



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*



CATPRN

Canadian Agricultural Trade Policy Research Network

Harvesting Public Policy? Private Influence on Agricultural Trade Policy in Canada

CATPRN Working Paper 2007-4

July 2007

Robert Wolfe

Professor

School of Policy Studies

Queen's University

robert.wolfe@queensu.ca

<http://www.catrade.org>

Funding for this project was provided by the Canadian Agricultural Trade Policy Research Network (CATPRN). The CATPRN is funded by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada but the views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the funding agency.

Earlier versions of this paper were presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, May 30, 2007; to the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago, March 1, 2007; and at the workshop on Agro-Food TNCs and Global Food Governance: The Challenge to Sustainability, Centre for International Governance Innovation, Waterloo, December 7-9, 2006

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada as part of a Standard Research Grant. I am grateful to Jennifer Clapp for stimulating this line of inquiry, for the comments of all the workshop and conference participants, for helpful suggestions from Karl Meilke and James Rude, and for the research assistance of Tim Sayle and Jesse Helmer.

Introduction

Who influences agricultural trade policy? Take a curious conjuncture of events in Canada preceding the December 2005 Hong Kong ministerial conference of the World Trade Organization (WTO). First, earlier that year, the Canadian organizers of the international “Make Poverty History” campaign, with their catchy TV ads and celebrity endorsements, engaged thousands of Canadians in a campaign explicitly oriented to the Gleneagles G-8 summit and the Hong Kong WTO ministerial (Smythe, 2007). One of the three objectives was to “make trade fair”, which included calls to “Support measures that boost farmers' power in the marketplace and that bring an end to the dumping of goods, which damages the livelihoods of poor rural communities.”¹ Second, at the WTO ministerial in December, 43 of the 69 Canadian observers were from agri-food associations (none of whom represented the associations then engaged in lobbying for or against the potential imposition of high duties on imports of U.S. corn), and only 10 observers came from the hundreds of associations behind Make Poverty History. Third, after a full day of unedifying debate on agricultural trade policy in November, the only debate on trade policy that year, the House of Commons gave unanimous approval to a motion instructing negotiators in Hong Kong to seek increased market access abroad for agricultural exporters (mostly in the west) while ensuring that the protection from imports offered the supply-managed sectors (mostly in the east) did not change (Canada, 2005c: 9960, 10017). This schizophrenic instruction obviously affected the public stance of negotiators, and limited the ability of Canadian ministers to be full participants in the negotiations by undermining their credibility, and it did not reflect the wider interests of Canadians, let alone the concerns of the make Poverty History campaigners, but does it show farmers harvesting public policy? Does it signify anything about the influences on Canadian policy in a global negotiation, or does it only show politicians competing for the votes of farmers? Some policy decisions have endogenous determinants, some are exogenous. Canadians can determine the position their negotiators adopt, but not the results of the negotiation, yet acceptance and implementation of the new obligations is decided at home. Since nobody expects Canada to leave the WTO if the terms of the Commons resolution are not met, is the Canadian agricultural trade policy process best understood as a deliberative process that helps those affected feel that they have helped shape the Canadian position, even if that position cannot determine the final outcome of the Doha round? Is it better to ask about how private actors attempt to influence trade policy, or about the problem of domestic resonance for an international negotiation?

Agriculture is a distinctive sub-set of trade policy. It is the issue that has slowed multilateral trade negotiations since the 1960s, yet it is a sector with a declining share both of the economy in OECD countries and of global trade. In most places agricultural policy serves a minority—farmers in rich countries, non-farmers in poor ones. The privileged place of supply management in Canadian politics might, therefore, have two simple explanations. The first is familiar in the political economy literature: the protection matters a great deal to a small number of producers (who would lose billions of dollars invested in quotas if the system ended immediately), while costing little for a large number of consumers. Many Canadians might think the price worth paying to preserve the family farm or a pleasant rural landscape. The second is more specific: it is said that the nature of Canada's first-past-the-post Westminster parliamentary system, with

¹ See <http://www.makepovertyhistory.ca/e/aim1.html>

rural ridings often at the lower end of the permitted population variance and urban ridings often at the upper end, allows a small number of ridings with relatively large farm populations to have disproportionate influence on national policy. These simple explanations do not go far enough, however. They explain why farmers' attempts to influence policy might succeed, without showing how it is done, especially given that barely a sixth of federal ridings have significant numbers of agricultural voters.² The simple explanations might explain farmers' success in getting MPs to pass non-binding resolutions, without predicting the prospects for implementation in Canada of any new obligations resulting from the Doha Round. More complex explanations of private influence are often based on the suspicion that agricultural trade policy is inordinately influenced by corporate interests, in the civil society literature (Murphy, 2006), or by lobbying, in the political economy literature (Gawande, 2005). In both cases the worry is that money buys trade policy. The first approach needs evidence of the presence of corporate actors in the process; the second infers influence from the presence of money or of particular policy outcomes. Except for one influential but now dated paper (Caves, 1976), nobody has done the empirical work in Canada to show that policy *is* what money would *buy*, and neither the civil society nor the political economy approach explains the Commons resolution or what it means.

Given the difficulties with a focus on policy outcomes, I look at the process, at how private interests attempt to influence one national government.³ Multilateral negotiations are not conducted among states as unitary actors. State "interests" emerge both in discussion with other states and in interaction with economic actors. States know what they want in part by talking to the actors affected by policy, just as those actors learn through talking to the state. I concentrate on the way farmers and processors organize to make their views known, and the channels they use, notably consultations, appearing before parliamentary committees, and lobbying. I do it with a reciprocal interaction in mind: private actors try to influence policy while negotiators try to build support for an agreement. In a rationalist framework, it would be called a two-level game, but in a constructivist frame it might be about how to promote genuine deliberation (arguing) without having so much transparency that bargaining is impossible. In the next section, I address some theoretical considerations about identifying all possible forms of private influence. After

² In 54 of the 308 ridings, the share of "occupations unique to agriculture" is both above the national average of 2.6%, and above the roughly 4% of broader agri-food employment in the workforce. Only 9 of the 54 ridings were in Quebec, and all but one of those went to the Bloc Québécois in the 2006 general election. The Conservatives won 29 of the 30 ridings west of Ontario, and 11 of the 24 ridings east of Manitoba. The Liberals won only 5 of the 54 ridings, confirming their role as a largely urban party. Source: Parliament of Canada, "Senators and Members", <http://www.parl.gc.ca/common/SenatorsMembers.asp> Updated June 15, 2007; (Canada, 2006a); and Statistics Canada. 2003. Profile of Labour Force Activity, Class of Worker, Occupation, Industry, Place of Work, Mode of Transportation, Language of Work and Unpaid Work, for Canada, Provinces, Territories and Forward Sortation Areas, 2001 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 95F0490XCB2001003. Ottawa.

³ Private actors may have indirect influence on the rules of the global trading system by helping to frame how the issues are understood at the WTO in Geneva, and these same actors may shape the terms of national debate. Oxfam's analysis (Oxfam, 2005) may not influence any government directly, but it might influence how citizens judge trade policy. Description and analysis of such discursive power is outside the scope of this paper.

describing the policy domains in the second section, and the actors of interest in the third section of the paper, I describe the recent evolution of consultations on agricultural trade policy in the fourth section, and in the fifth provide some evidence on lobbying. After this description of who seems to be heard, in the conclusion I speculate on why groups choose one or another channel of influence, and discuss the institutional design implications that affect whether private interests are able to harvest public policy.

Private influence in theory

Private actors engaged in the kind of activities described in this paper are often said to have “instrumental power”. The term implies a direct causal relation between the action and the outcome. Such causality is always hard to show (Woll, 2007); indeed since influence cannot be directly measured, judgements about the effectiveness of any private actor are necessarily subjective (Kraft and Kamieniecki, 2007: 24). It is impossible in this case to see power as “control over outcomes” because a small country like Canada does not control the outcome of a global trade negotiation. Even limiting the focus to the position adopted by economic actors and government negotiators is problematic because of the potential for posturing. Knowing the preferences of an actor is hard, and deducing it from public statements is risky. An acceptable outcome may be more limited than initial demands might suggest, and satisfaction with an outcome is not necessarily evidence of a group’s influence (Dür and Bièvre, 2007: 7-8).

Rather than investigate the impact on policy, therefore, I look for evidence of all of the ways in which agri-food interests attempt to influence the design and operation of agricultural trade policy in Canada. Private actors can influence policy directly, or through proxies that can shape ideas, or provide information. The influence can be through open consultations and parliamentary hearings, or through closed lobbying by firms and associations. When the agri-food share of the workforce is less than 4%, they cannot form their own political party, but they can offer campaign contributions, mobilize marginal voters in ridings where they form a large part of the electorate, demonstrate in the streets, or provide funds for think tanks. Campaign finance rules can increase the influence of groups that can supply the funds politicians need, or the rules can limit the influence of groups if contributions are restricted. The electoral system can give a bigger voice to groups that can sway even a small group of marginal voters (first-past-the-post), or it can strengthen groups that appeal to the general interest (some variants of proportional representation). Other resources that groups can supply to politicians or officials include information on what their members want, and technical expertise (Dür and Bièvre, 2007: 5). By tracing all the potential pathways we get some sense of how influence is exercised, and whether countervailing influence is possible.

The framework sketched here has obvious affinities with the approach variously called “policy communities”, “iron triangles”, “advocacy coalition”, or network analysis (Howlett, 2002). While the agriculture policy community cannot necessarily control the results of negotiations in the WTO, it would be worthwhile to ask if Canada has an identifiable agricultural trade policy community. In his attempt to operationalize this approach in Canada, Howlett’s (2002) evidence of who belongs to a network is based on appearances before a relevant Parliamentary committee. Accordingly in the sections that follow, in addition to looking at who participates in trade policy consultations, and who registers as a lobbyist, I also look at who

appears before parliamentary committees, in order first to provide a more fine-grained sense of who is engaged in the agricultural trade policy debate, and second to allow comparative analysis of where and how actors engage. Finally, the WTO is ultimately a Single Undertaking, allowing other parts of the overall package to affect or be affected by the outcome on agriculture. It might follow that private actors trying to influence Canadian agricultural trade policy might face political competition from other actors pursuing a cosmopolitan interest (in favour of the trading system as a whole, the global environment, or global justice), a general Canadian interest, or other private interests. Evidence of such interaction effects (within agriculture, and between agriculture, goods, and services) might be especially notable when looking at public consultations and parliamentary hearings.

The agriculture policy domain

In this paper the term “agriculture” should be understood to mean primary production and food processing, since both are exposed to trade. Primary agriculture in Canada is 1.3% of GDP and 1.9% of employment; when food, beverage and tobacco (FBT) processing is added, the agri-food sector is 3.4% of GDP and 3.8% of employment. Some primary producers (e.g. oilseeds) export two thirds of their production, but others (e.g. dairy) export less than 10%. FBT processors compete with imports for domestic sales, since imports account for 20% of the domestic market. About three-quarters of FBT production is consumed in Canada, but some sub-sectors are more export-oriented than others (Canada, 2006a). The implication is that interest representation will be fragmented since some producers and processors will resist liberalization in Canada, while others will be anxious to develop further export opportunities. The policy framework matters more to producers and processors than consumers: food consumption in Canada, including in restaurants, is barely 15% of household expenditure, but government support is close to 40% of agriculture GDP. Relative prices therefore matter much more to the actors in the sector than to consumers, who care much more about food safety and quality issues, and environmental sustainability.

The most significant farms for policy purposes would look very much like small businesses to most citizens. AAFC distinguishes among a number of different types of family farms, but only two are significant in commercial terms, the ones called Large Business-Focused farms, with revenues of \$100,000 to \$499,999; and Very Large Business-Focused farms, with revenues of \$500,000 and over. In 2004 the average Canadian farm’s total net worth was \$898,000. Roughly 80 percent of production is from 20 percent or less of the farms, and these farms are the main beneficiaries of agricultural programs (Canada, 2002). Average herd size in dairy farming, for example, is still relatively small at under 50 cows, but because of supply management, the average value of the quota giving the right to sell the milk from those cows is \$1.5 million (Canada, 2006a). Agriculture policy tends to see farms as businesses rather than seeing farmers as individuals, with the result that politically-motivated policies designed to help struggling farmers provide even more help to large farm businesses. The farms with the biggest assets are the ones where policy distortions are the most significant.

The focus of the framing paper for this project is Transnational Corporations (TNCs), but that focus is less helpful than one might expect in the case of Canadian agricultural trade policy. TNCs tend to support free trade, in public, but they also benefit from agricultural protectionism

due to their ability to adjust to any policy framework (Scoppola, 1995: 18). We observe few TNCs in Canadian agriculture, and their observable interests are congruent with those of other actors. Cargill and the other grain distributors are large, but the grain companies tend to subsume their interests with other grain exporters. Multinational dairy processors (e.g. Parmalat and Danone) have large investments based on the current structure of dairy tariffs, but their influence is congruent with the large domestically-owned dairy processors (e.g. the Agropur cooperative) with whom they are allied in the Dairy Processors Association of Canada (DPAC). Food processing is highly concentrated in Canada, with the top four firms in some sub-sectors (e.g. oilseeds and breakfast cereals) representing up to 80% of sales, but concentration indices decline when imports are considered (Canada, 2006a). Harrison and Rude (2004) conclude that market concentration is mitigated by trade openness; and concentration is not necessarily an indicator of market power (understood as pricing power). Vertical and horizontal linkages between various parts of the food supply chain—like contracts between farmers and processors—nullify any analytic value in artificial distinctions between farmers and agribusiness.

I would expect private actors to be interested in international negotiations and new regulations that affect agriculture at three points: upstream farm inputs (hormones, seeds, agro-chemicals), the downstream regulatory framework for processed food (food safety), and trade (market access, domestic support and export subsidies in Canada and abroad for commodities and processed food). I focus only on trade, since farm inputs are not part of “agriculture” in the WTO, and food safety, the Agreement on Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary Measures (SPS), is not part of the Doha negotiations.⁴

In addition to multilateral negotiations on new rules, the focus of the discussion below of *consultations*, I also expect private actors to be interested in how the trade regime shapes day to day food governance. The regime in operation is especially susceptible to influence at two points, discussed in the section on *lobbying*. First, private actors try to influence the details of tariff classifications, import permits and other technical or administrative issues, where consumers, and import-competitive sectors will have different interests. Second, private actors are interested in the operation of the dispute settlement system. Importers use the domestic trade remedy system to harass foreign competitors; exporters encourage the government to use the WTO dispute settlement system to force foreign governments to respect their obligations. Whether anything changes as a result of dispute settlement cases (always a debatable point), we have evidence that corporate interests are able to influence the choice of cases to pursue, more so in the USA than the EU (Sherman and Eliasson, 2006), and many cases are pursued because of business lobbying—indeed in many such cases, the legal bills are largely paid by industry, which is why big American and European law firms maintain Geneva offices staffed by trade lawyers. It is assumed, for example, that Brazilian industry lobbied for and helped fund the sophisticated challenges in the WTO to U.S. cotton and sugar subsidies.

⁴ I also do not systematically consider whether actors have different preferences for NAFTA and the WTO. While NAFTA had a significant impact on the structure of North American agriculture, the focus of new negotiations now is in Geneva.

Who are we talking about?

Before identifying all the private actors who try to influence Canadian agricultural trade policy, it is useful to identify the government actors they seek to influence, and the range of possible influences on government. Canada's constitution assigns authority for the regulation of trade and commerce to the federal (national) government. The federal government can sign international trade agreements, without seeking parliamentary approval, but Parliament must approve the legislation needed to implement trade agreements, and the national government also often needs the co-operation of provincial governments, especially in areas of shared federal-provincial responsibility, such as agriculture. Parliament is also a forum for opposition parties to question the Government, and standing committees in both the Senate and the House of Commons hold public hearings on international trade and agriculture.⁵ Trade policy touches many departments, including Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC), but the central role is played by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT). Some regulatory action is taken by departmental officials, such as the issuance of import permits for certain agricultural products, but many implementation actions are the responsibility of autonomous administrative agencies, including the Canadian International Trade Tribunal (CITT), which hears allegations of unfair trade practices, or trade remedy cases, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA).

For analytic convenience I largely focus on AAFC, with a nod to DFAIT. In Canada as elsewhere, agriculture stands out: few other sectors of the economy have their own ministry. Such departments of government see their mission as the promotion of agriculture, making them more susceptible to lobbying (Grant, 2003). And few other industries are able to send their own senior officials and ministers as full participants in the multilateral negotiations—other departments are represented through the trade minister. Ministers are members of Cabinet and accountable for the policies of their departments. In their assessment of what is best for Canada, they are influenced by other countries, by advice from officials, by representations from Cabinet and caucus colleagues, by consultations, and by lobbying. The Chief Negotiator is also influenced by other countries. It is vital to distinguish, however, between the technical information s/he needs to do the job, which can come from economic actors, and pressures for a change of policy direction, which usually only has an impact on officials when it comes as political instructions from the minister.

Who then are the private actors? When policy is highly salient, and the actors so numerous and diffuse, collective action is essential. In farming, the associational structure of interest aggregation depends in part on the rents created by policy (Schmitz, Furtan and Baylis, 2002) and on other factors that differ between countries including political institutions, like federalism (Skogstad, 1990b; Skogstad, 1990a). Divided jurisdiction in Canada means some producers organize on provincial lines, while other sectors organize to lobby the federal government. The industrial organization of a sector also has a big impact on who will want what kind of influence. Large heavily capitalized farms will differ from small-holders, as will those who produce for local as opposed to export markets, or those who produce bulk commodities rather than processed products. Similarly firms that use food as an input for other services, like grocers and

⁵ On committees as a form of consultations, see (Schofield and Fershau, 2007).

restaurants, will both have their own associations and make common cause with farm groups favouring liberalization. In consequence, in Canada at least, the associational structure of the agri-food industry remains fragmented.

The diversity of agriculture organizations in Canada is seen in the Annex. They organize by crop, by sector and by region. They associate with other groups based on their orientation to government policy, or to producers in other countries. Some only participate in consultations on the agricultural policy framework negotiations between Ottawa and the provinces; some take every opportunity to engage in WTO consultations; some do not participate in consultations at all, seeing lobbying as the best way to pursue their interests. The list of agri-food groups in the Annex is a subset of a larger database of over 100 groups known to have participated in AAFC consultations in the last few years, including on the domestic Agriculture Policy Framework (APF) in 2002 and the Next Generation consultations in 2007. The Annex retains only those groups who participated in a WTO-related event, many of whom have clear family ties to smaller or regional groups who only participated in APF events.

Beginning at the top, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture (CFA) is a peak association that still has broad membership of farm associations, both provincial and sector-specific commodity groups—it has no direct members, unlike the National Farmers Union (NFU)—but the Canadian Cattlemen’s Association and the newer Grain Farmers of Canada do not belong.⁶ The CFA was never the single voice of Canadian farmers, but since the 1980s it has struggled with newer groups. In the west, for example, changes to the transport subsidy regime alienated grain and livestock producers both from each other and from national bodies at the same time as new trade negotiations—the Uruguay Round and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)—brought more firms into the consultation process. Most of the sectoral groups have national umbrella organizations with the exception of the grains and oilseeds sector. There are also regional umbrella groups that represent a number of sectoral interests. Agri-food firms also tend to try to influence policy through associations and umbrella organizations rather than acting alone. They act through national and/or sectoral associations for primary processors, further processors, importers, exporters, distributors, retail grocers and food services firms.

It is now harder and harder for government and farm organizations to reconcile the divergent interests of export-oriented producers in the west with the protectionist Supply Management 5 (SM5) in the east who depend on import protection and supply management. In the west there are divergences between farmers who support the CFA, and those who think it a hindrance. One result was the formation in 2001 of the Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance (CAFTA) to support trade liberalization. It includes producers, processors and others in the export sector, and branded consumer goods firms. Meanwhile, as is to be expected in this context, both CAFTA and the CFA forge links with organizations in other countries (Coleman, in press: 212; see also Coleman, 2002). The most important links for the CFA are through the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP). It describes itself as the world farmers’ organization representing over 600 million farm families grouped in 115 national organizations in 80 countries. IFAP members appear to be similar to CFA—national organizations representing relatively small scale

⁶ This section draws heavily on (Skogstad, 2005: 194, 200, 209; and, Hedley and Gellner, 1995).

farmers. Members in Europe are national, not the Brussels based EU-wide bodies.⁷ IFAP and the CFA frequently organize sessions at the annual WTO public forum. CAFTA also has international links. In the U.S. firms and groups interested in liberalization formed the Food Trade Alliance in 2005. That group worked with CAFTA to create the Global Alliance for Liberalized Trade in Food and Agriculture, an international peak association, although one that lacks the size or infrastructure of IFAP. CAFTA is a member of the Cairns Group Farm Leaders that sends observers to ministerial meetings of the Cairns Group.

This fragmented associational structure of Canadian agriculture is reflected in participation in trade policy consultations.

Consultations

Mass demonstrations against the trading system did not begin with civil society organizations in the late 1990s. On February 21, 1992 after the publication in December 1991 of the draft Final Act of the Uruguay Round (the so-called Dunkel text), 30,000 farmers protested on Parliament Hill in Ottawa, believing that the potential outcome of the Round would destroy the institution of the family farm. Managing the end of the negotiations at home continued to prove difficult for the rest of the round. Agriculture negotiators discovered, painfully, that farmers did not have a great amount of knowledge at the end of the Uruguay Round, and that in consequence those most affected did not understand the deal. They decided to use “consultations” to ensure a better outcome in the next round.⁸

With new negotiations scheduled for 2000 as part of the WTO’s “built-in agenda”, veteran negotiators were determined to keep the farm community informed throughout the process so that they would not be caught by surprise at the end. The government signaled as early as January 1997 that it would engage in extensive consultations.⁹ The first step was a discussion paper distributed by AAFC that provided general background, and identified issues for negotiations. Officials subsequently met with umbrella organizations at the regional and provincial as well as the national, level. Ahead of the 1999 Seattle ministerial of the WTO, AAFC organized a broader conference in Ottawa to allow the stakeholders to learn from and react to the representations of other players in the industry. The public was not invited to most of these meetings, but the process was supplemented by hearings in the Parliamentary committees responsible for agriculture and for trade (Berg and Schmitz, 2006). This massive exercise involved thousands of people all across the country, yet while negotiators heard from everybody in the *industry*, including labour, they heard from few people outside the industry (Canada, 2000:

⁷ In the EU, export-oriented organizations tend to lobby Brussels while protectionist farmers lobby their national governments, although reality is of course more complex (Pappi and Henning, 1999). For a different take on EU groups, see (Wiggerthale, 2005).

⁸ In another paper (Wolfe, forthcoming) I provide background on consultations in Canada, in general, and then on the institutional structure for and history of trade policy consultations. This section is an elaboration of one of the case studies begun in that earlier work.

⁹ This history draws heavily on (Stairs, 2000: 21-2).

2-3). The people who came to the meetings were the people with the most direct interest. AAFC subsequently prepared a report on the consultations that was posted to its website in the form of a public statement on Canada's initial negotiating position in the proposed new WTO round (Canada, 1999).

After the launch of the Doha round in 2001, large open consultations were not repeated, but detailed annual updates are posted to AAFC's website (Canada, 2005b, for example, was the fourth in a series), and a large range of associations has been encouraged to participate in WTO-related activities, including observation of WTO ministerial meetings as well as the annual public forums organized by the WTO secretariat in Geneva. (DFAIT has also not repeated large multi-stakeholder consultations, now preferring to use more targeted mechanisms to elicit the information negotiators need.) These public events are open to anyone, but Table 1 shows that agriculture groups have taken far more advantage of these general opportunities than have other Canadians interested in trade policy. AAFC has also organized several roundtable discussions with industry representatives to discuss both specific issues and Canada's evolving strategy in the negotiations. In March 2006, for example, the agriculture and trade ministers jointly convened a roundtable discussion with industry stakeholders on Canada's approach to the WTO negotiations. Approximately 50 elected heads of national agri-food associations were invited to attend. Similar roundtable events were held in the summer and early fall of 2003, just prior to the Cancún ministerial, and again in October 2004 and May 2005. Parliamentary committees have also held hearings on a number of related issues, although WTO issues have not received as much attention from parliamentarians as one might hope (Berg and Schmitz, 2006). Table 2 shows the trade-related hearings held since the start of the Doha round, where agriculture groups dominate the agriculture committee, especially on specific issues, but play a smaller role when more general trade policy issues are addressed. The agriculture groups are identified in the Annex.

These sorts of events are not sufficient for providing detailed information, so Canada's Chief Agriculture Negotiator holds regular teleconference calls with industry stakeholders through the Agriculture Trade Negotiations Consultations Group (ATNCG).¹⁰ The frequency of those calls is determined by developments in the negotiations. The calls tend to be initiated before a major meeting, and/or during the meeting and/or after the meeting. Participants in that group represent the full range of agri-food stakeholders, including supply management, export-oriented, and agriculture and agri-food processing interests. Approximately 20 producer organizations, 15 processor/ transportation organizations, 4 producer/processor organizations, 3 individual firms, 7 government organizations, 3 non-governmental organizations and 3 food service/retail organizations have representation in this Group. Consultations with the ATNCG in principle provide for confidential dialogue between industry stakeholders and the Government, but in practice the calls are more useful for one-to-many communication about what is going on in the negotiations than for many-to-one messages about Canadian interests. Actors who want to exercise influence on the Chief Negotiator find other means.

The ATNCG includes stakeholders who have an interest, knowledge and technical expertise on agricultural trade policy and negotiations, have the ability to provide timely advice, and can serve as a contact point for their respective organizations. It is not easy, however, to find out who

¹⁰ This descriptive information was provided by AAFC officials in October 2006.

has been invited to these more restrictive meetings, although we can guess. Table 3 shows the frequent flyers in WTO-related events—the groups that participate most often are the ones with a particularly strong stake in the outcome of WTO negotiations. I presume that the frequent flyers in open consultations also participate in the confidential conference calls. Both the confidential briefings provided by AAFC and the public hearings conducted by parliamentary committees tend to be dominated by private actors, with few voices attempting to articulate a general interest. Table 1 does show, however, that both cosmopolitan and environmental groups have continued to engage with WTO consultations. Those consultations, however, are only one of the available channels of influence.

Lobbying

The modern political economy of protection literature that Kindleberger (1951) founded sees restrictions on trade as a privilege for the few gained by interest groups at the expense of the broad national interest. Agriculture is the archetypical example, since farming is heavily protected from foreign competition in so many countries. It is reasonable to ask if this triumph of a particular over the general interest is due to lobbying. In a utilitarian framework, the incentive for private (small group) collective action increases to the extent that the policy process creates private goods. Policy that benefits all equally (the general interest) generates few incentives to lobby (Gowa, 1988: 31). The more specific or individual the issue, the more firms would be expected to lobby directly; the more general the issue, the more firms would be expected to work through associations. These expectations are consistent with general Canadian experience. A small number of CEOs of larger firms, for example, joined their colleagues in the International Chamber of Commerce in a letter published in the world's leading business newspaper urging progress in the Doha round (Fourtoun, Fung and Wallenberg, 2007). At the other extreme, we know that the Big Three auto makers privately lobbied the government intensively to ensure a vigorous response to a WTO dispute over the Auto Pact (Krikorian, 2005: 148). In this section I consider whether those expectations are consistent with what can be observed of the Canadian agricultural trade policy process.

The considerable civil society literature on the supposed influence of corporations on agricultural trade policy tends to focus on the policy process in Washington, D.C. and to a lesser extent on Brussels (Deckwirth, 2005). Some of its claims (for example about a revolving door for officials moving from firms to government and back again) may be relevant in those cities, but they have less relevance in Ottawa (where many lobbyists were once in government, but few go the other way.) In an excellent survey of the literature on the connection between lobbying and the U.S. political process, Gawande (2005) distinguishes between lobbying designed to provide information in the utilitarian sense of signaling voter preferences to politicians (he cites Ainsworth and Sened, 1993), and *Quid Pro Quo* lobbying in which political contributions effectively buy the desired policy (Grossman and Helpman, 1994). The anomalies in these models of lobbying as exchange or as persuasion are troubling even in the U.S. case (Hall and Deardorff, 2006) and they are difficult to use in Canada because they depend on empirical information about campaign contributions that is not available. U.S. authors look at Political Action Committees, and where the money goes (Gawande and Hoekman, 2006; Fordham and McKeown, 2003). Previous research on Canadian interest groups found that few used political contributions as a form of influence (Landry, Amara and Lamari, 1999: 486), so it is not

surprising that a recent search of the Elections Canada database of political contributions showed that agri-food associations do not make political contributions to individual MPs, perhaps because of their limited ability to influence policy. It may also be that Canadian election law limits the utility of this kind of lobbying. Rather than Quid Pro Quo lobbying, however, farm groups no doubt engage in intensive information lobbying. Members of Parliament are subject to lobbying, in Ottawa and their constituencies, and they hear from their voters directly. Over half of Ontario ridings have less than 1% of the work force in “occupations unique to agriculture”, but the ability of a few hundred agri-food voters in many ridings with thousands of more urban voters to be heard by MPs is legendary. The electoral effect of their concerns is certainly discussed in the caucus of federal parties, but in Canada key trade policy decisions are made by the executive, who have broader concerns.

The usual lobbying models assume that the key policy decisions are made by individual legislators, which makes sense in the United States, but the models are less helpful on how to analyze interactions between lobbies and ministers or officials, which seems to be where the action is in Canada.¹¹ Lobbying in Canada is regulated under the *Lobbying Act*, which requires everyone to register who engages in any form of communication that involves verbal or written contact with a public office holder—an explicit intent to exert influence is not required (Canada, 2005a).¹² The Act distinguishes between consultants who lobby on behalf of others, and officers of organizations or firms who lobby on their own behalf. Registration is not required in order to participate in stakeholder consultations on policy proposals in cases where the communications take place in an open forum in which the subject matters, the names of participants and the name of the government organizations represented are a matter of public record. Preparation and presentation of briefings to parliamentary committees also does not require registration. Participation in the ATNCG, and any other private attempt to exert influence, does require registration. Until changes in the Act are implemented, however, lobbyists need indicate no more than the departments and the subjects on which they lobby.¹³ The Annex indicates which associations have registered to lobby on agricultural trade issues.

Trade negotiators are lobbied by many private interests, from sophisticated NGOs through farm groups to large firms.¹⁴ All the firms, organizations and NGOs want to make sure their message is heard and understood. They will ask to see anyone from the desk officer all the way up to the minister depending on the access their designated lobbyists can arrange. Firms usually request meetings more through associations, but individual firms do lobby directly, usually to deliver a detailed and specific message within a negotiation or a dispute settlement case. One frequent

¹¹ On the constitutional differences between Canada and the U.S. with respect to agriculture, see (Baylis and Rausser, 2001).

¹² For a survey of the issues in Canada and other countries, see (Wilson, 2006b).

¹³ The act was revised in 2006. On February 22, 2007, the Government announced consultations on new regulations to give effect to new provisions in the Act, including the apparent requirement for lobbyists to report once a month on which designated officials they met and what they talked about (Canada, 2007b).

¹⁴ Confidential telephone interview, November 2006.

reason for lobbying is to ask for what a group considers to be a fair share of tariff rate quota (TRQ) allocations.¹⁵ Canada maintains a number of agricultural TRQs but it seems that firms mostly lobby through their associations. Of the firms on the AAFC list of egg processors, for example, only one has a registered lobbyist.¹⁶ TRQ allocations apparently are hard fought battles, but this fighting over the rents created by a policy meant to serve other purposes does not necessarily drive the policy in the first place.

The lobbying process may be hard to observe, but we can learn something of how it works by looking at a current attempt to use trade remedy laws to influence the operation of the trading system. Canadian corn producers sought relief from supposed U.S. subsidization and dumping in cases brought before the Canadian International Trade Tribunal (CITT) in 1986 and 2000. Canada's average annual production of 8.7 million metric tons (MMT), largely from southern parts of Ontario and Quebec, is markedly smaller than U.S. average annual production of nearly 262 MMT. Under NAFTA, corn trade is duty free. Lower U.S. prices along with strong demand in Canada for industrial corn used for animal feed, ethanol production and some other food uses resulted in imports from the U.S. of 2.8 MMT per year (Schnepf, 2007). Importers were pleased to benefit from the lower U.S. price, but corn producers unhappy about competing with U.S. subsidies launched another case before the CITT in 2005. Corn users heavily opposed the petition, of course. Had it been successful, huge duties would have been applied to imports of U.S. corn, enough to effectively close the border and raise Canadian corn prices significantly, if not by the full amount of the duties. Canadian corn users would have been put at a competitive disadvantage relative to corn users in the U.S. Since Canadians export many corn-using products (hogs, pork, corn sugar (HFCS)), it was well worth while for users to invest effort in opposition. Table 4 shows the companies and organizations who appeared before the CITT as proponents of the case and as opponents. Many of the firms and groups were represented in these legal proceedings by registered lobbyists. Of the 14 associations on the list, only 3 appear in the Annex as a participant in WTO consultations, and only 1 appears on Table 3 as a frequent participant.

The CITT may be in the wrong business—agricultural economists are dubious that antidumping is an appropriate policy tool since farmers as price takers may often be forced to sell abroad at prices below their cost of production—but the transparency of its processes means that all private interests can be heard. The CITT procedures include solicitation of the views of representative consumer organizations in trade remedy cases since it may consider the views of “other” interested parties in all of the various hearings it conducts. As in the corn case, associations representing a *specific* consumer interest are no doubt often heard—firms that use a particular imported good as an input will want to counter producers seeking trade restrictions. But I found only three CITT cases in the first decade after the creation of the WTO where a *general* consumer interest was represented.

¹⁵ On TRQ administration, see (Canada, 1995).

¹⁶ The registered firm is probably the largest, however—MFI Food Canada Ltd. / Inovatech Egg Products. The full list of egg processors is at http://www.agr.gc.ca/poultry/esta-entr_ep_e.htm accessed February 19, 2007.

The CITT ultimately ruled against imposing new duties in 2006, but the corn producers did not give up, continuing to lobby the Canadian government about the unfairness of U.S. corn subsidies. On January 8, 2007, Canada initiated a WTO dispute settlement case (DS357) against certain aspects of U.S. commodity programs in general, and the U.S. corn program in particular (Canada, 2007a). The WTO case seems not to have attracted any lobbying in opposition, which may not be surprising: bringing the WTO complaint served the general objectives of Canadian negotiators as well as the private interests of corn producers. First, officials believe they have a good case: since the U.S. price is effectively the North American price, given their disproportionate share of North American production, U.S. subsidies by lowering the market price of corn drive down the price received by Canadian producers. Canadian corn users did not oppose the case: if it leads to a change in U.S. policy, the subsequent rise in the North American price would affect all users, which would therefore not create a competitive disadvantage for Canadian users. Second, the issues in contention affect all of the U.S. commodity support programs. By bringing the case now, Canada was able to get the attention of U.S. politicians drafting their new Farm Bill.¹⁷ There is a big difference between lobbying for protection from imports, which generates counter-lobbying from the interests that would be hurt by such protection (Cadot, de Melo and Olarreaga, 2004), and lobbying for reductions in protection received by producers in other places, which would only generate counter-lobbying if other groups thought that the negotiator's political capital was being expended on an inappropriate objective. In the corn case, therefore, corn users lobbied against the producers' demands for restrictions on imports, but nobody appears to oppose the government's attempt to reduce U.S. subsidies through the WTO challenge.¹⁸

This observation is consistent with an expectation that multilateral trade *negotiations* concluded as package deals, even within agriculture, promote the engagement of peak and cross-sectoral associations, but *judicialized trade remedy* cases, by de-linking issues promote action by intra-sectoral associations, or even individual firms (De Bièvre, 2003). A specific trade remedy case brings out a different pattern of interest representation than does broad negotiations. Individual actors can have multiple overlapping memberships, using a particular organizational form depending on the type of issue. The slim evidence on agricultural trade policy, therefore, is consistent with the expectation that the more specific or individual the issue, the more firms would be expected to lobby directly; the more general the issue, the more firms would be expected to work through associations, but it is inconclusive on whether the lobbying has much broad effect.

¹⁷ On the interaction between negotiations and dispute settlement, see (Josling, et al., 2006).

¹⁸ When the federal Court dismissed the Corn producers appeal of the CITT decision, the group said (CCP, 2007a) that they would “continue to lobby the Canadian Government to request a [WTO] dispute resolution panel.” When the government did request a panel after the failure to resolve the matter in informal discussions (WTO, 2007c), the basis of the complaint no longer highlighted corn, focusing instead on all trade-distorting commodity programs, including corn, but the corn producers were still pleased that the case was proceeding (CCP, 2007b).

Conclusion: private interests and institutional design

My interest in this topic was first stimulated at a briefing for Canadian participants at a WTO public forum in Geneva in June 2005 where two thirds of the participants represented agriculture groups while representatives of the civil society organizations I had expected to see were a small minority. As Table 1 shows, it turns out that farm groups dominate recent public consultations on WTO negotiations.¹⁹ This new engagement was evident in July 2004 when some Ministers and many senior officials joined WTO ambassadors in a regular General Council meeting to hammer out the new framework for the Doha Round that had eluded them in Cancún in September 2003. Agriculture was the most contentious issue, and 37 Canadian agriculture stakeholders were in Geneva while the framework was negotiated. Canadian Ministers and officials provided these stakeholders with daily updates, and met with them individually. The same thing happened in June 2006 when ministers of about 30 Members representing all the negotiating groupings were in Geneva in a last ditch effort to craft “modalities” for the agriculture negotiations. Canadian agri-food groups were there too, and many more participated in daily conference calls with ministers—agri-food groups represented half the participants in these calls.

Such transparency can be good and bad for negotiations, and public policy. Negotiators who operate under such close scrutiny may not be able to make the trade-offs that are needed in the final bargaining. U.S., European and Canadian agricultural groups know exactly what is going on in Geneva at any moment, and publicly instruct the negotiators on what is or is not acceptable, especially on matters as clear cut as a formula for setting tariffs. The transparency that modern governance demands undermines the privacy essential for negotiations (Stasavage, 2004). It may also undermine liberalization, or force protection into less transparent forms (Kono, 2006). Nevertheless, transparency is essential for deliberation, and deliberation is especially important whenever collective decisions allow burdens to be imposed on others. Does the Canadian process facilitate public understanding and deliberation?

A multilateral trade negotiation is not a single event that must be monitored, but a continuous process. Trade policy is so detailed and complicated, and has such a diffuse effect, that most interests have to be organized to be effective. AAFC is working hard to ensure that collective actors in the agri-food sector will not be caught by surprise at the end. After the massive consultations of the 1990s, however, the department’s own review noted that “the ‘education’ component was not achieved to as great an extent as might have been possible if AAFC had adopted an approach whereby different options, scenarios, and impact analyses were undertaken, shared and debated with participants (Canada, 2000).” Open consultations did not facilitate deliberation or learning as much as might be hoped. The subsequent consultation events listed in Table 1 may or may not be better in that sense for those involved, but they are certainly less engaging for the farm community as a whole. It remains to be seen whether farmers understand and are prepared to support an eventual Doha round package. A considerable amount of

¹⁹ The WTO pattern is not unique. The Codex Alimentarius Commission has an elaborate system for granting NGOs observer status, but one study found that of 150 organizations with that status, over 100 represented agri-food interests, both producers and industry as well as traders. The rest were mostly scientific or professional bodies, with only 10 representing a “public interest” organization—consumer, health, or environmental (Hüller and Maier, 2006: 279).

information is available, but does everyone have appropriate opportunities to use it? The ATNCG conference calls are excellent for providing information to selected stakeholders, if the leaders pass the information on to their members, but they are less useful as a channel for discussion, or for economic actors to pass information to negotiators. It is harder to ensure that the effect of the agriculture negotiations on the 96% of Canadians who work outside the sector is reflected in the Canadian position, and it is harder still in other areas of trade policy because the issues can seem even more diffuse, and less consequential for any one individual or firm. Does the differential knowledge of citizens and farmers provide flexibility or overly constrain negotiators? Citizens who do not fully understand may resist participation in the global trading system that would otherwise benefit them; and, actors who **do** fully understand may take advantage of the imperfect understanding of others in order to capture the trade policy process to their own benefit.

The challenge of open, transparent engagement is finding the right match between process and the nature of the interests. Given the limited overlap between participants in the events described at the outset, under what circumstances, do actors choose one or the other means to influence policy, from open consultations through closed lobbying to dispute settlement? Both very specific and very diffuse interests do not bother, or bother much, with consultations, especially when considerable resources are needed to prepare for or to travel to an event. Corn groups, as we saw, have a very specific interest in U.S. subsidies, so they lobby to ensure that their concerns are addressed, but they do not engage in broad trade policy consultations. The proposed changes to the lobbying regulations may make it easier to observe which other specific interests are lobbying for trade policy changes.²⁰ Diffuse interests also do not engage in consultations. In the late 1990s, NGOs tried to increase the salience of citizens' diffuse interests in trade and globalization, without great success, despite the battles in Seattle, which may be why consultations are increasingly dominated by representatives of more concentrated interests. When interests are concentrated and specific, keeping the process transparent can be hard, but input legitimacy can be critical. When interests are diffuse and general, it is hard for anybody to speak for them, which might make output legitimacy matter more. WTO output is mostly legitimate for most Canadians most of the time—which might be the message of low civil society participation in consultations. Most Canadians may truly not care about supply management, which has little cost for them and does not affect developing country farmers. Groups with a cosmopolitan interest are minimally represented in the ATNCG. It could be that they articulate a concern for those aspects of the Doha agriculture negotiations that do matter for developing countries and for sustainable development. Their understanding of and reaction to an eventual deal may help shape the broader acceptability in Canada of the package.

²⁰ I did not look for evidence of lobbying by groups in other sectors, but the U.S. pattern may be indicative. In October 2006, *Inside U.S. Trade* reported that “U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab ... told members of the services industry that they are leaving too much of the lobbying for approval of trade agreements to agriculture groups, which are taking on that effort to an extent that is disproportionate to the importance of agriculture for the U.S. economy. She pointed out that Federal Express in Tennessee and the Principal Financial Group in Iowa have more employees in those two states than there are farmers, but said the relative importance of services jobs to the U.S. economy is not reflected in services industry lobbying.” (Inside US Trade, 2006)

It is significant that almost all the groups that show up in Table 1, or appear before parliamentary hearings, are from the agri-food sector. Howlett showed that paradigmatic as opposed to incremental change only happens when a policy system is open to new ideas and influences. That in turn depends in part on the extent to which a policy community is insulated from outsiders (Howlett, 2002). In the U.S. case, permeable institutions limit the extent of control that can be exercised by the agriculture “iron triangle” in comparison to the situation in Europe and Japan (Sheingate, 2001; see also Gilligan, 1997). In Canada it appears that the same actors dominate the agricultural trade policy debate whether it is held in parliament, or in consultations, leading us to expect that significant change if it comes will be driven from outside the country in the form of new multilateral obligations. That is, the agricultural policy community is relatively closed to other interests. The appropriate institutional design question, therefore, is about all private interests, and not whether “agribusiness” should have access, as posed by ActionAid (Hilary, 2004; Eagleton, 2006). I am therefore less concerned than some civil society critics about the access of TNCs to the trade policy process in capitals and in Geneva (Murphy, 2006: 30), since they are far from being the most numerous frequent flyers, as we saw in Table 3. Indeed as that table suggests, the policy community is dominated by two opposed peak associations, CFA and CAFTA, which may well off-set each other.²¹ If only concentrated interests know that they have an interest, and have the capacity and resources to be heard, then the general interest can only be served by an open, transparent process that allows counter-lobbying. The general transparency of the Canadian process, with balanced representation in the ATNCG from producer and processor interests, ought to dampen the ability of any one private interest to distort policy, but real change may only come through the WTO.

If the agricultural trade policy community is more or less as insulated from outside influences in the rest of the world as it is in Canada, then no Member of the WTO will have a domestic reason to accept paradigmatic change, though all will demand that their trading partners make more than incremental changes. If each of the 20 aspects of agriculture in the Doha round were negotiated separately, and if agriculture was separate from the rest of the trading system, as it was until the Uruguay Round, then significant change would be unlikely. The WTO Single Undertaking, however, will ultimately force trade-offs both within agriculture and with other sectors. It is not surprising, therefore, that when agriculture is the dominant issue in the Doha round, exogenous pressure from other sectors is less able to overcome the endogenous stalemate in agriculture.

When trade minister David Emerson said the obvious in an interview, that supply management would not last forever (Wilson, 2006a), he was pilloried in public. He and the agriculture minister issued a hurried assertion of faith (Canada, 2006b). He was subsequently hauled before a parliamentary committee, where he professed undying support for supply management, but then made it clear that if an eventual Doha agreement would require changes to supply management, Canada would not stand in its way (Wilson, 2007). Given all the channels of

²¹ This pattern can be seen at an even more micro level. The Dairy Processors Association of Canada (DPAC) has been at odds with the Dairy Farmers of Canada (DFC) over changes to the regulatory framework and pricing structure for certain industrial milk components. The agriculture minister created the Dairy Industry Working Group in 2006 with representatives of both groups. When that group was unable to come to a consensus, the minister acted on the basis of recommendations from the moderator; he announced his decision in a speech to the DFC. DPAC was disappointed.

influence, it is not surprising that politicians are acutely aware of the trade policy views of the supply-managed sectors. But as participants in multilateral negotiations based on reciprocity, they also know that achieving the export enhancement objective of the 2005 Commons resolution will require compromises on the import protection objective, though I found little evidence that ministers are getting much help from actors in other sectors.

This conclusion suggests two tests of the Canadian agricultural trade policy. The plausible scenarios for a successful conclusion to the Doha Round of WTO negotiations will require Canada to allow more access to its market than the supply-managed producers would like. First, will negotiators have the flexibility to seek trade offs within agriculture and with other sectors in the broader Canadian interest? Or as some commentators claim (Reynolds, 2007), have the dairy farmers “held Canadian trade negotiators as hostages, bound and gagged, for years”? This test might require econometric analysis of the outcome in the context of assumptions about the optimal Canadian trade policy, or qualitative comparison of Canadian statements and the roughly 140 Canadian negotiating proposals in all aspects of the round against the results (WTO, 2007a: para 37; and; WTO, 2007b: Annex 1). Second, will Canadians, especially farmers and processors, have sufficient understanding of its elements to accept the obligations the new agreement entails? Does the Canadian process help those affected feel that they have helped shape the Canadian position, even if that position cannot determine the final agreement? Here the tools of public opinion analysis might help show whether the Canadian trade policy process contributes to arguing as well as bargaining.²²

²² Salter might challenge this conclusion. If the “public” in consultations is understood as interest groups, or stakeholders, then it makes sense, and it also makes sense if the public are seen as “experts” with valuable information to impart; but if the point of the exercise was public discourse, than acceptance of a single outcome is not necessarily the right test (Salter, 2007).

*Table 1 Canadian non-governmental participation in WTO-related public events**

	Total	Agriculture	Development	Environment	Academics	Individual	Business	Other
1996 Ministerial, Singapore	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
1998 Ministerial, Geneva	8	5	0	0	0	0	3	0
1999 Ministerial, Seattle	64	22	3	4	3	0	18	14
2001 public forum (Geneva)	10	2	4	2	2	0	0	0
2001 Ministerial, Doha	21	8	4	1	1	0	4	3
2002 public forum (Geneva)	20	2	6	5	5	2	0	0
2003 public forum (Geneva)	28	14	8	3	3	0	0	0
2003 Ministerial, Cancun	83	32	10	10	3	0	18	10
2004 July General Council	unknown							
2004 public forum (Geneva)	34	26	4	2	1	6	1	0
2005 public forum (Geneva)	90	66	7	5	8	2	2	0
2005 DFAIT Roundtable on Trade and Development			30?		5?			
2005 Ministerial, Hong Kong	69	43	11	0	3	0	6	6
2006 mini-ministerial teleconference	33	17	8		1		7	
2006 public forum (Geneva)	64	33	8	7	6	6	6	0

*This table was compiled from lists of NGO participation on the WTO website and then correlated with a summary provided by Canadian officials. WTO Forum refers to the annual symposium on WTO issues organized by the secretariat for civil society. The number in each cell is the count of individuals, not organizations. The categorization is based on the institutional affiliation each individual supplied. The numbers do not include the separate media briefings or government participants—the June 2006 telephone debriefings, for example, included over 30 officials.

Table 2 Parliamentary Committee hearings

Parliament	Session	Committee	Hearing Topic	Agricultural Group	Non-Agricultural	Canadian Government	Foreign Government	Agri-Business
39 th	1 st	AGRI	Agriculture and Agri-Food trade relations, Canada & US	0	0	0	2	0
			Own Use Import Program	2	0	1	0	0
			World Trade Organization	8	0	1	0	0
		CIIT	WTO: Services, Agriculture, and non-Agriculture Market Access	6	1	3	0	0
			CITT: Dumped and subsidized imports	0	0	2	0	0
			Canada's Trade Policy	6	16	19	18	0
			Trade Agreement: Canada & South Korea	3	3	6	0	0
			Canada - CA4FTA Negotiations	2	4	0	0	1
38 th	1 st	AGRI	Bill S-38: Trade Commitments regarding spirit drinks of foreign countries	0	0	3	0	0
			Corn Imports from the United States	9	5	8	0	2
			WTO Ruling on Foreign Grain Testing	2	2	1	0	0
		FAAE	WTO Meeting (December 2005)	4	3	0	0	0
		SINT	Canadian-U.S. Trade Issues	10	20	5	0	0
			Emerging Market Trade Strategy	2	30	10	0	1
37 th	3 rd	AGRI	Trade Negotiations and Cartagena Protocol	3	1	6	0	0
	2 nd	SINT	Strengthening Economic Ties with Asia	3	8	9	0	0
		SEN	The examination of the Canada-United States of America trade relationship and on the Canada-Mexico trade relationship	17	29	19	5	0
	1 st	FAIT	Summit of the Americas and the FTAA	1	21	4	1	0
		SINT	WTO Negotiations from a Canadian Perspective	15	34	16	0	0
			Canadian-Costa Rica FTA	2	1	2	0	3

Acronyms

AGRI	House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food
CIIT	House of Commons Standing Committee on International Trade
FAAE	House of Commons Foreign Affairs and International Trade
FAIT	House of Commons Foreign Affairs and International Trade

SEN Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade
SINT House of Commons Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and
Investment

Dates

39th Parliament - 1st 03/04/2006
38th Parliament - 1st 04/10/2004-29/11/2005
37th Parliament - 3rd 02/02/2004-23/05/2004
- 2nd 30/09/2002-12/11/2003
- 1st 29/01/2001-16/09/2002

“Committee Business.” Parliament of Canada. 17 July, 2007.
<<http://www.parl.gc.ca/common/committee.asp>>

*Table 3 Leading agricultural participants in WTO events**

Organization	Umbrella Affiliation	WTO Events	Hearings
Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance	CAFTA	4	7
Canadian Broiler Hatching Egg Marketing Agency	CFA/SM5	6	
Canadian Egg Marketing Agency	SM5	7	
Canadian Federation of Agriculture	CFA	8	6
Canadian Foodgrains Bank		4	2
Canadian Pork Council	CFA	5	1
Canadian Turkey Marketing Agency (CTMA)	CFA/SM5	5	
Canadian Wheat Board (CWB)	CFA	6	2
Chicken Farmers of Canada (CFC)	CFA/SM5	6	1
Dairy Farmers of Canada (DFC)	CFA/SM5	9	2
Union des producteurs agricoles (UPA)	CFA	6	2

* This table is extracted from the Annex. All of these associations are registered as lobbyists, and/or have a lobbyist registered to act on their behalf. The registrations mention international trade negotiations in general, or in specific bodies. Note that the associations would have to be registered as lobbyists in order to participate in confidential consultations such as the ATNCG.

Table 4 Organizations involved in the CITT corn case

Organization	Lobbyist
Proponents	
Canadian Corn Producers	McMillian Binch Mendelsohn**
Fédération des producteurs de cultures commerciales du Québec	
<i>Manitoba Corn Growers Association</i>	
Ontario Corn Producers' Association	
Opponents	
Ach Food Companies, Inc.	--
Animal Industry Corn Users	--
Animal Nutrition Association of Canada	Grey, Clark, Shih and Associates
Alberta Division	
British Columbia Division	
Manitoba Division	
<i>Canadian Cattlemen's Association</i>	Grey, Clark, Shih and Associates
<i>Canadian Pork Council</i>	Grey, Clark, Shih and Associates
Association of Canadian Distillers	The Trade Group*
Alberta Distillers Limited	
Diaego Canada Inc.	
Schenley Distilleries Inc.	Lang Michener LLP
Brar Natural Flour Milling Inc.	
Brewers of Canada	Grey, Clark, Shih and Associates
Canadian Pasta Manufacturers Association	Don Jarvis Consultants
Casco Inc.-Canada Starch Operating Company	Self, Borden Ladner Gervais**
Canadian Snack Food Association	--
Commercial Alcohols Inc.	The Wellington Strategy Group Inc
Corn Products International	--
Food Processors of Canada	Grey, Clark, Shih and Associates
General Mills Canada Corporation	Global Public Affairs
HYTEK Limited	--
Nature's Path Foods Inc.	--
Newco Commodities Limited	--
Ontario Agri Business Association	--
Maple Leaf Foods Inc.	Self; Hill and Knowlton Canada**
QTG Canada Inc.	Global Public Affairs
Que Pasa Mexican Foods	--
U.S. Corn Coalition	--

* also represented by other firms

** previously represented by Grey, Clark, Shih and Associates

Italics: participant in WTO consultations

Annex: Agriculture-related participants in WTO events*

Organization	Umbrella Affiliation	WTO Events	Hearings	Lobbyist
Agricultural Producers Association of Sask.	CFA	2	1	Self
Agriculture Institute of Canada		1		Self
Agri-Industry Trade Group		1		--
Alberta Chicken Producers		1		--
Alberta Egg Producers Board		1		--
Alberta Milk		2		--
BC Egg Marketing Board		1		--
BC Milk Producers Association		1		Self
Canada Beef Export Federation	CAFTA	2	1	Self
Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance	CAFTA	4	7	Self
Canadian Alliance of Agri-Food Exporters		2		--
Canadian Broiler Hatching Egg Marketing Agency	CFA/SM5	6		Self, Osler Hoskin & Harcourt
Canadian Canola Growers Association	CAFTA	2	1	Self
Canadian Cattlemen's Association	CAFTA	2	1	Grey, Clark, Shih Assoc
Canadian Council of Professional Fish Harvesters		2		Sjma Consultants
Canadian Egg Marketing Agency	SM5	7		Fleishman-Hillard Canada
Canadian Federation of Agriculture	CFA	8	6	Asnong, Edouard
Canadian Foodgrains Bank		4	2	Self
Canadian Horticultural Council	CFA	3		Dentelback, Chuck
Canadian Oilseed Processors Association	CAFTA	2		Self
Canadian Pork Council	CFA	5	1	Grey, Clark, Shih Assoc
Canadian Pork International		1	1	Self
Canadian Poultry and Egg Processors Council		1		Self
Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Assoc		3	1	Self
Canadian Sugar Beets Producers' Association		1	2	--
Canadian Sugar Institute (CSI)	CAFTA	2	2	Self
Canadian Turkey Marketing Agency	CFA/SM5	5		Self
Canadian Wheat Board (CWB)	CFA	6	2	Global Public Affairs
Canola Council of Canada	CAFTA	1		Self
Chicken Farmers of Canada (CFC)	CFA/SM5	6	1	Temple Scott Associates Inc.
Chicken Farmers of Nova Scotia (ns)		2		--
Chicken Farmers of Ontario		2	1	Temple Scott Associates Inc.
Chicken Farmers of Saskatchewan		1		--
Coop Conseil		1		--

Dairy Farmers of Canada (DFC)	CFA/SM5	9	2	Self
Dairy Farmers of Manitoba		1		--
Dairy Farmers of New Brunswick		1		--
Dairy Farmers of Ontario (DFO)		2		Hill And Knowlton Canada
Dairy Farmers of PEI		1		--
Dairy Farmers of Saskatchewan		2		--
Egg Farmers of Canada		1		--
Egg Farmers of Ontario		1		Hill And Knowlton Canada
Egg Producers of Newfoundland and Labrador		1		--
Fédération des producteurs de lait du Québec		3	1	--
Fédération des producteurs de volailles du Québec		2		--
Federation des producteurs d'ouefs de consommation du Quebec		2		--
Grain Growers of Canada	CAFTA	1		Self
ISEAL Alliance		1		--
Les Producteurs de poulet du Canada		1		--
Manitoba Corn Growers Association, Inc.		1		Mcmillan Binch Mendelsohn
National Dairy Council of Canada		1		Grey, Clark, Shih Assoc
National Farmer's Union		2	1	--
New Brunswick Egg Producers		1		--
Ontario Egg Producers		1		National Public Relations
Ontario Federation of Agriculture	CFA	1		Self
Ontario Pork		1		--
Ontario Soybean Growers		1		Self
Ontario Turkey Producers' Marketing Board		1		--
Potato Growers of Alberta		1		--
Saskatchewan Egg Producers		1		--
The Quebec Egg Board		1		--
Union des producteurs agricoles (UPA)	CFA	6	2	Self
Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association		3		Self
World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers		1		--

* Source: DFAIT; WTO; Parliamentary website; Public Register of Lobbyists (Canada, 2005d). “Umbrella Affiliation” refers to the organization’s affiliation with the two leading umbrella groups for agricultural trade policy, and whether the group is a member of the Supply Management 5. “WTO Events” refers to the number of times a group participated in one of the WTO events listed in Table 1. “Hearings” refers to number of appearances since 2001 before a committee of the Senate or the House of Commons. (Note a small number of associations and firms that made single appearances are not listed

here because they did not participate in any WTO events.) Lobbyist refers to whether the organization lobbies AAFC itself, through a firm, or not at all (--).

References

- Ainsworth, Scott and Itai Sened, (1993) 'The Role of Lobbyists: Entrepreneurs with Two Audiences,' American Journal of Political Science 37 (1993), 834-66.
- Baylis, Kathy and Gordon Rausser, (2001) 'Rules, Policy and Rent Seeking: A Cross-Border Comparison,' Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics 49:4 (2001), 493-504.
- Cadot, Olivier, Jaime de Melo and Marcelo Olarreaga, (2004) 'Lobbying, Counterlobbying, and the Structure of Tariff Protection in Poor and Rich Countries,' World Bank Economic Review 18:3 (2004), 345-66.
- Canada, (1995) 'Levels of Tariff Rate Quotas for Agricultural Products,' Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade: Notice to Importers, Export and Import Permits Act Serial No. 509 <http://www.international.gc.ca/eicb/notices/SER509-en.asp>, May 15, 1995.
- Canada, (1999) 'Canada's Initial Negotiating Position on Agriculture: Public Statement,' Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada: <http://www.agr.gc.ca/itpd-dpci/english/consultations/negotiating.htm>, August 19, 1999.
- Canada, (2000) 'World Trade Organization Consultation Process Review,' Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Review Branch: Assessment Summary Report July 2000.
- Canada, (2002) 'Characteristics of Canada's Diverse Farm Sector,' Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada: 2002.
- Canada, (2005a) 'Communicating with Federal Public Office Holders,' (Office of the Registrar of Lobbyists), <http://www.orl-bdl.gc.ca/epic/site/lobbyist-lobbyiste.nsf/en/nx00109e.html> accessed February 19, 2007
- Canada, (2005b) 'Looking Ahead to Hong Kong: An Update on the WTO Agriculture Negotiations,' Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada: <http://www.agr.gc.ca/itpd-dpci/english/consultations/infodocIV.htm>, November 2005.
- Canada, (2005c) 'Official Report (Hansard),' House of Commons Debates 140:155 (November 22, 2005),
- Canada, (2005d) 'Public Registry of Lobbyists,' (Office of the Registrar of Lobbyists), http://www.orl-bdl.gc.ca/epic/site/lobbyist-lobbyiste.nsf/en/h_nx00012e.html accessed February 19, 2007
- Canada, (2006a) 'An Overview of the Canadian Agriculture and Agri-Food System,' Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada: May 2006.
- Canada, (2006b) 'Canada's New Government Has Proven Track Record on Supply Management,' Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade: Press Statement No. 163, December 21, 2006.
- Canada, (2007a) 'Canada Requests WTO Consultations on U.S. Agricultural Subsidies,' Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade: Press Statement No. 2, January 8, 2007.
- Canada, (2007b) 'Canada's New Government Launches Consultations on New Regulations under the Lobbyists Registration Act,' Treasury Board Secretariat: February 22, 2007.

- Caves, Richard E., (1976) 'Economic Models of Political Choice: Canada's Tariff Structure,' Canadian Journal of Economics 9:2 (May 1976), 278-300.
- CCP, (2007a) 'Canadian Corn Producers Disappointed by Federal Court Decision,' June 5, 2007.
- CCP, (2007b) 'Canadian Corn Producers Encouraged by Canada's Request for WTO Panel,' June 8, 2007.
- Coleman, William D., (2002) 'Globalisation and the Future of Associational Governance,' in Greenwood, Justin, ed. The Effectiveness of EU Business Associations (New York: Palgrave), 209-22.
- Coleman, William D., (in press) 'Global Public Policy, Associative Orders and Business Interest Associations,' Governing Interests: Business Associations Facing Internationalization 199-218.
- Cosbey, Aaron, (2004) 'A Capabilities Approach to Trade and Sustainable Development: Using Sen's Conception of Development to Re-Examine the Debates,' International Institute for Sustainable Development: November 2004.
- De Bièvre, Dirk, (2003) 'International Institutions and Domestic Coalitions: The Differential Effects of Negotiations and Judicialization in European Trade Policy,' EUI Working Paper SPS No. 2003/17, 2003.
- Deckwirth, Christina, (2005) 'The EU Corporate Trade Agenda: The Role and the Interests of Corporations and Their Lobby Groups in Trade Policy-Making in the European Union,' The Seattle to Brussels Network: November 2005.
- Dür, Andreas and Dirk De Bièvre, (2007) 'The Question of Interest Group Influence,' Journal of Public Policy 27:1 (2007), 1-12.
- Eagleton, Dominic, (2006) 'Under the Influence: Exposing Undue Corporate Influence over Policy-Making at the World Trade Organization,' ActionAid International: 2006.
- Fordham, B. O. and T. I. McKeown, (2003) 'Selection and Influence: Interest Groups and Congressional Voting on Trade Policy,' International Organization 57:3 (Summer 2003), 519-+.
- Fourtou, Jean-Rene, Victor Fung and Marcus Wallenberg, (2007) 'Political Leaders Must Grasp Final Chance for Doha Deal (Letter to the Editor with 41 Signatures),' London: Financial Times, March 1, 2007,
- Gawande, Kishore, (2005) 'The Structure of Lobbying and Protection in U.S. Agriculture,' in Hoekman, Bernard M. and Simon J. Evenett, eds, Economic Development and Multilateral Trade Cooperation (London and Washington: Palgrave Macmillan; World Bank),
- Gawande, Kishore and Bernard Hoekman, (2006) 'Lobbying and Agricultural Trade Policy in the United States,' International Organization 60:3 (July 2006), 527.
- Gilligan, Michael J., (1997) Empowering Exporters : Reciprocity, Delegation, and Collective Action in American Trade Policy (Ann Arbor, Mich: The University of Michigan Press).
- Gowa, Joanne, (1988) 'Public Goods and Political Institutions: Trade and Monetary Policy Processes in the United States,' International Organization 42:1 (Winter 1988), 15-32.
- Grant, Wyn, (2003) 'The Politics of Agricultural Trade,' in Cardwell, Michael, Margaret R. Grossman and C. P. Rodgers, eds, Agriculture and International Trade: Law, Policy, and the WTO (Wallingford, Oxon, UK ; Cambridge, MA, USA: CABI Pub.), 49-68.

- Grossman, Gene M. and Elhanan Helpman, (1994) 'Protection for Sale,' American Economic Review 84:4 (1994), 833-50.
- Hall, Richard L. and Alan V. Deardorff, (2006) 'Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy,' American Political Science Review 100:1 (February 2006), 69-84.
- Harrison, Darryl and James Rude, (2004) 'Measuring Industry Concentration in Canada's Food Processing Sectors,' Agriculture Division, Statistics Canada: Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series Working Paper No. 70, July 2004.
- Hedley, Douglas D. and Jack A. Gellner, (1995) 'How Policy Decisions Are Made in Canadian Agriculture,' in Loyns, R.M.A., Ronald D. Knutson and Karl Meilke, eds, Understanding Canada/United States Grain Disputes: Proceedings of the First Canada/U.S. Agricultural and Food Policy Systems Information Workshop (Winnipeg: Friesen Printers),
- Hilary, John, (2004) 'Divide and Rule: The EU and US Response to Developing Country Alliances at the WTO,' ActionAid International: July 2004.
- Howlett, M., (2002) 'Do Networks Matter? Linking Policy Network Structure to Policy Outcomes: Evidence from Four Canadian Policy Sectors 1990-2000,' Canadian Journal of Political Science 35:2 (June 2002), 235-67.
- Hüller, Thorsten and Matthias Leonhard Maier, (2006) 'Fixing the Codex? Global Food-Safety Governance under Review,' in Joerges, Christian and Ernst-Ulrich Petersmann, eds, Constitutionalism, Multilevel Trade Governance and Social Regulation (Oxford: Hart), 267-99.
- Inside US Trade, (2006) 'Schwab Calls on Services Industry to Increase Trade Lobbying Efforts,' October 6, 2006,
- Kindleberger, Charles P., (1951) 'Group Behaviour and International Trade,' Journal of Political Economy 59:1 (February 1951), 30-46.
- Kono, Daniel Y., (2006) 'Optimal Obfuscation: Democracy and Trade Policy Transparency,' American Political Science Review 100:3 (August 2006), 369-84.
- Kraft, Michael E. and Sheldon Kamieniecki, (2007) 'Introduction,' in Kraft, Michael E. and Sheldon Kamieniecki, eds, Business and Environmental Policy: Corporate Interests in the American Political System (Cambridge: MIT Press),
- Krikorian, Jacqueline D., (2005) 'Canada and the WTO: Multilevel Governance, Public Policy-Making and the WTO Auto Pact Case,' in Gallagher, Peter, Patrick Low and Andrew L. Stoler, eds, Managing the Challenges of WTO Participation: 45 Case Studies (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press), 134-49.
- Landry, Rejean, Nabil Amara and Moktar Lamari, (1999) 'Les Determinants De L'effort De Lobbying Des Associations Au Canada,' Canadian Journal of Political Science 32:3 (September 1999), 471-97.
- Murphy, Sophia, (2006) 'Concentrated Market Power and Agricultural Trade,' EcoFair Trade Dialogue: Discussion Papers No. 1, August 2006.
- Oxfam, (2005) 'Kicking Down the Door: How Upcoming WTO Talks Threaten Farmers in Poor Countries,' Oxfam International: Oxfam Briefing Paper 72, April 2005.

- Pappi, Franz U. and Christian H. C. A. Henning, (1999) 'The Organization of Influence on the Ec's Common Agricultural Policy: A Network Approach,' European Journal of Political Research 36:2 (1999), 257-81.
- Reynolds, Neil, (2007) 'Make Dairy Farmers an Offer They Can't Refuse,' Globe and Mail, June 15, 2007, p.B1.
- Schmitz, Andrew, W. H. Furtan and Katherine Baylis, (2002) Agricultural Policy, Agribusiness, and Rent-Seeking Behaviour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
- Schnepf, Randy, (2007) 'U.S.-Canada WTO Corn Trade Dispute,' Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress: CRS Report for Congress January 31, 2007.
- Scoppola, Margherita, (1995) 'Multinationals and Agricultural Policy in the EC and USA,' Food policy 20:1 (February 1995), 11-25.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar, (1999) Development as Freedom (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Sheingate, Adam D., (2001) The Rise of the Agricultural Welfare State : Institutions and Interest Group Power in the United States, France, and Japan (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).
- Sherman, Richard and Johan Eliasson, (2006) 'Trade Disputes and Non-State Actors: New Institutional Arrangements and the Privatisation of Commercial Diplomacy,' The World Economy 29:4 (2006), 473-89.
- Skogstad, Grace, (1990a) 'Canada: Conflicting Domestic Interests in the MTN,' in Skogstad, Grace and Andrew Fenton Cooper, eds, Agricultural Trade: Domestic Pressures and International Tensions (Halifax: The Institute for Research on Public Policy), 39-60.
- Skogstad, Grace, (1990b) 'The Political Economy of Agriculture in Canada,' in Michelmann, Hans J., Jack C. Stabler and Gary G. Storey, eds, The Political Economy of Agricultural Trade and Policy: Toward a New Order for Europe and North America (Boulder: Westview Press), 35-56.
- Skogstad, Grace, (2005) 'The Uphill Struggle to Prevail: National Farm Organizations in Canada,' in Halpin, Darren, ed. Surviving Global Change? Agricultural Interest Groups in Comparative Perspective (Aldershot, UK ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate), 189-212.
- Smythe, Elizabeth, (2007) 'Don't You Know That Tears Are Not Enough? Transnational Campaigns, Canadian Foreign Aid and the Politics of Shame,' (paper delivered to the Canadian Political Science Association, May 30-June 1, 2007)
- Stairs, Denis, (2000) 'Foreign Policy Consultations in a Globalizing World: The Case of Canada, the WTO, and the Shenanigans in Seattle,' Policy Matters 1:8 (December 2000),
- Stasavage, D., (2004) 'Open-Door or Closed-Door? Transparency in Domestic and International Bargaining,' International Organization 58:4 (Fall 2004), 667-703.
- Wiggerthale, Marita, (2005) 'The Trade Agenda of European Agribusiness: The Interests of the Food Sector in Current WTO Agriculture Negotiations,' WEED Office Berlin: November 2005.
- Wilson, Barry, (2006a) 'Supply Management Days Numbered: Minister ' Western Producer (December 21, 2006),

Wilson, Barry, (2007) 'Minister Maintains Stance on Supply Management ' Western Producer (March 8, 2007),

Wilson, Howard, (2006b) 'Lobbying: Key Policy Issues,' Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: Public Governance Committee GOV/PGC/ETH(2006)6, 4 January 2006.

Wolfe, Robert, (forthcoming) 'Transparency and Public Participation in the Canadian Trade Policy Process,' in Halle, Mark and Robert Wolfe, eds, Process Matters: Sustainable Development and Domestic Trade Transparency

Woll, Cornelia, (2007) 'Leading the Dance? Power and Political Resources of Business Lobbyists,' Journal of Public Policy 27:01 (2007), 57-78.

WTO, (2007a) 'Trade Policy Review Canada: Report by the Secretariat,' Trade Policy Review Body, World Trade Organization: WT/TPR/S/179, 14 February 2007.

WTO, (2007b) 'Trade Policy Review: Report by Canada,' Trade Policy Review Body, World Trade Organization: WT/TPR/G/179, 14 February 2007.

WTO, (2007c) 'United States – Subsidies and Other Domestic Support for Corn and Other Agricultural Products; Request for the Establishment of a Panel by Canada,' World Trade Organization: WT/DS357/11, 8 June 2007.