

organizations that have helped to make this series possible. Firstly, I want to acknowledge Jumblies Theatre and Arts' Talking Treaties Project, the York Center for Indigenous Knowledges and Languages, and Deb McGregor's Indigenous Environmental Justice Project, who along with the Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change are co-presenting the series as a whole. I'd also like to thank the Toronto Biennial of Art, the Osgoode Hall Law School, York's Vice President of Research and Innovation, the Indigenous Teaching and Learning fund, YUFA's Community Projects, and Lisa Myers' Research Chair in Indigenous Art and Curatorial Practice for their support. I also want to acknowledge Ange loft and Victoria Freeman who I collaborate with as part of Talking Treaties, because the series very much comes out of our collective work together, researching and writing A Treaty Guide for Torontonians which is going to be launched at the Toronto Biennial of Art this spring. And *chi miigwech* to my colleagues Deborah McGregor and Lisa Myers who helped with conceptualization and fundraising for the series, and to my amazing research assistant Tara Chandra who makes everything happen behind the scenes. Um, so with that, I'm, I'm going to just I just want to take a look at the chat and see where everyone's coming in from. We have folks in Kingston, Treaty 13, Tkaronto, Curved Lake, all the way from so called BC, Calgary, wow that's great! Thank you so much all of you for being here today!

Well, with that I'm, it's my pleasure to introduce our first speaker. So, Dr. Leela Viswanathan is founder and principal of Viswali Consulting, which is a planning advisory firm that inspires planning with purpose and systems change. From 2014 to 2020 Leela was principal investigator of the Planning with Indigenous Peoples Research Group [at Queen's University], where she is also an Adjunct Associate Professor with the Department of Geography and Planning. Leela is a registered professional planner in Ontario, a fellow of the Canadian Institute of planners and an alumna of York University's Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change where she earned both her MEd in planning and her PhD. So, please join me in welcoming Leela.

DR. LEELA VISWANATHAN:

Thank you, Martha. Thank you so much. Aanii, boozhoo, sekoh and hello. I am really excited to be here with all of you today, especially as an alumna of the Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change-- way back when it was called the Faculty of Environmental Studies. And it's a real honor to share this space this morning with Selina Young and Bob Goulais. I am the daughter of arrivants from India who settled in Montreal and lived in Québec, and I'm now

in a place that is known as Katarokwi, or Kingston, as it was named by loyalists to the Crown in the 1780s. And before talking today, I wanted to do a little bit of reading on the treaty situation here in Kingston, and learning a little bit more about the Crawford Purchase, and there's not a lot that's actually written about the Crawford Purchase. And so, there's a lot more learning that I need to do. But the Crawford Purchase is named after Captain Crawford, a military fellow who brokered the purchase, which was ultimately outlined in a letter, a short letter that was written to Governor Haldimand and those of you who live in the Greater Toronto Area will be familiar I think with the name Haldimand. I want to reassert that, you know, this is a letter that the treaty that we understand, the Crawford Purchase, is actually a letter and it's a really short letter. It's not reflected in a Wampum Belt. It's not reflected in a formal Treaty document. It's in a letter and so to me, this really highlights the importance of having a conversation about both the meaning and the implementation of treaty and what that means in the modern day. Because as a non-Indigenous person, and an uninvited guest on these traditional territories of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and the Anishinabek Nation, these are territories that are also included in the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant and as a beneficiary of this colonial history, these treaties have been interpreted as being deeds of land surrender. This has major implications for how we talk about planning, how we understand planning, in the colonial present. So, this is a point of reflection in terms of how place and how our understanding - and limited I think understanding - for many of us as descendants of settlers, what that actually means for how we practice planning, particularly in the professional realm.

I also want to offer a note of gratitude to Carolyn King of the Mississauga the Credit First Nation, for her blessings and her permission so that I could share the story that we created together through our work on the reform of the Provincial Policy Statement that led to the recognition for the first time of Indigenous Peoples in the Provincial Policy Statement in 2014. And then, finally, I think, you know, there is something to be said that I'm speaking to these issues as a registered planner in Ontario. I'm not a lawyer. And so, when I do speak to the duty to consult, I'm speaking to an appreciation for how jurisdiction is interpreted and to remind everyone that these are colonial constructs within which we function in the planning realm, and that means there are major limitations. And it's important to understand that this planning that is done within this colonial construct is separate from Indigenous planning. They're not one in the same. Maybe obvious to some, but

I think something that I want to reassert. So, with that in mind, today I think my role is to provide an overarching set of reflections about policy as it relates to planning and the legal doctrine that is the duty to consult. Following that, to think about the implication of these legal doctrines and particularly the Provincial Policy Statement for planning and urban settings, and specifically Toronto. And I also want to spend just a little bit of time to think about and to share some thoughts about the concepts that underlie these doctrines and these planning documents, but mostly that are generated by them. These concepts are relationship building, trust, consent and time, and are really important in terms of understanding our relationship to treaty and our relationship to planning. So, my hope is also to ask this really big question—[laughs] we're in a seminar so I think if there's an opportunity to ask a big question, for which we need to explore some answers together, and I encourage the planning students to think about this as well. And this underlying question links trust, consent and time together in a process of relationship building. So, my question is: "what could Indigenous municipal relationships in Toronto and the Greater Toronto Region look like if we planned at the pace of trust [and] the pace that it takes to build relationships? As opposed to the pace that it takes or that is required to approve development requests". With that being said, I'm just going to take a sip of my tea here, and then I'll get started.

The duty to consult. It's important to recognize that a lot of the conversations about the duty to consult are rooted in case law and case law is ever changing. There's a lot of room for growth in that discussion of what the duty to consult actually means. But there were three Supreme Court cases that are really foundational to an understanding of how we talk about the duty to consult today. These were a Supreme Court cases involving the Haida Nation (<https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2189/index.do?r=AAAAAQAFaGFpZGEAAAAAAQ>), the Taku River Tlingit First Nation (<https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2190/index.do?r=AAAAAQAK-dGFrdSByaXZlZgAAAAAB>) and the Mikisew Cree First Nation (<https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2251/index.do>). And it's really the Haida Nation v. British Columbia, Minister of Forests in 2004, where Justice McLaughlin ruled that, "A legal duty to consult arises when the Crown has knowledge - real or constructive -of the potential existence of the Aboriginal right or title and contemplates conduct that might adversely affect it." And so, the implementation of the duty to consult is very much dependent on case law and therefore conversations that happened in the courts. And we're seeing more and more

these discussions around the implementation of the duty to consult in a municipal setting. You only have to open up the Toronto Star to see some of these discussions that are happening today around municipal land use planning in the Greater Toronto Area.

Now, while the Crown is very much the federal government in the conversations around the duty to consult, I want to remind us that the province and the municipalities are second and third parties of the Crown. And I'd say even five years ago in discussion with lawyers, they felt that the duty to consult had no relevance at the municipal level. But really now when I talk about this progression, you're going to be seeing - and you should be seeing more and more - how the Crown's duty to consult is really very much emerging in the municipal context, and Indigenous Nations are bringing that forward to bring constitutional rights into our discussions of planning at the municipal level. Justice McLaughlin also pointed to the relationship between consultation and reconciliation, and that consultation should be viewed and should be geared towards reconciliation regardless of whether reconciliation will be reached in the short term or whether a path will be open to longer term solutions. And so, as an area of common law and as a legal vehicle, we as planners need to keep the duty to consult on our radar - primarily because of this lack of a poor implementation, or the lack of an appreciation for what meaningful consultation could look like, or should look like. And so, folks are turning to the courts and using the duty to consult to really push forward their right to consultation and their rights to the effective implementation of Aboriginal or Indigenous treaty rights. Governments are still in a position where many are exploiting the fact. And Indigenous lawyers point to the fact that this is a rather unsophisticated interpretation of the duty to consult, but the duty to consult does not include a veto by Indigenous communities after an attempt at consultation takes place, and that consultation should really be a genuine attempt at listening to Indigenous Peoples prior to a decision being made. But we have to think seriously that when we talk about consultation, we're not effectively talking about consent, and we really need to bring this conversation of what prior and informed consent means, and what that means in relationship to consultation - so that we think seriously about the relationship between the federal government, the province and municipalities as well.

So, to the Provincial Policy Statement, I do want to say that there are a whole gamut of other provincial policies that have an effect on planning and most planners at the municipal level are working at the intersection of a variety of dif-

ferent documents, policy documents, the Planning Act, the Cemeteries Act, documents that also have a relationship to environmental planning. But I do want to focus specifically today on the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, which in the simplest sense, is a policy that regulates and has an impact on how land use planning in Ontario plays out. And in a very practical sense it's the document that municipal official plans must align with. So, you can think of it in those terms.

And at the risk of sharing a story that many of you may have heard before, or have read about, I do want to point to what instigated a big shift between the 2009 PPS and the 2014 PPS and if you are really interested in reading more details about the actual language changes that occurred between the 2009 and 2014 PPS, and then the 2014 PPS and the 2020 version, you can go to the Planning with Indigenous Peoples Research Group website where we've posted a lot of these analyses that we've conducted (see: <https://tinyurl.com/3j6vysvu>). But I do want to turn to story because it's the story behind these changes that I think is valuable here, and the story for me starts close to 2011 when I was introduced to Carolyn King of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation by Dr. Dan McCarthy, from the University of Waterloo. And it started off as a conversation where Dan realized that Carolyn and I had similar interests in changing the way in which planning needed to take place and that planning was a cross-cultural effort from our experiences. Mine, working primarily with racialized and immigrant communities in transforming the ways in which the city of Toronto would recognize racialized immigrants and refugees in Toronto, and Carolyn, really wanting to change the world! And the way in which the world recognizes Indigenous Peoples. Her interest was very much to ensure that Indigenous Peoples are recognized in planning processes. So, we started off by meeting once a month at New Credit. I had to bring cookies and muffins in hand for these meetings. That was one of the key requirements in order to be permitted [laughs] to enter into these spaces for conversations. And it became a, it became our joke. So, I would take an order from Carolyn before these meetings, but fair enough to have these conversations over food and to really allow for free flow of conversation to learn from one another where we were coming from and what we really wanted in this world. I soon came to realize, and it became quite evident from an understanding of Carolyn's experiences, where Carolyn would show up at meetings at the municipalities that were adjacent to New Credit, where she would show up in her traditional vest, uninvited, as a so-called member of the public, as a representative of her Nation to listen in on the conversations that were hap-

pening around planning issues. And she shared with me, and I saw, the growing pile of development requests that were coming to her office as a one-person land manager and land management office at New Credit-- the number of development requests that she had to go through. So, just think of this practically: you're driving on 401 or you're in Toronto and you see all the condo developments; you see the cranes; you see all the signs of construction and transformation of landscape and think of all the development requests that are associated with that. So, Carolyn had all of these development requests, and as one-person, would not have the time - the 30 days or the two weeks provided - to review them to offer input to Chief and Council and for a decision to be made about these development requests. At the same time, the level of discernment that was required to determine which of these documents was actually relevant to their traditional territories, let alone this process of seeking approval - rather than engaging in a conversation and seeking consent where necessary - was completely lost in the actual planning processes in place. And so, I'm in conversation with Carolyn and then with Janet Macbeth from Walpole Island First Nation Heritage Center. It became really clear that we need to, we needed to move up, we needed to look at where the province stood in terms of recognizing the importance of-- not simply consulting with First Nations, Métis and Inuit, but recognizing the present day, importance of engaging with First Nations, Inuit and Métis. And when Janet joined our conversations, it became clear that when this policy window opened - prior to 2014 - that all this work that we had been doing could be fed into the public consultations that were happening at that time. And I know for many of you it's been a long time since you've been able to engage in public consultations, given the state of our provincial government. But we all participated in public consultations, and my students played an instrumental role in preparing briefing notes that then Carolyn and Janet were able to bring forward in their meetings with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to put forward changes to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

So, this story I want to share is to point to the importance of how relationships between the universities, our students, First Nations and academics could really provide information and value to advocating for change. And it's a big deal that the Provincial Policy Statement in 2014 would recognize Indigenous Peoples beyond section 35 of the Constitution, and this key interest of Carolyn and Janet, for a provincial policy to assist them in potentially stemming the flow of development requests - not so that they won't be consulted, but that these requests would be relevant

to the interests of the Nation - was important for them to push that forward. Now this isn't to say that the PPS alone instigates that relationship building. There are still many municipalities that have been engaging with Indigenous Peoples long before the PPS was in place. But with the PPS in place, it gives something also for the municipal planners - who were doing this work as well - to think about what it means to engage with Indigenous Peoples and this was often outside of their job description or outside of the request by their superiors to do this work.

Now with all of these wonderful aspects of recognition, formal recognition, it's also important to be cautious here. Incorporating Indigenous inclusive language is one of the most important things that we can begin to do in terms of policy change, but recognize that these policies are still within a colonial construct and planning is still conducted within this colonial construct. But inclusive, having inclusive language doesn't really act as a stand-in for Indigenous led or Nation to Nation co-creation of plans. It is just a piece, but it is not a replacement. So, what we also have in the 2020 PPS, although the - I'm happy to say Indigenous people are/remain recognized within these policies - but there is a heavy land-based component to Indigenous recognition. And so, bringing this into the urban setting-- what this means is that those Indigenous Peoples who do not have formal recognition from the Canadian government, or who more recently did, and those who do not have Section 35 rights are often excluded from the conversation of what it means to engage with Indigenous Peoples, those without reserve lands, or those whose governance structures are not formally recognized are not included within the scope of the PPS, and it's also a big deal when we think that, and we realize that, Indigenous Peoples are the fastest growing urbanizing demographic in Canada. And there is a multitude of Indigenous Peoples who live in the city of Toronto and in the Greater Toronto Area.

Speaking as a non-Indigenous planner to other non-Indigenous planners, we cannot afford to be ignorant of the weight of Crown-Indigenous relationships and the rights of Indigenous Peoples who are accorded what is referred to as "Aboriginal and Treaty Rights" flowing out of Section 35 of the Constitution Act of 1982. Because being ignorant of this means that it will be especially difficult for us to implement the PPS in accordance with Aboriginal and treaty rights, and it will be very difficult for us to really think beyond these minimum requirements and to be innovative and creative, to engage in co-creation of, of new possibilities, new formulations of relationships. So, I encourage all of us to really think carefully about the importance of

understanding not just the Crown, but the role of the province and how that relates to our relationships with municipalities. And as I said, you can read more about the details in the wording that transforms the way in which lawyers and planners talk about these policy documents.

So, I want to now move into the concepts, the ideas that are actually related to the practice of planning and can be viewed as, at least from my perspective, foundational to any conversation that involves planning with Indigenous Peoples. And the first, the first is relationship building. Treaties are founded on relationships. If we do not take the time to engage in an appreciation for what goes into relationship building, we missed the point. We missed the point on what it means to plan across cultures, to respect the existence of Indigenous law, which is different and separate from Western laws - and it's the Western laws that are ruling planning. And if we continue to consider one as dominant, that is, this notion of Western law dominant to Indigenous law, we're not going to ever get to a point where we come to an understanding of one another. So, it is the responsibility, I believe, of non-Indigenous Peoples to begin to work on appreciating both the existence and the value of Indigenous law and what that means for Indigenous Peoples in their role of, of planning for themselves. So, this being said, you know, what actually goes into building sustained human relationships? What goes into building relationships between non-Indigenous and Indigenous Peoples? And as a racialized person, what does that mean when I work with folks who are new to this country and need to build an appreciation for treaty? What do those conversations need to look like? And with the new generation of planners, the Generation Z, the majority of whom are racialized minorities, I should say as well. What does that mean for how we engage in conversations with one another? So, how we think about relationships has a direct relationship with - too many words in relationship - but it has a direct relationship to how we act in those relationships and those fall also outside of these legal doctrines. So, I guess what I'm saying is that we shouldn't depend wholly on these legal doctrines to define how we build relationships. In fact, we might consider that as the last resort, which is ultimately what we're seeing with the rush to implement the duty to consult, which is what is being made manifest right now in Ontario.

And this brings us to trust building and consent. With our ongoing history of broken promises and our attempts to rectify those, and the witnessing that we have of continuing practices of broken promises between many different governments and Indigenous Peoples; building trust and

finding ways to be accountable for our actions is both the ethical thing to do, but it also creates what my friend who is here today, which could speak to like, creating these ethical spaces for relationship building. And then there's consent, and we all too often practice consultation without recognizing the relevance of consent. As researchers, we are aware of the importance of consent, but how does that translate then to ethical practice as planners? Decision making needs to be based on a practice of seeking consent rather than a practice of seeking approval. And I know that's a contentious issue, and many planners will say that that's a pie in the sky sort of thing, but I'm really putting this forward to bring us back to thinking about consent in our discussions around planning.

Then finally, the biggest concept is that of time. For many of us, there are times we feel in control of time, and when time is out of our control, but really time is regulated within a lot of the documents that are laid out - in terms of the time that we allow, that is permitted for First Nations, Métis and Inuit to respond to requests for planning and development approvals. So, the question really is: what would it take to engage in planning at the pace that is actually required to build trust and to sustain relationships? What does it mean to plan at the pace of trust rather than according to the time requirements for seeking approvals for development?" Because what we're seeing right now is a concerted effort to speed things up. And what I'm calling for is for us to consciously slow things down so that we can work on what it means to build relationships. So, I'm offering these big questions as an endpoint to my contribution because there are so many different ways that we can begin to consider building relationships and because it's in my view, it's so important that we forge a future that includes all of us, rather than continuing to build a future that is created at the expense of Indigenous Peoples. So, with that, I'm going to pass it on back to Martha. Chi miigwech, and I'm looking forward to hearing from Selina and Bob.

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Leela, thank you so much. Thank you for that, really, sort of detailed overview of the legal framework for planning and consultation here in Toronto and the evolution of the PPS. But your encouragement for us to remember that these are colonial constructs, and that they are minimum standards and to think about going beyond colonial law to acknowledging and respecting Indigenous law is just so important. And I love this, this question that you leave us with, which is what would it look like if we, if we planned at the speed of trust so much. It just opens up so much possibility for change. So, thank you for that.

I'm going to introduce our second speaker today, Selina Young. I'm just so grateful that Selina is joining us today all the way from BC on a on a family trip. Selina is Métis from Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan, and the Director of the Indigenous Affairs Office of the City of Toronto. She has 25 years of experience in the public service, having worked for governments in Ontario, Canada and Scotland. Selina has undergraduate and graduate degrees in aquatic toxicology and environmental studies, including an MES from the Faculty of Environmental Change, which was Environmental Studies at the time in 2006. She's volunteered throughout her life most recently as a board member of Katimavik, as a member of the Toronto Public Library's Indigenous Advisory Council and as a member of the Peel Regional Police Chiefs resource of counsel. Selina, we're just so grateful to you for joining us today.

SELINA YOUNG:

Leela, wonderful, wonderful context to set us up in such a good way. I'll start by saying thank you, maarsii to York University and in the Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change, as an FES alumni, as you heard. I'm still adjusting to the name change! [laughs] But I know it was a good thing, a good thing to do. I'm also so grateful to be here with all of you and to learn from Leela and Bob. I'm going to try and build on what you heard from Leela. I should also probably start by disclosing that I am not a lawyer or a planner. I have also had an interesting journey to working in Indigenous Relations, working with and advocating for my community, and other Métis communities, First Nation, and Inuit communities as well. I'm also not going to speak in any great detail about the duty to consult and the legalities and colonial structure embedded in that duty. I think Leela did a brilliant job of setting that context. I will say that I have heard a small number of Indigenous leaders share that, in their view, the City of Toronto doesn't have a duty to consult or a fiduciary duty to First Nations, Inuit and Métis in the city; that instead that duty rests with the federal government, and in some cases - given the division of constitutional powers between jurisdictions - that duty also rests with the province. Given that cities are in large part, a construct of the province, I think there very well could be a duty. While some may think that a city taking meaningful action to advance truth, justice and reconciliation, is doing the right or just moral thing, something that they should do/have to do; I think as a level of government in this country called Canada, cities do have an immense responsibility. Even more so given the number of First Nations, Inuit and Metis. Part of my view on this is that I'm also admittedly very tired of what I call the jurisdictional hot potato, that First Nations, Inuit and Métis find our-

selves in: no one willing to take responsibility and act and work with us in a truly relational way. So, we are passed around and around. It is ridiculous to treat sovereign Nations that's probably, like probably we could be using much harsher language than "ridiculous."

I mainly want to try and focus my remarks on three things three areas with you today. Relationships. You heard Leela talk about that, I hope to build on that a little bit. The significance of connection to land and water, and I want to try and share some of the urban Indigenous context. When it comes to urban Indigenous communities, while each city or municipality varies across the country, over 80% of us, 80% of First Nations, Inuit and Métis live in cities. And that number is growing, especially with our youth, especially amongst Indigenous in Toronto. If you talk to Elders, knowledge carriers, service providers that are on the ground working with First Nations, Inuit and Métis, there are upwards of 90,000 – 100,000 First Nations, Inuit, and Métis living in Toronto that have come here from all over Turtle Island – myself included [laughs] - trying to access services, trying to be healthy, prosper - and a very important part of that is access to land and water.

In addition to the large, diverse and vibrant urban Indigenous communities, there are also treaty and territorial parts. At the City when we say "treaty and territorial partners," we're referring to the many Nations who have stewarded the land since time immemorial - including the Huron-Wendat Nation, the Haudenosaunee and Anishinabek. We typically acknowledge Treaty 13 and the Williams Treaties. I also know, as Leela mentioned as well, there are different views amongst Indigenous Nations about it. Unfortunately, what this means in practice at times, is there's a tension related to urban Indigenous communities' voices, rights, and those of multiple treaty and territorial partners. What we need to do is work in good relations, listen to and respond to all those diverse voices. And that is of course, no easy task.



Photo 1 – Gä·sweñta', also known as The Two Row Wampum Belt (photo: Onondaga Nation - <https://www.onondaganation.org/culture/wampum/two-row-wampum-belt-guswenta/>)

Maybe it is because I'm a Métis who was raised amongst Mohawks; however, when it comes to relationships, I often reflect on the Two Row Wampum or the Gä·sweñta' [see: photo 1]. As I was taught, the Gä·sweñta' symbolizes an agreement of respect and peace between the Haudenosaunee and Europeans - initially the Dutch. The principles were embodied in the belt by the virtue of its design. Two rows of purple wampum beads on a background of white beads represent a canoe the European ship. Parallel paths represent the rules governing the behavior of the Haudenosaunee and European people. It's meant to stipulate that neither group will force their laws, traditions, customs or language on each other, but will coexist peacefully as each group follows their own path - they will be heading in the same direction and in their own ways. I see the two Row Wampum as a way of being, paddling through life based on the principles of respect and kinship. And that way, the Gä·sweñta' may be able to function as a framework for improved relations between Indigenous Peoples in various levels of government.

I'd like to share some thoughts, and this is really where I'll leave you today on the significance of connection to land and water and some examples of work between the city of Toronto and Indigenous communities. Following generations of colonization, forced assimilation and displacement, Indigenous Peoples remain disproportionately under-housed, homeless, imprisoned and unemployed. There have been countless commissions and reports that document this history, and presentations consistently calling on all levels of government, and really all of society, to do our part in healing these wounds. Connections to land and water, including parks ravines, trails - for Indigenous healing and well-being - is of the utmost importance in that work. Through a process of what we call Indigenous place-keeping with Indigenous communities, the City of Toronto is looking at how we decolonize and indigenized public space, to improve the visibility of Indigenous Peoples, and explore ways to better share space. And through that, you know, honoring and respecting, celebrating the vibrant and diverse Indigenous cultures that exist in and around Toronto. We have to look at all aspects of this work. So, how do we plan? That's a big focus today. We also have to think about design, how do we manage and experience public spaces to create places that promote social cohesion, engagement and help? There's a lot of examples including land based education, sacred fires - which I'll talk a little bit more about - medicine gardens, gathering spaces, housing, deeply affordable housing, and art.

[The City of Toronto is] trying to live out our commitment to truth and reconciliation and to decolonize the public realm. So that land, water and public space serve as the foundation for living together in this city in a good way, as settlers and Indigenous Peoples. When you think about the public realm, if you step back and think about it for a moment, yes, it is land and water and that's the foundation - you think of parks and the waterfront - but it also includes the built environment. Including the design of libraries, community centers, names of [places], and there are so many opportunities when it comes to this. I think of Indigenous design and planning imagine culturally responsive and value based approaches to community development. Think of policy and capacity. Do we have the policies? Or can we develop policies to support decolonization and truly respect Indigenous rights? Programming and partnerships: It could be Indigenous recreational programming, land and water based learning opportunities, land stewardship - so many opportunities here! We become better stewards, I believe, by creating the conditions that enable knowledge carriers and earth-workers to have informed decisions that affect change. We need to create space: urban agriculture, gathering spaces. Commemoration is important for naming and public art, as well as recognition. Even staffing and representation - are we recruiting and retaining Indigenous talent? Are we hiring local Indigenous businesses to support their work? Cultural awareness: the land is an incredible teacher. When we talk about cultural awareness, we are usually understandably talking about non-Indigenous people needing this awareness. That is very much true and we will never have justice and reconciliation if we don't spend time on the truth and building that understanding. However, I also think there's a role in place-keeping for Indigenous people who have been disconnected from our culture by no fault of their own. Due to colonialism and racism, some First Nations, Inuit and Métis, are only finding out now that they are Indigenous. In some instances, folks are only starting to feel safer to identify and learn more. So, I believe we have a responsibility to these folks who are trying to connect with their culture and their languages, and land and water. They have a huge part to play in this. I am very blessed in that I grew up in culture and with my language, and I've spent the last four days being surrounded by a lot of my family and our Métis matriarch. However, when I was growing up, I was told to speak it behind closed doors, which is where my family spoke it. And it is only in the last five years or so that I am re-learning, remembering and speaking up, and I'm just one Indigenous person. So, I do think we need to create that space for First Nations and Inuit, work with Indigenous communities, to create that space so we can be connected to our culture, our communities, and languages.

I thought I'd leave you with a few examples of some of the work underway with the City of Toronto, and of course, in deep partnership with the urban Indigenous community in Toronto. So, really, thanks to the generosity and spirit of some community members, the City has been able to work with community on an incredible lodge and gardens along the Humber River. I think community came to us originally in good faith wanting to work in the best possible way with the city. They didn't want to see the lodge they built torn down by the City because it did not fit into a City bylaw, or it didn't have a permit - or heaven forbid someone at the city didn't understand what it was or wasn't willing to learn. And it has been quite a learning curve for many at the City. Still, City staff trying to move out of the way to support access to land and water for ceremony, and to work in relationship with urban Indigenous community on this lodge. It is not about the duty to consult and accommodate; it is about respecting Indigenous Peoples as sovereign beings. They have a right to be on the land, practicing. The City is also embarking on some work with community around sacred fires. Team members in the Indigenous Affairs Office are doing an incredible job of stewarding this work, talking about decolonizing policy when it comes to sacred fires... Until a year ago, it was about a year ago, folks had to pay for a permit for sacred fires. I think there are two fundamental issues here. Why should Indigenous people be paying to have ceremony? First Nations, Inuit and Métis have Aboriginal and Treaty Rights, not to mention inherent rights. So, asking a community member or an Indigenous organization to pay to practice that right is inherently wrong. The other issue is the highly colonial nature of permitting. A government at any level should not be needed, to be giving permission for folks to practice ceremony. So, we have removed the requirement to pay for a permit for sacred fires, and we have an alternative process that instead of a permit there's a form and the [Toronto] Fire Services knows the location and contact at that sacred fire. This is not a perfect solution - it is a step, we hope, in the right direction.

Last example I'll share with you: The city has worked with a few different organizations to support on-the-land programming, or activation of land supports, for children and families. This was a very significant need during the pandemic because gathering inside wasn't permitted. Once children and their families were on the land, you could see how their spirits were lifted, how they connected to culture, to one another, and we're committed to continuing to support this work because it is so important to health and well-being. Cities have a lot of work to do to include Indigenous nations and communities with planning and

decision making including in relation to land and water. We've taken some very small steps and we must continue on that path. Thinking of the Gä'sweñta' again, it is a living treaty, a way that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people can live together in peace, with each nation respecting the ways of the other, and agreeing to meet to discuss solutions to the issues that are important for them, to work together in right reciprocal relations. That is where I will leave you, emphasizing the need to work together in right reciprocal relations. Maarsii, thank you, and Martha, I will pass it back to you.

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Maarsii, Selina, that was a really fantastic reminder about the importance of decolonizing and indigenizing public space as the foundation for living together in a good way, and for reminding us of the Gä'sweñta' as a useful framework - as a fundamental framework - for thinking about how we move this work forward. It's exciting to hear about these sort of first, really important steps that that your office is facilitating in terms of helping the urban Indigenous community to access land and waters in Toronto and to be able to practice ceremony. It's both exciting to hear about the work happening and frustrating to hear about the challenges involved in making it so! So much respect and gratitude to you for helping to make that happen.

I'm going to introduce our next speaker now, Bob Goulais. Bob is Anishinaabe from Nipissing First Nation. He's a sought-after speaker, traditional teacher, facilitator and master of ceremonies, providing valuable cultural context and traditional knowledge to diverse audiences across Canada. In 2015, Bob founded Nbisiing consulting and specializes in Indigenous community engagement, communications, cultural advisory services, cultural competency training, public policy and management consulting. He is an experienced senior executive and consultant who's provided over 20 years of leadership and public service to industry, government, not for profits and Indigenous organizations, and we are just so lucky to have you here with us today. Bob, thank you so much for being here. Chi-miigwech!

BOB GOULAIS:

Chi-miigwech, Martha, and chi-miigwech Leela and Selina as well for everything you've shared today. Boozhoo ndi-nawemaaginidowag niikaanisidowag. Mzhakot ndi-zhinkaaz, migizi n'doodem, Nipissing Ojibway Anishinaabe n'daaw, Mtigaaning miinwaa Nipissing First Nation ndoo-nji wedi. Good morning everyone. Happy to be here with you. My English name given name is Bob Goulais

from Nipissing First Nation and you know, it's so important to start with those introductions to start with-- not only introductions to people, we don't know, oftentimes, you know, we need to start with introductions in order to facilitate that way of life that was given to us. It's a part of our protocols. So, even if I knew everyone on this particular call, you know, I would still give my name, my Clan, and where I'm from. Because those are the protocols that are given to us. I want to acknowledge my name, which comes from that that sky realm, that place in the clouds Mzhakot. Which is-- in the story of how the name came, talks about how this physical earth ends, and those spirit realms begin. And that's also where my Clan comes from, the Bald Eagle Clan, that high flying bird that's the Chief of the binshiinyag. You know, it's so important to acknowledge that we are, and we continue to be sovereign Indigenous Nations. I am of the great Anishinaabek Nation, which is part of the Three Fires Confederacy, one of the three great confederacies that existed in this territory north of Lake Ontario - this Dish with One Spoon Territory. And that's where my input and that's where my contribution will start, is the importance of understanding and integrating our ways of knowing and ways of being as Indigenous people - as Anishinaabe. The other thing I'm going to share is I can only share from my perspective, I can't presume to know the Métis perspective that Selina shares, or the Haudenosaunee perspective that my brothers and sisters from the Six Nations in the Longhouse share, or the Wendat perspective, those that are living in Wendake and call this place Wendake Nionwentsio, this place that was inhabited and, and was a part of that history.

This knowledge that's been given to us comes from an uninterrupted line of knowledge going back to creation, not just time immemorial. It goes back to creation, where the spirit Gichi-manidoo, our great kind spirit, provided this way of life for us. And with that way of life comes our governance, our traditional governance, for us as Anishinaabe that comes in the form of our Dodemaag, our clan system. It comes in the form of that confederacy governance, and oftentimes when I speak about the beginnings of powwow and that contemporary gathering, I speak about the Anishinaabe origins of that gathering. When you look at the grand entry that comes in from eastern doorway, those eagle staffs that are carried in, adorned in the colors and the beautiful eagle feathers decorated so nicely. Those are our confederacy pipes. At one time those confederacy pipes brought in all the Chiefs and head people that would sit in that confederacy lodge. That is where, again, our governance resides. You know, we have lost sight of that, because of the Indian Act; because of colonization; because of those colonial influences.

I think it's important that we understand the perspectives from the colonial way of knowing. So, you know, the planning policy, for example, we need to, you know, find our way to understand that. The Provincial Policy Statement provided again, it's like it's a governmental process. It's the province of Ontario's policy in relation to working with Indigenous people-- just a few lines in there. It's not even a significant body of work. And even the Supreme Court decisions, we're thankful for Justice McLaughlin and others that have stood up and spoke out the truth and, and provided us with a basis to start those assertions based on the duty to consult. But again, the duty to consult is a colonial process. And as Martha rightfully says it is the start of things. It is a minimum standard when it comes to working with First Nations, Métis and Inuit people.

What I would like to put forward in this conversation is that concept of reconciliation. And, you know, I'm going to take that with a bit of a grain of salt because there's so many of our people with that lived experience, that hold that pessimism when it comes to, you know that explanation of reconciliation. That reconciliation is something that was created by non-Indigenous people, that aspect that was provided by that Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I'm going to go forward to say that the concept of reconciliation comes from those stories and experiences of our Elders and the residential school survivors. You know, we need to understand that it was their call, to call for Canadians and Indigenous people to come together and restore that relationship - and that's consistent with our teachings. It's consistent with those stories. It's consistent with our most sacred prophecies. I talk about that Eight Fire prophecy: you know, we've been inundated with seven fires worth of prophecies that spoke of our destruction, that spoke of how we would be taken advantage of, that we're going to lose so much, we're going to lose our cultures, will lose even our lives in a lot of cases. You know, there would be peril. You know, it talks about the coming of the light skinned race, that they would immediately start with the bearing of that face of brotherhood, but at some point, be wearing that face of destruction. It speaks of a time when the rivers would flow/run with poison, and the fish would become unfit to eat. We've seen that for countless now generations since the coming of that era of colonial perspectives.

That eighth fire talks about how we as the children of the seventh fire, we will be sought after for our way of life again, that knowledge that we carry will become a part of the future direction of our societies and we will come together! Just like Gä•sweñta' (photo 1) shows us - that Salina

talks about that others have talked about - how we will be navigating that river again side by side. And those three rows of wampum in the middle of the Gä•sweñta' that separate those two rows speaks of that balance between peace and friendship, but also speaks of the balance between respect and recognition. That our prophecies tell us at a time that that balance will be restored. And I do this work because I look forward to that time, that time where we're going to be able to work together. So, a lot of my perspective in the work that I do in the planning environment, in community engagement and working with First Nations, Métis and Inuit, is really based on my hope for the future - and that hope that reconciliation brings. That direction provided to us by Justice Sinclair, by the commission, by those survivors that have gone through so much to provide us that, that way of life and provide us, you know, where we're going with regard to reconciliation. So, I asked those of you that, you know, have that/may carry that-- and we all carry that trauma, we carry that, that our perspective of what reconciliation might be, that there is hope there. And that's what that my approach talks about.

Again, the duty to consult is that minimum standard in the area - I think - of community engagement. And I don't use the term consultation, you know, consultation because of the Haida, Taku River and the Mikisew Cree decisions have really accented the word from consultation from an, a small c consultation to capital C consultation process. The minute you provide a notification - again, old school way of doing things: 'we're going to send you a notice of commencement of a particular project, and it's going to be on the letterhead is going to be addressed to the chief', the minute you put the capital C consultation, we want to consult with you please take a look at these documents. A copy does go to the consultation department, but more often than not a copy also goes to the legal department, or goes to legal advisors. You know, I really advocate for the need for relationship building, just as Selina, just as Leela says. Relationships - even when you don't need them, develop those relationships first. Those relationships will be there when contentious issues happen. You know, and then you're not looking at a duty to consult that's project base, you're looking at community meaningful engagement from a relationship perspective.

So, I'm going to share with you my top 10 - and I got my timer going - of best practices/wise practices that you can take as planners, as officials, as students, and as people that work in the space, that might help you really move the conversation from the duty to consult to meaningful engagement. And I speak about again, moving on, what I like

to say is moving beyond the duty to consult - something that I refer to as a spectrum, which starts with engagement: providing that information and in a respectful way asking for the input feedback from communities. And sure, you know, they're going to provide you their interests on the territory; their interests with regard to their assertions, any claims that are there, their Aboriginal, treaty rights and views and perspectives on those. They're going to provide that through engagement. But let's not just stop with engagement. Let's move towards greater involvement! When I develop engagement plans, I want to do that, I want to co-develop those with the Indigenous community. I'm not going to go to Six Nations of the Grand [River] or-- I see Chad is in the in the audience. I'm not going to go to Hiawatha First Nation and presume to know better than Tom Cowie, or, you know Shawn at Hiawatha. They know how to engage their community. They will co-develop - I hope - in partnerships so that we are reaching them effectively. So, we need to look at collaboration and partnership. So, those are the standards I'm looking at: moving towards collaboration and partnership.

So, my top 10:

Number 1: strive for meaningful engagement rather than consultation. So, again, that's key: meaningful engagement. And what is meaningful mean? Meaningful isn't for the City of Toronto to say what's meaningful, or for the, you know, project developers I'm working with that tells me what's meaningful, or the Government of Canada, or you know, a consultant to tell you. It's the Indigenous community that will tell us what's meaningful. Meaningful is an outcome. Meaningful engagement should be an outcome. So, that's the first one.

The second one as you can tell, what's very important to me is our way of life as Nishnaabe, and hopefully as Métis for Selina, for other people who identify as Indigenous. To be values based. Don't be just project based, be values based. Integrate, you know from the Haudenosaunee perspective, the teaching of the good mind, where we use that piece, that we found within ourselves to work together on various projects - to put the best foot forward. You know that that good mind-- from the Anishinaabek those Seven Grandfather Teachings are so important to us. Those gifts were given to us to be able to work with each other, to work through our relationships with creation. So, be values based in your work.

The third piece of advice is again be relationship focused rather than project focused. So many, you know, clients

that I work with, you know, hire me or hire different consultants that come forward because they have a certain project. They always want something from the Indigenous community. I would love to someday be hired by a consultant or hired by a client or a particular project where they don't want anything from the Indigenous community, other than to establish that relationship. That's what Gā·sweñ·ta' is about. It's about that respect, recognition, peace and friendship. So, let's figure out how to be relationship focus, rather than just project focused.

My fourth piece of advice is to strive towards co development and shared decision making. And I'll give you a good example. I'm working right now with the City of Toronto on a significant master plan in the, in one of the major parks in the city. And, you know, there's conversations going forward on how we can work to co-manage parks, with Indigenous rights holders. How do we, you know, what does that look like? I think of you know, Selina talks about the importance of finding space/keeping space for ceremony. Well, you know, it shouldn't be non-Indigenous park personnel that are managing ceremonial space! Those lands out on the Humber shoreline should not be managed by non-Indigenous people, you know? They have to be managed by First Nation, Métis and Inuit decision making.

Number five, establish partnerships. Start the relationships with formal Memorandum of Understanding, partnership agreements, if it's projects where you can see some benefit employment, revenue, resources or otherwise, those benefit sharing agreements are quite important. You don't see them much in southern Ontario, but why not? Why can't we develop agreements that say, I'm going to hire so many First Nation, Métis and Inuit youth? You know, I'm going to establish these-- why can't we develop those kinds of agreements. So, you know, work towards establishing those partnerships.

Number six, and this is key. Planners take this advice: we need to invest in Indigenous capacity. There is a serious contemporary stereotype out there that First Nations are getting hand over fist when it comes to money. Millions of dollars are going directly to line the Chiefs pockets and you know, they must hire you know, dozens and dozens of high price consultants. All of that is just hogwash. It's contemporary stereotypes. First Nations do not have planners. We have not-- you know there are some First Nation planners for sure. But you know, we don't have planning departments, we don't have engineering departments. If you want us to be fully involved in your project to provide that analysis and that kind of involvement, they are going to

need to hire somebody to do that. So, you're going to need to invest. And you know, my advice to Selina right from the beginning when we're working on that path to reconciliation is the budgets need to be there as well. It's so easy, and a colonial way of passing the buck is to say, well, we don't have that in the budget. We've never done that before. Well, it's time to put your money where your mouth is: invest in Indigenous capacity.

Number seven, consider the [TRC Calls to Action and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of] Indigenous Peoples. The framework is there provided to us by the TRC. That framework to reconciliation is there, you know, and those things can't be implemented in isolation. They have to be done in partnership with First Nation, Métis and Inuit. So, you know, please do encourage that collaboration in working on your reconciliation action plans, commit to making those things happen.

Number eight, take steps as Selina says, towards decolonization and Indigenization of engagement processes. You know, gone are the days - I hope- and it's a slow go we know - gone are the days where it's a one size fits all engagement process. You know, it boggles the mind when anytime I'm involved in a federal process, they point to the 2011 advice from Natural Resources Canada and Indigenous Affairs Canada, on implementing the duty to consult, you know, it's you know, all of these different steps and phases. You know, we need to look at how do we decolonize our way out of that. And the definition of decolonization is to critique these processes that we continue to reproduce. Critique them, you know, it's not a metaphor. It's an actual corporal process where you sit down in collaboration with Indigenous people. Take a look at your engagement plan, take a look at your human resource policy. And don't be afraid to mark it up. That leads us to Indigenization-- is replacing those elements that need to be replaced. Fill them with Indigenous values, with Indigenous ways of knowing, with Indigenous perspectives, and that's a pathway to reconciliation.

Number nine - I'm going to be a minute overtime Martha [laughs] - number nine! Be trauma informed. Be aware that there is a lot of mistrust, anger, frustration, and there's legitimate reasons for that. That you need to provide that support you need to provide that kindness, gentleness and understanding whenever you can. And those are important values for me: to lead with kindness, to lead with gentleness - no matter how tough those engagement meetings get, you know, no matter how strong people's voices are, you know, we need to lead with that kindness and be aware

that, you know, people that participate in these processes, perhaps need those additional supports; need someone to talk to; need our Elders to be involved. Include Elders in your engagement meetings. Make that a part of how you do things.

And last but not least, consider the diversity and wide-ranging voices and needs of Indigenous community. Diversity with respect to women, men, gender diverse communities, a huge spectrum of gender diversity. You know, think of that gender diversity. Elders, youth, the needs of Two Spirit peoples, LGBTQ2+, many distinct and different First Nations. In my own home, right here I'm in Markham today. There are three distinct Nations of Indigenous people living in my home! The cultures are absolutely different from each other, the governance systems, our ways of thinking our ways of life, very different, as different are as somebody from Italy is from somebody from the Philippines. Very, very different. And when it comes to First Nations, we know First Nations live off reserve or on reserve. You know, I live on reserve, but you know, Chad, I think you're coming to us from Montreal I seen in the chat, you know, you're living off reserve. Some can be status; some could be non-status. So, even amongst First Nations, there's a lot of diversity there. The Métis, Selina is over in the Métis Nation of British Columbia, my buddy Jeff Schiffer from that same Nation over there, quite different from those that are in the Métis home heartlands of the Red River, which is quite different from Métis experiences in Georgian Bay. Some are contemporary community, some are historic collectives, historic communities. But in Ontario there's even treaty beneficiaries who are Métis! So many distinctions there. And then even Inuit, I had the pleasure last week to go and visit Iqaluit, and had spent some time up there which is quite different from those in Inuvialuit or Nunavik. Very different experiences. So, you know, be aware of that tremendous diversity and take that into account in your planning. So, I'm gonna leave it there. I'm a couple of minutes over but turn it back over to you Martha, chi-miigwech!

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

Chi-miigwech Bob, that was such a such a beautiful way of-- you've given us such an incredible I mean, I don't want to say roadmap... but the 10 steps for how we can think about living by the Gā•sweñta', living by our treaty relations in terms of you know, how we, how we go about things in a good way with friendship and peace and respect. And maarsii to Selina for taking notes for us in the chat.

BOB GOULAIS:

That's awesome Selina wow!

MARTHA STIEGMAN:

You can you can scroll up and down and get on, and get all top all 10! Except for number seven because you froze in the middle of number seven. Can you look in your notes and see how you articulated that one? Because we were just a little, we weren't, we weren't crystal on that one.

BOB GOULAIS:

That was the framework based on the TRC calls to action and the United Nations declaration.

Q&A WITH SPEAKERS

MARTHA:

Okay. Okay. There we go. Well, before I open to questions from the audience, I'd like to just take a minute to ask Bob, Selina and Leela if you have questions or reflections or comments for each other?

LEELA:

I can listen to Bob and Selina talk forever [laughs].

SELINA:

I was gonna say the same thing about Leela and Bob. [laughs] I mean I no offense Martha and everyone here but I said yes, because I was like, 'I get to sit in space and learn from Bob, again still, and Leela?' [laughs].

MARTHA:

None taken! [laughs]

BOB:

I guess I got a question for Leela and other planners-- and happy to work with Carolyn. Carolyn is a family friend. She goes back a long, long time and love, love Carolyn King and others, and happy to been involved and support their work on the Shared Path Consultation initiative. Happy to hear what you're doing. Thanks for sharing the link, Leela. But you know, is there really an appetite for the planning community to integrate Indigenous ways of knowing? and doing things in a different way? There's a lot of planners who frankly are - I don't want to disparage anybody -but you know, dinosaurs don't just exist in archaeology. They're all over the place. And some people you know, you know, have a long ingrained perspective when it comes to "Indian" people; Indigenous people. You know, although we're getting to see younger people such as yourself, Leela that are really making the case for change. What are your

thoughts on the future and seeing those changes at the planning level?

LEELA:

Wow, that's such a great question, Bob. And thank you for calling me young. Because I really don't get told that very often anymore [laughs]! I think you're feeling my energy, rather than actually my age [laughs]. I think, you know, there are many other planners here can speak to the so-called appetite. And I think that there's something to be said about the appetite and devouring information but then misusing that information and really not considering it in context, and really honoring how to use the information that is that is given, particularly directly from Indigenous communities. I'm still very much learning myself. I can say Bob, that there has been progress over the past two decades to bring these conversations to the realm in which professional planners are, where they meet. Back in the 90s, there was a working group that was really trying to push to have these conversations in these planning conferences and we're facing a lot of, of pushback. And yet now there is, in Ontario, an effort to - through the Ontario Professional Planners' Institute (OPPI), and Stephanie Burnham is here, she may be able to speak to that a little bit - really think about how to transform the planning profession, to recognize the knowledge that exists, and that is shared by Indigenous communities. And not to fall into this pan-Indigenization of planning, right? Rather to recognize the distinct knowledges that emerge at the community level. So we have a long way to go. And I'm in my 50s! [laughs] So, I'm a young 50s! [laughs] And I'm still learning so much. And unlearning - I should say I'm unlearning a lot as well. So, there is hope and I think that it is the desire amongst young people now in planning school, who are going to make a really big difference. And also, Indigenous young people who are choosing to learn about planning and to advocate for their own communities within this colonial system, because that that advocacy happens within the system and outside the system, and I think we need to find allies, within both. So, there is an appetite, but you have to be cautious about that appetite, so that it is working towards the interests, I think, of First Nations. So I hope that answers your question, Bob.

Q&A WITH AUDIENCE

MARTHA:

Stephanie Burnham? Can, I can ask you to unmute yourself. You want to ask your question?

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER – STEPHANIE:

How's it going? You guys Geez [laughs]. This is such a great conversation. I am so excited to be a part of it, like to be here with you guys and hear this. And Bob, I want to start off by just saying nya:weh, for like, all the words that you shared. It was like, really reaffirming for me and a lot of work that I'm doing as a planner, as a young planner. I recently graduated from the University of Guelph just last year, and was scooped up by [a consulting company]. My experience before that is about 15 years of working-- I grew up in the community of Six Nations, I'm from Six Nations, Cayuga Nation, Wolf Clan. A lot of my experience was-- I started my career actually working on UNDRIP in Argentina at one of the Indigenous Summit of the Americas that led into the finalization of it in 2007. Then from there, I did a lot of community planning work with my confederacy chiefs and you know, working in that capacity and so the knowledge that I bring to the table is like-- going into the planning program and understanding that there wasn't much of a voice for Indigenous people, and that things were just starting to shift in this conversation, and it it's opened my eyes in a way to saying that there's a lot of space for this Indigenous conversation and it needs to be hitting the ground, and it needs to be hitting it hard.

And a lot of the-- since working with Dillon, a lot of the municipalities that I've been working with to update their official plans, are really open to having this conversation and understanding the importance of it. And the perspective that I come with is saying you know, as much as official plans and planning in the colonial sense is super important, to manage the development, understanding that Indigenous planning is very much focused on the health and well-being of Indigenous Peoples and all peoples that are utilizing the land is the most important perspective that you can take to the table, and that that's why it's so important to create that space for Indigenous decision making. Because if we could all plan in a way that—Indigenous [ideas] of health and well-being as opposed to being focused on economics and growth and development, we'd be in such a better place as a human race, you know? And so, this is just something that I wanted to share, but I also just really wanted to thank you guys for this because it's really reaffirmed like the approach that I take in the work that I've been doing, and the perspectives that I bring to the table. I don't feel so lost in this Western world of thinking and planning [laughs].

I appreciate this so much and we do need to build capacity in Indigenous planning! We need more Indigenous young people coming to the table and learning the planning, and

understanding the Western perspectives on this planning, and then bringing that knowledge to the table and saying 'this isn't how we need to plan it doesn't have to be stuck in stone this way. We can do so much better and there's so many other ways to do this'. So, yeah. Nya:weh!

BOB:

Nya:weh.

MARTHA:

Nya:weh, Stephanie.

LEELA:

Stephanie always reminds me that planners have agency, and she is a wonderful example of that. But also recognizing, in my view, I've learned so much from Stephanie's stories about being a member of her community, and not really taking off her 'community member hat' and her 'planner hat', that she's has those roles wherever she goes. And that carries a lot of weight in my appreciation for the role that Indigenous peoples play. Especially those with that planning experience in the Indigenous and non-Indigenous spheres, and working through those tensions. So, thanks, Stephanie, for being here and sharing your story

MARTHA:

I have a question for—I think more for Bob and Selina but maybe also for you, Leela. I love this idea of co-manage parks that you were talking about - and I would just love to get a sense of where the needle is on the dial in Toronto in terms of you know, what are the, you know, we've heard a little bit about the amazing restoration work that's going on the Humber... But could you tell us a little bit about like, what does it look like on the land and waters in Toronto? Where are the most exciting examples of where the envelope is being pushed? Where Indigenous people are really, kind of, asserting stewardship and practicing ceremony and maybe with tacit recognition, or minimal support, or warming relationships with the city in order to be able to do that

SELINA:

Bob, I think you were alluding in your remarks to work on the Toronto islands. So, I think there's some amazing potential there - given the significance of that place, and of course the connection quarter. One example that I'll share a little bit more detail on-- its work led by incredible, incredible Indigenous organization, Toronto Council Fire, in Toronto. As the main I would say, and Bob correct me if I've got this wrong, but the main organization who for decades, has supported survivors. Survivors of residential

and day schools, sixties scoop, millennial scoop. And they have this beautiful vision - that they are making a reality - to create a space for Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities to gather, to learn, to heal, to share. That space and place is being built on Nathan Phillips Square, outside of Toronto City Hall on Queen Street (<https://www.councilfire.ca/spirit-garden.html>). And so, the City is supporting that work, other levels of government are supporting that work. The incredible vision that Toronto Council Fire has and I think we just started to talk about what does co-management look like in that space? You know, how do we support Indigenous youth potentially accessing opportunities for planting, for horticulture, for programming, for I mean, anything and everything could be on the table. And those conversations are just starting and yeah, we will see where Council Fire wants to go with that. That's one area in the city, pretty central, pretty prominent, because it will be such an incredible space and place for community - the broader community bringing together Indigenous knowledge. The vision that Council Fire has is absolutely incredible and their working with Indigenous artists to bring-- to activate to make it inclusive [audio cuts out].

BOB:

Miigwech Selina, Yeah, that's certainly a great example: the Spirit Garden that's going to be at the Nathan Phillips Square, again stewarded by Toronto Council Fire but you know, what happens to that spirit garden after it's built and established? The fundraising is done? The construction is done? It only makes sense that, you know, with the lodge that's there, with the teaching that has to happen there. It should, you know, be turned over to be co-managed by Indigenous people to be able to tell those stories and manage that. Same with the Toronto Islands. I couldn't name it without the permission of my client. So, Selina, you are my client so thank you for that. But I do, I do think that there is significant opportunity, you know, with regard to-- we're just "master planning" at this point, so, it's still a long journey to go. But just talking about interpretation on the Island. You know, they'll be able to create some tours and create some destination and some activities, you know, that could include Indigenous folks that-- you know, Marketplace that's over at the at the at Center Island can be a possibility. But you know, the real, the need and what we're hearing from the community is the need for more ceremonial space that's connected to the water, as Salinas speaks to. And you know, again, that that needs to be managed and co-developed with the rights holders, with the Mississaugas of the Credit, but also the urban community as well to make sure that there is access there. So, that makes real sense. To, to respond to your question directly "how is the

city moving towards this?" Martha, I would say that the city is beginning to get it. I'm having conversations every day with Parks, Forestry and Recreation, one division, but, you know, getting to know the leadership there, constant seeking advice, you know, they're starting to get it. And it's got to start with that that cultural change. It's got to start with personal sustained action. No matter how, you know, Selina and the City Manager and the Mayor, you know, they can put these great policies together and, but they can't tell you how to act. They can't make you feel a certain way and understand and accept the truth about colonization. You know, it's gonna mean something and, you know, that's where that cultural change will start. And it's beginning - I wouldn't say we're quite there. I don't think everyone's on board with co-management of significant spaces yet, Martha and others, but you know, it's a step - and it's a step towards hopefully cultural change that change that long after we're gone, hopefully our children and grandchildren will benefit from it.

MARTHA:

Miigwech Bob. Are there any other questions or comments from the audience?

SELINA:

Just don't mind if I could add-- just cultural change piece and thinking about Bob's point about thinking about our youth. You know, kids, grandkids, great grandkids. I also think back and I think of my ancestors often. I think of my grandparents. And my grandma is about to turn 90, which is why I'm out here. They left Saskatchewan due to some pretty significant racism, and over time, ended up and eventually ended up here in BC. But anyway, I'm thinking about my grandparents. And they were on one side there was 14 kids on the other side, there was 16, I think - huge family. And they would never in a million years believe that a talk like this could happen.

My grandfather had been gone for 26 years, he would have never - I know he's watching - and I would never believe that there would be this type of thinking, you know? Indigenous planners, like Stephanie, a director of an Indigenous Affairs Office, Bob, you know, working with governments to make this change. So, I think that's really significant. Yes, we have so much further to go, but I know in my family that even where we've gotten to now this would be pretty substantial for my-- again to Bob's point I can't speak for all Métis, let alone all Indigenous peoples I can only speak for me. But I think it's really important to think about where we've come from, and where we need to go. And who we're doing for and with.

MARTHA:

Maarsii, Selina. There's a question in the chat from Victoria Freeman. Victoria asks, "What about consultations with a treaty holder? Is that any different from consultation with the Urban Indigenous community? How does the City navigate the various different relationships that sovereign Indigenous Nations and that the Indigenous urban community have here?"

BOB:

Maybe I'll take a stab at that one, Martha, and then I'll turn it over to Selina because I know that Selina has some great work coming forward that we're just excited to, to see happen on a Reconciliation Action Plan. But, you know, great question, Victoria. It's one of the added benefits and value that I bring to my clients. And you know, not all my clients are public clients. I've got a few private clients, but one of the added value I get is to really share and to teach. That's what my vocation in life is. I really differentiate my vocation from my profession. But when I get a chance to teach, I'm happy to do that. And really teach that govern-- that First Nations - and maybe not Indian Act Chiefs and Councils - but let's just say First Nations in general you know? Are not, are not only the rights holders, you know, the treaty rights holders and have Aboriginal rights protected by Section 35; but they are also the governments of Indigenous communities, the governments of the First Nation, the Métis Nation of Ontario is the government of the Métis in Ontario. You know, Inuit may not have government communities here in Ontario, but the ITK is the voice of that particular-- of the Inuit. So, in that way, you know consultation, or as I like to say engagement is different because I encourage the proponents, I encourage governments, I encourage the municipalities to treat First Nations, Métis and Inuit as the governments of their community.

So, that's a little bit different, because government to government relationships are about, you know, long term relationship building, establishing those-- as I said in my talk, those formal relationships, those arrangements, which is quite different from the urban community. There are a billion - there are opportunities to develop formal relationships with, you know, Friendship Centers, with TASC, Toronto Aboriginal Support Circle, Support Services Council, and others, but it's a very grassroots level engagement when it comes to the community voices in Toronto. Whereas, you know, those rights holders it's about engaging of that council. Same with the Métis Council, it's about engaging that counts as governments. Maybe a little bit more from Selina.

SELINA:

To be honest, I try and approach it without... in some ways without distinction. Like we are, we are living on this land together, and need to be in right relations and what does that mean? Right, so thinking you know, some of what you heard from us today about relationships and how we paddle together, or at times apart [laughs]. How do we bring it back together? So, I try and approach conversations, whether I'm having those conversations with the Huron-Wendat Nation, or I'm having those conversations with Indigenous land stewards in High Park. I'm trying to always approach it from something that we know: from kindness, from gentleness, from openness. And trying to make sure that Indigenous ways of knowing, Indigenous values, and ultimately the Indigenous communities in and around Toronto, have what they need to be well. And that will vary, what, you know, what the Mississauga Nation or the Huron-Nation need and want will differ from communities living in and around Toronto. So it's not, while I approach it similarly the needs are very different, and distinct. And I think that needs to be recognized, acknowledged, and you find a path forward through that.

MARTHA:

Maarsii, Selina. We have another couple of questions in the chat. Field asks, "What about when an entity is governed by foreign investors who have never been introduced to a local government?" So, I suppose in situations where there are multinational corporations that are leading development, I'm guessing that that's what Field is thinking about?

SELINA:

I wonder, I mean; I haven't experienced that directly... So, full disclosure. But given the nature of the City of Toronto, given the nature of Toronto - being a large, urban center - and given the nature of the Toronto Public Service, being a very large organization, 37,000 staff to try and support in certain ways that entity that is the city, I am sure, there could be times when a developer/developers would seek advice, introductions, conversations, you know, that's maybe not the most, maybe not the highest priority in my role in the Indigenous Affairs Office, but I could see that advice, you know *inaudible*.

Part of the work of the Indigenous Affairs Office - although we are small and mighty - that is, there's an external piece and an internal piece. The internal piece of our work is to support those 37,000 staff in the work that they do, and so it's, in a way, it's trying to work with community to help those 37,000 staff, 44 divisions build capacity, invest in

capacity, what you heard from Bob, but invest within the Toronto Public Service as well. So, in that way, I would hope that our Corporate Real Estate Management division – Create TO, that agency of the city that is so heavily involved in development would be, you know, they are building that capacity, they are building that capacity amongst/within themselves. So that when they're doing the work that they need to do with community, for community, that they're doing it in the best possible way. And then that also impacts how they're working with potential developers, or potential investors-- that ripple effect. Does that makes sense?

BOB:

I've got a little bit of experience in this situation. I am working right now with-- it's actually a Métis client that is working with an investor from Australia. And they're going to be doing some work in the Innu community in Labrador and [they] have absolutely no knowledge of First Nation, Métis or Inuit-- you know, the duty to consult or anything related to Indigenous folks. So, I think awareness, and you know, the openness of learning is incredibly important. There's a lot to catch up when it comes to just colonial policy with regard to Indigenous people - the Indian Act and all of these things - but, you know, hopefully there's some willingness to learn from people that want to invest in, in Canadian, you know, projects and development. But you know, it's not just a problem with foreign investors, though there is a whole lot - from direct experience - of Canadian corporations and investors that have no awareness either. And what's even worse than someone with no awareness, is somebody who has a direct opinion on Indigenous rights and, you know, feel that Indigenous rights, Aboriginal rights and treaty rights are, are subject to opinion and their own ways of thinking on that. And that is far, far bigger barrier than others that are coming in from foreign countries that want to invest here. Where, you know, they know that there's a legal construct and are willing to learn about that, you know, but then we still have a problem with many Canadian corporations and investors that are just ignorant of Aboriginal and treaty rights and those requirements and it's a sad thing. But the answer is again: partnership, education, awareness, you know, those steps towards reconciliation.

MARTHA:

Miigwech for that Bob. Are there any other questions from the audience before we wrap up? Well, Sharon Hong has kind of left us with a with a beautiful, aspirational question and thought: "What would our cities look like - the streets, the buildings, public spaces - if Indigenous sovereignty,

governance lifeways, planning and laws were fully recognized, respected and practiced on these lands?" Maybe that's something that we can we can close our conversations for almost close our conversation today, thinking about--

Lisa, did you have a-- Lisa? Did--

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER – LISA:

It's okay. It's okay. I think I think I have a question that might open a big can of worms. So, I think I'll just leave it for now.

MARTHA:

Are you sure?

SEMINAR AUDIENCE MEMBER – LISA:

Well, I'm just I'm just thinking about, you know, in many of our readings in our class and stuff we were thinking - cause we're teaching a class around this, this talk too - and I just well, I want to say miigwech to the speakers. It's been really fascinating, and also just in the readings that I've been doing recently-- but thinking about what really has struck me heavily, and it relates to what you're saying, but it also is a little outside of it. What really struck me was the jurisdictional kind of conflict or problem in terms of on-reserve, you know, being federal jurisdiction, and thinking about drinking water and thinking about potable water on-reserve, like in communities where there isn't some. And then thinking about water services as being a municipal service. And then when we're talking about municipal planning, or thinking about planning, and then thinking about the jurisdictions of province, the municipal and federal, I feel like the dilemma of one, of one of the big problems with-- well, I'm wondering about municipal water, drinking water services, you know, that jurisdiction and how could - it might not be possible, but how could nearby municipalities to reserves somehow find a role, or have a role in, in you know, supporting or developing water treatment, whatever-- I don't know all of the ins and outs of that, but I do see the jurisdictional barriers around that. And so that was kind of fascinating to me. So, if anyone had a very brief response to that, because I know I'm kind of opening up a big thing, but I think it really does relate! And it comes down to really on the ground stuff that people-- that our communities are dealing with. So, I just think it's an interesting, it's something that needs to be done properly. So, that's what I was thinking about.

MARTHA:

Excellent. Question, Lisa.

BOB:

Good, good answer in the chat, Leela. You know, that's another example of, you know, I know in the north, we have Community Benefit Agreements, but that's where we can look at, you know, can Indigenous people find some benefit through, you know, those kinds of services and being involved? And I'm going to tie an answer to Lisa's question to your wrap up question, Martha, "what do we see the future here?" And to me, this is a perfect example. Water is the eminent domain of the Spirit and those that are in our culture, asked to speak to that water are Anishinaabekwe, Anishinaabe women, Indigenous women. So, we need to figure out a means to actively involve, collaborate and partner with Indigenous communities in all of these aspects. Management of water, you know, water infrastructure, providing clean water to First Nation communities, you know, Anishinaabekwe can play an important role in speaking for that water and being involved. Because again, that's the eminent domain of what was given to us in our teachings.



So, you know, we need to integrate Indigenous ways of knowing into a lot of these things. It's not just policy. It's not just engineering. It's not just lost my speaker [laughs]. It's not just, it's not just funding, all those things are inadequate. But when you include Indigenous people, and you include the voices and include voices of Indigenous women, then you know, it will—you, that that can contribute to solving these problems.

LEELA:

It couldn't have said it better, Bob and I think that there are so many examples of Indigenous-led solutions to the question that Lisa put forward, and also that Sharon put forward. And as much as we are talking about collaboration, I think it's really important to look at those Indigenous-led examples for inspiration - as a starting point. I think that, that it's great, Lisa, that are that you're having these conversations in your classroom. I think that planning education still has a long way to go in terms of bringing these conversations forward. So, this is a shout out to everyone in my alma mater, to keep these conversations going, and to those who are outside of this jurisdiction of the Dish with One Spoon territory, to bring those conversations into your classrooms as well. Thank you.

MARTHA:

Thank you, Leela. Well, I think we're gonna we're gonna leave it there. This has been such an incredibly rich conversation. Miigwech, nya:weh, maarsii, to all of you for joining us! And to Bob, and to Salina, and to Leela for taking the time to share so much of your knowledge and experience and wisdom. Thank you very much. Bye everybody.