



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 008

Thursday, October 23, 2025

Chair: Terry Duguid



Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Thursday, October 23, 2025

• (1105)

[English]

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

I would like to acknowledge that we are meeting on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe Nation.

Welcome to meeting number eight of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders.

I remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

There are a couple of things before we start. Yesterday, the Subcommittee on Committee Budgets of the Liaison Committee adopted the travel budget that we submitted. The next step is approval of the House.

There's a bit of change in plans. J.P. Danko has a two-way trip to the Saguenay and Sudbury because of some scheduling conflicts. Safe travels, J.P. I know you'll enjoy Mario's company very much; he'll treat you well.

On Thursday, October 30, we will start the forestry study. If everybody agrees, I propose to invite the Department of Natural Resources for an hour and do drafting instructions on this, our critical minerals study, in the second hour.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted on Thursday, September 18, 2025, the committee is resuming its study of the development of critical minerals in Canada.

I would like to give a warm welcome to the national chief of the Assembly of First Nations, Cindy Woodhouse Nepinak, who is from Manitoba, my home province. I get to see the national chief pretty regularly, often on a plane from our home province.

We also have Julie McGregor, acting chief of staff to the national chief, Assembly of First Nations, and Benjamin Green-Stacey, adviser to the chief.

Thank you for being with us today, National Chief. Normally a witness would have five minutes for an opening statement, but there's latitude as you are the only witness. We really want to hear from you. We know that you have important things to share, and I know colleagues will have some questions for you shortly.

Please proceed.

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak (National Chief, Assembly of First Nations):

Chi-meegwetch for welcoming me here today.

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

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

[*Witness provided the following translation:*]

A huge thank you for welcoming me here today. I'm very honoured to be with you all and glad you are all able to attend this event today.

[English]

I also thank Creator for bringing us together this morning and for giving us all another day of life.

I want to say, for the tech people in the room, that sometimes these committees happen really quickly. I'll remind Parliament and of course the Senate itself to make sure that you're reaching out to, (a), first nations, or (b), to the Assembly of First Nations, and we can certainly help you make sure that when parliamentary committees come up, the voices in this country are all heard. It's not like we're all going to get along every single time, but at the same time, I think it's so important to hear the voices of Canadians, including first nations.

Thank you for welcoming me here today.

To all the members who are gathered here, I would like to acknowledge again that we are gathering here on the territory of the Algonquin nation. I want to thank the committee for the invitation to appear today.

First and foremost, first nations maintain sovereignty over their lands and over their waters and territories. The development of critical minerals must include the free, prior and informed consent of first nations. Now is the time to recognize the strength of first nations as partners in facing geopolitical uncertainty and the threat of increasing U.S. colonialism. First nations lands hold vast deposits of critical minerals and freshwater supplies that sustain communities on both side of the border.

Speaking as national chief of the Assembly of First Nations, we are pleased to submit the Assembly of First Nations' technical brief on critical minerals development. Our written submission provides detailed recommendations in five key areas. For the sake of time, though, we will be focusing our remarks today on the first three areas—the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, economic reconciliation and water rights—while noting that the environment and gender-based violence issues are fully developed within the content of our technical brief.

Canada must ensure that all mining projects and activities that take place on or that will affect first nations lands and waters, which is all of this beautiful country, adhere to the minimum standards of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, particularly article 32. Past legislative development processes where this did not happen, such as the Natural Resource Transfer Agreements, need to be corrected in collaboration with first nations. For example, this committee should support the first nations call for a constitutional review of the Natural Resource Transfer Agreements. All of Canada's laws and policies, including both their final content and the process for the development, must be compliant with section 5 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act and the objectives of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Economic reconciliation must guide critical minerals policies and activities. Economic reconciliation must not be an afterthought but a guiding principle of Canada's critical minerals strategy. Economic reconciliation means that policies and programs must enable first nations to fully participate not just as stakeholders but also as rights holders, equity partners and co-developers. As one example, despite its recent enhancements, the indigenous loan guarantee program is fundamentally not designed to address community infrastructure needs, the fundamental barrier to economic inclusion and self-determination. Not only that; it appears that the loan guarantee program has effectively replaced Canada's 2022 commitment to developing an actual benefits-sharing framework.

With the increasing attention to critical minerals and fast-track projects, recommitting to a comprehensive benefits-sharing framework with a distinctions-based approach will be critical to ensuring that first nations benefit from any resource development, including mining on their territories. More generally, Canada's approach to critical minerals development must include collaboration with first nations to identify strategic infrastructure and development projects that can serve community needs, support participation in the critical minerals supply chain and strengthen Canada's broader economic and defence priorities.

This is what we mean when we say that collaboration with first nations on strategic dual-use infrastructure projects will serve both community and industrial purposes, and will ensure prosperity for all.

- (1110)

On recognizing and implementing first nations' rights to water, water is life, and the protection of first nations' water rights must guide all critical minerals policy.

In addition to surface disturbances from extractive activities and associated infrastructure, mining activities produce polluting waste,

including tailings and waste water. Disasters such as the Mount Polley, B.C. tailings breach show that spills and contamination persist. Too often, first nations are the last to be informed.

We are looking to this committee to recommend to the Government of Canada to introduce first nations water legislation that ensures safe drinking water and waste-water standards; that respects the interests, rights and unique needs of first nations; that reinforces the human right to water and to sanitation; and that includes robust provisions for a statutory funding framework.

The recommendations we have summarized today are elaborated in the AFN's technical submission to this committee.

Chi-meegwetch. We'd be happy to take questions now on this important issue.

The Chair: Thank you, National Chief, for that presentation.

Indeed, we welcome technical briefs. I know the members will look at them very carefully.

We'll start our round of questions with Mrs. Stubbs for six minutes.

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

Thank you, Grand Chief and your delegation, for being here.

I come from Treaty No. 6, and I was very honoured and privileged to be able to meet you at transport committee in June, and we discussed Bill C-5.

To that end, critical mineral development is part and parcel, at least according to the government's claims about Bill C-5, of the development they want to advance. They've been in government for 10 years. You've made comments today and previously about the significant investment that mining projects can bring to remote regions, where often there are indigenous communities with all kinds of lack of infrastructure and essential needs.

In your view, has the federal government done enough to align with the Assembly of First Nations and other rights and title holders' vision of economic reconciliation so communities can be ensured long-term, sustainable opportunities for self-reliance and economic opportunities?

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: First of all, when it comes to the Assembly of First Nations, we're the collective organizer; we're not a rights holder. I just wanted to say that for the record. There are 634 rights holders from coast to coast, and we're so grateful to be the political organizer. We organize and bring them together twice per year. We're thankful for the participation of first nations from coast to coast at the AFN.

From the creation of this entire country, every single government has failed first nations people. I do want to lift up the little things that matter to our relationship like Stephen Harper's apology, for instance, on residential schools, and there was Paul Martin's commitment, first and foremost, when he was there, to try to push the Kelowna accord. Justin Trudeau did well in trying to bring up the living standards for first nations. You look back at all of that. Yes, I'm glad when prime ministers and their governments try, but at the same time, they have to....

Here we are. I'm glad we're around this table today, but we did have to push a little bit to make sure that we had a space around this House and around the Senate. I think we can do things a lot better. We do have a \$350-billion infrastructure gap in communities.

The government came in, just in the spring, for over 20 days and rammed through Bill C-5. That was very fast and very tough for first nations. We were shut out of Parliament. I'm glad we had a few moments to discuss our stance on it but, at the same time, there was lots of leadership here who wanted to speak in this House.

It's so important as Canadians that we make sure that we don't govern like that together. We need to protect the fact that there are environmentalists, Canadians and first nations people and groups who want to talk about some of these issues. Those voices should never be shut down.

Have things improved? They have in some part. At the same time, there's a long way to go. We have to work on procurement problems.

There are too many pretendians out there, and there are too many companies not engaging with first nations but saying they are indigenous. There's that issue alone.

When it comes to critical minerals development, we have to make sure that first nations on the ground have free, prior and informed consent. We need to work, of course, on the recommendations that we're giving here today.

Thank you.

• (1115)

Shannon Stubbs: National Chief, what concerns me is that neither your organization nor rights and title holders were adequately consulted in the development of Bill C-5, which we discussed during that time.

Now I have concerns, although I have great respect for the individuals on the indigenous advisory council for the major projects office. Given your comments about the requirement and the court precedents that sufficient duty to consult requires a two-way dynamic with decision-makers at the table, Bill C-5 sets out politicians and cabinet members as decision-makers.

Do you think the inclusion of an indigenous advisory board is going to be enough to fulfill the Crown's duty to consult? That is what is important, also given the fact that Conservatives supported the Liberals' claim, through Bill C-69, that they were going to provide capacity funding for sufficient engagement of indigenous communities, because we all know that getting to "yes" in a good way is the only way these projects can be built.

Do you have concerns that decisions coming out of that will face challenges or litigation, or do you want to expand on how that can properly be done with that two-way dynamic and decision-makers at the table?

Julie McGregor (Acting Chief of Staff, Assembly of First Nations): To go back to your earlier question about Bill C-5 and whether that consultation and all of those promises occurred to have that engagement, the answer is not to our knowledge.

There is a long way to go in terms of going directly to rights holders. As the national chief said, the engagement was very brief before the bill, and now following it, we think there is a long road to go to ensure that first nations are properly involved in the process.

In terms of the advisory council, we hold up the people who are involved in that. However, that's not a replacement for rights holders and direct engagement with those individuals.

Shannon Stubbs: I share that concern. I hope you are listened to.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Stubbs.

We're now over to Mr. Hogan for six minutes.

Mr. Hogan, go ahead.

• (1120)

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

Thank you, National Chief. It's great to see you again. You were one of the first individuals I met as a newly sworn-in MP in the new government, and you made me feel very welcome, and I appreciate that greatly.

The new government is one that stands on the progress of other governments, like the work you mentioned of prime ministers Martin, Harper and Trudeau. As has been discussed, reconciliation is a long road that requires us to move backwards and address past wrongs, but we also know we don't have a time machine and we need to move forward and walk paths together in a better way.

Of course, one of the ways that needs to be done is through free, prior and informed consent. One of the things we've heard from other witnesses is that capacity building is very important.

I'm wondering if you could take the opportunity to expand on capacity building. What is your view of the level of resourcing—obviously we have heard that needs to be increased—but also the approach to capacity building that's been taken? Are there things the government should consider as it looks at critical minerals?

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: I think we can list several that are complex, long-standing, systemic and, frankly, unacceptable, but perhaps the most poignant one is that I am the only one here. That's the problem. You can't just have the national chief representing all first nations who are stewards of the land, water and resources that this country is eager to export.

Canada needs to be more proactive in engaging rights holders from coast to coast, and we'll be there to help you as the AFN. That includes, at the absolute minimum, inviting more first nations as witnesses in this study. I am hoping we can do that for next week.

These are the basics when we insist on “nothing about us without us,” of course.

Beyond that, key barriers include limited access to capital, which constrains opportunities for equity participation and project investment; capacity challenges across the project life cycle, including proposals; during flexibility studies, due diligence and technical assessment; navigating complex permitting processes that are often difficult to navigate without specialized technical experts in the field; a general distrust of industry stemming from negative experience, including limited transparency and insufficient early engagement; and a lack of infrastructure, which I know we talked about earlier, such as roads, energy and broadband, particularly in remote northern regions. Some of our kids don't even have access to high-speed Internet or wired Internet. We have a long way to go on that, and that's just one piece.

As well, there are socio-economic factors stemming from colonial policies and programs and a lack of consideration or meaningful engagement in the development of federal strategies or regulatory processes. There is a lot to discuss. Those are just some barriers.

Corey Hogan: You mentioned becoming equity partners. I think, broadly, the structuring of deals is something that we have also heard from witnesses about. There have been many comments about the difficulty of accessing equity, becoming meaningful partners. I'm wondering if you have any thoughts on that you want to share with the committee.

Benjamin Green-Stacey (Assembly of First Nations): Accessing equity is only one part of meaningful participation in Canada's economy by first nations. When you think about these major projects, they're opportunities to generate a lot of revenue for a lot of governments, for a lot of private interests, for a lot of corporate

and shareholder interests, but for first nations communities, the reality day to day is that there might not be access to high-speed Internet, there might not be access to clean drinking water.

When you see programs like CILGP, which provide access to capital for investment in for-profit major projects, they don't do anything to address on-reserve challenges, which is why the national benefits-sharing framework needs to have a dedicated first nations chapter. That's why it's a priority. We need to address real day-to-day problems that affect people's lives and ability to function before we start talking about major projects that can line pocketbooks.

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: If I could just add to that, as I said in my speech there, I look to this committee and your political will to call for a constitutional review on the Natural Resources Transfer Agreements. I don't know if you all know what those are, but they were agreements between the federal government and three provincial governments that purported to transfer control over Crown lands and natural resources to three prairie provinces. This occurred without the free, prior and informed consent of the first nations whose land and resources were affected.

This shift in jurisdiction has complicated first nations' participation in resource development, including critical mineral development. Decisions about our traditional lands and territories have continued to be made without our input. This committee must acknowledge the Natural Resources Transfer Agreements as a fundamental impediment to first nations' economic development and self-determination, and support the Assembly of First Nations' call for a constitutional review of the NRTA and their compatibility with section 35 of the Constitution Act of 1982.

We look to you all to stand with us and call for that. You see one province trying to threaten to leave to the U.S. It's so unacceptable. She doesn't even have land to take. That land is Treaty No. 6, 7 and 8. Those are their lands.

I know there are tough discussions to be had, but pieces of legislation like this from the 1920s impact us and continue to pull us down today. I think we can do better as a country. Let's get to the table. Let's have these big discussions. Even though they're uncomfortable, we can make a better country by working together in a better way.

Thank you.

• (1125)

The Chair: Thank you both.

We're going to move to our final speaker in the first round.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simard, you may go ahead for six minutes.

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

National Chief Woodhouse-Nepinak, at the end of your last answer, you talked about tough discussions that needed to be had on a nation-to-nation basis. As a Bloc Québécois member, I completely understand what you're saying.

You said that a legislative review was needed in relation to the transfer of control over land. Would you say you are in a dialogue with the federal government as equal partners? If not, what could be done in the short term to establish such a dialogue, especially in the context of fast-tracking the development of critical minerals? What could be done to foster a dialogue with first nations as equal partners?

[*English*]

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: That's a good question.

I know there are so many other ways, but one way.... We always jump forward to participate in federal-provincial-territorial meetings. We're invited for a couple of hours the day before. Then the next day, when the federal government comes in, with the premiers for instance, they'll talk to us for maybe an hour or two. I always tell them it's "the little kiddie table". I got into an argument with the premiers this summer about that, but thankfully we went out of there and we were united.

It's tough. For instance, with health care—or this issue or that issue—you come together to speak about these things and there's always, like, an hour set aside to talk about indigenous issues. Then the provinces and the feds say, "Okay, thank you. Go out now", and we're excluded from those talks. I think that has to change in this country. It's always so disrespectful to have to leave the next day, when the real business gets talked about.

This past summer I met with all the premiers and I told them to make a seat for us at the table. They said that they always need their own group to talk as premiers. I get that, but when they're speaking with the feds and first nations people are left to the side, who's speaking for us? Nobody. Everyone wants to say that they have jurisdiction over us, yet nobody is speaking for us. We often get left out of big conversations. It always seems to be the elephant in the room.

Here's another example. I was saying to Indian affairs.... I always call it Indian affairs. I know you all switch that name every few

years to Indigenous Services and everything else, but it's Indian affairs. There's not even an FPT table for them. There's no talking space for the provinces and the feds to speak with first nations directly on many issues—on health care, on education or on big projects. There's no set space for these conversations.

I think if we had that, we'd be further ahead as a country, instead of piecemealing and always trying to get our voices heard, so I think one thing is including us as true partners in this country.

• (1130)

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard: I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I take it that the government's approach to consultation is just a facade, so it can say that it consulted you. However, a lot needs to be clarified before the process can be called a real consultation.

I've always wondered about the concept of free, prior and informed consent. It's something that is hard to define, especially with the passage of Bill C-5, which allows the government to take liberties in relation to standards and regulations.

I'd like to know whether there are any mechanisms that provide support, given the highly complex technical and technological aspects of mining projects in some cases. I'm not sure whether you receive any sort of guidance to help you with all that. It seems to me that, before you can give free, prior and informed consent, you need to have not just all the information, but also the ability to make sense of it all.

Is there some mechanism for natural resource projects to ensure that that information is provided?

[*English*]

Julie McGregor: That's a really good question.

It's actually a very big challenge, in terms of major natural resources projects going forward, that there's inconsistency in terms of support that first nations have.

You're right. The regulatory processes are very complex and very long. The lifespan of a project can have several regulatory processes that first nations just don't have the capacity to meaningfully participate in, even though that's the law. Even in duty to consult, first nations have to be meaningfully engaged in the process. Often, it's left to industry to provide that support.

The Crown often delegates its authority to that and that makes for inconsistent application of.... There's really no mechanism beyond the fact that it's a legal standard. There is no uniform mechanism for first nations and rights holders to be meaningfully part of the engagement, the consultation and, as you say, free, prior and informed consent.

That standard requires exactly that: Free means first nations are willing to do this; prior means beforehand; and informed means that they have all the information in front of them in order to engage in the process. That's the standard and there should be adequate resourcing for them to do that for a multitude of reasons, but mainly the ones our national chief mentioned. There's an infrastructure gap. There's chronic underfunding. First nations are always in a situation where they're trying to manage a multitude of social and economic factors along with being part of a complex regulatory process.

The Chair: Thank you.

Colleagues, we're going to go to our second round.

Monsieur Malette, please go ahead for five minutes.

Gaétan Malette (Kapuskaing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk, CPC): National Chief Woodhouse-Nepinak, *wachay*.

Since the introduction of Bill C-69 and its framework for impact assessment, has the government fulfilled its commitment to meaningfully consult and consider indigenous communities in project reviews?

• (1135)

Julie McGregor: It depends on the project, obviously. If you were to canvass rights holders as to whether they feel they've been adequately consulted on these things, I think the answer would be no.

As the national chief mentioned, Bill C-5 was the example of how things go in terms of major projects and consultation and FPIC. You're given a very quick turnaround time in which to provide your consultation, and there aren't adequate resources to do it, so I'd say no.

Gaétan Malette: You said, "It depends on the project". Would you have a project that would be a model—maybe not a model, but one that could guide us?

Benjamin Green-Stacey: The best examples of Impact Assessment Act implementation would be the regional impact assessments that are happening right now for the St. Lawrence and for the Ring of Fire.

However, with the implementation of the Building Canada Act and with the progress of these major projects, there's no guarantee, no certainty, that the findings of these assessments will be in any way considered before these projects are authorized and implemented. That's unacceptable.

One of the recommendations that we're making in the report is that regional development plans be developed and supported with first nations. What that could look like is a comprehensive regional impact assessment.

Gaétan Malette: Along that same line, should we prioritize deeper consultation with indigenous communities and empower them to lead negotiations directly with resource companies? What are your thoughts on that?

Julie McGregor: Yes.

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: Absolutely—and in a respectful way. I know that there was one company, for instance...and I've

talked to him extensively about this. Relationships are important in this country for all of us, no matter whether it's in business, politics, industry or anywhere, right?

It was disheartening. I know that there was one company that reached out to Chief Jeff Copenace from Onigaming, and it was very disrespectful to him. It called him down in an email on that same day, which was interesting. I had to reply. I felt terrible for the chief to have to see abuse like that from a mining exploration company, for it to be so disrespectful to him.

At the same time, you see the relationships being built in another province that same day with the premier, different first nations groups and different industry people coming together. That was nice to see, but on the same day, you could see the different contrast with regard to that. Relationships are important. At the same time, if any smart company wants to do business somewhere, anywhere, in Canada, it needs to figure out where it's going and which first nations are impacted in that area, and it needs to pick up the phone and call them.

People think it's so complex, but just like anywhere else, if you're developing somewhere or wanting to develop somewhere, you have to make sure that you reach out to those first nations. They're human, too. They'll pick up the phone, and they'll tell you if they want to speak to you or not, just like any one of us.

Thank you.

Gaétan Malette: You've touched on a word: "relationships". Relationships are extremely important, and different people may interpret that word differently, which is always sad.

Madam McGregor, your answer was a strong yes. Could you elaborate a little bit on it? What are the key points to the changes?

Julie McGregor: Well, again, there are capacity issues to begin with. I think we need to start looking at the infrastructure gap, as the national chief said. It's a huge part of the problem when looking at these major projects going forward. It's not even a thought in anybody's mind that there is a lack of clean water and a lack of, as the national chief said, broadband technology. We don't even have winterized roads in the north for our first nations communities.

Instead of looking at how we solve the problem to get to the yes, or however you want to look at it—the consent of it—start looking at it in terms of a whole process. Solving the infrastructure gap is a major project in Canada. It is part of ensuring that first nations are engaged in processes and are fully partners in these mining or natural resources projects that are happening. There's the capacity, but also understanding that the capacity is also rooted in a major infrastructure problem across Canada.

Then, again, like the national chief said, the engagement part of it, the relationship part of it, sitting down with people to actually learn from the communities about their knowledge and the impacts on their rights and their lands, and ensuring there's a certain level of benefit brought to the communities as well. It can't be just a one-shot deal for approval processes; they have to be long standing and something that benefits future generations of first nations.

• (1140)

The Chair: Thank you.

We have Mr. Guay for five minutes.

I've given a little latitude because we have important guests.

Claude Guay (LaSalle—Émard—Verdun, Lib.): National Chief, thank you very much for being here with us. We really appreciate it.

I want to reassure you that we've actually had other first nations representatives who have come to the committee before you. It may not be an exhaustive list, as you highlighted, of rights holders in this country. I would appreciate your recommendations if you look at the list and think we should have others prioritized. Of course, we're not going to be able to meet all of them, but we welcome your feedback and input on some of the most representative ones. I really wanted to give you that message.

The real question I wanted to ask you is this. I haven't had a chance to read your report, but one of the things, particularly with the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, that we're very interested in developing is templates for agreements with the first nations. I'll come back to talk about the loan guarantee, but as you pointed out, the equity aspect is only one aspect of projects. I'm interested in your knowledge of best practices. You said some projects are done well, and some could be much improved in the process, the consultation and participation of the first nations. I've heard a lot about capacity and infrastructure, but I'm wondering if you could help us with your feedback. What is the list of elements we should contemplate on any major project with a first nation? More than just ticking a box, give us insight as to the elements that should be considered by the promoters, by the government or by the first nation itself.

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: To support first nations in critical mineral development projects, the federal government must take a leadership role in setting standards for respectful, inclusive and rights-based engagement. This includes requiring project proponents to involve first nations early in decision-making processes and ensuring that engagement is not rushed or treated as a checkbox exercise.

The government can also play a critical role by directly funding first nations-led projects and related infrastructure, which are often foundational to participation.

Facilitating partnerships, including co-ownership and equity opportunities, is another way that the federal government can make a difference. In addition, developing and sharing best practice templates for partnership agreements, benefit-sharing models and community engagement approaches can guide companies in building meaningful and lasting relationships with first nations.

Ultimately, the federal government must be grounded in recognition of first nations' rights and focused on creating the conditions for equitable participation in the critical mining economy.

I don't know if you want to add anything further.

• (1145)

Julie McGregor: I want to say one cautioning thing in terms of looking for templates and quick ways of going around this. Sometimes, in our world, slow is fast. When we say rights holders, we're not joking. These are constitutionally recognized rights, and first

nations will go to court to protect their rights. If you don't consult properly and don't make sure that an agreement really meets the needs of that community—and all communities are different—then you will see issues in terms of protracted litigation on these projects.

Before you slam down a template agreement and say, “Here you go. Take it or leave it”, remember that you really need to consult with the communities. You need to engage with them. You need to get their free, prior and informed consent, and you need to understand what they need. It's not as easy as a template agreement.

The Chair: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Go ahead, Mr. Simard. You have two and a half minutes.

Mario Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Woodhouse-Nepinak, as far as the study goes, one of the big challenges around deploying critical minerals is the lack of infrastructure. Critical minerals are generally found up north, which is home to many indigenous communities, who live on and use the land.

You talked about codevelopment. When it comes to deploying projects, whether it's rail or road infrastructure, a model based on indigenous community partnership strikes me as a good one. To your knowledge, are there any such partnerships with indigenous communities in terms of existing infrastructure development projects?

[*English*]

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: The key to supporting first nations in the participation of emerging critical mining systems is closing the infrastructure gap. For decades first nations have called on Canada to address the chronic underinvestment and neglect that have caused the staggering socio-economic and infrastructure gaps between first nations and the rest of this country.

Through ministerial mandates and the Speech from the Throne, Canada has stated and reiterated its commitment to close the infrastructure gap in first nations by the year 2030. To advance this joint priority, in partnership with industry-leading engineering and consulting firms, Indigenous Services and the AFN have quantified the cost and benefits to closing the infrastructure gap in first nations by 2030, which now exceeds \$360 billion and includes nearly every infrastructure asset class, including roads, ports, energy and telecommunications.

One of the main barriers to mineral development in Canada is a lack of infrastructure in remote regions. Connectors that make it easier to engage in mineral development are also connectors for first nations, meaning that there are a variety of economic and social co-benefits that come from federal economic investments in related infrastructure.

Canada's approach to critical minerals development must also include collaboration with first nations to identify strategic dual-use infrastructure and development projects that can serve community infrastructure needs and support first nations' participation in the critical mineral supply chain, the green energy transition and Canada's defence industrial base more broadly.

I hope that's helpful.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms. McGregor.

Julie McGregor: There's a theme to that, and the members are asking for specific examples. We represent 634 first nations, but we're just the advocacy body. If you really wanted good examples, or even bad examples, of where infrastructure projects partnered with communities, you really should invite the first nations rights holders to the committee and your study and let those voices be heard, because then you will get detailed information about successful projects or ones that weren't so successful.

Thank you.

• (1150)

The Chair: We're on to our last two speakers.

Mr. Martel, please go ahead for five minutes.

[*Translation*]

Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for being with us today.

Ms. Woodhouse-Nepinak, right now, economic development projects are very needed. It's clear from the geopolitical situation that we need to start creating wealth.

It always takes a long time for an economic development project to get off the ground. Sometimes, we miss our opportunity, but you, too, are missing an opportunity. I find it hard to believe that we can't move faster in a way that doesn't cut corners. I'd like to hear your thoughts on that. It seems to me that it's possible to move faster when it comes to regulations and negotiations.

[*English*]

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: Thank you very much.

The federal government can do better by working with first nations. That includes including us as true partners; ensuring that all benefits are shared, including revenues generated from resource extraction; providing funding for early engagement and capacity building; embedding indigenous participation plans, IPPs, in project governance and regulatory processes; and promoting equity partnerships, revenue-sharing agreements, and impact and benefit agreements.

I think that's one way we want to fast-track this. Why not start working together?

Julie McGregor: If the government wanted to play a role in that, they could encourage the implementation of the UN declaration as part of the regulatory process and look at different reports. There have been so many reports with respect to the cost of doing business and the human cost of that in our communities. The final report on the missing and murdered indigenous women had a lot to do with the impacts of these projects as well, so it would be good for those recommendations to be revisited.

[*Translation*]

Richard Martel: Should the unanimous consent of all affected communities be a prerequisite for any development project on indigenous territory?

[*English*]

Julie McGregor: Obviously, in the development of the law in Canada and looking at it from the UN declaration, it is a question of the rights and interests that are affected. There are communities where there is a potential mining project right in their backyard, but there are also communities downstream from the project that may be affected. You really have to look at the rights that are affected. To do that, you have to consult with the rights holders so they can tell you exactly how they're going to be affected by something. Then it's a matter how you address those concerns. It's not a question of whether everybody has to agree or everybody has to say yes or no. It's a question of the interests and the rights being affected.

[*Translation*]

Richard Martel: Ms. Woodhouse-Nepinak, you said earlier that the government was afraid of bringing you to the decision-making table. You probably know some of the reasons why it doesn't want you at the table, so can you tell us what they are?

[*English*]

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: I don't know. It's been happening for a long time. I feel for national chiefs before me. I can think of the likes of Perry Bellegarde, Phil Fontaine and Ovide Mercredi. I know that they always had to push.

For instance, a first ministers meeting, which we may have now, thanks to the premiers being united.... At the same time, we had tough conversations around the table on participation in this country. At the same time, we came out of that—first nations and the premiers—united in that we do need a first ministers meeting to talk about some of these issues. I also talked to the Prime Minister the other day and he's open to that.

I know that we have to do that, but more importantly, how do we work more consistently across this country to make sure that we're inclusive with each other, so that every time there is a Council of the Federation meeting or a first ministers meeting...? We're glad for that couple of hours before, but at the same time, as foundational people who contributed to the creation of this country, we need to be more respected to make sure that we're around those decision-making tables more than ever before.

In every single war and every single time that this country has faced tough times, first nations have signed up in more numbers than anybody else in this country to be at the front lines. We'll continue to do so. We stand with Canadians against illegal tariffs toward our country and we stand with you to try to make sure that there is prosperity for all. At the same time, we need to be more respectful of each other and we need to make space for each other to meet, to talk and to have these conversations—not in the public eye, but sitting and making those decisions together.

Thank you.

• (1155)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. McKinnon, you have five minutes and then we'll take a break.

Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Thanks, Chair, and thank you all for being here today.

National Chief, you mentioned the importance of more equity participation. I note that we have this loan guarantee program that has been increased from \$5 billion to \$10 billion.

I think that's a step in the right direction, but I'm wondering what we can do to make that more useful.

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: I also want to remind all of the members here.... It's not in my notes, but I do want to lift up the First Nations Major Projects Coalition. It is 181 first nations that are united and I want to uplift them for their work on the indigenous loan guarantee program. I commend their advocacy for that.

I don't know if you want to add further on the indigenous loan guarantee. I know that our techs will have some stuff to say on that. Let's make that the best it can be.

Go ahead.

Julie McGregor: The program has indigenous grants of a maximum of \$200,000. Throughout the life of the process, that could be eaten up pretty quickly in terms of technical expertise and engagement, so increased grants and increased amounts for first nations' participation and engagement in capacity-building....

If you look at it, \$10 billion is a lot, for sure, but we're going to keep banging on the drum about the infrastructure gap. We're talking about a \$400-billion infrastructure gap. We're trying to plug a \$400-billion hole with a \$10-billion loan guarantee program. It's not a fix-all; it's not a cure-all. We've talked previously about the need for impact and benefit agreements and more benefits to the communities.

It's a great program, like the national chief said. We definitely lift up those who were involved in developing it, but just know that it's

not a lot compared to the ground we're trying to make up to ensure that there's first nations participation.

Ron McKinnon: Are you saying that we need to increase the categories that are supported under this program or do we need to increase the amounts of the grants available? Do we need to do both?

Julie McGregor: I'd just say yes, of course, we always need to expand and replicate.

While I'm glad that this is now one solution, we look for it to be expanded, absolutely. We want all of you to help us get that expanded and replicate the indigenous loan guarantee to finance first nations-led infrastructure projects that address community infrastructure needs and support Canada's broad economic, environmental and defence priorities including the critical minerals strategy. I hope that's helpful.

Ron McKinnon: Thank you.

There's been a lot of discussion today around the need for consultation, and I fully agree with that.

We're also hearing from industry though that the need to get to decisions quickly is very important for the flow of applying capital to projects.

I'm wondering how we can improve the consultation process and what kinds of mechanisms are needed so that we can get to the decisions we need with appropriate consultation but in a timely manner. Do you have thoughts on that?

• (1200)

Julie McGregor: Ben will pick up where I left off, but he did mention the regional consultation framework agreements that need to be.... One of our recommendations, again, is to support those; and engaging early on with first nations communities is key to that. As I said, sometimes slow is fast in this process, and industry has to understand that as well.

We tend to look at it and say that it's a roadblock. It's not a roadblock. It's a strengthening of your project when you have that involvement early on, and you're guided by the communities on what they want to see to be involved in this. It just makes everything stronger and faster in terms of your project.

I think industry gets it. Government also has to get it.

Cindy Woodhouse-Nepinak: I'm going to add that, when there are missions around the world, and Canada wants to put itself out there, if you're out there and there are no first nations people in your delegation, even that is just a step back.

I was quite disappointed last year at a technology conference, for instance. I think it was in Germany. Canada was selling itself there—good for Canada—but there was no first nations representation. There are first nations people in Canada. We have 634 first nations. We need to make sure that, when we go as a country around the world, you're including first nations people.

If we can improve our relationship with each other—the first nations, the provinces and the federal government—things will go better.

I just had to throw that in there. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you for your important testimony today, National Chief.

Thank you, Ms. McGregor and Mr. Green-Stacey. It was very important testimony, and we welcome the brief that I'm sure will amplify some of these points.

I think you can tell that colleagues were very engaged—good questions by all, and a very fruitful hour indeed. Your recommendations and your brief will be considered carefully, I assure you.

The analysts have been scribbling, I know your arm is sore, Laura.

With that, colleagues, we're going to break for five minutes, and welcome the next set of witnesses.

• (1200) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1210)

The Chair: Colleagues, let's reconvene.

I'd like to make a few comments for the benefit of our witnesses, particularly those online.

For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your mic, and please mute yourself when you are not speaking. Also, at the bottom of your screen, you can select the appropriate channel for interpretation: floor, English or French. For those in the room, you can use the earpiece and select the desired channel.

All comments should be addressed through the chair.

I would like to welcome our witnesses on the second panel.

We have Heather Exner-Pirot, director of energy, natural resources and environment at the Macdonald-Laurier Institute. She is online.

From the United Steelworkers Union, we have Meg Gingrich, assistant to the national director, in the room. We also have François Soucy, legislative staff representative.

We have Paul Blom, chief operating officer from BC First Nations Energy and Mining Council. He is online, I believe.

Welcome to you all.

You will each have five minutes for your opening remarks, and we are going to start with Ms. Exner-Pirot

You have the floor for five minutes.

Heather Exner-Pirot (Director of Energy, Natural Resources and Environment, Macdonald-Laurier Institute, As an Individual): Thank you so much, chair and committee members, for the opportunity to speak to you today.

Although everyone depends on mining products in their daily lives, critical minerals have become a hot topic only in the past five years or so. This is largely owing to, first, supply chain concerns raised by the COVID pandemic and later the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Second, there has been the desire to electrify transportation and therefore develop more battery minerals. Most recently, there have been concerns about our overreliance on adversaries, particularly China, even in the basic materials needed for our defence industrial supply chain.

While our attention has become focused, our policy discourses and thus responses are still not at an appropriate level of sophistication. The greatest demonstration of this is our bundling of 34 minerals and metals, half of the periodic table, into one broad category. The umbrella term “critical minerals”, sometimes even conflated with “rare earth”, is good for messaging but is bad for policy nuance.

There are at least four categories of minerals that call for different strategic and policy responses.

The first is minerals in which Canada is dominant and has global market-setting power, in which I would include potash and uranium. How can we gain leverage with our allies or disrupt authoritarian manipulation in this category?

The second is minerals that are major GDP drivers for Canada. How can we enhance competitiveness, attract investment and drive up global market share in minerals such as gold, metallurgical coal, copper and nickel?

The third is minerals for which technologies or market structures favour future growth such as lithium, graphite, cobalt, helium and silver. How can we ensure that Canadian projects and Canadian companies are best positioned to take advantage of changes to the market cycle and be first movers?

The fourth is our minerals for which market structures are weak but security of supply is essential such as gallium, germanium, tungsten, antimony and rare earth. Where are the financial tools the state can use to develop supply in these commodities by ourselves and with our allies?

In general, Canada has taken a disinterested and laissez-faire approach to our minerals sector in the past decade rather than treating it as a strategic industry to be cultivated and fortified. Despite that, Canada retains many strengths that we can and should leverage going forward.

The first is endowment. As the second-largest country in the world, we have a lot of geology and a lot of untapped reserves. We're the world's top destination for exploration dollars. We need policies that make it as easy as possible to translate that mineral potential into economically competitive and thus producing projects. We don't have that today.

The second is our strong mining business. The TSX and TSXV are home to about 40% of the world's publicly listed mining companies, more than any other exchange in the world. This is leverage that we need to maintain and support through policies that attract anchor listings, ensure access to the biggest possible pool of foreign capital investment, and promote tax and regulatory competitiveness. Canada should want to be the first choice for mining companies to list and headquarter, but we have been losing that advantage.

The third is our geopolitical reputation. The world is obviously a more complicated place these days. Global superpowers are acting in a predatory manner. We are among wolves, but Canada does not need to be the sheep. In my opinion, our highest and best purpose is to use our mineral, energy and agricultural potentials to ensure that our friends and allies have access to the materials they need to thrive, prosper and fend off authoritarian manipulation and volatility. To be that reliable supplier, Canada needs to produce more products competitively and get them to global markets more reliably.

I hope this committee can collectively work on creating a policy environment that gets that done.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to questions.

• (1215)

The Chair: Thank you.

We will now go on to Meg Gingrich, assistant to the national director at United Steelworkers of Canada, with François Soucy.

You have five minutes, please.

Meg Gingrich (Assistant to the National Director, United Steelworkers Union): Thank you, Chair, and members of the committee.

My name is Meg Gingrich, and I am the assistant to the national director of the United Steelworkers Union in Canada, where we represent over 225,000 workers across Canada in every part of the industrial economy, including critical minerals. I'm here with François Soucy, our legislative staff representative.

Critical minerals are not just about the future of technology; they are about the future of work. The energy transition, our manufacturing base and our national security all depend on whether Canada builds and processes these resources here with good union jobs, or keeps exporting raw materials and importing finished goods.

Canada is well positioned to lead in the global race for critical minerals. We have major reserves of nickel, copper, lithium, graphite, cobalt and rare earth elements. We already produce 60 minerals and metals at 200 mines and 6,500 quarries across the country. According to Statistics Canada, over 213,000 people worked in mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction in 2024. Our union represents tens of thousands of these workers, including roughly 28% of our Quebec membership and nearly a quarter of

our Ontario membership. About one-third of our Canadian mining membership is in western and northern Canada where there were over 30 active mines and 90 advanced projects in 2024.

USW members truly form the backbone of this sector and the potential for more good-paying unionized jobs is enormous. But it does take about 15 years to bring a mine from concept to production. If we don't accelerate investment now based on a comprehensive strategy, we'll miss our opportunity. The new Major Projects Office is a welcome step, but workers and unions must have a seat at the table from the start.

This must be done in partnership with indigenous peoples. Development can only move quickly if it also moves responsibly, with full respect for indigenous rights and participation in decision-making. Meaningful consultation and benefit sharing through mechanisms like impact and benefit agreements are essential to ensuring projects earn local support and deliver shared prosperity.

At the same time, new U.S. tariffs on Canadian copper, aluminum and other products show the danger of relying on volatile foreign markets. Canada must build refining and processing capacity at home so the value created from our resources stays here. That means ensuring new federal programs and Canadian procurement rules are tied to real domestic benefits, not loopholes that allow imports to replace Canadian production.

The steelworkers support a thorough, clear regulatory process with reasonable timelines. We also need to train and attract the next generation of skilled workers. The mining sector already employs more indigenous people than any other private industry except construction, and indigenous-led partnerships are proving that reconciliation and development can go hand in hand.

A real critical minerals industrial strategy must build an integrated value chain from exploration, refining, processing and manufacturing to recycling, so the jobs and wealth remain in Canada.

It must also support circular economy initiatives like battery materials' recycling and the use of Canadian-made clean technology and new mines. New programs must include binding requirements for unionized labour, Canadian content and community benefits. Public money must deliver a public good.

Finally, Canada needs to enforce fair trade and reward low-carbon production at home, while ensuring that imported products meet the same environmental and labour standards we expect of Canadian producers. Canada has the workers, resources and expertise to lead the world in responsible critical minerals development. What's needed now is the political will and coherent industrial policy to make it happen.

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

- (1220)

The Chair: Thank you.

Now we are going to Paul Blom. He will be wrapping up for our speakers, and then we're going to questions.

Mr. Blom, please go ahead.

Paul Blom (Chief Operating Officer, BC First Nations Energy and Mining Council): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to acknowledge the committee for allowing us to speak today. I am calling in from the Snuneymuxw territory on the west coast of Canada. I flew to Ottawa when we heard about this committee for a Monday presentation, but we were moved to today. I appreciate the time through video conference.

I have a four to five-minute presentation that I'll walk through about who our council is and about first nations and critical minerals in British Columbia.

The First Nations Energy and Mining Council is a first nations-mandated policy and technical organization advancing rights-based participation, governance and benefits across energy, mining and related infrastructure in British Columbia. Our mandate is from the leadership. The council was established to serve and support the First Nations Leadership Council, FNLC, the provincial political forum which comprises the BC Assembly of First Nations, the First Nations Summit and the Union of BC Indian Chiefs. Our council provides FNLC with research, policy development, negotiation support and implementation tools across energy and mining life cycles.

We develop first nations-led strategies, including the first nations energy and mining critical minerals strategy. This was developed with first nations in British Columbia over four workshops in 2023 and released in 2024. We create these strategies with the advice from first nations in British Columbia. I listened to the national chiefs' presentation, and a lot of the answers to the questions are in the recommendations in this strategy, which I made available to you. I do have hard copies if the committee is interested in seeing hard copies.

We support first nations as decision-makers across the project life cycle, including access, exploration, assessment, permitting, construction, operations, closure and reclamation. We build capacity, including training, guardianship and technical literacy. We convene tripartite working tables and catalyze fair-share benefit agreements, which include equity, revenue sharing, procurement, jobs and training. We promote green power and transmission to allow low-carbon mining and processing.

This matters because critical minerals underpin Canada's net-zero economy and supply chain security. In British Columbia, all prospective areas are on or affect first nations lands. Project certainty and performance, therefore, depend on recognition of free, prior and informed consent, and co-governance with the rights holders who steward those lands.

Our council convenes first nations, Canada and British Columbia in consent-based processes, while engaging labour, industry and civil society to align policy, de-risk projects, and deliver community and national benefits. We seek a durable, investable, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples-aligned critical minerals regime, where first nations are joint planners, joint decision-makers and owners, ensuring world-class environmental performance and equitable prosperity.

In summary, the strategy is a living, province-wide framework developed by first nations leaders and broad stakeholders to align B.C.'s and Canada's approaches with first nations rights and practical pathways to net zero.

The core principles of the strategy are that rights and title are recognized; decisions that affect rights require free, prior and informed consent, with processes consistent with the UN declaration and Truth and Reconciliation commitments; tripartite co-decision-making for environmental assessment, permitting, compliance and adaptive management occurs through first nations-Canada-B.C. decision structures; first nations guardians are resourced across the mine life; and consent-based approvals and fair share mean that approval frameworks embed benefit agreements in equity, revenue, jobs, training and procurement and are grounded in value-chain economics.

We support pathways to clean, investable supply and green power first. Off-grid deposits require renewable generation and strategic transmission corridors to ensure truly low-carbon minerals. First nations power developers should be positioned as preferred suppliers.

• (1225)

Through a value-chain lens, benefits and carbon are accounted for across the value chain, from exploration to processing and recycling, not just at the mine gate.

The Chair: Mr. Blom, we're going to have to ask you to wrap up. The committee is anxious to ask some questions. Just take 20 seconds to finish your last thought.

Paul Blom: Sure. Thank you.

I do have a written submission, which I was reading.

In closing, the First Nations Energy and Mining Council critical minerals strategy provides a clear, investable path that combines the UN declaration-aligned governance with green power and value-chain economics to accelerate secure, ethical supplies of critical minerals while delivering durable prosperity for first nations and Canada alike.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Blom.

Thank you to all of our witnesses.

Just to re-emphasize the point that Mr. Blom made, we welcome written submissions. For your strategy and for the other witnesses, if you want to submit something electronically, we would welcome it. Please send those in to the clerk and she will ensure that they are made available to us and are incorporated into our testimony.

We're going to our rounds of questions and comments.

Starting up again, we have Mrs. Stubbs followed by Mr. McKinnon and Mr. Simard, each for six minutes.

Mrs. Stubbs, we go to you.

Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair. Thank you to all of our witnesses here.

I always regret the limited time, so I just want to reinforce the chair's comments about sending in written submissions.

Dr. Exner-Pirot, I know that you know this well because you've spoken so much about this publicly and in all kinds of formal situations. A 2024 survey of mining executives found that no Canadian jurisdiction is among the top five globally for mining investment. You have talked often about how it takes even up to 18 years, if we're lucky, to get a mine built in Canada. This is 38% longer than in the United States and 23% longer than in Australia, which are Canada's major competitors.

You've made the case about why resource development is also important for affordability and for national security.

Can you expand on the anti-development policies and laws that block building and whether or not you see Bill C-5 as a sufficient remedy?

Heather Exner-Pirot: We all lament that it's taken so long in Canada to bring deposits to production. We've all seen now how that's impacting not only affordability but also our national security. We need to ramp it up.

There are many policies that have impacted this and created this. Part of it is just the Canadian cultural shift about 10 years ago to

not appreciate the value of extractive resources and to think that they're bad, dirty or something we should be ashamed of when obviously they're a critical part of our lives and we should be looking at ways to build and attract talent to those sectors.

Some of it is policy such as the Impact Assessment Act, which often added redundancy to provincial assessments and timelines. It added some uncertainty to investors who were wondering when they'll get a return on their money and when they'll start producing. It didn't always give certainty there.

The industrial carbon price is also an issue in competitiveness, especially in the processing and smelting phases, but also in several others.

There are also the clean electricity regulations. We are starting to see some energy and electricity scarcity in this country. Mines need reliable access to electricity and we're starting to see that this is becoming a problem. We see B.C., for example, introducing legislation this week to ration electricity, so that it can maintain a carve-out for the mining sector.

There's a lot that provinces can do. Some provinces do better than others. Saskatchewan and Quebec actually do quite well on the mining policy front. Others need to do much better.

As to whether Bill C-5 and the Major Projects Office are the solution, that's unlikely. There are literally hundreds of mining projects in the queue in Canada. Filtering private, proponent-driven projects looking to move to the next stage and looking to attract investment through the bottleneck of the MPO is unlikely to produce the outcomes that we're looking for.

A broader structural reform of how we regulate extractive resources, mining in particular, is what's needed to really unleash our potential.

• (1230)

Shannon Stubbs: Of course, you know that Conservatives supported Bill C-5. We put forward major amendments to improve the bill. Wouldn't it make sense, instead of focusing on this legislation that does a workaround of laws and policies that clearly block building by the necessity of Bill C-5 having to be implemented, to just fix those fundamentals to be able to give certainty to investors and proponents so that projects and proponents are not still stuck in red tape losing money and time?

To your whole point about basic infrastructure also being required in these areas and all the elements that make it very easy for layering on of policy as to make Canada uncompetitive globally, one thing that boggles my mind is this key infrastructure of indigenous-led roads to the Ring of Fire, for example, which is still stuck in limbo, and the government still hasn't given it the green light.

Do you have any other points to expand on in terms of ensuring that we can accelerate approvals and provide clarity for indigenous communities that want economic “reconciliation”, proponents and all Canadians everywhere?

Heather Exner-Pirot: Yes, the favour that Bill C-5 did for us was to outline specifically in legislation the main sorts of legislation that are the problem, and it allows the Major Projects Office's nationally designated projects to work around those. Obviously, it's also telling us that all those pieces of legislation need some reform so that all projects can benefit from more efficient processes. I think it's a great place to start nationally designated projects that may get through the MPO to give that benefit and that certainty to all projects.

On the indigenous side—and I'm sure we can get into this more—I have more specific thoughts on some financial tools to get indigenous partnership, but I think we should be looking at strategies that align industry and indigenous interests, especially on the economic side. We've often focused on rights and accommodation discussions, and I think that there's a lot more room and a lot more runway we could be doing on economic incentives to make sure that indigenous communities are partners and are benefiting sufficiently from these types of projects.

Shannon Stubbs: If there are any other top priorities you would like to add to that ensure Canada, after the last, lost, antidevelopment decade, can meet the Prime Minister's stated ambition of Canada's becoming an energy superpower—directly opposed to the agenda they've implemented in the last 10 years—please share that in the last 30 seconds.

Heather Exner-Pirot: Yes, one more is labour disruptions. We talk about pouring billions of dollars into ports and railroads when the top priority for shippers is usually the labour disruptions we've been having at these places. I've seen itineraries of strikes, calendars of the strikes that Canada's going to have. We have power under the labour code to be more forceful and more muscular in ensuring a common, peaceful labour situation, so give that certainty. Instead of pouring money into a broken system, use the tools we do have to ensure that labour disruptions are minimized as we export.

The Chair: Thanks very much.

Mr. McKinnon, please go ahead for six minutes.

Ron McKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank all the witnesses for being here.

I'm going to focus on Mr. Blom because, being a B.C. guy, I want to focus on B.C.

Mr. Blom, we've had testimony before this committee regarding the complex assessment processes that are involved in critical minerals development. They involve federal, provincial or territorial and indigenous groups. How would you fit into that? Are you guys decision-makers, or would you be people who are putting forward proposals?

Paul Blom: Our council is advocacy and policy support for the decision-makers. The decision-makers would be the 204 communities in British Columbia. As you're aware, there are provincial environmental assessments, there are federal environmental assessments and there are first nations environmental assessments.

I think part of the reason for Bill C-69 and the amendments in the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Act was to bring first nations into the fold to work together on environmental assessments.

Hopefully, that answers your question. First nations rights holders impacted by a project are the ones who would participate in the environmental assessment.

• (1235)

Ron McKinnon: Is it different for an ordinary organization to put forward a proposal for a mine versus an indigenous group? Do you have any better access or more direct access to getting approval?

Paul Blom: Usually, mining exploration companies are the proponents. Their job is often to get a project explored, find a resource and then get it into the environmental assessment process and get a certificate. Once that certificate is realized, usually what they do is sell it to a major company for development.

The successes you're seeing now are when exploration companies partner with the first nation on whose territory they're exploring. That is a recipe for a successful project.

Ron McKinnon: One of the things we're hearing, and you mentioned it yourself, is the need for free, prior and informed consent. We also know that capital needs to move quickly. These projects need to move much faster than they have been historically. That seems to be a conundrum here. If we're making sure we're consulting adequately, how do we also get these decisions made in a timely manner?

Paul Blom: Capital would flow quickly if they saw that the first nations were involved in participating with project proponents. That's the success model that we've seen. I would encourage more of that—companies seeing the opportunity if they want to raise capital. If you have the first nation partnering with you to raise capital, it will flow much faster than if they weren't part of the team.

Ron McKinnon: Are you saying that if companies can partner with first nations groups, it may well improve their ability to get things done in a timely manner?

Paul Blom: Yes, I agree 100% with that comment.

In addition, first nations or indigenous groups, if you're looking across the country, have access to capital through the federal indigenous loan guarantee program and other federal and provincial infrastructure funds.

Besides private capital, first nations have direct access to government capital, so there's an additional benefit if a company partners with a first nation.

Ron McKinnon: I mentioned the loan guarantee program in our earlier panel. That has increased from \$5 billion to \$10 billion, but there was some concern that the grants weren't large enough or they're restrictive in categories.

What would you say to that comment?

Paul Blom: I listened to the national chief and her team respond to that, and I agree with her comment.

It's a huge opportunity, this \$10-billion loan guarantee program, but a first nation that is interested in accessing it may not have that capacity to ask, "What does this program mean?" They have an ability to acquire, I think, \$200,000 of grant funding to essentially see if there's a project that's worth investing in with a partner.

I don't know if that's a sufficient amount, but at least it's a start. We didn't see that with the Canada Infrastructure Bank, so it's a start, but I think the federal government should open that door to allow for a bit more flexibility beyond the \$200,000.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. McKinnon.

[Translation]

Mr. Simard, you may go ahead. You have six minutes.

Mario Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Exner-Pirot, in your opening remarks, you talked about the need for nuance in categorizing critical minerals. I found that interesting. Certain minerals are on the critical minerals list, and that ties them to tax advantages. Strangely, though, the same tax advantages are not available for all critical minerals. For example, there's no tax credit for phosphate.

First, have you put together some sort of table laying out the different categories you mentioned?

Second, does that mean the different categories of critical minerals require different strategies for development?

• (1240)

[English]

Heather Exner-Pirot: That's my next writing project. Thank you so much for the question. I'll definitely be publishing that. I've been thinking about it.

To your point, which I think will be of great interest to Quebec, gold, as you know, is not on the critical minerals list, and yet it is Canada's most valuable mineral product and mineral export. In fact, it's our second most valuable export at all behind crude oil. Gold also acts as a first mover in regions. It's a bit easier with its smaller mines, and it's easier to process than most base metals. You can develop a mining ecosystem and some mining infrastructure on the back of gold that makes it easier to then crowd in other commodities that you might want for battery minerals or defence minerals and that kind of thing.

All of that is to say, yes, we've been talking about critical minerals for too long. I will know that we are sophisticated when we start talking about specific commodities, because the market for each commodity is different and the policy response is different for each commodity. Some markets are healthy. We are attracting investment into potash and uranium and gold right now. Some markets

are extremely unhealthy, where China is putting on export restrictions or there are some severe market manipulations.

Yes, I think it's time that Canada starts sorting these. I'll endeavour, sir, to write that on paper and add my thoughts. I think it would be helpful for the government to do so as well.

[Translation]

Mario Simard: In the meantime, it would be appreciated if you could send any information you do have to the analysts. It could prove very helpful when we prepare our report.

Infrastructure is another must-have when deploying and developing critical minerals. What the committee has heard and what I've heard from people with mining projects is how challenging it is to get the infrastructure needed to provide market access. It could be rail or port infrastructure.

An hon. member: Natural gas is another one.

Mario Simard: No, we never talked about natural gas.

Ms. Exner-Pirot, do you think the federal government's strategy is sufficient to deploy and develop this type of infrastructure?

[English]

Heather Exner-Pirot: That's a great question. Again, this is where sophistication in what we're talking about comes out. The highest volume, by far, of what we're shipping is potash and metallurgical coal and grains. That mostly goes out of Vancouver. When you're talking about rare earths, you don't need to build whole ports or whole railroads for some of these very small niche metals. You don't need to put infrastructure in places where you're not going to have volume, but you do need infrastructure in some places. We need to be so strategic. It can't just be throwing it at the wall, where any railroad, any road or any port will do. You have to match it to where the deposits are and what the market is looking for.

I have actually written a paper on critical minerals in the Arctic. My Ph.D. was focused on the Arctic. I can send it to the committee. It was trying to look at some of the ways in which we can leapfrog. Railroads are extremely expensive. What are some technologies we could take advantage of to make it cheaper and more economic to do critical minerals development in northern and remote places? Small modular reactors is certainly one, where transmission is very expensive or where diesel is not only expensive but also bad for the environment. There's tremendous potential that everyone's looking at for small modular reactors or microreactors being able to be put in places where you need heat and power and can operate off-grid for industrial solutions.

We're also looking at airships, which I know the Government of Quebec has invested in. I admire that they are looking at this innovation, but for a lot of these projects in some places, again, it's the road. It crosses caribou paths and migratory animals. If you could have airships that are low and slow, very cheap to transport, and require very few fuel requirements for some of the lighter metals you could fly out, such as gold, silver and rare earths, that would be a way to access some northern and remote locations without requiring a lot of infrastructure. Then it's using and maximizing telecommunications to help address some labour force issues.

Lots of smart people are thinking about this issue. I think we shouldn't knee-jerk toward the most expensive or the most obvious 20th century solution to a lot of this unleashing.

• (1245)

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard: Any documentation you have on the logistics for building a critical minerals sector would be appreciated. It would be very helpful to our analysts.

Do I have any time left, Mr. Chair?

[*English*]

The Chair: No.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard: Thank you.

[*English*]

The Chair: We're on to our final round.

Mrs. Stubbs, you have five minutes.

Shannon Stubbs: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Dr. Exner-Pirot, I share your view. We have been hearing a lot of talk and rhetoric about critical minerals. You're totally right about the so-called strategy that was announced in 2023 missing major categories that Canada should have been leading on already since we are home to the second-largest reserves in the world.

Perhaps this will help you expand on Mr. Simard's questions but also according to your own expertise.

Can you speak more about northern critical mineral development and the challenges that Canada has against our global competitors? This is why the policy environment legislation can make Canada and Canadians, especially junior explorers and producers, unable to compete.

Also, because of your expertise, do you have any comments on tungsten?

Heather Exner-Pirot: Okay. Fantastic. I know where this tungsten conversation is going.

There's nothing I want more than to have more northern economic development. However, the fact is that almost any commodity developed in the territories, or in northern Quebec or northern Labrador, is going to be much more expensive than even in southern Canada and we're not a particularly cheap jurisdiction in the provincial north either. In general, it's about two and a half times more to develop a base metal mine in the Arctic than it is in south-

ern Canada. You have to have an extremely high commodity price and a line of sight on several years of a high commodity price to make those projects worthwhile.

Anything you can do to reduce the cost and reduce the timelines is very helpful. It helps encourage that business case, which is already quite difficult.

Where we have been seeing growth is in gold, silver and diamonds. The vast majority of the mining that takes place in those territories is gold, silver and diamonds. Those aren't considered critical minerals at all but they are extremely important for regional and economic development.

Cleaning up jurisdictional issues, making it easier for indigenous communities to get consent faster, and helping address some of the liability issues is very important. I think in Yukon it probably costs them more to do mining than they make in mining because of all the liability and remediation that they have to do.

Shannon Stubbs: Everything you just outlined is exactly why the federal government cannot layer on anti-competitive policies and legislation that add cost and time for proponents because that's [*Inaudible—Editor*] maker.

Let's move on and talk to us more about tungsten.

Heather Exner-Pirot: We mentioned tungsten because it's on the NATO critical minerals list. It's very important for hardening some materials that are very useful in defence equipment. The United States, through the Defence Production Act, has given one of its seven awards to a tungsten project near the Yukon-Northwest Territories border, I believe, and I think Canada has matched it through NRCan.

It is some of these smaller mines where perhaps a deposit was discovered a long time ago or maybe even some brownfield that was mined in the eighties or nineties that we could put back on the market much quicker. It's not the 18 years of a whole new greenfield mine. There are some projects that would be much closer to getting up and running. I do see quite a bit of optimism in Arctic territorial mining discussions by focusing on those defence critical minerals where obviously the state has an interest. You could use some of our NATO defence spending targets to get some projects going there that may not be on their own in the market viable.

• (1250)

Shannon Stubbs: This is especially the case for tungsten where I think there are four major plants or processors in the world. Other than in the United States, it is being produced out of countries that are not allies with Canada.

Heather Exner-Pirot: This is true.

On tungsten and manganese, B.C. just approved—manganese or magnesium—a mine yesterday. There are a few of these but then again this gets to your policy question. It's not easy to refine and process in Canada as these are often very energy-intensive operations. If you have a scarcity of electricity or if you have restrictions on the use of natural gas or if you have a high industrial carbon price, those things don't happen and don't emit. They go to China to happen and to emit and we become reliant on them for some key materials.

Shannon Stubbs: It's so key that our own domestic government take off these antidevelopment laws and costs, so that our own developers can compete, especially on this issue where Canada can play such a crucial geopolitical role. It is all tied to our critical minerals, rare earth metals and core commodity development.

Certainly I think the government should take your advice on reviewing the critical mineral strategy that it announced a number of years ago and has made no real, deliverable progress on at all.

The Chair: Thank you both.

Mr. Danko, you have five minutes.

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

Speaking as the member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, United Steelworkers and steelworkers have been the backbone of Hamilton's economy for decades. It's good to have our guests here as a backbone of the mining sector as well.

I think we have a shared interest in getting projects to development faster and to production faster. That's a shared interest between government, industry and also workers. Unfortunately, what I think we've heard today and what we've heard previously in this committee from our Conservative friends is that this often means “cutting red tape”. What we've heard is that means cutting regulations, removing protections for the environment, removing protections for climate change and removing protections for workers.

Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair. If we're going to do this, we are going to get into a debate because nobody is going to put words in my mouth or misrepresent our position.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, that is debate.

A voice: It's garbage.

Shannon Stubbs: Well, let's not lie at this table then.

The Chair: We're not allowed to use that word, as you know.

Please let Mr. Danko proceed. He did offer you that courtesy as well.

John-Paul Danko: As I was getting to my point, we've seen the fundamental Conservative anti-union bias on display, where the fundamental rights of workers are seen as red tape. I would like to give our United Steelworkers guests an opportunity to respond to the role of union workers in critical mineral development.

Thank you.

Meg Gingrich: Thanks.

I am hearing the repeated term of “anti-competitive decade” or whatever and then concerns have been raised about, for example,

workers having the right to strike and the need for reforms to the Canada Labour Code. We want the Canada Labour Code perhaps reformed in a different way—one which protects our constitutional right to strike. That's something we don't take lightly.

I think that Canada's advantage is, in fact, that we do have strong workers' rights. Our members in mining are some of our highest-paid members and they've fought for that over decades. They have high health and safety standards. We think it is important, when we're developing our critical mineral sector responsibly, to use this to our advantage.

We do think that it can take too long to get a mine from its initial stages into operation, but it can't be at the expense of workers' rights, the environment or consultation with indigenous peoples. There are likely areas where things could be streamlined a little bit. I'm not denying that.

Ultimately, we think it's really important that we're ensuring that we're actually using to our advantage the fact that mining workers are highly unionized and well paid. These are community-supporting jobs. It's essential, as part of a critical mineral strategy, to really leverage that as much as possible.

Then also, as we expand mining, ensure that workers are involved and identify training needs. Ensure that we have essential infrastructure, not just in terms of the roads, rail and things like that, but in communities where mines are expanded, have adequate health care, child care and schools. That's something we hear from our members when new mines open up: They don't necessarily want to move to a new community if they don't have essential services, schools and things like that.

This is the importance of having a comprehensive strategy that isn't just getting things done faster at the expense of the environment, at the expense of workers and at the expense of indigenous peoples.

● (1255)

John-Paul Danko: Thank you.

You spoke in your opening statement and just now about the importance of bringing on workers in the skilled trades. That's beyond just the mining and critical mineral sector. That's important for Canada as a whole.

I wanted to give you an opportunity to expand on how the unions, whether it's steelworkers or unions in general, can be involved in training and getting more workers into the skilled trades to participate in the industries that are critical to Canada's economy.

Meg Gingrich: Yes, I think the skilled trades are important. I will also point out one of the initiatives that our union is taking on, particularly in western Canada. It's not just a matter of identifying the skilled trades and ensuring that there's union involvement in identifying where there may be gaps or where workers are aging out of the workforce. It's also about production workers and other jobs that are in mines.

We are actually trying to develop some mining schools where we are directly involved in recruiting and training workers. We are not a construction union, that's been a model that has existed in other types of unions. We haven't done that so much. That's something we're really looking into and looking for funding for as well. We think we can play an essential role in identifying the needs of the existing and future workforce, not just in the skilled trades but also in other jobs that are needed.

The Chair: Thank you both.

Mr. Simard, you have two and half minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Gingrich, since we have you and your colleague here from the United Steelworkers Union, I want to take this opportunity to talk a bit about aluminum. You mentioned it in your presentation.

If I remember correctly, the U.S. consumes four million tonnes of aluminum per year, and about 2.8 million tonnes of that comes from Canada. A key consideration that often comes up in the discussion on critical minerals and metals like aluminum is the supply chain. From the conversations I've had with your steelworker colleagues, I learned that Canada has never had a strategy to build that supply chain. Neither has Quebec, whose government I rarely criticize.

Today, the big aluminum plants are entirely reliant on the U.S. market. With the Midwest premium, they're able to pass the costs on to the next link in the supply chain, even if it creates problems and distortions.

Nevertheless, there's never been any interest on the government's part to tie financial support to local processing. With that in mind, I'd like to hear your thoughts on the idea of creating an aluminum supply chain.

Meg Gingrich: Thank you for your question. I understood everything, but I'm going to answer in English.

[*English*]

I think this is true. In Quebec, you developed a way to create the cheap energy that's needed for aluminum and to send it to the United States. Americans rely on that aluminum because they can't really produce it there. It does highlight the need in Canada for more comprehensive industrial strategies so that we're actually able to use the products that are produced here in value-added manufacturing, creating those good union jobs—not just resource extraction and then shipping it off but actually having incentives for buying Canadian-produced aluminum, the aluminum that's produced in Quebec by our members. We need to ensure that we have incentives there. If public money is going to projects, it has to be tied to using that aluminum or other materials that are produced in

Canada. I think it is an essential component of this in a larger critical minerals strategy to have that industrial strategy that links all of these different parts of the supply chain.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Tochor, please go ahead.

Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Thank you very much to our witnesses.

We talked about the Conservative position to our union friends today. Our position is that we want projects to go ahead. We would like the insane Liberal policies to be rolled back—policies that have hurt us for 10 years—so that your workers can get to work. That is what the goal of our Conservative position is. I think that's why a majority of the private sector members voted for Conservative members in the last election.

• (1300)

John-Paul Danko: I have a point of order, Chair.

Could the member stick to relevant questions?

The Chair: That is debate, Mr. Danko.

Corey Tochor: Thank you, Chair.

It is relevant because we lost a whole decade. There are countless projects....

We heard earlier from first nations people of hundreds of mining projects that have been shelved and killed because of Liberal policies that have kept them in the ground, and how wrong that was for first nations across Canada because of the powerful paycheques that those families could have earned so that they could provide for themselves.

Do you feel that some of your members would share that...and voted Conservative in the last election because of a disdain for Bill C-69, which has kept projects shelved for too long?

Meg Gingrich: I'll just say that our members have voted for every political party across the board. They pretty much mirror the general population of Canada.

Of course, our members want to see good jobs and the expansion of good jobs. There's no doubt about it. They don't want to see it at the expense of health and safety. They don't want to see it at the expense of their communities. Whatever happened in the past 10 years, I think looking forward is most important here. We're in a moment here where we can really develop and create a critical mineral strategy where we are taking advantage.

Corey Tochor: Unfortunately, the same government is now carrying on with these disastrous policies. I too want environmental, sustainable projects that make sense and have that first nations involvement.

Some of the most successful projects in Canada have been found in northern Alberta. I would say that those first nations are the most progressive, most successful people in North America because of those projects that were approved well before the Liberals took over and caused this lost decade. To clarify, that's our Conservative position.

Moving to Dr. Exner-Pirot, we talked about the importance of critical minerals to the defence of Canada. We have lost a decade where, instead of nation building we had a decade of weakening our nation. Can we hear more about how critical minerals could help in the true building of Canada and the defence of our nation?

Heather Exner-Pirot: Certainly.

I want to point out I'm not anti-worker. My husband is a mining worker. He's up in the Northwest Territories on a two-week shift right now, and I'm very concerned about him having access to market for the products he helps produce.

In terms of the security aspect, obviously we're all looking for economic growth. Everyone's aligned on that. Our allies are asking us almost daily for access to more critical minerals and trying to reduce their dependence on China. China has been very forcefully and muscularly using and manipulating markets, putting on export restrictions in the last two years and affecting supply chains here in North America.

What can we do to adjust that? Canada is in a unique position in the G7 and in NATO, as we are an export country when it comes to minerals. We are not a net importer. We import some products, obviously, but on the whole, we export. We have more than we could ever use ourselves, and that's not true of the United States and it's not true of almost every one of our European allies. They can't go and mine something else or get a by-product of an existing mine like we can. Where we do have that capability—especially for things that are on either the NATO defence materials list or China's export restriction list—we should be doing so very quickly and urgently.

Again, this is not tending to be opening up a greenfield mine, where you have to go through 15 or 18 years and get fresh consent from indigenous communities. Oftentimes, it's just about processing what we already produce at these mines and we already refine and taking out some products that just wouldn't be economic if you left them on their own.

Germanium, gallium and some rare earths would be at the top of the list, and antimony and tungsten would be at the top of the list for us to start developing urgently to supply defence needs.

Corey Tochor: Thank you so much.

Earlier, you made comments about how, unfortunately, in the world we are surrounded by wolves, and the Liberals have made us into sheep, as a way of putting it. I want to unpack a little bit your beliefs about how to get us back on our feet. We know it has taken this government 10 years to get us into this terrible position. How many years do you think it would take to get out of it?

• (1305)

The Chair: Give a quick answer, please.

Heather Exner-Pirot: All of this is to say we're producing a lot of things already. There is investment that wants to come to Canada. There's not a long list of great jurisdictions to put mining money in. A few policy tweaks or a few signals to the investment community that we really are open for business in the next two months would be fantastic.

Corey Tochor: Would that include repealing Bill C-69?

Heather Exner-Pirot: I would say it would include reforming the Impact Assessment Act. The Mining Association has given lots of recommendations.

The Chair: Thanks so much to you both.

Mr. Guay is going to get the last word.

Mr. Guay, you have five minutes.

Claude Guay: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Blom, I have a question for you.

One of the things NRCan and the government are looking for is a lot of best practices or not-less-good practices. We can translate that into lists of elements to include in the first nations.

One of the things I found interesting as I became interested in the topic is, depending on the level of maturity of a first nation, depending on the assistance they have and depending on the appetite for risk they have, some want to be involved in the equity, some want nothing to do with the equity, some want to do it early and some want to do it later.

Of course, in government, we try to create programs to help the development of first nations. I'm wondering what advice you have for us on where to focus from a participation perspective.

Paul Blom: I have lots of thoughts around that.

We have created, with Canada and British Columbia, a regional energy and resource table. That table started two years ago with a collaborative framework that was agreed to at a political level with the B.C. government, the federal government and the First Nations Leadership Council. That table focuses on critical minerals and five other areas. I think there's a good start, continuing that table, as we have three governments at the table.

We also have a mining and consent paper, which was not part of my presentation, but it is on our website. There's a lot of information there on best practices.

To give you one quick example, it's the creation of a resource negotiation support team for those communities that don't have the expertise. It is a team of people who could come in and support a community that's looking for negotiation on a project. That's one of our recommendations in the critical minerals strategy, among 49 others.

Claude Guay: Can I ask, since you didn't include that paper, that you supply it to the committee so that we can take it into consideration as we draft our report? It would be much appreciated.

Paul Blom: Yes.

The Chair: Colleagues, let me on your behalf once again thank our witnesses for their testimony. Again, the offer is there to submit a brief if you wish. We'd appreciate it.

Colleagues, I think you will agree that we heard a diverse set of views, particularly on this last panel. We heard a diverse set of views from colleagues as well. That's what committees are for, to hear strong and opposing views. I dare say, colleagues, that there's a great deal of consensus, too, that I think we're hearing that will make its way into our final report.

I appreciate your focused questions today, and we'll see you back here on Monday.

We stand adjourned.

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>