ANNE MCLELLAN, P.C., O.C., B.A/B.L., M.LL., ACADEMIC AND POLITICIAN,LIBERAL MP FOR EDMONTON NORTHWEST, WEST AND CENTRE (1993-2006); DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF NATURAL RESOURCES, MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND MINISTER OF HEALTH; FROM MAY 12TH, 2006, DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR IN RESIDENCE, AMERICAN STUDIES INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH: August 31st, 1950 in Hants County, Nova Scotia

Date and Place of Interview: 11:30 am, July 11th, 2011 in the offices of Bennett Jones LLP

3200 TELUS House, South Tower
10020 – 100th Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 0N3
Tel. 780-969-2648
email mclellana@bennettjones.com

Name of Interviewer: Adriana A. Davies, CM, PhD

Name of Videographer: David Bates

Consent form signed: Yes
Initials of Interviewer: AD

Last name of subject: MCLELLAN

AD: My name is Adriana Davies, and I am an oral history researcher for the Petroleum History Society Oil Sands Oral History Project. It’s 11:35 on 11 July 2011, and I’m interviewing the Honourable Anne McLellan in the Bennett Jones LLP offices in Edmonton.

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the Oil Sands Oral History Project.
AM: My pleasure.

AD: I’d like you to give me a summary biography, with the highlights of your educational background and your career to date, and then we’ll move into the specific questions related to the project.

AM: I was born and brought up in Nova Scotia, brought up on a farm in Nova Scotia; graduated from Dalhousie University with both an arts degree and a law degree; then went to the University of London, King’s College for a master’s degree in law [University of London, UK]. I decided fairly quickly I didn’t want to practise law but would like to teach law. I taught for 17 years, four years at the University of New Brunswick, 13 years here at the University of Alberta, before going into politics in 1993. I served for almost 13 years in the governments of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and Prime Minister Paul Martin, and as of February ’06, I left politics and that’s when Mr. Martin’s government lost, that election, and as of July 1st, ’06, I joined as counsel the law firm of Bennett Jones for part of my time and part of my time is spent at the American Studies Institute at the University of Alberta.

AD: What year were you born?

AM: 1950.

AD: Okay, thank you. You’re very youthful.

AM: Well, thank you.

AD: In terms of your involvement with industry and specifically the petroleum industry, that began with your first ministerial appointment. Can you tell me a bit about that? Why were you given that ministry?

AM: That was after the 1993 election, when Mr. Chrétien formed the government, and that election was an interesting one for me, to say the least, because I, on election night, had won that election by one vote. So I’m my very own footnote in Canadian electoral history and I suppose as an example of every vote does count and people should go out and vote. So there obviously was going to be a judicial recount. Mr. Chrétien was putting his Cabinet together. I didn’t expect to be in Cabinet. First time running, it wasn’t clear whether I would actually be the Member of Parliament for what was then Edmonton Northwest. But I got a phone call on a Sunday morning from a couple of his advisers, asking me to come to Ottawa for the following Tuesday, that the Prime Minister elect would like to see me, so I thought, Well, that’s interesting. And everybody knew that he was in the process of forming his Cabinet. So down I go, and I made it quite plain to them that there would be a judicial recount. That was starting on the Monday, and I said, “Look, it’s not clear Prime Minister...
wants to meet with you anyway.” So off I go, and Tuesday morning I go into his office, which was his office as the leader of the Official Opposition. He says to me, “I would like you to be minister of natural resources,” as the department was called by that time. And I remember saying to him, “Well, you know Prime Minister that I may not actually have won this election. We don’t know. Judicial recount is in …” By that point on the Tuesday—it took three days and we didn’t have the results of the judicial recount until late Wednesday night, at about 11:00 o’clock Ottawa time on Wednesday. The Cabinet was being sworn in at 10:00 o’clock Thursday morning, so on the Tuesday morning when I met the Prime Minister elect, I said, “You know we may not have the results.” He said, “yes, I know. I realize that.” He said, “I can wait until Wednesday, in the morning, but after that if we haven’t heard I will have to go to someone else.” And I said, “That’s quite understandable.” But when he said I’d like you to be minister of natural resources, I said, “Well, that really, even though I’m from Alberta that’s not my background. You know, I’m not an engineer. I’m not a geoscientist, I’m not a geologist. I’m a lawyer.” And I said, “Maybe I could be solicitor general.” And he said, “No, you can’t. I’m giving that to somebody else.”

And I think it was quite clear to me that this was the first Liberal government elected since the end of the National Energy Policy, which was of course in the first term of Prime Minister Mulroney. So I think Mr. Chrétien wanted to send a message to the Province of Alberta, to the oil and gas industry, that things had changed. He had already indicated in I think his first autobiography, *Straight from the Heart*, that the National Energy Policy in retrospect had been a mistake. But I think he wanted to send a message of some reassurance to most of Albertans and to the industry by appointing an Albertan. I’m not exactly sure how reassuring it was, because nobody in the oil and gas industry knew me. There was no reason why they would know me, and I remember one of them quoted in the paper as saying that in a sense she could be our worst nightmare, because she was a woman, a feminist, and a lawyer.

It was an interesting situation, and of course everybody was watching very carefully, because this was the first Liberal government since the National Energy Policy. So I think people were a little uneasy, if you like, as to what this all might mean for the oil and gas sector, but after the judicial recount … We didn’t get the final results until 11:00 o’clock Wednesday night. I presumed that at that point the Prime Minister elect had gone to someone else, which was completely understandable to me. But I got a phone call from his office saying, “No, that he had waited and that I was to show up at 10:00 o’clock the next morning at the gates of Government House.” Where we were all there — I remember meeting Sheila Copps and Paul Martin and everybody. We were all milling—Herb Grey—we were all milling around at the entrance to Government House, waiting to go up to obviously be sworn in by the Governor General and the Clerk of the Privy Council. And as they say, “The rest is history.”
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AD: How do you get up to speed in terms of this new ministry which you were responsible for, and, secondly, what was the first issue that you had to deal with?

AM: It is all a bit overwhelming because, of course, unlike a number of my colleagues—Herb Grey, Sheila Copps, Paul Martin—people like that who had been in the House; they’d sat in Opposition, in some cases, in Mr. Grey’s case from ’84 ’til ’93. He had of course been in the House in Mr. Trudeau’s government. But I was a brand new Member of Parliament, too, so I had to learn, to figure out what it meant to be a Member of Parliament, get a constituency office up and running. I became a minister of the Federal Crown in an area—natural resources—which obviously was of key important to the Province of Alberta. But also it didn’t only deal with oil and gas. That department deals with the mining sector generally; it deals with forestry; it deals with nuclear; it deals with energy efficiency; it deals with renewables; it deals with a wide range of issues. Obviously, any and all of those things can touch and do touch local communities, in some cases, in many cases, First Nations or other Aboriginal communities.

There was also a particular challenge within the department because Prime Minister, I think it was Prime Minister Kim Campbell, who in fact took the Department of Forestry … There had been a separate forestry department, small but separate, and she had put that in the department of what became natural resources. And there was some ill, well ill feeling is probably too strong a word, but there was some concern on the part of the forestry guys that they would lose their identity, that they would lose, you know, that they would be tossed in with this larger department where oil and gas and mining played a predominant part. So that was part of the internal challenge of the department.

But I must say, from the beginning I had a great deputy and great officials, but when you’re a new minister and Member of Parliament, you’re hiring staff. And the two staffs are quite different. Certainly, it took a while to find the right people for me, in terms of feeling comfortable with staff and that kind of things. And your political staff work very closely with officials in the department, but you hope, if you’re lucky, that they have some general familiarity either with the department or the subject matter of the department. I got lucky. The first person I hired was a guy called Dan Pasikowski. He had worked in Liberal research and he, in fact, had written part of the Liberal platform that dealt with mining and forestry. And Dan … actually his Dad was a hard-rock miner, who lived in, among other places, Pickle Lake, Ontario, which Dan and I then went to visit a couple of years later. So he was my first hire, and you know you’re lucky if you can find people like that to hire on to your political staff in the department, because they do come with some background. In fact, Dan had more background in terms of mining and forestry than I did at that point.
So you build, you hire your staff, you work with the department, you get to know the people in the department, and I was very lucky. It was a good department with good solid people. I remember as it relates to the oil and gas sector, very early on … [Videographer changes tape]

AD: You may continue then.

AM: Ya, obviously with any new minister obviously key parts of the resource industry want to get in to see the minister, get their oar in the water as quickly as possible. So Gerry Protti called, and obviously the Department, and David O’Brien was the industry chair of CAPP at the time. He was chair of Pan Canadian, or he was president and CEO of Pan Canadian. He was chair of the board of CAPP. And I remember them coming early on. It was maybe toward the end of November, early December, perhaps, to Ottawa, and I was still new. You very quickly realize in government that everybody comes with a deck, right? Today, people would have a power point. But in 1993, power point not so much, hard copy, deck. And they would pass out the deck and take you through the deck. And I remember Gerry and David O’Brien coming. They had the deck. We started to go through the deck, and that was the beginning of my relationship with those two gentlemen, but obviously it relates to the department I’d had a number of briefings as it relates to the oil and gas industry by then, as I had with mining, as I had with forestry, and other aspects of the portfolio. But I remember that was my first official meeting with CAPP, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers.

AD: Who was your deputy minister at the time?

AM: I knew you were going to ask me that, and actually, you know what, every now and then I’ve reached that age where it will come to me … it will come to me. Mr. Bilodeau, Ron Bilodeau. And Mr. Bilodeau had had a distinguished career in the public service, and in fact went on after moving from the Department of Natural Resources to work in the PMO with Mr. Chrétien on a number of important files. And then actually worked, after he left government, I think, worked with Canadian Pacific for a while. But a gentleman, a wonderful man, very thoughtful, very able. You know, in my mind the very model of the professional, non-partisan public servant.

AD: In terms of the research staff at the department, was there continuity? Would those have been the people who developed the policy framework. In other words, the National Energy Policy? Would those people still be around?

AM: Maybe some of them. I mean, [Marshall] Micky Cohen had been the deputy minister during that time, and Mark Lalonde was minister for part of that time. Nicky Cohen was deputy minister for part of that time. People like Ed Clark, who’s now president and CEO of TD Bank, one of the world’s most successful bankers in light of everything we’ve been through recently. Interestingly, he
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was referred to as Red Ed by people in Calgary. And I think it was Mr. Clark and probably Nicky Cohen who were instrumental in both developing and implementing the policy at the time. Neither of those two gentlemen were there. They left I think shortly after Mr. Mulroney, or even before Mr. Mulroney, became prime minister. So, ya, there were probably some officials at lower levels that had been around at that time, but that was almost nine years … That was nine years later, so certainly I was not consciously aware of, you know, officials who had been there at that earlier stage.

**AD:** During your time there, who were the people who briefed you on conventional oil and oil sands?

**AM:** People in the department. You know, there would be director generals responsible for various areas in the department. I remember, I don’t remember his name—I should—but the director general in the energy sector. Good guy; these were all very thorough, very talented people, and then you would put your political staff. You would have an oil and gas person. My person was Dan Seekings, who actually came out of the department. Dan had been in the department and my chief of staff got to know Dan and asked whether he could be seconded to be my oil and gas person, and he was pretty well known by people in the industry. And then I also had a young lawyer from Toronto, Janice Wright, who worked with me on energy efficiency, who worked with me on the global warming file, and of course there’s overlap in all those areas. A little less so in those days than today. So you would have your people working with departmental people. They would … when the departmental people or my staff thought I should be briefed on something, either in general or because I was meeting somebody, they would work together to make sure that briefings were thorough, briefings were meeting the needs of the minister and so on.

**AD:** You have talked about your first meeting with representatives from CAPP. Can you tell me what was memorable? When was there discussion in the House with respect to conventional oil or oil sands where your mettle was tested?

**AM:** Well really in the House, no. I mean these things don’t really come up in Question Period. Sometimes they can. My very first question in Question Period was from Preston Manning and it was about a carbon tax. Whether the Liberal government intended to impose a carbon tax? And I’ve smiled often about that since, because it’s an issue that of course continues in some senses public discourse around what the appropriate tools are to deal with global warming. And Preston, to his credit, called me before the day he was going to ask me the question.
I hadn’t had a question in Question Period. The Department of Natural Resources is not a … you know, it’s usually not front and center in Question Period, either then or now, unless something particularly noteworthy has happened. It’s often unfortunately a disaster of some sort: a pipeline break or, you know, something like that. So I remember getting a call from Preston Manning. I was in my office in Westlawn, and he said, “I just want to give you a head’s up. I’m going to be asking you a question today, and it’s on the carbon tax.” And I said, “Thank you very much.” I get on the phone to, I remember, Dan Seekings, my staffer in this area, and say, “Dan, what’s a carbon tax?” Because of course this wasn’t part of the public discourse really at the time. And it was not the biggest issue … it wasn’t really an issue on the radar screen in the department. I mean, we had a lot of other issues we were dealing with. So Dan said, “I’ll be right over.” And so we prepared as ministers do for Question Period, and it’s to Preston’s credit that he didn’t want to catch me off guard. He wanted a substantive answer to the question. And Dan briefed me on, I went into the House, he asked the question. I answered the first question, I think, and then I think either the Prime Minister or Paul Martin, the Minister of Finance, answered the supplementary. I think that’s how it went.

AD: What was the gist of your response?

AM: Well, it was a pretty simple response, in that the answer was, “No, the government had no intention of introducing or imposing a carbon tax.” And then as I may have mentioned, I’m not sure, I think Mr. Chrétien, the Prime Minister, or Mr. Martin, the Minister of Finance took the supplementary, which I don’t remember, but it was you know it was an interesting time, because that was my very first question as a minister in the House of Commons, so that was a pretty big day. I’ve always appreciated, and I’ve told Preston this many times, that I appreciated the fact that he called and gave a head’s up, that he would be asking the question so that I could be prepared.

From that point on, every now and then, the Reform Party, obviously, would ask a question about some aspect of the industry or the carbon tax, trying to get at the fact that did the Liberal party, did the Liberal government, have a hidden agenda I suppose around the oil and gas industry, but obviously as our 13 years in power indicated, we did not intend to impose a carbon tax, we didn’t impose a carbon tax. Now, it’s interesting that there’s a lot of discussion around what the best tools are to deal with global warming, and many in the industry now say that a carbon tax, if developed and constructed appropriately, is probably the most efficient and effective way to deal with the challenge. But back then a carbon tax, and even the whole subject of global warming, this was three years after Rio, people were just really starting to bear down in terms of what global warming was about, what various commitments could be made, how one might achieve the commitments that might be taken up. It was before Kyoto, and all of that came later.
**AD:** When did the oil sands surface on your radar screen?

**AM:** In a direct way—I mean obviously there would have been briefings when I became minister, but in a direct way when the Task Force on the Oil Sands, which was put in place here in the province, when that task force reported then led by Eric Newell, and others, but I remember Eric most directly, they wanted to come to Ottawa and talk to me and the department about the recommendations of the task force. And the task force, and I’m sure that you’ve talked with Eric and others, the task force was key because people … [videographer changes cartridge] You look at the oil sands today and the billions and billions of dollars that have been spent and will be spent in terms of developing that resource, but at the time it was not clear what the future of the oil sands actually was. It was a high-cost resource, and obviously in a remote part of the Province of Alberta, well away from the key markets for the product. So the task force was actually put in place here in the province to try, I think, and get some momentum behind what I call that next phase, or tranche, of the oil sands. But at the time it wasn’t clear what the future of the oil sands would be.

And obviously they wanted to come to Ottawa and talk to the Government of Canada about what they thought might be needed from the federal side, if the oil sands was to get that uplift that it needed. Clearly, they were looking for some new fiscal terms for the mining side of the oil sands, which, and of course in '93 that was virtually all that was going on in the oil sands—the oil sands of this world—and they were mining operations. Obviously, today we’re seeing more and more in situ and CAPP predicts that in 2017 or thereabouts, actually, in situ is going to be well over 50 percent of the extraction process. And mining over the next 20 to 30 years will become much, much less important in terms of an extraction process. But at the time, mining was key, and what the task force had recommended, and what Eric and others when they came to Ottawa wanted, was some consideration in one of Mr. Martin’s budgets around things like accelerated capital cost allowance, so that the mining of oil sands was treated more like conventional oil and gas or more like mining in other parts of the resource sector.

**AD:** Can you talk more specifically about that, in terms of the negotiations what the Liberal government ended up doing?

**AM:** Well, keep in mind that that was the time when the country was, and the Government of Canada along with all the provinces, was dealing with deficit debt. The IMF had, in late, well I guess it was ’94, I’m not sure, early ’94 or thereabouts, had indicated that Canada was close to being a third world nation in terms of its deficit and debt situation. So Paul Martin, as Minister of Finance, had to deal with that and had to, with Mr. Chrétien, help all the rest of us understand what a difficult situation the Government of Canada was in and what a difficult situation the provinces were in as well. So it wasn’t a great time to be talking to the Minister of Finance or others in the government of
Canada about various kinds of fiscal, if you like, or tax breaks, if you wanted to call them that to incent more oil sands development.

But Eric Newell and his people, Al Hyndman was someone who practically lived in Ottawa—he was an employee of Syncrude—Eric really put most of his team on this at Syncrude: the Darcy Levesques, the Denise Carpenters, the Al Hyndmans, and Eric himself—Jim Carter—and they spent an awful lot of time in Ottawa trying to help people understand what they needed. I remember—I joke with Al Hyndman even now that Al practically lived in Ottawa at the time. He showed up at every Liberal event. He bought tickets for every Liberal reception. He’d even show up at the Liberal Christmas caucus parties. I’d say, “How did you get in here?” He’d say, “I know people. People, you know I’m a guest of X or Y,” and we would laugh. And wherever the Minister of Finance was, you’d find Al Hyndman not far behind.

We talked about this, obviously; Dan Seekings and my officials in the department were working closely with the Finance Department. Finance was a very tough sell on this, for a number of reasons, but one of which was they were dealing with this horrendous deficit and debt situation. and they weren’t interested in the potential of foregoing any revenue at that particular time. I think Eric, I remember Eric at one of our meetings, and there were many of one kind or another, I remember saying to Eric that “Look if you want me to try and sell this to the Minister of Finance and to my colleagues around the Cabinet table at this difficult time, you really do have to go across this country and try and sell this as a national project, that this isn’t just about the Province of Alberta. This is a national endeavor that will, in fact, inure to the benefit of all Canadians.”

And Eric said that he would do that, and he and I have often laughed, because I think he visited every chamber of commerce he could possibly get an invitation to talk about the benefits, the potential benefits for other parts of the country. For example, I remember him talking to me about going to Hamilton and talking about the steel that was going to be required to build these big industrial complexes. But he did that across the country, and I’ve often said that Eric was true to his word. He took the time and traveled across the country helping people understand why the oil sands mattered and why it should matter to communities all across the country.

And, in fact, we’ve seen, it’s been proven over these now some 16, 17 years since ’94, ’95 that the benefits of the oil sands have extended well across the country; whether it's steel; whether it’s employment for people across the country; all kinds of input services, goods, financial services, legal services, you know, you name it; engineering services. Really, the oil sands have provided a lot of employment of one kind or another for people across the country. But people forget that at the time, nobody knew that. Nobody … [videographer changes cartridge] the oil sands were still, “Ya
they’re there. Yes, they’re struggling with high cost.” I don’t know what the price per barrel, what the WTI was at the time per barrel of oil. I don’t know, let’s say it was $10 and it cost $13, well it costs more than that, but well you know it cost more to take a barrel of oil out of the oil sands than it did in terms of what you were being paid for that on the global market. So, I mean, it was not at the time clear that this was a profitable enterprise at all. And so, Eric did his part, as I’ve often said. He went across the country talking to people about the potential of the oil sands and why it should matter to people outside of Alberta.

Jim Dinning was Provincial Treasurer here in Alberta at the time. He had a good working relationship with Paul Martin. Pat Black, now Pat Nelson, was the Provincial Minister of Energy, and she and I worked well together. Her deputy at the time was Rick Hyndman, and [videographer changes cartridge]. And so Pat Nelson, Pat Black as she then was, was Minister of Energy here. And we worked well together on a number of things, including oil sands. It was important that the province changed their fiscal regime. It was important that we make some changes to our fiscal regime to get that incentive, that uplift, if you like, for some of these big projects. People at the time weren’t as aware as they are today that you’ve got a huge up-front capital investment, and it takes time to get that investment back long before you start to make any money. And these are projects that last 30 or 40 years and potentially seem longer, but certainly 30 or 40 years. So, you know, I think it was clear that if anything was going to happen, both federal and provincial governments needed to work together; both ministers of energy and finance needed to work together; and I think also the premier, Premier Klein, and Mr. Chrétien had a pretty good relationship. Mr. Chrétien knew about the oil sands because he and Peter Lougheed … When the former premier was, when Mr. Lougheed was premier in the early ’70s, I think, Mr. Chrétien and Mr. Lougheed worked on really the first involvement of the oil sands, and whether there was anything there that could possible be profitably extracted. So, Mr. Chrétien had a general familiarity with what the oil sands were. So, you know, those discussions happened.

I would say that finance officials probably weren’t very keen on doing anything for a variety of reasons. But, by budget ’96, that was the budget where changes were made to the capital accelerated cost allowance to help the mining, the extraction, the mining process in the oil sands, and the province managed some changes on the royalty side. And, then, I don’t remember the exact date, although I’ve got a picture in my office, there was this big ceremony. Mr. Chrétien came to Fort McMurray. Guy Boutilier was mayor at the time. Mr. Klein was there, and there was this declaration of opportunity. Pat Black was there, and the building trades were represented. Bob Blakely—you should talk to Bob actually—on the building side. He was here then; he’s now in Ottawa. The First Nations communities were represented. A number of the major players in the oil sands on the private sector side were there. And we were all arrayed on the stage in the auditorium in Fort
McMurray and it was a big event that was a celebration of this signing of the declaration of opportunity, which at the time envisioned a few billions of investment and the private sector had made that commitment. And, of course, shortly after that, within six, seven years after the signing of that and the fiscal changes being made, it was clear that it was going to be tens of billions of investment. So I suppose … [videographer changes cartridge]

There were many reasons why the oil sands took off when it did, including of course the increase in the price of a barrel of oil and the demand for oil growing around the world. But there’s no question that the changes that were made at the time on the fiscal side, both within the province on the royalties side, on the federal side with the tax act, helped enormously and also provided a psychological boost. That people believed in this project, that people believed that it was possible to extract oil from this, you know, sand way up in northern Alberta. And that there would be something there long term that would be profitable. So, I think it was touch and go several times in terms of federal provincial, getting both sides working together, coordinating all this, but it happened. And again, as we say, “The rest is history.”

**AD:** Would you say that that was the turning point, that the oil sands then ceased to be a sinkhole for investment and that those incentives had the desired effect?

**AM:** Well, I think from that point on what you saw were big investments in oil sands. People could see that it was a huge resource and that it could be profitable. Certainly, the various shocks that were happening globally in terms of the increase of the price per barrel of oil on the global market ultimately was the most important part of this. But the industry, through the application of technology, got costs down. Better technology, more efficient, more effective, and all of that brought the cost per barrel of production down. The cost per barrel was going up in the global market. They got their provincial royalty changes. They got their incentives through the accelerated capital cost allowance on the federal side, for the mining extraction prospects. I mean it all came together.

I suppose if all those things hadn’t come together in quite the right way at that time, we might still be thinking about the potential of the resource. But it all came together in a way that led to this declaration of opportunity and industry delivering on their commitments on investment. Governments delivering on what they promised, providing huge amounts of work for the building trades, helping local communities, local First Nations communities, who have been able to find employment for large numbers of their people, be able to start businesses for all sorts, providing services to the oil sands. A huge amount of training that companies have done up there with Aboriginal Canadians.
Syncrude for a long time was the single-largest employer of Aboriginals in Canada. They’re now the second largest employer, I think. Cameco, obviously, is Saskatchewan-based but globally a uranium mining company, I think, now is the single-largest employer of Aboriginals. But at the time, again, I think Eric Newell understood the importance that, if the oil sands were going to succeed, then companies had to make sure that all members, all parts of the community—the local communities—felt involved, and they saw benefit from what was happening up there.

Therefore, Eric was, from the beginning, a big proponent of training Aboriginal Canadians to work in the oil sands. He encouraged, once they got their feet under them and were feeling comfortable with various parts of the business, that they would form their own independent companies, small- and medium-sized businesses, and they would sell services back to oil sands companies. That has happened, over and over again. And, I think, you know I give Eric a lot of credit, because I think he was very far-sighted in understanding that it was ultimately going to be important to have the support of the community, all parts of the community. And that meant First Nations needed to be an integral part of that development from the beginning. And he deserves a lot of credit for really helping other companies and other employers understand that, if you’re going to exploit the resources in this area, where First Nations live, they’re going to have to see real, tangible benefit. Otherwise, there are going to be a lot of tensions and a lot of challenges around successfully developing the resource.

**AD:** I believe you had that portfolio for four years.

**AM:** Until 1997, after the June election of 1997, Mr. Chrétien was … we were returned to power, another majority government, the second of his third majority governments, and of June ’97 I became Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada.

**AD:** Did you view this achievement with respect to oil sands, which basically signalled this very successful era that we’re in today, at the time did you feel this was an achievement?

**AM:** Well, I think we all felt it was an achievement in both provincial and federal governments, in industry, in the Fort McMurray community, with the building trades, with the First Nations. I think we all felt that this was something that needed to happen if the oil sands were going to have a future. It was not clear to us, I think by ’97, how successful the oil sands would become. I mean certainly I think by the time I left the portfolio of natural resources, it was clear that industry was stepping up to the plate, that the billions of investment exceeded our wildest expectations, but it was still early days. But I think we were comfortable in that we had done together—all of working together—we had done what was necessary to give the oil sands a chance, if you will. That in a sense at that point,
after the signing of the declaration of opportunity, after the actions of both governments, in a way at
that stage it was over to the industry, to the private sector, to see what they could do with this, and
in fact that was the expectation all along and that was the commitment of the private sector, that
they would pick up this ball and they would run with it. And, as they say, “The rest is history”:
billions and billions of dollars of investment, exceeding people’s wildest expectations, at least in the
mid and the late ’90s. And clearly, you know, the size of the resource is remarkable. There are still
challenges, obviously, in terms of the Fort McMurray area – Aboriginals; communities in the area;
whether they feel that they’re getting the benefit that they should from the exploitation of the
resource; the environmental issues. All of those things remain and are serious and important issues,
and they will for as long as people are extracting oil from the oil sands.

**AD:** In your time in government, later holding other portfolios, including the Deputy Prime
Minister, did the environmental issues begin to surface in that period?

**AM:** I think the environmental issues surfaced really from the beginning, although it was only later
that they became more difficult for everyone to manage and deal with. I mean we were dealing with
the whole challenge of global warming from the beginning. Mr. Mulroney had signed Rio, and
everybody knew that coming out of Rio there would be something that would be, would be or
would not be signed by countries around the world, and that, ultimately, became the Kyoto Accord,
which Mr. Chrétien did ultimately sign on behalf of the Canadian government. I think that wasn’t
until, though, 2002 or something like that, when he signed. I think Canada and Russia were the last
two countries to sign the Kyoto Accord, which provided the requisite number of countries, however
many that was, so that the Convention would become operative, and of course we took up certain
commitments under that Accord, as had other countries, different commitments of different kinds.

But, ya, I think from the beginning … I mean you don’t move without causing impact. The mining
operations disturb an awful lot of land, and you don’t move that much land and use that much water
in the process, extraction and production processes, without creating, leading to a lot of questions as
to what was happening and what is happening. And, obviously, the whole issue of cumulative effects
and the whole approach to what I think of as the environment. So it wasn’t just one thing at one
specific time, but the whole notion of cumulative effects: so it’s water; it’s air; it’s habitat; it’s land
disturbance; it’s tearing up the lands of First Nations People, where they collected berries and roots
and things for medicinal purposes or ceremonial purposes. It was their hunting and their disturbance
of land as it related to caribou, elk, whatever it might be. So, I mean today we’re still not where I
think we need to be, but today we understand that you look at the cumulative effects of this kind of
intervention with the natural landscape, and, obviously, the oil sands have become a flashpoint for
many global and local and national environment organizations.
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I think industry understands that they have to do better that, on the technology side, on the research and development side, they need to do better whether it’s in terms of water use, whether it’s CO2, carbon capture and storage. Again habitat, how quickly you reclaim. These mining operations have tailings ponds. In situ doesn’t, which is an advantage of the in situ extraction, but big tailings ponds—they’ve been there a long time. The science: I think they’ve taken a while to catch up to the nature of the problem, and it’s unfortunate that it took 1,600 or more dead ducks a couple of years ago for people to all of a sudden say “Okay we have to do better here.” But you see companies like Suncor. They’ve invested hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars, so now we reached a point where Rick George, their CEO, can say, “We at Suncor will be out of tailings ponds in ten years.” That’s a great forward step.

I think government has a role to play, especially provincial government, in terms of regulations, making sure they are always looking at best in class, if you like. But all of that, your regulatory regime and even your research and development, to some extent, is probably driven by cumulative effects. So it’s the science. You have to know what’s happening up there. You have to know the impacts on the Athabasca River, for example. You have to know if there are higher levels of various carcinogens in the bloodstream of First Nations People or the food they eat. You have to do the science, and from the science, one hopes if its world class, which we now talk about and are hoping to create, world-class monitoring systems around cumulative effects. Then, the province and the federal governments should be building regulatory regimes and industry should be responding. Now, it’s always better if industry is out in front of these issues, but very often, and as we’ve seen, much as industry sometimes complains about regulation, I think reasonable, smart, forward-looking government regulation is required. Industry is not going to do a lot of these things on their own. And, therefore, governments who are in the business, or should be in the business of protecting the collective public interest or public good, I think have to work with industry. Make sure we’re collecting the right data; make sure we’re understanding what it’s telling us; and, then, create the regulatory regimes that are required.

**AD:** In your time in government, what was done to develop and enhance regulatory regimes to respond to success because I think you went from the industry needing an incentive. It happened and then it became a runaway success, with attendant problems and then you have to begin looking at the regulatory framework to deal with the outcomes of that success. Would that be fair?

**AM:** Well, certainly I think first of all there is a role for both the federal and provincial governments, but obviously the Government of Alberta jealously guarded what it perceived to be its jurisdiction, in relation to water and air and things. But, quite clearly, the federal government also has a role to
play. The Supreme Court has made that clear that most of these areas of environment are shared jurisdictions, to some extent. And it wasn’t always easy to work with the Alberta government around some of these issues, because they were somewhat skeptical in terms of letting either us as a Liberal government or even presently this Conservative government. I think you see the same kind of pushback or concern on the part of the province that somehow the federal government is going to move in and regulate aspects of oil sands development and the environment in ways that the province doesn’t want. It’s not even the case of the province agreeing or disagreeing. It’s somehow the province saying, “Okay, this could be the thin edge of the wedge here, and if we let them do this, where will they want to go next,” kind of thing, which is a long-standing issue not only here in Alberta with the federal government but across the country. So, it’s part of our Constitutional history, this kind of chippiness along the lines between provincial, territorial, and federal governments. But I think there has been a lot of learning in terms of the kinds of things that, the kinds of impacts that oil sands developments have had.

I think probably we could all be criticized—federal provincial governments, industry—for not being more proactive in understanding what some of the cumulative effects actually were and are. But I think Canada has gotten a black eye globally because of the oil sands, and it’s not only about global warming. Whether it’s habitat, whether it’s water, whether it’s air, these issues all come together in one way or another for environmental groups. So, globally we’ve gotten a bit of a black eye. I think nationally people legitimately have questions around the oil sands and their impact. And in Alberta—Albertans ask serious questions around the impacts, the cumulative impacts around oil sands development, and that’s why you hear some Albertans talking about the government, the provincial government, should be more interventionist and have some sort of staged or managed approach to the development of the project. That’s a very controversial subject in the province. Industry is opposed to that kind of approach. The government doesn’t support it. But you hear more and more Albertans talking about the fact, you know boom and bust, and people remember … [videographer changes cartridge]

The boom is great, apart from the fact that it puts huge pressure on everybody in the province. The physical infrastructure in the province can’t keep up. The human infrastructure, the human resources are found lacking, input costs go through the roof and you start to price yourself out of the market. Some, I suppose. would say that is, “You know the market actually manages the economy pretty well because once those input costs get sufficiently high these projects become unprofitable, as we saw in the last boom and they’re deferred or put on hold, or whatever the case may be.” But we’re about to enter another so-called “boom” period, and it will be interesting to see what we’ve all learned from the last one, if anything.
But, I think, on the environmental side, it’s very clear that companies are very aware of the fact that probably the most important licence you ever get to do business is the social licence. That comes from communities that do business. It comes from having a societal consensus that what you are doing is of value, and the harm you do in doing it is less than the benefits, and I think that’s why you see so much more investment now by the private sector around research and development in the impacts of these big developments on communities and on the physical landscape. The drive to … you know it’s not only a case of if you use less water, the project is more cost effective but also the project is more socially acceptable. If you actually were able to develop carbon capture storage in a cost-effective way for oil sands projects that would help. It would not be the answer, but it would help with CO2, and the concerns that people have with the oil sands and global warming. So, there is a lot happening on the environmental front. You’re seeing now federal and provincial governments talking about putting in place world-class scientific monitoring systems that deal not only with water but deal with biodiversity - deal with water, deal with air, the cumulative effects of both.

I think we’ll see a little bit of chippiness between the federal and provincial governments while they work through how this actually is done. Nobody wants unnecessary duplication, so it will be better if the two governments can agree and work together. But, I think, industry now understands pretty clearly you constantly have to be in the business of doing better; you constantly have to, and it’s not only, some people in the industry have talked for a long time about, “Well, it’s just about communications. We don’t communicate effectively.” Well, I think certainly the industry doesn’t, or hasn’t communicated effectively. But it’s not just that - you have to have something to communicate. I think most of the industry now understands that you have to have concrete results, like Suncor’s tailings ponds research and development. That you have to actually have something concrete that you have done that moves the environmental yardsticks forward, that you can talk to people about.

**AD:** The federal government as the senior level of government has to occupy itself with the national interest. In terms of the principal companies, with respect to the oil sands extraction, they have been large corporations, multinational corporations. Where does the federal interests and the interests of the multinationals involved in the oil sands, where do those two converge?

**AM:** Well, if you’re talking about foreign ownership, it’s interesting. The oil sands require such huge amounts of capital investment that there’s no way that that investment could come from Canada alone. And, therefore, you’ve got to raise that money; you’ve got to raise it around the world. And it’s no secret that, at this point, the Chinese, for example, with their growing economy, need more energy. They want to make sure they can control their own economic destiny, which means that they need to know that they’ve got secure supplies of a whole range of inputs, including energy and some
part of that will be oil and gas. So, you see big, state-owned entities like a number of companies from China, from India. Statoil. I mean Statoil is 75 percent owned by the Norwegian government. These companies are all investing in the oil sands, and you couldn’t have the kind of development you have without those dollars.

I think we live in a global world. Money moves across boundaries. It goes where it’s going to make the best return, where there’s a demand. The world needs more oil, so I think there’s no question that the Government of Canada does need to make sure when a foreign entity—especially a state-owned or state-controlled entity—chooses to buy a controlling interest or some significant part of a company in the oil sands, I think the government needs—there’s a test whether or not this investment is a net benefit to Canada. It is incumbent upon the Canadian government to apply that test, and they will require undertakings from companies, especially I think, and you’ve started to see this, especially from state owned or controlled companies. They want to make sure that these companies are operating on a commercial basis. That their motivations are commercial as opposed to some other state-imposed motivation. They want to ensure that there are benefits, whether it’s in terms of employment or head offices or investment in research and development. There are a whole range of conditions that the government can impose. Governments can also—it seems to me that the Alberta government could impose, if it chose, could be more interventionist, if you like, while working with the Government of Canada. Elsewhere around the world, if you go into countries to extract resources, it is very clear that other countries impose very strict conditions...[videographer changes cartridge]

**AD:** You were talking about the role of the federal government imposing frameworks for investment?

**AM:** Or requirements to make sure that foreign direct investment is in the best interest of Canadians. These are Albertan/Canadian resources that companies from other countries, especially state-owned companies, come here to exploit. Yes, we want to be open to foreign direct investment. We want their capital to help fund these big projects. But, we do want to make sure we’re extracting conditions, imposing conditions or extracting promises from them that one would see in other countries, including Australia, the United States, the UK, other parts of Europe. So, I think we’ve been a little less willing for whatever reasons, to impose those kinds of conditions, but I think with the development or the growth of state-owned companies coming into areas like the oil sands, I think you’re starting to see the Government of Canada become more vigorous in terms of their approach to reviewing these investments and what they require in return and how they’ll go about enforcing those promises.

**AD:** After the years of development of the oil sands, both the technology and in terms of the infrastructure development, the jobs have been Albertan centred. Now, we’re actually talking about a new era. We’re actually talking about, potentially, the bitumen could be transported
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through pipelines and that whole exploitation of the resource could happen elsewhere. It could happen offshore.

AM: You mean the value added.

AD: Yes.

AM: Yes, because we’ve been … I mean the bitumen itself has been moving through pipelines to markets in the United States [AD: for actual processing] for a long time. Now, there are upgraders both in the Fort McMurray area as well as here outside Edmonton, and that’s part of the value-added process. I think it’s quite clear the provincial government would like to encourage that value-added upgrading before the product then moves through pipeline to refineries in the United States for final refining. How much of that happens here, that remains to be seen.

You’ve got projects like Nexen’s at Long Lake where we have an upgrader as part of our SAGD operation. Clearly, there are upgraders—Syncrude, Suncor. Suncor Total are going to build a new upgrader at their Voyager project in the north. You’ve got upgrading here with Shell outside the city of Edmonton. Apparently, a new upgrader is going to be built there, although that hasn’t happened just yet. So there is value added. The raw bitumen is not exported via pipe to the U.S. in all circumstances. Quite clearly, there is upgrading that takes place here. Is it as much as the government would like, the provincial government would like to see? No. I think that probably not. And that whole value-added equation becomes one of cost and incentives provided by the provincial government, I guess.

And you know there are things you see the provincial government are doing. For example, they’re taking, in many cases they’re taking their royalty in kind, so that they’re actually getting the bitumen the they will supply to an upgrader so that that an upgrader has a confirmed, committed supply to upgrade. But how much of that one actually does, I think, the jury’s still out on exactly how much of that upgrading will take place here. I think, although don’t quote me, that I saw a number recently that about 60 percent of product from the oil sands is upgraded to some degree or some extent here in the province before it leaves. But it still leaves a lot of value added still on the table. But it may not make economic sense. It seems pretty clear it doesn’t make economic sense to do a lot more of that upgrading here, at least for the present time.

AD: I’m sure you saw the job creation statistics for June, and the comparison to the U.S. The U.S. as a whole created less jobs in June than the Province of Alberta. [AM: Right.] A significant number of those are to do with oil-sands-based projects. So, in terms of the economy of Canada, it isn’t just the revenues that are generated. It’s all of the other stuff.

AM: Oh absolutely, the work that’s provided … these big projects during the construction phase they all have five, six, 7,000 people on site, who come from all over the country. And,
then, on top of that you’ve got all the services. I mean during the last boom, we all saw and heard the stories, you know, Tim Horton’s couldn’t keep the lights on, because they couldn’t find people to work. Or if they were working at a Tim Horton’s or a McDonald’s, they were being paid $15 an hour. They were being paid … if they were young people they were being offered bonuses so that, if you worked for us, we’ll pay your tuition to university or college. These big projects not only sop up a whole lot of dollars in terms of their development but they sop up a whole lot of human resource too. And human resources that are not only the men and women building the plants, fabricating the steel, doing the legal and financial work, but dry cleaners, the Tim Horton’s, the McDonald’s—you know, you name it. The health care, all of these aspects of the physical infrastructure that communities need, the oil sands had created a lot of those sorts of jobs, and good paying jobs too.

**AD:** I wanted to ask a question in relationship with your involvement with, as a distinguished scholar at the University of Alberta in American Studies. It seems to be that the whole energy politics with respect to the U.S. Is that part of your mandate?

**AM:** It is, although it’s not part of the work I do at the American Studies Institute. What I focus on is borders, security issues, and NAFTA and the future of NAFTA, and whether NAFTA has a future. But energy, to some extent, is part of that whole NAFTA discussion because Mexico and Canada are two—Canada being the largest, Mexico I think after Saudi Arabia being the third largest supplier of oil to the United States—but really certainly energy policy is part and parcel of researchers work within the American Studies Institute. But it’s not work that I particularly do myself. And the Institute exists through its fellows, so it’s the institutional research of its fellows. But certainly, energy, if you’ve got the Alberta Institute of American Studies here at the University of Alberta in this province, energy is clearly one of those issues between the countries that is important. Although it’s been one that I think, in a sense, has almost been taken for granted, in that the product comes out of the ground somewhere in Canada, it’s put in a pipeline, somehow it’s moved to the United States for upgrading, refining, and ultimate finished product that is sold in whatever form.

I think Americans take Canada for granted in terms of being a secure source of energy, and Canadians take it for granted that they’ve got a market, and that’s why Canadians and especially Albertans I think in the industry got so concerned and have been so concerned over these past few years about the fact that, if America got serious about global warming, then, in fact, there may be barriers created to the entrance of oil sands product into the United State energy mix. Or, there may be you - know there’ve been discussions around, “Could the U.S. pose some kind of import tariff on product from the oil sands as opposed to conventional, and would that price the product out of the market?” Now, it would seem, one would think, that that’s counterproductive for the United States with its energy demands and needs, and everything that’s happening in the world right now in terms
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of uncertainty around certain markets from where the U.S. gets oil. I think those kinds of issues are out there, and I think they’re the kinds of issues that an American Studies Institute needs, among many others, to be looking at. What is the American approach—and it’s not only national government but state by state—what is their approach to global warming and CO2? What kinds of regulatory regimes might they put in place? They’re a sovereign nation. States within their jurisdictions can do what they want. We’ve seen the State of California move fairly aggressively on some of the CO2 issues.

There are provisions I think in federal legislation [videographer changes cartridge]. I think there’s federal legislation that suggests or requires the federal fleet of vehicles not to use certain kinds of gasoline and petroleum products from carbon-intensive areas, such as the oil sands. There’s no question though that extraction of product from the oil sands is much more carbon-intensive than conventional. And, of course, the product itself is more carbon intensive when it’s burned than conventional light sweet crude. The United States, as a sovereign country, can choose to impose regime, the regulatory regime that it wants, but it stands to reason that Canada will try, in ways that it can, to influence that regime, and even within the United States, or particularly in the U.S., you see an awful lot of discussion and disagreement around what approaches are appropriate and not. I think a lot of this has yet to be played out, but certainly in context of the American Studies institute at the University of Alberta, we have people who do research on energy and the environment, and that’s a good thing.

**AD:** You also sit on the board of Nexen. You have another contact with the energy industry. Do you want to talk about that?

**AM:** I’m on the board of directors of Nexen. Nexen is a mid-size Canadian oil and gas company. We do business around the world. We are involved in the oils sands at Long Lake. We have a SAGD project with an upgrader. SAGD is obviously in situ. It doesn’t disturb the land. It looks much more like a conventional oil extraction operation. We still use a lot of water, which is an issue obviously. We still emit CO2. We use natural gas. Actually, right now in our SAGD projects they use more natural gas than we would like to, going forward. That’s why research is being done all the time in terms of how we can make SAGD more energy efficient and, therefore, less intrusive in the environment. But we - Nexen does business around the world. We’ve been in Yemen for over 25 years, and, right now, with everything that’s happening, the uncertainty in Yemen, that makes it an interesting place to do business. We’re in projects off the coast of Nigeria, offshore Nigeria. We’re in Columbia. We’re in the North Sea. We’re probably the largest producer of oil right now in the North Sea, and we have fairly extensive shale gas holdings in northeastern British Columbia. Also, some shale gas that we’ve just gotten involved with in a joint venture in Poland. So, a mid-size company does business around the world. Certainly we’re very conscious, as it relates to our oil
sands project, very conscious of issues around oil sands and the environmental concerns that people have.

AD: Now, using a new generation of technology, you’re not going to be dealing with a tailings ponds.

AM: Well not at SAGD, no. And I guess if you take Rick George and Suncor at their word, their new technologies will be able to deal with the tailings pond issues much more efficiently and effectively than in the past.

AD: And there will be an accumulation of 40 years that will have to be dealt with.

AM: Yes.

AD: But new developments?

AM: New developments going forward there should be much less impact on the natural environment, absolutely.

AD: Is there any other issue that you see surfacing, or anything that you’ve remembered with respect to your tenure in government relating to the energy sector, specifically petroleum?

AM: No. The oil sands, we’ve talked about that remarkable period of time, where the provincial and federal governments of the day were able to work together to do what was required. I think what people forget was that, in 1993, it wasn’t clear what the future of the oil sands might be, and it wasn’t clear it had a future for a whole lot of reasons. And now, some 17 years later, one looks at this and thinks, after the billions of dollars of investment and the millions of barrels of oil that are being produced and will be produced out of the oil sands, it’s hard to reflect or remember that it wasn’t clear what the future would be back in 1993. And, I think, it does indicate it was an example of where government was far-sighted enough, in spite of tough circumstances in which both the provincial and federal governments found themselves financially, that they decided to take this step, because they saw something there that could be enormously beneficial to the future, to the energy future of Canada and the United States and, potentially, if we gain access to the Asia-Pacific markets, beyond Canada and the United States. There’s an awful lot of resource there. But, I guess, the other thing we could say is that industry and governments again have an important role to play in terms of the regulatory regimes in place and the monitoring that goes on.
But again, if we’re going to be able to continue to exploit that resource going forward decades from now, we all have to do better. We all have to continue to work hard, through research and development, to understand the impacts of what we’re doing. We have to make sure we’re always raising the bar in terms of that scientific enquiry that will help us in terms of the next generation of technologies; that will help us capture more CO2; that will help us use less water and less natural gas to produce the resource; that will help us build better pipelines with less corrosion. All those kinds of things; industry constantly has to be pushing those boundaries. They have to make those investments. And there’s a role for government, both in terms of the regulatory regime to encourage and push and, in some cases, impose, but also a role for government in terms of working with industry the way we did in ’93, where it’s appropriate, to give them the incentives to make the investments.

**AD:** Finally, what is the role of the universities? Because you ended up a political career attached to a university, a think tank, right?

**AM:** I think universities play a very important role, and I think they must. Universities first of all play a fundamental role in research, basic research. And it’s absolutely key that universities be doing research into whether it’s extraction methodologies, whether it’s use of water, co-generation, CO2 capture and storage, impacts on water, a whole lot of stuff; biodiversity generally. Universities have to be doing that kind of research and they have to be encouraged to do it—in some cases, industry will support it—but it can’t be industry-directed research. I think industry, as we’ve seen here, industry has to help fund this, but the enquiry needs to be free of industry influence or direction.

And industry has to understand that, ultimately, there will be times when results and enquiry leads in a direction that’s uncomfortable for them, but, at the end of the day, it is better over all to have that research done and have that enquiry pursued to its logical ends, so that we all learn and we all can do better. I mean the oil sands really would not exist today but for a combination of industry, government, and university research and enquiry. And, I think, universities have a very important role to play. [videographer changes cartridge]

**AD:** Any final reflections on the whole political aspects of the oil sands?

**AM:** No, other than to say it will continue. The oil sands will continue to be a political challenge. Not at this point so much in terms of providing incentives, and, in fact, we’ve seen the Harper government take, withdraw most of those incentives that we put in place. And that, in a sense, makes sense because they were there to provide an incentive at a given time to get this industry to the next level, and it’s not only gone to that level but well beyond. So when you’re looking at the Tax Act, as the Government of Canada, or Royalty regime, as a province can take a look at it, and
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say, “Okay those things were put there for a certain purpose at a certain time. Are they still required?” and those are legitimate questions for governments to be asking themselves on behalf of their people. And, then, I think in terms of political involvement going forward, it’s going to be around foreign direct investment and conditions imposed, especially on state-controlled and state-owned companies in the oil sands, and in the energy sector more generally.

And it’s also going to be around the environmental issues, particularly around the environmental issues and the roles of governments at whatever level, in terms of regulating natural resource extraction, so that we ensure that we understand the cumulative effects of what we’re doing. And we understand the impacts on the air, the water, the land, and the people who live on the land. So, politics is going to continue to play an important role. Energy and natural resources of any kind, but the oil sands have attracted a lot of political attention from around the world, and they will continue to do so. And governments, both here and around the world, will need, will continue to express views on what is happening in the oil sands; how it’s happening; whether it should be happening at all; and the costs and the benefits. And sovereign nations like the United States may choose at some point to impose an import tariff on product extracted from the oil sands. Or not. Who knows? Or some other aspect of regulatory regime that sends a signal around carbon-intensive energy sources. So, the politics, it’s a political stew around the oil sands and it will continue to be so. I don’t see that ending any time soon.

**AD:** Are there any people that you would recommend that we should interview?

**AM:** Well, I think you’ve interviewed Eric Newell, for example. You’ve interviewed Jim Carter. You know, you should interview someone like Al Hyndman on his involvement as really the guy, the guy in Ottawa who practically lived in Ottawa during this time, and was a bit of a go-between between the federal and provincial governments. You know somebody like Rick Hyndman, who was Deputy Minister of Energy in the provincial government at the time. I think you’ll probably talk to Pat Nelson. She was Minister of Energy at the time. Jim Dinning, Paul Martin, they were the finance ministers in the two jurisdictions at the time. People like that. I would also interview Bob Blakely from the building trades and get their perspective on why they threw their support behind the declaration of opportunity. And, of course, some of the First Nations leaders, who were an instrumental part of making this happen in the mid ’90s and late ’90s. And also I think their perspective on what has happened over the last 15 years and whether they think it’s been to their benefit or not.

**AD:** Well thank you so much.

**AM:** You’re welcome; my pleasure.