



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 027**

**PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT**

Thursday, March 12, 2026

---

Chair: Terry Duguid





## Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Thursday, March 12, 2026

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.)):** I call our meeting to order.

We'll start, as we always do, by acknowledging that we are meeting on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe nation.

Welcome to meeting number 27 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today's meeting is taking place in hybrid format, although we don't have anyone attending virtually, so I am going to dispense with that.

As a reminder to our participants, please wait until I recognize you. No one is participating by video conference, so I'll skip that. As a reminder, all comments should be addressed through the chair.

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

Colleagues, I'd like to welcome, once again, National Chief Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak. It was an exciting day for you yesterday, National Chief. Congratulations on having a good day yesterday.

With you today are Benjamin Green-Stacey, director of economic development, and Dr. Graeme Reed, strategic adviser. Welcome.

Is there anyone else in your delegation, National Chief? You have some support folks there, who are welcome at the table if they want to come.

**National Chief Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak (Assembly of First Nations):** As they should.

**The Chair:** You'll have five minutes for your opening remarks, after which we will open the floor to questions.

Colleagues, the national chief can stay for only about half an hour to 35 minutes or so. We're going to try to get through two rounds. I may have to shorten the second round. I know you will be accommodating.

With that, National Chief, it's great to see you and your team. Welcome.

**National Chief Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak:** Thank you, Chair, so very much.

Thank you to each and every one of you for being here today. I do want to thank all the members. I know that it's always tough to work on residential school issues.

I want to thank, of course, the Prime Minister, the previous prime minister and many members of Parliament from all parties who have helped me in the past couple of years during my leadership, and even prior to that when I was regional chief, to make sure that we do the work of calling residential schools what they are.

I know we have a long way to go, but that was a historic day the other day. It was the beginning of, I hope, many where we're able to repatriate some of our artifacts back here to this country, and to remember, of course, the dark history that had happened in our country, but certainly to try to find our way forward together. It was a really emotional day, and I'm really thankful to everybody who attended. Members from every single party attended, and I'm so thankful for that. I give respect where respect is due.

I want to thank the late pope and the current Pope, whom I will be seeing on April 9. I get to spend the day with him, and I'm really looking forward to that, because God is so good, and God gave us today. Again, I acknowledge the Creator for bringing us all here together today to have this important discussion.

[*Witness spoke in Anishinaabemowin and provided the following text:*]

Apiichi-gii-chii-nay-dum Akiinaah o-gii-bii-izah-iing omahh noo-gom.

[English]

I'm welcoming you in a little bit of my language.

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak. I'm the national chief. We bring greetings on behalf of the 633 strong, independent first nations from coast to coast to coast. We are one of the indigenous groups. We are the largest at 1.4 million strong across the country, and we make up over 90% of indigenous people in this country.

First nations are a very large and very diverse group, so I want to always do my best to try to be balanced in our diversity across this country. Canada's economy is deeply connected to our lands and to our waters, stewarded by, of course, first nations. Territories are rich in minerals, forests and fresh water that sustain communities from coast to coast.

Today, we are here to affirm that first nations are ready to work in partnership to unlock sustainable economic growth that will contribute to Canada's shared prosperity for generations to come, advancing modern water legislation that recognizes water as a fundamental human right—an inherent right—and where source water protections are a required consideration in the assessment of major projects.

Over \$600 billion of projects are forecasted to be launched on our traditional lands over the next decade. The potential benefit of these projects is in the trillions of dollars. They represent a cornerstone of Canada's future economic growth, but they won't advance without the support of first nations.

Already, first nations are directly involved in oil and gas production, electric power generation, hydro transmission lines, energy corridors and many emerging clean energy projects. Energy exports support thousands of first nations workers across Canada. First nations-owned service companies and joint ventures provide own-source revenue, long-term employment and training and skills transfer for youth and workers.

To become a global energy superpower, as is Canada's ambition, first nations ownership and partnership must be prioritized. First nations must lead the conversation on energy development in their territories, ensuring that inherent treaty rights are upheld and that their voices guide policies, partnerships and sustainable practices in alignment with Canada's obligation under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

• (1535)

It's also important to recognize that first nations never surrendered title to natural resources. On the contrary, these agreements recognize the inherent right of first nations to manage and benefit from lands and waters within their territories. That is why the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, which was negotiated between Canada and the three prairie provinces in 1930, violates first nations rights under these treaties. They gave provinces control over Crown lands and resources without the free, prior and informed consent of first nations.

The unilateral imposition of these provincial agreements undermines the solemn promise of treaties and stands in direct conflict with the honour of the Crown. Today, we restate our call for Canada to complete a constitutional review of these natural resource transfer agreements.

Critical minerals are another example. Canada has identified the export of critical minerals as a national priority to meet the global demand for clean energy transition, defence and new technology applications, but first nations have been disproportionately impacted by these extractive activities for generations. Rights holders have been excluded from decision-making that impacts their lands and communities, excluded from decisions that impact inherent first nations and treaty rights and excluded from revenue sharing and benefit agreements—but not anymore.

First nations spoke out in opposition to the Canada-Alberta memorandum of understanding when they unanimously passed emergency resolution 33/2025. Thanks to the sacrifices of our ancestors and the perseverance of people in this room, first nations,

including coastal first nations, are changing the course. We are developing strategies and recommendations that reflect our priorities, leadership and approach to critical minerals development. At our December assembly, chiefs led the way, approving a first nations-led critical minerals strategy focused on ownership, revenue sharing, procurement, training and environmental protection. Through this national policy, and, hopefully, the conversations taking place here today, we can enhance first nations' economic participation in the critical minerals value chain forever.

Accordingly, we have included a significant emphasis on infrastructure. First nations infrastructure priorities are matters of national interest and priority. To fully realize Canada's economic potential and reach the critical minerals this country wishes to export from first nations territories, critical infrastructure is required. It's essential that Canada provide predictable funding and financing certainty, so projects addressing this gap can move through a single envelope.

I look forward to your questions today.

*Meegwetch*, Mr. Chair.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** Thank you, National Chief.

We are going to questions and comments now.

We're going to start with Mrs. Stubbs for six minutes.

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

National Chief, I am proud to work with and represent five first nations and four Métis settlements in Lakeland, in Treaty No. 6.

As you outlined, given the different views, values, aspirations and ambitions among the hundreds of first nations across Canada, can you speak to the rights holders', title holders' and federal Crown's duty to consult in a meaningful, two-way dynamic?

**Graeme Reed (Strategic Advisor, Assembly of First Nations):** *Meegwetch* for the question.

*Meegwetch* to the national chief for inviting me to join.

As you know, consultation and accommodation are constitutional obligations that have been affirmed in section 35 and through multiple Supreme Court jurisprudence. Over the last decade or so, we've been pushing the conversation on what free, prior and informed consent looks like, how we uphold the minimum standards outlined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and how those standards are mainstreamed in federal decision-making.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you. I appreciate that. It links to the topics we're discussing today.

I was honoured, National Chief, to meet you at the transport committee in June regarding Bill C-5. Like Bill C-69, Bill C-5 sets up cabinet as the ultimate decision-maker. Of course, first nations view the federal Crown.... As law and judicial precedent uphold, it is distinctly the federal Crown's duty to consult.

I admire people on the indigenous advisory board attached to the MPO very much, but will this be enough to fulfill the Crown's duty to consult and ensure that decisions can stand up to challenges afterwards, which indigenous people have a right to make?

I ask this question because Conservatives know the only way to get to yes in a good way on major projects that benefit indigenous people and all Canadians is for the feds to fully uphold their duty to consult.

**Graeme Reed:** Absolutely. We would tend to agree with you in terms of the priority of upholding the duty to consult and accommodate, as well as moving toward the full recognition of free, prior and informed consent.

In the preparation for the Building Canada Act in Bill C-5, we were concerned not only with the mechanisms of decision-making but also about the process through which that piece of legislation was quickly passed through Parliament without full conversations with first nations from coast to coast to coast. Both in substance and process we need to consider the specific role of first nations participation. Advisory committees like the IAC are insufficient for doing that.

● (1545)

**Shannon Stubbs:** I, too, shared exactly the same concern and worked hard during those debates to make sure the federal government understood that.

Regarding the MOU that you've raised, in December the Liberals announced the work toward the Pacific pipeline. Last month, I asked the natural resources minister for an update on the federal Crown's indigenous consultation to date on that project. He could not, but of course such a pipeline is federal jurisdiction, as is the duty to consult.

With such a pipeline, first nations in each province will have different views. Have first nations been consulted on that project to date, or on any of the 11 projects that the federal Liberals have so far referred to the Major Projects Office, as far as anyone can understand?

**Graeme Reed:** I'll start briefly with the memorandum of understanding.

No, the first nations in assembly were clear in December that there was a concern in moving forward with that MOU without the full free, prior and informed consent of first nations. In the resolution that the national chief referenced, there are specific calls to the Government of Canada to reflect those concerns of first nations.

In terms of the 11 projects referred to the Major Projects Office, there is a varying amount of first nations participation. Many of those projects are already quite far advanced. Our position is to consider the diversity of first nations and also support the ongoing consideration of how the Major Projects Office and the Building Canada Act operate, once there is a project that is formally designated to the MPO and through the BCA.

**Shannon Stubbs:** In debates on Bill C-69, Conservatives supported the promise of capacity funding for indigenous people to participate in the regulatory process. This is why we also supported loan guarantees and other fiscal measures that you have all called for. Sometimes first nations need to litigate on many of the issues that the national chief has raised through regulatory processes because they're ignored on other issues by other governments.

I wonder if you could explain whether or not, between Bill C-69 and Bill C-5, any of that capacity funding for regulatory participation has actually gotten to local first nations to ensure that projects can be approved in a good way.

**Graeme Reed:** Starting with Bill C-69, obviously the major approach to funding was still maintained through specific project development. The capacity support program is an important program to support first nations involvement. I don't think any first nation—

**Shannon Stubbs:** I hear from the first nations in my community that nothing ever flowed.

**Graeme Reed:** I was about to say that it was insufficient, even for those who accessed it.

In the Bill C-5 context, we know there was the \$40 billion, but that's only specific to the projects that are formally designated through the Building Canada Act. First nations have also been concerned by an absence of resources to support participating through that regulatory process to begin with.

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

Mr. Clark, you have six minutes.

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

National Chief, thank you very much for being here.

To all of our guests and witnesses today, it's very much appreciated.

In your opening statement, National Chief, you gave an excellent summary of the historical context, obligations and potential of the projects that are currently before the government and those that could come forward in the next decade or so. I believe you mentioned \$600 billion in project value that could translate into trillions of dollars over decades to come. Of course, that's a tremendous opportunity, but like any opportunity, it poses real challenges that we need to work through together.

In your opening statement, you touched on two principles that are fundamental to the discussion today. One is partnership and the other is ownership. In your view, how can the federal government, working in partnership with first nations across the country, promote ownership so there is an equity stake and a generational value to these projects in the long term?

**Benjamin Green-Stacey (Director of Economic Development, Assembly of First Nations):** Back in 2021, the minister responsible for NRCan was directed to develop a national benefit-sharing framework. This was in direct response to action plan measure 33 in Canada's UNDA action plan.

One of the things that we've seen is that the work has stalled. In fact, it's probably safe to say that it's crashed out and needs to be rejuvenated, revitalized and put back on the list of priorities for this government.

What we see now in play is the indigenous loan guarantee program. There's an opportunity to promote equity and an ownership stake in major projects. However, that doesn't address the fundamental problems that first nations are facing in communities on a day-to-day basis. The indigenous loan guarantee program is focused on providing opportunities for nations that are already ready to receive that funding and to take ownership in a major project that's going to benefit the broader Canadian economy.

The reality is that many first nations are not there. They're not ready for that opportunity. There are more immediate and pressing challenges around infrastructure that need to be addressed first. The Assembly of First Nations has costed this at close to \$400 billion to close the infrastructure gap, and that's just to bring first nations to parity with the rest of Canada.

• (1550)

**Braedon Clark:** Right. I think those are certainly fair points; there's no question about that. The indigenous loan guarantee program, as you know, went from \$5 billion to \$10 billion. Correct me if I'm not interpreting what you said correctly, but I think that's a very useful tool for communities that may have the capacity or the ability to take on a complex undertaking. However, there's another level that is not being met through that program itself. Is that correct to say?

**Benjamin Green-Stacey:** That's absolutely correct to say.

**Braedon Clark:** Okay.

I'm also curious about certain projects. Are there any specific projects that may or may not be on the MPO list where first nations are seeing some barriers to access? Also, what can we do as a government to make sure that those barriers are lowered and that groups can participate?

**Graeme Reed:** The existing projects that have been referred to the MPO do have a varying level of first nations participation. Some are championed through equity partnerships, and some are not quite there. Many of those have not yet benefited from some of the programs that were identified through the Building Canada Act generally, largely because they had already started prior to the creation of that act.

I'll conclude by saying that there are a variety of first nations, as Ben shared, that are expecting additional resources to support the preconditions needed, even to participate within major project development.

**Braedon Clark:** Yes.

We talked about Bill C-5, and as the national chief mentioned, obviously, there were issues in terms of how that was moved through. That was in June. I know that since that time, the Prime Minister and others have met with the national chief and other leaders on a couple of occasions.

Could you summarize the evolution of that process over the last nine or 10 months, and where we can keep moving forward on that to ensure that the objectives are met for all interested parties?

**Graeme Reed:** I think first nations across the country appreciate the willingness of the Prime Minister and many others to have conversations with them about the implications and opportunities. That doesn't necessarily address some of the fundamental concerns that were raised within the legislation and the powers afforded through the legislation.

What is interesting is both how we accelerate and support first nations participation and also—and I think the national chief spoke about this—how we consider the central question of respecting the inherent rights and title of first nations in all decisions, all energy projects and all major development projects more broadly.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Reed and Mr. Clark.

[*Translation*]

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

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

National Chief, I've remembered where we met: It was on October 23, when you came to testify as part of our study on critical minerals. We had a discussion about the infrastructure needed.

Earlier, you talked a bit about the indigenous loan guarantee program. Earlier this week, a witness named Ms. Pruden told us that one of the issues was the lack of technical support. Meeting the various administrative measures related to the loan guarantee program does require some technical knowledge, and she told us that a number of communities were having trouble with that.

We want this to be an efficient and effective program. I don't know what could be done here. I don't know how you see this. Is it something simple and user-friendly? If you have any advice for the committee on that, it could be very helpful.

● (1555)

[*English*]

**Benjamin Green-Stacey:** It's not just the indigenous loan guarantee program, but general barriers include limited access to capital, and I don't mean capital for participation but capital for a surety and bonding. Land tenure on reserve makes it impossible to use property and assets as collateral. It's a major barrier, and any other company or any other corporation that's working in construction just doesn't have to face it. It's not a reality for them.

First nations have unique barriers and challenges to participating in any of these programs or taking advantage of any of these possibilities and opportunities for economic development and success that are not going to be captured within the programs that are not distinctions-based. There are very real and unique challenges associated with the Indian Act legislation that need to be addressed in unique programming for first nations.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** Thank you.

I'll give you a very hypothetical example, but one that's important for us, because we're currently working on opening a corridor for critical minerals to pass through, and there are first nations involved in that. We thought it was a good idea to see if first nations could, through the loan guarantee program, become proponents of such a project.

If I understand what you're saying, there are a lot of obstacles to overcome before a first nation can promote an infrastructure project, because there's no alignment on title to property. That's what I understand from your answer. Nevertheless, do you know of any cases where first nations have owned this type of infrastructure?

In the past, I imagine there have probably been projects where first nations were the proponents. I assume that's been done in the past. If we think of roads that are further north, I suppose that has already happened. Is there a model in place that would facilitate this?

[*English*]

**Graeme Reed:** That's a really good question. The one example that comes to mind is the Wataynikaneyap power transmission project, which was a partnership of multiple first nations in northern Ontario to support energy development to multiple different reserves.

There are others. They're not coming to my mind currently, but I can absolutely follow up in writing on that specific question.

**Benjamin Green-Stacey:** This may not be on specific projects, but certainly to follow up on some of the challenges, the new fiscal relationship is obviously a step in the right direction to get away from programs, but it was underfunded from the start, and the 2% escalator doesn't even match inflation. Challenges for first nations around capacity to participate at any stage of a project's life cycle,

including feasibility studies or doing due diligence and technical assessments, are things that programs just aren't going to address.

Again, it's one of those problems or challenges in which if you don't already have it, you're not going to be able to participate fully. It's exclusionary in nature to have programs like the ILGP. They are absolutely great and fantastic, and they will be taken advantage of by those who are capable of doing so and are in a place where they can do that, but for those nations that don't already have that bureaucratic infrastructure and that capacity in place to participate, it leaves them further behind.

● (1600)

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** If you have any examples of infrastructure projects, whether energy or roads, I'd like you to submit them to the committee and explain how they were done.

Earlier, you said that there are bigger infrastructure issues in indigenous communities. Can you think of any infrastructure projects that are important to you and would help the community, but would also foster economic development? If you have any information to submit to the committee on that, it would be very helpful.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

Colleagues, as I mentioned, the national chief is going to have to leave shortly.

National Chief, I wonder if you have about eight more minutes. Is that possible? That leaves us time for a quick round of three minutes, three minutes and two minutes.

We're going now to Mr. Malette for three minutes.

**Gaëtan Malette (Kapuskaing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Madam Woodhouse-Nepinak, thank you very much for coming here.

We talked earlier about all of these great projects that may be happening. Out of that, there are great opportunities.

At this time, approximately 6% of indigenous people are working in the energy sector. In the future, how can we increase our indigenous workforce? What should we be doing? To me, this is probably very critical. How can we help?

**National Chief Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak:** Thank you for the question, and I'm sorry. I'm a little bit off. I'm just dealing with something with my cousin. Anyway, I have to get home soon.

There are so many ways—and I have my experts here—to help first nations people. There are the investments, of course, and I know we're going to have a first ministers meeting later this year. I look to everybody around this room to make sure that we try to make some changes in this country when it comes to the way first nations are treated in our own homelands.

Even when we talk about these other issues with banking.... I met with a minister earlier today to talk about making sure that we're included in a program. One of the responses was, "Well, we'll be working with the provinces and the territories." I said, "But that's not...." Because we're under the Indian Act and because we're on first nations communities, that often excludes us from those provincial transfers.

I know that those are really difficult discussions to be had, but it's so important that we are at the table together. I'm glad the Prime Minister and the premiers around this entire country finally called. After 20-plus years, we're finally going to be at the table together to talk about some outcomes, but it shouldn't be just every 20 years.

I ask this House and the provinces as well that we continue to dialogue together and come up with solutions so that we can change the trajectory of our country into the best country that it can be. If we closed that infrastructure gap for first nations, we'd be at the top of the G7 countries around the entire world. It would kick aside Trump's illegal tariffs and we could have a really good country, but we would have to work together and we would have to make sure that we're opening investments with each other and sharing in the prosperity of this country.

When it comes to the banking systems, I talked to a few other people this morning on that. We had a big discussion about it, in that first nations have to almost come to Ottawa to ask the minister for a ministerial loan guarantee. What other municipality, town or city would have to do that? I know that we have a long way to go in our relationship with each other, but let's get on a better footing. There's just so much....

Let's be making sure as well that we invest in children's education and training. We've heard that before, but let's actually do it. Let's target those young people and give them a chance to work. I think we're depending too much on bringing in other people from other countries around the world when there's this big untapped market of young first nations people.

• (1605)

**The Chair:** Thank you, National Chief and Mr. Malette.

We'll go to Mr. Hogan for three minutes or less.

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

It's very nice to see you again, National Chief.

At the heart of this, we're talking about expanding energy export ambitions at a time when you've highlighted growing concerns about previous commitments in this space not being met. Our opportunities can be developed only in partnership. As the global environment changes and as the global environment demands it, we want to take advantage of opportunities so that we all, first nations and otherwise, can benefit, prosper and be more secure.

You've identified many challenges in many different states, some historical, some long-standing and some present today, most present today, frankly. There is capacity funding that exists, but it might not be enough. There is opportunity for nations, but it's uneven.

How do we scale something that is imperfect and untailed? Can we scale something imperfect and untailed? What programs are ready to scale and what programs need to be fundamentally rethought?

**National Chief Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak:** We can write you a whole brief on that.

**Corey Hogan:** That's perfect; we love briefs.

**National Chief Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak:** We can give you all the solutions.

I'll let Graeme speak to this.

**Graeme Reed:** I will start, and then Ben can add on.

I want to come back to the point that Ben raised with respect to closing the infrastructure gap, which is really the foundation to ensuring that first nations have parity across the country.

There are specific numbers attributed to net zero and adaptation in that \$30 billion for adaptation, \$29.6 million for net zero. Those are both investments in first nations' ability to participate meaningfully.

We talk about exporting energy. We also know that first nations across the country continue to navigate diesel generators and continue to navigate the need to have investments to support clean energy development in their communities. There are specific programs that have started that process but, like many others, they are insufficiently funded.

It's not only about scaling programs; it's also about envisioning first nations as direct partners and moving towards treating first nations as governments, not recipients of non-first nation programs.

**The Chair:** You have time for a really quick one, Mr. Hogan.

**Corey Hogan:** No, Chair. I'm happy with that.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** That is great.

Wrapping up, we have Mr. Simard.

[Translation]

You have the floor for two minutes.

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

I'll be very brief.

Mr. Reed, I just want to conclude with something very ironic that you just said. We're talking about infrastructure and exporting energy when some of your own communities are having trouble getting onto the power grid.

Sometimes a problem can become an opportunity. If ever you can let the committee know, is there any energy infrastructure that could serve your needs and also be used to develop mining or other types of projects? I think that could be very useful for us. It would also be very helpful to hear what you think about this specifically. We could kill two birds with one stone and perhaps meet your infrastructure needs while developing this.

You won't be able to answer this in two minutes, but if you have any information to pass on to the committee, we would appreciate it.

[English]

**Graeme Reed:** First nations have the highest number of clean energy projects across the country. There are 2,700-plus projects that first nations have been advancing that emphasize clean energy development. A lot of that is to support specific community needs and then also support how that energy is the foundation to the points that national chief raised, whether that's education, training or infrastructure.

Many of these tools have been used by first nations to create own-source revenue to then invest in the infrastructure that's required to close the infrastructure gap.

There are many examples that we can highlight for you of that.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Thank you, National Chief, for your presentation this afternoon. Thank you for your commentary and a good exchange with MPs. It's very essential for our study that we are conducting on energy exports.

I wish you safe travels. I'll probably see you on a plane very soon, because we go back and forth to and from Manitoba.

We'll go on to the next part of our meeting.

We'll take a short break. We'll be suspending for 10 minutes, because we are going in camera.

[Proceedings continue in camera]

• (1610)

(Pause)

• (1640)

[Public proceedings resume]

**The Chair:** We're back in session, colleagues.

I believe the mover of the motion will speak to the motion. I'm taking a speakers list.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you, Chair and committee members, for your indulgence on this important topic.

I would like to move the following motion, which I put on notice on February 20:

That, further to its study on Canadian Energy Exports, the committee hold one additional meeting, and, for the purpose of this meeting, invite Gregory Ebel, President and Chief Executive Officer of Enbridge, for one hour, by himself, and that this meeting be held at the earliest opportunity.

The reason I bring this motion forward is that the Liberals are claiming they want to see Canada become an energy superpower and that they want to see major projects built. Conservatives, consistently over the last decade, have advocated for the Liberals to make the regulatory framework, laws, policies and taxes competitive, primarily with the United States, and to advance energy export infrastructure beyond the United States. It is currently Canada's biggest customer and competitor, because it has pursued its own energy independence.

We had a decade of antidevelopment policies. There were two pipelines for export, with one for the Asian market approved by the former federal Conservative government. The former Liberal prime minister vetoed it instead of taking the option to redo indigenous consultation, which the Liberals also had to redo on their own indigenous consultation during the assessment of the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion.

The west-to-east pipeline proposal would have provided energy security for all Canadians. As well, it would have created the potential to export to Europe. Despite wide-ranging support across the country, from Alberta to Atlantic Canada and everywhere in between, the proponent had to abandon that proposal due to regulatory uncertainty and the goalposts being changed by the federal Liberals.

It is catastrophic for those of us who believe that Canada should and can be the global supplier of choice for energy to our allies and to people in regions around the world who require greater energy sources for their own industrialization to counterbalance hostile regimes in an increasingly dangerous geopolitical situation.

Canada is home to the fourth-largest oil reserve in the world. The majority of that is in the oil sands. It used to be the third-largest, but Iran made other discoveries, so Canada is now fourth. There is 40% of Canadian crude oil and natural gas that comes from conventional sources. It should alarm everybody that the president and CEO of Enbridge, the proponent of the northern gateway pipeline, had the support of every first nation along that route, both in Alberta and in British Columbia. They worked long and hard to secure mutual benefit agreements and other arrangements with the proponent.

The former prime minister, Justin Trudeau, vetoed that pipeline instead of taking that option. He certainly didn't do that in consultation with all of those indigenous communities counting on that infrastructure to provide for themselves and their futures. It was a great loss to all Canadians everywhere. What a different world it would be. Canada would be in a different situation with respect to our self-reliance, security, sovereignty, unity and economic opportunities if both of those things had happened.

• (1645)

Given that an MOU was announced between the federal government and the Government of Alberta, that the Premier of Alberta had to bring three proponents together to make this bid to the federal government, and that an interprovincial pipeline designed for export—the pipeline to the Pacific that the Prime Minister promised—is exclusively and irrefutably in federal jurisdiction, it is deeply alarming that the president and chief executive officer of Enbridge, in part because of the experience they went through on the northern gateway pipeline, said, “I don't think investors or the infrastructure companies should be taking on all that risk of the development in jurisdictions that have historically created a challenge.” Of course, he means Canada and the federal framework have created this challenge.

Conservatives have consistently called on the Liberals to fix the fundamentals, all the antidevelopment laws and regulations that they themselves list in Bill C-5 and, in doing so, admit this blocks building. Therefore, I believe this is an extremely important subject for us committee members to discuss, and that it behooves us to hear from the president and CEO of Enbridge. All pipeline companies in Canada are important operators in and of themselves, but, obviously, Enbridge is a proponent that could establish a Pacific pipeline if the federal government is serious about delivering on that promise in their jurisdiction, which an interprovincial pipeline for export is, irrefutably.

This isn't an issue where two premiers need to work things out. It is absolutely an issue the federal government must be a leader on. They must fulfill their own jurisdictional duty and show Canadians that they will match their actions to their words, which is the promise of this Pacific pipeline.

I am confident that every member of this committee sees the significance of and risk to the Liberals' ability to deliver on the promise they made to Albertans and the majority of Canadians who have always supported, but do so now more than ever, the construction of export pipelines beyond those to the United States. All members of Parliament know, as all Canadians do, that this is more important than ever.

Colleagues, those are the reasons I have moved this motion. I hope you will support an additional meeting on the study of energy exports, since it is so clearly germane to hear from the private sector proponent cautioning us about the ability of private sector proponents to construct pipelines across provincial borders for export. Regardless of your view on whether more pipelines should be constructed in Canada, or whether oil and gas should continue to be developed in Canada, it seems to me, in the case of fairness, honesty and actions matching words, that it is a no-brainer for members of the committee to support this motion and have this additional meet-

ing, given that this is, ostensibly, precisely the reason we are all engaging in a study on the importance of energy exports for Canada.

• (1650)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mrs. Stubbs.

We have three members on our list who have raised their hands: Mr. Guay, Mr. Hogan and Mr. Danko.

We're starting with you, Mr. Guay.

**Claude Guay:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

I believe we had an agreement, so I don't know if I need to move an amendment that we remove “by himself” from the motion. We will support it if we can remove “by himself” so the CEO of Enbridge can come with the appropriate support from his company.

If Mrs. Stubbs is okay with that, we'd be okay with it.

**The Chair:** It's friendly.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Absolutely. Thank you. I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** Okay. It's duly noted.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Mr. Hogan.

**Corey Hogan:** I'm good.

**The Chair:** Mr. Danko.

**John-Paul Danko:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm glad that we're going to have an opportunity to question Enbridge at committee. This is of particular interest for Hamilton, in my riding. There are two Enbridge pipelines that are of local interest.

Line 5, which goes from the U.S. Midwest through to Sarnia, is critical for Ontario's economy. It carries, I believe, fracked oil from the U.S. Midwest. Because it crosses the border, there is a substantial risk to Ontario's economy with ongoing tensions with the U.S. The other one is Line 9, which goes through Hamilton. It has been a source of environmental concerns for years. It's listed as a high risk for ruptures and has a history of leaks. There's local indigenous opposition.

I'm very interested to find out what Enbridge has to say about those two issues local to Ontario and to my riding. Hopefully, again, our intention is to move away from reliance on U.S. sources if there are better options.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** We'll hear from Mrs. Stubbs, and then Mr. Waugh.

**Shannon Stubbs:** No, I'll go after.

**The Chair:** Mr. Waugh, I forgot to welcome you to the committee, the best committee on Parliament Hill, as you know. You are now part of it. Please go ahead.

**Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC):** I like this motion very much. I have met Gregory Ebel several times, mainly because Enbridge has been producing pipelines in my province of Saskatchewan.

This is an important pipeline to go through. I say that because not only does it affect our energy in Alberta and B.C., but I want people to know that we have a steel plant in Regina, Saskatchewan: Evraz. It produces 100% Canadian-made pipe. We have over 1,000 unionized workers at the Evraz plant on the north side of Regina.

I want committee members to know that Canadian Natural Resources' pulling out of an \$8.25-billion commitment expansion last week has sent shockwaves through the industry. This is why we need Enbridge right now. CNRL's announcement that it's not going to proceed right now with its expansion is not good. We need jobs. As we've seen in Iran these days.... Canada has plenty of energy to share worldwide.

I think this motion to bring Mr. Ebel to committee to talk about Enbridge is good. They have spent a lot of money in this country, and I think they do need partners to move on with an Alberta and B.C. pipeline. I think this committee would be wise to hear from them.

• (1655)

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

We'll go to Mr. Guay and then, hopefully, wrap up with Monsieur Simard.

**Claude Guay:** Mr. Chair, I move that we vote on the motion.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, I'm not sure we need a vote.

We had a friendly amendment accepted. Is that correct?

**Shannon Stubbs:** Can I just make one final comment?

**The Chair:** You can, quickly.

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

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** No, he called the vote.

**Claude Guay:** I called the vote.

**Mario Simard:** If he called the vote, we can't—

**Claude Guay:** No more speeches.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We don't vote when we have consensus, but we'll just call the vote.

**Claude Guay:** If we're all okay, we're all meeting.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Yes, I think we are all okay. I just wanted to say to John-Paul, thank you for your support and your willingness because, of course, it was the former Conservative government that did the Line 9B reversal in order to bring western resources to fuel the Pearson airport in Ontario and Quebec. It's also why Conservatives really urge the Liberals—

**Claude Guay:** I have a point of order.

**Shannon Stubbs:** —to help bring the resources to bring stability to Line 5 for exactly the reasons you outlined.

Thank you, and I anticipate your support.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Stubbs, there's a point of order. There is a point of order.

**Claude Guay:** I asked for a vote, Mr. Chair. Let's please go to a vote.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clerk.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Jean-Luc Plourde):** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**The Chair:** Procedurally, colleagues, she did have the floor.

Do you want to wrap up quickly, Mrs. Stubbs? We do have consensus.

**Shannon Stubbs:** I appreciate that, Chair, since I still sometimes am unclear about these rules in this august institution, but I think I'm good.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, we've had a good meeting. We have consensus. Do we need a vote? I don't think so. We've had a friendly amendment.

(Motion as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We'll invite Mr. Ebel. We are agreed.

If there's no other business, we will adjourn. Oh. There's more business.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Yes, there is. Let me get myself sorted out.

Thank you, colleagues, for such a great—

**The Chair:** I think Mr. Simard put up his hand.

**Shannon Stubbs:** I think you acknowledged me first, though.

**The Chair:** Yes, go ahead.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you.

I appreciate that discussion and all the indications of collaboration from all of the members.

I would like to move the motion that I put on notice on March 10. The motion reads:

That, further to its study on Canada's energy exports, the committee hold additional meetings in relation to the decision of Canadian Natural Resources Limited to defer their \$8.25 billion Jackpine Mine expansion due to a lack of certainty around carbon pricing and methane emissions rules, and for the purpose of these meetings, the committee invite the following witnesses:

- a) Scott Stauth, President of Canadian Natural Resources Limited,
- b) The Honourable Tim Hodgson, Minister of Energy and Natural Resources,
- c) Julie Dabrusin, Minister of the Environment, Climate Change, and Nature,
- d) Dianna De Sousa, CEO of the Fort McMurray Chamber of Commerce,
- e) Heather Exner-Pirot, Senior Fellow and Director of Energy, Natural Resources and Environment at the Macdonald-Laurier Institute,
- f) Lisa Baiton, President and CEO of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, there's a motion.

I see Mr. Hogan or Mr. Simard.

**Corey Hogan:** He was first.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** Excuse me, Mr. Chair, but I had my hand up before—

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I thought we had started again.

Go ahead, Mr. Simard.

[*Translation*]

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

I think there's less consensus on this motion. So I would be ready to vote right away. Let's do it right now.

[*English*]

**Shannon Stubbs:** Mr. Chair, I think—

**The Chair:** Colleagues, procedurally, if someone wants to speak, they are allowed to speak. You can't just call the vote.

Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?

**The Clerk:** In the House, there's no calling the question.

**The Chair:** That's right.

**Claude Guay:** Shall we move to adjourn?

**The Chair:** A motion to adjourn is always in order.

**An hon. member:** Mario, move to adjourn.

**Shannon Stubbs:** Mr. Chair, I think your point is that I continue to speak.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** My understanding is that I still had the floor.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Well—

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard:** If we don't go to a vote, I'd be prepared to adjourn debate on that. I don't think there's consensus, and I think we're going to waste a lot of time. I would therefore be prepared to adjourn the debate.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Simard had the floor. He's moving to adjourn. It's a dilatory motion.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4)

• (1700)

**The Chair:** Colleagues, we are adjourned.

It was a good meeting. There was a little rough patch at the end.

Have a great weekend.







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>