



# INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION

**MARK CARNEY  
AND A CALL FOR  
MEANINGFUL  
RECONCILIATION**

**TRUE RECONCILIATION  
REQUIRES  
REMEMBERING**

**RECONCILIATION  
FOUNDATION  
FOR CANADA'S  
FUTURE PROJECTS**

**BROKEN PROMISES,  
AND RECONCILIATION**

**CULTURAL AGILITY IS KEY  
IN ADVANCING  
RECONCILIATION**

**Safety of Indigenous  
WOMEN AND GIRLS IS IN  
THE NATIONAL INTEREST**

**Why the Major  
Projects Office  
THREATENS REAL  
RECONCILIATION**

**NATIONAL INTEREST SHOULD  
INCLUDE RIGHTS  
OF INDIGENOUS  
WOMEN AND GIRLS**

**WHY BILL C-5 AND MAJOR  
PROJECTS OFFICE  
can be a game-changer for  
Indigenous communities**

**TRUE RECONCILIATION REQUIRES  
REMEMBERING,  
learning from  
OUR COUNTRY'S HISTORY**

Dancer Odeshkun Thusky performs at the Survivors' flag raising ceremony at Parliament Hill on June 21, 2023. The Hill Times photograph by Andrew Meade



# INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION Policy Briefing

## ‘Keep that nation-to-nation concept strong,’ say Indigenous leaders, as Canada moves on major projects

David Chartrand, president of the Manitoba Métis Federation, says ‘if you’re asking us to trust you, you should have no problem signing legal documents to ensure that the promise you’re making is real and will be kept.’

BY JESSE CNOCKAERT

As Canada begins prioritizing the economy and nation-building projects in the wake of a trade war with the United States, Indigenous advocates and leaders argue that an important aspect of reconciliation includes keeping an open dialogue.

“The most important priority is to keep the conversation of reconciliation alive and central in the discussions that are unfolding at the national level and across the country right now,” said Ry Moran, associate university librarian for reconciliation at the University of Victoria, and a former director of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation.

“There’s a lot of talk about building Canada ... [and] about generational investments, and I think what’s so critical right now is that we don’t forget that investing substantially and thoroughly and deeply into the work that has been outlined by the TRC [Truth and Reconciliation Commission] is the generational change that is actually necessary if we’re serious about moving towards respectful and sustainable futures in Canada.”

The National Day for Truth and Reconciliation is Sept. 30. Moran, a member of the Red River Métis, argued that as Canada moves forward with major projects, that this work is seen through the lens of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which he said includes the concepts of free, prior and informed consent.

Prime Minister Mark Carney (Nepean, Ont.) launched the new



Ry Moran, associate university librarian for reconciliation at the University of Victoria, says moving quickly doesn’t mean ‘jumping over or bypassing’ the long-standing principles around how Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples ought to be approaching projects. Photograph courtesy of the University of Victoria

Major Projects Office (MPO) on Aug. 29, intended to serve as a single point of contact to get nation-building projects built faster. The office is supported by an Indigenous Advisory Council, with members including Kluane Adamek, a former Assembly of First Nations (AFN) Yukon Regional Chief; and Chief Darcy Bear of the Whitecap Dakota First Nation in Saskatchewan.

“As an observer, it does seem that things are moving at an extremely fast pace, and that’s necessary sometimes. However, moving quickly doesn’t mean jumping over or bypassing or skirting very hard fought for, and now some pretty long-standing principles that we have established in Canada around how we ought to be approaching these projects together, between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples,” said Moran.

“We have to remember that adopting the principles inside of UNDRIP prevent harms from occurring, which in fact, allow us to go faster in the future, because we’re not making the same mistakes over and over again.”

*The Hill Times* reached out to the AFN to ask about reconciliation priorities, but an interview could not be arranged before deadline. National Chief Cindy Woodhouse Nepinak said that major project development “cannot happen without us,” and that “sustainable development requires respecting First Nations rights and including us as full partners in the determination of projects in the national interest,” in an AFN press release on July 22.

David Chartrand, president of the Manitoba Métis Federation

(MMF), told *The Hill Times* that he considers the most important issue pertaining to reconciliation to be “not straying from this government-to-government recognition.”

“Keep that nation-to-nation concept strong. Preach it into your departments—that’s the new way. That’s the way we’re going to do business. It’s the way we’re going to make change, and we’re going to allow Indigenous people to choose their own fate,” he said.

The MPO was established following royal assent of the One Canadian Economy Act in June 2025. The legislation has drawn criticism from Indigenous chiefs across the country who are concerned the bill could be used to potentially bypass regulations such as the Impact Assessment Act, the Canada Energy Regulation Act, or the Indian Act in order to expedite projects deemed to be of national importance.

Chartrand told *The Hill Times* that he supports Bill C-5, but added that trust should go both ways.

“Canada has asked us to trust them, and that trust is hard. They’ve breached trust with us so many times,” he said.

“Here’s the key for me; if you’re asking us to trust you, you should have no problem signing legal documents to ensure that the promise you’re making is real and will be kept. That should be an easy task for any government, because I think we all will be working together to defend our country.”

He described the Red River Métis as an “economically driven people” who still “have the environment in the back of our minds.”

“Right now, we need to support Bill C-5. We just have to

because it’s bigger than the Red River Métis. It’s about Canada. It’s about our country. We are at war, and we’ve got to take it seriously,” he said.

“I would encourage the Government of Canada ... [if] we know the long-term effect to our villages [and how] communities could be impacted, then you’ve got to find a way to assure us that you’re going to fix that later. Ensuring that. Guarantee it’ll be fixed. But more importantly, guarantee us that we will understand fully ... what the damage could be to the next generation, so we could be preparing ourselves.”

Chartrand and then-minister of Crown-Indigenous relations Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough-Guildwood-Rouge Park, Ont.) signed a treaty on Nov. 30, 2024, recognizing the MMF as the government of the Red River Métis, with an inherent right to self-government and law-making powers over its approximately 44,000 citizens, including for elections and other operations. The next step is to introduce federal legislation to bring the treaty into effect.

Chartrand said he hopes legislation for the treaty would be introduced in the fall. In regards to current Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations Rebecca Alty (Northwest Territories), Chartrand said he doesn’t know her very well yet, but said “she’s trying. I’ll give her that.”

Chartrand said another reconciliation priority is resolving a land claim issues between Canada and the MMF.

As part of the agreement for Manitoba’s entry into Confederation, the Manitoba Act of 1870 set aside 1.4 million acres of land to be distributed among the Métis of the Red River Settlement. However, problems with the land distribution included delays, and insufficient land allotments that were often far from traditional Métis communities.

In 2013, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the federal Crown had failed to implement the land grant provision, establishing that the claim represents “unfinished business” for Métis people with Canadian sovereignty.

The November 2024 treaty includes paragraphs that commit the MMF and Canada to continue the government-to-government negotiations in regard to that land claim issue, according to an FAQ on the MMF website, adding that the MMF is “actively at the negoti-

ation table with Canada to reach a land claim settlement.”

Chartrand said that former prime minister Justin Trudeau never delivered on promises to resolve the Métis land claim, but said he expects Alty and the current Liberal government to follow through.

In regard to whether Alty will follow through, Chartrand said he would “wait and see.”

“Trust me, I will hold her accountable. I will definitely be pushing our agenda, which a promise is a promise, and I’m a man of my word. If I give you a promise, I will never break that promise. I expect the same from this government. I expect the same from Alty.”

*The Hill Times* reached out to the Native Women’s Association of Canada (NWAC) to ask about reconciliation priorities and about Alty, but national president Josie Nepinak was not available before deadline.

Beth Dimsdale, NWAC’s chief operations officer, sent *The Hill Times* a statement by email, which criticized slow progress in the implementation of the 94 Calls to Action, the list of priorities released in June 2015 by the TRC intended to further reconciliation between Canadians and Indigenous Peoples. Slow implementation of the calls “demonstrates a continued failure to prioritize justice for Indigenous women in all their diversity,” according to the NWAC statement.

Beyond 94, a website that monitors progress on the TRC’s 94 Calls to Action, reported that 15 of the calls had been implemented by April 23, 2025, while 33 were listed as in progress with projects underway, 29 listed as in progress with projects only proposed, and 17 not yet started.

Call to Action 39 calls upon Ottawa to develop a national plan to collect and publish data on the criminal victimization of Aboriginal people, including data related to homicide and family violence victimization. While Beyond 94 lists Call to Action 39 as completed, the NWAC disagrees.

The NWAC argues that call remains incomplete, despite efforts by Statistics Canada to collect and publish data related to Indigenous victimization.

“NWAC asserts that existing data systems must be significantly expanded to capture the lived realities of Indigenous women. Data on Indigenous vic-





# Policy Briefing INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION

Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations Rebecca Alty speaks with reporters after the Prime Minister's First Nations summit on Bill C-5 in Gatineau, Que., on July 17, 2025. *The Hill Times* photograph by Andrew Meade

and non-status Indians—ethnically Indigenous people who do not have full Indian status under the Indian Act—are included in the term 'Indian' in Sec. 91 (24) of the Constitution.

The case was initiated by Harry Daniels, who was CAP president at the time.

Moore said that CAP has been excluded from the National Council for Reconciliation, an Indigenous-led independent body intended to advance reconciliation. The council was established through Bill C-29, the National Council for Reconciliation Act, which received royal assent on April 30, 2024. The AFN, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, the Métis National Council, and NWAC were all invited to nominate individuals for director positions.

"CAP was one of the organizations that were left off of the reconciliation Committee, which leaves out the majority of Indigenous peoples whenever it comes to having the capacity to have their advocates' input on reconciliation," said Moore.

"Reconciliation that leaves out off-reserve people isn't reconciliation; it's exclusion and enfranchisement dressed up in new clothes."

In regard to Alty, Moore said she's the first minister Crown-Indigenous Relations in years to meet with the Congress of Aboriginal people face to face.

"We have hope there. I'm always trying to build bridges, and hope that they're looking to build bridges. We had a meeting last week with her and her team, and they felt very constructive," he said.

"CAP has been representing these distinct people for over 50 years, and we need to be respected as the national Indigenous organization that we have been historically. She's met with us, and so we'll see what comes of that, but we have hope."

Hillary Thatcher, managing director of Indigenous and Northern Investments for the Canada Infrastructure Bank (CIB), told *The Hill Times* that reconciliation and infrastructure are linked. Reconciliation means that communities get an opportunity to participate in talks about infrastructure, and that participation comes in many forms, she said.

"It can be actually building and owning and operating infrastructure in your community, but it can also be participating in the larger projects that are happening on your territory," she said.

"Being able to create tools so that they can actively participate and benefit from those projects, it's really about inclusion in the economic growth of this country ... [and with] the major projects office, certainly, this government is certainly moving in that direction. When you create economic

growth and it's inclusive of those that have been left out, that's reconciliation at its core."

Thatcher said to help address the infrastructure gap facing Indigenous communities in Canada, the CIB created the Indigenous Community Infrastructure Initiative.

The CIB also set a target to invest at least \$1-billion in revenue-gener-

ating Indigenous infrastructure projects. The office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer released data on July 10 which found that disbursements for Indigenous projects have already met that \$1-billion target, and are expected to reach \$3.1-billion by 2027-28.

*jcnockaert@hilltimes.com*  
*The Hill Times*

## Indigenous Infrastructure Gap Statistics



*The Hill Times* photograph by Andrew Meade

- First Nations lack essential infrastructure—housing, clean water, schools, healthcare, and roads—available to most Canadians. The gap is the estimated \$349.2-billion investment needed to close these disparities by 2030. This includes \$135.1-billion for housing, \$5.2-billion for digital connectivity, and \$208.9-billion for infrastructure.
- As of July 25, 2022, there were still 31 long-term and 14 short-term drinking water advisories in effect on 43 on-reserve communities across Canada, down from 105 in November 2015.
- Of an estimated 85,700 existing housing units, 34 per cent require minor repairs and 31 per cent require major repairs. An additional 108,803 housing units are needed to address overcrowding, replacement, and population growth.
- From 2020 to 2030, First Nations' on-reserve population is expected to grow at an average rate of 1.7 per cent per year compared with only 1.0 per cent for the rest of Canada. Most building, utility, transportation, and housing infrastructure cannot accommodate such growth and requires immediate upgrading and long-term planning to ensure the continued functionality of on-reserve community infrastructure for First Nations.

Source: *Closing the Infrastructure Gap by 2030*, released in December 2023 by the Assembly of First Nations

## For more than 160 years, Indigenous children were forced into Indian Residential Schools.

September 30 is National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, a day to learn about the 150,000 childhoods lost to Canada's Indian Residential School system.

[ontario.ca/LearnTheLegacy](https://ontario.ca/LearnTheLegacy)

Paid for by the Government of Ontario

Ontario 



# INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION Policy Briefing



A group of First Nations youth gather outside the Prime Minister's First Nations summit on Bill C-5 in Gatineau, Que. on July 17, 2025, calling on the government to respect treaty rights and oppose Bill C-5. *The Hill Times* photograph by Andrew Meade

## National interest should include the rights of Indigenous women

Bill C-5 is a major setback to reconciliation and the path to ending violence against Indigenous women and girls.

Pamela Palmater

Opinion



**T**ORONTO—This year's National Day for Truth and Reconciliation is marred by the One Canadian Economy Act, which allows the federal government to fast-track major projects deemed to be in the so-called "national interest," attempting to bypass the constitutionally protected rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Despite the federal government's failure to consult with First Nations on Bill C-5, the widespread criticism of the bill by Indigenous lawyers and experts,

and the Assembly of First Nations' request for the Governor General to delay its passage, Liberals and Conservatives banded together to ensure its speedy passage. In so doing, Canada made it clear that reconciliation and the "national interest" do not include the health, safety, or decision-making authority of Indigenous women.

The newly-created Major Projects Office (MPO) has the authority to consolidate and accelerate oversight and approvals across departmental and regulatory regimes. The MPO also established an Indigenous Advisory Council (IAC), whose primary purpose is to foster partnerships with Indigenous Peoples and encourage their economic participation. However, it lacks any legal authority or decision-making powers. If the creation of the IAC was a political attempt to deflect Indigenous criticism, the government grossly underestimated the commitment of First Nations to protect their inherent, Aboriginal, treaty, and land rights. Nine First Nations in Ontario have already launched a constitutional challenge to C-5. To make matters worse, the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario have created similar legislation, while

Quebec has signalled its intention to do so this fall.

The prioritization of the interests of transnational corporations involved in the extractive and energy industries over the constitutionally protected rights of Indigenous Peoples is striking. Not only do for-profit companies have no legal rights in First Nations lands and resources, but they are also a known danger to Indigenous women and girls. The National Inquiry into Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls—which found that Canada was guilty of both historic and ongoing genocide through its law, policies, and practices—found "substantial evidence of a serious problem that requires focused attention on the relationships between resource extraction projects and violence against Indigenous women." Camps of men near resource-development sites are implicated in higher rates of violence, exploitation, sex trafficking, and disappearances of Indigenous women and girls, as well as increased law enforcement and surveillance of the Indigenous land defenders and water protectors.

The primary objectives of colonial "Indian policy" have always

been to acquire First Nation lands and resources with little regard for the rights and interests of First Nations, especially women. The National Inquiry's Calls for Justice called on Canada to protect the rights of Indigenous women and girls by implementing international human rights protections like those contained in various United Nations (UN) treaties, conventions and declarations, including the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Countless UN committees and reports have called out Canada for its grave human rights violations against Indigenous women, including its failure to protect them from the violence of the extractive industry and associated law-enforcement measures.

The approach embedded in Bill C-5 clearly contradicts Canada's stated commitments to reconciliation. The TRC called on Canada to adopt the UNDRIP (which they have) and use it as the framework for reconciliation and respect for Indigenous rights. The whole purpose of this

recommendation was to prevent the unilateral decision-making of precisely this kind. Bill C-5 effectively embeds the old colonial mindset of exploiting Indigenous land and resources at any cost. Speed and corporate economic interests trump Indigenous rights and safeguards for Indigenous women. The legislation perpetuates the same systemic disregard that the National Inquiry identified as part of a broader pattern of genocide against Indigenous women and girls. This imbalance undermines reconciliation and places the lives of Indigenous women and girls at continued risk.

Bill C-5 is a major setback to reconciliation and the path to ending violence against Indigenous women and girls. It relegates Indigenous Peoples to mere interest groups with no decision-making powers or actionable rights. If the government were truly serious about reconciliation and an end to the crisis of murdered and missing Indigenous women and girls, it would ensure decision-making authority of First Nations, including Indigenous women, over their respective territories – the free, prior and informed consent guaranteed in UNDRIP. It would also ensure Indigenous women led any and all gender-based analyses of major projects to decide which, if any, projects proceed and on what conditions.

The "national interest" can never be defined to exclude the rights, interests and safety of Indigenous women. Until Canada embeds consent and Indigenous women's authority into its law, reconciliation will remain rhetoric rather than reality.

*Pamela Palmater is a Mi'kmaq lawyer from Eel River Bar First Nation, and is the chair in Indigenous Governance at Toronto Metropolitan University.*  
*The Hill Times*



## Policy Briefing **INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION**

# From reconciliation to results: why Bill C-5 and the Major Projects Office can be game-changers for Indigenous communities

The MPO is the front door that co-ordinates financing and accelerates regulatory approvals so that top-tier projects can get to 'yes' faster, with Indigenous partnership built-in from the start.

Liberal MP  
Buckley  
Belanger

Opinion



I'm a rural, Indigenous member of Canada's cabinet. Where I come from, opportunity is something you build—with neighbours,

Elders, and youth rolling up their sleeves together—not something that lands on your doorstep. The journey towards reconciliation begins with recognition, but it can only be completed with results. Bill C-5, the One Canadian Economy: An Act to enact the Free Trade and Labour Mobility in Canada Act and the Building Canada Act, and the new Major Projects Office give us practical tools to move from promise to progress.

Bill C-5 became law on June 26. It does two big things: it removes federal barriers to internal trade and worker mobility; and it creates a clearer path to streamline major infrastructure projects, while upholding Indigenous rights and environmental standards—including ports, railways, critical minerals, and energy corridors. The Major Projects Office (MPO) is the front door that coordinates financing and accelerates regulatory approvals so that top-tier projects can get to "yes" faster, with Indigenous partnership built-in from the start. Streamlining removes duplication; it does not weaken rights, safeguards, or community

consent. Faster and fairer must travel together.

Let me be clear: the concerns I've heard from Indigenous communities about major projects are real and valid. They want confidence that "faster" decisions won't compromise the Crown's duty to consult and accommodate. They want to know if "participation" means equity, revenue sharing, jobs and contracts, or just more meetings. And they want processes and decisions they can trust, with benefits that reach families on the ground.

Prime Minister Mark Carney has been clear in public and private that Indigenous partnership is central to the work of the MPO, and to the government's broader mission to build major infrastructure faster. The Indigenous Advisory Council's job is simple: guide the work of the MPO towards projects with equity ownership, call out where engagement is falling short, and help translate commitments into real outcomes for Indigenous people.

Over the course of the past few months, I've had the chance to hear from Indigenous leaders in

my own backyard and across the country, and to get their honest opinions on C-5. I heard both hope and healthy hesitation.

This summer, the prime minister held summits with First Nations, Inuit, and Métis leadership to make sure candid consultation, partnership, engagement, and participation sit at the heart of every project of national interest. We heard support for Bill C-5 as a way to bring clarity to nation-building projects, and we heard concerns that these projects could sideline rights or environmental stewardship. These summits showed clear expectations: respect consent, protect lands and waters, resource participation, report publicly on progress, and ensure benefits reach families on the ground. That guidance now shapes how the MPO operates.

Many Indigenous communities across Canada—many with proven track records in business and resource development—have stepped forward in support of C-5 because they see that it unlocks a chance for real ownership, reliable revenue, long-term

careers, and the chance to plan for prosperity as full partners in the new Canadian economy. They know these projects can be game-changers if Indigenous nations co-design them, consent is respected, and the benefits are hard-wired from day one.

Here's the bottom line: these projects will better connect our economy, diversify our industries, and create high-paying careers, all while protecting this country's rigorous environmental standards and upholding the rights of Indigenous Peoples. This isn't optional: this is the bar we intend to meet.

Canada's Indigenous Peoples are on a journey of social and economic justice, but they aren't asking for handouts: they're asking for access to capital, fair chances, real seats at the table, and clear rules that respect their time and their rights. Economic independence is real independence, and economic reconciliation is how we get there. This means using our resources wisely, investing in our people, and ensuring communities have an ownership stake in the wealth created on our lands—real action that improves quality of life. But progress moves at the speed of trust.

Together, we will build One Canadian Economy and make sure it truly leaves no one behind.

Liberal MP Buckley Belanger, who represents Desnethé-Missinippi-Churchill River, Sask., is also the secretary of state for rural development in Prime Minister Mark Carney's cabinet. Before entering federal politics, Belanger served for more than 25 years in the Saskatchewan Legislature, representing the northern riding of Athabasca from 1995 to 2021.

The Hill Times

# Message to Carney: the safety of Indigenous women and girls is in the national interest

If Canada is serious about building an economy rooted in dignity and human rights, the Liberals must ensure that Indigenous women and girls are given a seat at the table, that our voices are heard, and that our lives are safeguarded.

NDP MP  
Leah Gazan

Opinion



With Parliament back for the fall sitting, one of Prime



People mark the National Truth and Reconciliation Day in Ottawa on Sept. 30, 2022. The Hill Times photograph by Andrew Meade

Minister Mark Carney's top priorities is now implementing Bill C-5, the controversial major projects legislation rushed into law before summer adjournment. Bill C-5

grants cabinet ministers sweeping powers to undermine the Constitution and other key legislation to approve major projects deemed to be of 'national interest'.

Unsurprisingly, the Liberals faced widespread condemnation for passing this legislation without adequate consultations, especially since the Bill stands

to undermine the democratic process, Indigenous constitutional rights, environmental protections, and public and worker safety.

Equally troubling is the Liberals' total disregard for the 231 Calls for Justice of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG)—despite clear evidence that fast-tracked resource projects fuel violence against them. This is unacceptable. We cannot embrace development projects that Carney's Liberals deem to be of national interest if they endanger the lives of Indigenous women and girls.

The National Inquiry found clear evidence linking industrial work camps—like those in projects advanced by Bill C-5—to increased violence, determining these 'man camps' "are implicated in higher rates of violence against Indigenous women at the camps and in the neighbouring communities." In a 2022 study, the House of Commons Status of Women Committee affirmed this finding.

Continued on page 23



# INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION Policy Briefing



Keisha Paulmartin, president of the youth advisory council in Kashechewan First Nation, speaks with a group of First Nations youth gathered outside the Prime Minister's First Nations summit on Bill C-5 in Gatineau, Que., on July 17, 2025, calling on the government to respect treaty rights and oppose Bill C-5. *The Hill Times* photograph by Andrew Meade

## Fast-tracking past justice: why the Major Projects Office threatens real reconciliation

The pressure to 'fast track' projects transparently signals workarounds to avoid legal obligations around Indigenous consultation, placing advisers in an untenable position.

Vanessa Ambtman-Smith

Opinion



As we approach the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, we must confront an uncomfortable truth: Canada's new Major Projects Office and its Indigenous Advisory Council represent a dangerous regression in our journey toward reconciliation, not progress.

In the words of Canadian academics Eva Jewell and Ian

Mosby: "In the short time we have been annually observing Canada's record on its supposed progress, we've held the tension of the promise of reconciliation with the actual reality, exacerbated by the deep chasm between the two."

My heart sank reading the Sept. 10 announcement. As an Indigenous adoptee who became a health system leader, and now an Indigenous scholar studying healing spaces, I know first-hand how these structures become vehicles for tokenism. Having chaired numerous advisory bodies during two decades in Ontario's health system, I've witnessed how quickly "advisory" becomes "rubber-stamping" when bureaucracy controls the agenda. These councils, stripped of real decision-making power, legitimize colonial agendas that circumvent legal frameworks Indigenous Peoples fought decades to establish.

The 10 appointed advisers face an impossible task: representing the diverse perspectives of all Indigenous Peoples coast to coast on major projects. As Jewell and Mosby's Yellowhead Institute analysis reveals, this represents "symbolic" rather than "transformative" reconciliation: performative measures creating

the appearance of progress while avoiding necessary structural changes. Their research shows that at the current pace (2.25 calls per year), it will take 38 more years before all Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) Calls to Action are complete.

In my role as a "bridge builder" between Indigenous knowledge systems and Western institutions, I recognize the difference between authentic partnership and tokenistic inclusion. The MPO offers none of the TRC's requirements: sustained institutional commitment, dedicated resources, or respectful engagement with Indigenous knowledge systems.

The pressure to "fast track" projects transparently signals workarounds to avoid legal obligations around Indigenous consultation, placing advisers in an untenable position. I know the weight of being expected to be an expert on everything—from land protection to climate change while simultaneously building bridges with the colonial government whose policies continue harming our communities.

As NDP MP Leah Gazan correctly identifies, this structure appears designed to sidestep gen-

uine consultation with rights and title holders. The Building Canada Act allows cabinet to push through projects deemed in the "national interest" while bypassing environmental protections crucial to Indigenous communities' well-being. This isn't reconciliation; it's recolonization through bureaucratic manoeuvring.

The timing is particularly galling. Ten years after the TRC's 94 Calls to Action, only 14 have been fully implemented. Health care for Indigenous Peoples remains in crisis. Educational inequities persist. Yet the government fast-tracks major projects that will likely harm Indigenous communities for generations.

The council's composition reveals critical gaps in place-based representation. Quebec has only two representatives, with no representation from the Kanien'kehá:ka Nation or other Haudenosaunee communities whose traditional territories span proposed project areas. Indigenous health geographies teaches us that meaningful consultation requires representatives who carry specific knowledge of local ecosystems, waterways, and land relationships that vary dramatically across regions. The absence

of representatives from specific territories means the absence of irreplaceable place-based knowledge systems.

This geographic imbalance undermines the very foundation of Indigenous governance, which is rooted in specific relationships to particular lands rather than pan-Indigenous generalizations. As political science professor Peter Graefe notes, while high-profile appointments suggest potential influence, "A big question will be: do they really get to play a role in shaping decision-making, or is this just a form of whitewashing, trying to gain consent without really doing much to ensure that consent?"

Real reconciliation demands structural change. The success of Indigenous-led programs like the Queen's-Weeneebayko Health Education Partnership demonstrates what's possible when communities shape their own futures.

If Prime Minister Mark Carney's government genuinely seeks reconciliation, it must commit to meaningful consultation with each affected rights and title holder, grant the Indigenous Advisory Council actual veto-power over projects affecting Indigenous lands, prioritize implementing existing TRC Calls to Action before creating new bureaucratic structures, and ensure Indigenous communities have the resources and authority to make decisions about projects affecting their territories.

As we mark another National Day for Truth and Reconciliation on Sept. 30, we cannot allow the rhetoric of "partnership" to mask continued colonial practices. Through my doctoral research on environmental repossession, how Indigenous Peoples reclaim healing spaces within colonial institutions, I've learned that transformation requires fundamental shifts in power, not cosmetic changes.

Indigenous Peoples must have meaningful decision-making authority—not advisory roles—when major projects affect territories and treaty rights. Without these changes, the MPO risks becoming another chapter in Canada's long history of broken promises. The difference is clear: symbolic gestures maintain colonial power while appearing progressive; transformative change requires settlers to relinquish control and honour Indigenous governance.

As Jewell and Mosby conclude: "With four years of data indicating glacial progress on the Calls to Action and reconciliation generally, it is becoming increasingly clear that transformative change is required." The MPO, as currently structured, is not that change, it's more of the same dressed in new language.

Vanessa Ambtman-Smith (Niizhobinesik) is an assistant professor in the Indigenous studies program and department of geography and environment at Western University, with a PhD in Indigenous health geographies. A former public servant with over 20 years in Ontario's health-care sector, she brings both academic expertise and front-line experience to health-care transformation.

*The Hill Times*



# Policy Briefing INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION

## Cultural agility is key in advancing reconciliation

Cultural agility means being able to work and build relationships across cultures without leaving one's own behind.

Anne Harding

Opinion



I recall a conversation a decade ago with a Haudenosaunee colleague and mentor, just before we began delivering yet another “Indigenous Awareness” training course at a major energy company. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Final Report and 94 Calls to Action had recently been released. With equal optimism and skepticism, he observed: “A window has just been opened, and I give it about a decade until it closes again.”

He was referring to the window of time when meaningful progress could be made toward the systemic change needed for reconciliation and justice in



The Bentwood Box, which travelled with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission containing survivors’ personal items, is placed on stage at the National Truth and Reconciliation day event at LeBreton Flats in Ottawa on Sept. 30, 2022. *The Hill Times* photograph by Andrew Meade

Canada. As a non-Indigenous person working in Indigenous relations, I often remind fellow non-Indigenous colleagues that the 94 Calls to Action are not for Indigenous Peoples alone. They are calls to all of us—the 95 per cent of the population whose richness and wealth, as former Assembly of First Nations national chief Ovide Mercredi put

it, come from a one-sided interpretation of the treaties.

Over the past decade, working with organizations of all sizes and sectors, I’ve seen that Canadians want to keep the window open. Whether it’s a newcomer recognizing parallels between the oppression their families faced elsewhere and that are faced by Indigenous Peoples here, or a

senior executive exploring ways to support Indigenous economic sovereignty through partnerships, the intention is the same: a desire to do better.

Some Calls to Action offer tangible steps, like No. 57’s directive for governments to educate public servants about Indigenous history. Others demand harder, systemic change—rethinking policies in child welfare, health, and justice. The urgency for this deeper kind of change was amplified by the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, whose 2019 report declared 231 Calls for Justice.

As Canadians start with the easy stuff; that is, to learn more about the harms that have been done to Indigenous people, there is an understandable desire to not do any more harm with potentially ill-informed actions or changes. But then comes hesitation. People worry about causing more harm with a misstep. Many recall a time they tried to say or do the right thing, only to be told they were wrong. Out of fear, they retreat into silence.

They may continue to learn from the safety of their e-reader or podcast feed, but they stop short from taking action that might result in real change. While this response makes sense when we consider the stereotypical Canadian ethos of politeness, the result of such paralysis is that the window for systemic change is starting to close.

And yet, progress has been made. Many Indigenous and non-Indigenous leaders have pushed past fear of offending into

complex conversations and structural shifts. Their communities, employees, and constituents see these examples and follow, moving beyond learning into action, with humility.

Developing this “cultural agility” is key to keeping the window open. Cultural agility means being able to work and build relationships across cultures without leaving one’s own behind. It is more than reading a land acknowledgement or taking an awareness course. It is grounded in ethical curiosity and developed through taking action. For those who have invested in developing it, the change is profound: blinders fall away, new possibilities for advancing reconciliation appear, and the fear of “getting it wrong” gives way to optimism and agency. Many describe feeling “unstuck,” more willing to try, learn, and adapt.

As we look back through this past decade’s window, the choice before us is clear. Canadians must move past the fear of missteps and lean into the harder work of systemic change. By cultivating cultural agility, we strengthen the relationships that will allow us to navigate complexity together. In doing so, we may keep the window of reconciliation open—perhaps not just for another decade, but for generations to come.

Anne Harding (MA, CP3) is the owner of Forum Community Relations, an Alberta-based company working across Canada to help ‘connect the dots’ for people and organizations who want to do better in Indigenous relations and community engagement.

*The Hill Times*

## Mark Carney and a call for meaningful reconciliation

True reconciliation means advancing the legislative priorities of Indigenous peoples, as well, and recognizing that we are equally sovereign.

Cody Groat

Opinion



Later this week, we will mark the fourth annual National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, and this December we will mark 10 years since the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. We need to recognize the long-lasting impacts of the Indian Residential School System, but we also need

to recognize that Indigenous Peoples are sovereign, and that questions of self-governance, economic prosperity, and rights to our traditional territories are central to how we govern ourselves alongside the Canadian nation-state.

Prime Minister Mark Carney has already demonstrated his approach towards Indigenous reconciliation, leaving much to be desired. He is a more strategic parliamentarian than his predecessor, as seen through some of his early legislative accomplishments. In his first month in office, Carney introduced the controversial Bill C-5, or the Building Canada Act, and expedited this through Parliament without giving Indigenous Peoples the opportunity to voice their concerns or to propose legislative amendments. After the act received royal assent, the federal government convened a First Nations Major Projects Summit to engage in “meaningful consultation” regarding the new Major Federal Projects Office developed through Bill C-5. Of

course, this summit was largely one-sided. The legislation was already in effect. Reconciliation is more than merely investing in projects and infrastructure that might have trickle-down benefits for Indigenous Peoples. Reconciliation is ensuring that our rights to meaningfully consult are truly respected, which means inviting us to the table prior to passing legislation that directly impacts our nations and our future.

Sovereignty and nationalism have been at the forefront of Carney’s early tenure as prime minister, partially stemming from Alberta separatism and threats of American annexation. One result has been the clear and definitive assertion of Canadian sovereignty, which becomes complicated when considering the conflicting interpretations of sovereignty that are maintained by Indigenous Peoples. In response to the national and international rhetoric regarding Canada’s place in the world, the Prime Minister’s Office issued a formal invitation to King Charles III to deliver the government’s Throne Speech in

May. In his address, King Charles recognized that the federal government would “discharge its duty to protect Canadians and their sovereign rights,” while reminding federal parliamentarians that they were meeting on the “unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinaabeg people,” articulating the need for “truth and reconciliation, in both word and deed.”

I doubt that reconciliation will be a priority for the prime minister during the new legislative session. We have seen a more centrist vision for the Liberal Party that offers some contrasts with the government of Justin Trudeau, despite much of the caucus and cabinet being the same people. Several pieces of legislation that were highly consequential to Indigenous Peoples were being considered prior to the dissolution of the 44<sup>th</sup> Canadian Parliament this past March, and it will be interesting to see which of these—if any—are reintroduced by the government.

In November 2024, for example, five months prior to Carney’s swearing in, then-minister of Crown-Indigenous relations, Gary Anandasangaree, and David Chartrand, president of the Manitoba Métis Federation, signed the Red River Métis Self-Government Recognition and Implementation Treaty. This was the first modern treaty signed between Canada

and a Métis nation. This treaty was multi-faceted and included provisions for the advancement of Métis self-governance. Sec. 119, though, states that its ratification is conditional upon the federal government passing legislation to officially implement the terms of the treaty. Bill C-53 from the 44<sup>th</sup> Parliament would have served as such legislation, but it did not receive royal assent prior to dissolution.

We have seen that Carney is willing and able to rush legislation through the House of Commons and the Senate when it meets his needs. True reconciliation means advancing the legislative priorities of Indigenous Peoples, as well, and recognizing that we are equally sovereign.

As we mark this National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, and as we approach the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, we will watch the prime minister and hope for real change, instead of platitudes or empty words.

Cody Groat is a Kanyen’kehaka citizen and a band member of Six Nations of the Grand River. He is an assistant professor in the Department of History and the Indigenous Studies Program at Western University.

*The Hill Times*



# INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION Policy Briefing

## Broken promises and the need to move towards reconciliation

With each new and re-elected prime minister, Indigenous Peoples hear more promises. It does not take long at all for these promises to be broken.

NDP MP  
Lori Idlout

Opinion



Long before Canada became a country, Inuit, First Nations and later Métis thrived on these lands. As Indigenous Peoples, we fell deep into abysmal victimhood with genocidal policies from both the British Crown and churches. These settler policies continued even when Canada became its own country.

For almost 200 years, we continue to be traumatized by policies that keep us oppressed, and with lower health and well-being standards compared to Canadian standards. I interpret this to mean that those genocidal policies are still working.

For deep-rooted reasons, reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples is of most importance. Sept. 30 is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. Sept. 30 is more important than July 1 for most Indigenous Peoples. On this day, Canadians will see many orange shirts being worn.

Government after government, with each new and re-elected prime minister, Indigenous Peoples hear more promises. It does not take long at all for these promises to be broken. I have only to mention in this five-month-old Carney government the passage of C-5, the so-called Building Canada Act.

This current Liberal government has already proven that it will not move toward reconciliation. I have very little hope this government will respect Indigenous nations as promi-

nent decision-makers in policies that impact Indigenous Peoples' lives. First Nations and Métis demanded that they are afforded the free, prior, and informed consent as legislated in UNDRIP. Rather than upholding Indigenous Peoples' rights, this Liberal government decided to use the threat of United States President Donald Trump to prioritize activities that will further expedite climate change.

By this time, I ask: are there any decisions that Carney can make to get on the track of reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples?

While there is not one easy answer, there are some steps this prime minister can take.

First: Increase—not decrease—the funding for Indigenous Services Canada; investments for Indigenous Peoples have never been enough. There are many reports that illustrate the investment gaps are in the billions of dollars. There must be no further cuts. Further, this government must balance investments when addressing Arctic security and sovereignty. This government will put Inuit at risk if it dispropor-

tionately funds the military in the Arctic over social programming. If this government focuses as well on addressing the chronic lack of investments in housing, education, health care, and major transportation infrastructures like airports and marine ports, Inuit communities will be able to be as engaged in Arctic security as its military partners.

Second: Introduce legislation that puts on par Indigenous Peoples' rights alongside Canadian human rights. Two such examples that this Liberal government will need to table are Indigenous water legislation, and Indian Act amendments on Indian status. The bills introduced in the 44<sup>th</sup> Parliament were substandard because both bills would have kept Indigenous Peoples below Canadian standards. Had they passed, First Nations would most likely have ended up in never-ending negotiations with municipalities and provinces, and First Nations women—who were found to be discriminated against—would have been prevented from seeking reparations. This time around, the Liberals

would do better by Indigenous Peoples by introducing legislation that enshrines the rights of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis, allowing for self-determination.

As I have said publicly—given the current geo-political climate—I fully believe that we need to invest in Arctic security and Arctic sovereignty in Canada. There needs to be balanced spending to ensure northerners, too, can be engaged in Arctic security. New Democrats want to ensure that Inuit and Northerners' knowledge and expertise are used to help keep the Arctic secure. Prioritizing so-called nation-building projects and military spending while neglecting the fundamental needs of Nunavummiut and northerners shows the lack of commitment to reconciliation and investing in Indigenous Peoples. Carney's plan for nation-building should have included sorely needed investments in schools, adequate housing, dependable electricity, transportation infrastructure, including airports and marine infrastructure and better health care for Arctic communities. It is time for Canada to strengthen Arctic security and sovereignty by investing in the peoples of the region.

*Lori Idlout is a Canadian politician who has served as an NDP MP for the riding of Nunavut in the House of Commons since 2021. Before her election, Idlout practised law in Iqaluit with her own firm, Qusagaq Law Office. The Hill Times*

## Reconciliation is the foundation for Canada's future projects

When governments, industry, and Indigenous nations build together, all of Canada moves forward.

Katherine  
Koostachin

Opinion



Reconciliation is not optional. It is not a trend or an economic calculation. At its heart, reconciliation reflects Canada's responsibility to walk in partnership with its original peoples, honouring relationships that pre-date Confederation, and ensuring Indigenous nations are full participants in shaping the country's future. The success of every major project depends on this foundation. Projects built with First Nations thrive; those without strong engagement risk delays and obstacles.

Since the Truth and Reconciliation Commission released its 94 Calls to Action, Canada has taken meaningful steps forward

by adopting UNDRIP, affirming Indigenous jurisdiction in child welfare, investing in clean drinking water and housing, and resolving long-standing disputes, among other measures. These achievements signal progress, yet persistent service inequities and infrastructure gaps continue to impact Indigenous communities, reminding us that much work remains.

At the same time, political attention has increasingly shifted toward geo-political and economic pressures—to strengthen productivity, protect jobs, and move resources to new markets. Without careful focus, reconciliation risks slipping from view. That would be a missed opportunity. Reconciliation is not only a moral responsibility; it is also the foundation for Canada's economic future. Even when it is not in headlines, its importance remains constant.

Bill C-5, the Canada Build Act, is designed to accelerate approvals for projects of national interest. But experience shows that speed without thoughtful engagement can create conflict. From Oka in 1990 to Wet'suwet'en in 2020, the lesson is clear: consultation treated as a formality carries high costs. For industry, investing time early to build relationships and understand Indigenous priorities reduces delays and fosters stronger outcomes.

To support effective project delivery, Canada has established the Major Projects Office, and affirmed that it will respect Indigenous rights; uphold free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC); and provide equity opportunities for nations. It has also created the Indigenous Advisory Council to help advance this work, which is a good step. However, nations continue to seek clarity on the process for project designation under the act and how their rights will be respected. Governments can respond with transparent standards, clear timelines, and mechanisms to ensure commitments are followed.

Canada has referred five projects for potential designation under the act, several made possible by years of engagement between industry and local nations. What remains to be tested is how new or conceptual projects will proceed. Success depends on investing time and resources up front and embedding consultation, environmental responsibility, and Indigenous decision-making from the start. Even in urgent times, these steps cannot be rushed without affecting trust and stability.

Ensuring nations have the tools to lead is also essential. Projects such as the Wataynikan-eyap Power Transmission Line

and the Kivalliq Hydro-Fibre Link show what is possible when Indigenous leadership drives development. Expanding such models requires reliable access to capital. Canada's \$10-billion Indigenous Loan Guarantee Program is a valuable resource, but financial tools complement, not replace, genuine partnership and consent. For industry, this means designing projects to include equity opportunities, technical support, and shared governance with Indigenous partners.

FPIC is central to reconciliation. It ensures communities have complete information, time to deliberate, and the ability to make decisions. FPIC may not be a veto, but it is a path to authentic participation and collaboration. Embedding FPIC in practice strengthens relationships and supports lasting outcomes.

Consultation that reflects Indigenous priorities from the outset builds confidence among governments, industry, and nations that commitments will be respected. Advisory councils can certainly guide the process, but the Crown retains the duty to consult. Governments can support this by establishing clear requirements and reporting publicly on progress. And industry can contribute through early and consistent engagement, designing projects to

include equity opportunities, and integrating Indigenous priorities. Loan guarantees and ownership tools enhance participation but never replace consent.

When these practices are in place, all parties can work together more effectively. True success comes when governments, industry, and Indigenous nations act as partners from the outset. This includes addressing past harms while developing forward-looking solutions. Governments can provide frameworks and accountability, industry can invest responsibly, and nations can lead in shaping projects that affect their lands and communities.

This Reconciliation Day is a reminder: reconciliation is not a barrier to progress. It is the foundation of Canada's future. Reconciliation is ongoing, and every project provides a moment to strengthen relationships, embed Indigenous leadership, and get it right. When governments, industry, and Indigenous nations build together with trust, equity, and consent, all of Canada moves forward. *Eh-ko-teh. Meegwetech.*

*Katherine Koostachin, a Mushkegowuk Cree from Attawapiskat First Nation, has advised the Prime Minister's Office and federal ministers, and continues to guide governments, industry, and Indigenous nations in delivering projects that achieve results while reflecting Indigenous values. She is currently the vice-president of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation with Sussex Strategy Group. The Hill Times*



# Policy Briefing INDIGENOUS RECONCILIATION

## True reconciliation requires remembering and learning from our country's history

While the Government of Canada has taken important steps since the devastating policies that once removed Indigenous children from their families and communities, much work remains.



Wilton Littlechild, a former commissioner on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, a former Progressive Conservative MP, and a residential school survivor, speaks at the National Day of Truth and Reconciliation on Parliament Hill on Sept. 30, 2023. *The Hill Times* photograph by Sam Garcia

Liberal MP  
Ginette Lavack

Opinion



As we mark the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the TRC's final report and the 94 Calls to Action, and the fifth year of the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation on Sept. 30, this year is an important moment for reflection and resolve. It is a time for us, as Canadians, to acknowledge the progress that has already been

made while charting the next steps on our shared path toward reconciliation.

In my own province of Manitoba, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action resonate deeply. Across the province, organizations are responding in meaningful ways, through education, commemoration, and action, always with an eye on both the past and the future. As Prime Minister Mark Carney reminded us on National Indigenous Peoples' Day in June, the TRC's Calls to Action remain essential to advancing reconciliation, and to reaffirming the partnerships between Canada

and the Indigenous Peoples with whom we share this land.

In August, I attended the unveiling of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada's commemorative plaques at the National Indian Residential School Museum in Portage La Prairie, Man., led by Long Plain First Nation. Touring the building and its exhibits, we were confronted with the stark realities of how children lived, ate, and attended classes while separated from their families and forbidden to speak their own languages. The museum draws visitors from around the world, offering Canadians and international guests

the opportunity to learn from this painful history and to imagine—however incompletely—the hardships these children endured. Parks Canada, which oversees the site, works closely with Indigenous partners, communities, and individuals to guide how former residential school sites are commemorated. This collaboration reflects the Government of Canada's commitment to advancing Call to Action No. 79, and ensuring that the stories of survivors and their families are honoured with truth and dignity.

One of the foremost national locations for this ongoing work of reconciliation is also in Manitoba,

at the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation (NCTR), which safeguards the archives of survivors, preserving the records on behalf of them and their families. This is the other side of the Commission's legacy: as Canadians, we have a responsibility to remember the truth of what was done to Indigenous Peoples, especially the children who suffered at the hands of those who were meant to protect and care for them.

Each year, Truth and Reconciliation Week provides an opportunity to educate Canadians of all ages both in classrooms and in communities, about the history and lasting impacts of residential schools on survivors and their families. As the NCTR notes, no fewer than five different Calls to Action—Calls 65, 71, 72, 77, and 78—speak directly to the centre, and its vital role in record-keeping and education.

True reconciliation requires more than acknowledging; it demands that we remember our country's history, learn from it, and act differently going forward. While the Government of Canada has taken important steps since the devastating policies that once removed Indigenous children from their families and communities, much work remains. At the National Indian Residential School Museum, I saw this commitment in action: the plaques unveiled there tell this painful history in five languages, English, French, Anishinaabemowin, Cree, and Dakota. By integrating Indigenous languages into the narrative of our shared past, we help build a new heritage, one where reconciliation is not a symbolic gesture but a daily act.

*Liberal MP Ginette Lavack, who represents Saint-Boniface-Saint-Vital, Man., is the parliamentary secretary for Indigenous Services Canada, and lives on Treaty 1 Territory.*

*The Hill Times*

## Message to Carney: the safety of Indigenous women and girls is in the national interest

Continued from **page 19**

urging the government to require companies to implement community safety plans and to hold companies accountable when they fail to do so.

Unfortunately, when I questioned the minister of energy and natural resources about this study in relation to Bill C-5 during debate in the House of Commons, he indicated that he had not read the report, suggesting rather that it was an issue for law enforcement. His failure to recognize

the urgent need for community safety plans to protect Indigenous women and girls is unacceptable. The Canadian economy must not be built on a foundation of violence.

According to the national inquiry, resource extraction projects consistently bring into rural and remote areas many transient workers who have no ties to their host communities. These communities frequently report elevated levels of harassment and violence perpetrated by transient young men, particularly against Indig-

enous women and girls. During an industrial project in Fort St. James, B.C., RCMP data showed a 38 per cent increase in local sexual assaults in the first year alone.

The economic dynamics of 'boomtowns' often exacerbate gender-based violence. Indigenous women are frequently excluded from the negotiation of development projects, even on issues that directly impact their safety and economic wellbeing. Promises of employment opportunities made to Indigenous nations rarely translate into benefits

for Indigenous women themselves. Instead, high-paying jobs are disproportionately given to incoming transient, often young, male workers. The resulting economic vulnerability of local residents creates conditions ripe for exploitation, including human trafficking and the sexual exploitation of women and girls.

These realities underscore why the national inquiry called on governments to require gender-based impact assessments for all resource projects. Shockingly, Bill C-5 contains no such review processes, demonstrating a failure of the federal government to include a gender-based analysis. Pushing through projects without community safety plans will inevitably condemn Indigenous women and girls to bear the cost of corporate violence.

Then-prime minister Justin Trudeau admitted that the crisis of MMIWG amounts to an ongoing genocide. Yet the Liberals continue to turn their backs on Indigenous women and girls through Bill C-5. Carney is the latest prime minister who has abandoned the National Inquiry's Calls for Justice, while also violat-

ing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act (C-15), by which Canada must "ensure that Indigenous women and children enjoy the full protection and guarantees against all forms of violence and discrimination."

Is protecting the lives of Indigenous women and girls not in Canada's national interest? Do we truly want to build an economy in a way that knowingly places Indigenous women and girls at risk? If Canada is serious about building an economy rooted in dignity and human rights, the Liberals must ensure that Indigenous women and girls are given a seat at the table, that our voices are heard, and that our lives are safeguarded.

*Leah Gazan has been the NDP MP for Winnipeg Centre, Man., since 2019. She is currently her party's critic for families, children, and social development; critic for women and gender equality; and critic for post-secondary education. Gazan is a member of Wood Mountain Lakota Nation, located in Saskatchewan, Treaty 4 territory.*

*The Hill Times*