



ANISHINABEK NATION

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS (INAN)

**Bill S-2: An Act to Amend the Indian Act
(New Registration Entitlements)**

**Submitted by:
Grand Council Chief Linda Debassige
Anishinabek Nation
May 7, 2026**

HEAD OFFICE: NIPISSING FIRST NATION

1 Migizii Miikan, P.O. Box 711 | North Bay, ON P1B 8J8 | Ph: 705-497-9127 | Fax: 705-497-9135 | 1-877-702-5200
info@anishinabek.ca | www.anishinabek.ca |  Anishinabek Nation |  @AnishNation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
3. LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT	4
4. LEGAL AND INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK	4
5. ENFRANCHISEMENT AND ASSOCIATED LAND LOSS	5
6. THE SECOND-GENERATION CUT-OFF	6
7. SENATE AMENDMENTS, A CLEAR LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION ALREADY EXISTS	7
8. CONSULTATION	7
9. JURISDICTION AND REGISTRATION VS CITIZENSHIP	8
10. CAPACITY, COST, LAND, AND IMPLEMENTATION	9
11. POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION REALITY	10
12. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF THE INDIAN ACT	11
13. ANISHINABEK NATION CITIZENSHIP – E'DBENDAAGZIJIG (THOSE WHO BELONG)	11
14. RECOMMENDATIONS	12
15. CONCLUSION	13
16. ANISHINABEK NATION DECLARATION ON E'DBENDAAGZIJIG	15
17. POPULATION STATISTICS S.6(1) AND S.6(2)	16

1. INTRODUCTION

The Anishinabek Nation represents 39 First Nations and approximately 70,000 citizens across treaty and unceded territories throughout Ontario.

This briefing paper provides the position of the Anishinabek Nation on Bill S-2 and the proposed Senate amendments. It is intended to inform deliberations of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs (INAN) and to clearly articulate the expectations of Anishinabek Nation leadership and citizens.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Anishinabek Nation supports legislative action to eliminate discrimination in the Indian Act. However, we do not support incremental or partial approaches that knowingly leave discriminatory provisions in place.

The Anishinabek Nation supports the Senate amendments to Bill S-2, including the adoption of a one-parent rule, as a necessary and immediate measure to eliminate the second-generation cut-off and to ensure equality that is guaranteed under Section 15 of the Charter.

Bill S-2 presents Canada with a clear and immediate responsibility to comply with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; uphold Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982; align federal law with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act; and meet the April 2026 deadline arising from the Nicholas decision.

While the bill addresses enfranchisement, it fails to fully resolve broader inequities, particularly the second-generation cut-off. The current federal approach proposes to defer these issues to future processes under the justification of consultation and implementation readiness.

The Anishinabek Nation rejects this approach.

Discrimination that has already been identified, litigated, and acknowledged cannot be deferred. Consultation must guide implementation, not delay equality.

The impacts of the Indian Act must also be understood in their full context. Enfranchisement resulted not only in the loss of status, but also the loss of land and displacement from First Nation territories. Addressing status without addressing these broader impacts risks incomplete redress.

Concerns raised regarding population projects and implementation capacity must be grounded in evidence. Historical experience demonstrates that increases in registration occur gradually over time, and speculative projections must not be used to delay legislative action.

The Anishinabek Nation also emphasizes that First Nations are not waiting for direction from Canada. Our Nations are actively advancing citizenship laws and preparing for implementation. Chiefs and communities are directly engaged in shaping this work.

At the same time, Canada applies inconsistent approaches to identity. While other Indigenous peoples determine their own citizenship through their own systems, and Canadian citizenship has been expanded across generations, First Nations remain subject to a federally controlled registration regime that continues to limit identity.

This must change.

Bill S-2 must be understood as part of the cumulative impacts of the Indian Act. Partial solutions risk continuing a pattern of discrimination across generations.

Canada is not being asked to develop a solution.

The solution has already been placed before you through the Senate amendments.

3. LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

Bill S-2 is intended to address inequities arising from enfranchisement provisions in the Indian Act. As noted in parliamentary debate, the bill seeks to restore entitlement to approximately 3,500-6500 individuals and their descendants affected by historical policies.

The Minister of Indigenous Services has acknowledged that the Indian Act is discriminatory, that the second-generation cut-off continues to cause harm, and that further reforms are required but should proceed through a separate collaborative process.

At the same time, Canada has heard clear and opposing views that discrimination has already been established through decades of legal and policy review, that further delay is unjustifiable, and the proposed approach risks perpetuating inequality.

This tension forms the core issue before the Committee.

4. LEGAL AND INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

Canada's obligations in relation to Bill S-2 are grounded not only in domestic law, but also in its international commitments.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act affirms that UNDRIP has application in Canadian law and requires the Government of Canada to take all measures necessary to ensure that federal laws are consistent with the Declaration.

UNDRIP affirms the right of Indigenous Peoples to determine their own identity and membership (Articles 9 and 33); the right to not be subjected to forced assimilation (Article 8); and the right to lands and redress for lands taken without consent (Articles 26 and 28).

These rights align with and reinforce protections under Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 and Section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

5. ENFRANCHISEMENT AND ASSOCIATED LAND LOSS

The provisions addressing enfranchisement represent a necessary and overdue correction to historical injustice. Individuals and families affected by these policies have waited generations for recognition.

The Anishinabek Nation supports immediate passage of these provisions, compliance with the Nicholas decision deadline, and restoration of entitlement without delay.

Failure to act would maintain unconstitutional provisions, undermine confidence in Parliament's ability to respond to court rulings, and continue harm to affected individuals and families.

The impacts of enfranchisement extend beyond the loss of individual status. Impacts also include the loss of First Nations lands.

Under the Indian Act, enfranchisement was not only a mechanism to remove individuals from the Indian Register, it also had direct implications for land tenure and reserve status.

In many cases, when individuals or families enfranchised, the Crown treated this as a basis to declare that no members remained on the reserve. Enfranchisement was used as a mechanism to enable the Crown to acquire and dispose of First Nation lands resulting in the permanent loss of land and displacement of First Nations people from their territories.

While Bill S-2 seeks to restore status to individuals and descendants affected by enfranchisement, restoration of Indian status alone does not address the full impact of enfranchisement, particularly where loss of land occurred.

The Anishinabek Nation emphasizes that enfranchisement is both about identity and land. Restoration of status should not be disconnected from the loss of land and the community connection that accompanied it.

Let us be clear, Federal policy must acknowledge and address the historical taking of lands linked to enfranchisement as affirmed in UNDRIP. Article 26 affirms the right of Indigenous peoples to their lands and territories, while Article 28 affirms the right to redress for lands that have been taken without consent.

Canada's UNDRIP Act also recognizes the right to lands and redress for lands taken without consent.

Addressing enfranchisement without acknowledging associated land loss risks failing to meet these international standards.

Canada has committed to implementing UNDRIP. Advancing Bill S-2 without fully addressing known discrimination and its associated impacts risks falling short of that commitment.

Canada cannot claim to implement UNDRIP while maintaining policies that limited who we are as Nations.

6. THE SECOND-GENERATION CUT-OFF

The second-generation cut-off is not a new issue. It has been identified in previous legislative reforms, examined through multiple court cases, and raised consistently by First Nations across the country.

Its impact is clear, it limits the ability of First Nations individuals to pass on status, it divides families across generations, and it results in the gradual reduction of recognized First Nations populations.

Data from Anishinabek Nation communities demonstrates that a significant portion of our population is already registered under section 6(2), often ranging between 40% to over 50% in some communities. This means that a large segment of our citizens can only pass on status if they parent with another entitled individual.

Our analysis further confirms that, of the remaining citizens registered as 6(1), many of these individuals are now beyond their child-bearing years. The opportunity to transmit status has already been lost, entire family lines have been cut off from registration, and the impacts are permanent. This impact is not theoretical; it is measurable within our Nations and is an ongoing and accelerating loss of identity.

Parliamentarians have described this outcome as a form of "legislated extinction". Despite this, the current federal position is to acknowledge the issue, study potential solutions, and defer legislative action.

The Anishinabek Nation does not accept this approach. Where discrimination is known, delay is a decision to maintain it.

The cumulative effect of these policies cannot be ignored. When Canada maintains rules that limit the transmission of identity and delays correcting known discrimination, it is

not neutral. It is complicit in the continued erosion of First Nations populations through legislative design.

The continued application of the second-generation cut-off is inconsistent with Article 8 of UNDRIP which affirms that Indigenous peoples have the right to not be subjected to forced assimilation.

The continued application of the second-generation cut-off is inconsistent with Section 15 of the Charter, Section 35 of the Constitution, and UNDRIP and affirmed by Canada's UNDRIP Act. It is also inconsistent with First Nations-led citizenship work already underway, including the Anishinabek Nation's E'Dbendaagzijing Naaknigewin (Citizenship Law).

7. SENATE AMENDMENTS, A CLEAR LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION ALREADY EXISTS

The Senate amendments to Bill S-2 provide a clear and actionable solution to one of the most significant outstanding inequities in the Indian Act: the second-generation cut-off.

Central to these amendments is the adoption of a one-parent rule, which would enable First Nations individuals to transmit status to their children regardless of the status of the other parent, eliminate the second-generation cut-off as a barrier to identity, align registration provisions with Charter equality protections, and restore fairness between men and women in the transmission of status.

These amendments are not theoretical. They represent the result of decades of advocacy, a legally viable pathway forward, and a direct response to known discrimination.

The Anishinabek Nation supports these amendments.

8. CONSULTATION

The Government has emphasized the legal duty to consult as justification for not proceeding with broader amendments at this time.

The Anishinabek Nation affirms that consultation is a fundamental principle First Nations must lead in shaping solutions. However, consultation must not be misused.

There is a critical distinction:

Is this Legitimate Consultation, or Misuse of Consultation.

Does Consultation guide implementation, or delay recognition of rights.

Does Consultation support First Nations decision-making or maintain federal control.

Does Consultation build consensus on approach, or does it avoid legislative responsibility.

Decades of consultation have already occurred on Indian Act discrimination. At this stage, continued reliance on consultation risks becoming a mechanism of delay. The duty to consult must not be used or be perceived as a tool to postpone the elimination of known discrimination.

The Anishinabek Nation's work on E'Dbendaagzijig demonstrates that First Nations are not waiting for consultation processes to advance solutions, this work is already underway.

9. JURISDICTION AND REGISTRATION VS CITIZENSHIP

This Anishinabek Nation's position is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which affirms in Article 33 that Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity and membership. Article 9 affirms that individuals have the right to belong to their Nation in accordance with its own laws and traditions.

Bill S-2 raises an ongoing issue regarding the distinction between Federal registration under the Indian Act and First Nations citizenship and belonging.

The Anishinabek Nation asserts that citizenship is governed by Anishinaabe law, including the principles of E'Dbendaagzijig ("Those Who Belong") and that Federal registration does not define Nationhood.

Canada must not conflate administrative status with identity. At the same time, Canada must not use jurisdictional arguments to avoid correcting its own legislation or maintain discriminatory rules while claiming to respect First Nations authority.

The Anishinabek Nation also notes a broader inconsistency in how Canada approach's identity across different Indigenous groups.

The Metis Nation of Ontario exercises control over its own citizenship and maintains its own registry system. It defines belonging, self-identification, demonstrated ancestry, and acceptance by the Metis Nation is required. There is no generational cut-off, connection to culture and community is integral to citizenship and belonging, and citizenship can be removed subject to their internal policy processes.

Furthermore, recent changes to Canada's Citizenship Act have removed generational limits and expanded the ability of Canadians to pass on citizenship to their descendants born outside of Canada, including across multiple generations. Citizenship is granted to individuals who may live abroad or have never resided in Canada.

In contrast, First Nations remain subject to the Indian Act.

While other Indigenous peoples can define and govern their own citizenship systems, and Canadian citizens are able to extend Canadian citizenship for individuals in other countries, First Nations remain subject to a federally controlled registration regime that continues to limit the transmission of identity.

Canada's responsibility is clear. Canada needs to fix federal law, and respect First Nations jurisdiction. These obligations must proceed together, not sequentially.

The Anishinabek Nation's position is further supported by Section 15 of the Charter, Section 35 of the Constitution, Articles 9 and 33 of UNDRIP, and Canada's UNDRIP Act. Federal control over registration must not undermine these protections.

10. CAPACITY, COST, LAND, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Concerns have been raised regarding population impacts, service delivery, and administrative capacity. However, these discussions are incomplete if they do not address the most critical issue: Land.

The restoration of rights through Bill S-2 will inevitably require access to land, expansion of community infrastructure and the ability of First Nations to grow their populations within their own territories.

At present, the Additions to Reserve (ATR) federal policy process presents significant barriers including lengthy approval timelines, complex and burdensome requirements and limited responsiveness to community growth and planning needs. These barriers undermine the ability of First Nations to fully realize the benefits of restored entitlement.

The Anishinabek Nation emphasises that rights restoration must be matched with land access and expansion mechanisms; the ATR process must be modernized, accelerated, and adequately resourced; and Federal policy must support, not restrict the return of people to their communities.

Without meaningful reform to land access policies, the restoration of rights risks being symbolic rather than practical.

Evidence presented in Parliament indicates that growth will occur gradually and costs are manageable within existing federal frameworks. Similar reforms in the past have not resulted in projected uptake levels.

The Anishinabek Nation emphasizes that cost is not a valid justification for maintaining discrimination. Capacity gaps are a federal responsibility to address, and implementation challenges must be managed, not used as barriers.

11. POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION REALITY

Concerns have been raised regarding the potential number of individuals who may become entitled to registration if Bill S-2 is passed, particularly with respect to the second-generation cut-off.

Estimates suggesting that as many as 350,000 individuals could be registered in the first year have been presented. These projections require careful scrutiny.

From a practical standpoint, such numbers are not achievable within a single year. Based on standard federal processing capacity, registering 350,000 individuals in one year would require the processing of approximately 1,346 applications per working day (based on 260 working days per year). This level of processing is not consistent with current administrative capacity.

Historical experience further demonstrates that projections of large, immediate increases in registration have not materialized at the scale or pace suggested.

Bill C-31 (1985) recorded approximately 174,500 individuals added to the Indian Register. 106,781 were reinstated and 59,798 were born after the legislation came into force.

Bill C-3 recorded approximately 37,000 individuals registered.

Bill S-3 recorded approximately 28,970 individuals registered. Of those, 17,260 were affiliated with Section 11 Bands, and 10,533 were affiliated with Section 10 Bands. 1,168 were placed on the General List.

These increases occurred over time, not within a single year.

With respect to Bill S-2, enfranchisement-related entitlement alone is estimated to result in approximately 3,500 to 6,000 individuals becoming eligible for registration. This reflects a significantly more measured and manageable impact.

Population growth resulting from legislative changes occurs gradually, not instantaneously. Application processes, documentation requirements, and individual circumstances all contribute to a phased and incremental increase over time.

Projections of immediate, large-scale increases in registration risk overstating the practical impacts of legislative change.

Decisions regarding the elimination of discrimination should not be influenced by speculative or exaggerated population estimates.

There is also a broader concern that must be acknowledged.

Policies that restrict entitlement and reduce the number of registered First Nations people have the effect of limiting federal obligations over time. Whether intentional or not, the outcome is the same. Fewer individuals will be recognized. Fewer services will be required, reducing federal responsibility.

This dynamic cannot continue to influence legislative decision-making where equality rights are at stake.

12. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF THE INDIAN ACT

The issues addressed in Bill S-2 cannot be understood in isolation. They are part of the broader and ongoing cumulative impacts of the Indian Act which has systematically shaped and constrained First Nations identity, governance, and land over generations.

These impacts include the erosion of identity and belonging, gender-based and generational discrimination, disconnection from the land, constraints on governance and jurisdiction, and socio-economic impacts.

These impacts do not occur independently. They are interconnected and reinforced. Each generation inherits the consequences of previous legislative decisions. Bill S-2 must, therefore, be understood not as a single legislative fix, but as part of addressing a broader pattern of cumulative harm. Addressing one element of discrimination while leaving others in place continues this pattern.

What we are witnessing is not a single policy failure, we are witnessing the accumulated effect of over 150 years of federal control over First Nations identity. Addressing one element of discrimination while leaving others in place continues this pattern of cumulative harm.

13. ANISHINABEK NATION CITIZENSHIP – E'DBENDAAGZIJIG (THOSE WHO BELONG)

The Anishinabek Nation has not approached citizenship as a theoretical concept. We have taken concrete steps toward the exercise of our jurisdiction through the development and advancement of our citizenship framework, grounded in E'Dbendaagzijig – Those Who Belong.

In 2009, the Anishinabek Nation established the E'Dbendaagzijig Naaknigewin (Citizenship Law), which affirms that citizenship is determined by the Nation, not by federal legislation. This work continues to evolve.

In June 2025, the Anishinabek Nation Grand Council Assembly adopted the Declaration on E'Dbendaagzijig (Those Who Belong) affirming the inherent right of the Anishinabek Nation to determine our own citizens; the responsibility to bring our people home; and the movement toward a citizenship model grounded in a one-parent principle, consistent with our laws and traditions.

This is not aspirational. It is active Nation-building.

Across our First Nations, discussions on citizenship laws are ongoing, communities are preparing for implementation, and governance structures are being developed to support Nation-building citizenship. Canada should not be asking whether we are ready, we are already doing the work. What we need from Canada is to remove the barriers, not impose them.

14. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to advance Bill S-2 with the Senate amendments intact, recognizing that these amendments provide a clear and immediate legislative solution.
2. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to implement the one-parent rule as the mechanism to eliminate the second-generation cut-off and end known and ongoing discrimination in the Indian Act. Parliament must not defer this issue to future processes or consultation.
3. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to ensure that Bill S-2 aligns with Section 15 of the Charter, Section 35 of the Constitution, The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act.
4. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to reject the use of consultation to delay equality and recognize that consultation must guide implementation, not be used to postpone the elimination of discrimination that has already been identified and acknowledged.
5. The Anishinabek Nations calls on Canada to recognize and respect First Nations jurisdiction over Citizenship and to affirm the distinction between federal registration and First Nations citizenship, to ensure that federal legislation does not constrain or undermine First Nations-led citizenship frameworks such as E'Dbendaagzijig.
6. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to address land impacts associated with Enfranchisement and acknowledge that enfranchisement resulted in both loss of status and loss of land. A commitment to processes would identify lands lost through enfranchisement, explore options for redress, restoration, or compensation, and align with UNDRIP Articles 26 and 28.

7. The Anishinabek Nations calls on Canada to reform its Additions to Reserve (ATR) Policy to accelerate and streamline ATR processes to ensure First Nations have access to land required for housing, infrastructure, and community growth resulting from restored entitlement.

8. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to ensure federal responsibility for capacity and implementation by recognizing that capacity constraints are a federal responsibility and must not be used as a justification to delay legislative reform.

9. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to base implementation planning on realistic population projections to ensure that planning and decision-making are based on realistic, phased population growth, informed by historical implementation of prior legislation, actual administrative capacity and evidence that uptake occurs over time, not immediately. Speculative or exaggerated projections must not influence decision on eliminating discrimination.

10. The Anishinabek Nation calls on Canada to proceed with equality without further delay. Parliament must act to eliminate know discrimination now. Delay results in the continued denial of rights.

15. CONCLUSION

Bill S-2 represents an opportunity for Canada to take meaningful action; however, partial solutions are not sufficient.

This is not simply a policy decision, it is about ensuring that federal law aligns with Section 15 of the Charter, Section 35 of the Constitution, The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and Canada's commitments under the UNDRIP Act.

The Committee must recognize that Bill S-2 is not occurring in isolation, it is part of the cumulative impacts of the Indian Act. Partial solutions risk continuing a pattern of discrimination across generations.

Anishinabek Nation Chiefs and their communities are directly involved in actively advancing citizenship and registration reform. Chiefs are not waiting, and they are not outside the process, they are leading within it and shaping the path forward.

The Anishinabek Nation urges this Committee to act with clarity and purpose. Canada is not being asked to develop a solution, the solution has already been placed before you through the Senate amendments.

The Anishinabek Nation approaches this work guided by our teachings. One of those teachings is simple: We must never leave anyone behind.

This principle reflects our responsibility to one another across generation to ensure that our families, our citizens, and our future generations are coming from a place of inclusion and not exclusion through laws that divide us. Bill S-2, and particularly the second-generation cut-off stands in direct contradiction to that responsibility.

The question is not whether First Nations are ready. The question is whether Canada is prepared to move forward with us.

The Senate has done its work. First Nations have done their work. The courts have done their work. Now the responsibility sits with this Committee and with Parliament.

Every delay divides families, denies rights and continues discrimination.
Pass the bill. Adopt the amendments and finish the work.



ANISHINABEK NATION DECLARATION ON E'DBENDAAGZIJIG

**1. Debenjiged gii'saan Anishinaaben akiing giibi dgwon gaadeni
mndoo waadziwin.**

Creator placed Anishinaabe on earth along with gift of spirituality.

2. Debenjiged Kiimiingona dedwinwe wi naagdowendiwin.

Creator gave us sovereignty to govern ourselves.

**3. Debenjiged kiimiingona e'dbendaagzijig wi naaknigewag wi
namaadziwag.**

We belong to the land, and follow our own laws.

**4. Debenjiged kii-miingonaanh gshkewiziwin wii-mkwenmangid-
waa e-dbendaagzijig.**

We have the right to determine who our people are.

5. Dedbinwe gwa ggii-gkenmaanaanik e-dbendaagzijig.

Through our own governance principles and structures we decide who belongs.

**6. Kina kowaabindaamin shkakmikong, nibi, noodin, shkode, miin-
waa kina bemaadziimgak miinwaa ezhi-nawendaasying.**

Together, all of us, we take care of each other, earth, water, air, fire, and all our relations.

**7. Mshkogaabwitownaanh gaa-miingwewiziying wi naagdawen-
dizowin, wii-mnaadenmangid shkakmikwe miinwaa debendaag-
zijig, e-kidoomgak gaa-kidwaad nishnaabek naaknigewining
gaa-zhibiigaadegiba – niizhing mdaaswaak-shi-nchwaaswi.**

We assert and exercise our inherent right of self-determination for the protection of our lands, and our E'Dbendaagzijig as affirmed by the Anishinabek Nation E'Dbendaagzig Naaknigewin, 2009.

ANISHINABEK NATION POPULATION STATISTICS S.6(1) AND S.6(2)

Region	Admin	First Nation	Governance	6(1)	6(2)	Total	% 6(1)	% 6(2)
Population								
Southwest	172	Aamjiwnaang	11	1495	1080	2575	58.0583	41.9417
Southwest	171	Chippewas of Kettle & Stony Point	10	1638	1011	2649	61.8347	38.1653
Southwest	166	Chippewas of the Thames	11	2087	1059	3146	66.3382	33.6618
Southwest	168	Munsee Delaware	11	487	231	718	67.8273	32.1727
Southeast	160	Alderville	11	668	710	1378	48.4761	51.5239
Southeast	138	Chippewas of Georgia Island	10	503	454	957	52.5601	47.4399
Southeast	163	Algonquins of Pikwanganagan	10	2484	1659	4143	59.9566	40.0434
Southeast	161	Curve Lake	11	1526	1302	2828	53.9604	46.0396
Southeast	141	Beausoleil	11	1856	1293	3149	58.9393	41.0607
Southeast	140	Mississaugas of Scugog	11	139	127	266	52.2556	47.7444
Southeast	139	Chippewas of Rama	11	1217	931	2148	56.6574	43.3426
Southeast	135	Moose Deer Point	11	281	262	543	51.7495	48.2505
Lake Huron Region	224	Atikameksheng Anishnawbek	11	980	626	1606	61.0212	38.9788
Lake Huron Region	180	Aundeck Omni Kaning	10	583	355	938	62.1535	37.8465
Lake Huron Region	218	Dokis	11	770	645	1415	54.417	45.583
Lake Huron Region	231	Henvey Inlet	10	758	497	1255	60.3984	39.6016
Lake Huron Region	174	Magnetawan	11	213	148	361	59.0028	40.9972
Lake Huron Region	200	Mississauga #8	10	883	623	1506	58.6321	41.3679
Lake Huron Region	178	Sheshegwaning First Nation	10	300	175	475	63.1579	36.8421
Lake Huron Region	181	M'Chigeeng Anishinabek	10	1906	883	2789	68.3399	31.6601
Lake Huron Region	220	Nippissing First Nation	11	1946	1375	3321	58.5968	41.4032
Lake Huron Region	201	Serpent River	10	964	640	1604	60.0998	39.9002
Lake Huron Region	202	Thessalon	10	706	493	1199	58.8824	41.1176
Lake Huron Region	176	Sheguiandah	11	325	136	461	70.4989	29.5011
Lake Huron Region	199	Ojibways of Garden River	10	2084	1315	3399	61.3122	38.6878
Lake Huron Region	230	Ojibways of Whitefish River	10	989	569	1558	63.4788	36.5212
Lake Huron Region	175	Wiikwemkoong	11	6178	2529	8707	70.9544	29.0456
Lake Huron Region	232	Wahnapiatae	11	361	368	729	49.5199	50.4801
Lake Huron Region	136	Wasauksing First Nation	10	875	531	1406	62.2333	37.7667
Lake Huron Region	173	Zhiibaahaasing First Nation	11	139	45	184	75.5435	24.4565

Northern Superior Region	192	Pic River/Biigtigong Nishnaabeg	11	855	446	1301	65.7187	34.2813
Northern Superior Region	197	BIINJITWAABIK ZAAGING ANISHINAABEK	11	584	245	829	70.4463	29.5537
Northern Superior Region	187	Fort William First Nation	10	1764	1089	2853	61.8297	38.1703
Northern Superior Region	184	Long Lake #58 First Nation	11	1270	628	1898	66.9125	33.0875
Northern Superior Region	225	Michopicoten	11	768	609	1377	55.7734	44.2266
Northern Superior Region		Namaygoosisagagun First Nation	Non-Status					
Northern Superior Region	191	Pays plat First Nation	10	181	125	306	59.1503	40.8497
Northern Superior Region	195	Pic Mobert/Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg	10	781	358	1139	68.5689	31.4311
Northern Superior Region	193	Red rock Indian Band	11	1293	1043	2336	55.351	44.649
Total				42837	26615	69452	61.6786	38.3214

Total Section 10	16
Total Section 11	22
Total Self-Governing	8
Total Non-Status	1
Total	47

NOTE: Data originates from the Indian Register and was obtained February 9, 2024.