



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 026**

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

---

Chair: Terry Duguid





## Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

• (1150)

[*English*]

**The Chair (Hon. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.):** Good morning, colleagues. Let me call this meeting to order.

I hope everyone had a good constituency week.

Let me start, as we always do, by acknowledging that we are on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe nation.

Welcome to meeting number 26 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Before we begin, I'd like to take a moment to clarify something with the committee. A meeting was initially called for yesterday to deal with the travel budget for the Sweden and Finland trip and have the committee adopt it in time to be considered at the next SBLI meeting, otherwise known as the budgets subcommittee, which was scheduled for tomorrow. That meeting has been moved to March 25. That gives us time to adopt the budget in the appropriate time frame, and it's likely, colleagues, we'll be dealing with that on Thursday.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format. I'd like to remind participants of the following points. Before speaking, please wait for me to recognize you. There are folks who are going to be coming in by video conference in the second hour, so we'll give them those instructions when that time comes.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted Thursday, September 18, 2025, the committee shall resume its study of the management of Canadian energy exports.

I would now like to welcome our witnesses and apologize for the delay. We had a vote that took us a little bit of time.

**Claude Guay (LaSalle—Émard—Verdun, Lib.):** Did we ask the witnesses if they're going to have the full hour? I would like to spend the full hour.

**The Chair:** I was going to get to that. Thank you for the reminder, Mr. Guay.

I would like to welcome the Canadian Association of Energy Contractors, represented by Mark Scholz, president and CEO. Welcome, Mr. Scholz.

From Canada's Building Trades Unions, we have Sean Strickland, executive director. Sean, welcome.

From Svante Technologies Inc., we have Brett Henkel, co-founder and senior vice-president, building development. Welcome.

Folks, because of our vote, we're a little bit behind in the committee proceedings, so we're going to have about 45 minutes with you, our first panel, and 30 minutes with our second panel. That should be time for some good exchanges, questions and responses.

We're going to start now with each of you for five minutes for your opening remarks, after which we will open the floor to questions.

Mr. Scholz, you have the floor for five minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mark A. Scholz (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Association of Energy Contractors):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the standing committee on behalf of the Canadian Association of Energy Contractors.

The study of Canadian energy exports is critically important for our country's future. As we navigate global energy demands and market diversification, energy exports represent not just economic opportunities but a pathway to secure jobs, thriving economies and Canada's role as a responsible energy leader.

In light of escalating tensions in the Middle East, Canadian energy is essential to bolstering global supply chains, supporting our allies and realizing Canada's potential as a reliable middle power on the world stage.

Our association represents over 100 drilling rig, service rig and oil sands mine drilling rig companies operating a fleet of 336 land drilling rigs and 667 service rigs across northeast British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, southwest Manitoba, Ontario and offshore Newfoundland.

Our members are diverse: big, small and medium-sized enterprises that create opportunities for young people, indigenous communities and middle-class workers. They employ thousands of people in rural, remote and indigenous communities, securing subsurface resources that fuel local economies while advancing both traditional oil and gas and emerging sectors like lithium for EV batteries, helium for medical and nuclear applications, geothermal energy, hydrogen, potash and storage for carbon dioxide.

The drilling and service rig sector is the backbone of Canada's energy workforce. Our recent analysis shows that one operating drilling rig and service rig creates 317 full-time equivalent jobs across site preparation, drilling, well servicing operations, fracturing, completions, tie-ins and abandonments. In 2026, we estimate that over 85,000 jobs will be created nationwide.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Simard.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard:** Mr. Chair, I would ask the witness to slow down because the interpreter is hyperventilating. It's a bit too fast.

[English]

**The Chair:** We've stopped your time, Mr. Scholz.

Maybe just slow it down a wee bit for the sake of our interpreters.

If it's a bit slower, we'll give you a little extra time.

**Mark A. Scholz:** These are not just numbers. They represent real livelihoods in communities where energy development is often the primary economic driver. Our members provide high-paying skilled employment that supports families and local businesses.

For decades, indigenous representation has been integral to our sector. From indigenous-owned companies to partnerships, ownership stakes and training programs, our industry fosters meaningful economic participation and reconciliation. These opportunities build capacity, create wealth and enable self-determination in remote regions where energy exports directly translate to community prosperity. However, these benefits hinge on market access and competitive public policy. Without reliable export infrastructure, such as pipelines and LNG facilities, our sector faces volatility.

Competitive policies that accelerate critical projects, such as those under the Building Canada Act, are essential to diversify markets, attract investment and boost drilling and service rig activity.

Positive steps include the recent agreement to advance Newfoundland and Labrador's Bay du Nord offshore project and federal funding for E3 Lithium's Clearwater project in Alberta, both of which will create thousands of jobs and generate billions in economic wealth.

However, barriers persist. For instance, helium development could be unlocked by extending standard depreciation treatment and flow-through shares to this critical mineral, aligning it with policies for other resources.

Removing obstacles like the proposed oil and gas emissions cap, ensuring a globally competitive industrial carbon pricing model, and sensible methane emission regulations would provide stability, preventing investment flight to less responsible jurisdictions.

Streamlining regulations and harmonizing interprovincial rules, such as transportation and tax policies, would enhance workforce mobility, enabling our agile business model to thrive across borders.

Incentivizing innovation is equally vital. Our sector has pioneered technologies like high line power, battery storage and alternative fuels, reducing GHG emissions by up to 85% to 95%. However, exclusions from clean technology investment tax credits, simply because our equipment serves both traditional and emerging resources, undermine this progress. By supporting a full spectrum energy economy, we can ensure sustainable jobs that transition seamlessly from oil and gas to critical minerals and clean energy.

To close, CAOEC urges this committee to recognize the vital role of energy exports in sustaining jobs and communities. By building infrastructure and having competitive policies, we will secure economic growth, energy security and a bright future for all Canadians.

Thank you, and I look forward to the questions.

• (1155)

**The Chair:** Thank you Mr. Scholz.

We're going to go on to Mr. Strickland for five minutes, please.

**Sean Strickland (Executive Director, Canada's Building Trades Unions):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Honourable members, thank you for the opportunity to share our perspective regarding the committee's important study of Canada's energy exports.

My name is Sean Strickland. I'm the executive director of Canada's Building Trades Unions, CBTU. I'm here to speak on behalf of our 600,000 unionized skilled tradespeople from coast to coast who work in more than 60 different trades and occupations.

In 2024, Canada exported energy worth \$208 billion—close to one-third of the nation's total goods exports—and 89% of those energy exports went to the United States. The Government of Canada has made it part of its core mission to diversify our markets, including our energy markets. It is a priority that we at Canada's Building Trades Unions share wholeheartedly.

The members of this committee understand very well that to achieve this goal we urgently require new major energy infrastructure projects: pipelines, LNG facilities, ports and mines, to name a few. Such projects take time to build, and up until recently in Canada, too much time was wasted to assess those initiatives before construction could begin. The TMX expansion is a case in point. It took four years to build but 10 years to approve.

This is why CBTU supported Bill C-5, which introduced the Major Projects Office and a new impact assessment regime for projects of national interest. Now that these tools are in place, Canada must get moving for real. We need governments and stakeholders to proceed rigorously, because, yes, we have to protect the environment and consider the concerns of affected communities, including building partnerships with indigenous nations, but also expeditiously, so that final investment decisions are made and shovels are in the ground as soon as possible.

These projects are needed for our nation's prosperity, as they provide generational opportunities for thousands of skilled workers and apprentices. As an example, at peak for LNG Canada phase 1, there were more than 9,400 highly skilled Canadians working in Kitimat.

However, projects will deliver maximum benefits for Canada and its workers only if certain conditions are met. Indeed, CBTU is convinced that any time the Government of Canada makes an investment to help attract private capital, that investment should be conditional on good wages and benefits—prevailing wages—as well as apprenticeship requirements and local and indigenous hiring obligations.

That is precisely the model that Bill C-59 put into place with its clean economy investment tax credits, ITCs. To benefit from the full ITCs, proponents must ensure that tradespersons are remunerated for their labour in accordance with the prevailing wages set out in operative multi-employer collective bargaining agreements. This prevents contractors from hiring workers for wages and benefits that are below the industry standard for a given trade and region.

We must also ensure, as per Bill C-59, that at least 10% of the labour hours for Red Seal trades or the equivalent are performed by registered apprentices. We know from experience that this requirement has accelerated the completion rate of apprentices in achieving their Red Seal or equivalent status.

During last year's election campaign, the Prime Minister committed to reinstating and improving the programs that encourage employers to hire apprentices and to financially support those apprentices while they complete their training. We call on the government to deliver on these commitments.

We also recommend that a labour supply advisory committee be put in place so that projects' labour supply plans are properly coordinated and we can optimize jobs for Canadians and reduce reliance on temporary foreign workers.

Canada's economy is at a crossroads. A significant part of our prosperity will depend on how we leverage our extraordinary wealth and energy resources. We need to produce more energy, to export more and to export to more regions of the world. For this to

happen, government approvals, investment decisions and construction must happen as quickly as possible.

Honourable members, CBTU's 600,000 members are willing and ready to build Canada's future.

I look forward to your questions.

● (1200)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Strickland.

Wrapping up, we have Mr. Henkel.

**Brett Henkel (Co-Founder and Senior Vice President, Business Development, Svante Technologies):** Mr. Chair and honourable members, thank you for the invitation to speak here today.

My name is Brett Henkel. I'm co-founder of Svante Technologies, a Canadian carbon management company.

The world needs energy, and Canada has it. Let's grow our energy exports to meet global demand and build prosperity for all Canadians. My own family depends on oil and gas. At the same time, let's build the next industry the world is demanding, and position Canada as a carbon management leader.

In 1974, Alberta created Oil Sands Technology Research Authority to turn steam-assisted gravity drainage, SAGD, from a theory into a proven process: Burn natural gas, produce steam, inject it into the ground and extract oil. It worked. Alberta paid for it. Industry scaled it. Ottawa supported the science and the policy. It was Canadian ingenuity at its best. SAGD is now at about two million barrels per day, but it also emits a lot of CO<sub>2</sub>—about 85 megatonnes and growing.

Canada is at a crossroads. Expanding the oil sands requires major investment, even another potential export pipeline through British Columbia, but customers and financiers are increasingly carbon hesitant. Why do finance expansion without a decarbonization plan? Is China now shaping the future for a lower oil demand, using less gas and diesel last year? If Canada wants to remain the supplier of choice, we need to pair energy export with decarbonization.

How do we cut emissions at scale? The Oil Sands Alliance is proposing the Pathways carbon capture and storage network, potentially reducing emissions up to 40 megatonnes per year. Natural gas combined-cycle power, combined with carbon capture and storage, can provide reliable baseload power needed to support renewables.

Canada is also well positioned for bioenergy, with carbon capture and storage, our large pulp and paper sector and abundant biomass. Direct air capture, which is removing CO<sub>2</sub> directly from the atmosphere, is an emerging global market. Companies like Microsoft are already purchasing negative emissions credits for BECCS and DAC projects, and, of course, renewables and electrification are making remarkable progress.

Why is this a Canadian opportunity? We have the technical expertise. We have world-class storage. We have a track record of first-of-a-kind projects, like the Boundary dam and Quest, and Canada is already a leader. Carbon Engineering, a Canadian direct air capture company, sold for \$1.5 billion. Svante, the company I co-founded, has raised over \$800 million. We invented new metal organic framework materials and built a carbon capture management component manufacturing facility in Burnaby, keeping Canadian intellectual property right here in Canada.

The demand for carbon management is real, and it's growing. There are three ways that the government can help.

Provide a policy framework that gets projects built. An investment tax credit, a carbon price and certainty are essential. Government and industry can figure this out together. Their framework should support decarbonization across all industries—cement, steel, power, plastics and more—and it should apply across Canada.

Allow carbon management to access the federal clean technology manufacturing investment tax credit. The ITC covers minerals, solar, wind, hydrogen, nuclear—all of them—but not carbon management. Including it would build the backbone of the industry. Intellectual property manufacturing and innovation would stay in Canada.

Also, encourage Canadian content: Attach Canadian content requirements to federal financial support where appropriate, strengthen federal programs that support development of Canadian technology and scale up federal purchases of carbon removal credits.

• (1205)

Canada largely missed the manufacturing waves in solar, wind and batteries, but carbon management is still early enough for Canada not only to participate but to lead. We can grow jobs in both the energy export industry and the carbon management industry at the same time.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

**The Chair:** Thank you to you all.

We're going to go to questions, but just before I do, I want to welcome Mr. Bélanger and Mr. Stevenson to the committee. It's a great committee. We get along, for the most part.

We're on to questions, and Mrs. Stubbs, we're going to start with you.

**Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to all the witnesses for being here and making clear the truth that Conservatives have always known and stood up for: The gift and the promise of Canada is in "all and every kind" of energy, rather than the "either-or", isn't it?

I would just make one point, though. Canada, from your perspective, Brett, may have missed the boat on many of these technologies, but Alberta, of course, hasn't; it's been home to the largest and oldest commercial wind and solar farms in the entire country for decades. This was mostly done in our province through the private sector by oil sands and pipeline companies.

I want to thank you all for talking about the full spectrum of energy and its importance in creating jobs and its community contributions. The Canadian Association of Energy Contractors say Bill C-5 is a "first step", which is, of course, why you all know that Conservatives helped improve and pass it last year. However, they said broader reforms—as you touched on—to the regulatory and policy environment are essential for investor confidence and obviously to unlock the full potential of Canada's conventional oil and gas.

The oil sands get a lot of news and they get a lot of noise, because that is what puts Canada on the map in terms of global reserves.

Mark, from your perspective and for your members—who are mostly individuals, small and medium-sized companies, home-grown Canadian companies owned and built by them, and very many indigenous entrepreneurs like those I represent in Lakeland—would you outline the top priority laws and regs that must be repealed or fixed to address what you have all said needs to be done urgently?

Also, I might note the Liberals have given us a hand in that by listing them in the back of Bill C-5, because that's why they brought in that bill. It was to work around those very laws themselves that Conservatives say they ought to fix fast.

• (1210)

**Mark A. Scholz:** Thanks again for the opportunity to be here.

I think the government has introduced a number of key pieces of legislation that deal with, in the short term, some of the great challenges we face as a country. When we look around the world, we see the immense geopolitical tensions. We saw the invasion of Ukraine. We have people in our own country dealing with affordability crises.

We have a bountiful resource here in Canada that the world desperately needs, and we've spent the last 10 years as a lost opportunity, a lost decade for Canada. The legislation that has been introduced recently, I think, is a step forward in the right direction. I think it addresses some of the major challenges in the short term in terms of building infrastructure in this project.

Let's be frank. At the end of the day, without infrastructure, without port access, without pipelines, Canada can't get its products to market. Then, at the end of the day, I think long term we need to start looking at creating the regulatory framework that allows capital to come back into Canada so that we can show the world that we can get stuff done and we can get things built.

Keep in mind what I really want to focus in on is how we spend a lot of time speaking about infrastructure and the lack of infrastructure to get our products to market, but one of the things I'll point out is what's behind that infrastructure. When we can build that infrastructure, we can start hiring tens of thousands of drillers and service rig contractors all across Western Canada. We can start building and manufacturing steel that could potentially go into new drilling rigs and new service rigs and new pieces of equipment that could unlock everything from helium to lithium to new oil and gas reserves. This is a huge opportunity for Canada to look at this in the sense of, yes, we have challenges, but there's an immense number of opportunities that we can take advantage of.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Yes.

**Mark A. Scholz:** We're moving in the right direction.

We need to have a whole rework of the regulatory framework that allows not just projects that get designated in the Major Projects Office but allows projects, both brownfield and greenfield projects, to come forward with certainty of what that regulatory process looks like.

**Shannon Stubbs:** So far, the Liberals have announced about 11 projects with some already being built and some already being approved. Apparently, they're going to the MPO, which hasn't approved a single thing. There are 72 real projects with real private sector proponents in front of the three federal regulators. They are in limbo land while these guys create yet another layer, an expensive office, and say that it's going to get things built at speeds not seen in generations. However, not a single thing has been built, except things that have already been approved.

The Liberals killed a dedicated export pipeline to Asia, when they should have redone the indigenous consultation. That was over a decade ago. Northern gateway would be operating out of my riding, in Bruderheim, if that were the case. They killed a west-east pipeline for Canadian energy security and exports to Europe through death by delay, and they kept moving the goalposts deliberately for domestic politics. Then, they had to buy TMX, because they wouldn't clear the path for certainty for the proponent to actually build the pipeline once it was approved. Now it's on the taxpayers' dime.

Would you agree that the government needs to fix the fundamental laws and regulations it admits to blocking? Then every investor and every proponent across the entire spectrum of energy development in Canada could have certainty to propose and build projects. They would know that they would get the green light and that the

government would back them. They could create jobs and contribute to all the communities across the country. All three of you have articulated that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Scholz, give a quick answer. We're out of time.

**Mark A. Scholz:** That's a tough one to unpack, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You can say yes or no.

**Mark A. Scholz:** There's no question that it's been a difficult past decade. We did get a pipeline built, which ended up being essentially nationalized.

We have serious problems, from a regulatory perspective. I do believe that we've seen a tonal change by the federal government. We have seen bills introduced that I think are going to be dealing with some of the short-term challenges. However, there's no question that we need a systemic change in how we regulate and how we approve these projects so that we can get products to market.

● (1215)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We will go to Mr. Hogan for six minutes.

**Corey Hogan (Calgary Confederation, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, witnesses. It is great to see you all today.

Mr. Scholz and Mr. Strickland, your testimony was a reminder that we do this for Canadians. We do it for workers, for their families and for their communities. That is ultimately what all this drives to. We talk about energy policy, fiscal policy and environmental policy. These are all means to an end, but not an end in their own right. We do these things to provide as many people as possible with the opportunities to build better lives. I want to thank you.

Ms. Stubbs and I agree on some things, and we disagree on others. However, we certainly agree that it needs to be easier to unlock opportunities that put people to work, as the Prime Minister has said and as the Prime Minister has tasked the Major Projects Office to do.

Mr. Henkel, I don't want to leave you out of my thanks. Your work has a very interesting connection to the work of Mr. Scholz's members, which is where I want to start today.

Mr. Scholz, I don't know if many people fully appreciate how the same people who drill and service oil wells, with the same equipment, are involved in so many other parts of the energy sector and how that could unlock export opportunities. I'm hoping you can expand on the variety of work done by your members and the opportunities for growth and stability, keeping people working through declines in oil prices as well as the booms.

**Mark A. Scholz:** Thanks, Mr. Hogan.

When it comes to the energy services sector, there are tremendous opportunities to unlock traditional energy sources—oil and gas—which represent 90% to 95% of what we do today. That's the bread-and-butter of our industry, and that will always be the case.

It's interesting that the same technology, the same processes, the same equipment and the same people are easily transferable to the extraction of lithium resources, helium resources, potash or geothermal. We're going to be drilling all the carbon storage wells and facilities. In situ hydrogen is now another opportunity for Canada. You cannot extract subsurface resources without a lot of the same people and equipment from the oil and gas industry moving into those budding and emerging sectors.

When we look at things like battery technology, the lithium that's going to go into potentially Canadian-made batteries is going to come from western Canada. When it comes to helium and our defence industries and our nuclear strategies.... I said in my opening remarks that we do have some fiscal restraints in the Income Tax Act that need to be reformed to allow helium to reach its potential, but that's going to be a huge opportunity for Canada to extract that resource. There is a plethora of opportunities.

At the end of the day, as energy service companies, we are part of both the clean and the conventional energy superpower potential, and we look forward to working in collaboration with the government to deliver.

**Corey Hogan:** Thank you.

I certainly agree about the opportunity and that maybe there are some tools that need to be modified to unlock it.

Because we are a little pressed for time, I'm going to give the rest of my time to my colleague MP Danko.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Danko.

**John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.):** Thank you.

My question is for Mr. Strickland.

You started your comments by talking about how, as representing the building trades, you support the diversification of Canada's energy exports and reducing that reliance on U.S. markets, which is certainly a big focus of the government. Then you talked about leveraging public investment in energy infrastructure. When we're leveraging private capital, make sure that includes local indigenous hiring. You talked about the need for fair wage policies.

I was wondering if you could expand on that and also on how we can include buy Canadian policies when it comes to developing Canada's energy exports.

**Sean Strickland:** Let's start with the second part in terms of buy Canadian. It has to come through procurement. I think there's a similarity between buy Canadian requirements through procurement....

I referenced the TMX pipeline, for example. Much of that pipeline did not come from Canada. Now, there were some issues with respect to the diameter of the pipe and it only being sourced from overseas, but these are the kinds of things that we need to do a better job of in Canada when we're building major infrastructure projects.

There's good news from Bay du Nord, but all the topsides are going to be built overseas. The fact that we had a floating dock out of that is good, but we need to really look at our procurement practices for these major infrastructure projects to maximize that economic benefit throughout the supply chain.

In terms of workers' benefits, our position is that, whenever there's a tax incentive or Canadian taxpayer dollars going into a project, those projects must have a requirement for a prevailing wage, as in Bill C-59. Bill C-59 is working really well. My office has received hundreds of inquiries over the past couple of years asking for the collective agreements.

The point is that, if the Canadian taxpayer is going to provide large, well-capitalized industries with up to 30% tax credits.... On a billion-dollar project, it's \$300 million. You had better make sure it's tied to the best wages that are available in the marketplace. That's the prevailing wage. That's the union wage. It doesn't necessarily mean you have to hire 100% union, but if you're going to hire a non-union person, then you pay them the best wages that are available in that market. That's the way in which we can lift people into the middle class. We can provide apprenticeship opportunities and continue this life cycle of leveraging our investments to improve Canadian workers' lives and their families' lives.

• (1220)

**The Chair:** Thank you, both.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simard, you have the floor for six minutes.

**Mario Simard:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Scholz and Mr. Strickland, I'm going to explain the slight problem I see, and I'm not acting in bad faith by saying this.

I believe that what the federal government announced, by signing the agreement with Alberta, is a way of passing the responsibility on to the Alberta government and the oil and gas companies. What I'm seeing right now is that few big companies are willing to raise their hands to build infrastructure. That was seen again last week, when people said that the regulations were still too burdensome even though the government was prepared to ease off. That's what is happening with Bill C-5.

I get the impression that the cost of building this infrastructure makes it difficult to turn a profit, so big oil and gas companies are reluctant to make these investments, unless there's a very strong signal from the government that public funds will be injected. I don't want to act in bad faith by saying this, but I'd like to hear you talk about it.

Mr. Scholz, I know you emphasized that members of your association work in the oil and gas sector and would benefit from infrastructure development. The same goes for Mr. Strickland.

However, I want to look at this in a very realistic way. I wonder if there's a business case for building oil and gas infrastructure without public funds. The signal I'm seeing from the big companies is that they themselves don't seem to believe in that. Beyond the political issue, big companies would have to believe in the model for building oil and gas infrastructure.

I'd like to hear from each of you about that.

**Mark A. Scholz:** I'll start.

[English]

First of all, let me qualify that I don't represent the pipeline industry. I represent the drilling and service rig industry. There's no question that our workforce, our members stand to benefit from greater capacity.

What I would say is this: I think the challenge that Canada has, particularly with the west coast pipeline, is that Canada does not have a very good track record for private companies trying to get through the regulatory process and being able to satisfy the risk profile. I think Canada has created a huge risk profile that does not give companies the certainty that, if they get the regulatory green light, they can actually get a product to the finish line.

Even though we have made good progress in Canada on things like Bill C-5—and we're starting to take a deep dive on how we set up a good regulatory system for future projects—a company needs to have the assurance that they can get to the finish line, and right now, it's a big question mark for a lot of proponents. There is a tremendous amount of risk.

I think that there is still an opportunity. I think there is a business case for a new pipeline. I think the biggest issue for Canada is the strategic importance of optionality for our products outside of the United States. That's a national interest concern. It's difficult to put that into a business case. That's a Canadian government strategic approach, not necessarily a business case.

I would say that history has dictated to proponents that we have not done a very good job of signalling to the investment community

and to project proponents that you can actually get infrastructure built in this country. We have to fix that.

• (1225)

**Sean Strickland:** I would answer that in two ways because you seem to imply...through your question about the nationalization of a pipeline rather than the private sector. We have that already with TMX. I think there are two directions. Like Mark, I don't speak on behalf of the pipeline industry, the oil and gas industry. I speak on behalf of our members and jobs. These infrastructure investments create jobs, so we are very much aware of what's happening in this industry.

TMX, for example, can be expanded and increased in capacity to send oil down to Burnaby. It could also be expanded to send a new pipeline to Churchill, Manitoba and Hudson Bay and have a new terminal in Hudson Bay, a new oil and/or gas terminal. That's a pipeline the Canadian government already owns.

In terms of a pipeline in the MOU to the west coast, as you very well know, we live in a federation, and in order to get big things built in Canada, you need to have the provinces onside. You need it for regulatory approval. You need social licence. You need to work with the provinces to get these big projects through the approval process. That's why it's critically important to have these MOUs. I also see that different provinces are creating MOUs for more infrastructure projects across their provincial boundaries.

As it relates to a new pipeline to the west coast, I think we have to decarbonize our traditional production of oil from the oil sands. Pathways, now the Oil Sands Alliance, has talked about that, and in order to do that—

[Translation]

**Mario Simard:** Thank you, Mr. Strickland.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you. We're at the end of the time, Monsieur Simard. I know we're a little crunched for time today.

Folks, we're going on to our second round.

Ms. Kronis, welcome to this exciting committee that you are now a part of.

Mr. Rowe and Mr. Guay, we're going to have to cut you back to three minutes each.

[Translation]

Mr. Simard, you will have two minutes.

[English]

We're rationing time. I know your remarks are of high quality and very to the point, Mr. Rowe.

Please go ahead.

**Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Strickland, for talking about the Bay du Nord project. My father is part of the carpenters union in Newfoundland, Local 579. That announcement was big. The provincial PC government was able to strike a deal with Equinor and BP to build this project. That's going to bring \$6 billion in revenue over its lifespan and additional investment in the floating dry dock, as you mentioned.

What's interesting in this deal is that the construction of the drill ship, also called the FPSO, will be put on tender. People and facilities around the world can put bids on it. The Cow Head facility in Marystown, Newfoundland, has built topsides for these FPSOs in the past. They have built topsides for oil rigs. That site had over 700 union members—high-paying jobs—on its last project.

I want to see that Cow Head facility used for this construction. How can they compete with international markets with the heavy tax burden that we have in Canada?

The Atlantic investment tax credit has up to 10% on equipment and capital for fishing, farming, logging, manufacturing, processing and prescribed new energy generation. At one point, that tax credit applied to offshore oil and gas, but now it doesn't. Do you think that reinstalling that tax credit could increase competitiveness and incentivize these companies to employ hundreds of unionized workers and create high-paying jobs in Newfoundland and Labrador and Atlantic Canada?

• (1230)

**Sean Strickland:** I'm sorry. I don't know enough about the Atlantic tax credit. I remember it being in place a number of years ago. I'm not 100% sure about what kind of results it delivered.

If it is modelled after Bill C-59 and the investment tax credits, I think there's room in the Canadian economy and in government policy to provide tax credits to promote industry, as long as they are tied to good-paying jobs and apprenticeship opportunities.

With Bay du Nord, I know that Trades NL and my colleagues there are quite pleased with the deal. I've been speaking with them this past week. Is it a perfect deal? No. Where do you get perfection in this world? I don't know. It's very difficult to achieve that kind of 100% benefit in that kind of a deal when you're working with these large projects. However, it is much improved over what was originally proposed, where we weren't going to see any of that work in Canada.

The provincial government and Trades NL did a really good job of getting as much of that work back as they possibly could.

**Jonathan Rowe:** I did see as well that it's not just Newfoundland that is going to be affected.

Do you think the increased number of high-paying, unionized jobs in the rest of Canada and Atlantic Canada by using Canadian steel, Canadian manufacturing and Canadian transportation would not just impact Newfoundland, but would impact the rest of Canada as well?

**Sean Strickland:** Absolutely. Also, when you look at Bay du Nord and that FPSO—it's basically a big ship that sucks oil out of the bottom of the ocean—it is delivering tremendous economic op-

portunity to Canada and to the Government of Newfoundland in terms of royalties. There are ongoing maintenance jobs. The knock-on effects from that kind of project are quite substantial.

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

Mr. Guay, you have three minutes.

**Claude Guay:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to all three witnesses. I really appreciate the content of your discussion.

One of the things I appreciate the most is seeing in all three why we aspire to be an energy superpower in both clean and conventional energy. All three of you have touched on the fact that there is opportunity for Canada in both clean and conventional energy.

Mr. Henkel, would you talk about the economic opportunity inside the country and, if you have a little bit of time, the exporting that carbon capture represents?

This is a new area, so I really would like to understand from you how that can help Canada internally and with exporting.

**Brett Henkel:** I'll start with carbon management. It can and will be a very large industry in the future. Some studies out there are saying that carbon management can be as big as the oil and gas industry in the future. There's a lot of carbon to deal with. Canada has the opportunity here to actually build projects in Canada, prove the technologies and create jobs while we're doing it, because we have the expertise here to do it. As the gentleman over here was saying, the skill sets of our oil and gas energy industry are the same skill sets we need for decarbonization. We can do it here. We have the geology. We can prove it here.

The world is demanding carbon management. When you talk to Europeans, it's on the tip of their tongue. They're talking about carbon management on a daily basis. Asia is now going the path of carbon management. Japan, Singapore and Korea are leading the way on carbon management in Asia. Worldwide it is a topic. It is an industry that is going to grow over the next decades. Canada can be a leader in this space. We can create high-paying jobs while we're doing it.

• (1235)

**The Chair:** You have 30 more seconds.

**Claude Guay:** For this industry to expand, do we need industrial carbon pricing to have some level of certainty?

**Brett Henkel:** Absolutely. I believe so. We need industrial carbon pricing. Certainty is the key, right? It has to be. Let's start with something. Let's be certain about it. Let's send the signals to industry. Then industry will move. The worst case is where it's unknown and just talked about. There's no certainty. Well, then, nobody can move. We need certainty.

**The Chair:** Thank you, both.

To end this round, we have Monsieur Simard for two minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to follow up on that, Mr. Henkel.

Something seems to have been misunderstood, or there's a misunderstanding between the industry and the people who want to develop carbon capture and sequestration technologies.

From what I understand, it's impossible to implement carbon capture and sequestration strategies without a price on carbon. However, people in the industry don't seem to want a price on carbon. It's a bit like the snake eating its tail.

Why, then, invest massive amounts of money in decarbonizing oil if there are no incentives to do so?

I say this in good faith: Sometimes, it gives outsiders the impression that it's more of a sales hook. Some people will present that as greenwashing rather than a genuine desire to decarbonize the sector.

I'd like to hear your comments on that.

First, do you agree with a price on carbon?

[*English*]

**Brett Henkel:** Yes. I agree with the price on carbon. I do believe industry wants to decarbonize and to have a price on carbon, because the energy industry needs investment. It needs global investment. Global money is increasingly carbon-hesitant. It wants to see a decarbonization plan for investing in oil and gas and energy. That's why industry here in Canada wants this in place. They want, in general, a carbon price so that they can move forward and show the rest of the world that we're expanding energy exports but we're also putting a plan in place for decarbonization.

Does that make sense?

**The Chair:** That makes sense.

Thank you, witnesses, for your presentations and for the great dialogue we've had over the last 45 minutes. We packed a lot in there. We're grateful for your presence.

Colleagues, we will take a five-minute recess. Then we will be back with our second panel.

• (1235)

(Pause)

• (1240)

**The Chair:** Welcome back, colleagues. We're going to resume our meeting.

I'd like to welcome our witness this afternoon, Victoria Pruden, president of the Métis National Council.

Noah Goslin is here in person.

I have a few comments for the benefit of our witnesses.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. I will remind you that all comments should be directed through the chair.

Ms. Pruden, you will have five minutes for your opening remarks, after which we will open the floor to questions. Because we had a vote, our time is somewhat constrained, so we'll have a good quality half-hour with you. I'm sure that we'll learn a lot from one another.

Please proceed.

• (1245)

**Victoria Pruden (President, Métis National Council):** Thank you, Chair.

First off, I would like to thank very much the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources for the invitation to be a witness today to speak about Canada's study on Canadian energy exports.

As you mentioned, Chair, my name is Victoria Pruden. I'm a proud seventh-generation Métis Michif woman with deep roots extending from Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Northwest Territories and Pembina territory down in the Dakotas. I have a long history personally and also as a representative politically and as a technician across the Métis nation during my tenure. I'm celebrating about 28 years of representation for the Métis nations that I belong to. I'm calling in today from Treaty 6 territory, amiskwaciwâskahikan, Edmonton, which was actually named by my ancestor who was the chief factor at Fort Edmonton, previously Beaver Hills House.

This is also the traditional territory of the Métis as well, as represented by Otipemisiwak Métis government within the Métis Nation of Alberta and occupied by Métis Settlements General Council and other recognized section 35 rights-bearing Métis communities.

I'm very proud to serve as president of the Métis National Council, the recognized national and international representative of the Métis nation in Canada since 1983, the year after we were recognized in section 35.

We recognize that Canada's energy sector plays a major role in the national economy and global energy supply. We also recognize that the majority of energy exports from Canada currently go to the United States and that the current geopolitical uncertainty underscores the importance of diversifying our partnerships. Many of the energy exports take place across the Métis historic homeland, which extends across the Prairies and contiguous parts of Ontario, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories.

As a result, the Métis nation has a direct interest in discussions regarding Canada's energy exports, related infrastructure development and the economic and environmental impacts of these activities. It's very important that any study undertaken by this committee recognize that Métis workers, businesses and communities are already deeply entwined in Canada's energy system. Many of our Métis citizens work across the energy sector in both renewable and non-renewable industries, including, of course, oil and gas and clean energy projects, and they contribute as skilled tradespeople supporting energy supply chains across this country.

Our most recent study on the status of the Métis economy shows that the Métis economy is integral to Canada's economy. The Métis economy produced \$21 billion in GDP in 2015, and Métis businesses generated approximately \$25.4 billion in revenue in 2020. Those are the most recent statistics that we were able to glean from this report. Additionally, Métis citizens show high labour force participation, with Métis citizens recording an employment rate of about 61% in 2021 and an unemployment rate of 11.4%. These figures demonstrate that both significant contributions are there.

However, we're also vulnerable to gaps in economic participation. Métis governments themselves are increasingly participating in energy development through partnerships, procurement opportunities and project ownership across the country. This trend is particularly strong in the renewable sector, where 85% of clean grid projects have included a degree of indigenous ownership, reflecting how indigenous governments are becoming key partners in Canada's energy transition.

I was listening in earlier. We know what a priority it is.

I want to talk about a strong example of renewable energy. Here in Alberta, where I'm calling in from today, the Otipemisiwak Métis government has a Métis Crossing solar project that is called *salay prayzaan*. It's a 4.86-megawatt community generation solar installation that will be the largest northern grid-connected solar project of its size in Alberta, demonstrating a very positive case study about how Métis-led projects can contribute directly to Canada's clean energy as well as to local economic development.

- (1250)

For those of you who have ever been there, you know that it supplies energy not only to the amazing infrastructure at Métis Crossing but also to the local community of Smoky Lake municipality. It's an excellent example of renewable energy that can be Métis-led and contribute greatly.

In order to access opportunities like this, many Métis governments rely on mechanisms such as the indigenous loan guarantee program to facilitate capital investment and support Métis as full partners in energy infrastructure. However, it's critical to include

distinctions-based funding to support equitable access to energy infrastructure projects. This was one of the priorities definitely underlined in the "What We Heard Report" when Métis leaders met with Prime Minister Mark Carney and several cabinet ministers last year.

Indigenous participation is too often collapsed into a single category. Disaggregated data, including Métis-specific labour and business metrics, is essential to understand who benefits from energy exports and where these gaps still remain. We encourage you to centre the study on the understanding of the special nature of the indigenous-Crown relationship, reminding all of us, as we know, that Canada has a constitutional obligation under section 35 to act in a manner consistent with the honour of the Crown with respect to the duty to consult and, where appropriate, accommodate indigenous peoples before, during and after development.

Separate but related is section 5 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, which states that "Canada must, in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous peoples, take all measures necessary to ensure that the laws of Canada are consistent with the [United Nations] Declaration [on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples]". As such, the duty to consult on section 5 consultation and co-operation commitments embedded in UNDA must guide this study and its recommendations.

Ensuring fair participation is an important part of advancing economic reconciliation with indigenous peoples. Therefore, we encourage the committee to examine examples across Canada where proper consultation and indigenous equity participation have occurred very successfully, as well as where indigenous communities were not meaningfully included. This will help provide a balanced and holistic understanding of how Canada's energy export systems interact with indigenous rights, interests and economic participation.

In closing, I want to bring to the committee's attention that large extractive projects and the transient workforce, which used to be referred to as "man camps," always bring heightened risks of sexual and gender-based violence against indigenous women, girls, 2SLGBTQQI+ people and vulnerable men, as documented by the national inquiry and reaffirmed by Parliament's status of women committee. We had a wonderful presentation a few weeks ago at the federal-provincial-territorial table on MMIWG2S+, where we saw a very positive example in British Columbia of a partnership between first nations and private industry to successfully enhance safety in the community.

In response to calls for justice 13.1 to 13.5, we urge governments and industry to embed gender-based socio-economic impact assessments, safety plans and concrete mitigation at every stage of project planning, approval and monitoring. This is critical when we seek to understand the role of extractive industries and indigenous peoples. Again, there are some very positive examples out there of how industry has partnered with indigenous communities to really make that happen.

*Kinana'skomitina'wa'w.* I really look forward to your questions, and I thank you again for this opportunity to join you virtually today.

• (1255)

**The Chair:** Thank you so much for your testimony this morning.

Colleagues, as you know, we're a little tight for time this morning, so I'm recommending we do just a first round with five minutes each, and that'll get us out of here around a quarter after one.

With that, Mrs. Stubbs, you're first up.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for your powerful presence and words here, and also for highlighting Métis Crossing in my riding in Lakeland and the project going on there. I am certainly proud to represent the four Métis settlements in Lakeland, as well as the Métis people who are members of the Métis Nation of Alberta right across the region I come from. Your testimony struck near and dear to my heart. All those Métis communities are, as you thoroughly outlined, involved in one way or another in energy development in my backyard and all throughout Lakeland.

You noted—and I have some questions for you about this—that, in 2016, it was affirmed that Métis and Inuit peoples have section 35 rights, and this corresponds to the federal Crown's irrefutable duty to consult.

I want to note that, during the debates on Bill C-69, Conservatives supported the Liberals' claim that they were going to deliver capacity funding for indigenous people's full participation in the regulatory process in Canada.

I would like to know whether, since all that time, that capacity funding has flowed to communities on the ground. Has it made a difference in terms of the development of Bill C-5? That's also extremely important. The Prime Minister says that indigenous people are at the core of Bill C-5. I raised many concerns relating to indigenous consultation and the Crown's delivery of their duty during the debates on that. Has that been your experience?

Maybe you could touch on those two things, since they are inter-related, I think.

**Victoria Pruden:** Thank you so much for your comments.

Our section 35 rights were affirmed in 1982 in the Constitution, and in 2016. Of course, we're celebrating 10 years since the Daniels decision, which affirmed federal fiduciary responsibility for programs, services and investments in support of Métis people, and that this must flow through Métis governments.

Unfortunately, we haven't seen as much concrete action and investments for Métis governments as we would have liked. It absolutely needs action. While there has been some progress made, we haven't seen renewed investments for Métis capital corporations. We haven't seen distinctions-based commitments in terms of absolutely essential programs, which is related to equity investment for Métis governments and recognized section 35 Métis rights-bearing communities.

I thank you so much for highlighting the gaps in the implementation of the Daniels decision, which are very relevant to Bill C-5 and major projects.

Have I adequately answered?

There's a priority there that needs to be explored, and we certainly appreciate your in-depth understanding of how we may work together to ensure that it happens. The time is now. We can't be left behind.

**Shannon Stubbs:** I agree entirely, and thank you for this affirmation. It is why I fought so hard during the debates on Bill C-69 and Bill C-5 in order to ensure that the Crown had a plan to fulfill its duty to consult. The only way to get to yes on major projects, in a way all Canadians want now more than ever, is to get there in a good way, through a two-way dynamic with decision-makers at the table, with rights respected and with the federal Crown delivering on its irrefutable duty.

You touched on some pathways and specifics about how this can be done well. I wonder if your organization, or any of its governing nations, has been consulted yet on the 11 projects the Liberals have announced they've referred to the Major Projects Office.

Also, do you want to expand on any of those other specific pathways, or comment more on the way the federal government can live up to the promises, in its own words, that it made to indigenous people and Canadians in every single corner of the country?

• (1300)

**The Chair:** We have about 30 seconds, Ms. Pruden.

**Victoria Pruden:** Thank you again for your in-depth understanding.

To my knowledge, we have not had another Métis government-specific consultation.

While there are two Métis representatives on the indigenous advisory committee with respect to major projects, we have not seen a Métis government-specific, in-depth consultation process with section 35 rights-bearing Métis governments and communities. We have not seen it extend beyond that, and it's necessary.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Clark, you have five minutes.

**Braedon Clark (Sackville—Bedford—Preston, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Pruden, for being here. I think you said earlier that you're in Edmonton. Correct me if I'm wrong on this, but I assume that one of the reasons you're there is that yesterday your organization signed an MOU with the Northwest Territory Métis Nation. Is that correct?

**Victoria Pruden:** It absolutely is. The memorandum of understanding that we signed formally yesterday is a pathway that's been long in the making for us to sign a true partnership agreement with our relations north of 60. We were very happy to bring together the elected leadership of NWT Métis Nation and the Métis National Council and we will continue to expand those types of partnerships.

This was groundbreaking and it's been a long time coming. We're very happy with the potential that relationship represents both for our relations north of 60 and for the Métis National Council as a national indigenous organization.

**Braedon Clark:** That's excellent. I wanted to congratulate you on that, because obviously it's a big deal to get to that stage. Congratulations.

I wanted to touch on something you've mentioned a couple of times previously and in your opening statement as well, which is around distinctions-based funding and some issues you see there. Could you expand on that a bit and explain to the committee what precisely that means and where you'd like to see that going to benefit your organization and the Métis Nation?

**Victoria Pruden:** Absolutely. When we talk about the need for distinctions-based funding and distinctions-based opportunities, it means ensuring that taxpayers' dollars in opportunities like the indigenous loan program are fulfilling investments that are equitable not only for first nations but for Métis governments and recognized section 35 rights-bearing Métis communities and Inuit. When there's not enough attention paid to distinctions-based set-asides or distinctions-based monitoring, the Métis Nation can be left behind. We really need to make sure we're encouraging that this be reflected in the study.

A pan-indigenous approach or an approach that allows for non-equitable outputs can leave behind those opportunities for Métis governments, people and communities. At this moment in time, it's more important than ever before to make sure we don't allow that to happen. The economic participation for our governments and for our people is absolutely essential across the board.

**Braedon Clark:** Yes, absolutely.

You mentioned the indigenous loan guarantee program a couple of times as well, which is up to \$10 billion now. This is obviously great news. From a standpoint of distinctions-based funding, could you walk me through what that would look like, practically speaking? If there's a project going through the Major Projects Office or the indigenous loan guarantee program, how would distinctions-based funding work and be beneficial to the people you represent?

**Victoria Pruden:** I think there are a couple of really important points about this. We've had discussions previously at the technical level and at the political level in terms of the indigenous loan guarantee program.

What we're finding, what we're hearing and what Métis governments articulated at the round table with the Prime Minister is that Métis governments and Métis enterprises often lack the capacity and the technical support that's required. If we don't have adequate capacity funding, and that means the people to be able to have the technical expertise to help draft what's required in terms of the borrowing and all of the work that it requires to get a loan of that size.... To have meaningful participation, we need to make sure the capacity is there for Métis governments, Métis businesses, Métis enterprises and Métis communities. Often, they lack capacity in terms of the human resources and technical expertise required to participate at that level.

I'll give you a concrete example. Investment in terms of Métis capital corporations for support for Métis businesses and Métis governments has remained static for many years. We really need to make sure there is follow-up in terms of access for economic development capacity for Métis governments and Métis businesses. We would be more than happy to provide a very detailed series of recommendations.

• (1305)

**Braedon Clark:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you both.

[*Translation*]

Finally, Mr. Simard, you have five minutes.

**Mario Simard:** I want to go back to the indigenous loan guarantee program. You mentioned meetings that have taken place. If you have any documentation, it might be interesting for you to submit it to the committee for analysis.

I'd also like you to clarify something. When you talked about technical capacity, if I understood correctly, you were referring to the technical capacity to fill out all the administrative applications related to these particular funding programs. That means that there isn't currently any support from the federal government in the application process for the indigenous loan guarantee program. Is that what you meant? Okay.

I would now like to switch gears. In your opening remarks, you mentioned that there are still questions about whether indigenous communities are truly benefiting from indigenous participation in energy exports.

For my part, I'm trying to see the balance between energy exports, infrastructure projects and the way the programs put in place by the federal government can help indigenous communities carve out a place for themselves. There's the indigenous loan guarantee program, which we talked about, but I find that these major infrastructure projects are generally overseen by large companies that are mostly American. However, that isn't what I want you to talk about. I find it hard to see, beyond being service providers, what can be done to provide a place for indigenous communities.

I'd like to hear your thoughts on that.

[*English*]

**Victoria Pruden:** I will endeavour to answer that in the best way that I can.

Thinking about those large infrastructure projects, which often are owned, operated and delivered by large corporate entities, we participate in a number of ways. In our Métis nation communities, most of our businesses are small to medium-sized enterprises that play a role in terms of providing service, being subcontractors or providing that type of a role in terms of energy exporting, so we have interest in procurement.

We're very interested in seeing how there may be opportunities for equity investment for Métis governments in certain geographical areas. We really are pushing for opportunities that can be own-source revenue for Métis governments. Also, the employment aspect of meaningful, well-paid employment opportunities for Métis people across the country is of high priority.

We would be most happy to provide a summary to committee that provides a more in-depth analysis and series of recommendations. As mentioned in my opening comments, we have just done a deep-dive study on the status of the Métis economy, so we would be most happy to provide follow-up recommendations in writing to the committee to speak to specifics, if that's okay with you.

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** I encourage you to do so.

Finally, at the end of your opening remarks, you mentioned the phenomenon of man camps and the impact that this can have on communities. If you have any additional information to submit to the committee in connection with that, I invite you to do so. That isn't something we have addressed so far, but I think it could be important for the drafting of our report.

Thank you very much.

[*English*]

**Victoria Pruden:** Thank you so much.

It would be absolutely my pleasure to do so. I spent many years at the community, regional, provincial and national levels as an advocate for women's safety, and I understand very well the intersection between man camps and vulnerabilities to indigenous women, girls, two-spirited people, and vulnerable men and boys in community.

We had an amazing presentation of a very positive case example a few weeks ago at the MMIWG2S indigenous-federal-provincial-territorial summit. We'd be most happy to provide a brief with recommendations.

This can be done in partnership with indigenous communities and industry in a very powerful way that could actually make a huge impact across the board in terms of the resources industry.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Pruden, and thank you, Mr. Goslin, for coming to see us this morning. It was very interesting testimony, and there were good questions by colleagues.

Colleagues, this brings our meeting to a close.

Let me also, on your behalf, thank our analysts, the clerk, the amazing interpreters and all the folks.

Thanks go to Shannon, of course.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Thanks go to the poor interpreters. I know I'm the worst.

**The Chair:** That brings our meeting to an end. We'll see you in the House in less than an hour.





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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 House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 des communes.

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 de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>