

## Table of Contents

	PAGE
<i>About the Authors</i> . . . . .	iii
<i>Preface</i> . . . . .	ix
<i>Table of Cases</i> . . . . .	xix
 <b>Chapter 1 Situation Critical: BC Looks to Leapfrog to the Head the Critical Minerals Race</b> . . . . .	1
 <i>Selina Lee-Andersen</i>	
Setting the Stage . . . . .	1
Canada Takes the Stage. . . . .	2
What Makes a Mineral Critical? . . . . .	3
The Global Market for Critical Minerals . . . . .	4
The Canadian Advantage. . . . .	5
Spotlight on BC . . . . .	6
Mineral Tenure Act Reforms in BC . . . . .	8
The Fast and the Furious — BC Seeks to Streamline Permitting Processes . . . . .	10
Meeting the Environmental Challenge . . . . .	12
 <b>Chapter 2 Canada’s Arctic Foreign Policy and Critical Minerals</b> . . . . .	15
 <i>André Durocher, Fasken, Michael J. Bourassa, Fasken, Frank Mariage, Fasken and Johanna Fipke, Fasken</i>	
Canada’s Arctic Foreign Policy and Critical Minerals . . . . .	17
The Canadian Critical Minerals Strategy . . . . .	19
The Critical Minerals Strategies of Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut . . . . .	21
Yukon . . . . .	21
Northwest Territories . . . . .	21
Nunavut . . . . .	22
The Critical Minerals Strategies of Manitoba, Québec and Newfoundland and Labrador. . . . .	23
Manitoba . . . . .	23
Québec (Nunavik) . . . . .	24
Newfoundland and Labrador (Nunatsiavut) . . . . .	24
The Critical Minerals Strategies of the Arctic States . . . . .	25
Kingdom of Denmark (for Greenland) . . . . .	25
Iceland . . . . .	26
Norway . . . . .	26

Sweden . . . . .	28
Finland . . . . .	28
Russia . . . . .	30
The United States of America (for Alaska) . . . . .	30
Conclusion. . . . .	31
<b>Chapter 3 Is Expedience Always Faster? Avoiding the Paradox of Speed in the Streamlining of Impact Assessment under the <i>Building Canada Act</i> and the <i>Protect Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act</i> . . .</b>	<b>33</b>
<i>Larissa Parker, Associate, Gowling WLG; Chris Hummel, Associate, Gowling WLG; Graham Reeder, Associate, Gowling WLG; Stacy Porter, Associate, Gowling WLG</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	33
The Streamlining Laws . . . . .	35
The Federal <i>Building Canada Act</i> . . . . .	35
Designation of “National Interest Projects”. . . . .	36
Deemed Approval . . . . .	36
Conditions for Approval . . . . .	37
The <i>Protect Ontario Act</i> . . . . .	39
Designation of Special Economic Zones . . . . .	39
Legal Immunity Clauses . . . . .	41
What Regulatory and Consultative Processes are Lost? . . . . .	42
Lost Procedures under the Federal Framework . . . . .	44
Lost Procedures under the Provincial Framework . . . . .	48
Risks for Communities, Governments, and Proponents . . . . .	50
A Call for the Adoption of Voluntary Assessment Processes . . . . .	54
<b>Chapter 4 Ontario’s Bill 5 and the New Wave of Infrastructure Development Legislation Across Canada . . . . .</b>	<b>59</b>
<i>Talia Gordner, Partner at McMillan LLP and Sharon Singh, Partner at McMillan LLP</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	59
Ontario’s Bill 5: Purpose, Powers, and Intended Effects . . . . .	60
Why Now? Exploring Trends Across Canada . . . . .	63
Bill C-5: towards “One Canadian Economy” . . . . .	63
British Columbia: Bills 14 and 15 . . . . .	66
Other Jurisdictions. . . . .	69
Will Bill 5 Succeed? Legal Challenges and Risks . . . . .	69
Challenge One: Indigenous Consultation . . . . .	69
Challenge Two: Environmental Litigation . . . . .	70
Challenge Three: Effectively Addressing Administrative Delays . . . . .	70

How Will Bill 5 Achieve Its Intended Purpose? Recommendations for Canadian Businesses Navigating the Regulatory Landscape . .	72
Conclusion. . . . .	73
<b>Chapter 5 Looking Inward: A View From The West Coast On The Push To Fast-Track Canadian Clean Energy (And Other) Projects . . . . .</b>	<b>75</b>
<i>Tony Crossman, Paulina Adamson and Matthew Vreugde</i>	
Recent Provincial and Federal Initiatives . . . . .	76
B.C.'s Clean Power Action Plan . . . . .	76
Federal Indigenous Loan Guarantee Program . . . . .	78
Recent Legislative Developments . . . . .	80
B.C. Fast-Track Legislation . . . . .	80
Canada's Fast-Tracking Legislation: the <i>Building Canada Act</i> . .	82
Implications of the New Regulatory Framework — Too Good to be True, or the Best is Yet to Come? . . . . .	84
Streamlined Approvals May Provide Certainty, Timely Approvals and Spur Investment . . . . .	84
Streamlining Won't Come Without Risk . . . . .	86
Less Regulatory Burden, More Judicial Review? . . . . .	88
Conclusion. . . . .	89
<b>Chapter 6 Atlantic Winds, National Goals: Developing Offshore Renewable Energy Projects in Atlantic Canada . . . . .</b>	<b>91</b>
<i>John Vellone and Nick Pinsent</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	91
Building the Regulatory Foundation for Offshore Wind Renewables . . . . .	92
Key Consequential Changes Across Bills 471, C-49 and 90 . . . .	92
Offshore wind in Canada . . . . .	93
Key Barriers to the Development of Offshore Renewable Energy Projects . . . . .	94
Local demand . . . . .	95
Cancellation of the Atlantic Loop and impact of planned infrastructure . . . . .	95
Cost. . . . .	96
Regulatory Considerations. . . . .	96
Public Perception and Lack of Experience . . . . .	97
Overcoming the Barriers to Development. . . . .	98
Regulatory Certainty . . . . .	98
Connected Transmission System . . . . .	99
Funding . . . . .	100
Freshwater offshore wind . . . . .	101

Conclusion. . . . .	101
<b>Chapter 7 <i>Kebaowek First Nation v. Canadian Nuclear Laboratories</i> and the application of UNDRIP in Canadian law . . . . .</b>	<b>103</b>
<i>Jacqueline Wilson and Michelle Lin</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	103
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission's Decision. . . . .	104
Federal Court of Canada's Decision . . . . .	104
The Federal Court of Canada's Ruling . . . . .	105
CNSC's Consultation Process with Kebaowek First Nation Was Inadequate. . . . .	105
The Significance of the Court's Reasons . . . . .	106
Conclusion. . . . .	110
<b>Chapter 8 RE: NexGen Energy: Still Some Regulatory Challenges to Building Projects Quickly . . . . .</b>	<b>111</b>
<i>Stan Berger</i>	
<b>Chapter 9 Recent Trends in Climate Change Litigation based on Human Rights: Increasing the Burden on States whilst Decreasing the Burden on the Private Sector . . . . .</b>	<b>113</b>
<i>Evelyne M. Ameye</i>	
The Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> case did not open the floodgates for new climate change litigation in Europe. . . . .	114
At global level, the Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> case resonates in the International Court of Justice's Advisory Opinion following the <i>Vanuatu Initiative</i> , endorsing governments' climate change obligations. . . . .	122
By contrast, Royal Dutch Shell implies a major blow to private companies' climate change obligations . . . . .	124
Climate change litigation unfolding in Canada. . . . .	126
The "drop in the ocean argument" burdening governments whilst relieving private companies . . . . .	131
Conclusion. . . . .	134
Index . . . . .	137