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THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for your patience. We are now ready to get going.

My name is Terry Sargeant. I'm the Chair of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission. I'm also the Chair of this panel. With me on the panel are Mr. Edwin Yee and Mr. Wayne Motheral.

I have a few opening comments just to set out the parameters of our review. The Clean Environment Commission has been requested by the Minister of Conservation to conduct an investigation into the environmental sustainability of hog production in Manitoba. The Terms of Reference from the Minister direct us to review the current environmental protection measures in place relating to hog production, in order to determine the effectiveness of those measures 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 means of public
meetings in the various regions of Manitoba.

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

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 may be necessary to provide for the environmental sustainability of hog production in this province.

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 our province. These meetings will continue through April, or 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 our mandate. 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, provided that
the presenter has arranged with our staff prior to
the presentation.

Those making presentations will be
asked to take an oath promising to tell the truth.
Presentations should be relevant to the mandate
given to us by the Minister and to the issues
described in the Guide to Public Participation in
this review. If a presentation is clearly not
relevant, it may be ruled out of order. And if it
is clearly repetitive, it may also be ruled out of
order.

Members of the panel may ask questions
of any presenter, during or after the
presentation. There will be no opportunity for
any others to ask questions or to 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. For the most
part, those will be in late June. Individuals,
anyone who is interested, will be invited to provide comment on any of the reports, if they so wish. A reasonable, albeit brief period of time, will be allowed for these comments.

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

We also realize that many people are reluctant to make presentations in public for a variety of reasons. To that end, we have engaged a student from the University of Manitoba to meet with, or talk on the phone, with people who would rather not speak at the meetings. These meetings will be kept in confidence. Information as to how to contact her is available at the back of the room, and also on our website.

Some administrative matters. If you wish to make a presentation today, and have not already registered to do so, please register at the table at the back of the room. As is our normal practice, we are recording these sessions. Verbatim transcripts will be available online in a day or so. You can find the link from our website.
In respect of cell phones, I would ask that they be turned off, or at least that the ring tones be turned down. If you must take a call, I would ask that you leave the room. And, finally, I would ask that you not engage in any conversations in the audience while people are making presentations. Thank you.

We have a number of people who have registered to present this afternoon. The first person on the agenda, I'm not sure is here. Is Liz Clayton here? No. Then the next person who is registered is Mr. Rick Prejet. Is he here? Please come up to the table at the front, please. Would you please state your name for the record?

MR. PREJET: Richard Prejet.

RICHARD PREJET, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and please proceed.

MR. PREJET: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Richard Prejet. I am a hog producer from Notre Dame de Lourdes. I would like to start by giving a brief background of myself and the companies that I am a partner in: Porcherie Lac du Onze and
Porcherie Notre Dame.

I was born and raised in Notre Dame de Lourdes on a grain and dairy operation. After completing Grade 12, I moved to Winnipeg to take my diploma in agriculture at the University of Manitoba, with the intention of somehow, one day, returning to Notre Dame to farm.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prejet, could you just speak a little more slowly so that our reporter can keep up?

MR. PREJET: During my agriculture course, I had the privilege of meeting with Mr. Bruce Campbell of Landmark Feeds. And seeing that farming was out of the question at this time, I decided to accept his offer to become a dairy specialist with Landmark Feeds. I was with Landmark for seven years, and all the while had the intention of returning to farming. During this time, Elite Swine was being developed. And I soon saw that the hog industry might be the only way for me to return home and be involved in agriculture.

So in 1989, my wife, Roseline, and I moved to Notre Dame and built a 150 sow, farrow to feeder, operation that we expanded to 200 sows in
1990. And being highly leveraged, those first few years were very difficult. Of course, there was very little time, since I ran the operation on my own.

In 1993, I was approached to become involved in a 1,200 sow operation in southeastern Manitoba. Since the last few years had been somewhat difficult, we decided to accept, much to the disappointment of our family, friends, community, and ourselves. This, in turn, was the catalyst to the development of Porcherie Lac du Onze, or LDO, as we call it.

A group of local residents approached my wife and I to see if there would be the potential to build such an operation in Notre Dame to keep us there, all the while creating employment in the area. These local residents were all very strong, community-oriented families, who were willing to take the risk to make things happen in Notre Dame. Today, LDO and PND are operations with sales in excess of $10 million. We employ 17 full-time staff and have a payroll in excess of $600,000.

We purchase a large percentage of our supplies and services from local companies, and
are very active in supporting the local activities in the community, as is evidenced by our donation of $100,000 to the Wellness Centre, which is currently under construction in Notre Dame.

In fact, the existence of LDO and PND has led to further hog industry developments in our area, and to other contributions to things like the Wellness Centre, as well as in other community projects and activities.

All this to say that, in our community, the hog industry has been a success story; the economic and social impact have been very positive.

Over the last 25 years, I have seen many changes in the hog industry.

For the last several years, our operation has filed Manure Management Plans completed by someone who is properly trained. In our first years, manure application wasn't done in balance with the crop being grown. Now we monitor nutrient levels, paying special attention to phosphorus levels. Every field is tested before application. Manure is analyzed several times and applied at recommended agronomic rates. All manure is injected with a dragline system to
reduce nitrogen losses, reduce odours and minimize damage to the roads. We follow up with lab analysis and monitor soil tests in the following years. There is a very tight window for applicators to get their work done in the fall. Therefore, we have to use past experience, and the expected levels of some nutrients, to formulate a management plan, but we adjust from year to year.

As for odour, we have implemented measures to reduce or control it. We cover our lagoons, as required. We keep in touch with our closest neighbours and encourage them to let us know if odours become a problem. This is where we need mutual trust. Both our neighbours, and us, know that there will be odours at times. But as long as everyone understands that this is part of the reality of living in the country, along with the noise of tractors and the dust of combines, then a compromise is usually easy to reach. I personally live one mile from one of our sites, and don't want to live with the constant smell of hogs, so I make sure that it is controlled and kept to a minimum.

Groundwater quality and supply is something else that we monitor. Water samples are
taken at least once or twice per year, and the
results are submitted to the Department of
Conservation. Our employees track weekly water
consumption and are encouraged to use water
wisely. Fixing leaking water nipples and
minimizing soaking times are part of the norm.

As time goes on, and more
evidence-based research is available, Porcherie
Lac du Onze will continue to review and revise its
methods and adopt new technologies, as
appropriate, to improve manure management, control
odours and protect water quality.

In the last 25 years, I have also been
witness to a number of negative incidents. We've
had to deal with such things as public municipal
meetings. And I personally have been attacked and
accused. It is disappointing to see that some
people resort to such tactics. I am sure you have
heard, and will hear, all kinds of comments at
these presentations about the hog industry and the
people involved in it. It seems that the more
extreme the lie, the more chance that some part of
it may become believable.

Please keep in mind that the majority
of people in the hog industry in Manitoba are
good, honest people that have strong farming backgrounds and strong attachments to the land and the environment. It is important that we support and encourage these people to continue to provide high quality pork that meets the demands of our country and the world, instead of creating roadblocks.

We must also acknowledge the tremendous amount of work and research that has occurred, and continues to occur, in the hog industry to protect the environment.

Environmental regulations have been put in place. We need to allow time for the regulations to have an impact on the end result. We need to continue to monitor the situation, on an ongoing basis, and to enforce these regulations to ensure compliance by all. We do not need to stop the hog industry from growing for a minority who attempt to bypass those rules. That would be like taking all vehicles off the road because some people drive over the posted speed limit.

We need to be reasonable and use common sense. It seems that most of the rules and regulations that have been put in place are because of the fear of a massive expansion by
large corporate giants. Although some claim that
they want to protect smaller operations and family
farms, these are exactly the type of operations
that are being pushed out. So who is going to
survive the future in an over-regulated hog
industry? Who is going to be willing to attend
heated council meetings?

Picture this: A husband and wife have
a son and daughter-in-law that want to farm. The
size of the farm is too small to support two
families, and the parents are too young to retire.
Land is either too expensive or not even for sale
in the area. Dairy and poultry are near
impossible to get in to. Wouldn't a couple of hog
barns be a perfect fit? Big enough to hire some
full-time help to have some time off once in a
while, fertilizer at a fraction of the cost of
commercial fertilizer, and with a nutrient plan
even better than the commercial fertilizer.

But the father sees the hassles of
getting a permit and the friction it may cause in
the community. And even if he does get it built,
the ongoing time and money to invest in filling
out forms, meeting all the rules and regulations
for manure management, Canadian Quality Assurance,
traceability, workplace health and safety, dealing
with opposition and controversy, et cetera, it all
seems quite overwhelming. The son and his family
move away to the city and the parents sell the
farm to a neighbour. This scenario is all too
common.

Again, we need to use common sense.
Not having rules and regulations is not an option.
But adding to what we presently have is too much,
and the end result may be a nonexistent hog
industry. But for a small group of vocal
opponents, it appears that this is the only thing
that would finally satisfy them.

The right to farm must be protected,
not by producing more rules and regulations to
allow farming, but by not creating rules and
regulations that make it impractical, or nearly
impossible, to farm in the first place.

Hog farmers are good honest people who
want to get things done and do them right. Hog
farmers are not criminals waiting for an
opportunity to break the law. Hog farmers need
support and access to resources and expertise.
The type of information and support that is
accessible, through organizations such as the
One of the recommendations to the government should be to support these organizations that are experts in the hog industry and the work that they do.

Another recommendation to government would be concerning reviewing land use planning. Forming planning districts is a great idea, but a world of troubles can be created. For example, expansion may be permitted in select areas, but those areas may not have the required resources, i.e., water, clay base, sufficient spread acres and labour within a reasonable distance. Existing grain farmers who would like to build may not be able to because they live in a restricted area. So if they can't build close to home, where they can keep an eye on the operation and use the manure to fertilize their own land, then a very viable option is gone.

Another problem is in municipalities where the pressure from the anti-hog people has been so great that good, honest, level-headed councillors have been treated as liars and servants to the hog companies, and have decided:
"I don't need this BS", and have stepped down, only to be replaced by anti-hog people. In many cases, good people, who may run for council, will be discouraged for the fear that someone may apply for a permit to build a hog barn. What we end up with, in the end, is a situation where the hog industry is cut off at every turn. New operations will not be built, older operations will not be replaced, and the whole service industry surrounding the hog industry will slowly begin to waste away.

In conclusion, we have an opportunity here to show Manitobans what the hog industry is all about. As much as I disagree with the pause that our government has placed on the hog industry, I believe that the study into the sustainability of the Manitoba hog industry will reveal that Manitoba hog producers, in collaboration with the organizations aforementioned, are managing the Manitoba hog industry in a responsible and appropriate manner, and in accordance with the best practices recommended by experts.

I also believe that when this is over, we will be positioned to grow in the primary
production, as well as the processing industries. And this, in turn, will fuel the Manitoba economy for the benefit of all Manitobans.

Thank you. I would be glad to answer your questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Prejet. That was a very well put together presentation. I would just like to ask you a couple of questions about these two different operations. Can you tell us a little bit about LDO and PND?

MR. PREJET: LDO is a sow operation, a nursery operation. We have 3,200 sows in inventory in that company. And Porcherie Notre Dame is our finishing branch. We have five finishing barns, 100 head finisher barns.

THE CHAIRMAN: They each have 100? MR. PREJET: They each have 100.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I particularly noted your comments, near the end of your presentation, about the land use planning process. And we have been made aware, in other meetings, and in some of the other research that we have done to date, that there are concerns in this area. How could it be changed? I mean, some of
the concerns you raise in here I know all too
well. And I'm sure that Wayne does from his days
as a municipal politician. I know that they are
very real problems, but those are more problems
with people, rather than systems or systemic
problems. Are there ways that we might recommend
changes to the systemic matters that would help
the process?

MR. PREJET: Yes. A very good
question, and it's a tough one, because I expected
to be questioned on those comments. And the only
thing I can think of is, if I understand it
correctly, is that there is no appeal process. So
that if the municipality decides that there will
not be expansion in a certain area, or what have
you, there is no way for that producer to follow
up on that. The answer is "no", and that's it.
So the only way you can get around this, the thing
I don't want to encourage, and I was worried about
making these comments here, is I don't want to
make it sound like we want to take the power away
from local government. To run everything right
out of downtown Winnipeg, I don't think, is a very
good idea. So we need to maintain decision-making
powers locally. But somehow there needs to be
kind of a balance there so that we can bring back
some common sense and be able to field some of
these decisions. Because really at this point,
right now, whoever is on council is what it comes
down to, and that's going to be unfortunate in a
lot of situations.

THE CHAIRMAN: And just one question
on the appeal process. Do you see that appeal
process -- it couldn't be through the council,
could it? Would it be an arm's length government
body?

MR. PREJET: Yes. I mean, I am not
going to say that I have all of the answers on
that one. Something needs to be done on that
question, but it probably needs to be a local
government. Somehow the local government maybe
has to answer to somebody.

THE CHAIRMAN: So is there the Farm
Management Practices Board?

MR. PREJET: I'm not sure. I would
have put more thought into this. But there are
other people who can answer this question better
than me.

THE CHAIRMAN: But some kind of an
appeal process?
MR. PREJET: That's correct, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where, if you were turned down by the council, you would be able to have an appeal?

MR. PREJET: That's right. I mean, you can't -- that is something that you will have to cross. Because not every -- you would always have an appeal process. There has to be some kind of application process. And whoever is going to deal with this appeal, they would say, well, there is definitely something wrong in the fact that this got turned down. In other situations, they were turned down for very good reasons, and we don't want to waste our time on appeals for projects that should have been turned.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Prejet. I certainly feel for you when it comes to local government. And I can talk to you a long time about that, because I have been involved in it quite a bit.

But with the new Planning Act, of course, the local governments must come up with the local livestock operation policy. And from what I understand, several municipalities are reluctant to do that right now because of this
particular hearing going on right now. I think they wish to see what becomes of this hearing before they start doing operation policies. But municipalities have always fought for that final say in land use planning, and I don't know how that's ever going to change. I've always thought that when things go right, you like to take credit for it. And when things go wrong, you want somebody else to look after it. I think that's, in a lot of cases, in a lot of local councils where there has been friction, and it's tough when it's local people. So I don't know what the answer there is.

In your operation, getting back to your operations, do you have your own injection or spreading equipment, or do you have that hired out?

MR. PREJET: We have that hired out. Actually, there is a local fellow who started a business last year. And this is his first year. He is doing pretty much all of the hog operations in and around the area.

MR. MOTHERAL: We have been hearing that around, that there are some excellent people that do that.
MR. PREJET: Yes, definitely.

MR. MOTHERAL: Your water, like your groundwater quality, and everything, all of your water comes from wells?

MR. PREJET: Yes, they are all dug wells, 50 to 100, and plus. Feet.

MR. MOTHERAL: And they are sufficient?

MR. PREJET: Yes. Volume is sufficient, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that general in this area?

MR. PREJET: In this whole area it changes very rapidly. And that comes back to the comments about land use planning and these comments. The water is very, very variable in this area in Notre Dame. And you could be digging here and find 100-gallons a minute, and go one-half hour over and can't find anything. So that has been the case, in the last three years, we have had three different sites that we have barns on. So we dig around and find the one. Number one, have you to find the water. Number two, the land has to be for sale. Number three, the clay has to be in the soil. And
so it is pretty tricky to put up a barn in our area.

MR. MOTHERAL: And it is generally good water?

MR. PREJET: Yes, the quality is generally pretty good.

MR. MOTHERAL: We are hearing a lot in some of our -- in our hearings so far about the possibility about separating the liquid and the solids from the manure. Have you ever thought of any of that to possibly make it easier for your nitrogen and phosphorus combinations? Because within the phosphorus regulations, you may not be able to put on enough nitrogen.

MR. PREJET: Yes. Almost, approximately, a year ago, I spent ten days in Quebec looking at different things. But one of the things was the manure separation system, and what have you. And I think I visited five or six different systems that were either under development, or on the verge of being sold commercially, and what have you. So we spent a lot of time looking for that. Because exactly, for the reason that I said a while ago, if you want to do an expansion, it would be tough to find
places where, you know, you have enough spread acres, or what have you. So we looked into that. And we have, actually, had one gentleman, in particular, who came out, I think, three times to Manitoba to make a presentation to sell the system. This particular system, the company is HET. I forget what it stands for right now. But Mr. Paul Boudreau came out. And in the end, for three sites, we were looking at having to spend $2 million to put in the system. And roughly about $100,000 a year to maintain it and use the polymers, and what have you, to have the separation happen and so on. And that was one of the systems that seemed like it was going to work, that was actually working, and what have you. All of the other systems, we didn't get exact pricing because they never made up presentations and so on. But we talked to people over there. And there was concerns with reliability and the cost. Almost all of them, it came down to cost. But we didn't get any exact costs for our situation in Manitoba. We know in Quebec they were all very expensive systems.

MR. MOTHERAL: One more question, do you have -- do you have, obviously, sufficient
spread fields for your manure? Do you own it all
or do you have to rent acres out for that?

MR. PREJET: We don't own many acres
all together there. Most of the land that we
spread on are people who have invested, a couple
of families who are fairly large grain farmers,
and the rest take the manure.

MR. MOTHERAL: Just one more question,
and I won't spend much time. How many acres do
you need -- because these aren't very large
operations here, how many acres do you need to
spread that?

MR. PREJET: Well, on our finisher
sites, we are probably looking at 700 to
1,000-acres year, probably, somewheres around
there. Our sow barn runs somewhere in the area of
about 400-acres a year. And our nursery site
would probably be somewheres around that 300,
400-acres a year, or so.

MR. MOTHERAL: So a total of around
about --

MR. PREJET: About 2,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Mr. Prejet, you have
mentioned that there has been many positive and
social impacts, as a result of the hog industry in your community. Are there other operations, other than the LDO and the PND, besides those operations in the community?

MR. PREJET: Yes. There are a number of larger and smaller operations. There has been quite a few producers that, you know, have around 400 or 500 finisher hog or 100 sows, or what have you, that have been around the area for a very long time. And, actually, a number of people that will be presenting here today are the producers in our area there. So, yes, there is quite a number of producers.

And, you know, one thing that hit us, we were talking about the hog industry a couple of years ago at the rink. And we kind of started looking around at all of the parents that were involved in the hockey team. We figured about 80 plus percent of the people, the children were children of people directly involved in the hog industry. And so it kind of hit home when we saw that.

MR. YEE: You mentioned also in your presentation that you use covers on your lagoon. Are those straw covers or synthetic?
MR. PREJET: We've got both, actually.

One site we straw cover, and that's in the permit we have in the R.M. of South Norfolk. In the R.M. of Lorneside, we have a lagoon that we had bought the negative air pressure cover. And that's back a few years ago now. It's a fairly small lagoon. The cost was fairly high for that size of lagoon, but we thought it would be a good time to see if they would work, and if they are durable, and what have you.

MR. YEE: Do you find any advantage on the synthetic cover over the straw?

MR. PREJET: Yes. There is no question that it seals it off completely. The straw, the problem that you have -- there is a few, I guess. But keeping the cover on it properly. You know, the winds pick up, you know, a percentage of the lagoon will open up. And, you know, what we usually do is go back a few weeks later and top it up again, kind of thing. So we get pretty good coverage with straw. But then you've got to deal with the accumulation of straw down the road, and those kind of things. If you have a clay-based lagoon, it's not too bad. But if you have a lagoon with the synthetic liner in
the bottom, and you have to go back and pull out
the straw, that could become a challenge. I
haven't done it yet, but I'm sure it is going to
be a challenge.

MR. YEE: You mentioned also, in your
example about the husband, wife, son and daughter,
trying to get into maintaining the lifestyle in
the agricultural field. But a statement that you
made, I just want some clarification here, you
mentioned dairy and poultry is nearly impossible
to get into. Is that just because of the economic
costs?

MR. PREJET: A few things. Like when
I was trying to get into farming back then, I
looked at dairies, because we wanted to be in
Notre Dame. But you couldn't move the quota.
Like, you had to buy the barn. The quota is
attached to the barn in dairy, and it's the same
thing with poultry, so that was one problem. And
then the second problem was, yeah, the cost. Back
then it wasn't quite as bad, although it is all
relevant to time, I suppose. But now, of course,
paying whatever, $27,000 per 1,000 kg for a dairy,
I'm not sure. And it is pretty tough to get going
today in a decently sized dairy operation.
MR. YEE: Just one last question. And we've had this discussion at several other presentations, it was, again, about the whole permitting process. You mentioned it is a hassle getting a permit. I don't mean to put you on the spot, but what's your opinion? Do you have an opinion, in terms of how that can be improved, or is there a better way of getting permits, or making the regulatory burden less of a hassle on producers?

MR. PREJET: You are talking about all the way back to the technical review and everything else?

MR. YEE: Yes, the Technical Review Committee and the whole conditional land use, all of that, is there way of improving that that you can see?

MR. PREJET: Really, I think, in the end, like we've been through it here the last time with the Technical Review Committee, and everything else. Although, at that time the planning district wasn't in place, or anything. And the R.M. said: Would you go through the land use permitting process anyways? And we said, yeah, we will through it. And I found the biggest
problem was just time. It just drags on,
especially during the summertime, and everything
else. And, you know, just the staffing to address
the technical reviews, and so on and so forth.

The other part of it, I mean -- and
again, the whole public hearing thing for the
municipalities, I mean, I am not in council, never
been on there, but it must be hell in there, you
know. Because these people on the council are
just trying to do the right thing. And they get
attacked pretty hard at times. I have heard a lot
of horror stories about that. And I don't know
how to get around that one. There has to be
public meetings. And people have questions and
comments to make, so that's a tough one.

But I think time is the thing that,
you know, right now, and again we haven't built in
a few years, but probably if you are going to
build now, you probably got a year or so, probably
two year's lead time to really get the project up
and running, at least not far from that. By the
time you do your own planning and prepare
everything, and get it in and then wait for an
answer back from all the levels of government.

MR. YEE: Thank you, Mr. Prejet.
THE CHAIRMAN: I have a couple more questions. These two companies, you have said that people in your community came together and suggested that you join them in setting this up. So are these two companies largely or completely owned by people in the Notre Dame area?

MR. PREJET: That's correct, yeah, it's all people in the community or relatives of these people who are living either in Winnipeg or elsewhere so that's basically all locally owned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks. And you're the manager of it or the operator?

MR. PREJET: I'm one of the owners, and I'm the general manager, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Following up on Wayne's question about the amount of land you need, with the new phosphorus regulation, how will that change the amount of land you need?

MR. PREJET: Well, we are still kind of working through that, and working with some people on really getting a feel for this. But right now for our area, it appears that it is not going to have a huge impact, because the phosphorus levels are relatively low in our area. So we don't think it is going to be -- there will
be an increased number of acres required, but we have those available, so right now it is not a huge concern for our area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Just a municipal question, kind of. How compatible are the two municipalities in handling these things? Are they similar, or are there any problems with one in particular to the other?

MR. PREJET: Between the municipalities in our area?

MR. MOTHERAL: I mean you've got two operations. And they are in different municipalities; is that right?

MR. PREJET: That's right, yeah.

MR. MOTHERAL: I am just wondering if you've had more problems with one than the other? I may be putting you on the spot.

MR. PREJET: No. Actually, the R.M.s in our area have been quite good. They ask good questions. They give you the opportunity for -- like, in our last construction project in the R.M. of South Norfolk, you know, we were struggling with this whole thing. So the organizers were quite nice, and they gave a chance for people who
were opposing the operation and for ourselves to
bring in people to speak on our behalf, you know,
like experts, to talk about what we are doing.
And that was exactly what happened. It was a good
process to go through because we were able to
bring in our engineer and be able to bring in
our -- what's it called -- agronomist, or
whatever, for the Manure Management Plan to
explain what we are doing, what we are planning,
how the barns will be built, and all of these
things. And the opposition has the chance to do
the same thing. So that way you are not under
kind of a public pressure cooker in front of
everybody kind of a situation. So the councillors
were able to hear the story from both sides, in a
very relaxed action. So that worked really well,
actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Prejet. Next up is Mr. Normand Prejet. Would
you please introduce yourself for the record?

MR. PREJET: My name is Normand
Prejet, and I'm from Notre Dame.

NORMAND PREJET, having been sworn, presents as
follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may
proceed.

MR. PREJET: First of all, my presentation here is going to deal with the impact of our hog operation on our farm and our community, so it is more about our own family farm.

Before I start on what I have written here, I am a graduate of the University of Manitoba, Bachelor of Commerce, so my background is business and marketing.

My boys, three boys farming with me, all went to the University of Manitoba in the Department of Agriculture. So we are farming with, I think, a fairly good educational background. And I think that that's the future for farming. It's a big business.

Our farm base is located approximately six and a half miles southeast of Notre Dame, along Highway 245 to Carman. Our operation consists of approximately 2,100-acres of grain land, as well as a hog feeder operation. And this operation markets approximately 18,000 hogs annually. My wife, Liliane, and myself have been farming for 30 years on this family farm. And we now farm with our three sons, being fifth
generation producers.

Liliane, myself, as well as our three boys, all attend the University of Manitoba. I studied business management, and they focused on agriculture. They, therefore, have a good grasp of animal husbandry and soil science. When all three boys decided to farm, we knew that expansion into the livestock sector was the only way to provide for three or more families. So began our move into the hog industry.

I recall an article written by a non-farmer, who stated that grain farmers should get a real job, instead of working three months of the year. Well, I can assure you that our operation has little time for leisure and that young, hard-working individuals, like our three boys, are very valuable assets, not only to our operation, but to the our community.

Our eldest son, who is here today, is now married. And his wife, originally from Miami, is a doctor of veterinary medicine practicing in Notre Dame. Our second son is also married. And his wife, originally from Bruxelles, teaches in the area. This ability to retain young people is vital to the survival and prosperity of our small
rural community.

Over the years, I have seen a number of projects in our community; namely, a new hockey arena, a new recreation hall, a new church. And, more recently, our community raised $1.5 million for a new health clinic presently under construction. These projects were made possible, in large part, to a healthy and prosperous agricultural sector. In and around Notre Dame, that includes grains and oilseeds, dairy, beef, as well as hogs. Our hog operation also contributes to local taxes, which, in turn, support public services. This particular operation is contributing approximately $6,000 annually to the rural municipality, and approximately $7,000 annually to the local school division. And we are talking only about the hog barns.

During its construction, it required the services of local contractors for concrete, buildings, electrical, plumbing, not to mention the ongoing services required from trades people and feed mills, et cetera. So when certain individuals state that the hog industry provides little benefit to their community, think again!

Another long-term benefit provided by
our hog operation is our ability to reduce commercial fertilizer on our land. We are now able to inject manure on approximately 350 acres of grain land annually, with what we consider natural material. Although the application costs are about the same as the costs of commercial fertilizer, we have discovered that the manure continues to provide nutrients beyond any fertilizer we could buy, and that its slow-release process provides fertilizer value for two more years. That's not to mention the improved conditioning or texture of the soil. We estimate that at today's cost of nitrogen, the value of this nutrient alone is upwards of $30,000 per year. With this in mind, why would we waste such a valuable resource?

Now that I have touched on the human resource and economic factors, let me deal with some of the environmental issues. Our farm operation is certainly doing a better job of monitoring its grain land than we ever did before we had the hog operation.

We are now soil testing our land to 24-inches and injecting hog manure, which is also tested for nutrients at a provincial laboratory,
according to a Manure Management Plan registered
with the Province.

Some of the other environmental
protection measures adopted in our hog operation
include:

The construction of manure storage
that's been lined, tested and approved by Manitoba
Conservation.

The construction of a fence around the
manure storage to protect wildlife, as well as
protect the liner from damage.

The installation of four monitoring
wells around the manure storage with an outside
party collecting and submitting samples for
analysis, and reporting to Manitoba Conservation
on an annual basis.

The application of a straw cover on an
annual basis to minimize odours.

The planting of shelterbelts around
the barn site.

The testing of well water on an annual
basis.

The installation of wet/dry feeders
that has reduced water consumption and manure by
an estimated 20 percent to 25 percent.
The installation of water metres which monitor water consumption in every room in each barn.

We are right now presently in the process of upgrading our handling of dead stock, and have applied to the Natural Farm Stewardship Program, for assistance under the Environmental Farm Plan. And once we are approved, we will be purchasing a cooling storage unit for this operation so that our dead stock can be handled more efficiently.

In summary, our hog operation has had a very positive impact on our farm and our community. It's helping us to retain human resources in our community, provides economic benefits for both our farm and the community, whether directly or indirectly.

Although environmental issues are always a question mark, we are attempting to be the best stewards of the land and provide the best possible animal care. Our farm and family has a vested interest in protecting the quality of the air and water, since we are the closest residence to the barn site. Our children, and hopefully our grandchildren, will be living in this environment.
And we plan to continue to make it as safe as reasonably possible. Why would we do otherwise?

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Prejet.

You said that when your sons -- is it all three sons that are on the farm?

MR. PREJET: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: When your sons indicated that they wanted to join you in farming, you concluded that the only way to do so was to go into livestock. Has that proved to be a good business decision?

MR. PREJET: Yes, it has. We had started on a smaller scale, back in '97, '98, when my first son came out. And we actually took over an operation that belonged to my brother, who just made a presentation. And he ran the sow barn for a few years. It became quite difficult because the hog barn was -- the sow barn itself was a little small. And when my second son came farming, we built one finishing barn. And we were unable to share labour between the two barns. It has to do with disease. So presently our sow barn is shut down, and we have expanded our finishing operation.
THE CHAIRMAN: So this is a very broad question, and it may apply to you, and it may apply to the whole industry. So, in general, is hog production, hog farming, a reasonably lucrative endeavour?

MR. PREJET: Probably for our farm it is, simply because we look at the hog operation as something that's going to help us to rebuild some of our land.

THE CHAIRMAN: But currently it's supporting you, your wife, three sons and their families in a reasonable lifestyle?

MR. PREJET: Yes. My -- obviously, my family is still very young. My oldest boy has a grandson. But my children do not have children themselves, so the families are not large. So for the time being, this operations able to -- is able to supply for those two or four families. My youngest boy is not married.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: I was very interested to note -- Mr. Prejet, by the way, an excellent presentation. It does bring the economics into the situation. And it has been suggested, in several of our visits in these environmental
hearings that have been put on, that sometimes economics have to come into the picture. We are hearing that more and more.

The monitoring wells that you do have around your storage lagoon, and you say they are tested by an outside party, was that a condition or was that by your choice?

MR. PREJET: You know, I really don't know, because we never did the collection ourselves.

MR. MOTHERAL: I see.

MR. PREJET: I think it has to be done that way.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

MR. PREJET: No. I don't think we would collect them ourselves. These wells are locked. And I don't know if we even have the keys to get into them. We have not been into them. I don't know. That is a condition, probably.

MR. MOTHERAL: That is something that I will know by the time the day is out. That's all I have. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Prejet, just a quick question. I noticed that you gave us a list
of things that you include as part of your
procedures in terms of environmental stewardship.
The question I am going to ask, because I have
heard this from a number of other presenters, is
the food aspect, the feeding of the livestock,
that they use enzymes to better update the
phosphate. Do you do any special feed
formulations, and do you use the enzymes to
utilize the phosphates?

MR. PREJET: Well, our feed is being
supplied by outside feed mills, so we are in the
same situation as these other producers who are
buying the feed. That's all can I say.

MR. YEE: No, that's fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Prejet. Thanks for coming out here. We are
going to have to take another short break. I am
sure it will only be a few minutes. Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:00 P.M. AND RECONVENED
AT 2:27)

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's resume now. I
just wanted to explain the delay. Lisa, our court
reporter, was driving from Killarney this morning,
as were the rest of us, but she witnessed a fairly
serious car accident, and gave evidence to the
fire and paramedic people that showed up at the
scene. And then just about a half an hour or so
ago, an RCMP officer showed up and wanted to ask
her for a witness statement as well, so that's the
reason for the delay. We thank you for your
indulgence. And we will now continue.

The next person on our agenda for this
afternoon is Alf Poetker. Would you please state
your name for the record?

MR. POETKER: My name is Alf Poetker.

ALF POETKER, having been sworn, presents as
follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Please
proceed.

MR. POETKER: Mr. Chairman, members of
the panel, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm a professional civil engineer with
primary experience in water and wastewater
treatment, waste management and environmental
services. My experience in waste management
provided me the opportunity, in the 1990s, to
become involved with large livestock operations.
Specifically, with the onset of more rigorous
Manure Management Regulations, the requirement for
professional services in obtaining approvals for
various facilities became commonplace.

I grew up on a typical family farm in southwestern Manitoba. It included grain and forage production, a beef cattle operation, a modest dairy, poultry for meat and eggs, and a small hog operation. In keeping with the common practices of the day, livestock was pastured or, otherwise, free-roaming outdoors in the summer and confined to barns in the winter. Manure was manually removed from the barns on a daily basis and hauled to a nearby manure pile. Mixed with snow, the manure pile became fairly high by the spring, shrinking considerably every year as the snow melted and the water oozed out and drained away. Some manure was spread on nearby frozen fields from time to time.

Changing times brought changing practices. Cattle were housed in open barns, allowing the manure to be built up with frequent addition of straw bedding. Manure was removed during the summer months, and typically spread on the fields as a fertilizer resource. However, while undertaking a planning study for one of Manitoba's planning districts in the early 1980s, I observed an open housing barn and feedlot which
was located in a sheltered ravine, next to the
creek channel. Spring run-off regularly
over-topped the channel and washed away much of
the manure that accumulated over the winter.
Another producer informed me that he had much the
same convenient arrangement, though I did not
observe his operation. At the same time, many
pasture animals had their watering holes along the
creeks and in sloughs or dugouts with connections
to the creeks. This became a point of
concentration of animal manure.

Again, times changed. The
establishment of ever-larger livestock operations
brought about a regulatory framework that began to
address the management of such operations. Under
the Manitoba Planning Act, which underwent a major
change in 1976, large livestock operations within
an established planning district were typically a
conditional use. This meant that a public hearing
was required, at which the planning board heard
representations from the producer and from
affected citizens, and then set certain conditions
for the operation. This would be in addition to
the normal limitations imposed by the zoning
bylaw. The planning board would often seek advice
from a Technical Advisory Committee made up of representatives from various government departments. In order to assist producers and regulators alike, a series of comprehensive guidebooks for livestock production and manure management was developed, to include hog, poultry, and cattle production. Participants in the preparation of these guidebooks included people from government departments, municipal associations, citizen groups and livestock production and marketing organizations. The guidebooks assisted producers in developing sound practices in the management of their operations, and assisted authorities having jurisdiction in evaluating and approving conditional use applications.

The evolution of the regulatory framework, together with the increasing cost of inputs into livestock production, resulted in producers becoming more strategic in the management of their operations.

In 1994, the Province of Manitoba introduced a major change to the Livestock waste regulation. Manitoba Regulation 81/94 introduced a number of requirements for storage, transport
and application of manure to land. Setbacks and limits were prescribed. And any operation greater than 400 animal units in size was required to obtain a permit for storage and disposal of manure. The permits imposed further environmental requirements.

In 1998, the Province introduced the Livestock Manure and Mortality Management Regulation. It incorporated and expanded on many of the features of the Livestock Waste Regulation which it replaced. In its tone and language, it treated manure as a resource rather than as a waste. Producers with operations greater than 400 animal units were required to file annual Manure Management Plans in advance of applying manure to agricultural land. Such plan was to provide details, as required by Manitoba Conservation, so that the director could be satisfied that the application of manure would not cause pollution of surface water, groundwater or soil; and that no manure would escape from the boundary of the agricultural operation.

The regulation introduced a prohibition on winter spreading, thereby requiring most large producers to build new storage
facilities. Such facilities required a permit, which, for the most part, introduced the need for professional services to ensure that the storage was designed and built to securely store the manure for an extended period of time.

Another major change was to limit the amount of nitrogen applied per acre of land. This often required the producers to apply the manure over a larger area than had been used in the past. It required an investment in equipment to transport the manure over greater distances, offset, in part, by a reduction in the need for commercial fertilizers.

Producers are also typically innovative. Borrowing an idea from the irrigators, they began to install pipelines into their fields so as to pump the liquid manure directly from the storage to pivot outlets in the fields. Connected to tillage equipment via high-pressure hoses, it is possible to inject the manure directly into the soil. This minimizes the odour and maximizes the nutrients which get bound up with the soil. With modern GPS and GIS technology, this also enables the producer to manage the nutrients to the needs of the soil and
the specific crops which are planned for that
field.

In 2003, the Director introduced a
number of additional requirements via a directive
which required the use of professional engineers
for design and certification of manure pumping
systems, storage facilities and distribution
pipelines. A major amendment to Regulation 42/98
was introduced in 2004, which incorporated these
additions and provided more detail and rigor to
the categories of manure management in the
regulation. It also introduced a timetable
whereby these requirements would apply to
livestock operations greater than 300 animal
units, down from 400.

In 2006, Regulation 42/98 was again
amended, now providing a timetable for the
management and limitation of applying phosphorus
to land. Again, producers have been proactive,
anticipating this change. Management of
phosphorous is already underway. It includes
genetic research, and development into livestock
to reduce phosphorus in manure, development of
feeds with lower phosphorus fields, crop rotation
selection, and rotation to better utilize
phosphorus in the soil. I believe this regulation now provides an effective tool to limit the development of large livestock operations where there is an inadequate land base for the spreading of manure.

Crop production and land tillage practices have changed significantly over the years. 50 years ago, many producers would fallow their fields one year in three, or even every second year. Repeated cultivation to control weeds resulted in leaving the soil vulnerable to wind and water erosion. Similarly, the practice of straw burning was more common at that time, removing the trash from the soil and promoting erosion. Since phosphorus is typically bound up with the soil, and is mobile particulate form, this practice provided the opportunity for phosphorus to be carried by wind and water into the rivers and lakes.

At various times, opinion has shifted from believing that nitrogen is the main cause of algal proliferation in our waterways, to believing that phosphorus is the controlling factor. For now, it appears that phosphorus is winning the battle for our urgent attention. And the sudden
discovery of major algal development in the Lake Winnipeg north basin has triggered a sense of urgency, if not panic, to deal with the problem. My guess is that these algae have been flourishing for some time and that we have Google Earth to thank for the graphic display that has brought it to wider public attention. I believe that the problem of massive algal blooms is not the result of the recent proliferation of large hog operations in Manitoba. Opinions vary on the percentage of responsibility which the hog industry has on this problem: From a low of one percent, which I understand approximates the percentage of phosphorus which this industry generates, to a much higher percentage, which represents the opinion of some as to the relatives mobility of phosphorus from this industry. I believe that in the past, notwithstanding a smaller industry, the opportunity for phosphorus movement into our waterways, from former management practices and lack of regulation, has contributed to the concentration of nutrients in Lake Winnipeg. But let's not forget all the other
contributors who, by some estimates, contribute up
to 99 percent of the phosphorus to the lake. 50
years ago, when producers typically concentrated
manure in leaching manure piles, the towns and
cities of our Province typically provided only
token treatment of their wastewater, and
phosphates in detergents were considered to be a
marvelous way to get our laundry fresh and clean.
Today, we see what that did to our lakes.

But nature is wonderfully resilient.
I believe we sometimes give ourselves too much
credit in terms of our ability to change things at
the macro level. In last Sunday's Winnipeg Free
Press, it was reported that a prominent national
politician visiting the city claimed that we could
save Lake Winnipeg by simply changing the name of
our Prime Minister in the next federal election.
I'm afraid that won't do it, and I'm not
politically partisan, one way or the other.

I do believe that the current level of
responsible management of livestock operations,
and the strategic application of manure to the
fields, will have a long-term, beneficial effect
on our environment going forward, but it won't
happen overnight, and the producers can't do it
alone. It requires patience and partnership. It will take time for Lake Winnipeg to heal itself, as we manage our own environment in a responsible and sustainable way. We need the partnership of our cities, as they work together with other levels of government to reduce their contribution of nutrients, which are often discharged directly into the water environment. And we absolutely need the participation of our neighbours to the south, to the east and to the west.

Federal and Provincial Governments help cities in the financing of their wastewater facilities. I appeal to those governments to also assist producers in the financing and development of costly infrastructure in order to manage livestock manure in the manner required by the regulations.

A few quick takes, if may, as I conclude. The 2006 amendment to Regulation 42/98 gives authority for the temporary suspension of permits for hog manure storage facilities, while the Clean Environment Commission undertakes this review. A notable exception to the suspension is the development of facilities acceptable to the
Director for providing anaerobic digestion of the manure. When I inquired about the details, I was informed that they would be systems used to produce methane for the generation of electricity.

Coincidentally, last Friday, the Winnipeg Free Press reported on a pair of Ontario farmers who won a $50,000 award for the development of an anaerobic digester for manure from their dairy farm. The methane from the digester is used to run a generator for about 14 hours per day, reportedly saving the operation almost $2,500 per month in their electricity bill. Unfortunately, the article told only half of the story. What it did not mention is the cost of developing and running the digester and generator. After factoring in capital amortization, debt servicing, maintenance and operation, and equipment replacement costs, the electricity cost savings may be largely or totally offset.

A pilot study into the generation of methane from hog manure, conducted at the University of Manitoba's Glenlea Farms by graduate students in the 1970s, found that the energy inputs exceeded the energy outputs, and that did not even account for the cost of the equipment.
So as a word of caution, Manitoba may be well positioned as a province of water power and wind power. Hog power is not likely to follow any time soon.

Last fall, I attended a technical conference of the Canadian Water Resources Association, held in Winnipeg. The topics of water quality, Lake Winnipeg, and phosphorus control predominated. The latter covered phosphorus from urban and industrial wastewater, from agriculture and from natural areas. I was looking for some answers as to the mechanics of phosphorus movement from agricultural fields to our lakes, especially given the soil, fertilizer and crop management practices of today. Unfortunately, it seems that research in this area is very limited.

The Government of Manitoba is prepared to spend money on this review by the Clean Environment Commission. They are prepared to impose a the moratorium, which represents a cost to the industry. I would suggest that some focused research and consultation with the industry on the management of phosphorus and the identification of the mechanisms and extent of its
movement from fields to water courses would serve
both the industry and the province to the
betterment of the environment for us all.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Poetker, for a very thought-provoking
presentation. I have a few questions that come
up. You talked earlier, in the first paragraph,
on the last page, you say:
"I appeal to governments to assist
producers in financing and
development,"
et cetera. Are you aware of what programs are in
place, at the present time, in this respect? Are
there any?

MR. POETKER: I believe there was
something by PFRA in the development of manure
storage facilities, but I think that it's expiring
or has expired.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then a little later
on, in the same page, you talk about the anaerobic
digester, and you reference the one in Ontario. I
believe the Manitoba Government, at the same time
that they made the announcement on the hog barn
pause, also announced three pilot projects on
anaerobic processors. Are you familiar with those?

MR. POETKER: No, I'm not.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're not. Okay. We are not terribly familiar with them yet. We will be briefed on them at some point. I know that they are out there somewhere, but exactly the nature of them, I'm not sure.

In your final sentence you talk about "focused research and consultation". Is there -- well, I am sure there is. We have heard from other presenters today, and in the past week or so, there is a lot of research going on. What research, or are you familiar with what research would best attract government money to look into phosphorus management in this industry or in the whole agricultural industry?

MR. POETKER: Well, at the conference that I mentioned, I was listening for information about the movement of phosphorus from the fields to water, because phosphorus, unlike nitrogen, is not soluble, so I believe that it must move in particulate form. I think the management practices of the producers now are so different than they were in the past that erosion from the
fields, water movement carrying particles of soil is much less prominent now than it used to be. We don't have the kind of wind storms that I remember when I was younger. And so if people say that phosphorus is still continuing to move from the fields, and now with the management of phosphorus in the regulation, I would like to see some research done, some live research on the fields, to see if phosphorus is, in fact, moving from agricultural fields into our streams. Because right now we are hearing people saying that it's -- some say one percent. I have heard someone say as high as 14 percent. That's a very big difference. And I think some good research would tell us what it is. And it would also help us -- if we find that there are some mechanisms that are causing phosphorus to move, then it would help us to manage that and to try to prevent that in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if I understand your presentation, if I understand correctly what you are saying, earlier when you talked about the movement of nutrients into Lake Winnipeg, are you suggesting that this recent boom in algal blooms started some time back, that it is sort of a
long-time movement of nutrients into the lake.

And with better nutrient management now, that a few years down the road it might pick up, is that your suggestion?

MR. POETKER: That is my suggestion.

I heard an interview with a fisherman last summer who said that he saw those algal blooms many years ago in the north basin. And there are many things that we see from the perspective of space, now that we have cameras up there, that we may not have seen in the past.

I believe that the contribution of nutrients has been happening for a long time. The City of Winnipeg built a major sewage treatment plant in the 1960s. They did not do nearly the same level of treatment before that. And many of the towns built their sewage treatment facilities only in the late fifties and sixties, as well. So nutrients have been contributed, and continue to be contributed. The City of Winnipeg does not practice nutrient removal from their wastewater, even to this day. They manage their systems better, much better than they used to, but the nutrient management is happening in the agricultural sector.
And you say in a couple of years or in a few years. I think it will be beyond my own lifetime. 50 years, perhaps. It takes a long time. But the lake is resilient. I think that with cleaning up of the south shore of Lake Eerie, there has been a remarkable recovery of Lake Eerie. And I think that that can happen here, too, and will be happening over the next 40 or 50 years. But I think if we expect a quick fix -- and I was just being facetious about the politician's remark, but that's the way the newspaper reported it. If our next Prime Minister is Stephane Dion, Lake Winnipeg is safe. And it isn't going to be that simple, and certainly not that fast.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know how long or at what cost Lake Superior recovered?

MR. POETKER: I was talking about Lake Eerie.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, it slipped my mind. Yes, Lake Eerie.

MR. POETKER: I don't know what the timeframe was. But it was within the time of my professional career that major sewage treatment started to happen from the industries on the south
shore of Lake Erie.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do remember news stories about rivers that were so polluted they would catch on fire.

MR. POETKER: I've heard that.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the rivers leaking into Lake Eerie. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My first comment is just a comment. You touched my heart when you said that manure was manually removed from the barns on a daily basis and hauled to a nearby manure pile. That's the particular reason why I never became a livestock farmer. I stuck to grain.

THE CHAIRMAN: And only had to work three months a year.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes, only three months a year.

Mr. Poetker, at the very end of your presentation, you speak about the need for more research on phosphorus moving in soil. That very research is being done. And maybe you're not aware of it. I am sure you probably are. The Deerwood Soil and Water Association, in southern Manitoba, have an organization that are
continually seeking funds to do this. They were
doing it on an ongoing basis. And they spoke of
their research of phosphorus, their ability to
know that phosphorus is coming off of fields into
streams. And they are very concerned that even at
natural levels, and the variations that come from
year to year, don't make sense with anything
that's coming from fertilizer or manure. They are
really scared. And there is more phosphorus
coming from wooded lands than there is from the
other areas. And maybe you have heard some of
that.

MR. POETKER: Well, I have heard some
of that. And as you said, they are continuing
that research. So that's why I hope that through
this presentation, and through your work, that you
can encourage the government and recommend that
they also honour the work of these associations
with their financial support, as well.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you.

MR. YEE: I have a question for you,
Mr. Poetker. In regards to your comment about the
appeal to government to assist producers in
financing and development of costly infrastructure
to manage livestock manure, do you have something
specific in mind in terms of the infrastructure?
Are you referring to new technologies, or storage facilities, or what sort of infrastructure are you referring to?

MR. POETKER: I find that the producers are very innovative in terms of the technologies, but it does cost a lot of money. And one of the producers who spoke here this afternoon mentioned that the cost of using -- of applying manure is not that different than the actual cost of buying commercial fertilizer, and I have heard people say that before. And I believe, too, that there is a benefit, nonetheless, of using manure as a resource because it has a soil mineral character that mineral fertilizer does not.

But it does cost a lot of money to build storage facilities. When the '98 regulations came out with the prohibition of winter spreading, and I'm not saying they shouldn't have done that, but many people had to build large storage facilities in order to keep that manure in storage all winter long, and that costs a lot of money. That costs a lot of money to put in the equipment, the pipelines to the
fields. I think that's a great idea. And the equipment to knife it into the soil. So buying that equipment and installing that infrastructure is costly to the producers. And, goodness knows, they work on close margins.

MR. YEE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your presentation today, Mr. Poetker.

Next up, Edward Hofer, Phillip Hofer and Brad Schnell. Gentlemen, would you please introduce yourselves for the record?

MR. P. HOFER: Hello. I'm Phillip Hofer.

MR. HOFER: I'm Edward Hofer from James valley colony.

MR. SCHNELL: And I'm Brad Schnell.

EDWARD HOFER, PHILLIP HOFER, BRAD SCHNELL, having been sworn, present as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You may proceed. Who is going first?

MR. P. HOFER: I am Phillip Hofer.

And we have got our speech spread up in the three because of our families, and we can't spend all day writing reports. So I will speak on behalf of our history. And then my brother, Edward, will
speak on manure applications and land usage
because he has been -- that's been his profession.
And then we have somebody with us. It's Brad
Schnell. He has been helping us manage our Manure
Management Plan our manure and our agricultural
land.

Hello. My name is Phillip Hofer, from
James Valley Hutterian Colony from Elie, Manitoba.
I'm here to speak on behalf of my family. I have
five children; two boys and three girls. I also
want to speak on behalf of the other 25 families,
who also live here at our colony. Our colony is
one of the oldest colonies in Manitoba. It was
established in 1918, when we moved here from South
Dakota. As you may know, we are part of a
Christian faith, a church that was founded in the
early 16th Century during the Reformation. We are
generally known as Anabaptists, because we believe
in adult baptism.

Our better-known religious cousins are
the Amish, as well as the Mennonites. The main
difference between us and the other Anabaptists is
our choice to live in what we call
"Gutergemeinschaft", which we understand to mean a
full and voluntary Christian community centered on
the teachings of Jesus, having all things in common, as it states in the book of Acts, chapter two, verse 44:

"Now all who believed were together and had all things in common."

Our forefathers had many hardships and struggles moving from South Dakota to Manitoba. Winters were very harsh and cold, which made it especially hard on their livestock, their horses, cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry. They soon realized that their animals needed to be established -- to be sheltered against the harsh climate.

In 1930, sows only farrowed only once a year and chickens only laid seasonally, which made eggs and pork a special commodity. Hutterites made improvements.

And by 1940, chickens started laying almost year-round and pigs farrowed both in early spring and late fall.

We see ourselves as part of Manitoba's progressive and hard-working country people, trying to make our living in agriculture. For example, in our dairy, we have been doing selective breeding of purebred Holsteins for the past 42 years, and have managed to become one of
the highest producing herds in Manitoba, with good
environmental practices.

Here at James Valley, as in most
colonies in Manitoba, we rely a great deal on the
income of our hog farm. We have 620 sows,
farrow-to-finish, high health nucleus where we
produce female offspring and implemented a high
biosecurity program, as well as C.Q.A. and T.Q.A.
validation programs.

We have learned, over the years, that
it is very important to be good stewards of the
land, that we keep our drinking water and
environment clean and healthy so that we can pass
on our to community way of life for many more
generations.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

We have heard of C.Q.A. What is T.Q.A.?

MR. HOFER: T.Q.A. is a program
established that was by the same group of people.
It is trucking to handle our animals safely and
make sure that during the transportation the
environment and temperature and everything is
being controlled when the livestock is on the
road.
MR. E. HOFER: Hi. My name is Edward Hofer from James Valley Colony. Thanks for letting me say a little something today.

My job at the colony has been Water Plant Operator for the last ten years. I've had my Class 1 Certification since 2005. I took the course at Red River College.

Since 1998, I have also been looking after our manure storage, handling, pump-out and injection, which we do ourselves with our own equipment.

I remember 16 years ago when I had a job of hauling our manure from our barns. Back then we had underground pits which had to be pumped every three to six weeks, depending on which barn it was. We just spread it out, winter or summer, rain or shine.

Well, folks, I am pleased to tell you that we've come a long way with our Manure Management Program since then. It all started in 1997, when we built our new earthen storage facility one mile northeast of our yard. All of the manure from our 600 sow, farrow-to-finish operation, over 14,000 layer chickens and 45 head
dairy barn is pumped or hauled to this storage facility.

In 1998, we invested in some drag hose, including one mile of drag hose, and we built our own injector cultivator, and wheels and pumps, and whatever.

In the fall of '98, we pumped out our storage for the first time, with no flow meter, and we covered about 100-acres.

The next thing I felt was needed to do a better job was a flow meter. That year we increased it to about 300-acres. Since then, we have continually kept on increasing our applied acres and improving our equipment.

In the year 2000, we put in an underground 8-inch PVC line three-quarters of a mile north and west across Highway 248.

We filed our first Manure Management Plan with the Province in the year 2001.

In 2005, we hired a company called Agritrend. They specialize in fertility management and manure management. Since then, our agent, Mr. Brad Schnell, has been a big part of our team. Brad does the soil testing. We plan and submit our plans together, and it has worked
out very well. Brad manager all our land, not just the land involved with the manure.

Just last year, we installed another 8-inch PVC pipeline which runs two and a quarter miles south west off our yard. This pipeline was engineered and approved by Cochrane Engineering and Manitoba Conservation. We put this pipeline in due to the new phosphate regulations and to increase our land base.

Last year, we also reworked our cultivator, made it wider, and put on a good chopper manifold, so that it would be easier to cover more ground and inject more acres.

So we have invested a lot of money in our Manure Management Program. It would only be fair to say that we pride ourselves in doing a good job, and that we take this end of our business very seriously.

We have also benefited greatly from these management practices. We are seeing better yielding crops, reduced fertilizer costs and healthier soils. In 2006, the canola on our manured land yielded 19-bushels an acre more than the canola fertilized with commercially fertilized land.
And in the last five years, I've seen attitude for manure really change, from it being a waste, and now people look at it as a real resource.

The next thing I want to talk about is the colony's water supply. Our water supply comes from a series of shallow wells along Scott drain. Three of these wells are located right at James Valley, and another four are located one mile west of our yard. As we all know, shallow wells are very prone to contamination. So, therefore, it is very important to take great care of our fertilizing and manure handling in this area.

We could be -- who would be the first people affected if our manure was mismanaged? We would be. Our children and our seniors and livestock all drink this water. Therefore, being environmentally conscious is very important, and having good management practices in place is crucial.

Are we good stewards of the land? My answer would be: Yes. Of course, there's always a little trial and error along the way, and some learning curves, but all in all, I feel we exercise due diligence wherever possible.
We are a fourth generation farm. And if we do a good job and the good Lord allows it, hopefully there will be four more generations. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hofer.

The eight inch pipelines that you've run, is this to move the manure out into the field?

MR. P. HOFER: Yes, from the storage.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's similar to what Mr. Poetker was talking about earlier in his presentation?

MR. P. HOFER: That's it, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Schnell?

MR. SCHNELL: Yes, my name is Brad Schnell. And I'm an agronomic consultant working for James Valley Colony on their Manure Nutrient Management Plan, as well as their overall cropping plans.

We have been working together since the spring of 2005. I was hired to assist them to be environmentally sound in using their manure as a valuable cropping input. What I will cover today is the steps on their farm that they go through to apply their manure using
environmentally sound practices.

And I guess I will give you just a little bit of background on myself. I, too, grew up on a family farm in the Sanford area. I have worked in that southeastern Manitoba area. I went to university and went into agriculture. I worked in the Landmark-Steinbach area as an agronomist for many years. I did a lot of nutrient management planning, or manure nutrient management planning, before the word was -- before that phrase was even coined because, again, of course, there is a lot of livestock in that area. So my background goes back a number of years in the livestock areas of being an agronomist and working together with manure.

What I would like to talk about today is basically James Valley, and taking a look at what we do in terms of the Manure Nutrient Management Plan, and how much effort goes into putting together a Manure Nutrient Management Plan. What I want to cover is:

Crop planning,

filing a Manure Nutrient Management Plan,

GPS soil testing,

submit Schedule E, which is crop planning and the
soil test.
And then going back to manure analysis and
application.
And then, basically, looking at field programmers
that we have to do once that manure is in place.
And then the livestock analyzer that we use.
I hope that shows up well enough.
But, basically, this is what is called a field
profile that we use. And what this is, is we
record all of our fields. And I've been working,
as I say, since 2005, but we have more data than
this. But, basically, here you can see we have
the 2005 crop, the 2006 crop, and now what we are
planning for 2007, as well as the target yields
that we are trying to achieve on their farm.
And when we back up and look at what
we have to do as far as the Manure Nutrient
Management Plan, we almost have to start planning
a year in advance of what crops we put in. That
way we know that in those fields that we don't
have a crop like corn or sunflowers that comes off
late. And then we can't do that because there is
a very narrow window. So you want to try and put
something on it that when we are heading for those
fields that come off at the right time. So there
is a lot of planning that goes ahead. And the
fields that go into manure, you usually want to
use a crop that has a fairly high uptake of
nutrients and will use those nutrients wisely.

So if you look here, we are going to
be talking a little bit about field number 12,
which is Lavoie. I am sort of going to go through
that one particular field. And if you look at
that, basically, we've got field number 12 is 305
acres. And this coming year we are going to put
it into canola. We have got a 55-bushel target.
The previous year was oats. And the previous year
to that was canola.

When you are doing a Manure Nutrient
Management Plan, we, as I say, plan what crops are
going to be growing in there. By the 10th of any
year, we have to have our Manure Nutrient
Management Plan in place. And this is just one of
the lead copies into that. I have got a bunch of
it here. And, you know, to photocopy it all and
show it to you -- but, basically, this is part of
their Manure Nutrient Management Plan and their
cropping plan.

So you have to submit, by July 10th of
every year, a plan and know what crops are going
where. And this is the Schedule E, which is probably the main guts of what we have to do. We have got to take and identify, before we actually put on the manure, what fields we are going to put it on to and have a plan in place. In this particular year, we had field number 2, Bonhomme, field number 11, Larson, and field number 12, Lavoie.

I will just run through Lavoie a little bit. We, basically, have to send that in and identify that before we actually have to put manure in place on that. We also have to send in with that roughly what our manure levels are in there. So we do a manure analysis every year of what our manure actually has in place. And in this particular one, we have got, roughly, if you do the calculations, I don't want to go into a lot of detail on it. But with the ammonia and the release from the organic matter, we have 24 pounds per 1,000-gallons. So, again, we are looking at what kind of nutrients are in there. We also have analysis on the phosphate as well.

MR. MOTHERAL: I have a question. And I know this could be a common thing, it's the first time I have heard it, where you have one
MR. SCHNELL: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: What difference does that make in the analysis of your fertilizer, like, the fertilizer value?

MR. SCHNELL: That's a really good question. You know, the different ones are definitely different. Like, the hogs, they have got a farrow to finish operation. So it's pretty much the overriding factor in there, because it does produce the most manure. Where they have got a smaller dairy and then they have chickens.

Chickens have a higher concentration of nitrogen and phosphorus. So at the end of the day, when it's all -- and then dairy cattle have a lower concentration. So when I see what has happened, it almost comes back about what the hog levels are, just because of their mixes, one is lower and one is higher.

MR. MOTHERAL: I was just curious.

I've never heard of that before. You still have to tested. I had an uncle years ago who used to say: Oh, the roses need chicken manure.

MR. SCHNELL: And as I say, not a
lot -- you know, a good question there, but carry
on?

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes.

MR. SCHNELL: So, yes, basically, you

have got manure tests for each one. And what they

actually try to do is they actually try to test --

when we go to each field, like you saw the three
different fields on there, we try and actually
test. As we go to each different field, and start
pumping on to a different field, we take another
test. And then we actually program -- you will

see a little bit later that we program that in

into each field. They start pumping into a
different field. And you see that with a
different program we pump that on to the different
fields. And we, actually, do a complete test of
all nutrients, plus micro-nutrients as well.

Once we have submitted the plan and
then we have that in place to the Government, and
have submitted our plan, we then have to wait for
the crop to come off in the fall time. And then
we then go out and soil sample. And we use GPS
coordinates that we come back to the same place
every year. And, as you can see on here, this is
where we have marked "X"s. And that's so,
basically, when we come back out to that field, we will have as consistent results as we possibly can have. But we do come back and do a good job of monitoring that field. And, basically, we know exactly where we have tested so that each year we can come back again.

Just interesting enough, on this particular one, if I could show on here a little bit. But when Edward was talking about these wells, I believe the wells are -- where exactly are they?

MR. P. HOFER: Just in the mix there.

MR. HOFER: The little white spot.

MR. SCHNELL: Right about there. So we are putting manure on the fields. And the wells are close at hand, so we want to make sure that we are doing a good job of what we are doing. And they are monitoring their water at all times, as well. By the way, there is a lot of land in through here. The colony is here. And then they have a lagoon up there, and the land is all around there, their water sources and their colony. I think you've got a map there, as well, that sort of points that out there, as well.

MR. P. HOFER: I just kind of threw
that map in at the last minute. I didn't really
think about it.

MR. SCHNELL: Once we take this
sample, then we take a look at the nitrogen levels
that are in that field. Because at this point in
time, we are filing for nitrogen, and that's how
we do a Manure Nutrient Management Plan. In the
next two years, we will, basically, have to start
monitoring our phosphate and doing a phosphate
application, as well. We will be starting to
submit that this coming year and abiding by the
laws as they come into place here.

But, again, as you can see here, we do
a complete soil test. And then we monitor what's
in the nitrogen and then we file our plan
accordingly. So now we have got to resubmit
Schedule E which, basically, here is Lavoie again.
So we file that on. And we take a look at the
crop we are going to grow and the nitrogen that's
in the soil. And then we file that and we work
that out back that we can put on X amount of
gallons. In this particular case, 7,000 gallons
or 7,500-gallons. And then are we going to start
doing that application.

I then send out to Edward a work order
applicator's log, and say: This is the field we are going to do it on and what rates and that. And then Edward has that. And you can see it's a working copy. And he writes on what he actually has done, and where he has applied manure. And in it particular case, he didn't quite finish off the field, so you can see, you know, "no manure on the east 80". And he submits that or, you know, we work together on that. And we actually came out that we put on roughly 6,888 gallons, when all was said and done. So we put a monitor on that. And they have got, basically, a monitor as to how many gallons they are pumping and record. And then we work together to make sure we get that filed.

We then have to send in a confirmation sheet that is submitted to Manitoba Conservation. So once we are finished, then, basically, we map it out and show them what we have done, in what field, the rates. And we tell them, you know, that we have completed the job in that particular field.

This is a field programmer. And what we do is we take it sort of the next step. Because, as we said, manure is a very valuable resource. It's not a waste. It's not anything
else. But it's a very, very valuable resource. And what you can see here now is we are targeting for canola on this field at 55-bushels. The soil test is in the middle. So when I'm making the recommendation, I can see what's in the soil.

You can see that I have then plug in a fertility recommendation of just a little bit of phosphate as a starter and a little bit of sulphur as a starter. And that's all we are going to use, basically, because we have cold, wet soils. And in the springtime, we still see a little bit of a benefit, on a yield basis, by putting a little bit of a starter on it. Because we do want as good a crop in there, as we possibly can, to make sure that it is using up all of the nutrients that we have applied.

In our calculations at the top, we plug in 6,000 gallons, as you see on the top part. And it, actually, estimates a manure application going through it, 160 pounds of nitrogen is what we put on. The phosphorus is 55 pounds. It's available. About 168 pounds of potash. 12 pounds of sulphur. And then you can see all of the other nutrients, as well as the micro-nutrients. We put on boron, copper, iron, manganese, and a little
bit of zinc, as well, goes into that.

And then you can see, basically, then we have got from a seed placed, we then make a recommendation for 15-pounds of phosphorous and the 15 pounds of sulphur. And then that's the program in place. And we are doing an agronomically sound job of that so, basically, what the crop is going to remove from the -- from the soil, okay.

MR. MOTHERAL: Basically, when you soil test the following year, do you, basically, use up all of that phosphorus? Or do you find that your levels in the spring are constantly or are you continually building up?

MR. SCHNELL: With phosphorus, it's an interesting nutrient that we do add. In most cases we add a little bit more than what the crop uses, just based on how the manure is situated. And it depends on which -- you know, whether you've got just a straight sow barn, a nursery barn or a feeder operation. And they all vary slightly.

So in a lot of cases, if the guys are using phytase and that, and I think somebody asked the question: Are they using a feed additive?
Most of the guys are trying to bring their phosphate values down, basically, that they don't have phosphate in the soil, but it also helps their feed efficiencies, as well. So, in most cases, though, we are probably putting on a little bit more than what the crop is going to remove. But we do have a lot of -- I don't know if I want to get into a lot of detail. But we have got a lot of calcium in our soil that ties up phosphorus quite readily. And it turns it into, basically, a form that's not available, you know, to the crop at all, so it ties it up very rapidly.

So a lot of times our soils aren't very quick to build because we have got this -- if you look in our soil sample, we have got about 4,870 parts per million of calcium, which is almost 10,000 pounds. You've got to multiply parts per million by two to get the pounds. So that calcium ties up and rapidly binds to phosphate that we apply and, basically, makes it into a phosphate rock that's not available. So our soils aren't very quick to build.

So, basically, what we do is we work out -- and this we do for every field, we work out
a -- you know, we have a soil test. We work out a
fertility program for everyone, whether we have
manure or don't have manure. I am just going
through this one. We actually have a program
inside that, actually, does the calculations. We
know it's what's in the manure and know how many
gallons. And that nicely puts that together for
us so that we can monitor what we have done or
what we have applied.

In this part of our program, too, is
we have what's called a soil analyzer. And we
have multiple years of soil tests in here. And
this one says that we have the 2005, 2006, 2007.
We can watch what's happening with our phosphate
levels and our other nutrient levels. And it
helps me to make a recommendation that, you know,
I can look back and see, oh, the soil is doing
this and doing that, and where it is actually
going in terms of its nutrient values.

We also have what's called a livestock
analyzer, where the top, basically, says it is a
600 sow, farrow to finish, operation. And the
lagoon capacity is roughly 6.5 million-gallons.
And in the calculator at the bottom, basically, we
put into it and say there is 14,000 layers, and
roughly 600 sows, farrow to finish, and 600 dairy cows. And then it, actually, tells us what the output of those animals are. And it, basically, says it is going to produce how many gallons of output of manure on a daily basis. So then when we empty the lagoon, it starts again filling it back up. And you can see at the top, because we empty it in the fall, it is, give or take, 11 percent full, there should be about 720 -- or 721,000-gallons in there, at this point in time, roughly.

And then we also have the manure applications, since I started recording them, on a field-by-field basis, and what went on to them. And you can see on August 31, 2005, we did 17 North Waldheim Road and put on so many gallons, and it was on so many acres. And we have got a complete log of all of the fields that we have done to date.

And, basically, that's what I wanted to talk today about. You know, we do a good job of handling our Manure Nutrient Management. We do a good job of having to crop planning. We file the Manure Nutrient Management Plan. We have to do the GPS soil testing. We have got to then
submit our Schedule Es. And we have to look at
the crop plan and soil tests and submit that so
that it does adhere to the Government regulations.
We also do the manure analysis and the
applications. And then we just keep track of
things well with our field programmer and our
livestock analyzer.

Now, I guess, in conclusion, you know,
James Valley Colony is committed to an
environmentally sound practice in using their
manure as a valuable resource in their operation.
They have been living there and raising their
families for almost 90 years now, and remain
committed to sustainable agriculture for
generations to come.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Schnell.

Do all hog operations have to keep similar records
and file similar reports?

MR. SCHNELL: Anything that has to --
I think Mr. Poetker said earlier that, basically,
anything over 300 animal units has to file a
Manure Nutrient Management Plan and, basically, do
similar to what I just said, that they have to
submit, you know, the plan before July 10th and go
through all of those steps.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, I guess, this is just an economy of scale. The larger the operation, the more of this paperwork they would have to do?

MR. SCHNELL: Yes. In reality, everybody has to be in compliance with the rules and regulations. It is just 300 animal units ones that have to file. But in reality, everybody has to be in full compliance with the rules and regulations that are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm aware of that. I guess what I'm thinking of is just the costs to operations of doing this. Either they have to have somebody in their family or on their farm who can do this and keep these records or they engage somebody like you; is that correct?

MR. SCHNELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is it a significant cost? I don't want you giving away proprietary secrets, or anything. But is it a fairly significant cost to an operation to engage all of the experts that they need to comply with these regulations?

MR. SCHNELL: I don't know. I don't
know if I'm the right one to answer that.

MR. P. HOFER: It pays off to have it done. We even do it on the land that is not used, you know. It is an extra cost, but hopefully we capture it with better maintenance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: No. I don't have any questions.

MR. YEE: Yes, I have a few questions, I guess. And I think what Mr. Sargeant was getting at is that, in terms of this, it looks like a pretty sophisticated analysis. We understand that over 300 animal units you need to file a Manure Management Plan and the crop plan and the soil tests, and the manure is analyzed and the soil is analyzed. But do you think people have similar programs to the field programmer or the livestock analyzer? Do they apply such technology or do they just do it based on the manure management and the soil?

MR. SCHNELL: You are asking me?

MR. YEE: Yes. I think this looks like a very sophisticated program. And I am wondering if other hog operators have access to this type of program or do they do a similar type
of analysis?

MR. SCHNELL: Well, I think, in varying degrees, yes. There are other people out there, like myself, that do do good jobs for the individuals. A lot of the producers do have somebody that, you know, helps them file their plans and all of that. And different people pay more attention to that. The nice part of what I am doing is, like, I am sort of trying to tie the cropping value into it, as well as the manure end of things, and just looking at it as an overall approach.

MR. YEE: One of the things I've noticed in the data, I like to look at data a lot, there is an aluminium value of 18 parts per million in the manure, and it jumps up to 172 parts per million in the soil. And I guess the question, and I know it's been asked before, is there potential for metal loading in the soils, as a result of manure spreading? And we do have any such data? I know you are collecting data over several years here. Are you showing any signs of metal build-up in these soils?

MR. SCHNELL: At this point in time, I would say no. You know, we can get into a bit of
discussion on it after. But at this point in
time, I would say no.

MR. YEE: And I know it is probably

not a requirement of the Manure Management Plan,

but do you analyze soils on fields that aren't

spread fields as background?

MR. SCHNELL: Basically, in here, we

have a soil sample on all of our fields. And we

watch all of their nutrient values and levels and

that, yes, we do.

MR. YEE: All right. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
gentlemen.

MR. MOTHERAL: I am just admiring the

complexities of farming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next on the agenda,

Raymond Timmerman. Could you please state your

full name for the record?

MR. TIMMERMAN: Raymond Timmerman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,

Mr. Timmerman, please proceed.

RAYMOND TIMMERMAN, having been sworn, present as

follows:

MR. TIMMERMAN: Okay, my name is Ray.

I said Raymond, but it is Ray mostly, Timmerman.
I farm southwest of Treherne on about 1,600 acres of farm land. I farm in partnership with my wife Leona and two sons, Dallas and Justin.

And our farm is a third generation mixed operation consisting of annual crops, a cow/calf operation and finishing, hog finishing operation.

I would just like to add that my eldest son, he graduated from university -- from high school and started farming when he was 18. I have a second son that graduated with a master's degree in soil, environmental soil science, at the University of M and is right now employed with Manitoba Department of Agriculture. He is a manure management specialist. And my other son, Justin, our third son, graduated with a degree in agronomy from the University of Manitoba. And he, at the present time, has a consulting business, along with his partner in her operation.

When our eldest son, Dallas, began farming, we expanded our farm or operation. Raising hogs has been and continues to be a financial benefit. This income means we have a better cash flow and helps provide us with a comfortable living. My father used to say or use
the term that mortgage lifters when referring to
the hogs. And I think he's right. And certainly
the hogs has definitely been a benefit in our
operation.

We strive to build a sustainable
farming business that will continue to be not only
economically viable, but also environmentally
viable. With the cost of inputs and living
expenses rising, increasing our current hog
enterprise is a necessity. And expansion in our
hog sales means we would realize more income to
help cover those higher costs on our farm.

Pigs or hogs are being raised in two
conventional barns and four hoop structures. We
are not a big hog producer. We probably market
somewhere around 2,000 hogs. And we produce both
liquid and solid manure. The manure is applied to
our land, following the recommended set-backs from
our creeks, cities and wells.

Site-specific soil sampling is done
prior to manure application to determine not just
which field, but where within the field the manure
should be applied. And this is where our son
Justin is involved. Being an agronomist, he's
responsible for the testing of soils and making
sure that they are applied at the right amount and in the right place. We use a GPS system to be able to pick out spots in our fields that need more application of manure.

With financial funding from the Canada Manitoba Farm Stewardship Program, after completing our Environmental Farm Plan, the regular manure testing will be implemented on our farm. Composting of the solid manure will also be implemented on our farm, making it affordable, more affordable, for us to spread the composted manure on land that is farther from the yard site. The cost of moving that manure gets pretty expensive if you don't compost it. And we have been doing it for the last couple of years. And we are going to increase all of our manure, our cattle manure as well.

Livestock mortalities are composted on the farm. And this year we were in the process of improving our structure for dead livestock composting on the site.

A significant portion of our annual crops, which include peas, barley and wheat are grown as feed for the pigs. Peas works well in our rotation. It allows us to zero till and seed
the following cereal crop into the low residue pea
stubble; therefore, dramatically reducing soil
erosion and carbon emissions. Barley, the main
ingredient for our hog operation, and to our pig
ration, is the most competitive cereal crop,
allowing us to reduce our chemical and mechanical
methods of our weed control.

In 2003, we received the Family of the
Year award from our local Conservation District.
This award was given to us by our peers, who
recognized the work that we have done, and
continue to do in soil and water management on our
farm. This acknowledgment -- this award
acknowledged that we, as a family, showed
responsible farm practices. And some of the
practice we do, and this is maybe not in the hogs,
but in our cattle operation, we have done some
repairing and fences around slews and lakes. We
have a fairly good-sized lake. We have fenced it
so we have a riparian area. And we use off-site
water systems. And we've been doing that now for
17 years. There hasn't been one of our cows drank
out of any one of our dug-outs.

On an annual basis, we have our well
water tested, since this water is used not only
for our livestock, but for our own personal
consumption and use. With the proper livestock
manure management, along with proper well
maintenance, we have always, and continue to
drink, our groundwater due to the acceptable
nutrients and bacteria levels.

With our awareness in executing the
proper management techniques, we are meeting our
goal of being within government regulation
allowances of soil and water nutrient levels.
Everything we do today is to save and improve the
land, water and air quality, so that they are here
for the next generation tomorrow.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much,
Mr. Timmerman.

MR. MOTHERAL: I am just curious, this
is not much to do with it, which conservation
district are you?

MR. TIMMERMAN: LaSalle/Redboine
Conservation District.

MR. MOTHERAL: And that's fairly new,
 isn't it?

MR. TIMMERMAN: Fairly new, yes, about
three years ago.
MR. MOTHERAL: Have you benefited by using that program, the Federal Environmental Protection Plan, where you make your own -- you evaluate yourself? Have you found that very useful?

MR. TIMMERMAN: Yes, I do. And, by the way, I was probably one of the first ones taking it, because they wanted people interested in taking it from different groups. I thought it was really good, really valuable, because you assess yourself. And by going through the workbook, you start to realize that, yeah, there are certain things there that you are doing. You don't even realize that you are doing it to improve the environment. And there are other areas where you can make some nice little changes, which doesn't really mean that you have to go for funding. You can do this at very little cost. But we also do take advantage of some of the BMPs to help us, particularly in the soil and water management area.

MR. MOTHERAL: We have been hearing very good reports on that.

MR. TIMMERMAN: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: And it is an
opportunity to give yourself a pat on the back sometimes, too.

MR. TIMMERMANN: Yes, I agree. But it does make you realize that you are doing not that bad a job. There are also areas of improvement, but there are also areas that you are doing a good job.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Timmerman, that's all.

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Timmerman, I gather, because you have somewhat of a mixed operation, you have both cattle and hogs, and so you are dealing with both solid manure and liquid manure?

MR. TIMMERMANN: Yes.

MR. YEE: Would the liquid manure be of greater amount than the solid manure that you have to deal with?

MR. TIMMERMANN: Pardon me?

MR. YEE: The liquid manure is greater than the solid?

MR. TIMMERMANN: No.

MR. YEE: It's the other way around?

MR. TIMMERMANN: No. Our liquid manure is probably only from about 600 pigs.
MR. YEE: Okay.

MR. TIMMERMANN: Where the rest of it comes from is the hoop barns, straw-based. And our cow cattle manure is all straw-based.

MR. YEE: So you are composting the solid and spreading it?

MR. TIMMERMANN: We have been doing it for about three years with the hogs. We are going to start to do it with the cattle, too.

MR. YEE: And as far as the manure, you are also composting that?

MR. TIMMERRMAN: The liquid manure?

MR. YEE: Yes.

MR. TIMMERMANN: No. The liquid manure is applied on the land, spread on the land.

MR. YEE: Is that by injection?

MR. TIMMERMANN: No. Because we are under 300 animal units, we were able to apply it by spreading.

MR. YEE: Right, okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Timmerman. Can we get a copy of your presentation today? She did get a copy of it already?

MR. TIMMERMANN: Yes. She got ten
copies of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, good, thanks. Next up is Real Comte. Would you please state your name for the record?

MR. COMTE: Real Comte.

REAL COMTE, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. COMTE: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Real Comte. I own and operate a hog, grain and oilseed farm in Notre Dame. I have a 100 sow, farrow to finish, operation with 800 acres. I am the fourth generation on this centennial farm.

The hog operation started in 1974 with a 300 feeder pig finishing barn and 480 acres. It currently houses 1100 pigs and is a 100 sow, farrow to finish, operation. There is also 525 cultivated acres and 245 acres of woodland. We are not a large operation because we expand only when we see there is an interest from the next generation. Financially, the advantage of having pigs and grain is for the diversification and steady cash flow that it provides. When the price
of pigs are up positive, the price of grain goes
down, and vice versa. Without these two
two enterprises, farming would not be a reality for
me. This was also the case, even for my father
back in the seventies.

The water supply for the barn and
house is from the same source. It is a 55 foot
deep well, which is 30 inch wide casing, and is
made of fiberglass. The water comes from quick
sand, which is approximately 30 feet beneath the
surface. It is hard water, so a softener is used
to remove iron at the house. The water has been
sampled yearling for the last 33 years and has
remained unchanged. This proves to me that our
farming practices are not polluting the water
source in any way.

Manure provides the fertilizer for the
grain, which we grow and is then fed back to the
pigs. We also add granular fertilizer in the
spring only, before seeding, to top off whatever
nutrients are missing from the manure. This is
done with consultations with an agronomist where
we purchase our inputs.

Our soil is sampled every two year to
make sure there is no excessive buildup of
nutrients like phosphate and nitrogen. We currently have 130 days of storage, manure storage, in concrete pits beneath the barns. We have also broadcasted our manure ourselves with a liquid manure spreader. By spreading the manure ourselves, we are able to apply the manure on the least productive spots of the fields. The manure is always incorporated within 24 hours of spreading, with a cultivator. We set realistic targets and yield potential for our crop production. And we have noticed, over the years, a big improvement in our soil production output.

The immediate future for the farm, alongside with the financial support of the Manitoba Stewardship Program, will see better improvements to our farming practices. Manure will no longer be broadcasted on the soil but, rather, incorporated directly into the ground. This will increase the nitrogen level in manure and also eliminate nuisance odours. Another improvement will be the use of a GPS and auto steer to the tractor to limit the over-applying of fertilizer.

Our farm has 275 acres of woodlands,
which remain untouched. Therein lives a great
deal of wildlife. We, as a family, enjoy the
woods for all its natural beauty and recreational
pastimes. We have no intention of ever clearing
these areas.

The family farm can compete and thrive
in the hog industry. We will expand, as the
children get old enough and become interested in
continuing the tradition. We take great pride in
preserving our environment for the sake of future
generations, as it was taken care of for me. More
unnecessary regulations can jeopardize the future
by burdening the process down with red tape. More
should be done to get the abusers of the system,
and not the innocent.

The Manitoba Pork Council is already
very active in informing the hog industry of
proper management. The C.Q.A. program is one of
those programs that ensures all pigs are produced
humanely and safely. I would like to thank the
CEC for providing us this time to bring forward
our concerns regarding these hearings. I hope
that we have positively influenced your decision
in this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much,
Mr. Comte. Do you think that the current regulatory regime is sufficient or that it is too much?

MR. COMTE: I think that it is sufficient as it is now.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you can work with the current regime?

MR. COMTE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Including the phosphorus regulation?

MR. COMTE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you probably would rather not see any additional regulations?

MR. COMTE: That's correct, yes. I think that we take great pride in making sure that it's taken care of for our future generations. And with consulting agronomists, on a yearly basis, and others in the industry, that the regulations right now are sufficient.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Comte.

Just for a point of clarification, in your one sentence you say when you were incorporating it. You know, when you were injecting it into the ground, you say:
"This will increase the nitrogen level in manure and eliminate nuisance odours."

I didn't quite get that.

MR. COMTE: Right now the manure is broadcast on to the soil. By incorporating it in, there is a lot of nitrogen evaporating. And by incorporating it in, it would be more beneficial for me. It would pay off for me to actually incorporate it.

MR. MOTHERAL: It is the same amount in the manure, it is just better utilized when it is incorporated?

MR. COMTE: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: That's all I wanted.

MR. YEE: Just one quick question, Mr. Comte. I noticed that you are broadcast spreading your manure. Have you had many complaints of odour as a result of this type of spreading?

MR. COMTE: Not to my face. But I have certainly had concerns, yes. But I think it's even a nuisance for us. I think it's more of a nuisance for ourselves, as well as everybody else.
MR. YEE: So would there be a great deal of increase in cost if you were to till it? Not till it in, but inject it in?

MR. COMTE: The spreader that we currently have has the attachments already available to be able to put a knife injector on it as it is. So with the funding of the new farm plan, which would pay a third of it, it would be feasible to put the attachment on the spreader at very little cost.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming out here this afternoon, Mr. Comte. Next up is Liz Clayton.

MS. CLAYTON: Just one second. I am trying to get the power point up and running. I have some notes and some pictures. Yeah, I guess, by way of introduction --

THE CHAIRMAN: Just wait a moment, please.

MS. CLAYTON: Oh, I haven't sworn to tell the truth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get the technology dealt with first, and then we will take care of that. Please state your name for the
MS. CLAYTON: My name is Elizabeth Clayton.

ELIZABETH CLAYTON, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Please proceed.

MS. CLAYTON: Okay. So my name is Liz, and I am what I understand to be an increasingly rare statistic, and that's a person who has moved into, rather than away from, the country. The de-population of the prairies is one of the greatest challenges facing our rural communities. And from reading the papers out here, it is apparent that a lot of R.M.s are looking at ways to attract, and keep, new people and new ideas to your communities.

My partner, Henri, has brought machinist skills to the community. And I have a background in volunteer management and media. And I have money to invest from selling my home in Winnipeg. We plan to design and develop, with the help of our friends from the University of Manitoba, an energy-efficient, sustainable Northern Greenhouse for the production of fresh
green food year-round.

So when we decided to move to the country, we started spending our weekends exploring Manitoba and as far away, actually, as Eastern Saskatchewan, looking for the perfect piece of land. A place that reflected traditional notions of "country". You know, a place with a big sky and maybe some rolling hills and lots of pastureland and bush and cows and maybe even some hay fields. You know, this kind of picture comes to mind when you think of the beautiful countryside. And that's a farm just north of Treherne.

So this is what we were looking for.

But in so many areas of Manitoba, we found something that looked more like this when we were looking for a place to settle. As we know, intensive livestock operations have been springing up all over the countryside.

And just looking at the numbers here, we have had a great proliferation, since 1996, when we went from the single desk system to more of a vertically integrated system. So from 1996, we only are 3.2 million hogs. And then 2001, about five years later, 5.4 million. And then in
2006, we had 8.63 million. So we have had a huge increase in the amount of hogs in our Province of Manitoba.

Sometimes the operations are in the middle of nowhere, much as this one is, and sometimes they are right on the edge of sizable towns. Anyway, we kept looking until we found the perfect place. And we did find a place in the R.M. of South Norfolk. Here is the corner where we turn off to head to our place. It is the corner of Highway 305. That's about one mile east of our land. And these are the Tiger Hills in the background there. And this is the road going up in front of our house, and Tiger Hills, once again, looking towards the escarpment.

And the bush here, on this side, is the riparian zone that surrounds the Boyne River that winds its way through to the Stephenfield Provincial Park and then into the Stephenfield Reservoir. And that supplies this town of St. Claude and Carman with their drinking water. And so this is giving an idea of the escarpment there. We have got the Tiger Hills. This is the Boyne River down below. And here is the Stephenfield Lake.
So, anyway, we are very lucky because now we are doing what a lot of people only dream of doing. And that's, you know, unplugging from the city and setting up a permaculture homestead on 33 acres. Our land is zoned agriculture, but it is not suitable for any sort of large scale agriculture because of the bush, the drainage, the river and the escarpment, the topography. And we are on the edge of the Manitoba Escarpment, which was the old lakeshore of Lake Agassiz, about 20,000 years ago.

But in the spring the run-off filters through our property, and then it rushes into streams that flow into the Boyne River. Here is a picture of the Boyne River overflowing. And that's from the Stephenfield Conservation District website, and that's from 2004.

And here is it overflowing the road that just crosses right by our section from Highway 305. And here it is behind our house, on the neighbour's land, flowing through. So as you can see, drainage is really a problem. This river can really grow and run off. I am kind of keeping an eye on it right now because, you know, we are kind of heading to that season.
Out here, the soil is pretty sandy, and it doesn't take long for that soil to get absorbed into the ground. We are at basement level. And this is what happens. This is a stream that runs through the coolie that runs right through our place. This is taken on the September long weekend of last year. And as you can see, it is pretty much dried up, so the river is compromised. It doesn't flow through the late summer a lot of the time.

According to the Manitoba Sustainable Irrigation Discussion Paper that was released in November 2001, they were reporting something called the Wet Sands area, which is considered a high-risk area for aquifer protection.

And the river itself, here is a map of it, okay? Here is a picture of the conservation district that shows the general lay of the land. You can see the escarpment running through. And the Boyne River and numerous tributaries that run into it. Now, in this area there are about four hog operations, at this point, with one more on the books, so we will get to that shortly.

When the CEC confirmed that this examination of the sustainability of the hog
industry in Manitoba wouldn't be limited to just environmental concerns, specifically water quality in Lake Winnipeg, but also be looking at all of the impacts of this industry, I was really relieved that we could maybe have an opportunity to put some of the other impacts of this industry on the table here today.

So moving right along here, this document here is from Conservation Manitoba, "An Examination of the Environmental Sustainability of the Hog Industry in Manitoba". Fairly recent, it came out in 2006. And from that we have here a look at the location of permitted manure storage facilities from April 2006.

So as you can see, there is a huge dark section. Excuse the scale. Okay, there is a huge section down there, and that's around Steinbach, Hanover, La Broquerie. Here we've got a little bit of an intensive process going on just south in the Lorne District. We have quite a few hog barns starting to show up here. And we have a few in South Norfolk, where I live.

But I am just wondering, you know, just to consider: How would you like to own, you know, a family farm right in this area here, where
we have got a whole ton of hog barns? We
travelled that way on Highway 12 last spring to
visit some friends several times last year. And
the odour -- it was after April 10th, and the
odour was omnipresent, and it was absolutely
overwhelming. It was not pretty driving down
there. Dozens of steel barns are visible from the
highway. It's called "hog army".

And we spent the night in a charming
guest house, in a beautiful meadow, surrounded by
poplar trees, thunderstorms raging, a beautiful
spring night in June. It was, like, the most
romantic, beautiful setting. But the smell wafted
in from all directions, all day long, and it was
totally enough to gag a maggot. It was just
terrible.

So as a person with money to invest,
ideas and energy to share, this would be the last
place I would set up a small farm. I was sad that
the people we were visiting had lived there for 27
years, and had invested their lives into
developing their property, but had no choice but
to stay in the middle of all of that.

The Manitoba Pork Council can empty
their deep pockets on the public relations spin
all they want, but it won't change the fact that these large-scale operations, with anaerobic liquid storage and lagoons, smell really bad. How bad do they smell? Well, it's hard to measure odour. It's almost as hard to measure odour as it is to measure quality of life. But we can now measure how important odour elimination is becoming, which is an indicator of quality of life.

And here we have a slide of the burgeoning air freshener industry, where we see that it is up $600 million since 2003. These are American numbers, by the way. 40 percent of the people who buy these products didn't start until six years ago. Now, this could be the result of constant advertising. You know, every time you hear on the T.V. you are hearing about Febreeze. But there is a generation that is considered to be ultra-sensitive to any kind of odour. And I would be really interested to see what they will be looking for in a property when they become buyers. I'm from an older generation, a little earthier, perhaps, and even I have some issues with odour. But this new generation, I don't know.

Odour is a real bugaboo for the hog
industry. The footprints of these ILOs extend far beyond the land that they are built on. And besides the soil and water issues, the odours downwind are unmeasurable and unpredictable, and unpleasant. And I'm not talking about that sweet barnyard smell of nicely rotting manure. If you are surrounded by fields that are part of the Manure Management Plan, you are subjected to what is called "nuisance odour" every spring, summer and fall.

And although Conservation has called for an end to winter spraying some time ago, in this report that's mentioned here, barns of under 400, built before the regulations, are allowed to continue with winter fertilizer application until 2010. And judging on the amount of winter spreading going on this week, there are quite a few farms in my area with the grandfathering clause intact.

There has been a lot of talk about science, and keeping this whole inquiry very scientific. And the government has list add whole pile of hog-related research projects that they have funded, and that is in this document here.

And we are going to move to a slide
here. This is the amount of money that has gone
into scientific research here in Manitoba,
according to this document. ARDI Funding to the
pork industry, between 1998 and 2006, it was over
$3 million. And that was money contributed to the
industry for research by the government, which is
us, the taxpayers.

Generally, it works out to -- looking
at the different types of experiments and the
types of projects that they use here, there are
certain different categories. And 26 percent of
the government funding went to manure management
and odour-related research here in Manitoba.

And 74 percent, actually, just went to
other aspects of the hog industry, hog feeding,
hog health and other projects that just generally
go to profit, the industry, funded by the
government, aka, the taxpayers.

And further, too, there is some more
contributions, as well, here where the government
contributes to the Manitoba Livestock Manure
Management Initiatives nearly $1 million a year.
And private industry, of course, also adds to the
fund.

There is a lot of support from
taxpayers to enable -- that's a lot of support
from taxpayers to enable an industry that has
grown to 8.3 million pigs. Perhaps some of those
research dollars could be diverted into seeking
new and emerging food production systems, like
northern greenhouses, and not growing an industry
that is already established.

There are programs for special
breeding and special feeding. But there is no
research being done in these reports here of all
of the research being done to measure the impacts
of bacteria and virus-fighting antibiotics
vaccinations that the hogs excrete, then mix and
ferment in an anaerobic environment before the
liquified is applied.

There is no doubt about the desire of
the industry at large to make all of the bad stuff
go away. Here a study that found,
scientifically -- oh, yeah, here, is a study that
found, scientifically, that the odour inside homes
measures to be more than the odours that are
emanating from a hog barn. It's from the Pork
Producer Magazine in Iowa. And it says:

"Recent odour studies produce
encouraging results. It's a 16-month
study around Iowa hog farms, by Iowa State University, and it found that:
Activities inside the home cause more odour problems for rural residents than neighbouring hog barns. They found inside the home ammonia levels higher than outside levels. And they point to the inside sources being litter in a cat box, someone was smoking inside one of the homes, and other pets were kept inside the house."

So this is a peer-reviewed scientific study. And I don't know who has a home that smells like that. I am sure that no one in this room could say that's the case.

So there is a desire -- actually, it is almost funny when you start looking at the amount of research that's being done and the things that are for sale to prevent odour. It's almost like 19th Century snake oil salesmen. A whole side industry has sprung up, with gadgets like electron beams and radio waves that break up the content. But you can stir it up all you want, because when you break it down, the raw
ingredients of decomposition, the ammonia, the
urea, and 166 other ingredients, like hydrogen
sulfide and sulphur dioxide, are all still there.

At the end of the day, at the end of
the dollar, there isn't really a darn thing you
can do about the smell with the current ILO model.
Because of the liquified slurry, and the anaerobic
lagoons, and the need to transport manure to sites
where the nutrients can be properly and thoroughly
used up by the crops. Even if manure comes out
sweet from all of the feed programs that are going
on, when it is liquified and stored in the dark
without air, it changes into something else. That
smell is something that good science can't fix, no
matter how many peers review it.

A generation of Manitobans have had
their daily lives impacted by ILOs going upwind of
them. And a generation of urban people visiting
the country in the spring for rest and relaxation,
for a breath of fresh air, or a Sunday drive, or a
visit, or lunch sometimes, have a hard times
driving with the windows open.

So out of respect for the farmers and
the townspeople who were here on this land first,
odours suppression should have been a requirement
from the very beginning, and not a catch-up
measure only now getting some action, slowly, and
when it's affordable. Lagoon coverage should have
be a condition in the annual Manure Management
Plans, effective as soon as possible, for all
existing operations that operate with the liquid
manure system. And also the sub-soil liquid
injection manure systems should become mandatory,
as well.

At present, there are no odour
regulations for the livestock operations by
Manitoba Conservation because odour is the
responsibility of the R.M. And while we are
talking about foresight, according to the Manure
Management Plan, the Province only introduced the
notion of well-water testing in 2002, according to
this report. And that requirement only came into
effect in 2004. So there were a lot of hogs here
when the Province started to look at the
regulatory framework for the industry more
closely, and there is a lot of catching up to do.

Perhaps the people who run the
Manitoba Pork Council, or even Conservation
Manitoba, don't live in the country and are
unaware of the proliferation of something called
midnight farming. Now that I live out here, I find a strange amount of work going on in the middle of the night, or on weekends starting at 4:15, or Friday afternoons. And from the sights and the smells, it is mostly about manure management. Mixed farming, traditional farming, honest farming, is a daytime, right out in the open, kind of public event. But some of this factory farming is very, very quiet. No people, no animals, no farm gate, no visitors because of biosecurity.

So why is the hog industry so beleaguered? After hearing the Manitoba Pork Council's soothing and "good science and manure management" approach, you begin thinking: Gee, you know, these guys are doing everything right. They don't even get a break. They get more regulations. They get more inspections. They have to fill in annual manure management reports. And, by gosh, they can't even build or expand right now because of this temporary pause on building. And not only that, you can plan a barn, following all of the regulations and still get shot down by an R.M. after that onerous and off-putting, uncontrollable factor called a public
hearing for a conditional use permit. Mr. Peter Mah, of the Pork Council, says that it's not fair to the hog industry. Proponents can do everything right, but still get turned down at that stage of the process.

Well, let's look at how effective that process has been to the hog farm development. Here is some more science. This is an estimate, actually, based on memory of residents of the number of projects stopped at the R.M. level through the public hearing process since 1996:

Seven. The number of projects successfully established and operating here in Manitoba right now: 1400. So as you can see, it certainly looks, with the odds being 200 to 1 in favour of the proponent, that the public hearing actually does work for the proponents, the stats say yes.

And contrary to the image that the Pork Council paints, the challenges of learning and interpreting and employing all of these regulations isn't always the case of a struggling independent farmer starting from scrap. With a vertically integrated industry, the hog farmer has the experience of experts to advise him through many stages of this process, particularly the
regulatory stages.

Now, I am tired of getting assaulted by being incapable of understanding the science, or making a reasoned conclusion, by an industry-funded lobby group that works full time to promote and grow their industry with an annual spin budget of $3.5 million. That, to me, is a special interest group.

There is an article that I have here on this desk that I have made really messy really fast. Here it is. Western Producer, January 25th of this year, by Ron Friesen, in which Peter Mah advised the government to not make policies based on "public opinion". So I suppose policies based on back-room deals and the "economy of the moment" would be better for the future of our province?

He said that "public opinion" is based on "subjective and often biased, piecemeal, anecdotal, and founded on a "not in my backyard perspective". And that's maybe true, but why is that? The Pork Council has deep pockets to work within. They can afford to buy media, place ads, golf with the government. And they have been telling the Manitoba public exactly the same message, over and over again, since 1996, that the
hog industry is wonderful for everyone. And if
the public doesn't buy it, maybe that's because
they see with their own eyes and smell with their
own noses. And Mah complains that "special
interest groups" are on a witch hunt. But from
all of the intolerant literature that I read from
people who don't support the constant and infinite
growth of this industry, I feel that he is on a
witch hunt.

So I will tell you what I have learned
since January 4th of this year. And that's when I
first read in my community paper, "The Treherne
Times", that a Conditional Use Permit had been
granted to Biopork Enterprises Limited following a
public hearing on December 12th. When I read in
the paper about the public meeting, I saw that it
was only attended by the proponent, Mr. Barry
Watson from BioPork, and Gary Plohman of the
There was no other public there.

And seeing that the section involved
was kitty-corner to my section, I was concerned.
So I called the R.M. office and asked them to see
me all of the information about the public
hearing. They responded by sending me just some
Finally, late in January, I did receive the Technical Review Committee report in the mail. And I was kind of stunned to discover the scope of this project because the place where I was just getting settled into, where I hoped to spend the rest of my life, was going to have 19 barns, the pigs rotating every 120 days, a total of 16,000 pigs a year, will be moving in uphill and upwind from me. With no odour control because, as it says here, the manure will be composted on site, handled as a solid and, as a solid, there would be no odour. And mortalities would be composted on site. Now, I could not find the numbers for the average mortalities. But if the barn has a 95 percent success rate, we are still looking at composting more than 800 pigs a year.

So then I went to Treherne to look through back issues of the Treherne Times to see if I had missed something about the public meeting. There was nothing in the paper, for a month prior to the meeting, so I hadn't. And it turned out that the R.M. erred, and they did improper notification. And there was supposed to
be a proper public hearing. And it is actually quite lengthy. And I am really going to cut this short for time and try to abbreviate as part of this. I have it all on tape, audiotape. So it is about three days' worth of phone calls to get to the truth of the process. And I will be submitting that, along with my proposal or my background.

Okay. So Regional Planning called the R.M. It turns out that there should be a public hearing at some point in our future. But I have been unable to determine if the application, so far, has been recalled from Conservation, Manitoba.

Some of the problems in the report, though, there is no reference to the big picture. The sites between the Manitoba Escarpment and the Boyne River, as we just saw, the whole area is subject to extreme run-off in the spring. That's not mentioned in the report. And some of the sections found in the area are actually underwater in the spring.

And when I checked the fields slated for the Manure Management Plan, I found that every single field has drainage going to the Boyne
River, according to my R.M. map. And one section included the Boyne River itself.

So there were a number of flaws, I thought, in this Technical Review Committee process, starting with no public hearing posted, no acknowledgment to the big picture, and no reference of run-off, and no reference to the Boyne River. And as you may know, the Boyne River supplies water to over 11,000 Manitobans in the South Pembina Water District, a district that is very challenged to get water to the citizens and is on limited supply.

The water quality in the Stephenfield River is compromised, and the capacity of the reservoir is reduced two-thirds by silt deposits. And this project requires over 7,000-gallons of water day.

There are some flags on this report that are put in by the scientists. Some of the lands spreaded are at nitrogen capacity already, some have poor soil, but who is going to act on the flags? The Technical Review Committee does not review the proponent's proposal for accuracy. It just checks the plans against Provincial regulations. So is it up to the R.M. and the
Public Hearing for the Conditional Use Hearing to ask for more due diligence, or is that up to Water Conservation, or does Conservation just handle the "water license" and the "digging of the lagoon"? Does anyone in this process stand back and look at the land and look at the big picture.

Here is the big picture here. As I sit here, the bush and the marginal land continues to be cleared to enable more application at the top of the hills. This is right near a barn in our Tiger Hills area. Here is the view on the very top of the Escarpment, where the soil is the thinnest. This is the very top of it. Miles of bushland that was protecting the top of the hills from erosion have been bulldozed. And you can see the soil is very stony and not very productive looking there. And this is looking down the hill. And, I guess, that's to show that the sediment from these hills here are actually completely barren, sweeps down the hills during run-offs, which are very short and very severe. And they can wash out the bridges and do a damaging job down below. So I am just going to conclude here. When I read the vocabulary of this hearing, of the initiatives and cooperative efforts of the
government and the hog industry, I get very
discouraged because I'm an outsider, a "not in my
backyard" kind of person. I am one of the people
who the industry feels simply needs more education
on the "good science" to prove that everything is
hunky dory, that the hog industry is a good
steward of the land and a good neighbour.

I found that this was such a very
interesting document, though. It says here that:

"The Manitoba Government has a role to
play in ensuring that the growth of
the livestock sector continues to be
viable."

And that's on page 5 of this. So the Manitoba
Government wants to continue to grow the industry.

And on page 7 here, it is about manure
application, that:

"Our hog industry requires between
474,000 and 742,000 acres of land.
Expansion of the hog industry could
require between 73,700 and 92,900
additional acres."

And that, I estimate, to be 20 percent more growth
in the hog industry. So if we're at about
8.5 million now, we will be looking at 10 million
pigs. And then after that, two percent a year to keep up with world population growth.

This initiative is being funded, the government part is anyway, by the taxpayer. And it proves the absolute imbeddedness of this industry with our Provincial Government. There is a number of different studies here. There is a recommendation on page 12, recommendation 20 from the Livestock Stewardship Panel, which says that:

"Industry and government should pay greater attention to familiarizing the public with the in-barn environment and precautions that are taken to raise healthy animals."

And the government responded with a fact-sheet series.

Water testing, it says here, item 13:

"The government is picking up 70 percent of the cost for private well testing, and 100 percent of the testing for repeat tests of wells which positive results."

That's a nice bonus. There were programs for sustainability, and all of these sorts of things. And I have already told you that the government is
funding $4.2 million into the industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Clayton, I hesitate to interrupt you, because we haven't heard too much from the opponents from the hog industry, but you are fast approaching twice the allotted time, so we will give you another moment or two.

MS. CLAYTON: Okay. Quickly, this is an industry where there is a lot of cross-pollination. These are people who have worked for the Manitoba Government, or have in the past: Peter Mah, Andrew Dickinson, formerly with MAFRI, formerly from intergovernmental affairs. And Gary Plohman, currently from MAFRI. And looking here, we see the same people, employed by the Manitoba Pork industry. So these are -- there is a lot of cross-over here. And when it comes to regulations, funding, applications and things, I am wondering if this is just too close for comfort.

I have some suggestions now. I suggest that the hog industry should stop expanding and learn to be healthy and sustainable at about 8 million pigs. Shelterbelts and lagoons should be covered. And old ILO systems should be phased out.
All new projects should be based on the straw-based bio-barn system.

A dwelling should be included in a site plan.

R.M. officials and community members should be part of the Technical Review Committee process so that the big picture is not missed.

A proper chain of custody for water taken from test wells should be instituted.

Measurements and standards for odour measures should be instituted by Conservation Manitoba.

Public-minded citizens should be trained and empowered to investigate incidents of "night farming".

A province-wide public information campaign should be launched with information about environmental rules and regulations, and a snitch shine.

And the Planning Act should be amended to map out ILO-free zone that encourage small farms, mixed farms, market gardens and traditional beef livestock and dairy operations.

I will have to wrap it up there, even though I have got some more stuff.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Have you given us a copy of your written report?

MS. CLAYTON: I will print some out.

My printer kind of expired somewhere today.

THE CHAIRMAN: We do have a copier here. We could make one copy today and make more back at the office.

MS. CLAYTON: There was some stuff that I thought was quite pertinent about the sustainability of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will read it. We will make a note of those comments when we have an opportunity to read the report. Thank you.

MS. CLAYTON: Do you have any questions?

MR. MOTHERAL: No questions.

MS. CLAYTON: No?

MR. YEE: No questions.

MS. CLAYTON: No, not a single question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next up is Bill Harrison. Could we have order in the room, please? Mr. Harrison, you promised to tell the truth at the Winnipeg meeting last week, so we consider that you are still abiding by that
promise.

MR. HARRISON: Well, I hope so. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

BILL HARRISON, previously sworn, presents as follows:

MR. HARRISON: First, I would like to thank the CEC for the opportunity to comment on the subject of the environmental sustainability of the hog industry in Manitoba. It's good that the CEC will listen to critics of the hog industry and their suggestions for improvement in the protection of the animals' quality of life, with the resultant protection and improvement of the health and our ground and surface waters, our soil and, of course, that of our air, never mind all of us.

May I assure the hog industry that if they improve their protection of the above, the increasingly enlightened health conscious consumer will accept the increased cost of their pork. One cannot increase trust in that industry by denial and putting blame on critics of their profit-oriented animal management practices. The consumer has every right to be a vocal partner in
the meat they purchase and consume.

The public expects the Provincial Government, with the help of such communal processes as these CEC hearings, to ensure that the hog industry raises the animals under their care with respect for their natural life processes and their feelings as living creatures. If the public perceives the hog industry as being given too much leeway to abuse the quality of life of animals under their care by our government, which is elected, one assumes, to ensure the public's health is protected, then we have a serious problem. That is if the hog industry is seen as contributing to pollution of our waterways, such as Lake Winnipeg our neighbouring Stephenfield Lake, we assume it is the Provincial Government which must enact legislation to minimize and ideally eliminate this threat. Industry, as well as individuals, must follow the law, as well as practice common sense to protect our drinking water, in particular.

Unpolluted water is key to human health and welfare. It is the government's job to ensure all sentient beings are looked after. We must be assured that what we consume is safe and
healthy, whether it's food or water. Industry
constantly reminds us they follow government
regulations. Therefore, it is the Province's
responsibility to regulate the hog industry as
strictly as necessary, whether it's their feed,
the water they consume, the air they pollute, or
the manure they spread.

Municipal governments are not required
to bare this responsibility. In my R.M. of Lorne,
our council has ducked the responsibility to look
after the public health by denying to enact a
livestock by-law. Fortunately, the province has
forced our R.M.s to develop such by-laws under the
new Planning Act, so at least we have a beginning.
Hopefully regulations governing ILOs will evolve
and become stricter, so as to enhance water and
air quality and, ultimately, animal and human
health.

An example of the failure of the
government system to protect its waterways is the
new by-law in the R.M. of Lorne. Our watershed,
that is the Roseisle Creek Watershed Association,
worked with the R.M. of Dufferin, which surrounds
the Town of Carman, in the last two years, leading
up to Lorne's creation of its own development
plan. Dufferin, unlike Lorne, is downstream from us in our watershed, which includes Roseisle Creek, the Boyne River, some of Lyle Creek, and all of them are feeding into Stephenfield Lake. And the main source for the Pembina Valley Water Co-op, which feeds treated water to many towns such as Haywood, St. Claude, Carman, Roseisle, Miami, et cetera, as well as many farms in the area. And, of course, many irrigators use this water.

Now, the R.M. of Lorne initially declined to cooperate with the R.M. of Dufferin over the latter's concerns with polluted water coming from our R.M., which is Lorne, with its rapid growth of ILOs. And due to the combined efforts of our watershed group, working with the R.M. of Dufferin and meeting with representatives of Water Stewardship and Manitoba Conservation at the Legislature, we managed to achieve some compromise set-back distances from the R.M. of Lorne, along the Lyle and Roseisle Creeks, and the latter being the largest single feed to the Boyne River, for the construction of new ILOs in Lorne's development plan. So we got some compromises. However, since the R.M. of Lorne has not been
known to refuse any proposal for a new ILO, and I see Ms. Clayton has touched on that topic, it has been known -- I mean, it has not been known to refuse any proposal to ILOs, we have not given up on our efforts to improve our watersheds by persuading them to improve on their by-law.

The provincial planning process is flawed. Three separate hog ILOs, were approval in our R.M., even though they did not meet the Province's Farm Practices Guidelines. These were the Picardie Farm, one-half mile of St. Lupicin, Martin Grenier barn one mile south of Notre Dame de Lourdes, and the Charriere barn two miles east of Lourdes. This has really become a social, as well as an environmental, issue. No party seems to take responsibility.

Our council originally had no livestock by-laws, and refused to enact one until they were forced to by the Province via the Development Plan. Thanks to the Province for the baby step.

Technician reviews, which the Province mandates, are simply advisory. Since the reviews did not say no to the construction, our council saw this as an approval process.
For example, Picardi Farms' proposal did not originally meet the Farm Practices Guideline of too many dwellings within a mile of the proposed site, according to the Technical Review Committee. However, they then reversed their decision when our council arbitrarily reduced the number of dwellings and, of course, our council approved the project. When the neighbours to the proposed project pointed out this discrepancy to the Farm Practices Board, the board's response was that they could not deal with their complaint until after the operation was up and running. Talk about a catch 22! It is obvious the government must improve on the complaints process before ILO projects are permitted to build. Now, this allow for greater public input, and the public has a right to be involved. I mean, we are all neighbours. We all have to work together in our communities to build, you know, healthier and safer communities.

In yet another case, just west of Somerset on Highway 23, an ILO, which had burned, was ordered rebuilt on the same site by the insurer, across the road and less than 600 feet from Mr. Bill Acheson's farm. This is not the
barn proponent's fault. Good government could have intervened and mandated insurance companies, and they still can, to permit reconstruction of such barns at another site more equitable to the neighbour and the barn's owners. This could make for a better and healthier relationships in farm communities. Who is driving the planning train, anyway?

Now, it's known that it takes 4,000 to 5,000 litres of fresh, clean water to produce one, yes, one kilo of pork. An 8,000 feeder operation, such as the Picardie site, south of St. Lupicin, uses approximately 160 million litres of clean water a year, according to Manitoba agriculture. This is at a time when scientists are warning of global warming and prolonged drought. Much of the water is used to make the hog manure into a slurry to more easily, and cheaply, spread it on the land, which can and does create hazardous run-off and soaking into aquifers. This must change! Government must mandate composting manure systems as a real beginning to protect our ground and surface waters.

And, at this time, I would like to thank Mr. Timmerman for his comments regarding
that he is, at this time, doing some composting,
at least in his cattle manure. But I would
hope -- and I understand that there is a project
going on near Treherne, a couple of young hog
producers are working with the Province now to
develop a better method of composting hog manure
from their biotech barns. I wish them luck, and I
hope that will be the future for our Province.

Straw bedding systems must be used,
such as in the biotech barns, or the pure lean
pork hog production system. And I don't know if
their website is still active. But I understand
they had a little problem because they weren't as
profitable as the liquid manure system barns.
They never became terribly popular.

Now, liquid manure pits, even with
plastic liners, are known by engineers to seep up
to 10 percent into the earth and aquifers below.
No, they don't leak. This does not have to
happen. If jurisdictions in Europe, the U.S., and
even in Quebec, can produce high quality pork
profitably by using above ground manure storage
tanks, using manure composting, not using
antibiotics when an animal is sick, not using sow
grates and by using straw bedding, then what is to
prevent our government from gradually legislating
the same processes here in Manitoba?

   Corporate hog producers must catch up
with the rest of the enlightened world. They
ought to wake up to consumer choice. They just
might find compliance, cooperation, and
environmental sensitivity will profit them more
than resistance and denial and their expensive
good science. Let us work together, consumers and
producers, to create a more environmentally
sustainable, tastier and health healthier meat so
this debate can go away.

   We cannot prove the environmental
sustainability of the hog industry while we're
constantly adding new barns; just like a fireman
cannot put out a fire if we keep adding fuel to
the fire.

   Please, let's make this pause into a
permanent moratorium. I heard last week the Pork
Council said that they were at probably about nine
million hogs now in the province. So if we go
back to 2006 where at the beginning of 2006, where
the number was 8.3 million, so that exponentially
we can expect that by early next year there will
be ten million hogs in Manitoba, and that should
be enough.

So, again, please let's make this pause into a permanent moratorium. Nine to ten million hogs in Manitoba is much more than enough. The hog industry should not have to be reminded that had over-production leads to lower prices and even collapse of the market. And how is that sustainable?

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harrison. You commented about -- you referenced, I think, it was three different barns that were allowed to go ahead, even though they didn't meet the Best Practices -- the Best Management Practices or was it just the farm practices?

MR. HARRISON: Just the farm practices.

THE CHAIRMAN: The farm practice guidelines?

MR. HARRISON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How would you suggest that that problem be fixed?

MR. HARRISON: That's a good question. It probably won't be a simple one. There is no
simple answer to that. I think that there should be more public consultation. I don't expect that the board, your board, can make all of the recommendations just with this information that I am giving you.

But one hopes that -- you know, that if the industry sits down together with environmentalists and, you know, people from Conservation, people from Water Stewardship, particularly, and, you know, maybe we can research and talk amongst ourselves and figure out some answers to that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that that is one area that we may well give serious consideration to, the whole approval process. Because we have heard from concerns from people on at least two sides, maybe more than two sides, of that issue. So, you know, any input that you might give us about how you think that the approval process might be improved would certainly be valuable.

MR. HARRISON: I would like to do that. If I could, I can always make up a written submission as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. HARRISON: Another written submission for another time, another meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would appreciate that.

MR. MOTHERAL: I am confused myself sometimes with some of these things, Mr. Harrison. There is reference to the Farm Practices Board, and there is reference to Farm Practices Guidelines. And I do believe that they are, like, two separate issues.

MR. HARRISON: They are two separate issues.

MR. MOTHERAL: Because the guidelines are there for municipalities to assist them in their development plans. And also the Farm Practices Board is a board that handles nuisance complaints, I believe, is it not?

MR. HARRISON: That's right.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. I was getting them -- you were referencing them as though they were the same thing.

MR. HARRISON: No, that was not my intent.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

MR. HARRISON: No. The Farm Practices
Guidelines, many of them, actually, have become law in the new plan before the previous government, the Conservative Government, had made the recommendations originally. So nobody followed them until now. With any new operations, they all have to follow them as law, not just as guidelines.

MR. MOTHERAL: And just another comment, too, and I've mentioned this before today, that with a new Planning Act, the municipalities must or are mandated to come up with a livestock operation policy, and many of them are reluctant right now because of this review going on.

MR. HARRISON: I understand that.

MR. MOTHERAL: So we understand that.

MR. HARRISON: It's difficult. I mean, so many things are overlapping. And, you know, I can understand it. But our council, unfortunately, took the option to just wait and wait and wait, until finally the government -- they got involved in the process. And then, at the same time, the government is trying to say: Well, you have to do this and you have to do that with the new changes in the Planning Act. Because
when they changed the Planning Act, of course, that caused confusion because it held up our process in Lorne and developing of the plan, because they have been changing as they were going along. But now, apparently, that by-law has been passed.

MR. MOTHERAL: That's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Mr. Harrison, maybe if I can just get some comments, because you had mentioned the Planning Act, and indicated one of the useful things about the amendment to the new Planning Act was the fact that municipalities now have to plan their developments in terms of livestock operations. But one of the things that we've heard from some municipal councillors is that there is a downside, as well, because municipal council no longer can put in by-laws respecting how manure is managed. Do you have any comment on that?

MR. HARRISON: Well, I would like to see, actually, some input from councillors -- from council, I mean. That's another issue. I know that a lot of power has been taken away from the R.M. And sometimes, in my R.M., I would have to
say, actually, that it is probably a good thing.

But in other R.M.s, it might not be. It is,
again, that balancing act, and it's tough. You
know, it's tough to find a compromise.

Again, I don't have a straight, you
know, pat answer to that, of course. I don't
know. But, again, it requires more consultation,
I suppose, from, you know, all of the
stakeholders, as we call them. And, as I say, it
is important the public is heard. It is
unfortunate that all of the public doesn't come
here. And I see the Pork Council is here because
the Pork Council encourages people to come and
give a presentation because their industry is
under attack.

And as I travel around, people say,
well, the government do what they want, anyway.
And, unfortunately, they put a word in with the
neighbours that they have. And a few people like
myself, or Ms. Clayton, or myself may come and
have an opinion as a layperson, not as a hog
producer, but somebody who lives in a community
and has concerns about the quality of life and, of
course, the water and the environment, et cetera.
And we want the industry to be sustainable, but
most of us feel that there is a limit. There has to be some limit. If you can just keep expanding and expanding, as I say, it is like adding fuel to the fire. How can we examine the sustainability of the hog industry if we don't take a pause and see if it is manageable, and if the manure, or whatever, you know, the threat to our water is manageable, you know.

And to be fair, perhaps we should also be saying or looking at the other livestock producers in the industry. I mean, they are out there doing their business, too. And they also have manure, you know, a lot of manure, to dispose of. And maybe it will still come to that. I don't know.

MR. YEE: Thank you, Mr. Harrison.

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

MR. HARRISON: Thanks very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next up is Rick Maendel and Cameron Maendel.

Yes, would you please state your names for the record?

MR. R. MAENDEL: Ricky Maendel.

MR. C. MAENDEL: Cameron Maendel.
RICKY MAENDEL and CAMERON MAENDEL, having been sworn, present as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

MR. R. MAENDEL: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am here today on behalf of my community, which is Fairholme Colony of the Hutterian Brethren Church, Schmiedeleut Conference. From the Mennonites, our people learned to farm on the steppes of Russia in the late eighteenth century.

My community makes its living in the farming and livestock industry. We farm 5,000-acres of mixed crops and grazing; turkey, hog, chicken and beef production. Raising hogs generates over half of our income.

A farm of this size needs a substantial amount of drinking water for both livestock and human consumption. Our well is situated in the Assiniboine River flat, approximately 100 metres from the river. This is also the drinking water source for our community. Obviously, it is in our best interest to keep our water clean and safe.

It has been over five years since we
have applied manure to the fields in our river flats. It is our choice not to, because we do not need to. We have an underground irrigation system covering over 2500-acres of our land; thus, manure need not be reapplied on the same land for over seven years. Our manure is injected into the ground by a cultivator or a disc cultivator.

The manure from our turkey operations stored in composting piles, which we use to decompose dead stock. When manure has sufficiently decomposed into dirt, it is spread over our lightest sand hills and fields to return fiber into the land and enrich the soil.

We practice zero tillage on most of our agricultural land. Currently, we are in the process of building a lagoon, because of the recent history of slurry tank failures, and although our storage tank passes government inspections.

I voluntarily took a two-year pork production technician course through Assiniboine Community College in Elie, and am now a licenced technician in the pork industry. I am aware of the environmental concerns facing the hog industry, and wish to be an active members in
conserving and being responsible for the future.

With my experience of working in the barn, and the technical training that I received, I am better prepared, more aware and willing to do what I can to make a difference. My being here in front of you today attests to that!

Another way we try to conserve our environment is by the use of phytase in our hog feed to limit the amount of phosphate being excreted by the animals.

Our high school is very involved with environmental programs that foster awareness of environmental conservation. For the past seven years, a team from our school has participated in the Manitoba Envirothon. This is a hands-on environmental education competition for high school students from all over the province. The students have to do an in-depth study of four main categories; forestry, wildlife, aquatics and soils, plus a different subject each year, such as climate change and point source pollution.

In all seven years, our team made it into the top three! As well, our team was the Manitoba champion in the 2005 Envirothon, going on to represent Manitoba at the Nationals in
Missouri, USA.

In 2005, our community was also awarded the Conservation Family of the Year Award in the LaSalle Redboine Conservation District. These informed students are a significant part of our future, so teaching them in their youth to be good stewards of our environment will pay off in the long run.

Finally, our community, in the summer, looks and feels like a forest or park, with houses and buildings nestled right in among giant oak trees, many of which are 75 years old! We believe in conserving our natural heritage. And we plan to leave it for the future generations to cherish and enjoy. Thank you.

MR. C. MAENDEL: Hello. My name is Cameron Maendel. The Fairholme Colony Hog Barn is committing itself to a sustainable and productive future for us and for our children. In the last couple of years, we have taken a number of steps to ensure better manure management and proper disposal of dead livestock.

Last year, we started to build a lagoon, even though our current slurry store system has passed all government inspections. The
lagoon is being built to last for one year, which means we have to empty it out annually. This is in keeping with the law that was enacted to ensure that the lagoon is properly maintained and can easily be fixed if something goes wrong.

We regularly take soil samples so that we can stay within provincial regulations on the amount of manure we apply to our land. This manure is used as fertilizer, of course, and its application is controlled by the flow of the pump and the speed of the tractor.

Previously, we gauged ourselves by how far the slurry store levels receded in a certain period of time, but now we have accurate gauges telling us exactly how much we are injected.

About six miles down the road from us, our neighbours have installed a separator in their hog barn. This separator is not only made for hogs, but chickens as well. The end products are in a solid state, and the liquids are pumped out into a lagoon. And these solids are good fertilizer for gardens and lawns. Because they do stink for a while, they are unattractive to the consumer.

Another option is to purify the manure
into pure phosphorus and pure nitrogen, then
turning around and selling it to fertilizer
companies. Unfortunately, this is an expensive
way to go. Our neighbours, who own this
separator, have offered to pump our manure down to
their separator and sort of split the cost of
handling it. However, we have to think about our
herd health and the transfer of diseases.

Inside our barn, we try to keep our
pits as clean as possible. And this way, they
stay free of any debris and do not plug up the
sewers. And if that happened, we would have a
spill and contamination of the environment would
take place.

Our herd is Canadian Quality Assurance
verified, and we follow its guidelines rigorously.
This program is set up for the consumer and
producer alike. The C.Q.A. requires keeping the
hog barns clean and safe. It was implemented to
help us produce pork in an environmentally safe
manner. Manitoba processors offer decent levies
for herds that are C.Q.A. certified, because it
requires a little extra work. But we feel, in the
end, we are producing a better product.

The C.Q.A. program involved adding
improvements, such as the newly set up traceability program, which allows us to trace the pork chop on the shelf back to the farm. This program allows producers, vets and processors to work together, if there is a disease outbreak, which helps us control any problems that might arise.

To conclude, as hog producers, we are always looking for viable ways to improve our manner of animal husbandry here on the farm. This is where we live and where we want our children and their children to live in the future. Farming is not just another job to us. It's our lifestyle and our vocation, which we want to conduct in an ecologically viable and sustainable manner.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can you tell us a little bit more about your operation? You described it -- Ricky, in your paper you described it as 5,000-acres, but then you said turkey, hog, chicken, beef. How much of each of those do you have?

MR. R. MAENDEL: Beef, we have approximately 2250 cows, which would be with calves over 500 head. We have 800 sow piggery,
where over approximately half our pigs are raised offsite by employing three other families that raise them in biotechs for us.

The turkey operation, we have four barns that are filled three times a year. Approximately, the turkey quota goes by kgs, it would be 800,000 pounds or 300,000 kgs, approximately. All of that is put in stock by us and used for decomposition. And we have a lot of land, which is why we use zero tillage, to keep the soil there. And then we spread that over it.

And the pullets, we just raise custom pullets for layer operations, two sets of year of 11,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yeah. I was just curious when you were saying that you -- most of the land you don't spread after -- you spread every seven years?

MR. R. MAENDEL: We don't need to spread on the same field for seven years because our irrigation system has twelve inch to eight inch lines that run underneath from field to field. And they are all interconnected and we can pump to whichever field we want.
MR. MOTHERAL: Got you. I missed that, I guess. And can I ask a question of Cameron?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes. We have heard about the separator process where, you know, the liquids and the solids are separated. We heard about that yesterday. And there seems to be probably, from what we can gather, there maybe is some future in that possibly. And some people say it has been working quite well. I will think of another question in a minute, but I will pass it on.

MR. YEE: Just a question, I guess, to Cameron. You are building a lagoon. I was just going to ask if you were going to employ a cover or what type of cover?

MR. C. MAENDEL: We haven't really looked into that yet. And so right now I don't think we are because it's not a law right now, is it?

MR. YEE: Right. Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Just one more. I didn't quite understand this:

"Manitoba processors offer decent
levies for herds that are C.Q.A.
certified.

MR. C. MAENDEL: They do offer levies
for C.Q.A. certified herds.

MR. R. MAENDEL: Premiums.

MR. C. MAENDEL: Premiums.

MR. MOTHERAL: All right. That's why
I didn't understand it. I will change the wording
here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, yes. I just
note that I was quite aware of the success of your
students at the Envirothon. A former employee of
the Clean Environment Commission is one of the key
organizers for the Manitoba Envirothon, so
congratulations to them.

MR. R. MAENDEL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last person on our
list for the afternoon is Harvey Harland. Would
you please state your name for the record?

MR. HARLAND: Harvey Harland.

HARVEY HARLAND, having been sworn, presents as
follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Please
proceed.
MR. HARLAND: Yes. My name is Harvey Harland. I am an interested agriculturist. And I live across -- in the R.M. of Victoria, across the road about half a mile down from Oak Ridge Colony.

I have two purposes today. I want to sort of give you an indication -- they have requested me to give you an indication of how I observe what they do as farmers, and how they handle their livestock waste program.

Now, the Oak Ridge Colony has about 600 sow, farrow to finish, operation. They have 150 beef cows. And then about, I think, 10,500 layers. And, approximately, a 500,000-pound turkey quota.

They have two large slurry tanks that they store their hog manure in. I believe it is just the hog manure that is stored in there. And they inject that into the soil approximately, I think, 350-acres twice a year. They do this under the management, the same Agritrend group that you saw here earlier today. So anything that they do with their livestock, and their fertilizer management, is through that same consulting firm as what the James Valley Colony did.

They farm about 5,000-acres there,
4,500 to 5,000. And they do this application of manure on the basis of what the nutrients require from one year to the next.

And they also are -- in my view, I would class, from what I have observed there and see, that they are probably very top quality stewards of their management of their waste material.

Now, the other thing that I wanted to mention today, I have been involved -- I have been involved in the grain business and the feed business in Manitoba since 1960. I have had an awful lot to do with grain selling and grain production and grain regulation. But I want to -- I want to illustrate here that some of the things that I think are most important in why we have had such large expansion in the livestock industry in Manitoba? And, basically, it simply comes down to: What are the facts of what has happened in Manitoba? And I understand, by swearing in this, to tell the truth and that you are interested in the facts.

Now, back a number of years ago we had the crow rate change. And since the crow benefit has been paid out to the farmers, and the massive
number of dollars that went into the adaptation programs for Manitoba, and you can get the exact numbers from the Manitoba Adaptation Council as to what extra money went into Manitoba to change from marginal land going into grain production to other things like pasture and hay lands, and things that there is only one or two species of animals one can have. And that's the beef animal.

And also the grain will become feed grain because we can't compete in this province. We are in the center of the country and with the crow benefit gone, we have got a history, and we will live with it forever, as having the highest cost of trading export grain out of this province. And it's right now $50 to $60 a tonne for grain to go any direction out of Manitoba. Therefore, the fact is that it's going to stay in Manitoba and be fed to meat animals and meat birds.

And so this province is moving very quickly from one of grain export to one of meat and vegetables. And we are seeing that getting more and more into vegetable production and more potatoes and more pork and more beef. In fact, it is the only province -- I happen to be on the Manitoba Beef Enhancement Council. And it is the
only province in Canada right now that is still increasing somewhat in beef production. So we have moved into that phase.

Manitoba, as I said earlier, is no longer competitive with Saskatchewan and Alberta and Ontario for exporting grain. So that's the main point of my presentation today. I don't have a written report for you, but I think I spoke slowly enough so that it can be recorded.

But I want to take — two small things here at the end is that to me, having been involved in this business for the number of years that I have, it is inconceivable to me that one or two inches of pig poop could do any particular harm to the water supply in this province.

And I'm absolutely convinced that when the analyses are done and the whole industry comes down to understanding and hitting right to the facts, that there's the possibility of contamination under the guidelines that we have, and if we do increase them, we will, that this industry can't stop but expand. This industry cannot stop from expanding. And we have to understand that.

And to wrap it up, I want to say that
I know that there is an awful lot of apprehension out in rural Manitoba for having the autonomy taken away from the municipalities. But I am going to say that I do believe that eventually we are going to have to have some kind of an appeal for not only one side, but maybe even the other, to a government body to appeal decisions that have been made by municipalities.

So with that, I would like to say thank you, and that's it for me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Harland. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: No.

MR. YEE: No, I'm fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comments. That brings us to an end of the afternoon presentations. We will be reconvening at 7:00. We have at least a couple of people who have indicated they wish to speak this evening. So we will see you back here at 7:00, if you are so inclined.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 5:02 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 7:03 P.M.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Can I ask you to take your seats,
please, and we will get the evening underway.

Welcome back. We have three people who have indicated they wish to make presentations this evening. The first is Mr. Herb Watson. Please state your name for the record?

MR. WATSON: Okay. My name is Herb Watson.

HERB WATSON, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. WATSON: Good evening, everyone, ladies and gentlemen.

I decided to ask to present tonight because we do have hogs on our farm. And we also are in the potato business. And we are doing something which we feel is somewhat unique with the potatoes and the hogs.

I will just give you a little bit of background on how we got started in the hog business. My wife is there, the gray-haired, good-looking lady. Anyway, she has been a very big part of our farm for many, many years. So she was also a part of getting back into hogs in 1994. And we got back into hogs because of the decision
to do away with the crow rate, and we thought that we were going too have to add value to our grain in order to be sustainable over time. That may or may not be true, but that was why we got into hogs.

So we built two shelters. We chose to go with straw-based shelters, simply because of low capital costs. And some of the other side benefits which have come along are, you know, we thought that those buildings could be used for something else. It turns out that the odour is less, in our opinion. And it is natural ventilation, and it is healthy for the stock people that look after the hogs.

At first, we built two shelters in the fall of 1993. And Shirley and I looked after the pigs in those two shelters for that winter. And then the next summer, we built six more and we ran eight for a while. And currently we have 20 shelters. We have an environmental permit for 4,500 hog places. And we currently sell 13,500 hogs, give or take a few. We turn 4,800 about three times a year. We have been turning it three times a year.

So it has gone from quite a small
enterprise to, for us, quite large. But there is
many big systems of hogs in the province, which
still make us look pretty small.

However, it is a big part of our
income for our farm. We've been Canadian Quality
Assurance since the year 2001. And I fully
support the Canadian Quality Assurance Program,
and think it's very important for sustained high
quality hogs coming out of Manitoba.

In the summer of 2005, we expanded
from 12 shelters to 20. And when we did that, we
needed to get an environmental personality to do
that, and so we started planning that a couple of
years previous to that. And, anyways, we did get
the permit for 4,500 hog places.

We make a Manure Management Plan,
that's part of the permit, an environmental
permit. And we comply with the provincial
regulations. And that was the request of our
local council. They said: Well, we don't mind if
you go ahead with this project, as long as you
comply with the provincial regulations, so that
was their say in the matter.

So, anyway, to comply completely with
that, we built a composting pad, which is 40,000
square feet. So all of the manure that comes out of these shelters is composted. This composting pad, I think, has 10,000 yards of clay. Because we are on very sandy soil, so this was part of the compliance. And it's designed so that it's slanted in to a French drain from the length-wise to the center. And then on the long-wise, it drains towards the ends where there is catchment. They are really retention ponds. So any run-off from the manure that's composting is caught in those catchment basins.

We also have six monitoring wells, which are checked on an annual basis, to see if there is any nutrient leaching from the barns, and so we're quite new with that. And, currently, there hasn't been any sign of any leaching at all. We have done testing previous to that. Over the years, John Malbon, who worked for the Department, had an engineer come out and drill holes. And when they tested on the holder barns, they found nothing.

Anyways, just to go on from there, the manure is cleaned out of the hog barns with a loader. And then it is loaded on to semis and placed on this composting pad. The rows of manure
are 10 feet wide and 6 feet high. And those rows
are then turned with a special compost turner.
And depending on climate conditions, they need to
be turned from three to five times before you end
up with mature compost. This process takes from
90 to 120 days, again, depending on climate
conditions, mostly rainfall. If it is really dry,
it doesn't work as good as if it rains. And you
can add water to help the process along.

So, anyways, the monitoring results
are checked once a year. And the results from
those monitoring wells, or those numbers, are sent
to the Manitoba Conservation Department.

We have been working closely with
Dr. Katherine Buckley, who has a research program
going on at our place right now. And she works
out of the Brandon Research Station. So we are
doing, basically, what she tells us to do. And
she has experience in compost, although I think
it's cow manure that she has been working on since
1998. So she really believes in this project and
believes in enhancing soil organic matter. So
that's kind of how the hog operation is operating,
and how we manage the manure.

Now, the composting, and this wasn't
part of the plan when we started into hogs, but
now what's happening to the compost manure is
we're selling it to the potato operation. Because
when Simplot came to Portage, we went into the
potato business. And we currently have
1,000-acres of compost under irrigation. So the
compost is sold to the potato company.

The potato company runs under the name
of WM Ventures. We're a 50 percent shareholder in
that potato company. And my sister's family, the
Metcalfs, are the other 50 percent. My son and my
nephew manage the potato operation.

Now, what happens is we -- just to
give you an idea of how we arrive at costing out
this compost, we -- the pigs bear the cost of
cleaning the barns out, so all that is, is a
loader. And then from there on, we keep track of
all of the costs that are incurred at making that
compost, and the potato company pays for it. They
pay for the composting operation. They pay for
the transportation of the compost from the site to
the field. When it's going to be spread on for
potatoes, they pay for the spreading. And even
after all of those costs are incurred by the
potato company, they still are $30 to $50 ahead.
If you price the nutrients' value of the compost, it is the same as we would pay for commercial fertilizer to do the job.

The finished compost looks like black dirt. It's very humous, that's the difference.

So we -- what happens, then, to get spread on those fields is we have a consulting group. It's two or three guys. Actually, the guy who owns the company's name is Trevor Thornton. They call themselves Crop Care Consulting. And we hired them the first year to help us with potatoes, because we knew nothing about them and we needed help. So what they do is they test the -- they analyze the nutrient value of the compost, and they also soil test the land. And then they have a good -- we target the yield of the potatoes that we want, given normal conditions, and then they spread compost and fertilizer to the level that we need to in order to obtain that yield of potatoes. And the potatoes are all irrigated.

So in the summer of 2006, it was a long growing season, hot weather, so the potatoes had all of the things that they needed. And they were -- we would do leaf tests all through the summer. And they were running out of nitrogen, so
we added a little bit more nitrogen through the water, the irrigation water, just so that we would get the full potential of the crop, so that worked very well.

And the thing that -- I think the compost, you know what, I am not really familiar with all of the analysis of the compost, but it is lower in phosphate and nitrogen. So in order to use all of the nutrients possible, it is important enough to have nitrogen available, so there is commercial nitrogen applied.

The crop rotation with the pools is wheat, potatoes and then an oilseed. They are talking about putting a legume into the rotation. The potato harvesters have choppers to chop the vines. And then they are spread evenly out over the field. And that acts as an organic residue, and it stops erosion.

The addition of this compost is pretty important, we feel, on potato fields. As you know, the potato fields have got a track record of erosion, and so the addition of organic matter is pretty important.

Again, Katherine Buckley, from the Brandon Research Station, is doing trials, and so
we cooperate with her. And each year we have a
test strip that has compost and a strip that
doesn't have compost and only commercial
fertilizers. And all of the results have been
very positive towards yield and quality of the
potatoes. There has been an increase. And so
it's just a combination of two things that's
working very well.

Our land management strategy, in terms
of erosion, is we try to get the very best fields
for potatoes, because that's one of the things
that we believe makes it work. So the very best
field, in our opinion, would be a field that has
quite good internal drainage, but yet has the
ability to hold -- the water holding capacity is
quite high. So we have picked out a lot of
fields. And our hog operation is along the
escarpment, but the potato operation is along the
river, so most of our irrigation water is coming
out of the river.

So what would happen, in terms of
tillage, after the potatoes is if it was a lighter
piece of land, after we're finished harvesting, we
wouldn't work it at all until the following
spring, just before it was seeded. If it is
heavier land, and there is no risk of erosion, then we would work it.

We feel the integration of livestock and crop production, in our case, is sustainable. The hogs have made money. They haven't made money in the last 15 months or so. The potatoes have made us money. We had a really terrific year last year. And I think part of any livestock, or farming operation, to be sustainable, it needs to be environmentally sustainable and also financially sustainable. Because you can't have one without the other, in our opinion. And so we've kind of got a unique situation, I think, that's working for us.

I thank you for allowing me to present. And if there is any questions, I will try and answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Watson. It sounds like an interesting operation. Tell me about hoop shelters, or biotech shelters, as compared to the more conventional barns? What are the pros and cons?

MR. WATSON: Well, you know, I have never managed or been -- I have been involved with conventional hog barns. In my humble opinion, I
believe that, you know, we need some sort of conventional facilities to have baby pigs in. But once the pigs are 50 pounds and up, they can be very economically raised in hoop shelters.

Now, they can also be raised very well in conventional barns. The system that would be very different is the manure system. We work with straw and manure, and they work with liquid manure.

I think the thing that's happening, like 20 percent of the hogs going to Maple Leaf in Brandon are out of hoop shelters. And they feel seemingly very happy with our pigs. So I think it's quite possible to have a good quality pig come out of a hoop shelter.

I think the thing that's driving the hoop shelters, more than anything, is the high cost of new conventional barns. And it's my understanding that those costs are almost prohibitive. So hoop shelters are a way that can work. And I think that they can be very economical. The management would be very different.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any -- the amount of labour that goes into running one, as
opposed to the other, would it be similar?

MR. WATSON: Well, you know what, our labour runs about $5.30 a pig. And I think that you probably have people in your audience that could tell you what the labour was for a conventional farm. But my understanding is that we are right in the ballpark there.

THE CHAIRMAN: And just the nature of the work, is one more difficult than the other?

MR. WATSON: Well, I think it depends on how you have your facility set up. We have two guys that predominantly look after our hog operation. They come to work at eight o'clock in the morning and finish at five o'clock, and are usually done Friday at noon. They come in for an hour a day over the weekend, just to make sure that the water and feeders are working. So we've worked really hard at making it kind of a pleasure to come to work. Because if you don't do that, you don't get people to do the work. So, you know what, I think if you talk to our employees, they would be pretty happy.

But I think that there was a couple of tough months. Now, in the winter time, you are out in the cold instead of inside. And certainly
this winter was a test. But I think that we made
it through quite good. And we just provided lots
of good, warm clothing and do everything that we
possibly can to make it kind of pleasurable for
our people.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the cold stretch
this winter, was it any particular challenge for
the hogs?

MR. WATSON: No. You see, if you get
delivered 50 pounders when it's 30 below, then you
have to do some special management things to make
them come through that cold weather. The hogs
that are established there, the way that they stay
comfortable is the manure is actually composting
in the shelters so that there's heat. So as long
as they are provided with lots of good, dry straw,
then they just lay on top of there. And you dig
down in that straw and it's 100-degree. So they
just find a level that's comfortable for them. So
they get up and eat and drink and then they just
go back and lay down.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Watson.

I got some questions that you may find -- put it
this way, I've never raised pigs.
MR. WATSON: All right.

MR. MOTHERAL: I'm certainly learning a lot about them in the last month, I'll tell you. The compost that you have, do you spread it in combination with other fertilizers on your potatoes?

MR. WATSON: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Now, if you're growing, like, I am just saying 1,000-acres of potatoes, how far will that compost, do you spread that over your entire acreage or do you just do a certain portion of it?

MR. WATSON: Well, if we have enough, we do the entire acreage. And you know what, we are just a year away, or a year and a half away, to expanding to the level that we are at now in the hog business. And we think we will have enough to do that 1,000-acres, so it will be real close.

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, I guess it's too early to tell. I was going to ask you if you find your soil tills and structure is improving over the years?

MR. WATSON: Well, I think it is too soon to tell. But you know what, from all that
you read and understand from adding compost to land, it definitely will. The one thing I missed in my presentation, because I don't like reading it, is there is -- the compost takes three years to let all of the nutrients out. It doesn't happen all in one year. So we spread that compost on the potatoes to take care of certain nutrients that are required by the potatoes in the first year. So, therefore, for the next two years, there is still nutrients coming for the crops following the two years that there are not potatoes.

And we aren't grain farming any more, but one of the fellows we rented land to got 7,000 pounds of sunflowers last year on last year's potato ground.

MR. MOTHERAL: Wow, that's a lot of sunflowers.

MR. WATSON: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: I've only heard of that once before. I think somebody at Morden beat that. I think they got 3,800. You use all of your own compost. If you didn't have your potato enterprise, is there a possible sale for that compost? And is there a possible value added in
that if you didn't have that?

MR. WATSON: Well, I think there -- now that we have a bit of a history, and a bit of a track record, certainly this crop consulting, these Crop Care people are looking at it. And they don't only work for us, they work for other potato farmers. So it is looking like there would be a sale to other potato farmers.

Now, I don't know the economics of spreading it on grain land. Maybe there is economic -- I mean, there is no doubt that it would work, but I don't know how the numbers shake out.

MR. MOTHERAL: And just one more question. And I have forgotten what it was. I will think of it later. I will give Edwin a chance.

MR. YEE: Mr. Watson, whereabouts is your hog operation located?

MR. WATSON: If you know where Rathwell, Manitoba is, it's two miles south and two miles west.

MR. YEE: And your potato acreage is nearby or in close proximity?

MR. WATSON: Well, the biggest part of
the potato operation is nine wells south of the
Assiniboine River. We do have a dug-out, which is
in an aquifer, which we usually have 130-acres.
One circle of potatoes is close to where that
dug-out is, within two or three miles.

MR. YEE: So are the transportation
costs relatively high for your compost, getting it
from your hog operation to your crops?

MR. WATSON: Well, we haul it in
gravel trailers, semi gravel trailers. And you
know what, I can't tell you the breakdown or cost.
My son could tell you that. But it isn't
prohibitive for that distance.

MR. YEE: So there is a potential to
use it on crops further away, as well?

MR. WATSON: I think so, yeah. And as
fertilizer costs continue to escalate, because of
the petroleum, it just becomes more and more
feasible.

MR. YEE: Thank you very much.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes. I remember the
question. It's back to the organic composting
again. Would that compost then be suitable for a
registered organic grower to use?

MR. WATSON: That would be a
Dr. Katherine Buckley question. I think it would.
And the only reason I say this is because I have had phone calls from, I think it was Kroecker Farms, who do grow some organic potatoes, about what we're doing. And they didn't ask to buy it, but they wanted to know about the soil. But to be sure on that, I would --

MR. MOTHERAL: No. That's fine. I was just looking at the potential.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Watson. Mr. Gerry Maendel. Please state your name for the record?

MR. G. MAENDEL: Gerry Maendel.

GERRY MAENDEL, having been sworn, presents as follows:

MR. G. MAENDEL: Yes. I'm Gerry Maendel from New Rosewood Colony. I'm a journeyman electrician on the farm. We have a farrow to finish, 550 sows. We have 20,000 layer chickens. We have 20,000 starter chickens, or whatever you call it. And we have 50 dairy on the farm.

And four years ago we had to build a lagoon. And we got a contractor to build a lagoon. And we built it to eight million gallons.
And we filled it up. And it took us about two years to fill it. And we got a custom applicator to empty it out after those two years. And we covered about 1,000-acres, around there. And we did all of the manure management. We have to do exactly the James Valley Colony. Excuse me, like they showed. We don't have the same guy, but we have to do everything they do. We get something from the area here. So you can see that we are concerned about all of that.

And when we emptied it, we really thought about, rather than spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, we will look into a separator. And we didn't like when we agitated, it washes out the banks. And we have heard a lot of stories about that, washing off banks and damaging our lagoon. And we spent too much money to build it. And we spent $100,000 to empty it, to inject it, and that came up to quite a bit of money. And we didn't want to spend that every year or so.

So we looked into that separator. And we looked a long time. And we found one at Wawanesa, basically what we wanted. We made an appointment to come down. We went there,
actually, when they were emptying out the lagoon.

We wanted to see how we were doing. He told us:

We promise you are not going to go home. If you haven't bought any injection system, or anything, you will do that. So we went there with all of our higher-ups from home.

So when we went there, they were emptying out with an irrigation system. And everybody knows, you can't empty out a lagoon with an irrigation system, because two miles off you couldn't be around that irrigation system, emptying out the hog lagoon. And we had to drive right up there to smell the lagoon. The smell, you couldn't say was really bad. You could stand it. And right there we were so impressed.

And he took us over to the lagoon where they were emptying it out and he said: I have to show you some other things. So he jumps out of the truck, washes his hands in that lagoon. And we seen where they suck it out of the lagoon while they were doing it. He washed his hands, shook them off a bit. He even took his hands up to our noses. It smelled sour quite a bit, but nothing really. And we, actually, went home and we decided we have to do something about that. So
we got on to it. So we actually put one in.

I have all of the proof there. And it
cost us close to half a million dollars to put it
in, and it works very good with hog manure. We
could almost say perfect. It is exactly what we
wanted. But the smell isn't quite as gone as the
one in Green Acres because we have all those
chickens. And we're the first ones in North
America -- the first one in the world, I think,
yeah, it is the first one in the world, that tries
to separate with that separator chicken manure.

So now they are doing so many test
results because they promised us that they will
get the smell down, too, where the other colony is
with that chicken manure. They haven't yet, but
they are really working on it. In spring they
want to shock the lagoon with the separator with
the chemicals that we have to put in. And they
are all environmentally friendly. And we kind of
are going ahead and really concerned about it.

And I really didn't like what that lady said
before. If you can't get the smell down, I would
say the smell is down quite a bit less than half.
But theirs is extraordinary compared to this. And
anyway, it's very good.
And our teacher, she got into an environment program, too. They are doing waste water, and you name it, at the Oak Hammock Marsh. She wanted me to read this. They are really proud, the children, what they are doing. And it says here:

"Our Grade 7 and 8s entered a contest on Manitoba Youth Stewardship and an Environmental Sustainability Showcase at Oak Hammock Marsh and won a platinum plaque on the research on how we address our waste management. We had to address three points: Sustainable life on earth between environment, human health and well-being and economy. We improved water and soil quality by planting various plants, managing and watching growth rate for four to five weeks. The pictures in our album show how various plants prosper from the dry solids. The pictures also show the difference before solid separation. And after, feel free to browse through the album and ask questions."
They actually made a small separator like we had with wood and that. And the people were so impressed with that separation, I guess, that that's how they won it. Because they actually did a showcase there right there showing how to separate the manure.

Oh, yeah, I forgot about the main thing. And on the record here, it says that's why we actually did it, because that monkey was on our back still about all of the phosphorus. And rather than spending all of the money, we take 90.6 percent of the phosphorus out of that stuff that is in the lagoon. Most of the time we got 96 and 94 percent. But they put down -- the government people or whatever, they put down 90.6. But the solids, we tie them up now.

But we are waiting for an option to come up. There is one right near our farm there, a mushroom plant that went broke. We are waiting for that. It is $100,000, or something, for a new one. For what we wanted, that's exactly what we want. So we want to compost it and sell it.

We approached the greenhouses in Winnipeg and landscapers. They are very interested in the product. As soon as we compost
it, what are you doing? Even our gardener said: We are not going to have enough for him. So we even decided we might buy a bagger and bag it and sell it. We're not there yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: So can you tell us a little bit more about this separating machine? How does it work? Is it a press or a centrifuge?

MR. G. MAENDEL: No. First it goes through one screen and takes out the really big solids. Then it goes into a separation process. We put three chemicals in there. They are all environmentally friendly. They don't tell the secret, really, what it is or not. But it is really no secret. All of the towns use that process, I think. And then it goes into the second screen, where it is processed. And that takes out most of it, the phosphorus and that. Then it goes into a fan separator that really lots of people have. And that really just dries it out and it comes out dry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is this equipment manufactured?

MR. G. MAENDEL: All over. Ours was manufactured in New Brunswick, or something. But it's just that the guys that own it come from
there, so they make -- most of the stuff is made
with stainless steel. There is not really that
much to it, really. And the screens come from
Germany, I think, or something.

MR. YEE: Mr. Maendel, is there a
certain capacity for this separator or it can
handle a large capacity or volume?

MR. G. MAENDEL: Oh, yeah. We could
go up to -- we could handle, they said, for sure a
2,500 sow operation with the one we have now.

MR. MATHESON: 100-gallons a minute.

MR. YEE: Yeah. My understanding,
from some of the other presenters, or what I have
already read, or heard in some cases, if you have
a small operation it is not economical because,
you know, your operation is too small to use the
separator versus if you have a separator with that
capacity, you can handle much more.

MR. R. HOFER: Half a million dollars
separator, they have a lot to pay for.

MR. G. MAENDEL: There is another
thing I want to say. If our industry shuts down,
our colony, it's 60 years old. And our hog barns
are 35 years old. We could never make it with our
hog industry. We have to build a new system. And
if we are going to -- we have to expand, you know, we have to with the grain prices. Now they are not bad, but we have to put it to our hogs to do it, we figure, now.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Maendel, I missed it at the outset. What colony are you from?


THE CHAIRMAN: New Rosedale. Where is that?

MR. G. MAENDEL: As the crow flies here, north west from here.

MR. MATHESON: It is on the 305 Highway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming out tonight. Mr. Robert Davy.

MR. DAVY: Good evening, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please state your name?

MR. DAVY: Robert Davy.

ROBERT DAVY, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, please.

MR. DAVY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and Board of Representatives.
I will be short and sweet. We are just here, basically, to make a point on behalf of the R.M. My name is Robert Davy, as you've heard, newly elected reeve of the R.M. of Lorne.

I make this presentation today because our municipality is concerned about restrictions against the hog industry and the new directions this may take.

We are all very aware of the environmental changes occurring around us. We believe that the government and the municipal regulations we will protect our potable water and aquifers for generation toss come.

We must educate the public, both urban and rural, regarding the changes that have occurred.

We have many producers in the R.M. of Lorne who inject hog manure for odour, better use of fertilizer, with no loss of benefit. Some of these producers are not obligated to inject because they are under 300 animal units, but pay the extra costs because they feel it is a small price to pay for insurance and prosper from the natural fertilizers.

The Rural Municipality of Lorne is
restricted from growing specialty crops, such as
sunflowers and beans because of a lack of heat
units. The main crops grown in the R.M. of Lorne
are cereal crops and livestock are necessary to
subsidize the farm operations.

New regulations, like proposed
phosphate rules, will hinder many operations in
expanding, or where they can build, especially in
the marginal higher classes of soils.

Planning districts are used as
controls for land use, but let us not forget that
the people still own their land, and this should
not become a dictatorship.

I think it is very hard for a hog
farmer to be proud of how they make their living
in this province. We, in the R.M. of Lorne,
believe that they are good stewards of the land,
and should be allowed to make their living doing
so.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Davy. I
have got a couple of questions. One just to show
my ignorance. What do you mean because of the
lack of heat units?

MR. DAVY: On the Escarpment, which
entails the majority of the R.M. of Lorne, from the eastern part of the escarpment is where the R.M. of Lorne begins. We're, I believe, eight miles wide and we're 36 miles long in size. The majority of the whole R.M. is up in the Escarpment. We're at anywhere from 1,400 to 1,700, 1,750 above sea level, and we are a cooler climate. We are marginal soils. We are very rough terrain at the western part of the R.M., also in the eastern part of the R.M., but in between we have got some good arable land.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you for that. I would like to ask a question that we really didn't address at all in your presentation tonight. And we haven't had too many municipal reeves here before us. And that's just with respect to the approval process and the role that municipalities play in that process. Do you have any concerns about how that process works?

MR. DAVY: As I said at the beginning, I am newly elected, so I'm learning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. DAVY: I do have some personal concerns. I didn't want this presentation to get into detail. We just basically wanted to make a
point on behalf of our R.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fair enough. I won't put you on the spot.

MR. DAVY: Good, thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: I wish I would have had that statement a few years ago when I was a municipal councillor.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can only use it for so long, because then you are no longer newly elected.

MR. MOTHERAL: As a newly elected am public official, I guess you could say, you have found it quite demanding, as far as the public perception, of what's going on in the area? Would you run again? Maybe that's not fair.

MR. DAVY: Do you know some of the history?

MR. MOTHERAL: Actually, I do, so that's why it's not fair.

MR. DAVY: It's been quite demanding, Wayne, to be quite honest. It came at a time that we had some issues that we were all not prepared for in the Municipality of Lorne. Many of the incumbent had been through some of the issues with another site. And when I walked in, I never
I had gotten oriented on the Friday. And on the Tuesday of the next week, we had a public hearing.

My first meeting was a public hearing. And we couldn't hold a hearing in chamber. I hadn't held a regular R.M. meeting. And I was the newly elected reeve. And I was chairing a public hearing that we had to rent the hall out. There was a big concern and there was a big push with First Nations and being in their area, and it was coming from the federal government. We got into a lot of heat over that.

The hall was just about filled, probably a good half of it, to two-thirds of it, was First Nations people. And we understand their position and their point. Their First Nations land is all within our jurisdiction. And they were coming over to our jurisdiction and wanting to have some say and some clarification and make their point heard. And they made it heard quite loud and clear. And that was my first experience. And then it mushroomed from there. And it has quieted down right now with the pause that's been taken, no doubt.

The particular site, just for your
information, was supposed to be in the hopper. And we could not get anybody from the Department of Natural Resources, or Mr. Struthers, to acknowledge our questions in order to get an answer back. And, finally, we did get the phone call. And it was five after 12, on a Friday afternoon from a subordinate that was to pass on the message that, two and a half weeks after we had been trying to get ahold of somebody and get some answers and talk to somebody, as we are all part of government. And we are a lower form of government, but we still should all work together. So we had the message passed on to us that it had just been passed in the legislature that morning at 10:30 and was now part of the pause, and that's where everything stopped.

MR. MOTHERAL: Right. And I wish you well in the future. And one statement you did make that I thought that really touches us all is the education part. And I know that we need to -- that's a must. And it is probably going to be even part of our recommendations. Who knows. We don't know that yet. But education has got to be part of everything, and I actually wanted you to know that. And there are some good things going
on in the country right now regarding that. So, anyway, I wish you well in the future. And thank you for the presentation.

MR. DAVY: Thank you, Wayne. A small little addition that I would like to make, that I've been made aware of, and kind of a nice piece of education, is residential water on an acre of land seems to grab a lot of people. And you have heard those comments before, 20,000-gallons. And people on the street, even in our own backyards, and in our small communities, haven't heard that. And when they hear somebody is applying 3,000-gallons or 5,000-gallons an acre, they figure this is the end of the world. It is not even a quarter inch of water. And the crops are certainly absorbing this. And mother nature is going to be using it in its process. Thanks.

MR. YEE: Mr. Davy, just one question, more for my clarification, and I will give you some background here. We have heard from some presenters, from a municipal perspective, in terms of the Planning Act. You made a statement here that planning districts that use these controls for land use should not forget the people own their land, and this shouldn't be a dictatorship.
But the presentations we have heard, more or less, indicated that some municipal officials felt that they wanted more control than what the Planning Act provided in terms of the Conditional Land Use permitting. What's your opinion on this, or how is this reflected in this statement that you've made?

MR. DAVY: Well, that's something we are all struggling with. Everybody wants more control. But when you do get that control, we have to live in these communities. And we all see each other and we all know each other by our first names. And you start taking those responsibilities and making those decisions, and as you should well understand, it becomes very political. It becomes verbal. It becomes human nature for people to begin -- how would I say that -- attempting to disrupt your lives at times. And you wonder if it's all worth it.

Because, at the best of times, as Wayne can probably vouch for, the positions we hold in municipal government are no more than a voluntary position. If anybody thinks they are in it for the money, they had better go work on the calculator a little bit harder, because that's not
why you're there. You are trying to do the best you can for your community and grow from that. But it's a question of, I wonder personally, that's personally, if we're the right people that should be making that decision, whether some of these operations should be going ahead or not. Like you go through the technical review, and you see all of the requirements, and then you go to the department of natural resources, and you go to the Environment Act. We, as municipal officers, already have too much on our plate. And we're already talking about, there is no way we can handle these presentations and these meetings in a day. At one time it used to be done in half a day. We are finding that it's overload. Our time is being on committees. And we, with our resources, are not unlimited. We have very little time for our own. It is very demanding. I don't know in small municipalities it is proper to have the municipal government having the last say. And that's my personal opinion, sir. I am not speaking for any of my councillors here or anybody else.  

MR. YEE: Thank you, Mr. Davy.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Davy, for coming out tonight.

MR. DAVY: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody else in the audience tonight who wishes to make a presentation? This is the last chance here in St. Claude. Okay. Well, we will bring the evening sessions to a close. We will reconvene tomorrow in Emerson at 1:00.

Thank you all for coming out here this evening, and some of you this afternoon. We have had a very full and enlightening day here in St. Claude. Thank you and good evening.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 7:53 P.M.)
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