

2011 Membership Survey Results

3 Surveyors Randomly called 360 phone numbers in the Kahnawake Directory. Each surveyor was working independently and neutrally and was responsible for 120 surveys each. Comments are all below.

1. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law determines who is a Kanien'kehá:ka of Kahnawà:ke and who can receive services administered by the Mohawk Council of Kahnawà:ke. The criteria says:

Must be identified as a Kanien'kehá:ka of Kahnawà:ke at birth

Must be born of 2 members, or born of 1 member and the other parent being one of the 5 nations (Seneca, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Tuscarora)

Must have 4 or more Kanien'kehá:ka Great Grandparents

Must have a clan or will get a clan affiliation following a process

What do you think about the membership criteria for family bloodline?

300 of 360 responded

- **Keep criteria as described above – no change in the current Membership Law.** 138 (46%)
- Keep criteria as described above but use 50%_Mohawk blood quantum instead of Great-Grandparents. 42 (14%)
- Keep criteria as described above but use *three* Great-Grandparents instead of four. 80 (27%)
- Keep criteria as described above but use *two* Great-Grandparents instead of four. 40 (13%)

2. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law, a person who has Indigenous lineage or who has little or no Kanien'kehá:ka lineage may apply to be confirmed as a member if the person is married or living in a common law relationship with a member.

Do you agree with these criteria?

330 of 360 replied

- Totally/Somewhat/Agree: 150 (45%)
- Somewhat Disagree/Totally Disagree: 180 (55%)
- Totally Agree: 36 (11%)
- Somewhat Agree: 81 (24.5%)
- Agree: 33 (10%)
- Somewhat Disagree: 52 (16.5%)
- Totally Disagree: 128 (39%)

2a. Do you agree that being married and living in common law relationship are equal conditions to be considered for membership?

339 of 360 responded

- Yes: 88 (26%)
- No: 251 (74%)

b. If a person who has Indigenous lineage gained membership through marriage to a Kanien'kehá:ka of Kahnawà:ke, should membership for that person be kept when the marriage dissolves?

326 of 360 responded

- Yes 111 (34%)
 - No 215 (66%)
-

3. Do you think if non-natives consistently become part of the community, that over time this will give the Federal government enough power to take away our reserve and Mohawk status?

333 of 360 responded

- Yes 282 (85%)
 - No 51 (15%)
-

4. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke: Membership Law, a member who *adopts a child* who has no Kanien'kehá:ka or Indigenous lineage, that child is not eligible for membership.

Do you agree with this?

333 of 360 responded

- **Totally/Somewhat/Agree:** 214 (64%)
 - **Somewhat/Totally Disagree:** 119 (36%)
 - Totally Agree: 101 (30%)
 - Somewhat Agree: 60 (18%)
 - Agree: 53 (16%)
 - Somewhat Disagree: 66 (20%)
 - Totally Disagree: 53 (16%)
-

5. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law, an adopted child who has 4 or more Kanien'kehá:ka Great-Grandparents and normally resides in the Territory, at age 18 years must reaffirm a Member's Pledge within a year of turning 18 years old or their membership can be revoked.

299 of 360 responded

- I agree with the statement above, at 18 years a Member's Pledge must be made to keep membership – *no change* in the current Membership Law. 69 (23%)
 - When an adopted child with 4 Kanien'kehá:ka Great-Grandparents turns 18 years old, the person will make an *application* for membership as an adult member. 54 (18%)
 - When an adopted child with 4 Kanien'kehá:ka Great-Grandparents turns 18 years old, the person will present themselves to the Council of Elders and *request* adult membership. 50 (17%)
 - When an adopted child with 4 Kanien'kehá:ka Great-Grandparents turns 18 years old, the person will *notify* the Membership Registrar and request to be placed on the Registry and be issued a band card. 126 (42%)
-

6. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law, a person is eligible to apply for permission to be a non-member resident if the person has *some* Kanien'kehá:ka lineage, maintains family ties and has made positive contribution to the community.

Who do you think should be eligible to apply for non-member residency?
Please check one option that best matches your opinion on eligibility for non-member residency.

286 of 360 responded

- As above, the person must have some Kanien'kehá:ka lineage, maintain family ties and has made positive contribution to the community to be a non-member resident – no change in the current Membership Law. 188 (66%)
- As above, but make a change so that any person with or without some Kanien'kehá:ka lineage who is married to a member can apply to be a non-member resident. 61 (21%)
- As above, but make a change so that any person with or without some Kanien'kehá:ka lineage who is living in a common law relationship with a member can apply to be a non-member resident. 37 (13%)

7. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law, membership criteria refers to “community ties.”

Of 360 participants, the amount who responded is unknown.

- What would best describe “community ties” to you? Please check **all** options that best describe what you think “community ties” mean.
 - Having your own biological child. 226
 - Being an adopted child raised in Kahnawà:ke. 200
 - Work in the community for more that 10 years. 123
 - Having biological family in the Kahnawà:ke (parent, sister, brother, aunt or uncle for example). 272
 - Married to a Mohawk who is a member. 195
 - Living in a common law relationship with a Mohawk who is a member. 98
-

8. The Kahnawà:ke Membership Law should allow all non- natives married to a member to live in Kahnawà:ke. Do you agreement with this statement? Please circle your level of agreement.

339 of 360 responded

- **Totally/Somewhat/Agree:** 76 (22%)
 - **Somewhat/Totally Disagree:** 263 (78%)

 - Totally Agree: 22 (6%)
 - Somewhat Agree: 31 (9%)
 - Agree: 23 (7%)
 - Somewhat Disagree: 83 (24%)
 - Totally Disagree: 180 (53%)
-

9. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law, the Council of Elders is appointed by the community and is a group made up of not less than 9 and not more that 15 Elders.

317 of 360 responded

Please check one option best matches your opinion on how many people should make up the Council of Elders.

Keep the number: 197 (62%)

Lower the number: 118 (37%)

- Keep the same number, 9-15 Elders – no change in the current Membership Law. 132 (42%)
 - Lower the number to 5 – 9 Elders, with one extra to be an alternate. 67 (21%)
 - Lower the number to 5 – 7 Elders, with one extra to be an alternate. 51 (16%)
 - Keep the same number (9-15 Elders) but have the Council of Elders be divided into small groups to make membership decisions on a rotating basis. 67 (21%)
 - No Council of Elders: 1
-

10. Currently in the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law, the definition of an *Elder* for the Council of Elders refers to being an adult, a registered member, one who has community trust, respect and confidence and has knowledge of our customs.

Should there be more or other requirements to be on the Council of Elders to make decision on membership based on the Membership Law? Please check one option best matches your opinion.

315 of 360 responded

- Yes, being on the Council of Elders should have requirements besides what is currently described above. 219 (70%)

- No, you could be on the Council of Elders if you want to, if the community does not disagree. 96 (30%)

10a. Should the Council of Elders be selected by an election?

300 of 360 responded

- Yes 225 (75%)
- No 75 (25%)

10b Should the Council of Elders serve for a limited number of years?

- Yes 201 (67%)
- No 99 (33%)

10c. If yes how many years?

See comments

11. If the Kahnawà:ke Membership Law allowed non-natives to live in the community, should there be any requirements for residency? Please check all that you think should be required for non-natives to live here.

Unknown # of respondents of 360 participants

- Be married to a Mohawk member. 172
- Be required to pay fees for residency services. (Residency services may apply to school bus services, snow removal and road maintenance, and land use fees for example. Fees, for example, can be used to lower the MCK annual community maintenance costs). 116
- Should leave the community when the person is no longer married to the Mohawk. 165
- Should live here until any biological children reach the age of 18 years. 101
- Should have residency criteria (contribute to the community, volunteer for example) identified by the Council of Elders. 117
- Kahnawà:ke is not for non-natives. 207

12. Have you ever been told that if you marry or live with a non-native that you would not be able to live in Kahnawà:ke with the non-native?

330 of 360 responded

- Yes 289 (80%)
- No 41 (20%)

Comments separated by categories

(# indicates which question the comments refer to)

- If they have 4 great grandparents, why does it matter that they were adopted? 5
- What happens to that person? – very touchy. 4
- If that child is raised by us, then it is part of us. 4
- can't call themselves a Mohawk 4
- Shouldn't even ask. 5
- The child will/would be raised here, brought up w/our culture/traditions & then once they become an adult, they would be told that they 'don't belong' that is inhuman. 4
- Child should stay on list at 18 if they fit the 4 great grandparents automatically. 5
- Either you're born Indian or you're not. Can't answer it. Doesn't make sense to me. 5
- They already are a member. 5
- It's their right. Shouldn't have to go through a process. Go at 18 and get band #. 5
- Should just automatically receive band #. 5
- Can't answer. 5
- What difference does it make if the adopted child grandparents are members? 5

Adoption/Children Comments

- I think you would have to be adopted into the Longhouse or MCK through a process that could grant you membership. 1
- Culturally speaking when we adopted a child they became our family and are now community members, or part of the nation. There were guidelines to the rights that the person had we need to revisit those guidelines and find a way to use them. That individual is raised in a Kanien'kéha house hold then they need to be acknowledging as one.However, again that does not mean that if an individual who is on the band list marries or common law with a non-native who has children can adopt them so that they get the rights. Only if the adoptive parents are both on the band list would the adopted child be eligible. 4
- Yes they are still a part of community 4
- I think they should have status. 4
- What if a member can't find a child of Indigenous lineage? 4
- Should be allowed up to 18 then reapply. 4
- Very sensitive issue. 4
- They should marry w/in the community. 4
- Becomes family 4
- If he's adopted & brought up as Native, he should be considered Native. 4
- Adoption is adoption. You are disconnected from your past. 4
- Adoptive non-native children should not be included on our membership list and should not benefit from being a resident of Kahnawake. 1
- What is this? Member's Pledge. 5
- Question does not make sense. A pledge to who? When you're named in Longhouse, you're accepting your responsibility as a Kanienkehaka person. 5
- How do we know their lineage? Some fathers don't even sign for them. Hard to confirm. 5
- It's not fair – should be done automatically. 5
- I agree with the statement above, at 18 years a Member's Pledge must be made to keep membership – no change in the current Membership Law. 5
- Only if they have little to no native ancestry. 5
- What is the Member's Pledge? They should stay on the membership list because they're native. 5
- Should be automatic. 5
- If you're non-native, you're non-native. You can't give someone lineage through adoption. 4
- Should be able to gain membership until 18 at least 4

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Very tough question. 4
- Being an adopted child raised in Kahnawà:ke. 7
- I somewhat agree on the assumption that the child is white. 4
- If the child is native regardless of nation, they should be adopted and become a member. 4
- Depends on a case by case basis. 4
- You can have a couple that adopts Cree children. My concern is the other natives. If you're native, you're native. 4
- Don't like the scope to include just 6 nations. 4
- When it comes to a child, I have a problem, if I had to, I'd adopt a native child. 4
- The Great Law says when you adopt someone, you forget about their past. 4
- I don't know. 4
- If a baby is living here, growing up here, probably learning the language, they should be kept here. But if they marry out, they're out. It's their choice. 4
- Maybe they should have membership up until 18. 4
- If he's adopted and brought up as native, he should be considered native. 4
- If I adopted a child, I would raise the child with native values but after 18, they would lose their rights. 4
- If that child is non-native, they should be raised as a non-native. Should bring that child and raise that child in non-native society in their culture. 4
- A child should be Mohawk if they're adopted and they should be raised as a Mohawk. 4
- If you raise a child native, that child is native. 4
- It depends on how they are brought up. If they're brought up in the culture, they should be allowed to be a member. 4
- Adoption is adoption. You are disconnected from your past. 4
- Child is already here. Shouldn't throw them out. It's mean. I would agree to a limited membership. 4
- Can't call themselves a Mohawk. 4
- If child is legally adopted and accepted by the band. 4
- I don't think it's right. If that child is already Mohawk why should they have to reaffirm? 5
- They are already Indian, just leave it alone. They're here! 5
- Once they are adopted and meet the requirements, they should not have to reaffirm at 18 years. 5
- How do we know their lineage? Some fathers don't even sign for them. Hard to confirm. 5
- They are equal in the lineage equation, they just happen to be adopted through no choice of their own. 5
- They should already be allowed to remain a member as they meet all the criteria. 5
- Why do they have to ask to be a member? You are who you are when you are born. 5
- If they are native, it's not necessary – they are native. 5
- It's not fair – should be done automatically. 5
- They shouldn't have to re-apply because they already meet the current criteria. 5
- They should stay on the Registry no matter what. They're still the same person as they were at 10. 5
- Once you're native, you're native. They can't take that away from you. You shouldn't have to beg. 5
- If they meet the criteria why should they go through this process. 5
- They should stay on the membership list because they're native. 5
- Child should stay on the list at 18 if they fit the 4 great grandparents automatically. 5
- Only if they have little to no native ancestry. 5
- But make it harder for them to become a member to make sure they appreciate being a member. 5
- It still should be automatic if they meet the criteria. 5
- I think if they're accepted as a member with 4 great grandparents, they should not have to present themselves again at 18. 5
- Whatever currently applies. 5
- Why do they have to make a membership application? 5

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Why do they have to wait until 18? You're not more or less Indian at 18. 5
- They shouldn't have to do anything for membership as they already qualify. 5
- If they are native, adopted, should not be singled out. 5
- If they're native, they're registered, they shouldn't have to apply for membership. 5
- It should be automatic. 5
- If they already meet the criteria, why do they have to reapply? 5
- They are already a member. 5
- They should just automatically be put on. 5
- If a child is on the band list and fits the criteria they should not have to jump through hoops to maintain status. 5
- Not if the child is non-native. 7
- Very vague question. 7
- If they're native. 7
- It depends on who the mother and father are, if they're Mohawk and not white. 7
- Kind of tricky – native automatically. 7
- If you're native. 7
- If they are native. 7
- It's a family tie. It depends on how the child is raised, and if they are native. 7
- If you're raised here, you're part of the community. A child is innocent. 7
- Depends on how long they've been here. 7
- If they are raised by Mohawk people. 7
- Depends if the child is non-native. 7
- Only if Mohawk or from another reserve. 7
- If the child is Mohawk, yes. 7
- If the child is native, yes. 7

Blood Quantum

- Should be 75% Mohawk blood quantum. 1
- I am completely against the family bloodline. I think if a person was born here, they're from here. Your home is your home. I am a Mohawk woman. Nobody is going to take that away from me. Then I married a Mohawk 1
- I don't see too many people whose great grandparents who are full blooded Mohawk. 1
- I don't believe in the 50%. I don't agree with any of the choices. The names of the fathers may not be so. Bloodline doesn't make sense. Who am I to change the Great Law of Peace? 1
- Other natives okay. Leary of people without First Nations bloodline. 2

Community Ties

- Not all of the above are equal in weight is you're trying to measure the tie. 7
- Community ties – Mohawk woman who married non-native prior to the current law should automatically be given back their status. 7
- The question doesn't define 'community tie'. 7
- Not qualified enough. 7
- If you're from Kahnawake. 7
- With a Mohawk? On the Registry? 7
- If both parents are Mohawk. 7
- At least if the child is 50%. 7
- Have community ties to a degree – but that degree has to be determined. 7
- A little tricky. 7
- If they're Indian, yes. 7
- Yes, if you're native. 7
- With a Mohawk? It's not specific, not descriptive enough. 7
- As long as one is native. 7
- Does that mean if you don't have any children, you don't have a tie to the community? 7

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- By somebody that's native. 7
- If they're native, yes. 7
- It depends if the Indian is the mother. 7
- Don't see how this relates. If I have a child, how does that related to the community? 7
- By a Mohawk? 7
- Not if the child is non-native. 7
- Very vague question. 7
- If they're native. 7
- It depends on who the mother and father are, if they're Mohawk and not white. 7
- Kind of tricky – native automatically. 7
- If you're native. 7
- If they are native. 7
- It's a family tie. It depends on how the child is raised, and if they are native. 7
- If you're raised here, you're part of the community. A child is innocent. 7
- Depends on how long they've been here. 7
- If they are raised by Mohawk people. 7
- Depends if the child is non-native. 7
- Only if Mohawk or from another reserve. 7
- If the child is Mohawk, yes. 7
- If the child is native, yes. 7
- I worked in Montreal for 10 years. It was my job. I didn't have ties to Montreal. 7
- Only if they're Mohawks. 7
- Convolutd. MCK attorneys work in community and KMHC doctors and nurses. It's a link not a tie. 7
- Does that apply to me as an Onkwehón:we? If I worked in Chateauguay, I would not have a community tie to Chateauguay. 7
- Not clear, is it for native or non-native? 7
- If they live here. 7
- If you're native. 7
- Depends on job – not if you're working in a cigarette factory or selling drugs. Has to be a professional positive contribution example – teacher. 7
- It depends on what they're doing. If they're here to take advantage of the community, then No, but if they're contributing then I would say Yes, if they're bringing something to the community. 7
- That depends on the situation, only if they're from the community. 7
- If the person has a tie to the community. 7
- Only if the person is native. 7
- Only if they are native. 7
- I don't believe that just because a person works in Kahnawake deserves the title of having ties. I would not be considered a Chateauguay resident or having ties because I worked there or went to school there. Many people continue to work here to avoid taxes and to work under the table, they are already cutting corners. For those working on the books, it is their choice to work here, if they want to live closer to their job and avoid traffic, move to Chateauguay of another surrounding community. Yes there are many people who have contributed to our community, but the reality is that people can contribute where ever they choose because they want too, not to receive added incentives. 7
- Think that it depends on what the person bring to the community. 7
- Whatever is decided someone has to monitor and look at if they start to stir up trouble etc. Then they would have to be asked to leave. Somehow this has to be built into it. Don't see that incorporated in this. 7
- Community Ties “not sure what exactly would define what this tie would be....can't answer this question. 7
- So much room for anyone to just come and live here. Should just stand firm on the laws already set. Keep going back to starting over, starting over. Why do they keep doing this? 7
- Not if you didn't grow up here. 7

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- You can have a family in Kahnawà:ke but never been here, so no community ties – no relationship. 7
- Again, to a degree but that degree has to be determined. 7
- Native only. 7
- Is a tie but needs to have a commitment to the community. 7
- With lineage. 7
- No, if I have a family member in Chateauguay, doesn't make me have a community tie to Chateauguay. 7
- But if you're brought in from the U.S., you don't have the understandings of what being on reserve means. 7

Elders Council

- Not so much the question of not sitting there – as the people themselves and the criteria for selection. 9
- There's no explanation on the numbers. Why 9 to 15? 5 to 9? 5 to 7? What's the rationale? It would help! 9
- The town should be run by the clan mothers. 9
- Too many people, nobody will agree on anything. Always going to be friction. 9
- With a proviso that they can't be related, immediate family, no siblings. 9
- Only 3 to 4 people should be on the council of Elders. 9
- Don't agree. How can these people judge people like me? If they don't like you, you can be sure you won't get on. Some of them were prejudiced. The questions weren't relevant. Would the background of these people (elders) be questioned? 9
- Not interested in numbers, I am interested in the qualifications of the ones on the Council of Elders. 9
- Why do they have an Elder's Committee? 9
- What happens when they die? 9
- Should only be 5 on the Council of Elders with 1 as an alternate. 9
- Should be divided up in 3 clans of 2 members = 6 people until consensus is reached, plus 1 war chief. 9
- The more opinions there are, the harder it's going to be to make a decision. 9
- Much easier to reach a consensus with a smaller group. 9
- Even lower if possible. Too many people, too much emotion. 9
- Small groups of 4 or 5 – not an inquisition. 9
- What does this mean? It's not clear. 9
- It's like a traditional decision-making process – clan process 9
- Lower the number to 9 – 12 elders. 9
- I don't believe in the Council of Elders. Are they picking and choosing? Everything is already in place at the Longhouse. 9
- The 'customs' is very vague. 9
- I don't believe the Council of Elders should exist or have somebody else judging you. 9
- Objectivity. 10
- Have the language. 10
- Minimum age of 35 or 40. If you want youth, change the name. 10
- They should be a mix of elders, adults and youth – broader range of ages. 10
- They should not have a child who has a white father, on a case by case basis for the good of the town. 10
- Need to have some life experience and children themselves. They need to have trust/respect/confidence/compassion in the people they are making decisions on. This needs more careful consideration. 10
- Should be able to speak Mohawk, have an I.Q. test. 10
- Should be more specific on who should be an elder – the criteria. When you say 'elder', it implies more matured and defined. At least 50 years old and has gone through a lot of life and have more life experience. 10

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Elder should be over 30 years old.10
- Emotional intelligence.10
- Important to state in writing why they want to be an elder. Elder should be 35 and over. Membership is too important to be taken lightly. No hidden agendas. 10
- Have a criminal background check. Respect how? Trust? Lack of definition. How can someone be totally non-biased? What are the parameters? A certain age - 50 plus. 10
- Should know who and what they are talking about. Age should be not too young or too old – 20 to 70. Can't be racist. Should all have the same mind.10
- Add customs and laws.10
- Should be some youth in there – just because a person is an elder doesn't mean they're wiser.10
- Should be a mix of people between 35 and 50, owns a home, is responsible, has a job, is a family man, has family ties.10
- Have an open mind. Keep their personal feelings out of it.10
- An education, worldly experience, having been outside of the community, have community experience ex: sitting on a board, being part of the Longhouse.10
- Should have more knowledge of our past laws and the community and the people.10
- Should have mostly a native family without children or grandchildren who married out.10
- Shouldn't have their own agenda. If they don't like you, you don't get in. Should be at least 50 years and a family person EX: mother or grandmother. Have to judge the personality.10
- Have a clan, keep updated, be older and have knowledge of the history of how this began.10
- Certain level of education.10
- Know more about the community, more knowledgeable of who people are, more history, how things were run before, how decisions are made based on the old ways.10
- Elder should be at least 50 years old. We have to have a common definition of what an elder is. Must have knowledge of our community and traditional ways. Should not have personal vendettas.10
- An elder is biological. Around 49 years and using the medicine wheel concept of 7. 10

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Age requirement – 3 yrs + option to run again. 10
- Already broke this one (respect, trust)! 10
- Add another box 10:
- Change the membership law to eliminate the Council of Elders. 10
- Yes, being on the Council of Elders should have requirements besides what is currently described above. 10
- Depends on the changes that are implemented in the membership law. 10
- Age requirement – not too young, not too old. 10
- The younger ones don't know as much about the community at 18. Don't know the families. 10
- Must be an "elder". 10
- Age should be past 50 at least 10
- Elder should be more than 18 yrs. (40 yrs) and someone married to Kanien'kehaka from Kahnawake. Not a non-native. Someone should have understanding of our laws. 10
- A resume of what they've been doing in the community, good citizen, people know you. 10
- Not have an agenda. 10
- Change to over 50 to 60 that knows the community, only 2 to 3 of the Council of Elders to be between 50-60 years. 10
- Person must have gone through self discovery/self awareness, personal development, psychology, spiritual, physical emotion. Have to be healed and have to be well. 10
- Need healthy minds and healthy hearts. Membership isn't the issue – it's community pain and emotional damage. 10
- Should be an educational process. Must be living here, sense of community. Open minded and unbiased. 10
- Being 18 doesn't make you an elder. Should be 40+. 10
- For Elder, should be 18 year old --- 35 + 10
- Age is one – should set age requirement. 10
- Age limit – not too young, not too old. 10
- Age / not 18 – 45 for example too young. 10
- Important to state in writing why they want to be an elder. Elder should be 35 years + over. Membership is too important to be taken lightly. No hidden agendas. 10
- Must be defined – community trust, respect and confidence. How to measure this? 10
- Elder – at least 30 yr. 10
- Because you won't get any applicants to run. 10
- Community to decide. 10
- In an open forum appointment. 10
- Doesn't guarantee you'll get the right people. 10
- Should be staggered, alternating terms. 10
- No council of Elders! 10
- As long as you are capable & want to and fair. 10
- Change name to something generic like "Membership Committee" 10
- Obviously until able. 10
- As long as they are willing & able. 10
- Serve until able. 10
- Someone recognized y the community, shows leadership skills, a role model, has experience, someone who the people have confidence in.
- Older people – 65 years plus.10
- Should have a cultural aspect, of our culture. 10
- Have more knowledge of community. All have to say who they are. Both parents should be Mohawk, who their parents are. Should be full blooded. Why do they want the job? 10
- Should have a good mind (Kanikonrhiio), come to 1 mind. 10
- Should be able to live in harmony in the community. 10
- Should be a good person and live like that and be recognized in the community as a good and just person. 10
- Elder should be 50 plus. 10

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Trust, respect and has community confidence – how is it measured? 10
- An elder should be 50 plus. 10
- Background check. Have a standard as far as morals and good character, good references, should be living in Kahnawake so they know what's going on. Age requirement should be at least 50 years. 10
- Minimum age of 35 years to be an elder. 10
- Age should be 50, or having lived in the community for 50 years. 10
- Should have psychological testing – should be of sound mind. Elder should be 30 to 60 years old. 10
- An elder is someone who knows the families, the people. They need to look at people according to their family tree – some are there to crucify people. No personal agendas. 10
- They should live in Kahnawake. 10
- Elder should not be only 18, should be 65 or older. They should know our history, laws and have been here for many years. 10
- Should be someone who is not prejudiced. 10
- Minimum age to be considered an elder – 60 years plus. 10
- Add if you have education – reading skills, experience, board training. Age requirement should be at least over 30 years. 10
- Age requirement should be at least 60 plus. Must have knowledge of community and families with no hidden agenda. 10
- Change to over 50 or 60 that knows the community. 10
- Just 2 or 3 of the Council of Elders should be between 50 and 60. 10
- These should have compassion. The process is nerve-wracking. Give them criteria. Maybe give them some lessons on how to treat people. 10
- A resume of what they've been doing in the community, a good citizen, people know you, not have an agenda. 10
- Put age to 20 plus. 10
- Elder should be more than 18 years – more than 40 years old. Be married to Kanien'kehaka from Kahnawake. Not a non-native. Someone who has understanding of our laws. 10
- Age should be past 50 at least. 10
- Elder should be at least 30 years. 10
- Being 18 doesn't make you an elder. Should be 40 plus. 10
- For elder, should be more than 18 years old – 35 plus. 10
- Elder should be over 40 – mature. 10
- Elder should be 30 years and over at least. 10
- Should be an educational process. Must be living here. Have a sense of community, open-minded and unbiased. 10
- Person must have gone through self discovery / self awareness/ personal development / psychological, spiritual, physical, emotional, like Kiti Gan Zibi / Maniwaki or Traditional Healing Akwesá:sne or go to a retreat. Have to be healed and have to be well. Need healthy minds and healthy hearts. Membership isn't the issue – it's community pain and emotional damage. 10
- The younger ones don't know as much about the community at 18. Don't know the families. Should be 30 plus. 10
- Background screening process, no hidden agenda, for the best interest of the community. 10
- Sanity being one. Have to be a fair, decent person. Good track record of being honest and respectful. You need people to speak on your behalf that are trustful, honest and a decent person. 10
- Should be knowledgeable of what the Indian Act did to us. Should know the families / family histories. Should be old enough to know who's who. Should be 50 +. 10
- They should be firmer in their laws. 10
- Just because you're an elder, doesn't mean you grow sweet. 10
- Must be defined – community trust, respect and confidence – how to measure this? 10
- As long as they are healthy. 10
- It has to be more than just attending 1 band meeting or no objections that is becomes automatic. 10

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Hopefully there will be screening and eligibility requirements and a large voice by community. 10
- Should be something more structured. But if you have a big family, you can get in, which is not right. 10
- They should be screened. Some one who is understanding and has knowledge of the people going before them. 10
- Some new opinions, new ideas. 10
- If there are more than 7 candidates. 10
- I don't know. 10
- Probably wouldn't hurt. Person should really want to be on the Council of Elders. 10
- By secret ballot. 10
- Have a panel of Longhouses and MCK to make decisions on membership for the Council of Elders. 10
- Because they could stack the deck and be unfair. 10
- Turns in to a popularity contest. 10
- Should be more publicity to recruit elders, make it more appealing, more information. 10
- Just a waste of time and money. 10
- Community to decide. 10
- Doesn't guarantee you'll get the right people. 10
- It is very difficult to get large groups of people together because of the many different commitments. 9
- Need to have enough of a mix of people with knowledge of our community. 9
- What is an Elder, that should be decided. Not a 20 year old who doesn't know anybody. 9
- 2 years 46 (Q 10)
- 3 years 25 (Q10)
- 4 years 22 (Q10)
- Tricky question and not very good for the survey. Much discussion could be had with this question to give a more clear answer.10
- The previous panel consisted of self-appointed persons, many of whom were egotistical, mentally unstable or just plain dumb. Based on the criteria above less than half actually fit the bill. Resolve how you're going to recruit trustworthy individuals.10
- Way too many people on the Council of Elders. Should have some sort of process, many people were not acting in a good manner. They should have been thrown off.10
- The criteria should be very strict many of the previous council were a joke and a disgrace on how they treating people who would stand before them.10
- Not sure because not enough people really want to be put in that position.10
- Hard to find good people. 10
- Training should be intensive and to all. Maybe some sort of testing on their mental stability. 10
- I stood before them and was treated very respectful but know that was not everyone's experience. 10
- It should be followed I know that a few people were allowed to become members and they did not meet the criteria. Which is unfair to others who weren't. 10
- Consistency is important in making the decisions, not always black and white. Decisions should be based on the criteria. 10
- 10B – Should the COUNCIL OF ELDERS serve for a limited number of years?
- YES: [85]
- 3 years.
- 4 years.
- 3 years.
- 3 to 4 years.
- 4 years.
- 3 years.
- 5 years staggered.
- 2 years.
- 2 to 4 years.
- 2 to 3 years, 3 tops.

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Can't go on forever with no limits, 2 to 3 years.
- 3 years.
- 5 years.
- 2 years.
- 3 to 4 years.
- There should be a term limit.
- There should be a limit of the number of years.
- 4 years.
- 3 years.
- Rotating terms, one year on, one year off.
- 3 years.
- 2 terms of 3 years each.
- 2 years then re-election.
- 3 or 4 years, then sit out for a few years. If they suffered a debilitating illness that affects the mind, they should be asked to step down.
- 4 years.
- 4 to 5 years.
- Minimum of 5 years, staggered terms.
- 3 years, staggered terms.
- 3 years.
- A probation period of 3 years, but at any point they could be removed.
- 5 to 10 years.
- 4 years.
- 5 years.
- 3 or 4 years.
- 2 years.
- 4 years.
- 3 to 5 years.
- 2 years.
- 3 years.
- I don't know.
- 3 years.
- 2 terms.
- 3 to 5 years.
- 3 years.
- There are benefits for rotating people because you get new ideas.
- Depending on their age, every 3 years.
- 3 years, staggered terms with an option for renewal for continuity.
- Every 3 years.
- 3 years.
- 1 year.
- 2 years.
- 5 years.
- 3 years.
- As long as they are healthy.
- 2 years.
- Maximum 3 years, no more than 2 terms.
- 2 years.
- 3 or 4 years.
- On a rotating basis for 3 years.
- 5 years.
- Should be a limit – at least 2 to 3 years.
- 3 to 4 years.
- 10 years.
- 3 to 5 years.

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Every 4 years.
- 2 years.
- 6 years. ○ If they don't have children, they should leave. 8
- 3 years max.
- But have requirements.
- 3 years.
- 4 years.
- 2 years.
- 2 or 3 years.
- 9 years.
- For 3 years.
- Maybe for only 5 years.
- Should be staggered, alternating terms.
- They should run for as long as they keep getting elected.
- Should be a decision for themselves.
- The more experience, the better.
- As long as they are healthy.

Enforcement of the law

- How many times do we have to go through this...1981 1984 and many still are living here. Feel very frustrated because now don't even care no matter what you say, someone has to enforce this law who??? PK'sMCK...?? 1
- Need to know who will enforce this...we currently have many people living here that should not be here. 1
- Who will be responsible for enforcing the law? What about the ones living here now working for MCK, KSCS, Tewa? By allowing them to work and live here we are saying it is okay. Another issue is the school system...again allowing them to go to school. I realize it is the children and it is not their fault but law is law, right? 1
- Everyone should know about Membership, we still have men and women having children with non-natives and what happens, NOTHING. They go to school here, go to daycare etc. It is a big joke, the young people don't care and don't realize how hard it will get when we have to pay taxes, etc. I hope that I am not here to witness this. MCK is trying hard but afraid to enforce and community needs to back them up. 1
- I hope they can really make the changes this time, wonder what they could do different for people to understand? 1
- In the case of death of the native or break in relationship, the non-native should be asked to leave and it should be enforceable. They should not be entitled to inherit any land or property. 6
- Why is this even a question? Who put it there? This is what gets us to keep going back and back. We have a law just enforce it and follow it. NO exceptions. 8
- I am frustrated with this questions. Many people worked so hard to bring awareness in the community and so if 300 people agree to having all non-natives live here is it okay. I don't think so. 8
- It depends. If they have children, yes. 8
- All the time! 12
- Of course, my family is Onkwehón:we and the only people who do not tell their children this are NON NATIVE. 12
- That's how I was brought up. 12
- But parents never said don't. It was an unspoken rule, we just knew. 12
- You marry out, you're out. 12
- More directed at my sister, and her friends. Heard it in all families. 12
- I did! 12
- And I teach my children that. 12
- I am a non-native. 12
- I was told I would lose my rights, never that I would be able to live here. 12

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- My family has never said this but I do hear it around town. 12
- Was just told not to marry a white man. 12
- Not me personally, but my son has. 12
- Depend on when they got married. 8
- NO! NO! NO! We have been stifled enough by non natives, they would be taking advantage of our rights and avoiding paying their dues to their government. 8
-
- Never told that & from seeing what other people were doing. I thought that men & woman had the same rights! 12
- If they choose to stay - why not? 2b
- They are Native so why not. 2b
- You can't take away something you already gave! It shouldn't be given in first place. 2b
- If they are of good standing to our community. 2b
- If meet criteria for being indigenous. 2b
- Isn't this the same as a person who lost their spouse? 2b
- Only Indigenous (50%) 2b
- It depends – if they have children 2b
- Depending on death, depending on divorce. 2b
- Should reapply 2b
- What of the children of the union? 2b
- Maybe can apply afterwards or depending on divorce/age/death??? 2b
- The whole thing is very delicate. You can't help who you fall in love with. Marriage strengthens the line. 6
- What is common law criteria? 6
- As long as it's not a white person. 7
- Because you have children. 7
- But if you're white, this isn't your community. 7
- Not if you're not living here. 7
- If a Mohawk marries a white woman or man – too many variables. 7
- But not for non-natives married to a member. 7
- Not clear. Does this refer to a man or woman? Differences are man staying and woman has to go. 7
- Not if they're white. 7
- But not a non-native. 7
- It depends on if they have children. 7
- Don't believe anyone should be marrying non-natives from off reserve. 7
- But only if they are married to Mohawks. 7
- Native or non-native? 7
- If you're both native. 7
- If children are involved. 7
- Non-native will learn the culture. 7
- That depends if that person is living in town, if they're married to someone from town but not living in town. It could be a community tie. 7
- 53 survey respondents said 'It has already been answered many many times or NO they don't belong here. 8
- Would have liked to see a question on common law here. 8
- As long as it's not a white person. 7
- What is the criteria for common law? 7
- It depends on how long, more than 10 years. 7
- But if you're white, this isn't your community. 7
- If there are children involved. 7
- Not clear. Does this refer to a man or woman? Differences are man staying and woman has to go. 7
- Not if they're white. 7
- Depends on the duration of the relationship. 7

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- If one is non-native, it's not a community tie. 7
- We will always fight that from happening. 3
- Will never happen. 3
- I hope not. 3
- If 0 Mohawks exist, how can we be "Mohawks of Kahnawake"? 3
- It depends on if they have children. 7
- Only for the duration of the relationship. 7
- If you're both native. 7
- If children are involved. 7
- If they can contribute to the community, yes. 8
- Should have a responsibility attached. 8
- My core belief – people should stop bringing non-natives to the community. 8
- Only if they don't have the rights, man or woman. 8
- That person who marries a non-native should go live where the non-native lives. 8
- If the non-native works for our community, our children, they should be allowed to have residency rights. On a case by case basis. 8
- But without membership. 8
- If it were my own kids who married someone from Chateauguay, they would have to move to Chateauguay. But I wouldn't love my kids or grandkids any less. 8
- Should be determined on a case by case basis and looked at very carefully. 8
- Process should be set up, shouldn't be automatic. 8
- I don't know about this – along time ago, if a non- native woman married a native, and the man died, the non-native women had to sell. 8
- The men do it, why not the women? 8
- The ones who are here from 1981 – yes. Anybody else new now, they are both out. They should make considerations for non-native people who are helping community members. But once relationship dissolves or native person passes, the non-native should leave. 8
- I truly believe in building lineage. I pray for consistency right across the board in any changes to be made. No one is 100%. Where do you start the new line? The law should apply to everyone, male and female. 8
- If they don't have children, they should leave. 8
- If they have children, they should stay. 8
- It depends. If they have children, yes. 8
- I wasn't allowed to live here and I'm Mohawk and now we're going to allow non-natives to live here? 8
- Should be subject to review – should have the option of eviction, shouldn't be a blanket statement. 8
- If the non-native becomes a member, they should not be allowed to own anything. 8
- Why is this question on here? Of course I disagree. Goes back to Traditional. People should be going back to the Longhouse. 8
- The council should have been on top of the 1982 memorandum and we would not have had to send out letters. The law should have been up held. 12

General Comments

- Can't make a decision. 1
- Not sure what should be done 1
- Think that this is so hard to make a decision 1
- None of these options matches my opinion 1
- So difficult to answer because we are all touched by this subject in one way or another!1
- Waste of time!!!! 1
- I think it's useless. It's all talk but nothing is done. 1
- History on TV was really dull. 1
- I don't know. 3

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Do not agree with this portion of the statement 2
- Has to have lineage. 2
- Three (lineage) options to answer 2
- There needs to be much more research into whether one of the above or something different is suitable for the community. 1
- Confusing 2
- If you are common law, it is easier to get out of the marriage. Then if you have membership, you can do things on your own. 2
- Should separate answers – make it a choice (with little or no above) 2
- If children are involved. 7
- Criminal record review. 7
- That depends if that person is living in town, if they're married to someone from but not living in town, it could be a community tie. 7
- Being accepted and welcomed by the members of the community. 7
- You are a recognized member of Kahnawake or are a recognized (as in can prove) membership from another Native community and you have a child or are living with or married to a recognized member of Kahnawake. 7
- All of the above should be held with equal regard. Any one of these is acceptable. 7
- Accumulation of all above. 7
- Having your own biological child. 7
- If Native 7
- By someone that's Native. 7
- By a Mohawk 7
- Don't see how it relates? If I have a child, how does that relate to the community? 7
- Until 18 yrs. 7
- If you are Mohawk or Native. 7
- If the child is native yes. 7
- Depends on how long they've been here. 7
- There is a lot of objectivity that needs to be had in making decisions on who could stay here and who should leave. People have to really think.
- Too difficult to answer.
- If the child is Mohawk yes. 7
- Native only and indigenous. 7
- Not if the child is non-native. 7
- Work in the community for more that 10 years. 7
- If the person has a tie to the community. 7
- If they live here. 7
- Having biological family in the Kahnawà:ke (parent, sister, brother, aunt or uncle for example). 7
- Not if you didn't grow up here. 7
- But if you're brought up in U.S. you don't have the understandings of what being on reserve means. 7
- Must have indigenous lineage. 7
- Should know history culture language 7
- A person could have immediate family, but have no communication. 7
- All of the above as long as they have intent to maintain and pass on our culture & language. 7
- There should be a residency by-law. Countries have a process for new residents and we should have the same. 8
- But only if they have positive intent of learning our way and passing it forward. 8
- Always have changes – what happens to people already here? 8
- Why is this question on here? Of course I disagree. Goes back to traditional. People should be going back to the Longhouse. 8
- only if Native?? 7
- Meet criteria - membership 7
- Apply & meet criteria. No undesirables. 8
- Very hard decision. 1

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Section needs to change – not sure. 1
- I don't believe in the 50%. I don't agree with any of the choices. Who am I to change the Great Law of Peace? The names of the fathers may not be so. Bloodline doesn't make sense. 1
- I am forced to get a Quebec birth certificate for my son, can't afford to send him to our own school with traditional document. I am traditional and don't agree with the process. Are you working with Longhouse? 1
- I don't agree with any of the above. I know of people who have been accepted on both sides. I would prefer to see a survey and fill it out myself. 1
- Not going to have anyone if have to go to far. 1
 - Differentiate between little or no. 2
- You need a starting point before you can start making exceptions. 1
- All this info comes from church documents, so there's a possibility of a margin of error. Hard to confirm. 1
- I think anyone who is born a Mohawk, they will always be a Mohawk. 1
- All this info comes from church documents so there is a possibility of a margin of error. Hard to confirm. 1
- I wasn't allowed to vote so I went to the church and got my records back to 1735. My mother was Mohawk and my father was non-native. 1
- No answer – not sure if they contributed to the community – there are a lot of givers and takers. 2
- This is such a hard questions because this affects my family and don't want to see my sister-in-Law have to leave. She doesn't have anywhere to go we are her family. 2
- There is no membership law at the point because it was not voted on or ratified. 2
- Only Indigenous – 50% plus 2
- Use "resident" instead of member. 2
- I don't know. (10) 3
- It would be a special case to inherit status. 3
- Can't take our status away from us. 3
- Don't know. 3
- I don't know. 3
- Is there a precedent in Canada? Has it already happened? 3
- As long as we raise our kids in our Kanien'kehaka culture, then we can never lose it. 3
- Part of the community, does it mean resident or membership? Should be better defined. 3
- I don't know. 4
- I don't know. 4
- Don't want to comment. 5
- What is a member's pledge? 5
- I don't believe in oaths. 5
- Either you're born Indian or you're not. Can't answer it. Doesn't make sense to me. 5
- I think question 1 should be resolved before this can be answered. 6
- Define 'positive contribution'. Is very subjective. 6
- I don't get this law stuff. 6
- If you're talking about Mohawk people, yes to all options. If non-aboriginal, then, it's a gray area. All they have is a physical and emotional tie, but not ancestral language and cultural ties. 7
- I don't know. 8
- I truly believe in building lineage. I pray for consistency right across the board in any changes to be made. No one is 100%. Where do you start the new line? The law should apply to everyone, male and female. 8

Great Grandparents

- 5 great grandparents (15) 1
- The criteria as above is fine, however better details need to be given to the community that the 4 great grandparent on the registry does not mean 50% blood quantum. 1
- A clearer explanation that the 4 great grand parents do not need to be 100% they could be 30% but were recognized by the registry. 1

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- I think that we should just keep it the same with 4 great-grandparents we should start to re-build that is the message to send out. Not keep starting over. 1
- I don't agree with 4 great grandparents. Suppose you marry a native from other than from the 5 nations? Being native should count, not native from Africa, Mexico, etc. 1
- They are already native since they have 4 great grandparents. 5
- I assume that if the child had 4 or more great grandparents that they will automatically become a member. 5
- If they already have 4 Kanien'kehaka Great Grandparents, why do they have to reapply? 5

Losing Membership

- Some of our own people don't belong here for what they do and don't do. What about the law for convicts etc. 2
- On consideration that they are living up to Kahnawake standards.2
- Child is already here. Shouldn't throw them out. It's mean. I would agree to a limited membership. 4
- If I adopted a child, I would raise the child with native values but after 18, they would lose their rights. 4
- Maybe they should have membership up until 18. 4
- I don't think it's right. If that child is already Mohawk why should they have to reaffirm? 5
- They are already Indian, just leave it alone. They're here! 5
- Once they are adopted and meet the requirements, they should not have to reaffirm at 18 years. 5
- How do we know their lineage? Some fathers don't even sign for them. Hard to confirm. 5
- They are equal in the lineage equation, they just happen to be adopted through no choice of their own. 5
- They should already be allowed to remain a member as they meet all the criteria. 5
- Why do they have to ask to be a member? You are who you are when you are born. 5
- If they are native, it's not necessary – they are native. 5
- It's not fair – should be done automatically. 5
- They shouldn't have to re-apply because they already meet the current criteria. 5
- They should stay on the Registry no matter what. They're still the same person as they were at 10. 5
- Once you're native, you're native. They can't take that away from you. You shouldn't have to beg. 5
- If they meet the criteria why should they go through this process. 5
- They should stay on the membership list because they're native. 5
- Child should stay on the list at 18 if they fit the 4 great grandparents automatically. 5
- Only if they have little to no native ancestry. 5
- But make it harder for them to become a member to make sure they appreciate being a member. 5
- It still should be automatic if they meet the criteria. 5
- I think if they're accepted as a member with 4 great grandparents, they should not have to present themselves again at 18. 5
- Whatever currently applies. 5
- Why do they have to make a membership application? 5
- Why do they have to wait until 18? You're not more or less Indian at 18. 5
- They shouldn't have to do anything for membership as they already qualify. 5
- If they are native, adopted, should not be singled out. 5
- If they're native, they're registered, they shouldn't have to apply for membership. 5
- It should be automatic. 5
- If they already meet the criteria, why do they have to reapply? 5
- They are already a member. 5
- If a child is on the band list and fits the criteria they should not have to jump through hoops to maintain status. 5
- If they already have 4 Kanien'kehaka Great Grandparents, why do they have to reapply? 5

Marriage Comments

- I would agree that native women who lost their status by marrying a non-native should be allowed to come back without their husband. Non-native women shouldn't be here. 1
- If there are children involved it becomes more complicated. 2
- If the union breaks, will they still be a member? 2
- I always take for the underdog – women's rights. 2
- If you are common law, it is easier to get out of the marriage/union than if you have membership, you can do things on your own. 2
- Indigenous only. 2
- But children should be considered. 2
- What if there are children from this union? 2
- It depends if they have children. 2
- If they have children, they should have full rights until children are 18.2
- The non-native people keep it, so why shouldn't a native?2
- It depends on how long they've been together and if there are kids involved.2
- If they have at least 3 great grandparents.2
- If you were married only. 2
- Must be married to get here or nothing. 2
- What is meant by 'common law?' What is the criteria? 2
- Definition of common law needs to be determined and other considerations Ex: Canadian government determines you are common law if you have a child. 2
- I am not sure. 2
- Question is vague – question sounds like you could be married to anyone. 2
- Depends on how many years they've been living together and if there's children. 2
- Shouldn't be a deterrent. 2
- If they stay together for a least 5 years and are both native. 2
- Only if they are native. 2
- If it's to a native. 2
- But it has to be a native. 2
- Only if they are native. 2
- As long as they are native. 2
- If they are Indian. 2
- Only if they're native. 2
- If you have no lineage, I don't agree with that. 2
- It's not fair. 2
- If they have no lineage, they should not apply. 2
- A non-native should not be allowed to be Indian. 2
- Native only, not white people. 2
- How do you determine the other person's lineage? 2
- Native from another nation is more desirable. 3
- Residency contingent on marriage. 6
- Non-Indian woman marries a native, she gets to live on the reserve, own a house and has status (has same status as her husband) and her children whereas the Indian woman married a non-native and is not even being looked at. At this point, we should be recognized as native and be able to come home with our husband and children (6.1). 6
- Only if has lineage. 2
- If only native of some kind. 2
- But the % must meet our criteria or higher. 2
- Only if indigo lineage not non-natives at all 2
- A non-native should not be allowed to be Indian. 2
- How do you determine the other person's lineage? 2
- If Native 2
- If they are both Native 2

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- If Native 2
- Depends on the person's relationship with the community. 2b
- Living in a common law relationship with a Mohawk who is a member. 7
- If both are Native only 2
- If both Native 2
- If they have kids 2
- Only the children who are part-native Ex. Restigouche. 2
- Should be married legally! 2
- People who married before the 1981 moratorium should not be affected but the one afterwards knew what the consequences of marrying out were! 7
- Married to a Mohawk who is a member. 7

Married to a Mohawk member:

- As long as it's not a white person. 7
- Because you have children. 7
- But if you're white, this isn't your community. 7
- Not if you're not living here. 7
- If a Mohawk marries a white woman or man – too many variables. 7
- But not for non-natives married to a member. 7
- Not clear. Does this refer to a man or woman? Differences are man staying and woman has to go. 7
- Not if they're white. 7
- But not a non-native. 7
- It depends on if they have children. 7
- Don't believe anyone should be marrying non-natives from off reserve. 7
- But only if they are married to Mohawks. 7
- Native or non-native? 7
- If you're both native. 7
- If children are involved. 7
- Non-native will learn the culture. 7
- That depends if that person is living in town, if they're married to someone from town but not living in town. It could be a community tie. 7

Living in a common law relationship with a Mohawk member:

- As long as it's not a white person. 7
- What is the criteria for common law? 7
- It depends on how long, more than 10 years. 7
- But if you're white, this isn't your community. 7
- If there are children involved. 7
- Not clear. Does this refer to a man or woman? Differences are man staying and woman has to go. 7
- Not if they're white. 7
- Depends on the duration of the relationship. 7
- If one is non-native, it's not a community tie. 7
- It depends on if they have children. 7
- Only for the duration of the relationship. 7
- If you're both native. 7
- If children are involved. 7
- Duration of Membership
- If they have been here for more than 7 years...they should stay. 2
- If they have been here for 1-2 years definitely no they should leave. 2

Non Member Residents

- The person with little or no Kanien'kehaka lineage shouldn't be able to apply for membership. 2

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Don't see a problem with non-natives being residents but not membership. 2
- Deceased, divorced, separated – you're French, you're French. You're black, you're black. 2
- Based on circumstance if person continues to live here or not. 2
- This is not a straight forward yes no answers, there is a need for more detail. I believe that a person who has proven/supported indigenouness lineage would be entitle to maintain their membership in Kahnawake, however if there is no lineage or lineage that does not meet our membership criteria then it needs to be dissolved. 2
- What happens if they are older and lived here for 50 – 60 years? 2
- I don't believe anyone who has no lineage ought to be allowed to live on reserve. No exceptions. 6
- I think question 1 should be resolved before this can be answered. 6
- This is a difficult question because some of the non-natives contribute more to the community, but I guess they need to feel a part. 6
- They have to have at least 1 parent that is native. 6
- All people who have no Kanien'kehaka or Indigenous lineage should be required to apply for non-member residency. 6
- It gets me confused – it says 'member' and 'resident'. I believe they are two different things. 6
- Residency contingent on marriage. 6
- Non-Indian woman marries a native, she gets to live on the reserve, own a house and has status (has same status as her husband) and her children whereas the Indian woman married a non-native and is not even being looked at. At this point, we should be recognized as native and be able to come home with our husband and children (6.1). 6
- There has to be a special process for non-natives, would have to be set up. 6
- All should apply. It a security for the community. 6
- Shouldn't have the benefits of living here tax-free. 6
- I would add that if a person is physically or mentally challenged, they should have a medical exemption where medical care is needed 24/7 or supervision. 6
- I don't get this law stuff. 6
- All are okay. Non-member residency should be renewed every 3 years – not permanent. 6
- I still firmly believe that the more non-natives we allow to live here, we're going to end up like Kanehsatà:ke. 6
- Don't believe there should be non-member residents. They're occupying space and taking advantage of the economy. 6
- Please define what is positive contribution. 6
- Don't agree with the criteria 'without Kanien'kehaka lineage' 6
- The whole thing is very delicate. You can't help who you fall in love with. Marriage strengthens the line. 6
- What is common law criteria? 6
- Don't agree with the criteria 'without Kanien'kehaka lineage' 6
- In some cases, it is for humanitarian reasons. Ex: the non-native is a caregiver and demands nothing from the MCK. 6
- In the case of death of the native or break in relationship, the non-native should be asked to leave and it should be enforceable. They should not be entitled to inherit any land or property. 6
- Can't answer it. If you have Indian blood and Indian relatives, then why can't they live here? 6
- Define 'positive contribution'. Is very subjective. 6
- If you have Indian blood and Indian relatives, then why can't they live here? 6
- Please define what is positive contribution. 6
- As long as not a white person. 7
- Define positive contribution? Very subjective. 6
- Add another box: 6
- Only native persons from other communities who can prove and match our membership criteria can reside on the territory. 6
- With some lineage. 6
- It's the same thing. 6
- Only with lineage 6

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Should not give the choice of 'without' some lineage. 6
- Especially if they have children 6
- Can't answer it. 6

Non-Natives

- The big issue is non-native 1
- If they are non-native, they should not have rights. 2
- Because the non-native would get what the native woman lost. 2
- If I choose to fall in love with a non-native, I would move to where they come from. 2
- Should depend on the character of the person. 2
- Why ask this question?? Of course they should leave and why should they keep their membership status, the men should not have been here in the first place. 2
- Too many variables to be cut and dry. 2
- It would depend on how long they stayed in the community. 2
- Many "non-natives" contribute more to this community. 2
- Don't agree with 'non-native' part of the question. Indigenous should include other natives. 2
- Non-native would learn the culture. 7
- Very emotional – can't answer. 11
- Laws always changing – this is complicated. 11
- Be married to a Mohawk member. 11
- or Common Law 11
- or common-law acceptable too. 11
- Depending on age & how long been married. 11
- Be required to pay fees for residency services. (Residency services may apply to school bus services, snow removal and road maintenance, and land use fees for example. Fees, for example, can be used to lower the MCK annual community maintenance costs). 11
- Would be the start of taxation. 11
- But also non-native doctors, teachers, etc should pay residency fee) 11
- Should leave the community when the person is no longer married to the Mohawk. 11
- Death or Divorce 11
- or Common Law 11
- Only if there are no children involved. 11
- Unless they have children 11
- Children inherit the home but the non native parent is still here. Each situation is different. Why boot them out? Have to have some compassion. 11
- Should live here until any biological children reach the age of 18 years. 11
- If divorced or widowed, if still married can't ask that person to leave. 11
- And their spouse passes. 11
- If in charge of child – have custody. 11
- Should have residency criteria (contribute to the community, volunteer for example) identified by the
Council of Elders. 11
- Too many here already. 11
- They have our jobs. 11
- Should be put in law, not ideas from C of Elders. 11
- They should have to sign a paper with witnesses agreeing to all these requirements. 11
- Don't think it's the council of elders' place. Can't make someone do something they don't want to do. They should be encouraged not made to. 11
- Preferably. 11
- Economically, if we say this, no one will come here. 11
- Once you let that happen, what happens to our bloodline? Have to have two parents with a clan. 11
- Tricky, it's true but don't want Kahnawake to be a ghetto. 11
- Request permission to live here. 11

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- There should absolutely not be non-natives living on the territory. 11
- Apply annually for residency permit if allowed however Kahnawake is not for non-natives. 11
- No non-natives. If you choose outside persons (society) to marry, you should move there! 11
- In our community there are undesirables, such as drug dealers & crime involvement who should be asked to leave. Not the person who adheres to all the laws of the community. 11
- Have to take a class on our history, culture, introduction and agree to maintain and teach it to their children if any. 11
- Background check, letter of reference, explanation of how they would like to contribute to the community. 11
- Not for non natives w/out community ties. 11
- If no ties to the community, they shouldn't live here. 11
- People should be given an orientation – what's required expected. 11
- If they are going to be here and be required to go by our criteria, we should be fulfilling that criteria first. (ex: Eunice Williams) 11
- Very hard to answer. 11
- Don't agree. Talks about people who are totally non-native. 2
- believe that is why the Indian act was created 3
- Back 350 yrs ago, a few no natives would join our community, however I believe that if it were to come to a point where close to 50% or more of the residence we no longer recognized by our membership criteria I can see the gov't saying that the majority of residence are not indigenous and therefore you can no longer be recognized as a First Nation reserve and we would now be seen as a municipality, subjected to all taxes and lose all benefits as First Nations peoples. 3
- I really think the Indian Act was created for this purpose (10) 3
- Not sure where this question comes from but I think that was the purpose of the Indian Act. 3
- I believe it is possible over time, maybe that was their intention to cause all these problems knowing that the women raise the children. Knowing that the men were away so all these children of white mothers would be raised white. That doesn't sound very nice but it is true. 3
- It could become a problem but unsure! 3
- For sure, we'll lose out! Got to protect what you have. 3
- Well isn't this what we are trying to avoid. 3
- Think about it...what do you think? 3
- If that child is non-native, they should be raised as a non-native. Should bring that child and raise that child in non-native society in their culture. 4
- You can have a couple that adopts Cree children. My concern is the other natives. If you're native, you're native. 4
- I somewhat agree on the assumption that the child is white. 4
- This is a difficult question because some of the non-natives contribute more to the community, but I guess they need to feel a part. 6
- Non-Indian woman marries a native, she gets to live on the reserve, own a house and has status (has same status as her husband) and her children whereas the Indian woman married a non-native and is not even being looked at. At this point, we should be recognized as native and be able to come home with our husband and children (6.1). 6
- Don't agree with the criteria 'without Kanien'kehaka lineage' 6
- In some cases, it is for humanitarian reasons. Ex: the non-native is a caregiver and demands nothing from the MCK. 6
- Don't believe there should be non-member residents. They're occupying space and taking advantage of the economy. 6
- I still firmly believe that the more non-natives we allow to live here, we're going to end up like Kanehsatà:ke. 6
- There has to be a special process for non-natives, would have to be set up. 6
- Not if the child is non-native. 7
- It depends on who the mother and father are, if they're Mohawk and not white. 7
- Not if they're white. 7
- But not a non-native. 7
- As long as it's not a white person. 7

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- If a Mohawk marries a white woman or man – too many variables. 7
- NO! NO! NO! We have been stifled enough by non natives, they would be taking advantage of our rights and avoiding paying their dues to their government. 8
- But not for non-natives married to a member. 7
- As long as it's not a white person. 7
- But if you're white, this isn't your community. 7
- Not if they're white. 7
- If one is non-native, it's not a community tie. 7
- If you're both native. 7
- 53 people said 'It has already been answered many many times or NO they don't belong here. 8
- Why is this even a question? Who put it there? This is what gets us to keep going back and back. We have a law just enforce it and follow it. NO exceptions. 8
- I am frustrated with these questions. Many people worked so hard to bring awareness in the community and so if 300 people agree to having all non-natives live here is it okay. I don't think so. 8
- If they can contribute to the community, yes. 8
- Should have a responsibility attached. 8
- My core belief – people should stop bringing non-natives to the community. 8
- Only if they don't have the rights, man or woman. 8
- That person who marries a non-native should go live where the non-native lives. 8
- If the non-native works for our community, our children, they should be allowed to have residency rights. On a case by case basis. 8
- But without membership. 8
- If it were my own kids who married someone from Chateauguay, they would have to move to Chateauguay. But I wouldn't love my kids or grandkids any less. 8
- Should be determined on a case by case basis and looked at very carefully. 8
- Process should be set up, shouldn't be automatic. 8
- I don't know about this – along time ago, if a non- native woman married a native, and the man died, the non-native women had to sell. 8
- The men do it, why not the women? 8
- The ones who are here from 1981 – yes. Anybody else new now, they are both out. They should make considerations for non-native people who are helping community members. But once relationship dissolves or native person passes, the non-native should leave. 8
- I truly believe in building lineage. I pray for consistency right across the board in any changes to be made. No one is 100%. Where do you start the new line? The law should apply to everyone, male and female. 8
- If they don't have children, they should leave. 8
- If they have children, they should stay. 8
- It depends. If they have children, yes. 8
- I wasn't allowed to live here and I'm Mohawk and now we're going to allow non-natives to live here? 8
- Should be subject to review – should have the option of eviction, shouldn't be a blanket statement. 8
- If the non-native becomes a member, they should not be allowed to own anything. 8
- Why is this question on here? Of course I disagree. Goes back to Traditional. People should be going back to the Longhouse. 8

Other Aboriginals/Indigenous Comments

- What happens if you marry outside of the 5 Nations? 1
- My daughter's father is from out West? What about her? 1
- If someone is married to a Cherokee, Navajo, etc. They are being tossed out the window, completely overlooked. 1
- 5 nations or anyone aboriginal, first nations not sure what the correct terminology 1

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Is it just 5 nations? Wasn't aware of that, thought it was for any Onkwehón:we person. 1
- I don't agree with 4 great grandparents. Suppose you marry a native from other than from the 5 nations? Being native should count, not native from Africa, Mexico, etc. 1
- Kind of convoluted. What if they are Seminole from Florida? Indigenous should not be limited to a certain geographic area – should include American Indians. 2
- Definition of Indigenous should be expanded. 2
- There are other aboriginals living in Kahnawà:ke Ex: Cree, Micmac, Sioux – they should be accepted. 2
- Indigenous should include all native nations. 2
- Don't agree with the definition of Indigenous. Should include all natives.2
- Why just 5 nations, why not all Indigenous people? 2
- Don't agree with 'non-native' part of the question. Indigenous should include other natives. 2
- Do they have to give up their rights on their reserve?2
- They're still Indian. 2
- Only the children who are part Native, ex: Restigouche 2
- Other natives okay. Leary of people without First Nations bloodline. 2
- Definition of Indigenous needs to be expanded. 4
- You can have a couple that adopts Cree children. My concern is the other natives. If you're native, you're native. 4
- Don't like the scope to include just 6 nations. 4
- Can't answer it. If you have Indian blood and Indian relatives, then why can't they live here? 6

Survey Comments

- Don't agree with this question – don't see how lowering the number of great grandparents would make a difference. 1
- I don't agree with any of the above. I know of people who have been accepted on both sides. I would prefer to see a survey and fill it out myself. 1
- This section / question needs to be changed – not sure. 1
- This should be 2 questions: For Indigenous – somewhat agree. For no Kanien'kehaka – totally disagree. 2
- No specific enough. 2
- It sounds like 2 questions. 2
- Isn't this the same as the person who lost their spouse?2
- Don't understand it. 2
- This is a loaded question! 3
- I don't want this Survey being used for the decision making process. 1
- Discussions have to take place, not over the phone. 1
- What kind of question is that and does it really belong in this survey. 3
- A lot of assumptions can be made from this question. 3
- Likert scale used for this survey is not appropriate. 4
- Question does not make sense. A pledge to who? A pledge to what? When you're named in the Longhouse, you're accepting your responsibility as a Kanien'kehaka person. 5
- I don't agree with the tactics for this procedure. It's done in a condescending manner. 5
- Don't agree with any of the options. 5
- Sorry but this question totally doesn't make sense. 5
- I don't understand should be worded properly. 5
- Much too wordy 5
- Why is this question even a part of this survey 5
- Stupid Question, poorly written, I could have done a better job with this question and survey. Questions are too leading, should ask for my opinion. 5
- Again, stupid question, where do these questions come from, no they don't belong here no matter what. 6
- Should be 2 questions – answer more than 1. 6
- It's a dumb question. 6

Questionnaire on Membership in Kahnawà:ke and the 2003 Kahnawà:ke Membership Law

- Should have been a 2-part questions – should have been worded differently – one ‘with’ and one ‘without’. 6
- This is really confusing. Was the survey looked at by poll professionals like Ipsos Reid? Really complicated. Too hard to follow. 6
- Don’t agree with these options. 6
- It’s the same thing. 6
- Question doesn’t make sense. 6
- It’s the same thing. 6
- Not clear, is it for native or non-native? 7
- Question’s purpose is not clear, therefore, cannot answer with confidence. 7
- Community Ties “not sure what exactly would define what this tie would be....can’t answer this question. 7
- What is the point of this question? 8
- Unclear – are the ones that are here now or starting tomorrow? 8
- Although it was mentioned that these will be randomly selected, I believe that the phone interviewing job should be contracted out to ensure accuracy of the results.
- This questionnaire should be made easily assessable to all in the community. i.e. putting a copy in everyone’s mailbox or placing them in the Eastern Door.
- Traditional Membership/Clans
- You either have one or you don’t. 1
- Have a problem with clans – you can be a non Onkwehón:we and get a clan. 1
- I don’t agree with all 4 criteria. 1
- What we follow is you are what your mother is. I believe on going through the matrilineal line. 1
- The clan. What happens if they don’t get a clan? 1
- I am Traditional and don’t agree with the process. Are you working with the Longhouse? I am forced to get a Quebec birth certificate for my son. I can’t afford to send him to our own school without traditional document. 1
- How can you get a clan? If you’re not born from a woman who has a clan, you can’t get a clan. I have a book on clanology. 1
- Culturally speaking when we adopted a child they became our family and are now community members, or part of the nation. There were guidelines to the rights that the person had we need to revisit those guidelines and find a way to use them. That individual is raised in a Kanien’kéha house hold then they need to be acknowledging as one.However, again that does not mean that if an individual who is on the band list marries or common law with a non-native who has children can adopt them so that they get the rights. Only if the adoptive parents are both on the band list would the adopted child be eligible. 4
- The Great Law says when you adopt someone, you forget about their past. 4
- Why is this question on here? Of course I disagree. Goes back to Traditional. People should be going back to the Longhouse. 8