

**AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD ADMINISTRATIVE  
MONETARY PENALTIES ACT**

**DECISION**

In the matter of an application for a review of the facts of a violation of provision 40 of the *Health of Animals Regulations*, alleged by the Respondent, and requested by the Applicant pursuant to paragraph 9(2)(c) of the *Agriculture and Agri-Food Administrative Monetary Penalties Act*.

**Aaron Tang, Applicant**

**-and-**

**Canada Border Services Agency, Respondent**

**CHAIRMAN BARTON**

**Decision**

**Following a review of the written submissions of the parties including the report of the Respondent, the Tribunal, by order, determines the Applicant committed the violation and is liable for payment of the penalty in the amount of \$200.00 to the Respondent within 30 days after the day on which this decision is served.**

**REASONS**

The Applicant did not request an oral hearing.

The Notice of Violation dated October 29, 2005, alleges that the Applicant, on or about 10:15 hours on the 29<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2005, at the Vancouver Int'l Airport, in the province of British Columbia, committed a violation, namely: "Import an animal by-product, to wit: meat, without meeting the prescribed requirements " contrary to provision 40 of the *Health of Animals Regulations* which states:

40. No person shall import into Canada an animal by-product, manure or a thing containing an animal by-product or manure except in accordance with this Part.

In general, *Part IV* of the *Health of Animals Regulations* permits importation into Canada of most animal by-products, if the country of origin is the United States. If the country of origin is other than the United States, importation into Canada is only permitted (except for certain specified products such as gluestock and bone meal, for which there are other specific requirements) if the importer meets one of the following four prescribed requirements of *Part IV* of the *Health of Animals Regulations*, namely:

1. Under subsection 41(2) if the country of origin has a disease-free designation and the importer produces a certificate signed by an official of the government of the country of origin that shows that the country of origin is the designated country referred to in the disease-free designation.

No such certificate was provided.

2. The importer meets the requirements of subsection 52(1) which provides as follows:

52(1) Notwithstanding anything in this Part, a person may import an animal by-product if the person produces a document that shows the details of the treatment of the animal by-product and the inspector is satisfied, based on the source of the document, the information contained in the document and any other relevant information available to the inspector and, where necessary, on an inspection of the animal by-product, that the importation of the animal by-product into Canada would not, or would not be likely to, result in the introduction into Canada, or the spread within Canada, of a vector, disease or toxic substance.

.../3

No such document was produced.

3. The importer has acquired an import permit pursuant to subsection 52(2).

No such permit was tendered.

4. The importer has presented the animal by-product for inspection and a satisfactory inspection has been carried out under paragraph 41.1(1)(a) which states as follows:

41.1(1) Notwithstanding section 41, a person may import into Canada an animal by-product or a thing containing an animal by-product, other than a thing described in section 45, 46, 47, 47.1, 49, 50, 51, 51.2 or 53, if

(a) an inspector is satisfied on reasonable grounds that the animal by-product is processed in a manner which would prevent the introduction into Canada of any reportable disease or any other serious epizootic disease to which the species that produced the animal by-product is susceptible and which can be transmitted by the animal by-product, provided that the animal by-product or the thing containing the animal by-product is not intended for use as animal food or as an ingredient in animal food.

No inspection of this nature took place.

The uncontradicted evidence of the Respondent (in fact admitted by the Applicant) is that the Applicant imported from Hong Kong a plastic sealed package of beef jerky without meeting the above prescribed requirements.

Although the Tribunal has no reason to doubt the Applicant's evidence that this was a careless mistake and not a deliberate violation, the lack of intention to commit a violation or the lack of knowledge of the requirements are not defences to a violation by reason of subsection 18(1) of the *Agriculture and Agri-Food Monetary Penalties Act* which states as follows:

.../4

18.(1) A person named in a notice of violation does not have a defence by reason that the person

- (a) exercised due diligence to prevent the violation; or
- (b) reasonably and honestly believed in the existence of facts that, if true, would exonerate the person.

The authority of the Tribunal is restricted to determining whether or not a violation took place and if so, whether the penalty assessed was in accordance with the *Regulations*. It has no ability to change a Notice of Violation with a penalty to one with a warning, or to forgive the violation.

In this case, the Tribunal finds the Respondent has established, on a balance of probabilities, that the violation was committed and that the penalty was properly assessed.

The Tribunal wishes to point out to the Applicant that this is not an offence, but a monetary violation, and that he has the right to apply after 5 years to have the notation of this violation removed from the Minister's records in accordance with subsection 23(1) of the *Agriculture and Agri-Food Administrative Monetary Penalties Act*, which states as follows:

23. (1) Any notation of a violation shall, on application by the person who committed the violation, be removed from any records that may be kept by the Minister respecting that person after the expiration of five years from
- a) where the notice of violation contained a warning, the date the notice was served, or
  - b) in any other case, the payment of any debt referred to in subsection 15(1), unless the removal from the record would not in the opinion of the Minister be in the public interest or another notation of a violation has been recorded by the Minister in respect of that person after that date and has not been removed in accordance with this subsection.

.../5

Dated at Ottawa this 14<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2005.

---

Thomas S. Barton, Q.C., Chairman