



Testimony

Before the Subcommittee on Commerce,
Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness,
Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives

For Release
on Delivery
Expected at
10:00 a.m. EST
Thursday
October 31, 1991

FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY

Inspection of Canadian Meat Imports Under USDA's Streamlined Procedures

Statement of
John W. Harman, Director
Food and Agriculture Issues
Resources, Community, and Economic
Development Division



Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Subcommittee:

We are pleased to be here today to discuss the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) "streamlined" procedures for inspecting Canadian meat and poultry imports. Our testimony is based on our July 1990 report¹ raising issues about a USDA proposal to end Canadian meat inspections and on our work done at your request asking us to review various matters related to allegations and statements made in hearings before this subcommittee by a USDA import inspector stationed at the Sweetgrass, Montana, port of entry. Specifically, you asked us to (1) determine whether inspection procedures are adequate to protect the consumer; (2) confirm the inspector's description of the streamlined procedures; (3) verify whether the inspector's records corroborate his statements about tainted Canadian meat; and (4) collect USDA inspection and rejection data for Canadian meat.

In summary, our work shows that:

- The assurance that Canadian meat is wholesome and consumers are protected rests primarily on an FSIS determination that Canada's inspection system is equivalent to the U.S. inspection system. However, in our 1990 report we found that USDA's Canadian equivalency review was outdated and poorly documented such that we could not independently review the basis for FSIS' determination. Although, as recommended in our report, FSIS recently updated its equivalency review, the results are not yet final.
- The USDA inspector's description of streamlined inspection procedures, including the pulling of samples in the Canadian plant, is accurate. Under the streamlined procedures, Canadian shipments do not automatically stop and unload at a border inspection facility for a routine visual inspection for general condition. Instead, FSIS spot checks compliance by randomly selecting about one in eight or nine shipments and inspecting samples, pulled by Canadian inspectors, for wholesomeness. FSIS also operates an intensified program that focuses additional inspections on shipments from plants that fail a streamlined inspection.
- The USDA inspector's statement that he rejected over one million pounds of Canadian meat in 1990 was substantiated by USDA records. In his statement he frequently cited the presence of fecal material, but our review of the records showed that the great majority of his rejections were for other defects, such as the presence of hair, bone

¹Food Safety: Issues USDA Should Address Before Ending Canadian Meat Inspection(GAO/RCED-90-176, July 6, 1990).

fragments, blood clots, and bruises and for transportation damage.

- FSIS inspection data show that rejection rates for shipments of Canadian meat were lower in 1990 than in 1989 and appear to be decreasing in 1991. For example, rejection rates resulting from product examinations for the first 7 months of 1991 have decreased since 1989 for both the streamlined and intensified programs (from 3.0 percent to .8 percent, and from 8.3 percent to 3.9 percent, respectively).

Inspection of Canadian meat imports became controversial after USDA adopted the streamlined inspection procedures in January 1989 and subsequently proposed an "open border" test that would end all inspections. While USDA withdrew the open border proposal this month, the streamlined procedures remain. In our view, the streamlined inspection procedures, as currently designed, will continue to be a source of allegations, controversy, and criticism and may erode consumer confidence in the system. As you know, we are conducting a review for four other congressmen to identify alternatives for strengthening import inspection procedures.

BACKGROUND

The Federal Meat Inspection Act requires that meat imports be produced under inspection systems that are at least equivalent to that of the United States and that the imports are wholesome, unadulterated, properly marked, labeled, and packaged. (Canada exports mostly meat to the United States.) FSIS is responsible for reviewing the inspection systems of eligible exporting countries for equivalency and for inspecting imported meat items at the port of entry to help ensure product integrity. FSIS often refers to import inspections as reinspections to recognize that imported meat has already been inspected and approved by the exporting country's inspectors.

The streamlined procedures were introduced in January 1989 in response to the 1988 United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement (FTA). Prior to that time, under "traditional" import inspection procedures, every shipment of Canadian meat was inspected for general condition; in addition, a sampling of these shipments was inspected for wholesomeness. However, to facilitate commerce between the two countries, the FTA limits inspection of meat and poultry imports to "spot checks" necessary to ensure compliance with each country's standards and technical regulations.

The two key inspections performed on Canadian meat under the streamlined procedures are product examinations and chemical residue tests. The product examination involves a comprehensive examination whereby a USDA import inspector feels, smells, and visually examines exposed product samples. Causes of rejection

include contamination (grease, glass, paper, plastic), processing defects (hair, bone fragments, blood clots, bruises, detached cartilage, ingesta, feces), unsound condition (rotten, putrid), and pathological defects (grubs, abscesses, lesions). For residue tests, the inspector draws samples and sends them to designated laboratories for analysis. Almost all rejections (by weight) of Canadian product result from product examination failures; few residue tests fail.

In hearings before this Subcommittee on May 15, 1991, the Sweetgrass inspector testified regarding his concerns about the streamlined inspection procedures. The inspector said that every shipment is no longer inspected for general condition, Canadian plants are given advance notice when an inspection for wholesomeness is assigned, the samples are pulled at Canadian plants and placed in the rear of the truck, accepted shipments are no longer stamped "U.S. Inspected and Passed," and rejected shipments are no longer stamped "U.S. Refused Entry." To support his concerns about the need for stronger inspection procedures, he provided data and examples relating to rejected Canadian meat during 1990 at Sweetgrass and noted other problems with trucks assigned an inspection not stopping at the border and rejected meat being reshipped to the United States.

PRIMARY ASSURANCE OF WHOLESOMENESS BASED ON EQUIVALENCY OF CANADIAN INSPECTION SYSTEM

Port-of-entry inspection is not the primary means of protecting consumers against unwholesome meat imports. The assurance that Canadian meat complies with U.S. standards is primarily based on FSIS' determination that the Canadian meat inspection system is at least equivalent to the U.S. inspection system. However, in our July 1990 report we found that this determination was outdated and not sufficiently documented to allow an independent, objective review of how FSIS arrived at its determination. In response, FSIS initiated an equivalency review update. FSIS has completed its updated review of the Canadian inspection system but has not finalized the results. The final report is due in November 1991.

STREAMLINED INSPECTION PROCEDURES

The Sweetgrass inspector's description of streamlined inspection procedures is accurate but incomplete. He did not distinguish between FSIS' streamlined and intensified inspection program for Canadian meat; explain that the samples are pulled in Canada only under the streamlined program; and make clear that when samples are pulled in Canada, the Canadian inspector is responsible for overseeing sample selection. However, we share the Sweetgrass inspector's concerns about samples being pulled in Canadian meat plants and trucks not stopping for inspection. These concerns were raised in our 1990 report.

Under the streamlined procedures, shipments of Canadian meat are no longer automatically stopped, unloaded, inspected for general condition and proper labeling, and stamped "U.S. Inspected and Passed." Instead, an FSIS computer program randomly selects meat and poultry shipments for border reinspection based on a goal of reinspecting a total of 3,000 lots annually (referred to as "normal" inspections). Shipments not selected for inspection can proceed directly to their delivery point. (Attachment I details the differences between the traditional import inspection procedures and the streamlined procedures.)

To determine whether a planned shipment of Canadian meat will be subject to U.S. inspection, FSIS procedures call for a Canadian government inspector to contact an FSIS field office and provide product information that is entered into the FSIS computer system. If the lot is selected (about one in eight or nine are), FSIS informs the Canadian inspector of the specific samples required. The Canadian inspector then pulls the specific samples, identifies them, and puts them at the rear of the truck. All other shipments may proceed to the border, through U.S. Customs, and to U.S. establishments (for further processing) or into distribution channels without border reinspection.

FSIS instituted an intensified inspection program in April 1989 to inspect additional shipments from individual plants which fail streamlined inspections. FSIS established the program when streamlined program inspections resulted in a higher than anticipated rejection rate. Under the intensified program, if a plant fails a product examination for wholesomeness, the next 15 shipments from that plant must stop at a border inspection facility where a USDA inspector selects the samples and inspects them.

The streamlined procedures are controversial because of (1) the advance notice given Canadian plants for shipments that FSIS has selected for normal inspection and (2) the pulling of samples by Canadian inspectors. Although FSIS has attempted to strengthen controls and correct problems with its inspection procedures, it continues to allow Canadian inspectors to draw samples for FSIS inspection. However, FSIS has no control procedure to ensure that samples are pulled in accordance with FSIS instructions, other than its trust in the integrity of Canadian inspectors. FSIS officials believe that the system is working well and that Canadian inspectors are pulling samples properly. However, in our 1990 report we said that the primary issue raised by these sampling procedures is not whether Canadian inspectors can be relied on to follow them, but whether the procedures themselves instill consumer confidence.

Further, FSIS has experienced a problem of "bypassing"-- truckloads of Canadian meat designated for inspection that fail to stop at border inspection facilities. After 15 trucks with lots designated for inspection bypassed from January through April 1989,

FSIS directed that plants whose trucks failed to stop would have to send their next 10 shipments to the U.S. border inspection facility regardless of whether the shipment is assigned an inspection. Despite the penalty, the problem continues. During the last 8 months of 1989, another 22 designated trucks did not stop. In 1990, 21 trucks bypassed, and this year, through October 1, 20 trucks have bypassed. Overall, however, almost all of the approximately 3,000 trucks scheduled to stop have done so.

ALLEGATIONS OF TAINTED MEAT

In his May 1991 testimony before your Subcommittee, USDA's Sweetgrass import inspector said that he had refused entry to over one million pounds of Canadian meat in 1990. He also described vivid examples of meat he had refused entry, including sour and putrid meat, and the presence of fecal material and pus-filled abscesses. The inspector also charged that imported meat previously rejected was sometimes re-exported to the United States.

We reviewed the Sweetgrass inspector's allegations about unwholesome meat. The inspector's records corroborate his testimony on the amount of meat he has rejected and generally agree with USDA data accumulated in its Automated Import Information System.² However, the records also show that the great majority of the inspector's rejects have been for processing defects such as hair, bone fragments in boneless meat, blood clots, and bruises, and for transportation damage rather than for defects such as sour and putrid meat, and the presence of fecal material and pus-filled abscesses. As shown in table 1, in 1990 the inspector rejected 103 lots of Canadian meat, including 75 lots (73 percent) for processing defects and another 17 lots (17 percent) for transportation damage. Although 5 of the 75 processing defect rejections involved the presence of ingesta, his records showed no rejections involving fecal material or pathological defects (lesions and abscesses) in 1990.

²The Automated Import Information System (AIIS) is a computerized system that centralizes import inspection and shipping information from all U.S. ports. In preparing our July 1990 report, we tested the reliability of 1989 AIIS data. At that time, we found that inspection and rejection data were generally reliable except for data on the weight of rejected shipments. FSIS implemented software changes to correct this problem in January 1990. We also made some additional limited tests as part of this review. These tests also confirmed that the system's data were generally reliable.

Table 1: Reasons for Product Rejections by USDA Sweetgrass Import Inspector, Under Normal and Intensified Programs, 1990

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Total product refused</u>	
	<u>Lots</u>	<u>Pounds</u>
Product examinations:		
Processing defects	75	2,242,134
Unsound condition	6	165,708
Contamination	1	39,991
Other reasons:		
Transportation damage	17	6,270
Labeling defects	3	14,788
Missing shipping marks	<u>1</u>	<u>2,148</u>
Total	<u>103</u>	<u>2,471,039</u>

Source: Data obtained from FSIS' Automated Import Information System.

Overall, the Sweetgrass inspector's rejections accounted for about 39 percent (by weight) of all imported Canadian meat rejected in 1990. Further, most of the rejections (over 93 percent) resulted from the intensified program.

Regarding re-exporting previously rejected meat, FSIS allows meat that has been refused entry into the United States to be returned to the origin country, reworked to eliminate the defects, reinspected and recertified in that country, and exported to the U.S. Such reworking essentially makes a previously refused shipment into a new shipment subject to Canadian inspection and U.S. reinspection procedures. Canadian policy is similar to FSIS policy--it allows previously refused U.S. product to be returned to Canada if it is reworked, reinspected, and recertified.

The Sweetgrass inspector charged that previously refused meat shipments have been re-exported to the U.S. without being reworked. He reported one particularly graphic example in his testimony last May. He described how a shipment of reeking, putrid beef he refused was only re-boxed by the originating plant--not reworked--and presented once again for reinspection at a North Dakota border inspection station where it was also rejected. The inspector says he is alerted to cases of such attempted illegal entry when he inspects samples and finds the plastic bags used by USDA inspectors when thawing meat to be inspected, or telltale signs that the meat has been previously cut and thawed for inspection. The inspector's records documented his suspicions for eight instances starting in 1989 of previously refused Canadian product being offered for import into the United States without the requisite reworking. The documentation included his remarks on rejection log sheets and his photographs of previously cut meat and restamped boxes with the shipping marks of the previously rejected shipment marked out.

Obviously, the opportunity exists for abuse of the reinspection system by Canadian meat exporters willing to subvert the established procedures. As with all aspects of the U.S.-Canadian meat program, however, FSIS relies on the inspection system in Canada to carry out inspection responsibilities in a manner that complies with FSIS regulations. This includes reliance on the Canadian certification process to prevent Canadian exporters from attempting an illegal reshipment of previously refused product.

REJECTION RATES DROPPING

According to FSIS inspection data, the rejection rates of Canadian meat were lower in 1990 than in 1989 and appear to be continuing to fall in 1991, for both normal and intensified inspections. For example, as shown in table 2, 3.0 percent of the randomly selected lots for Canada as a whole failed product examination under normal inspection in 1989 compared to 1.6 percent in 1990 and 0.8 percent for the first 7 months of 1991.³ (FSIS believes that violations occurring in less than 1 percent of the population indicate that there is not a general problem.)

Table 2: Number and Percent of Canadian Meat Lots Inspected and Rejected for Product Examinations

<u>Program</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July 1991</u>
Normal:			
Lots inspected	3,030	2,702	1,730
Lots rejected	90	42	13
Percent rejected	3.0	1.6	.8
Intensified:			
Lots inspected	1,962	2,658	971
Lots rejected	162	174	38
Percent rejected	8.3	6.5	3.9

Source: Data obtained from FSIS' Automated Import Information System.

For the intensified program, 8.3 percent of inspected lots failed product examination in 1989 compared to 6.5 percent in 1990 and 3.9 percent for the first 7 months of 1991. FSIS officials

³The inspection and rejection data provided by FSIS did not include sampling errors and confidence intervals, except for total normal rejections in 1989 and 1990. FSIS reported that with a confidence interval of 95 percent the estimated rejection rate for product examination was between 2.4 and 3.6 percent in 1989 and between 1.1 percent and 2.1 percent in 1990.

told us that rejection rates for the intensified program are expected to be somewhat higher than the streamlined random inspections because intensified inspections are targeted to plants having already failed an inspection and, therefore, more likely to have a problem. Attachment II summarizes the number of pounds of Canadian meat imported, inspected, and rejected by year. Attachments III and IV provide similar information for each port of entry.

A preliminary analysis of port-of-entry data showed that under the normal program most ports were inspecting similar amounts (9 to 14 percent) of Canadian imports entering the United States and rejecting similar amounts (0 to 2 percent). While there was little variance in the port-by-port rejection rates for normal inspections, there was a large variance in rejection rates under the intensified program. For example, excluding two small ports, during the first 7 months of 1991, intensified program rejection rates ranged from a low of 2 percent for the Buffalo port of entry to a high of 17 percent for Sweetgrass.

CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

The basic criticism of the streamlined procedures made by the Sweetgrass inspector and others opposed to them is that they give advance notice to the exporting Canadian plant that a shipment will be inspected and permit the Canadian inspector to pull the samples. The inspector's allegations are, in large part, related to what he believes are the inherent weaknesses in these procedures. For example, although the overall rejection rate for random inspections has fallen to less than 1 percent, the Sweetgrass inspector suggests that the rate is dropping because the Canadians have learned to doctor the samples on these inspections, as indicated by his 17 percent rejection rate on intensified inspections for which he selects the samples.

In our 1990 report we noted that the primary issue raised by the streamlined procedures was not whether Canadian inspectors can be relied on to follow them, but whether the procedures themselves instill consumer confidence. We pointed out that the Canadian inspector who is selecting the samples is part of the Canadian inspection system that FSIS import inspections are evaluating. To have the person being evaluated pull his or her own sample creates the appearance that the sampling process lacks independence and objectivity. In our opinion, the streamlined inspection procedures, as currently designed, will be a continuing source of allegation, controversy, and criticism.

Rather than trying to substantiate individual allegations, we believe that the focus of inquiry should be on the validity and reliability of the streamlined procedures themselves. As you know, we have a separate request from four congressmen asking us to review various issues related to import inspection of Canadian

product. As part of that request, we have been asked to identify alternatives for strengthening import inspection procedures for Canadian meat while still easing entry of Canadian meat into the U.S. in the spirit of the Free Trade Agreement.

Madam Chairwoman, this completes my prepared statement. I would be happy to respond to any questions.

COMPARISON OF TRADITIONAL AND STREAMLINED
INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR IMPORTED MEAT

TRADITIONAL INSPECTION

USDA inspector calls field office (FO) for assignment ("skip" or "inspect") when truck arrives at border.

All trucks (including "skips") stop for limited USDA inspection.

As part of limited inspection, USDA inspector checks health certificate on all shipments (including "skips") at border.

As part of the limited inspection, all shipments (including "skips") unloaded; the USDA inspector checks certification, verifies count, and identifies transportation damage.

USDA inspector selects all samples for "inspect" lots.

All lots (including "skips") inspected and passed, stamped "U.S. INSPECTED & PASSED".

Following rejection of lot, all lots inspected (no "skips") until 15 consecutive lots pass.

STREAMLINED INSPECTION

Agriculture Canada inspector notifies FO of planned shipment by calling for assignment. FO enters data in FSIS computer which determines if the shipment is a "skip" or an "inspect".

Only trucks carrying lots identified for inspection stop. Most shipments ("skips") move directly to customers without USDA intervention.

Agriculture Canada inspector sends health certificate to FO on "skip" shipments and with trucker on "inspect" shipments.

Only samples unloaded for "inspect" lots.

Canadian inspector selects samples for "inspect" lots.

Stamping of inspected and passed product eliminated.

Following rejection of lot, all lots inspected (intensified) until 15 consecutive lots pass. If any "inspect" truck fails to stop for inspection (bypasses): 1st incident - next 10 shipments must stop at border for assignment, 2nd incident - all shipments for next 90 days must stop for assignment, 3rd incident - all shipments must stop for assignment indefinitely.

ATTACHMENT I

Each container of rejected lot stamped "U.S. REFUSED ENTRY".

ATTACHMENT I

Stamping of refused entry product eliminated.

CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY OFFERED, INSPECTED,
REJECTED AND BASIS FOR REJECTIONS, 1988-91

	<u>1988^a</u>	<u>1989^b</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July 1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)			
Pounds offered:	680,209	711,691	701,213	383,255
Pounds inspected:	145,679	121,687	135,236	63,913
Normal	N/A	N/A	71,788	45,508
Intensified	N/A	N/A	63,447	18,405
Pounds rejected:	3,390	7,181	6,376	1,645
Normal	N/A	N/A	1,035	457
Intensified	N/A	N/A	5,341	1,189
Basis for rejections:				
Product examinations ^c	2,615	6,591	6,282	1,564
Normal	N/A	N/A	1,018	385
Intensified	N/A	N/A	5,264	1,179
Other reasons ^d	775	590	94	81
Normal	N/A	N/A	17	71
Intensified	N/A	N/A	76	10

^a1988 was the final year of traditional inspection for Canadian meat products. Streamlined procedures were implemented in January 1989.

^bAlthough intensified inspections were initiated in April 1989, FSIS' Automated Import Information System does not break out separate weight data for 1989 normal and intensified inspections.

^cReasons for product examination rejections include contamination, processing defects, unsound condition, and pathological defects.

^dReasons for other rejections include labeling defects, missing shipping marks, violative net weight, and transportation damage.

Source: Data obtained from FSIS' Automated Import Information System.

AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGES OF CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY
INSPECTED, BY PORT OF ENTRY, 1989-91

<u>Port of entry</u>	<u>1989^a</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July</u> <u>1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)		
Blaine, WA			
Pounds offered	59,802	33,126	12,772
Normal inspections			
Pounds	12,445	5,746	3,086
Percent	20.8	17.3	24.2
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	6,293	558
Percent	N/A	19.0	4.4
Buffalo/Holly/Gasport, NY			
Pounds offered	133,874	128,296	74,427
Normal inspections			
Pounds	21,094	13,235	10,548
Percent	15.8	10.3	14.2
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	5,657	1,484
Percent	N/A	4.4	2.0
Caribou, ME			
Pounds offered	1,563	1,082	561
Normal inspections			
Pounds	149	59	5
Percent	9.5	5.5	.9
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	102	5
Percent	N/A	9.4	.9
Champlain, NY			
Pounds offered	237,612	246,167	133,251
Normal inspections			
Pounds	30,793	25,585	15,039
Percent	13.0	10.4	11.3
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	6,748	4,578
Percent	N/A	2.7	3.4

AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGES OF CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY
INSPECTED, BY PORT OF ENTRY, 1989-91

<u>Port of entry</u>	<u>1989^a</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July 1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)		
Detroit/Hamtramck, MI			
Pounds offered	56,058	54,462	32,676
Normal inspections			
Pounds	8,913	5,723	3,343
Percent	15.9	10.5	10.2
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	1,956	1,167
Percent	N/A	3.6	3.6
Eastport, ID ^b			
Pounds offered	N/A	79,707	46,187
Normal inspections			
Pounds	N/A	6,556	4,482
Percent	N/A	8.2	9.7
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	18,071	3,731
Percent	N/A	22.7	8.1
Pembina, ND			
Pounds offered	86,360	56,228	24,818
Normal inspections			
Pounds	19,021	4,742	2,325
Percent	22.0	8.4	9.4
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	8,640	2,746
Percent	N/A	15.4	11.1
Swanton, VT			
Pounds offered	2,471	14,028	8,364
Normal inspections			
Pounds	374	1,607	1,012
Percent	15.1	11.5	12.1
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	28	571
Percent	N/A	.2	6.8

AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGES OF CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY
INSPECTED, BY PORT OF ENTRY, 1989-91

<u>Port of entry</u>	<u>1989^a</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July</u> <u>1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)		
Sweetgrass, MT			
Pounds offered	133,914	88,117	50,198
Normal inspections			
Pounds	28,896	8,535	5,670
Percent	21.6	9.7	11.3
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	15,952	3,565
Percent	N/A	18.1	7.1
Total for all ports			
Pounds offered	711,691	701,213	383,255
Normal inspections			
Pounds	121,687	71,788	45,508
Percent	17.1	10.2	11.9
Intensive inspections			
Pounds	N/A	63,447	18,405
Percent	N/A	9.0	4.8

^aFSIS Automated Import Information System does not break out separate weight data for 1989 normal and intensified inspections.

^bFSIS did not open its Eastport, Idaho station until 1990.

Source: Data obtained from FSIS' Automated Import Information System.

AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGES OF CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY
REJECTED,^a BY PORT OF ENTRY, 1989-91

<u>Port of entry</u>	<u>1989^b</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July 1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)		
Blaine, WA			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	12,445	5,746	3,086
Pounds rejected	442	95	0
Percent rejected	3.6	1.6	0.0
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	6,293	558
Pounds rejected	N/A	533	12
Percent rejected	N/A	8.5	2.2
Buffalo/Holly/Gasport, NY			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	21,094	13,235	10,548
Pounds rejected	1,017	138	51
Percent rejected	4.8	1.0	0.5
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	5,657	1,484
Pounds rejected	N/A	125	28
Percent rejected	N/A	2.2	1.9
Caribou, ME			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	149	59	5
Pounds rejected	0	.15	0
Percent rejected	0.0	0.3	0.0
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	102	5
Pounds rejected	N/A	0	0
Percent rejected	N/A	0.0	0.0
Champlain, NY			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	30,793	25,585	15,039
Pounds rejected	887	243	212
Percent rejected	2.9	0.9	1.4
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	6,748	4,578
Pounds rejected	N/A	142	100
Percent rejected	N/A	2.1	2.2

AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGES OF CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY
REJECTED,^a BY PORT OF ENTRY, 1989-91

<u>Port of entry</u>	<u>1989^b</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July 1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)		
Detroit/Hamtramck, MI			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	8,913	5,723	3,343
Pounds rejected	584	55	54
Percent rejected	6.5	1.0	1.6
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	1,956	1,167
Pounds rejected	N/A	14	42
Percent rejected	N/A	0.7	3.6
Eastport, ID ^c			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	0	6,556	4,482
Pounds rejected	0	161	43
Percent rejected	N/A	2.5	1.0
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	18,071	3,731
Pounds rejected	N/A	1,259	114
Percent rejected	N/A	7.0	3.1
Pembina, ND			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	19,021	4,742	2,325
Pounds rejected	2,203	241	42
Percent rejected	11.6	5.1	1.8
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	8,640	2,746
Pounds rejected	N/A	639	288
Percent rejected	N/A	7.4	10.5
Swanton, VT			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	374	1,607	1,012
Pounds rejected	0	0	0
Percent rejected	0	0.0	0.0
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	28	571
Pounds rejected	N/A	0	0
Percent rejected	N/A	0.0	0.0

AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGES OF CANADIAN MEAT AND POULTRY
REJECTED,^a BY PORT OF ENTRY, 1989-91

<u>Port of entry</u>	<u>1989^b</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>Jan.-July 1991</u>
	(pounds in thousands)		
Sweetgrass, MT			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	28,896	8,535	5,670
Pounds rejected	2,049	103	55
Percent rejected	7.1	1.2	1.0
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	15,952	3,565
Pounds rejected	N/A	2,630	604
Percent rejected	N/A	16.5	16.9
Total for all ports			
Normal			
Pounds inspected	121,687	71,788	45,508
Pounds rejected	7,181	1,035	457
Percent rejected	5.9	1.4	1.0
Intensified			
Pounds inspected	N/A	63,447	18,405
Pounds rejected	N/A	5,341	1,189
Percent rejected	N/A	8.4	6.5

^aPounds rejected are for both product examinations and other reasons. Over the years, product examinations have accounted for over 90 percent of total rejections by weight.

^bFSIS Automated Import Information System does not break out separate weight data for 1989 normal and intensified inspections.

^cFSIS did not begin inspections at its Eastport, Idaho, station until 1990.

Source: Data obtained from FSIS' Automated Import Information System.

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

**U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, MD 20877**

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 275-6241.

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

<p>First-Class Mail Postage & Fees Paid GAO Permit No. G100</p>
--