



ONTARIO PORK

Resolutions Booklet

2009 - Results

INDEX OF RESOLUTION GROUPINGS

SAFETY NETS

Resolution 1 - PASSED	3
Resolution 2 - PASSED	3

SAFETY NETS – OCHHP

Resolution 3 – NOT FOR DEBATE	4
Resolution 4 NOT FOR DEBATE	4
Resolution 5 – NOT FOR DEBATE	5

SAFETY NETS – RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Resolution 6 - PASSED	5
Resolution 7 - PASSED	6

MARKETING STRUCTRE

Resolution 8 - DEFEATED	6
Resolution 9 – PASSED	7
Resolution 10 - PASSED	7
Resolution 11 – NOT FOR DEBATE	8

ENFORCEMENT

Resolution 12 – NOT FOR DEBATE	8
--------------------------------	---

ELECTORAL STRUCTURE

Resolution 13 - DEFEATED	8
Resolution 14 - PASSED	9
Resolution 15 – NOT FOR DEBATE	10

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Resolution 16 – NOT FOR DEBATE	10
Resolution 17 - PASSED	11

TRANSPARENCY

Resolution 18 – NOT FOR DEBATE	11
--------------------------------	----

LATE RESOLUTIONS

Resolution A – DEFEATED - NOT FOR DEBATE	12
Resolution B – DEFEATED - NOT FOR DEBATE	12
Resolution C – DEFEATED - NOT FOR DEBATE	13

RESOLUTION RANKING

	14
--	----

SAFETY NETS

RESOLUTION 1

For Debate

Whereas the Provincial OCHHP payment used 2000-2004 based figures provided by the Federal Government from the Cost of Production payment, which then were used by the Federal KickStart-AgrilInvest program, and;

Whereas these old numbers do not reflect 2007-2008 actual losses suffered by pork producers, and;

Whereas Minister Dombrowsky has stated that the OCHHP payment does not relate to the 2007 and 2008 production years, and;

Whereas Producers suffered large losses due to fluctuation in the dollar and feed grain prices and low market hog prices in 2007 and 2008 years,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork ask both levels of government for a direct payment program for producers who actually were in business in 2007-2008.

Submitted by: *Oxford County*

Amendment: the payment be based on 2008 production numbers
Voted on amendment - Total votes 120 Total Yes – 109 Total No – 11 PASSED

RESOLUTION 1 RESULTS

Total voted: 136

Total Yes: 123

Total No: 13

Outcome: PASSED

RESOLUTION 2

For Debate

Whereas many beginning and expanding farmers were left out, or treated unfairly by the OCHHP payment,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork lobby for future payment programs that address these inadequacies and level the playing field for all ACTIVE pork producers.

Submitted by: *Oxford County*

RESOLUTION 2 RESULTS

Total voted: 135

Total Yes: 120

Total No: 15

Outcome: PASSED

SAFETY NETS - ONTARIO CATTLE, HOG AND HORTICULTURE PAYMENT (OCHHP)

RESOLUTION 3

Not For Debate

Whereas not all producers have been treated fairly with regards to the Ontario Cattle Hog and Horticulture Payments, and;

Whereas Ontario Pork is to advocate on behalf of all pork producers;

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork lobby on behalf of all pork producers, including the Beginning Farmers for payment through alternative funding programs

Submitted by: Lambton County
SEE NOTES

RESOLUTION 3 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

RESOLUTION 4

Not For Debate

Whereas the Ontario Cattle Hog and Horticultural Program (OCHHP) did not meet the needs of beginning and expanding farmers due to a lack of historical reference data, and;

Whereas retiring farmers in some cases received significant payments under the program, while benefiting from the sale of inventory the previous year,

Therefore be it resolved that the OPPMB encourage the provincial government to find new money or identify those individuals who should not have received funds under OCHHP and claw back those funds with the intention of reallocating funds to beginning and expanding farmers who did not qualify for money under the original program framework.

Further be it resolved that the provincial government should be encouraged to develop programs in the future which allow county averages to be used by young farmers who have not yet established sufficient reference periods.

Submitted by: Middlesex County

RESOLUTION 4 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

RESOLUTION 5

Not For Debate

Whereas the Ontario Cattle Hog and Horticultural Program(OCHHP) failed to provide adequate funding to beginning and expanding farmers due to a lack of historical reference data for their farms;

Therefore be it resolved that the OPPMB work with and encourage the provincial government to allow beginning and expanding farmers to use county averages of similar sized farms for production and income as their historical reference data when applying for provincial assistance programs. This will allow those most in need of provincial assistance, equal access to available funding.

Submitted by: *Middlesex County*

RESOLUTION 5 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

SAFETY NETS - RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

RESOLUTION 6

For Debate

Whereas the Risk Management Program (RMP) has been developed for Grains and Oilseeds producers, and has been supported by the provincial government, and;

Whereas the AgriStability Program (CAIS) does not effectively work for all hog farmers,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork fund a study for a Cost of Production Program (similar to RMP) for the Hog Industry, encompassing a new vision for safety nets with multiple options and an open minded approach to sustainable hog production in Ontario.

Submitted by: *Durham Region*

RESOLUTION 6 RESULTS

Total voted: 138

Total Yes: 86

Total No: 52

Outcome: PASSED

RESOLUTION 7

For Debate

Whereas the Risk Management Program (RMP) has been developed to offset losses in the Grains and Oilseeds sector, and;

Whereas RMP payments were clawed back from AgriStability (CAIS) payments,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork lobby the government to decouple Risk Management from AgriStability (CAIS).

Submitted by: *Durham Region*

RESOLUTION 7 RESULTS

Total voted: 138

Total Yes: 114

Total No: 24

Outcome: PASSED

MARKETING STRUCTURE

RESOLUTION 8

For Debate

Whereas the Farm Products Marketing Commission ruled in October on a new direction for Ontario Pork, and;

Whereas the chairman of Ontario Pork supported this new direction on behalf of the Ontario Pork Industry,

Therefore be it resolved that Pork Producers endorse the changes proposed by the FPMC and encourages Ontario Pork to move forward in implementing the changes.

Submitted by: *Oxford County*

RESOLUTION 8 RESULTS

Total voted: 159

Total Yes: 58

Total No: 101

Outcome: DEFEATED

RESOLUTION 9

For Debate

Whereas the Farm Products Marketing Commission is stripping back the powers of Ontario Pork, and;

Whereas Ontario Pork is severing off the marketing and sales department and therefore no longer able to use its reserve funds for financial protection, and;

Whereas the Ontario Pork industry will have no financial protection plan in place in the event of a processor becoming insolvent, and;

Whereas pork producers cannot bear any financial losses due to processor insolvency, which American producers have protection against,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork assist in developing a financial protection plan and solicit the Ontario government to agree to administer and provide the funds for such a plan before the implementation of the Farm Product Marketing Commission's decision.

Submitted by: *Wellington County*

RESOLUTION 9 RESULTS

Total voted: 153

Total Yes: 132

Total No: 21

Outcome: PASSED

RESOLUTION 10

For Debate

Whereas Farm Products Marketing Commission has brought down a decision to change our marketing system, and;

Whereas the decision is being imposed upon producers in a very aggressive time frame,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork lobby for much more direct producer input into developing the final plan.

Submitted by: *Grey-Bruce County*

RESOLUTION 10 RESULTS

Total voted: 150

Total Yes: 109

Total No: 41

Outcome: PASSED

RESOLUTION 11

Not For Debate

Whereas Farm Products Marketing Commission has created an open market system, and;

Whereas service fees for marketing are unknown,

Therefore be it resolved that attention be paid to eventual marketing fees to be fair.

Submitted by: *Grey-Bruce County*

RESOLUTION 11 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

ENFORCEMENT

RESOLUTION 12

Not For Debate

Whereas there are outstanding fees owed to Ontario Pork, and;

Whereas the role of Ontario Pork is uncertain after this decision is finalized, and;

Whereas it is not clear if outstanding fees will get 'lost' in the transition,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork continues to enforce collection of overdue service fees and have the guilty parties pay all legal fees.

Submitted by: *Grey-Bruce County*

RESOLUTION 12 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

ELECTORAL STRUCTURE

RESOLUTION 13

For Debate

Whereas the Ontario Pork Board of Directors has engaged in a consultation process over the past year in various ways including Policy Day, and;

Whereas contraction of the industry has determined a reduced number of Councillors and also a reduced number of Directors would be appropriate,

Therefore be it resolved that the elected Councilor body be called upon to support the proposed model.

Submitted by: Ontario Pork Board of Directors

RESOLUTION 13 RESULTS

Total voted: 157

Total Yes: 70

Total No: 87

Outcome: DEFEATED

RESOLUTION 14

For Debate

Whereas the new governance proposal calls for 80 councillors to be elected at the district level rather than the county level, and;

Whereas it appeared that the Councillor body at Policy Day preferred Councillor by county, and;

Whereas the role of the Councillor is to focus on policy creation, and;

Whereas policy creation should benefit and reflect the opinions and needs of all producers, and;

Whereas there are areas, particularly in the districts of the proposed Zone Three east of Toronto where the number of producers are significantly less and distributed over a very large geographical area, possibly impacting the cohesiveness and policy participation efforts of the districts,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork change its position on governance structure so that in areas where producer representation is geographically challenged, Councillor Representation be determined by county instead of Councillor by district.

Submitted by: Durham Region

RESOLUTION 14 RESULTS

Total voted: 150

Total Yes: 78

Total No: 72

Outcome: PASSED

RESOLUTION 15

Not For Debate

Whereas the membership of Ontario Pork cannot be adequately consulted, concerning their options regarding the future nature and scope of Ontario Pork's governance model within the timelines prescribed by the Farm Products Marketing Commission's Pork Decision dated October 6, 2008, and;

Whereas Commission Policy clearly states that all Pork Producers should be permitted to vote on the various options which exist in relation to the future scope and mandate of Ontario Pork, and;

Whereas the proposed Ontario Pork Board Structure Implementation Plan December 2008 recommends elections for the councillors and board of directors take effect in 2010,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork lobby the Farm Products Marketing Commission for a full and complete stay of the Pork Decision dated October 6, 2008, pending appropriate consultation with all membership and stakeholders of Ontario Pork, after an independent review by the Tribunal of the proposed councilor allotment by District, possibly replacing it with a similar reduction model that is based on county allotment.

Submitted by: *Durham Region*

RESOLUTION 15 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

STRATEGIC PLANNING

RESOLUTION 16

Not For Debate

Whereas the Ontario pork industry has been in turmoil for some time and the near future of Ontario Pork is uncertain, and;

Whereas some producers have the perception that Ontario Pork is trying to create new "make work" projects, for example "Supply Chain Coordination",

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork focus on current services and improve effectiveness and efficiencies of such.

Submitted by: *Oxford County*

RESOLUTION 16 RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

RESOLUTION 17

Not For Debate – Challenged on the floor and passed – FOR DEBATE

Whereas Ontario Pork has been without a CEO since April, and;

Whereas without having a CEO is perceived as being a weak link,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork get on with having a CEO from within or outside the organization.

Submitted by: Simcoe County

RESOLUTION 17 RESULTS –CHALLENGED ON THE FLOOR - FOR DEBATE

Total voted - 158 Total Yes – 103 Total No – 55

(Decided 2/3 was not needed since it was not a late resolution)

RESOLUTION 17 RESULTS

Total voted: 158

Total Yes: 83

Total No: 75

Outcome: PASSED

TRANSPARENCY

RESOLUTION 18

Not For Debate

Whereas Ontario Pork announced that it had spent one million dollars on a Market Renewal Strategy and a clear accounting was never provided regarding how the money was spent, and;

Whereas a final report has also not been provided regarding this expenditure,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork provide itemized accounting on annual reports with regards to special projects.

Submitted by: Lambton County

Notes: This concern should be addressed during the Financial Report at the Annual General Meeting.

RESOLUTION 18 RESULTS– NOT FOR DEBATE

LATE RESOLUTIONS

LATE RESOLUTION A

Whereas the FPMC conducted a hearing during July, 2008 and rendered its decision on October 6th, 2008, and;

Whereas the decision did not take into account that producers had discussed and voted on a Strategic Direction at a Policy Day on June 11th, 2008, and;

Whereas the FPMC has exhibited questionable judgment in its approach to implementation of the decision both on timelines and in its formation and conducting of the Hog Industry Advisory Committee, and;

Whereas the FPMC has allowed producers in other commodities the right to vote on major change in their organizations, and;

Whereas the FPMC has not offered producers in the hog industry the right to vote on the changes and timelines imposed by the decision,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario Pork petition the Ontario Minister of Agriculture to fully and comprehensively investigate the conduct of the Farm Products Marketing Commission in its approach to the hog industry in Ontario.

Submitted by: Grey-Bruce County

RESOLUTION A RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

Total voted - 160 Total Yes – 103 Total No – 57 (not 2/3)

LATE RESOLUTION B

Whereas in 2007 and 2008, Ontario Pork was in the midst of a strategic planning process that was to lead to its next business plan. The resulting Strategic Direction document included: “Implementing an expanded vision of producer marketing choice...¹”, and;

Whereas it took many months for Ontario Pork to build a consensus in support of this Strategic Direction document. Producers voted support for the Strategic Direction at the Policy Day on June 11th, 2008, and;

Whereas that Strategic Direction document included the retention of the marketing powers granted under the Farm Products Marketing Act but using these powers in more flexible ways, including a concept of licensed agents that could accommodate innovative supply chains such as the one created by Progressive Pork Producers Coop/Conestoga Meat Packers, and;

Whereas the Pork decision made by the Farm Products Marketing Commission on October 6th, 2008 has eroded the consensus that Ontario Pork had worked so hard to create, and;

Whereas the appeals of the Pork Decision are likely to create a long period of uncertainty about the future role of Ontario Pork in marketing hogs², and;

Whereas the Farm Products Marketing Act includes a powerful democratic tool for determining whether a sector is ready for major changes in marketing powers – an expression of opinion vote – but this is not needed if Ontario Pork is allowed to return to its consensus approach to marketing choices,

Therefore be it resolved that this Annual General Meeting ask Ontario Pork to approach the appellants of the Commissions Pork Decision and the parties supporting the commissions Pork Decision and ask them to consider a better way forward – less uncertainty, more consensus, a reasonable timeline for specific decisions and serious consultation with Pork Producers – and allow Ontario Pork to return to the Strategic Direction democratically endorsed by Councillors' at the June 2008 Policy Day without any constraints from the Commissions' Pork Decision or the Appeals.

Submitted by: Huron County

RESOLUTION B RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

Total voted – 160 Total Yes – 100 Total No – 60 (not 2/3)

LATE RESOLUTION C

Whereas the Commission's decision and the appeals made against that decision has created uncertainty for many producers in the marketing of their hogs, and;

Whereas the letters of Jan 8 and Feb 17 by Geri Kamenz created more uncertainty about the direction Ontario Pork was taking in establishing sales and marketing org. The Jan 8 letter indicating the decision to establish a separate arm was promoted by the advisory group and was consistent with the policy direction the board received from Councilors this past November, and;

(The Hog Industry Advisory Committee began in mid November 2008, to meet on a weekly basis, to dialogue and respond to issues pertinent to a successful transition approach. Some of these issues and the positive direction going forward include:

- Ontario Pork's establishment of a sales and marketing organization that is independent from Ontario Pork is focused on being competitive in the market place and providing valued services to Ontario producers. This approach is consistent with the policy direction the board received from Councilors this past November.)

The Feb 17 letter by Geri Kamenz it was Ontario Pork who decided to separate the marketing and create two organizations'.

(The Commission's decision specifically spelled out that producers who wish to continue to market through Ontario Pork will still have that option.

Ontario Pork decided to separate the marketing from universal services, creating two organizations. The Commission did not direct Ontario Pork to separate itself into two organizations.)

Whereas establishing of tow separate organizations' may cost millions of dollars and the Nov meeting did not give clear direction for any of this,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario pork maintain the marketing and sales within the Ontario pork board structure and ensure the marketing and sales of hogs will b competitive and giving Producers assurance they will be able to market their hogs no matter how small or large they are.

Submitted by: Huron County

RESOLUTION C RESULTS – NOT FOR DEBATE

Total voted – 160 Total Yes – 91 Total No – 69 (not 2/3)

RESOLUTION RANKING

In order of importance as voted by delegates

RESOLUTION 1 – 27 votes – Most Important

RESOLUTION 9 – 24 votes

RESOLUTION 10 – 19 votes

RESOLUTION 14 – 18 votes

RESOLUTION 17 – 17 votes

RESOLUTION 7 – 12 votes

RESOLUTION 6 – 10 votes

RESOLUTION 2 – 9 votes– Least Important