

Proposed changes to Heritage Conservation Act expand First Nations decision making on Crown land | Vancouver Sun

Opinion: The government claims it is speeding up decisions and reducing complexity, but its proposed solutions expand the scope of authority to a joint or consent basis with First Nations

Author of the article: By [Warren Mirko](#), [Geoffrey S. Moyse](#)

Published Sep 17, 2025

3 minute read

British Columbians don't want First Nations to have a veto over Crown land. This has been made clear repeatedly, from the public outrage last year when the government of B.C. tried to hand over joint-decision making power over all Crown land in the province [without proper engagement](#), to recent [polling](#) from the Angus Reid Institute showing only 22 per cent of British Columbians think First Nations should have the final say over projects in their traditional territory.

Surrendering control over Crown land was never on the NDP's election platform. Yet Premier David Eby has pressed ahead, rebranding his approach in hopes British Columbians won't notice the steady abdication of provincial authority over public lands. That is why there's so [little transparency](#) and [continued secrecy](#) around recent joint land-use planning agreements. The lack of transparency is deliberate, because the premier knows British Columbians don't support it.

The Heritage Conservation Act is the government's latest legal tool to shift authority over B.C.'s public lands. At an Aug. 20 information session, officials were explicit: The [proposed changes](#) aim to "recognize First Nations as decision makers on Crown land."

Framed as modernization to improve heritage protection, the changes expand Indigenous authority over Crown land. The government claims it is [speeding up decisions and reducing complexity](#), but its solutions expand the scope of authority to a joint or consent basis with First Nations. These layers of shared control will inevitably cloud jurisdiction and create conflicts. One information session suggested the government may seek a Cabinet [mandate](#) to enforce First Nations cultural laws across parts of B.C., further complicating governance.

Another troubling change is the introduction of "intangible heritage values," which would broaden the conditions under which First Nations could veto development. Even without full legislative detail, it's clear that spiritual practices, songs, ceremonies, and other

intangible claims could block both Crown and, through operational agreements, even private land use.

Yet in many cases, First Nations refuse to disclose the location or details of the sites to either the proponent or the provincial Heritage Branch. Companies must still fund assessments often conducted by archaeologists selected by the claiming First Nation. It's problematic because First Nations could assert that land has intangible heritage importance, claiming that it is spiritual or could be tied to rituals, regardless of archaeological evidence or historical presence. Under the proposed legislation, the government could then grant them authority over Crown land on that basis, effectively allowing decisions that impact public land without much verifiable foundation.

The proposed legislation also gives First Nations the power to deploy “guardians” to oversee an expanded compliance and enforcement regime, with penalty revenues directed to the same groups. This further muddies who ultimately holds authority over public land — the province, or whoever asserts and is granted heritage authority.

Under the current Heritage Conservation Act, project proponents can be required to complete archaeological overview assessments if First Nations claim there is an overlap with an archaeological site. For private property owners and developers, the consequences are serious. As the archaeological mapping system evolves to require First Nations monitoring and consent, anyone disturbing land within an asserted or protected zone could face restrictions. First Nations can self-declare these zones without archaeological evidence, effectively controlling access and use of land based on claims that cannot be independently verified.

What makes this most troubling is the broader pattern of granting decision-making power over Crown land and resources to Indigenous governments without proof of Aboriginal title. True reconciliation should be built on [Canadian constitutional law](#), yet these changes are being made outside that framework. They fundamentally reshape the rights and responsibilities over land that belongs to all British Columbians, without meaningful public consultation or approval at the ballot box. The result is a dramatic shift in authority over our shared lands imposed from above, without mandate, oversight, or accountability.

Warren Mirko is executive-director of the Public Land Use Society; Geoffrey Moyse is a senior lawyer, now in private practice, who served as legal counsel on Aboriginal and Treaty law to the province of B.C., advising six successive governments over more than 30 years.