MANITOBA CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

HOG PRODUCTION INDUSTRY REVIEW

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* *

Held at the Morden Friendship Centre

Morden, Manitoba

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

* *

APPEARANCES:

Clean Environment Commission:

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

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

NO EXHIBITS MARKED

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

UPON COMMENCING AT 1:20 P.M.

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

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

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

The Clean Environment Commission has

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: Herm Martens.

HERM MARTENS, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

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

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

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

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

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

communities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The R.M. of Morris is very concerned

and aware of the environment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

comes from that.

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

This causes great frustration to the council.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As you can hear from my presentation

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: We will not be able to

insist on new permits to have the manure incorporated.

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: Yes, we do.

THE CHAIRMAN: A municipal performance bond?

MR. MARTENS: That is a municipal performance bond.

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: And how are these -- I

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: Right.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, when the province

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

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

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: Mine is about 196 animal units.

THE CHAIRMAN: Farrow to finish?

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

18 pounds.

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

MR. MARTENS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: They spread during the winter?

MR. MARTENS: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: They truly leave it in piles?

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

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

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

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

MR. MARTENS: They just spread in winter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just in winter?

MR. MARTENS: M'hm.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: Not one.

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

MR. MARTENS: Around the whole site.

MR. MOTHERAL: The whole site?

MR. MARTENS: The whole site. And, of

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

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

MR. MARTENS: Which is considerably less.

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

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

that was a happy medium and acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MARTENS: That applies to all hog barns.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MR. YEE: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

MS. SWEETNAM: Miriam Sweetnam.

MIRIAM SWEETNAM, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We bought his 80 cows and other stock,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

producers take to provide a quality product for consumers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II:

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

To use his quotation:

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

Thank you for listening.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. SWEETNAM: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why?

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: By the way, I farm.

MS. SWEETNAM: Good. You pass.

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

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

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

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

MR. MOTHERAL: That's this year?

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

MR. MOTHERAL: And does that coincide

with the new phosphorus regulations?

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

MR. MOTHERAL: Not until November.

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

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

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

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

MS. SWEETNAM: And I certainly understand that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. YEE: Thank you.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Sweetnam.

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

yourselves for the record?

MR. McEWAN: Les McEwan.

MR. ORCHARD: Gordon Orchard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

reports are issued in 2008.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fecal coliforms are used as an indicator of potential contamination by fecal matter getting into the water. Measurements at all sites are represented as the number of fecal coliforms per 100 milliliters of water. Measurements at all sites are represented as the number of fecal coliforms per 100 milliliters of

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

impact on the water quality of the watershed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. ORCHARD: You want me to slow down?

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

application?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

lower.

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

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

Some solutions from the final report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

all contributors of N and P to our environment.

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. McEWAN: That's our plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McEwan.

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

MR. McEWAN: 11, I think, maybe.

MR. ORCHARD: It has implications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. McEWAN: Yes.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

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

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

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

MR. McEWAN: Well, construction and maintenance.

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

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

MR. NEUMANN: Sig Neumann.

SIEG NEUMANN, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

expansion".

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

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

come and visit council before the process of public hearings?

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

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

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

We like to see it totally covered up

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

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

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

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

MR. YEE: Thank you.

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

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

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

MR. HOFER: Edwin Hofer.

EDWIN HOFER, having been sworn, presents as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: What kind of system was that?

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

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

MR. HOFER: 700 sows.

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

MR. HOFER: Farrow to finish.

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

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

is tied up in the slab of cement.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

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

MR. HOFER: Thank you.

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

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

MR. D. McLEAN: Done McLean.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Farming, and farmers like us, depend

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Most of these efforts come at a

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

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

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

ability to succeed.

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McLean.

How big are your hog and cow/calf operations?

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. R. McLEAN: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. YEE: Thank you.

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

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

different ones.

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

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

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

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

was beneficial.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

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

MR. D. McLEAN: It is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Learning it was a benefit?

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,

gentlemen.

MR. R. McLEAN: Thank you.

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

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

(PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 3:48 P.M.
AND RECONVENED AT 7:05 P.M.)

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: Wendy Friesen.

WENDY FRIESEN, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

coolest part of the day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: Near Low Farm, Manitoba.

THE CHAIRMAN: And how many hogs do you have?

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

THE CHAIRMAN: 50?

MS. FRIESEN: 50.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it is a fairly small operation?

MS. FRIESEN: Pardon me?

THE CHAIRMAN: So that is a fairly small operation?

MS. FRIESEN: Yes, it is.

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

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: For the most part, mice.
MR. MOTHERAL: Oh, mice, okay.
MS. FRIESEN: Yes.
MR. MOTHERAL: I was wondering with all of the anti -- the steps you were taking. I'm a farmer myself and my problem, of course, was with rats, but they are the same family.
THE CHAIRMAN: But you lived closer to the border.
MS. FRIESEN: Well, we choose to keep the mice out of the barns for cleanliness reasons and also for longevity of the barn structure itself.
MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. Another question, when you said you have a pond dug-out, so does that mean a dug-out for your water supply?
MS. FRIESEN: That's right.
MR. MOTHERAL: And is that groundwater or is that surface water? I mean the dug-out is fed by underground water, is it?
MS. FRIESEN: No.
MR. MOTHERAL: It is all from surface water?
MS. FRIESEN: It's surface water. But we have a dike that runs passed the front of our

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: Yes, Morris.

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

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

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

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

MR. MOTHERAL: Per month.

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: Currently, yes.

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

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

MR. MOTHERAL: You do?

MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

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

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

You mean the dead animals?

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: I may be wrong on that.

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

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

MS. FRIESEN: That was one of the

years, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: '96 as well?

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Did it flood the lagoon?

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. Yes, okay. Edwin?

MR. YEE: I am just wondering, Miss

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

MS. FRIESEN: Right.

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

MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

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

MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

MR. YEE: Thanks.

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

MS. FRIESEN: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

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

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

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

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

MR. SMITH: My name is Dave Smith.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

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

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

MR. SMITH: I just wanted clarification on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

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

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

CERTIFICATE

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

Lisa Reid