CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE/ÉTUDE ORIGINALE

Resistance and Opposition: Analyzing the Defeat of Bill 57 in the Manitoba Legislature as an Act of Indigenous Counter-Securitization Discourse

Aidan Trembath[1] and Kelly Saunders[2]

[1]Department of Political Science, University of Alberta, 116 St & 85 Avenue, Edmonton, AB, T6G 2R3, Canada and [2]Department of Political Science, Brandon University, 270 18th St, Brandon, MB, R7A 6A9, Canada
Corresponding author: Aidan Trembath; Email: atrembat@ualberta.ca

Abstract

Securitization scholars in Canada have investigated how settler-colonial governments discursively construct extractive infrastructure and policing on Indigenous lands as "critical" for Canada's economic security. Less literature exists about how Indigenous activists through provincial institutions counter colonial securitization discourse and legislation. This article interrogates discourse in the Manitoba Legislature pertaining to three "critical infrastructure" bills presented by the PC government during the fall 2020 and winter 2021 sessions: *Protection of Critical Infrastructure Act* (Bill 57), *Animal Diseases Amendment Act* (Bill 62), and *The Petty Trespassers Amendment and Occupiers' Liability Amendment Act* (Bill 63). The study combines an analysis of the bills' debates, drawn from Hansard, with an interview with then-official opposition house leader, Nahanni Fontaine, to explore the interactions between securitization and counter-securitization discourse(s) and defeat of Bill 57. The study hypothesizes that Indigenous MLAs' counter-securitization discourse reconstructed the bills as attacks on Indigenous ontological, environmental, and physical security.

Résumé

Les spécialistes de la sécurisation au Canada ont étudié la façon dont les gouvernements coloniaux conçoivent dans leur discours les infrastructures d'extraction et le maintien de l'ordre sur les terres autochtones comme étant d'une importance cruciale pour la sécurité économique du Canada. Il existe moins de documentation sur la façon dont les militants, par le biais des institutions provinciales, s'opposent au discours de sécurisation coloniale et à l'utilisation de l'Internet comme moyen de communication et d'instrument législatif. Cet

article interroge le discours de la législature manitobaine en ce qui concerne trois projets de loi sur les « infrastructures essentielles » présentés par le gouvernement PC à l'automne 2020 et au cours de l'hiver 2021 : *Loi sur la protection des infrastructures essentielles* (projet de loi 57), *Loi sur la protection des infrastructures essentielles* (projet de loi 58), *Loi modifiant la Loi sur les maladies animales* (projet de loi 62), *Loi modifiant la Loi sur les petits intrus (Petty Trespassers Amendment) et relative à la responsabilité des occupants* (projet de loi 63). L'étude combine une analyse des débats sur les projets de loi, tirés du Hansard, avec une interview de la cheffe de l'opposition officielle de l'époque Nahanni Fontaine, afin d'explorer les interactions entre le(s) discours de la sécurisation et de la contre-sécurisation et la défaite du projet de loi 57. L'étude émet l'hypothèse que le discours de contre-sécurisation a reconstruit les projets de loi comme des attaques sur la sécurité ontologique, environnementale et physique des peuples autochtones.

Introduction

Settler colonial societies and governments use discourse to portray critical infrastructure as requiring protection to achieve economic security. This discourse often conflicts with Indigenous peoples' understandings of lands and frames dissent as dangerous for infrastructures that sustain resource extraction. Debates about infrastructure security and Indigenous resistance can be found in the Manitoba Legislature. This study focuses on the debate surrounding three government bills introduced during the third session of the 42nd Manitoba Legislature: Bill 57, *Protection of Critical Infrastructure Act*; Bill 62, *The Animal Diseases Amendment Act*; and Bill 63, *The Petty Trespassers Amendment and Occupiers' Liability Amendment Act*. The debates surrounding these critical infrastructure bills illustrate how the previous Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba constructed the purpose and meaning, or ontology, of land as sites for infrastructure projects.[1] Indigenous opposition members of the Legislature at the time expressed concerns that these bills limited Indigenous protest and access to ancestral lands and were connected to a broader settler-colonial system of cultural, physical and environmental violence. Despite the Progressive Conservative Government's majority of seats, the Opposition NDP caucus was able to defeat Bill 57, which was the most expansive piece of critical infrastructure legislation of the three in consideration. The work, and specifically discourse, of Indigenous opposition members in the Manitoba Legislature bears important implications for critical security studies, Indigenous resistance and the role that settler institutions can play in effective resistance.

Theoretical and Research Designs of This Study

Through a case study of the Manitoba Legislature, this article interweaves three theoretical fields: securitization/counter-securitization discourses, Indigenous resistance and the roles of elected legislators. We begin with an overview of the

theories employed throughout the article, along with the central research puzzle that the Manitoba Legislature poses for securitization and Indigenous resistance, respectively. We outline the article's methodology, followed by a more extensive review of the securitization, counter-securitization and Indigenous resistance literatures. A discussion of methodology precedes the literature review, given that we draw from primary sources throughout the article. Following the literature review, the findings section presents the three critical infrastructure bills and related debates. The article concludes with considerations for the theories explored.

This article joins the literature on securitization and counter-securitization. Securitization discourse was developed as a critical approach to security studies in international relations that analyzes how speech transforms a political issue into one that requires immediate and significant political action (Wæver, 1995). Our study aligns with more recent work on securitization as a back-and-forth dialogue among security actors and audiences (Balzacq, 2005; Marx, 2015). Analysing security discourse as a dialogue is important for recognizing how dissenting actors expose and reframe the initial securitizing actor's assumptions and security values. Recent scholarship (for example, Jamal, 2020; Stritzel and Chang, 2015; Topgyal, 2016) has defined this response to securitization as counter-securitization. We define securitization as discourse that transforms an issue into a matter of security to legitimize an extraordinary security response as "normal politics" and in effect delegitimize counter security claims as outside normal politics. We define counter-securitization as a political actor's reply to the original securitization discourse to redefine the terms of threat and safety. Securitization/counter-securitization dialogue is the theoretical foundation through which this study frames the interactions between Canadian governments' legitimization of occupying Indigenous lands (securitization) and Indigenous resistance toward the state's infringement on human and more-than-human lives and lands (counter-securitization). Understanding the resistance of Indigenous activists and land defenders through counter-securitization is crucial for resistance studies, as the Canadian critical security literature has given more attention to settler-colonial governments as securitizing actors than it has to Indigenous counter-securitization.

This article also explores the connections between two traditionally separate fields: Indigenous resistance and the work of elected provincial legislators. Many Indigenous theorists are rightly critical of the role that settler institutions can or should play in achieving decolonization, resurgence and self-determination (for example, Corntassel, 2021; Coulthard, 2014; Flowers, 2015). Much resistance and resurgence scholarship has focused on direct protest action outside of Canadian state institutions to challenge settler colonialism (Mittal, 2021; Morden, 2015; Pasternak and Dafnos, 2018). This article does not contest the resistance conducted outside of state institutions or the scholarship that understands self-determination and working with state institutions as incompatible. We are not prescribing what resurgence and self-determination should and should not look like and how they align with critical infrastructure. This study does not aim to legitimize the ongoing occupation of Indigenous lands by settler institutions. Rather, this study presents a case study where Indigenous resistance through state institutions has occurred. The findings of this article expand on the securitization and Indigenous resistance

literatures by illustrating how Indigenous members' discourses in the Manitoba Legislature serve as powerful and effective resistance of settler colonial governance.

The Manitoba Legislature and the opposition caucus during this time are important case studies for securitization and resistance because of the decolonial work that Indigenous opposition members led. The official opposition offered many departures from the usual composition of Canadian caucuses. The NDP caucus was comprised of five Indigenous members, roughly a third of the party's total seats in the Manitoba Legislature. Indigenous opposition members held important legislative positions, with Wab Kinew[2] as party leader, Nahanni Fontaine[3] as house leader and Ian Bushie[4] as deputy house leader. Each Indigenous opposition member brought extensive activism backgrounds to their roles, including but not limited to Bernadette Smith's[5] and Fontaine's wide and respected work on protecting and advocating for Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls and Two-Spirit Peoples (MMIWG2S). Many Indigenous opposition members, including Bushie and Amanda Lathlin[6], brought Indigenous government experience to their legislative work. The caucus was significant for gender representation: Lathlin is the first Indigenous woman to be elected to the Manitoba Legislature, and Fontaine is the first Indigenous woman to be house leader in any Canadian Legislature or Parliament. Each member represented a fusion of Indigenous activist and provincial representative identities who used their elected position to dismantle settler-colonial discourse and legislation within and outside of the Legislature. We attribute the Manitoba Government's inability to pass infrastructure security legislation to the counter-securitizing discourse of these Indigenous opposition members.

Through a counter-securitization and Indigenous resistance lens, this article addresses why Bill 57 did not pass into law despite the Manitoba Government's majority of seats in the Legislature. This article is also interested in why Bill 57 was defeated when similar critical infrastructure bills, Bills 62 and 63, passed third reading. We argue that Indigenous opposition members' counter-securitization discourse framed the bills' passages into law as threats to Indigenous lives, rights and lands. We further hypothesize that the Manitoba Government did not revisit Bill 57 because of how Indigenous counter-securitization discourse and use of legislative mechanisms, such as designation,[7] rendered further debate as incompatible with allyship and reconciliation. Bills 62 and 63 were not designated, suggesting that a combination of counter-securitization discourse and legislative designation produces a more durable stoppage of settler-colonial legislation.

The methodological design of this study combines qualitative methodologies and sources to explore counter-securitization-as-resistance in the Manitoba Legislature, beginning with reflections from then-opposition member of the legislative assembly (MLA) Nahanni Fontaine. One researcher conducted a semi-structured interview[8] with Fontaine on her experience as a MLA, her role in debating Bills 57, 62 and 63 and pathways to decolonizing the legislation, culture and discourse within the Manitoba Legislature. Fontaine is a key actor of institutional and extra-institutional transformation. We chose to interview Fontaine for her extensive activism and expertise on protecting lands and Indigenous ontologies and for her pivotal legislative role as opposition house leader. Her words and stories, both within and outside of the legislative chamber, offer an essential critical assessment of the bills in consideration and are the primary interpretation of the bills that we defer to

throughout our analysis. We supplement Fontaine's considerations of the bills with Hansard quotations of then-Critic for Indigenous Reconciliation and Northern Relations Ian Bushie. Following the literature review, the first step of analysis is a small-N, most-similar comparison of Bills 57, 62 and 63 and the political context in which they were introduced. We discuss the bills in particular because of their thematic similarities to which Indigenous opposition members have drawn attention. Fontaine (2022: Interview) explains that "you couldn't just separate Bill 57 from 63 and 62. You can't see them as separate. They are all married to create an environment that really impacts on the rights and lives of Indigenous peoples, but were actually really also geared toward Indigenous peoples." The political context in which the bills were introduced is also significant. The bills entered debate 4 years after the shooting of Colten Boushie and during Wet'suwet'en land defenders' protests. These appeared in the Manitoba Legislature debates surrounding private property, critical infrastructure and their impacts on Indigenous peoples.

Following a discussion of the bills, this study turns to legislative debate between Government and Indigenous opposition members to illustrate the interactions between securitization and counter-securitization discourses. Debate quotations come from the Manitoba Legislature's official verbatim debate transcript, Hansard. The Hansard transcript search included a comprehensive analysis of every deliberation pertaining to Bills 57, 62 and 63 during the 3rd session of the 42nd Legislature. The Hansard transcripts quoted below do not cover every discussion of the bills in the House, but rather demonstrate the common themes found in the debates: economic security, public safety, private property and protection of Indigenous lives, lands and ontologies. We follow an analysis of first readings with Indigenous opposition members' responses and conclude with the Government's defence of their legislation. Focusing on security discourses does not imply that oppositions members' counter-securitization alone led to the bill's defeat. However, an analysis of the Government's responses to counter-securitization illustrates that Bill 57 could not be decoupled from prioritizing economic and property security above Indigenous peoples' physical, cultural, environmental and ontological security. What follows is a literature review that situates this article's case study within the fields of securitization/counter-securitization and Indigenous resistance.

Reviewing Perspectives on Securitization, Counter-Securitization and Indigenous Resistance

Securitization and counter-securitization discourse theories

Securitization discourse theory offers a critical approach to security studies by explaining how political actors employ emergency discourse(s) to convince an audience of the necessity for extraordinary political action (Jamal, 2020: 933). Securitization has evolved from a study of a singular speech act (Wæver, 1995) into an interdependent process, focusing on context, the audience's reaction and the responses of any group(s) that is constructed as dangerous to the referent object receiving protection (Balzacq, 2005). A securitizing act's legitimacy relies on the power position of the securitizing actor, the nature of the target audience and the "main opponents or alternative voices within the relevant social field—either

individual or corporate, ad hoc or institutionalized" (Balzacq, 2005: 179). Opposition is integral to securitization and captures the interdependent formation of the meaning of security. An appropriate social context, identity of the securitizing actor and a receptive audience are crucial aspects of the securitizing process, but a fundamental hurdle for the securitizing act to achieve mainstream legitimacy is how securitized subjects may resist this speech. Securitization requires a study of multiple actors: how securitizing actors attempt to move the politics of the ordinary to the extraordinary and how counter-securitizing actors respond by contesting oppressive discourses.

The growing body of counter-securitization scholarship explores how groups constructed as dangerous employ discourse to resist and dismantle this imposed image (Vuori, 2015: 30). A competition of (counter-)securitizing moves among the original securitizing and counter-securitizing actors takes place over the identities of human and more-than-human subjects (land, infrastructure and so forth) and appropriate subjects to afford security (Jamal, 2020: 933; Marx, 2015: 18; Stritzel and Chang, 2015: 549). As with securitization, counter-securitization is context dependent, and the act alone of counter-securitizing is inherently no more or less a tool of resistance by securitized actors as it is by aggressors (Marx, 2015: 17). In settler-colonial societies, however, counter-securitization has become a means to resist the othering of Indigenous peoples. Indigenous protesters dialectically create their own identities by exposing and questioning the assumptions of settler-colonial discourse; "narrating Indigeneity by securitized native groups becomes equivalent with counter-securitization" (Jamal, 2020: 934). Counter-securitization becomes a far more complex study of dialectical and mutual identity creation than the original Copenhagen School's speech-act provides (Han, 2021: 157); dialectical (counter) securitization entails that "authority, legitimacy, and consent are in constant need of being established and re-established" (Stritzel and Chang, 2015: 554). Understanding a securitizing or counter-securitizing actor's discourse should be understood as related to the discourse(s) of competing security actors, as well as historical and contemporary cultural and political contexts.

Securitization and Canadian settler-colonial governance

Many scholars have critically examined security discourse in the Canadian context. Canadian settler-colonial rhetoric attempts to disguise the appropriation of land and continued violence directed toward Indigenous peoples in neoliberal euphemisms of "progress," "(white) normalcy," "reconciliation" and "modernity" (for example, Dorrell, 2009; Pasternak and Dafnos, 2018; Preston, 2013) while portraying Indigenous land defenders as threats to Canada's economy and sovereignty. Recognition politics, whereby the settler-colonial state claims authority to determine how Indigenous peoples are to be categorized within the settler state, reproduces colonial ontologies that aim to erase Indigenous land stewardship practices. This discourse claims the displacement of Indigenous peoples as a necessary and legitimate act of securing state sovereignty (Coulthard, 2014; Proulx, 2014). A "language of engagement" by the Canadian state bears a progressive façade yet masks asymmetrical power relations and ongoing physical and systemic violence (Mittal, 2021: 126). Scholars (Dorrell, 2009) have criticized reconciliation policies as

the Canadian state's attempts to relegitimize its sovereignty on stolen lands and describe injustices toward Indigenous peoples as having happened in the past. State-centred narratives of reconciliation ignore and impart further harm upon Indigenous peoples, lands and ontologies by disguising land displacement and violence as "normal politics" that Indigenous peoples must reconcile themselves to (Dorrell, 2009). In spite of the state's reconciliation narratives, Indigenous peoples continue to experience state- and settler-driven violence and discursive othering today. This includes but is not limited to direct violence toward land defenders and Indigenous peoples living in proximity to critical infrastructure sites, and this violence has especially gendered impacts (Knott, 2018). As Fontaine (2022: Interview) expresses:

> Discourse, language, informs the way that we see things, and so one of the things that I always talk about in respect to the issue of Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls and Two-Spirited, one of the reasons why it was allowed, or still allowed to this moment … (is) because of the language that is utilized to construct Indigenous women.

Settler governments continue to engage in security discourses that aim to delegitimize Indigenous peoples' experiences of physical, cultural and environmental violence for the purpose of securing the economic and governing assets of the state.

"Critical infrastructure" discourse in settler-colonial societies is an example of securitization that often displaces Indigenous peoples' inherent rights to land, whereby securitizing actors assert the protection of infrastructure and the surrounding land as necessary for a functioning economy. The discourse redefines infrastructure's importance by describing it as "critical." Rejecting, protesting or otherwise challenging critical infrastructure becomes synonymous with an infringement on the material and ontological survival of the state (Monaghan and Walby, 2017: 53; Spice, 2018: 42). Canadian officials cite a broad range of perceived threats as justification for protecting critical infrastructure (Rudner, 2009), and this often extends to explicit and implicit depictions of Indigenous land defenders as security threats. Canadian governments have responded to Indigenous protests of critical infrastructure projects through public and private surveillance (Monaghan and Walby, 2017: 52), police intervention (Crosby, 2021: 2) and security legislation (Proulx, 2014) that seek to normalize the practice of land and resource extraction. Critical infrastructure discourse in Canada often aims to delegitimize Indigenous protests of Canadian sovereignty claims and exploitative capitalism (Crosby, 2021: 3) and frames Indigenous actions as extremist and destructive (Spice, 2018: 43). Fontaine (2022: Interview) explains the destructiveness of settler colonial critical infrastructure discourse in relation to its impacts on Indigenous lives:

> If you think that all Indigenous men are criminals … if you're constructing them as criminals, then how is that informing the policies, and the laws, and the decisions that you're making in that space? It's not good. None of it can be good. When you are intrinsically looking and understanding on a group of people as less than, nothing good can come out of that.

Designating infrastructure as "critical" in a settler-colonial context perpetuates dichotomies of "civilized/uncivilized" and "culture/nature" that codify modern settler society as "progressive" and Indigenous sovereignty and perspectives of human and more-than-human relationships as threatening progress (Pasternak and Dafnos, 2018: 741; Spice, 2018: 42). Canadian governments that prioritize economic security may use "critical infrastructure" discourse to delegitimize the duty to consult with Indigenous peoples as a source of uncertainty for the unchallenged circulation of goods (Pasternak and Dafnos, 2018: 749). The construction of critical infrastructure constitutes "a form of settler colonial invasion" (Spice, 2018: 42) that Indigenous protesters seek to expose.

Canadian governments' understanding of Indigenous protest as threatening critical infrastructure illustrates the state's efforts and limitations in securing itself. Fontaine (2022: Interview) asserted that governments may attempt to determine what constitutes legitimate and illegitimate protest: "There's still a movement toward having protest that is acceptable to the government in power." As Crosby explains, Indigenous protest that challenges the "post-colonial fantasies about Canada's formation and deeply colonial relations [are interpreted by an insecure settler-Canada] . . . as threatening the fragile foundation on which settler society attempts to reproduce and secure itself" (2021: 3). Analyzing securitization in Canada as a network of securitizing and counter-securitizing moves rather than an uncontested speech act illustrates that notions of security are never settled and always contestable (Topgyal, 2016). Counter-securitization discourse highlights the power of Indigenous resistance to set new terms for whom or what must be protected, which international relations theory has traditionally undervalued (Van Rythoven, 2021: 266). The dialectical nature of security discourse suggests there are opportunities for resistance movements to expose the Canadian state's claims of unchallengeable sovereignty on Indigenous lands as illegitimate.

Indigenous articulations of security and resistance through direct action

A wide range of scholarship has produced important insights on non-state Indigenous resistance and security, where expressions of discontent and autonomy often take the form of protesting economic systems. Scholars have written about how Indigenous communities' approaches to security often feature a complex relationship among the referent objects of security that range from cultural to economic and social wellbeing (Hossain, 2016: 422). It is important to stress that Indigenous peoples' approaches to the multitude of security referents is not uniform.[9] However, much literature on Indigenous security shares that Indigenous peoples' protection of lands and ability to manage resources independently or in substantive collaboration with settler and Indigenous governments is critical to achieving security (for example, Spice, 2018; Coté, 2022; Miltenburg et al., 2022). Land occupations, marches and demonstrations outside of legislatures and on resource extraction sites constitute some of the ways in which direct action seeks to resist imposed critical infrastructure projects (Morden, 2015: 257; Spice, 2018: 48; Stanley, 2019: 1147). Direct action can also highlight where Indigenous peoples feel Canadian governments' consultations on economic projects have been superficial or perfunctory performances of reconciliation and nation-to-nation dialogue (Medby,

2019: 1282; Youdelis, 2016: 1385). Land-based protest, premised on a respect for the territories that sustain human and more-than-human entities, has popularized positive descriptors such as "land defender" (Fontaine, 2022: Interview; Spice, 2018: 48) that reframe protests as protecting lives and environments. Direct action can be used by groups who lack regular access to representative institutions and who behave in ways that fundamentally challenge the ontological assumptions of state authorities (Morden, 2015: 257). This article does not seek to dichotomize direct and institutionalized resistance or Indigenous peoples who seek differing notions of security. Woons identifies a concern some scholars share, that Indigenous resistance and state action are incompatible because the latter legitimizes "fundamentally colonial institutions and their past and present assimilationist polices" (2013: 18). We seek to expand on resistance by presenting elected Indigenous activists who choose institutions as one of many methods to express their political will. Direct action remains a crucial channel for Indigenous resistance, and Indigenous activists working in institutions regularly express themselves politically outside of state institutions. As Fontaine (2022: Interview) says, "I'm a long-time activist. I understand the importance, and critical need, and transformative effect of protest."

Indigenous elected representatives in the Manitoba Legislature

Indigenous members' experiences in legislative assemblies are relatively underexplored in the legislature literature, especially related to Manitoba. Fontaine (2022: Interview) reflects on her experience as a legislator:

> It took me a long time to kind of figure out how to operate in that space, but one of the things that I do in order to survive is to be true to myself. And I will often say to people, we're only here for a short period. I have to be true to myself. If that means that people don't elect me, it is what it is. I'll move on to a different path. And my job as an Indigenous woman, as an activist . . . is to dismantle the discourse, to dismantle the status quo in that place, to make it easier for the next ones coming out after me. But also, to impact on the lives, not only of Indigenous Peoples, but all BIPOC peoples. In my mind, that's my role.

Scholars describe how legislators either embrace or choose against representing and promoting communities that they share identities with, with legislatures serving as sites of resistance to government actions through legislative scrutiny, question period, debate and committees (Docherty, 2005: 28; Rayment and VandenBeukel, 2020: 379). Representation without structural change, however, falls short of challenging the settler-colonial status quo of legislatures, as Maddison (2010) argues. Indigenous members of legislatures and their approaches to governance are as diverse as Indigenous peoples themselves and should not be misconstrued as monolithic with the same legislative goals. Furthermore, the aims of legislative and direct activism should not be perceived as homogenous (Peach, 2011: 24). However, Fontaine (2022: Interview) identifies the presence and challenges of opposing settler colonial discourse in the Legislature: "I try to get up as much as I can to kind of dismantle that [discourse], which is not easy. It's not an easy space" and "We still

have a really long way to go." Indigenous resistance in the Manitoba Legislature exhibits a pattern of challenging critical infrastructure legislation and discourse, with Indigenous opposition members as influential actors of counter-securitization.

The incompatibility of Indigenous resistance and counter-securitization

Scholars have identified the incompatibility between Indigenous resistance and counter-securitization through state channels because of the state's role in recognizing the legitimacy of Indigenous political expression. Hossain, 2016: 421) writes that the power asymmetry between state governments and Indigenous communities means that the former determines how to provide space and legitimacy for the recognition of the latter's rights and security priorities. In Canada, Greaves (2018: 108) maintains that (counter-)securitization by Indigenous activists has been largely unsuccessful, evidenced by the lack of government action that would alleviate "environmental security claims that identify damage inflicted to Indigenous lands and lives by natural resource extraction [or] Indigenous peoples' lack of authority over their traditional territories." Indigenous (counter-)securitizing moves have been met with rejection by governments that choose not to halt the economic systems that damage Indigenous lives and territories. Indigenous counter-security discourse is thus challenged by the fact that the audiences Indigenous activists try to convince are often the sources of insecurity (governments, corporate actors and so forth) who routinely meet their concerns with hostility. Changing settler institutions' governing practices from within also bears challenges because of the frequently hostile working culture in legislatures[10] (Fontaine, 2022: Interview; Morden, 2018) and may not be the goal of some decolonial efforts in the first place (Tuck and Yang, 2012).

The Manitoba case may offer an exception to present securitization theory by representing how counter-securitization discourse may be successful at halting oppressive legislation, but not because the government audience is fully convinced of the premises of these claims. Instead, Indigenous counter-securitization's effectiveness may grow because of what Van Rythoven (2021) describes as many settlers' "feeling of unease" to define Indigenous protests as security threats. Settler government officials may feel compelled to reevaluate the public legitimacy of their securitization because of recent turns to reconciliation and their efforts to distance themselves from appearing complicit in Canada's history of settler violence (Van Rythoven, 2021: 256). As overt securitization claims of Indigenous protests become less publicly defensible, Indigenous counter-securitization may become more publicly acceptable and more effective at leveraging contradictions between governments' securitization discourses and its reconciliatory narratives of healing. However, the securitization of Indigenous protest may not disappear and may still thrive in private or less obvious contexts, such as interdepartmental memos and closed-door conversations, or by individuals who actively seek controversy (Van Rythoven, 2021: 253). Fontaine's accounts of the legislative chamber illustrate that the devaluing of Indigenous experiences in public spaces is ongoing.

Securitization and efforts to achieve decolonization through settler institutions have been questioned as prescriptive means to dismantle settler colonialism. Bertrand (2018: 287) notes that security scholars remove communities from being

able to conduct their own securitization: "Putting words into the subaltern mouth is problematic as it buries those words under layers of representation and thus silences them further." Scholars impose their perspectives by determining which securitizing acts by Indigenous communities are and are not successful. Scholars have also identified the incommensurability of settler institutions and decolonization, as striving to improve rather than unsettle settler institutions may simply reify them and prevent settlers from relinquishing "land or power or privilege" (Tuck and Yang, 2012: 10). We respond to these arguments by suggesting that it is still necessary to discuss notions of security in academic literature because failing to do so prevents researchers from imagining and acknowledging the circumstances in which Indigenous counter-securitization as resistance and through legislative channels finds success. Our determination of what is successful follows the analytical cues of the individuals directly involved in the security discourses. While we cannot completely diminish our settler perspectives in this article, we aim to mitigate "speaking for" Indigenous Peoples by following the analytical leads of Fontaine, Bushie and Indigenous scholars and shifting the analytical centre to them. This is not to say that counter-securitization is without its assumptions of what security should look like, which we consider following the findings section on legislation and security discourses.

Findings and Analysis of Securitization and Counter-Securitization in the Manitoba Legislature

Contextualizing and comparing the bills

Discussion of Bills 57, 62 and 63 requires their contextualization within the political background they were introduced. Fontaine (2022) explains in her interview comments that the shooting of Colten Boushie in Saskatchewan and the Wet'suwet'en protests across Canada comprised two major incidents that preceded the introduction of Bills 57, 62 and 63: "[At that time] there were land defenders that were defending lands across Canada and all over . . . and a little before, you have the Stanley trial with Colten Boushie." In 2018, Gerald Stanley went on trial for the 2016 murder of Colten Boushie, a 22-year-old nêhiyaw man who had accidentally entered Stanley's farm with four friends. Macdonald (2021) explains that the inequities throughout Stanley's trial, including but not limited to a jury that had not been screened for anti-Indigenous bias as well as Stanley's acquittal, makes the trial an example of how Canada's justice system ignores and enacts direct and systemic violence upon Indigenous experiences and lives. Two years after the trial, Wet'suwet'en hereditary chiefs protested a proposed pipeline, Coastal GasLink, through their territories. Wet'suwet'en claims over their ancestral lands, as recognized by Canadian governments, have been unresolved for decades and remain so today. Protests across Canada, including in Manitoba, supported many Wet'suwet'en land defenders' rejection of the pipeline. Fontaine (2022: Interview) explains that the protests were "about defending lands, protecting the environment, all of those things, which people have done since time immemorial." The introduction and debate of the bills occurred within this political context.

A comparative reading of the three bills illustrates how they codified land as a matter of economic and provincial security. Bill 57 explained that "infrastructure is

critical infrastructure if the use or presence of the infrastructure makes a significant contribution to the health, safety, security or economic well-being of Manitobans" (2(1)) and that "land or premises on which critical infrastructure is located is considered to form part of the critical infrastructure" (2(3)). Under section 4 of Bill 57, courts could make an order to

> (a) designate an area surrounding the critical infrastructure as a critical infrastructure protection zone; (b) prohibit or restrict a person from entering the critical infrastructure protection zone; (c) prohibit or restrict specified conduct within the critical infrastructure protection zone; (d) prohibit or restrict the interference with or blockading of any access required to bring people or materials into the critical infrastructure protection zone.

Bill 62 allowed agricultural industries to establish a "biosecurity zone," which meant "an area on or within a farm, animal production facility, or animal processing facility" that an established agricultural metric or government agency, including the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and the National Swine Farm-Level Biosecurity Standard published by the Canadian Pork Council, would designate. Bill 62 stipulated that "a person must not interfere with a biosecurity zone or compromise the integrity of a biosecurity zone," (13.1(2)), "interfere with or interact with a commercial animal in a biosecurity zone" (13.1(3)) or "interfere with or interact with a commercial animal being transported by or kept in a vehicle" (13.2(2)). Bill 63 prohibited entry to "lands or premises without the permission of the owner, tenant, or occupier," including "(iii) a construction site,... (v) a farmyard or storage site for agricultural equipment, (vi) lands or premises used for the cultivation of crops, the grazing or feeding of animals, the raising of birds or fish, or beekeeping." All three bills codified land as a space upon which to conduct and secure the economic functions of the province. The bills ranged in scope from a single industry, as with Bill 62, to a broad list of critical infrastructure, as with Bill 57: agriculture and food production; communications; government facilities "for the effective functioning of the Legislature"; healthcare; justice and public safety; oil, gas, and electricity, including pipelines; transportation, including railways; waste disposal; and water, sewers and drainage. Lastly, the bills gave critical infrastructure on private lands legal protection against interference and authorized the Manitoba justice system and/or the agricultural sector to determine how land should be owned and used.

The bills were similar in that they determined what spaces were available for public entry. The court that issued a critical infrastructure protection zone under Bill 57 would then:

> designate an area near or within the critical infrastructure protection zone as an area where people may congregate for the purpose of exercising their rights to freedom of assembly and freedom of expression, if the court is satisfied that (a) the designation is necessary for those rights to be adequately protected; and (b) the designation does not create a safety risk to any person. (5(1))

Courts were empowered to determine whether protesters should have the space to protest and what activities constituted legitimate protest (that is, nothing interpreted as unsafe or threatening the infrastructure). Bill 62 prohibited a person from entering "a biosecurity zone without the consent of (a) the owner of the commercial animals being kept in the zone; or (b) the occupier of the zone, if no commercial animals are being kept in the zone at the time of entry" (13.1(1)), while Bill 63 1(1) a) authorized the expulsion of anyone from anywhere that "fences, walls, or natural boundary . . . [or] signage . . . indicate an intention to keep persons off or animals on the lands or premises." All three bills prescribed where public entry was permissible and when the court or private landowner had the legal authority to bar entry. Consent was conceptualized as being wielded by private owners, not as being held by or in consultation with Indigenous land stewards.

The bills differed in terms of the limitations on public protest and "appropriate" activities on land. While Bill 63 did not explicitly limit the space for protest in relation to critical infrastructure or private lands, Bill 57 limited protests once a court had authorized a critical infrastructure protection zone. Bill 62, section 13.2(1) stated that a "person must not stop, hinder, obstruct or otherwise interfere with a vehicle transporting a commercial animal," which could be interpreted as including protest. However, Bill 57 was the broadest attempt at limiting direct courses of action that Indigenous peoples may employ to express their dissent toward critical infrastructure projects in Manitoba. The House deliberations illustrate the dialectics of securitization and counter-securitization pertaining to the three bills.

Securitization discourse: introduction of government bills

Government ministers introduced Bills 57, 62 and 63 as attempts to balance protest with the economy. Bill 57 was described as protecting "critical infrastructure if and when a protest harms or threatens to harm the public interest of Manitobans," with the right to protest being balanced with "the rights of Manitobans to enjoy their property and preserve their livelihoods" (Cullen, 11/2/20: 438). All three Bills securitized land-as-infrastructure: Bill 57, against "undue obstruction"; Bill 63, against "confrontations between landowners and trespassers"; and Bill 62, against "persons who interfere with food production facilities that could result in harm to people, animals, and the food supply" (Cullen, 11/2/20: 438–439; Pedersen, 11/2/20: 436). In each case, the Manitoba Government securitized against activities that may obstruct the use of land for the provincial economy.

According to securitization theory, the first readings performed to all legislative members, and secondarily, the Manitoba public that protecting critical infrastructure required legislating acceptable and unacceptable interactions with infrastructure. The first readings equated "Manitobans" to "landowners" and those trying to make a "livelihood," in contrast to the "trespasser" or "protester" who may aim to disrupt economic infrastructure. This discourse created a binary between supporters of critical infrastructure and those who may protest it, thus reinforcing the notion that provincial institutions should be empowered to determine how land is used and conceptualized. The first readings codified land as private property and the basis of industry, while not respecting Indigenous understandings of land stewardship.

Counter-securitization discourses: ontological resistance

Indigenous opposition members saw the bills as security measures that protected the economy and private property and threatened Indigenous peoples' rights to freedom of expression and mobility. Fontaine critiqued Bill 57 for giving "the minister and large corporations unprecedented power to silence those that would dare to protest for environmental rights, Indigenous rights, women's rights, just to name a few" (03/25/21: 2046). She drew attention to the restrictions on mobility imposed by Bills 62 and 63 in relation to Bill 57: "You can't look at Bills 62 and 63 without looking at Bill 57 . . . . These bills are meant to restrict the movement of Manitobans who are seeking justice or remedy" (05/20/21: 3359). Fontaine's discourse reframed the bills as sources of insecurity for Indigenous peoples who wish to voice their discontent and to reclaim space for dissent and freedom of movement.

Indigenous opposition members counter-securitized the three bills as infringing on the lives of Indigenous peoples and land and animal defenders. Fontaine argued, under Bill 62, an individual could be fined up to $10,000 or imprisoned up to 1 year for giving farm animals water (04/12/2021: 2313). Fontaine's framing connected the penalties of Bill 62 to direct impacts on the lives and autonomy of animal defenders and more-than-human beings. Bills 57 and 63 were framed in more life-threatening terms than Bill 62, with Bill 57 seen as a targeted attack against Indigenous land defenders, environmentalists and labour and animal welfare activists (03/17/21: 1718). Ian Bushie's (03/22/21: 1844) reframing of Bill 63 anticipated an erosion of Indigenous–settler relations: "[the Bill] brings forward and incites confrontation. The minister talks about [how] this is going to eliminate those confrontations. Fact of the matter is, it's going to incite [them]." Fontaine and Bushie described the bills as threatening to how Indigenous peoples conduct their lives; the referent of security through this lens became Indigenous lives facing insecurity from critical infrastructure legislation. Furthermore, Fontaine's and Bushie's counter-securitization of the bills reframed the conceptualization of land within the bills as a source of physical insecurity rather than of economic security.

Indigenous opposition members described the bills as reinforcing ontologies of Indigenous lands as private property and industrial sites. They were framed as restricting how Indigenous peoples interact with land, requiring individuals to obtain consent before entering and interacting with animals in tightly controlled agricultural areas and giving the government "incredible powers" to designate areas as "protest-free zones" (Fontaine, 03/17/21: 1717). Fontaine's discourse repositioned the referent of security from economic systems to individuals whose inherent rights to access land and protest were facing restrictions. Bushie (03/22/21: 1844) examined the bills' descriptions of "landowners" and "trespassing" in relation to the murder of Colten Boushie: "Colten Boushie did not trespass. He was on land that inherently belonged to Indigenous peoples; that inherently belonged to his community; traditional territory of his ancestors and will be traditional territory of his future generations." Bushie connected his analysis to Bill 63's marginalization of Indigenous landholders:

> We talk about who is inherent in this land and who are the landowners, and the minister talks about if there's a fence up there, if there's a fence that clearly defines your land. So all those generations ago, if Indigenous peoples put a fence on the east coast, the west coast, the north and south coasts, is that good enough? Would that be good enough to now claim this land as theirs? Because it is; it is inherently Indigenous peoples that are the rightful inherent landowners here, and Bill 63 works to eliminate that, works to try and so-called clarify the landowners and the landholders of this territory. (03/22/21: 1844)

Both Fontaine and Bushie described Indigenous lands and ontologies as facing insecurity because of the Bills. The MLAs challenged the bills' binary of "landowners" and "trespassers," arguing that such terms narrowed Indigenous lands to that of strictly being sites for critical infrastructure. By shifting away from the landowner/trespasser binary, Indigenous members expanded the referent of security. Fontaine (03/22/21: 1843) explained that "Indigenous peoples are not happy about the sweep of legislation that we see, but so are Manitobans." This introduced an inclusive "Manitoban" referent, one that countered the landowner/trespasser binary that the bills established and broadened the discussion of security beyond the bills' focus on economic security.

Government responses to counter-securitization discourses

Government members responded to the counter-securitization of Bills 62 and 63 by shifting the discourse to public safety and de-escalation rather than repeating its securitization of economic systems. It attempted to reframe Bill 63 as an effort to de-escalate conflict. As Minister Friesen stated, "It is in no one's best interest that some kind of confrontation—a face-to-face confrontation—happens, and right now with our rules, that is exactly what must occur in order for someone to convey to someone else that they shouldn't be on that property" (03/22/21: 1838). He further asserted that the government respected the hunting, trapping and fishing rights of First Nations and other Indigenous peoples, and that "these amendments do nothing to impinge or impugn those rights" (Friesen, 03/22/21: 1838) to try and re-shift the referent of security to all Manitobans and present Bill 63 as an answer to confrontations on property. Bill 62 similarly saw the Government shifting the security discourse to refocus the referent of security to livestock and families:

> After Bill 62 was introduced, my department received notification from a producer—a chicken producer—about an uninvited visitor at their home last December. This individual switched off the main power—the hydro source. It was also noticed that packs of matches were left behind on the ground, and the individual drove around the barns on the property. These are the kinds of actions that are being endorsed by the New Democratic Party, and it's shameful and it affects the safety of our farm families and their livestock. (Pedersen, 04/12/21: 2313)

This anecdote attempted to reframe the security discourse to that of addressing individual misconduct rather than community protest as the source of insecurity.

The rhetoric also attempted to frame the opposition's concerns about Bill 62 as primarily partisan and securitizes such partisanship as contributing to the insecurity of farmers and livestock.

The (counter-) security and ontological discourses of what land represents persisted throughout Bill 57's debate. When called upon to withdraw Bill 57 by Fontaine, the Premier asserted that:

> Indigenous peoples care about property, too. They really care deeply about property, and that's why we've negotiated tens of thousands of acres of treaty land entitlement . . . and land to First Nations all over this province that the NDP did nothing—they did nothing for years . . . That member from St. Johns [Fontaine] was supposed to be representing the views of Indigenous peoples, but there is no evidence she ever did any work. None. None whatsoever. Zero impact. But this government has got tens of thousands of acres of land over to Indigenous peoples to show that we care about reconciliation, something that the member couldn't give a darn about. (Pallister, 03/17/21: 1718)

The discourse on Bill 57 differed from the discourse on Bills 62 and 63 in that there was no similar attempt to de-securitize the legislation. The Government's response did not reframe the legislation as not infringing on Indigenous lives and rights. Instead, the Premier reasserted a conceptualization of land-as-property and explicitly imposed that understanding on Indigenous peoples. Accusations of partisanship were invoked, but an attack on an Indigenous individual's commitment to supporting Indigenous peoples separated the Government response on Bill 57 from the responses on Bills 62 and 63. As Fontaine (2022: Interview) expresses, "a real ally would never say that to an Indigenous woman. Never."

The Government's reframing of Bills 57, 62 and 63 did not change their content, but rather represents a shift in performance on the latter two bills. The Government discourse attempted, to varying degrees, to shift the bills' meaning from being interpreted as sources of insecurity for Indigenous peoples. However, the ontology of land as private property remained, as demonstrated during Bill 63's third reading: "the bill is designed so that a property that is marked or partially enclosed, there when a person enters into it without permission, that would constitute trespassing" (Friesen, 05/20/21: 3359). The private property/trespassing binary persisted throughout the Government's discourse. However, there was no similar reframing of Bill 57 as an effort to promote public safety as there was for Bills 62 and 63. Government discourse on this Bill ignored Indigenous conceptualizations of land and imposed settler-colonial understandings of land-as-private property upon Indigenous peoples. Ultimately, the government's actions illustrated that no piece of legislation was exempt from Indigenous opposition members' scrutiny. Their resistance through counter-securitization exposed critical infrastructure securitization within the legislative chamber as far from normal, necessary and unchallengeable.

Limitations to Prescribing Counter-Securitization and Future Considerations

Prescribing counter-securitization as a means for resistance in legislative discourse bears limitations. The passing of Bills 62 and 63 demonstrates that counter-securitization discourse alone may not stop every piece of critical infrastructure legislation. Pairing counter-securitization with institutional mechanisms such as designation may lead to more robust resistance than counter-securitization on its own. While Bill 57 itself may not be a topic of deliberation, the discussion of critical infrastructure and its security continued beyond its designation, as efforts persisted to limit protest to forms acceptable to the government at the time (Fontaine, 2022: Interview). Counter-securitization can problematize specific instances of securitization, such as Bill 57, so as to reframe the passing of legislation as dangerous for Indigenous peoples, but the legislated securitization of land persists. However, this is not to say that inclusive changes in legislative language do not or have not occurred. Fontaine (2022: Interview) articulated that changes in language are continually occurring, such as recently with "the Rules and Procedures, . . . to make all the language gender neutral."

Securitization's inherent structure of competition and dominance limits the prescriptive value of counter-securitization-as-decolonization. Counter-securitization falls short of challenging dialectal competition in legislative debate because of its reliance on confrontational discourse. Ahenakew et al. (2014) agree that counter-hegemonic resistance has been a necessary means for Indigenous peoples to survive in environments defined by cognitive imperialism, but is insufficient for imagining a pluralist future that challenges modern practices of dominance/subservience. Counter-securitization by resisting actors can lead to further securitization by the government and can become an endless struggle for narrative supremacy, further challenging the legitimization of Indigenous voices and worldviews in legislatures. Settler representations of Indigenous knowing are often "superficial, stereotypical, and based on desires for redemption and re-centring of the Western subject," a re-centring that (counter)securitization dialectics on their own fall short of fundamentally challenging (Ahenakew et al., 2014: 220). The dialectics of securitization and counter-securitization perpetuate a "vicious cycle" (Jamal, 2020: 953) that additional securitization on its own may aim to transcend but may rather reproduce the discourse it tries to repudiate. However, this is not a reflection of the work that Indigenous opposition members have done in the legislature, but rather a criticism of the current state of debate and culture in the Manitoba Legislature and of counter-securitization as a normative model of decolonization.

A further implication of the study's findings for counter-securitization is that it does not challenge the legitimacy of the state, but rather reifies its ability to determine what acceptable governance is for Indigenous peoples. Bill 57's defeat illustrates a reauthorization of a legislature to determine how provincial governance impacts Indigenous peoples. However, the key addition to the securitization literature here is that Indigenous elected officials led this legislative resistance and demonstrated that the acceptable practices of the Manitoba Legislature can, and may continue to, change in pace with settlers' growing feelings of unease (Van

Rythoven, 2021). The Manitoba case illustrates how legislatures, as an audience for the government, can also act as securitizing actors and use institutional means to challenge settler-colonial legislation at its inception. This further illustrates that even governments that hold a majority are still audiences to legislative oppositions. The defeat of Bill 57 demonstrates that majority-governments-as-audiences may also be considered receptive to some counter-securitizing moves, especially those paired with legislative designation. Counter-securitization within settler institutions, then, may not offer a clear means to dispute the legitimacy of legislatures, but it does offer an important means to disrupt settler-colonial governance that Indigenous legislators may perceive as illegitimate.

The prescriptive value of counter-securitization stems from its ability to delay securitizing legislation and compel critical engagement with security discourse in legislatures. Counter-securitization is only one of myriad examples of resistance in legislatures, and Indigenous MLAs are more than counter-securitizing actors. Settler institutions such as the Manitoba Legislature become a site of transformation because Indigenous activists can use them to disrupt settler-colonial norms in legislative and legislated spaces. Through Indigenous counter-securitization, (counter-)security discourse and the Legislature itself fulfill Ahenakew et al.'s call for "integrating [Indigenous] traditional practices in non-Indigenous institutions, . . . putting Western tools at the service of Indigenous communities, [and] enacting Indigenous wisdom in environmental and social activism" (2014: 218). However, in no capacity does this study prescribe that Indigenous actors should rely on settler institutions to recognize Indigenous worldviews as legitimate. Individual and collective self-recognition that originates from and thrives on "a politics that is less oriented around attaining an affirmative form of recognition from the settler-state and society, and more about . . . a radical alternative to the structural and psycho-affective facets of colonial domination" (Coulthard, 2007: 456) must exist and prosper because of their inherent right to do so. As Burow et al. explain, decolonization is a hybrid process, and discussions of land "cannot simply be the rejection of one modality of land for the other, but rather follows an uneasy path to maintain a hybrid assemblage of ontologies, with all their attendant affordances and limitations" (2018: 67). Indigenous resistance and the decolonization of lands have every right to originate and operate in all Indigenous and settler institutional and extra-institutional systems and approaches to legislation.

Conclusions

Indigenous opposition members' activism in the Manitoba Legislature demonstrates that institutionalized action is not only possible, but is happening successfully. Counter-securitization represents a discursive tool available to challenge the current culture of house proceedings, rhetorical exchanges by members and the crafting of legislation. Indigenous opposition members' counter-securitization works to reclaim the referent of security for human and nurturing more-than-human subjects, away from the primacy of extractive infrastructure. However, the confrontational nature of counter-securitization suggests that counter-securitization-as-resistance should be prescribed as an area for further academic evaluation rather than a practical rhetorical tool for reimagining legislatures in the long term.

Still, the Manitoba Legislature bears transformative potential for legislative debate, Indigenous activism and Indigenous–settler relations because of the members chosen to transform its operations. This is especially apparent with the most recent Manitoban election. One-third of Government now consists of Indigenous members, with many of the same Indigenous activists that had led the resistance of critical infrastructure bills filling vital executive positions. Wab Kinew is now the first First Nations premier in Manitoba history and minister responsible for Indigenous Reconciliation; Bernadette Smith and Nahanni Fontaine are the first First Nations women to sit at Manitoba's cabinet as Ministers of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness and of Families, respectively; and Ian Bushie now serves as Minister of Natural Resources and Indigenous Futures. As Fontaine (2022: Interview) concludes the conversation, "That's how you change the discourse, and the culture, and all the -isms within that space, is by who you elect."

Competing interests. The authors declare none.

Notes

1 For this article, the "Manitoba Government" refers to the government formed prior to the recent October 2023 election that witnessed the election of Wab Kinew and the NDP; the same applies to the Official Opposition.

2 Originally from Onigaming First Nation in northern Ontario, Wab Kinew is the current Party Leader of the Manitoba New Democratic Party (NDP), Premier of Manitoba, Minister responsible for Indigenous Reconciliation and MLA for the Winnipeg riding of Fort Rouge. He was elected to the Legislature in 2016 and became Party Leader and Leader of the Official Opposition in 2017. https://winnipeg.ctvnews.ca/wab-ki new-leader-of-the-manitoba-ndp-1.4566755.

3 Nahanni Fontaine is a member of the Sagkeeng Anishinaabe First Nation and has been the MLA for the Winnipeg riding of St. Johns since 2016. She is the current NDP Government House Leader, Minister of Families, Minister responsible for Accessibility, and Minister responsible for Gender Equity. https://www.go v.mb.ca/minister/min_families.html

4 Ian Bushie is a member and former Chief of Hollow Water First Nation. He has served as the MLA for the north-eastern Manitoba riding of Keewatinook since 2019 and is the current Minister of Natural Resources and Indigenous Futures. He served as the critic for Indigenous Reconciliation and Northern Relations during the debate of Bills 57, 62, and 63. https://www.gov.mb.ca/minister/min_indigenous.html

5 Bernadette Smith has served as the MLA for the Winnipeg riding of Point Douglas since 2017. She is the current Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness and Minister responsible for Mental Health. She is the co-founder of the Drag the Red Initiative. https://www.gov.mb.ca/minister/min_housing.html

6 Amanda Lathlin is a member of the Opaskwayak Cree Nation (OCN) and former OCN band councilor. She was elected as the member of the northern Manitoba riding of The Pas (now The Pas-Kameesak) in 2015 and has served as the Opposition Critic for Sports, Culture and Heritage. https://www.thompsoncitize n.net/nickel-belt-news/manitobas-first-female-first-nations-mla-sworn-in-4282969

7 Designated bills cannot be passed in the session they are designated and must be delayed until the subsequent fall sitting for completion. The opposition can designate up to five Government bills each session. https://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/business/bills.html

8 The interview with Nahanni Fontaine took place at the Manitoba Legislature on April 22, 2022.

9 It is important to note that not all Indigenous peoples are opposed to critical infrastructure projects and resource extraction activities. For example, some groups within the Wet'suwet'en Nation supported the construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline. We thank an anonymous reviewer of an earlier draft of this article for bringing this point to our attention.

10 Reflecting on Elijah Harper's experience with the Manitoba Legislature's persistent discriminatory work culture, Fontaine (2022: Interview) describes how he was interrupted by the speaker one day for using "unparliamentary language" when describing the daily racism that occurred there.

References

Ahenakew, Cash, Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, Garrick Cooper, and Hemi Hireme. 2014. "Beyond Epistemic Provincialism: De-provincializing Indigenous Resistance," *Alternative* **10** (3): 216–31.

Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience, and Context." *European Journal of International Relations* **11** (2): 171–201.

Bertrand, Sarah. 2018. "Can the Subaltern Securitize? Postcolonial Perspectives on Securitization Theory and Its Critics," *European Journal of International Studies* **3** (3): 281–99.

Bill 57. 2021. *The Protection of Critical Infrastructure Act*. 3rd sess. 42nd Legislature, Manitoba.

Bill 62. 2021. *The Animal Diseases Amendment Act*. 3rd sess. 42nd Legislature, Manitoba.

Bill 63. 2021. *The Petty Trespasses Amendment and Occupiers' Liability Amendment Act*. 3rd sess. 42nd Legislature.

Burow, Paul Berne, Samara Brock, and Michael R. Dove. 2018. "Unsettling the Land: Indigeneity, Ontology, and Hybridity in Settler Colonialism," *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* **9**: 57–74.

Corntassel, Jeff. 2021. "Life Beyond the State: Regenerating Indigenous International Relations and Everyday Challenges to Settler Colonialism," *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* **1**: 71–97.

Coté, Charlotte. 2022. "tiičʔaqƛ: Understanding Food Sovereignty and Its Potential For Indigenous Health and Decolonization," In *A Drum in One Hand, A Sockeye in the Other*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Coulthard, Glen S. 2007. "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition in Canada," *Contemporary Political Theory* **6**: 437–60.

Coulthard, Glen S. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Crosby, Andrew. 2021. "The Racialized Logics of Settler Colonial Policing: Indigenous 'Communities of Concern' and Critical Infrastructure in Canada," *Settler Colonial Studies* **11** (4): 411–430.

Docherty, David C. 2005. *Legislatures*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dorrell, Matthew. 2009. "From Reconciliation to Reconciling: Reading What 'We Now Recognize' in the Government of Canada's 2008 Residential Schools Apology," *English Studies in Canada* **35**: 27–45.

Flowers, Rachel. 2015. "Refusal to Forgive: Indigenous Women's Love and Rage," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* **4** (2): 32–49.

Fontaine, Nahanni. 2022. Interview. Conducted by Aidan Trembath. April 26, 2022. Manitoba Legislature.

Greaves, Wilfrid. 2018. "Damaging Environments: Land, Settler Colonialism, and Security for Indigenous Peoples," *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* **9**: 107–24.

Han, Saerom. 2021. "Securitization of the Unemployed and Counter-Conductive Resistance in Tunisia," *Security Dialogue* **52** (2): 156–173.

Hossain, Kamrul. 2016. "Securitizing the Arctic Indigenous Peoples: A Community Security Perspective with Special Reference to the Sámi of the European High North," *Polar Science* **10**: 415–24.

Jamal, Amal. 2020. "Ontological Counter-Securitization in Asymmetric Power Relations: Lessons from Israel," *International Studies Review* **22**: 932–56.

Knott, Helen. 2018. "Violence and Extraction: Stories from the Oil Fields." In *Keetsahnak: Our Missing and Murdered Indigenous Sisters*, ed. Kim Anderson, Maria Campbell, and Christi Belcourt. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2020. *Debates and Proceedings*. November 2, 2020.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. April 12, 2021.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. March 16, 2021.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. March 17, 2021.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. March 22, 2021.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. March 24, 2021.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. March 25, 2021.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. 2021. *Debates and Proceedings*. May 20, 2021.

MacDonald, David B. 2021. "Settler Silencing and the Killing of Colten Boushie: Naturalizing Colonialism in the Trial of Gerald Stanley," *Settler Colonial Studies* **11** (1): 1–20.

Maddison, Sarah. 2010. "White Parliament, Black Politics: The Dilemmas of Indigenous Parliamentary Representation," *Australian Journal of Political Science* **45** (4): 663–80.

Marx, Gary T. 2015. "Security and Surveillance Contests: Resistance and Counter-Resistance." In *Contesting Security: Strategies and Logics*, ed. Thierry Balzacq, New York: Routledge.

Medby, Ingrid A. 2019. "State Discourses of Indigenous 'Inclusion': Identity and Representation in the Arctic," *Antipode* **51** (4): 1276–95.

Miltenburg, Elisabeth, Hannah Tait Neufeld, and Kim Anderson. 2022. "Relationality, Responsibility, and Reciprocity: Cultivating Indigenous Food Sovereignty within Urban Environments," *Nutrients* **14** (9): 1–16.

Mittal, Paarth. 2021. "Extraction, Indigenous Dispossession, and State Power: Lessons from Standing Rock and We'suwet'en Resistance," *The Arbutus Review* **12** (1): 121–41.

Monaghan, Jeffrey, and Kevin Walby. 2017. "Surveillance of Environmental Movements in Canada: Critical Infrastructure Protection and the Petro-Security Apparatus," *Contemporary Justice Review* **20** (1): 51–70.

Morden, Michael. 2015. "Right and Resistance: Norms, Interests, and Indigenous Direct Action in Canada," *Ethnopolitics* **14** (3): 256–76.

Morden, Michael D. 2018. "Parliament and the Representation of Indigenous Issues: The Canadian Case," *Parliamentary Affairs* **71**: 124–43.

Pasternak, Shiri, and Tia Dafnos. 2018. "How does a Settler State Secure the Circuitry of Capital," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **36** (4): 739–57.

Peach, Ian. 2011. "The Power of a Single Feather: Meech Lake, Indigenous Resistance and the Evolution of Indigenous Politics in Canada," *Review of Constitutional Studies* **16** (1): 1–29.

Preston, Jen. 2013. "Neoliberal Settler Colonialism, Canada and the Tar Sands," *Race & Class* **55** (2): 42–59.

Proulx, Craig. 2014. "Colonizing Surveillance: Canada Constructs an Indigenous Terror Threat," *Anthropologica* **56** (1): 83–100.

Rayment, Erica, and Jason Vanden Beukel. 2020. "Pandemic Parliaments: Canadian Legislatures in a Time of Crisis," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* **53**: 379–84.

Rudner, Martin. 2009. "Protecting Canada's Critical National Infrastructure from Terrorism: Mapping a Proactive Strategy for Energy Security," *International Journal* **64** (3): 775–97.

Spice, Anne. 2018. "Fighting Invasive Infrastructures: Indigenous Relations against Pipelines," *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* **9**: 40–56.

Stanley, Anna. 2019. "Aligning against Indigenous Jurisdiction: Worker Savings, Colonial Capital, and the Canada Infrastructure Bank," *EPD: Society and Space* **37** (6): 1138–56.

Stritzel, Holger, and Sean C. Chang. 2015. "Securitization and Counter-Securitization in Afghanistan," *Security Dialogue* **46** (6): 548–67.

Topgyal, Tsering. 2016. "The Tibetan Self-Immolations as Counter-Securitization: Towards an Inter-Unit Theory of Securitization," *Asian Security* **12** (3): 166–87.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization is not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* **1** (1): 1–40.

Van Rythoven, Eric. 2021. "A Feeling of Unease: Distance, Emotion, and Securitizing Indigenous Protest in Canada," *International Political Sociology* **15**: 251–71.

Vuori, Juha A. 2015. "Contesting and Resisting Security in Post-Mao China." In *Contesting Security: Strategies and Logics*, ed. Thierry Balzacq, New York: Routledge.

Wæver, Ole. 1995. "Securitization and Desecuritization." In *On Security*, ed. Ronnie D. Lipshutz, New York: Columbia University Press.

Woons, Marc. 2013. "Taking the Road Less Travelled: Indigenous Self-Determination and Participation in Canadian Institutions," *Federal Governance* **10** (1): 14–35.

Youdelis, Megan. 2016. "'They Could Take You Out for Coffee and Call It Consultation!': The Colonial Antipolitics of Indigenous Consultation in Jasper National Park,' *Environment and Planning* **48** (7): 1374–92.