

ALGONQUIN TRIBUNAL

Reply Submission by the Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn First Nation **Disputed Ancestor: Hannah Mannell (RIN #18786)**

POSITION STATEMENT

This document is a follow-up to our responding submission from last month. It follows the instructions for reply submissions published on the Algonquins of Ontario website: “The primary purpose of reply submissions is to address any new information or arguments that may have been included in the responding submissions of a participant who takes an opposing view. It is expected that reply submissions will be brief and specifically address any new information or arguments.” As such, our reply submission comments on the following seven documents available on the Tribunal website:

- Responding Submission by C. Dickson on behalf of her family;
- Responding Submission by W. White on behalf of R. Fabian; and
- Responding Submission by L. Hanley (in five documents).

None of the arguments forwarded by these parties in their responding submissions are supported by the historical record. It is our continued position that Hannah Mannell is not an Algonquin Ancestor according to Article 1 of the Special Resolution of January 22, 2020.

Analysis of Submissions in Favour of Hannah Mannell’s Continued Inclusion

The first document was compiled by Cindy Dickson on behalf of her extended family. It’s a collection of short responses regarding the Enrolment Officer’s report, Dr. Veldon Coburn’s initial submission, and our initial submission. The authors call for the Tribunal to disregard the two submissions that openly disagree with their beliefs. The next submission is by a third-party, Wendell White, on behalf of Ron Fabian. It contains sections that provide counterpoints to those contained in the EO’s report and Dr. Coburn’s initial submission. It also calls for the Tribunal to ignore Dr. Coburn’s submission because he’s a citizen of the AOPFN. We strongly urge the Tribunal to ignore these calls to discount our contributions or those of our citizens to this process. The next submissions were by Lynn Hanley, in five separate documents. Ms. Hanley repeats some of the same arguments and material as in her previous submissions.

The following discussion is representative of the flawed arguments made by the authors and is not an exhaustive list.

Misreading of Evidence or Documentation

As part of their argument that Hannah Mannell was Algonquin, Dickson *et al.* (Document 9) wrongly state that she lost her Indian status: “Our ancestor was a woman, which meant that due to the Indian Act, she lost her ability to maintain ‘status.’” However, Mannell died about a decade prior to the creation of the *Indian Act, 1876*, which established the status regime. As such, she couldn’t have lost her status.

Among his arguments, White (Document 10) repeatedly states that Kenogamissi Lake, Hannah Mannell's recorded birthplace, is in Algonquin territory, but that does not appear to be the case. He uses research on Lake Abitibi and the Abitibi River to support his claim, but Kenogamissi Lake is about 100 kilometres southwest of Lake Abitibi. As the EO's reply submission makes clear, Mannell's mother was more likely from either Cree or Ojibway territory.

Finally, Lynn Hanley suggests that AOPFN submitted misinformation about Charles Thomas in our initial submission. However, the information we shared about Charles Thomas related to a letter written on behalf of Chief Makwa (a.k.a. Jean Baptiste Otiskwekijik), which was featured in the EO's report. While Ms. Hanley might find the contents of that letter "offensive" and "disrespectful" to her ancestors, as she states, the EO nonetheless has a responsibility to present all existing historical documentation related to the Thomas-Mannell family and the Algonquin community at Golden Lake. From Chief Makwa's letter, it is sufficiently clear that the Thomas-Mannell family was not considered an Algonquin family by Algonquins living at Golden Lake. Their settlement on Golden Lake around 1833 was apparently seen as an attack on Algonquin sovereignty in the area.

Besides airing out grievances with AOPFN's position, Ms. Hanley makes consistent errors in her most direct reply (Document 11.5). For instance, she once again ignores the documentary proof included in the EO's report that demonstrates that John Mannell was living at and setting up Kenogamissi Post by June 1794, and stayed there past the time of his daughter Hannah's conception in December 1794. Further, she states erroneously that Hannah and Charles lived "in the large Algonquin community of Lake of Two Mountains in Quebec," when they lived in Vaudreuil, a burgeoning French-Canadian town at the time that is near the opposite shore from the Lake of Two Mountains mission. Vaudreuil was one of the launching-off points for the HBC, with whom Charles was employed. Finally, Ms. Hanley appears to misunderstand the nature of the evidence cited in the EO's report and our responding submission, as she states, "The most irritating and absolutely false statements are those about Chief Makwa complaining about Charles hunting on his ground." These are not statements about Chief Makwa, but rather, are statements dictated by Chief Makwa to a government official who later transcribed them. In other words, they are part of the historical record, one of the few instances, other than the numerous petitions, in which the voice of an Algonquin leader was captured by colonial authorities.

The Enrolment Office produced a detailed report on the potential identity of Hannah Mannell's mother. Unfortunately, those committed to her continued inclusion on the Schedule of Ancestors have not engaged fully with those documents. It is our continued position that Hannah Mannell is not an "Algonquin Ancestor" as defined in Article 1 of the Special Resolution of January 22, 2020.