



Environment
Canada

Environnement
Canada

www.ec.gc.ca



Mi'kmaq knowledge of species at risk in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island

Anne Benoît, Andrea Dykstra, Cheyenne Francis,
John James Gould, Michelle Knockwood, Patricia
Knockwood, Franklin Levi, Adele Levi, Catherine Paul,
and Brian Prosper

Atlantic Region

Canadian Wildlife Service
Technical Report Series Number 510

Canada 



CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

This series of reports, introduced in 1986, contains technical and scientific information on Canadian Wildlife Service projects. The reports are intended to make available material that is either of interest to a limited audience or is too extensive to be accommodated in scientific journals or in existing CWS series.

Demand for the Technical Reports is usually limited to specialists in the fields concerned. Consequently, they are produced regionally and in small quantities. They are numbered according to a national system but can be obtained only from the address given on the back of the title page. The recommended citation appears on the title page.

Technical Reports are available in CWS libraries and are listed in the catalogue of Library and Archives Canada, which is available in science libraries across the country. They are printed in the official language chosen by the author to meet the language preference of the likely audience, with an abstract in the second official language. **To determine whether there is sufficient demand to make the Reports available in the second official language, CWS invites users to specify their official language preference. Requests for Technical Reports in the second official language should be sent to the address on the back of the title page.**

SÉRIE DE RAPPORTS TECHNIQUES DU SERVICE CANADIEN DE LA FAUNE

Cette série de rapports, créée en 1986, donne des informations scientifiques et techniques sur les projets du Service canadien de la faune (SCF). Elle vise à diffuser des études qui s'adressent à un public restreint ou sont trop volumineuses pour paraître dans une revue scientifique ou une autre série du SCF.

Ces rapports techniques ne sont habituellement demandés que par les spécialistes des sujets traités. C'est pourquoi ils sont produits à l'échelle régionale et en quantités limitées. Ils sont toutefois numérotés à l'échelle nationale. On ne peut les obtenir qu'à l'adresse indiquée au dos de la page titre. La référence recommandée figure à la page titre.

Les rapports techniques sont conservés dans les bibliothèques du SCF et figurent dans le catalogue de Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, que l'on retrouve dans les principales bibliothèques scientifiques du Canada. Ils sont publiés dans la langue officielle choisie par l'auteur, en fonction du public visé, accompagnés d'un résumé dans la deuxième langue officielle. **En vue de déterminer si la demande est suffisante pour publier ces rapports dans la deuxième langue officielle, le SCF invite les usagers à lui indiquer leur langue officielle préférée. Les demandes de rapports techniques dans la deuxième langue officielle doivent être envoyées à l'adresse indiquée au dos de la page titre.**

MI'KMAQ KNOWLEDGE OF SPECIES AT RISK IN NEW BRUNSWICK, NOVA SCOTIA AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

**Anne Benoît,¹ Andrea Dykstra,² Cheyenne Francis,³ John James Gould,⁴
Michelle Knockwood,⁵ Patricia Knockwood,⁵ Franklin Levi,⁶
Adele Levi,⁶ Catherine Paul,⁷ and Brian Prosper⁸**

**Technical Report Series No. 510
Canadian Wildlife Service
Atlantic Region**

¹ Canadian Wildlife Service, 17 Waterfowl Lane, P.O. Box 6227, Sackville, NB E4L 1G6. Author to whom correspondence should be sent.

² Pictou Landing First Nation, Site 6 Box 55, R.R. #2, Trenton, NS B0K 1X0

³ Lennox Island First Nation, P.O. Box 134, Lennox Island, PE C0B 1P0

⁴ Wagmatcook First Nation, P.O. Box 30001, Wagmatcook, NS B0E 3N0

⁵ Fort Folly First Nation, 38 Bernard Trail, P.O. Box 1007, Dorchester, NB E4K 3V5

⁶ Elsipogtog First Nation, R.R. 1, 373 Big Cove Road, NB E4W 2S3

⁷ Eskasoni First Nation, P.O. Box 7040, 63 Mini Mall Drive, Eskasoni, NS B1W 1A1

⁸ Afton First Nation, Council of Paq'tnkek First Nation, R.R. #1, Afton, NS B0H 1A0

Mi'kmaq knowledge of species at risk in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island

ISBN 978-1-100-17402-0

Cat. no.: CW69-5/510E-PDF

Information contained in this publication or product may be reproduced, in part or in whole, and by any means, for personal or public non-commercial purposes, without charge or further permission, unless otherwise specified.

You are asked to:

- Exercise due diligence in ensuring the accuracy of the materials reproduced;
- Indicate both the complete title of the materials reproduced, as well as the author organization; and
- Indicate that the reproduction is a copy of an official work that is published by the Government of Canada and that the reproduction has not been produced in affiliation with or with the endorsement of the Government of Canada.

Commercial reproduction and distribution is prohibited except with written permission from the Government of Canada's copyright administrator, Public Works and Government Services of Canada (PWGSC). For more information, please contact PWGSC at 613-996-6886 or at droitdauteur.copyright@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca.

Photos: © Environment Canada

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, represented by the Minister of the Environment, 2010

Aussi disponible en français

ABSTRACT

This study documents the type of knowledge held by Mi'kmaq of the species listed and protected by Canada's *Species at Risk Act* (2002) and found in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as of 2005. Nine individuals from seven Mi'kmaq communities in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia interviewed a total of 150 individuals within their own communities. In order to compare the Mi'kmaq knowledge collected with the species' known distributions, we grouped participating Mi'kmaq communities in four regions: New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, mainland Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. Community members recognized nearly half of the 71 species presented to them. Most of the species identified by the Cape Breton (Nova Scotia) and the Prince Edward Island Mi'kmaq communities were typically not found in their region while most of the species identified by the mainland Nova Scotia and the New Brunswick Mi'kmaq communities were typically found in their region. This suggests that the movement of Mi'kmaq individuals from one community to another has provided an opportunity for Mi'kmaq knowledge to be shared among communities and maintained within the Mi'kmaq Nation. We demonstrate that wildlife management agencies responsible for species recovery would benefit greatly from expanding their request for Mi'kmaq knowledge beyond communities found nearby known locations of particular species at risk.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACTi

1. INTRODUCTION.....1

2. METHODOLOGY3

3. RESULTS5

4. DISCUSSION6

5. Acknowledgements9

6. Literature cited.....9

Figure 1:.....12

Table 113

Table 2:14

Table 3:15

Table 4:16

Table 5:17

Table 5:18

Table 5:19

Table 5:20

ANNEX:21

1. INTRODUCTION

Aboriginal knowledge has been gaining recognition in scientific circles for its contribution to environmental and wildlife management as well as conservation since at least 1987 at the meeting of the World Commission on the Environment and Development (Blanchet-Cohen 1996). There are many variations used to describe this type of knowledge: traditional knowledge, indigenous knowledge (e.g., Agrawal 1995), traditional environmental or ecological knowledge (e.g., Usher 2000, Nadasdy 1999), and naturalized knowledge system (Lickers 2001). Emery (1997) has defined traditional ecological knowledge as a “body of knowledge and beliefs transmitted through oral tradition and first-hand observation. It includes a system of classification, a set of empirical observations about the local environment, and a system of self-management that governs resource use.” While Licker (2001) has defined naturalized knowledge system “As they [Aboriginal people] adapt [to a defined geographic area], they gain knowledge, intense knowledge of that system. And then, they have methods to transfer that knowledge from one person to another, from one group to another and from one generation to another.” In this paper, we use the term aboriginal knowledge primarily to specify knowledge from Aboriginal peoples because as Nadasdy (1999) argues, the term “traditional” assumes that only traditional people or elders possess traditional ecological knowledge and that their knowledge is restricted to traditional activities inherent to the aboriginal culture.

The Government of Canada has recognized the valuable contribution that aboriginal knowledge can provide to environmental assessments, to pollution prevention, and more recently to species conservation (see the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (1992, c. 37), the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999* (1999, c. 33) and the *Species at Risk Act* (2002, c. 29), respectively). Despite legal obligations stemming from 1992, government officials are still working to include aboriginal knowledge in environmental assessment processes (Usher 2000).

Under the *Species at Risk Act* (2002), the Government of Canada established an aboriginal traditional knowledge subcommittee to the Committee on the Status of

Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) (subsection 18(1) in Statutes of Canada, 2002). COSEWIC is responsible for assessing the status of wildlife in Canada. These assessments must include the best available information from scientific research, aboriginal traditional knowledge as well as community knowledge (subsection 15(2) in Statutes of Canada 2002). It can be assumed that the subcommittee will provide some guidance for the evaluation of aboriginal traditional knowledge to COSEWIC members. The Government of Canada has further committed to consider aboriginal traditional knowledge in developing and implementing recovery measures for species at risk (see preamble in Statutes of Canada 2002). The *Species at Risk Act* also provides for the cooperation of Aboriginal peoples affected by the recovery strategy in the preparation of the recovery strategy (subsection 39(1) in Statutes of Canada 2002).

The potential of Mi'kmaq knowledge to help make better management decisions with respect to species at risk stems in part from their long association with their traditional territory. At the time of first contact with European explorers in the 16th and 17th centuries, the Mi'kmaq lived in the region now known as the Maritimes (New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia) and the Gaspé peninsula (of Quebec) (Nova Scotia Museum 2002). The Mi'kmaq dependence on hunting and gathering has provided them with opportunities to accumulate long series of historical observations of relevance to sustainable resource use and conservation of biodiversity (Gadgil et al. 1993).

The goal of this project is to document some of the knowledge held by Mi'kmaq communities regarding the species found in their traditional territory that were listed and protected by the *Species at Risk Act* in 2004. We are hopeful that providing wildlife management agencies with the types of aboriginal knowledge available on species at risk will help them determine which communities to contact and with whom to negotiate access protocols for specific knowledge held by Mi'kmaq communities. We are careful to provide as much control to the participating Mi'kmaq communities over the information collected from community members because of sensitivity related to the protection and ownership of the information (Battiste and Henderson 2000). The Mi'kmaq researchers in this project were involved in the analysis, interpretation and publication of research

results (see list of authors) but the specific stories and information shared by people interviewed are kept within the Mi'kmaq communities.

We initiated this work because we wanted to know whether wildlife managers could assume that Mi'kmaq knowledge of species is locally bound by the geographic location of their community or if their knowledge is held more uniformly across the Mi'kmaq territory. A second and important purpose for this work was to help Mi'kmaq communities build databases of their members' knowledge of species at risk.

2. METHODOLOGY

This work was conducted by nine individuals (see co-authors) from seven Mi'kmaq communities in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia (Figure 1). These individuals were hired by their community Band Council or a First Nation organization to interview members from their own community during the spring, summer and fall of 2004. Interviewers were trained by the Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre, a non-governmental organization whose mission is “to assemble and provide objective and understandable data and expertise about species and ecological communities of conservation concern, including those at risk, and undertake field biological inventories to support decision-making, research, and education in Atlantic Canada” (www.accdc.com).

Interviewers were provided with a list, pictures and short description of 71 species at risk listed under either the *Species at Risk Act* or two provincial endangered species acts (New Brunswick 1996 and Nova Scotia 1998). At the time, Prince Edward Island had not currently listed any species at risk under their provincial legislation. They showed pictures to as many community members as possible and interviewed a variety of individuals from different backgrounds and lifestyles. Individuals were selected based on their availability, known general knowledge of nature or of their lifestyles and to provide as wide a variety of community members as possible. Because interviewers were indiscriminate in selecting individuals, it enables us to emphasize that the knowledge collected was not necessarily coming from “elders” or “custodians of knowledge” but is community-based. Interview methods were also different among communities: some

communities selected talking circles where a number of community members are brought together to discuss specific topics, while some interviewers preferred one-on-one conversations or door-to-door canvassing.

There was also no specific or predetermined question, to allow an open interview process to which the interviewers could freely adapt to meet their community needs. However, interviewers during their training with the Atlantic Conservation Data Centre agreed on a number of categories to capture and record specific information provided by interviewees. The knowledge collected was categorized as follows: medicinal, food/beverage, tool/implement, craft/art, social/ceremonial, environmental association, habitat association, species association, historical changes to the population, species location/knowledge of distribution, pre-colonial knowledge/legends/stories. These 11 categories were selected based on the views of participating Mi'kmaq communities and organizations as well as federal government funding agencies (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Environment Canada, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada) to ensure that the study was both useful for management agencies as well as participating communities. Some of these categories (medicinal, food/beverage, tool/implement, craft/art, social/ceremonial) are not presented in this report at the request of the participating communities. The environmental, habitat and species associations were defined as instances where the identified species was either associated with, or knowledge of that species pertained to, environmental or climatic conditions, habitat-related or related to another species (at risk or not). It was believed that wildlife management agencies would be interested in these knowledge categories as well as historical changes to the population, species locations or knowledge of the species distribution and whether pre-colonial knowledge existed of that species.

The participatory action research approach we used allows Aboriginal peoples to feel that they are in control of the entire research process from beginning to end. This view is increasingly supported in the literature because participant-led and co-managed research provides far more reliable and useful results than research imposed and carried out solely by outsiders (Lambrou 1997). Categorizing the information was useful to the community to control (and protect) the specific information collected because it provided a mechanism to report to funding agencies the information collected without identifying

specific sensitive information. Because the original dataset is controlled and managed by participating Mi'kmaq communities, wildlife management agencies are encouraged to contact the community directly for access to the information (contacts are provided in the Annex).

For analysis purpose, in order to compare the Aboriginal knowledge collected with the species' known distributions, we grouped participating Mi'kmaq communities in four regions: New Brunswick (NB) included Elsipogtog and Fort Folly First Nations, Prince Edward Island (PEI) included Lennox Island First Nation, mainland Nova Scotia (mNS) included Afton and Pictou Landing First Nations, and Cape Breton (CB) included Wagmatcook and Eskasoni First Nations.

The range of the species was based on that reported on the *Species at Risk Act* registry (www.sararegistry.gc.ca).

3. RESULTS

We conducted 140 interviews and interviewed 150 Mi'kmaq individuals from seven communities in the Maritimes (Table 1). Among those interviewed, 35 were identified as Mi'kmaq elders (Table 1).

The Mi'kmaq communities interviewed were spread across the Maritimes but concentrated mainly around the Northumberland Strait (Figure 1). Unfortunately, we were not able to get participation in this study from northern New Brunswick Mi'kmaq communities or from any of the southern mainland Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq communities. There was also no Maliseet community involved in this study, but some of the individuals interviewed might have been Maliseet since there are some intermarriages and movements between these two aboriginal groups (pers. comm.).

At the time of this study, there were 40 species at risk in New Brunswick, 12 in Prince Edward Island, 38 in mainland Nova Scotia and 20 in Cape Breton. Of the 71 species presented to them, New Brunswick (48%), Prince Edward Island (45%) and mainland Nova Scotia (41%) Mi'kmaq communities identified more species than Cape Breton (30%) Mi'kmaq communities. In each region, Mi'kmaq communities identified species that were typically not found within their region (Table 2) or failed to identify

species of their region (Table 2). Lennox Island (Prince Edward Island) was most successful in identifying species at risk within their region (33% success rate) and also of species of other regions. Most of the species identified by the Cape Breton (67%) and Prince Edward Island (75%) Mi'kmaq communities were species typically not found in their region, while most of the species identified by the mainland Nova Scotia (28%) and New Brunswick (35%) Mi'kmaq communities were species typically found in their region.

For plant species found only in specific locations, it is apparent that many Mi'kmaq communities not within proximity of those known locations possess knowledge of those species (Table 3). As an interesting example, Furbish's Lousewort is a species known to be found only in Maliseet territory, i.e., only along the St. John River, yet Mi'kmaq communities along the Northumberland Strait in New Brunswick (Figure 1), Prince Edward Island and mainland Nova Scotia identified the plant and reported that they possess potentially useful management information about that plant (Table 3).

Interestingly enough, there were 16 species not identified by any Mi'kmaq interviewed. These were birds, lepidopterans, lichens, molluscs, plants and reptiles (Table 4), but all mammals were identified.

While interviewing Mi'kmaq individuals, the information collected was categorized. Six of the categories held potential useful information from a wildlife management point of view: environmental, habitat and species associations; locations; historical changes to the population or to the species; and pre-colonial information. Table 5 presents the type of knowledge held by communities for different species. Mi'kmaq communities in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island seem to possess a much more in-depth management-related knowledge for any given species when comparing to Mi'kmaq communities in Nova Scotia (mainland and Cape Breton).

4. DISCUSSION

We have chosen to drop the term traditional because we have interviewed a wide variety of Mi'kmaq people (young, old, men, women) who are not all elders or traditionalists and because the term implies a restriction of knowledge for traditional

activities inherent to the Aboriginal culture (Nadasdy 1999). The distinction of elders is important given that these individuals and their knowledge are held in high esteem by Mi'kmaq (and other Aboriginal peoples) (Stiegelbauer 1996) and require special care and protection to ensure that the information is safeguarded against inappropriate use. The term traditionalist in the Mi'kmaq culture is not necessarily associated with an elder. In the context of this study, traditionalists are those Mi'kmaq people living and practicing the traditional Mi'kmaq way of life. We have made no distinction in our target interviews between elders or traditionalists; instead, we believe to have captured a snapshot of knowledge of species at risk held within the Mi'kmaq Nation of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is also why we were not concerned with standardizing the interview methods or the questions asked by interviewers, to allow an unrestricted knowledge flow as well as a personal ownership for the interviewer of his or her portion of the study. We believe this approach to be truly participatory action research (Lambrou 1997).

We demonstrated quite clearly that wildlife management agencies should not rely on the geographic proximity of Mi'kmaq communities in order to access valuable aboriginal knowledge with respect to a particular species. This is somewhat intuitive given that many Mi'kmaq and Maliseet individuals do not necessarily settle in the community where they were born, which is not dissimilar from what is happening in non-Aboriginal communities in the Maritimes (see Statistics Canada, 2008 and Rothwell et al. 2002). Individuals travelling to different communities are getting exposed to a broader range of species and knowledge held by these different communities. This characteristic could serve to preserve Mi'kmaq knowledge since communities without elders could benefit from second-hand stories and knowledge accumulated from newer community members who were exposed to Mi'kmaq elders' knowledge in other communities. However, a movement of Mi'kmaq individuals to bigger urban centres which provide greater access to industrial products would be an obstacle to the transfer of traditional knowledge, at a great loss for the communities (Neishem et al. 2006).

Despite their current rareness, nearly 50% of the species at risk were identified by Mi'kmaq. We would like to caution readers not to interpret the non-identification of a particular species as a lack of Mi'kmaq knowledge about that species. Even though we

have interviewed a large number of Mi'kmaq, this represents only 25% of the Mi'kmaq communities and 0.6% of the Mi'kmaq population (based on 2000 Statistics Canada Census data). The success rate is impressive given that many Mi'kmaq individuals believe that much of the aboriginal knowledge and traditional way of life have been lost within their communities because they have no or few elders left in their communities (Francis 2003). Most likely, the movement of Mi'kmaq individuals from one community to another has provided an opportunity for Mi'kmaq knowledge to be shared among communities and maintained within the Mi'kmaq Nation. Alternatively, there could have been some errors in species identification due to the quality of the pictures or misidentification of some of the species. Despite the most likely high error rate in species identification, this study provides a starting point for wildlife management agencies interested in receiving Mi'kmaq guidance with respect to species at risk management. Providing a list of potential management-related information with respect to each species identified will further guide wildlife management agencies in seeking access to species-specific information and helps the Mi'kmaq Nation control and protect its own knowledge (Mauro and Hardison 2000, Simpson 2001 and Ellis 2005). For instance, Nabhan (2000) demonstrates how indigenous knowledge of ecological interactions involving threatened species may offer Western-trained scientists and resource managers with hypotheses to test and apply to endangered species recovery efforts. Further, Nabhan (2000) proposed that endangered species recovery teams include local experts from indigenous communities to aid in the integration of knowledge bases derived from various cultural perspectives.

Agrawal (1995) argues that those who are seen to possess knowledge must also possess the right to decide on how to save their knowledge, how to use it and who shall use it. At the same time, it should be kept in mind that *in situ* preservation is likely to make aboriginal knowledge more costly for those outsiders who wish to gain access to it and disseminate it freely to others (Agrawal 1995). However, Nadasdy (1999) argues against the collection and documentation of traditional ecological knowledge as intellectual product to be integrated with science because researchers are helping to extend the power of scientists and managers in aboriginal communities, which helps to concentrate power away from these communities. However, what Nadasdy (1999) fails to

recognize is that similarly to science information, there is no value or power gained if information is never shared. Inherent to this sharing of information is the risk of how the information will be used by the individual receiving the information. In high-risk situations, Aboriginal peoples may choose to negotiate terms and conditions for information use or may choose not to share the information. The bottom line is that aboriginal communities should be empowered to make those decisions regarding the information held within their communities, and wildlife management agencies should be provided with some guidance related to the type of information held in specific aboriginal communities.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, we would like to thank all interviewees for the valuable information they shared with us and the time they took to tell us stories about these species. We would like to thank the Chiefs and Councils of the participating communities, the Boards of Directors of the participating First Nation organizations, and the Mi'kmaq Ethics Watch Committee for approving this work and the collection of the information from their communities. We would like to thank the Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre for providing valuable assistance and for being wonderful teachers. We would also like to thank our funding partners who made this work possible: Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, and Environment Canada. Finally, we would like to thank Dan Busby, Diane Amirault and Sean Blaney for providing us with valuable species-specific information, and Kim Mawhinney, Andrew Boyne and anonymous reviewers for reviewing earlier drafts of this manuscript.

6. LITERATURE CITED

Agrawal, A. 1995. Indigenous and scientific knowledge: some critical comments. *IK Monitor* 3(3), 8 pp.

Agrawal, A. 1995. Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change*. 26: 413-439

Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre: www.accdc.com

Battiste, M. and J.[S.]Y. Henderson. 2000. Protecting indigenous knowledge and heritage: a global challenge. Purich Publishing Ltd. 324 pp.

Blanchet-Cohen, N. 1996. Strategies for a living Earth: examples from Canadian Aboriginal communities. Report prepared for the Biodiversity Convention Office, Environment Canada. 33 pp.

Ellis, S.C. 2005. Meaningful consideration? A review of traditional knowledge in environmental decision making. *Arctic* 58(1): 66-77.

Emery, A.R. 1997. Guidelines for environmental assessment and traditional knowledge. A report from the Centre of Traditional Knowledge of the World Council for Indigenous People. Ottawa: Centre for Traditional Knowledge.

Francis, C. 2003 The importance of oral knowledge. *Mi'kmaq-Maliseet Nations News*. June edition.

Gadgil, M., F. Berkes and C. Folke. 1993. Indigenous knowledge for biodiversity conservation. *Ambio* 22(2-3): 151-156.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Atlantic Region Aboriginal communities map. www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ai/scr/at/mp/mp-eng.asp

Lambrou, Y. 1997. Control and access to indigenous knowledge and biological resources. Document submitted to the Biodiversity Convention Office, Environment Canada.

Lickers, H. 2001. Traditional ecological knowledge workshop. Haudenosaunee Environmental Task Force facilitated at the International Joint Commission's Biennial Forum on November 19, 2001, in Montréal, Canada. www.hetfonline.org/pages/TEK_workshop_2.htm

Mauro, F. and P.D. Hardison. 2000. Traditional knowledge of indigenous and local communities: international debate and policy initiatives. *Ecological Applications*. 10(5): 1263-1269.

Nabhan, G.P. 2000. Interspecific relationships affecting endangered species recognized by O'Odham and Comcaac cultures. *Ecol. Applic.* 10(5): 1289-1295.

Nadasdy, P. 1999. The politics of TEK: power and the "integration" of knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology* 36(1-2): 1-18.

Nova Scotia Museum. 2002. The Mik'maq info sheet.

<http://museum.gov.ns.ca/arch/infos/mikmaq1.htm>

Rothwell, N., R.D. Bollman, J. Tremblay and J. Marshall. 2002. Recent migration patterns in rural and small town Canada. Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series No. 55. 76 pp.

Simpson, L. 2001. Aboriginal peoples and knowledge: Decolonizing our processes. Canadian Journal of Native Studies 21(1): 137-148.

Statistics Canada. 2008. Report on the demographic situation in Canada: 2005 and 2006. www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-209-x/91-209-x2004000-eng.htm

Statutes of Canada. 1992. Chapter 37 Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. An Act to establish a federal environmental assessment process. Assented to June 23, 1992.

<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/C-15.2>

Statutes of Canada. 1999. Chapter 33 Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999. An Act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development. Assented to September 14,

1999. <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/C-15.31>

Statutes of Canada. 2002. Chapter 29 Species at Risk Act. An Act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada. Assented to December 12, 2002.

<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/S-15.3>

Statutes of New Brunswick. 1996. Chapter E-9.101 Endangered Species Act. Assented to March 22, 1996. www.gnb.ca/acts/acts/e-09-101.htm

Statutes of Nova Scotia. 1998. Chapter 11 Endangered Species Act. Assented to December 3, 1998. <http://www.nslegislature.ca/legc/statutes/endspec.htm>

Stiegelbauer, S.M. 1996. What is an elder? What do elders do?: First Nation elders as teachers in culture-based urban organizations. Can. J. Native Studies 16(1): 37-66.

Usher, P.J. 2000. Traditional ecological knowledge in environmental assessment and management. Arctic: 53(2): 183-193.

Figure 1: Geographic location of Mi'kmaq communities interviewed for this study. Map showing all locations of Mi'kmaq and Maliseet communities can be found at: www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ai/scr/at/mp/mp-eng.asp



Table 1: Number of Mi'kmaq communities for each region (New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, mainland Nova Scotia and Cape Breton), number of interviews, number of people interviewed, and number of elders interviewed.

	New Brunswick	Prince Edward Island	Mainland Nova Scotia	Cape Breton	Total
Number of Mi'kmaq communities	2	1	2	2	7
Number of interviews	37	47	25	31	140
Total number of people interviewed	39	52	25	34	150
Of those interviewed, number of elders	13	4	11	7	35

Table 2: Number of species identified or not in each study region by the Mi'kmaq communities of four study regions: New Brunswick (NB), Prince Edward Island (PEI), mainland Nova Scotia (mNS), and Cape Breton (CB).

Study Regions	No. of species with range overlapping within study regions	No. of species identified in each study region	No. of species not found in a given study region but identified by the Mi'kmaq communities of that region	No. of species found in a given study region but not identified by the Mi'kmaq communities of that region
NB	40	34	12	18
PEI	12	32	24	4
mNS	38	29	8	16
CB	20	21	14	16

Table 3: Plant species known to be found in specific sites but identified by Mi'kmaq communities of other study regions. Study regions in this study are: New Brunswick (NB), Prince Edward Island (PEI), mainland Nova Scotia (mNS), and Cape Breton (CB).

Plant Species	Species known location	Location of Mi'kmaq communities who identified the species			
		NB	PEI	mNS	CB
Furbish's Lousewort	NB	X	X	X	
Van Brunt's Jacob's-ladder	NB		X	X	X
Redroot	mNS	X	X	X	
Eastern Mountain Avens	mNS	X	X		X
Golden Crest	mNS	X	X	X	
Long's Bulrush	mNS		X		X
Tubercled Spike-rush	mNS	X	X		
Plymouth Gentian	mNS		X		
Pink Coreopsis	mNS	X	X	X	X
Thread-leaved Sundew	mNS		X	X	X
Water-pennywort	mNS	X	X	X	X

Table 4: List of species that were not identified by any Mi'kmaq interviewed.

Species	Type
Least Bittern	Birds
Yellow Rail	Birds
Boreal Felt Lichen	Lichens
Eastern Lilaeopsis	Plants
Pinedrops	Plants
New Jersey Rush	Plants
Parker's Pipewort	Plants
Prototype Quillwort	Plants
Southern Twayblade	Plants
Leatherback Turtle	Reptiles

Table 5: List of species identified for which useful information for recovery strategies, management plans or status assessments by province was identified by community members. Knowledge useful for management agencies are: environmental (Env), habitat (Hab) or species (Sp) associations; historical changes in the population (Chg), locations (Loc) and pre-colonial knowledge or legends (Leg). Regions in this study of participating Mi’kmaq communities are: New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, mainland Nova Scotia, and Cape Breton.

List of species	New Brunswick	Prince Edward Island	mainland Nova Scotia	Cape Breton
American Marten	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg		Loc	Loc
Anticosti Aster	Env Hab Chg Loc			
Bald Eagle	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Loc	Env Sp Chg Loc Leg
Barrow’s Goldeneye	Env Sp Chg Loc	Chg	Hab Loc	Loc
Bathurst Aster	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	
Bicknell’s Thrush	Env Chg Loc			
Blanding’s Turtle	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg		Loc	Loc
Butternut	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc		Loc	
Canada Lynx	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Loc	Env Hab Chg Loc

Table 5: cont.

List of species	New Brunswick	Prince Edward Island	mainland Nova Scotia	Cape Breton
Redroot	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	
Sweet Pepperbush			Loc	
Eastern Cougar	Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Chg Leg	Chg Loc	Env Hab Loc
Eastern Mountain Avens	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp		Loc
Eskimo Curlew		Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	
Furbish's Lousewort	Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Loc	Loc	
Gaspe Shrew	Env Hab Chg Loc		Loc Leg	
Golden Crest	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Sp	Loc	
Gulf of St. Lawrence Aster		Env Hab Sp	Loc	Loc
Harlequin Duck	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Chg Leg		
Van Brunt's Jacob's-ladder		Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	Loc

Table 5: cont.

List of species	New Brunswick	Prince Edward Island	mainland Nova Scotia	Cape Breton
Leatherback Turtle	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg		Hab Sp Loc	
Long's Bulrush		Env Hab Sp Loc		Chg Loc
Tubercled spike-rush	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp		
Maritime Ringlet	Env Sp Chg Loc			
Monarch Butterfly	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	Loc
Moose	Loc		Env Hab Chg	Env Hab Chg Leg
New Jersey Rush	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc			
Eastern Ribbon Snake	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Chg Loc	
Peregrine Falcon	Sp Loc	Env Hab Sp Chg Leg	Loc	Loc
Piping Plover	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Loc	Env Hab Chg Loc	Loc
Plymouth Gentian		Env Hab Sp Chg Loc		

Table 5: cont.

List of species	New Brunswick	Prince Edward Island	mainland Nova Scotia	Cape Breton
Red-Shouldered Hawk	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp	Sp Loc	
Pink Coreopsis	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	Loc
Roseate Tern	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc		Loc	
Short-eared Owl	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Sp	Loc	Loc
Southern Flying Squirrel	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Loc	Loc
Thread-leaved sundew		Env Hab Sp Loc	Loc	
Water pennywort	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc	Env Hab Sp	Loc	Loc
Wolverine		Env Hab Loc		
Wood Turtle	Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab Sp		Loc
Woodland Caribou	Env Hab Sp Chg Loc Leg	Env Hab	Hab Loc	Loc

ANNEX: Contact information of participating Mi'kmaq communities and First Nation organizations

Elsipogtog First Nation, c/o Dawn Ann Levi, Adele Levi and Franklyn Levi, 373 Big Cove Road, Elsipogtog, NB E4W 2S2 (admin@bigcoveband.com)

Fort Folly First Nation, c/o Tina Milner, Patricia Knockwood, Michelle Knockwood, 38 Bernard Trail, PO Box 1007, Dorchester, NB E4K 3V5

Lennox Island First Nation, c/o Cheyenne Francis, P.O. Box 134, Lennox Island, PE C0B 1P0

Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI, 200 Read Drive, Summerside, PE C1N 5N7

Pictou Landing First Nation, c/o Andrea Dykstra, Site 6 Box 55, R.R. #2, Trenton, NS B0K 1X0

Afton First Nation, c/o Brian Prosper, Council of Paq'tnekek First Nation, R.R. #1, Afton, Antigonish County, NS B0H 1A0

Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq, 57 Martin Crescent, P.O. Box 1590, Truro, NS B2N 5V3

Eskasoni First Nation, c/o Catherine Paul, PO Box 7040, 63 Mini Mall Drive, Eskasoni, NS B1W 1A1

Wagmatcook First Nation, c/o James Gould, PO Box 30001, Wagmatcook, NS B0E 3N0

Unamaki Institute of Natural Resources, c/o Lisa Paul, PO Box 8096, Eskasoni, NS B1W 1C2

www.ec.gc.ca

Additional information can be obtained at:

Environment Canada

Inquiry Centre

351 St. Joseph Boulevard

Place Vincent Massey, 8th Floor

Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0H3

Telephone: 1-800-668-6767 (in Canada only) or 819-997-2800

Fax: 819-994-1412

TTY: 819-994-0736

Email: enviroinfo@ec.gc.ca