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UPON COMMENCING AT 1:05 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I call the proceedings to order.

I would like to welcome you all here to Dauphin for the public meeting here in the City of Dauphin. My name is Terry Sargeant. I'm the Chair of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission, and I'm also the Chair of this panel.

With me on the panel are Wayne Motheral and Edwin Yee.

I have a few comments, by way of opening comments, that I would like to make and then we will proceed with presentations from people who have indicated they wish to make presentations.

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 their effectiveness for the purpose of managing the industry in an
environmentally sustainable manner.

Our investigation is to include a public component to gain advice and feedback from Manitobans. We have been asked to take into account efforts underway in other jurisdictions to manage hog production in an environmentally sustainable way.

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

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

To ensure that our review includes issues of importance to all Manitobans, the panel has undertaken to hold 17 days of meetings in 14 communities throughout the agricultural part of Manitoba. Today, I believe, is the eighth day of these hearings. The meetings will continue through March. Although, actually, this is the last meeting for March. They will continue in
April, with the final meeting currently scheduled for Winnipeg on April 27th.

At these meetings, it is open to any group or individuals to make a presentation to the panel on issues related to our mandate. For the most part, presentations are to be limited to 15 minutes. Exceptions may be made, in some cases, where a presenter needs more time, as long as that person has indicated that to us before their presentations. Those making a presentation will be asked to take an oath promising to tell the truth.

Presentations should be relevant to the mandate given to the Commission by the Minister. If a presentation is clearly not relevant, it may be ruled out of order. And if a presentation is clearly repetitive, that also may be ruled out of order.

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

In addition the public meetings, the CEC has engaged consultants to assist us in this
review. The results of those research endeavours will be posted on our website upon receipt, which, for the most part, will be in late June. Anyone who is interested is invited to provide comment on any of those reports, if they so wish. A reasonable, albeit brief period of time, will be allowed for this.

Written submissions will also be accepted. Information on how to submit written suggestions is available at the table by the entrance. Deadline for written submissions is May 7th.

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

Finally, some administrative matters. If you wish to make a presentation today, and haven't registered, I would ask that you indicate
to Joyce at the table at the back of the room or
at the entrance.

Also, as is our normal practice, we
are recording these sessions. Transcripts,
verbatim transcripts, will be available online in
a day or so. You can find the link from our
website.

In respect of cell phones, I would ask
that they be turned off, or at least that the ring
tone be turned down. If you must take a call,
would you please 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. So far, I believe, we have
had six, seven people that have indicated that
they wish to make presentations this afternoon.

The first is Mr. Harry Harris. Would
you please come up to this table? Would you just
take a seat, Mr. Harris? Mr. Harris, would you
please introduce yourself for the record?

MR. HARRIS: My name is Harry Harris.

I'm the manager of the Alonsa Water Conservation
District.

Harry Harris, having been sworn,
presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Please proceed.

MR. HARRIS: Well, good afternoon,
ladies and gentlemen. Is it okay if I just stand
up and address you like this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he can give you a
cordless mike.

MR. HARRIS: Can everybody hear me
clearly? Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I
would like to thank the Commissioner for the
opportunity to speak.

Before I get into the presentation
itself, I would like to preface my remarks with a
few comments. At first glance, being from Alonsa,
which is primarily a beef cattle producing area,
this might not seem to be terribly relevant on the
face of it. But I think you will find that there
are some very relevant issues when it comes to the
soil types in the southwest region.

My Board has noticed several
inconsistencies in the section that had been used
to monitor water quality in the past. As you will
know, they have set up watering stations, but none
of them which are representative of our district.
And also, from both the Federal and the Provincial Government, we have been getting a lot of these Best Management Practices pushed towards us, and they seem to be very heavily skewed towards livestock production.

And there seemed to be some problems with that, in that we live in an area with calciurias underlay soils, which just eat up phosphorus, so we are in a very low phosphate environment. And the major crop in the Alonsa Conservation District is alfalfa, which requires no nitrogen.

So if the stated goal is to get an immediate 10 percent reduction in the phosphorus and nitrogen going into Lake Winnipeg, we saw some inconsistencies with the idea that farmers with livestock were being targeted as the people who have to take the measures to try to reduce that in-flow, when we couldn't actually see where it was coming from.

So we decided that it was important to get a set of data for our local area, so we took 16 tests last year. And I am going to give you a brief summary of those results. And I would add that this is just one set of results. And so,
scientifically, this has very little backing. But I think you will find some interesting results, all the same. And we do intend to continue this process, and to expand it in the coming years.

This is a map showing the Alonsa Conservation District, which comprises 1,300 square miles on the west side of Lake Manitoba, roughly from Sandy Bay Reserve, in the south, to Toutes Aides Bay, in the north. And you see can, from the little red dots on the map, if you look at it closely, I know it is pretty hazy with the light from the windows, but the samples are very heavily skewed from the north end to the south end of the District, and that's because that's where the major drainage area is within the Alonsa Conservation District.

MR. MOTHERAL: Can you go back to that last slide there, please? I didn't quite get what the whole district is of Alonsa. Can you point it out? Oh, I see, the brown one. Where is the outline of the Alonsa District?

MR. HARRIS: The Alonsa Conservation District is right here to Toutes Aides Bay, which will be right at the top here, so basically this area here.
MR. MOTHERAL: Okay, that's fine. I just didn't know if I could get a perspective. Thank you.

MR. HARRIS: Now, you might want to take a good look at this part. This is the north part of the Alonsa Conservation District, which is primarily in the R.M. of Lawrence. And you can see that the area surrounded with the brown lines, there is an area around Magnet, which is intensively farmed for crops, that's class two and three land, and that is mostly cereal and pulse production.

Above that, in the Tame Hay area, it is almost all cattle ranching and hay production. Over on the Alonsa site, it is mostly Crown land, with almost no agricultural use, with very light grazing. Keep those in mind when we get to the actual results.

In the south end -- by the way, the drainage in the north part is from south to north. Everything is going north to Toutes Aides Bay. In the south part, everything goes from west to east. West, where you have got community pastures in McCreary and Alonsa, to Lake Manitoba. There is a small area of fairly arable land down by Amaransk,
but most of this is hay and cattle, a grazing
area.

Now, we tested for a wide range of
criteria. The first thing we are going to look at
is the results of E. coli. From a health
viewpoint, this has some considerations after the
Walkerton tragedy. And, basically, it's very hard
to see any trend in these results. I have no
idea, for instance, why the Rorketon Drain, which
you see the second column over, why it's twice as
high as anywhere else. Although the Rorketon
Bridge, this one here, this is further up the same
drain closer to the lake, so there is a diluting
effect as you move downstream. When we go to the
south readings, you can see some of them are
actually nil.

I am just going to go back to that
previous one again. This one here, the second one
here, Crane River, is a natural waterway. There
is no agricultural use at this particular site, so
there is a natural level of E. coli in Manitoba.
It's probably wildlife related. So not all of
this is livestock related in any way, shape or
form.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harris, what are
the measures, parts per million?

MR. HARRIS: Those are just actually the numbers, one, two. Usually zero is drinking water is considered what you want. So natural run-off water in Manitoba would not be safe for human drinking.

These are the south readings.
Mellonville Drain was an interesting case. This is the second one, again, over here. You see it's zero. This is an agriculture drain, but what you would probably call your best case scenario for an agricultural drain. It is water at the downstream end of the drain, which is filtered through a huge marsh system called the Clark Marsh. And as you can see, that's actually zero. But several other drains, not as well thought out as that one, actually measure zero or are very low on the scale.

This is the Mellonville Drain right here. And just to show you, the dark blue lines are in-flows into Lonely Lake. The pale blue is the only out-flow. And this is the fish hatchery we have here. Last year, we encountered some serious problems with our fish hatchery, which we thought was related to the quality of water coming
out of Lonely Lake. But that would seem to not make sense, if you think that the in-flow water from the Mellonville Drain, at least, was pretty much free of bacteria.

Sulfate is an interesting case.

Sulphur, as you know, from other studies, it is fairly mobile and would tend to go to the lowest point in your system. So the closer you get to the lake, generally the higher the sulphur levels would be, and that is borne out. These results tend to be fairly high in the north end.

Everything drains into Toutes Aides Bay, which is a highly salinized area. Those of you who know it, would know that. And the sulphur levels are fairly high in this area.

But, again, take a look at Crane River, a completely natural system. It's more a function of the bedrock than anything else. So you are probably not going to really see much results from taking sulphur samples, except from just an area of interest viewpoint.

On the other hand, Toutes Aides Bay, where three of those systems empty into, you can see each one of them, from this aerial photograph, has a significant salination problem. These areas
are showing water coming in that is carrying particulate matter from the south. Particularly this one here, Dufous Creek, which is the extension of the Hamelin Drain. The Hamelin Drain, being the one that drains that main cropping area around Magnet.

I have taken a boat in here before. And you can literally step up in the boat and stand up in the lake and just barely get your feet wet on one side of the boat. And on the other side, you can't even touch the bottom. That's an idea of just how much it has built up over the years.

The south sites are pretty much the same thing. It depends where you are and what the bedrock type is. There is one interesting exception to this, though. And I thought, while you guys are taking into account water quality, there are other factors, other than agriculture, even in the rural landscape. And I bring your attention to here, the Duggan Drain, which is already a high figure, downstream here it comes the North Leifur Drain. And so this one here, it jumps up significantly.

And I am just going to show you what I
think might be the reason for that. The North Leifur Drain flows right passed a gypsum mine. This gypsum mine has had a leaking berm for over two years, which no one has taken responsibility for. This picture is taken in January of 2006. This is open water, in the middle of January, seeping through the berm from the flooded pit. Gypsum is a hydrated form of calcium sulfate. And, obviously, we are going to be getting sulfate levels coming into the drain.

Now, down to the two more relevant nutrients: Phosphorus and Nitrogen. Fairly obvious from here. Again, the Hamelin Drain and Dufous Creek are showing, by far, the highest levels of phosphorus. Keep in mind, those do not come from livestock areas. They come from crop areas. So we are not getting agriculture off the hook here, by any means. But I think that if we're looking at what the primary cause of agriculture's input into our water systems are, it's not livestock production, it's crop production. And that will show up even more when we get to the nitrates.

Here is the south end. You see, there is no crop areas. It's pretty steady right across
the board. Roughly a quarter of the level that you see coming off of the Hamelin Drain system. Now, these are the same scales, by the way. Now, all of these maps are the same scales, north to south.

And, I think, this is probably the most telling graph of all that we have in here. Again, the Hamelin Drain and Dufous Creek. I am just going to care this to the south end. The same scale. And just to put that into perspective, the orange, or brown, it looks here, there is two readings. The blue is the other 14 readings combined. So I think what we're looking at here is a fairly obvious trend that nitrogen and phosphorous are not coming from areas with beef cattle production.

Now, as I said, I know this is a hog industry review. We don't have hogs in our particular area. But I'm thinking that this has relevance to this whole geographic area. Because, basically, the underlying soil types are the same. And you're not going to get phosphorous, in particular, running off from fields where it's been applied on to alfalfa, because it is eaten up so quickly in the first year. The only way you
get a nutrient like phosphorous is going to come off the field is if that field is bearing. And I think that is a lesson that we can learn from this set of results.

Again, I will state that's one year's results. And I don't like to make too big a federal case on one set of results, but we are planning to expand this program. And we're not trying to hide anything at all. But these are the results that we have gotten so far. And I am hoping that you find them at least somewhat interesting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harris. Who did the surveys for you? You did it?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. And the testing was done by Enviro Test Laboratories in Winnipeg.

THE CHAIRMAN: So your role was just to gather the water?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then Enviro Test did the actual testing?

MR. HARRIS: Absolutely, yes. I did put -- with the copies of my presentation, there is one set of the raw data, if anybody is interested in actually going through the Enviro
tests results, which are quite detailed and complex. We spent about $2,300 on testing for the 16 sites. And that doesn't include my gathering costs. And we are going to have to take a few extra sites next year, probably 20.

MR. MOTHERAL: Mr. Harris, what was the driving force that spurred you to do this project?

MR. HARRIS: I think the Agricultural Framework Policy Program, the way it was being directed towards livestock producers. We were seeing on a lot of programs being offered, like exclusion fencing, and riparian protection for livestock, and programs like that. And we were thinking: Are those really sources of nutrient flow from our area or not? And what we would like to do, as a conservation district, is and an MRAC, Rural Agricultural Council, has added programs like this. We would like to tailor programs to what might actually work. And what might be accepted by the producers in our area, rather than taking a menu that was prepared in Ottawa and saying: Here, what would you like to do with this? Because there are financial costs to
producers involved with all of these programs. It might be 25 percent. It might be 23 percent. And, in some cases, 50 percent. And in today's tight economic environment, in agriculture, we can see that the uptake is going to be very poor on a lot of these programs, if they don't seem to be relevant to the areas where they are being offered. And I think that that was our primary incentive.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. Another question, you test the water that's out of these drains, et cetera, et cetera, going into a body of water. Were there any soil tests taken of the soil where this water was coming from?

MR. HARRIS: There would be a record of soil tests in the area.

MR. MOTHERAL: I think in order to make this really valid, I think you need to do that, too. And that's just my own opinion. I think you need to know what the soil levels, or the N and P levels are in the soil at the time, actual soils, et cetera. This is just for future testing.

MR. HARRIS: Right.

MR. MOTHERAL: It's just a suggestion.
MR. HARRIS: Well, when it's done, this is done in the springtime, this set of results. And it would be a rather wet environment to collect soil tests. And then you have this whole source point, too, which ones are contributing.

MR. MOTHERAL: I know. You had -- you are concerned with the livestock industry. And you have answered that question. I think that's all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Harrison, just a couple of questions here. I realize that this data set is from April of 2006. Do you sample -- have you sampled previously?

MR. HARRIS: This is the first time. But we do want to have a program.

MR. YEE: So you are going to look at trends over a period of time?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, we are looking at trends.

MR. YEE: And keeping the same monitoring stations?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. YEE: And monitoring for the same
parameters?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. YEE: Well, Wayne had already asked you the question about soils. But I was thinking in terms of sulfates, which are a little different, but I think you said that was the gypsum leaching. And I think you could look at the soils in the wintertime, as opposed to the springtime. So are you planning on doing sampling in the spring and other seasons?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. As far as the soil testing goes, I have been with the Conservation District for 17 years. And when I see a soil test with high sulphur levels, I can tell you where it came from, it has to be somebody close to the lake.

MR. YEE: And do you also have any fecal coliform data?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. The data is all there.

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

Next is David Manchur. And would you please state your name for the record?

MR. MANCHUR: My name is David
Manchur. I'm a farmer and resident from Gilbert Plains, Manitoba.

DAVID MANCHUR, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

MR. MANCHUR: Good afternoon. My name is David Manchur. My two brothers and I are investors and managers of a 4,000 head hog finishing operation called Northview Feeders in the R.M. of Gilbert Plains. I would like to thank the Clean Environment Commission for coming out to this area to hear comments from the public regarding the sustainability of the hog industry in Manitoba.

Northview Feeders began operations in 1998, and was started by several investors from Gilbert Plains, Grandview and Daughin, almost all of whom are farmers. As grain producers, we wanted to diversify our operations by going into hog production. Rather than build a dozen small, inefficient hog barns, we pooled our resources and built a larger, more efficient hog production facility. A 4,000 head finishing operation is about the smallest size hog finishing operation
that provides the economies of scale that are required to be viable. This size production unit is required to achieve efficiencies in labour, trucking and other costs. Larger operations are also able to have the finances to meet the extra costs associated with meeting the requirements of government regulations.

There is a popular misconception that smaller operations are a more desirable approach to farming. In fact, larger operations provide greater economic benefits for both owners of the agricultural enterprise and the area in which they are located. Larger operations are better able to comply with increasingly stringent government regulations and, actually, cause less environmental damage than multiple smaller operations. Larger operations provide for better care and nutrition for animals than smaller operations.

Small-scale hog operations, like small-scale cattle and grain operations, cannot provide farm families with the financial security that they require and are thus not sustainable in the long term. My report will summarize the economic benefits of modern hog operations, as
well as our ability to meet and exceed environmental regulations.

The construction and operation of a hog operation can contribute greatly to the local and provincial economy. The Northview Feeders hog project had capital expenditures of $1.1 million in 1988, with many local business and tradespeople participating in its construction, including the supply and installation of concrete, building supplies and equipment. The operation also generates considerable economic activity on an ongoing basis.

From a direct employment standpoint, two jobs have been created. These employees have steady, secure employment which allows them to raise a family and contribute to our community. Local business and tradespeople benefit from thousands of dollars being spent annually for repair and maintenance, propane, supplies and services. Local ratepayers in the R.M. of Gilbert Plains benefit directly from our barn, as over $7,500 of property tax revenue is generated for the R.M. As well, an additional $4,400 is generated for the school division from the collection of taxes. The federal and provincial
income tax base is also enhanced with over $20,000 of annual income tax payments being budgeted by our operation.

The most significant economic impact generated from our operation relates to the largest item on our budget, which is feed, and the prime component of that feed, which is barley. In the last fiscal year, approximately $680,000 was spent on feed made in Dauphin at Agassiz Feeds. Over 130,000 bushels of barley was purchased locally, processed locally, and utilized in our barn. And employment was created in the manufacture and delivery of feed, as well as providing a local market for deliveries of barley by grain farmers.

The hog industry is highly regulated and environmentally sustainable. In terms of environmental sustainability, hog operations are environmentally friendly and must meet many regulatory requirements. And I would like to discuss how our operation is environmentally sustainable.

The operation was constructed according to the requirements in the Livestock Manure and Mortality Management Regulations,
The earthen manure storages required a permit to be issued by Manitoba Conservation prior to construction. A soil investigation and a storage design was done by a professional engineer, who supervised construction. Inspections during construction were done by Manitoba Conservation staff and the consulting engineer. The engineer certified that the storages complied with the siting and construction requirements outlined in the Regulation. Although monitoring wells were not required by Manitoba Conservation, Northview Feeders installed monitoring wells, at our own cost, at different locations around the earthen manure storages. Samples are collected and checked by an independent third party on an annual basis. The results of the water samples have shown that there are no problems with seepage from the storages. And I must add, that our earthen manure storages are inspected on an annual basis by Manitoba Conservation staff.

Manitoba Conservation requires that the livestock operations that use over 25,000 litres per day have a Water Rights License. Northview Feeders has received a license and files
actual water consumption volumes on an annual basis. The operation also submits an annual water analysis report of water from the operation's drinking water source, which is a drilled well located approximately 2,000 feet from the barn site. The reports have shown no indication of any contamination of the water.

Northview Feeders is required to and has always filed an annual Manure Management Plan, MMP. This involves the soil testing of all application fields, testing of the manure for nutrient analysis, and then applying the correct amount of manure to meet the crop requirements for the following year. The manure is applied in the fall to fields as a fertilizer and eliminates the need for commercial fertilizers. This is a very sustainable practice. The LMMMR has nitrogen and phosphorous limits that ensure that nitrogen does not leach into groundwater and phosphorous does not affect surface water.

There have been some concerns that the regulations are not being enforced. Although understaffed, I believe Manitoba Conservation does do sufficient audits to ensure the regulations are being adhered to. Northview Feeders has been
audited by Manitoba Conservation, who did soil
tests spread fields near the barn to determine
nitrogen levels. The results showed that the
levels were well below the legal limits specified
in the regulation. Also, soil test results taken
for the annual MMP have shown that phosphorous
levels are not a concern, and are below limits
where application rates would have to be
phosphorous based. There was actually one spread
field that had a crop of wheat growing last year
that showed a phosphorous deficiency in the tissue
analysis of the wheat! Northview Feeders uses
phytase in its rations, which reduces phosphorous
excretion by the pigs. This, along with the ample
spread acres, prevents phosphorous buildup in the
soil. The density of hog operations in our area,
as well as most areas of the province, is such
that there is room for considerable expansion of
the hog industry. The province has regulations in
place now that would ensure expansion of the
industry in a sustainable manner.

Our operation is also concerned about
odours and the impact on neighbours. When
selecting a location, a site was selected such
that the closest neighbour was almost one mile
from the barn. I live approximately one quarter mile away. Since the greatest source of odours is generally considered to be from the earthen manure storages, the storages are covered with approximately 8 to 10 inches of barley straw every spring. This ensures that the surfaces are covered and minimal odours are released from the storages until being emptied in the fall. Manure application is done by custom applicators that inject the manure below the surface of the soil. To ensure complete coverage of the manure, and to further reduce odours due to the manure application, a tillage operation is done with 24-48 hours after the manure injection. A treed shelterbelt was also planted around the site to help diffuse odours, which may leave the site. A clean, well-managed barn also helps reduce odour generation.

The LMMM Regulation requires that mortalities be disposed of by burial, incineration, composting, or delivery to a rendering plant. It also states that the mortalities must be secure and continuously frozen, or refrigerated, if not disposed of, within 48 hours of death. Northview Feeders has a
refrigerated storage shed for mortalities, which
are picked up by the Rothsay Rendering on a
regular basis.

In conclusion, new livestock proposals
have to go through many regulatory hoops to ensure
that they are properly sited and are
environmentally sound.

The Planning Act requires that
operations over 300 animal units have a technical
review conducted by a Technical Review Committee
to obtain a condition use permit. A public
hearing is held to hear any concerns residents may
have. Even if all of the required permits and
siting criteria is met, the R.M. Council can still
turn down the conditional permit request. The Act
also stipulates that R.M.'s have a livestock
operations policy, which states where the
livestock operations may or may not locate within
the municipality.

The LMMMR ensures that the hog
proposal does not cause any environmental
concerns. Manure storages must be permitted,
designed and certified by a consulting engineer,
and monitored for seepage. Annual Manure
Management Plans must be filed to ensure manure is
applied at agronomic rates, which do not exceed nitrogen and phosphorous limits that could cause groundwater and surface water quality concerns. Winter spreading of manure is not allowed. Mortalities must be disposed of properly. Producers are required to submit annually the results from samples of drinking water provided to their livestock.

The Farm Practices Act is in place to protect neighbours against nuisance issues, such as odours that are caused by unacceptable farm practices.

A Water Rights License is required whenever a livestock operation draws more than 25,000 litres per day. Actual water consumption volumes must be submitted annually.

I believe that the hog industry is very sustainable in Manitoba. What can be more sustainable than growing crops such as barley, canola, wheat, feeding them to hogs, thus adding value to the crops, and providing a high protein feed source for human consumption, taking the manure from the hogs and applying it back to the fields in an environmentally friendly rates, and then growing more crops?
Approximately 15 years ago, the federal government eliminated the freight subsidy on grain, known as the Crow rate, and encouraged farmers to diversify. There has been considerable consolidation in all agricultural sectors since then, and yet hog production is the only enterprise that is currently faced with a moratorium. Myself, my partners, and my fellow producers in the hog business, feel that this is unjustified. And, in light of the facts presented in my report, it is my hope that the CEC will come to the same conclusion.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Manchur. You're both injecting the manure, as well as tilling it?

MR. MANCHUR: Yes. The tillage follows immediately after injection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that typical?

MR. MANCHUR: Yes, that has always been a typical practice, I think, for most farmers, and certainly for our farm.

THE CHAIRMAN: To do both?

MR. MANCHUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne?
MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you.

Mr. Manchur, it appears as though you have pretty well everything covered here. I mean, it almost is -- I can't even hardly ask any questions. You have done a great job of putting this report forward.

You went through a conditional use hearing when you were putting this particular enterprise up, did you?

MR. MANCHUR: Actually, there were no restrictions from our R.M. At the time we were constructing, we did not have to go through that process.

MR. MOTHERAL: Oh, you didn't. Okay, I was just wondering that. So the municipality had their plan in place before this was -- this came up?

MR. MANCHUR: Actually, their conditional use process came into effect after our barn was constructed.

MR. MOTHERAL: Oh, I see.

MR. MANCHUR: In our R.M. So presently, except for the moratorium, then new producers would have to go through that process.

MR. MOTHERAL: Your municipality, does
it have its own planning or is it in conjunction with other municipalities?

MR. MANCHUR: It is part of the Mountainview Planning District, so there is municipal planning in place.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. The new phosphorous regulations that just recently came out, obviously, it doesn't seem to be a problem with your operation because you feel as though your phosphorous levels are low enough and will never climb high?

MR. MANCHUR: Yes. I'm not familiar with the details of the levels or the science there. I know, from a practical standpoint, that we have sufficient spread acres that eliminate our concerns with phosphorous levels. And the testing we've done on our nutrient levels in our manure seems to indicate that we don't have a spread problem right now.

MR. MOTHERAL: You have more than enough acres for spreading, then?

MR. MANCHUR: That's correct.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. Are there any custom applicators? I hear you have custom application with the injection. And we have heard
that before, in several other areas of the province. Would that be a business? Would there be a business there for somebody to do this? Is there enough popularity for it?

MR. MANCHUR: Well, I'm guessing right now that there is a fairly good balance between a number of applicators and those that require the services, like the hog operatives. Obviously, if there was an expansion in the hog business, then that would provide opportunities for new hog applicators to get into business. It is a very highly capital intensive business, the manure or the hog application business.

MR. MOTHERAL: I think that that's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will just follow up on one of the questions that Mr. Motheral asked you. You didn't have to go through a conditional use hearing?

MR. MANCHUR: No, we did not.

THE CHAIRMAN: So there was no T.R.C., Technical Review Committee, report? Was that necessary for your --

MR. MANCHUR: I am not totally sure on those details. I know we followed whatever
permitting process was required by Manitoba
Conservation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

Edwin?

MR. YEE: I have no questions.

MR. MOTHERAL: I think I took them all.

MR. YEE: Yes, I had a few, but you covered them. Thank you.

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

MR. MANCHUR: Thank you. Next is Larry Powell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please state your name for the record?

MR. POWELL: My name is Mr. Powell. I'm from Roblin.

LARRY POWELL, having been sworn, presents as follows:

MR. POWELL: Thank you for this opportunity. We, the undersigned, and I'm wording it that way because I believe the members of the Commission will now have a hard copy of a summary of my presentation signed by members of the group that I represent for Citizens for Family Farms.
We reside in the vicinity of the Town of Roblin. In 2000, operating as Citizens Against Factory Farms, we banded together to struggle against a secretive plan for a massive complex of hog factories in our community.

We collected extensive research from around the world, and soon discovered this kind of development to be a misguided method of food production and a blight on many hitherto happy communities.

In our experience, factory hog barns create, number 1, health problems. Reputable medical institutions, like the Centres for Disease Control, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and the Canadian Medical Association, all warn that the long-standing overuse of antibiotics in raising the animals that we eat, like the pigs we produce "assembly-line-style," compromises the effectiveness of these drugs in fighting serious human infection. The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences was set up 40 years ago as part of the U.S. Surgeon-General's office. It published a study just a few months ago. And I'd like to read to you the abstract from that study, if I may.
"The industrialization of livestock production and the widespread use of non-therapeutic antimicrobial growth promotants have intensified the risk for the emergence of new, more virulent or more resistant micro-organisms. These have reduced the effectiveness of several classes of antibiotics for treating infections in humans and livestock. Recent outbreaks of virulent strains of influenza have arisen from swine and poultry raised in close proximity. This Working Group considered the state of the science around these issues, and concurred with the World Health Organization, called for a phasing-out of the use of antimicrobial growth promotants for livestock and fish production. We also agree that all therapeutic antimicrobial agents should be available by precipitation only for both human and veterinary
Number 2, environmental pollution. The slurry produced by millions of hogs is escaping from our lagoons and spread-fields into our waterways. Knee-jerk denials from industry notwithstanding, this slurry is a significant culprit in the eutrophication of lakes, rivers and streams. How could it not be?

And there is a picture that you will have there. Sorry I wasn't able to project it. I will explain what that picture shows. It was taken in the hills east of the R.M. of Roblin. On the hills there, you can see a very fine white line, which is the tip of a roof of a hog barn. In the middle of the picture is a spread-field. And in the foreground, there is water in the ditch by the road, which is certainly well nourished, by the look of it. And it is totally green.

Now, I didn't come here armed with a scientific study showing the cause and effect in that photo. I came hopefully to appeal to people's common sense, and to assume that it would seem logical to assume that some of that -- those nutrients, they are not magically stopping at the roadway or on the fence line. They are getting
into ditches like that and, therefore, into our environment.

The last official census by the Government of Canada shows the human population to be 31,612,897. Manitoba's hog population, at the end 2000, according to the Canada Pork Council, was 8,803,000. Now, the most conservative estimate I've read is that each hog produces four times the waste of a human being. Therefore, Manitoba's hogs produce the waste equivalent to at least 35,212,000 people. That's well more than the human population of the country.

Now, what I would like to point out is that the human sewage problem is serious, as well. I have a front page copy of a McLeans magazine. And it's called: "From Sea to Stinking Sea". "200 billion litres of raw sewage are dumped into our waterways every year. It's a national disgrace."

Now, if we have those kinds of problems with our human sewage, I'm asking you to consider the extrapolation that I have just made. Yes, as I've just said, I would ask you to consider what I've just said about hog waste and draw your own conclusions. And please don't
misunderstand me. I fully recognize that all of our society contributes to this problem, and all of our society must face these responsibilities equally.

Five years ago, a study -- and I am turning to the water question now. Five years ago a study by the "Agrifood Research and Development Initiative" of the Government of Manitoba concluded that total drinking water consumption by hogs is a close approximation of total waste production. A general assumption within the industry has been that waste production equals water consumption.

Now, I can't quote a study on my next part here. But if one assumes people and hogs drink an equal amount of water, which I believe would be a conservative assumption on my part, then Manitoba's hogs also consume more water than the entire human population of Canada.

And I have a newspaper clipping here on the water problem. It's a quote from David Schindler, who is an internationally respected water scientist from the University of Alberta. His quote is:

"Western Canada is due for a
multi-year drought that will make the dirty thirties look puny."

And to quote a recent major study by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, again on the water topic, that study is ominously entitled: "Livestock's Long Shadow":

"The world is moving towards increasing problems of freshwater shortage, scarcity and depletion, with 64 percent of the world's population expected to live in water-expressed basins by 2025."

Number 3, conflict of interest. The history of hog factories near my home, and elsewhere, is rife with tales of corruption among approving authorities. And this includes attempts, successful or otherwise, by elected officials to benefit financially if these industries go ahead.

Number 4, secrecy. It was apparent in my community that the public was not supposed to know too much, if anything, about a network of hog factories that were planned nearby until much of the planning was developed and land deals were put
into place. I learned, not from any member of my
R.M. council, but over coffee in Roblin, that
certain council members were showing overseas
investors properties in the vicinity that could
serve as sites for a network of huge hog
factories.

Number five, coercion. At least four
people linked to our citizens' group were
threatened with either loss of jobs or business if
they spoke out publicly. One of those individuals
decided not to join the group, as a result of
this. And others opted to keep a low profile, not
daring to write letters, or to take a public
position. We talked to several other people in
private who agreed with us, but either through
fear or natural inclination, did not take an
active part.

Number 6, a flawed approval process.
Technical Review Committees are notorious for
their bias towards proponents, and their neglect
of evidence of negative environmental
consequences.

In conclusion, or nearly conclusion, I
know the Pork Council does quite often say how
much misinformation is being spread about their
industry. That is why I have made every effort to
confine my observations to my own personal
experiences as chair of our citizens' group. And
if anyone should know what those experiences have
been, surely I should.

The rest has been gleaned from the
most reputable sources I could find. So if the
council, or the government, for that matter, does
not see fit to believe me, then I guess I would
invite them to disbelieve the Centres for Disease
Control, the World Health Organization, the Food
and Agriculture Organization, or the Canadian
Medical Association.

In closing, and I guess it is really
in closing this time, I implore you, the Clean
Environment Commission, to please recommend to the
Government of Manitoba that the existing
moratorium on hog barn development be kept in
place indefinitely. I further request that you
recommend the moratorium be extended to the 17 or
so applications that were pending when the
original announcement was made.

And, thank you, I appreciate the
opportunity to appear today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Powell.
MR. MOTHERAL: Not yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Powell, in the 17 applications pending, are these within this municipality or are they province wide?

MR. POWELL: They are province wide, yes.

MR. YEE: And has your group been involved in terms of any permit, conditional use permits, for hog operations in the municipality?

MR. POWELL: Is it involved?

MR. YEE: Yes, there is a public hearing component to that. Has your group presented at any public hearings about conditional use?

MR. POWELL: No, I can't speak about that. I don't remember. You are talking about the experiences I listed with the hog barn proposals in 2000, is that what you are referring to?

MR. YEE: Well, that and, yes, there is a statement you also made about how the Technical Review Committees, there is a conflict. And they often don't having the right information or are presenting the right information. And I am
just wondering, from your own experiences of the
group, if they have been involved in such a
hearing process?

MR. POWELL: Yes, I think -- I am
going by memory here, so I wouldn't want to say
with any certainty. But I think maybe, in that
case, I am gathering my information from
elsewhere, from outside the area. It runs in my
mind that there was -- there may have been a
Technical Review Committee hearing. And this I'm
not certain on, but it was -- it wasn't very
widely advertised. Now, I stand corrected on
that, but I'm pretty sure of that. The only other
example that I could give, and I would be happy
to, is the one that I skipped over here. But
that's not my own experience, that's someone
else's.

MR. YEE: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Powell, have you
given us or could you give us copies of the
McLeans article and the Schindler article?

MR. POWELL: Yes, I sure could. I
have given them to Joyce, actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, you have.

MR. POWELL: I am sure you will be
getting them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine.

Thank you very much, Mr. Powell.

MR. POWELL: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: David Kynoch. Just before we start, I would like to remind people not to engage in conversations, please, while we are in the proceedings. Would you please state your name for the record?

MR. KYNOCH: David Kynoch.

DAVID KYNOCH, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Go ahead, please.

MR. KYNOCH: Good afternoon, members of the CEC panel. I would like to thank all of you first for the opportunity to speak to you today on our hog industry and the importance that it has on our very existence.

My name is David Kynoch. And I'm here today to speak on behalf of multiple colonies here: One which is Rolling Acres, Riverside, Grass River and Parkview. Some of these will also speak on their own behalf, as well.

I am also involved in the hog industry
myself as a sales representative, and was fortunate enough to have been raised on our own family hog farm.

These three colonies, actually four colonies, are made up of many families that rely on the hog industry as an integral part of their daily lives. It is a major source of income that allows them to support their families and future generations. Regardless of the number of animals raised on these colonies, they are truly the version of a family farm. They vary from 15 to up to 22 families on these farms, which are all supported entirely by their own agricultural industry.

I am sure, from this, you can see just how important the agricultural industry is to them for their own existence and for future generations. Who is more concerned about the stability of the agriculture than a farmer? Who is a better steward of the land today than a farmer? We know that what we do today has an adverse effect on the future of our children, as well as any chances they have to thrive in this agricultural industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just interrupt
for a second? Do you want to say "an adverse
effect" or just an effect?

MR. KYNOCH: Just an effect is fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said "adverse".

MR. KYNOCH: And one of the instances
that I have, it is an added cost that the farmers
utilize is the use of separators for their manure
systems, as well as the incorporation of a product
called phytase in their feeds to lower the
phosphorous levels on their land. Just as a note,
these are additional expenses that we are not able
to recuperate on the farms, but just for the
sustainability of our environment.

As farmers, we work very hard to
produce the best possible products we can for our
consumers. Canadians are well known for raising
some of the best pork products on the market
today. This is only attained by taking the best
care of our land and ensuring that the correct
animal practices have been followed.

We support the government in their
efforts to protect the surface and groundwater
supply. The Manitoba pork industry relies heavily
on the use of good quality water, not just for our
animals, but for future generations that will rely
on the same land.

We do realize that there are some people out there that do not follow the set regulations or that farms do operate in areas with little regulations. These people damage the environment and seem to give other, more efficient and environmentally friendly farms a bad reputation in the public today.

We also concern ourselves with nutrient management by testing our soils to ensure that the proper amounts of nutrients are applied. We know that phosphorous is a naturally occurring mineral. It is an important mineral in the production of our crops. And we focus on the amounts of phosphorous in the soil, as too much of it increases algae blooms, which threatens plants and organisms in our lakes and streams. That being said, only about 13 percent of the phosphorous that has contributed to Lake Winnipeg comes from the agricultural industry, and of that 13 percent, one percent comes from our hog industry. I don't understand how someone could actually single out our hog industry when such a small percentage of the phosphorous can actually be linked to the hog industry.
Hog producers are not the only contributor to this growing phosphorous level. They also come from such areas such as industry, human waste in cities, natural deposits, dishwasher detergents, and lawn fertilizer. I have yet to see any regulations that restrict the cities on their levels as strongly as the farms have been. In everyday life, we have the ability to remove the phosphorous levels in our households by simply using phosphorous-free laundry detergents, dishwashing soap and lawn fertilizers, as well as what we wash our vehicles with.

In 1970, the government banned the production of detergents containing more than 25 percent phosphate. Exempt from this ban were detergents used in dishwashers, car washers and manufacturing. Now, here we are, 37 years later, and wondering what has happened to our Lake Winnipeg.

We are all concerned about the protection of our environment. And over many generations, it has become evident that our attitudes have changed. There is no question that we must be more careful with the use of our environment and the water resources, but "we" must
also include all contributors to this growing concern. If every pig in Manitoba was to be gone today, does anyone think that it would make a difference on the nutrient load on the land? What we do not put down in organic form would just end up being in synthetic fertilizer. And for a generation of people who are asking every day to have organic food products, why would our government limit this very resource, this very valuable resource, hog manure, to such a large extent? If we expect to fix this problem, we need to involve more than one percent of the source.

Thank you for your time and consideration on my comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kynoch.

MR. KYNCH: You're welcome.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Kynoch, I realize that these colonies will likely be presenting today, but I just wanted to get an idea of whether they are all within this area. Whereabouts are they located?

MR. KYNCH: We have some north of Neepawa. Actually, they are all north of Neepawa.

MR. YEE: Okay, thank you. I will
wait until they do their presentations to ask for the specifics.

MR. KYNOCH: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: You mentioned, Mr. Kynoch, that there are bad eggs in every industry.

MR. KYNOCH: Yes, of course.

MR. MOTHERAL: And they sometimes send out a bad reputation. In that sense, do you think -- and there are inspections. There are inspections of lagoons. There is inspections of that. You have to soil test and things like that. Should there be, or what kind of fine is there right now, if anybody is -- if anyone does not comply with these regulations? I know, in the past, that I have heard that the fines are not large enough, and that it's all part of the business expense, which doesn't get you anywhere. Do you feel as though these fines should be larger, then, to try and phase out all of those bad eggs?

MR. KYNOCH: I think that to get a better handle on this, like I said in my last paragraph, is that we are looking at one percent of the phosphorous levels that have been
contributed to Lake Winnipeg from farms. I think that if we actually want a real solution to understanding this phosphorous and get a control on it, that we need a team effort from everybody out there, not just the hog producers. I think that the hog producers have worked very hard. I think that, yes, you know, if we have, in practice, done it wrong that there should be fines. But I think that this should take into consideration every aspect of our daily lives, including cities, waterways, golf courses, absolutely everything there is out there, rather than working on one percent of the issue.

Mr. Motheral: Okay. I take it that was a yes.

Mr. Kynoch: Yes.

Mr. Motheral: That's all I have.

The Chairman: Thank you very much, Mr. Kynoch.

Mr. Kynoch: Thank you.

The Chairman: Next we have Byran and Jason Ferriss. Please introduce yourself for the record?

Mr. Ferriss: I'm Bryan Ferriss. And I own and operate Porkchop Enterprises Ltd., both
in Manitoba, my son Jason, who is a co-owner in
the company.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Ferriss.
I apologize for mixing up your name because it is
written differently on the agenda.
BRYAN FERRISS, having been sworn, presents as
follows:

MR. FERRISS: As I said, my name is
Bryan Ferriss. And I operate a company with our
son, Jason, in Bowsman, which is in the middle of
the Swan River Valley, about 120 miles northwest
of here. We operate a 350 sow, farrow to
weanling, operation. And we also have 1,300 acres
of cropland, as well.

I have farmed with my parents since
1969. And we have never operated without hogs,
starting with a small grow to finish and slowly
growing to where we are today, with our last barn
being added in the early eighties. My wife,
Donna, and I, as well as my parents, my dad is 85
and my mom is 82, have lived all our lives
100 feet from the front of our barns, and still do
today.

Donna and I have raised three
children. And if it wasn't for hogs, we would not
be farming today. We also have three
grandchildren. And we keep kidding to our three
kids that if we had known grandchildren were as
much fun as they are, we definitely would have had
them first.

But at any rate, my presentation today
will be much more personal than technical. And I
will try to tell you how we manage, as we see it,
our environmental footprint, if you will, of our
family business.

The first topic is nutrient and manure
management. Because we were an existing operation
when the new Manure Management Regulations were
brought in, we are still allowed to winter spread,
which we do, as our barns are liquified manure,
but all pits are concrete under the slats.
Because of the design, we have approximately 30
days storage within our pits.

We have always, from the beginning,
maintained a buffer from all ditches and in summer
incorporate with a cultivator, as soon as
possible, for obvious reasons, to capture
nutrients and reduce the odour.

In the winter months, we spread on
fields that are a minimum of a quarter mile up to
three quarters of a mile from the closest ditch,
on the drainage side of the field. And what I
mean by that, is all surface water in our area,
and the valley, as a whole, for that matter, runs
southwest to northeast, so we know which direction
any snow melt will flow.

The soils in the valley are naturally
lower in phosphorous, so the nutrient uptake and
the corresponding yield increase by the crop is
significant. And at nearly $1,000 a metric tonne
for nitrogen, and over $600 a metric tonne for
phosphorous, today, the financial benefit to our
grain production from manure application is huge.
As well, with 300 sows and 1,300 acres of land,
there is not any risk of over-application.

Groundwater supply and quality. All
of our water supply, for both the barns and our
houses, comes out of the same dugout, which is
replenished every year by surface water runoff.

Our dugout, which is about 150 feet
from our barns, has been tested several times over
the years. And the last time we had it done,
about four years ago, the fellow doing the testing
said it was amongst the cleanest dugout water he
had ever tested. So the people who are advocating
that it is virtually impossible to have a hog barn
and potable water on the same site, from my
family's experience, is just simply not true. We
have always maintained the same buffer on the
ditch that fills our dugout as we do on all the
other ditches around our farm.

Soil quality. Three of the quarters
of land we have purchased over the years has been
sandy loam. And some of the ridge had been wind
eroded to the point where it was impossible to
grow much of any crop at all. And now, after
nearly 30 years of proper soil management
practices, the first of which, in our opinion, is
proper manure application, those ridges grow as
good a crop as any other area on that land.

So, clearly, it has been a win/win
situation, where we have gained from an
environmental stewardship perspective, and with a
direct correlation to the gain on our balance
sheet from increased production on those eroded
lands.

And now the odour. We have neighbours
from just across the road from us, to a mile away
on nearly every side. We have always had a good
shelterbelt of trees around our building site,
which has been very beneficial. We also have done what we could to stop air currents by hooping exhaust fans and drawing inlet air from the open side of the yard, and exhausting it out to the outside, closer to the shelterbelt. This seems to have been relatively effective, as when we ask our neighbours, and we do from time to time, about odour, they have said consistently that only very rarely that they do get any odour at all, but at times there is some odour. And we get some odour as well in our house.

But I have to tell you that the only time in our house that we get any odour in our house, or mom and dad's house and our house, which are about 50 feet apart, is when it's going to rain. And it must be, I guess, the change in the low pressure area or something. I don't know what it is. I have to tell you that we can forecast rainfall better than Revenue Canada can, or Environment Canada, hands down.

THE CHAIRMAN: Revenue Canada just takes a different kind of rain.

MR. FERRISS: Yes, that's right.

Disease transmission. This is something that I will speak to you about from two
separate perceptions: One is from the stock inside the barn and, secondly, from my family's health.

We have, for the last 15 years, or so, maintained bio-security within our barns, as it relates to visitors, with very little, if any, traffic allowed.

As a producer, it is very troubling to hear that exhaust air coming from our barns are laced with toxins, and various other organisms. And I have to tell you that after 38 years of marriage, and raising our family "on site", if you will, I just simply do not believe those sorts of comments to be true. And, as I have mentioned before, we live 100 feet from our barn and have raised our family in the same environment. My parents, who, as I have said, are both in their eighties, still live in their own home, "on site", unsupervised without any medication whatsoever. Our three children all attended University of Manitoba: Jason in agriculture, Jennifer now in public health, and Jaclyn, a bio-systems engineer with Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food in Saskatoon.

My point being, that if there was to
be any ill effects on personal health and
well-being, we, as a family, have certainly not
seen it. And I realize when I make that statement
that there is a lot more criteria to good health
than just that. But to some degree, I believe
that God has blessed us with good health. But I
also believe that with the heavy shelterbelt, as I
said, around our building site, if, in fact, there
were toxins, or any other things coming out of
that barn, that we would have had to have absorbed
some of that, and we would have seen some sort of
effects from that over all these years, we would
have to believe.

With regards to climate change and
environmental liability, the only way that this
can be determined, as accurately as possible, in
my opinion, is through factually sound,
scientifically based research. Our family has
participated in the same way every producer in the
industry in Manitoba has, and that is through a
mandatory check-off, of which a portion is
allocated to research projects and development
through the Manitoba Pork Council.

To name just a few, there has been
nearly $200 a year committed to the Manure
Management Initiative, as well as $750,000 donated to the new NCLE Research Centre at the University of Manitoba, over the last 36 months, with another $600,000 committed over the next 36 months. And I would have to say that, over the years that that check-off has come through, the industry has, at times, not been generating any profit whatsoever. And that 80 cents a hog, or 19 cents a weanling, amounts to a fair bit of money. And when you are looking at a shortfall on your balance sheet, very often, I have to tell you, in all honesty, that probably the families that sit around those tables have done with less so that those research projects could be funded on behalf of industry, as a part of what we share in it.

As well, we have heard it said that Manitoba does not have the capability of raising more hogs. Which, if you have driven through the parkland regions of Manitoba, is difficult to understand. Because pretty much all you're going to see is miles and miles of not much more than miles and miles. The opportunity for agricultural diversification and economic growth within my industry, the hog industry, I believe, is very large.
This region can grow some of the best quality, highest yielding field grains anywhere in Manitoba. And with a feed conversion of approximately 3.1 for every pot-load of market hogs that are finished here, it replaces three loads of field grain that is being trucked elsewhere.

A significant reduction in greenhouse gas, i.e. carbon emissions from fuel being expended on highway tractors, as well as a reduction, over time, in highway maintenance and repair, at a cost of what I have heard at about $1.5 million a mile for re-surfacing, that savings could be better spent in other areas, or even on healthcare or education or even environmental grants or incentives to the larger urban centers, i.e. Winnipeg, so that our urban cousins can have better waste management systems that could be improved from where they are today.

And I have to say that as well, with regards to those savings, that there is no question, as agriculture, that we can certainly appreciate consideration of some of those expenditure of funds, which will help us afford, down the road in the future, with regards to
handling environmental concerns and that sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Ferriss. Bear with me a moment. Something popped in my mind as you were making the presentation. I just have to find it now. Oh, yes, when you talked about your particular experience with soil quality, and you said that a lot of the land, or a significant part of the land that you have purchased over the years was sandy loam, from which there was a lot of wind erosion. And you'll have to forgive me, I'm not a farmer.

So the management of this particular soil with manure was the large that you were able to reconstruct the soil?

MR. FERRISS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you don't have a wind erosion problem anymore?

MR. FERRISS: Not anywhere near it.

I would say that probably about five percent of that 480 acres was wind eroded, in that it is a bit rolling and the tops of the knolls were blown off, and there was several acres in certain areas.

And our management practice, over the years, has been to cover as much of it as we can, not to
spread it too heavily, but heavily enough that you
do get an increase in yield, but to cover as much
of the area as we possibly can.

But, given the fact that our operation
is a farrowing operation, our manure has much more
water content than what you would get out of a
grow to finish operation. So we don't have the
nutrients in it that you would on a per gallon
basis, as I said, from a grow to finish operation.

But the problem initially was that you couldn't
grow a good enough crop to stabilize those ridges
previously, because it would only get about this
high, and you could literally see a pop can 50
feet away. And over the years to date, as I said,
now those ridges grow as good a crops as any of
our best productive lands. So it has been
beneficial, as I said, on those parts.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said that the
weanlings' manure doesn't have as much nutrients,
but it is still enough for your needs?

MR. FERRISS: Yes, it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. YEE: Oh, yes, Mr. Ferriss, you
mentioned you had a 450 sow operation. And I am
just trying to get my hands around or my head
around this. The economies of scale, what would you consider -- I gather that your operation is economical for you. Is there a breaking point in which the operation is too small, in your mind, to support the financial economic viability of the operation?

MR. FERRISS: That’s a very good question. There are so many variables that, obviously, would play into that, the liability or debt is one thing. And the fact that we have been there as long as we have been. Jason represents the third generation, quite frankly, is helpful, there is no doubt about that.

The second thing that we have done, just recently in the last two years, well, it is two years ago just now, we have switched away from the conventional market into the niche market. And we are currently breeding wild boar with a conventional cross, and supplying breeding stock, as well as slaughter animals, for that market. We have hooked up with a company in Alberta. And it has been very beneficial for us. We get paid a premium for what we do.

To get back to your question, could you start and be viable today with a 300 or 350
sow, farrow to weanling, operation? I have to believe if the will is there, I think you probably could. It might require some off-farm employment. I have never personally worked off-farm since we came back to farming. The wife worked for three years until she was pregnant with Jason, our first son, and has since then not worked off the farm. It was our choice for her to be there with our family. But as I said, that's a tough question, without sitting down and doing a lot of work on it.

MR. YEE: Thank you. I appreciate that answer. Just one other question. You also mentioned that you were established prior to the Manure Management Regulations, so you do spread in the wintertime. Do you file a Manure Management Plan?

MR. FERRISS: No. We aren't required to because of the fact that we are under 300 animal units.

MR. YEE: Well, I gathered that. I just want to know. So you don't do any of the soil testing?

MR. FERRISS: Actually, we haven't tested our manure. We are planning on doing it in
2007. And the rationale behind that is because we soil test. And we have never seen our phosphorous or nitrogen in the soil come up. Well, phosphorous hasn't moved at all. The nitrogen does vary a little bit from year to year, but you will see that when there is manure application or not.

And so, as I said before, we spread our manure as far as we can, because we want to cover as many areas as possible to get that one year bang for your buck, if you will, rather than concentrate too heavily in one area.

MR. YEE: So you do test your soils?
MR. FERRISS: Yes, we do.
MR. YEE: Is there any need to add synthetic fertilizers?

MR. FERRISS: We haven't had to add synthetic fertilizers for, I would say, five years. And I would have to say that, in all probability, we have sacrificed some yield because of that. But from risk management tool, we don't have that fertilizer to put on the fields in the fall. And our crops have -- we've grown 42 acres of canola without fertilizer. We do some in the fall as well. But it's just to give us some
nutrients from the manure again in the summertime. So there is no question that that plays into it. But from a personal perspective, the choices that we made, do we believe, honestly and truly, that we have made the right choices, as far as the way, that we manage our farm? Yes, we do, yes.

MR. YEE: Thank you, Mr. Ferriss.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be a particular hardship if regulations were changed, and you had to file a Manure Management Plan or you couldn't winter spread?

MR. FERRISS: That, again, is a very, very good question. And that's something that I would have to tell you, in all honesty, that Jason and I have talked about. I can't see us quitting the industry just because of that. Would it create some hardship for us? Yes, it would, there is no question about that. And I guess it would depend upon a lot of variables that no one knows for sure. And that is whether there will there be any government assistance to help producers to make that adjustment, when that might come? Given the fact that if we can maintain the contract that we have in a niche market where our profit levels
are somewhat higher than the conventional hog market, would it be beneficial, there is no doubt about that.

I guess, as much as anything, as well, what we have talked about doing, because of the fact our dugout is about a five million litre or five million gallon dugout, it's quite large, actually. It carries almost two years, or better, worth of water. We have looked at the possibility of doing testing. Because we are on heavy clay, right where our building site is, to drain the dugout, block the inlet, and do the upgrading that would be required to convert it to a lagoon. And put the proper cover on it, whether it's straw, or a plastic cover, or whatever the case might be, drill a well right close to the barn, and then go that, as far as water supply is concerned.

The reason that we went with dugout water initially was because groundwater, unless you get down below -- right in our area where we are, unless you get down to below about 200 feet, it has a very high sulfate level. And you tend to get scarring in the little pigs, and that sort of thing, because of that.

So we, actually, drilled a well of
about 150 feet, and ran it for about a year and a half, about two years. And we started to try to manifold our dugout water in with it. And then we finally just expanded the dugout and said that we have had enough of this. We are going to go with groundwater because there were just too much problems. But we know that if we go deep enough, we can get good potable water there, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there much competition, or threat of competition, in your niche area?

MR. FERRISS: Well, it's like anything else. It's like lentils. I mean, if you are one container short, the market is good. If you are one container over, it goes into the tank. So you have to be very, very careful. We are confident that these fellows that we are hooked up have a good enough handle on this. I mean, their market is Japan. It's a fresh restaurant trade over there for the meat. So is there room for other producers? That's not for me to say. That's for him to say. We are just very thankful we've had the opportunity to be a part of that, that's for sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne?
MR. MOTHERAL: You have just about covered them all. I am just curious, I am interested, where do your weanlings go?

MR. FERRISS: Actually, our weanlings are either finished here in the southern part of the province or else out to Alberta.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. I was curious with the winter spread, too, you are grandfathered in because of the regulations. And I was going to ask also about what would you consider if the regulations came in, and you answered that.

How many acres -- it says here that you are farming 1,300 acres. And I know that 350 sow weanlings are not going to give you probably sufficient nitrogen, that's for sure, over the 1,300 acres. But you did say that you did summer fallow some acreage for your spreading. How many acres do you figure you can do with a year's worth of supply in manure?

MR. FERRISS: Well, that's a good question, you know. I have really never kept track of the number of acres. I would have to believe probably 30 to 40 in a summer, like in a year, as far as the total year's spread is concerned. But, again, that's just a guess.
MR. MOTHERAL: And you say you don't use any dry fertilizer at all?

MR. FERRISS: No, we haven't.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay.

MR. FERRISS: I shouldn't say none.

We basically take two crops in the summer fallow. And on our stubble crop we do about 40 in, or 45-gallons, as far as nitrogen is concerned on most fields. On some fields we don't, on some fields we do. But on summer fallow -- on any other land we use no phosphorous whatsoever. And on summer fallow we use absolutely no fertilizer whatsoever.

MR. MOTHERAL: I couldn't help but hear you when you are talking about knolls, and all of that, because I came from a farm also. And sometimes I remember saying that an American farmer told me one time, he said: I was only an inch of rain away from being a good farmer last year. And I have noticed that in my high ground, a lot of the reason why it's been growing these last few years is because of our wet cycle that we have been having, and that has a lot to do with it.

MR. FERRISS: I have to tell you that
that is absolutely true. We are very blessed to
be living where we are. And that's not to say
that everybody else that lives in rural Manitoba
isn't. But so far, in our valleys, with our
rainfall here. Our land is relatively new as
well. When I started farming in '69, we opened
up, and I mean opened up, we took a portion off of
three-quarters of the 1,300-acres that we are
currently farming. So we still have a high degree
of organic material. And also there are some
farms that have been farming for longer
generations and that, and some of the farms
haven't got that left in their soil.

        We have started, as well, doing some
acreage, 150 acres we've seeded down to alfalfa.
I know this has very little to do with the hog
industry, but we would very much like to seed an
annual alfalfa, where you could seed it and plow
it down that fall, and to have that as a standard
crop for the weed control, and all of that sort
thing.

        THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Ferriss. Before I call Mr. Whitaker, I just
want to take a two-minute break and grab a glass
of water, and then we will get right back.
THE CHAIRMAN: Could I have you resume your seats, please? When I said a couple of minutes' break, I'm serious, okay? Please introduce yourself for the record?

MR. WHITAKER: John Whitaker.

JOHN WHITAKER, having been sworn, presents as follows:


MR. WHITAKER: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is John Whitaker. And together with the family, we raise beef cattle east of Erickson, about 100 kilometres south of here, on the other side of the park.

I have been on a couple of panels recently, which also tried to assess the environmental sustainability of hog production in Manitoba. The first one was the Livestock Stewardship Panel in 2001.

And the second one I was on the Clean Environment Commission hearings on the second shift for the Maple Leaf Hog Plant in Brandon in 2003. And this hearing is not known for having
addressed hog production but, actually, it did.

On the first day of the hearing, we had a request from Glen Koroluk, who was with Hog Watch, at the time, to expand the scope of the hearing to include hog production. And his argument was that the second shift for the Maple Leaf Hog Plant would -- a reasonable consequence of that would increase hog production in Manitoba and, therefore, the hearings should also consider hog production, and we agreed with him. And so we did agree to increase the scope of the hearings to include the hog production in the Assiniboine River Watershed.

But in the case of both of these panels, we were unable to evaluate properly the environmental sustainability of hog production because of missing information, and we recommended studies to correct this. And I hope the information that we were missing is going to be available to this panel.

Now, the essence of our recommendations was a study, which would measure nitrogen and phosphorous in the surface and groundwater emanating from fields to which hog manure had been applied. We already know that
nitrogen and phosphorous levels are trending upwards in our rivers, with dire consequences for Lake Winnipeg, but the source of this additional nutrient has not been adequately traced back to the field level.

The study would involve selecting perhaps 10 hog operations representing the variability found in the current industry, and measuring nitrogen and phosphorous levels in run-off water from manure spread fields, with sampling concentrated during the spring melt and during heavy rainfall events. Grain farms using commercial or synthetic fertilizer would serve as controls, and would facilitate a comparison to rate the hog industry against conventional grain production. Of course, additional controls would also be useful, should similar data be available from forage production, pastures, and from areas of natural vegetation. And measurements of nutrient escape to groundwater, as well, would complete the picture.

Until such a study is done, and we can assess the relative contributions of several styles of agriculture to the increasing nitrogen and phosphorous levels found in our rivers, as
well as the contributions from other sources, like municipal sewage lagoons, it will be difficult for the panel to do its job.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Whitaker. In your second paragraph, you say:

"We weren't able to evaluate the environmental sustainability because of missing information..."

Now, the missing information, is all of it as listed out in the next couple of paragraphs?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, from my perspective, it is. Now, there was another issue back then, and that related to the odour coming from hog barns. And we had people coming from before us who said that their lives had been devastated from the odours from a neighbouring hog barn. And then we had other people saying they noticed no odour at all. And I think a study has been done on that. And I don't know if that has been presented to you or not, but it was simply interviewing neighbours from varying distances from hog barns as to the odour. And so that may have been covered. But, to me, the missing piece
is still what is happening with that run-off water.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the academics that we have engaged to do some literature research, or a review for us, is an expert in odour. And we haven't seen it yet, but we will be seeing probably a fairly comprehensive review of what's been done or the studies. What that would be, I can't say at this time, but we will see it. Edwin?

MR. YEE: Now, Mr. Whitaker, this is probably more of a comment than it is a question. With respect to your proposed study here of 10 hog operation, would you also consider that soil type, and analysis of currently available nutrients in the soils, and the distribution on these 10 operations throughout the province with varying soil types?

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, for sure. When I say it should be representative of the industry, it should cover the range of soil types, as well. And, essentially, we're looking at a study of nutrient dynamics here and how hog manure interacts with the soil and how much, if any of it, ends up in run-off.
MR. YEE: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes, Mr. Whitaker, you're right, we don't have enough information, and that's something that we are going to be pursuing, for certain. But on the run-off of phosphorous and nitrogen, or whatever, phosphorous mostly, right now today, off of agricultural land, there is a group, the Deerwood Soil and Water Association, that are doing some excellent work on that. And, actually, they came in front of our panel almost pleading for more money, lobbying for money, so that they could finish their research.

But these are the kinds of things that they are doing. And they are finding the levels of phosphorous coming off of fields, in field situations. And they are quite surprised that, without any fertilizer at all, without any hog manure, or without any kind of added phosphorous, that the phosphorous levels coming from wooded areas and grasslands areas is phenomenally high. They don't know where these tests are going to go, but it shows that there are a lot of areas where phosphorous can come out of soils.

MR. WHITAKER: Are fields receiving hog manure part of the Deerwood study?
MR. MOTHERAL: No, they aren't. But they are using the levels of phosphorous studies right now.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, the Deerwood have been doing those samples. And, I guess, the embarrassment is that that's all we have got. Now, they are doing good work, but it's not enough.

MR. YEE: Obviously, they have taken the same initiative as the Alonsa Conservation District. And I don't know if Harry Harris is still here, but they are trying to find out if there is any phosphorous pollution, mostly from the beef industries. And they have just started their work there, so I would imagine they are going to continue with something, too.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, that was encouraging what Harry had to say, that the conservation districts are taking it on, as well. So that would should be an encouragement to you to get these numbers.

MR. MOTHERAL: Hopefully, yes, that could be one of our recommendations, but we don't know that. Thank you.

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

Next is Mr. Irvin Gross. Would you please state your name for the record?

MR. GROSS: Irvin Gross.

IRVIN GROSS, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, go ahead.

MR. GROSS: Good afternoon, or evening, members of the Clean Environment Commission panel, and ladies and gentlemen of the audience.

My name is Irvin Gross, manager of Rolling Acres Hutterite Colony. We are a new colony, which began farming in 1995, but only started residency in January of 2005.

Our community is located between two villages; two miles south of Birnie, or two miles north of Eden, and 12 miles north of Neepawa, in the R.M. of Rosedale. Our community currently has 65 members, which is 16 families. Our livelihood is almost entirely dependent on livestock production, which includes a 1,250 sow hog production unit, which produces 30,000 weanlings annually, of which 16,000 to 18,000 are finished at home, and the remaining are sold as isowean
pigs. We also have a 200 cow/calf herd, where our calves are sold as finished livestock.

In addition to our livestock, we grow oilseeds, cereals and forages on 5,300 acres of land, of which 800 acres are rented.

I would like to take this opportunity to enlighten you, and the audience, about the way we operate our colony, in the context of the issues you outlined in your presentation guide. In doing so, I hope I can dispel some of the myths and misconceptions that the public has about the hog industry, and show you that the hog producers are responsible stewards of the land.

Nutrient management. As I stated earlier, we are a new colony, but we are very receptive to new technologies and techniques when it comes to hog production practices.

In accordance with Manitoba's Nutrient Management Regulations, we contract an independent third party, Agri Trend Agrology Ltd., to test our soil, water and manure regularly, and to make recommendations on manure application rates to improve overall crop fertility. Ron Curtis, our agri-coach from Agri Trend, who is here with us today, provides us advice on how to balance the
nutrients from our manure, and supplemental
commercial fertilizers, with crop plant nutrient
needs, in order to minimize the nutrient loss and
maximize crop fertility and yields.

We view manure as a valuable resource
for our crops. Just like commercial fertilizer,
we are concerned with the way we manage our
nutrients because over-application can negatively
affect our crops, our financial bottom line, and
our environment.

Our field are soil tested every year,
and we use the information to make science-based
decisions for manure application.

Manure management. Manure management
on larger livestock operations is tightly
regulated under the Manitoba Livestock Mortalities
and Manure Management Regulation. This regulation
is relatively new to Manitoba and provides strict
rules on how our manure and mortalities are
handled.

While smaller livestock operations are
still exempt from the rules, larger operations,
like ours, are required to file an annual Manure
Management Plan.

Using our colony as an example, part
of our plan requires that our fields be soil
tested at depths from 0-6, 6-12 and 12-24 inches,
as recommended by Agri Trend, which is more than
the minimum requirement for a manure plan. We
also test our manure for each field, so that we
can track the rate at which manure is being
applied. Furthermore, all of the manure is
injected to reduce nitrogen loss and to reduce
odours.

In addition, all of the equipment that
we use to seed crops, fertilize, spray herbicides
and fungicides, and inject manure, is equipped
with the latest GPS technology and auto steer,
which prevents over-lapping and over-application
of manure and chemicals. Larger operations are
more likely able to purchase this technology than
smaller operations; therefore, we are better
equipped to manage the environmental risks.

Groundwater supply. A good supply of
good quality water is vital to the livelihood of
any agricultural operation, and our community is
no exception. In Manitoba, we are fortunate that
groundwater supplies are managed by the Manitoba
Water Stewardship under the Water Rights Act. The
department carefully considers and balances the
water needs of all users in an area, with the
aquifer's ability to recharge and issues water use
licences only if the supply can meet the demands.

Currently, domestic uses, or small
agricultural operations which use less than 5,000
gallons per day, are exempt from licensing.
However, larger users are required to have a Water
Rights License. We have a Water Rights License
from the Province of Manitoba, which allows us to
use 25,000 gallons of water per day from the
Birnie aquifer. Our community currently uses
about 15,000 gallons per day, on average. We are
as concerned as anyone about the ability of our
water supply to continue to meet our quality and
quantity needs well into the future.

Soil quality. With regards to soil
quality, I am pleased to say that our land is in
better condition now than it was before. By
applying manure to the land in accordance to
regulations and crop needs, our land is producing
higher yielding, better quality grain.

Yearly testing shows that the soil on
our land are in better condition after, than
before, the manure application. And we are a
minimum till farm, and so we return as much
residue into the land as possible, and we don't
burn straw. The organic and moisture contents in
our soil are improving and, with this, so are the
crop yields.

Remember, our land is our future. We
need to be able to produce 200,000 bushels of
grain annually to feed our livestock.

Odour. Odours are inherent in any
agricultural operation, whether it is from dairy,
cattle, poultry or hogs. Odour is one of the
biggest concerns that the general public has about
hog operations. But please be aware that the hog
industry has made huge advances in technologies
and farm practices in those areas, which tend to
cause problems, such as manure storage, handling
and disposal.

Injecting manure into the ground
significantly reduces the amount of odour produced
when compared with surface spraying techniques.
As an example, our neighbour, who is also our
councillor, visited us this last fall to see when
we would be injecting manure on the land, and we
told him that we were already finished. Well, he
was pleasantly surprised. You see, odours can be
managed.
Groundwater quality. I can't stress enough the importance of water quality to us and the value of our manure as a natural fertilizer source. We use manure wisely to reduce commercial fertilizer costs and to minimize risks to groundwater quality. However, the cost of properly storing manure and applying it doesn't come cheap. We estimate that it costs us about $60,000 annually to apply manure in accordance with provincial regulation.

Furthermore, to help increase public confidence in the protection of our groundwater supply, our manure is stored in two concrete above-ground tanks, each having a holding capacity of three million gallons. These tanks alone cost us about $800,000, which works out to about $12,300 for every man, woman and child in our community. This is a long, long-term investment for our community, and we are here for the duration.

Let us compare this with the $100 million price tag that the City of Winnipeg will have to bear to upgrade their wastewater treatment system. This works out to only about $200 for every man, woman and child in Winnipeg.
I think you would find it hard to convince people in Winnipeg to spend $12,000 each for the sake of the environment, but the hog industry in Manitoba is already doing it. I think this demonstrates our commitment to the environment and our water resources.

And groundwater quality is important, not only just to our members and neighbours, but also to our livestock. If our groundwater supply was ruined, we could never haul enough water to meet our needs. With the amount of time, money and effort we would have to invest in our buildings and operations, we are as concerned about the contamination as anyone, regardless of the source.

This is why we work with accredited agrologists to help us with the hog production and manure management decisions and have invested in excellent manure storage facilities.

Surface water quality. Surface water quality can be easily affected by all kinds of activities that take place on or near a surface water body.

At our site, we protect our surface water bodies, as small as they are, by injecting
manure only in the fall. We do not winter spread. And we have adequate storage so that we can store manure throughout the winter and spring months, without having to interrupt or delay our seeding program in the spring.

Our cattle use water troughs, as we have no large water bodies nearby. Our cattle do not have access to creeks in which they might want to wade into.

Disease transmission. Our barns have high health herd standards, which requires that everyone must shower in and shower out for the health of both the livestock and the workers. These protocols are strict to prevent the occurrence of diseases.

In addition, at Rolling Acres, we have a two site system to reduce the risk of transmitting diseases between animals of different ages, one barn for farrowing and a separate barn for finishing. Hog mortalities are frozen and picked up at the site by Rothsay's Rendering once a month.

Environmental liability. As you can see, meeting or exceeding the regulation has been very costly in our community. We are very
concerned about keeping our location as pure as when we got there, because our future generations will be required to clean up our mess if we leave one. 

Our goal is to maintain an economically feasible community, but also to keep it environmentally friendly. Common sense is an important factor in accomplishing this. And most situations dictate that common sense be used.

Let's work together to put in reasonable, workable and affordable solutions for the hog industry.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Gross.

Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Gross, you have mentioned in your presentation that you are growing oilseeds, cereals and forages on 5,300 acres, of which 800 acres were rented. I would imagine that is sufficient spread field for your manure at this point in time?

MR. GROSS: Yes.

MR. YEE: Do you see any difficulties with the latest amendment for the phosphorous regs in terms of impacting your spread fields?
MR. GROSS: Well, the tests we have been doing, and any time we have done soil tests, it has never shown up that the phosphorous levels, or nitrogen levels, has gone up even after a year of cropping and after putting manure down.

MR. YEE: So you wouldn't foresee any problems with being compliant with the new phosphorous regulations?

MR. GROSS: It depends how strict they are applied, I guess.

MR. YEE: Okay. And in terms of the -- and I realize your other comment that you made about you being able to maintain an economically feasible community, but do you see more stringent regulations affecting your operation?

MR. GROSS: Yes, I would.

MR. YEE: That's all I have. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: To what extent or how would they affect your operation?

MR. GROSS: Well, if they kept banning livestock, or building for livestock, and if they got stricter with injecting of the manures, we could probably or possibly run out of acres and
have to truck it a long ways.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you. Mr. Gross,

I had forgotten -- I have heard a lot about hogs in the last month or so. Isowean, what does that mean?

MR. GROSS: Isowean is a pig under 21 days.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. It wasn't some complicated ISO, or something. You also had one statement here, and that's with regards to soil quality:

"I am pleased to say that our land is in better condition now than it was before."

Before what?

MR. GROSS: Before we started applying manure.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. I thought that's what you meant. What is the shelf life, or what would you call it, of an above-ground storage tank? Is there a guarantee that they will last so many years?

MR. GROSS: I was talking to a company out of the States, and they are putting a 25-year
MR. MOTHERAL: When they put a guarantee on it, if something happened, would they pay for the clean-up?

MR. GROSS: I don't know about the clean-up.

MR. MOTHERAL: It's interesting because we get lots of area, for instance, in the Red River Valley, where there is sufficient clay for your manure. But you are in an area where you are required to do that? You are required?

MR. GROSS: Yes. Our R.M. requires above-ground. They don't allow lagoons.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Gross. Edward Stahl. Please introduce yourself?

MR. STAHL: My name is Edward Stahl. EDWARD STAHL, having been sworn, presents as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. STAHL: You have got to excuse me because I don't have my best voice today. But, otherwise, I will try my best. So I wanted to say good afternoon to you members of the Clean Environment Commission
panel, and to the ladies and gentlemen of the audience.

My name is Edward Stahl. I am here today as a representative of the Grass River Hutterite Colony. And not only for the colony, but for the hog producers up in this area, and for the hog industry, as a whole, in this province.

Our colony is located four miles east of Glenella, Manitoba, and we do farming in Glenella, Manitoba. Our colony has a population of 104 people, which is made up of 24 families. And the hog production is a very, very important business in our colony, and it has been for almost 40 years.

We farm 2,800 acres of land and run a 550 sow, farrow to finish, hog operation. We have 50 dairy cattle and between 8,000 to 9,000 layer hens.

The public often thinks of Hutterite colonies maybe not only as big farms, but they think of them as big factory-sized barns, or big farms that have dug up all of the land around the neighbouring areas. And when they see the large manure storage tanks or slurries and lagoons, they generally think that there is a higher risk of
contamination. But whether you have a small
slurry or a big slurry, you still have to follow
the rules and regulations to apply manure,
according to the Manitoba regulations. And there
is a recent survey that was done recently by the
Canadian Government that states that larger
operations tend to be managed better than smaller
operations.

And just to use our colony as an
eexample about those factory-sized barns, or
factory farms, on a Hutterite colony we have more
than a few colonies. So on our colony, for
example, we only run 22 sows per family or five
per person. And we farm 116 acres per family or
26 acres per person. So we, actually, farm less
than a quarter section of land per family. So
Hutterite colonies are quite small, compared to
some of the privately owned farms, when you take
into account on a per family basis. Nowadays,
individual farmers will tell you that you need,
at least, 120 to 140 sows per family, or 600 to
800 acres of land, in order to turn a decent
profit.

I would just like to talk a little bit
about what we do on our colony for manure
management practices. We manage our manure in accordance with the Manitoba regulations. And to help us develop our manure disposal plans, we do hire a professional agrologist. In our case, it is Agri Trend Agrology Ltd, which is one of the most respected, not only this province, but in the prairie provinces. They do our soil analysis. And we apply manure according to their testing and their recommendations. We also hire commercial manure applicators so that we don't apply our manure ourselves. And they use GPS technology units that they put into it, and they apply the manure at the recommended rates. And with the GPS technology, there is no risk of over-application in any one area.

We also spend $60,000 to $70,000 for manure disposal, and to hire professional people that we feel we need to hire so that we follow the rules and regulations. Also, the manure that we use on our colony is worth $90 to $100 an acre, so it is something that we are not going to be able -- or we are not going to be out there and over-applying, because it is worth a lot of money to us. And we don't need to buy fertilizer when we use our manure on the farm.
So we also incorporate a product called Maxizyme Plus into our pig's feed to reduce phosphorous and ammonia levels into the manure. It is made by a company in Quebec called Numac. And they have done an incredible amount of research to prove its effectiveness. What Maxizyme is, it is a scientifically selected naturally occurring micro-organisms and microbial enzymes, which enhance fermentation in the pig's digestive system.

And maybe a lot of the audience knows when we have the breweries going through a fermentation process, in order to pull out all of the good ingredients out of the grains, in order to get the best product. So that's what's happening inside of the pig's digestive system is that product pulls more nutrients and more ingredients for the pig's use, so that it utilizes a lot more of the ingredients than it would otherwise. And where a pig would have used maybe three pounds of feed to gain one pound of body weight, it only needs two or two and a half pounds of feed now. So there you are using less feed and you are reducing the phosphorous level and the nitrogen and ammonia levels.
I just want to give you a little bit of an example. When we did apply for an application for the new barn, we had our town council, and nobody did object to us building the barn. But we had our reeve comment that the first year when we did apply manure, he said that we could smell it all the way to town. And in the last few years, he had said that you have virtually got to drive right by the field in order to smell that you are applying manure. So we do feel that we are doing a good job. And we are doing everything to ensure that the ammonia levels are under control.

By incorporating better manure management practices, and introducing innovative ways of reducing nutrient levels in manure, we are reducing the risk of nitrates, phosphorous and bacteria entering our surface and our groundwater systems. We have tested the water from two of our wells recently, and found that neither had any levels of nitrates and phosphorous and E. coli.

One well, in particular, is located about 50 feet from the river. We do have a river that runs right by a colony. And, generally, the public thinks that you've got all of the manure
running off into the rivers and into those
drainages. So we did do some tests. And we -- on
the farm, we have tested our water at least two to
four times a year to ensure that there is no
bacterias.

Another one of the wells happens to be
in an area which runs water from beneath the land
that has received manure for the last 35 to 40
years. These water supplies are very vital to the
life and the livelihood of our colony, and we do
care about the environment.

And to illustrate this, I would like
to point out to you that in the last four years,
Grass River Colony has spent over $600,000 to
store our manure and wastewater in accordance with
the provincial standards. This is over $5,000 for
every woman, man and child on the colony. A
recent report prepared by the Fraser Institute
said that it would cost Canadians about
$90 billion, or about $3,000 per Canadian, to
build or upgrade domestic wastewater treatment
systems to meet Canadian standards, but that
Canadians were reluctant to pay for this. This
demonstrates that the hog industry does care about
the environment. And we are willing to spend more
of our hard-earned dollars into protecting it than
the average Canadian does.

Looking at the economic perspective of
the hog industry in Manitoba, hog producers spend
over $450 million annually in feed costs, $205
million in fuels and hydro, $150 million in
building and building supplies, and $115 to $120
million in wages. The pork industry creates over
15,000 jobs in our province. Now, most of those
jobs are directly related to the hog industry. So
if we look at it, indirectly, you know, there
could be a lot more jobs that are involved in the
hog industry.

Manitoba hog producers have invested
$20 million in new technology and independent
environmental research. We also contribute over
$1 billion in our provincial economy. And it is
the largest source of farm cash of any
agricultural commodity in Manitoba. We are also
one of Canada's largest hog production and
pork-exporting provinces. Pork exports now
generate more money for the provincial economy
than Manitoba Hydro does to export sales of
electricity.

Manitoba hog producers are putting our
province on the export sales map because we are

gaining the reputation of consistently producing

high quality pork in an environmentally

sustainable and economically viable way. We

produce enough pork to meet our own needs, and do

not need to import, which is a good thing for

Manitobans, very important to Manitobans.

    In closing, I wish to leave you with a

short take-home message. We know a lot of farmers

invest their life-savings into those barns. And

they put every penny they have ever owned into

purchasing those farms. And the farmers spend 15

to 20 years of their lives to pay for those farms.

And so to say that they are intentionally going to

destroy the land, and their water quality, which

is the foundation of their livelihood, and of

their income, I think we need to realize that

farmers aren't going to destroy the land

intentionally after what they have put into what

they have.

    So I want to thank you, again, for

your time and for your support.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stahl.

MR. YEE: Yes. Mr. Stahl, you

mentioned in your presentation about the large
manure storage tanks. What size are your storage
tanks?

MR. STAHL: We have four and a half to
five million gallons.

MR. YEE: And is your operation --
what's your nearest neighbour to your colony?

MR. STAHL: I guess it would be about
a mile to a mile and a half from the colony.

MR. YEE: And the nearest town?

MR. STAHL: Would be Glenella, which
is four miles west of our colony.

MR. YEE: So have you had many odour
complaints?

MR. STAHL: To this day, I don't
recall one that we had, so I --

MR. YEE: In terms of your manure
application, you're injecting the manure? Are you
using the injection method to spread the manure?

MR. STAHL: Yes. Yes.

MR. YEE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stahl, you
mentioned that you use GPS, or the highest
technology, in applying your manure. Do you know
how widespread that is among larger operators?

MR. STAHL: I know that a lot of the
farmers in our area are trying to incorporate that idea a lot more, to hire somebody with the equipment, because it is more precise in what you are doing. And it is cheaper to hire them than to put up with the equipment that you have to buy and all of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know do custom applicators use GPS?

MR. STAHL: Absolutely they use GPS, yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Yes. Mr. Stahl, I meant to ask this question, and I forgot to, of the previous speaker, Mr. Gross. You both use Agritrend as your --

MR. STAHL: Agrologist.

MR. MOTHERAL: For your soil testing, et cetera, et cetera.

MR. STAHL: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: And Mr. Gross said that they chose to do the three samples: 0-6, 6-12, and 12-24 inches for each. That's the way -- I used to work in the Provincial Soil Testing Laboratory, and that was the way that all samples were taken. That's over and above. You don't really need to -- according to your manure plan,
you don't really need to do those three, do you?

What is the requirement of the Manure Management Plan?

MR. STAHL: If I could get Mr. Curtis to answer that for me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just identify yourself for the record, please?

MR. CURTIS: Ron Curtis. The requirements right now for manure analysis would be 0-24 inch sample. We split it so that we can trace the nitrogen and the phosphate to see whether it is leaching down, moving at all. We want to know where it is so that we can get better uptake.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that your company's practice?

MR. CURTIS: It is, too, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it common in the industry to do a similar thing?

MR. CURTIS: Common in the industry would be a 0-6 sample and then 6-24.

MR. MOTHERAL: Okay. Just another question on that same subject.

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: I know what they used
to cost. And I also know they are probably considerably more today. What does it cost for a soil sample?

MR. CURTIS: The ones that we run on all of our fields that we take, we do not -- it depends what you analyze for. We do not analyze just for nitrogen. N, P, K, S, we do a total analysis of all of the settlement, organic matter, nitrates. So the total analysis is approximately $160.

MR. MOTHERAL: That would be for a field?

MR. CURTIS: Per field. We would take 20 samples in the field, cores, make a composite sample of it, send that away for analysis.

MR. MOTHERAL: It used to be $6.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now you're showing your age.

MR. CURTIS: Things have changed.

MR. MOTHERAL: Well, that's a considerable amount. I know that there is a certain value to it that's higher than that, but it just surprises me that it's that high, the cost.

MR. CURTIS: We treat the manure the
same as fertilizer. We are trying to make the
best use of it as a nutrient source, not just as
manure.

MR. MOTHERAL: I understand that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Stahl.

Now that, brings us to the end of
people who have indicated that they wish to give a
presentation. Is there anybody else in the
audience who wishes to make a presentation this
afternoon? Well, we will adjourn, but we won't
leave, so that if anybody else arrives and wishes
to make a presentation, or one of you changes your
mind and would like to say something, please let
us know, and we will reconvene and hear you. We
will be resuming at 7:00 this evening. We have at
least one person who is registered to speak after
supper. Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS RECESSSED AT 3:25 P.M.
AND RECONVENED AT 7:08 P.M.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening. We will
come to order. We have one person, so far, who
has indicated that she wants to make a
presentation this evening. If there are any
others in the audience who would like to make a
presentation, please indicate after our first presenter. Kate Storey. Would you please name for the record?

MS. STOREY: I'm Kate Storey.

KATE STOREY, having been sworn, presents as follows:

MS. STOREY: First of all, I would like to apologize that I was a few minutes late. I had a bit of car trouble.

THE CHAIRMAN: No problem.

MS. STOREY: I am a hog farmer. I considered bringing along a piglet to prove that, but I thought that perhaps you would pay more attention to what I had to say if I didn't have a cute little pig running around here.

I am a hog farmer, but I don't run a factory farm. We raise pigs in shelters filled with straw. They are healthy because they spend lots of time outdoors playing pig games, like rooting up sod, wallowing in the mud or digging up straw piles. We sell weanlings, hogs and pork. We make about $10,000 a year doing that. This is a welcome addition to any diversified farm income.

The moratorium on the hog industry expansion does not affect operations like mine.
The moratorium only applies to barns that are big enough to threaten the health and welfare of the surrounding community. Farmers can still raise pigs, or expand their farms, or start new operations, as long as they stay below 300 animal units in size.

300 animal units is a lot of pigs. It could mean 300 sows or 2,000 hogs. 2,000 hogs, at an average price of $150, just a guess, just an estimate, and prices change, of course, at that price it would give a farmer a gross income of $300,000. That would be a quarter of a million dollars, and that should give a farmer a great income, right? Wrong! Factory farming is so inefficient that the farmer ends up with, according to my neighbour, about $20,000 in his pocket in a good year. And that is with high prices for hogs, low prices for grain, and only if the American dollar is high, and if interest rates stay low. That is all a lot to ask. Most years, $10,000 could be expected, and maybe $5,000, or even less for a year's work.

Last year it cost my neighbour about $70 to feed a hog to slaughter weight in an expensive, temperature controlled factory barn.
Due to the crowding and lack of sunlight, a variety of antibiotics and vitamins must be bought. There is the bill for power and all that water to keep the manure flowing. Also, the interest rates or the interest payments on that state-of-the-art barn. I would invite the Commission to get up-to-date costs from one of the intensive barn owners that will be appearing before this Commission. I imagine you may have done so.

That 300 animal unit operation, with a three quarter million dollar mortgage, and a leaking manure lagoon, averages $5 to $10 profit per hog, according to my neighbour. I have heard that 2006 was a good year and profits were up to an average of $11 a hog on provincial averages. That was last year, I understand, and pork prices are falling rapidly today.

In contrast, a straw-based operation, like mine, expends more on feed costs. My pigs are more active and spend at least part of each day outside, even in winter, so they eat more. I estimate that we use $100 of grain to feed a hog to slaughter weight. But that is almost all we spend. No antibiotics, no vitamins. Maybe a
dollar per pig for straw to fill an old shelter that we got for free. A bit for an old building and heat-lamps to shelter winter-born piglets. No loan payments or shareholders to pay. At most, we spend $120 to raise a hog. And the meat is worth more. A naturally raised hog gets $50 to $100 premium over factory-fed pork. What this means is that only 100 to 200 naturally raised hogs are needed to make profits comparable to that 2,000 hog barn.

So it confuses me when I hear factory farm operators complaining that the moratorium will put them out of the pig business. It also confuses me to hear them say they must constantly expand in order to break even. Why would they want to increase their investment in an industry that is putting itself out of business?

And why should our society sacrifice water quality just to expand an inefficient industrial hog industry?

The environmental impacts of concentrated hog manure are well known. Many people are arguing about the source of the contamination in Lake Winnipeg. It's impossible to be sure how much comes from human sewage and
how much comes from the hog manure. However, the hog industry is the only nutrient source that has expanded. Manitoba’s human population is certainly not growing. There are almost the same 1.2 million people in Manitoba today, and therefore, the same amount of toilet use, as there was a decade ago.

There are a lot more pigs, though. There are seven million more pigs today than there were in the nineties, if I read the statistics right, and four to five times as much hog manure leaching into the water. Is it strange, then, that the increase of hog numbers parallels the increase in phosphate concentrations in Lake Winnipeg?

Manure can be a valuable asset when mixed with straw on my farm, but it becomes a toxic liability when too much liquid manure is spread on too little land. There are many who will present evidence of the damage caused by too much manure. They will also speak about contaminated wells, rising asthma rates, declining property values, terrible working conditions and, of course, all of that algae in Lake Winnipeg.

The municipal councillors will try to
counter all of this with stories of all of the
taxes that can be made on these barns. But of
what value are higher tax revenues if they come at
the expense of public health? What good are
higher taxes during an outbreak of E. coli from
contaminated wells? What good are higher taxes if
Lake Winnipeg is too contaminated for drinking or
swimming or fishing?

It doesn't have to be this way.

Farmers can farm. Farmers can make a living
raising pigs without keeping them in industrial
factory barns.

I would like this Commission to
consider the whole picture when examining a hog
industry in Manitoba. What future is there for
factory farming? There are a lot of indications
that the hog industry is in for a rough time for
the next decade, or even longer.

Grain prices are rising. This is not
one of the usual market fluctuations, but a
reaction to a whole new demand for feed grains.
Ethanol production is using up an awful lot of pig
feed, and promises to make hog farming
unprofitable for the foreseeable future. Why
would a hog farmer want to take on more debt when
profits are dropping?

And that's not all. Many pigs are sold to the U.S. The falling American dollar makes Manitoba pigs increasingly difficult to sell. It also drives up the interest rates on those state-of-the-art hog barn loans. As well, industrial farming, including hog factories, are highly dependent on fossil fuels. As the U.S. loses control of Middle East oil supplies, our fuel prices have nowhere to go but up, putting still more pressure on hog production.

Any hog barn that starts up under these negative economic conditions is likely to fail.

I believe that the hog moratorium is a blessing in disguise to the hog industry. It will stop the industry from over-expanding at a time when we are heading toward long-term economic challenges. Additional growth would not only increase the risks to health and environment, but it would also weaken the existing industry and the economy of Manitoba. I believe that the Manitoba Provincial Department of Conservation was wise to implement a moratorium on the expansion of the industrial hog industry. And I hope that the
Manitoba Clean Environment Commission recommends extending that moratorium indefinitely, for our health, for our environment, and for our economy. Nine million hogs is enough.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Storey. And, if your numbers are correct, I find it totally astounding that these large hog operation factories are operating at such a small margin.

MS. STOREY: That information comes from the net profits from the Manitoba government websites. They are net profits for the hog industry in 2006. Maybe there is some large hog barn owners here that might be able to clarify that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that there are this evening.

MS. STOREY: That is generally it, you know.

MR. PAVELIN: But I believe it. That's why there is mass hog barns because the margin is small, one leads to the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, if you are netting about $10,000 on your very small
operation, and some of these aren't doing that much better with 1,000, that sounds like it might be a shaky business.

MS. STOREY: I sell hogs for $250 each.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. STOREY: I sell sides of pork for, you know --

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you sell, obviously, to some kind of a niche market?

MS. STOREY: I sell direct to consumers.

THE CHAIRMAN: You sell direct to consumers?

MS. STOREY: And direct to consumers, I can make $60 on a pig. And you have to take costs off of that. But that's the same as Maple Leaf is taking.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many hogs do you run?

MS. STOREY: I have, right now, six sows. I average about 19 weanlings per sow per year.

THE CHAIRMAN: 19 weanlings.

MS. STOREY: Per sow per year.
THE CHAIRMAN: What age do you sell them?

MS. STOREY: We keep some to full slaughter weight. We sell some as weanlings. And it also depends on the price of grain. I think this year a lot more are going to be sold as weanlings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it sounds like, compared to the size of your operation, you are doing exceedingly well.

MS. STOREY: We are not the only ones. If you just want to be a pig farmer, it is possible. My message is that it is possible to be a pig farmer if you want to get income from that. I'm hearing messages from the industrial hog industry that, you know, this moratorium is not allowing people to be pig farmers, and I just don't agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you said that you mix your manure with the straw. Do you compost it?

MS. STOREY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you do with your manure?

MS. STOREY: Compost it and then
spread it on the fields.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edwin?

MR. YEE: Yes. Ms. Storey, just for clarification here, you noted that the average for these larger hog producing operations is $5 to $10 profit per hog. What are you averaging on your farm for profit per hog?

MS. STOREY: Depending on if we can sell it direct or not, $75 average.

MR. YEE: And you mentioned that you compost your manure. Do you spread it on your own crops?

MS. STOREY: On our own crops, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne?

MR. MOTHERAL: Just for clarification on the one statement:

"The 300 animal unit operation with a three quarter million dollar mortgage, and a leaking manure lagoon averages $5 to $10 per hog."

Are you talking about one you know of or is that in general?

MS. STOREY: That information would have been given to me by Elite Swine. I called them up, because I'm a hog farmer, and I asked:
What would it cost for me to put -- at the time it was 292 animal unit barn? One of my neighbours, not real close, but six miles away had just built an Elite Swine barn, 202 animal units. And they gave me the figures. The figures were for a $750,000 loan. They had it all figured out, as far as the profits to expect. Their pigs in, their feed in. I would pay the labour.

My loan would cover the construction of a barn at those prices that year, and the manured lagoon. And their sales pitch to me was $10,000 profit per year, assuming I got -- I raised healthy pigs. But they controlled, you know, the pigs and the feed.

The next year that cost was down. And this year, according to the Manitoba statistics, the cost is up. But they are all ranging within the values that I recorded there.

MR. MOTHERAL: Maybe you misunderstood my question. I realize the $5 to $10 profit per hog. But just before that you said "and a leaking manure lagoon".

MS. STOREY: Okay, the leaking manure lagoon came from discussions with Lawrence Manchur. He is in the Department of Agriculture.
I think it was Lawrence. There are several
Manchurs.

Anyway, I called up the Department.
And I asked them, at the time, manure leakage from
lagoons was being discussed in the community. And
what he indicated to me was that an inch and a
half leakage was expected and from any clay-lined
manure lagoon, that was allowable and expected.
That is an inch and a half for the whole area of
the lagoon.

At the time, I figured out how many
gallons that was. It was quite a few. But I
don't remember that number. And we were concerned
because there was barns going up, and they were
possibly infringing on the aquifers in the area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Elite Swine told you
that you could expect a profit of $10,000 for 292
animal unit operation?

MS. STOREY: That's what they told me.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would have been a
farrow operation?

MS. STOREY: No, hogs. They would
bring weanlings in and finished hogs out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MR. MOTHERAL: I don't think so. I
was just wanting to clarify that. It is just that
I didn't know whether you meant that most lagoons
leak or did you have to have a leaking lagoon to
make $5 or $10 profit per hog?

MS. STOREY: No. I meant leaking
lagoons, that they are expected to leak.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
Ms. Storey. This is not an argument we've heard
before in our hearings. It is nice to hear a
different perspective, so thank you very much for
coming out tonight.

MS. STOREY: Well, thank you very much
for taking your time to come out here and for
listening to me.

MR. PAVELIN: Can I make a comment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Come up to a mike right
here, please, sir? Would you just introduce
yourself and where you're from and feel free to
make a comment?

MR. PAVELIN: I'm George Pavelin. I'm
from Dauphin here. I'm just a grain farmer. I
want to make a few comments. The water that is
polluted anywhere in the world travels around the
world, and it is pollution all over, the same with
the air. So this pollution has got to do with the
whole world. I can clean up my act, but the big picture would mean nothing. If they can drill in the ice up north, and for each year they can see what pollution is in that ice.

I just got a comment on dugouts. There is so many dugouts in Manitoba, all over Canada. They are not fenced. And the herd of cattle go out there in the summer, where they drink they urinate and they crap. And this is going into the water. And the chances are that these dugouts are connected to underground streams. And the man down the road, or the ten farmers down the road, wonder why today their wells are contaminated? How come that's not all cleaned up? I mean, this is so obvious. That's just one comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. PAVELIN: Because I see these dugouts all over the place, and they are not fenced. And you've got community pastures. And the government talks the talk, but it doesn't walk the walk. They are just as bad as the private guy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a good question, but not in the mandate of this current
MR. PAVELIN: I just wanted to make a comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, what was your last name again?

MR. PAVELIN: Pavelin.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pavelin, P-A-V-E-L-I-N?

MR. PAVELIN: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody else wish to make a comment or a presentation this evening? Well, that would bring our hearings here in Dauphin to a close, then. Thank you all for coming out. Some of you were here this afternoon as well. We will adjourn. We resume our hearings on April 10th, I believe, in Whitemouth is the next hearing. So thank you all and good night.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 7:30 P.M.)
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