

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

Appeal Name: Murray vs. MNBC Central Registry
1-26-12-36-2-00097

Date: 2012/09/30 and 2013/05/26
Senate Clerk: Thibeault
Location: Richmond

Between:

Matilda Murray

Applicant

And

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

Respondent

Reasons for Decision

Residing Senators (September 30, 2012):

Senator Alan Edkins

Senator Philip Gladue

Senator Margaret Penner

Senator Al Desmarais

Senator Bill Betty Hoogendoorn

Senator Gerald Pope

Senator Ron Snider

Residing Senators (May 26, 2013):

Senator Gerald Pope

Senator Philip Gladue

Senator Margaret Penner

Senator Alan Edkins

Senator Al Desmarais

Senator Betty Hoogendoorn



Introduction

[1] On August 29, 2011 the applicant, Ms. Matilda Murray 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 the following:

"Thank you for your application for Métis Nation British Columbia (MNBC) citizenship. Please be advised, that the Central Registry has been unable to verify your genealogical connection to a Métis ancestor. The genealogical information you have provided with your application therefore, does not meet the required criteria for Métis citizenship within the province of British Columbia".

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 people who, in addition to their mixed ancestry, developed their own customs, way of life, and a 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 3.2.

[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.

[8] On September 08, 2011 Ms. Murray supplied a signed and witnessed "Consent to Release Confidential Information" form. This form provided the Senate with the following consents:

- i. Utilization of the documentation supplied to the MNBC Central Registry for the purpose of the applied for appeal.
- ii. To send the contents of Ms. Murray's Citizenship application file to a third-party for a second professional genealogical opinion.
- iii. To utilize all the information supplied or demanded, for the purpose of writing this MNBC Senate decision.

Second Genealogical Opinion

a) Société historique de Saint-Boniface

[9] Ms. Janet La France from the genealogical department of the Société historique de Saint-Boniface supplied a second professional genealogical opinion by letter on September 19, 2012. Mrs. La France indicated the following:

*"The information submitted by your client, Ms. Matilda Murray (née Wehner), has been reviewed. We were able to trace back the lines in question to Eastern Canada, without encountering any evidence of Métis ancestry. Therefore, Ms. Murray's ancestors do **not** connect into the Historic Métis Nation as they were then known or their homeland."*

The Standard of Review

[10] 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. 3.2**. The Senate further understands that the onus to prove citizenship is the responsibility of the applicant, Ms. Murray, not the respondent, the MNBC Central Registry.

[11] 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

[12] 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

[13] During verbal discussion with a member of the family of the appellant on the first hearing on September 30, 2012 mention of a further document surfaced during the testimony. This document was said to be the birth certificate of an ancestor grandmother who was aboriginal. The Senate indicated at that time that the said document may be a vital part of the information package to consider for the appeal.

[14] On October 23, 2012, the Senate Clerk wrote an update letter to the appellant and other family members in regard to the appeal being placed in abeyance pending receipt of the aforementioned document (birth certificate).

[15] On January 29, 2013 a letter was received by the Senate Clerk from the appellant stating that the sought after birth certificate had been destroyed in a fire and was not available; thus the family would not be able to submit additional documentation. Given this information, the appeal information was again reviewed by the Senate at its May 2013 session.

[16] 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.

[17] Furthermore, there was not any primary or secondary source documentation provided that would indicate Ms. Murray's genealogical ancestry held any connection to an aboriginal (Métis, First Nation or Inuit) origin.

[18] The Senate relies to some extent, although not exclusively, on the presence of primary or historic documentation to supply proof of the ancestry of the appellant

having identified themselves as Métis/half-breeds in origin.

[19] 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. Murray's genealogy.

c) MNBC Legislative Adherence

[20] Ms. Murray fails to comply with three parts of the National Definition as specified in the **MNBC Citizenship Act**.

Those being;

- i) *Ms. Murray failed to supply the appropriate documentation that proves her historic Métis Nation Ancestry.*
- ii) *Ms. Murray failed to supply the appropriate documentation that proves any Métis ancestry that connects to the Historic Métis Nation Homeland.*
- iii) *Ms. Murray failed to supply the evidence which would identify a historic Métis "distinctiveness" in her ancestry.*

Decision

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

[22] 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.