



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CANADA

**THE INVESTIGATION AND THE GOVERNMENT
RESPONSE FOLLOWING THE DISCOVERY OF A
SINGLE CASE OF BOVINE SPONGIFORM
ENCEPHALOPATHY**

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Agriculture and Agri-Food**

**Paul Steckle, M.P.
Chair**

November 2003

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

If this document contains excerpts or the full text of briefs presented to the Committee, permission to reproduce these briefs, in whole or in part, must be obtained from their authors.

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Available from Communication Canada — Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

**THE INVESTIGATION AND THE GOVERNMENT
RESPONSE FOLLOWING THE DISCOVERY OF A
SINGLE CASE OF BOVINE SPONGIFORM
ENCEPHALOPATHY**

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Agriculture and Agri-Food**

**Paul Steckle, M.P.
Chair**

November 2003

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

CHAIR

Paul Steckle, M.P.

Huron—Bruce, Ontario

VICE-CHAIRS

Gerry Ritz, M.P.

Battlefords—Lloydminster, Saskatchewan

Rose-Marie Ur, M.P.

Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Ontario

MEMBERS

G rard Binet, M.P.

Frontenac—M gantic, Quebec

Rick Borotsik, M.P.

Brandon—Souris, Manitoba

Rick Casson, M.P.

Lethbridge, Alberta

Claude Duplain, M.P.

Portneuf, Quebec

Mark Eyking, M.P.

Sydney—Victoria, Nova Scotia

Marcel Gagnon, M.P.

Champlain, Quebec

Howard Hilstrom, M.P.

Selkirk—Interlake, Manitoba

Rick Laliberte, M.P.

Churchill River, Saskatchewan

John Maloney, M.P.

Erie—Lincoln, Ontario

Larry McCormick, M.P.

*Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and
Addington, Ontario*

Louis Plamondon, M.P.

*Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—B cancour,
Quebec*

Dick Proctor, M.P.

Palliser, Saskatchewan

Bob Speller, M.P.

Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant, Ontario

OTHER MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED

Peter Adams, M.P.	<i>Peterborough, Ontario</i>
Odina Desrochers, M.P.	<i>Lotbinière—L'Érable, Quebec</i>
Cheryl Gallant, M.P.	<i>Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Ontario</i>
Inky Mark, M.P.	<i>Dauphin—Swan River, Manitoba</i>
Carol Skelton, M.P.	<i>Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Saskatchewan</i>
Monte Solberg, M.P.	<i>Medicine Hat, Alberta</i>

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

Bibiane Ouellette

FROM THE RESEARCH BRANCH OF THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Jean-Denis Fréchette, Principal
Frédéric Forge, Analyst

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

has the honour to present its

THIRD REPORT

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee proceeded to a study on the investigation and the government response following the discovery of a single case of bovine spongiform encephalopathy. After hearing evidence, the Committee agreed to report to the House as follows:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
EPIDEMIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION BY THE CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY: AN EXEMPLARY APPROACH	1
OPENING OF EXPORT MARKETS AND THE BSE RECOVERY PROGRAM: A HESITANT APPROACH.....	4
A. Opening of Export Markets.....	4
B. The BSE Recovery Program	8
PRICE TRANSMISSION ALONG THE BEEF PROCESSING CHAIN: AN UNCLEAR MECHANISM	11
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS	13
APPENDIX A — LIST OF WITNESSES	15
APPENDIX B — LIST OF BRIEFS.....	19
REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE.....	21
MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.....	23

THE INVESTIGATION AND THE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE FOLLOWING THE DISCOVERY OF A SINGLE CASE OF BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY

INTRODUCTION

The occurrence on 20 May 2003, of a single case of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) in Alberta set off a chain reaction, the consequences of which were then unknown. It quickly became apparent, however, that it would have political, economic, trade and social repercussions on the agriculture and agri-food sector in Canada, in the Western provinces especially, for many months to come. The Standing Committee took immediate action and held its first special information session on 27 May with officials from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC). Standing Committee members subsequently participated in various telephone conferences and, although Parliament had adjourned for the summer, they decided to assemble in Ottawa in order to meet with stakeholders in the various sectors of the cattle industry. These special meetings made it possible to follow the CFIA investigation and to discuss with government officials and stakeholders the measures taken by the government regarding compensation and diplomatic relations with Canada's trading partners, in the context of what may now be called the "mad cow crisis."

This report is not intended to describe or summarize the crisis, since this type of information has been widely publicized. However, certain relevant and important points were raised at the meetings and deserve special attention. Three major themes pertaining to the control of the mad cow crisis came up regularly in the Standing Committee's hearings. They are what could be called "tests," which the government and the domestic market had to pass. And, like all tests, some were handled better than others.

EPIDEMIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION BY THE CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY: AN EXEMPLARY APPROACH

The CFIA had to face the first test imposed by the mad cow crisis, which was to conduct a concerted epidemiological investigation into the discovery of a BSE case and its immediate control. The various stakeholders who appeared before the Standing Committee commended the CFIA for its exceptional work

following the discovery of a case in Alberta. Standing Committee members can also attest to the transparency and openness that the CFIA has shown since the crisis began.

Recognition of the CFIA's excellent scientific work came as well from the group of international experts who had examined Canada's actions following the detection of an indigenous case of BSE:

The team wishes to clearly acknowledge the openness, full disclosure and access to personnel provided by the Canadian authorities to our team, the international community and the public. The approach to sharing of information and communication demonstrated by Canada is a model to be emulated.

[...] The team is impressed with the comprehensive scope, level of analysis and thoroughness of the investigation to date. In a very short time Canadian experts have collected and assessed a level of information that exceeds the investigations done in most other BSE-affected countries. This serves as a testament to the competence, capacity and dedication of effort of Canadian officials.¹

Standing Committee members feel that this passage alone of the expert group's report sends a strong message to all of Canada's trading partners on the quality of the CFIA investigation and, therefore, on the fact that Canadian beef products reaching the market are absolutely safe. Furthermore, the federal government's swift implementation of certain recommendations in the report — within two weeks of its release — was another message likely to increase the confidence of our trading partners. For instance, on 18 July 2003, the Government of Canada announced a new Specified Risk Materials (SRM) policy jointly developed by the CFIA and Health Canada, which requires the removal of the brain, spinal cord and other tissues from carcasses of cattle older than 30 months.² A portion of the small intestine will also be removed from carcasses of all animals. **This approach is entirely consistent with international standards.** Other countries, notably in the European Union, have adopted even more stringent measures, not necessarily based on science, but rather because of socio-economic and logistic reasons, notably to prevent possible cross-contamination. This presumably explains why the group of international experts recommended that "Measures to ensure that SRM are not included in **human** food and **animal** feed should be implemented, enforced and audited for compliance."³ In the

¹ U. Kihm (Switzerland), W. Hueston (United States), Dr. D. Heim (Switzerland), *Report on Actions Taken by Canada in Response to the Confirmation of an Indigenous Case of BSE*, Bern (Switzerland), June 26, 2003, CFIA Internet site, p. 1.

² Government of Canada, "Government of Canada Announces New BSE Measure", Communiqué, Edmonton, 18 July 2003.

³ U. Kihm (Switzerland), W. Hueston (United States), Dr. D. Heim (Switzerland) (2003).

present context, the Standing Committee considers that going beyond “making an already very safe system even safer” might be a good strategy that could eliminate all trade barriers. Therefore:

RECOMMENDATION 1

The Standing Committee recommends that measures to ensure that Specified Risk Materials are not included in animal feed be implemented, enforced and audited for compliance.

The Standing Committee was also pleased to see that the group of international experts had highlighted in its report the importance of a good veterinary infrastructure for surveillance systems to be effective. This was the subject of a recommendation in an earlier report by the Standing Committee,⁴ on which the government acted by injecting additional funds into faculties of veterinary medicine in Canada.

With regard to the value of surveillance systems, the Standing Committee acknowledges that Canada already has in place a very well-established inspection and animal identification system that is recognized worldwide for its effectiveness. Despite this, the fact that our agricultural sectors are diversifying and becoming more integrated, both domestically and internationally, means that the potential risk of future instances of serious communicable diseases being introduced into the domestic animal populations is increasing exponentially. On 20 May 2003, when news of Canada’s BSE case became public, the CFIA undertook immediately to trace the cause of the BSE to the source farm. While this was done with considerable speed, the Standing Committee believes that the use of new technologies could have substantially reduced the time required to complete this process. The Standing Committee believes, therefore, that special attention should be given to implementing a program that would facilitate the immediate trace-back of animal history and lineage in instances of serious communicable diseases. In doing this, all efforts should be made to ensure that any proposed national system incorporates existing regional and national practices along with new technologies and animal health procedures. Furthermore, when devising such a national traceability system, the government should be mindful that all Canadians would benefit from effective tracking of animals, and program costs should be distributed accordingly. Such a system would provide economic and health benefits, and be a mechanism to promote and demonstrate superior food security both to Canadians and to our trading partners abroad. Therefore:

⁴ House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fifth Report, *The Future Role of the Government in Agriculture*, 37th Parliament, 1st Session, June 2002, Recommendation 28, p. 52.

RECOMMENDATION 2

The Standing Committee recommends that the federal government work, in cooperation with the CFIA, the industry and provinces, to enhance the existing Canadian Cattle Identification Program by establishing a comprehensive and cost-effective national traceability system, as rapidly as possible.

OPENING OF EXPORT MARKETS AND THE BSE RECOVERY PROGRAM: A HESITANT APPROACH

The second test involved the federal government, which had to react quickly in order to mitigate the devastating economic and trade effects that resulted from the closing of the continental and international markets to Canadian beef and cattle exports. The Canadian cattle industry exports approximately 60% of its production, and its extensive integration with the American market results in the United States absorbing 80% of Canadian beef exports and almost 100% of cattle exports. When an industry's viability depends largely on annual exports totalling approximately \$4 billion, and this viability is jeopardized because trade has been stopped for reasons other than scientific and/or health concerns, it is the federal government's responsibility to ensure that export markets are rapidly re-established by making all of the appropriate diplomatic efforts. Its role, in collaboration with the provinces and industry, is also to try to maintain the industry's production capacity so that it may become viable again.

A. Opening of Export Markets

In a crisis, everyone seeks an immediate solution that would curb any incidental effects — often negative — that in the long run could turn into an unresolvable debate or an economic impasse. Unfortunately, in the area of international trade, examples of ongoing economic impasses are not lacking, as evidenced by the European ban on imports of hormone-treated beef, and the Canada–United States trade in softwood lumber.

International trade does not involve issues of market access only; the negotiation process, which allows for discussion, must be seen as fair and transparent and, understandably, it must take into account trading partners' sensitivities. Likely with this in mind, witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee were very critical of the diplomatic approach taken by the federal government to inform its trading partners about the ongoing investigation. Some witnesses felt that Canada's diplomatic approach was perhaps coloured by its heavy dependence on the American market, which might have blinded it to the fact that trade depends on a global market and that all trading partners, even those with less economic clout, must be treated equally.

In Japan, [...] for the first three and a half weeks of this crisis, during the time when Japan slowly and continually hardened its positions on Canadian beef, [...] during that first three and a half weeks, Canada did not engage with regulators in Japan.

Twice during that period, Japan asked to send their technical teams to Canada, and twice they were rejected. Only after it appeared that Canada and the United States had great momentum to an early marketing opening between the two markets, yet no engagement, no information, no interaction with Japan had been achieved, only then did Japan take steps, because of the absence of information. There was no science. So in that position, they said "If Canada and the United States are going to cut a private deal and Canadian beef is going to go into the United States in an undifferentiated fashion, we need to protect ourselves until our own scientists can review the situation." They only returned home less than a week ago.

Mr. Ted Haney of the Canada Beef Export Federation, Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Evidence, Meeting No. 40 — 11:00 a.m., 37th Parliament, 2nd Session, Ottawa, 10 July 2003.

However, in a previous meeting, officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) had contended that every effort to reassure Japan was already being made:

Discussions at the scientific level are continuing. As you are aware, Japan is a particular key in light of U.S. concerns about their exports to Japan. That's why we sent the mission yesterday to Japan. The Japanese mission was in Canada last week. We're there to provide the reassurances the Japanese need so that they do not impose measures on the U.S. based on the U.S. understanding that we're operating a continental market.

The Japanese initial thoughts were to impose restrictions that sought to somehow segregate Canadian beef from U.S. beef. That is very difficult to manage. That's why we are in Japan, to explain to the Japanese and to provide comfort to them.

Mr. Claudio Valle of DFAIT, Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Evidence, Meeting No. 39 — 10:30 a.m., 37th Parliament, 2nd Session, Ottawa, 30 June 2003.

According to CFIA and DFAIT officials, even if Japan had shown interest in visiting Canada while the investigation was under way, they felt it would be better to wait until the investigation was closed so that the results of the scientific investigation could be shared.

Actually, we made an intervention with them and reminded them of the circumstances they had when they were dealing with BSE. They quickly realized that what they really wanted to see was the results of the investigation. We told them at that point in time that we would invite them as soon as the investigation was coming to a close. And in fact that's what happened.

Mr. Robert Carberry of CFIA, Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Evidence, Meeting No. 39 — 11:00 a.m., 37th Parliament, 2nd Session, Ottawa, 30 June, 2003.

A delegation from Japan visited Canada during the week of 23 June, and Canada's Chief Veterinarian went to Japan on 30 June, and then on to Korea, to continue discussions and share first hand the results of the investigation in special meetings with appropriate authorities. Some witnesses mentioned to the Standing Committee that a united diplomatic effort by the government and industry would have provided greater reassurance to our partners.

Many believe that Canada wrongly evaluated the potential effects of its decisions, and therefore see Canada's approach as a diplomatic faux pas that exacerbated the effects of the crisis, especially its effects on the closing of export markets. While such a conclusion may be true, we will perhaps never know whether it was well founded. However, it is well known that at one point the Canadian cattle industry was losing \$11 million a day. At this rate, an industry's production chain deteriorates rapidly, to the point that it may, over the longer term, reach a point of no return to its past production capacity.

Canada's so-called faux pas may have had a destabilizing effect that made it lose sight of the fact that the real solution to the mad cow crisis must first address the international recognition of its new country status as "non BSE-free." Before May 20, 2003, Canada qualified as "provisionally free of BSE risk and was scheduled to attain free status following two additional years of the meat and bone meal feed ban introduced in July 1997."⁵ Canada's status is no longer the same as it was before May 20, it is now "minimal BSE risk." On the basis of the new status, our trading partners can make a decision about their trade with Canada, and Canada, in turn, will be able to establish whether any countries are blocking Canadian exports without a valid reason.

There is, however, a void in terms of internationally accepted trade-related measures that can be taken following the discovery of the disease in a particular country. For this reason, Canada, the United States and Mexico have jointly requested that the Organisation internationale des épizooties (OIE) "begin the

⁵ Canadian Food Inspection Agency, *Narrative Background to Canada's Assessment of and Response to the BSE Occurrence in Alberta* Ottawa, July 2003, CFIA Internet site, p. 1.

dialogue necessary to develop more current practical, science-based guidelines relevant to BSE risk management.”⁶ The effects of the mad cow crisis on Canada’s capacity to trade freely may well last for months. Accordingly:

RECOMMENDATION 3

The Standing Committee recommends the establishment of an industry/government task force that would focus specifically on the trade issues involved in the full restoration of export markets for livestock and its related meat products.

Moreover, at its meeting on 11 August, the Standing Committee unanimously approved a motion asking the Prime Minister to intensify diplomatic efforts to facilitate the opening of the United States border to pre-May 20 levels.⁷ At subsequent meetings, it was mentioned that trade missions to various countries were in fact conducted by government officials, but neither the industry nor Committee members were informed of such missions. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION 4

The Standing Committee recommends that the livestock industry and Parliament be kept informed on a regular basis of diplomatic efforts and trade missions conducted to improve Canada’s livestock trade situation.

Finally, fully opening export markets will entail changes in practices, such as those already announced by Canada on the removal of specified risk materials from cattle at slaughter, or increasing the number of BSE tests on slaughtered animals. An increase in direct and indirect costs throughout the production chain is to be expected. Consequently:

RECOMMENDATION 5

In order to ensure that the increased costs resulting from changes made to inspection, rendering practices and traceability systems are not borne solely by livestock producers, the Standing Committee recommends that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food increase the budget of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.

⁶ Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, news release, August 25, 2003.

⁷ House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, <http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfoComDoc/37/2/AGRI/Meetings/Minutes/AGRIIn41%285208%29-E.htm>.

Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the Minister name an auditor to ensure that any additional costs be kept to a minimum and shared equitably among all stakeholders in the livestock sector.

B. The BSE Recovery Program

On 18 June, federal, provincial and territorial agriculture ministers announced a program to provide \$460 million in temporary assistance, \$276 million of which was to come from the federal government, so that the Canadian cattle industry could continue to operate despite having lost 60% of its export market. The recovery program in response to BSE was twofold: a slaughter compensation program with a budget of \$420 million, and an inventory and pricing incentive component with a budget of \$30 million. On 12 August, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food granted extension funding of \$36 million to the program. Funding for the recovery program was limited, and so it ended in August when expenditures reached the ceiling, even though the border was still not completely open to exports of all cattle and beef products.

The slaughter compensation program aimed to increase the number of Canadian cattle slaughtered in order to reduce the accumulation of calves and cattle for slaughter, to regulate the flow of cattle when the border reopens and to increase the cattle industry's liquid assets. The primary goal of the program was to increase the number of cattle slaughtered each week to some 50,000 head. Before 20 May, 70,000 head were being slaughtered for the Canadian market and the beef export market, and another 20,000 live animals were intended for the cattle export market. In the weeks following the closing of the export markets, the average weekly slaughter was around 30,000 head. Producers raising and selling cattle in Canada were eligible to receive compensation based on a reference price and a sliding scale, which allowed market signals to be felt.

The inventory and pricing incentive program was designed to provide assistance to meat packers to help them move beef products that were in lower demand and to encourage them to offer higher prices for the cattle they purchased.

While the government and industry had worked together closely to develop the recovery program, it appears that the program as announced by the government was changed and fell short of producers' expectations.

Over the next two weeks, we met intensively with federal officials and developed a program that we thought would be sustainable. Unfortunately, prior to the implementation, several key actions were either ignored or modified from the original proposal, rendering many of the positive outcomes ineffective. The two most significant were changing the end date of the program from 30 days after the reopening of international markets to

live cattle sales to immediately upon reopening of markets to muscle-cuts; and a significant change to the format and conditions of the diminishing market adjustment formulas.

These changes resulted in several damaging outcomes as predicted by the industry in advance of the announcement, particularly excess selling of slaughter cattle, the collapse of finished-cattle markets, and increased anxiety of cattlemen about the future.

Mr. Brad Wildeman of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Evidence, Meeting No. 39 — 11:15 a.m., 37th Parliament, 2nd Session, Ottawa, 30 June , 2003.

Nonetheless, the program did meet some of the industry's expectations, primarily by allowing for more animals to be slaughtered and on a more regular basis. By the end of the program in August, 72,631 head were slaughtered during the last week — 8.5% more than the previous week and the corresponding week in 2002. The cattle sector must now regain the fluid and functional production it had before, but probably with a lower slaughter level.

We have to attempt to get to a supply-demand balance. All the things that are wrong are just that. We have an incredible oversupply and we can't expect our domestic marketplace to do that. I think everybody in this room will agree that the Canadian consumer has been tremendous in response to us. We could not ask for a better response than what they've given us. But the reality of the situation is that you can't eat it all.

Mr. Brian Nilsson, Co-Chief Executive Officer, Nilsson Brothers, Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Evidence, Meeting No. 41 — 11:20 a.m., 37th Parliament, 2nd Session, Ottawa, 11 August, 2003.

A new approach would create a structured marketing that would prevent the sector from possibly having to confront a shortage. Suggestions made to the Committee included:

- a floor price to prevent sales below the threshold of 50 cents a pound;
- a compensation equal to 90% for sales above 50 cents a pound but below the reference price;
- a livestock feed assistance program; and
- a commitment from the various governments that a program would be maintained until the export markets make it possible for the industry to be viable again.

One frequently mentioned suggestion involved an action plan for a national livestock culling program aimed at animals older than 30 months. The lack of any markets for these cattle means they have low value, while their costs to breeders are increasing. The Beef Industry Roundtable comprising both industry stakeholders and government representatives is looking into market opportunities for these animals. Even though Canada's top priority must remain the complete re-opening of export markets, the way in which our new minimal BSE risk status is limiting our export capacity forces us to re-examine our production chain for beef products, and tailor it to suit current supply and demand conditions. Accordingly:

RECOMMENDATION 6

The Standing Committee recommends a compensation plan for a culling program, which would include dairy cull cows, that should be conducted according to an attrition rate that would allow the industry to better balance supply and demand.

Furthermore, since such a program will require the development of meat products with greater value added, the Committee recommends that the government support the industry through a special assistance fund for the development of new market opportunities.

Lastly, the business risk management (BRM) component of the Agricultural Policy Framework (APF) was discussed many times during meetings of the Standing Committee over the summer. But the capacity of the BRM to respond to the financial difficulties of Canadian cattle producers is in dispute, especially with regard to provinces that have not yet signed this APF component. Agriculture and Agri-food officials told members of the Standing Committee that the APF could well help the cattle producers:

We do believe that the APF and the BRM component as it is could be of significant assistance to producers, in particular the cow-calf producers and the backgrounders. The production margin, compared to what was there before, offers excellent protection for them.

Mr. Gilles Lavoie, Senior Director General, Operations, Market and Industry Services Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, Evidence, Meeting No. 41 — 1:45 p.m., 37th Parliament, 2nd Session, Ottawa, 11 August 2003.

While producers are in immediate need of new funds, some members of the Committee are sceptical about the APF's capacity to generate quickly the financial assistance necessary to keep the Canadian cattle industry viable and/or until there is a return of the market conditions that existed prior to 20 May 2003.

PRICE TRANSMISSION ALONG THE BEEF PROCESSING CHAIN: AN UNCLEAR MECHANISM

The third test concerned the domestic market and how prices for beef products are determined. While the closing of export markets brought a significant drop in the prices paid to cattle farmers, retail prices did not follow suit. However, consumers have handled the crisis well, maintaining or even increasing their consumption of beef. **The Committee is pleased to recognize the support consumers have shown by not abandoning the beef market.**

The maintenance of high retail prices has, however, made many stakeholders angry, especially since the various governments injected \$30 million under the inventory and pricing incentive program to help meat packers, who are seen as primarily responsible for maintaining elevated retail prices. During Committee meetings, various representatives from the beef processing sector explained the mechanism that determines the price of beef and its products and pointed out that meat packers have fixed costs oriented around the slaughter of 65,000 head a week. Consequently, their operations and profit margins have been largely disrupted because the rest of the cattle production chain has slowed down. Moreover, the best cuts, which are usually in high demand, account for only 13% of a carcass. Export markets are necessary to make entire carcasses profitable and to establish competitive domestic prices. The prices of certain cuts, in particular those corresponding to the imported products, eventually came down, but on the whole prices have not dropped to the levels expected by consumers and analysts.

Many of these arguments failed to sway the Committee, which believes that a specific beef processing sector should not profit unduly from a crisis that is seriously affecting Canadian cattle farmers, especially when the entire sector is receiving government aid. Therefore:

RECOMMENDATION 7

The Standing Committee recommends that the Competition Bureau conduct an investigation into the pricing of beef at the processing and retail levels. To this end, the Committee Chair and five other members will send an official written request to the Bureau.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1

The Standing Committee recommends that measures to ensure that Specified Risk Materials are not included in animal feed be implemented, enforced and audited for compliance.

RECOMMENDATION 2

The Standing Committee recommends that the federal government work, in cooperation with the CFIA, the industry and provinces, to enhance the existing Canadian Cattle Identification Program by establishing a comprehensive and cost-effective national traceability system, as rapidly as possible.

RECOMMENDATION 3

The Standing Committee recommends the establishment of an industry/government task force that would focus specifically on the trade issues involved in the full restoration of export markets for livestock and its related meat products.

RECOMMENDATION 4

The Standing Committee recommends that the livestock industry and Parliament be kept informed on a regular basis of diplomatic efforts and trade missions conducted to improve Canada's livestock trade situation.

RECOMMENDATION 5

In order to ensure that the increased costs resulting from changes made to inspection, rendering practices and traceability systems are not borne solely by livestock producers, the Standing Committee recommends that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food increase the budget of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.

Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the Minister name an auditor to ensure that any additional costs be kept to a minimum and shared equitably among all stakeholders in the livestock sector.

RECOMMENDATION 6

The Standing Committee recommends a compensation plan for a culling program, which would include dairy cull cows, that should be conducted according to an attrition rate that would allow the industry to better balance supply and demand.

Furthermore, since such a program will require the development of meat products with greater value added, the Committee recommends that the government support the industry through a special assistance fund for the development of new market opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION 7

The Standing Committee recommends that the Competition Bureau conduct an investigation into the pricing of beef at the processing and retail levels. To this end, the Committee Chair and five other members will send an official written request to the Bureau.

APPENDIX A LIST OF WITNESSES

Associations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Canadian Food Inspection Agency Robert Carberry, Vice-President Claude Lavigne, Associate Executive Director	27/05/2003	32
Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Gilles Lavoie, Senior Director General, Operations and Agricultural Industry Services Directorate, Market and Industry Services Branch		
Alberta Beef Producers Arno Doerksen, Chairman	05/06/2003	36
Canadian Cattlemen's Association Jim Caldwell, Director, Government Affairs Stan Eby, Vice-President Dennis Laycraft, Executive Vice-President Ben Thorlakson, Director, Canada Beef Export Federation Brad Wildeman, Chair, Foreign Trade Commission		
Butte Grain Merchants Rick Paskal, Alberta Cattle Feeder Cor Van Raay, Alberta Cattle Feeder	30/06/2003	39
Canadian Cattlemen's Association Jim Caldwell, Director Stan Eby, Vice-President Brad Wildeman, Chair		
Canadian Food Inspection Agency Robert Carberry, Vice-President		
Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Gilles Lavoie, Senior Director General, Operations and Agricultural Industry Services Directorate, Market and Industry Services Branch Andrew Marsland, Director General, International Markets Bureau		
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Andrew Moroz, Director, Trade Controls Policy Claudio Valle, Director, Technical Barriers and Regulations		
As an Individual Calvin Vaags	30/06/2003	39

Associations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Canada Beef Export Federation Ted Haney, President	10/07/2003	40
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors Paul Fortin, Vice-President Nick Jennery, President and Chief Executive Officer Kim McKinnon, Vice-President		
Canadian Meat Council Robert Weaver, General Manager		
Maurice Guillemette Inc. Pierre Guillemette, Co-owner André Toutant, Managing Director		
Retail Ready Inc. John Ferraro, President		
United Food & Commercial Workers International Union Paul Meinema, President		
Canadian Cattlemen's Association Stan Eby, Vice-President	11/08/2003	41
Canadian Food Inspection Agency Robert Carberry, Vice-President		
Carman Meats Inc. Jim Holmes, President		
Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Gilles Lavoie, Senior Director General, Operations and Agricultural Industry Services Directorate, Market and Industry Services Branch Andrew Marsland, Director General, International Markets Bureau		
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Andrew Moroz, Director, Trade Controls Policy Claudio Valle, Director, Technical Barriers and Regulations		
Lakeside Packers Garnett Altwasser, Chief Executive Officer		
Levinoff Meats Limited Brian Read, General Manager		
Nilsson Brothers Brian Nilsson, Co-Chief Executive Officer		

Associations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
St. Helen's Meat Packers Ltd. Robert Bielak, President	11/08/2003	41
Dairy Farmers of Canada Réjean Bouchard, Assistant Director, Policy and Dairy Production Bruce Saunders, Second Vice-President	30/09/2003	44
Farm Credit Canada John Ryan, President and Chief Executive Officer Janet Wightman, Executive Vice-President and Chief Operating Officer	02/10/2003	45
Bank of Nova Scotia Bob Funk, Vice-President, Agriculture	07/10/2003	46
BMO Bank of Montreal Don Wither, Director, Market Segment Solutions		
Canadian Bankers Association Terry Campbell, Vice-President, Policy		
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Pieter Kleinschmidt, Vice-President, Agricultural Credit		
National Bank of Canada Yvan Beaudin, Director, Agri-business Services		
Royal Bank of Canada Brian Little, National Manager, Agriculture and Agribusiness		
TD Canada Trust David Marr, National Manager, Agricultural Services		
Mediagrif Interactive Technologies Michel Simard, Chief Operating Officer	21/10/2003	48
Viewtrak Technologies Inc. Jake Burlet, President and Chief Operating Officer Michael Conlon, Chief Technology Officer		

APPENDIX B LIST OF BRIEFS

Canada Beef Export Federation

Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Canadian Meat Council

Carman Meats Inc.

Dairy Farmers of Canada

Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Farm Credit Canada

Maurice Guillemette Inc.

Mediagrif Interactive Technologies

Vaags, Calvin

Viewtrak Technologies Inc.

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee requests that the government provide a comprehensive response to this report.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food (*Meetings Nos. 32, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 48 and 51 which includes this report*) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Steckle, M.P.
Huron—Bruce

Chair

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, October 29, 2003
(Meeting No. 51)

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food met *in camera* at 3:35 p.m. this day, in Room 371 West Block, the Chair, Paul Steckle, presiding.

Members of the Committee present: Gérard Binet, Claude Duplain, Larry McCormick, Louis Plamondon, Gerry Ritz, Paul Steckle and Rose-Marie Ur.

Acting Members present: Stan Dromisky for John Maloney, Nancy Karetak-Lindell for Bob Speller and John O'Reilly for Rick Laliberte.

In attendance: Library of Parliament: Jean-Denis Fréchette, Principal.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee resumed consideration of its draft report on the BSE situation in Canada.

It was agreed, — That the draft report, as amended, be adopted.

It was agreed, — That the report be entitled: *The Investigation and the Government Response Following the Discovery of a Single Case of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy.*

It was agreed, — That the Chair, Clerk and researchers be authorized to make such grammatical and editorial changes as may be necessary without changing the substance of the report.

It was agreed, — That the Chair present the report to the House as the 3rd Report of the Committee.

It was agreed, — That, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee request that the Government table a comprehensive response to the report.

At 3:59 p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

Bibiane Ouellette
Clerk of the Committee