

Along the Trail S1 E2: Dr. Frank Tough

Molly: Tawnshi listeners and welcome back to Along the Trail, a podcast celebrating the work and ideas of Metis Studies researchers! I'm your host, Molly Swain, Métis PhD student at the University of Alberta's Faculty of Native Studies, and currently based in beautiful amiskwaciwâskahikan Edmonton, Alberta.

Today we have a chance to hear from Dr. Frank Tough! Dr. Frank J. Tough is a professor at the Faculty of Native Studies at the University of Alberta and the director of the Métis Archival Project Lab, aka the MAP Lab, which has been running in some form for over two decades! He's the author of numerous chapters and articles, and the book *As Their Natural Resources Fail*, which looks at the shifting economic roles of First Nations and Métis people in northern Manitoba from 1870-1930. He describes his research focuses as combinations of history, geography, law, and economics, based in the archives and oriented towards real-world applications. Frank has been called on by the Métis Nation numerous times as an expert witness in court cases, and the data collected by his MAP Lab is publicly available online as the Métis Nation Historical Online Database. In 2019, Frank was awarded the Order of the Métis Nation, the Métis National Council's highest honour, for his work protecting and promoting Métis rights.

Dr. Tough and I ended up visiting for nearly three hours, so this episode has been edited for length and to centre his voice and experiences. We start to have a bit of degradation in the sound quality in the last four minutes or so of our chat, a peril of Zoom calls. You can reference the episode transcript if you have any trouble hearing us. Getting Frank's perspective on the evolution of what we now call Métis Studies, the role of archival research in the fight for Métis rights, and how he came to be involved in the field was so beneficial to my own knowledge – I learn so much from Frank whenever we have a chance to talk – and I'm so excited to be able to share this conversation with you! So without further ado, let's get this Red River Cart on the trail!

Frank: And I think that's, that's the problem with the bourgeois Academy. You can have a kind of radical critique, but fundamentally it's not really aimed at any sort of political action. One of the reasons I left McGill, is I wasn't really interested in the political economy theorizing. I was interested in the empirical argument. And so the political economy thing was very short and was replaced by post-structuralism, post-modernism, but we've lost that political economy dimension. You know, what's wrong with colonialism. Because London finance capital¹ didn't finance Hudson's Bay Company traders so they could go there and force people to become Christians or learn English. It was about accumulating wealth and the fewer changes to that society, the better. The more they kept their land skills, the more productive they could be in terms of sustaining the fur trade. So, so you don't see the colonialism or the long run activity when you construct it as a partnership, right?

¹ More precisely, mercantile capital.

And, and it's a really bizarre notion of partnership because— a very basic notion of partnership requires equity. So, what equity did Native people have in the Hudson's Bay Company fur trade? No, they they're often in debt. They were able to consume, and they've got technology that reduced work times in certain respects.

But you know, I see the fur trade as kind of— and this is what makes it maybe unique, but certainly different in the Western hemisphere— and that is that there's a kind of—colonialism is seductive, not by coerced violence, but by the seduction of consumption.

Molly: And you're talking specifically about the fur trade in Northwest.

Frank: Yeah. So in this is something I published on, you have these guys doing this phenomenally difficult labor of the York boat work, it's brutal labor. Okay. So how do you get people to do that? Well, you could hold a gun to their head, right? They could be coerced; they could be the property of other people.

But that's not what happened in the fur trade. Because people always had the option that if they tried to use coercion or overt violence, then people would just leave, right, they had access to the land. And on the other side of it, the Company would say distinguishes much of Canada is, is a really relatively low ratio to speak in economic terms of labor to land.

Whereas other parts of the world, there was very little land and there's a lot of labor. And so you could use coercion on labor. So, in this setting, it's such sort of limited parameters where there's more give and take, right? So, these guys make this trip from York Factory to Norway house. They do it.

They manage to jam two trips in there and they earn, which was probably a fair amount of money at the time, about five English pounds a trip. And what do they buy? They buy handkerchiefs, right? They buy clothing, like 51% of the consumption is ready-made clothing. Okay. Very practical stuff.

Heavy cotton, some wools, cloth, then there's coffee, sugar, tea. There's very little of the means of production. They get that in another way. So, you know, I think it's perhaps women are encouraging them to go out and do this work. Cause if you look at it, the handkerchiefs, right? Like why would you carry 200 pounds on your back, cross a long portage, for handkerchiefs?

And the same thing is, is that it's not, the company could have had it fairly easy just to say, okay, we have one blue shirt, one white shirt, one shawl. They didn't, they had a variety of what we call separate commodities. So, they had maybe three, four or five different types of shawls with different prices, right?

Big price differential, which I leave it to others, whether this is about status, but what you wear gives you status, what you can afford to buy, gives you status. I leave it to others to think— there's no way of knowing if that was the motivation back in 1870. But not all the consumption was utilitarian.

So these guys went off and did this boat work. Them and their families were able to consume more. And I think that therefore is the motive. And I think that's the seductive nature of mercantilism in Canada in this era. So, it's very interesting to look, I'm trying to promote this hemispheric look at the world like of what we call the "New World" was called the New World or the Western Hemisphere, except for the States, but Latin America, Indigenous people there.

Different colonial powers to try and look at the differences. And not that, you know, Canada was better, or the British were better or anything like that. But just to see at the level of, you know, the use of the power or the use of violence, but also the political economy behind it and how it worked, because it all ends up getting colonized in the end, right. It's just at different paces.

Molly: So, you've built this body of work and these analyses over the course of, you know, decades at this point. But how did you get started? What sparked your interest in this?

Cause my guess is that this was not necessarily something that you saw yourself doing from a very young age. Did you want to be a professor? Did you want to do this kind of research? What brought you here?

Frank: Yeah, so I did, you know, I come from working class background.

Nothing in my grades in middle school or high school would suggest that I would ever achieve anything in university because I was quite lazy. But there were so few barriers to getting into university then, that I went, and I probably was thinking about politics and law in my first year.

And geography, my kind of natural inclination to geography kind of got me through, helped patch over some of the laziness in my first year, I mean, I passed every course, but they're not stellar. And then sort of my mentor was in geography at the University of Winnipeg, a very radical guy at the time, John Ryan, and he sort of pushed me to go to grad school and eventually I did. And at McGill I was interested in Development Geography. So, my interest was largely the Third World, and I had been interested in the Caribbean. I had been a participant on the World University Services Canada's seminar in the Caribbean.

So, I was quite kind of interested in, in the Caribbean, but I was mainly interested in development and under-development in the Third World and things of that nature. At that point I certainly wouldn't have really found many intellectual challenges in Canada that interested me apart from the national question, apart from you know, can we have national development in Canada break from the United States, right? The left nationalist position. So, I went to McGill and that's where I got introduced to Harold Innis and the Staple Thesis, which I knew nothing about, by John Bradbury. And I was actually going to do my thesis on mahogany in Belize and I drag my partner, now my wife, we took a bus from Montreal to Mexico City, where she had her passport stolen. We eventually get to Belize. There's lots of prospects there, but then I get sick. So, at some point after all kinds of things going wrong, I sort of said you know, maybe Northern Manitoba, I can apply the same theoretical stuff with respect to Staple Thesis or dependency theory to Northern Manitoba, because you know, I

was feeling a little sick, and I was sweating, and we'd had all these problems. So, headed back up there, getting back to Canada problem, actually. And I started that summer into finding that there was really enough on fish. And I looked at the commercial fishing industry in Lake Winnipeg.

And it's basically an economic history. Very, very empirical all kinds of graphs, but it's also here that I sort of saw the impact of commercial fishing on Native fisheries, that there was a fairly substantive conflict over who gets the resource. And there was a struggle there. So that was kind of an interest and, so somehow that thesis got through McGill. It came under attack from other people in the department, they were sort of attacking me, but aiming at my supervisor, but I had already decided to go to York. I sort of decided I didn't really want to pursue this sort of Marxist theorizing. And I was really more interested in empirical stuff. And so I was attracted to York by Skip Ray and his book on *Indians in the Fur Trade*.

And York in those days was competing with the U of T and it didn't have a lot of graduate students. But on the other hand it also had six or seven historical geographers, and it was coincidence that the very last course I took as an undergraduate was a course in historical geographies, like the historical geography of settlement.

I wasn't really interested in it, but I needed a 400 level course. And that was sort of the grounds of how I became a historical geographer because of the technique. The mapping technique. And so when, when Dave Parent talks about the tax rolls and municipalities, well, the real first sort of empirical research I'd done in this course, it was tax rolls.

And what sort of information you can get on land use from these tax rolls. So I think David's a little surprised that that was my humble origins, was the tax rolls in the Interlake Manitoba. But what's interesting is, the guy who I took that course from, Richtik, one of my research associates in the lab and we're looking at well, how does the land quality relate to the development of the Métis?

Why do you have a critical mass in Western Canada? And so while it's interesting, because you have the grasslands, the park lands, and the plains, and then a bit, you have this kind of Hudsons Bay low land, but in Ontario you only have these lowlands and then the boreal forest, you have no grasslands and you have no park lands.

You have the idea of a critical mass of people organized around an economy. And the critical mass is what gets politics. Right? And that's the big difference, I think. And we haven't written that up, but at any rate, so she was looking around and turns out she finds an article that Richtik had written years ago.

And it helped us with an analysis of some of these maps we're getting. And we're trying to map out where these different zones were, so that's a good, I think of a good example of scholarship in the sense that it was useful, but you know, 30, 40 years ago I would have sort of dismissed it because there's a lack of politics, right?

Cause this analysis of maps and how surveyors perceived land quality you know, lacked kind of the correct ideology. It didn't embody a critique of capitalism in it. But 40 years later, she

stumbled across it, looking for it, I suppose. And it helps us do the research today. So that's, I think my point of empirical studies can be highly useful in the long run.

Molly: Was your idea, you just wanted to sort of cast a net over all of these sort of different quantitative data sets and see what you could have brought out of them? Was that your approach and that's, what got you interested in doing it this way?

Frank: Well, in the MA, I ended up going to the archives.

So actually, my first visit to the archives was in 1978, the Hudson's Bay Company archives. And I met up with a friend who was trying to do community history for a Northern community and said, come on down to the HBCA. And I think the people in geography at University of Winnipeg kind of dissuaded me from going there, because I was too radical and I might upset things, right. Which they're probably wise about.

So I— to do the work on the fisheries, which was federally regulated, I had gone to the archives in Ottawa. And it was just fascinating. I mean, I tell people that I could live in an archive. It's a bottomless pit. And in a lot of ways, sadly in terms of empirical research, it's more fun to collect stuff than to analyze it and write it up. That's the least fun part of it. There's always quite a bit to be analyzed and quite a bit of meaning to derive from it. So, what happened at York? And I think the department at York was in a lot of ways, small C conservative in certain respects, is I really got into you know, empirical stuff. But my interest wasn't in the pre-1870 fur trade. It was in the post-1870 fur trade. So, a couple of friends of mine who had worked for the Manitoba government had developed this report on Northern Manitoba and had kind of thrown out the idea that under mercantile capital, Aboriginal people had played big roles, right?

They were essential economically, but by the time you get to industrial capital—and this wouldn't be a word used at the time—but they're, they're marginalized, right? So, you have mining, hydro, all that stuff comes in. So, it was my view that in the transition from mercantile to industrial capital in that regional economy, they just got sort of shoved out.

So I was interested in, you know, accepting from political economy that mercantile capital, industrial capital have some sort of meaning and outcome and effect on what was happening regionally. So that's where I headed. So, I didn't head back into the pre-1870 fur trade because I felt that, you know, maybe in terms of the contemporary situation of Aboriginal people, and we're looking at, you know, the pre-constitutional stuff by and large, the rights struggle around Section 35 to get it into the constitution.

And not a lot of knowledge of it. No, no awareness in a place like Toronto. But I sort of thought that by working on that period of history, it might have some relevance to more contemporary concerns. And it's, it's kind of funny, you know, I was in a meeting in Winnipeg and guys would come up to me and introduce themselves and said, I read your book. And that happened when I went to a Treaty Five thing. And one thing you should learn about, as an academic as a cheap joke. If someone says, they've read your book, you could say, that makes two of us.

So, it does seem to, and I often think that people in Northern Manitoba read that book more closely than academics. So, I think that achieved that and that from the thesis to the book, I shifted by explicitly referring to it as economic history.

But in the process of writing my thesis and this maybe gets us closer to Métis Studies. I had started working at the University of Saskatchewan and I was teaching to SUNTEP² students. And I was hired by Tony Lussier and you know, probably at the time, I didn't think the books that him and Sealey- by the way, I had taken a course from Sealey at the University of Manitoba— I didn't think they had a really strong academic knife to them. But when you look back, I think people have to look back at those books and analyze them as a kind of early well, perhaps first-generation Métis scholars in the Academy writing about Métis stuff. So, in some ways I appreciate them more now than before.

So, the good thing is well the course was a year long. And Tony Lussier had already set up the syllabus for it. So, it was easy to plug in and then I could bring a lot of my fur trade knowledge to that course. And it's in that course or in looking at Métis stuff, you come to the difficult issue of Scrip.

I bumped into Ron Bourgeault in the archives and then talked to him about Scrip and he really figured a lot of it out, but didn't publish or write on it. And some of the crucial aspects of his analysis didn't get into the AMNSIS Report and Association of Métis Non-Status Indians. They'd been doing some claims work, and he basically lived in the archives for nine or 10 years.

And so that was of interest. And so, teaching SUNTEP students, teaching Métis history, and then a former student of mine had advised Clem Chartier that somehow he should get me involved, and he was a little unsure because he didn't know where I stood on the Nicaragua question with the Miskito Indians.

The Sandinistas had had a wonderful revolution, in Nicaragua, but then they had alienated the Miskito Indians and were being very colonial themselves. And imperialism was, I would say taking advantage of that, but it didn't, in my mind, exculpate them from their own actions.

And so, Clem Chartier, he had been president of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples and he had gone down there. And he gotten Brooklyn Rivera up for a tour of Canada. And so he wasn't sure about me and where I stood on things like the Miskito. And so, we met and there was pressure in Northwest Saskatchewan to do something.

So, Métis litigation's kind of slow out of the blocks. And there's really nothing prior— treaty people had Supreme Court law on treaty rights that existed before the patriation of the Constitution. Métis, really nothing. There's some obscure cases, but they're not based on the collectivity of the Métis. They are sort of issues of fraudulent use of property, things of that nature. So through the 1980s, they were trying to get the self-government agreement into the Constitution. And so leadership efforts were directed that, it tanked. Then we had Meech Lake, and then we had the Charlottetown Accord also, also didn't work out for the Métis, but

² Saskatchewan Urban Native Teachers Education Program

my, as an outsider, my sense is they're kind of focused on that. But at the community level, as President Chartier says it, community people were putting pressure on them because they were being charged for things like hunting— really exercising Section 35 rights. And the fact he had a law degree created an expectation on their part for him to do something.

So, there was a case, he got me involved and with very little funding, and also Jean Teillet. Jean Teillet was a student at U of T at the time. I think she may have been articling. So, it was really the three of us and we drove up to Buffalo Narrows and you know, I was trying to cram a preparation in, I was tense about how this might work— a lot of academics regardless of their political leanings for the downtrodden and the oppressed won't go into the courtroom. They won't put it on the line.

Molly: And so, what made you agree to do that?

Frank: So, my view of this was that Section 35 rights were one site of struggle. Maybe not the most important and certainly not exclusive, but it was a site of struggle that I could get involved with. All right. You know, very technical sort of way. So, I thought it was a legitimate way to go about it. And I know other intellectuals saying, well, this collapses into the politics of recognition and all that sort of stuff. But that wasn't really the approach that the Métis were taking.

So, I did what I could and it was a fun event. The judge was very good. And we had no guidance from the Common Law, except in very general Aboriginal aspects and being able to use the constitutional rights argument, but we basically, threw everything we could at it; had all kinds of types of stuff.

Because, you know, there was nothing specific from the Common Law that we could use. And I know Jean, the judge asked her, "Well, what are the cases on this?" And she basically said, "There is nothing." So, I also have to say that, you know— so we do the court and decision comes down and President Chartier calls me up and says we won the case.

And that was an unbelievable sort of joy. I mean, certainly I would say I got far more joy out of that victory than if an editor sent me a letter and say your article has been accepted for publication. The two did not, not compare. So basically, I thought that you know, being in the sort of genteel occupation of a professor, there are certain obligations to society.

And that, that I could get beyond the Ivory Tower, and get beyond the bourgeois university, and help the court, like as an expert witness, you're trying to help the court. And so that was a very encouraging start. And Clem eventually was able to get some funding for the land claim. And by then I had moved to the University of Alberta.

So, what I've tried to do all along here was the applied research, the rights agenda. And there's been some things I've done for Treaty people around the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, and even the book *Bounty and Benevolence* with colleagues Skip Ray and Jim Miller that came out of the Office of the Treaty Commissioner.

And it was part of a, trying to get a better public awareness of what the treaties were about. As a step to treaty implementation. But it was also interesting the sort of reactions you do get from the Academy because there's a suspicion that you're tainted, right?

Molly: In what sense?

Frank: That you're, you're biased, you're biased towards the Natives. You're biased towards the clients. And even, you know, we got some of that in the reader's review of the book. They couldn't really say, "Don't publish the book." But, you know, they could, they could throw that out. And that's also interesting. Jim Miller back in 1987, basically said that he came to the defense of Thomas Flanagan because the Métis had attacked Thomas Flanagan and laid a big, big warning down about claims research tainting the discipline of history. My how things change.

But things should change with struggle. Right? It's not about being perfect in the past. In my view, it's about how struggle can change things. Part of this also goes back to me teaching research methods, the Section 35 stuff being important in the early days of Native Studies at the University of Saskatchewan, and a kind of notion that we should train a cadre of people that could engage in rights litigation. And not just become lawyers.

Molly: And so, this is where the MAP Lab comes in.

Frank: Yes, the MAP Lab grows out of that. And we see the other thing is, there's probably two things I could've done. I could've worked privately as a consultant on the side and done my teaching and double dipped, or I could bring funding to the research with one of the most important objectives being to give students applied research experience and to do some good for the community. But of course, you know, and one of the reasons this happened well, there's two reasons was the Associate VP³ was very receptive to this because the boiler plate contract at the University of Alberta research in 1998 says, "This research will not be used to sue anyone."

Well, in fact, that was the entire purpose, but it was a lot of money, right. So we can scrap that clause. Not that it didn't create complications because at some point the Justice Department came after me. So, I sort of felt that Native Studies needed to demonstrate it could bring funding to the university. We would pay our per diem⁴, happily. I would pay the per diem and make the contribution to the Academy. I think I could have made a different argument. And so yes, this is sort of where the MAP Lab comes from. So, we start off very focused on the claims. An excellent student that contributed to how I conceptualize Scrip was Kevin McLennan, because he said we should call it an entitlement. And I—at first I said, "No, no, no, we're trying to minimize this. Let's not call it an entitlement." But eventually I saw his reasoning and so I certainly learn from the students in this process. So, the first phase was called MatriX, which was Métis Aboriginal Title Research Initiative.

³ Senior Associate Vice President Research Bill McBlain, he was very supportive of applied research relating to Métis rights.

⁴ [Indirect cost of research]

And one of the questions in the interviews was, “Would you take the red pill or would you take the blue pill?” But in a way, we were actually trying to do what The Matrix did and there's all this chaotic archival information. And we deliberately set out to set up a Cartesian coordinates system over it with spreadsheets and databases.

So Matrix sort of applied. And it's amazing how everyone sort of accepted the name. You know, we sort of make something up and people start calling us that. And then we went to things like briefly we were CSI Criminal Scrip Investigations. We were the X-Files because of the, so, you know, Hollywood was constantly ripping me off, you know, and then we went to MAP, with the Powley funding to work on the kind of criteria of showing a objective and verifiable the link to historic Métis communities.

That's when we became MAP, we became the Métis Archival Project, and our thrust there was to put the Métis on the map. So, if you look at, for example, the 2003 or 2004 federal governments claim maps, it's all where the treaties are, where the comprehensive claims have been negotiated and outstanding comprehensive claims.

There's no Métis on that map.

Molly: And is that also you know, everybody calls it the blue blob of the Métis homelands. Was MAP Lab involved in developing that?

Frank: I'm not sure, because I've kind of— haven't pulled the veil back on what that map what might look like. And it's one of our major projects for this year that's been funded. The original MNC, which is to take the provincial political boundaries, and then kind of it had sort of this curvilinear United States part in a curvilinear for North of 60, and then a bit of BC.

So, it's obviously more and more of an issue. It kind of depends how you go at it. And this is, I think, where the digital records are important. And you know, there are some parts of the MNC that don't like what I'm saying. It's perhaps an open question, whether BC is part of the Homeland, it sort of depends when, and also depends on critical mass. You know, if you go to maybe the 1931 census of Western Canada, you might find there are 156 Bulgarians in that census, but does that make Western Canada part of the Bulgarian Homeland? Or you have the Kanaks, the Hawaiians who got involved in the fur trade and then some of them settle and live on Vancouver Island.

They get involved with the fur trade and other things, people from Hawaii, and they intermarry. Well, does that mean that parts of Vancouver Island are part of the Hawaiian Homeland? Because you can demonstrate some presence of some people, right.

Molly: I'm just so interested too, in this distinction between Homeland and territory.

I think when people hear the word Homeland, especially in connection to Indigenous people, they assume that we're asserting a specific type of territorial claim. But on the other hand, I also really, haven't heard a good definition of what a Homeland is. So, I mean, they could be totally different things and yes, maybe, you know, parts of Western Canada are part of the quote unquote Bulgarian Homeland, but what is a Homeland? I'm not, I'm really not entirely sure.

Frank: Right. Don't think we've done much thinking on it. I think it's more been a kind of almost an affective thrust, as opposed to an empirical, and then, you know there's a lot of doubts in the modern Academy about boundaries, right? I mean, I think one thing that we haven't factored in, because maybe it's assumed as if there's not exclusive occupancy by the Métis except in the Red River settlement there.

And even then, it's not exclusive. So fortunately, we have the Scrip records to help us out. So we know, say, the number of Halfbreeds that, say, were born at York Factory and then moved to other parts of the fur country. And what I recently came up with is that the Northern Department of the Hudson's Bay Company which was headquartered at York Factory, but included the Red River country, the Mackenzie, the Peace, for a little while Caledonia, the Saskatchewan district, Norway House, all of that is really sort of the Métis Homeland to some degree or another. So, you do have Métis at Fort Simpson, right? We are working now on a report.

It's basically going to be Métis in the fur trade, but it's an argument for commercial rights of the Métis, which you know, it's going to be interesting to see what the reaction or, I mean, I think it's a very easy case to be made, but I think it needs to be made— the stakes are potentially so big that it has to persuade the biggest skeptic. What we have to first establish is that the fur trade is commercial.

Now that sort of may be obvious to some people, but it's not, there are many ethno-historians and anthropologists and historians who don't see the fur trade as first and foremost commercial, they sort of see, well, the perseverance of the so-called subsistence sector.

Molly: The idea is that you're arguing beyond this idea of the moderate livelihood?

Frank: Well, legally, I don't necessarily have a problem with the moderate livelihood because in fact, traditionally people don't try and accumulate wealth in a reckless sort of way. So if moderate livelihood could result in sort of co-manage agreements that do in fact provide for a livelihood that, that recognize the livelihood histories that people made a living off this, then I wouldn't necessarily be against the use of moderate. And unfortunately, what happens if you don't go to court with your terms, then the court would come up with things. So, one of the problems with, I think Aboriginal law is it is so ad hoc and even cases you win down the road, they're a bit of a poison pill there under a different circumstance. So, they don't really develop principles that can be recognized with British Common Law and that provide a consistency. Instead, you get a lot of ad hoc stuff. And because you also lose things because of the lack of principles.

So there's really been almost no discussion about, you know, how this fits into the rights litigation is just sort of been, "Yeah, we think we have commercial rights. Maybe we need to go to court on it." You know, there were some— an unextinguished Section 35 right to commercial activities will have certain costs. And so for awhile there, when the Métis had come under the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, there were some problems in resource use and there was, you know, people coming in and there was a bit— kind of unregulated and, you know, motivated by some of the downsides of commercial [rights].

So, my advice would be, from my precepts of the court is, be able to come to court with also you know, an understanding of what that would be and not be. So basically, there is a sense that, you know, because of the fur trade, we have commercial rights. And so it's a matter of documenting them, but so the first step is really establishing that the fur trade was commercial.

And that's, that's been good because it's required me to do a lot of thinking. And so when we have things, we have things like credit. We have contracts. The boatman signed contracts. Okay. This was not a equivalent of getting a canoe and paddling somewhere. In the case of the Portage La Loche Brigade, I mean, half of their wages were paid out before they sat down in the boat.

Right. There's advances. And the first advance came at Christmas time. Imagine that! You know, when there was labor struggles in the boat brigades, there were strikes, there was mutinies. It was tough work. So contracts, credit, capital accumulation. These are all things we're going to very clearly define.

That the fur trade is commercial, and then putting the Métis in that. So, the thrust on mapping out the Métis Homeland fits very well with this because it is my argument, and I know it's very much a minority argument, that the economic niches, that the fur trade created were very important for the development of these new people.

And they varied. We know about the plains stuff, which came to a crashing end. So how do you reconcile, you know, the economic forces that nurtured something, provided a space for something, and then that goes away. And how do you reconcile that? But that's not the only one there are then the boat brigades, right?

And these guys travel from Red River up to Norway House, they drop things off. They pick up other things cause Norway House is an inland depot. So stuff is shunted into Norway House so it can get up to the Mackenzie district. And then you go to Cumberland, Ile a la Crosse, things are swapped at Methye Portage.

So Methye Portage divides the great Arctic drainage basin from the Hudson's Bay drainage basin. And it's my view that when those two drainage bases were united by this portage, which was done by work by Métis at Portage La Loche that's the foundation for Canada. It gives a geographical foundation.

You know, if the Russians had gotten there, we would look very differently. And then back, then they retrace the route to Norway House. Then you're up to York Factory down to Norway House and then to Red River. So this is connecting communities. And people know each other. So that's another economic- the other one you have is the managerial class and the laboring class, a lot of posts were mixed bloods. And so they're part of the equation. The other one is the so-called Freeman, which is very interesting. And I think as much as I've criticized Giraud about the notion that you go from voyageur, to Freeman, to Métis, kind of makes sense. And there's a shifting demography. There's certainly a shifting political consciousness. And there's shifting economic roles. And so basically people define the Freeman as ex-employees of the companies who stay in the fur country, rather than going

back to say Montreal and they have families. And that all sounds pretty reasonable, and it's, I think it's basically actually on kind of a feeling you get from the records. You know, you see certain people's names here or there. What we've done is actually established that. And so one of the exciting things that the lab, largely through Sandy Hoyer, is getting into document linking.

We're not as sophisticated as the NSA or the CIA or the FBI, who mastered that, but we are, we are document linking. So out of University of Minneapolis, there were social historians that wanted to use large data sets and link people and to do it automatically. So we see a "Molly Swain" in maybe say the 1991 census.

And then we see an "M Swain" in the 2031 census. Well, are these the same people or not? So, there are programs, algorithms, which we've been working on— not me, but our contacts— to link these people. But then we also do a kind of human check. Cause our data sets aren't huge. So what they're doing, were doing in the States is they would say draw 20% sample from 25 million people and see how much they can link them, test certain ideas and social history for example, can we link fathers and sons, is there social mobility? Is the son stuck in the father's occupation, or has he received social mobility? You can do that by cherry picking, finding two or three things where that works, or you can try being more systematic. And our ability to link Métis people in different censuses in the entitlement records— our results seem to be as good as the Americans. And where this is really gonna pay off is with women. Trying to not be too gender blind. And it's actually, there are papers published in the Canadian Historical Review⁵, which got this all wrong. It said that married women, weren't entitled to Scrip, and this is sheer nonsense.

And you have to stop and think before you use the Scrip records you have to, and most don't, what is the state's intention here? Well, it's to surrender property rights. And so, you know, in 1885, they would want to surrender your property rights just as soon as they'd want to surrender any of your other relatives', so this is the British common law approach is to be very certain with these property relations. So, they did that, and the beautiful thing is, and this should not all that obscure is the women had their own applications. And so their children and her parents are in there. So they're wonderful. Now what happens in the census is women's maiden names, if I can use that, are not recorded.

So they almost disappear. So if in census, in the, say the 1901 census this person is listed under her father in the intervening period, she marries and appears under her husband's name. Well, we can't sort of patch that up very easily. But with the Scrip records we can, so what we can do now is not only link Métis to Scrip records, but we can specifically link women who took Scrip or the Manitoba Entitlements to the subsequent censuses.

Molly: So, is all of this going to be filtered into the public database as well?

Frank: That's our objective, cause to tell you the truth? Well, it's been a real struggle the last year and a half. Although on the data production side, we've done wonderfully, but on resurrecting that database has been a bit of a nightmare at the U of A campus.

⁵ Actually one paper.

But I would say in terms of sort of digital data, that's in pretty good shape. That online database only represents about 30% of what we have.

Molly: Wow. And that's sort of information that you've analyzed and you've done this work and treated-?

Frank: We've been compiling it. We've had to do less of the direct drudgery of data entry and been able to do more verification and we've been able to do linkage stuff.

The other thing that we worked on, which was a data set, that's been kicking around for 10 years— and one of my problems, and one of my problems with publishing is, one of the ethos of MAP is to do it right the first time, as opposed to spending the money and getting a paper out and moving onto the next grant.

So, in the early years we spent a lot of time and money on getting imagery right. Because it was gonna be online. So the thing was, we always said, "Whatever text summary we have, we have to have the image." Now there's a few cases where that didn't happen. We have to have the image in the image has to be good and that's expensive.

And so my basic feeling here is that it's not really expensive because if say a hundred people have to squint for half an hour at the document, doing the same squinting, that's expensive. But what things like archives have done is transferred that expense to the user. Whereas, we've come along and tried to create the best possible image so that they don't squint for half an hour. And that's doing it right the first time. Same with verification that a couple of mainstream historians visit the lab once, and they were quite shocked that we do a hundred percent verification as opposed to 20% verification. And again, there's a reason for this. If you're a social scientist, you know, if someone typed your name in as S-T-A-I-N instead of S-W-A-I-N in social science and you're drawing samples, then you're not really concerned about first names. It's a minor mistake that doesn't lead to error, but if you're doing genealogical work and the names— and it's hard enough with knowing what the name, how they spell the names in this document versus another document and how people today know how they spell their names. That's hard enough—

But if you get it wrong, then you're creating not just a mistake, but an error, because someone searching may not find that bit of information. So again, it's about doing it right the first time. And you know, the digital preservation means that the worst thing that could happen to me is sort of people coming along and saying, "Oh, we've got to re-enter the data. the MAP Lab did a horrible job. It's too expensive to fix on its own. So we'll just start over again." That would be horrible. So we are better along in that way. And oh, another record we've looked at is the Hudson's Bay Company employment records, and they're quite fascinating, and I think we're finding a higher Native, and I would say it's basically Métis.

I mean, one of the differentiations, I think in most instances is that First Nations did not seek or may have been barred from wage labor. And even the Europeans in the wage labor situation, many of them will have Métis families. And so this has been a difficult record, but expands a big chunk of the 19th century. And we have been using it to link the part of this fur trade Homeland business, and pinning down the Freeman has to do with using the

employment engagement. Because it tells you, we've got the name, but we get the occupation and we get the salary, and we can trace people back to Quebec parishes or to Orkney parishes.

So it's kind of neat. So, to get back to the Freeman. A lot of people inferred that yeah, these Freeman kind of become Métis, say. Well, we've been able to, by document linking, prove that, basically. And the interesting thing is the Freeman were conceptualized by the Hudson's Bay Company in their bookkeeping, their records are kept separate, right? Because perhaps because of who they are, they have a slightly different relationship to the Company and its operations than other people.

It's hard to say in a sense, like, to me, I think it just reflects that again, that there are specialized economic niches in the 19th century that persevere long enough that you've got two or three generations, right. And it's far different than what's happening in the States, say in Iowa or Nebraska, you do have mixed bloods. There, you get half-breed tracts are set aside, but there is not a community as such. So, we were able to prove that by this document linking. So we were able to take this 1857 list of Freeman in the Saskatchewan department, and take it into the engagement register into Northwest Scrip in the 1881 census. So we're able to demonstrate empirically that the Métis have, in this region, roots with the designation Freeman proven, not just sort of supposed, right. And again, this takes this category of people into the fur trade argument.

Molly: MAP Lab's been going for 20, 21 years?

Frank: Over 20 years. Yeah.

Molly: So what keeps you going? Cause I know, you said your first case was a big win and that was like such a rush and it was so awesome, but I know that you've also talked about, in subsequent cases, it's been really hard and stressful and you know, you get lawyers trying to mess with you and you get Departments of Justice investigating you and this and that.

So what, what keeps you doing this? What keeps you driven to, because you know, archival work is, is it's a lot of drudgery.

Frank: Well, it's a commitment, right? We haven't got the land back, in some ways we haven't finished the research there. So it's, it's first and foremost a commitment, but it's intellectually satisfying. Doesn't necessarily fit so well in the Academy. The applied research is a wonderful way to, to train students as a kind of mentoring. And what I really liked was when I could teach two courses under Ellen Bielawski⁶ and we had the subsidies where the first course was a bootstrapping and historical analysis, where each day they got a single document, and they went through a gamut of questions about it, and then they developed a proposal and then we went to archives for nine days. And this was this course when I look back at it, it's like drinking from a fire hose. Because I sort of set something up that like most consultants with 20 or 30 years research experience couldn't do.

⁶ The first Dean of the Faculty of Native Studies.

Right. I know, like it takes me months to write a report. We just wanted a simple memo. So, it was very much applied. Like I'm not interested in students writing 10 page essays. The substance of which if I've taught the course many times, I've read many times, right? But to say a more pragmatic thing is okay, write your memo to a lawyer or write your memo to Chief and Council, or write your memo to the Métis Settlements Council, right? Like that's how you're going to write it. You can write a memo, not an essay. And you're going to tell them the research you did. So, trying to be very pragmatic in that respect. And that's a bit of that is also in the methods courses I've taught. So that was always great when we went there for nine days and most of them loved it.

They all kind of endured. There was other things that went on there that— like the visits to the Gatineau preservation systems, a thing, which is an amazing facility that most Canadians have never heard of. It's like a world-class facility for preserving archival stuff. It's quite mind blowing. And the architecture of the building is also mind blowing. So, they love that they work hard. The day started, you know, we'd have a 7:30 meeting over in the archives where we do a go around. And so some of the slackers would realize that, you know, people are working, they're making progress. And also, people would help each other out, and just to share, like to learn from each other. And so that's how we started out and then they're pretty much on their own. I tried to help them out. The archives were always fantastic when the MAP Lab went there, when MatriX went there and when our courses went there, they facilitated us as much as possible.

It's quite a nice institution in that respect. You know, you have to kind of seek them out and you have to keep them informed you can't just sort of show up and say, ah, "Where's our documents? Here's 30 kids here. Where's our documents?" And you have to really plan things out with their cooperation. And so then, then we would go 'til about four o'clock.

And then we would have a little, highly informal seminar by someone from Ottawa and it would not be Native stuff. Like it might be Peter Usher talking about doing research on his Jewish cousins that had signed up for the RAF and were shot down, or even Cheryl McWaters on the use of accounting books. So we had all these sorts of visitors coming in. Jeff Murray. And then they would cook something and then most of them would go back to the archives until it closed about 11. And there was time off to do sightseeing, but most of them, you know, they did a three hour sightseeing thing and went across the river to go to the museum or a few things like that. Most of them were totally committed to extracting from the archive. And of course they, you know, pulled more data than they can analyze and all that sort of stuff. So that was always fun. I always loved doing that and in that sense, there was informal instruction. So I would just say, order up a bunch of maps and they would be in the rare book reading room. And then I would just gather up whoever I could, and I gave them an impromptu lecture. I would just take them through that sort of stuff. So, yeah, I think it's, it's like the old apprenticeship program, where you kind of learn on the spot. And I think research is a skill that requires apprenticeship; maybe less so these days with digital stuff and with so much secondary information but yeah, I love teaching that. And so there was very much a fit with the research and various grants helped that out. Part of it was being able to engage in that sort of teaching, the commitment to the communities.

That's the other thing about people working in the Lab, is, especially around the claim, is they were able to visit communities and the communities are always extremely receptive to us. And when I've spoken at, you know, formal Métis political gatherings, I get a lot of very positive feedback and appreciation, quite astonishing. Not the sort of thing that would happen in an cutthroat academic conference. And some of them have been in on meetings where the leaders and community people and the lawyers are talking about a litigation strategy and they're sitting there, they're not going to get that in the classroom.

And in fact, it's possible their instructor never had that sort of experience. But that's all very kind of time-consuming. To do that community engagement, even when they kind of set up the other end, it's very time consuming. So that was another, I would say, instructional part of things that brought them into a kind of an organic relationship with the community, because these young people were perceived as doing research that could help out Métis communities.

So there's that. There's been times when there's been basically no funding, very hard to keep it going. The turnover of staff is problematic. Often we skilled people up- on a couple of occasions, we skilled people up and then the provincial government snapped them up and we called them- Chris actually called them, he coined it "the Body Snatchers." And so it's been a real struggle to keep it going for 20 years. It's frustrating because it's very hard to get stuff into what the journals are interested in terms of peer review. And also I think basically, the whole kind of post-structuralist way of seeing things doesn't fit with me and what I produce. And I'll give you an example of that. Submitted an article to a journal, which was basically a cartographic history of Northwest Saskatchewan. And this goes back to my training at York, actually, Conrad Heidenreich and other people. Who just looked at maps as historical documents and analyzed them. And from Conrad Heidenreich, I really— kind of confused me because I came out sort of, okay, we've got some data, we've proven our point aren't we great. We're looking for the proof of what we believe in what we're saying in the introduction. Whereas, he always had this scholarly skepticism, so we would meet in his room, he actually smoked a pipe in his room, in his office, and he would go over stuff. And he said, "well, I don't know, you know, this is here, that—" he cast so much doubt on it. It was confusing, but really it was a scholarly skepticism that I picked up from there, but also the way he analyzed manuscript maps.

So, we had collected manuscript maps. And nowadays, there is this whole business of the date of effective control for Métis rights. Which I think has not been handled too well, and I've come up with things which would indicate it was some, and again applied research, what might constitute effective control by the Crown. So, the good thing about that is it's always better than the Crown saying, "we're sovereign over this territory, 1670, you know, 1867," whatever. It's, it's better because we can go at it. And one of the things I thought that would indicate whether or not the Crown, and when it might've established effective control, a single indicator was the maps. Like, how can you say if you have effective control over a region, if you don't have a map of it? Or the map's not very accurate? So how do you decide that? Well, then you do what I was trained at York University, which is you start sort of at the beginning and trace the cartographic history through.

So I kind of make that argument and the best journal for me to go into is *Cartographica*. So, but it's all now GIS stuff. Right. So I do that, but the response is sort of, I need to say that colonialism was oppressive, right? So I'm not bringing in a modern post-structuralist sort of line of things into this. In fact, I'm sort of, to some degree, I'm saying this the opposite, it's almost like, you know, what did the Romans ever do for us? Maps, right? So there was never any intention by the surveyors to help the Métis out. They were doing a job and we can evaluate them on how accurate their maps are. Did they only know the rivers? When did they map beyond the rivers? Right. And so, I'm sort of saying that these historical records are valuable because they are evidence vis-a-vis the date of effective control for the Métis. And so this is a, like an argument, someone else might look at it and say, "Well, Tough, you talk about this map, but I don't think you got that right. It doesn't add up." Fair enough. But, so there was never any critique of my argument, right? No, that I didn't prove what I said I would prove, or that this evidence wasn't adequate, that was never touched. It was more a kind of moralizing thing. Or, "How come you're not talking- Indigenous people have maps.

How come you're not talking about Indigenous maps?" Well, sure they did, but that has very little to do with the court evidence needed to say, what was the state up to. Right. So it was, I thought I'd rather sloppy thinking. So it's going to be very hard for me to publish applied research because by and large, the kind of popular theoretical stuff has no relevance to what we're up to.

And I also recall this was really a gem and someday I may reveal it. A SSHRC application and there was this one evaluation which sort of chastised me and lectured me on not being informed by post-colonialism. Fair enough. I have kind of problems with, with the notion because I don't— you know, if there's an economic dependence, I don't think that colonialism is over. Right. And then, the conclusion was "Don't fund this guy because he's going to use the research to sue the government," which I would think would be an act opposing colonialism. So, this is how muddled it is. It's extremely muddled. So you have a lot of kind of a virtue pleading going on here.

I would develop this idea of trying to do an internal critique and an external critique. So my approach to economics is to kind of, even though political economy rejects the neoclassical economics, but I accept their premises and do an internal critique of how they fail in those arguments. And then I do an external critique. So there didn't seem the ability to do that. A lot of it just seems to be rhetoric.

Molly: Sort of generally, would you say Sociology, Geography, Native Studies, where would you— or are you being more specific?

Frank: I would say it's in the Academy and you know, in the social sciences it's dominant, I would say one, I think distinction in Native Studies is— so if you have certain experiences and the theory isn't helping us through that, you have another lens for looking at that theory and for discussing that theory, which I don't think you get outside of say Native Studies, unless this is an Indigenous person in another discipline.

Molly: So, thinking more specifically about Métis research then, in your mind, what's really sort of changed, evolved, grown out of it in the past few decades?

Frank: I love the question. I love the question. So let's go back. You have kind of these, you could say they're apologists for you know, Stanley, WL Morton and they were, they were fixed on the political development of Western Canada. And how Métis kind of threw a monkey wrench in all of that, a couple of times. And I have to say my prejudice here was sort of talking about these two Rebellions, and then what, right? But when you bring the social history into it then a three month course is barely a start, you know? And I loved the old days, where we had a whole year to take a course and we didn't have to cram so much, it takes that time to sort of sink in. But then you get the claims thing happening. And Doug Sprague's work which was aimed at the court case. And then it just didn't work out, but he brings a quantitative social history to Métis Studies as does Gerhardt Ens, who works for the other side. So you have a very small number of people there, and then you have Flanagan.

So, I don't know if that's a second wave and then there's some encouragement after 1985 with the a hundred year of the Northwest. And then I would say, what is incentivized with the Powley Decision is genealogical work. Because that can get you into the governance agency, following the sort of notions of what's in Powley. So that's kind of another area. And of course, the big shift into that sort of third wave. And this is a very provisional ways of describing it, are more Métis academics, grad students contributing to that. People like Brenda Macdougall, but it's also very much on identity. And law, there's some stuff on law, which I don't think is always really informed by the legal history. And then I suppose there's me and the MAP Lab and Scrip. And the kind of political economy of the fur trade and the political economy of Scrip.

So, one of the reasons, I guess, another reason why I'm sort of stuck with this is because it's an intellectual challenge, right. Because what the claim set off to do I mean, two basic things in the claim was the assertion of Aboriginal rights, existing Aboriginal rights, and the assertion of Aboriginal title requiring the claims process. And the first one, a lot of progress was made in Saskatchewan before and after the Powley test. And then the second one comes down to be a bit problematic. And what we really had to do was to prove the Scrip was fraudulent. As a potential way of sort of saying, setting aside the clear and plain intent by the Crown to take title away and to start the claims process. And so, it's been a bit challenging to sort of say— how do you prove fraud for something that happened 125 years ago?

But I think we've done it. And that's why in a lot of ways you know, lawyers for Justice Departments are more thoroughly read in my work than academics. But there was an intellectual challenge there. There was a specific problem, that in my view could not be solved by a lot of rhetoric. You could have a lot of rhetoric, right. But that wouldn't solve the problem. And the other thing I've argued; it just sort of came to me a few years ago and I've written a lengthy piece for a book by librarians. Either people look at this title and nothing else, or it might entice them, it's called "The X-Files: The Truth is in the Archives, but Access is Denied". It sort of came to me, as much as my mind is capable of a full blown epiphany, was that what we're doing all along, for 20 years, was using the Crown's records against the Crown. So the historical record, say on Scrip, is what's going to be the proof of fraud, and they admit it, they admit it in Senate— and also that it was criminal. There are aspects of the criminal code that kind of tie title to Scrip, they see Scrip as a form of title and the records all

around that. Well, because Scrip was used in Ontario and there's a lot of fraudulent— it was the same old thing.

So, when Macdonald stands up in the house on the 4th⁷ of May 1870s and introduced the Manitoba Act, although at that point it wasn't the 1.4 million acres, Ontario is going at him hard and he basically placates them by saying, "You remember the Scrip to the children of the United Empire Loyalists."

And that assuaged them. And when we get that from Hansard⁸ and we also get that, sitting in the gallery, is Governor Northcote from the Hudson's Bay Company. And in his diary, he also records that, which is totally different from how the lawyers argued the Manitoba Act in the MMF case, right. Which they were successful to a degree.

So, it is the intellectual challenge of proving a difficult problem that's also kept me going. And so the whole interesting thing is that the irony of it, of course, you know, the Métis litigators have the community, right? They have Elders, they explain who they are. They explain their customary practice, all that's vital, but we really nailed the Crown with their own records. Or Hudson's Bay Company records, which in part is why there's some interesting legal reasoning because common law really cannot deal with the existence of Indigenous people vis-a-vis property rights. I mean, there's a whole bunch of it, but it's all, you know, okay, if there's an uprising in 1763, they'll come up with a Royal Proclamation.

But it's not terribly well thought through, which has the advantage today. We can, we can establish meaning. But the point here is that the law is not well formulated, and that these are all hard cases, again, as I pointed out before. And so, one approach is to just try and apply legal principles to the Métis. You know, is the treaty— the recognition of treaty rights vis-a-vis the common law— how much does it add? I mean, the better way is a kind of, I would think is an inductive way, and look at the relationship between the Crown and the Métis. And develop a legal history of that. Because I think there's a very different notion between saying, "Yeah, you messed up the land grant and you delayed implementation." Okay. My argument, which may never have any credibility in court, is that there was an outright intention to dispossess these people and they dispossessed them because in effect the settlers were a better class of people. So, there was an intention for this. And I think that's a more accurate legal history. But I think you have to think very hard about how you could use that as a strategy in court. I know there's people will say there's lawyers, Métis lawyers will say, "Well the court will never find this, so we're going at a technical thing about delay or whatever."

Precedence is a bit of a weak point in English common law. It's very convenient, right, to apply precedence to a new situation, very different from Scottish law where they go to principles. Or European. And it's also why they prevent certain records and why the Justice Department kept a lid on all these legal opinions. And so, in 1991, I got permission to see a legal opinion, a file around hunting rights in Ontario for treaty people. And I got to see about 70% of it; the crucial legal opinion I wanted to see was redacted. Then when I go back, this

⁷ Actually, the Bill was introduced on the 2nd of May.

⁸ Verbatim records of Parliament.

would have been 2017⁹ or so, the file has been re-reviewed, so you think, “Oh great, they’re enlightened now! Now they’re going to let me see everything!” No, they have redacted even more!

I go into that in detail in the article in, in that chapter. Now it's very unique. Like most stuff is pretty boring. So what it says is, basically, “The restrictions of files may occur – it doesn’t say it has to occur – with respect to solicitor-client privilege. And so, what they're saying is, in those conditions, the material *may* be used. And so the “may” in the statute, turns out to be rather subjective. Because in 1991, 70% is used. Years later, after much “enlightenment” and “reconciliation,” it's down to 20%! I reconstruct that in that article on “The Truth is in the Archives, But Access is Restricted.” So when I was writing that, that's when I said, “Well, what we're doing here is we're making cases with Crown’s evidence that the Crown doesn't like our arguments,” right? So that was kind of a neat twist.

Molly: I love how strategic your approach is on this too. Really sort of foregrounding the applied and the applied research and just using whatever tools are effective in the moment.

Frank: I guess the other thing is we have to do the best possible job, because people’s rights, and their relationships to the broader society are affected by the outcomes of our research. So if we do a shoddy job, it’s not likely to help them. All we can do is the best possible job.

Molly: It seems like a great spot to sort of close out. Is there anything else that you wanted to add on anything or any question that you sort of wish you had been asked about your work?

Frank: So, you know, or maybe perhaps a fourth wave is, is very much focused. You know, on genealogy, but identity and cultural practices, those sorts of things. That's been very much a focus. So that leaves me with a lot of space on Scrip fraud and the political economy of how we got to where we are.

Molly: Thanks so much, Frank, for sitting down with me to have this conversation. It's been really such a pleasure to talk to you about all of this, because you are one of the great human resources, both I think, at the university and also obviously for the nation, right. They keep calling you up!

Frank: My pleasure too, because these questions were interesting and, you know sometimes you're so busy with applied research, you don't really get to sort of sit back and think of the big picture. So my pleasure too also an opportunity to communicate to a grad student. I mean, the only other thing one should say about, well that I would like to go on record with the RCMR, is that the driving force was Lorne Gladue. He was really the driving force and the one that got it implemented.

Molly: Thanks again to Dr. Frank Tough for sitting down with me for a really informative chat, and thanks to you, the listener, for tuning in to the second ever episode of Along the Trail, a

⁹ Actually, it was 2016.

podcast celebrating the work and ideas of Métis Studies researchers. If you'd like to learn more about Frank's work, you can check out his books *As Their Natural Resources Fail* and *Bounty and Benevolence*, as well as any of his other many chapters and articles. You can also check out the public-facing side of the MAP Lab's archival work: the Métis National Historical Online Database. You can find links to some of these in the show notes.

Along the Trail is brought to you by the Rupertsland Centre for Métis Research! The RCMR Research is a joint venture between the Métis Nation of Alberta, the Rupertsland Institute: Centre for Métis Excellence, the Faculty of Native Studies, and the University of Alberta. The RCMR is an academic research program specifically geared toward Métis issues. The goals and objectives of the centre include: building provincial and national connections with the Métis community; increasing research capacity to advance Métis-specific research; and training and employing student researchers. To learn more about RCMR find us on Facebook @ Rupertsland Centre for Métis Research.

And finally, thanks always to RCMR administrator Amanda Evans for designing our logo and setting up a lot of the backend stuff that makes podcasts happen, and Faculty of Native Studies PhD student Wyatt Shiefelbien for his great rendition of Whiskey Before Breakfast, our intro and outro music. We'll catch you next time, along the trail!