



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on International Trade**

---

CIIT • NUMBER 047 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, September 27, 2012**

—  
**Chair**

**The Honourable Rob Merrifield**



## Standing Committee on International Trade

Thursday, September 27, 2012

• (1535)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, CPC)):** I call the meeting to order.

We are working on Bill C-24, the free trade agreement between Canada and the Republic of Panama.

We want to thank our witnesses for being here.

From the Embassy of Panama in Canada, we have with us Ambassador Corona. Thank you for being here.

Before we get to our witnesses, we have a motion for which we need unanimous consent to bring forward because of the timing.

Do we have unanimous consent to bring it forward?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Then we will ask the mover if he's interested in moving it.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's, CPC):** Sure.

**The Chair:** Okay. Go ahead.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** The motion is fairly straightforward. There has been a lot of open debate and discussion on the free trade agreement with Panama, both in the two previous Parliaments and in this Parliament.

We had second reading debate in the House. We could wrap up our hearings in pretty short order, I think, proceed to clause-by-clause study, and get back to the House for third reading.

It's just an attempt, Mr. Chairman, to move this along in a reasonable fashion. I think there would be agreement from the House leaders to hear it on third reading.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Easter.

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Chair, are we talking on this motion? I'm sorry....

**The Chair:** Yes. We're into discussion on the motion.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Well, the motion claims that if the clause-by-clause consideration hasn't been completed by 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, October 4, the chair.... That's the motion...?

First, my apologies for being a few minutes late, Mr. Chair. I didn't have the benefit of the discussion—

**The Chair:** We've just started.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** —but I do want to speak on this. I would ask the parliamentary secretary to reconsider this motion.

I've only seen this motion once before, and I've been around here a while. The place I've seen it was the committee discussing the Canadian Wheat Board legislation, which the government rammed through without allowing a vote of producers. There were certain clauses that needed much more than the five minutes of discussion time and there were others that didn't, but I firmly believe that this motion is an absolute affront to our system of democracy and how Parliament should work.

This is something that you would see in a totalitarian regime, not in a democracy like Canada's. None of us on the opposition side, do I think, are being problematic in trying to move this legislation through. We want to see it done, but I'll tell you this: if this motion passes, you're not going to find that kind of cooperation from me in terms of trying to get it through, because you're shutting down the voice of the Canadian people, through their elected MPs, to do an adequate job of discussing issues that will affect their lives in the future. It's wrong.

This is the second time. A precedent has been set.

Is this going to happen at every committee? I don't think the parliamentary secretary drafted this motion. This comes out of somewhere at the centre, because it's exactly the same as the motion that went to the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Chair. I'm telling you that I'm very, very much against this, and I think it will make opposition members harder to get along with because it is, in all honesty, something that you'd expect to see in a totalitarian regime, not in an open and transparent democracy, which Canada is.

It takes the opportunity of voice away from members of Parliament, who have a responsibility to do their job and analyze, question, and debate legislation properly. I'm telling you that it's wrong, and I'm suggesting to the parliamentary secretary that it might be a wise move to just not push it: I think you'll get your legislation through faster.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you.

Just to let the committee know, I actually sat on the committee that our honourable colleague was just talking about. This is a different motion. This is the first time I've seen this motion.

We're debating this motion. That's what we're about to do.

Go ahead, Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** On behalf of the official opposition, I would like to note for the record that we share, if not the exact expressions of Mr. Easter, certainly the tenor of his comments.

In my four years here, I've never seen any attempt to restrict parties to debate for a maximum of five minutes per party per clause of legislation. The motion already has a deemed passage of the bill if we're not through clause-by-clause study by 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, October 4, so already the government is guaranteed passage of this bill out of committee by the close of October 4.

However, the government is not content with invoking closure; this motion actually would restrict our examination or discussion of each clause to five minutes. I have to say this is wrong, it's undemocratic, and it needlessly limits parliamentarians' focus. There could be some clauses that are less important, but on some clauses the parties may want to dig in and have some meaningful input, and that will be simply impossible.

We're already in a situation in which we have exactly three meetings of witnesses—three simple meetings of witnesses—whom we're going to hear from before we pass what the government calls an important piece of legislation. The official opposition has had seven minutes of questioning of our own government on this bill. If we're fortunate enough to have the departmental officials come back on Tuesday, which Mr. Chairman has already said would be the case, that may stretch out to 14 minutes. At the outside, we may have 19 minutes, a full 19 minutes of official opposition questioning of our own government on a free trade agreement with Panama.

The government has said repeatedly that it's justified in rushing this bill through this Parliament because it has been tabled in previous parliaments and has been discussed before, but I would point out that this is a new Parliament, Mr. Chairman, with new members. In fact, every single member of the official opposition is new on this side, and we've been elected since May 2011.

More importantly, the government will say, and has said, that when we get into the discussion of Panama we expect the witnesses to say that things have changed since this agreement was last tabled in Parliament. They will say that the state of democracy has improved. We already heard at our last meeting that one of the major criticisms when this bill was before Parliament earlier was that there was no tax information exchange agreement with Panama. Now we heard last time that we're in negotiations with one, so that's a significant change.

The government can't have it both ways and say it's going to ram this bill through this Parliament because we've talked about this before, when we have new members and there have been changed circumstances on the ground. This bill, by trying to limit not even a person but a party to five minutes per clause, is as undemocratic as I've seen in my time. I don't think any parliamentarian from any party should be supportive of such a limitation.

Remember, governments change. There will be a time when the Conservatives will be sitting on the opposition side, and I wonder how they will feel when any government of the day says it will limit their whole party to five minutes of discussion.

Therefore, we'll vote against this motion.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** Okay. Just to interpret how I would read it as the chair, the motion is that it may limit debate in keeping with the timeline of being through clause-by-clause study on Thursday, so I certainly wouldn't be limiting the debate if we could see that we could get it through by the timeline of Thursday evening, which is midnight Thursday. That would be the way I would interpret the motion, as the chair.

Go ahead, Mr. Keddy.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** After the 53½ hours of debate already, 22 hours of debate in this Parliament, I think it's time to move it on. We typically question witnesses here for seven minutes per party, Mr. Chairman. I'm not interested in debating this ad nauseam. I'm really not. If the members want to go in camera and debate this for the rest of the day, we can, but if not, I suggest we vote on it and move forward.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** I've got one question—

**The Chair:** Just a minute, Mr. Easter. We'll go to Mr. Davies very quickly, and then Mr. Easter, and then we'll move on.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chairman, I have two points to make.

One is that I appreciate your interpretation, but the motion very clearly has two clauses. One says the chair may limit debate on each clause to a maximum of five minutes per party per clause, and then the second one deems that if clause-by-clause consideration has not been completed by, essentially, midnight on Thursday, then the bill will be deemed to have passed.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** It goes back to the House.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'm sorry; that's right. It'll pass committee.

With great respect to my friend Mr. Keddy, my second point is that I don't believe that debate in the House is the equivalent of what a committee does. Bills are referred to committee after second stage for detailed scrutiny and clause-by-clause analysis. The purpose of committee is to have a much more in-depth, rigorous examination of the wording of the bill and how each clause fits with the others. That's not the same thing as the general debate that happens at second reading, nor the debate at third reading.

Essentially, Mr. Keddy is saying that we don't really need an effective committee examination of a bill. I'm sure that's not what he meant, but that's what it sounded like.

The committee structure is a very important part of the British parliamentary system. It's an important part of the Canadian parliamentary system. I've heard no compelling reason given by the government side as to why it is vital that we ram through the Canada-Panama trade agreement in four days of committee hearings. Is there a deadline looming? Is there some imperative?

**An hon. member:** There's no deadline.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** I think the point is made. We can go back and forth on it, but you made the point effectively.

Just to clarify for the committee, what I'm to understand is that it is to be done by midnight. We start at 3:30, so that's eight and a half hours of debate on clause by clause.

Go ahead, Mr. Easter.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** I agree with the points Mr. Davies has made.

As I said, I have a question for the parliamentary secretary. Can he explain fully to me why this is necessary and why this approach is new to this government? If it's not the exact wording, Mr. Chair, it's exactly the same principle as what happened at the Canadian Wheat Board committee. You know that. Deadlines are imposed, proper debate is not given, and parliamentarians and parties.... You're shot down to parties now. We're all elected in our own right, but you're down to parties.

Can the parliamentary secretary explain to me why this is so necessary? I assure you that this is going against the grain of gaining cooperation and understanding from the public and from at least this party.

**The Chair:** Okay, we'll have Mr. Keddy answer, then we'll move on to vote.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Mr. Chairman, I very much suggest that we vote on this. It's quite simple. We have agreement among all the parties to report this back to the House by October 4. This is just to put some parameters around that to make sure that we're able to do it. It's as simple as that. There's nothing new here. There's nothing nefarious. This is simply the motion we've already passed to meet those parameters.

**The Chair:** We'll go to Mr. Easter, very quickly.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Listen, we have agreement by the parties on a timeframe, and I expect that we'll meet that agreement. This motion is not necessary. It's absolutely not necessary.

Democracy here is being eroded stroke by stroke. This is the second time I've seen this particular motion. Once was a bad experience. I don't want the bad experience at this committee, when this committee has been relatively cooperative. I don't know where the push for this motion comes from. I don't expect that it came from you.

I want to see this trade agreement done too, but I do not want to see this trade agreement done by denying MPs, who represent the public, their right to proper discussion. This is setting a dangerous precedent, mark my words. It's wrong. I'll just say one last time that this is what you would expect to see in a totalitarian regime, not in an open democracy like Canada, and it's wrong.

I'd ask the parliamentary secretary to consider withdrawing it.

**The Chair:** Okay, we're ready to go.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Is it anything new, or is it reinforcing the same thing?

**Mr. Don Davies:** This may help, Mr. Chairman.

The difference I see is that generally, when a government—this government or any government, I think, in fairness—wants to make sure that a bill passes by a certain day, they have the “deemed passage by 11:59” clause. As much as we may or may not support

that, it's a legitimate tool. I don't agree with it, but I can understand it.

The problem here is the first paragraph. It is not necessary to achieve this goal, because this bill's coming out of committee next Thursday. It doesn't matter if we're talking at 11:59. You have that guarantee. What I object to, and what is unusual here, is the ability of the chair to limit debate on each clause to a maximum of five minutes per party. That is not necessary to accomplish the government's goal of getting this bill out of committee on Thursday.

What I would suggest, if Mr. Keddy would consider it, is that we strike the first paragraph and keep the other two paragraphs. Then you get the bill out of committee, but you don't restrict us to a maximum of five minutes per clause.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** Can I see if there's a consensus here? I'm going to ask the mover if he would consider amending that first paragraph, if that's the issue.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** I want to hear his amendment, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chair:** Do you have an amendment for that?

**Mr. Don Davies:** Yes. I move that all the words after “2012” in the third line of the first paragraph be struck so that it reads, “that the committee begin clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-24 on Thursday, October 4, 2012,”.

Then it carries on with the second paragraph: “that if the clause-by-clause consideration has not been completed”, there would be no further debate, and the rest would read the same. It would just eliminate the part about limiting debate to five minutes.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Yes, I accept that.

**The Chair:** It sounds like we've got a consensus.

All in favour of the amendment—what's that?

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** I want a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** You want a recorded vote on the amendment? Is it a friendly amendment?

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** It's a vote on the amendment.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** I think we're all in agreement on it.

**The Chair:** Does everyone agree with the amendment? Then we can just go on. It's a friendly amendment, so we'll go right to the motion.

The amendment has been agreed to. Let's go to the motion and to record the motion. I'll ask the clerk to do that.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Sorry; is it a recorded vote on the amendment or on the motion?

**The Chair:** It's on the motion.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I want a recorded vote on the amendment.

**The Chair:** We all agree, 100%.

**Mr. Don Davies:** That'll be recorded that way?

**The Chair:** Yes. Very good.

The amendment is unanimous. That's agreed. Let's go to the main motion, then, and we want to record it.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Ed Holder (London West, CPC):** On a point of clarification, Chair, to allow the amended motion to live and the original motion to not live, we've already supported the amended motion. Is that right?

**The Chair:** That's right, and now we're voting on the amended motion.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** It's on the amended motion.

**The Chair:** We've passed the amendment, and now we're voting on it as amended. That's right.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Paul Cardegna):** The question is on the motion in the name of Gerald Keddy, as amended by the committee.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

**The Chair:** We have our witnesses with us. I believe you're prepared to answer any questions we may have. We'll move right into questions and answers, unless you have an opening statement of any kind.

Please go ahead, Mr. Ambassador.

Just before that—

**Mr. Ed Holder:** I apologize, Mr. Ambassador, and to you, Chair.

I have a point of clarification. I know we have two sets of speakers. Is it your intent to split the time so that we can hear equally from both?

**The Chair:** We have the ambassador here. I don't believe there's much of an opening statement, so my intent would be to finish off the first hour with the ambassador and then move into the second hour. That's my intent, unless you would like to further exhaust—

**Mr. Ed Holder:** I'd like to hear them equally. That's why, with the limited resources—

**The Chair:** Let's see how it goes.

Please go ahead, Mr. Ambassador.

**His Excellency Jorge H. Miranda Corona (Ambassador, Embassy of Panama in Canada):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for inviting me to attend this meeting.

In fact, we received the invitation just yesterday, on short notice, so we got the instructions today. I'm prepared for your questions. I don't have anything like a statement to deliver right now—

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll go right to questions and answers.

Mr. Davies, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ambassador, for being here today. I'd like to welcome you and your assistant to our committee.

Mr. Ambassador, in previous parliamentary hearings and debates, serious concerns were raised by a number of sources that Panama is a known tax haven. The practice of people sheltering money in offshore accounts with little or no disclosure requirements is

estimated to cost governments billions of dollars around the world in lost tax revenue, including Canada.

What can you tell us about the state of tax secrecy or sheltering laws in Panama today?

• (1555)

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Thank you very much for your question.

What I could say is that in order to comply with international standards and the issues that you are raising today, Panama has negotiated with several countries what we call in Spanish *tratados para evitar la doble tributación*, double tax treaties, and actually we have negotiated that agreement with your country, although it has not been signed yet. It is a treaty that we have signed already with Spain and other countries, OECD countries, which were basically the countries that were having some issues in regard to these issues that you raised recently. We are expecting to sign this treaty soon with your country. Both countries can benefit from that treaty, especially to avoid what you mentioned.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Ambassador, there is a difference between a treaty on double taxation and a treaty that obligates the countries to exchange tax information. Those are two different treaties. Are you talking about Canada signing a double taxation treaty, as opposed to a tax information exchange treaty? That is what you actually said.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** It is a treaty to contain mechanisms to exchange information according to our interests and laws. We have signed this treaty, which I can send to you if you want, with Italy, Spain, France, Belgium just to mention a few.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Have you signed that agreement with Canada?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Canada has not signed the treaty yet, but we are expecting your government to do so in the coming months or whenever you are able to do so, because now it's in legal wording.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Ambassador, I understand that the current Conservative government wants us as parliamentarians to ratify a free trade agreement with Panama before we have a tax information exchange agreement in place. Now I understand, if I am correct, that this is the opposite approach to what the U.S. Congress took, which was that they would not ratify a free trade agreement until a tax information exchange agreement was completed. Is that correct? Was that the approach the U.S. Congress took?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** I don't really know the policy towards the United States of America. What I can say is that we had two treaties with the U.S. recently that related to this. They are the tax information treaty that I mentioned, as well as the free trade agreement that is in place right now with the United States.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I congratulate you, Ambassador, on signing the tax information exchange agreements. I understand that has taken Panama off the grey list, because Panama has now apparently signed the minimum required, which is 12 agreements, I believe. Is it 12 agreements Panama has signed now?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** We have signed 14 agreements.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I congratulate you on that, but my first question was really directed more at whether you have changed the bank secrecy laws in Panama that change the actual domestic internal banking disclosure requirements in Panama. Has there been any domestic change in those laws?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** We have not considered ourselves banking secrecy. We are expecting this treaty to provide more information to the rest of the world in that line. We are out of the grey list, as you mentioned.

What I could also say is that there is a high-level commission in Panama working on this issue, especially to provide information and other laws to combat money laundering and drug trafficking as well. We are—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Do you acknowledge that's been a problem in Panama in the recent past? Has this problem of a lot of laundered drug money finding its way into the Panamanian banking system been a problem in Panama?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** I don't have figures right here about money laundering in Panama, but if I asked my authorities back in Panama, I could share with you what the Panamanian authorities are doing towards and against money laundering in my country. However, I don't have the figures with me right now.

• (1600)

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'll tell you where I got my figures. Cornell University studied U.S. Internal Revenue Service investigations of drug-trade laundered money between 2004 and 2007. It found that Panama was tied with the Cayman Islands for first place in the world as a source of tax-laundered money emanating from the illegal drug trade.

Do you have any comment on that?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** It is the opinion of a prestigious university, but it's not an official institution that we could take—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Actually, Ambassador, it was a study of the Internal Revenue Service, IRS, investigations between 2004 and 2007 from the U.S.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Perhaps this is what they thought, and I'm sure that's why the U.S. pushed to sign this agreement with us—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Does that agreement have fully automatic information sharing between the two countries? I understand it to be a case-by-case exchange of information. You only release information if it is specifically requested on a case-by-case basis. It's not an automatic sharing treaty.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** I'm not an expert on that. I'm not technically knowledgeable about this trade specifically, but what I could say is that OECD countries such as Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, and the U.S. are happier with what they did with Panama, so I think it will benefit Canada and it will benefit Panama too.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Ambassador.

**The Chair:** I think this line of questioning would actually be appropriate for the department officials when they come back. They could give you the details of that on Tuesday, I believe.

Go ahead, Mr. Keddy.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Your Excellency, to committee. Congratulations on your new posting, and welcome to Canada.

This agreement, as you have heard in some of the preliminary debate, has been around. I think this is the third incarnation and third Parliament now. Certainly I think most parliamentarians would want to support rules-based trading and clarification of rules with countries and emerging economies around the world. I can't imagine that anyone would not support this free trade agreement at the end of the day.

Ambassador, I realize you are new in your role and you may not have all the numbers at your fingertips, but what other countries has Panama signed free trade agreements with in North, Central, and South America? I guess you could expand that to the EU as well.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** We have recently been working seriously toward these negotiations of free trade agreements with other countries of the world and the hemisphere. We recently finished a negotiation with Peru. We are having conversations with countries of the CARICOM, the Caribbean commonwealth. We have celebrated a free trade agreement with the United States of America as well. We approved in October 2010 the free trade agreement with Canada, and it's a law of the Republic of Panama. We are expecting Canada to approve this because it will benefit both countries.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Do you have a free trade agreement with Mexico, or is that a preferred trading agreement? Is there an exceptional agreement with Mexico as well?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Yes, there is an exceptional agreement with Mexico.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Thank you for that.

My reason for asking that goes back to rules-based trading and equal footing for Canadian companies vis-à-vis our competitors, quite frankly. We already have a free trade agreement with the United States and we already have a free trade agreement with Peru. It would only make sense that these countries sign agreements with Panama, and Panama being in the position it's in—a very, very important conduit for international trade and shipping around the globe and a growing economy that is expected to grow exponentially, as a matter of fact, in the next decade—it would make sense that we would be on equal footing with our competitors.

I'd ask you this as a Panamanian. Since the military dictatorship has fallen in Panama and with the work that's been generated with infrastructure demands on the twinning of the Panama Canal that will carry 5% of the world's trade, how have you seen the standard of living in Panama affected by that exponential growth, by free trade agreements signed with other countries, and the ability for Panamanians to have jobs and opportunity in Panama? Have you seen a serious change in the Panamanian economy?

• (1605)

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Thank you for the question.

Indeed, since Panama achieved the return of democracy in 1990, improvement in the quality of life has taken place, and not just for economic reasons, but in civil laws and the rule of law that we are pursuing.

Also, I have to mention that the economy of my country has grown considerably in the last few years. It's one of the highest-rated economies in the hemisphere right now. That is based upon open trade. The economy of Panama is mostly based on trade. We are not a growing industrial economy; we are a trade economy. We are basically merchants. Trade has always benefited the Panamanian quality of life.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Your Excellency, I have another question that I want to ask. Panama has a growing extractive industry, a growing mining industry, with some Canadian companies involved. One of them was a witness here this week at committee. They are doing a lot of work and a lot of projections in Panama.

How do you see that, as a transformation? These are very, very large extractive projects that will last 20, 30, 40 years, generating billions of dollars for the Panamanian economy. This is a little outside the bounds of the free trade agreement, but it shows that Panama is open for business, open to investment.

How do you see that affecting Panamanian society and the opportunities for Panamanians?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Let me talk briefly about this. This Canadian company based in Toronto, named Inmet Mining Corporation, is making a huge investment in Panama. Exploitation of the minerals in Panama is expected to last about 100 years.

The investment your country, through this company, is doing in my country is comparable to the investment the United States did when they built the canal. This is something that I want to remark on today, because it will turn the economy, and social and political relations, to a new era with Canada.

Scotiabank is also present in Panama. Also, entrepreneurs, little investors, are opening bed and breakfasts, hotels—little businesses—in Panama. When you go to the beach, you see a lot of Canadian flags right now in some places in Panama.

It's very interesting to mention this. Inmet Mining, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the Government of Panama, is doing a good job, taking the environmental issues in a good manner. They are socializing the project among all the peasants who live in this rural area of the province of Colón, which is north of Panama City.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Easter, you have seven minutes.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome, Mr. Ambassador. I also would like to congratulate you on your posting. When we look at how Panama's economy is growing—and certainly part of it is the canal expansion project—we see it's certainly to your country's credit. I think others have said that as well.

I am a member of Parliament from Prince Edward Island, so one of the areas I'm certainly interested in, in terms of the free trade agreement, are the tariffs on frozen potato products. Those will

certainly come down. I expect you know that those good potatoes are from the wonderful red soil of P.E.I., and we're encouraged to hope to see more movement in that area, with less restriction.

My initial questions are along the lines of procurement. As I understand it, there will be a lot of opportunity in the canal expansion project the government has put forward, and a lot of the procurement related to the canal expansion project is already locked in or complete. Is the canal expansion project on any of the jobs surrounding that specific project—which is to your credit, again, and is going to mean a lot for shipping—already locked up or completed by the United States as a result of their capital investment in their agreement? Is there really much leftover opportunity for Canada, if I could put it that way, in terms of the canal expansion project, or are we looking mainly at other areas?

• (1610)

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Let me begin by saying that the Panama Canal Authority is the institution in charge of procurement for the expansion of the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal Authority is an independent entity of the government. They have their own procurement system. I mention that because sometimes people from abroad tend to think that the Panama Canal Authority is the same as the Government of Panama. It's part of the state of Panama, but they have their own way of dealing with their own activities.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Am I correct that in the procurement process, the Panama Canal Authority would be obligated to abide, if that's the right word, by this Canada-Panama FTA? The state authority is over and above the Panama Canal Authority. I know they're operating as a separate entity, but they have to abide by the rules of this FTA.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** They will.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Again I come back to the question of procurement. Maybe you don't know, and that's fine—I understand that—but is the procurement basically settled on this particular project? I think there is a view that while the Panama Canal is being built, there will be great opportunities there for us as construction companies, etc., but I think that's pretty well a done deal. I think the opportunities are already gone.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** I think it's a great opportunity to continue to look out for opportunities in Panama, because the canal expansion project is open to the world community. When you go to the project, you see Spanish companies, Japanese companies, not just us. Some companies are expected from the U.S. that are very interested in the expansion, but we are open for business with anyone around the world.

I don't have the figures from the Panama Canal Authority on what they are planning to do, if they have bids that are still occurring, but probably they do because of the canal expansion, so we'll have something.

• (1615)

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** There's no question there will be opportunities once the canal is completed.



**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** The canal expansion is one of the largest investments in the region right now.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** When the canal is built, there will be opportunities for services, etc. There's no question about that. However, on the main procurement for the project, I think we're getting to the starting gate after the project is basically contracted out. On that area though, as I understand it in terms of the background I looked at, there are a number of projects over the next five years for which there might be an opportunity for Canadian companies to put in a competitive bid. Can you tell us what any of those might be?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** For other investment that will occur in terms of procurement, I don't have the exact numbers here.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Okay.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** They are mostly managed by the Panama Canal Authority, and they have a plan to tender those bids. What I could say is that since 2010...for the Canadian approval of the FTA that will allow the entry into force of this agreement, it's important to note that the TPA with the U.S.A. will probably be effective at the end of October, which means that the American exporters will be able to use the preferences established.

That's why we are expecting the agreement with Canada to pass soon, because companies from Canada that invest in Panama will benefit from the free trade agreement, but with the Americans going —

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** We don't want to be displaced in the market by the Americans. We are being displaced in Korea, and we don't want to be displaced any more.

**The Chair:** Your time is gone.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Holder, you have seven minutes.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to also acknowledge your presence and welcome you here to Canada. We're delighted, Mr. Ambassador, that you're here. Panama has been well served by your predecessor, His Excellency Carlo Escobar. We very much look forward to your following in those steps in having a very successful time. You will actually be the ambassador in place when the Canada-Panama free trade agreement is put in place.

Welcome. We're just delighted by this, and we're honoured to have your colleague here as well. I echo Mr. Keddy's comments. It's rather interesting that Mr. Keddy has grown natural highlights since this Panama free trade deal started.

It's been going through a few different intercessions. This is our third time, and we think this will be a charm. It's our hope that we will have this done. I hope for the sake of all of our colleagues that we will be supportive and show good faith to Panama. I would say that in the last Parliament the Liberal Party, which today is the third party, was very supportive. I have no doubt that they will be again, and it's my hope that our colleagues in the official opposition ultimately will feel the same way. That might be a shift, but I certainly appreciate the spirit of the words that I've heard, so perhaps there will be some movement there.

Mr. Ambassador, you made reference about the United States agreement being in place by the end of October. We certainly heard that from our officials this past week. My concern is with Canada not being quite there and our not moving this as quickly as we should have already done; however, we are where we are today. What kind of disadvantage do you think Canada might experience in its relationship with Panama as a result of this trade deal still not being passed? Do you have some thoughts?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** What I have in my instructions, and it reflects part of the answer that you are looking for, says that American exporters, with the recent coming into force of the free trade agreement with the U.S., will be able to use the preference established in the agreement, while Canadian exporters will pay the MFN duties. That's why we are expecting the—

**Mr. Ed Holder:** You said the Canadian exporters will pay. Isn't that the point, Mr. Chair? I think that's a very valid point.

We could have done this before, but we had such significant opposition in the last Parliament, which is not your issue, that we were not able to do it. We've disadvantaged our farmers. We've disadvantaged our manufacturers. We've disadvantaged every exporter who exports from Canada to Panama.

What's clear about this free trade agreement is that it takes immediately drops tariffs off almost 90% of the exchange of all goods that we trade. I think that makes a big statement. It's a great opportunity for us, particularly as we try to compete against the United States in Panama. With Panama being that great gateway to the southern hemisphere and to Central America, I think this is critical.

I need to ask you a question. I was looking at our statistics. In 2011, I think bilateral trade between Canada and Panama wasn't the biggest number. It was some \$235 million, split almost equally, but it was not a large amount.

In your opinion, Mr. Ambassador, why do you think this free trade deal is so important when, of the agreements we have with other countries, it doesn't necessarily represent the biggest number? Do you have an opinion on that?

• (1620)

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Yes, indeed I do. Thank you for the question.

As I said earlier, Canada is gaining a space that is very important in Panama, not only through the investments of the biggest companies but also from the presence of the little entrepreneurs who are going to Panama. Many people retiring to Panama from Canada are looking for other options for living. With the passage of the free trade agreement, this space will be solidly gained. It's a step I think is necessary for gaining ground in the country, doing more investment, and having more presence.

As I understand it, your country is reliant upon trade, as is my country, so it would benefit both sides. I think the passage of this free trade agreement will benefit us all.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** I'm glad my colleague from the third party is here to hear this question. He asked a very important question earlier about procurement—

**An hon. member:** It was about potatoes.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Well, I love their potatoes—too many of them, actually.

The discussion has been around the Panama Canal Authority. That expansion project is worth something like \$5.3 billion, I think.

I want to come back more specifically to this question of procurement. Is this done, or will Canada, through procurement opportunities, have some ability to do business in Panama with the Panama Canal Authority? How do you see that working?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** As I said, they have a plan. I don't know if they have finished the plan and have put out all the bids for companies abroad, but I am sure that the expansion will continue the way it is right now. I am pretty sure that there is more space for companies abroad to invest in the Panama Canal.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** It's rather interesting. Over the time we have had these discussions about Panama free trade, we've had many hearings. At one point, as I refer to some older notes, Panama committed to implementing the OECD standard for the exchange of tax information to combat international tax evasion. Last summer, the OECD placed Panama on its list of jurisdictions that have substantially implemented international standards for the exchange of information. I think your country needs to be applauded for that kind of progress. I think that's important for Canada.

I was listening to my colleague, the vice-chair of the official opposition, when he was making some reference to what gets signed first, the free trade agreement or an exchange of tax information, and what Canada should do. With all due respect, we don't take our marching orders from the United States. We will do a deal with Panama because it's in Canada's interest. Frankly, it's in Panama's interest, as well.

**The Chair:** I will allow a very short answer. Do you have any comment?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** I have no comment.

**The Chair:** Okay, very good. That's a good comment. It's a good way to close it off.

We have Mr. Sandhu, for five minutes.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Welcome to the committee, Mr. Ambassador.

I'll follow up with a question from my colleague. You've told this committee that you have already negotiated a tax exchange treaty. You have that.

•(1625)

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Do you mean with Canada?

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Yes.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Yes. We are expecting the signature.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Could you provide a copy of that to this committee?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Yes, of course.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Thank you.

You know, up until recently we haven't had cooperation, or at least Panama was hesitant to sign this agreement. That was up until recently, until now.

I understand that you've signed treaties with 14 other nations. Why was Panama hesitant to sign these treaties previously?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Panama is opening a policy of looking for transparency, and we wanted to be out of the list that we were on before. That's why the government created this commission to negotiate treaties with other countries as well, to comply with international standards.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Can you give us some concrete examples of measures that your government has taken in Panama to allow for this exchange of information?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** I don't have the exact figures right now. What I have is the list of the countries that we have signed treaties with, but I don't have an example here of exchanges of information.

I could ask my authorities to give me some, if you want. I am more than happy to do so.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Then you don't have any evidence in regard to providing us with information—

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Not here.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** —that will give us an idea of what improvements Panama has made or what new laws they have brought in to be able to exchange tax information.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** No, but I could provide you with all the information you want.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** You don't have it here right now.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Right now, no, I don't

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Okay. I'll move on to a different question.

What industries, what businesses, what products do you think will benefit in Panama? What sorts of industries will benefit in terms of the products that would come into our countries?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Do you mean from Panama?

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Yes.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Our sea products are an example. You have to keep in mind that Panama does not have an agro-industrial economy. We provide mostly services, but a small percentage of our economy has agro-industrial products. That includes, for instance, products of the sea, such as raw fish. We have a small sector that could provide seafood to Canadians.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** You would see the fishing industry and the agricultural industry in Panama benefiting with this agreement.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Indeed.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Okay.

I'll move on to another area.

Mr. Ambassador, there's an area on, I believe, the Atlantic coast that is called the Meso-American biological corridor. Are you familiar with that?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** *El corredor biológico mesoamericano*: yes, I know it.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** That area has been protected by the Panamanian government as a biological reserve, is that correct?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Yes. It is part of a corridor that extends from Panama to the Central American region.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Have you had applications from Canadian mining companies to mine in those areas?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** To mine in the corridor? Not that I know of.

• (1630)

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu:** Okay. I'll move on to a different area again.

The indigenous—

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Let me just say that the Inmet Mining Corporation, which is a Toronto-based company, is located in Donoso, a small city in the province of Colón. They are close to that corridor. It's my understanding that they are close to the corridor, because they are close to the Coclesito area.

My understanding is that the Canadian company is taking measures to protect the areas that they are treating. That is my understanding.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Shory, we'll give you five minutes if you make it fast.

**Mr. Devinder Shory (Calgary Northeast, CPC):** As always, Mr. Chair, but thank you.

Once again, Your Excellency, congratulations on your posting in Canada, and welcome to Canada from me as well.

Mr. Chair, when I see the numbers of hours and the time put in this legislation, and when I hear my colleague from the NDP.... Of course, we all know the NDP is anti-trade anyway.

It has been so detrimental to Canadian businesses. We all face these extra tariffs, which could be removed once this agreement is passed and implemented.

I am from one of the western provinces. I know that once this agreement is implemented, we definitely will have the benefit of exporting so many things, such as processed foods, etc.

I want to clarify procurement. I have a simple and clear-cut question. My Liberal colleague's comment was that we have lost 100% of the opportunities on procurement. Is that right or wrong? Is it right to say that we have some opportunities left, or are 100% of the opportunities gone in procurement?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** In procurement, there are opportunities in the Panama Canal Authority, of course.

**Mr. Devinder Shory:** Because we did not sign this agreement in a timely manner, we did lose some, but still, opportunities are there. Thank you.

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** The passage of this treaty is not related to the Panama Canal Authority bids, but certainly the passage of the treaty will benefit the sense of the investment.

**Mr. Devinder Shory:** I have another question, on taxation. Actually, before that, this money-laundering issue was raised by the NDP. Again, it's fearmongering, basically. That's how I look at it.

Let me ask you this. In your opinion—and I'm sure you've had this experience as well—in Panama, have things changed from 2002, 2003, and 2004 as far as the money-laundering laws are concerned?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Indeed, they have changed dramatically.

**Mr. Devinder Shory:** How? Are they more stringent than before? If yes, how are they more stringent and what are the outcomes? What are...?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Laws have changed. It is not as easy for someone to open an account in Panama as it used to be. The laws comply more with the international laws against money laundering. We are trying to do our best in our institutions, in security, and we expect also to share information and have more cooperation, for instance, with Transport Canada. Transport Canada is helping us in a great manner. It's a good institution.

**Mr. Devinder Shory:** Did you have a chance to meet Canadian businesses that are already involved in Panama?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Yes. I had the opportunity to see the Inmet Mining Corporation in Panama. Also, as I mentioned, I visited some bed-and-breakfast hotels, little investments that some Canadians are doing in Panama. There is also the presence of Scotiabank. I don't know them. I haven't met them.

**Mr. Devinder Shory:** I know that you've made some comments about the level of investment they've made. During all their business activities, do they—in simple language—regret making investments, or are they excited to see if the agreement will be implemented so that they will have some expansion opportunities and will have more comfort in expanding all of those? What do you see?

**Mr. Jorge H. Miranda Corona:** Companies are happier in Panama, including Inmet, Scotiabank, and the entrepreneurs that I mentioned. Besides that, we recently approved a law so that all you Canadians could come to Panama and have your migratory papers without bureaucracy, without papers.

Very soon, too, you will be able to obtain your naturalization in a very simple manner, because we are trying to attract people from your country, and people from other parts of the world as well, to come to live in my country. This law that I mentioned benefited not just Canadians, and it's not part of the treaty. It's a law that the government passed recently. It also benefited citizens of the U.S., Spain, and other countries, who we are looking to attract to spend their lives in our country.

• (1635)

**The Chair:** That's very good.

We want to thank you very much for coming in, Ambassador. We thank you, Mr. Aparicio, for being here as well. We look forward to the completion of the deal, the signing of it, and putting it into law as soon as possible.

With that, I want to suspend the meeting and ask our next panel to come forward. We will just pause as we do that.

•(1635) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

•(1635)

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order.

We have our witnesses at the end of the table. We have members taking their seats.

First we want to thank Jennifer Moore, from the Latin America program of MiningWatch Canada, for being here. We have Canada Pork International, represented by Jacques Pomerleau. You've been here before, and we welcome you back. We look forward to your testimony.

We'll start with Madam Moore. The floor is yours.

**Ms. Jennifer Moore (Latin America Program Coordinator, MiningWatch Canada):** Thank you very much for the opportunity to present to the committee today. My comments are going to focus on the investment aspects of the free trade agreement in relation to the Canadian mining industry and related services in Panama.

In short, MiningWatch's concerns haven't changed much since we last contributed to these hearings in November 2010, but they have grown more acute as a result of developments over the last 22 months, since the committee last met to discuss implementation of the agreement.

Just to summarize, this agreement is going to ensure greater legal stability for the Canadian mining industry within the context of a regulatory regime in Panama that has demonstrated itself to be ineffective at preventing detrimental consequences to the lives and well-being of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples and the environment they depend on. It will provide access to Canadian mining companies to costly international dispute settlement procedures to which affected communities and other Panamanian citizens and public interest groups have no access. Although it includes an environmental side chapter, this is a non-binding declaration that relies on political will for its implementation, of which sort we have not seen in Panama. On the contrary, we've seen the undermining of environmental protections at the behest of Canadian companies.

Just to illustrate these points a little bit further, contrary to the assertions of mining industry representatives who have already presented before this committee, the Canadian mining industry has been a source of serious conflict in Panama and has given rise to broad-based opposition to mining in the country.

Donald-Fraser Clarke, who presented to this committee in November 2010 as a representative of Clarke Educational Services, is known in Panama and to the Canadian embassy in Panama as a representative of Corriente Resources, an exploration company. Corriente Resources has been operating in western Panama, in the Ngöbe Buglé *comarca*, an area administered by the Ngöbe Buglé indigenous people, without the consent of their representative organizations and without any licence from Panamanian authorities. His team has been accused of fomenting divisions and rumours and of supporting particular electoral candidates within the *comarca*, and as a result of this, Clarke and his team have been declared *personae non gratae* in the *comarca* and repeatedly asked to leave.

Furthermore, the testimony of a Ngöbe Buglé general council member who was in Ottawa earlier this week indicates that Clarke helped form and support a local association on their territory that aggravated conflict between the Ngöbe Buglé and the Panamanian government throughout 2011 and 2012. Over this period, the Ngöbe Buglé, Panama's largest indigenous population, have staged massive protests in opposition to changes to the state's mining legislation. In January 2012, one protestor and one bystander were killed when state police and border patrol enacted a brutal crackdown on the Ngöbe Buglé's road blockade.

The evident lack of effective channels for peaceful dispute resolution in Panama and the government's lack of compliance with promises and agreements it has made with the Ngöbe Buglé has also led to loss of credibility of the governing regime and loss of confidence in the political will to genuinely solve existing problems.

Inmet Mining has also claimed before this committee to have a good reputation in Panama and to have demonstrated respect for free, prior and informed consent of indigenous communities that will be displaced by its massive three-pit copper project. This project will open up some 59 square kilometres within largely primary rainforest in the Meso-American biological corridor, which has an average annual rainfall of some five metres per year. Local indigenous community members report that far from respecting their right to give or withhold their free consent, the Inmet subsidiary has been pressuring them to accept a relocation compensation package.

In early 2012, Martin Rodriguez, a community leader in the area, told CBC reporter Mellissa Fung that:

People who are working for the mine turned up in our community and explained that at some point everyone would have to be evicted, because they say the lands here are part of the mining concession.

When community members refused to leave, Rodriguez said that Inmet tried to gain their favour through other means:

They say that they're going to give us a health centre and a school. But I don't want that from them. As a leader, I can see through that. How much destruction and pollution is there going to be? Schools and health centres, that's the government's responsibility.

Inmet's claims of corporate social responsibility have also been thrown into question by its efforts to obstruct environmental protection measures by taking advantage of weaknesses in the Panamanian regulatory and judicial system. In particular, the company sought a constitutional injunction against the creation of a protected area in the district of Donoso, where it's operating.

•(1640)

The Supreme Court found against this injunction in July of 2011, but only announced its decision a day after the environmental authority in Panama approved the company's environmental licence in late December of 2011. Later, in April of this year, an administrative tribunal overturned the protected area status. The Panamanian Environmental Advocacy Center notes this latter decision was emitted under the charge of a court magistrate who was named by President Martinelli and who is a former adviser to the current president.

Furthermore, in the wake of major protests and the death of two indigenous men, the Panamanian government has enacted mining code reforms that permit Inmet to obtain foreign state financing to facilitate its project in the province of Colón. Public interest organizations in Panama have been criticizing this decision as unconstitutional, given that the Panamanian constitution prohibits national territory from being ceded, leased, or transferred, either temporarily or partially, to other states.

As a result, mining-affected communities and civil society organizations in Panama have demonstrated growing resistance to mining and are in favour of sustainable development options. In early 2011 proposals to ban open-pit mining nationwide attracted high-level attention, at which time the national ombudsman and others called for a moratorium on mining until the country could strengthen its institutions.

A national survey carried out at this same time found that 67.7% of Panamanians were opposed to mining in Panama and that 68.8% of Panamanians disagreed with pro-mining legal reforms. In 2012 the Ngöbe Buglé achieved prohibition of mining within their administrated area, and now among those believed to be running for the president's office in 2014 is an environmentalist who has been building his platform in part based on opposition to mining.

Under such conditions, implementing the Panama-Canada free trade agreement would be to give Canada's seal of approval to a questionable regulatory and institutional framework that is failing to ensure democratic channels and effective protections for the lives and living environment of indigenous and non-indigenous Panamanians, while conditions already skewed in favour of a conflict-ridden industry are shored up.

Thank you very much.

• (1645)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We will now move on to Canada Pork International. Mr. Pomerleau, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau (President, Canada Pork International):** I will make my presentation in French.

Thank you for inviting me to discuss the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Panama. I will discuss only the part that applies to free trade.

I want to begin by saying that the negotiations on our product, pork, have been fairly complex. That product is a sensitive one for Panama. Despite everything, our negotiators have successfully obtained a comprehensive elimination of tariffs that applied to our products, even though it is over a longer period than what we had seen in other agreements.

We are satisfied with the agreement that has been concluded in terms of our product, as we have maintained very close contact with the negotiators over the course of the negotiations with Panama. We know how difficult it was to obtain concessions from that country. In addition, we applaud the wisdom of our negotiators who succeeded in negotiating a clause that will help us catch up with the Americans once they have been able to implement their free trade agreement.

We think that should happen within the next month, once the agreement between the United States and Panama goes into effect.

It should be pointed out that Canada, historically speaking, was Panama's first foreign supplier and maintained that status for a number of years. As the Americans have concluded and finalized an agreement before us, we are losing the competitive advantage we had in that country.

We are also very pleased that the government was able to create coordinating positions though the agreement to help facilitate the resolution of sanitary and phytosanitary issues that could arise between our two countries. As I mentioned, this agreement is very complex. It is actually the most complex one I have ever seen when it comes to pork, regardless of the country. Despite the difficulties our negotiators came across, we are very happy with the final outcome.

However, it is still difficult for us to note that failing to conclude an agreement, not ratifying it on time or ratifying it after our main competitors, does place us in a difficult situation and makes us lose markets. I think you are very familiar with the situation involving South Korea. We were that country's preferred supplier, but since we have still not managed to conclude an agreement, that very substantial market is slipping away from us. In Panama's case, the agreement has been concluded, but it has not been ratified yet, and that puts us in the same situation.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

• (1650)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for that testimony.

We will now move to our first questioner, Ms. Papillon.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Annick Papillon (Québec, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank the witnesses for coming here today to answer our questions.

I will first address Ms. Moore.

In 2010, the Panamanian government announced Law 30, which eliminated the requirement to carry out independent environmental assessments prior to approving major mining projects. That law was strongly opposed and was ultimately struck down.

However, according to a number of environmentalists, there has nevertheless been a dramatic drop in environmental protection with the introduction of the new Law 65.

Could you compare Panamanian and Canadian laws when it comes to environmental protection?

[*English*]

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** The environmental protection was the link.

There were significant protests following Law 30, which is referred to as the "sausage law", because they tried to jam so much into it. Protests at the time actually resulted in some significant repression.

Environmental protections in Panama are weak at best. The environmental assessment process does not allow for sufficient time, resources, or opportunity for effective community or public interest organizations to participate.

This is an issue that has emerged recently as well, with Inmet Mining's project. They submitted a 14,000-page environmental assessment in late 2010. Organizations were given 10 days to provide their comments on that massive tome. There are considerable weaknesses in it as well as in the institutions that are in place to monitor and regulate the sector. The environmental ministry also lacks its own capacity to properly assess and deal with these sorts of environmental assessments.

Once again, in the case of Inmet Mining's project, they had to pay for a consultant to work for the Panamanian environmental authority to take a look at Inmet's environmental assessment. Their choice of consultant was highly contested by civil society as a result of the person's close association with the mining and oil industry in Chile.

[Translation]

**Ms. Annick Papillon:** Has the Government of Panama proposed concrete solutions to the communities that have been affected by the violation of environmental rights?

[English]

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I'm sorry; could you repeat that?

[Translation]

**Ms. Annick Papillon:** I would like to know whether the Government of Panama has proposed concrete solutions to the communities affected by the violation of environmental rights and whether this agreement could provide those local communities with some answers.

[English]

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** The channels for the resolution of these disputes have generally been limited, and communities have seen a necessity to protest massively in order to reach a resolution to these disputes.

In the case, first, of Law 30, it was not passed, as a result of massive protests throughout the country at that time in 2010. Similarly, in 2011 and 2012, while there was recent resolution to disputes over mining law reforms that were being proposed, it was only after several indigenous protesters were killed at the hands of police and border patrol guards that a dialogue space was opened up. In this case, mining code reforms were shoved through, and a prohibition was placed on mining in an indigenous-administered area that has, for now, quelled the protests in that part of the country. However, in terms of a resolution for affected communities in other parts of the country, those are still outstanding.

• (1655)

[Translation]

**Ms. Annick Papillon:** In December 2010, CIAM, Panama's leading environmental law centre, testified before the Standing Committee on International Trade. It stated the following with regard to the supplementary agreement on the environment associated with the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and Panama:

The so-called environmental agreement, in chapter seventeen of the FTA, is made up of three articles that amount to a non-binding declaration of principles or good

intentions. It then constitutes a non-self-executing treaty, the implementation of which relies on political will.

Do you share that opinion?

[English]

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** No. We share a similar concern. The Panamanian government has not shown the will to consistently apply environmental measures and protections within the country. I think one good example of this is how it has dealt with the protected area in the district of Donoso within the Meso-American biological corridor.

It's worth pointing out that in 2008 the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the IUCN, recommended a moratorium on all mining within this biological corridor, given its sensitivity, the endemic species found there, and the presence of primary forest. In Panama and the area in which Inmet is located in the district of Donoso, this is the third-last and largest forest within Panama.

While in 2009 there was a protected area designated for that area which should have started a process for the development of a management plan, the company immediately sought an injunction against that protected area, which stifled the management plan process from taking place. Even though that injunction was denied two years later, there were irregularities in the way that decision was made public. It was withheld from the public for four months and only released after the environmental authority had announced its approval of the company's EIA, environmental impact assessment. When the Supreme Court made that decision, the company did not disclose that information. Some months later, an administrative tribunal actually overturned that protection.

There are serious questions, then, about the will, and also the strength and independence, of the institutions and judicial system within Panama to ensure significant protections of important areas, both for their ecological value and also because they're where people live.

[Translation]

**Ms. Annick Papillon:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Mr. Cannan, for seven minutes.

**Hon. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thanks to our witnesses.

Mr. Pomerleau, we just heard from Ambassador Corona, who's the third ambassador I've heard from while on this committee. I know you've testified to our committee numerous times. I'm not sure how many times—maybe you could let the committee know how many times you've been here and over how long a period.

I know the NDP started off the meeting, and they're against trade; they wonder what the urgency is for getting this agreement through. Could you enlighten the committee as to why time is of the essence?

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Nothing was said on this side of the table that we're against trade. That's what Mr. Cannan just said.

**The Chair:** That's fine. That's debate.

Go ahead, Mr. Cannan.

**Mr. Don Davies:** We didn't say that, Mr. Chair.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** Time is of the essence, Mr. Chair, and the indication from the opposition is, what's the hurry?

This has been in the works for a number of years, and maybe you can enlighten this committee about why it's so important for your industry to get this agreement implemented as soon as possible.

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** As I mentioned, Canada was the number one supplier to Panama over the last 20 years, and now, because the Americans have concluded an agreement, we are losing ground and we're definitely losing market share.

Where it becomes important is that, as I also said, our negotiators were able to obtain a clause by which we would follow the Americans, but we cannot allow them to take too much of a step ahead of us; otherwise we are likely to be out of it. Our understanding is that the free trade agreement with the Americans will be implemented next month.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** Thank you. I understood that too from previous witnesses. They're getting closer day by day.

Ms. Moore, welcome back to the committee. I know you've testified before.

Could you enlighten the committee on who MiningWatch is, how you are funded, and who you represent?

• (1700)

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** MiningWatch Canada is a public interest initiative that came together in 1999. We're composed of environmental, social justice, indigenous and union organizations from across the country. We came together to coordinate a public response to the impacts of the mining industry on communities, both in Canada and internationally, and to advocate for strong protection of water and strong environmental evaluation processes, and also to ensure that the rights of communities are respected.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** Those are noble causes.

What operations in mining in Panama or around the world has your association supported?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** What mining operations in Panama and around the world have we supported? In what fashion? I don't understand.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** Have you shown any support? I've read your website, and it's anti. It's anti, it's against everyone. I haven't seen anything there of support. Does anybody do anything properly? Are there any examples you can follow?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** The conditions for mining in many parts of the world right now have been seriously eroded by the implementation of mining code reforms over the last number of decades that do not make serious efforts to ensure protections for the environment, for water, and for community rights.

There are some examples in northern Canada, northern Quebec, the Northwest Territories and Newfoundland where we have seen at points in time significant advances in environmental evaluation in terms of independent environmental monitoring, for example in the Ekati mine in the Northwest Territories and in a decent impact benefit agreement in northern Quebec at the Raglan mine.

There have been a couple of examples of advances being made, and those have happened when strong regulations and effective use of institutions have been in place, as well as strong civil society organizations to make sure that happens. That participation is significant, yes.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** In your opening comments you mentioned that the agreement will provide more stability, and you see the fact that it has the environmental and the labour side agreements and levels the playing field.....

Are there any free trade agreements that MiningWatch has supported to help provide jobs and hope and opportunities for people of developing countries such as Panama?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** The way the free trade agreements have been designed so far shore up protections for industry rather than for the collective rights of affected communities and workers, unfortunately, and unfortunately the labour and environmental side agreements do not provide binding measures or mechanisms to ensure that protections for workers and the environment and communities are significant. Unfortunately, that's the situation.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** There hasn't been any trade agreement that you've supported yet, then.

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** Not that I am aware of, and I might highlight that some of our trade agreements have been implemented at times when there has been significant violence in which Canadian mining companies have been involved. Such was the case of Peru, where some 33 indigenous people and police officers were wounded during a violent confrontation, and the Canadian government remained silent on that.

There has been some shameful activity regarding how we've negotiated and implemented these agreements, unfortunately.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** On your website you state that there are no regulations or controls on their activities to prevent these companies from profiting from weak protection for the environment.

There are controls and regulations put in place in each country, and these are even stronger ones, so are you just saying you don't agree because they are not strong enough?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** These are stronger tools for companies to assert protection over their investments. The strongest tool they have is access to international arbitration tribunals. It costs, for both them and states, millions of dollars to have their disputes heard. Affected communities and public interest groups do not have access to that mechanism. There's been no creation of such mechanisms through these agreements. That's a significant problem and is a reason we have not supported them. We do advocate for those stronger controls as part of our work.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** We had a mining company as a witness at a previous meeting. They were actually in support of the agreement, because they're in support of preservation of the environment as well. Do you feel that the companies aren't concerned about the environment?

• (1705)

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I believe that you're referring to Inmet Mining. Unfortunately, there are a lot of contradictions in that company's statement. Specifically, that company has a very strong public relations campaign that uses the concept of corporate social responsibility, but its actions demonstrate that it has tried to undermine environmental protections in Panama. An example is the constitutional injunction it sought against the protection of the Donoso area within the Meso-American biological corridor.

It has also learned the language of free, prior, and informed consent, but unfortunately, the evidence we have seen does not show that it has taken the steps necessary to obtain that from the local indigenous communities that will be displaced by its large copper project.

**Hon. Ron Cannan:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Mr. Easter, you have seven minutes.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I might not use all of my seven minutes so that I can free up some time for others.

The first question is to Canada Pork International. There's no question that pork needs every opportunity these days. I don't know whether committee members know, but the biggest producer in Canada, Big Sky Farms in Saskatchewan, went under about three weeks ago. The second biggest producer in Canada is under creditor protection. The pork industry is in huge trouble, as I'm hearing from my pork producers as well.

Basically what you're saying, Jacques, is that this agreement is certainly to your satisfaction. I understand that. I know that we're the number one supplier in there, and yes, we're losing some market share, but at what point does the American agreement kick into place so that we will start to be displaced?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** Based on our experience in other markets, it will start.... It has started, because some of them say that Canada is not serious about having a steady market, so they have already started to look at the Americans. It has already started. However, to be significant, it usually takes about four to six months after the implementation of the agreement by the other party.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** That's an interesting point, that their view is that we're not serious about having a steady market because we haven't implemented the FTA as yet. Yes, that's worrisome. Certainly the minister should be able to massage that one. He's doing a lot of travelling, I will admit, but maybe he should send a message as soon as this hits the House next week or shortly thereafter. That would be my recommendation, in any event.

We are supportive; at least, our party's supportive. We do need to get this done, but we do have to have proper discussions.

On the mining issue, Jennifer, I hear what you're saying. There was a lot of controversy last week over three MPs who went with a

mining company to tour a mine. I was asked, and I would have gone, only I was tied up. I think criticism of those folks is wrong, and I'll defend any of them, whether they're Conservative, Liberal, or Bloc. The NDP didn't go.

I do think you need to see both sides of the issues. If I were to look at a mine with a mining company, they wouldn't sway my views, but I would want to see if it were possible to go with a union group and see their side of the story too. I just want to lay that on the table, because I think the flak we get for trying to get more information is absolutely wrong.

In terms of this particular agreement, the bottom line for me is this: from your perspective, do we make things worse or better with an FTA between Canada and Panama in terms of the mining industry? Where I sit, I think we make it better. I think we've got more say in the country, in terms of saying they have to do more in mining, more in terms of regulation, protection, enforcement, etc., for mining.

How do you see a free trade agreement between Canada and Panama compromising our position in terms of thinking that there should be corporate social responsibility for mines?

• (1710)

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I think the Canadian government would do better to focus on creating some strong regulations to provide more significant oversight of the overseas mining industry, rather than focusing on promoting these sorts of investment agreements, which do not have any significant mechanism to ensure further protection for the environment or for workers or affected communities. They provide an additional mechanism for the mining industry to access international tribunals in the case of disputes and a sense of greater legal stability for them to stand on, which I don't think does anything to respond to the situations in the country.

What I heard from the two witnesses who spoke on Tuesday is some ambiguity about even the extent to which it matters to them, in the context such as Panama, where things are already very much skewed in their favour in terms of legal supports for their interests, so I'm not sure. I don't see what this does to improve our engagement or to improve the response to the conflicts and to the abuses that are happening at the hands of the Canadian mining industry in a country like Panama.

**Hon. Wayne Easter:** As the pork producers just said, a lot of players are involved here, and one of the problems is everybody's in there for self-interest. We understand that, but do you think it's not best if you have an economic relationship that's important to their country and important to us? Do you not think it would make more sense to have an agreement, and then we would work in parallel on those other issues that you're talking about?



I agree with you 100%. One of the problems I have with labour and environment is there are no enforcement procedures—there should be, and there aren't—but do you not think it's better to do the agreement and then work in parallel to try to do what you're asking?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I don't think whether this agreement is in existence or not is going to make a difference in whether or not there is Canadian mining in Panama.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We'll now move to Mr. Hiebert. You have seven minutes.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC):** I thought it was five minutes.

**The Chair:** It's seven minutes. I'll give you five if you want.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** That's probably all I need.

I'll start with Ms. Moore. I listened with interest, Ms. Moore, to your responses to the questions of my colleague Mr. Cannan, and found it quite interesting that you couldn't provide an example of a mining operation or an agreement that MiningWatch has actually supported or endorsed.

It begs me to question the balance of your organization if you can't find some examples of an institution that's actually doing something good, or an agreement that Canada has with some other country that actually protects the environment to your satisfaction.

Do you want to try answering that question again, or is it pretty much clear that there is nothing you can support?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I believe I provided three examples. We have seen some significant improvements in terms of independent environmental oversight with regard to the Ekati diamond mine in the Northwest Territories. We have seen some significant advances in the nature of the impact benefit agreement with regard to the Raglan mine in northern Quebec. The environmental assessment process with regard to Voisey's Bay also showed some significant modifications in the way those developments have happened.

We engage in a lot of different spaces, and I think in a very positive way in terms of coming with proposals on what can constructively be done. We're also not shy of saying when things are actually eroding and making life harder for the workers and communities that are affected.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I definitely get the sense that you're not shy on that side.

Are you saying that you've publicly endorsed the Ekati, Raglan, and Voisey's Bay mines? Have you made public statements to that effect?

•(1715)

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I was not around when those things were happening. I do know that we have referred to those as examples in different spaces and in different conversations.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** You've referred to them as positive examples, as ones that you've endorsed, like the—

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** They are ones that my colleagues refer to and have guided me to, yes.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Okay.

Just before I move on to Mr. Pomerleau, you mentioned that MiningWatch was formed in 1999 and that it's a collection of environmental, social justice, and indigenous organizations. Could you just give me the names of those organizations and the source of funding that you receive from those organizations?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** There are 24 different organizations. The list is available on our website. We could run through all of those. Eighty percent of our funding comes from a wide range of foundations, as well as from some of our member organizations.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** And the other 20%?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I believe the 20% is from our member organizations and about 80% from different foundations.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** You said 20% comes from the founding members and 80% from foundations. Would those all be Canadian foundations, or are they from other countries?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** No, they're not all Canadian foundations.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Can you give me a breakdown as to how many would be domestic and how many would be foreign?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** No, I don't have that off the top of my head.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Is it maybe 50:50? Do you have no idea?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I'm not sure. You can look at our annual report. It's very transparent in that regard.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I was looking for it, actually, on the CRA website, and I wasn't able to find it, so that's why I'm asking.

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** You can just go to our website. They're all posted there.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Okay.

Mr. Pomerleau, you mentioned a number of things that I want to follow up on. In your opening statement you said there was a clause allowing you to catch up with United States competitors. Could you just explain what that clause allows and how it works?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** Basically, it will allow us to catch up with the elimination stages because the tariffs will be eliminated over a long period of time. Some are starting immediately and others are starting at a later date.

The point is that we will catch up with them, with their calendar, but we will lose three, four, or five months for the difference when we don't have a treaty. We will catch up with them, but we could lose some time.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Wouldn't this clause then give some assurance to the Panamanian exporters that it's just a matter of time and this clause will allow you to catch up? Are you really falling behind that much? Is it that much of a competitive disadvantage to not have this agreement ratified?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** It would be if it isn't, but Panamanians are not familiar with our political situation here, so how could they trust that the Canadian government could implement in one month or three months or three years or five years? They don't know, so they act on what they see.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** And what they see is a U.S. that's open—

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** They see a U.S. free trade agreement being implemented next month.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Right.

Can you give me some idea as to the impact in dollars or a percentage for how much of an advantage we're losing as a nation?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** As I said, it could be difficult to assess, but I can tell you that the market was around \$7 million or \$8 million in the last two or three years. What we've seen is that for this year we've already lost something like 15% compared to last year.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** That's substantial.

You also talked about the agreement having a beneficial dispute resolution. Could you explain how that dispute resolution mechanism works?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** It would be only on the sanitary and phytosanitary issues. What the agreement would do is establish coordinators for each party. Those two coordinators would be charged with trying to resolve, through meetings or whatever other means they have, the outstanding sanitary and phytosanitary issues that we could have.

At this time we don't have any, but you never know when it will happen. I don't know. We've seen it in the past, when we've had to deal with disease factors and that kind of thing. At least we have a mechanism by which we could facilitate communications and try to resolve issues. It's one of the very first agreements in which we've seen that.

• (1720)

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** If those coordinators aren't able to resolve things among themselves, is there another further level of appeal or binding arbitration?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** Oh, I don't think so. It's literally between the veterinary services on each side or the agricultural services on each side. No, I don't think there would be anything binding there. It's very difficult. In that case, you have to deal with sovereignty and different regulations, so it would be very difficult to have anything binding here.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** I have a brief point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Moore offered to supply the committee.... She said the website of MiningWatch had the breakdown of their source of funding and who those supporters were. Can you follow up through the clerk with the organization and get that for all the members?

**A voice:** I'm on the website right now.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** If it's not on the website, can we get it? I don't see it on the website.

**The Chair:** I'm sure we can look at that for you. We'll look into that.

Go ahead, Monsieur Morin.

**Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP):** Ms. Moore, maybe you can help me validate the information I have. It seems that indigenous people in Panama have been left out of the economy for the last 400 years. With improvements in Panama, when they got rid of the dictatorship and when they started moving into more democratic governments, they got the first area on which

they had any land rights. I believe Inmet is going to be mining right in the centre of that area.

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** Where Inmet is located is not within one of the designated administrative areas, which are known as *comarcas* in Panama. It is located in the area of a number of indigenous communities that are living effectively outside of one of these areas—here, we might say “off reserve”. They are living in that area and have done so for a long time. The company is located within the Meso-American biological corridor and in an area where there have been attempts to protect it.

**Mr. Marc-André Morin:** Is the sacred mountain unfortunately a big pile of copper?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** You might be referring to Cerro Colorado, which is located within the Ngöbe-Buglé *comarca* in western Panama, where a group of consultants have been working for a company called Corriente Resources. It's unclear if that's the company they've continued to work for, because it was bought up by a Chinese consortium that bought their holdings in Ecuador a number of years ago.

It has been working on promoting mining in that area, where the pushback on that and the massive protests in the last couple of years have actually led to a prohibition on mining in the area of Cerro Colorado currently.

**Mr. Marc-André Morin:** Do you think there's a way an agreement with Panama will improve the social responsibility of Canadian mining corporations with regard to the conditions for aboriginal people in Panama?

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** No, unfortunately, I don't. I don't see any incentive with this agreement to improve corporate behaviour within Panama. Rather it's a reinforcement of the status quo, which to date has not been very beneficial to indigenous peoples in Panama. They have suffered tremendous repression over the course of the last couple of years. They've lacked effective access to democratic channels to have their disputes solved peacefully and they continue to complain about the Panamanian government's failure to follow through on its obligations to ensure social, educational, and other benefits for their communities, regardless of whether or not mining is happening in their territories.

**Mr. Marc-André Morin:** Thank you. That's it.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much.

We'll now move to Mr. Shipley.

You have five minutes.

**Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC):** Thank you very much. I think I have a short time.

I am looking at your website, and I can't find those things that have been asked.

However, when you mentioned the mines in Canada, I didn't hear you mention anything about the oil sands development. Could you give me an opinion on that?

• (1725)

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** No, we don't work on oil or gas.

**Mr. Bev Shipley:** Oh, okay, that's good.

Mr. Pomerleau, thank you for coming again. It's good to see you here. I know the producers know the value you provide for them. We recognize the importance of the work you do for an industry that it seems to me rides a roller coaster a lot in terms of its strength in markets and revenues.

My understanding is that you are the third-largest exporter of pork in the world, at a little under \$3 billion, and that shouldn't go unnoticed. It's more than that now. To our colleagues around the table, I think when we're talking about the significance or the urgency of making sure that we move ahead, particularly with Panama this time, it reflects, in terms of an industry that is basic to Canada, a lot about how important it is that we would be able to move ahead.

The question came up about an easier resolution to the conflict issue, and we go back to the COOL. In the United States, as we continue to move forward with that, and hopefully have that resolution that was made a long time ago, do you recognize two things? One is that this now gives a diversity of markets when those things happen; is that of significance? Two, if that type of non-tariff barrier jumps in front of us again, do you see this type of a resolution being better?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** One thing we've noticed is the more you lower tariffs, the more you're likely to get non-tariff and technical barriers in place. We've seen it with several countries, including the largest ones, and even with our friendly neighbours. The point is that with this type of mechanism in the Panama treaty, in this case at least, they agreed to talk. It's a good start, because at times we just hit the wall—who do you talk to, or do they just ignore us or whatever? We've seen that with countries that I won't name, but they are quite significant markets for us.

Therefore, the more we have those kinds of clauses in our treaties, the better I think we'll be. One thing I should also mention is that 65% of our production is exported.

**Mr. Bev Shipley:** You said 65% of all the production in Canada is exported. Does most of that have pretty good access to terminals for export, in terms of transportation?

**Mr. Jacques Pomerleau:** Oh, it's no longer an issue. It was a couple of years ago; we couldn't get enough reefers.

At the same time, we have to be careful. A lot of our big plants are located in the Prairies. It might be easier at times to truck the containers all the way to Vancouver than to get a slot on the trains. It's always been an issue.

There are some efforts being made to get the product not only from the Asia-Pacific gateway but also from the Halifax area. More and more, especially if we are successful in negotiating an agreement with the European Union, it would become very significant that we have access.

Right now it's not an issue because there are more reefer containers available on the world market, now that some troops are not posted in Asia, as they used to be.

• (1730)

**Mr. Bev Shipley:** Is that it?

**The Chair:** Yes, I'm afraid that's time.

I want to thank you both for coming in, Mr. Pomerleau and Madam Moore.

Madam Moore, before we let you go, I've checked with the researcher who checked your website to see if the breakdown of those contributors is there. They're there, but not in percentage form. We could be missing it....

**Ms. Jennifer Moore:** I think if you go to the "about us" section, all our annual general reports are there. There are financial reports in that section.

**The Chair:** We'll check into it. If we can't find it, perhaps you could have it provided. We'll have our researchers get hold of you, if that's okay.

Thank you very much for coming in.

With that, the meeting is adjourned.





Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>