Background on Issues Relating to the CWB

CWB a barrier to Value-Added processing

Minister Ritz repeatedly states that the elimination of the single-desk will open the door to value-added processing in Western Canada. The October 18, 2011 Agriculture and Agri-food news release introducing the Marketing Freedom for Grains Farmers Act promises that an “open market will attract investment, encourage innovation, and create value-added jobs”. The role of the CWB in encouraging value-added processing continues to be misunderstood. The difference is encouraging value-added in a manner that is positive to farmers without modifying the domestic pricing policy/structure to stimulate value-added at the expense of lower farm gate returns.

- The marketing system does not influence production or act as a barrier to value-added processing on the Prairies. Growth in value-added processing occurs because of demand, whether for export or domestic end-use. Value added is not determined by the marketing system.

- The CWB plays an important role in bringing price discipline to the domestic market, that is, millers cannot "bid down" the posted daily price for Western Canadian wheat. Through this discipline, the CWB is able to ensure producers benefit by collecting the maximum available premium for wheat and durum from the market place for the pool accounts, to be shared by all producers.

- The CWB mill price is guided by North American Hard Red Spring wheat values which provide market price transparency to all buyers. This includes anyone who wishes to build a mill or pasta facility. Individual producers and grain companies cannot compete through price discounting to execute mill or malting business.

- Farmers have been delivering directly to mills and maltsters for years. Producers can negotiate directly with the end-processor for reduced handling, elevation and cleaning charges as well as benefit from potential trucking incentives.

- Wheat and durum, which are naturally heavy products, load in bulk easily and can travel long distances relatively inexpensively and store well.

Each commodity faces a different business case and economics. As such, they must be examined separately. Oats, canola, durum wheat, wheat and malting barley are examined below.

Oats

While there have been positive developments in the oats industry over time, the following factors are the major reasons for growth in domestic oat processing and exports:

- Since the removal of the CWB single-desk marketing authority in 1989, there has been significant growth in oat exports to the United States. Significant declines in U.S. oat production is the primary cause. U.S. government support for oats has declined relative to support for other crops (e.g. , soybeans, corn, wheat, barley). In 1982, U.S. farmers harvested 10.3 million acres of oats. By 2004, harvested acres had decreased to less than 1.8 million acres.

- The shipping of bulk oats from the Prairies to destination is very costly. Oats are processed close to the source of the raw product, as roughly 35 to 40 per cent of the raw oat volume is comprised of the hull and is of relative little commercial value. Raw oats are bulky and expensive to ship on a per tonne basis. Value-added processing located at the source of the raw material close to its source offers freight and manufacturing advantages.

- The Canada-U.S. free trade agreement (CUSTA) resulted in the elimination of tariffs on oat products. U.S. tariffs on oat products in 1988 were about $18 per tonne and these were gradually reduced to zero. The removal of tariffs on oat products increased the attractiveness of Canadian oat products to U.S. buyers and contributed significantly to the expansion of oat processing in Western Canada.

- The removal of the Western Grain Transportation Act (WGTA) transportation subsidy in 1995 also increased the economic incentive to process oats on the Prairies by reducing the cost of the raw product for Western Canadian processors. The elimination of this subsidy eliminated the artificial incentive to ship oats to terminal position for export.

- There has been a significant increase in the perception of consumers that oat products have positive health benefits. This has increased demand for oat products. The amount of oats used for human food purposes has more than doubled from the 1985-1989 period.

Canola

- The same processing and logistics factors that apply to oats also apply to canola, making canola ideal for processing near where the crop is grown. Only 42 per of canola's weight is the high value oil. The balance is relatively low value meal and by-products.

- Worldwide demand growth for wheat has not kept pace with the increase in soybean/oilseed demand. This inevitably has contributed to increased oilseed production. For example, in the mid-90s, China imported virtually no soybeans. China is importing almost 60 million tonnes today. High demand for oilseeds has also meant that canola prices generally exceed spring wheat prices.

- The U.S. renewable fuel standard and various other supports for the U.S. biofuel industry has resulted in increased demand for crops used in biofuel production, particularly corn.

Malting Barley

- Malt capacity in Western Canada has almost tripled in the last 20 years and now accounts for over 75 per cent of domestic capacity. In contrast, U.S. malting capacity has declined.

- Canada processes three times more malting barley per capita than the U.S and malt exports are about twice as much as the United States. The U.S. exports are primarily to Mexico for which they have an advantage. Canada exports more than 10 times the malting barley as United States.

- The decision by the International Malting Co. (IMC) to locate their malting facility in Great Falls, Montana a few years ago instead of Western Canada (Camrose, Kindersley and other sites were explored) had no connection to the CWB. Instead, IMC built the Great Falls plant to serve the Southern U.S. market. Rail freight for malt from Camrose to California would be about US$25/tonne more than from Great Falls. There were also water supply concerns at the Canadian Locations.

- IMC received US$10-15 million in government subsidies (water, sewer, road, rail spur, tax breaks) which was the main reason for locating in Montana.

Durum

- Wheat and durum are naturally heavy products, load in bulk easily, store well and can travel long distances at a relatively inexpensive cost.

- Western Canada has nearly 40 per cent of Canadian durum milling capacity while North Dakota (ND) has 29 per cent of U.S. milling capacity. In ND, there are 5 durum mills with capacity of 36,000 cwts (or hundred weights) and in Western Canada there are currently 4 durum mills with 11,725 cwts capacity.

- The pasta plants in the U.S. were built with government incentives including favourable tax treatment, and various level of governments grants and subsidies.

- While exporting over 60,000 tonnes of pasta in 2010, Canada imported 190,000 tonnes of pasta in the same year. Consumers unfortunately favour imported pasta, although Canada continues to produce high-quality pasta products domestically. This trend can be attributed to the low price for U.S. pasta imports and a cultural preference for Italian pasta by consumers.

- The CWB sells roughly 650,000 tonnes to the U.S. annually, which amounts to 30 per cent of the durum ground for pasta. This trend clearly indicates that CWB pricing of durum is competitive to processors and that CWB pricing is not a factor in the processor determining the best location for their processing plant.

- On Oct. 7, 2011, Alliance Grain Traders (AGT) announced a pasta plant in Regina, SK. AGT's business model includes a model that looks to source directly from producers for lower prices. "Margin erosion is combated by negotiating lower prices from growers" (p. 9, AGT 2010 annual report)

Wheat

- Canadian exports of wheat-based products have increased 25 per cent over the last 10 years. This trend continued to increase in 2010 despite the negative impact of the strong Canadian dollar on all manufactured goods.

- In 2010, wheat-based product exports totalled 960,000 tonnes. This compares to 901,000 tonnes in 2009 and to 767,000 tonnes in 2001. This means that in 2010, slightly more than 40 per cent of all wheat ground in Canadian mills was ultimately exported from Canada in the form of value-added product.

- Canadian milling capacity has grown close to 10 per cent over the past decade.Canadian milling capacity in 2011 is 10, 975 tonnes of flour per day (14,630 tonnes of wheat). This compares to 2010 at 10,695 tonnes of flour (14,435 tonnes of wheat). Ten years ago, flour capacity was 10,013 tonnes of flour (13,350 tonnes of wheat). In Western Canada, milling capacity for the 19 mills is 4,085 tonnes per day.

This compares to 15 mills and 3,653 tonnes per day ten years ago. An increase of four mills and 11.8 per cent in milling capacity.

- U.S. milling capacity has decreased over the ten years, by 2.8 per cent and the number of mills has reduced from 200 in 2001 to 167 in 2011. The milling capacity of the six Northern-tier states has increased nine per cent and the number of mills has remained static.

- There is a small quantity of low quality flour imports into Canada. Imports of flour were 77,000 tonnes in 2010 compared to 92,600 tonnes in 2009. The major import market in Canada is located primarily in Southern Ontario and Quebec. Flour imports reported were valued at C$37 million or C$477.14 per tonne. The reported value of flour imports is C$110/tonne below the reported value of Canadian flour exports.

CWB Producer Plebiscite
The CWB decision to hold a plebiscite was made after it became clear that the Minister for the CWB would neither provide farmers the opportunity to vote, nor consult with them on the future. The *CWB Act (Article 47.1)* states that to *"exclude any kind, type, class or grade or wheat or barley"* from the single-desk the Minister must consult with the CWB board, and that "*the producers of grain have voted in favour of the exclusion*".

Results were announced September 12, 2011. The results were: 62 per cent of wheat producers and 51 per cent of barley producers voted to retain the CWB single desk. Voter turnout was 56 per cent, despite the Minister for the CWB repeatedly telling farmers that the vote did not matter.

- MNP, a third-party coordinator, was hired to manage the process and to ensure legitimacy and credibility of the results.

- The voter list was selected to capture producers that were actively involved in the production of wheat and barley, and to mirror, as closely as possible, the CWB Act and the regulations governing board of director elections. It incorporated changes made by the Minister of the CWB to CWB board of director elections and elements of the Federal government 2007 plebiscite on barley.

- The two option question was supported by the general farm groups in all Prairie Provinces in 2007, as well as the National Farmers Union and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

- The CWB board of directors repeatedly pledged that they would honour the results of the plebiscite, elevating the process from a glorified survey. The cost to administer and advertise the plebiscite was more than half the $1.2 million the federal government spent on advertisement alone in their 2007 plebiscite.

- The CWB board listened to farmers, and was prepared to respect their wishes no matter how they voted. Would the Minister for the CWB have respected the results and process, if farmers voted to support his and Prime Minister Harper's agenda?

- The requirements were fair and credible, with care given to provide all producers of wheat and barley a voice. Ballots were mailed to farmers who had an *active* CWB permit in the past two crop years and *deliveries* in the past five years. CWB and MNP audits of the list removed all multiple land holders and producers with no deliveries from the original list. If a farmer was *recently* deceased and the CWB was not notified, their estate may have received a ballot

- The Canadian democratic system is based on the principle of majority-rule. This is evidenced throughout the system whether it is a vote by quorum at a provincial commodity group annual meeting, provincial marketing plans that cover non-board commodities, or most obviously in supply-managed commodities. This is not about individual property rights and it never has been. If it was, why doesn't the government apply its ideology to supply management? What makes a grain famer any different from an egg farmer? Why does a double standard exist?

  The Federal Conservatives govern with roughly 40 per cent of the popular vote and roughly a 60 per cent turn-out. This is equivalent of only 24% of eligible voters that supported the conservative platform. In this context, the plebiscite result for wheat was 56 per cent turnout with 62 per cent support provides a far more convincing mandate.

- A general election is a vote on *numerous* different policies and ideologies (i.e. long-gun registry, crime, social welfare… etc) It is not a vote on one issue, as the Government claims. The CWB board of directors is composed of 10 elected board of directors- eight of which who have been democratically elected by farmers on a pro-single desk mandate.

- In the current Government's 2007 plebiscite, a five year production range was also included. Farmers were required to have produced barley at least one year from 2002 to 2006. The CWB plebiscite required farmers to have delivered grain (which ensures production) once in the last five years.

Farmer and CWB consultations
The government has stated that it has consulted with farmers on the proposed legislative change. Given the monumental and irreversible changes the Government has proposed, farmers- the individuals most impacted by the change- have not been thoroughly consulted.

- What has been the nature of the government's consultations?

- The Government makes no secret of their favouritism to two groups in particular- the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association (WCWGA) and the Western Barley Growers Association (WBGA). The WCWGA and WBGA are the main source of information, repeatedly quoted in the government's public relations campaign. They were featured at their October 16, 2011 closed-door speech outlining why the Harper Government is proceeding with the legislation and quoted in the October 19, 2011 question period as supportive of the government's legislation. In 2009, the WCGA testified before the Standing Committee on Agriculture that their organization was comprised of less than 1000 members (two tier membership: farmers and agri-business).).In fact, their lobby registration form indicates that they are or will be receiving money from the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan in the current financial year. Are they truly representing farmers?

- The Grain Growers of Canada is composed of both the WCWGA and WBGA, and has no direct farmer membership despite boasting that it represents over 80,000 farmers on the Prairies.

- The Minister for the CWB has visited the CWB (despite numerous requests) only once since taking office, and it was to tell the board that legislation was being changed and that they better come up with a plan. The CWB board of directors invited the Minister to its last meeting October 12 and 13 in Winnipeg, but he was unable to attend.

- The premise of marketing freedom is in fact an ideological crusade being waged by Prime Minister Harper. Farmers have voted through a democratic process to retain the CWB as their chosen marketing instrument, both by electing pro single-desk board of directors and voting in favour of maintaining the single-desk in the plebiscite.

Requirements for a successful CWB
With the help of KPMG, the CWB outlined six key business requirements critical to the success of a new organization. The CWB shared the requirements with Minister Ritz in July 2011 and is still awaiting feedback. These requirements were:

1) **Capital/equity.** Government would need to contribute sufficient capital in the order of magnitude of $225 million, to finance grain inventories and conduct business operations. Under the circumstances and given the proposed timelines, it would not be possible for a new entity to raise equity from the private sector.

2) **Financing/borrowing.** Government would need to provide guarantees of borrowings by the new entity for a period of at least five years. In addition to a base level of equity, a new entity would require debt financing. It would not be possible for a new entity to access debt financing without government guarantees, given that any new entity would have no business track record to provide comfort to lenders.

3) **Risk management.** Government would need to provide a risk reserve in the order of magnitude of $200 million to replace its current guarantees of initial payments that are made to farmers (payments made before sales returns have been fully generated). A risk reserve would be necessary to enable a new entity to offer price pooling to farmers with initial payments that could attract sufficient grain deliveries.

4) **Ownership structure.** Government would need to act as the initial owners of a new entity with a share-capital structure. Under the circumstances, and in view of the short timeframes, a new entity would be unable to operate under any other ownership structure. An appropriate exit strategy would have to be put in place to enable the government to divest its shares in a new entity in due course.

5) **Access to country and port grain terminals.** Government would need to ensure regulated access to grain-handling facilities to ensure competitively priced access with service levels that would enable third parties to effectively compete.

6) **Export access.** Government would need to provide a new entity with regulatory authority to direct its own grain to port terminals of its choosing.

Taskforce on Marketing Freedom
Created in July 2011, the purpose of the working group was to make recommendations to Minister Ritz on the future of the grain marketing and transportation system. Membership of the group was limited to Government officials from Agriculture and Agri-food and Transport Canada, as well as industry representatives from various commodity groups, the Canadian International Grains Institute and the Canadian Grains Commission. The report was publically released September 28, 2011.

- The CWB declined an offer to co-chair the task force. This decision was made after it was clear that the terms of reference did not focus on farmers nor facilitate a real discussion on the future of grain marketing in Western Canada. Nevertheless, the CWB served as a resource to the working group and provided information on aspects of the current system and the implications of changes.

- It was not an “extensive consultation” with farmers. There was no farm representation on the board. The government refused to include the Keystone Agriculture Producers (Manitoba), the Wild Rose Agriculture Producers (Alberta) and the Agriculture Producers Association of Saskatchewan (APAS), key farm groups representing wheat and barley farmers, in the working group. This lack of farmer representation is evident in the report.

- The final report lacked any serious or in-depth analysis on the impact of the proposed change and the report recommendations.

Australian Wheat Board

The transition from a single-desk to an open market occurred over a period of two decades (compared to 5 years), beginning in 1989 with the removal of the single-desk from domestic sales and terminating in 2008 with the removal of the Australian Wheat Board single-desk on bulk wheat exports.

Farmers were consulted at various stages over the two decades, ultimately deciding to privatize the AWB and move to a share-holder controlled entity to generate additional capital. Shares were issued to both private investors and Australian farmers, maintaining a certain degree of control of the new organization. Farmer shares were eventually eliminated and, today, the AWB has been purchased and is operated by Cargill.

- Despite the assurances from the Australian Trade Minister at the Cairns Groups meeting in Saskatoon and some in the Australian wheat industry, much uncertainty remains and farmers are still struggling to adjust.

- Australia has, and continues to experience various bottlenecks in their supply chain. Australian producers have struggled to deliver their grain to receivable sites at harvest and the bulk handlers, through various means, have held producers captive to their handling and transportation systems.

Natural monopolies

- Three regional grain handling (not marketing) monopolies control the export of Australian export products. The government imposed regulatory oversight (regulated access, access agreements) to secure independent exporters' competitive access to storage facilities, transportation and port services. Currently, South Australia and Victoria are reviewing the performance of their regional bulk handlers for lack of performance and restrictions to port access.

- Viterra is currently under investigation by a Federal Senate standing committee for their poor service to farmers. Viterra was recently forced to change the way it allocates shipping periods to competitors, as the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission found that they were limiting competitor access to deep water ports during the peak shipping season.

- Of the 29 accredited exporters that ship grain from Australia, be it in bulk or containerized shipment, four companies control over 80 per cent of the Australian wheat export market. The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission is constantly reviewing and monitoring access agreements for conditions of non-competitiveness.

Voluntary pooling

- Australian farmers have minimal on-farm storage, and pooling eases storage pressure. In Australia, roughly 20 per cent of wheat is pooled and 80 per cent is cash-bought. On-farm storage is increasing in Australia, as farmers look to prevent the need to deliver at harvest as congestion and low prices prevail.

- While voluntary pooling exists in Australia crops, it isn't successfully transferable to Canada. Canadian on-farm storage is common and farmers are very familiar with cash marketing. Farmers will commit to the pool in a falling market and choose to sell their grain on the open market when prices are strong.

Increasing Wheat Acres in Australia

- The recent increase in wheat acres and production is independent of the marketing structure, and not because of the elimination of the single-desk. Acres in the 2011 crop year have increased 30 per cent since 2006 and 2007. The 2006 and 2007 crop years (prior to deregulation) were record drought years in Australia and, therefore, skew the baseline scenario for comparison. Acreage increased since deregulation because:
  - global wheat prices resulted in an increase in all major wheat cropping areas;
  - Australia suffered its largest drought in the 2006 and 2007 crop years, and
  - Australian sheep decreased and pasture was converted to cropland.

Industry good services and declining quality in Australian grain exports

- Previous to 2008, industry good functions, such as market development, branding, promotion, quality control, were provided or funded directly by the AWB. There was a lack of coordination of these important functions during the period following deregulation and as a result, gaps and overlap emerged.

- Concerns among international customers and Australian farm groups have been raised regarding the deteriorating reputation and quality of Australian wheat exports, raising the question of whether the increase in Australian exports has been a benefit or an expense.

Agriculture marketing structures

Ontario and Quebec wheat marketing

- Ontario farmers *voted* to transition the Ontario Wheat Producers Marketing Board (now Grain Farmers of Ontario) from a single-desk to an open market. It was farmers' decision through their board of directors, not the government.

- Quebec recently voted to establish a single-desk for marketing wheat. The vote to establish a wheat marketing board was made through a democratic process set-out through their provincial farm product marketing act.

- Leveling the playing fields in Western Canada and Ontario, as promised by the government, ignores the realities that make grain industry in each of these regions unique. Compared to farmers in Ontario, western Canadian farmers export a much greater proportion of their grain production. This means that a single-desk marketing organization has much greater potential to create value for farmers in Western Canada than is the case in Ontario.

Canadian marketing boards

- Farmers' ability to come together and collectively market their product is core to many of the agriculture groups and marketing boards across Canada. For example, in Ontario, 60 per cent of all agricultural products are marketed through 21 different producer directed marketing boards. Farmers have come together to exert increased market power and control over their production through controlling various aspects of marketing and industry advocacy.

Alberta Bean Pool

- There is no available evidence that the Alberta Bean Pool is successful. There is no website or information available other than to talk to a Viterra representative.

Western Canadian Acreage

- Analysis of western Canadian farm acreage since 1990 reveals two obvious trends:
  - a significant increase in canola acres, and
  - a decline in spring wheat acres.

- There have been two significant changes to the grain industry which have led to the shift in Western Canada's crop acreage. First, from the mid-1980 to the mid-1990 wheat prices were negatively influenced by the effects of a subsidy war between the U.S. and European Union. Second, the removal of transportation subsidies in 1995 raised producer shipping costs for transport from local elevators to export position. This increase in shipping costs resulted in lower farm gate grain prices and lower rates of return for Prairie grain and oilseed producers. Farmers quickly recognized that in order to continue operating in the new environment, they would have to alter their production patterns. Production on the Prairies shifted towards higher valued export crops (canola) and grains used domestically as livestock feed.

- Farmers in Western Canada are not the only ones to reduce wheat acreage. Similar declines have also occurred in the United States, where farmers focus increasingly on higher return alternatives, including corn and soybeans.

Ontario Acreage

- Ontario wheat acreage has been trending higher for many years, even prior to the opening of their wheat market. Some of this has been driven by declines in the tobacco industry. In comparison to western Canada, a much more significant proportion of Ontario's wheat production comes from lower quality winter wheat varieties and therefore acreage responds to different market dynamics and agronomic factors, including planting conditions in fall when winter crops are seeded.

The Economy

- The current government should actually be concerned with the current state of the economy; instead, they are announcing subsidies to the port of Churchill and will be forced to increase the amount of subsidies through crop insurance and other agricultural safety nets in the future.

- The government has conducted no analysis on the impact this decision will have on farmers' bottom line or rural economies. The government is spending taxpayer money to get rid of an organization that the majority of farmers support. The government is reducing farmers' marketing power and transferring it to large multinational corporations. It is clear the government is not interested in the health of the prairie economy, as they continue down the path of handing over wealth and power to corporations.

Transportation

Producer cars and Shortline railways

- Farmers who load producer cars save $1,000 to $1,500 on elevation and cleaning costs per car shipped. In an open market, railways and the grain companies will control the movement of western Canadian grain. Neither would have any incentive to facilitate the use of producer cars, looking instead to drive grain through local grain handling facilities and avoid risk of taking possession at Port.

- As the use of producer cars declines, so would the viability of locally owned shortline railways. Without an alternative business model, more shortlines would be forced out of the market.

The Port of Churchill

- The CWB is able to use the Port of Churchill to minimize transportation costs for farmers in Western Canada.

- The CWB, in most years, is the sole agricultural shipper through the Port of Churchill. Overall, CWB grains account for an average of 95 per cent of shipments through the Port. In an open market, private companies will have little incentive (without government subsidization) to use the Port of Churchill as they now own port facilities at the West Coast and along the St. Lawrence.

Levelling the playing field

- Western Canada's grain marketing system is often viewed with envy by farmers in other countries for its ability to effectively compete in the global grain market. Despite trade concerns from competing countries, the CWB has always been found to be a fair trader under the existing laws which govern world trade.

  "Capitalizing on their export monopoly and captive producers, the CWB can and does offer different prices in different markets."

  "The US wheat industry commends the US trade negotiators for inclusion of the elimination of export State Trading Enterprises (STEs) in the current Doha draft modalities. This is quite possibly the single most important market access barrier to free and fair US wheat trade and would be a major achievement."

  US Wheat Associates Submission to USTR
  November 18, 2009

  This is perhaps the key item in leveling the playing field for US exports around the world. Tariff reductions, market access measures, etc. all go a long way but the single most important action to come out of the multilateral WTO process would be the elimination of export STEs."

  United States Trade Representative 2009 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers

- The elimination of the advantage famers in Western Canada have without any concessions from competing countries, the government is acting outside the best interests of farmers.

- The CWB is an organization operated by farmers for farmers giving them the ability to offset some of the market power that would otherwise be held by the grain companies and railways. By removing it, the playing field will tilted against them.

Current Elected CWB Directors Representing Saskatchewan Farmers

District 3 Stewart Wells (elected)
Stewart was born and raised on a family farm near Swift Current, SK. He and his partner Terry Toews co-own and operate the third generation farm, with the majority of acres seeded to organic red spring wheat, winter wheat, peas and lentils. Stewart has a Degree in Agricultural Engineering from the University of Saskatchewan. He served as a farmer-delegate to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. He was elected to the national board of the National Farmers Union for 12 years, including serving for eight years as its President. Stewart has also served as an advisor to the board of the Canadian Agri-Food Policy Institute and has sat on numerous provincial and national committees related to marketing, trade and safety nets.
Swift Current, SK
Tel: (306) 773-6852
E-mail: stewart_wells@cwb.ca

District 4 Bill Woods (elected)
Bill was born and raised on the family farm near Eston, SK, where he and his wife Cindy still reside. He was a key organizer of the first ever producer car unit train and a founding member of the West Central Road & Rail Ltd.
Eston, SK
Tel: (306) 962-4477
Fax: (306) 962-4222
E-mail: boxcarwilly@hotmail.com

District 5 Allen Oberg, CWB Chair (elected)
Allen and his brother, John, run a grain and cattle operation near Forestburg, AB. He began working for Alberta Wheat Pool in 1976 before starting to farm full-time in 1980, but continued his association with the Alberta Wheat pool as a delegate in 1986. He was elected to the Board of Directors in 1990, and remained on the board until the Agricore-United Grain Growers merger in 2001. For the past two years, he has served on the federal Minister's Advisory Committee on Co-operatives.
Forestburg, AB
Tel: (780) 582-2171 (daytime)
Tel: (780) 582-2271 (evenings)
Fax: (780) 582-4127
E-mail: allen_oberg@cwb.ca

District 6 Cam Goff (elected)
Cam farms a family-run operation of 5,000 acres near Hanley, SK, and grows malt barley, canola, spring and winter wheat, durum, oats, flax, peas, mustard, lentils and chickpeas. He and his wife, Beverley, also operate an agricultural supply business.
Hanley, SK
Tel: (306) 544-2790
E-mail: trailbreak@sasktel.net

District 7 Kyle Korneychuk (elected)
Kyle and his wife Susan operate grain farms in the Pelly and Stenen, SK areas. Kyle is a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan and holds a B. Sc. in chemistry. He has been involved in numerous farm and community organizations, including Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Borage Growers Group and Prairie Alliance for the Future. In addition to Kyle's farming experience, he has been employed in the mining industry and in government. He has represented both provincial and federal governments on national agriculture and environment committees.
Pelly, SK
Tel: (306) 595-2094
Fax: (306) 595-4545
Email: kylekorneychuk1@sasktel.net

District 8 Rod Flaman (elected)
Rod farms with his wife Jeanne just south of the Qu'Appelle Valley near Edenwold, SK. They produce a variety of field and horticultural crops, including certified organic grain. Educated at the University of Saskatchewan, Rod has served as a director at Terminal 22 at Balcarres, Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Fruit Growers Association.
Edenwold, SK
Tel: (306) 771-2823
Fax: (306) 771-4218
E-mail: rodflaman@imagewireless.ca