

KRL Regulation Community Feedback Report

Two initial community input sessions were held prior to the regulations for the Kahnawà:ke Residency Law being brought before Chief and Council for further feedback. The community sessions held on February 6, and 19, 2020 produced some concerns held by community members. Those concerns and suggestions are produced below.

Regulation #2: The Community Review Board

It was stated by a community member that the Community Review Board requires more community involvement in selecting the members of the board. Those community members in attendance were in agreement that the possibility of having three members of the Community Review Board be elected from within the community, while have the two legally trained members be appointed.

Regulation #5: Applications

A community member pointed out an issue with two definitions within the law, that are essential to this regulation. The definition that was discussed was “Common Law” to which the community member took issue with having the length of time needed to be considered common law at the discretion of the Registrar.

The second definition that was discussed was that of “Immediate Family”. A community member suggested that the definition be changed to “Onkwehonwe Immediate Family” to ensure that a person applying for the Residency Permit held Onkwehonwe ties to the community.

There were two minor changes to the regulation respecting applications which the community members in attendance suggested. First to have the administrative fee accompanying an application to be an amount fixed at a later date, and second to change the word “Gender” to “Sex” in the applications.

Regulation #6: Complaints

A community member suggested that the Kahnawà:ke Kanien'kehá:ka Registry be made more available for community members who wish to make a complaint against a person.

An issue with having a fee attached to the complaint form which would be refunded upon verifying the validity of the complaint was brought forward by a community member. The community member stated that they should not have to pay multiple fees if they had multiple complaints to make, as it may be too costly at the beginning. A suggestion was made to wave the fees for a complaint for the first year of implementation.

A community member stated that the definition of “Criminality” being left to the discretion of the registrar. The community member stated that the definition must specifically mention certain crimes such as “Murder, and Sexual Assaults” as automatic grounds for either an application to be dismissed or a revocation of right/permission to reside. Another community member brought up the idea that the Registrar should have someone or possibly a body they could turn to, that wouldn't influence their decision, but could give advice on matters of criminality.