

**HEARD IN FRONT OF THE MÉTIS NATION BRITISH COLUMBIA'S SENATE**

Appeal Name: Beaudry vs. MNBC Central Registry,  
2-07-30-86-3-00047

Date: March 28, 2011  
Senate Clerk: Thibeault  
Location: Kelowna

Between:

**Jenna Rebecca Beaudry**

Applicant

And

**Métis Nation British Columbia (MNBC)  
Central Registry**

Respondent

**Reasons for Decision**

Residing Senators:

Senator Alan Edkins

Senator Ron Snider

Senator Margaret Penner

Senator Gerald Pope

Senator Philip Gladue

Senator Betty Hoogendoorn

Senator Al Desmarais



## **Introduction**

[1] On January 23, 2008 the applicant, Ms. Jenna Beaudry received a letter from the respondent, the MNBC Central Registry, indicating that her citizenship could not be validated or verified based on the qualifiers for MNBC Citizenship. Specifically, the respondent's letter highlighted:

*"In regard to your application for a MNBC citizenship card, the MNBC's Office of the Provincial Registrar must inform you that based on the definition for the Métis, ratified in September 2002 by the Métis Nation General Assembly, MNBC cannot verify your genealogical connection to the traditional Métis homeland".*

However, the applicant has requested the Senate to review the applicant's citizenship application package and all related materials and decide if the process and interpretations of the registrar was consistent with the intent of the "national definition" and the **MNBC Citizenship Act**.

## **Summary of the Case Law and MNBC Legislation**

### **a) Canadian Law**

[2] Subsections 35(1) and (2) of the **Constitution Act, 1982**, being Schedule B to the **Canada Act 1982** (U.K.), 1982, c. 11 state:

*35(1) the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.*

*35(2) in this act, "aboriginal peoples of Canada" includes the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of*

Canada.

[3] The definitive Supreme Court of Canada case setting out the requirements for establishing a Métis constitutional right is **R. v. Powley**, [2003] 2 S.C.R. 207, 230 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 177 C.C.C. (3d) 193, 2003 SCC 43. At paragraph 10, the Court defined the term "Métis" as it is used in s. 35, finding that while the term does not include all individuals with mixed Indian and European heritage, it does refer to:

*...distinctive peoples who, in addition to their mixed ancestry, developed their own customs, way of life, and recognizable group identity separate from their Indian or Inuit and European forebears. Métis communities evolved and flourished prior to the entrenchment of European control, when the influence of European settlers and political institutions became pre-eminent.*

**b) MNBC Legislation, Policies and Procedures**

[4] Section 61 of the **MNBC Constitution** states that a Métis means a person who self-identifies as Métis, is of historic Métis Nation Ancestry, is distinct from other Aboriginal Peoples and is accepted by the Métis Nation. The MNBC Constitution further states the following;

a) 61.1. "Historic Métis Nation" means the Aboriginal people then known as Métis or Half-Breeds who resided in Historic Métis Nation Homeland.

b) 61.2. "Historic Métis Nation Homeland" means the area of land in west central North America used and occupied as the traditional territory of the Métis or Half-Breeds as they were then known.

c) 61.3. "Métis Nation" means the Aboriginal people descended from the Historic Métis Nation, which is now comprised of all Métis Nation citizens and is one of the "aboriginal peoples of Canada" within Section 35 of the **Constitution Act of 1982**.

d) 61.4. "Distinct from other Aboriginal Peoples" means distinct for cultural and nationhood purposes.

[5] Articles 2, 3 and 4 of the **MNBC Citizenship Act** further define the **MNBC Constitution** definition of Métis as stated above and, more specifically, the process in identifying citizens.

[6] Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the **MNBC Citizenship Act** highlight the roles and responsibilities of the Central Registry, Registry Office and the Registrar. It further states in 8.0 that the registrar must adhere to all policies and procedures developed by the MNBC. This includes the MNBC Guidebook, Central Registry Policy and Procedures and the Senate Policy and Procedures version 3.1.

[7] Section 6.2 of the **Senate Policies and Procedures ver. 3.2** highlights the process utilized when conducting a citizenship and/or central registry appeal.

## **Second Genealogical Opinion**

### **a) Société historique de Saint-Boniface**

[8] Mrs. Janet La France from the genealogical department of the Société historique de Saint-Boniface supplied a second professional genealogical opinion by letter on November 30, 2009. Mrs. La France indicated the following;

*"The information submitted by your client, Ms. Jenna Beaudry, has been reviewed. There is one line on the*

*paternal side that we could not trace in the United States. Depending on where in the United States these ancestors came from it may be worth looking into. However, as it presently stands, we were able to track her lineage back on all other sides to Quebec. Ms. Beaudry's ancestors do **not** connect into the Historic Métis Nation as they were then known or their homeland".*

### **The Standard of Review**

[9] The Senate's role is to ensure that all legislation, policies and procedures were adhered to and that the applicant has received a fair decision during the application review period. Since this appeal involves a question around the genealogical interpretation of the respondent, the Senate has ordered a second professional opinion to assist in their review. Furthermore, the Senate will adhere to the citizenship and/or central registry appeal process highlighted in Section 6.2 of the **Senate Policies and Procedures ver. 3.1**. The Senate further understands that the onus to prove citizenship is the responsibility of the applicant, Ms. Beaudry, not the respondent, the MNBC Central Registry.

[10] The Senate has based this decision on the evidence supplied by the applicant and respondent and weighed this to the summary of case law at the time of the hearing.

### **Analysis**

#### **a) MNBC Policy and Procedure Adherence**

[11] The applicant did request that a review of the policies and procedures be conducted. However, the Senate,

upon review, found that the MNBC Central Registry did not violate or over-look any policies or procedures.

**b) Genealogical Interpretation**

[12] Both the MNBC Central Registry and the historique de Saint-Boniface indicated that they could not determine a link and/or ancestor that identified as Métis and resided within the Métis Nation Homeland.

[13] However, during deliberations in December of 2010 the Senate was concerned that the historique de Saint-Boniface indicated that there was one line on the paternal side that could not be adequately traced in the United States and that, depending on where in the United States these ancestors came from, it may be worth looking into. Thus the Senate decided to return the file to the Central Registry with a request that there be more research to look into any possible Métis connections on the line in the United States.

[14] The research conducted by the Central Registry provided the following. *"The applicant's ancestor's surnames are Beaudry, Delorme, Fontaine & Laurence. The applicant indicated in documents requested and submitted the Métis ancestor is their paternal grandmother, Marie Anna Aldea Delorme. The Central Registry researched Marie Anna Aldea Delorme's maternal & paternal lines; no indication of aboriginal ancestry was found on the paternal or maternal lines. The applicant's ancestors resided in the province of Quebec from approximately the early 1800's until approximately 1900 when the applicant's paternal great-grandmother was born in Montcalm, Manitoba.*

*The family next appears in Saskatchewan in 1924 and remains there until at least 1986 when the applicant was born in*

*Regina, Saskatchewan."*

[15] Further in the letter, the Central Registry indicated to the Senate that *"Additional research, as recommended by St. Boniface Historical Society, was conducted by the Office of the Provincial Registrar in the above noted Citizenship Appeal file. Specifically the Desautels line of ancestry. The applicant's Desautels family originates from Quebec in the early to mid 1800's until approximately 1902 when the family appears in the USA until approximately 1924. Upon analysis of the genealogy and supporting documents in this file the decision rendered is the applicant does not fit the criteria for MNBC Citizenship."*

[16] Thus, there was no evidence supplied that would indicate Ms. Beaudry's genealogical ancestry held any connection to an aboriginal (First Nations, Métis or Inuit) origin.

[17] Based on the information supplied, testimony and the genealogical opinions (MNBC Central Registry and the historique de Saint-Boniface) the Senate could not identify a genealogical connection to the Métis Homeland or the presence of a Métis ancestor in Ms. Beaudry's genealogy.

**c) MNBC Legislative Adherence**

[18] Ms. Beaudry fails to comply with three parts of the National Definition as specified in the **MNBC Citizenship Act**. Those being;

- i) Ms. Beaudry failed to supply the appropriate documentation that proves her historic Métis Nation Ancestry.*
- ii) Ms. Beaudry failed to supply the appropriate documentation that proves any Métis ancestry that connects to the Historic Métis Nation*

*Homeland.*

*iii) Ms. Beaudry failed to supply the evidence which would identify a historic Métis "distinctiveness."*

### **Decision**

[19] The MNBC Senate finds in favour of the Métis Nation British Columbia's Central Registry.

[20] It ought to be noted that should the parameters for MNBC citizenship change, or if the applicant discovers new information or documentation, that this decision does not limit or negate the applicant from reapplying for MNBC citizenship.