

**Brief to the Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples**  
**Submitted by Lynda Price - October 28, 2025**  
**Addressing Inequality**  
**Bill S-2 An Act to amend the Indian Act (new registration entitlements)**

The purpose of Bill S-2 is to address four main areas including enfranchisement, enable individuals to voluntarily remove themselves from the Indian Register, enable women to reaffiliate with their natal band, and remove derogatory language from the Indian Act in particular “mentally incompetent Indians”.

The issue I will address today is the unequitable provisions in the *Indian Act*, RSC, c I-5, s. 6(1) persons entitled to be registered as follows:

- 6(1) (a.3) that person is a direct descendant of a person who is, was or would have been entitled to be registered under paragraph (a.2) and
- (i) They were born before April 17, 1985, whether or not their parents were married to each other at the time of the birth, or
  - (ii) They were born after April 16, 1985; and their parents were married to each other at anytime before April 17, 1985.

The above-noted legislation that exists under the *Indian Act* does not permit the *Indian Registrar* to equitably address issuing *Certificates of Indian Status* to siblings and their grandchildren within the same family unit with identical genealogy. This is evident in the example attached entitled ***Price Family Grandchildren***.

When you review the attached *Price Family Grandchildren* chart you will note that **Grandparent, Theresa, was enfranchised because she married a non status husband.** She was reinstated under Bill C-31 in 1985.

Theresa had two children under first generation of children named Mike (dob 1949) and Lynda (dob 1959). Both children also were reinstated to status registration under Bill C-31. Mike and Lynda both married non status spouses Mike the eldest before 1985 and Lynda the youngest after April 17, 1985.

In the second generation of children Mike’s daughter, Rebecca, was born before April 17, 1985; and Lynda’s son, Carey, was born after April 17, 1985. They both received their status registration under Bill C-3 in 2011.

In the third generation of children Mike’s grandchildren received their status registration under 6(2); however, Lynda’s grandchildren’s *Certificate of Indian Status* card applications were rejected and the letter from the Indian Registrar cited the following:

**“You are subject to the second-generation cut-off rule as you have one parent entitled under 6(2) and your other parent is not entitled to be registered under the provision of the *Indian Act*. I regret to inform you that I am not able to determine that you are entitled to registration under the provisions of the *Indian Act*.”**

I respectfully request that the above-noted legislation in the *Indian Act* be amended to comply with Canada’s *Constitution Act, Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, s. 15 equality rights for siblings within the same family unit.