

## ALGONQUIN TRIBUNAL

### Responding Submission by the Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn First Nation **Disputed Ancestor: Thomas Lagarde dit St. Jean (RIN #11565)**

#### POSITION STATEMENT

This document is a follow-up to our original submission last month. It follows the instructions for responding submissions published on the Algonquins of Ontario website: “The primary purpose of responding submissions is to provide information and submissions responding to, or commenting on, the materials submitted by another person.” As such, our responding submission comments on the following eleven documents available on the Tribunal website:

- Initial Submission by D. Scott;
- Initial Submissions made by L. Clouthier on behalf of Lagarde-Carrière Line; and
- Initial Submission by D. Chaput (in 9 separate documents).

For our analysis, we only address the submissions that argue in favour of retaining Thomas Lagarde dit St. Jean (and Sophie Carrière) on the Schedule of Algonquin Ancestors. None of the arguments forwarded by these parties are supported by the historical record. **It is our continued position that neither Thomas Lagarde dit St. Jean nor (his wife) Sophie Carrière are an Algonquin Ancestor according to Article 1 of the Special Resolution of January 22, 2020.**

#### Analysis of Submissions in Favour of Lagarde dit St. Jean’s Continued Inclusion

The documents in this group each vary in length, but their authors all firmly believe that one or both of either Thomas Lagarde dit St. Jean and Sophie Émélie Carrière were Algonquin. D. Scott’s submission includes a photo and the transcript of the 2013 Chadwick decision on Thomas Lagarde. Lynn Clouthier’s submission includes portions by Emmett Godin, Ronald Romain Sr., Jane Lagassie, Carole Turcotte, and Geoff Soulière. Denise Chaput and Connie Mielke’s submission appears to be written by the authors. The arguments used to further the authors positions can be grouped into four different, interrelated themes. The following discussion is representative of the arguments made by the authors, it is not an exhaustive list.

#### *Photographic “Evidence”*

Each of the authors includes at least one photo that they believe provides proof of their ancestors’ indigeneity. D. Scott and Chaput and Mielke provide the same portrait of Sophie St. Jean, her husband, their child, and two of their grandchildren, taken circa 1870 in Pembroke. Sophie St. Jean was Thomas Lagarde’s daughter. While D. Scott provides no text to accompany the photo, Chaput and Mielke argue that the photo “clearly shows the woman [Sophie St. Jean] sitting down in this picture looks Indigenous.”

This photograph, and photographs more generally, do not prove indigeneity or Indigenous identity. Dark hair is not a physical feature unique to Indigenous peoples, nor are other facial features usually imagined as “Indigenous.” The reliance on photographs by these parties does not support their arguments.

#### *Lateral Relations and Genealogical Connections*

One notable aspect of the arguments forwarded by the Clouthier and Chaput and Mielke submissions is the effort to demonstrate social and genealogical connections between their French-Canadian ancestors and Algonquins. As Chaput and Mielke explain, “Our lineage intertwines with many Algonquin lines through marriage and being raised with them. This we wish to show you, because we believe that this shows many from our line who grew up believing they were Algonquin and still believe that to this day.” Since the authors also acknowledge that there exists no document that demonstrates that Thomas Lagarde or Sophie Carrière were Algonquin/Indigenous, they turn to ideas that do not support their claims about Algonquin identity. For instance, they point out several *lateral* relations and genealogical connections that do not satisfy the evidentiary requirements of Article 1 of the Special Resolution of January 22, 2020, on Algonquin Ancestors.

For example, in Document D of Clouthier’s submission, Carole Turcotte traces the ancestry of Marie Alexina Turcotte, whose mother was Esther Hurteau, back to the early 1600s. She explains that Hurteau is a descendant of Françoise Grenier (born 1604 in France), a French woman who was deemed not to be an Algonquin ancestor by Justice Chadwick in 2013. Nonetheless, Turcotte speculates that Grenier was Indigenous and, thus, Marie Alexina Turcotte, born more than two centuries later, was also Indigenous. The conclusion about Grenier’s identity is based on speculation, besides the fact that having a single ancestor born at the beginning of the seventeenth century does not make one Indigenous today. Also, her claims do not reflect on either Thomas Lagarde or his wife Sophie Carrière’s identities.

The next example provided by Turcotte is that of François-Xavier Turcotte’s younger brother Nazaire. François-Xavier married Sophie St. Jean, Thomas Lagarde’s daughter. Nazaire married Marie-Anne Lemaire dit St. Germain, whose mother was an Indigenous woman named Marie-Anne Wendapikinum. While this is true, Nazaire is Thomas Lagarde’s son-in-law’s brother, and therefore who he married is unrelated to Lagarde or his wife Sophie Carrière’s identities. This is an example of what genealogists and anthropologists call a *lateral* relation. A lateral relation does not satisfy the evidentiary requirements of Article 1 of the Special Resolution of January 22, 2020, on Algonquin Ancestors.

A second document in Lynn Clouthier’s submission relies on lateral relations to assert that either Thomas Lagarde or Sophie Carrière were Algonquin. In the unsigned Document G, the author presents evidence that Carrière’s paternal grandmother Marie-Madeleine Marier’s first marriage was to a Mohawk man named Thomas Dicaire. The author also acknowledges that Marier was of only French origins. Of course, the fact that

Marier was married to a Mohawk man does not prove that Sophie Carrière, who had a different grandfather, was Algonquin in any way. Later in the same document we are told that Marier's uncle Antoine Marier married Marguerite Louise Duboc, whose grandmother was a Huron-Wendat woman named Marie Félix Ouentonouen Arontio (b. 1640). In this case, the author is talking about Sophie Carrière's grandmother's uncle's wife's grandmother, another lateral relation.

Finally, the author tells us that Marier's aunt, Marie-Marguerite Marier, married Guillaume Prévost, the grandson to Marie Olivier Sylvestre (b. 1624), an Algonquin woman on the AOO's Schedule of Ancestors. In this case, the author is talking about Sophie Carrière's grandmother's aunt's husband's grandmother. Besides the fact that none of these lateral relations are directly related to Sophie Carrière's identity, most French-Canadians today have Indigenous ancestry in the 1600s. Discovering that Sophie Carrière's distant relatives were married to other French Canadians with distant Indigenous ancestry is to be expected. A genealogical study of any of the millions of French-Canadian families today would find similar results.

Chaput and Mielke also rely extensively on lateral relations in their submission. For instance, they give the example of Thomas Lagarde's great-great grandson Norman Sylvestre (a first cousin and godfather to one of the authors) who married Joyce Elizabeth Needham, Mary-Ann Jocko's granddaughter. The fact that Thomas Lagarde's descendant married an Algonquin woman in no way changes Thomas's identity. Besides, all of Mary-Ann Jocko's descendants are eligible to register with the AOO because her own ancestors are on the Schedule of Ancestors.

Another example discussed by Chaput and Mielke is that of Emmett Chartrand, a descendant of Thomas Lagarde and Sophie Carrière who married Katherine Mary Jocko, a citizen of the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation (AOPFN). The descendants of this union continue to be citizens of the AOPFN. The fact that one of Thomas Lagarde's great-great-great-grandchildren (Emmett Chartrand) married an Algonquin woman in no way changes Thomas's identity.

In "Batch 2" of their submission, Chaput and Mielke continue to document lateral relations between the Chartrand/Turcotte families and Algonquin families. They begin with Michel Chartrand, who married Thomas Lagarde's daughter Elisabeth Félicité Turcotte. Michel's sister Joséphine married Théophile Montreuil, a descendant of an Algonquin woman named Marie Kakwabit. All the Kakwabit descendants can be registered with the AOO because she is on the Schedule of Ancestors. Nonetheless, the fact that Thomas Lagarde's son-in-law's sister married an Algonquin man does not change either Lagarde or Carrière's identities nor does it make all their descendants Algonquin.

The authors' heavy reliance on lateral relations and genealogical connections does not support their arguments.

### *Family Lore Versus Oral History*

Closely associated with the previous theme, the authors writing in favour of securing Thomas Lagarde/Sophie Carrière's place on the Schedule of Ancestors rely heavily on family lore in their submissions. Family lore can be understood as a form of inter-generational communication that imagines historical events and relations in a manner that positions a given family as having unique customs or values. In their creation of lore, families focus on stories about overcoming adversity and injustice. The submissions in this section often confuse family lore with Indigenous oral history, which has legal requirements and specific Indigenous protocols, and at times, ceremonies attached to it.

In Document A of Lynn Clouthier's submission, Emmett Godin, a Lagarde/Carrière descendant, explains that, for a time, his father accompanied an "Indian trapper named Tennisco" on his trap line along the railway lines. While this may be true, going out hunting or trapping, including with an Algonquin man, does not mean that Godin's father was Algonquin himself. Godin acknowledges that there exists no documentary evidence that his family was Algonquin but uses this example of proximity to an Indigenous person as evidence for his beliefs about their Algonquin identity. Unfortunately, family lore does not provide evidence, but clues that must be pieced together, as the Enrolment Officer's original report does.

In Document F, Geoff Soulière, another Lagarde-Carrière descendant, maintains that his grandmother, Joséphine Soulière (b. 1898), was Algonquin because of her looks, where she lived, and the fact that she ate beaver and rabbit, among other cultural practices. He even states, "I have a faint memory of her mentioning something to me about being native." Many, if not most French-Canadians have similar lore about living in the bush, sometimes in proximity to Indigenous peoples, eating the fruits of hunting, fishing, and gathering. Because of their relative mistreatment by English-speaking settlers, especially in regions in Ontario where they were a numerical minority, French-Canadian settlers have created family lore that assigns their historical poverty and lack of opportunity to an imagined Indigenous identity. Because of the widespread circulation of this family lore among French Canadians in Ontario, it is an unreliable form of historical evidence.

In "Batch 2" of the Chaput-Mielke submission, they provide information about the families who were dispossessed by the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited's construction of the nuclear power generating system along the Ottawa River. These households, along the shorelines in Deep River, all featured descendants of Jean-Baptiste Lamure, an Algonquin man who is on the Schedule of Algonquin Ancestors. Of the ten families living at the "Indian Village" there, two of Jean-Baptiste's sons married Chartrands, who were Lagarde-Carrière descendants. Of course, the fact that some of their descendants married Algonquin individuals and lived in an Algonquin settlement does not mean that Lagarde or Carrière were Algonquin themselves. Proximity to Indigenous peoples does not make one Indigenous.

### *Misreading of Evidence or Documentation*

In Document A of Lynn Clouthier's submission, Emmett Godin asserts that, "another interesting story, and this came out in the 2013 Protest, and I believe it was the researcher working for Pik, she could not find any Indian anywhere on record, but she did find that Sophie's brother was noted as a Metis, but then struck out and replaced with French. Now this apparently took place in Manitoba. So, did he look Indian or mixed blood. It seems obvious." Joann McCann, the historian who worked for the AOPFN during the 2013 hearings, is on record in the transcript as saying that Jules St. Jean, Sophie's brother, was not identified as "Aboriginal or Métis" after he moved to Manitoba.

In Document I of Lynn Clouthier's submission, Carole Turcotte speculates that André Falmard (b. circa 1740s), Sophie Carrière's maternal grandfather, was Indigenous. Her claim arises from her misreading of Falmard's 1773 marriage record. Following his name in the record, are the words *agé de* (years old). The same words follow his wife Marie-Madeleine's name (*agée de*, the feminine form). It was common in marriage records for the priest to record the husband and bride's age in this way. For some reason, Turcotte interprets *agé de* as *ouane*, which leads her to speculate about Falmard's identity in ways that are simply are not supported by the historical record.

In "Batch #3" of their submission(s), Chaput and Mielke make unsupported claims about historical maps of Grand Calumet and Allumette Islands. They argue that because no Turcottes, Lagardes, St. Jeans, or Clouthiers were recorded as landowners on the map, they must have been considered Indigenous, and thus, unable to own land. However, there is a much more plausible explanation given the extensive historical documentation showing those families were French Canadian. If they did live on those islands at the time, as Chaput and Mielke maintain, they were likely squatters. In fact, the Clouthier submission cites a piece of writing called "The Squatters of Grand Calumet Island Prior to 1845" in reference to the Lagarde family. More than half of the surveyed plots on the islands have no recorded landowner, suggesting that a large portion of the islands is inhabited by squatters who do not have legal title to the land, which was common in French-Canadian settlements in the Ottawa River Valley in the mid to late 1800s.

Later in the same document, Chaput and Mielke argue that being recorded as a "hunter" under the occupation column in the Census of Canada normally means that the person was Indigenous. They give examples of Turcotte, Chartrand, and Paquette men from the 1891 Census of Canada who were each recorded as "hunter." However, in the same census returns individuals from those households who were recorded as "hunter" were also recorded as French Canadian. It was common for white settlers in the 1800s to be recorded as "hunters" under occupation.

Finally, in "Batch 9" of their submission(s), Chaput and Mielke make several unsubstantiated claims about the historical record:

Written history was limited to church records written by whites and census records who showed indigenous people who lived on reserves and at trading posts etc. On no marriage license that I have ever seen does it ask for your ethnicity. Many churches have burnt down, so we know records were lost. We doubt very little was written of indigenous people who lived off the land and stayed away from populated areas.

It is untrue that written history was limited to church and census records; one of the main pieces of evidence supporting the Algonquin land claim are the multiple petitions that Algonquin people wrote and signed between 1772 and the late 1800s. Nor does the written record ignore the presence of Indigenous people who lived off the land. Dozens of census records exist of Algonquin families living throughout the Algonquin homeland. From the headwaters of the Rivière du Nord and Lac Nominique in the Laurentians to Lac Simon and the Rivière Rouge in the Outaouais to Sharbot Lake and the headwaters of the Madawaska River, Algonquin families living together in small encampments are well documented in the historical record from 1861 onwards. Claiming that records of Algonquin people who lived outside of white settlements did not exist is plainly false.

More to the point, the Enrolment Office produced incredibly in-depth reports on both Thomas Lagarde and Sophie Carrière's identities. Unfortunately, none of the authors supporting their inclusion on the Schedule of Ancestors engaged with the EO's thoughtful research. Instead of relying on the idea that the records proving that Thomas Lagarde or Sophie Carrière were Indigenous were destroyed or never existed, the authors could have engaged with the actual documents produced by the EO that prove without a doubt that both of these individuals were white French Canadians.