooperative. The farmer, providing he follows the  
6 rules, is then at the end of the day given a  
7 premium. That premium may be in a region of \$8 to  
8 \$10 a pig, which compensates the farmers for  
9 producing pigs under this alternative system.

10           The other aspect of Niman Ranch is  
11 that it follows animal welfare programs written by  
12 the Animal Welfare Institute. Other organizations  
13 also have their animal welfare rules, but  
14 basically they are based on what we call, and I  
15 think you are all familiar with the five freedoms  
16 of animal welfare, freedom from hunger and thirst,  
17 discomfort, pain, injury and disease, and this  
18 last one here, the last two, the freedom to  
19 express normal behaviour and freedom from fear and  
20 distress. So those are the major points I think  
21 from an animal welfare point of view.

22           The main point currently that the  
23 industries around the world are concerned with in  
24 animal welfare would be the gestation crate. And  
25 we have seen already the mention I have made of



1 Smithfield and Maple Leaf, in the United States,  
2 more recently Cargill at certain States in the  
3 United States have banned the use of gestation  
4 crates.

5                   Practical issues on animal welfare  
6 include the sick, euthanasia, feed interruption,  
7 and some recent books I think very interesting,  
8 "Omnivore's Dilemma" by Michael Pollan, which  
9 looks at this whole business of alternative  
10 systems, and "The Fast Food Nation" by Eric  
11 Schlosser.

12                   I want to have a look briefly at some  
13 of the other factors that are involved in this  
14 chain of supply. We have sustainable systems, we  
15 have support from the Leopold Centre in Iowa, in  
16 the Midwest, which is linked to the University of  
17 Iowa State. We have money from the Kellogg  
18 Foundation and other trust funds around the U.S.A.  
19 We need more training and information still, in  
20 spite of the fact that the system is up and  
21 running, and we need and we already get a premium  
22 for welfare. Not totally for welfare, because it  
23 is a premium for taste and flavour and quality of  
24 food, and how the food is produced. And in most  
25 developed countries, particularly in the U.S.A.



1 and Western Europe, there is already a group or a  
2 number of customers, a segment is probably the  
3 right word, of customers who are prepared to pay  
4 extra, an extra cost at the end of the day in the  
5 marketplace for the food, for the pig meat that is  
6 produced in these alternative systems.

7                   So I think I will leave the point  
8 there and invite questions. Thank you very much  
9 indeed.

10                   THE CHAIRMAN: Sir, what are some of  
11 the downsides of a straw-based system?

12                   MR. THORNTON: It is not for  
13 large-scale production. I could not design a two  
14 and a half thousand sow unit, which is typical of  
15 some of the units in Manitoba, that would be based  
16 on the straw-based system. The Niman Ranch system  
17 really is family farmed, it is for family farmers,  
18 farmers who must, as owners, be involved in the  
19 farm business. And the range of sows would be  
20 from 20 sows at the lower end to 300 sows to 500  
21 sows, and the average again is much lower than  
22 that. So the downside is the size of operation.  
23 There is no way that the alternative system could  
24 sweep away existing confinement systems, but it  
25 certainly could offer an alternative on a niche



1 basis, and would lead to changes in the way  
2 confinement systems are operated at the present  
3 time.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: We've heard that  
5 particularly keeping hogs outside can lead to  
6 disease problems.

7 MR. THORNTON: Yes, that is a valid  
8 point. In fact, one of the reasons the Midwest  
9 moved from extensive outdoor systems to indoor  
10 systems was because of the spread of disease.  
11 Brucellosis was one, and there were other diseases  
12 that were spread from farm to farm with outdoor  
13 pigs. But I think that is a possibility, that  
14 could happen.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: We have also heard at  
16 one meeting, in very colourful language, about  
17 aggressive behaviour among sows. The colourful  
18 language we heard was, have you ever seen a pig's  
19 vagina ripped out?

20 MR. THORNTON: Yes, I have seen it in  
21 lots of situations. Mixing of sows is not easy,  
22 it is a management skill. And the large farms, at  
23 the end of the day, in confinement, will have to  
24 find a system to mix their sows at weaning to have  
25 them in groups of gestation. In Europe by 2013,





1 the gestation stall and tether stall is illegal.  
2 It has been illegal in England since 1999. And  
3 they have found a way of grouping the sows during  
4 gestation without loss of production. And the  
5 American industry, the North American industry is  
6 heading in the same direction and will have to  
7 follow the same management rules to do that.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, perhaps you could  
9 give us more information on the British and  
10 European practices, or soon to be practice. Will  
11 the removal of the gestation pens, will that lead  
12 necessarily to group, or will it just lead to a  
13 larger pen that is open, that allows them --

14 MR. THORNTON: Yes, it could lead into  
15 two directions; it could be lead into group  
16 housing, groups of six or twelve, or in the case  
17 of the work at the Prairie Swine Centre in  
18 Saskatoon, where they have done a lot of work with  
19 group housing with slatted floors, it could lead  
20 to 50 sows, 60 sows, 100 sows in the group, so  
21 that is one direction. Or it could lead to an  
22 individual pen in which the sow can totally turn  
23 around. That is almost impractical and very high  
24 cost, so I think that alternative will not happen.  
25 So we are headed, I think, towards group systems.



1                   The beauty of the straw system is that  
2 it acts as a buffer in that group housing system.  
3 As I said, Iowa State have just completed this  
4 three-year experiment, and the production from  
5 sows housed in group systems on straw in a hoop  
6 building, the productivity has increased.

7                   THE CHAIRMAN: So you are offering  
8 these suggestions as alternatives, you are not  
9 saying that the whole industry should or must go  
10 in that direction?

11                   MR. THORNTON: No, no. I don't want  
12 that misunderstanding. This is a niche industry.  
13 But, for instance, in the United States, the niche  
14 industry, if I add the Niman Ranch pigs all  
15 together, if I added all of the pigs together that  
16 are produced on straw or outdoor systems, probably  
17 the best estimate is 750,000 hogs per year  
18 slaughtered, and it could be by the end of next  
19 year a million. Now, it is a million hogs against  
20 the total annual slaughter, which is probably in  
21 excess of 85 probably 90 million pigs per year, so  
22 on a percentage basis it is quite small, but it is  
23 growing and it is growing rapidly.

24                   In the developed countries, in fact,  
25 the increasing pig production is slowing. It is



1 in the underdeveloped companies where pig meat  
2 production is increasing. So this is a huge  
3 growth market. Again, it is the smaller unit, it  
4 is straw based, it needs a Niman Ranch  
5 organization to orchestrate, to work the system,  
6 they buy the pig, they offer a premium, they sell  
7 the pig at the end of the day to a white table  
8 restaurant. And if you go into a restaurant in  
9 Chicago or Des Moines, or East or West Coast, it  
10 would be a Niman Ranch entree which will be well  
11 priced by any standards, but which consumers are  
12 willing to pay because of the flavour and the  
13 taste, and the way in which the animal is produced  
14 from an environmental point of view, from a  
15 welfare point of view, from a taste and flavour  
16 point of view.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Just out of curiosity,  
18 would it be identified on the menu as Niman Ranch?

19 MR. THORNTON: Yes, it would indeed.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: So it is well enough  
21 known?

22 MR. THORNTON: Yes, it is a very  
23 widely recognized brand name in the U.S.A. It  
24 also sells pork and pork products to a chain  
25 restaurant called Chilpolte, which is Mexican



1 based, which is owned partially by McDonald's.  
2 But this restaurant, Chilpolte, sells fast food  
3 and it is all based on alternative systems of  
4 production, and well advertised inside of their  
5 restaurants.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: And how much is the  
7 premium?

8 MR. THORNTON: The premium on a pig  
9 would be in the range of \$5 to \$8 per hundred  
10 weight live. So at the end of the day the farmer  
11 might get \$10. It is a sliding scale with a  
12 floor. The safety net is very important. We  
13 don't go back to a period in the Midwest, say of  
14 1998, where hogs were 10 cents a pound. So we  
15 have a floor in the system, a sliding scale which  
16 rewards that producer for doing the job. It is a  
17 system which I say blends all of these various  
18 aspects together, sustainable, reduction in odour,  
19 it is a natural system producing the solid manure  
20 back to the farm. Particularly in Manitoba where  
21 you have a huge production of wheat, the United  
22 States has a problem with small grains production,  
23 it is mainly a corn producer. And it is an entry  
24 for first time farmers, first time farmers will  
25 come into this niche market easier than they can





1 get into a huge confinement system. The capital  
2 costs are much lower.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne.

4 MR. MOTHERAL: Just a couple of  
5 questions, Mr. Thornton. On one of your beginning  
6 presentations, it is hard when we don't have the  
7 information here in front of us, and I have  
8 forgotten, but I believe it was in Sweden you  
9 talked about the birth rate of 12.6 piglets and  
10 then the weaning of 10 point something; is that  
11 right?

12 MR. THORNTON: Yes.

13 MR. MOTHERAL: The difference would be  
14 the mortality, would it?

15 MR. THORNTON: Yes, which in that  
16 calculation would be around 12 per cent, I think.

17 MR. MOTHERAL: Is that a normal  
18 mortality rate in a system?

19 MR. THORNTON: Yes. Let's put it this  
20 way, that a well-run large scale confinement unit  
21 with all mod cons, highly mechanized, well  
22 supported, well organized, may occasionally get  
23 its pre-weaning mortality down to 8, 10 per cent,  
24 in that range. I have worked in this business for  
25 many, many years, and so that is the sort of going



1 rate. That is a target, it can be achieved  
2 occasionally.

3 In an alternative system, it may well  
4 be 11 to 12 per cent, not much different, but  
5 there is a difference in the cost, in the capital  
6 cost of setting up that system.

7 So I'm not going to say that the  
8 alternative system will match a well run  
9 confinement in terms of pre-weaning mortality, but  
10 in terms of weight gain, in terms of feed  
11 efficiency, in terms of cost of production, which  
12 is a major part of pig production in the wean to  
13 finish stage, it is equivalent and sometimes  
14 better.

15 MR. MOTHERAL: Okay, I believe you  
16 have answered my question. Just one more thing,  
17 weed free straw, how important is that and how  
18 feasible is it? I know almost to me as a farmer,  
19 weed free straw is an oxymoron. You would have to  
20 have a weed free field then. But how important is  
21 that in straw?

22 MR. THORNTON: I just throw that out,  
23 I'm not an agronomist, I like more dust free than  
24 weed free, but you are familiar with that  
25 production of herbicides. I suspect that a lot of



1 straw would be reasonably weed free. I'm thinking  
2 of contaminants like ergot, for instance, that  
3 could be a problem in straw bed systems, but it is  
4 very rare.

5 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin.

7 MR. YEE: Yes. Thank you,  
8 Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of very quick  
9 questions. In your presentation on the Swedish  
10 style, you indicated 135 sows. Is that about the  
11 average or does it vary? Similar to you mentioned  
12 the Niman Ranch operation goes from 20 to 500?

13 MR. THORNTON: 25 sows to three or  
14 400, that sort of range.

15 MR. YEE: Right.

16 MR. THORNTON: Sweden -- generally the  
17 American industry, from a technology point of view  
18 from confinement, has gone in leaps and bounds in  
19 the last 15 to 20 years with these huge units of  
20 two and a half thousand sows, 6,000 sows, 10,000  
21 sows on one site. That is totally unheard of in  
22 Europe, because of welfare regulations, because of  
23 planning regulations, because of land use  
24 regulations. Because planning, in particular, it  
25 is almost impossible in England, you could not



1 build a Manitoba style confinement unit because it  
2 would just be out of the question, the aesthetics  
3 of the business, of maintaining the village, the  
4 town, the boundaries, the countryside, the  
5 appearance. So this is a big factor in size of  
6 unit in a country like England, even in a country  
7 like Germany, and certainly in the Scandinavian  
8 countries.

9 MR. YEE: So in Sweden there would be  
10 no large confinement operations?

11 MR. THORNTON: Large would be four or  
12 500 sows, small would be in the range 50 to 70,  
13 that is the sort of range. England would have, I  
14 don't think in England I know of a thousand sow  
15 unit, whereas here I wouldn't have to go very far  
16 here to find several in the range of two to 3,000  
17 sow units on one site. That is the difference and  
18 that is where we have gone, and probably it is not  
19 too late to turn back. We are not going to upset  
20 the confinement industry, or turn it over  
21 overnight totally, but the system that I'm  
22 describing is well founded, technically sound,  
23 environmentally sound, friendly to the pig from a  
24 welfare point of view, friendly to the operators,  
25 and sustainable and has a long term future.





1 MR. YEE: Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thornton, you did  
3 talk a little bit about manure management. What  
4 ecological environmental benefits are there from a  
5 straw-based system? I mean, we have been asked  
6 specifically in broad terms to look at the  
7 environmental sustainability of the industry.

8 MR. THORNTON: Yes, I think, again, it  
9 is a return of manure to the land in reasonable  
10 amounts. There is no runoff, there is very little  
11 pollution, there is no odour. That is how I  
12 describe it. I can't quantify it exactly, but  
13 those are the main benefits that we have. We can  
14 store, we can compost, we can wait until we have a  
15 window when we can spread the manure, and so we  
16 have more flexibility than we have say with liquid  
17 manure in the lagoon.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I don't  
19 think we have any more questions. Thank you very  
20 much for coming here today, sir.

21 Finally this morning, Mr. Sid Baumel.  
22 SID BAUMEL, having been sworn, presented as  
23 follows:

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

25 MR. BAUMEL: Thank you. First of all,



1 good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. And my  
2 thanks to Keith Thornton for his brilliant and  
3 enlightening presentation, and to the CEC for  
4 funding it.

5                   Animal Watch Manitoba looks forward to  
6 a day when people no longer kill animals for food  
7 except for survival, and the burden of being at  
8 the same time lovers and admirers and protectors  
9 of other animals, and tormentors and killers of  
10 other animals has been lifted from our  
11 consciences. Until that day, animal farming must  
12 at the very least become much more humane and  
13 sustainable. Keith has pointed the way for our  
14 province to do this at a time when consumers are  
15 finally starting to see through the shrink wrap to  
16 the ugly realities beneath.

17                   An objective scientific approach to  
18 sustainability requires us not only to ask what is  
19 sustainable hog production, but whether other  
20 means of feeding ourselves in the world would be  
21 significantly more sustainable, as broadly defined  
22 by the Province's Sustainable Development Act,  
23 which includes not only preservation of the  
24 physical environment but of human health as well.

25                   National food guides accurately tell



1 us that pork's primary role in the human diet is  
2 as a source of protein, excess protein,  
3 unfortunately, for North Americans who eat well  
4 beyond their protein needs, which promotes kidney  
5 failure in old age. Pork is also very often a  
6 source of excess calories, feeding the epidemic of  
7 obesity and obesity-related illnesses.

8                   High quality epidemiologic studies  
9 also suggest that the more pork, particularly  
10 cured pork, people eat, the higher is their risk  
11 for several cancers, including the usually  
12 terminal pancreatic cancer.

13                   In contrast, the staple proteins of a  
14 plant based diet, especially beans and nuts, but  
15 also grains, especially whole grains, are all  
16 associated in long-term human studies with less  
17 chronic degenerative disease and greater  
18 longevity.

19                   Manitoba has no problem growing beans  
20 and grains, and even the nutritionally exceptional  
21 nut of the hemp plant. Our geography doesn't  
22 compel us to become the pork basket of the planet,  
23 and yet Manitoba produces and exports more pork  
24 and more pigs than any other province, well over  
25 90 per cent of what we produce, and this is in a



1 country that is a leading exporter of edible pig  
2 products, the number one exporter of pork itself,  
3 according to the FAO.

4           A paper published in 2003 in the  
5 American Journal of Clinical Nutrition can help us  
6 grasp the extreme environmental inefficiencies of  
7 producing pork as a source of protein. The  
8 authors of this paper which is titled  
9 "Quantification of the Environmental Impact of  
10 Different Dietary Protein Choices" are Lucas  
11 Reijnders, PhD, who is an environmental scientist  
12 and professor at the University of Amsterdam, and  
13 Sam Soret, PhD, who is chair of the Department of  
14 Environmental and Occupational Health at Loma  
15 Linda University, School of Public Health. These  
16 are well credentialed scientists writing in a peer  
17 reviewed scientific journal that is to nutrition  
18 what the journal of the American Medical  
19 Association is to medicine.

20           According to Reijnders and Soret, the  
21 protein conversion efficiency of pork is about 9  
22 per cent. That means that producers have to feed  
23 11 pounds of vegetable protein to pigs in order to  
24 produce just one pound of pork protein. This is a  
25 spectacularly inefficient way to feed a world





1 where nearly one billion people go hungry every  
2 day. Why is a would-be green and socially  
3 responsible province like Manitoba supporting a  
4 recipe for even more world hunger?

5                   What about climate change? Reijnders  
6 and Soret write,

7                   "Depending on the relative intensities  
8                   of agricultural practices...",

9 and by intensities they mean the spectrum of from  
10 organic through to the most non-organic or  
11 intensive ways of producing pork and other  
12 commodities,

13                   "...the efficiency of fossil fuel use  
14                   may be a factor 2.5-50 better for  
15                   vegetable proteins if compared with  
16                   animal husbandry."

17 In other words, the greenhouse gas impact of  
18 animal agriculture is at least two and a half  
19 times and as much as 50 times greater than the  
20 impact of growing protein rich crops for human  
21 consumption.

22                   The impact of pork production is so  
23 high because the greenhouse gas emissions from the  
24 hog barns themselves, the CO<sub>2</sub> and the methane from  
25 the pigs, the nitrous oxide from the manure, are



1 only part of the story. There is also all of that  
2 feed. Whatever it costs in greenhouse gas  
3 emissions to produce the corn, the barley, the soy  
4 or other feed grains, you have to multiply that by  
5 ten or so to get the same amount of pork protein,  
6 which is the end product that pork is produced  
7 for.

8                   What about the efficiency of turning  
9 calories of fossil fuel into calories of food?  
10 According to a peer reviewed study by  
11 geophysicists Gidon Eshel and Pamela Martin of the  
12 University of Chicago, it takes 27 calories of  
13 fossil fuel to produce one calorie of pork. In  
14 contrast, according to their calculations and  
15 data, it only takes one calorie of fossil fuel to  
16 produce over four calories of soy, two and a half  
17 calories of corn, 1.2 calories of potatoes, and  
18 even a little over one calorie of apples.

19                   When it comes to climate change, diet  
20 is the new transportation. Meat production,  
21 especially intensive non-organic production, which  
22 obviously is the kind that predominates in  
23 Manitoba right now, is a global warming machine.  
24 Last year the United Nations Food and Agriculture  
25 Organization, in a 390 page monograph entitled



1 "Livestock's Long Shadow" calculated that nothing  
2 we humans do, not even transportation, is fueling  
3 global warming more than global livestock  
4 production. Why is Manitoba peddling an SUV diet  
5 in the global marketplace?

6 I'm not here to argue that everyone  
7 must become a vegan or a vegetarian, or that  
8 Manitoba must get out of the livestock business,  
9 because I know that is an argument I just can't  
10 win. But just as we all accept that we must use  
11 less fossil fuel in transportation, heating and so  
12 on, if we are objective, we must also recognize  
13 the need to trim the greenhouse gas flab from our  
14 diets and agriculture. And that means eating and  
15 producing more beans and grains and less bacon and  
16 eggs.

17 How big is the payoff of doing that?  
18 Eshel and Martin, the University of Chicago  
19 scientists who I said a moment ago, calculated  
20 that the average American diet, which derives 28  
21 per cent of its calories from animal foods, is  
22 responsible for approximately one and a half more  
23 tons of green house gases as CO2 equivalents per  
24 person per year than a fully plant based or vegan  
25 diet. One and a half tons, in other words, if you



1 follow a typical omnivorous diet, you are  
2 responsible for one and a half more tons of  
3 greenhouse gases compared to a fully plant based  
4 diet.

5                   If you cut your consumption of animal  
6 foods by a third, you cut your greenhouse gas  
7 footprint by half a ton per year. If you cut it  
8 by two-thirds, according to Eshel and Martin's  
9 calculations, you have just done the equivalent of  
10 trading in your Toyota Camry for a Toyota Prius.  
11 As a province, should we not be doing the same  
12 with our agriculture?

13                   Last year in an Italian study  
14 published in the European Journal of Clinical  
15 Nutrition used standardized ISO 14040 lifecycle  
16 assessment methodology to model the sum total of  
17 adverse environmental and public health impacts of  
18 vegan, vegetarian and omnivorous diets, both  
19 conventionally and organically produced. The  
20 assessment, the scientists explained, and I'm  
21 quoting them here,

22                   "...includes the whole lifecycle of  
23 the process or activity, from the  
24 extraction and processing of raw  
25 materials, to the production,





1                    transportation, distribution, use,  
2                    re-use, recycling and final disposal."  
3    In other words, Luciana Baroni and her associates  
4    applied state of the art science to compare the  
5    total farm to plate, to sewer, to lake, to  
6    atmosphere, sustainability of nutritionally  
7    adequate diets that differed significantly only  
8    with respect to their balance of animal and plant  
9    foods. As a real world reference -- because these  
10    diets were sort of on paper based on their  
11    nutritional understanding of balanced diets in the  
12    different categories -- as a real world reference,  
13    they threw in the average Italian diet which is  
14    omnivorous and conventionally produced. The  
15    complex methodology of this study passed peer  
16    review in a major nutrition journal published by  
17    Nature, one of the world's top scientific  
18    journals. Baroni and her associates ran their  
19    data through three different "perspectives"  
20    reflecting the range of scientific uncertainty  
21    about environmental and health impacts. These  
22    range from relatively conservative to relatively  
23    liberal with respect to what kind of impacts one  
24    can expect. In every one of the perspectives, the  
25    vegan diets, especially the organic vegan diet,



1 had a dramatically smaller adverse footprint than  
2 the omnivorous diets, especially the  
3 conventionally produced omnivorous diets. When  
4 the perspectives were combined and averaged, the  
5 average impact scores were as follows, in order of  
6 increasing adverse impact.

7                   The vegan organic diet scored 0.57.  
8 The conventionally produced vegan diet scored  
9 0.81. The vegetarian organic diet scored 0.96.  
10 The omnivorous organic diet scored 1.26. The  
11 conventionally produced vegetarian diet score  
12 1.38. The conventionally produced omnivorous,  
13 which is what most of us are eating, scored 2.14.  
14 And the average Italian diet, and I'm not sure why  
15 this was the case, scored 5.41.

16                   In other words, the adverse impact of  
17 the conventional omnivorous diet, the kind that  
18 most Manitobans still eat, was nearly four times  
19 as great as the adverse impact of the vegan  
20 organic diet, and nearly twice as great as the  
21 adverse impact of the omnivorous but organic diet,  
22 which is the kind of diet that would be based on  
23 the farming that Keith was describing earlier, and  
24 I am sure many other presenters have described to  
25 you.



1           Baroni her associates wrote in their  
2 conclusions, and I will quote again here,

3           "If animals are considered as food  
4 production machines, these machines  
5 turn out to be extremely polluting, to  
6 have a very high consumption and to be  
7 very inefficient. When vegetables are  
8 transformed into animal proteins, most  
9 of the proteins and energy contained  
10 in the vegetables are wasted. The  
11 vegetables consumed as feed are used  
12 by the animals for their metabolic  
13 processes, as well as to build  
14 non-edible tissue like bones,  
15 cartilage, offal and feces.

16           A shift in eating habits toward the  
17 increase in the direct consumption of  
18 plant foods seems to be a desirable  
19 objective in this perspective. Owing  
20 to their lighter impact, confirmed  
21 also by our study, vegetarian and  
22 vegan diets can play an important role  
23 in preserving environmental resources  
24 and in reducing hunger and  
25 malnutrition in poorer nations. "



1                   So what are we to conclude? I would  
2 like the panel to very carefully consider the  
3 proposition that intensive meat production,  
4 including pork, which is about midway on the scale  
5 of non-sustainability between dairy and eggs and  
6 poultry at the sort of lower end of better  
7 sustainability, and grain fed, feed lot finished  
8 beef at the high end of non-sustainability, in  
9 other words, being the least sustainable. I would  
10 like this panel, I would like you to very  
11 carefully consider the proposition that intensive  
12 meat production, including pork, is inherently  
13 incompatible with environmental sustainability,  
14 and that intensive meat production on a mass scale  
15 such as we have in Manitoba's pork industry is  
16 massively incompatible. I would like you to very  
17 carefully consider the scientific case for  
18 recommending to the Government of Manitoba that it  
19 adopt policies to deintensify and scale down the  
20 pork industry, while cultivating agricultural  
21 opportunities that will help us solve the  
22 challenge of local and global sustainability, not  
23 exacerbate it. Thank you.

24                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Baumel.

25                   Now, without oversimplifying what you





1 have just said to us, your view is that by, either  
2 reducing the amount of meat produced in the  
3 province or by changing the way it is done, we can  
4 vastly improve the environment? Is that, in very  
5 simple terms, is that your --

6 MR. BAUMEL: Yes, absolutely, and I  
7 think it is a view that is borne out, I know it is  
8 a view that is borne out very well by the science.  
9 If you check into that with the sources, for  
10 example, that I cite in this presentation, I will  
11 give you a printed copy later on with the  
12 references in it, you will find that that is  
13 generally, there is really no contest about that,  
14 it is a slam dunk.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?  
16 Edwin?

17 Thank you very much for coming out  
18 here today and for your presentation. We will now  
19 break for lunch. We will come back at  
20 1:00 o'clock sharp. We will be resuming at  
21 1:00 o'clock sharp, so come back a few minutes  
22 before that.

23 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 12:06 p.m.

24 AND RECONVENED AT 1:00 P.M.)

25



1                   THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're going to  
2 come to order, please. Please take your seats.

3                   GEORGE DERENCHUCK, having been sworn,  
4 presented as follows:

5                   THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

6                   MR. DERENCHUK: Yes. A presentation  
7 to the Clean Environment Commission concerning  
8 environmental sustainability of an ever-expanding  
9 hog industry in Manitoba.

10                  My name is George Derenchuck, lifetime  
11 resident of Winnipeg and a seasonal cottager at  
12 Matlock Beach on Lake Winnipeg. I am vitally  
13 concerned with regard to the environmental  
14 well-being of Lake Winnipeg, especially since  
15 numerous e. coli warnings and the presence of  
16 green algae formations impact upon quality of life  
17 aspects and possible health issues that might  
18 arise.

19                  Recently, I reviewed the report,  
20 "Nutrient Loading to Lake Winnipeg and Its  
21 Watershed, Our Collective Responsibility and  
22 Commitment To Action" put out by the Lake Winnipeg  
23 stewardship board. I am perplexed to observe that  
24 a billion dollar industry, the hog industry in  
25 Manitoba is barely mentioned in the report. No



1 picture of a hog or a hog barn, no picture of a  
2 hog lagoon or metal manure storage tank still, no  
3 picture of a hog manure spreader spraying the  
4 land, but only pictures of cattle. Is this an  
5 oversight perhaps?

6                   Is the hog industry immune from  
7 sharing some of the responsibility for the plight  
8 of Lake Winnipeg? Why does the Lake Winnipeg  
9 stewardship board chairman appear in Manitoba Pork  
10 Council ads. He's allowed to, but there you are.

11                   Speaking on behalf of the provincial  
12 Ministry of Agriculture, Rosanne Wowchuck, at a  
13 producer's Manitoba swine seminar held in  
14 Winnipeg, February, 1, 2007, Deputy Minister Barry  
15 Todd of Manitoba Agriculture Food and Rural  
16 Initiatives, praised farmers for their efforts in  
17 alleviating fears, safeguarding the environment,  
18 and sustaining the industry. He further praised  
19 the hog industry management so they would be  
20 workable for producers.

21                   Mr. Deputy Minister, how about being  
22 instrumental in developing regulations for manure  
23 management utilizing independent, free thinking  
24 researchers, who are not beholding to any special  
25 interest groups, research not funded by the Pork



1 Council, research in support of the environment.

2           If all is well in the hog industry,  
3 then why the need for a moratorium on hog barns in  
4 this province? Perhaps the Quebec experience  
5 helps to explain this need, rapid overexpansion,  
6 contaminated waterways. One cannot but help to  
7 think that the Department of Agriculture has  
8 already decided that a potentially ever-expanding  
9 hog industry is sustainable, even before the  
10 findings of the Clean Environment Commission are  
11 finalized, with recommendations to the Minister of  
12 Conservation.

13           Offering hog producers the solutions  
14 that they want at the expense of environmental  
15 concerns is most inappropriate, in my view.

16           Backing up fears with scientific  
17 evidence will be the biggest challenge for people  
18 striving to restrict the potential massive  
19 expansion of the hog industry in Manitoba. So say  
20 proponents of hog industry expansion. However, it  
21 is essential to keep in mind that such expansion  
22 can only lead to adverse consequences should  
23 proper controls and enforcement of environmental  
24 standards be neglected.

25           Speaking of scientific evidence, the





1 Manitoba Pork Council continues to insist that the  
2 industry is one and a half per cent responsible  
3 for the total phosphorus content load in Lake  
4 Winnipeg. In the meantime, Allan Barron, co-chair  
5 of the Citizens for the Responsible Application of  
6 Phosphorus claims that the ever-expanding hog  
7 industry in our province could be responsible for  
8 up to 18 per cent of the problem. Who am I to  
9 believe, my friends?

10                   Now, I want to refer to a report that  
11 I observed, I read this in the Interlake  
12 Spectator. In a presentation to the environment  
13 hearing, the Whitemouth/Reynolds Soil and Water  
14 Conservation Association stated that they were  
15 surprised at low nutrient levels in the Whitemouth  
16 as compared to other rivers flowing into Lake  
17 Winnipeg. One looked at a map of Manitoba shows  
18 that Whitemouth runs through or near four  
19 provincial forest areas, Northwest Angle,  
20 Sandilands, Agassiz and Whiteshell. How can one  
21 dare to compare the nutrient runoff from this  
22 forested area to flat fertilized farmland in  
23 Southern Manitoba? I hope that the Clean  
24 Environment Commission noted that this selective  
25 study does not represent all of Manitoba's rivers,



1 for example, the Icelandic River. How about doing  
2 a study on that one, my friends?

3 To continue, the Manitoba Pork Council  
4 continues to pressure politicians to ease up on  
5 criticism of the hog industry and to promptly  
6 remove the moratorium on hog barn expansion. I do  
7 hope that our politicians are not captives in the  
8 holding pen of the pork industry lobby. More  
9 independent and free thinking research is needed  
10 before the moratorium is lifted.

11 The Manitoba Pork Council insists that  
12 the Manitoba Hog Industry is held to stringent  
13 environmental standards, over-regulated, but fails  
14 to mention that enforcement practices are often  
15 lacking and could stand improvement.

16 Permit me to share with you a summary  
17 of some of the environmental mishaps and  
18 misdemeanors that have been identified in other  
19 jurisdictions, as well as in Manitoba. These  
20 revelations do not require scientific proof,  
21 rather these are self-evident.

22 Permit me to continue. The first one,  
23 "Dead Hogs Discovered," Interlake Spectator, May  
24 12, 2006. Twenty dead hogs piled in a wooded area  
25 adjacent to a brand new hog barn just north of



1 Arborg. The fine was just \$500 out of a possible  
2 \$50,000 fine. So much for enforcement.

3                   Second item, "Manitoba Conservation  
4 Probes Manure Spill," CBC News, April 28, 2006. A  
5 1.5 million litre spill, manure spill at the  
6 Kasmsley Hutterite Colony 60 kilometres south of  
7 Portage la Prairie. The manure spill reached the  
8 Cypress River. The colony must properly repair an  
9 earthen storage unit for manure. What's the  
10 problem? Why didn't they look after this in the  
11 first place instead of spending money on public  
12 relations tactics?

13                   Next item, "Hog Farm Ordered to Cover  
14 Manure." A 6 million-gallon manure storage area  
15 in Southern Manitoba is causing excessive farm  
16 odour. The Farm Practices Board has ordered  
17 Pircardy Farms to cover their manure by June 1st.  
18 I think they should have ordered them to cover it  
19 a lot sooner. What's the hold up here?

20                   Next item, "Pork, Premium Standard  
21 Produces Smell of Money." This references to the  
22 St. Louis Missouri area, St. Louis Post Dispatch,  
23 December 26, 2006, "Premium Standard Produces the  
24 Smell of Money." Premium Standard Farms  
25 Incorporated, the second largest U.S. hog



1 producer, will pay \$4.5 million to six plaintiffs  
2 who claim that odours from one of its swine farms  
3 interfered with their ability to enjoy their  
4 properties, a quality of life issue. Premium  
5 Standard Farm produces about 4.1 million hogs  
6 annually. They are forced to pay the fine.

7 Now I am told by people in the pork  
8 industry that the odour is negligible or whatever.  
9 Well, my friends, look at the research.

10 Next item, Maple Leaf fined more than  
11 \$600,000 for violations at the Dundas plant, Stony  
12 Creek News, November 4, 2005. Eighteen charges  
13 were laid, including causing adverse odour,  
14 discharging excessive amounts of effluent, failing  
15 to comply with a provincial order to commission  
16 two of its lagoons. After the fine was paid, this  
17 company spent \$49 million to upgrade their ancient  
18 operation. And in spite of spending 49 million to  
19 upgrade their operation, they were fined again.

20 I am told that with the proposed  
21 Olywest plant to come to Winnipeg, that everything  
22 will be A-1. Well, just a minute, friends, let's  
23 be realistic here.

24 Next item, City of Winnipeg variance  
25 order, Granny's Poultry request for a zoning





1 variance. Oh by the way, with regard to the Maple  
2 Leaf fine, 600,000, I have before me -- I do tax  
3 work for a living -- a Manitoba odour control tax  
4 credit form. When I do tax work for a farm  
5 return, farm people are allowed to claim a  
6 Manitoba odour control tax credit. Yet I'm told  
7 by powers that be, odour, what odour? How come  
8 the province has to resort to this if there is no  
9 such thing as odour? Give me a break, folks.

10                   Now, getting back to the variance  
11 order, City of Winnipeg. Granny's Poultry were  
12 looking for a new plant location for their  
13 hatchery and office complex. They took a look at  
14 the St. Boniface Industrial park location, but  
15 realizing that there was to be an Olywest plant to  
16 be placed to that area, they decided to look  
17 elsewhere because they were fearful of possible  
18 biological health contamination of the hatchery  
19 unit if there were to be a hog processing and  
20 rendering plant right next to their location. So  
21 guess what, they looked for another location in  
22 Transcona. They found another location, but that  
23 location was zoned M3, the same as the St.  
24 Boniface Industrial Park is. Granny's Poultry  
25 were able to convince the City of Winnipeg zoning



1 authorities to change the zoning from an M3 down  
2 to an M2, so that in future there couldn't  
3 possibly be a pork processing plant built next to  
4 their hatchery. And I have the evidence here  
5 because I attended the variance meeting and they  
6 sent me the results. I have it here.

7                   So, my friends, I am wondering why  
8 Mr. Doer and Mr. Katz didn't do their homework in  
9 terms of anticipating that placing a hog  
10 processing and rendering plant into a location  
11 where we already have an existing Vita Health  
12 Foods operation.

13                   THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Derenchuck, we are  
14 not here to review the Olywest, and if you keep  
15 going off on tangents, you won't finish your main  
16 presentation.

17                   MR. DERENCHUK: Thank you very much.  
18 The hog industry is not in a particularly strong  
19 economic position at this time and this leads  
20 smaller independent producers to accept contracts  
21 with larger factory farm vertical integrators.  
22 Confinement feeding becomes the order of the day,  
23 and such practices as confinement feeding as  
24 opposed to open range small operation feeding  
25 procedures lead to severe waste management



1 problems. That is to say liquified hog manure.  
2 You get more of that happening when you resort to  
3 confinement feeding in a cage, factory farm,  
4 industrial factory farm system. Guess what,  
5 folks, it's more economical to do that for the  
6 operators, so they hose out the contaminants and  
7 then it's placed into holding tanks and placed  
8 into lagoons, and then it is spread on neighboring  
9 farmer's fields.

10 Properly enforced regulatory  
11 strategies must be followed if we are to reassure  
12 the public that the threat to water quality caused  
13 by the spreading of liquified manure is  
14 controlled. The larger hog operation barns should  
15 only participate in the application of often  
16 untreated liquified hog manure based upon soil  
17 tests and actual crop needs, the practice of  
18 buying up marginal farmland, not really  
19 sustainable for the growth of crops, and requiring  
20 little or no fertilizer, merely for the purpose of  
21 providing a venue for liquid waste dispersal must  
22 be curtailed. Rotation schedules should be  
23 completed, registered with Manitoba Conservation  
24 authorities and strictly adhered to.

25 Economic accommodation factors should



1 never be allowed to overpower environmental  
2 sustainability as it affects quality of life  
3 aspects and the environmental health of Lake  
4 Winnipeg.

5                   Now I'm going to quote Laura Rance in  
6 her article, "Complex Issues Face Pork Producers,"  
7 Winnipeg Free Press, February 12, 2007.

8                   "It is one thing for industry to  
9 lobby. It is another for government  
10 to buy its rhetoric."

11 Perhaps the greatest risk to the hog industry's  
12 growth isn't a government imposed pause itself,  
13 the moratorium, but that that second sober thought  
14 will prevail. It may also be its greatest chance  
15 for a viable future.

16                   I appeal to the Clean Environment  
17 Commission to support further independent, free  
18 thinking research with reference to hog industry  
19 expansion and environmental concerns as a result  
20 of such expansion. Limits to growth are sometimes  
21 the correct path to follow. Thank you.

22                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
23 Mr. Derenchuk. Thank you, sir, thank you for  
24 coming out this afternoon and preparing this  
25 presentation.





1                   Now, I'm informed that David Hedman,  
2 who was to be our first presenter this afternoon,  
3 will not be presenting. The next on the agenda is  
4 Hilary Versavel. Is she here? No? Louise  
5 Hedman.

6                   LOUISE HEDMAN, having been sworn,  
7 presented as follows:

8                   MS. HEDMAN: Hello, my name is Louise  
9 Hedman. I am here today to share my story of how  
10 the hog industry in Manitoba has affected my life  
11 and to present some of my views on the industry.

12                   Some of the things I may say may fall  
13 outside of your guidelines. If they do, maybe  
14 just let me know.

15                   THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

16                   MS. HEDMAN: What I say is in no way  
17 motivated by financial gain. I am a busy mother  
18 of two young children and took time off of work to  
19 be here.

20                   I was introduced to the hog industry  
21 on November 23, 2005, when Winnipeg City Council  
22 voted in favour of the Olywest deal, with only  
23 nine days notice. It was at that time I was able  
24 to see the report dated November 16th, 2005,  
25 prepared by Olywest and the city. The contents



1 shocked me. The Olywest consortium were proposing  
2 to situate a live hog barn which would house 4,000  
3 hogs, a 16-hour per day slaughter, rendering and  
4 processing schedule, relentless traffic volumes,  
5 and all this within city limits. It was intended  
6 to transport these trucks full of hogs directly in  
7 front of existing homes and businesses. It was  
8 then I realized just how close they were intending  
9 to put this facility to my home and community.  
10 That was when the battle began.

11                   The conduct and tactics of the  
12 industry was revealed in May of 2006. A rally was  
13 planned at City Hall to show City Council that the  
14 citizens of Winnipeg and surrounding communities  
15 did not approve of the deal made to locate a hog  
16 barn, slaughter house and rendering factory within  
17 city limits. The City's own report stated that  
18 there would be a need to increase the amount of  
19 hog barns within a hundred kilometre range of the  
20 city to feed the plant.

21                   Little did we know, Olywest had  
22 conspired with city officials well before the day  
23 of the rally to allow themselves, their  
24 proponents, and their paid actors into council  
25 chambers over an hour and a half before the



1 scheduled opening. Tax paying citizens of this  
2 city locked out of the gallery and treated like  
3 animals behind bars. The people that filled these  
4 seats were almost exclusively from outside  
5 Winnipeg, even in at least one instance out of  
6 province. It was at that moment I realized these  
7 people would stop at nothing to get what they  
8 wanted.

9                   Since that day, we have had Olywest  
10 people park outside our home and then make a point  
11 of telling us they know where we live. I would  
12 like to ask anyone in this room if these sound  
13 like the actions of good corporate citizens that  
14 they claim to be?

15                   The hog industry is continually trying  
16 to make the point that continued expansion is  
17 needed to save existing hog producers from  
18 financial ruin. To that I would say, hog  
19 producers did okay 10 years ago when the hog  
20 population was two million. Through government  
21 approval and support, by using taxpayer dollars,  
22 the industry has been allowed to grow to  
23 10 million. Karl Kynoch, chairman of the Manitoba  
24 Pork Council has stated in the Pork Council's  
25 newsletter that if Olywest were to be relocated



1 outside of Winnipeg, it would require even more  
2 public tax dollars. I must have missed the day  
3 when their absolute right to our tax dollars was  
4 proclaimed. This has only served to create a  
5 great deal of wealth for a few select  
6 corporations, while squeezing out small family  
7 farms.

8                   The industry claims they are  
9 responsible for 1 per cent of the pollution in  
10 Lake Winnipeg. I am not a scientist, but as I  
11 think about it, it seems totally illogical, given  
12 that there are 10 million hogs in the province and  
13 only 1.5 million people. Hogs produce four times  
14 as much waste as people. This would equate  
15 dropping 40 million people into a band across  
16 Southern Manitoba and spreading the untreated  
17 waste on the fields. If field application can  
18 miraculously make this huge volume of waste  
19 magically disappear, the solution to Winnipeg's  
20 contribution to Lake Winnipeg would be to stop  
21 treating the waste at the treatment plants and  
22 simply spread it on the fields. This method,  
23 unfortunately, may limit the areas available for  
24 pig waste. Unacceptable, of course, if you  
25 subscribe to the pigs before the people concept.





1                   I would like to present the picture  
2 from the urban point of view. People who reside  
3 here have made probably the biggest investment of  
4 their lives with the purchase of their homes.  
5 They chose to live in the city for various  
6 reasons. They did not choose to live on or near a  
7 farm. What gives the corporate pig farmers the  
8 right to decide they are going to locate a plant  
9 smack dab in the middle of these homes, over the  
10 rights of the people living in these homes? The  
11 government has allowed a conflict to be created by  
12 not considering all aspects of the situation and  
13 by only bending over backwards to the hog  
14 representatives.

15                   The glossy brochures, newspaper and  
16 billboard ads all like to portray hog farmers as  
17 young families just starting out in the world who  
18 need the industry to expand in order to survive.  
19 The problem is that greed begins to take over and  
20 there is always a desire for more. The large  
21 corporations start to approach small farmers with  
22 offers to expand their operations for them and to  
23 use their land to make the barns bigger and  
24 bigger. It now becomes a corporate business and  
25 is no longer a small family farm.



1                   OlyWest's glossy brochure shows a  
2 smiling family barbequing pork. I'm not sure what  
3 the message is here. Probably that without this  
4 plant in our community people that enjoy pork  
5 won't be able to buy it, or maybe Olywest pork  
6 will be better than the pork available now, or  
7 maybe these people are happy to live beside a  
8 rendering plant because their property value  
9 increased? Don't laugh because this is actually  
10 implied in the first brochure they mailed out.

11                   There are many of us who tried to get  
12 information about the permits, inspections and  
13 enforcement of regulations on specific hog  
14 operations so that we could make informed  
15 presentations to this panel, but have been told  
16 that due to the volume of requests and limited  
17 staff, this information will not be provided for a  
18 very long time, well after this process has been  
19 concluded. Not enough staff. I would say too  
20 many pigs is the problem, and my opinion is the  
21 staff should be increased and the industry should  
22 pay.

23                   Respectfully to you, the members of  
24 the CEC, I don't believe any of you would be happy  
25 to live beside a hog barn or a rendering plant.



1 My home is situated within one kilometre of where  
2 they propose to transport the hogs to the  
3 slaughter house and rendering factory. Olywest  
4 continually tries to downplay the true distance  
5 between the trucks and the factory and our homes,  
6 schools, daycare and churches. Let's not forget  
7 the various types of businesses established in the  
8 industrial park.

9           The community of Transcona has been  
10 there since the early 1900s, farmhouses were  
11 everywhere. The industrial park in question was  
12 established in the late 1980s with no intent  
13 whatsoever to allow heavy industry to operate  
14 there.

15           One of the things that struck me as  
16 very odd, as I drove through hog alley in Southern  
17 Manitoba, was the mass amounts of hog complexes  
18 with numerous exhaust fans protruding from the  
19 sides and not a sign of human life, no farmhouse,  
20 no people, no animals, just stink. Where is the  
21 justice when the hog producers erect huge confined  
22 animal farming operations in closer proximity to  
23 innocent non hog farming people's homes than their  
24 own? The owners of these satellite barn's homes  
25 are nowhere in sight.



1                   I have spent thousands of hours  
2 educating myself on the corporate hog industry and  
3 how it operates. If the public actually knew all  
4 the details how factory meat is raised, the  
5 practices of the hog industry -- the practice the  
6 hog industry accept as standard procedure would be  
7 surely outlawed.

8                   My story is just one of thousands  
9 across North America. I have heard stories from  
10 people all over this country who have the same  
11 concerns as I do. This Olywest proposal has  
12 created a controversy unlike any other.

13                   I am asking the CEC to carefully  
14 review the presentations put forth throughout  
15 these meetings by the ordinary people, the people  
16 who are not benefiting financially, the people who  
17 are using their own unpaid time to make the effort  
18 to present the other side of the story, the people  
19 who are trying to protect their homes, businesses,  
20 farmsteads, investments, families, and most  
21 importantly, trying to preserve the air and water  
22 quality of this province for our children and  
23 grandchildren to enjoy. Don't be lead astray by  
24 fancy presentations, advertising, or slick talking  
25 PR guys. Deep down people know what is right and





1 wrong, sometimes they just forget. Profit over  
2 people's rights appears to be the wave of the  
3 future.

4 Thanks for allowing me to tell my  
5 story.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Hedman.  
7 You were correct at the outset saying that you may  
8 not be terribly germane to our current mandate,  
9 but I did allow you the opportunity to say your  
10 piece.

11 You note, or you mention at one point  
12 that when the industrial park, the St. Boniface  
13 industrial park was set up in the '80s, there was  
14 a clear intention, at least you say that, that  
15 heavy industry would not be allowed to operate  
16 there. What constitutes heavy industry?

17 MS. HEDMAN: M3.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, M3?

19 MS. HEDMAN: M3.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: And there was never an  
21 intention for it to be an M3?

22 MS. HEDMAN: Mr. Bernie Wolfe was  
23 involved in setting up that park, and he has  
24 spoken out on numerous occasions that that was  
25 never the intent. It was supposed to be a high



1 tech industrial sort of a park and never meant for  
2 M3.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You also  
4 mentioned on your last page about driving through  
5 what you call hog alley in Southern Manitoba, and  
6 you say there was just stink. Where did you  
7 encounter the just stink?

8 MS. HEDMAN: Pretty much --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Where were you, driving  
10 on highways or roadways?

11 MS. HEDMAN: We have friends that live  
12 in Kleefield, and we visit them on lots of  
13 occasions. And in the spring when they spread the  
14 manure and throughout the summer, it's just in the  
15 air, thick in the air everywhere.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: And what is the source  
17 of this smell?

18 MS. HEDMAN: It's manure being spread  
19 on the fields.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the spread manure  
21 that stinks all summer or --

22 MS. HEDMAN: I believe so, or the  
23 exhaust from the barns, a combination of both.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: And how big is the hog  
25 operation in question, do you know?



1 MS. HEDMAN: There is several of them  
2 all over the place. They are everywhere you look.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin?

4 MR. YEE: Oh, yes, thank you,  
5 Mr. Chairman.

6 Ms. Hedman, you noted in your  
7 presentation about the concept of these large  
8 corporations, and you have indicated where small  
9 farms are being offered to expand by these  
10 corporations, they no longer become a small family  
11 farm but a part of the corporation. I was just  
12 wondering, we have heard many presentations and we  
13 have heard from father/son operations that have  
14 relatively large number of hogs in their  
15 operation. Would you consider those to be  
16 corporate operations?

17 MS. HEDMAN: Probably it depends who  
18 is actually running the operation. Is it really  
19 the father and the son or is it another company?

20 MR. YEE: Yes, it is. It was the  
21 father and son in this particular instance.

22 MS. HEDMAN: It depends on how many  
23 livestock do they have.

24 MR. YEE: It was a fairly large hog  
25 operation, this was in Southern Manitoba. I can't



1 remember the exact number, but it was over a  
2 thousand, I believe.

3 MS. HEDMAN: That would probably be  
4 considered a smaller one, in my eyes.

5 MR. YEE: So they wouldn't be  
6 considered a corporate operation?

7 MS. HEDMAN: Well, what I'm referring  
8 to there is a company like Hytek, for instance, or  
9 Maple Leaf operating as something other than Maple  
10 Leaf and going in and purchasing properties,  
11 putting up large hog barns, sort of under the  
12 disguise of the owner of the property, things like  
13 that.

14 MR. YEE: Would you view the Hutterite  
15 colonies as corporate operations?

16 MS. HEDMAN: I believe some of them  
17 are. They are actually owned, or operated, or  
18 jointly by large companies like Maple Leaf. So  
19 some may be, some may not be.

20 MR. YEE: Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
22 Ms. Hedman.

23 MS. HEDMAN: Thanks.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, is Hilary Versavel  
25 here yet? Twyla Francois? We might have an





1 easier afternoon than we had anticipated. Curtis  
2 Ewacha?

3 Well, those were the people that we  
4 had, who had indicated they wished to make  
5 presentations this afternoon between 1:00 and  
6 3:00 o'clock. At 3:00 and at 4:00, we have two  
7 sort of major wrap-up presentations by, first by a  
8 collective of environmental groups, and finally by  
9 the Manitoba Pork Council. The three or four  
10 people who had indicated they wished to speak are  
11 not here yet. We will adjourn. When they show  
12 up, if they show up, we will reconvene. Otherwise  
13 we will definitely be back here at 3:00 o'clock  
14 sharp. But if others show up, those who had  
15 indicated, Ms. Versavel, Francois or Mr. Ewacha,  
16 we will reconvene.

17 (Proceedings recessed at 1:39 p.m. and  
18 reconvened at 1:47 p.m.)

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we come back to  
20 order, please? We have one of the scheduled  
21 people has shown up and she is ready to proceed.  
22 She has asked for and will have up to a half an  
23 hour for the presentation. Can you please take  
24 your seats?

25



1 TWYLA FRANCOIS, having been sworn,  
2 presented as follows:

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

4 MS. FRANCOIS: My name is Twyla  
5 Francois, I'm head of investigations for Animals  
6 Angels Canada. Animals Angels is an  
7 internationally operating animal welfare  
8 organization with permanent inspectors in Europe,  
9 Australia, the U.S., and now Canada. Our focus is  
10 on improving conditions for farm animals.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Could you just slow  
12 down a touch so the recorder can keep up?

13 MS. FRANCOIS: Okay. We work  
14 primarily in the field inspecting livestock trucks  
15 on the highways, or visiting markets, collecting  
16 stations and slaughter houses. We closely  
17 cooperate with auction managers, transport  
18 companies, and numerous authorities such as the  
19 police, veterinarians, and CFIA. Animals Angels  
20 is a part of the world society for the protection  
21 of animals and the only animal welfare  
22 organization that is an official member of the EU  
23 Commission Advisory Group on the food chain and  
24 animal and plant health.

25 Animal welfare and sustainable



1 development: As we all know, Manitoba's hog  
2 industry is under increasing scrutiny by a public  
3 that is demanding assurances that the product they  
4 are buying was not produced inhumanely.  
5 Unfortunately, our investigations provide  
6 compelling evidence that the public's concern is  
7 well-founded and that a hog industry that polices  
8 itself, with little or no public oversight, can  
9 not ensure the welfare of animals which are often  
10 viewed as a disposable commodity.

11           Driven by consumer demand, farm animal  
12 welfare standards are rising throughout the  
13 developed world, as witnessed by the European  
14 Union ban on sow stalls, and more recently with  
15 Smithfield Foods, Maple Leaf and Cargill's  
16 decision to phase out the use of sow stalls as  
17 well.

18           If Manitoba wishes to sustain its hog  
19 industry domestically and abroad, the CEC review  
20 has an essential role to play in reviewing and  
21 recommending changes to the province's system of  
22 animal welfare oversight of the provincial  
23 slaughter houses, pig collecting facilities,  
24 livestock markets, and the intensive hog  
25 operations themselves where nearly nine million



1 pigs are produced each year.

2                   Intensive farming is just not designed  
3 with the animal's welfare in mind. By its very  
4 nature, the focus is on doing more with less, and  
5 unfortunately this means increasing profit through  
6 reducing the animal's quality of life. It is also  
7 based on a business model where decisions are made  
8 purely to maximize profit in the short-term rather  
9 than provide long-term benefits for animals,  
10 society and the environment. The effect of this  
11 on the pigs themselves is devastating, as will be  
12 illustrated in the coming slides.

13                   Case studies: Manitoba Pork Marketing  
14 Cooperative and Grunthal Livestock Auction. In  
15 2006, I conducted investigations on two of  
16 Manitoba's pig collecting stations, Manitoba Pork  
17 Marketing Cooperative receiving yards, or MPMC,  
18 located at 750 Marion Street in Winnipeg, and  
19 Grunthal Livestock Auction in Grunthal, Manitoba,  
20 which serves as a pig collecting facility one to  
21 two days a week.

22                   MPMC was chosen as I had begun  
23 receiving photos from St. Boniface residents who  
24 were concerned with what they were seeing at the  
25 facility. Grunthal Livestock Auction was randomly





1 selected, as were the days that I chose to  
2 investigate both facilitated. I recorded numerous  
3 violations of the Provincial Animal Care Act and  
4 the Federal Health of Animals Act.

5                   According to the Animal Care Act,  
6 section 2.1,

7                   "A person who has ownership,  
8                   possession or control of an animal  
9                   shall ensure that the animal has an  
10                  adequate source of food and water and  
11                  shall provide the animal with adequate  
12                  medical attention when the animal is  
13                  wounded or ill."

14       Yet I witnessed at MPMC the routine abandonment  
15 of sick and injured pigs left with no medical  
16 attention, food, water or straw to lie on,  
17 although it was clear they were dying. These were  
18 three live pigs, the one in the foreground was  
19 seizing. As you can see they have no substrate,  
20 they have no food, no water, they were left there  
21 overnight in this condition.

22                   The Health of Animals Act part 12,  
23 Sick, Pregnant and Unfit Animals, section 138.2  
24 states,

25                   "No person shall load or cause to be



1           loaded, and no one shall transport or  
2           cause to be transported an animal that  
3           by reason of infirmity, illness,  
4           injury, fatigue or any other cause  
5           cannot be transported without undue  
6           suffering during the expected  
7           journey."

8   And 138.2.1 further states,

9           "No animal can be loaded if it is  
10          probable that the animal will give  
11          birth during the journey."

12   However, at MPMC I documented a great deal of  
13   evidence showing the transport of pregnant sows  
14   too close to term, forcing them to give birth on  
15   board, only to have their piglets attacked and  
16   partially eaten by the other stressed pigs aboard.

17           I showed all of this evidence to CFIA  
18   head office in Ottawa, and Gord Doonan was  
19   particularly upset by this photo. He said it is  
20   very, very likely this piglet was born onboard and  
21   eaten.

22           This is another piglet. And what I  
23   found concerning is that the snow has melted on  
24   the snout of the pig, meaning it had died recently  
25   before being thrown in the snow. More piglets at



1 MPMC.

2                   On this day there were four garbage  
3 bags full of piglets in the back parking lot.  
4 This was probably done by a scavenger. There is  
5 two red fox and a feral colony of cats that hang  
6 around Manitoba Pork Marketing and they probably  
7 were eating this piglet. This was particularly  
8 upsetting, we've got a fetal piglet and it still  
9 has the placental sac attached and the umbilical  
10 cord. And again, the snow has melted on his nose.

11                   The Provincial Animal Care Act,  
12 Section 3.1, prohibits the infliction of  
13 suffering.

14                   "No person shall inflict upon an  
15 animal acute suffering, serious injury  
16 or harm, or extreme anxiety or  
17 distress that significantly impairs  
18 its health or well-being."

19 Yet I recorded numerous cases of what appeared to  
20 have been still live, but dying pigs, tied up to  
21 posts outside and left to die. Many of these pigs  
22 had bleeding ligature wounds on their hind legs  
23 where the tether had been.

24                   For example, in this picture you can  
25 see the tether mark on the right rear leg and a



1 blood splash. And here you'll see the bleeding  
2 nose and some substance exuding. I'll explain  
3 what is the cause of that after.

4                   This was the photo that actually got  
5 me interested in MPMC. This was sent to me and  
6 the residents were curious about what was  
7 happening here. It was plus 35 on this day.

8                   Here again we have two tied, the one  
9 on the right is particularly distressing. This is  
10 definitely not just a jab to bleed out, it looks  
11 like it was done with a pipe.

12                   Part 12 of the Health of Animals Act  
13 states that,

14                   "Sick, pregnant, and unfit animals  
15                   shall not be loaded or attempt to be  
16                   loaded."

17 Yet at Grunthal we documented the attempted  
18 loading of this severely arthritic, non-ambulatory  
19 cull sow. She had been run out with the others,  
20 and her rear joints were so arthritic they were  
21 fused together so she was not able to walk. And  
22 yet they pushed her down the gally way into the  
23 round pen and there they held her. They ran three  
24 other groups through and she would have to sort of  
25 wobble to the side to get out of their way.





1 Eventually they decided not to load her probably  
2 because of our presence and it is illegal. They  
3 abandoned her in the full sun, it was about  
4 35 degrees on this day. She was panting, she  
5 hadn't had water in who knows how long, and she  
6 had vomited here.

7                   According to section 2 -- sorry, the  
8 Animal Care Act, section 3, prohibits the  
9 infliction of suffering on an animal. But we  
10 recorded numerous cases of causing undue suffering  
11 to a pig through overuse and improper use of  
12 electric prods. You'll see in the video later,  
13 but this cull sow is being electrically prodded up  
14 her vagina, and it's there for a number of seconds  
15 and then he kicks her.

16                   According to section 2 and section 3  
17 of the Animal Care Act,

18                   "An animal must be provided with  
19                   adequate medical attention when ill  
20                   and must not have suffering inflicted  
21                   upon it."

22 But we recorded the unloading of a still living  
23 but non-ambulatory sow by pushing her head first  
24 off the top level of a trailer to the ground below  
25 so as to cause her death by breaking her neck.



1 And we know this was what their purpose was  
2 because we heard the manager, I have it on tape,  
3 the manager telling the worker to do this, to  
4 break her neck.

5                   Response from Provincial Government to  
6 violations documented: Evidence collected from  
7 these facilities, including the photos you have  
8 just seen was, provided to the office of the Chief  
9 Veterinarian, the provincial body charged with the  
10 responsibility for ensuring the welfare of farm  
11 animals in Manitoba. And while the office agreed  
12 that violations of the provincial Animal Care Act  
13 had occurred, we were shocked and disappointed to  
14 learn that the office of the Chief Veterinarian  
15 would not be referring either case to the Crown  
16 for prosecution, levying any fines, or even  
17 sending letters of reprimand to either facility or  
18 the trucking companies involved.

19                   It is noteworthy, however, that the  
20 Canadian Food Inspection Agency, the Federal body,  
21 provided with the same evidence, submitted three  
22 separate non-compliance reports for documented  
23 violations that fell under their jurisdiction.

24                   This same evidence was also provided  
25 to the chief executive officer of the Ontario



1 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,  
2 who stated that the behaviour captured was  
3 "clearly chargeable" and that "both the Federal  
4 and Provincial Governments have equal  
5 responsibility."

6 It was also sent to Dr. Karen von  
7 Holleben, an accredited expert in animal handling  
8 by the European Commission, who stated the  
9 following,

10 "I cannot understand why the  
11 authorities don't stop such severe  
12 infringements of animal welfare  
13 causing severe pain, injuries, and  
14 unnecessary suffering to the animals."

15 Complaint based system: To add  
16 further concern, these violations would not have  
17 come to the attention of the authorities had we  
18 not documented them. I have been informed by the  
19 Office of the Chief Veterinarian that there had  
20 been no routine unannounced inspections of  
21 facilities where farm animals are held, such as  
22 livestock markets, collecting stations,  
23 provincially approved slaughter houses, or  
24 intensive hog operations for at least 25 years.  
25 The Office of the Chief Veterinarian is purely



1     reactionary, responding to complaints which, as we  
2     discovered, is no assurance that the Animal Care  
3     Act will be followed or enforced.

4                     Conflict of interest, the connection  
5     between government and industry: The Manitoba  
6     Farm Animal Council or MFAC, is a conglomerate of  
7     agricultural industry groups in the province. It  
8     includes the Manitoba Pork Council, the Manitoba  
9     Dairy Council, et cetera. The emergency animal  
10    care line is phone line citizens are asked to call  
11    should they have welfare concerns over specific  
12    farm animals. From MFAC's website it would appear  
13    this that this line is operated by them, only with  
14    the assistance of the government. It is not clear  
15    which body is, in fact, responsible for it. It  
16    surely constitutes a conflict of interest for an  
17    industry public relations group to management  
18    concerned what should be under governmental  
19    jurisdiction. Concerned with the true  
20    confidentiality of the line, many citizens may not  
21    call, feeling it is industry controlled.

22                     Similarly, the office of the Chief  
23    Veterinarian works with only two organizations,  
24    both of which are industry public relations  
25    groups, the above mentioned MFAC and the Manitoba





1 Pork Council. The interest of the animals on  
2 which the industry profits are not represented.  
3 In fact, although I have suggested that Animals  
4 Angels or any reputable animal welfare  
5 organization of the office of the Chief  
6 Veterinarian's choice, for example, the Winnipeg  
7 Humane Society, the Ontario SPCA, the Alberta  
8 SPCA, be invited to the table to represent the  
9 welfare of pigs. I was told that their office  
10 would have to check with MFAC first. Surely, a  
11 governmental body should not require approval from  
12 an industry public relations group.

13           The exported of Manitoba's pigs: In  
14 Manitoba, the transportation of live pigs, and  
15 even health compromised sow pigs such as sows and  
16 boars, occurs over sometimes shockingly long  
17 distances. We have recorded pigs being shipped to  
18 Mexico, Korea, California, and in 2003 exposed the  
19 trade of live pigs by truck and boat to Hawaii, a  
20 journey that takes nine days, during which time  
21 the pigs are only watered and fed every 36 hours,  
22 as per Canada's maximum time allowed before pigs  
23 must be unloaded, rested, fed and watered. Also  
24 shocking is that no matter how many hours the pigs  
25 have already been on board, when the truck



1 carrying them reaches the U.S. border, the clock  
2 is set back to 0 until an additional 28 hours are  
3 reached before they can be fed and watered again.

4           As mentioned, there are many welfare  
5 concerns with cull sows and boars. The majority  
6 of these pigs are in a health compromised state,  
7 having spent their lives in gestation crates,  
8 breathing in toxic fumes, living lives of  
9 intensive confinement and severe depravation.  
10 These are the animals we most often see down or  
11 non-ambulatory due to severe arthritis, broken leg  
12 and pelvis bones, severe respiratory distress from  
13 pneumonia and heart attacks, or a lack of  
14 conditioning before being exposed to drastic  
15 temperature changes from existing in temperature  
16 controlled barns to open trailers with little or  
17 no protection from the sun and heat or rain and  
18 snow.

19           Most of the culled pigs from Manitoba  
20 are shipped to Iowa, Wisconsin and South Dakota.  
21 Unfortunately, there are no laws against dragging  
22 downers in any of the States we export our pigs  
23 to, meaning injured pigs are dragged with chains,  
24 pushed with bobcats, or lifted with skid steers.  
25 We saw this as recently as January of this year.



1 On the right is a dead sow, on the left is a  
2 downer sow. When we brought the downer sow to the  
3 attention of the staff, they simply pushed her  
4 into a bobcat and drove her away from us.

5                   This is a downer sow that we followed  
6 from the Brandon area across the border into  
7 Wisconsin. She was down in this position. And  
8 she did go through the USDA inspection. And USDA  
9 inspections take about a minute. They peer into  
10 each hole very briefly. She was passed. She was  
11 allowed to go through. So she travelled like this  
12 for 20 hours. And when she got to the slaughter  
13 house, because she was so fatigued and injured and  
14 she couldn't get up, the worker electrically  
15 prodded her 12 times.

16                   Acceptance of cruel and abusive  
17 practices: Boar bashing is a practice that  
18 involves smashing a boar in the snout with a  
19 baseball bat with enough force to break the snout.  
20 This is done so boars can be transported together.  
21 According to Federal regulations, boars must be  
22 segregated during transport to prevent fighting,  
23 but this is costly and inefficient. Producers  
24 want to ship as many animals as possible in one  
25 trailer as the cost of transportation is high, And



1 metal dividers take space that could be filled  
2 with an income generating boar. So rather than  
3 separating the boars, their noses are smashed.  
4 The pain this causes is difficult to describe as  
5 pigs have extremely sensitive snouts. The pain  
6 causes the boars to become incapacitated to such a  
7 state they will not fight. This practice is well  
8 known by government officials but tolerated. It  
9 is also conducted extensively. I have yet to see  
10 a deceased boar that is not bleeding from his  
11 snout. A great deal of evidence of boar bashing  
12 was seen at MPMC, as illustrated here. These are  
13 all different boars taken at different times,  
14 different months even.

15                   Hog barn fires: Because of a complete  
16 lack of fire code regulations in hog barns,  
17 thousands of pigs are burned alive in barn fires  
18 annually. Just a few weeks ago, 3,000 sows were  
19 burned alive trapped in their gestation crates at  
20 Vermillion Colony Farms near Sanford, Manitoba.  
21 Aside from the unimaginable suffering, volunteer  
22 fire fighters are often called in to battle the  
23 fires, risking their own lives. The number of hog  
24 barn fires annually has been increasing  
25 correspondingly with the growth of pig industry in





1 Manitoba. In 1999 there were 62 hog barn fires,  
2 but each of these fires represents the agonizing  
3 death of thousands of pigs. By failing to set  
4 fire code regulations for hog barns, the  
5 Provincial Government is complicity in this  
6 suffering.

7                   These are photos taken at Vermillion  
8 Colony. This was two days post fire. The  
9 particularly sad thing about this photo is it's a  
10 farrowing crate, so you can see the charred  
11 remains of the sow in the middle, and she probably  
12 had 12, 15 piglets on either side. This is the  
13 charred remains of another sow. You can see her  
14 right rear hoof. And this is all of the gestation  
15 crates lined up.

16                   Recommendations: The conditions we  
17 have documented in Manitoba are disturbingly  
18 indicative of a failure of the animal welfare  
19 system in Manitoba to protect farm animals from  
20 severe neglect and abuse. Unfortunately, the  
21 cases documented here are not uncommon. They are  
22 routine and daily occurrences. I have yet to  
23 conduct an investigation and not uncover routine  
24 abuses, cruel practices, inappropriate handling,  
25 or other violations in the pig industry.



1                   In the case of transport, unnecessary  
2 suffering of pigs is inherent, as our legislation  
3 is weak and rarely enforced, and as mentioned  
4 before, many facilities are simply not inspected  
5 at all.

6                   To begin with, the Provincial Animal  
7 Care Act must be updated and the language of it  
8 clarified to make practices such as boar bashing  
9 clearly illegal. There must be immediate  
10 development and enforcement of strict hog barn  
11 fire codes. A system of routine unannounced and  
12 regular audits of facilities by arm's length  
13 investigators must also be developed. The hog  
14 industry simply cannot police itself. We would  
15 not tolerate a lack of inspections of our  
16 restaurant industry. Intensive hog operations,  
17 provincial slaughter houses, livestock auctions  
18 and collecting stations require a similar program  
19 at a minimum.

20                   And finally, there must be an increase  
21 and real deterrents and penalties for violations  
22 of the Provincial Animal Care Act. There are  
23 currently no incentives for companies to avoid  
24 incurring large numbers of fines. In fact, the  
25 fines are tax deductible and are simply claimed



1 back at the end of the fiscal year, implying that  
2 violating the law is a legitimate business  
3 expense. Other countries have a cap of three  
4 violations per year, at which time their business  
5 licence is suspended.

6                   An important societal value in  
7 Manitoba today is the protection of animals from  
8 suffering and pain. Changes such as these are  
9 required to reflect the values of the citizens of  
10 our province. And I'd like to conclude with this  
11 short video.

12                   (Video played)

13 The sow on the left is still alive.

14                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,  
15 Ms. Francois. Looking at the video at the end,  
16 does this largely occur during the transportation  
17 of the animals?

18                   MS. FRANCOIS: The majority of the  
19 problems I think -- well, I guess the focus of  
20 Animals Angels is on improving conditions for  
21 livestock and transport, so that is mostly what we  
22 focus on. And a lot of these issues are related  
23 to transport, like the boar bashing is done so  
24 they can load them together, but I think the  
25 handling with the electric prods, the overuse and



1 things like that, I think that probably begins  
2 right from the beginning when they are born.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Before we  
4 proceed any further, this camera, who does it  
5 belong to?

6 MS. FRANCOIS: CBC.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. No problem. I  
8 wasn't sure.

9 So your concern isn't really with the  
10 on-farm treatment, it's from sort of when they are  
11 loaded on to the trucks or as they are loaded onto  
12 the trucks, transported?

13 MS. FRANCOIS: Yeah, that's Animals  
14 Angels --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: And then at the  
16 processing plant?

17 MS. FRANCOIS: Yes, that's Animals  
18 Angels focus, but because of my work I do see  
19 what's happening on farms as well and there's a  
20 great many concerns there as well. The body  
21 condition of these animals that we are seeing  
22 developed over a period of time in the barn. So  
23 the broken limbs, the weakened state, this is all  
24 because of the intense confinement that they are  
25 kept in.





1                   THE CHAIRMAN: You've said that you've  
2 never gone out without finding some violations,  
3 but how widespread is it? I mean, can you tell us  
4 sort of what percentage of operators or what  
5 percentage of animals might suffer?

6                   MS. FRANCOIS: Pigs are the worst in  
7 Manitoba. They seem to be almost singled out for  
8 abuse, especially the sows. I don't really know  
9 what the reasoning is, but if I see a sow, it's  
10 almost a guarantee that it's not well, it's going  
11 to be electrically prodded, because generally they  
12 are injured, they are weak, and the people want to  
13 load them quickly, and so they think that prodding  
14 will make them move faster.

15                   THE CHAIRMAN: What should happen to a  
16 weak or arthritic or injured sow or hog?

17                   MS. FRANCOIS: Well, preferably, they  
18 wouldn't get to that state. If we move to  
19 different housing systems that didn't keep them so  
20 intensely confined, I don't think we would see  
21 these problems. I've been working at Quebec the  
22 last three weeks, and what what's really neat is  
23 they still have smaller farms. Here, and even  
24 talking to the producers in Quebec, they recognize  
25 that Manitoba is big pig, it's 5,000 in a barn.



1 But there, there's still the small farms, and we  
2 don't see the problems with the sows like we do  
3 here. Their body condition is good, their weight  
4 is good, they can walk, they are not crippled. So  
5 I think that it has to start on the farm, getting  
6 rid of these intensive systems, and that would do  
7 a lot to remedy the situation.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: And sort of following  
9 that premise, in a smaller operation where it's  
10 not as intensive and the pig is in a better  
11 condition, do they suffer less problems during the  
12 transportation?

13 MS. FRANCOIS: Definitely, definitely.  
14 We don't see a huge amount of problems with market  
15 hogs because they are young enough to tolerate it,  
16 and they have had some freedom, while they are  
17 still kept in crowded pens, they have some freedom  
18 at least.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: So the problems are  
20 largely with older sows?

21 MS. FRANCOIS: Yes, definitely, the  
22 culls, the cull boars, the cull sows. The other  
23 thing people don't recognize is that boars live  
24 their life just as intensely confined as sows do.  
25 They are kept in these crates as well. And then,



1 of course, recently we've been finding that they  
2 seem prone to other major problems like the  
3 detusking and the breaking of their noses.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin.

5 MR. YEE: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman.  
6 Ms. Francois, I gather your organization is  
7 involved in the transport, in the welfare of the  
8 animals?

9 MS. FRANCOIS: Um-hum.

10 MR. YEE: Is it more prevalent in the  
11 pork industry than it is say in the cattle  
12 industry for this type of abuse to occur?

13 MS. FRANCOIS: It is. It is. They  
14 seem to be treated much more so as production  
15 units. People have less patience handling them  
16 for some reason. I mean, we see problems with the  
17 others, like cull dairy cows, because they are  
18 weakened as well, and you see tail twisting and  
19 electric prodding with them too, but it really is  
20 the pigs that get it by far the worst. Just right  
21 from the beginning, they are kept so confined and,  
22 yeah, they are just in such a weakened state  
23 generally. And there is something about pigs that  
24 makes people mistreat them. I don't know what it  
25 is.



1                   MR. YEE: I noticed you gave a couple  
2 of case histories, but in terms of your inspection  
3 activities, realizing again it's transport  
4 related, but you've mentioned you've seen the  
5 barns?

6                   MS. FRANCOIS: Yeah.

7                   MR. YEE: Do you also find it more  
8 prevalent just in the larger operations versus say  
9 some of the smaller hog producers?

10                  MS. FRANCOIS: Yes, it's a huge  
11 difference. I grew up in a small farm community  
12 actually, and the majority of my friends had small  
13 mixed farms. It was so different, you know, we  
14 would walk through the pigs in their pens and they  
15 didn't squeal and run, they were habituated to  
16 people. These they are confined. If you can  
17 imagine the life of a sow, she sees another sow  
18 front of her, she has one beside her. She can't  
19 put out her legs without them being laid on. She  
20 has no human interaction. There's no  
21 conditioning, the day that they go to market, they  
22 are just stuck out into the weather no matter what  
23 the conditions are. And there's no rules on  
24 whether there should be slats in the truck or not.  
25 It just seems like it's such a haphazard industry





1 to me that we need some regulations, we need  
2 something saying that this isn't good, this isn't  
3 all right anymore. And I really think that we  
4 need to have a ban on electric prods because they  
5 are just too easy to use.

6                   We went down to, it was a huge pig  
7 slaughter plant, I think it was Triumph in the  
8 States, and we met with the chief operating  
9 officer who mentioned that they use no electric  
10 prod. And it was wonderful. Even though they had  
11 7,000 pigs in the holding pen, there was no  
12 screaming, there was no chaos. They use large  
13 bendable capes, or we have seen things where they  
14 use shakers, I mean, even a detergent jug with  
15 rocks in it is enough. We don't need to have this  
16 hands on all the time.

17                   If people have training in animal  
18 behaviour, it's huge. We were just at market in  
19 Quebec. There was major problems with it in 2002.  
20 They adopted a no electric prod policy, and they  
21 had three weeks of training for every worker every  
22 year on animal handling. It was incredible. They  
23 were able to move the animals without touching  
24 them at all. There is a number of things we need  
25 to do.



1                   MR. YEE: Thank you very much.

2                   MR. MOTHERAL: I don't think I have  
3 any questions. I grew up on a farm also. There  
4 is no real easy way to handle sickness and death,  
5 when you have your particular pet animal and you  
6 know that it's going to end up on the table,  
7 because that's the purpose, that was the purpose  
8 of raising them to begin with.

9                   MS. FRANCOIS: But cruelty shouldn't  
10 be part of that, and we can prevent that suffering  
11 by changing the conditions they live in.

12                   MR. MOTHERAL: That is fine. Cruelty  
13 is a matter -- it can be misinterpreted too  
14 sometimes, in my own case. But I just wanted to  
15 let you know that I am certainly aware of what  
16 goes on. I grew up on a farm, so thank you.

17                   THE CHAIRMAN: Just on the issue of  
18 these older culled animals and those that have  
19 physical problems, physical or health problems,  
20 taking aside, or leaving aside your premise that  
21 they should be better treated and shouldn't arrive  
22 there in the first place. But if they do, would  
23 you rather see that they be euthanised rather than  
24 euthanised and then just composted or something?

25                   MS. FRANCOIS: Yes, that's what we



1 encourage actually. And that's the big problem,  
2 well, one, it would be much better if these cull  
3 animals didn't have to go 20 hours. It seems  
4 silly that our market hogs are just going to  
5 Brandon, but our weakened hogs are going 20 hours.  
6 What we already encourage is if an animal arrives  
7 down, and the CFIA made this law here, but if an  
8 animal arrives down that they just should not be  
9 dragged. Like these are animals with broken  
10 limbs, broken pelvises, and they are dragged with  
11 chains. This just isn't acceptable.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: And they are still  
13 alive?

14 MS. FRANCOIS: They are still alive,  
15 yes. They are picked up with any means possible,  
16 which is sort of unfathomable. Every facility  
17 should have a pistol or gun and should shoot the  
18 animal on board to save them the suffering of  
19 having to be dragged.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very  
21 much, Ms. Francois.

22 Now, have either Hilary Versavel or  
23 Curtis Ewacha arrived?

24 CURTIS EWACHA, having been sworn,  
25 presented as follows;



1 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

2 MR. EWACHA: I would like to thank CEC  
3 for allowing me to make this presentation. My  
4 name is Curtis Ewacha and I farm along with my  
5 brother Terry, and my parents, Alex and Violet, in  
6 Middleboro, in the extreme southeast corner of the  
7 RM of Piney. We farm approximately 1,800 acres  
8 consisting mainly of forage production and cereal  
9 grains.

10 In my opinion, the Manitoba hog  
11 industry has two huge environmental issues facing  
12 it which is their responsibility to improve. The  
13 environmental problems can be traced back to the  
14 simple fact that the Manitoba hog industry has  
15 expanded too rapidly and does not have any type of  
16 contingency plan in place.

17 The Manitoba Pork Council is  
18 constantly doing damage control by telling  
19 Manitobans that this industry is fine, look at the  
20 wonderful benefits we bring to the province. I  
21 for one do not believe them and feel this industry  
22 poses a serious environmental problem for the  
23 Province of Manitoba, and in particular Lake  
24 Winnipeg.

25 The Manitoba hog industry and Manitoba





1 Pork Council are in great disbelief that the  
2 Province of Manitoba would place a moratorium on  
3 new barn applications until an environmental  
4 review is completed. The underlying problem is  
5 the current manure management rules for Manitoba  
6 hog industry is based on nitrogen and not  
7 phosphorus. The Manitoba hog industry has  
8 expanded from 1.5 million hogs in the early 1990s  
9 to over nine million produced in 2006.

10                   The problem begins with the hog  
11 itself, as it does not effectively convert the  
12 high fortified diet of phosphorus, resulting in  
13 the majority of the phosphorus coming out the back  
14 end. The Manitoba hog industry has known this all  
15 along but did nothing on its own accord to provide  
16 a solution to the problem of overapplication of  
17 phosphorus which was occurring on many of the hog  
18 operations.

19                   Even with the new regulation which  
20 allows hog operations twice the crop phosphorus  
21 removal rate, only 69 per cent of the 851 hog  
22 operations that registered have enough spread  
23 fields. Only 57 per cent of the 851 hog  
24 operations would have adequate spread fields based  
25 on one time crop phosphorus removal rate. When I



1 apply my commercial fertilizer to my fields, I do  
2 not double the phosphorus level, so why the  
3 regulations allowing hog operations to continue to  
4 overapply phosphorus? The new regulations for  
5 phosphorus does not go far enough if the province  
6 wants to do what's necessary to cure Lake  
7 Winnipeg.

8                   The greatest expansion of the  
9 industrial hog barns has taken place in southeast  
10 Manitoban in the RMs of Hanover and La Broquerie.  
11 And this is where the most severe problem of  
12 overapplication of phosphorus is occurring, along  
13 with the largest deficiencies of spread fields.  
14 Soil scientists have stated this time and time  
15 again.

16                   I travel through the RM of La  
17 Broquerie in highway number 12 from spring to fall  
18 weekly and witnessed first hand the hog expansion  
19 which has taken place in this RM and it is  
20 incomprehensible.

21                   Manitoba's Water Protection Handbook  
22 states that most recharge in aquifers occurs in  
23 areas where sand and gravel is at the surface.  
24 Industrial barns have been built on quarters that  
25 have rock piles the size of houses consistently



1 throughout the quarter, literally within a couple  
2 hundred feet of each other. There are also barns  
3 that are built within a quarter mile of a gravel  
4 quarry. I would strongly suggest the CEC panel  
5 take a drive 20 miles southeast of Steinbach on  
6 highway 12 and get a firsthand view for yourself.

7                   To make matters worse, the hog manure  
8 is broadcasted on the land and is not injected  
9 into the soil because of the vast amount of stones  
10 and spread fields being in hay and pasture.

11                   Andrew Dickson, general manager of  
12 Manitoba Pork Council, stated in a July 21st, 2005  
13 letter to the Manitoba Cooperator, injection of  
14 fertilizer directly in the soil presents manure  
15 from running off fields and is recommended  
16 practice. I can only wonder how much runoff of  
17 liquid manure has occurred in this form of  
18 application.

19                   Mr. Dickson, also featured in  
20 April 19, 2007, of the Manitoba Cooperator where  
21 he tried to dispel myths about the hog industry.  
22 He mentions that hogs in Manitoba produce 29,840  
23 tonnes of manure. He went on to say that  
24 426,000 hectares are required to spread the manure  
25 based on manure management rules for nitrogen. It



1 is very convenient on his part to equate the  
2 amount of acres required to spread the manure  
3 using nitrogen rather than using manure management  
4 rules based on one time crop phosphorus removal  
5 rate. For Mr. Dickson and the Manitoba Pork  
6 Council, to feel vindicated by the province for  
7 placing a moratorium on industrial barn  
8 applications should not come as a surprise  
9 especially with respect to phosphorus overload.  
10 When Mr. Dickson was employed by Manitoba  
11 Agriculture, he was a member of many technical  
12 reviews for southeast region, and was present at a  
13 technical review public hearing for a hog  
14 operation in the RM of Piney in September of 2003.  
15 When the hearing was open to public questions, I  
16 specifically asked him if the Province of Manitoba  
17 was going to change the manure management rules to  
18 phosphorus from nitrogen. He stated the province  
19 is fully aware of the phosphorus situation,  
20 admitted something must be done. So now for  
21 Mr. Dickson, the general manager of the Manitoba  
22 Pork Council, to complain the province has  
23 unfairly singled out the hog industry is nothing  
24 short of hypocritical. The Manitoba hog industry  
25 has to stop pointing fingers and accept the fact





1 they expanded far too quickly in southeastern  
2 Manitoba.

3                   The regulation which allows hog  
4 operations with fewer than 300 animal units to  
5 winter spread manure until 2013 must be changed.  
6 With all the claims by the Pork Council of the  
7 benefit of hog manure as a fertilizer, why would  
8 someone spread manure on snow and frozen ground?  
9 In all my years of farming, I have yet to see or  
10 hear of a grain farmer spreading commercial  
11 fertilizer on the snow. Truly, what benefit can  
12 this be providing to any crop when it runs off  
13 with spring melt?

14                   Another issue which I feel should be  
15 of concern to all Manitobans is a breaching of the  
16 lagoons and holding tanks storing liquid manure.  
17 In the past few years there have been four major  
18 spills of liquid manure and these are only the  
19 ones that the public has heard about. There are  
20 many issues to be concerned about when incidents  
21 like this happen, such as runoff, seepage, and  
22 well water contamination.

23                   I contacted Manitoba Conservation who  
24 advised me that they have five field offices with  
25 a total of 17 full-time environmental inspectors



1 responsible for all livestock within Manitoba.  
2 There are over a thousand hog operations in the  
3 province alone. The number of inspectors seems to  
4 be stretched a bit thin when they are responsible  
5 for ensuring manure management regulations are  
6 being followed with regards to all spread fields.

7               We are all aware that 43 per cent of  
8 the hog operations are deficient in spread fields  
9 using the one time crop removal rate for  
10 phosphorus. The CEC must address this issue with  
11 the province, the Provincial Government, and  
12 insist more environmental inspectors are hired.

13               The other environment issue we should  
14 be concerned with amount of fresh water large hog  
15 operations are consuming. The fact that all  
16 livestock requires fresh clean water to grow and  
17 exist is not a problem with me. The process that  
18 upsets me is the wash water these hog operations  
19 consume on a daily basis. There were nine million  
20 hogs produced in Manitoba in 2006. The average  
21 hog uses seven litres per day. Of the seven  
22 litres, one litre is used for wash water. The  
23 Manitoban Pork Council stated on July 1, 2007  
24 there were three million hogs in Manitoba. That  
25 means anywhere from 2.5 to three million litres of



1 fresh water is being used just to flush the barns  
2 each day. I feel that this amount is a total  
3 waste of fresh water when we all know how valuable  
4 a commodity it is becoming. In April 2001 edition  
5 of the National Geographic, it stated that only  
6 2.5 per cent of the earth's total water is fresh  
7 water and that only .6 is usable.

8                   The 2006 annual report of General  
9 Electric, the single largest private employer in  
10 the U.S., stated 1.1 billion people lack access to  
11 adequate water supply, yet here in Manitoba we use  
12 912 billion to 1 trillion litres a year to flush  
13 out hog barns. The Manitoba hog industry has  
14 shown that the only thing that matters is their  
15 bottom line, and cleaning their barns with fresh  
16 water is the cheapest method.

17                   We in Manitoba already suffer from  
18 shortages of fresh water, as the RM of Morris  
19 applied to the Department of Conservation under  
20 the Environmental Act to have fresh water piped  
21 from an aquifer within the RM of Piney to the RM  
22 of Morris. This application was only recently  
23 rejected by the Conservation Department. The RM  
24 of Morris probably needed the fresh water to flush  
25 their barns.



1                   To avoid some of the problems with  
2 fresh water being used to flush barns, there  
3 should have been more straw based barns built  
4 during the expansion years, but we all know that  
5 they are more management intense. With all the  
6 liquid manure being produced and the sheer size of  
7 some of these hog operations, maybe they should  
8 have their own sewage treatment plants, especially  
9 when so many of them are within close proximity of  
10 each other.

11                   With the increased level of phosphorus  
12 being detected in Lake Winnipeg, we have to wonder  
13 if there is a direct correlation with the  
14 increased number of hogs being produced in  
15 Manitoba, from 175 million in the early '90s to  
16 nine million produced in 2006.

17                   This is something the CEC must take  
18 into consideration. If it is determined that  
19 agriculture's share of phosphorous being  
20 contributed to Lake Winnipeg has increased, it  
21 would be safe to assume that the hog industry is  
22 the reason why. The amount of seeded acres in  
23 Manitoba has not increased. With most farmers  
24 using zero till, it's a known fact that erosion  
25 has decreased, so that certainly would reduce





1 phosphorus runoff. We all know for a fact that  
2 with the increased price of commercial fertilizer,  
3 grain farmers are certainly not overapplying  
4 phosphorus.

5 I do not believe the recent amendment  
6 to the regulations pertaining to phosphorous for  
7 the hog industry is stringent enough. The  
8 Manitoba hog industry must be held accountable.  
9 The CEC has been given the authority to make  
10 recommendations to the Provincial Government, and  
11 they must insist changes be made for the  
12 betterment of Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. Thank  
13 you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Ewacha.  
15 Don't run away, we may have one or two questions  
16 for you.

17 You noted the top of your second page  
18 that manure couldn't be injected because of the  
19 vast amount of stones. How common is that in your  
20 area?

21 MR. EWACHA: It's very common in that  
22 stretch where the majority of the barns are built  
23 in the approximately 20 miles southeast of  
24 Steinbach on number 12, very prominent.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: So the manure is not



1 injected?

2 MR. EWACHA: I've always seen it  
3 broadcast, and like I say, I farm and I go down  
4 there enough, and I've always seen it being  
5 broadcast.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Is it incorporated  
7 within a short time?

8 MR. EWACHA: Well, if it's spread on  
9 pasture fields, pasture and hay, there's no  
10 incorporation.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Edwin.

12 MR. YEE: Yes. Just for  
13 clarification, I guess the only question that I  
14 have, Mr. Ewacha, is your estimation of the fresh  
15 water use. Is that an extrapolation based on the  
16 assumption of one litre is used for wash water?

17 MR. EWACHA: I phoned Ian, I don't  
18 know what his last name is, in swine, in  
19 agriculture -- Department of Manitoba Agriculture,  
20 and he's, I think, their swine specialist. And I  
21 asked him, I read that in several places the  
22 average hog uses seven litres, and I asked him  
23 specifically how much of that seven litres would  
24 be used for wash water? And he explained that in  
25 most cases six litres would be for drinking and



1 one litre would be for wash. And I asked him, is  
2 that safe for me to say something like that? And  
3 he said yes.

4 MR. YEE: Thank you.

5 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. Mr. Ewacha,  
6 you made one statement here that you said we are  
7 all aware that 43 per cent of hog operations are  
8 deficient in spread field use, because using the  
9 one time crop removal rate of phosphorus. Do you  
10 mean in all of Manitoba?

11 MR. EWACHA: Of the 851 they  
12 registered back in the fall.

13 MR. MOTHERAL: Of the -- I'm sorry?

14 MR. EWACHA: I guess the test was done  
15 with 851 operations, and they stated that 57 of  
16 them have adequate spread fields, 57 per cent of  
17 that 851 have adequate spread fields using one  
18 time phosphorus level rates for intake.

19 MR. MOTHERAL: The reason why I  
20 question this, I mean, in several areas in western  
21 Manitoba we find out there's very low phosphorus  
22 down there and they don't have any problems at all  
23 with spread fields with phosphorus. And I'm just  
24 wondering if you meant in the intensive area in  
25 southeastern Manitoba?



1                   MR. EWACHA: It just said, it didn't  
2 specifically say where the barns were in what part  
3 of the province, it just said 851, from what I  
4 read.

5                   MR. MOTHERAL: I think that's about  
6 all I had in this, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

7                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,  
8 Mr. Ewacha.

9                   MR. EWACHA: Thank you all for your  
10 time.

11                   THE CHAIRMAN: Now, one last chance,  
12 is Hilary Versavel here? Okay. We'll take a  
13 break for about 15 minutes. We'll reconvene about  
14 five to 3:00 with the environmental, the  
15 collective of environmental groups, and following  
16 that, the Manitoba Pork Council.

17 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 2:45 P.M.  
18 AND RECONVENED AT 3:00 P.M.)

19                   THE CHAIRMAN: Could I ask you to take  
20 your seats, please? I think there is a chance we  
21 may be out of here on time.

22                   Both of you have previously taken the  
23 oath to tell the truth, so I would ask you to  
24 introduce yourselves, just for the benefit of the  
25 audience, and then proceed with your presentation.





1 GLEN KOROLUK, previously sworn, presented as  
2 follows:

3 MR. KOROLUK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 My name is Glen Koroluk, I'm a  
5 community organizer for the Beyond Factory Farming  
6 coalition. We are a national organization of  
7 about 40 member groups across the country and we  
8 have got four part-time staff people located  
9 throughout the country and we work on factory farm  
10 issues.

11 I thank you for your endurance in the  
12 meetings we have had over the last two months, and  
13 I just want to say that this is just starting the  
14 process. There is a lot more work to do from here  
15 on in.

16 And where do we go from here? The  
17 Clean Environment Commission has the duty and  
18 powers to investigate the environmental  
19 sustainability of hog production in Manitoba.  
20 This investigation is to integrate economic, human  
21 health and social factors into the analysis, and  
22 include these factors in the recommendations  
23 report for the Minister of Conservation.

24 Our understanding is that a scientific  
25 report will be released in June, and the public



1 will have the opportunity to provide feedback on  
2 it. We would like some clarification on this  
3 stage of investigation and ask that the CEC panel  
4 provide adequate time for our feedback, and  
5 re-open the participant funding assistance to help  
6 us engage in this process.

7                   We wish to remind the panel that a  
8 number of principles must be adhered to for the  
9 duration of the investigation. Firstly, citizens  
10 must have rights to access to information. This  
11 same right must be utilized by the Clean  
12 Environment Commission. Without information, an  
13 informed decision cannot be made. A number of  
14 information requests have been made over the  
15 course of the half year through various public  
16 channels. We have not seen any of this data. We  
17 feel a determination of the sustainability of the  
18 hog industry cannot be made until the actual data  
19 is collected and analyzed and made available to  
20 the public.

21                   To remind the Commission, the  
22 information we require for this Hog Production  
23 Industry Review includes manure management plans,  
24 to see if producers are following the proper rules  
25 and guidelines for manure application; soil test



1 data, to see if nutrients and especially  
2 phosphorous is building up in the soil; water  
3 quality data from wells that are monitoring  
4 earthen manure storage facilities, to see if  
5 groundwater is being contaminated; source drinking  
6 water quality for pigs, to see if the source, the  
7 water source nearby the ILO is contaminated;  
8 actual water usage data, to see if individual and  
9 cumulative operations are overexploiting a local  
10 water source and see how many producers are  
11 extracting water without a license; an update of  
12 the nutrient trend analysis to give us a more  
13 recent status of the nutrient loading problem in  
14 Lake Winnipeg; a list of ingredients in the feed  
15 so that we could start to monitor other pollutants  
16 such as antibiotics that enter our environment; a  
17 list of deconditioned ILOs so that we can  
18 rehabilitate these sites and assign responsibility  
19 for cleanup costs; inspection records of ILOs so  
20 that we can truly determine the hog industry  
21 performance and their impact on the environment; a  
22 complete list of all ILOs currently in an  
23 operation so that we know their location for  
24 enforcement, monitoring and inspection purposes; a  
25 breakdown of the business ownership structure, so



1 that we can tailor public support programs to meet  
2 the needs of the family farm operation; business  
3 risk management payout programs so we can gauge  
4 how much the public is already supporting the  
5 industry; loans and lines of credit which are  
6 forgiven and outstanding so that we can gauge how  
7 much exposure the public has in the industry;  
8 records of complaints to the Farm Practices  
9 Protection Board to determine the usefulness of  
10 this board and the effectiveness of the  
11 legislation and to see if complaints were  
12 satisfactorily dealt with; copies of all relevant  
13 in-house and external studies which Manitoba  
14 Conservation reference in the report to determine  
15 whether relevant community health studies are  
16 taken into consideration for setback distances and  
17 siting; and finally injury and illness rates of  
18 hog barn workers to determine the magnitude and  
19 cost to our health care system.

20           The review process must maintain  
21 objectivity and independence. This principle must  
22 applied when hiring experts to assess the  
23 scientific information. It is extremely important  
24 that those experts hired are not the same people  
25 who supplied research to formulate our current





1 policies, programs, and regulations which we are  
2 currently reviewing. The experts must also be  
3 independent of any government industry,  
4 partnership, sponsorship program. The CEC's  
5 deliberation should incorporate science, and place  
6 greater emphasis on scientific studies that are  
7 peer reviewed and published in professional  
8 journals.

9           The remainder of this investigation  
10 must be adequately resourced, so that the  
11 technical resources, public information, and  
12 remaining consultation can be successful. If  
13 government agencies and the hog industry cannot  
14 provide information in a timely manner because of  
15 the lack of resources, then the CEC must lengthen  
16 its schedule on completing this review until all  
17 information requirements are met. The CEC has  
18 limited powers, but the ones they do have can be  
19 used effectively.

20           When making your recommendations, it  
21 is important that the regulatory system recognize  
22 the difference between high volume, high speed  
23 production for export, and smaller scale, more  
24 labour insensitive production for local, regional  
25 and domestic markets. Inappropriate regulations



1 for the scale and purpose for the operation have  
2 been used unfairly to push smaller producers and  
3 processors out of the market. Any publicly  
4 supported program contemplated by a new policy  
5 must acknowledge the distinction between ownership  
6 structures at the producer level. A family farm  
7 entity and family farm corporation, whereby most  
8 of the labour, management and investment are made  
9 by someone in the family is different from a  
10 corporate agri business investment scheme.

11           While we support the polluter pay  
12 principle, we recognize that small and medium  
13 sized family farm operations and co-operatives are  
14 least able to pay for the investment of capital  
15 and additional labour needed to implement  
16 beneficial practices, environmental farm plans,  
17 and the transition to sustainable agriculture, in  
18 order to provide ecological goods and services.

19           As a pollution prevention strategy,  
20 making a transition to sustainable agriculture is  
21 by far the most effective way to build community  
22 and improve the environment. Technological fixes  
23 will, for the most part, create other unforeseen  
24 problems.

25           The Beyond Factory Farming Coalition



1 calls for the transition to sustainable farming  
2 and socially responsible meat production as our  
3 preferred solution. Socially responsible meat  
4 production is an integrated approach to raising  
5 animals that respects the environment, treats  
6 animals humanely, supports local communities, and  
7 is economically viable for farmers. In areas  
8 where small scale organic and socially responsible  
9 farms are common, there is a higher degree of  
10 social and cultural development, as well as more  
11 viable local businesses.

12           Socially responsible farming includes  
13 certified organic farming, farms under holistic  
14 management, on-farm biodiversity that integrates  
15 crops and animals, no hormone implants or  
16 injections or use of non-therapeutic antibiotics,  
17 manure production not exceeding what can be  
18 utilized by crops grown on the land, family or  
19 cooperatively owned and operated farms, and  
20 animals raised in an environment where they are  
21 able to behave naturally.

22           To instill confidence in our citizenry  
23 who have witnessed the erosion of democracy in  
24 their communities and who have watched the  
25 denigration of our environment, we offer the



1 following simple interim solutions that will help  
2 guide us towards sustainable agriculture and  
3 vibrant communities.

4                   Firstly, phosphorous must be regulated  
5 based on residual soil nutrient levels.  
6 Application of manure is to be subject to annual  
7 manure management plans where operations are  
8 subject to conditional use. Soil testing must be  
9 done by an independent accredited third party for  
10 operations subject to a conditional use permit.  
11 In fields where there is variability of soil  
12 types, multiple soil tests must be taken, manure  
13 applications must be tailored to site specific  
14 conditions. Manure application rates must not  
15 exceed the average requirements for the specific  
16 crop to be grown, based on the average crop  
17 insurance yield for the risk area the crop is to  
18 be grown in. This must also take into account the  
19 heat units, phosphorous, and flooding risk in each  
20 area. We must move away from fall application of  
21 manure to spring time applications and during the  
22 growing season when plants take up nutrients.

23                   Secondly, ILOs must be regulated under  
24 the Environment Act by classifying them as a  
25 development under the classes of development





1 regulation. This will ensure that the public has  
2 the opportunity to get engaged in environmental  
3 decision making through environmental assessment  
4 and that local ecological knowledge is  
5 incorporated into this process.

6           Thirdly, the Planning Act must be  
7 amended to enhance community decision making and  
8 public participation. This includes a citizen's  
9 right to go to court on an infraction of the  
10 Planning Act, the removal of the technical review  
11 committee and technical review process, the  
12 requirement to designate any liquid manure system  
13 to conditional use permit, having the onus of  
14 proof within the decision making clause of the act  
15 placed on the developer, allowing local decision  
16 makers to place a higher level of environmental  
17 protection through conditions of approval if they  
18 so desire, allowing for precautionary decision  
19 making and bylaw making based on potential health  
20 impacts from air emissions and manure application,  
21 and allowing for flexibility to transpire in the  
22 development of a livestock operational policy.

23           Fourthly, citizens must be afforded  
24 the rights to enjoyment of property. This means  
25 citizens must be given back their right to sue



1 factory farms for nuisance under our common law.

2 Fifthly, we must reinstate single desk  
3 marketing of hogs which will provide equity,  
4 economic bargaining power, and transparency to the  
5 individual farmer.

6 Sixthly, conflict of interest  
7 legislation for municipally elected officials must  
8 be vastly improved.

9 Number seven, we must acknowledge peer  
10 reviews research that shows ILOs impact human  
11 health. This means the sub therapeutic use of  
12 antibiotics and rations must be phased out, and  
13 during the phase out period, we must establish  
14 effective monitoring and surveillance programs.  
15 Setback distances and siting of ILOs must be based  
16 on community based impact studies and regulated  
17 through the Public Health Act. Air emissions such  
18 as hydrogen sulfide, ammonia and odour, must be  
19 regulated under the Environment Act. Hog barn  
20 workers must be included within the employment  
21 standards code and classified and compulsory under  
22 the Workers Compensation Act. And the resources,  
23 expertise and infrastructure must be developed to  
24 respond to a major disease outbreak and epidemic.

25 Number nine, sufficient public and



1 private resources, both human and financial, must  
2 be allocated within government to allow for  
3 increased monitoring, data collection,  
4 enforcement, research, and program review. The  
5 province must develop a comprehensive data base  
6 which identifies locations of all intensive  
7 livestock operations situated in Manitoba, type  
8 and capacity of storage facilities and spread  
9 fields used in manure management plans, and this  
10 database can include soil tests, phosphorous  
11 results, as well as water quality test results in  
12 proximity to the ILOs.

13 Detailed public soil surveys to  
14 complete the remaining 70 per cent of agri  
15 Manitoba must be vigorously completed within the  
16 next four years. This will ensure that water  
17 quality management zones can be appropriately  
18 mapped. Comprehensive public hydrological and  
19 groundwater supply data must be completed as well  
20 as data which improves and updates the  
21 identification of groundwater pollution hazard  
22 zones. Surface water quality sampling must be  
23 more frequent, expanded to include additional  
24 sites, and must adequately capture major runoff  
25 events. Public participation and cooperation with



1 government in water sampling should be encouraged  
2 and a legally enforceable protocol developed.  
3 Groundwater well testing must be more frequent and  
4 include the parameter of nitrate as a subsidized  
5 test. As this data base is developed, this  
6 information must be made available to the public,  
7 updated at regular intervals, and offered in an  
8 interactive fashion through the Manitoba  
9 Government website. And water allocation permits  
10 must also be included within this data base.

11           And number ten, perverse subsidies  
12 which support unsustainable practices that impact  
13 our environment and health must be withdrawn and  
14 re-directed toward incentives, voluntary measures,  
15 best management practices, and development that  
16 prevents pollution.

17           And lastly, government education,  
18 outreach, research, and public information  
19 programs must reflect larger public good goals  
20 such as environmental and community health  
21 protection, and not be influenced by private  
22 economic interests. Thank you for your time.

23           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Koroluk.

24           I should have noted at the outset of  
25 these final two presentations that when we first





1 set up this process, we offered the opportunity on  
2 the final day to a group of environmental NGOs,  
3 such as at the table right now, and the Pork  
4 Council, an opportunity to offer final argument.  
5 So these aren't presentations in the sense that  
6 the ones up to over the last six weeks have been.  
7 So questions from the panel will really just be  
8 for clarification rather than any probing issues.

9 I will come back at the end of the  
10 presentation and address your concern about the  
11 scientific reports. I don't have any specific  
12 questions on your paper at this time. Do you have  
13 any clarification?

14 MR. MOTHERAL: No, questions at all.  
15 And thank you, I like these kind of reports, it is  
16 a check list that we can judge some of our future  
17 work, and I like that, I like that in simple form  
18 like that. Thank you very much.

19 MR. KOROLUK: We give out gold stars  
20 too.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: It helps to get  
22 recommendations, whether or not we accept them, it  
23 helps focus our deliberations.

24 FRED TAIT, previously sworn, presented as follows:

25 MR. TAIT: My name is Fred Tait, I'm



1 the chair of Hogwatch Manitoba. I'm going to  
2 reflect a little bit perhaps in this closing hour  
3 of this long venture that you have been on  
4 traveling around the province now since the 5th of  
5 March.

6 My journey started in the late 1990s,  
7 when the structure of the hog industry in Manitoba  
8 started to change, at a time when we had just lost  
9 single desk selling, at a time when the Hutterite  
10 brethren of Manitoba produced about 52 per cent of  
11 all of the hog production, where we had a system  
12 of price transparency, equal access to the  
13 marketplace, and equal return for a product of  
14 equal value, and a system of production that was  
15 driven by market signals. The relationship  
16 between grain prices and hog prices was always in  
17 transition, and there was periods where there was  
18 declining hog production to match the increase in  
19 grain production.

20 And, of course, we have moved away  
21 from all of that. And that system that was there,  
22 I don't ever remember hearing a complaint of a  
23 conflict between the neighbors and the hog  
24 producer. My own neighbour produced hogs for the  
25 first 25 years I resided where I am now. We had



1 no conflict. I suspect if he were to build an  
2 8,000 unit barn across the road now that our  
3 parting days would be somewhat stressed.

4 I have had the opportunity not only to  
5 travel to many communities across Manitoba, but  
6 I've been in Saskatchewan, I have been in Southern  
7 Ontario, and I have been in New Brunswick talking  
8 about this issue and learning about this issue.  
9 And the learning is the important part, because it  
10 never stops, the learning process. And through  
11 this process, the learning was just reflected in  
12 those multiple points that Glen Koroluk laid out.  
13 That is what comes back from the communities that  
14 we have visited and the people we have contacted  
15 over this long, long period of time.

16 And the problems of this industry, on  
17 one hand they are denied, on the other hand they  
18 are obvious. The economic stability of the  
19 industry now I think is very much in jeopardy.  
20 Because we established an industry on a couple of  
21 premises that would be difficult, in my mind at  
22 that time, to make business decisions upon. The  
23 one was that the American dollar would always stay  
24 at the differential it was then, which gave us a  
25 competitive advantage. That is a very, very weak



1 system of risk management.

2           The other was that because of the loss  
3 of the Crow in the '80s, farmers in Manitoba would  
4 continue in their enthusiasm to produce a supply  
5 of feed grain for the industry below the cost of  
6 production. That was the premise that we built  
7 the industry on.

8           The consequences of that, of course,  
9 that decision are now coming back to haunt us.  
10 The American dollar is extremely unstable. We  
11 have seen about a five cent shift in the last  
12 several weeks. And economic musing that I tend to  
13 read and follow are talking about a par, which  
14 would be devastating.

15           The other thing that is obvious, but  
16 yet is difficult to find, and that is I work -- my  
17 interest is in the economics of agriculture and  
18 the market power of different players in it. And  
19 so economists or researchers that I work with like  
20 Darryl Coleman, from the National Farmers Union,  
21 whose work is internationally recognized now, just  
22 a lay person, John Keene out of Saskatchewan,  
23 Professor Joe Delaquis, Earl Black, and others,  
24 have been searching diligently to try and find how  
25 much public support it takes at this time to





1 support this industry. And it is so well hidden  
2 you can not determine it. I was hoping to have  
3 that by this stage. So there is an area that yet  
4 has to be determined before we get a true picture.

5                   But there are indicators, and the most  
6 recent, second most recent issue of the Manitoba  
7 Cooperator again describes the pork industry  
8 demands a competitiveness action where it  
9 basically declares that it is in financial  
10 trouble. It calls for urgent reforms by  
11 eliminating certification and inspection fees,  
12 meaning that we will provide them as a public  
13 service. To only that section of agriculture I  
14 may ask? Cheaper and more available swine  
15 vaccines at the time when the alarm about the  
16 incidences of antibiotic resistances are growing  
17 and the evidence is mounting. An incentive to  
18 produce ethanol from plant cellulose rather than  
19 grain, at a time when the ethanol plant in  
20 Minnedosa is well advanced in construction, and  
21 will we really be changing it down and changing it  
22 over to the cellulose production system? I doubt  
23 that.

24                   Regionalizing in Canada to trace the  
25 control of livestock movements. There is some



1 merit to that in all livestock I suspect.  
2 Insurance against financial loss from livestock  
3 diseases. For which industry and for what  
4 purposes, and who covers the premiums? The more  
5 you concentrate an industry, the greater the  
6 possibility of a catastrophic disease outbreak. A  
7 five year, 30 million pork export promotion  
8 program. A trade action against the United States  
9 over the issue of country of origin labeling are  
10 just a few of the things.

11 I saw in my time, in looking at this  
12 industry, that pressure came from within industry  
13 to move the threshold, the cap for farm support to  
14 \$3 million from where it was before. And what  
15 that did, of course, is dilute what was available  
16 at the wider level, if more goes to the top.

17 And so we now end this process, or  
18 come close to ending this process, and I will have  
19 to tell you that as a strategy I made a very  
20 deliberate attempt that we should not clog these  
21 meetings with repetitive presentations. And I did  
22 not want to get into an issue where it would be a  
23 numbers game as to whose side had the most out.  
24 Because sustainability and environmental  
25 protection is not about numbers, and it is not



1 about who can assemble the greatest crowd, and it  
2 is not about who has the greatest wealth to  
3 participate at the highest level in the process,  
4 it is about the logic of collectively trying to  
5 come to development of a process that works for  
6 the betterment of all.

7                   And you are now going to move into a  
8 process where you are going to look at the  
9 interviewing expertise. And Glen touched on a  
10 concern there, and I too will share that concern  
11 with you. I have had a lot of experience in many  
12 areas that engage scientific expertise in the area  
13 of plant breeders rights, in the area of RBGH, the  
14 growth hormone that Monsanto was trying to  
15 introduce into the dairy herd. I have also been  
16 involved in the whole battle around the  
17 introduction of genetically modified wheat. And  
18 I'm very aware of the presence of Monsanto on the  
19 grounds of the University of Manitoba. And I have  
20 witnessed the silencing of Dr. Sid Sherp, Margaret  
21 Hayward, and other people who spoke out against  
22 the interest of corporate North America.

23                   So there is a caution here. And my  
24 caution is that when you look at the appendix that  
25 is in this document, that appendix shows some



1 interesting things. It shows that the University  
2 of Manitoba received \$2 million, or 61 per cent of  
3 ARDA research funding to the hog industry. The  
4 website, the ARDA website show that 59 per cent of  
5 the total funding went to the University of  
6 Manitoba 2005/2006. The integration today, the  
7 lines are clouded of the university, the academic  
8 community, the government and the industry. It  
9 creates problems in the public confidence. And  
10 the indirect financial interest does not inspire  
11 any further confidence. Almost all of the RD  
12 funded studies are published in-house and normally  
13 do not go through the normal academic review  
14 process. And there is no declaration of the  
15 competitive financial interest that may exist.

16 I await your report with some  
17 anticipation, because a lot about the future of  
18 where I live and the people I have got to know  
19 over the last nine years depends -- will be  
20 impacted by the results of this report. I know  
21 that, from past experience, that there will be  
22 some change. It would be foolish to imagine that  
23 you would go through this process and learn all of  
24 this material and the status quo would be  
25 maintained. So I know when that change comes





1 there will be a very concerted campaign across  
2 Manitoba by the Manitoba Cattle Producers,  
3 Manitoba Pork Council, the Keystone Agricultural  
4 Producers. With a joint check-off capacity of  
5 \$6 million roughly, they can certainly run  
6 effective campaigns.

7 I still languish in the afterglow of  
8 their latest joint effort in 2006, that was a  
9 campaign in opposition to the establishment of the  
10 Water Protection Act in the nutrient management  
11 zones. It was somewhat disturbing to see that  
12 this campaign was able to convince many of my  
13 neighbors that their very viability was in  
14 jeopardy if these very modest proposals, that were  
15 more political than functional, came into being.  
16 Because on my own farm it is impossible for me to  
17 do a phosphorous loading without going out and  
18 purchasing huge volumes of input beyond the need  
19 of the crops I grow on my farm. So economics  
20 prevents me from doing that, as it prevents all  
21 farmers from doing that. The campaign, though,  
22 was effective in mounting public opposition that  
23 was to protect those operations that were capable  
24 of creating those nutrient loadings.

25 I was further amused by the contention



1 that the mapping that was being used was  
2 inaccurate, and I live in an area that it is  
3 totally accurate. It is so accurate that it  
4 boggles my mind how it was done. After occupying  
5 the same farm as I have for some 40 odd years, one  
6 becomes intimately familiar with the soil of that  
7 place. And I was further disturbed when I knew  
8 the history of what we call the Alamsippi sands;  
9 the wet sands area west of Portage la Prairie are  
10 extremely vulnerable to contamination of  
11 groundwater due to the porous nature of the soil  
12 and the high level of the aquifer, which on my  
13 farm very seldom ever goes below two metres from  
14 the surface. To find that the changes that had  
15 been brought forward under the nutrient management  
16 regulation and the Water Protection Act had moved  
17 my farm from one of the highest risks in Manitoba  
18 to an area of the lowest risk, one can only marvel  
19 at such magic. And one can only say, was the  
20 issue here really about protecting the  
21 environment?

22                   And my experience, in listening to  
23 people I've met, you had one of them before the  
24 Commission, Ted Ross, talked about a municipality  
25 that was designated as 70 per cent environmentally



1 sensitive, and after it was adjusted through the  
2 planning process was down to less than five.

3 I will close by this observation, and  
4 it was actually made to me, it is not of my origin  
5 but of talking to another person who observed this  
6 process. And they said, you know, the people of  
7 rural Manitoba may not always be of the highest  
8 academic levels, many of us didn't go far in  
9 school, myself included when I had to quit at 16  
10 to take over the family farm. But they said, they  
11 have a collective understanding and a collective  
12 knowledge that they can apply to make this a  
13 better place. And I believe that.

14 And this is where this issue became so  
15 volatile. In all of my lifetime, things have been  
16 done to us. Decisions were made some place else,  
17 by forces we didn't understand or have any contact  
18 with, whether it be trade agreements or whatever,  
19 or corporate merger. But suddenly an issue came  
20 where we could see it, we could smell it, we knew  
21 who owned it, and we knew what it was there for.  
22 It was there not to help us, it was there to  
23 extract a profit from the area we occupy. And we  
24 have little left out of that old community  
25 structure, but we still had some water and we



1 still had some air, and we were determined that  
2 nobody was going to take that from us.

3           So people activated, as people should,  
4 and I was encouraged more than I have been in 40  
5 years of watching farm communities destruct.  
6 People took the task on, got elected to municipal  
7 government, said this is our place, we draw the  
8 line here. But it was predictable from my  
9 knowledge of looking at other jurisdictions that  
10 that line would soon be erased by changes to the  
11 Planning Act. And it happened, so we lost our  
12 control, and we wait now for the determination  
13 from this process to see if we regain some of what  
14 we lost, particularly hope. Thank you.

15           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much  
16 Mr. Tait. Glen, in almost at the opening of your  
17 comments you noted that we will have, you referred  
18 to it as a scientific report, I suspect it may be  
19 a number of different ones, but I'm not sure how  
20 it will be released to us, or delivered to us.  
21 And we have, and I have said on a number of  
22 occasions throughout the last couple of months,  
23 that we will give a reasonable amount of time for  
24 parties to respond to it. What would you consider  
25 a reasonable amount of time?





1                   MR. KOROLUK: Ten years, 13 and a  
2 half. I can't answer that. This is coming  
3 through the middle of the summer. You have to  
4 respect our working schedules in this part of the  
5 world.

6                   THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, six days would  
7 not be reasonable. Would two months be  
8 reasonable?

9                   MR. KOROLUK: Two months would be more  
10 reasonable than six days.

11                  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And at this time  
12 I can't commit that the participant assistance  
13 fund would be reopened, but I can't say that it  
14 will not either, so I will consider that. In my  
15 closing comments I have a little bit more  
16 explanation of where we go after today. So thank  
17 you very much. Do either of you have any  
18 clarification questions? Thank you very much for  
19 your presentations today.

20                  Can I ask the Pork Council to take the  
21 hot seat?

22                  Now, I believe that all four of you  
23 were on the panel at the outset and you have all  
24 taken the oath to tell us only the truth. So just  
25 for the sake of the audience, would you please



1 introduce yourselves?

2 TRACEY BRYSKA, KARL KYNOCH, ANDREW DICKSON, PETER  
3 MAH, previously sworn, presented as follows:

4 MS. BRYSKA: I am Tracey Bryska,  
5 manager of Public Affairs and Marketing for the  
6 Pork Council.

7 MR. KYNOCH: I'm Karl Kynoch, Chairman  
8 of Manitoba Pork Council.

9 MR. DICKSON: I am Andrew Dickson, I  
10 am the general manager of Manitoba Pork Council.

11 MR. MAH: My name is Peter Mah. I am  
12 the Director of Community Relations and  
13 Sustainable Development for the Pork Council.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

15 MR. KYNOCH: Good afternoon. First of  
16 all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity  
17 to speak on behalf of the hog industry in  
18 Manitoba. As Manitoba Pork Council, we are here  
19 today representing 1,400 hog farmers across the  
20 province.

21 The hog industry is an important  
22 sector for Manitoba. We contribute one billion to  
23 the Provincial economy each year and have created  
24 jobs for at least 15,000 Manitobans.

25 Today we would like to recap the



1 highlights of the presentation we made at first,  
2 at the first hearing on March 5th. We will talk  
3 about where we are heading in the future and the  
4 key points about our industry that we would like  
5 you to consider as you put your report together.

6           Through this review we are confident  
7 that you will find that the hog industry is  
8 environmentally friendly and good for Manitoba,  
9 unlike what some of our opponents have been  
10 saying. The hog industry is not having a negative  
11 impact on the communities, in fact, it is having  
12 just the opposite effect.

13           According to the province's recently  
14 released 2006 census figures, communities that  
15 have large livestock presence have actually been  
16 growing. The population count has increased in  
17 several rural municipalities in southeast  
18 Manitoba, which we know has the highest  
19 concentration of hog production in the province.

20           Between 2001 and 2006, Manitoba's  
21 population rose 2.6 per cent overall, but in the  
22 southeast region in the province it increased 7.6  
23 per cent, the strongest population growth of any  
24 region. Steinbach and the RM of Hanover accounted  
25 for nearly half of the growth. The RM of Hanover



1 reporting a remarkable 42.9 per cent increase in  
2 population. Other areas of significant growth in  
3 hog country include Niverville, which is up 28.3  
4 per cent, and the RM of La Broquiere which is up  
5 26.4 per cent. These numbers dispel the myth that  
6 hog farming is negatively affecting communities in  
7 Manitoba. The bottom line is that the hog  
8 industry is helping to boost communities, not  
9 detracting from their growth.

10                   Interestingly, areas of the province  
11 that have not been favorable to livestock  
12 production saw a decrease in population. These  
13 include the communities of Archie, down 34 per  
14 cent, Ellice, down 24 per cent, and Minto, down 14  
15 per cent. In the RM of Archie, one farmer wanted  
16 to involve his son and expand his hog operation.  
17 He faced some negative reaction from the community  
18 that he dropped his plans altogether, and now that  
19 puts another hog farm at risk of disappearing.

20                   Now, I would like to turn it over to  
21 Andrew Dickson, general manager of the Manitoba  
22 Pork Council, to address some of the specific  
23 areas you are addressing in your review.

24                   MR. DICKSON: I would like to thank  
25 the Commission for allowing us this opportunity to





1 present information to you in your deliberations.

2           If you turn to page 21, I will walk  
3 our way through the presentation and parts of it  
4 will be summarized in the overheads behind me as  
5 well, and we have given you a copy of that. I  
6 will highlight some of the various parts as I go  
7 through and some of the highlights are in the  
8 overheads. And Karl's presentation is on the  
9 first part, so if you turn to page 2-1, we will  
10 work our way through this.

11           Essentially, the opening remarks I  
12 would like to make are, as Karl said, there are  
13 15,000 Manitobans and their families that are  
14 dependent on the hog industry. This is an  
15 integral part of the provincial economy. We have  
16 a billion dollar impact on the provincial economy.  
17 Manitobans sell pork products into some of the  
18 most sophisticated food markets in the world. We  
19 are recognized worldwide for the quality of our  
20 products at competitive prices. This is just an  
21 outline of what the industry is about.

22           Now, we have attempted to try and  
23 summarize our comments on the various areas that  
24 were presented to us as the issues that came from  
25 your scoping hearings. So I'm going to walk



1 quickly through those and then we will turn to  
2 recommendations that we would propose to the  
3 Commission in terms of how to handle some of the  
4 issues that have been raised.

5                   One of the first ones is nutrient  
6 management. It has become apparent that there is  
7 this myth out there of 9 million animals, and this  
8 has created a lot of misconceptions about the  
9 amount of manure that is produced in the province,  
10 the amount of water consumed and so forth, the  
11 impacts on communities and so on.

12                   Essentially on January 1, 2007, there  
13 were 378,000 sows on Manitoba farms. This is the  
14 mother herd. And at any one time we had 2.96  
15 million head on farms, not 9 million, and of  
16 those, 1 million of those are small pigs, less  
17 than 20 kilograms. And more than half of these  
18 are actually exported weighing less than  
19 7 kilograms. And another .7 million on the farm  
20 at any one time are between 20 and 60 kilograms.  
21 And about a third of our production is exported at  
22 less than 50 kilograms.

23                   The key point is that the bulk of the  
24 pig numbers on the farm at any one time are small  
25 pigs which produce very little manure, especially



1 the isoweans.

2                   One of the other myths that seems to  
3 be promulgated in the media is hog manure is a  
4 toxic waste. Hog manure, pig manure is simply  
5 undigested feed. It is mostly fiber, it is mixed  
6 in with some urine, mostly ammonia and urea  
7 produced by food and feed animals which are  
8 actually eaten by us as fresh product. Manure has  
9 been used for thousands of years as the primary  
10 crop fertilizer, and it is superior in promoting  
11 crop growth. And this nutrient cycle, fertilizing  
12 crops to be eaten by animals which in turn are  
13 eaten by humans has been a sustainable practice  
14 for over thousands of years.

15                   The other one that comes up in terms  
16 of nutrient management is this issue of  
17 uncontrolled growth of the industry. And the  
18 reality is, if you look at the sow herd, the  
19 growth has been slow and gradual over the past 20  
20 years. And we provide a graph here. If you  
21 actually look at the sow numbers, the growth is  
22 almost imperceptible. What is dramatic is that  
23 these pigs, these sows produce weanlings, and we  
24 have had a significant growth in weanling  
25 production in the 1990s, and the growth has now



1 tapered off and we have returned to the slow  
2 steady growth that we experienced for many decades  
3 beforehand. And if you actually look at the  
4 number of finished pigs, that growth has been  
5 modest as well.

6           One of the facts that we have is there  
7 is lots of land here in Manitoba. The management  
8 of nutrients found in the manure produced by the  
9 hog industry has improved significantly over the  
10 past 20 years. If we allow for the volatilization  
11 of nitrogen during transfer and storage, the  
12 manure that we produce from the pig industry is  
13 sufficient to fertilize, based on nitrogen, about  
14 300,000 hectares or 6 per cent of the annual crop  
15 land in Manitoba -- 6 per cent of the crop land in  
16 Manitoba. And if you base it on the phosphorous  
17 regulations, there would be sufficient in there to  
18 fertilize 15 per cent of the annual crop land in  
19 Manitoba. In other words, a very small  
20 percentage. We have lots of land that will have  
21 to be fertilized by artificial fertilizer.

22           The fact, nutrient balance, to achieve  
23 that in the province we need to get focused on  
24 more organic fertilizers and less artificial  
25 fertilizers. If we could reduce the application





1 of artificial fertilizer, all of the agricultural  
2 regions in Manitoba could come into balance, both  
3 for nitrogen and for phosphorous. We need to  
4 encourage farmers to look at manure for their  
5 primary source as a crop fertilizer.

6                   And I put up here table nine, and if  
7 you look at region nine, which is the so-called  
8 hog country, if we could reduce the artificial  
9 fertilizer applied we could even bring this region  
10 into balance in terms of crop removal. It is a  
11 fact that technology can provide solutions. There  
12 are a host of feeding technologies and manure  
13 treatment systems that are being used to reduce  
14 the levels of nitrogen and phosphorous in manure.  
15 These include the reduction of dietary protein,  
16 using free amino acids, increasing the dietary  
17 energy content, using non-starch  
18 polysaccharides -- reducing them, sorry -- phase  
19 feeding, using manure covers, using phytase  
20 enzymes and rations, using sodium rather calcium  
21 phosphate, and continually improving the genetic  
22 selection for feed conversion which is one of the  
23 core factors. And I provide some more information  
24 about how we do that.

25                   In terms of manure management, manure



1 is highly regulated. I mean, the Manitoba  
2 Government has got almost 13 years of experience  
3 now in regulating the application of livestock  
4 manure on farmland. And they have built up  
5 considerable expertise on ensuring manure is  
6 managed sustainably and the environment is well  
7 protected. And these regulations have been  
8 amended every five years or so to provide greater  
9 clarification in different situations or deal with  
10 new concerns such as the level of phosphorous.

11           The main objective of the regulatory  
12 staff has been to achieve compliance, and as we  
13 showed in our earlier presentation, the level of  
14 compliance has actually been improving and the  
15 numbers of infractions are dropped.

16           Another message that we would like to  
17 pass on is stick to the science. The current  
18 regulatory framework is working reasonably well.  
19 New standards were brought in, in November 2006,  
20 dealing with phosphorous by Manitoba Conservation.  
21 These were based on the recommendations of an  
22 expert committee appointed by the Minister of  
23 Conservation, and it is critical that the  
24 government continue the approach of using science  
25 to base its regulations.



1                   As an aside, we would also like to  
2 indicate that the impact on small producers in the  
3 Red River Valley by these new regulations by  
4 banning winter spreading has not been properly  
5 addressed at this time, in our estimation.

6                   THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by  
7 that, Mr. Kynoch?

8                   MR. KYNOCH: Well, at the time we  
9 asked that -- the smaller producers were going to  
10 have to build extra storage capacity so they don't  
11 have to spread their manure. And we were told  
12 that there was going to be a financial package  
13 available to the smaller producers to help them  
14 adapt. And so far from what we can see, there has  
15 been a green loan program being announced by the  
16 province, essentially offering these farmers a  
17 loan. And there is some talk about going and  
18 getting some funding out of the agricultural  
19 policy framework in terms of best management  
20 practices and so on. But the farmer has to put  
21 money up front to access any of those grants.

22                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

23                   MR. KYNOCH: And what we were saying  
24 at the time is we wanted to see a package  
25 developed specifically for that designated region,



1 and so far we haven't seen that. Hopefully, it  
2 will come. So then probably as a result of your  
3 Commission's hearings, we might hear that.

4           The collection, the other point that  
5 we want to make here clearly is the collection,  
6 storage and application of manure to land is  
7 highly regulated at each stage during the year,  
8 detailed records are kept by producers, there is  
9 actual field audits, there is inspections carried  
10 out by government staff, and even the construction  
11 of the facilities is supervised by third party  
12 professional engineers. And these in turn are  
13 inspected regularly by the government for ensuring  
14 they are meeting the standards of construction.

15           Another fact, Manitoba is tougher on  
16 enforcement. And one of the unique things here in  
17 Manitoba is that conservation officers are allowed  
18 to issue tickets and common offence notices. This  
19 is unique in Canada, in fact, we are not even sure  
20 if it is available in the United States. This  
21 process allows them to deal with an issue quickly  
22 in the field and get compliance with the  
23 regulation. The alternative is to go through  
24 court orders. These are time consuming and  
25 expensive to get issued.





1                   In terms of land use planning, and we  
2 will deal with this in more detail in Peter's  
3 presentation, but the core message that we are  
4 trying to get through here is, municipalities are  
5 trying to work their way through this. Since 1975  
6 Manitoba has developed a comprehensive land use  
7 planning and management system at the municipal  
8 and provincial level. Local governments are  
9 expected to take responsibility for determining  
10 the most appropriate uses of land under their  
11 control.

12                   And in terms of the response as a  
13 result of the expansion of the hog industry in the  
14 1990s, yes, there were some bitter fights, we  
15 agree with that. But the history to date now is  
16 that the level of conflict has actually started to  
17 drop when local people become better informed  
18 about what their rights are on how the industry is  
19 actually going to work in the community. And  
20 after the barns are up and running, their  
21 attitudes tend to change.

22                   Behind the Planning Act has been, a  
23 critical point is that local elected officials are  
24 more knowledgeable about community goals,  
25 objectives and values. They are directly



1 accountable for their land use decision. The  
2 province is better positioned, on the other hand,  
3 to look after the broader environmental public  
4 interest. They have the technical capacity to do  
5 that, but it is critical that we maintain this  
6 division of interest in terms of local control  
7 over land use decision making and the overriding  
8 provincial responsibility for the environmental  
9 protection.

10                   One of the myths about the planning  
11 process, and I have no idea where it comes from.  
12 Municipalities, to this day, still retain the  
13 authority to deny a proposed hog barn development  
14 without having to provide any explanation for  
15 their decision. They can go through the  
16 conditional use hearing process, everything, and  
17 can still deny it without having to provide any  
18 reason, there is no comeback on them or anything.

19                   Other message; the local review  
20 process does work, and the technical review  
21 process does work, as an initial review of a  
22 proposal to provide some information to a  
23 municipality in terms of determining whether it  
24 meets the general character of the land that it is  
25 zoned for. And it is done in an objective manner,



1 there is a huge public hearing process, local  
2 citizens have a full opportunity to review the  
3 proposal and the TRC report well in advance of any  
4 decisions by council.

5 Another message is, we would like to  
6 see municipalities get on with planning after the  
7 changes in the Municipal Act in 2006. We need to  
8 start moving more quickly in addressing those key  
9 objectives in that. Peter is going to talk more  
10 about this.

11 In terms of groundwater supply and  
12 quality, the fact is our groundwater is protected.  
13 The use of groundwater in Manitoba is highly  
14 regulated to protect both supply and quality.  
15 There are standards for well construction, permits  
16 for wells, limits on the amount of water withdrawn  
17 in critical areas, and producers are required to  
18 keep records on consumption rates. Based on the  
19 records we could obtain from Water Stewardship in  
20 terms of groundwater use, there are 215 water  
21 rights licenses that have been issued to the hog  
22 industry for access to groundwater. How much do  
23 we use? Well, I should say the smaller producers  
24 would fall in the area of not having to have  
25 permits because they use less than 25,000 litres



1 per day. I'm missing an L in my presentation  
2 here.

3                   In terms of the groundwater use, we  
4 aren't causing dry wells. That is a fact. The  
5 amount of groundwater used by the hog industry is  
6 a tiny fraction of the amount we recharge  
7 annually. The annual allocation of groundwater is  
8 equivalent to the annual precipitation which would  
9 fall on three and a half sections of land, or for  
10 city people, three and a half square miles of  
11 farmland. Now, you want to compare that to the  
12 City of Winnipeg, this is equivalent to ten days  
13 of the amount of water allocated to the City of  
14 Winnipeg for its removal from Shoal Lake. It is a  
15 very small use of water.

16                   In terms of contamination and so  
17 forth, all of the studies that we could find have  
18 indicated that the problems in terms of the impact  
19 on water quality are due to poor well construction  
20 or maintenance, or they are very close to sources  
21 of contamination close to the well. And these two  
22 core sources of contamination are leaching  
23 domestic septic fields or malfunctioning septic  
24 tanks.

25                   In terms of surface water quality. We





1 recognize more than any that Lake Winnipeg is in  
2 trouble, but we all need to do something about it.  
3 This is the recommendation from the Lake Winnipeg  
4 Stewardship Board. It is a complex issues and it  
5 is going to involve all users of the landscape.  
6 The hog industry is just one stakeholder amongst  
7 many. Our role here is to return the soil  
8 nutrients which were removed in the production of  
9 livestock feed back to the ground. These plant  
10 nutrients and the microorganisms in hog manure are  
11 no different than those derived from other  
12 livestock, animals, plants, the soil itself,  
13 atmospheric fixation or artificial fertilizer.

14           And it is a fact that the hog industry  
15 contributes only 1.5 per cent of the phosphorous  
16 in Lake Winnipeg. We are a very small contributor  
17 to the problem. However, we recognize that we  
18 have to do something about it. The province  
19 finally has initiated the first set of phosphorous  
20 standards for levels in soil in November 2006.  
21 This was less than six months ago. And we need to  
22 get on with implementing those regulations.

23           Hog farmers can't carry the burden on  
24 their own. If the Provincial Government wants to  
25 see an increase in the pace of change, then we



1 need to have some significant public investments  
2 on individual farms to offset the cost of change.  
3 As an example, the new phosphorous regulations are  
4 going to cost hog producers eventually 18 to  
5 \$27 million per annum in annual operating costs.

6                   Soil quality: Basic message here is  
7 manure is good for the soil. It is exceptionally  
8 good for improving soil quality, and we provide a  
9 whole host of reasons as to why that is. I am not  
10 going to go through them here.

11                   In terms of odours, yes, there is a  
12 problem with odours with the industry, and we are  
13 working on it. Hog producers do not want to be in  
14 conflict with their neighbors, and we have made  
15 tremendous strides in reducing the problem of  
16 nuisance odours. Some rural residents have  
17 expressed concerns about odours, but the actual  
18 number of formal complaints is very limited.

19                   Here is a fact; the Farm Practices  
20 Protection Act was bought in, in 1994. The board  
21 has complete authority to order remedial action,  
22 and to date they have received less than four  
23 complaints of hog operations per annum. And it  
24 still doesn't take away the citizens' right to  
25 pursue an action in the courts under the Nuisance



1 Act. This is simply a first step process in  
2 trying to resolve the conflict, but they still  
3 retain their rights under the Nuisance Act.

4           Odours can be significantly reduced.  
5 We have manure storage covers, we use manure  
6 injection, shelter belts, basic sanitation and  
7 cleanliness. Another good technique is  
8 appropriate separation distances as outlined in  
9 the Planning Act and the Provincial Land Use  
10 Guidelines.

11           In terms of disease, modern swine  
12 production poses negligible threat to human  
13 health. Segregation of swine from pets and  
14 wildlife has reduced the human/animal interface so  
15 that the potential to human health from diseases  
16 and parasites has been reduced to negligible  
17 levels. And I provide a whole host of what  
18 happens here in terms of the health and comfort of  
19 the animals, which have been dramatically improved  
20 in the last 20 years. The physical separation of  
21 animals from their manure, controlled temperatures  
22 and air movement, biosecurity protocols for staff,  
23 multi-site production in terms of breaking the  
24 disease cycle at different levels of production,  
25 vaccines, science based rations, and many others.



1                   And in terms of the human/animal  
2 interaction, any potential threat to human health  
3 is handled by the current food inspection system.  
4 Local and provincial veterinarians are involved in  
5 all stages of the production process. There is a  
6 daily sharing of information between the Federal  
7 and Provincial Health and inspection authorities.  
8 And in addition, our industry in Manitoba has  
9 adopted the national Canadian Quality Assurance  
10 program for swine, and we use local veterinarians  
11 to ensure the producers are using strict regimes  
12 when using antibiotics.

13                   Another fact on here is the use of  
14 antibiotics is highly regulated. The use of  
15 antimicrobial agents such as antibiotics and  
16 disinfectants is highly regulated by the Canadian  
17 Food Inspection Agency.

18                   In terms of climate change, the very  
19 simple message here is that hogs in Manitoba are  
20 insignificant. The pork industry contributes in a  
21 very small way to the causes of climate change,  
22 and it is declining because we use better manure  
23 technologies and feeding practices.

24                   The pork sector in Manitoba  
25 contributes .077 per cent of the whole of Canada's





1 greenhouse gas problem in 2004.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: How was that  
3 determined, or who determined it?

4 MR. KYNOCH: The Canadian Pork Council  
5 commissioned a study on this and published that  
6 report, and they based it on national research and  
7 they just drew that out, so I drew it from that  
8 report. But I can go back and pull those out.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

10 MR. KYNOCH: In terms of environmental  
11 liability, in our original report we provided a  
12 detailed assessment from our lawyers on  
13 environmental liability. The key message here is  
14 that liability is complex, but there are laws in  
15 place to protect the public interest. There is a  
16 substantial body of legislation, of bylaws dealing  
17 with environmental liability. The advice that we  
18 received is that environmental liability is  
19 determined by the circumstances and parties  
20 involved in a particular situation. And we can  
21 provide more information on that, if so required.

22 In terms of other jurisdictions, we  
23 didn't do a very detailed review of all of the  
24 legislation and regulations in other  
25 jurisdictions. There is just so much. We want to



1 emphasize, though, that the Commission, when it  
2 does -- you will have your technical team who can  
3 do that for you. But consider the details of the  
4 various regulations and how they are actually  
5 enforced. There is a lot of stuff done on paper  
6 but maybe not enforced. The devil is in the  
7 details.

8                   The existing legislation and  
9 regulations in Manitoba have been developed by  
10 government officials after extensive comparisons  
11 with other approaches elsewhere and extensive  
12 public consultation. And it is time to deal with  
13 all of the rules that have been introduced. Our  
14 feeling is that we don't need any further  
15 regulations. It is time to get on with the job at  
16 hand.

17                   In terms of economic impact, as we  
18 said earlier, there is a number of studies that  
19 have been done on the economic impact. The core  
20 one was done by the University of Manitoba on a  
21 certain area of central Manitoba, they looked at  
22 196 hog operations, these produced \$267 million in  
23 goods and services and generated \$2,779 person  
24 years of employment.

25                   All we are saying here is, when you



1 are thinking of regulations and changing how we do  
2 business, think of the impact on the provincial  
3 and rural economy.

4                   In terms of the future, world growth  
5 or demand for pork products is increasing. World  
6 production needs to increase by about 25 to  
7 30 million hogs per year globally for the next  
8 decade to meet that demand. And in comparative  
9 terms, the total production of Canada at this time  
10 is about 30 million pigs, so world demand is  
11 increasing by the amount that Canada produces as a  
12 whole.

13                   In terms of threats, this is a fragile  
14 industry to some extent, like any other livestock  
15 industry, and we face the same issues that any  
16 other livestock sector faces in terms of the  
17 potential for constriction or diminishing of the  
18 industry could come from: Restrictive government  
19 policies, unforeseen animal diseases, shortage of  
20 investment capital, lack of competitively priced  
21 grains, exchange rate fluctuations, or restrictive  
22 U.S. border tariffs or regulations.

23                   Our core message here is any growth in  
24 the future will be modest, as we showed earlier in  
25 our graphs. We figure maybe a modest growth rate



1 of 1 or 2 per cent per annum.

2                   Some people asked, what is a  
3 reasonable number? And we feel that is an  
4 exercise in futility. The role of government is  
5 to provide the rules of conduct for individual  
6 entrepreneurs in the economy. The availability of  
7 capital, land, labour, profits, regulations, these  
8 will all determine whether the industry grows or  
9 shrinks.

10                   In terms of an innovative industry, we  
11 take pride in being proactive in emerging  
12 environmental issues. Unfortunately, for us right  
13 now, this pause has created a negative atmosphere  
14 and individual producers are very reluctant to  
15 make any further investments at this time, until  
16 this matter is resolved.

17                   In terms of the role of government,  
18 core message here is, please, use other policy  
19 tools. We have had enough with regulations, let's  
20 get on with what was been done. We still have yet  
21 to realize the impact of the existing regulations  
22 up to even November of 2006. There are a host of  
23 other policy tools that can be used, research  
24 funds, tax incentives, public assistance,  
25 education, general guidelines, conflict resolution





1 mechanisms, more organic farming in terms of  
2 recycling plant nutrient from manure, grants for  
3 reducing nuisance odours from existing operations  
4 using new technologies and so on.

5           The message is that the hog industry  
6 in Manitoba is heavily regulated. Successive  
7 Provincial Governments have created one of the  
8 strictest sets of environmental regulations for  
9 the livestock industry in North America.

10           The hog industry is ideal for  
11 Manitoba. It is a slow but steady growth  
12 industry. We need to finish more of the existing  
13 weanling crop, and there is all kinds of reasons  
14 why. And in terms of expansion, to put some  
15 perspective here, Manitoba in 2006, we may have  
16 built 12 barns. In Iowa they built 290 barns in  
17 the same year. So this is not dramatic growth or  
18 anything by any stretch of the imagination.

19           Now, if we could finish more of the  
20 weanlings, we could provide a domestic market for  
21 the grain and oil seed industry, we could reduce  
22 our dependence on synthetic and imported mineral  
23 fertilizers, we could reduce the threat of trade  
24 action, we could improve the stability of our meat  
25 processing industry, and we can add value to raw



1 grains and oilseeds.

2                   And a final message, Manitoba has a  
3 world class industry which can deliver final  
4 product into some of the most discriminating  
5 markets in the world. We should be proud of this  
6 achievement and encourage the industry to grow and  
7 develop for the benefit of all Manitobans.

8                   I'm going to turn it over to Peter Mah  
9 to provide sort of a looking forward piece and  
10 some conclusions and recommendations.

11                   MR. MAH: Good afternoon,  
12 Mr. Chairman, fellow Commissioners. It is my task  
13 to sort of bring home some conclusions and  
14 recommendations from this two month process,  
15 public process, 17 public meetings in 15 local  
16 areas throughout agri Manitoba.

17                   First of all, we want to say that we  
18 as the Pork Council recognize that the Clean  
19 Environment Commission, the public review process  
20 has been very beneficial, certainly in bringing  
21 forward a whole range of views from the public  
22 about our farms, about the environmental  
23 sustainability of our hog production industry in  
24 Manitoba. But there is two key observations that  
25 we have noticed throughout the whole two month



1 process.

2                   The first is, while protection of our  
3 precious natural environment is a concern to all  
4 persons, the environmental sustainability of the  
5 hog production in Manitoba is not, in our view, a  
6 significant issue for most Manitobans. And we  
7 cite really through the course of the meetings  
8 that somewhere in the order of about 150 verbal  
9 and formal written submissions to date have been  
10 received, not a great amount. Mind you, at the  
11 same time, we also note that the number of people  
12 who actually attended the meetings, and there were  
13 many time slots that were actually open to the  
14 Commission where people who had the opportunity,  
15 who were very, very concerned, to come forward and  
16 speak their mind, to give you suggestions. They  
17 did not appear. And of the people who did appear,  
18 about 90 per cent, in our view, were in favour of  
19 the industry, and felt very strongly that they  
20 were doing the most that they can do to protect  
21 the environment. So our conclusion is, as I have  
22 said before, that it is not a significant issue  
23 for most Manitobans relative to the environmental  
24 sustainability of this hog industry.

25                   We believe as well that most



1 Manitobans have confidence in government to  
2 monitor and enforce environmental regulations in  
3 the public interest, unlike some people who we  
4 believe are cynical of government and look at  
5 every opportunity to rail against establishments,  
6 certain processes, certain laws and regulations.

7           Our second observation is that there  
8 is a relatively small number, but determined group  
9 in their own right, these citizens who are very  
10 passionate about an anti-hog industry. I take  
11 nothing away from them, they are very passionate,  
12 but they are a very small group. Mr. Chairman and  
13 Commissioners, I have to tell you that they are  
14 the ones in the news, they are the ones at the CEC  
15 public meetings, and they are the ones who are  
16 here today. They have relied heavily on emotional  
17 debate. They have used anecdotal, connect the  
18 dots cause and effect hypothesis to argue the need  
19 for crisis regulatory intervention, crisis  
20 regulatory intervention.

21           And it is particularly noted that  
22 little in the way of very factual or documentary  
23 evidence sourced in Manitoba itself has been  
24 provided to substantiate the claims of gross or  
25 widespread environmental degradation by the hog





1 industry in Manitoba. So we ask, therefore, we  
2 ask Manitobans and we ask the Clean Environment  
3 Commission, where is the smoking gun?

4           Today hog farming is the most heavily  
5 regulated and publicly monitored industry in  
6 Manitoba, without a question. Yet there are  
7 relatively few formal warnings and charges for  
8 environmental offences for over 1,400 pork  
9 producers, in an industry that produces almost  
10 nine million pigs annually in Manitoba. This we  
11 believe is a testament to our producers'  
12 individual commitment to environmental farm  
13 stewardship on their farms and on the land.

14           And just to demonstrate, and I can  
15 give you copies of this later, I have a copy of  
16 the enforcement actions since 1998 to 2005. It  
17 indicates that in '98 there were 50 infractions  
18 and enforcement actions under the Livestock Manure  
19 and Mortalities Management Regulation, which of  
20 course affects all livestock species, not just  
21 hogs, there was 50 in that year, rising to a high  
22 of 130 in year 2003. So obviously there was a  
23 need to notch up the enforcement action, the  
24 public was demanding more enforcement, and that  
25 was done. And that is concomitant to the number



1 of increased warnings, violations and fines.

2           At the same time, since 2003 to 2005,  
3 those are the latest statistics that I have here,  
4 it went down from 130 to 100 violations, a  
5 decrease of 25 per cent. In a time when in fact  
6 the public scrutiny for more enforcement was  
7 taking place, the industry, the livestock industry  
8 in general, the violations went down. Very, very  
9 significant. And that was for manure management  
10 plan violations, permits, storages, confinements,  
11 spills and mortalities, the whole range, the whole  
12 gamut of public regulation on the livestock  
13 industry.

14           I cite as well that the Farm Practice  
15 Protection Board, again, citing 13 years of  
16 statistics established in 1994, there were 75  
17 complaints that were received in which decisions  
18 were rendered, 75 in that period of time. Now, 58  
19 of those were odour related. And as Andrew has  
20 indicated, yes, odour is an issue for our industry  
21 but we are addressing it. Of the 58 odours, 49  
22 were hogs. So, Commissioners, roughly 49 -- not  
23 roughly, 49 or about 50 of the 75 were hog  
24 related. Okay. So we have some work there.

25           I would like to just point out that,



1 as we had indicated on March 5th, in terms of our  
2 opening presentation, that we caution that public  
3 perceptions are not a good basis for public policy  
4 making, absolutely terrible.

5           Using manure application, as an  
6 example, it has been a point of controversy mostly  
7 because of its benefits as a tightly regulated  
8 manure natural fertilizer is not well understood  
9 by the general public. But soil scientists, and  
10 agronomists and producers know that when properly  
11 applied and recycled, manure helps to rebuild the  
12 soil and is a valuable source of nutrients to grow  
13 crops.

14           As such we believe that the CEC's  
15 investigation review be accountable and its  
16 findings and recommendations to be sound, it must  
17 carefully weigh within the scope of the mandate of  
18 the CEC hearing all of the information to be  
19 filtered by three tests, this is a reminder, one  
20 is relevancy, two is facts and three is good  
21 science.

22           We believe that Manitoba's hog  
23 producers, indeed the whole agriculture industry  
24 and agri business sector which, of course, is  
25 affected by this pause, like most Manitobans are



1 prepared to trust in the integrity and judgement  
2 of the Clean Environment Commission, particularly  
3 to decipher the factual merit of all the  
4 submissions and to arrive at well thought out and  
5 reasonable conclusions and recommendations.

6           One of the conclusions which we  
7 believe is defensible, and we trust the CEC would  
8 also conclude at the end of your findings that  
9 there have been a lot of legislative and  
10 regulatory changes adopted and initiatives taken  
11 by government to deal with livestock and the  
12 environment in Manitoba. It has been a big issue  
13 in Manitoba for the last ten years, more so since  
14 1999. In total, they would create a comprehensive  
15 safety net, a tool box for government and a tool  
16 box for communities, and a tool box for ordinary  
17 citizens, to ensure that the livestock industry  
18 grows in a sustainable way.

19           And these measures include the first  
20 set of livestock regulations to regulate manure  
21 application adopted in 1994, the Farm Practices  
22 Protection Act, the Farm Practice Guidelines to  
23 deal with livestock siting and odour management,  
24 formation and operation of provincial livestock  
25 technical review committees, the Livestock





1 Stewardship Review Panel report, and the public  
2 meetings, and the report submitted in December of  
3 2000, amendments to further strengthen the  
4 Livestock Manure and Mortalities Management  
5 Regulation in March of 2001, creation of the  
6 Office of Drinking Water, increased environmental  
7 monitoring and enforcement of livestock operations  
8 as a result, a further requirement for annual  
9 water source testing for livestock operations over  
10 300 animal units. The government themselves had  
11 filed a 2005 provincial sustainability report for  
12 all of Manitoba, not just the livestock sector,  
13 but all human made activities here in Manitoba.  
14 Adoption of the Water Protection Act in January of  
15 2006, the adoption of the Planning Act requiring  
16 mandatory local livestock policies, adopted and  
17 enforced in January of '06. There was a  
18 subsequent amendment to the Provincial Land Use  
19 Policy Regulation number 2 that, in effect,  
20 adopted minimum provincial siting standards or  
21 separation distances for livestock, and that would  
22 be from designated residences and designated urban  
23 centres, and that happened in January of '06.

24                   And of course, the government had  
25 completed its 2006 report called "Examining the



1 Environmental Sustainability of the Hog Industry  
2 in Manitoba," which I might point out,  
3 Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, identified no  
4 significant issues, no significant issues.

5                   We have as well mandatory registration  
6 and inspection of all manure storage facilities,  
7 mandatory. We have strengthened livestock  
8 technical review committees, mandates and  
9 resources, that just happened recently. As we  
10 know and we have already talked about the adoption  
11 of a new phosphorous regulatory amendment only  
12 recently in November of '06. And then the Lake  
13 Winnipeg Stewardship Board public review process,  
14 which again it was a whole public process, and  
15 they submitted the report in December of '06. And  
16 their report was called "Reducing Nutrient Loading  
17 to Lake Winnipeg and Its Watershed, Our Collective  
18 Responsibility and Commitment to Action." It  
19 noted as well that the province had already taken  
20 action on 113 of the board's 135 recognitions.  
21 Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I ask you, where  
22 is the smoking gun?

23                   Work in updating the Farm Practice  
24 Guidelines for hog producers in December of 2006.  
25 That has yet to be submitted for public release,



1 but we know the work has been done, it has been  
2 sitting on the shelf. There has as well been a  
3 public consultation period, extensively, through  
4 negotiations with consumers, public, agricultural  
5 groups, Manitoba Municipal Association, about the  
6 nutrient management regulation under the Water  
7 Protection Act. There has been an announcement of  
8 an expanded mandate for the Lake Winnipeg Water  
9 Stewardship Board made on February 14, 2007.  
10 Their role is to monitor ongoing progress and to  
11 restore the health of Lake Winnipeg and to  
12 coordinate a basin-wide watershed management plan.  
13 And, of course, we are here today over the course  
14 for the last two months before the Clean  
15 Environment Commission on your investigation of  
16 our industry.

17           Bottom line, taken as a whole, all  
18 Manitobans can be assured that Manitoba has a  
19 comprehensive safety net of public policy and  
20 livestock development, and environmental  
21 regulations at the Federal, Provincial and local  
22 levels and, in fact, some of the toughest measures  
23 to protect our natural environment for current and  
24 future use. A litany of whole new initiatives, a  
25 litany of acts and regulations; where is the



1 smoking gun? In terms of producers' financial  
2 commitment, I have got to tell you that in spite  
3 of all of the regulations and acts, we as an  
4 industry have not stood back and done nothing.

5                   Since 1999 when Manitoba Pork Council  
6 was created as a producer board funded solely by  
7 its members, we have invested over five and a half  
8 million dollars towards third party, independent  
9 research institutions in improving swine  
10 production, protecting the environment, and in  
11 technology transfer. This includes the University  
12 of Manitoba's Faculty of Animal Science, the  
13 Prairie Swine Centre, the Veterinary Infectious  
14 Disease Organization, the Canadian Research  
15 Network, Manitoba Manure Management Initiative,  
16 which by the way the hog sector is the principle  
17 funder in spite of the fact that it was supposed  
18 to be a livestock initiative, and the Lake  
19 Winnipeg Research Consortium, we have been funding  
20 for over the past three to four years. This also  
21 includes a half a million dollars of producer  
22 funds to the University of Manitoba's National  
23 Centre for Livestock and the Environment, and  
24 another \$850,000, ladies and gentlemen,  
25 contributed and pledged to its Glenlea Farm





1 Education Centre.

2                   What does this mean? It means that  
3 such research programs out of the pockets of  
4 producers, these programs, technology transfer and  
5 education benefits all of Manitoba and society,  
6 incurred by the hog producers of this province.

7                   Our pig producers have also invested  
8 14 and a half million dollars themselves to  
9 construct engineered manure storages and new  
10 manure management technologies directly on their  
11 farms since 1994. They have incurred that cost.  
12 Manitoba pig producers have also undertaken many  
13 environmental initiatives, employed many  
14 beneficial management practices that exceed  
15 current regulations.

16                   Over the next ten years, Manitoba pig  
17 producers will spend anywhere from 18 to  
18 \$28 million annually, according to a 2006 analysis  
19 by the University of Manitoba, to comply with the  
20 new phosphorous regulation, which again was  
21 adopted in November of '06. And when it is fully  
22 phased in, that will be again 18 to \$28 million.  
23 In addition to which, we are on track as Manitoba  
24 Pork Council on behalf of our membership, to  
25 invest another half million dollars annually on



1 ongoing environmental research, tech transfer and  
2 other environmental initiatives.

3           I have to tell you, Manitoba pork  
4 producers are part of the solution. We are  
5 strongly committed to environmental protection on  
6 our farms and we are heavily invested in our  
7 industry, as our industry continues to be  
8 environmentally friendly and sustainable. I guess  
9 if anything else, we challenge government, we  
10 challenge other industries, environmental  
11 coalitions, and ordinary citizens to do their part  
12 as much as our 1,400 pig producers.

13           In terms of recommendations, I will go  
14 through this very quickly. Manitoba Pork Council,  
15 on behalf of the pig producers in the province, is  
16 prepared to continue to work with the government,  
17 industry stakeholders and Manitoba communities to  
18 meet our common goals and objectives, and to this  
19 end we offer a number of recommendations to the  
20 Clean Environment Commission in three main areas,  
21 the livestock planning and approval process,  
22 regulations monitoring and enforcement, and  
23 working in partnership.

24           First the livestock planning and  
25 review process. Obviously this is a



1 multi-jurisdictional process involving federal,  
2 provincial and local authorities. And you may  
3 find in your booklets, Commissioners, that there  
4 is in fact a table, and in that table it lists the  
5 existing legislation. And as you go through that,  
6 you can see on the left-hand side that there is,  
7 in fact -- existing legislation is four federal  
8 acts, the Health of Animals Act, the Animal Care  
9 Act, the Fisheries Act, the Species at Risk Act.  
10 Provincial is the Animal Care Act, the Animal  
11 Diseases Act, Sustainable Development Act,  
12 Environment Act and so on. You go all of the way  
13 down right to the local municipalities and  
14 planning districts with development plans and  
15 zoning bylaws. If it is not there, then we should  
16 have -- we will make it available for you.

17           On the right-hand side is the proposed  
18 and draft legislation which again includes the  
19 provincial nutrient management regulation, which  
20 has been proposed, there is the draft Agri Food  
21 Traceability Act. At the local municipalities  
22 there will be local livestock operations policies  
23 and, of course, new livestock zoning, and the  
24 water planning authority, the water management  
25 plans yet to come. There is in fact a litany of



1 new legislation.

2                   For the farmer, I have to tell you  
3 that this is indeed formidable, it is indeed  
4 formidable.

5                   If I have lost you, I'm sorry, if you  
6 go to page 3-7, it deals with more livestock  
7 operations policy guidance. In this particular  
8 case we note that the advent of the new Water  
9 Protection Act also indicates that local livestock  
10 operations policies must consider the water  
11 quality management zones and any water management  
12 plans prepared by water management authorities. I  
13 have to tell you that these two planning  
14 requirements, to do the livestock operations  
15 policies and consider water planning policies is  
16 of itself very confusing. It is confusing a lot  
17 of local officials who are mandated to do that.  
18 And we feel it is very important that the province  
19 should show more guidance on how to prepare these  
20 local livestock operations policies, particularly  
21 in terms of the interface between those two acts.

22                   We feel as well that the province  
23 should encourage local planning authorities and  
24 municipal councils to adopt the updated Farm  
25 Practices Guidelines -- which have yet to come





1 out -- and the provincial land use policy,  
2 livestock standards number 2, which includes local  
3 mutual separation standards between residences,  
4 designated areas and livestock.

5           We also feel that one of the things  
6 that municipalities can do in developing a local  
7 livestock operations policy, and if I can turn  
8 your attention to this diagram on the wall, and  
9 that is to be able to take a look at a concept  
10 where, in fact, you have -- this is not going to  
11 work -- in terms of the designated urban centres  
12 and villages, the interface between residences and  
13 livestock is always a source of conflict, farm,  
14 non-farm. So in case of residences, they would be  
15 encouraged in urban centres but, of course, no  
16 livestock would and should allowed in villages and  
17 centres. At the same time, designated rural  
18 residential areas, which are quite common now,  
19 rural residences would be encouraged, but of  
20 course no livestock would and should be allowed.  
21 That seems clear.

22           However, when you go to the  
23 agricultural area, that seems to be the area of  
24 contention. And in the area of a designated  
25 livestock area, the Planning Act already provides



1 the ability for a municipality and a community to  
2 designate areas where livestock will, in fact, be  
3 permitted. The fact that it has not, first of  
4 all, is basically a missing point. I think there  
5 has been so much controversy and so much reliance  
6 upon conditional use process, which has some merit  
7 but which can be improved, this would in fact  
8 allow a municipality and a community to designate  
9 those areas which are best suited for livestock,  
10 from a resource point of view, from a land use  
11 point of view, from an infrastructural point of  
12 view and transportation point of view. In those  
13 areas, the livestock, in fact, based upon  
14 appropriate siting requirements, mutual separation  
15 distances, and conditions of approval, and that  
16 would be spelled out in the local livestock  
17 operations policies, that in fact livestock should  
18 be permitted in those areas, with the proviso that  
19 residences should not be allowed in those areas.  
20 Because when you get that proximity, that is where  
21 you get the conflict.

22           At the same time, in a general  
23 agricultural area, which is the bottom one, you  
24 would have perhaps an area where there is already  
25 some mixed land uses, and in those instances it



1 would be appropriate to retain the conditional use  
2 process where, in fact, the local compatibility,  
3 land use compatibility can be weighed.

4                   And that, Mr. Chairman and  
5 Commissioners, is one opportunity by which local  
6 municipalities and the province can move ahead.

7                   The conditional use process is very  
8 fractional, it is very confrontational, and I  
9 think a little bit more clarity, a little bit more  
10 precision will bring this home.

11                   Let me go to improving the technical  
12 review team process. The process itself is a  
13 valuable process, it provides a lot of expertise  
14 to both municipalities and the province. This is  
15 under page 39. To improve the process, however,  
16 we feel that more provincial staff should be  
17 assigned to the technical review team process. We  
18 feel that a one to two month period to complete a  
19 TRC report is appropriate to do the necessary site  
20 visits and do all of the analysis. A six month  
21 period is totally unreasonable. And we feel as  
22 well, with more staff assigned to the TRC process  
23 that, in fact, it would allow staff to go out to  
24 the conditional use meetings, where they may  
25 occur, to defend their report and answer questions



1 and clarify for the public and for council. So  
2 this would all come forward and, in fact, what it  
3 would do, it would bring a lot of precision, a lot  
4 of clarity and a lot of confidence to this whole  
5 process.

6                   Okay. I have already talked about the  
7 new regulations and processes to be implemented,  
8 and we are now going to move forward to, on page  
9 313, considering the impact of CEC  
10 recommendations.

11                   We think, we believe that the CEC  
12 should look at the impact of your recommendations  
13 about more regulations, or potential for more  
14 regulations. Numerous rules and regulations under  
15 which hog farmers and other livestock producers  
16 must meet to gain initial approval and to continue  
17 to operate already have serious implications for  
18 the future of livestock food production. As more  
19 and more regulations and resultant costs are  
20 added, they threaten the viability of farm  
21 operations with the potential to either drive  
22 existing producers off the land or to discourage  
23 young farmers from becoming livestock producers.  
24 And I have already gone through and just shown you  
25 that in fact there is a long list of regulations.





1                   There is also a need to consider the  
2 impact of trying to regulate the production model  
3 and scale of production. I have heard here today  
4 and at some of the other meetings that they are  
5 advocating that government should say we should  
6 move towards a straw-based system. Well,  
7 Manitoba's hog industry is characterized by both  
8 small scale farm families and larger more  
9 specialized producer companies. Both scales of  
10 production have their own unique merits and  
11 challenges.

12                   In the case of small scale farm family  
13 pork producers, they have typically diversified  
14 their farms with hog production but have limited  
15 ability to bring on outside labour, substantive  
16 new investment capital and apply new technology.  
17 Instead they utilize beneficial management  
18 practices that are appropriate and best suited to  
19 their own farm operation.

20                   On the other hand, larger scale pig  
21 producers in Manitoba are typically either more  
22 specialized producer companies, or those that are  
23 communally owned and operated by Hutterite  
24 colonies. They are more able to employ or retain  
25 specialist advice in nutrient management,



1 financial and marketing analysis, and are better  
2 able to invest and apply the latest technologies  
3 and innovations in their operations.

4           Manitoba's pig industry has evolved  
5 over time, and the pig producers should be able to  
6 choose the operational scale and model production  
7 that best fits the needs of the farmer, the  
8 marketplace, and farm location. The farmers'  
9 right to choose between a modern conventional farm  
10 versus straw based system must be maintained. We  
11 recommend therefore that government not regulate  
12 the type of production model or system that  
13 producers must use on their farms.

14           In terms of regulations monitoring  
15 enforcement, as I mentioned before, hog farming is  
16 subject to more public scrutiny and media  
17 attention than any other land use in agri  
18 Manitoba. We, as the Pork Council, encourage all  
19 producers to undertake full compliance with all  
20 applicable recommendations. Again, compared to  
21 Saskatchewan and North Dakota, Manitoba has the  
22 highest level of enforcement and soil auditing.  
23 And this includes the only jurisdiction, as I have  
24 mentioned, that requires the submission of annual  
25 soil tests prior to manure application by all



1 medium and large livestock producers, the in-field  
2 utilizing of soil tests, and the only jurisdiction  
3 in Canada where environment officers are empowered  
4 to issue automatic tickets.

5                   We do however feel that there is a  
6 need for the province to hire more enforcement  
7 staff to ensure that all producers are in  
8 compliance with the regulations.

9                   The Manitoba Government has committed  
10 to doing ten per cent of all manure management  
11 plans in terms of audits, and we feel that with  
12 more enforcement staff, they would be able to  
13 fulfill that mandate. We also feel that, and  
14 recommend that municipalities hire more  
15 development officers to monitor and enforce local  
16 conditions of approval, those conditions which  
17 they themselves have said they need to enforce.

18                   We wish to also recommend that the  
19 province proceed to amend the Pesticides and  
20 Fertilizers Control Act to implement the mandatory  
21 certification for manure applicators as soon as  
22 possible. I think we heard that before, that we  
23 are prepared as an industry to have that done.  
24 Both increased monitoring and enforcement and the  
25 certification of manure applicators is important



1 to our industry to ensure accountability for all  
2 producers and to ensure and build public  
3 confidence that enviromental regulations and local  
4 conditions of approval are, in fact, being  
5 followed.

6                   Working in partnership, and I am  
7 moving to a conclusion here, we are committed to  
8 work to ensure the sustainable development of  
9 Manitoba's pig industry producing safe quality  
10 food in an environmentally and socially  
11 sustainable manner. The government again needs to  
12 look at other policy tools other than regulation,  
13 and we believe that government and industry  
14 working in partnership can achieve more, we can do  
15 it sooner and at less cost when we work together.

16                   What we would like to see happen is  
17 the Manitoba Government join the producers in  
18 lobbying the Federal Government to remove  
19 specifically two barriers that restrict our  
20 ability to manage phosphorous. The first is to  
21 amend table 4 of the Animal Feed Act, which limits  
22 the benefits of phytase, which has the potential  
23 to reduce phosphorous by 40 per cent. Feed  
24 manufacturers today are obligated to add mineral  
25 phosphates to the feed rations and, of course, we





1 have concerns about that and we are using phytase  
2 to try to reduce it, so it counterbalances it.

3                   The second area in which we could use  
4 government's help is the need for CFIA to license  
5 grain varieties to remove barriers to allow the  
6 registration of the low phytate feed grains, and  
7 that in itself would also provide us with an  
8 ability to manage our phosphorous.

9                   To move forward in the next little  
10 while with all of the new regulations and with the  
11 phosphorous challenge, and the opportunity to  
12 improve our footprint, if you will, on the  
13 landscape, livestock producers are going to need  
14 help. They can't do it on their own. They are  
15 already making significant investments on their  
16 own farms, and as an industry as we have  
17 indicated, but they need help particularly in  
18 those areas southeast Manitoba and the Red River  
19 Valley where in fact more public incentives are  
20 required.

21                   We feel as well that in that sense we  
22 need to remove the government pause or moratorium,  
23 which we believe is counter productive, for four  
24 reasons. The industry is prevented from closing  
25 down old facilities and consolidating them into



1 modern facilities which would have to comply  
2 immediately with the higher environmental  
3 standards for nitrogen and phosphorous. They are  
4 prevented from doing that.

5                 Secondly, the pause threatens the  
6 economic viability of the industry by encouraging  
7 producers to build finishing facilities for their  
8 weanlings in other provinces and states. This  
9 results in the loss of real value added jobs in  
10 processing and other related support industries,  
11 reduces markets for local grain producers, and  
12 reduces the potential for raising more tax  
13 revenues to support vital services and jobs in  
14 rural communities.

15                 Thirdly, it discourages farmers from  
16 making long-term investments in new facilities and  
17 technologies which will result in a better  
18 environment for all Manitobans. Investment, as we  
19 know, is all about confidence in the future.  
20 Arbitrary decisions done for political reasons, in  
21 our view, do little to inspire confidence.

22                 Our last reason is, the immediate  
23 impact of a moratorium is lost jobs and  
24 investment. The key question that we have for the  
25 Commission is, how does this moratorium or pause



1 build a sustainable industry and a sustainable  
2 future for Manitoba?

3                   And I would now like to turn it over  
4 to the chairman for concluding comments.

5                   MR. KYNOCH: Once again, I want to  
6 thank you for your time and for giving us an  
7 opportunity to speak on behalf of the Manitoba hog  
8 producers.

9                   Over the last two months you have  
10 heard from a lot of people about the hog  
11 production and the hog industry in general in  
12 Manitoba. The majority of these presentations  
13 have been favorable and in support of our  
14 industry. I urge you to take that into account as  
15 you put your report together. Do not allow  
16 yourself to get swayed by a small vocal minority  
17 who philosophically oppose the hog industry. I  
18 trust you will stick to the issues at hand and  
19 within the scope of your review, that is the  
20 environmental sustainability of our industry here  
21 in Manitoba.

22                   As I have said before, we are  
23 confident that this review will prove what we  
24 already know, that the hog industry is  
25 environmentally sustainable and good for Manitoba.



1 Manitoba hog producers already follow some of the  
2 toughest environmental rules and regulations in  
3 existence.

4                   On behalf of the hog producers,  
5 Manitoba Pork Council invests millions of dollars  
6 into research to improve production practices and  
7 our impact on environment. In short, hog  
8 producers are good stewards of the land and will  
9 continue to be, protecting our land and precious  
10 resources for our future generations.

11                   More than anything, we encourage you  
12 to move swiftly as you prepare your report. The  
13 government did significant damage last December by  
14 introducing a pause on our industry and halting  
15 any new development or expansion. This has tied  
16 farmers' hands and prevented any forward planning.  
17 We are already seeing equipment dealers and  
18 construction crews facing layoffs. The long-term  
19 effects of the pause could be very negative for  
20 the future of our industry and, ultimately, the  
21 Manitoba economy. We want the pause lifted so we  
22 can move forward and hog farmers can get back to  
23 business, just like everyone else.

24                   Thank you for your time and we look  
25 forward to seeing your report.





1                   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I just have  
2 two or three questions of clarification really.  
3 On page 2-10, the very first paragraph -- just let  
4 me review this for a moment. Yes, the last part  
5 of the first paragraph you say, and producers are  
6 required to keep records on consumption rates. Is  
7 that all producers or producers over a certain  
8 size?

9                   MR. DICKSON: The producers who are  
10 licensed for these 215 have to keep records of  
11 what water consumption they have. And I know most  
12 producers under 25,000 litres per day, most of  
13 them keep some sort of records. The reason being  
14 is it determines how much your storage facility is  
15 filling up, because the water going in goes  
16 somewhere else.

17                   THE CHAIRMAN: Further down that same  
18 page, you talk about the annual allocation of  
19 groundwater is equivalent to the average annual  
20 precipitation, et cetera. That allocation, is  
21 that just the 215 or is that all hog farmers?

22                   MR. DICKSON: That is the 215 water  
23 rights licenses, and we did a calculation based on  
24 that. It would account for about 80 per cent of  
25 the production, as we outlined in the original



1 paper.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: So that is about 80 per  
3 cent, those 215 licenses represent about 80 per  
4 cent of the industry?

5 MR. DICKSON: They are the larger  
6 operations, some of these smaller users, the water  
7 is also used for, say community purposes, if it is  
8 a Hutterite Colony of a certain size they may have  
9 a license at that level.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Page  
11 3.5, and you have mentioned this other places as  
12 well, you talk about Manitoba pig producers  
13 spending between 18 to 28 million annually. Was  
14 that done in some kind of a report?

15 MR. DICKSON: I think we sent it on a  
16 report done by the University of Manitoba,  
17 Professor Don Flaten.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: It is probably in one  
19 of those three feet of binders, or foot and a half  
20 of binders you gave us. Okay.

21 MR. DICKSON: Well, you asked us to  
22 send you stuff.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm only be facetious.  
24 I will find it. Thank you. That is all I have  
25 for clarification. Do you have any questions for



1 clarification?

2 MR. MOTHERAL: No, I had a couple of  
3 land planning but you have brought them forward.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, thank you  
5 all very much for your presentation here this  
6 afternoon and your participation throughout this  
7 process.

8 I scolded somebody earlier for  
9 clapping, so I will repeat the scolding.

10 I have very few closing comments and I  
11 will just basically make some comments to wrap up  
12 the last couple of months. As has been noted a  
13 few times this is the seventeenth and final day of  
14 the public hearing part of this review. In some  
15 ways, I suppose we could call it our second phase,  
16 the first phase having been the scoping part of  
17 it. We will have, I'm not going to get at how  
18 many more phases, but our review will change in  
19 focus and the way we approach it over the next few  
20 months.

21 I think it was Peter in his comments  
22 noted that we have had about 150 participants come  
23 out and make presentations during the 17 hearings.  
24 We have heard on just about every imaginable topic  
25 related to pork production, and we have heard on



1 the broad spectrum one to the other as far as  
2 being pro or con the industry. And for the most  
3 part, we haven't had a lot of repetition in what  
4 we have heard. And also for the most part, people  
5 have been very respectful of other participants,  
6 whether they agreed with their positions or not.

7           The next phase, we will be doing a  
8 number of things over the next couple of months.  
9 One thing we will be doing is touring a number of  
10 hog production facilities. We will probably in  
11 late June, hopefully in late June we will receive  
12 the research that we've contracted with a couple  
13 of different parties, the University of Manitoba,  
14 and the International Institute for Sustainable  
15 Development. That will come to us, as we have  
16 noted, it will be posted, as it is received it  
17 will be posted on our website. As I noted earlier  
18 in response to Glen, we will allow a reasonable  
19 amount of time to respond. At this point I don't  
20 know how long that will be. It won't be overly  
21 lengthy, but it won't be ridiculously short  
22 either.

23           There was some comments made actually  
24 by, I think both of the closing parties as to sort  
25 of the independence of the research and who we





1 should trust. Believe me, we are well aware that  
2 some of the research that we will be getting may  
3 well come down on one side or the other. But have  
4 no fear, we didn't fall off turnip trucks, I think  
5 we can weigh and assess the research that we will  
6 be getting. And if there are some issues that we  
7 clearly have trouble with, we will find some  
8 completely independent people to give us an  
9 assessment of that. And as well we will get  
10 comments from a number of the parties who have  
11 appeared before us in the last couple of months,  
12 once they have had a chance to look at this  
13 research.

14                   Our target date for a final report  
15 remains the end of this year, so December 2007. I  
16 had indicated on earlier occasions that we may put  
17 out an interim report. At this point, I cannot  
18 guarantee that we are going to do that. A concern  
19 that we have is that with the huge amount of work  
20 that we are going to have to wade through over the  
21 next few months, focusing on an interim report too  
22 early in the process may cause us to miss the  
23 December date, which we really want to meet. I  
24 can't say 100 per cent we will meet it, but we  
25 certainly really want to meet that December date.



1                   Having said that, I would like to  
2 thank all of you for coming out here today. I  
3 would like to thank the many people who have  
4 appeared before us in 14 different communities  
5 over the last couple of months for their role in  
6 this.

7                   There is still an opportunity for  
8 people to make written submissions by the 7th of  
9 May. Information in that respect is available at  
10 the back of the room and also on our website.

11                   If you particularly want to keep  
12 abreast of the process over the next few months,  
13 just check in with our website, there will be  
14 regular updates on our website.

15                   Anything else? Haven't missed  
16 anything?

17                   MR. MOTHERAL: I don't think so. I  
18 would just like to say to you, I would like to  
19 thank you for the privilege of being on this  
20 particular --

21                   THE CHAIRMAN: Well you better wait,  
22 you are not finished with me yet.

23                   MR. MOTHERAL: I realize that. Okay,  
24 in other words you want me to be quiet right now.

25                   THE CHAIRMAN: No, I don't. I'm



1 embarrassed by compliments, but thank you very  
2 much.

3 MR. MOTHERAL: I want to say, I  
4 consider this a privilege, and I know we have a  
5 hard task ahead of us, but just as some person put  
6 it, this is not about picking sides, this is about  
7 dealing with issues and that is the way I will be  
8 approaching this.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Cathy, have I missed  
10 anything?

11 Thank you all very much. I'm actually  
12 quite amazed that we got through ahead of schedule  
13 today, but I guess one cancelled presentation and  
14 one no show has helped us achieve that. So we  
15 stand adjourned.

16 (Adjourned at 4:40 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

CECELIA REID and DEBRA KOT, Court Reporters, 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.

-----

Cecelia Reid

-----

Debra Kot





