

**The Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band and Others v. The
Attorney General of Canada
and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of
British Columbia**

Prepared for
James M. Mackenzie
Department of Justice
British Columbia Regional Office
Vancouver, British Columbia

February 8, 2007

© Joan A. Lovisek

**Joan A. Lovisek, Ph.D. M.E.S.
14965 25A Avenue
SURREY, BRITISH COLUMBIA. V4P 1N7
TEL: (604) 541-7921 FAX: (604) 541-9221
EMAIL: lovisek@telus.net**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
QUESTIONS	4
THE COAST TSIMSHIAN	6
PRECONTACT GROUP NAMES	7
MARINE RESOURCE USE	9
<i>Environment</i>	9
PRECONTACT MARINE RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY, CONSERVATION AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	10
<i>Conservation</i>	12
PRECONTACT SKEENA RIVER VALLEY AND INTERIOR	13
ARCHAEOLOGY VS. ETHNOGRAPHIC MODEL OF TSIMSHIAN SETTLEMENT AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION	20
<i>Protocontact Trade</i>	22
<i>Precontact: Coastal Marine Resource Use</i>	26
PROTOCONTACT –INDIRECT CONTACT WITH EUROPEANS	34
<i>Dundas Island Group</i>	39
PROTOCONTACT- HISTORICAL EVIDENCE	45
FORT SIMPSON 1834	76
<i>Intergroup Hostilities and Slavery</i>	83
MIGRATION TO METLAKATLA	100
NON- NATIVE SETTLEMENT	102
SOCIAL ORGANIZATION	118
<i>Tribe</i>	120
<i>Kinship Obligations</i>	123
PRECONTACT KINSHIP AND EXCHANGE	125
<i>Ethnographic Examples of Exchange and Trade</i>	127
PROPERTY AND OWNERSHIP	135
TERRITORIES	139
<i>Abandonment of Territories</i>	139
PRECONTACT POTLATCH	141
<i>Wealth</i>	143
SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS	144
<i>Summary Answer 1.1.1.1</i>	144
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.2</i>	145
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.3</i>	146
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.4</i>	146
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.4A</i>	147
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.5</i>	147
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.6</i>	147
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.6A</i>	148
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.7</i>	148
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.1.8</i>	148
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.3.1</i>	149
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.4.2</i>	150
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.14- 1.1.4.8</i>	151
<i>Summary Answer to 1.1.5.5-1.1.5.8</i>	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY	153
APPENDIX A – CURRICULUM VITAE	165
APPENDIX B- METHODS	184

<i>Ethnohistorical Method</i>	184
<i>Tsimshian Narratives</i>	185
<i>Ethnographic Present</i>	186
<i>Documents</i>	189
APPENDIX C- ETHNOGRAPHIC GROUP IDENTITIES, TERRITORIES AND FISHING LOCATIONS	190
<i>Gilutss'aaw</i>	190
<i>Ginaxangiik</i>	190
<i>Gispaxlo'ots</i>	190
<i>Gitando</i>	191
<i>Gitlaan</i>	192
<i>Gitnadoiks</i>	193
<i>Gitsiis</i>	194
<i>Gitwalksabae</i>	196
<i>Gitwilgyoots</i>	197
<i>Gitzaxlaal</i>	199
<i>Comparison of Duff's maps with Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map</i>	200

Introduction

I, Joan A. M. Lovisek, am a professional anthropologist and ethnohistorian. I hold a doctorate in Anthropology from McMaster University specialized in ethnohistory, and a Masters degree in Environmental Studies from York University. I am qualified to research and analyze Aboriginal issues involving historical land and resource use. I have conducted research projects, including the gathering and analysis of Elder testimony, in various Aboriginal communities across Canada. I have extensive research experience in primary historical and anthropological sources and have prepared, reviewed and assessed Aboriginal claim submissions for First Nations, governments and legal counsel. I have given papers at numerous scholarly conferences and have published articles in various academic journals and chapters in books (see Appendix A for curriculum vitae; Appendix B for a description of Ethnohistory).

I have been asked by Mr. James M. Mackenzie of the Federal Department of Justice to prepare an expert report which responds to several questions relating to the Lax Kw'alaams use of non mammal marine resources.

Questions

- 1.1.1. Before and at the date of first contact with Europeans:
 - 1.1.1.1. Who were the aboriginal people, if any, living on the west coast of British Columbia where the Skeena River joins it, and along the lower Skeena River and its tributaries (as outlined in maps attached to the Statement of Claim and Response to Particulars) ("Skeena Region People")?
 - 1.1.1.2. What was the nature of the Skeena Region People's use, management and conservation of fish, shellfish and aquatic plants ("Marine Resources"), if any?
 - 1.1.1.3. Which of the Skeena Region People, if any, engaged in harvesting, processing and trade ("Use") and/or commercial Use of Marine Resources?
 - 1.1.1.4. Were the Use and/or commercial Use of Marine Resources integral to the distinctive culture(s) of the Skeena Region People?
 - 1.1.1.4.A If so, which particular Marine Resources were integral to the distinctive culture of the Skeena Region people?
 - 1.1.1.5. What was the nature of the socio-political organization of the Skeena Region People?
 - 1.1.1.6. What were the distinctions, if any, between the Skeena Region People's onshore and offshore use,

management and conservation of Marine Resources?

1.1.1.6.A What were the distinctions, if any, between the Skeena Region People's use, management and conservation of Marine Resources as between fast-flowing and slower-moving parts of the Skeena River?

1.1.1.7. What were the Skeena Region People's concepts of ownership that regulated access to or management of Marine Resources?

1.1.1.8. What was the relationship, if any, between the Skeena Region People's use and ownership of Marine Resources and use and/or access by other aboriginal groups?

1.1.3 In 2002:

1.1.3.1. What was the nature and extent of the Skeena Region People's occupation, migration and abandonment pattern between 1787 and 2002?

1.1.3.2. Was there any difference between the conditions and the identities of the Skeena Region People at Contact and in 2002 as discussed in answers to the questions in paragraphs 1.1.1..?

1.1.4. Did aboriginal groups other than the Plaintiffs, use, own or occupy, or claim ownership and occupation rights over any of:

(a) the fisheries resource sites depicted on the map entitled, "Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map", Schedule "A" to The Plaintiffs' Amended Responses to Canada's Request for Further and Better Particulars dated May 4, 2004 and received by Canada on October 20, 2005; and

(b) the territories depicted on the map entitled, "Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map", Appendix "A" to the Amended Statement of Claim filed on September 29, 2005?

[(a) and (b) will be collectively referred to as the "Claim Areas"]

Please provide your opinion considering the following time frames:

- 1.1.4.1 as of approximately 1787;
- 1.1.4.2 from 1787 – 1846;

- 1.1.4.3 as of approximately 1846; and
- 1.1.4.4 from 1846 to the early 1900's.

1.1.5. Did non-aboriginal people use, own or occupy, or claim ownership and occupation rights over any of the Claim Areas? Please provide your opinion considering the following time frames:

- 1.1.5.1 as of approximately 1787;
- 1.1.5.2 from 1787 – 1846;
- 1.1.5.3 as of approximately 1846; and
- 1.1.5.4 from 1846 to the early 1900's.

The Coast Tsimshian

The Skeena River Peoples are identified in the ethnographic literature as Coast Tsimshian. Anthropologists distinguish between three divisions of Coast Tsimshian based on seasonal settlement location. One division comprised two village groups whose summer and winter territories were on the sea coast (Gitzaxlaal and Gitwilgyoots). A second division of eight village groups had winter villages on the coast and summer territories on the lower Skeena River below Kitselas canyon (Gitsiis; Gitlaan; Ginaxangiik; Gitnadoiks; Gitando; Giltss'aaw; Gispaxlo'ots; Gitwilsebwa). The third division comprised two village groups, the Kitselas and the Kitsumkalum (who are not plaintiffs) whose summer and winter territories were along the Skeena River near Kitselas Canyon.¹

The Lower Skeena Division included the Gitzaxlaal who had a summer location on the Ecstall River; the Gitsiis on the Khyex River; the Ginaxangiik at the Exchamsiks River; the Gitnadoiks at Gitnadoix River; the Gitando at the Exstew River; the Gispaxlo'ots on the Skeena River near Shames River; the Gitlaan near the Zymagotitz River; and the Giltss'aaw at Lakelse River. For the two Coastal Division groups, Martindale identified the Gitwalksabae who had, like all named groups, a winter village at Metlakatla and a summer village location in Tsimshian Peninsula, and the Gitwilgyoots, who had a summer village at Ridley Island. ² However, whether these named groups existed in the form described in the ethnographic literature during the precontact period, has not been examined in the scholarly literature.

The ethnographic and scholarly literature contains conflicting information concerning the locations of the various groups and territories. Although Archaeologist Andrew Martindale provided a synthesis of the most cited ethnographic sources, the inconsistencies may reflect different time periods, incomplete information and political motivations. The information used on the various maps also derives exclusively from ethnographic sources and does not always agree with contemporary Tsimshian divisions, historical data or archeological data.³ Martindale explained the difficulties with

¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 102.

² Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 103.

³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 102. See: Figure 5.1 and Table 5.1.

identifying territorial locations:

Tsimshian territorial divisions are a complex issue. Contemporary Tsimshian efforts to resolve boundaries are based, in part, on traditional territories but also incorporate significant changes of the post –colonial period. Efforts by researchers to identify the territorial boundaries in existence prior to contact are influenced by the contemporary political debate, problems which are compounded by disputes which were extant in the pre-contact period. Most of the data come from Tsimshian oral traditions (ada'wx) which often do not resolve disputes. Thus, maps showing definite territorial boundaries are arbitrary....⁴

Based upon ethnographic information derived from Allaire, Garfield, Halpin and Seguin, and Marsden and Galois, Martindale prepared a table showing the various group names and their summer and winter village locations.⁵ This data, however, has not been corroborated with historical or archaeological data.

The named groups are often called “tribes” in the ethnographic literature, although the word “tribe” has a different meaning in the anthropological literature.⁶ The linguistic area associated with the Coast Tsimshian linguistic group is not synonymous with a political boundary. The Port Simpson (now Lax Kw'alaams) and Metlakatla Indian Bands are two separate Indian bands which are comprised of amalgamations of members of four phratries, and the former ten local groups or “tribes”⁷ that traditionally wintered along Metlakatla Pass. The Metlakatla Band is not a plaintiff. The present Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla Indian bands are amalgamations of the former named groups or “tribes”.

There is insufficient data to identify when the ethnographically known Coast Tsimshian culture developed. The ethnographic data tends to conflate changes from the late precontact to early contact into a single model of what has been called “traditional” Tsimshian society.⁸ The term Coast Tsimshian is used in this Report as a linguistic, not a political designation.

Precontact Group Names

Precontact, the territory owning social unit was the clan (phratry) segment commonly referred to as a “House.” A House is a corporate territory holding group that has rights

⁴ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 102 ft. 2.

⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, Table 5.1, p. 103.

⁶ A “tribe” used in the anthropological sense is the maximum level of political organization. Most “tribes” including the Coast Tsimshian ten named groups are the products of political and economic pressures from outside after contact with Europeans. Precontact the ten named groups as collectives were not organized as “tribes”. For an anthropological definition of tribe see, Fried, Morton, H., *The Notion of Tribe*, (Menlo Park, California: Cummings Publishing Co.) 1975, p. 44.

⁷ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):177.

⁸ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 71.

and responsibilities related to its ownership of names and crests.⁹ When these Houses developed into the ten (or conceivably more) named groups which shared cultural, linguistic and ceremonial characteristics, but not political characteristics, as described in the ethnographic literature, has yet to be critically examined in the literature. It was the combination of population movement and amalgamation in the early 18th century that brought the Coast Tsimshian speaking peoples together into ethnographically recognizable groups such as the ten named groups which have been called “tribes.” While it is probable that precontact clan (phratry) names preexisted “tribes,” it is not as clear when village and “tribal” names became established.¹⁰

Anthropologist Viola Garfield stated that the Tsimshian occupied year round locations in the Skeena River watershed. The maximum social unit was the lineage or House, and the House or lineage leader was the highest political representative. As a result of Europeans (Russians) on the Northern Northwest Coast early in the 18th century, the Coast Tsimshian developed a seasonal round of subsistence activities between the coast and the interior. This is when the village became the maximum socio-political unit and the village chief was the political representative of the village. After direct contact with Europeans in 1787, the Coast Tsimshian settled year round in both the Skeena River and at Metlakatla. This is when the multi-village or “tribe” developed as the social unit, led by a “tribal chief.”¹¹

Since the precontact socio-political organization did not include “tribes,” territorial descriptions which rely on this level of organization cannot represent the precontact period. The territorial reconstructions of the named groups prepared by Anthropologist Wilson Duff have been included in Appendix C. This data shows inconsistencies in the use of locations as depicted on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map. The importance of applying the proper level of organization in the various historical periods is important for it also extends to such practices as trading prerogatives, which, as described in the ethnographic data, primarily refer to “tribes” and not clans, and to “tribal” leaders. Tribes and tribal leaders were a post contact development.

Thus the arbitrary use of “tribal” names to describe the precontact Coast Tsimshian can also be misleading with respect to marine resource use and trade, since fishing areas were clan or lineage owned and not “tribe” owned. This reality is reflected in the spatial organization of areas attributed to various clans as shown on maps prepared by Anthropologist Wilson Duff and Field Assistant, William Beynon. These maps show such use by clans as spatially fragmented rather than as geographically contiguous.¹² Because the various clans had usufruct rights to resources in various locations this further restricts what James McDonald calls: “the simple identification of a geographic area with a group.”¹³

⁹ Anderson, Margaret and Halpin, Marjorie, *Potlatch at Gitsegukla: William Beynon’s 1945 Field Notebooks* (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press), 2000, pp. 21, 25, 27.

¹⁰ Prince, Paul, *Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga*, B.C. Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998, p. 171.

¹¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 108, 388 Table 5.4.

¹² Map 10, colour coded territorial map, Beynon n.d. Plan 3, American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemisiyan Nation* by William Beynon.

¹³ McDonald, James Andrew, *Trying to make a life: the Historical political economy of Kitsumkalum* Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1985, p. 38.

Marine Resource Use

Environment

The Skeena River is the second longest river in B.C. approximately 560 km long and drains an area of 28,850 km².¹⁴ The inter-tidal areas and shallow offshore waters covering the continental shelf support various species of seaweed. Eel grass and bladder wrack are common shoreline species and there is abundant kelp (*Nereocystis luetkana*) in waters between two and 15 metres in depth. The most important fish are five species of salmon which have major runs in the Nass and Skeena Rivers. Pink and chum salmon also spawn in the smaller rivers and streams. Eulachon, another important species, spawn in the lower reaches of the Nass and the Skeena Rivers in the spring. The inter-tidal areas supported various bivalves including the butter clam, native little neck clam, cockle, horse clam, bay mussel, and California mussel and others. At the lowest tide level were northern abalone, green sea urchin and giant sea cucumber.¹⁵

Although eulachon spawn in the Skeena River, this run is relatively short lived and difficult to harvest. Eulachon spawn upstream as far as Shames River during large runs while an average run will extend upstream to the Kasiks and Gitnadoix River areas. Eulachon also spawn in the main stem of the Skeena River with high value spawning grounds around the lower Skeena River Islands and around the mouth of the Kwinitsa River. They also spawn throughout the Ecstall River system almost to Johnston Lake and in the Khyex, Scotia, Khtada, Kasiks, Gitnadoix and other tributaries in the vicinity. Eulachon are 20% by weight oil and when rendered into oil or grease, have the unique property of being solid at room temperature.¹⁶

Precontact, the primary marine environmental zone on the coast for the harvesting of marine resources was the shallow waters of the continental shelf, called the neritic zone. This zone was directly exploited by precontact peoples for marine mammals, fish, shellfish, bird and marine plants.¹⁷ The precontact economy was based on producing large volumes of storable foods. Salmon was important because of its abundance and storability. The precontact period falls into what archaeologists have called the Late Pacific Period, which extends over a large time horizon dating from AD 200-500 to ca. AD 1775. The precontact period is represented archaeologically by an intensification of exploitation of neritic (shallow water) resources, particularly salmon.¹⁸

¹⁴ Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998, p. 29. Martindale, Andrew, R.C., A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 15.

¹⁵ Archer, David, J.W., A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp. 3,5, 8, 9, 10; Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998, p. 29; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 15.

¹⁶ Stoffels, Denise, Background Report: Eulachon in the North Coast, Government of British Columbia, October 2001, pp. 1-7.

¹⁷ Ames, Kenneth, M., *The Northwest Coast, Evolutionary Anthropology* 2003, 12:20, 21.

¹⁸ Ames, Kenneth, M., *The Northwest Coast, Evolutionary Anthropology* 2003, 12:20, 30.

Precontact Marine Resource Technology, Conservation and Resource Management

Dependence upon salmon arose from its seasonal abundance and accessibility. It is during the salmon's ascent up rivers and tributaries that the runs were most accessible to precontact native peoples. Although Northwest groups, including the Coast Tsimshian, engaged in a troll fishery in the various channels or inlets, in which salmon were caught from baited hooks launched behind canoes, these fish were generally eaten fresh.¹⁹ The important mass harvesting of salmon was made when the salmon schooled. Along the coast this was undertaken at suitable beach sites. If there was a suitable beach at the stream mouth, the tides were relied upon to bring the salmon:

into large semi-circular enclosures--open on the landward side--within which they would be at first trapped and then stranded as the waters fell. These were built as low stone walls, sometimes as a complex of linked traps rather than singly. Posts and latticework raised some higher; others were reportedly of post and lattice alone. Still others had a box trap positioned at the seaward apex of walls that extended from higher on the beach. Whatever the form, when the tide fell, the entrapped dead or dying fish had but to be picked up.²⁰

Fishing stations on the Skeena River were on specific locations on waterways where there is evidence of traditional fishing facilities such as weirs or dip net platforms. The gaff hook²¹ was probably not aboriginal but it replaced spears.²² Dip nets could be used in relatively shallow or confined water. Dip nets were used to catch salmon in freshwater weirs especially in places where the river channeled through a constriction like a canyon such as that at Kitselas.²³ Gill nets were recently introduced to the coast by the Nisga'a and were not used precontact. Net technology was restricted or specialized in use, in contrast to spearing which the Coast Tsimshian developed "to its full potential."²⁴

Weirs were used to direct fish into traps or to confine fish so that they could be speared or dip netted. The precontact native peoples used tidewater salmon traps with either stake and pole or stone weirs; cylindrical river traps with or without a funnel entry, a trap door for removal of fish and a weir construction; open-top traps in a frame of posts

¹⁹ Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, p.1

²⁰ Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, pp. 1-2.

²¹ A gaff is a handle with one or more hooks for landing and lifting fish.

²² Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, p.133; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 82.

²³ Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 136, 137, 138.

²⁴ Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 137, 138, 140; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 110.

used with a weir across a stream; grid traps with a barrier of oblique stakes; 'pothanger' traps; weirs made of oblique stakes; and small rectangular, baited salt-water traps. Not all precontact groups used all methods because use depended on local conditions.²⁵

Archeological evidence consists solely of tidewater salmon traps, but none have been found in the Prince Rupert Harbour area, although forty were found south of the Skeena River estuary. Five stone tidal traps were found in the northern portion of the Claim Area, while others have been found along Portland Inlet. In addition, a tidewater trap made of wooden stakes has been found in the Skeena River estuary.²⁶ According to archaeologist David Archer, of the 46 recorded fish trap sites, all are situated in stream mouths in the inter-tidal zone and 42 are south of the Skeena River. Of all recorded sites recovered, 72% are habitation sites and 14% are fish traps.²⁷

The use of weirs restricts fishing to relatively shallow and confined situations and is efficient in small rivers and tributary streams, and where fish are moving in a predictable direction. The same restrictions do not necessarily apply to traps, although they are effective in areas where fish congregate.²⁸ The precontact Coast Tsimshian caught fish by angling (fishing with a hook and line) even though they possessed few hooks. The principal type used was the V shaped halibut hook. This differs from the Kitkatla who used the U-shaped halibut hook which was more common to the south. Archaeologist R.W. Nolan suggests that the precontact Coast Tsimshian relied less on angling because based on the species recovered in the archaeological record, species obtained by angling were not as important as those obtained by a more efficient technology.²⁹

Nolan estimated that the precontact Coast Tsimshian could probably have set fishing lines up to 60 fathoms³⁰ in depth. Much of the water depth in northern Hecate Strait, for example, is less than 60 fathoms but it is deeper in the southern Hecate Strait and in Dixon Entrance. By comparison, modern commercial fishers use lines between 200 and 250 fathoms. The ocean immediately off the Claim Area is mostly less than 100 fathoms and there are abundant fish in even shallower water.³¹ As noted, the precontact Coast Tsimshian engaged in a shallow water fishery.

The most important fishery for the precontact Coast Tsimshian was the inland tributaries. According to Anthropologist Donald Mitchell:

The greatest variety of traps and the most productive means of capture were employed after the runs began their ascent of a river. The various

²⁵ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 140-141.

²⁶ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, p. 141.

²⁷ Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp. 80-81. This report was written before Haggarty's finding of nine stone wall fish traps on the Dundas Island group.

²⁸ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977 p. 142.

²⁹ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 143, 144, 145, 146, 147.

³⁰ A fathom is six feet or 1.8 metres.

³¹ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 151, 152.

forms of barriers and traps were widely known and the adoption of a specific form seems to have depended on its appropriateness for a particular setting.³²

Mitchell made specific reference to the Skeena River:

Large rivers like the Skeena, Fraser or Columbia were too wide, deep, and powerful to permit the construction of weirs (here, the fish were speared or netted as they crowded the banks seeking slower water).³³

However, it was more usual for weirs to be placed across a small stream. Mitchell described other widely used traps where salmon were impounded into basket or other types of traps: "Most of the salmon harvest was taken with the aid of weirs or traps."³⁴

Conservation

The precontact Coast Tsimshian, like most if not all aboriginal people, did not have a concept of conservation in a Western sense in which selective methods were used to ensure the future reproduction of a species. The term conservation has conceptual problems when applied to the precontact Coast Tsimshian (or any aboriginal people), for in its very general sense conservation means prudent husbanding with the goal of future availability. The Coast Tsimshian attempted to attract marine resources by conjuring, ritual cleansing and other ritual observances. This method of conservation was based on an ideology of propagation. This means that the proper respect and ritual actions would lead to the future abundance of a species. This was an important function of the lineage leader or shaman, to have proper relations with the supernatural forces. The species selected for the most intensive ritual observances by the Coast Tsimshian included salmon and eulachon. These were species which were also collectively harvested and processed.³⁵

Conservation in terms of ritual observances was applied to onshore resources like salmon and eulachon and less to offshore resources. Both offshore and onshore marine resource harvesting locations were subject to ownership and rights of access by a House. All production capabilities of significant marine resources were limited not by the abundance of the species but by the capability to preserve the resource for storage.³⁶

³² Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, p. 2.

³³ Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, p. 2.

³⁴ Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, pp. 3, 4.

³⁵ Krech, Shepard, III, *The ecological Indian: myth and history*, (New York : W.W. Norton & Company), 1999, pp. 24-26.

³⁶ As Randall Schalk points out in a seminal paper, anadromous fish pose a problem of processing abundance in a very short time. Schalk, Randall F., The Structure of an Anadromous Fish Resource, in *For Theory Building in Archaeology: Essays on Faunal Remains, Aquatic Resources, Spatial Analysis, and Systemic Modeling*, edited by Lewis R. Binford, pp. 207-249, (New York: Academic Press), 1977.

The onshore marine resources were managed more closely by the House owners because species such as spawning salmon, eulachon and herring required intensive preparation, harvesting and storage which involved the construction of fishing weirs and traps, rakes, fences, drying racks, spawn collection materials etc. Offshore resources like halibut required less direct management and were individually harvested. Traps to obtain offshore marine resources, made of rocks, for example, did not require dedicated attention. Although stone traps can last centuries, there are as noted, none extant in the Prince Rupert Harbour area.

Of all marine resources, salmon was given the important ritual action by native people. If the proper respect was shown to the caught salmon, as long as it was completely consumed (and bones were burned afterwards or returned to the water), the Coast Tsimshian believed that the salmon would return the following summer.³⁷ For salmon to return the next year, the Coast Tsimshian believed that their flesh had to be consumed within a year and the bones burned.³⁸

First eulachon rites were practiced by the Coast Tsimshian and there were taboos concerning the eulachon, such as speaking badly of them, which would cause the fish to go away and the people to starve. The Coast Tsimshian would also follow a practice of making eulachon oil in the exact and appropriate way, for failure to do so would result in the fish becoming “ashamed, and perhaps never come again.”³⁹

Precontact Skeena River Valley and Interior

For the purpose of this Report, the date of first contact is 1787. The period prior to 1787 when the Coast Tsimshian would have been exposed to influences from Europeans (fur trade goods and later disease) is c. 1700 to 1787. This period is described as the protocontact or protohistorical period. The period prior to c. 1700 is the precontact period, which is prior to any influence with European culture.

The archaeological evidence from the Skeena River demonstrates that the settlement and occupation pattern was characterized by precontact use of interior tributary zones of the Skeena River by extended families who occupied large houses and who produced a surplus of food (berries) sufficient for ceremonial uses. This occupation is represented by the Psacelay site. This settlement pattern changed in the contact period (i.e. after 1787), as represented by the Ginakangeek site, to an occupation characterized by larger villages but smaller households which were located along the Skeena River to participate in the European fur trade. This settlement pattern was followed by a late contact settlement and occupation period which limited the use of the interior areas to trapping and prospecting and other restricted uses as a larger aggregation of Coast Tsimshian formed

³⁷ Seguin, Margaret, *Lest There be No salmon: Symbols in Traditional Tsimshian Potlatch in the Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. 119.

³⁸ Miller, Jay, *Tsimshian Culture: A Light through the Ages*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press), 1997, pp. 21, 24, 25, 28. With such ritual restrictions on salmon, it may be difficult to reconcile how the Tsimshian would trade it to other than responsible (related) people who could be entrusted to undertake the proper disposal.

³⁹ Mitchell, Donald and Leland Donald, *Sharing Resources on the North Pacific Coast of North America: The case of the Eulachon Fishery*, *Anthropologica*, 2001, xliii, (1):22, 30.

around Fort Simpson (post 1834).

The number of habitation sites on the Skeena River valley between the late phase precontact period and the contact period declined showing abandonment of some interior sites during the late precontact to contact period. This was in response to the post contact fur trade when the value of the subsistence economy diminished as the Tsimshian shifted to the Skeena River to maximize their access and control over the Skeena River trade route. There is almost the same number of habitation sites in the contact period and the post contact period.

Archaeological investigations in or adjacent to the Claim Area have mostly concentrated on the coast (such as the Prince Rupert Harbour area) and the canyon (Kitselas).⁴⁰ There are, however, 161 archaeological sites including villages, camp sites, cache⁴¹ sites, and rock shelters in the lower Skeena Valley.⁴² The archaeological sites found on the lower Skeena River are located at the mouths of tributary streams of the Skeena River, and on the first bench above the Skeena River.⁴³ The archaeological sites along the Skeena River were located on flat riverside terraces and were above the fall and early spring flood levels. Flooding was a major problem in the interior, mostly during the fall rains and spring snowmelt.⁴⁴

The Psacelay site dates to the mid 18th century and the Ginakangeek site (GbTh-2)⁴⁵ which is halfway between the Kitselas Canyon and the coast is a post-contact village site.⁴⁶ Psacelay is in the Gitnadoix valley while Ginakangeek is located in the Exchamsiks River. Psacelay is also located on Indian Reserve #77, which is also where the village called *Laxpse* existed, about four kilometers south of the Skeena River.

Significant food resources which were near the Psacelay site include salmon and riverine fish like varden, char, trout, land mammals and plants. More salmon run through the

⁴⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 69.

⁴¹ A cache is a collection of articles hidden for future use and may be associated with burials or caves.

⁴² Martindale mapped the location of the archaeological sites in the Skeena River. Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 16. figure 2.1

⁴³ Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp. 82-83, 97, 98; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 185, 186.

⁴⁴ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 197, 203.

⁴⁵ In Canada, archaeological sites are assigned site numbers consisting of four upper and lower case letters and a number which is called the Borden System. Canada has been divided into a grid of map units and longitude and latitude coordinate are assigned a capital letter. Borden Numbers are a sequence of four letters and a number that relates to the site's geographic coordinated and the order in which the site was recorded on the map unit. The first two letters are the site's latitude and the last two letters the longitude.

⁴⁶ Martindale defines the late precontact period 500 BP to AD 1787 and the contact period 1787-1850. Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 17.

south channel of the Skeena River than up the Gitnadoix River. All food staples were available within the catchments area of the Psacelay site.⁴⁷ The site at Psacelay shows a subsistence based on salmon and plant foods [berries] which were harvested during the summer to fall seasons. Psacelay was a late precontact site which was abandoned in the first decades of the 19th century. It had been occupied, however, for only two or three generations at most,⁴⁸ with a tentative period of occupation commencing from ca. 1740. This date would actually date the site to the protocontact period, although Martindale calls this site a late precontact period.

According to Martindale's archaeological investigations in the Skeena River watershed, there are significant differences in the settlement pattern (and socio-economic organization) between the late phase of the precontact period⁴⁹ represented at Psacelay and the contact period represented at Ginakangeek. The residents of Psacelay occupied small extended family household communities and dispersed throughout the interior zone. This settlement pattern allowed each household or House to live within its own resource territory when food staples such as salmon and berries were abundant: "Houses were the basic territorial and resource owning unit of Tsimshian society."⁵⁰ Thus Psacelay was only occupied during the summer and fall.⁵¹ Fishing stations in the Skeena River valley based on ethnographic data, likely included smokehouses and cabins at each fishing and hunting site. The cabins were similar to the permanent houses but "more roughly built."⁵²

The large houses of the late precontact Psacelay site disappeared and new smaller houses were constructed at the post contact Ginakangeek site. This decrease in house size was substantial because houses during the late precontact period, which would hold between 30 and 55 people, were reduced by more than half to houses which could support between 10 and 15 people. This reduction in house size indicates that from the late precontact to contact period the social and economic unit of the household became smaller. Whether the decrease can be attributed to biological effects like epidemics or some other cause, Martindale found that the autonomy of the former extended families had shifted to the nuclear family. Martindale interpreted the archeological data to indicate that the subsistence economy had been supplanted by other economic activities

⁴⁷ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 199, 200, 203, 206.

⁴⁸ A generation is usually represented as 25 years. So three generations would be 75 years. With an estimated abandonment in say, 1815, the site was first occupied about approximately ca 1740. Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 152, 162, 259, 279. The location of village sites is illustrated on figure 6.13, p. 158 and camp sites on figure 6-19, p. 167. Cabin sites are shown on Figure 6-22, p. 172 and cache pit sites are shown on Figure 6.26, p. 178.

⁴⁹ Martindale does not distinguish between the precontact, protocontact and post contact.

⁵⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 115, 116; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 15.

⁵¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 17.

⁵² Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 11.

and most likely by participation in the European trade economy: The subsistence economy precontact declined as the trade economy post contact increased.⁵³

At the late precontact site at Psacelay, too few species were recovered to estimate the value of salmon or shellfish or their importance to the economy other than salmon being a staple.⁵⁴ The absence of salmon fauna may be related to the ritual practice of disposing of fish remains in water or poor preservation. There is, however, a high incidence at Psacelay of floral remains in the form of elderberries.⁵⁵ Martindale found that the late precontact Coast Tsimshian society was organized to produce a sufficient subsistence surplus to permit people to survive on stored food for five months of the year and to allow households to produce sufficient excess foodstuffs:

to participate in the prestige economy of ceremonial exchange. After contact, these concerns remained, but a new way of participating in the prestige economy developed as a result of the fur trade.⁵⁶

In the late precontact period, trade in portable objects of highly valued (i.e. exotic) material was characteristic of the precontact exchange system.⁵⁷

Most of the late precontact Coast Tsimshian livelihood was not derived from surplus production for trade. Although Martindale stated that trade enabled a family to acquire goods it could not produce and exchange it to participate in the ceremonial life of Tsimshian society, he identified the surplus item as berries stored in eulachon grease, which contributed a significant surplus item.⁵⁸ The precontact Coast Tsimshian controlled resource surplus through mechanisms of social indebtedness through feasting and this was the primary exchange purpose of surplus production.⁵⁹

Based on ethnographic analogy, Martindale estimated that the two groups, (Psacelay and Ginakangeek) would have spent five months (October to February) at their winter coastal village (Metlakatla) where they lived primarily on stored food; four months (May to September) in the interior territory of the Skeena River valley where they obtained salmon, land mammals and plants; three to four weeks (late February to March) at the Nass River fishery for eulachon; and two to four weeks at Metlakatla (March or April) for herring roe, deep water fish and sea mammals. The greatest time was spent on resources in the early summer on onshore resources like salmon, and the least time was spent on

⁵³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 338.

⁵⁴ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 323.

⁵⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 245, 273, 275, 277, 278.

⁵⁶ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 40.

⁵⁷ See Bishop, Charles, *Coast-Interior Exchange: The Origins of Stratification in Northwestern North America*, 1987, *Arctic Anthropology*, 24(1):72-83.

⁵⁸ Martindale and Jurakic investigated the changing role of subsistence economies of the extended families as a result of Europeans and the rise of the market economy of the pre to post contact Tsimshian. Martindale, Andrew and Jurakic, Irena, *Northern Tsimshian Elderberry Use In the Late Pre-contact to Post-contact Era*, *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 2004, 28:254.

⁵⁹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 12, 321, 390, 395.

marine fish (ocean) and mammals.⁶⁰

Contact with maritime fur traders directly or indirectly, placed increasing value on resources like beaver, which were formerly marginal to the precontact Coast Tsimshian. With contact with these fur traders, the Tsimshian developed a more centralized regional economy.⁶¹ This is reflected in the settlement pattern of the post contact Ginakangeek site. The earliest level in the north part of the site dates from the early 19th century and represents a summer occupied hamlet of probably no more than two to four houses. The southern part of the site was probably used as a small fishing station while the houses of the north area were occupied. The next major occupation of the Ginakangeek site was between 1850 and 1875. This occupation was characterized by the abandonment of the north area houses and the construction of post and beam houses in the south part of the site. The site has since been in frequent use by recreational campers and fishers with the final phase of occupation occurring between the 1920s and 1952.⁶²

Martindale has also speculated that some village habitation or camp sites in the interior may have remained in use, or some village sites may have become camps in the contact period. Regardless, Martindale found that during the contact period, local groups started to consolidate into single summer villages, rather than staying in their resource territories. This suggested that the precontact small local groups had shifted away from habitation sites in their subsistence resource territories during the contact period to occupy sites along the Skeena River. The attraction was that the Skeena River had become a main artery of trade. Martindale describes this change: "This means there was a decrease in the significance of subsistence resources, in favour of economic activity within the trade economy."⁶³

The greatest concentrations of archaeological sites which date to the contact period were along the banks of, and at the mouth of the Skeena River.⁶⁴ During the contact period, which Martindale dates as 1787-1840, the small archaeological habitation sites located throughout the Skeena River watershed which were characteristic of the precontact period were replaced with larger village settlements, such as that of Ginakangeek where there were ten buildings, some with European design elements and artifacts. The evidence from faunal indicators (such as bones from mountain goat and mule deer), suggest that these sites which were used during the contact period, were also occupied in the summer and fall.⁶⁵

During the postcontact period, colonial phase, which Martindale identifies as 1840 to the present, there was a trend toward the abandonment of the Skeena River watershed.

⁶⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 103, 104, 105. The annual seasonal cycle is illustrated on Figure 5.2.

⁶¹ Paramount chiefs were what Garfield called "tribal chiefs". Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 4.

⁶² Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 262.

⁶³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 337.

⁶⁴ Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, p. 66.

⁶⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 191, 193, 194, 256.

Much of this abandonment related to the Coast Tsimshian being drawn into coastal urban centres such as Port Simpson. In the early contact period (after 1787), the archaeological data indicates that elderberry production increased dramatically and then declined precipitously through the 19th century. Martindale relates this decrease to a decline in traditional subsistence activities during the colonial era (post 1840) as the Coastal Tsimshian turned to market oriented activities and traded for food.⁶⁶

With the introduction of the fur trade, the movement of goods from the interior to the coast became increasingly important:

Where the pre-contact Tsimshian settlement pattern was well-suited to exploiting seasonally available resources, it did not promote continued access to interior-to-coast routes. That significant trade routes existed was a consequence of natural topography. Movement from interior to coast is limited by the Coast Mountain range to the major river valleys...the Skeena river is one of only four routes into the interior on the northern Northwest Coast. Travel by water was the primary means of shipping bulk items.⁶⁷

Summer villages were located at key points along the Skeena River which offered households the ability to exercise their rights to tariff trade goods passing through their area, as well as maintain reasonable access to resource areas.⁶⁸ What this suggests is that tributes or tolls related to trading along the Skeena River are post contact and that the village names and village level organization which became “tribal” names, may have emerged or solidified at this time.

Martindale concluded that the shift in settlement location from the interior to the Skeena River and the increase in population density:

correlates with a reduction in the economic importance of subsistence goods. With the advent of the market economy and the European demand for furs, especially land mammal furs after the sea otter population collapsed around 1805, much Tsimshian economic activity was reoriented to trade and fur trapping. Village locations on the Skeena gave each local group access to its subsistence resource territory as interior-to-coast trade through its section of the Skeena River. By the Colonial Phase [c. 1834], most of the economic activity of the Tsimshian was centred on the coastal villages.⁶⁹

Habitation sites along the Skeena River had decreased and new cabin sites were built throughout the watershed on a variety of landforms: “These differences suggest changes in the needs of the occupants through the Pre-contact to Contact Periods.” Although the interior areas of the Skeena River continued to be used

⁶⁶ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 191, 193, 194, 256.

⁶⁷ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 64, 66

⁶⁸ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 64, 66

⁶⁹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 197- 198.

for fur trapping and recreational hunting and fishing, Martindale notes:

Increasingly through the 20th century, fur trapping became less common and recreational use of the interior increased. Today there are few fur trappers in the area, but many cabins for use by sport hunters and anglers.⁷⁰

Post contact the Coast Tsimshian had developed a new form of regional settlement which included the construction of new villages on the Skeena River.⁷¹ Large village sites in the interior watershed of the Skeena River date exclusively to the contact period. These villages were on a local group's territory at that part of the territory that met the Skeena River. There were additional temporary hunting and fishing camps in the interior tributary watershed.⁷² These developments which supported increased participation in the trade economy over the subsistence economy and reduction in house size indicated to Martindale that fundamental changes in social and economic organization had occurred as a consequence of European contact. Martindale argues that these changes were part of a regional change which developed during the first 50 years after the arrival of Europeans.⁷³

In the post contact colonial area (c. 1834) there was continued occupation of interior villages but by a much reduced population. The Skeena River watershed was increasingly used by coastal residents for short periods of hunting and fishing. The Coast Tsimshian constructed special use cabins, and participated in industrial sites such as canneries, sawmills, mining camps, roads, rail lines, docks and rock fill quarries.⁷⁴ By the late 19th century, the annual journey to the interior for subsistence food collection had become "unnecessary" and the interior sites in the Skeena River watershed were infrequently used for hunting, or by a small number of individuals trapping fur. Both activities correlated with the construction of cabins, which were exclusive to the late post contact period.⁷⁵ According to Inglis and MacDonald, the lower Skeena River territories:

began to decline in importance when the Coast Tsimshian moved from their winter villages to the Prince Rupert Harbour area to Fort Simpson in the late 1830s. The increased distance to travel from this new location and the change in economic patterns led to a gradual shift away from traditional procurement strategies.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 179-181, 197- 198.

⁷¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 97.

⁷² Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 383.

⁷³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, pp. 19-20; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 2-4.

⁷⁴ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 182.

⁷⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 196.

⁷⁶ Inglis, Richard, I , MacDonald, George F., Introduction, in *Skeena River Prehistory*, R.I. Inglis

The extent of the abandonment of fishing locations can be directly correlated to the absence of settlement features like village, cabin or camp. This is demonstrated by comparing three maps produced by Martindale, Figure 6.28, which shows the late precontact period habitation sites, Figure 6.30, which shows the contact period habitation sites and Figure 6.31, which shows the postcontact period or colonial phase habitation sites. A comparison of the maps shows a marked reduction in habitation sites on the Skeena River valley between the late phase precontact period and the contact period. There is also almost the same number of habitation sites in the contact period and the post contact period. Martindale concluded from this evidence, that as a response to the post contact fur trade, the value of the subsistence economy had slowly diminished as the Coast Tsimshian shifted to the Skeena River to maximize their access and control over the Skeena River trade route.⁷⁷

Martindale would also conclude that not all “tribes” identified in the ethnographic record can be associated with habitation sites in the precontact late phase period. The Gispaxlo’ots, Gitando, Gitzaxlaal (or more precisely, the areas ethnographically associated with these named groups) are not shown to have sites with houses or camp sites on the Skeena River. In the contact period, however, all ethnographically identified groups except the Gilitss’aaw, the Gitando, and the Gitnadoiks (or rather, the occupants of the areas ethnographically associated with these named groups) *are* shown to have village sites on the Skeena River.⁷⁸ This finding differs from the location of groups as shown on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map. This would suggest that the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map may not represent late precontact conditions.

Archaeology vs. Ethnographic model of Tsimshian Settlement and Social organization.

After Martindale had undertaken his archaeological investigations of the Skeena River, he was able to critically review the various models put forth by ethnographers of the Coast Tsimshian. He noted that Franz Boas had stated that the Coast Tsimshian practiced a seasonal round in which they would move from the coast (Metlakatla) to the Skeena River and to the Nass Rivers. According to Boas, this settlement pattern characterized the “traditional” society, which has been interpreted by many cultural anthropologists to represent Coast Tsimshian precontact society. Boas found that the maximum level of social and political organization was the village and this organization was headed by a village chief. During the post contact period according to Martindale, Boas described the Coast Tsimshian residing in a year round settlement on the coast at Fort Simpson and the maximum social unit was the lineage led by a lineage leader.⁷⁹

Viola Garfield, Boas’ student, incorporated some changes into the Boasian model, but this model too was based primarily on ethnographic work. Precontact (or prior to the 18th century) Garfield stated that the Tsimshian occupied year round locations in the Skeena River watershed. The maximum social unit was the lineage or House, and the House or

& G.F. MacDonald (eds.), pp. 1-17. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 87, Mercury Series, (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada), 1979, p. 7.

⁷⁷ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 66, 187, 198, 195.

⁷⁸ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 187, 193.

⁷⁹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 108, 388.

lineage leader was the highest political representative. As a result of Europeans on the Northwest Coast early in the 18th century, the Coast Tsimshian developed a seasonal round between the coast and the interior. This is when the village became the maximum social unit and the village chief was the political representative of the village. After contact with Europeans in 1787, Garfield stated that the Coast Tsimshian settled year round in both the Skeena River and at Metlakatla. This is when the multi-village or “tribe” developed as the social unit, led by a “tribal chief.”⁸⁰ Martindale notes that in Garfield’s later work she stated that the summer villages were analogous to the winter villages and that the permanent villages at Metlakatla developed out of permanent villages along the Skeena.

According to Martindale, the two primary ethnographers on the Coast Tsimshian, Boas and Garfield, do not agree on the nature of Tsimshian settlement of the interior area of the Skeena River watershed. Franz Boas stated that the Tsimshian owned three permanent sites: Metlakatla (winter village); Nass River (eulachon fishery) and the interior of the Skeena River watershed. Martindale also believes that it is Boas’ work which is the source for the ethnographic settlement pattern shown in the Historical Atlas of Canada to represent the period c. 1750.⁸¹ Boas however, ignored developments since the time of contact and portrayed this settlement pattern as if it was characteristic of late precontact society.⁸²

Martindale determined from his archaeological investigations that Boas’ description of the Tsimshian seasonal cycle settlement pattern actually described the early 19th century (post contact) and was: “largely indigenous responses to European influence.”⁸³ Garfield’s late 18th century depiction of Coast Tsimshian settlement pattern, on the other hand, fused aspects of a precontact settlement pattern with that of the winter pattern characterized by a seasonal round between coast and interior.⁸⁴ This is why caution must be placed on the use of ethnographic resources including Tsimshian narratives,⁸⁵ when attempting to reconstruct the precontact Coast Tsimshian.

Since the Coast Tsimshian (specifically the Gispaxlo’ots under the leadership of Legaic)

⁸⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 108, 388 Table 5.4.

⁸¹ Macdonald, George F., Coupland, Gary and Archer, David, *The Coast Tsimshian, ca. 1750*. Plate 13. *Historical Atlas of Canada. Vol. 1: From the Beginning to 1800*. R. Cole Harris, editor, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 1987.

⁸² Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 387.

⁸³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 389. Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 388.

⁸⁴ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 388.

⁸⁵ The Tsimshian narratives include the vast corpus of narrative forms collected by Boas, Barbeau and their collaborators such as William Beynon and Henry Tate. These texts include stories, myths, legends, folklore, life histories and other native discourse including a particular genre called “adawx.” The function of adawx is to provide the foundation from which to assert family or lineage owned ritual and property rights during a feast or potlatch when it can be validated or disputed.

are frequently described as trading up the Skeena River, which according to Martindale developed post contact, it is important to consider the archaeology of the groups they purportedly would have been trading with, and when they would have been trading.

The fortified village site of Gitlaxdzawk in Kitselas Canyon for example, provides good evidence of contact with the coast in the form of sea mammals and shells, although the nature of the interaction is difficult to assess. The shell types found included *Clinocardium nuttalli* [cockles], *Mytilus californianus* [mussels], and *Haliotis sp.* [abalone] which was in the form of an artifact. However, there is no precontact evidence of trade between the coast and Kitselas canyon. Allaire, MacDonald and Inglis state: "The traditions [narratives] which depict the Kitselas as being intermediaries between the coastal-interior trade have yet to be verified in the archaeological record."⁸⁶

Archaeologist Paul Prince⁸⁷ is one of the few archaeologists of the Skeena River who focused on the protocontact period. This is the period when native societies would have been exposed indirectly to European contact, either through trade goods or disease. Prince's dissertation focused on the Gitksan, who are identified in the ethnographic record and the Tsimshian narratives as important trading partners of the Coast Tsimshian, specifically the Gispaxlo'ots. Although Prince's dissertation focuses on the effects of indirect contact by Europeans (the protocontact) on native social ranking and settlement patterns, he concluded that it was competition for trade between native groups in the protocontact period which contributed to increased warfare, population movement, amalgamation and increasing sedentism of Upper Skeena River groups, particularly near trade routes.

Protocontact Trade

Native trade may have brought iron across the Bering Strait as early as 1648 and these European goods reached the Skeena River at the beginning of the eighteenth century (c. 1700). Prince sees this protocontact period as characterized by a general increase in wealth and power within and between local and corporate groups.⁸⁸ It was the native chiefs who assembled the furs, organized the labour to process them and interacted and bargained with other traders. It was also possible at this time (protocontact) to distinguish between houses belonging to high status people, for they had a more varied diet, had access to exotic and prestigious species and probably had a more important role in fur trading.⁸⁹ Prince also concurs with George MacDonald's finding that the introduction of Russian fur trade goods in the early 1700s resulted in a general drifting northward with the Tsimshian eventually displacing the Tlingit.⁹⁰

According to Prince, it was the combination of population movement and amalgamation in the early 18th century that brought the Coast Tsimshian together into ethnographically

⁸⁶ Allaire, Louis, George F. MacDonald & R. Inglis, Gitlaxdzawk: Ethnohistory and Archaeology, in Skeena River Prehistory, edited by R.I. Inglis & G.F. MacDonald, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 87, Mercury Series, Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1979, p. 138.

⁸⁷ In 2001, Paul Prince taught anthropology at Trent University in Peterborough Ontario.

⁸⁸ Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. PhD thesis, McMaster 1998, pp. 54-56, 62, 72, 86, 93.

⁸⁹ Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. PhD thesis, McMaster 1998, p. 62.

⁹⁰ Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. PhD thesis, McMaster 1998, p. 20.

recognizable groups called “tribes.”⁹¹ The importance of this distinction may also extend to trading prerogatives, for as they are described in the ethnographic data, trading prerogatives always refer to “tribes” and not clans, and to “tribal” leaders and not lineage leaders.⁹² This suggests a post contact origin.

As a result of his findings Prince cautioned archaeologists who use ethnographic data to interpret archaeological data in the Skeena River region:

Archaeologists have taken the ethnographic record in the Skeena region as a representation of how things operated for millennia. For instance 1) the historic network of regional exchange in northern British Columbia is inferred to have operated as it was for 3000 years (MacDonald 1987: vii); 2) the social ranking system is presumed to have been in place for the last 2500 years (MacDonald⁹³ 1987: viii; Coupland⁹⁴1988); 3) the nineteenth century Gitksan system of resource ownership has been used as a general model for the last 2500 years (Coupland 1988:30); 4) the pattern of warfare has been extended back 2500-1300 years (Carlson 1996:223⁹⁵; Fladmark⁹⁶ 1986); and 5) group territories and traditional knowledge are presumed to extend back more than 5000 years (Harris 1995⁹⁷).⁹⁸

Although Prince acknowledged that aspects of each of these subjects may be represented in the precontact record, they should not be removed from their context and assumed that they represent the entire ethnographic region:

There are many sites along the Skeena, but most of them lack evidence of permanent occupation and are small, such as scatters, caches and isolated house depressions. These sites tend to be located near the confluences of small streams and major rivers and occur in high densities at major canyons. These sites are not at all contemporary, but the pattern does indicate an orientation towards particular types of locations and activities – probably mainly seasonal fishing for salmon which could be easily

⁹¹ Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. PhD thesis, McMaster 1998, p. 171.

⁹² This is not an issue of semantics but one of real changes in political organization prompted by European influence.

⁹³ MacDonald, George, Introduction, in Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare. pp.vii-xxv. edited by George F. MacDonald and John J.Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987.

⁹⁴ Coupland, Gary, Prehistoric Cultural Change at Kitselas Canyon (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1988.

⁹⁵ Carlson, Roy, The Later prehistory of British Columbia, in Early Human Occupation in British Columbia, edited by Roy Carlson and L. Dalla Bona, pp. 215-226, (Vancouver: UBC Press), p. 1996.

⁹⁶ Fladmark, Knut, British Columbia Prehistory, (Ottawa, National Museums of Canada), 1986.

⁹⁷ This refers to Harris, Heather 1995, Integration Oral Tradition and Traditional Knowledge in the Identification of Ancient Gitksan Village Sites, Paper presented at the 28th Canadian Archaeological Meetings, Kelowna.

⁹⁸ Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999:84.

netted and trapped at streams and canyons.⁹⁹

Prince extended his analysis to the lower Skeena River: “On the lower Skeena and Nass there are a number of villages. Village sites tend towards canyons and major river confluences, and have clusters of smaller sites around them which may have been used seasonally.”¹⁰⁰ Prince concluded that based on the distribution of sites, during the post contact period (which includes the protocontact period), there were more villages in the Upper Skeena River than precontact. The new post contact villages were established on junctions of historic trade routes which connected the Upper Skeena to Native trading partners:

Most notably, there are far more villages on the Upper Skeena in post contact times. This represents a dramatic increase in the evidence for permanent village settlement. Where settlement form is known at these sites, it closely represents the ethnographic Northwest Coast plank-house village... In terms of settlement location, canyons continued to be important locations for sedentary settlements and small confluences still had smaller camps. Major river confluences seem to be important locations for new villages. These are also the junctions of historic trade routes which connected the Upper Skeena to Native trading partners and to the sources of European goods discussed earlier. Several of the villages at key junctions are fortified. MacDonald (1984:9) suggested that forts were established in the protohistoric [protocontact] period to control access to trade routes. The importance of European trade is indicated in nineteenth century fur trade records which relate that inter-tribal trading expeditions occasionally turned violent and there was competition over the middleman position in trade between the interior and coast....¹⁰¹

Prince stated that the differences found in the archaeological evidence in the pre and post contact settlement pattern in the Upper Skeena, in addition to the increased fortifications on key routes of the trade routes suggested one thing:

that competition over control of trade in European goods and furs contributed to the establishment or expansion of this settlement system on the Upper Skeena. Trade competition is verified in both the oral and written records and oral traditions further relate expansion of Gitksan territories at the expense of their northern interior neighbours (Duff 1959).¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999:85-86.

¹⁰⁰ Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999:86.

¹⁰¹ Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999:86-87.

¹⁰² Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term

Prince's findings for the Upper Skeena River, which support a shift to more sedentary occupation of the upper Skeena River post contact as a result of protocontact European trade, are independently supported by Martindale's findings on the lower Skeena River. Both archaeologists found a similar pattern and similar rationale, for the change, namely European trade.¹⁰³

Anthropologist and Ethnohistorian, Charles Bishop studied precontact exchange between the coast and interior. He described the precontact trade as characterized by inter and intra-community exchanges in "nonessential- but not necessarily non-utilitarian- luxury goods involving a trading partner...." The key elements of this precontact exchange were luxury items and a partner. Bishop argued further that hereditary positions on the coast likely developed when the exchange of luxury goods could be monopolized by a few individuals. On the coast the items exchanged may have included horn, eulachon oil, furs and other materials: "These and other items were exchanged in early historic times." Bishop also noted that the existence of restricted rights to luxury goods would have required social acceptance through the potlatch, which then became a means of publicly validating positions. These positions were consolidated into hereditary offices among kinsmen and the precontact exchanges were accelerated by the influx of large quantities of European trade goods and later by the appearance of Europeans themselves:¹⁰⁴

Although coast-interior trade links appear to predate European intervention, the volume and regularity of trade appears to have increased markedly during the protohistorical [protocontact] period that began in the 1770s. Evidence of this comes from Chinlac, a site excavated by Borden (1953) at the junction of the Stuart and Nechako Rivers that produced late eighteenth century trade goods as well as dentalium shells and copper beads.¹⁰⁵

Trading prerogatives based on kinship which characterized the Coast Tsimshian, was extended to interior groups. As Bishop notes:

As intergroup alliances were extended to and consolidated among new groups, those who came to control the privilege to trade validated it by hosting a potlatch and often by marrying a relative of a high status person in another village...processes of change quickened during protohistoric

Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999, p. 87.

¹⁰³ As neither Prince nor Martindale cite each other's work in their bibliographies, I have assumed that their excavations and mutually confirming results, were independent of each other.

¹⁰⁴ Bishop, Charles, Coast-Interior Exchange: The Origins of Stratification in Northwestern North America, 1987, *Arctic Anthropology*, 24(1):74.

¹⁰⁵ Bishop, Charles, Coast-Interior Exchange: The Origins of Stratification in Northwestern North America, 1987, *Arctic Anthropology*, 24(1):75. A Chinese coin was found at Chinlac and trade copper items dated to 1705 AD. ±75: "it is now apparent that trade objects of European origin began to appear in the Skeena River district in the early decades of the eighteenth century although the first Europeans did not travel this river before another century had passed. MacDonald, George, Cove, John, J., Introduction, in *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John J. Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. xix.

[protocontact] and historic times....¹⁰⁶

Precontact: Coastal Marine Resource Use

In terms of archaeological sequencing, the Pacific Period began 5000 BP¹⁰⁷ and ended with direct contact with Europeans in the end of the 18th century. This period is usually divided into early, middle and late phases and the latter phase dates from 1500 BP to contact.

There are numerous excavated sites on the coast in Prince Rupert Harbour which is in the Claim Area. They are located on Tugwell Island, an island in Metlakatla Bay, Digby Island, Kaien Island, Ridley Island, Garden Island and the neighbouring continental coast line.¹⁰⁸

Archaeologist Frances Stewart¹⁰⁹ like Martindale, has also noted the limitations of using ethnographic data to interpret archaeological remains recovered from the coast for the precontact period.¹¹⁰ Stewart analyzed fish fauna [bones] from 5000 years ago to the 18th century from archaeological remains at Dodge Cove of Digby Island in the Prince Rupert Harbour area. The site is known as the Boardwalk site [GbTo31]. On the basis of the fish fauna recovered from the Boardwalk site, Stewart determined that immature halibut was one of the heavily fished species by the precontact peoples and that most other marine resources caught like sculpin¹¹¹, some flatfish, sea perches, rockfishes, mussels, barnacles, ratfish, greenlings, cabezon, and shore crabs, etc. were also obtained from the shallow water bordering the coast: The shallows: “would likely have been the most productive area for precontact fishing.” Fish like eulachon, and herring live in schools in open ocean water but they migrate to shallower waters to spawn. Not only were these fish available in shallower water, so were their predators like dogfish, other sharks, salmon, albacore and possibly cod.¹¹²

Because ratfish have poisonous reproductive organs they may have been harvested for their teeth or oil and not their flesh. Rockfish is edible and may have been harvested for food. Greenling are bottom fishes which are common around kelp beds but they can be found in shallow water throughout the year. Cabezon (a rockfish) are also abundant around kelp beds and spawning occurs between January and March. Since the roe of cabezon are poisonous, it was not likely eaten. Flatfish were perhaps the most important food-fish in the shallow water group. They have edible flesh and some are very large like halibut (although as noted only immature halibut were taken). They breed in shallow

¹⁰⁶ The trade was in luxury items and it was controlled by nobles. Bishop, Charles, *Coast-Interior Exchange: The Origins of Stratification in Northwestern North America*, 1987, Arctic Anthropology, 24(1):76.

¹⁰⁷ BP means Before the Present. The Present is 1950 AD.

¹⁰⁸ Ames, Kenneth, M., *Economic prehistory of the northern British Columbia coast*, Arctic Anthropology, 1998, 35:71, 72, figure 2.

¹⁰⁹ Frances L. Stewart was Honorary Research Associate in Anthropology at University of New Brunswick.

¹¹⁰ Stewart, Frances, L. *The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia*, Syesis, 1975, 8:377.

¹¹¹ Sculpins are bottom feeding fish which are not generally considered good to eat. They have sharp spines rather than scales.

¹¹² Stewart, Frances, L. *The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia*, Syesis, 1975, 8: 378 Table 1, 386.

water at different times during the winter, which makes them easily caught over a long period of time.

Rock sole are abundant from Cape Scott to Dixon Entrance. They migrate into shallow waters directly off the Prince Rupert area from May to October. Rock sole was probably regarded as food during the precontact.¹¹³ The starry flounder is a coastal fish which frequents bays, inlets and sounds of the North Pacific Ocean. It also swims into freshwater streams and can be found at mouths of rivers from November to February when it spawns in shallow water. This species would have been caught in the Prince Rupert Harbour area in winter. The Coast Tsimshian had a special tool, “the halibut hook” for fishing this species. Therefore it is probable that in the coastal shallow areas, flatfishes, particularly halibut and flounders were: “likely the most sought after species in this habitat” and particularly in winter. Despite their importance, however, Stewart cautioned that halibut was not as important as fish which live in the open water in schools.¹¹⁴

Herring spawn in late winter and are heaviest in early spring along the coast. Herring eggs are laid in the inter-tidal area and adhere to seaweeds, rocks or other supports and are generally abundant along the coast. Since they run in the spring (March) at a critical food shortage period, their absence from archaeological data recovered from the Boardwalk site was considered surprising. Stewart cites sampling error as a possible reason for their absence. Since their bones are very small they may have been missed during the excavation, or they may have decomposed or have been scavenged. Herring eggs leave no archaeological record.¹¹⁵

Prince Rupert Harbour is well within the range of all five species of salmon. Pink Salmon ascend the rivers in mid July, peak in August and spawn throughout September. However, the Skeena River system including its tributaries is the most important system for pink salmon. Chum [Dog salmon] enter the Skeena River and tributaries from mid July to Early September when spawning takes place in September. Coho spawn relatively late (October and November) when creek levels rise with increased precipitation. They run up at least as far a Lakelse River in October or later. Sockeye spawn at the outlet or in tributaries to lakes in late summer or autumn. The Skeena River is also the main sockeye producing area in northern B.C. They run from mid June to mid August with peaks in late July and early August. Nass River sockeye runs peak at the earliest in late June or early July.¹¹⁶

Some sockeye salmon spawn closer to the ocean while others migrate upriver prior to spawning in the fall. Chinook salmon (also called Spring salmon) move inshore into the rivers through much of the year. Concentrated runs occur in June, July and August with peak spawning occurring in September. Stewart concluded from his analysis of the fish

¹¹³ Stewart, Frances, L. The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia, *Syesis*, 1975, 8:379, 381.

¹¹⁴ Stewart, Frances, L. The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia, *Syesis*, 1975, 8:381, 382, 384, 385.

¹¹⁵ Stewart, Frances, L. The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia, *Syesis*, 1975, 8:382, 383.

¹¹⁶ The earlier arrival of these salmon may explain why groups such as the Nass Indians would have salmon earlier than other groups to the south and why they, and other more northern groups with earlier runs, would have provided salmon to Fort Simpson first.

fauna recovered from the Boardwalk site: “It is apparent that salmon were used by both prehistoric and historic Coastal Indians.”¹¹⁷

Eulachon was more important for its oil than its flesh. They run from mid March to May on the Nass River and also on the Skeena River in March and April. Eulachon were, however, absent at the Boardwalk site which might be explained by the processing which occurs at the Nass River.¹¹⁸ The archaeological evidence of the type of fish caught at the Boardwalk site in Prince Rupert Harbour during the precontact period is heavily concentrated on schooling fish (salmon), and on fish caught in shallow waters.

R.W. Nolan wrote a Masters thesis specifically on the precontact Coast Tsimshian use of fish resources. Nolan also found that the ethnographic sources were too unreliable to quantify dietary subsistence values from fish. However, the ethnographic evidence did suggest that trapping methods associated with weirs or traps in conjunction with spearing or dip netting, were of major importance to the precontact peoples.¹¹⁹

Nolan stated that the early ethnographers (like Boas and Garfield) drew assumptions about the type of salmon harvested from informants and myths and made little distinction between the five species of salmon. Nolan found that the ethnographic descriptions did not agree with the salmon types reported on the Skeena River. On the basis of mythology, for example, Franz Boas stated that spring (Chinook) was a major species caught by the Coast Tsimshian in the winter. Chinook was a variety of salmon that could be caught in spring, but Chinook were not the most important species harvested by the precontact Coast Tsimshian. By relying on myths, Boas may have erroneously inferred that the type of salmon caught by the Coast Tsimshian was that reported within the context of myths involving winter starvation. This would lead Boas to conclude that spring [Chinook] salmon was most important to the Tsimshian, because spring salmon would be the first species to arrive in the spring and relieve the starvation reported in the myths.¹²⁰

Boas’ student, Viola Garfield claimed that the most important salmon species for the Tsimshian was coho followed by sockeye and pink. Garfield said that these species were the most important for preservation and winter use. Nolan, however, found that Garfield confused spring [Chinook] salmon with coho.¹²¹

Despite these inadequacies with the ethnographic record, Nolan suggested that the combined ethnographic and archaeological data gives a general idea of what fish the Coast Tsimshian would have exploited precontact. The bullhead mentioned in the ethnographic sources is probably cabezon based on the archaeological data. Although the ethnographic sources identify halibut as an important species, three species of flatfish

¹¹⁷ Stewart, Frances, L. The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia, *Syesis*, 1975, 8:383.

¹¹⁸ Stewart, Frances, L. The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia, *Syesis*, 1975, 8:384.

¹¹⁹ Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 156, 158, 165.

¹²⁰ Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 166, 176, 382, 383, 384.

¹²¹ Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 166, 176, 382, 383, 384.

were taken, including arrowtooth and starry flounders.¹²²

In December, January and early February there were no highly desirable fish available in the Claim Area, but there were spiny dogfish, ratfish, starry flounder, possibly cod, lingcod, rock cod and others. This would favour winter settlements on the outer coasts, barring inclement weather. Sea mammals and shellfish also favour winter settlements on the coast.¹²³ The spring pattern would favour the herring run but it was limited to a few days. It was also taken in shallow water off coastal islands and portions of the mainland. Precontact the Coast Tsimshian would likely not have needed to move far from their winter village to exploit herring especially for its eggs or spawn. Also in the spring, the adult halibut would be moving into shallower waters and would be easier to capture. Other winter fish would also be easier to catch as they moved to more productive fishing banks. These resources could be efficiently exploited by small population units operating from base camps. Even though there is a run of eulachon on the Skeena River, it is less abundant than on the Nass and not great enough for “profitable exploitation.”¹²⁴ Not all five species of salmon would be equally exploited due to differences in abundance and preservation concerns, because not all salmon can be equally preserved. Pink and chum [dog salmon] are the only species that can be preserved long enough to last the whole winter. This likely contributed to a greater reliance on these species. Most sockeye do not spawn in the Claim Area, but move through the lower Skeena River on their way to spawning sites in Gitksan territory on the Upper Skeena. Sockeye would have been available to the precontact Coast Tsimshian only when they were running between June and August, after which time, most would have passed through their territory.¹²⁵

Based on spawning location and availability, the precontact Coast Tsimshian would have favoured Pink, Chum and Coho followed by Chinook in second place and Sockeye in third place.¹²⁶ If any salmon were caught in the winter they were likely Chinook which were caught by trolling with a sharp angled hook. The ethnographic data, however, does not support the use of angling gear.¹²⁷

The Nass River had a lower abundance of salmon overall than the Skeena River region, but there were sockeye spawning streams along the Nass. The only major salmon (Pink and Chinook) areas are Kwinamass River (off Steamer Passage Portland Canal) and the Toon River¹²⁸ (chum salmon). According to Nolan, there are no major Coho streams in the Nass River area.¹²⁹

¹²² Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, p. 183.

¹²³ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 315, 317.

¹²⁴ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 318, 319, 321, 322, 323.

¹²⁵ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 326-329.

¹²⁶ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 328, 329.

¹²⁷ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 376, 377.

¹²⁸ Toon River flows into Quottoon Inlet.

¹²⁹ Nolan, R.W., *The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation*, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, p. 336.

Freshwater streams provided the principal harvesting areas for salmon for the precontact Coast Tsimshian. The Skeena River had the most abundant salmon stocks in the Claim Area. Pink salmon was probably the most important to precontact subsistence while sockeye was not as important. Chum (Dog) was relatively low in number while Chinooks were neither abundant nor easily preserved. Coho were third in abundance, but could be preserved as could Chum.¹³⁰ Nolan stated that the exploitation of fish on the coast during winter months would be limited to shallow areas close to shore because of weather conditions. He also stated that coastal villages in the precontact period would be more like that found on the Boardwalk site than the ethnographic villages at Metlakatla.¹³¹ This may suggest that the Metlakatla village was a post contact or protocontact development and associated with the relatively recent occupation of the Skeena River (which Martindale places in the mid 18th century).

Although the Coast Tsimshian had “potential” access to salmon on the faster moving water of the Skeena River, Coupland, Martindale and Marsden found that the Tsimshian: “underutilized that potential” for they intensively fished the tributary streams more than the Skeena River. Precontact fishing technology, which consisted of weirs and traps such as basket traps and dip nets, were not effective on the lower Skeena River, but were effective on tributary streams.¹³² Coupland, Martindale and Marsden also state that while the most effective salmon fishing technique was the gill net, these nets were unknown or unused precontact: “Drucker (1955:169) reports that the gill net and other similar types of nets were unknown to or at least unused by the Tsimshian prior to European contact (see also Rostlund 1952:85).”¹³³

Coupland, Martindale and Marsden conclude that most of the fishing in the Skeena River was from tributary streams:

for most groups the precontact catch from Skeena River itself was probably quite small compared to the catch from the territorial streams that fed the Skeena. The exception, of course, are the Kitselas who controlled the very productive canyon fishery, and took much of their salmon catch directly from the Skeena using the existing technology.¹³⁴

In addition, the harvesting of salmon along the tributaries of the Skeena River dispersed

¹³⁰Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, pp. 337, 338, 339.

¹³¹ Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977, p. 374.

¹³² Coupland, Gary, Andrew R.C., Martindale, and Susan Marsden, Does Resource Abundance Explain Local Group Rank among the Coast Tsimshian? in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory* edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 2001, p. 235.

¹³³ Coupland, Gary, Andrew R.C., Martindale, and Susan Marsden, Does Resource Abundance Explain Local Group Rank among the Coast Tsimshian? in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory* edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 2001, p. 235.

¹³⁴ Coupland, Gary, Andrew R.C., Martindale, and Susan Marsden, Does Resource Abundance Explain Local Group Rank among the Coast Tsimshian? in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory* edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 2001, pp. 235, 236.

human labour and was less efficient than at Kitselas Canyon.¹³⁵ This would have limited surplus production of salmon beyond that of the extended family.

In 1996, Frances Stewart and Kathlyn Stewart¹³⁶ expanded the fish faunal analysis started in 1977 by Frances Stewart by adding a number of new archaeological sites in the Prince Rupert Harbour.¹³⁷ Of the represented classes of fauna [fish and animal bone] at the Boardwalk site, mammals were shown to be dominant at 90.8% compared to 4.3% fish, and 4.9% birds. At the Grassy Bay site, 76.3% of the fauna was from mammals, 3.5% fish and 20.2% birds. Of the mammals, sea otters, seals and other pinnipeds¹³⁸ comprised 32.7% of the total mammals.¹³⁹ What this means is that fish were not a dominant species harvested from these precontact coastal sites in Prince Rupert Harbour. It also indicates that sea mammals including sea otters provided a great deal of food and skins for clothing and other uses.¹⁴⁰ That sea otters were used for meat is clearly indicated by butchering marks on the limb bones and vertebrae which shows meat removal. Other butchering marks indicate that the sea otters were skinned. Sea otter teeth were also valued and were found with a human burial. Harbour seals were used for meat and skins, as were fur seals and sea lions. This indicates that very large meat sources and skins were available to the occupants of the site (and that they did not have to rely on trade for clothing). Deer were the dominant land mammal but dogs, wolves, beaver and porcupine as well as a number of bones from fur bearers like bear, marten and river otter were also recovered. More fur bearers were found in the later levels of occupation, which reflects the importance of the fur trade.¹⁴¹ The deer was probably sitka deer and it too could produce skins for clothing and other uses.¹⁴² What this indicates is that the Coast Tsimshian had supplies of animal skins for clothing and would not have been dependent on trade with others for these or related fur materials.

Other Prince Rupert Harbour area sites like McNichol Creek and a site on Ridley Island, known by its Borden number, GbTn-19, by comparison with the Boardwalk site, are dominated by fish bones. The fish bones at McNichol Creek may be salmon which had been harvested elsewhere (possibly the Skeena River tributaries) and brought in as

¹³⁵ Coupland, Gary, Andrew R.C., Martindale, and Susan Marsden, Does Resource Abundance Explain Local Group Rank among the Coast Tsimshian? in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory* edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 2001, pp. 235, 236.

¹³⁶ Kathlyn M. Stewart was Research Scientist with the Canadian Museum of Nature, Ottawa.

¹³⁷ Stewart in 1977 had examined the fish fauna from only the Boardwalk site. Stewart and Stewart have added the Grassy Bay site on Digby Island and a site on Kaien Island.

¹³⁸ Pinnipeds are carnivorous aquatic mammals that use flippers for movement, like seals, sea lions etc.

¹³⁹ Stewart, Kathlyn and Frances L. Stewart, Prehistoric subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: History and Synthesis of Zooarchaeological Research in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001, pp. 179, 187.

¹⁴⁰ This may limit the necessity for pelts or skins from the interior for clothing as documented in some Tsimshian narratives as a prerequisite for trade.

¹⁴¹ Stewart, Kathlyn and Frances L. Stewart, Prehistoric subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: History and Synthesis of Zooarchaeological Research in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001, pp. 187, 191.

¹⁴² Sitka deer were probably the most important land animal to Tsimshian. Ames, Kenneth, M., Economic prehistory of the northern British Columbia coast, *Arctic Anthropology*, 1998, 35:70. This would indicate that there was no necessity on trade for skins for clothing.

winter stores. However, the Ridley Island site shows that there was some winter and heavy spring collection of shellfish, and minor use during the summer and fall.¹⁴³ Mussels tend to cluster in large numbers on rocky foreshores: “and can be easily gathered in large numbers in intertidal pools. They are a low-cost resource. Clams must be dug up, usually one at a time. Most clam species provide a higher yield than mussels but at greater cost.”¹⁴⁴

At least some of the precontact villages in Prince Rupert Harbour were occupied year round, unlike the seasonal occupation characteristic of historic times and the ethnographic pattern.¹⁴⁵ The faunal evidence from McNichol Creek, Grassy Bay and Ridley however, indicate seasonal occupations, in which the occupants exploited specialized resources such as salmon from elsewhere. These sites exhibit a trend which apparently intensified in the early historic period of a seasonal exploitation pattern or seasonal round.¹⁴⁶

Archaeologist Kenneth Ames¹⁴⁷ integrated the faunal data collected by Stewart and Stewart with artifacts from which he was able to assign time periods. In the period between 1500 BP (400 AD) and Contact, older sites such as Boardwalk and Garden Island were reoccupied and new sites such as Grassy Bay were occupied for the first time. The latter two sites appear to be residential sites (or villages). The Boardwalk site was abandoned again in the 17th century. But it was during the 18th and 19th centuries that the Coast Tsimshian started to maintain principal villages in the harbour.¹⁴⁸ The Boardwalk site was then occupied by one of the Coast Tsimshian groups. Garden Island was also reoccupied and became a historic village location. The Boardwalk site was, however at this later period, used as a non residential site for collecting fauna.¹⁴⁹ What this suggests is that the Coast Tsimshian occupation of the coast and seasonal use of the Skeena River, likely occurred during the 18th and 19th centuries. This would also support some of the Tsimshian narratives which stated that the last migration of the Tsimshian occurred in the 18th century. This point will be discussed later in this Report.

Other scholars also have found differences in the precontact subsistence pattern compared to that portrayed in the ethnographic literature. In one of the few controlled

¹⁴³ Stewart, Kathlyn and Frances L. Stewart, Prehistoric subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: History and Synthesis of Zooarchaeological Research in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001, pp. 194,195.

¹⁴⁴ Coupland, Gary, Prehistoric and Economic Change in the Tsimshian Area, Research in Economic Anthropology, 1988 3:236; MacDonald, George F. and Richard I. Inglis, An Overview of the North Coast Prehistory Project (1966-1980), *B.C. Studies*, 1980-1981 (48):56.

¹⁴⁵ Stewart, Kathlyn and Frances L. Stewart, Prehistoric subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: History and Synthesis of Zooarchaeological Research in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001, p. 197.

¹⁴⁶ Stewart, Kathlyn and Frances L. Stewart, Prehistoric subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: History and Synthesis of Zooarchaeological Research in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001, p. 197.

¹⁴⁷ Kenneth Ames is Professor and Chair, Department of Anthropology, Portland State University.

¹⁴⁸ These dates correspond with Martindale's findings on the Skeena River.

¹⁴⁹ Ames, Kenneth, M., Economic prehistory of the northern British Columbia coast, *Arctic Anthropology*, 1998, 35: 75, 78, 79.

analyses of faunal material, the 1600 year old village at the McNichol Creek site shows that subsistence was based mainly on stored salmon, supplemented by shellfish, deer and herring. What have been considered ethnographically important resources from distant locations like eulachon and sea mammals were apparently not used by the occupants of this site. This precontact model of subsistence differs from the historical ethnographic pattern as it shows that certain key resources (eulachon and sea mammals) were not used in the early precontact period.¹⁵⁰

The McNichol site is in Melville Arm on the mainland north side of Prince Rupert Harbour, just west of the mouth of the McNichol Creek. Based on the site location, McNichol is located in an area considered by the plaintiffs on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map to be jointly owned.¹⁵¹ This would indicate that shellfish, deer and herring were common property.

Coupland, Bissell and King describe how the account of the seasonal pattern as depicted in the ethnographic record, which includes salmon, land mammals, sea mammals, eulachon, shellfish, herring, seaweed, halibut and eulachon, can only provide a general account of subsistence activities and how it ignores variability:

At least some variability should be expected since rights to resources were owned by lineages or "Houses," and Houses were not equally wealthy in terms of ownership. Poorer Houses may not have had access to all of the resources mentioned above, and therefore may not have participated fully in the generalized model of the annual round.¹⁵²

The McNichol site provides an example of differential access to resources and inequality between groups, for it represents the occupation of a local group which did not have sea mammal hunting territories from outside the inner harbour area. Sea mammal sites were relatively few in number and hunters required a costly procurement technology and specialized hunting canoes.¹⁵³ Coupland, Bissell and King also suggest that intensive harvesting of eulachon fishing may not have been developed until the introduction of the funnel-shaped eulachon net, which was not introduced until just prior to the historic period. But since the herring rake was aboriginal, this technology would have been the principal means of obtaining large quantities of eulachon. The authors conclude that if the Nass eulachon fishery did exist in precontact times, then the absence of eulachon at the McNichol site may indicate a lack of access by the occupants of the McNichol site.¹⁵⁴ The ethnographic record actually supports this, for not all of the Coast Tsimshian went to fish eulachon as some fished for halibut or hunted deer and birds, and others remained in the winter village.¹⁵⁵ William Beynon described how some Tsimshian would go to the

¹⁵⁰ Coupland, Gary, Bissell, Craig and Sarah King, Prehistoric Subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: Evidence from the McNichol Creek Site. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 1993, 17: 59.

¹⁵¹ See Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map, August 2, 2005.

¹⁵² Coupland, Gary, Bissell, Craig and Sarah King, Prehistoric Subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: Evidence from the McNichol Creek Site. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 1993, 17: 59-62.

¹⁵³ Coupland, Gary, Bissell, Craig and Sarah King, Prehistoric Subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: Evidence from the McNichol Creek Site. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 1993, 17: 67-68.

¹⁵⁴ Coupland, Gary, Bissell, Craig and Sarah King, Prehistoric Subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: Evidence from the McNichol Creek Site. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 1993, 17:68.

¹⁵⁵ Mitchell, Donald, Sebassa's Men, in *The World is as Sharp as a Knife: An Anthology in Honor*

Nass River for eulachon and grease while others went for herring eggs.¹⁵⁶

For the precontact group which occupied the McNichol site, herring may have been second in importance to salmon. Based on the faunal material, the McNichol site was occupied for much more of the year than described in the ethnographic model. The faunal evidence indicates that the precontact group who occupied this site relied more on dried salmon, herring and shellfish instead of eulachon or sea mammals, and over a longer period of the year, from mid winter to mid summer. This indicates that there was much more intensive occupation of one site, than described in the ethnographic model which is based on multiple seasonal moves:

Not all local groups vacated their winter villages at the end of the winter to fish for eulachon on the Nass River, or to hunt sea mammals on offshore islands in the spring. The ability to undertake these activities depended upon ownership of hereditary rights that ensured access to these resources.¹⁵⁷

Since a greater variety of fish species is represented in the archaeological record than in the ethnographic data, this suggests that Coast Tsimshian informants in their recollections of marine resource use, may have only stressed the most important species, perhaps those which were heavily fished or those which later had commercial value. It also suggests that the dependence on salmon and any necessity to exchange for salmon, would be offset by the availability of other marine and non marine resources.

Protocontact –Indirect Contact with Europeans

European trade goods such as metals were converging on the Northwest coast from three or four directions by the beginning of the 18th century. This is three quarters of a century before Europeans established direct contact. By 1700 AD, goods were flowing to Kamchatka and Chukotka (Siberia) which were transmitted through possible trading partners such as the Chukchis.¹⁵⁸ According to George MacDonald, wars at this time were organized for control of the trade routes and for: “historic trade in metals and improved weapons.” MacDonald draws upon Boas’ finding about trading partners to describe the type of trade which would have occurred.¹⁵⁹

of Wilson Duff, edited by Donald Abbott, (Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum), 1981, p. 85.

¹⁵⁶ PABC Boas MS 2102, A1413, Beynon notes, B.F. 131.1, p. 24, 28.

¹⁵⁷ Coupland, Gary, Bissell, Craig and Sarah King, Prehistoric Subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: Evidence from the McNichol Creek Site. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 1993, 17:70, 71.

¹⁵⁸ MacDonald, George, F., The Epic of Nekt: the Archaeology of Metaphor, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past, Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, pp. 74, 76. This article was evidently a reading copy as it lacks references. That iron and other non native trade goods filtered into Coast Tsimshian societies before the actual arrival of explorers and fur traders is also noted by Garfield. Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 7. The Chukchis are the aboriginal people of the Bering Strait and the Chukchi Peninsula in Siberia.

¹⁵⁹ MacDonald, George, F., The Epic of Nekt: the Archaeology of Metaphor, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past, Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, pp. 76, 78.

According to George MacDonald, in about 1720 AD, the Haida would have pushed the Tlingit north from the Prince of Wales archipelago (hence the establishment of the Haida known as Kigarnie or Kaigani).¹⁶⁰ MacDonald stated that this was also about the same time that the Tsimshian migrated out of the Skeena River estuary and dislodged the Tlingit possibly from the Prince Rupert Harbour. This general pattern of movement was related to groups pushing other groups: “to secure the trading trails that ultimately connected through to southeast Alaska and the new sources of wealth [Russian trade goods].”¹⁶¹

There is ethnographic and mythological data recorded in Tsimshian narratives that suggest that there were considerable migrations of individuals and small groups in the Claim Area. People could and did migrate out of non Tsimshian areas and joined or were adopted into phratries¹⁶² and or formed new clan subdivisions:

There has also been considerable movement of Tsimshian within their own territory. Migrants had experiences and contacts not shared with relatives left behind and in time came to consider themselves as separate clans or lineages.¹⁶³

Another subdivision known as the Eagle phratry was also called fugitives or runaways [*Gwenhoot*] who traced their origin to the southern Tlingit, along the Copper River in Alaska. The Wolf phratry (clan) traced its main subdivision to the Tahltan (Northern Athapaskan speaking peoples) ancestors near the Stikine River. The migration from Tongass (Alaska) resulted in a group settling on the Nass River and the other on the lower Skeena River.¹⁶⁴

There were at least two migrations to the coast according to the Tsimshian narratives. William Beynon stated that many Coast Tsimshian base their origin to a place called *Temlax'am*, which was a great village where mostly Gispawudwada [Killerwhale clan] people lived.¹⁶⁵ They originally came from a village on the Nass River. After a great war they moved to *K'saen* (Upper Skeena River) where they established *Temlax'am*. When they were feasting one early spring or summer it began to snow which was considered: “very unusual for this time of year.” Their houses were buried by heavy snowfall and the decision was made to move away from *Temlax'am*. The largest group was led by T'sibaaessae [Sebassa]. They had already established a village at Gitsegukla and as they

¹⁶⁰ Kaigani is located on the southern tip of Dall Island in the Prince of Whales archipelago. It was formerly a Tongass Tlingit village. It was occupied by the Haida chiefs Cow [Kow] of Dadens and Cunnyah of Kiusta who migrated there within the last decade of the 18th century. Malloy, Mary, “Boston Men” *on the Northwest Coast: The American Maritime Fur Trade 1788-1844*, (Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press), 1998, p. 186.

¹⁶¹ MacDonald, George, F., *The Epic of Nekt: the Archaeology of Metaphor*, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past, Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, pp. 79, 80.

¹⁶² Technically phratries are a kinship division consisting of clans. The Tsimshian have four clans: Killerwhale, Eagle, Raven and Wolf but precontact may have had only two, like their neighbours the Tlingit and Haida.

¹⁶³ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 21.

¹⁶⁴ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 21.

¹⁶⁵ There is no archaeological evidence which locates this place which is often described as somewhere near Hazelton.

traveled down the river they stopped at *Git'slaesan* [Kitselas] which was the main Skeena canyon. The rest traveled and stopped at a place occupied by the Gin'ax'ongik [Gitnadoiks] whose village was *Lasxp'sos'-lax* meaning "village on the sand bar." Another group of these people went to the Giludzau [Gilutss'aaw] whose village was on the Skeena River called *K'laxg ls-Klax*, meaning "on the place of fresh water mussels." Several others went to live with the Gi'and [Gitando].¹⁶⁶

Another group established a village called *K'is'nga'at* meaning "a ceremonial cane kept by a particular group." Afterwards they derived their tribal name of Gitga'at [Kitiata] or "people of the cane." They stayed on the Skeena River for a short time and then went to the Ecstall River, going over land until they came to Gitga'at River where they lived until they moved to Hartley Bay. Another group of the Gispawudwada [Killerwhale] clan went to the Gitwilgyoots or "people of the kelp seaweed."¹⁶⁷

The largest group went to the sea coast and finally went to the Gitzaxlaal which were further out to sea. This group was led by *Tsib'asesae*, which means "The small grouse sits all day with closed eyes." Another Gispawudwada [Killerwhale] clan migrated from the vicinity of Millbank Sound are termed *Gid'ast'sn*. Originally this group had come down the Skeena River with the Gitga'at [Kitiata] migration and went on further down the coast. Some of this group went first to the Gitxaeas [Kitselas], while others went to Metlakatla and settled with the Gisp'axl'ts [Gispaxlo'ots].¹⁶⁸

The Tlingit once extended as far south as Hartley Bay and even Gill Island where the Kitiata first made their village. The Tlingit were also living at the Kitkatla village at *laxklan*. They fought with the Kitkatla, lost and retreated to Dundas Island. This was the last attempt by the Tlingit to: "reestablish themselves in their old grounds."¹⁶⁹

The last described Coast Tsimshian migration which led to their occupation of the Claim Area likely occurred in the 18th century. Beynon describes the origin of the camps or villages sites first established by the Gitwilgyoots on Metlakatla passage:

which latterly became the central or winter village sites of the Tsemsiyaen (proper) group. It would appear that it was a move taken after the Tinkit [Tlingit] had been driven way and the first account of any settlement by the Tsemsiyan comes when *gilax'aks* built his palisade fort at where the present Cooperative Cold Storage stands in Prince Rupert.¹⁷⁰

Beynon stated in a footnote that: "it was generally known by the Tsimshiyen [Tsimshian] that the Tlinkit [Tlingit] people dominated the coast and they were

¹⁶⁶ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. I, pp. 16-19.

¹⁶⁷ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. I, p. 20.

¹⁶⁸ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. I, pp. 21, 23.

¹⁶⁹ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, pp. 37, 38.

¹⁷⁰ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. II, p. 1.

very careful when traveling to the coast not to meet the Tlinkit [Tlingit].”¹⁷¹

The Tlingit occupied Dundas Island and Portland Canal from where they raided to take control of the mouth of the Skeena and Nass Rivers. The Tlingit subsequently fled to Dundas Island: “Despite this, the Tlingits retained a presence in some “hiding places,” including K-don (*K'ton*) [Work's Channel], *Lax-maxl*, and Ktsem-adin Creek [Khutzeymateen].¹⁷² The Gitsiis, at some unspecified time moved up the coast to exploit the fishing and hunting grounds vacated by the Tlingit. The location is not identified, but this movement was generally described as up a tributary of the Skeena River¹⁷³ from which they crossed into another valley. The Gitsiis subsequently occupied a Tlingit village called *Lax-igu-sboil* which consisted of six houses by killing the Tlingit after their return from seal hunting. Another group of Tlingit on Khutzeymateen Creek fled to Alaska.¹⁷⁴

Most migrations by the Coast Tsimshian were to places where the migrant had relatives through common clan association and have been mapped by Beynon.¹⁷⁵ It should be noted that Beynon's descriptions apply contemporary “tribal” names to groups in the distant past which may not have had these names. Although it is difficult to precisely date the timing of the numerous migrations as described in the Tsimshian Narratives in which the Coast Tsimshian moved from other areas into the Claim Area, there is evidence that the most recent migration occurred in the mid 18th century.

Anthropologist Frederica De Laguna found that the Tlingit traced the origin of their clans to the Tsimshian, “below Port Simpson,” that is at the mouth of the Skeena River: De Laguna quotes Swanton: “It is said by some that nearly all the present clans immigrated in this manner, and that most of the “old Alaskans” those whom they found in possession, died out. ...” The Tlingit narratives describe migrations from the north, south and interior associated with population movements.¹⁷⁶ De Laguna also cautioned that “if we try to interpret these stories as history, we can never be sure to what period or periods they refer....”¹⁷⁷

¹⁷¹ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. II, p. 3.

¹⁷² Work's Canal [*K'ton*] or Work Channel is identified as a place under Tlingit control in several narratives and is the place identified with the introduction of copper or metal tools to the Tsimshian. Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit - Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 60.

¹⁷³ Perhaps the McNeill River.

¹⁷⁴ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 61, 62.

¹⁷⁵ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, Migration Map.

¹⁷⁶ De Laguna, Frederica, *The Story of a Tlingit Community*. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology: bulletin 172. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1960, p. 204; De Laguna, Frederica, Tlingit, in Handbook of North American Indians, volume 7, The Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, pp. 205-206.

¹⁷⁷ De Laguna, Frederica, *The Story of a Tlingit Community*. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology: bulletin 172. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1960, p. 204; De Laguna, Frederica, Tlingit, in Handbook of North American Indians, volume 7, The Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, pp.

Archaeologist David Archer also consulted the Tsimshian narratives which suggested that the coastal areas north and south of the Skeena River were formerly occupied by the Tlingit and that they once held territory as far south as Union Passage at the southern end of Pitt Island, until they were displaced by the Tsimshian. Archer did not offer a date for displacement of the Tlingit by the Tsimshian¹⁷⁸ but he found that in the Kitkatla area there were two distinct village patterns, one in which houses were five metres wide and 15-16 metres long and the other which were much smaller, at five metres wide but only nine metres long, almost half the length. Archer suggests that the difference in house size may relate to the occupation by two different ethnic groups as implied in the oral tradition, namely the Tsimshian and the Tlingit.¹⁷⁹

Glacial advances during the Little Ice Age [c.1550-1850] in southeast Alaska and adjacent B.C. had resulted in severe blockages of rivers. This led to population displacements and disruptions to fisheries.¹⁸⁰ Anthropologist Frederica De Laguna found narratives similar to the Tsimshian among the Tlingit about glaciers, snowfall and cold which forced the migration of groups from the interior down various rivers. De Laguna dated this movement to the late 17th and 18th centuries and stated that glaciation had removed all trace of earlier occupation.¹⁸¹ Anthropologist Philip Drucker was more specific in the date. He dated the Tlingit migrations according to climate change to c. 1750 AD.

In southeastern Alaska population pressure and fighting for lands may have intensified during a period of increasing local glaciation, which reached its maximum, according to tree-ring dating, about 1750. Glaciers advanced far down the inlets, rendering large tracts uninhabitable and fishing streams unusable. Indian traditions related that the Tlingit Hunakwan sharing a winter village in Glacier Bay scattered to live at their various fishing places when a glacier destroyed their village....¹⁸²

As previously noted, according to Archeologist George MacDonald, the Haida had pushed the Tlingit north from the Prince of Wales archipelago by about 1720. He also stated that this was about the same time that the Tsimshian pushed out of the Skeena River estuary and dislodged the Tlingit possibly from the Prince Rupert Harbour as well as from the Dundas Islands. This movement was attributed to groups pushing: “to secure the trading trails that ultimately connected through to southeast Alaska and the

205-206.

¹⁷⁸ Archer, David J.W., Kitkatla Heritage Inventory Project final Report, Department of Archeology, University of Calgary, Calgary/Alberta. Prepared for the Province of B.C., 1991, pp. 20-22.

¹⁷⁹ Archer, David J.W., Kitkatla Heritage Inventory Project final Report, Department of Archeology, University of Calgary, Calgary/Alberta. Prepared for the Province of B.C. 1991, p. 135. Archer provides no dates for the occupation.

¹⁸⁰ Cruikshank, Julie, *Glaciers and Climate Change: Perspectives from Oral Tradition*. Arctic, 2001, 54 (4):377– 393.

¹⁸¹ Prince, Paul, *Ridge-Top Storage and Defensive Sites: New Evidence of Conflict in Northern British Columbia*, *North American Archaeologist*, 2004, 25(1):51; De Laguna, Frederica, *Tlingit in Handbook of North American Indians*, volume 7, *The Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, p. 206.

¹⁸² Drucker, Philip, *Cultures of the North Pacific Coast*, (San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company), 1965, pp. 75-76;

new sources of wealth [Russian trade goods].”¹⁸³

Historian Jonathan Dean referred to a narrative recorded by Boas of the Tlingit driving the Tsimshian back up the Skeena River as occurring in the recent past: “three or four generations prior to the arrival of the whites.”¹⁸⁴ This too would date to the mid 18th century. The geologist George Dawson was given similar information in 1878 by a fur trader that the Tsimshian displaced the Tlingit only about 100 years or so ago.¹⁸⁵

Anthropologist Brian Ferguson who studied warfare on the Northwest Coast, suggests that these battles with the Tlingit occurred during the same period that the Haida (Kigarnie) displaced the Tlingit from the Prince of Wales Archipelago. The reason to push north (or to the coast for that matter, from interior locations) was to gain access to the Russian fur trade. It was after this period that the Tlingit are reported to have fought to hold on to their control of trade. Based on oral accounts, food was also a major enticement to war in the precontact period.¹⁸⁶ It was during this significant protocontact period, according to MacDonald, that the pattern of warfare became endemic and associated with the destabilization of traditional boundaries. Small forts proliferated at pressure points along the trail networks:

warfare on the Northwest coast in the eighteenth century was motivated by the desire to control a new and scarce valuable resource. These trade items include metal, and especially such weapons as guns and knives. The old view of the contract period on the Northwest Coast is proving to be far too simplistic. We tend to look only at the exploration records that came with Maritime contact, overlooking the vast traditional histories of the Indian people for earlier decades of the eighteenth century and beyond. Archaeological research on the proto-historic period in the interior has also been neglected.....¹⁸⁷

Dundas Island Group

Archaeologist James Haggarty¹⁸⁸ undertook archaeological investigations of the Dundas Island group. This group of islands at the eastern entrance of Dixon Entrance is 24 km west of Prince Rupert and in the Claim Area. The islands include Zayas, Dundas, Baron, Dunira and Melville. Coast Tsimshian people from Port Simpson and Metlakatla

¹⁸³ MacDonald, George, F., *The Epic of Nekt: the Archaeology of Metaphor*, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past, Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, pp. 79, 80.

¹⁸⁴ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 61.

¹⁸⁵ Dawson, George, M., *The Journals of George M. Dawson: British Columbia, 1875-1878*, edited by Douglas Cole and Bradley Lockner, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1989, p. 520.

¹⁸⁶ Ferguson relies on George MacDonald's unpublished notes which include Tsimshian narratives. Ferguson, Brian, *A Re-examination of the Causes of Northwest Coast Warfare, Warfare, Culture and Environment*, edited by Brian Ferguson (New York, Academic Press), 1984, pp. 274, 278, 279.

¹⁸⁷ MacDonald, George, F., *The Epic of Nekt: the Archaeology of Metaphor*, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past, Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, pp. 80-81.

¹⁸⁸ At the time of the writing of his paper, Dr. James C. Haggarty was Head of the Archaeology Unit and Acting Chief of the Human History Section at the Royal British Columbia Museum.

“seasonally occupy a number of small houses located on 17 small reserves scattered throughout the islands”.¹⁸⁹

Thirty two archaeological sites have been reported to be in the northern half of the area. The sites show 12 sites had been occupied in the historic period as native habitation sites; seven were used as general activity midden sites; nine were stone wall fish trap sites and four were isolated canoe runs sites. Haggarty discovered that the sites represented two and possibly three distinct settlement patterns.¹⁹⁰

Haggarty noted that in the historic period (post contact period) many Coast Tsimshian went in the late spring to the Dundas Island group: “to gather shellfish and hunt sea mammals.” Haggarty speculated that this limited time spent on the Dundas Island group should be reflected in the archaeological record as small shell midden sites and campsites rather than large, “winter” village sites such as that found near Prince Rupert. However, Haggarty reported finding a major village site. Based on botanical information (tree ring data and forest vegetation), the village site was probably abandoned about 1680-1730 A.D.¹⁹¹

In addition Haggarty found that the Coast Tsimshian occupation of historic habitation sites did not show any evidence of prehistoric (precontact) occupation: “This fact alone indicates that there is essentially no overlap between the two apparent historic period settlement patterns.” What Haggarty means is that there is no connection between the large village site dated by botanical information to 1680-1730 AD and the historic occupation sites related to the Coast Tsimshian (which he dates 1750 AD and after).¹⁹²

To explain the distinction between the occupations, Haggarty consulted the ethnographic data, particularly the Tsimshian war accounts collected by Henry Tate who worked for Franz Boas and by William Beynon, field assistant and translator to Marius Barbeau. In particular Haggarty identified the Tsimshian narratives which related information about: “prolonged conflict between the Coast Tsimshian and Tlingit, with the Tlingit being defeated by the Tsimshian.” Haggarty concluded that:

at some point in the past the Tlingit occupied Dundas Island and from it staged raids on the Tsimshian located in the Prince Rupert Harbour and Skeena River areas. Despite the detail contained in these narratives, it is not known whether the Tsimshian regained control over an area they had once occupied, or succeeded in capturing this area for the first time in the 1700s. ...what is clear from the wealth of ethnographic data collected during the first half of the twentieth century is that both Tsimshian and Tlingit groups claim the Dundas group as part of their respective traditional territory. In 1915, Beynon recorded that the Dundas region was part of the territory of Gitzaxlaal Tsimshian. This group, unlike other Tsimshian groups, had two clans (raven and wolf) rather than the usual four – a trait characteristic of the Tlingit rather than the Tsimshian. In addition many of their village names were Tlingit names and their chiefly

¹⁸⁹ Haggarty, James C., Zayas Island Archaeological Survey Project, *The Midden*, 1988, 20 (3):6.

¹⁹⁰ Haggarty, James C., Zayas Island Archaeological Survey Project, *The Midden*, 1988, 20(3):7.

¹⁹¹ This is within the protocontact period, which is post contact.

¹⁹² Haggarty, James C., Zayas Island Archaeological Survey Project, *The Midden*, 1988, 20(3):7-8.

house was associated with a subgroup of the Tongass Tlingit.¹⁹³

Haggarty also consulted ethnographic records for the Tlingit perspective and found, based on information obtained by Anthropologist R.L. Olsen in the 1930s, 40s and 50s, that the Tantakwan or Sanyakwan [Sanya or Cape Fox] Tlingit once occupied the Dundas Island group. Based on a description of the type of house associated with the Tlingit occupation, characterized by defined terraces inside the house types, Haggarty concluded that a reasonable explanation for the conflicting findings was that the major village site was a Tlingit village which was abandoned after attacks by the Tsimshian. The subsequent Tsimshian occupation was seasonal only. Haggarty also noted that the occupants of the village may have had kinship ties to both the Tsimshian (Gitzaxlaal) and the Tantakwan and Sanyakwan Tlingit. With the demise of the village in the late 1660s or early 1700s, the households dispersed to either of the two ethnic groups.¹⁹⁴

In terms of dating the different occupations, Haggarty did not employ the terms, protocontact or protohistorical period, as this distinction was not commonly used at the time of his writing.¹⁹⁵ Haggarty relied on two periods, prehistoric and historic without identifying the period in-between, namely the protocontact or protohistoric. When Haggarty considered the date of 1750 to be historic, it is actually protocontact, that is, post contact but before direct contact by Europeans. The Tlingit had direct contact with the Russians prior to the Coast Tsimshian having direct contact with Europeans, but the Tsimshian likely had indirect contact through European trade goods.

The inference to be drawn from Haggarty's work is that a Tlingit group (s) had a permanent occupation on the Dundas Islands during the protocontact and precontact periods. The Coast Tsimshian seasonally occupied the Dundas Island group protocontact and post contact. Since both the Tongass Tlingit and the Tsimshian used resources on Dundas Island in the early historic period, as will be demonstrated by the HBC records¹⁹⁶, it is likely that kinship ties between the groups and considerable intermixing existed between the two groups to permit such continued access. Since the date of the Tlingit occupation is 1630 – 1740 AD., the archaeological, historical and ethnographic evidence provides additional support for the Tlingit-Tsimshian hostilities occurring as reported in the various narratives, in the protocontact period.

There is also independent ethnographic support for the use and ownership of the Dundas Island by the Tlingit. As part of a U.S. Federal Indian policy initiative in Alaska post World War II to determine the lands held by the Alaska native people at the time of the 1884 Organic Act,¹⁹⁷ Walter Goldschmidt and Theodore Hass¹⁹⁸ interviewed natives

¹⁹³ Haggarty, James C., Zayas Island Archaeological Survey Project, *The Midden*, 1988, 20(3):8-9.

¹⁹⁴ Haggarty, James C., Zayas Island Archaeological Survey Project, *The Midden*, 1988, 20(3):9.

¹⁹⁵ The term "protocontact" was first used and applied by Ontario archaeologist William C. Noble. "Some Social Implications of the Iroquois 'In Situ' Theory." *Ontario Archaeology*, 1969, 13:12-14.

¹⁹⁶ This is discussed in detail later in this Report.

¹⁹⁷ The Organic Act of 1884 had guaranteed that the Alaska natives: "would not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use or occupation or claimed by them." Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., *Haa Aaní, Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], p. xiv.

¹⁹⁸ Dr. Goldschmidt was professor emeritus at the University of California at Los Angeles in the Department of Anthropology at the time of this updated publication. At the time of the original report in 1946, he was an anthropologist working for the Department of Agriculture. Hass was

across Alaska for relevant land use information. To ensure accuracy and reliability of their information, they verified information between persons giving separate information and the informants signed formal witness statements. Any conflicting claims were analyzed and either a determination was made, or the conflict was described as unresolved. This indicated either a conflict or joint use.¹⁹⁹

Of the many Tlingit groups which provided information were those called Saxman and Ketchikan. The Saxman, also known as Cape Fox Tlingit and Sanya appear by those names in the historical records (such as the HBC records and Maritime ship logs). The Ketchikan are known as Tongass and they appear by this name in the historical records and the HBC records. They are the Tlingit groups in closest proximity to the Coast Tsimshian.

The potential overlap area with the Tsimshian involves the Tongass:

The boundary of the Tongass aboriginal territory includes all of the Portland Canal; Pearce, Fillmore, Willard, and Nakat inlets as far as Tree Point; the southern and eastern coast of Revillagigedo Islands as far as including Haha bay, Garavinna, Annette, Duke, Zayas and Dundas Islands; and probably Moria Sound. Of this territory Annette Island, which is a reservation for the Tsimshian of Metlakatla, and the area within Canadian territory, is of course, effectively excluded.²⁰⁰

Goldschmidt and Hass also reported that the Ketchikan Tlingit territory: “went up Portland Canal as far as the community of Portland at its head. For the most part, however, they no longer go beyond River Point....”²⁰¹

In the area called “Canadian territory”, Goldsmith and Hass described the territory on Dundas, Wales and Zayas Islands and on the Nass River:

A Native of a Wolf clan formerly owned a place at the cannery of Wales Island (Herbert J. Burton #78). The Tongass people formerly went to Zayas Islands to dry halibut and gather seaweed. They have ceased to go there since the international boundary²⁰² has been established (Joseph Johns #80). On Dundas and Zayas island Tongass Natives also gathered

chief counsel with the Office of Indian Affairs. Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., Haa Aaní, *Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], p. xiii, xv, xvi.

¹⁹⁹ Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., Haa Aaní, *Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], pp. xvi, 6.

²⁰⁰ Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., Haa Aaní, *Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], p. 79.

²⁰¹ Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., Haa Aaní, *Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], p. 82.

²⁰² Convention between His Majesty and the United States of America respecting the Boundary between the Dominion of Canada and Alaska.--Signed at Washington, April 21, 1906.
http://www.lexum.umontreal.ca/ca_us/en/cus.1906.171.en.html

seagull eggs. They formerly had a number of houses in this area (Herbert J. Burton #78). Tongass Natives formerly went to the Nass River to smoke hooligans [eulachon] and gillnet for fish. They were intermarried with Nass River people and therefore had the privileges of going into this area. They also used to trade with the Nass River people.²⁰³

The informant, Herbert J. Burton, was born on Village Island on April 26, 1884 and raised in the house of his grandfather who told him about the places they used: “and I went to hunt and trap and get food with him and other members of the Tongass people”. Mr. Burton also stated: “Our people used to go to Dundas and Zayas Islands for seaweed and halibut and seagull eggs. There were a lot of houses there.”²⁰⁴ According to Susan Marsden, the Tlingit (Raven) groups made villages or seasonal camps on Dundas Island, Stephens Island, Work Channel, Khutzeymateen Inlet (*Kts'mat'iin*), *Ksiwaln* (adjacent to Tuck Inlet) and *Knamass* (Kwinamass River).²⁰⁵

The information and statements obtained from the various informants were marked on a map, Chart 4: Southeastern Alaska Showing Land Belonging to Tribes of the Tlingit and Haida.” The chart includes lands and waters which belonged to the Ketchikan (Tongass) Tlingit which extends from Dundas Island, includes all of Portland Canal. The area north of Portland Canal is shown as belonging to the Saxman (Sanya) or Cape Fox Tlingit. These areas are also claimed by the Gitzaxlaal, Gispaxlo'ots, Gilitss'aaw, Gitwilgyoots, Gitsiis and Gitando.²⁰⁶

In a narrative told by Charles Abbott to Beynon (no date),²⁰⁷ Work Channel was originally the property of the Tlingit: “The Tsimshian only passed the entrances of these inlets on their way to the Nass.” There was a village at the head of Work Channel (*laxma'xt*) which was a short distance (4 miles) over to the Skeena River. This village was encountered by the Gitsiis who first saw “copper tools”.²⁰⁸ This led to the Raven clan of the Gitsiis attacking and taking over the village of *laxma'xt* of Tlingits at Work Channel. The Tlingit fled to Tongass (Cape Fox). The warriors from other tribes who had assisted in the Gitsiis fight with the Tlingit were rewarded with slaves and “also given the right to fish here, which has been recognized to this day.” Many of the Raven clan of the Tlingit

²⁰³ Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., *Haa Aani, Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], p.83.

²⁰⁴ Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., *Haa Aani, Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946], pp. 167-168.

²⁰⁵ Marsden Susan, *Defending the Mouth of the Skeena: Perspectives on Tsimshian Tlingit Relations in Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, ed. Jerome C. Cybulski. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001: 74.

²⁰⁶ Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map.

²⁰⁷ Although no date is given, the story was probably recorded between 1927 and 1929 since Abbot was not living in 1929. Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 84.

²⁰⁸ These tools were probably metal since the Tsimshian, like other Northwest Groups lacked metallurgy other than cold hammering. For a history of the native use and European introduced copper see Jopling, Carol F., *The coppers of the Northwest Coast Indians: their origin, development and possible antecedents*, (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society), 1989.

who had resided at Work Channel were amalgamated into the Gitsiis Raven clan “and retained their old rights on the saltwater territories.”²⁰⁹

A Tsimshian narrative entitled “The Hudson’s Bay Company moves away from the Nass River” was provided by John Tate of the Gispaxlo’ots in 1948 at Port Simpson. Tate said that the Gispaxlo’ots had a camp on the east coast of Dundas Island at *Kserawtsae Kse*, known as Hudson’s Bay Pass. They went there for seaweed, dulse, herring eggs, seals, halibut, fur seal and sea otter:

The Tsimshian [Tsimshian] had at this time driven the Tlingit from Dundas Island. Many skirmishes had taken place between small groups of Tlingit and Tsimshian bands. At this time many new traders were meeting the people, and some of them came down from the north. These the Tsimshian term the Loosen (Russian)... the traders established themselves on the many small islands near *Kerawpe* (now known as Big Bay close to Port Simpson). At first only a few arrived then some time later, more. The Hudson’s Bay Company had now established their fort at *Larhgu’alaems* [Fort Simpson], and only the Gispaxlo’ots [Gispaxlots] had moved in any great numbers to the trading post newly established at Port Simpson. The other tribes still remained at Metlakatla....²¹⁰

Based on this narrative, the fisheries on Work Channel were used by the Raven clan of the original Tlingit occupants, the Gitsiis and warriors from other tribes who had assisted in Gitsiis (and presumably their descendants for Abbott states that the right “continues to this day.” The sequence of events in the Tate narrative indicates that the Tlingit were expelled from Dundas Island and then the Russian traders came into Tsimshian territory. There is a historical date for the appearance of the Russian (and Aleuts) which was in 1810. In addition, in a narrative in which the Gitwilgyoots who were described as famous sea otter hunters, as were the Gitzaxlaal and who claim the Dundas Island group, references to sailcloth and guns indicate that the narrative relates to a post contact period.²¹¹

Archaeologist Archer would also conclude: “at the time of contact, the Dundas Islands were probably occupied by Tlingit groups, though later on in the historic period these islands were taken over by the Skeena River Tsimshian.”²¹² Despite the Gitzaxlaal claim to ownership of the Dundas Island group, during the historical period, the Nass Indians were reported to be going to Dundas Island for *clacas* (seaweed) as did the Tongass Tlingit who went there for whales on May 3, 1841.²¹³ In the spring of 1838, the Kitkatla, also known in the historical record as the Sebassa people, were reported by the HBC fur

²⁰⁹ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 66.

²¹⁰ PABC, Boas Collection A 00267, Barbeau files: The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau. pp. 107, 1, p.2

²¹¹ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 174.

²¹² David J.W., Kitkatla Heritage Inventory Project final Report, Department of Archeology, University of Calgary, Calgary/Alberta. Prepared for the Province of B.C., 1991, p. 20.

²¹³ HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, May 2, 1841; May 3, 1841. PABC, Fort Simpson, Correspondence Outward, 1841-1844, A/B/20/si2. September 9, 1841, John Work/John McLoughlin. There was an “uncommon number of dead whales” found in 1841 which resulted in a large quantity of whale oil.

trader as having gone to Dundas Island: “to hunt and collect seaweed for food.”²¹⁴ Dundas Island was evidently used for marine resource harvesting by more than the Coast Tsimshian group such as the Gitzaxlaal. The Dundas Island group was also a frequent stopping place for the maritime fur traders.

Protocontact- Historical evidence

In July 1741, the second Russian (Kamchatka) expedition jointly headed by Vitus Bering of the *Sv. Petr* (St. Peter) and Alexei Chirikov of the *SV. Pavel* (St. Paul) explored the Northwest Coast. The *S. V. Pavel* had extended south from Alaska to a small cluster of islands off the Prince of Wales Island, just to the north of the Queen Charlotte Islands²¹⁵ and northwest of the mainland coast coincident with the ethnographic Tsimshian.

The two Russian vessels became separated en route with the result that on July 24, 1741, Chirikov made land fall where he encountered two canoes of Tlingit. Bering had shipwrecked off Eyak Island or Bering Island on July 20, 1741. The survivors returned in 1742 to Petropavlovsk with a cargo of sea otter pelts which had been taken over the winter while on Bering Island. These pelts soon made their way to a Chinese market and ignited what Historian Jonathan Dean has called a “fur –rush in the Russian Far East.” Over the next fifty years over one hundred companies were operating in the Alaska area. By 1784, the Russians had established a base on Kodiak Island which served as a staging area for further commercial expansion. The Russians would come to hold a 30 year lead in the sea otter trade before the renowned British explorer, Captain James Cook arrived on the Northwest Coast in 1778.²¹⁶

Archaeologist George MacDonald has associated the building of Fort Kitwanga in the Upper Skeena River area to the influence of European (Russian) trade especially in the 18th century when metal weapons including war daggers and metal arrow points gave military advantage as well as an economic one to native groups: “It is clear that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, chiefs competed with each other to control trade routes...”²¹⁷

Spanish explorer, Juan Perez reached the Queen Charlotte Islands in 1774. Perez observed that the Haida had some iron instruments for cutting, “like half of a bayonet and a piece of sword.”²¹⁸ Also associated with contact with Europeans, are biological effects in the form of epidemics. A major smallpox epidemic affected the northern Northwest Coast in the 1780s. This is evident in the records of early explorers and maritime fur traders such as the English fur trader Nathaniel Portlock, Captain of the *King George*, who accompanied Captain Dixon to explore the Northern Pacific Coast in 1787. He reported abandoned villages, pock marked faces and blindness among the

²¹⁴ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, April 15, 1838.

²¹⁵ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, p. 12.

²¹⁶ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 103, 104.

²¹⁷ MacDonald, George F., *Kitwanga Fort report*. Hull, Que.: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1989, p.18.

²¹⁸ Beals, Herbert K. (trans)., *Juan Pérez on the northwest coast: six documents of his expedition in 1774* (Portland, Ore.: Oregon Historical Society Press), 1989, pp. 4, 78, 101.

native people.²¹⁹ There is a possibility that the epidemic had been transmitted from Canton, China via Siberia through the Russians to the native population prior to the 1780s. An estimated two thirds of the Haida population was decimated by the epidemic. Wherever the source of the epidemic, the effects on inter group relations would have been immense particularly since it occurred during a significant period of climate change known as the Little Ice Age.²²⁰ Smallpox struck the Tlingit in 1775 or 1779, and worked its way south along the coast.²²¹ The Tlingit attributed the smallpox to punishment by the supernatural trickster figure, Raven, in response for their internecine wars. As Historical Geographer James Gibson observes, although the source of this epidemic is unknown, the effects are certain –death, blindness and deserted villages.²²²

By 1780 the growth of the sea otter pelt market would have immediate effects on the native groups who had access to sea otter resources on the coast. For the Coast Tsimshian, the first significant exchange commodity with the maritime fur traders was sea otter pelts.²²³

Contact Period

²¹⁹ Boyd, Robert, *The Coming of the Spirit of Pestilence: Introduced Infectious Diseases and Population Decline Among Northwest Coast Indians, 1774-1874*, (Vancouver & Toronto: UBC Press; Seattle & London: University of Washington Press), 1999, pp. 20, 24, 26, 204, 207; Portlock, Nathaniel, *A Voyage Round the World; but more particularly to the North-West Coast of American: Performed in 1785, 1786, 1787 and 1788, in the King George and Queen Charlotte, Captains Portlock and Dixon.*, Wisconsin Historical Society Digital Library and Archives, 2003, p. 272. The effects of virgin soil smallpox epidemics on native populations have not been intensively studied but would include: depopulation, territorial changes, group amalgamations, changes in balance of power between groups, general reorganization of society, and interruption in the transmission of oral traditions. Even finding a mate of the right age and kin status would be difficult in depopulated communities. A partial solution would have been amalgamation into settlements where the age-sex distribution was broad enough that mates would be available. Boyd, Robert, *The Coming of the Spirit of Pestilence: Introduced Infectious Diseases and Population Decline Among Northwest Coast Indians, 1774-1874*, (Vancouver & Toronto: UBC Press; Seattle & London: University of Washington Press), 1999, p. 217. Anthropologist Jay Miller investigated how Tsimshian elites manipulated knowledge, and how that knowledge was maintained through traditional and untraditional means to sustain the elites. Miller stressed the importance of how mythic accounts validate property rights and resource areas but also noted that the greatest trauma to any system was population loss: “knowledge belongs to the survivors, who use it for their sustenance and profit.” Miller, Jay, *Moieties and Cultural Amnesia: Manipulation of Knowledge in A Pacific Northwest Coast Native Community*, *Arctic Anthropology*, 1981, 18: 25-29, 31.

²²⁰ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, p. 274.

²²¹ Niblack, Albert, *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. (Washington), 1890, p. 237. Niblack states that the epidemic started with the Spanish.

²²² Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, pp. 273, 274.

²²³ Coupland, Gary, Andrew R.C., Martindale, and Susan Marsden, *Does Resource Abundance Explain Local Group Rank among the Coast Tsimshian?* in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory* edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 2001, p. 240. For a list of the vessels operating on the Northwest Coast 1785 and 1841 see Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992. Table 1, pp. 299-310.

In August 1787, Captain Colnett and Charles Duncan were the first reported Europeans to encounter Tsimshian speaking peoples. The Tsimshian they encountered have been subsequently identified as Kitkatla (who are not plaintiffs in this case). Although Captain Colnett noted in his journal of 1787 that he believed he and his crew were the first Europeans seen by the Tsimshian, he reported that the Tsimshian had European trade goods, including a piece of blue cloth.²²⁴ Captain Colnett's observations of the Tsimshian having European trade goods is not surprising given earlier encounters to the northern and western region by the Russians and Spanish.

Captain Colnett and crew appear to have had undisturbed access to fish on the Northwest Coast. In September 1787, as Captain Colnett traveled from Port St. James on the Queen Charlotte Islands to the eastern mainland shore he (or his crew) "caught several snappers & Hook'd several Halibut...."²²⁵ Colnett's crew also fished for salmon in the southern end of Pitt Island.²²⁶ Colnett's crew also harvested salmon from Tsimshian (Kitkatla) fisheries in October 1787, which were located just south of a fishery located at the mouth of the Kooryet Stream on Banks Island. Here Colnett's crew destroyed part of a fishing wire which had been used by native people to trap fish. The wire was likely a river salmon weir which shows a native adaptation to fishing to relatively small streams. The salmon harvested by the Colnett party was likely pink or chum based on the season.²²⁷

Captain Colnett's voyage led to a private British expedition referred to as the "Butterworth squadron" commanded by William Brown which sailed from London in 1791. Three vessels, the *Butterworth*, *Prince Lee Boo* and the *Jackall*, planned to establish a seal fishery or factories on the Northwest Coast, possibly on the Queen Charlotte Islands. This squadron shifted to collecting sea otter furs and operated for three seasons on the coast.²²⁸

In or before the early years of the maritime trade in the late eighteenth century, apparently coinciding with other migrations of groups like the Tsimshian and Tlingit²²⁹, some of the Tongass Tlingit villages on the Prince of Wales Island were taken over by the Kaigani Haida. American mariners knew the Tongass [Tlingit] were located mainly at two remaining locations which they called Tongass and Clemencitty. Clemencitty [Clemen city] is on Tongass Island near the mouth of Portland Inlet. There is a village on Tongass Island on Nakat Bay called Clemencitty. The village of Tongass on Tamgas Harbour was on Annette Island.²³⁰ Clement City or Clemencitty is identified in the historical record as *Tlehnonsiti* also *Tlechopcity*. It was located on Tongass Island just east of Cape Fox. This was where the Tongass [Tlingit] visited on their way to the Nass

²²⁴ Moeller, Beverly B., Captain James Colnett and the Tsimshian Indians, 1787, Pacific Northwest Quarterly 1966, 57(1):14-15.

²²⁵ Galois, Robert, ed. A Voyage to the North West side of America: the journals of James Colnett, 1786-89, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2004, pp. 138-139.

²²⁶ This is in ethnographic Kitkatla territory. Galois, Robert, ed. A Voyage to the North West side of America: the journals of James Colnett, 1786-89, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2004, p. 143.

²²⁷ Galois, Robert, ed. A Voyage to the North West side of America: the journals of James Colnett, 1786-89, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2004, pp. 138, 139, 143, 359, ft 314, 315, 355, fn. 275.

²²⁸ Galois, Robert, ed. A Voyage to the North West side of America: the journals of James Colnett, 1786-89, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2004, pp. 69, 326, fn. 442.

²²⁹ See section of this Report on Migrations.

²³⁰ Malloy, Mary, "Boston Men" on the Northwest Coast: The American Maritime Fur Trade 1788-1844, (Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press), 1998, p. 201.

River.²³¹

In May 1789 American fur trader, Robert Haswell aboard the *Columbia* cruised through the Butterworth rocks, which are at the entrance to Brown Passage and observed Tree Nob Island. Although Haswell made no observations of native occupation or use, he reported that he was visited by two canoes of native people as he entered a small cove and anchored somewhere, according to the notes of Howay, between Dundas Island and Stephens Island which connects to Chatham Sound. The area between Chatham Sound and Portland Canal was then known as Derby Sound. Haswell noted: "thare [sic] was every appearance that Derby Sound at some season of the year is numerously inhabited we thought it probable that some tribe might be found at no very considerable distance." Haswell subsequently noted:

we observed a canoe following us with grate [sic] haste shouted loudly for us to return. As soon as we saw them we hove about and stood inshore they soon came alongside and were very anxious for us to go to their village making signs that they had vast abundance of skins tho' they had none in their Canoe they were armed with iron barbed speers [sic] and wished one of us to go with them onshore a Chief offering to rema[i]n onboard as an hostage for our safe return. But the wind by this time had increased [sic] to a heavy gale and it would have been madness to attempt to seek a harbour so late in the day...²³²

The *Columbia* then steered from Brown Passage towards the Prince of Wales Island in Alaska.

The American maritime fur traders had gained a near monopoly on the maritime fur trade by the late 1790s, especially after Britain withdrew its ships from the Northwest Coast to fight the French during the Napoleonic wars 1792- 1815. By this time (1815), however, the sea otter population was already in decline.²³³

In 1791, Capitan Gray, an American coaster discovered that the Haida traded with the mainland (Tsimshian). In the fall after the Haida had completed their salmon fishing, the Haida traveled across Hecate Strait and bartered American trade goods, including cloth and blankets to the Tsimshian at a 200% to 300% profit. From the Tsimshian, the Haida obtained animal skins to trade to the American traders.²³⁴ By 1799, however the American maritime fur traders had intercepted this "native trade" and cut into, if not cutoff, the profits to the Haida. The Haida and other groups who took advantage of their middlemen positions between Euro-Americans and other native groups, would lose even

²³¹ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 27 fn. 52; 30 fn. 66.

²³² Howay, F. W, ed., *Voyages of the "Columbia" to the Northwest Coast 1787- 1790 and 1790-1793*, (Oregon Historical Society Press), 1990, p. 91, ft. 2.

²³³ Gough, Barry, M., *The Haida-European Encounter, 1774-1900: The Queen Charlotte Islands in Transition in the Outer Shores*, G.G.E. Scudder and N, Gessler, editors, (Skidegate, BC: Queen Charlotte Islands Museum), 1989, p. 252.

²³⁴ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), 1992, p.133.

more of their earlier middleman status in 1834 when the HBC established a post at Fort Simpson.²³⁵

On August 29, 1791, Joseph Ingraham, commander of the brigantine *Hope*, while anchored at a Haida village known as Cumshewa's village on the Queen Charlotte Islands, also reported that he had obtained information about people who occupied the mainland opposite the Queen Charlotte Islands from a Haida named *Skatzi*:

there were inhabitants on the mainland opposite to them whom he called Shaiks.²³⁶ He represented them as an ignorant set of beings, whom he said had never be on board a vessel or heard a gun. This, however, was a recommendation of them to me, though meant by Skatzi to have an opposite effect. He said they had no furs; however, this seemed unlikely, as the distance across is not above fourteen leagues. But according to the old man's account there were no sea otters anywhere else but in Cumshewa's [Cumshewa] sound.²³⁷

In September 1792, Ingraham reported that many of the natives at Cumshewa were visiting Shakes "on the main."²³⁸ This meant that the Haida from Cumshewa were visiting Chief Shakes of the Kitkatla Tsimshian on the opposite mainland where they traded European trade goods for furs. Also in 1792, the Spanish captain, Jacinto Caamaño encountered Tsimshian on Pitt Island on a village called *Ksidiya'ats*, a site which remains identifiable as an ancient habitation site. Caamaño did not encounter any Tsimshian near Metlakatla or Pearl Harbour.²³⁹

Caamaño did visit the Kitkatla chief, Jammisit [also Hammsit], and a chief named Gitejon, who was apparently accorded great respect by Jammisit. Caamaño also provided the first description of a Tsimshian (Kitkatla) village in 1792. Jammisit's village comprised five houses of about 50 to 55 feet (17 m) in length and 35 feet (11 m) wide: "with walls and roofs of well-fitted planking."²⁴⁰ Caamaño may also have visited the southern point of Dundas Island or the northern point of Stephens Island.²⁴¹ However,

²³⁵ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), 1992, pp. 133, 135, 163.

²³⁶ Shaiks or Shakes which probably refers to the Sebassa people or Kitkatla.

²³⁷ Ingraham, Joseph, *Joseph Ingraham's Journal of the Brigantine Hope on a Voyage to The Northwest coast of North America 1790-1792*, edited by Mark D. Kaplanoof, (Barre Massachusetts: Imprint Society), 1971, p. 144.

²³⁸ Ingraham, Joseph, *Joseph Ingraham's Journal of the Brigantine Hope on a Voyage to The Northwest coast of North America 1790-1792*, edited by Mark D. Kaplanoof, (Barre Massachusetts: Imprint Society), 1971, pp. 196, 230.

²³⁹ Martindale suggests that it is possible that they were in their interior resource harvesting areas in the lower Skeena watershed. Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 21; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D., University of Toronto, 1999, p. 340.

²⁴⁰ Henry R. Wagner and W.A. Newcombe, eds., *The Journal of Jacinto Caamaño*. Translated by Capt. Harold Grenfell R.N., *B.C. Historical Quarterly*, October 1938: 290, 293.

²⁴¹ Henry R. Wagner and W.A. Newcombe, eds., *The Journal of Jacinto Caamaño*. Translated by Capt. Harold Grenfell R.N., *B.C. Historical Quarterly*, July 1938, 189-222, October 1938: p. 267, fn. 39. The size is much wider than that reported in the archaeological record by Archer.

Caamaño made no observations of native occupation of this area.

Initially there appears to have been three trading harbours used in the early maritime trade in the ethnographic Tsimshian area. The harbours included: Big Bay, Tugwell Island and a location near the communities of Metlakatla in Venn Passage. The principal harbour later moved close to the mouth of the Nass River.²⁴²

By 1793, the maritime fur traders were not only trading European and American trade goods to the Tsimshian, but also trading native produced goods to other native groups. The fur traders, for example, started to trade Tsimshian produced eulachon oil directly to the Haida.²⁴³ In or before 1793, the maritime fur traders also started to winter on the coast. This contributed to the development of a new market for food stuffs from native peoples for such items as deer, duck, clams, geese, halibut, salmon, herring, berries and bird's eggs.²⁴⁴

In July 1793, Captain George Vancouver had reached the Gill Island²⁴⁵ area where his crew took an abundance of fish with seine nets and gathered berries. The only encounter with Tsimshian speaking peoples by the Vancouver party was short and involved the meeting of seven canoes by Mr. Whidbey, who described these natives as "little old men" with few young men or women or children. They brought what was described as an inferior sea otter skin to trade and by their appearance looked to Whidbey like a "poor tribe." Whidbey had explored the coast up to a branch of an entrance to the Skeena River, which Vancouver named, Port Essington. According to Whidbey: "Many sea otters were seen playing about, and diverting themselves amongst the rocks at all times of tide."²⁴⁶

Continuing north into Chatham Sound, Vancouver encountered the *Butterworth* commanded by Captain William Brown. Accompanying the *Butterworth* were two other vessels, the sloop *Prince Lee Boo*²⁴⁷ and the schooner, *Jackall*:

Mr. Brown informed me, that he had spent some time in this immediate neighbourhood, and on coming out of a harbour that lies to the N.N.W. of this station, about three leagues distant, his ship had struck upon a rock that seemd to be a small pinnacle situated by itself, as no soundings were

²⁴² Martindale, Andrew, R.C., A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 22.

²⁴³ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), 1992, p. 252.

²⁴⁴ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), 1992, pp. 209-210, 252.

²⁴⁵ Gill Island is in the ethnographic area of the Kitkatla Tsimshian.

²⁴⁶ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 89, 92, 99.

²⁴⁷ Prince Lee Boo is now the name of an island.

gained near it....²⁴⁸

While the *Butterworth* was forced into its stationary position, Brown, in his two other vessels went in various directions particularly northwest ward to procure furs.²⁴⁹ Brown had learned from the natives that there was an extensive inland navigation communicating with a sea to the northward that took three months to reach, and where the natives traded for whale oil, sea otter skins “and other marine productions.” Brown had managed to enter a small branch to the entrance of the navigation route where he came across some natives: “whose improper conduct made it necessary to fire upon them from the vessels, which was attended with some slaughter.” It appears that the navigation passage referred to by Brown may have been to the westward and along the Nass River since Vancouver notes that some of Brown’s “gentlemen” considered that the opening was farther westward and called by them *Ewen Nass*.²⁵⁰ *Ewen Nass* is the name generally applied to the Nass River.²⁵¹

Vancouver continued north along the coast in Chatham Sound and named the island now known as Dundas Island. He proceeded further up Portland Canal, which he named Point Maskelyne. Vancouver speculated whether Portland Canal was the so-called entrance mentioned by Brown as *Ewen Nass*. Vancouver stated that the length of time that Mr. Brown understood the natives to take to make the journey (i.e. three months):

may be accounted for by their tardy mode of traveling through each others dominions, or in passing through the various windings and crooked shallow channels, many of which, though sufficient for their canoes, were very probably unfit for the navigation of shipping. I have ever found it extremely hard, almost impossible, indeed, to make the inhabitants of

²⁴⁸ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. IV., pp. 112, 113.

²⁴⁹ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 112, 113.

²⁵⁰ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 114, 118.

²⁵¹ Vancouver likely met Tongass Indians who called the Nass, Ewen Nass which in Tlingit, which means food depot for both eulachon and salmon. McNeary, Stephen, A., Where fire came down: Social and Economic Life of the Niska, Ph.D. thesis, Bryn Mawr College, 1976, pp. 21-22. Nass is a Tlingit word, according to Anthropologist Jay Miller meaning, intestine in the sense of food belly because of the abundance of fish there. The Tsimshian name is *klusms*. Miller, Jay, Tsimshian Culture: A Light through the Ages, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press), 1997, p. 16.

these remote parts, and even the Sandwich islanders [Hawaiians], with whose language we are much better acquainted, comprehend the kind of passage that is required for ships to pass through, or the kind of port or opening in the land that is capable of affording them safe and convenient shelter. ²⁵²

At the newly named Point Maskelyne [Portland Canal], Vancouver was visited by five or six canoes of native people who brought little to trade. They also did not appear to understand the name “*Ewen Nass*”²⁵³ but gave some of his crew reason to understand that it was up the branch of the inlet. Vancouver went further up Portland Canal where he came across a small canoe where three of the natives were taking salmon from a run of fresh water that flowed into a cove. Vancouver purchased some of the fish but found them “small, insipid and inferior in flavor to European salmon.”²⁵⁴

As Vancouver progressed up Portland Canal he was approached by seven or eight canoes whose occupants were armed with spears, bows and arrows and wore iron daggers around their necks. Traveling along the Canal to a place named by Vancouver, Point Ramsden, Vancouver encountered fifteen natives in two canoes who had their faces painted in red, white and black and “expressed savage ferocity.” They also showed Vancouver their spears, bows and arrows and one native put on his war garment. These war garments were formed of two or more folds of hides of land animals which had a hole for the head and left arm to pass through, the right side remaining open. They also had breast armor made of thin laths of wood. ²⁵⁵

²⁵² Vancouver, George, *A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver*, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. IV., pp. 117, 118-119.

²⁵³ Ewen Nass are Tlingit words which, when pronounced with a British accent, may have been difficult to decipher.

²⁵⁴ Vancouver, George, *A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver*, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 123, 126.

²⁵⁵ Vancouver, George, *A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver*, (Lo Vancouver, George, *A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver*, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 133, 137.

The native people refused all presents but tried to encourage Vancouver to come to their village to trade. On shore their behavior was described as more civil and they were willing to trade sea otters which were, in Vancouver's opinion, the "worst I had yet seen on the coast." Although Vancouver initially speculated that the aggressive demeanor of this group may have been attributed to them being the group that Brown had been forced to fire on, Vancouver concluded that the natives were displeased that Vancouver was unimpressed with their trade items. Vancouver continued up to Alaska.²⁵⁶

In August 1793 Mr. Johnstone described to Vancouver the former residence of a numerous tribe of Indians, whose habitation had fallen into decay. It had evidently once been a fortress for it was described as situated on a point extending from the western shore on a:

remarkably steep, rocky precipice, and at high water becomes an island. This had formerly been appropriated to the residence of a very numerous tribe of Indians, whose habitations were now fallen into decay, but it still retained the appearance of having been one of the most considerable and populous villages that Mr. Johnstone had yet seen.²⁵⁷

This fort was located at 54°, longitude 230° latitude somewhere between Point Maskelyne and Port Essington. The Vancouver party then encountered another village where he observed the remains of a few Indian habitations that were more recently deserted. This was the village which Brown had fired his cannon upon: "The holes where the shot had made their way through the houses, prove it to be the identical place described by Brown."²⁵⁸

In 1795 the Russian American Company established a post at Yakutat Bay named *Slavorossia* (Glory of Russia). The 1790s saw a merger of the Russian fur trading companies into the United American Company and in 1799, Tsar Paul awarded an

²⁵⁶ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 133-136, 179-180.

²⁵⁷ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 196, 197. Vancouver was convinced that one of the natives that he had encountered was actually an escaped Spaniard pp. 230-31. This individual was dressed in a blue jacket and trousers and according to Vancouver, knew what pockets were for, which "to persons unacquainted with use, generally produce embarrassment..." The "Spaniard" was fond of cigars and smoked them in the Spanish fashion.

²⁵⁸ Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. iv., pp. 194, 195, 196, 197.

Imperial monopoly to the newly chartered Russian American Company.²⁵⁹ This was the start of land based fur trading on the northern northwest coast among the Tlingit.

In June 1795, Captain Charles Bishop onboard the *Ruby* was sailing around Banks Island (south of Porcher Island). He noted that the Tsimshian chief's name was named Shakes²⁶⁰ (which was the name Ingraham had earlier reported who traded with the Cumshewa Haida). According to Bishop, Shakes appeared to be 40 years old but was covered in the last stages of smallpox. Bishop speculated that these Indians (the Kitkatla) were not regularly visited by ships. In July 1795, after trading with "Shakes and his people" Bishop moved to the next group north of the Kitkatla, whose chief was Kinnieu. The location was called Port Teast which was southwest of Porcher Island.²⁶¹ Bishop understood that no ship had visited at this location, but that they knew of Captain Ingraham ["Ingreem"] of the *Hope* who had traded in 1791-2 on the Coast. On July 9, 1795, Bishop described the Kitkatla fishing practices:

As Shake's dominions are very Extensive and Contain many good Harbours and inlets, the Principal business is to look out for one near the residence of the Chief as in that Situation you are shure [sic] of Procuring the Furs of the whole Tribe, and in this respect the Season must be consulted, for they shift their Habitations often, we having fell in with several evacuated villiges [sic]. In the Spring and Early in the Summer the natives are found near the outside coast for taking the Hallibut [sic] and other Ground fish, but when the Salmon go up the Freshes [Freshet] to Spawn they shift to the narrows and falls for Procuring their winters Stock of this delicious food.²⁶²

Bishop then set off northwest of Port Teast and reached a chain of islands (probably northwest of Porcher Island into Chatham sound). During this trip, Bishop's crew used a seine net and caught "some good Fish." Bishop was also visited by a canoe of native people belonging to Shakes who were hunting otter and had taken two skins. Bishop proceeded six leagues northwest passing several islands when he came to the southwest coast of Digby Island. The Kinahan islands, which lie five kilometres west of Ridley Island, are the islands on the coast which could be named after Chief Kinnieu whom Bishop had met southwest of Porcher Island. A map showing Bishop's voyage indicates that he had traveled to Digby Island, Chatham Sound and into Portland Inlet, Portland canal and then north of Zayas Island.²⁶³

²⁵⁹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 112.

²⁶⁰ This is the chief that Ingraham identified. Banks Island is in the ethnographic territory of the Kitkatla.

²⁶¹ Bishop, Charles, The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, pp. 51, 67, 70, 72. See Map facing p. 51.

²⁶² Bishop, Charles, The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 73.

²⁶³ Bishop, Charles, The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, Map iv, facing p. 51, p. 73, ft. 2. Zayas Island was named after Jacinto Caamaño's second pilot Don Juan Zayas. Work, John, The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson

While Bishop was anchored in: “a fine sandy bay” perhaps the Kinahan Islands south of Digby Island, he was met by a canoe of four men belonging to the chief or *Smokett* known as Kinnieu’s tribe. Because they offered only raw otter skins (and some seal skins), Bishop told them to take them to their women to dress them and bring them back.²⁶⁴

Bishop reported that he (and his crew) obtained “plenty of Fish with the Seine...” by fishing in the ocean. While waiting for the Indians to come back with their prepared otter skins, Bishop sailed passed several islands, including Rachel Island, Alexandra Bank and Lucy Island until he reached Stephens Sound. Then on July 11, 1795, Captain Bishop sent out some men to look for the natives who later reported many places where Natives were seen including a canoe with four men belonging to Chief Kinnieu’s tribe. This encouraged Captain Bishop to proceed ten miles further up the Sound. Bishop was soon between Revillagigedo Channel and Portland Inlet on the western side of Wales Island. He described a canoe with three men in it who appeared to Bishop to be “wild and fearful in the Extreme.” However, once the natives saw that Bishop and his crew were unarmed, the natives became friendly and encouraged the men to anchor.²⁶⁵ The next day, July 13, 1795, a canoe with 15 natives sold Bishop:

many fine skins and Cloaks of Fur. It is a doubt with us, wither [whether] these People had ever seen a vessel before. They wore by far the most savage wild appearance I have ever seen. The variety of articles of trade on board the ship made them difficult and fickle in their Barter; the Place they come from was called by them Nash [Nass] and we believe it is about 10 or 12 miles up a River which appears to be fresh water lying in N East direction from the Ship. These People did not sell all their Furs but left us in the Evening and went on Shore in the bay where they Slept.²⁶⁶

The next morning these Indians sold their remaining skins and promised to return with more the next day. Bishop also reported that he caught some fish while waiting, “but not in abundance”.²⁶⁷

On July 16, 1795, two canoes came to the ship, one occupied by a Chief who presented

and return in the brig *Lama*, January-October, 1835, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 17 f. 18.

²⁶⁴ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, pp. 73, 74. There does not appear to be any correlation with the names of the chiefs identified in Dean of the Tsimshian with this name. The possibility exists that he could be the name of a family that later became extinct, or Tlingit. See Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993.

²⁶⁵ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, pp. 73, 74, ft. 1, 75, ft. 1.

²⁶⁶ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 76.

²⁶⁷ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 76.

Bishop with a:

Curious carved wooden mask. These were indeed very different people²⁶⁸ from those who were on board Tuesday, possessing a Gentleness of manners as conspicuously as the others were noted for their wild and Savage appearance. From the chief we learned that they were in a State of Hostility with these People and they Eat their Captives. This was spoken with such an air of detestation that I believe this chief does not join the Horrid Feasting: altho' the mask he presented is adorned with teeth. ²⁶⁹

This may relate to ongoing Tlingit and Tsimshian hostilities.

On July 17, 1795, Bishop headed again southward to find the Indians who had come on board on July 14, 1795 with furs. Bishop traded with these Indians but provided no further description. Bishop continued to catch salmon with a seine net and also landed some halibut with hook and line, some which weighed 100 pounds.²⁷⁰ Bishop was then in Tongass Bay where his crew again fished for salmon catching 450 in one cast of the seine net. The salmon were caught in shallow water near a water fall. Bishop proceeded to Port Meares (Long and Dall Island) to meet up with the Kigarnie Haida led by Chief Kowe. He then went back through Hecate Strait. As he crossed between Cape Farmer, which is one of the northern points of Dundas Island and Petries Island (Zayas Island) on July 26, 1795, he made no mention of seeing any Indians.²⁷¹

Bishop was back at Port Teast on August 24, 1795, where he again encountered the Kitkatla Chief Shakes, with his brothers and children. The Chief wanted to exchange four skins for Bishop's Jolly boat which had apparently been given to Bishop by Chief Kowe, the Kigarnie Haida chief. Bishop wanted 10 skins in payment.²⁷² Bishop observed that the Kitkatla canoes had salmon and that smallpox was raging amongst them. Although Shakes had recovered from the disease, his family was infected and Shakes had to bury one of his wives.²⁷³

On September 6, 1795 Bishop was around Banks Island where he saw on the middle of the island "an evacuated village built on a round Perpendicular Rock, with a Fighting stage, all around. There was only the shells of two Large Houses, each Capable of containing about 400 natives- This is one of Shakes' Strongholds in War, and erected

²⁶⁸ Perhaps they were Tlingit.

²⁶⁹ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 77.

²⁷⁰ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 78.

²⁷¹ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 79, fn 3.

²⁷² Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, pp. 91, 93.

²⁷³ Bishop, Charles, *The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799*, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, pp. 91, 92.

with no small degree of military skill.” Bishop named the fort, Fort Charles.²⁷⁴

Meanwhile inland, in 1806, the Northwest Company had started to establish land based fur trading posts in the interior of British Columbia, to trade with the Carrier or Dene, an Athapaskan speaking people. Several land based posts were established in the Skeena headwaters between 1806 and 1826 including Fort St. James, Fort Kilmaurs and Fort Connelly.²⁷⁵ At this time the sea otter population had started to show the effects of over hunting before its near extinction in 1830. This led to a gradual shift in furs from water to land mammals, especially beaver. The rise of the interior fur trade coincided with the arrival of the Northwest Company and their permanent trading posts in the interior of the upper Skeena River area.²⁷⁶

Samuel Furgerson was a ship’s carpenter on the American brig named the *Otter*. The master of the *Otter* was Samuel Hill who had set sail from Boston for the Northwest Coast on March 31, 1809. The *Otter* anchored near Dundas Island on February 27, 1810 when Furgerson reported that there:

are three or four different Tribes here in the morning, some of the Nass tribe were on board trading when we saw a canoe coming off which they said was to acquaint them that there was some difficulty with the other Tribes on shore, they immediately got out their armour...²⁷⁷

On April 5, 1810, the *Otter* was through Brown’s Passage passing Stephens Island and heading for the entrance of Nass Sound “or the Observatory Inlet.”²⁷⁸

On April 7, 1810 Furgerson reported that the Indians were occupied catching *shrow* [eulachon]²⁷⁹ for their summer provision...” and that they caught them with nets in great

²⁷⁴ Bishop, Charles, The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967, p. 94.

²⁷⁵ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 148; Prince, Paul, Artifact distributions at the Kitwanga Hill Fort: Protohistoric Competition and Trade on the Upper Skeena, in Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001, p. 253.

²⁷⁶ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period, in Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 23.

²⁷⁷ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson. Brown’s Passage is between the Tree Nob Islands and south Dundas Islands. Work, John, The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, British Columbia Historical Quarterly, p. 44.

²⁷⁸ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson. Work, John, The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, British Columbia Historical Quarterly, p. 44.

²⁷⁹ Shrowton, shrowtow and various other spellings like sow-tow refers to eulachon (oil or grease). The word derives from the Haida, since it is this group that the maritime fur traders obtained

abundance.” The eulachon provided both food and oil. The next day, Quillanah paid a visit accompanied by another chief “brought us some Shrow for Tinggystang²⁸⁰ & told the Capt. that they had no skins at present but would soon have some when they had done with the fishery.” Haida were also reported visiting the Nass: “whose vast numbers of Canoes” left Nass “loaded with dried Shrow [eulachon] packed in boxes,” so much so that they [Tsimshian] did little trading” with the fur traders. The Tsimshian at the Nass River traded the dried *shrow* to the Haida for European goods. If the dried eulachon was to be sold it was stored in boxes, and if the oil was exchanged it was poured into kelp containers.²⁸¹

William Beynon stated that the Nass River became a trading mart *after* the white traders arrived:

white traders were now coming to the mouth of the Nass in their schooners and trading ships and this became a centre from much of the trading not only with the nisse [Nisga] but tsimsyian [Tsimshian] and Tinkits [Tlingit] and soon the Hadas [Haida] began coming in great numbers²⁸²

The Haida would trade fur seals and sea otter skins to the white traders.²⁸³

On May 18, 1810, Chief Kow (Kowe) of the Kigarnie [Haida] had come to help the Cocklane Indians²⁸⁴ [Tlingit] “to fight against the Nass Tribe and as they know that a number of the Nass Indians are out hunting & fishing they meant to take advantage of the others in their absence.” In June 1811, most of a party of Kaigani Haida including Chief Kow, were killed by Tsimshian at Nass while buying *shrowton* (eulachon oil).²⁸⁵

On May 24, 1810, Furgerson reported that the Russians were bringing Aleut²⁸⁶ Indians down to hunt sea otter just north of the Skeena River:

Russians from Coneac [Kodiak Island Gulf of Alaska] who had brought their Asiatic Indians [Aleuts] with their Canoes or Bydarkies to kill otter

their first knowledge of eulachon. (In Haida, eulachon is *sáaw* and the eulachon grease or oil is *satáw*). See Gibson, James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships and China Goods, the Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1992, p. 231. “Shrow” technically refers only to the eulachon (the fish or flesh) as in the term, boxes of shrow, meaning boxes of the dried fish. When the word tou, ton or tow is added to shrow, it means the eulachon oil or grease.

²⁸⁰ Tinggystang means “small presents.”

²⁸¹ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, pp. 231, 232, 233.

²⁸² American Museum of Natural History, *Papers of Philip Drucker*, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation* by William Beynon, vol. viii, p. 47.

²⁸³ American Museum of Natural History, *Papers of Philip Drucker*, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation* by William Beynon, vol. viii, p. 47.

²⁸⁴ Cocklane's Harbour was at the northern tip of Mitkof Island, Petersburg Alaska. Malloy, Mary, “Boston Men” *on the Northwest Coast: The American Maritime Fur Trade 1788-1844*, (Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press), 1998, p. 180.

²⁸⁵ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, p. 174.

²⁸⁶ The Aleut are in the Aleutian Islands and Western Alaska. They are close to Siberian peoples and Inuit (Eskimo).

for them, the weather being moderate during the night and Capt. Hill wishing to ascertain who they were, we stood off & on till day light when we stood in towards the ships, we cast loose our guns & loaded them with round & grape shot to be ready to defend ourselves if occasion required it.²⁸⁷

Historian Jonathan Dean quoted from the ship log of the *Otter* for the same day:

In the afternoon two vessels were discovered at anchor 10 miles north of the Skeena. She proved to be the Ship Ocain of Boston Capt. Winship the other was the Russian ship Juno both from Shitgah [Sitka] with 180 Bydarkies [bidarkas]²⁸⁸ and 350 Cannact [Aleuts or Kodiak Islanders] Indians for the purpose of Killing Sea Otters which must be a great damage to other Ships.²⁸⁹

On May 29, 1810, the Russian and Aleut vessels had gone as far as Port Essington after hostilities had occurred between the Tsimshian and the Aleuts:

[Ocain and Juno off] Bound as we supposed Down to Port Essington the Indians not suffering them to Remain in there [their] former station having a few nights proceeding there [sic] Departure killed 3 of there [their] Canaacts [Koniags, or Kodiak Islanders] Cut their heads and Carried them away as trophies of there [their] Success.²⁹⁰

On May 30, 1810, William Martain aboard the *Hamilton* recorded that two vessels were seen on the north side of Brown Passage and the natives in “nass roads” informed him that they were “rutians [Russians] hunting sea otter.” In concert with the crew of the *Otter*, the Tsimshian drove the Russian and American vessels off.²⁹¹

A Tsimshian narrative appears to describe this event. The narrative stated that sea otter were formerly plentiful around *Laxsapaena* and *Laxlga'anis* (Lucy and Finlayson Islands) and noted that sea otter robes were highly valued by chiefs. Hunters (Aleutians) who came in skin canoes (bidarkies) camped on an island outside Georgetown on the west coast of the Tsimshian Peninsula which came to be known as *Laxgut'êx*. They were attacked by the Tsimshian but came back with their shaman who dragged a mink's rectum through Tsimshian waters to entice the sea otter to migrate north.²⁹²

²⁸⁷ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

²⁸⁸ A Russian or Siberian word for one or two hole kayaks used by Aleuts and Alaskan Inuit.

²⁸⁹ Quoted from Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit - Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 137.

²⁹⁰ Quoted from Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit - Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 137. Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the Otter, Robert Kemp, Master.

²⁹¹ Quoted from Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit - Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 137.

²⁹² Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit - Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 138-139.

The purpose of this Narrative was not to provide historical information per se, but to explain the absence of sea otter in Coast Tsimshian waters and why Tsimshian hunters were forced to travel north to the vicinity of Sitka to hunt otter.²⁹³

The entry in Lemuel Porter's logbook for June 3, 1810 notes that two or three hundred natives were alongside the *Hamilton*, "trading with scrow tow [eulachon grease] & they were sumthing insolent but we desided [sic] them with out any damage on oather [sic] side..."²⁹⁴ On June 17, 1810, while at the Nass, Robert Kemp, Master of the *Otter*, reported a great number of Massett Clonganee [Kigarnie] and Cocklane's [Tlingit] Indians at this place "trading for shrow."²⁹⁵

Furgerson described the eulachon fishery at Nass and noted how the barter included European goods:

..the Indians are coming & going between us and the shore all the time but they bring very few skins with them, they have been so busy about the shrow-tow [eulachon] fishery these 6 weeks back that they could not spare time to go hunting, the shrowtow is a great source of riches to the Nass Indians as it supplys [sic] them plentifully for provisions during the summer and enough to sell to other Tribes that comes and buys the shrow of them for cloth and other articles that they purchase from the ships for their otter skins.²⁹⁶

At this early date (1810), the trade for dried eulachon and eulachon oil between native groups, included the exchange of European goods.

On July 4, 1810, a Nass canoe came along side with only two men: "one of them is a small chief known to us by the name of Bonyparte he stayed on board to show us where the tribe was...." The location appeared to be due east of Dundas Island at the entrance of an inlet. An ebb tide prevented the *Otter* from sailing closer but when they were able to get in low tide:

we ran in through a great number of Canoes that were fishing in the mouth of the Inlet. the Indians were catching the halibut as fast as they could haul them into their canoes, the flood tide soon carried us up and we passed several small temporary villages before we could find any anchorage, but found bottom in 38 fathems [sic] of water where in a small cove in which stood of their villages, we were soon visited by Quillaha & Goodeenah [Coodeenah]....²⁹⁷

²⁹³ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 138-139.

²⁹⁴ Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3., Log book of the Hamilton, Master, Lemuel Porter.

²⁹⁵ Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the Otter, Robert Kemp, Master.

²⁹⁶ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson. June 27, 1810

²⁹⁷ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson, May 4, 1810. Coodenenah or Koodeenah or Coatanath was a Tlingit chief from Cocklane Harbour. Malloy, Mary, "Boston Men "

This would suggest that Indians called Nass Indians were fishing for halibut south “due east of Dundas Island” which may include Portland Canal or south of the Canal. This area is described on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map as Gitsiis.

On July 27, 1810, Robert Kemp, Furgerson shipmate, got ready to explore the area down to Port Essington to the Indian’s salmon fishing areas:

or some other Place near that of safe anchorages where we expect to find the Indians busy [sic] in taking and preserving their winter fish. These fish is salmon when split and dried in the sun serves them for their winter food instead of bread and meat.²⁹⁸

On August 5, 1810, however, Kemp describes the cruise down to Port Essington as “fruitless:”

we have spent 14 days in getting up to these Fishing quarters and have not bought one skin they are all attending solely to the Indispensible [sic] duty of catching and preserving their winter salmon...²⁹⁹

Neither Kemp nor any other maritime fur trader described these native people or any other native people trading salmon to other native groups. On August 2, 1810, the *Otter* proceeded to Kyshum or Kyshun River, where the Nass Indians were catching salmon. The Kyshun River could be Khutzeymateen River, which is claimed by the Gitsiis on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

On October 28, 1810 while at a place called Lannerkcoons [Lannacoon], a canoe belonging to Neshonnoot’s tribe³⁰⁰ informed Kemp that: “the Nass Indians were still up at Sheene [Skeena River] and had not as yet completed their salmon fishery but would be down at their winter’s residence the latter end of November 1809.³⁰¹ This suggests that the Indians known to the traders as Nass Indians fished at the Skeena River and had their winter quarters at Lannacoon.

On October 30, 1810 while anchored at Lannacoon, Furgerson also reported that the Nass Indians fished for salmon on the Skeena River: “The Indians told us that the Nass Indians were not come from Sheen [Skeena River] where they have been these 3 months past catching salmon for their winter’s provision.”³⁰²

By November 18, 1810, the salmon fishing was likely completed, for the trade in furs was brisk:

a number of Indians on board and trading brisk to day we were visited by Tomonalt the head chief of the Nass tribes, he had never been on board of any vessel before, he would not go below until another chief went down

on the Northwest Coast: The American Maritime Fur Trade 1788-1844, (Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press), 1998, p. 180. Perhaps Quillaha was as well.

²⁹⁸ Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the *Otter*, Robert Kemp, Master.

²⁹⁹ Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the *Otter*, Robert Kemp, Master.

³⁰⁰ If this is Nieshoot’s group, he was reported at Pearl Harbour in 1832 by Manson .

³⁰¹ Essex Institute Library M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the *Otter*, Robert Kemp, Master.

³⁰² Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

before him, but he came up very much pleased with the accommodations. There was other chiefs alongside that had never seen a ship, but they would not be persuaded to come on board, they belong to some of the tribes that live up the river where the vessels can't go. ³⁰³

Despite their unfamiliarity with ships, the Nass Indians were familiar with European trade goods and traded these items with the Americans. On November 25, 1810, Furgerson reported: "One of the chiefs brought off two fine brass sviwels [cannons] which the Capt. bought off of him. Another chief brought two brass four powders...." ³⁰⁴

It wasn't until maritime fur traders actually started wintering on the Northwest Coast that information about the wintering areas of the Indians appear in the historical record. Furgerson reported on December 25, 1810, that Captain Hill got all the otter skins at Lannacoon, since only the crew of the *Otter* knew where the Indians lived in the winter: "We get all the skins at this place as there is none of the other vessels on the Coast knows where these Indians live in the winter." ³⁰⁵

Although there are numerous references of the *Otter* being located at or near Dundas Island, Stephens Island, Observatory Inlet, and Port Maskelyne there are no descriptions of native occupation of these places. ³⁰⁶

The effect of the maritime fur trade was also experienced at the eulachon grounds. According to Susan Marsden: "oolicahn grease became almost a medium of exchange, allowing those without furs to access the trade goods of the Europeans, thus increasing the value of the oolichan grease." ³⁰⁷ According to Marsden, the exchange value of eulachon had increased with the fur trade. ³⁰⁸

Marsden also reported an ancillary effect from the maritime fur trade as: "an increase in competition for direct access to those producing the grease and to those who came to trade for it and increased the potential for hostilities." Marsden also noted that the ship logs referred to the mouth of the Nass River as *Chebbser* after Tsi'basaa [Sebassa], the leading chief of the Kitkatla. The Kitkatla apparently provoked the Nisga'a by giving a feast at the mouth of the Nass through which they hoped to assert their right to control the trade there with the Haida. Marsden supported this statement with an oral narrative obtained by Sam Lewis: "the Gitxahla [Kitkatla] had wanted to trade sea-foods for grease so they could take the grease and trade to other people and to this the Nishgas would not

³⁰³ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

³⁰⁴ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

³⁰⁵ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

³⁰⁶ Essex Institute Library M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the *Otter*, Robert Kemp, Master. See January 14, 1810; January 26 1810; April 5, 1810; July 29, 1810 for example.

³⁰⁷ Marsden, Susan, Review of Archival Materials for Information Pertaining to Tsimshian Use and occupation of the Nass River Area Greenville to Kincolith Highway Section, in McDonald, Susan Marsden, Chris Roth, Charles Menzies, Tsimshian Traditional Use Study and Impact Assessment of the Greenville/Kincolith Road Project, (Victoria: Ministry of Transportation and Highways), 1997, p. 17.

³⁰⁸ To support this conclusion, Marsden quoted from the June 26 and 27, 1810 entries in the log book of the *Otter*.

agree as they themselves wanted to trade with the Haidas....”³⁰⁹ Marsden reported numerous accounts of attacks by the Haida and the Tlingit downriver at the mouth of the Nass. Some attacks between groups took place on the eulachon grounds: “because opportunities for revenge were greater.”³¹⁰

On January 19, 1811 a sickness was reported among the Indians at Stikine and along the coast. One of the Stikine [Tlingit] Indians evidently informed Furgerson that: “they had all been sick, and that Cockshaws [Tlingit] their head Chief was dead and they had not yet made another they said there was no skins among them.” On January 23, 1811, perhaps in context of the Stikine, Furgerson stated that the Indians (Tlingit) had little to sell: “except some Moose skins manufactured into war dresses and these they ask a high a price for that the Capt. won’t buy them.”³¹¹ The sickness was again reported on January 25, 1811: “they have all been very sick here as well as at every other place on the Coast. There has been a general sickness among the Indians since last fall and all the winter, which I supposed is one greate [sic] reason of the skins being so scarce this season.”³¹² This sickness may have been a second outbreak of smallpox.³¹³

On February 9, 1811, while at Lannacoon, Furgerson reported a “brisk trade” in skins. The natives told Furgerson that their wives and children were so glad the ship had come as it would provide them with: “something good to eat.” This food was bread, rice and molasses.³¹⁴ On February 12, 1811, Furgerson reported an invitation by chiefs to Chebesha [Sebassa] Lanna (village) to a house warming and: “it is customary on these occasions to make a feast and invite the chiefs to it and distribute tingystang’s [presents] among them.” Furgerson also noted that the ship’s armorer was repairing muskets for the Indians.³¹⁵

Furgerson noted in his logbook for February 13, 1811 that the Masset Haida had been living at Lannacoon over the winter:

today the Masset Indians that has lived here this winter came on board with plenty of skins but sold only a few of them. They wanted the Capt. to give them more for their skins that he gave the Nass men, and because he would not they carried their skins ashore again. These fellows thinks that

³⁰⁹ Marsden, Susan, Review of Archival Materials for Information Pertaining to Tsimshian Use and occupation of the Nass River Area Greenville to Kincolith Highway Section, in McDonald, Susan Marsden, Chris Roth, Charles Menzies, Tsimshian Traditional Use Study and Impact Assessment of the Greenville/Kincolith Road Project, (Victoria: Ministry of Transportation and Highways), 1997, p. 18. The informant is Sam Lewis. See Museum of Civilization, Beynon Fieldnotes, v. 7, no. 99. “The origin of the Name Tsim-holgan”

³¹⁰ Marsden, Susan, Review of Archival Materials for Information Pertaining to Tsimshian Use and occupation of the Nass River Area Greenville to Kincolith Highway Section, in McDonald, Susan Marsden, Chris Roth, Charles Menzies, Tsimshian Traditional Use Study and Impact Assessment of the Greenville/Kincolith Road Project, (Victoria: Ministry of Transportation and Highways), 1997, p. 19.

³¹¹ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson Journal, 1809-1811.

³¹² Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson Journal, 1809-1811.

³¹³ Gibson James R., Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, p. 275.

³¹⁴ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson, February 10, 11, 1811.

³¹⁵ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

they are the wisest people on this Coast and they are just as much worse to deal with for they don't know what they would have. it is impossible to please them. ³¹⁶

On February 14, 1811, Furgerson reported that an Indian named "Estakhumah sold one of his slaves (a fine boy about 10 years old) for fifteen Clemel [moose skins], four otter skins & two Blankets." On February 20, 1811, some Indians started moving to the eulachon [shrow] village at Nass, which was estimated by Furgerson to be "about 40 miles" from Lannacoon.³¹⁷

On February 25, 1811, Shakes, the Sebassa [Kitkatla] chief came beside the *Otter* in a war canoe alongside Edensaw, the head chief of the Masset Haida. The trade in furs was described as just about over on February 26, 1811, after which the Indians went to their *shrow* [eulachon] village on the Nass as reported on February 28, 1811. ³¹⁸

At the close of the eulachon season in May 1811, Captain Lemuel Porter aboard the *Hamilton* reported that when his crew was getting water on shore, they were fired upon by "Musquet balls" which resulted in the death of an Islander (Hawaiian).³¹⁹ Historian Jonathan Dean compared this historical account with Tsimshian narratives, Dean stated that an incident similar to this 1811 incident is captured by at least three Tsimshian narratives collected by Beynon dating between 1927 and 1953. One narrative emphasized the role of a Gitando chief, *Sqagwet*. There is also reference to Gitsiis halibut fishermen in Work Channel. Another account put the event at Georgetown and not the mouth of the Nass where the event actually occurred. A third and most recent account by Morrison in 1953 recorded that not only were the Gitzaxtet [Gitzaxlaal] and Gitando hunting sea otter in concert, but that *Sqagwet* represented both villages in their trading with the Euro Americans. The third narrative places the 1811 event after the establishment of the HBC post on the Nass River in 1831 and before the post's removal to Tsimshian Peninsula. ³²⁰

Despite the differences in the versions, the end result was the same in all versions: it caused a blood feud between the Gitsiis halibut fishers who were wrongly attacked by the Americans and the Gitzaxtet [Gitzaxlaal] who had actually attacked the Americans. As compensation, the Gitzaxlaal lost "extensive hunting lands on Dundas Island" to the Gitsiis. ³²¹ This is what was important to the Tsimshian, and this is what is retained in

³¹⁶ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

³¹⁷ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

³¹⁸ Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

³¹⁹ Dean, Jonathon, R., The 1811 Nass River Incident: Images of First Conflict on the Intercultural Frontier, Native Studies , 1993, 13 (1): 88,96.

<http://www.brandonu.ca/Library/CJNS/13.1/dean.pdf>

³²⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 143, 144.

³²¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 143, 144.

the multiple versions.³²²

The *New Hazard* was an American ship out of Salem Massachusetts which arrived on the Northwest coast on March 28, 1811 and began trading with the Haida around Cumsheewa Inlet. The ship spent 18 months trading and sailing along Alaska and B.C. Coasts between 1811-1812 and made over one hundred separate landfalls and stops at major native villages several times. The trade manifest for the *New Hazard* suggests that the trade items exchanged with native people was extensive and included muskets, gun powder, shot, iron, copper sheathing, wearing apparel, Indian cottons, woolen, paint, sugar, bread in the form of pilot biscuits, molasses, rum, tobacco and woodenware.³²³

The *New Hazard*, like other ships, traded native produced goods between native villages: including eulachon grease, native built canoes (from Vancouver Island and sold to the Haida at Cumsheewa), dressed elk skins, ornamental abalone shells, preserved native foods between villages and human cargo (slaves).³²⁴ On November 12, 1811, the *New Hazard* arrived at Lannagoon: 'where the Nass Indians passed the winter last year and where Captain Hill got a great number of skins.'³²⁵ The *New Hazard* had started overwintering on the Northwest coast after learning of the success of Captain Hill, who had obtained large amounts of skins over the winter of 1810.

The American trading vessels mostly visited the area between Dixon Entrance and Queen Charlotte Sound and concentrated their chief trading area at Kaigani and Tongass (on Annette Island at the entrance to Clarence Strait). The *Hamilton* confined its trade to less than a dozen harbours between Skidegate and Stikine including Nass, spending about a week at each harbour. In 1812-1813, vessels started to winter on the coast at Principe Channel (Kitkatla). There was little fur trading during the winter and the traders started to depend more on local foodstuffs chiefly produced by native people.³²⁶

As noted, the influence of European trade on native people was not limited to the coast. In 1812 Northwest Company fur trader Daniel Harmon stationed at Fort St. James visited the Babine Carrier at Babine Lake and was the first European on the headwaters of the Skeena River. Harmon found that the Carrier received goods from the Pacific by way of "barter from their neighbours the Atenas [Gitsan] who purchase them directly from the white people." The European goods included guns, cloth, blankets, axes, cast iron pots, as well as Gitsan mountain sheep blankets. The Gitsan actually bartered these from coastal native middlemen, as there are no known descriptions of maritime fur traders ascending the Skeena River.³²⁷

³²² Dean, Jonathon, R., *The 1811 Nass River Incident: Images of First Conflict on the Intercultural Frontier*, Native Studies, 1993, 13 (1):90, 91.

<http://www.brandonu.ca/Library/CJNS/13.1/dean.pdf>

³²³ Knight, Rolf, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Labour in British Columbia, 1848-1930*, (Vancouver: New Star), 1996, pp. 56-57.

³²⁴ Knight, Rolf, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Labour in British Columbia, 1848-1930*, (Vancouver: New Star), 1996, p. 57.

³²⁵ Reynolds, Stephen, *The Voyage of the New Hazard*, (Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press), 1970, pp. 50-52.

³²⁶ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, pp. 207, 208.

³²⁷ Prince, Paul, *Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C.* Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998, pp. 51-54, 137.

By at least 1812, as noted for the *New Hazard*, the American fur traders were getting oil and fish from the Nass and selling it to other native people. The *Tally Ho* was reported on June 13, 1826 to have bought sixty boxes of *shrowton* at Nass for trade with the Haida Skidegate.³²⁸ Euro-American traders would also purchase certain shells and dentalia from native people to sell to other native people as recorded in Captain A. Simpson's Report to Chief Factor of Columbia district HBC in 1830. Simpson stated that he had procured "hyequas" [dentalium], from the Cape Flattery Indians on Vancouver Island before setting sail to the Nass.³²⁹

HBC Fur trader, Peter Skene Ogden³³⁰ visited the Carrier (Dene) village of Hagwilget in the 1820s where he found: "a constant barter of furs in exchange for articles of European merchandise procured from the traders by the Chyniseyans [Tsimshian]." ³³¹ Ogden wrote:

it may occasion some surprise that savages ,who as I have said, are perfect strangers to the sight of Europeans, should possess so many articles indicative of a commercial intercourse. To explain this, it is only necessary to state that the river affords a communication between these unsophisticated races and the Indians inhabiting the coast and its mouth, known by the name Chyniseyans [Tsimshian]. Through this channel a constant barter of furs in exchange for articles of European merchandise procured from the traders by the Chyniseyans [Tsimshian], upon a scale of magnificence of which the example cited must suffice.³³²

Although the river referred to may be the Skeena, given its late ice break-up and high rate of flow, the Skeena River was not considered a "superior route" for the conveyance of moose hides and marmot pelts.³³³ The Skeena and Nass have problems with navigation of spring flooding, seasonal flash flooding and winter freeze up "that put limits on their usefulness as well as for canoe travel. Overland trails and trails along the riverbanks, provided a much more reliable system for the transport of trade items."³³⁴ Water levels on the Skeena River can change by up to two metres on some rivers. High water comes twice a year: in early summer and in late fall. In winter, the rivers freeze over and walking becomes a feasible means of transportation. A dug-out canoe was the means to reach any area on the Lower Skeena River system. ³³⁵

³²⁸ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, pp. 231, 232, 233.

³²⁹ Rich, E.E., ed. *The Letters of John McLoughlin, from Fort Vancouver to the Governor and Committee: first series 1825-38* (Toronto: Champlain Society), 1941, Appendix A, p. 307.

³³⁰ Peter Skene Ogden was Chief Factor of Fort Simpson 1831-1835.

³³¹ Bishop, Charles, *Coast-Interior Exchange: The Origins of Stratification in Northwestern North America*, 1987, *Arctic Anthropology*, 24(1):75.

³³² Ogden, Peter Skene, *Traits of American-Indian Life and Character by a Fur Trader*, (London: Smith, Elder and Co.), 1853, pp. 92-93.

³³³ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 56.

³³⁴ MacDonald, George, Cove, John, J., Introduction, in *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John J. Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. xi.

³³⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 45.

By the 1820s, the maritime fur trade was no longer strictly maritime because it was based more on land fur bearers than on marine species, although ships were still used to trade and transport the furs. By diverting more land furs from the interior, the maritime traders were starting to encroach on the HBC interests inland, which would ultimately force the HBC to establish fur trading posts on the coast.³³⁶

Margaret Seguin³³⁷ [Anderson] has acknowledged that the: “highly structured world of the Tsimshian was ultimately radically transformed by the intrusion of Europeans and Euro-Canadians.” Seguin stated:

the chiefs who controlled the trade became wealthy, and the nineteenth century was probably the zenith of opulence for the traditional Tsimshian. Huge amounts of wealth entered the native economy from the trade and a ready supply of iron tools permitted greater productivity among carvers; at the same time traditional established relationships of rank were destabilized by new aggregations which formed around the trading posts, and staggering mortality rates owing to Old World diseases such as smallpox, influenza, and venereal disease, that swept through populations lacking immunity. Competition for scarce furs led traders to supply firearms and alcohol to the Tsimshian and their neighbours, further complicating relationships. ³³⁸

Seguin made these comments without having information about the extensive maritime fur trade records.

“Opulence” did not immediately apply to the Haida, however, for the once wealthy Haida were reduced to near poverty ca. 1821 after the decline in sea otters. John Scouler was a ship surgeon on the Hudson’s Bay Company vessel, *William and Anne*, which was sent to scout the coast for suitable post locations. Scouler described the Haida after the collapse of the sea otter population as being initially poor until they started making “curiosities” (argillite carvings), which became an important trade item for the Haida, growing and trading the potato, a European introduced crop,³³⁹ and making and exporting canoes. Scouler stated that in former times when the sea otter was abundant, the Skidegate, Cumshewa, Masset and other Haida groups who occupied the western side of the Queen Charlotte Islands:

were among the most wealthy on the coast: since the sea-otter has been destroyed, the Haidahs [Haida] have become poor, and have been

³³⁶ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, pp. 240, 241.

³³⁷ Dr. Seguin’s work is primarily concerned with the symbolic and belief systems of traditional Tsimshian, focusing on feasts as sustaining relationships with supernatural powers.

³³⁸ Seguin, Margaret, Introduction, in *The Tsimshian Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, p. xv.

³³⁹ Potatoes were introduced to the Queen Charlotte Islands by Captain Gray of the *Columbia* in the 1790s. But as soon as Fort Simpson opened in 1834, the Haida and Tsimshian traded potatoes, and the Tsimshian often traded potatoes received in trade from the Haida. Howay, F. W., *Potatoes: Records of Some Early Transactions at Fort Simpson, British Columbia*, *The Beaver*, March, 1929, pp. 155-156

reduced to other plans in order to procure blankets. They fabricate most of the curiosities found on the coast, but their staple article is the potato, which they sell in great quantities to the mainland tribes. In the autumn, there is a quite a competition among the Hadahs [Haida] who shall carry early potatoes to the mainland. Fleets of from forty to fifty canoes arrive in September, and proceed to the different villages of the Chimmesyan [Tsimshian] nation, and the potato-fair seldom end without more or less fighting. They also manufacture and export canoes, and are themselves venturous on the deep. When they visit the mainland, they are bold and treacherous, and always ready for mischief.³⁴⁰

This description suggests that the Haida started manufacturing canoes for sale after the introduction of Euro-American trade goods and tools.³⁴¹ Much is cited in the ethnographic literature which describes the Haida trading canoes to the Tsimshian, but few have dated when this might have occurred. Garfield stated that while Tsimshian canoes were adequate for transportation in island sheltered waters, Haida canoes were more seaworthy in heavy quartering seas. For the Tsimshian: “where customary routes did not extend across open sea” not having Haida canoes was probably not a significant issue. Garfield suggests that whenever the Tsimshian required more open sea transportation they acquired Haida canoes.³⁴² Garfield does not speculate when this acquisition would have taken place. Based on the Scouler’s observation, the Haida bartered canoes in the post contact period. The Haida were described as towing canoes to Port Simpson for trade in the 1880s.³⁴³ In addition, as noted, maritime fur traders were trading canoes between native groups.

After the amalgamation of the Northwest Company with the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1821, the HBC established Fort Kilmaurs on Babine Lake in 1822. In the report of April 3, 1823 HBC fur trader, William Brown reported difficulties in obtaining the Carrier furs because they traded them with Indians (Tsimshian) from the sea coast: “Three fourths of the Furs procured by the Indians of Simpson’s Rivers [Skeena River or Nass River³⁴⁴] were carried below and traded with the Indians of the Sea coast.³⁴⁵

William Brown also witnessed the protocol involved in such trade between the Carrier and the Tsimshian:

On their arrival at a Village they ascertain...who have furs and the amount of them, on which they go to the person’s lodge blow a parcel of swans down [swan’s down is the down of a swan] upon his head (which is

³⁴⁰ Scouler, John, Observations on the indigenous tribes of the N.W. Coast of America, *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, 1841 (11): 219. Scouler likely obtained his information on the Haida from fellow physician, William Tolmie. Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University), 1992, p. 246.

³⁴¹ Obviously the Haida made canoes before contact, but it is their capability and motivation to make canoes for trade that is important.

³⁴² Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 12.

³⁴³ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890, p. 296.

³⁴⁴ Walbran, Capt. John T., *British Columbia Coast Names, Their Origin and History*, Vancouver, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1972, p. 352.

³⁴⁵ HBCA., B. 11/e/1, Babine, Report on District 1822-1823.

reckoned a mark of treat honor both amongst the Carriers and the Athnas) and then commence dancing and singing a song in his praise, after which they make him a present and treat [him] with something to eat, when he according to the custom of his country makes them in return a present of his Furs, which if not equal to what he received adds Siffleu [marmot] robes and dressed skins to make up the value.³⁴⁶

On March 7, 1826, Brown reported that the: “Indians of the Coast was here in the fall & of course traded many things of the Fur Kind they had...” As Brown attempted to reach the native groups who were most influenced by the coastal traders he reported on March 9, 1826:

From the upper three Villages, there is a track over land leading to a large River, where the Nation call *Ute sin hah* reside. These people are said to be hunters – The People who inhabit the sea coast are call Kees pall lotes [Gispaxlo’ots], and their village at the entrance of the River has the same name.

From what I have seen of the River and every information I could procure regarding it, it is navigable – A canoe moderately loaded when the water is not too high, could go from our present Establishment [Fort Kilmaurs on Babine Lake] in the Babine Country to the upper Atna Village in three days, from there to the Forks in other three- and from that to the sea in six days more – making in all twelve days to descend – Now allowing five days to come up the current, for one to go down the Voyage even then would not exceed two months and a half- so that this is certainly the shortest communication that is to be found between Western Caledonia and the Sea- But it would not answer for sending out the return as all the Furs procured at the different Establishments in the winter and spring would have to be sent to the Babine country by trains [dog sled]. For the water in the River [Skeena River] would be too high to descend before the Lakes would open to land them by Canoe.³⁴⁷

On March 10, 1826, Brown suggested to officials of the HBC a way to obtain furs from those interior groups who regularly traded with the coastal groups:

To manage the trade with the most advantage it will be necessary to make a voyage there late in the spring, to collect what they may have killed in the winter, to prevent the traders from the Coast securing it in the summer – and another voyage on the arrival of the People in the fall, this last would be in Canoe- and on reaching the Forks go up Simpson River as far as it may be practicable by water & from there overland to Hotset [Moricietown] and trade the fall hunts of these Indians after which the party might go as far down the River as it may be deemed prudent for any

³⁴⁶ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 150, 151-152.

³⁴⁷ NAC, MG 29, series D. 8, v. 2. Report from Fort Kilmaurs by Brown for 1826.

thing to procure.³⁴⁸

Although Brown was informed that the Gispaxlo'ots were the principal traders to the Gitksan of European trade goods, another informant apparently told him there were "3 distinct nations."³⁴⁹

It was not long before the HBC secured the Northwest Coast furs. In 1825, as noted, the HBC vessel named the *William* and *Ann* was dispatched to Portland Canal. In its first trading with Tsimshian and Nisga'a, the fur trader Henry Halwell found a population already familiar with European products and trade. Most of the Nisga'a had guns and many wore European clothing and had more tobacco than the HBC had on hand to trade.³⁵⁰

The name Legaic³⁵¹ appears in the log of the brig *Griffon* on November 25, 1826. It is with reference to his association at Lannacoon, and his hostilities with the Kaigani [Haida] after returning from trading with the Nisga'a. The skirmish ended unfavorably for the Tsimshian. According to the logbook of *Griffon* of November 25, 1826:

the Kigarnee [Kigarnie Haida] Indians passed here on the way home having visite'd the Nascar Indians [Nisga'a] and on their way back met a party of Lenna coon Indians with Chief Legaick [Legaic] at clement City [Clemencitty Alaska]; a battle immediately commenced between them which ended by killing 15 of the Nasse [Nass] Indians....³⁵²

As noted the maritime traders called the winter village site of the Nass Indians and trading location, Lannacoon. Dean described Lannacoon as a village on the Tsimshian Peninsula northeast of Brown Passage on Chatham Sound called by the HBC, *Lax'ku*. It was also a winter village occupied by two Tsimshian chiefs, Legaic and Sqagwet, the latter who was a Gitando chief.³⁵³ Beynon described Lannacoon as near Georgetown, Big Bay and was a prime sea otter hunting area.³⁵⁴ Martindale identified three main

³⁴⁸ NAC, MG 29, series D. 8, v. 2. Report from Fort Kilmaurs by Brown for 1826.

³⁴⁹ Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998, pp. 143,148.

³⁵⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003, p. 24.

³⁵¹ Legaic has been identified with various names in the historical and ethnographic literature including: Ilgeth, Ulgayauch, Elgeg, Leegaick and others. Stone cliff is the literal translation of Legaic. Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. viii, 27, ft. 20.

³⁵² Marsden, Susan, Review of Archival Materials for Information Pertaining to Tsimshian Use and occupation of the Nass River Area Greenville to Kincolith Highway Section, in McDonald, Susan Marsden, Chris Roth, Charles Menzies, Tsimshian Traditional Use Study and Impact Assessment of the Greenville/Kincolith Road Project, (Victoria: Ministry of Transportation and Highways), 1997, pp. 18-19.

³⁵³ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 632; Dean, Jonathan, R., "These Rascally Spackaloids:" the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, B.C. Studies, 1994 (101): 47-48, ft. 22.

³⁵⁴ PABC Boas MS 2102, A1413, Beynon notes BF 132.3, pp. 13 -15. An Adventure with Traders.

trading harbours on the coast: Big Bay, Tugwell Island and somewhere near Metlakatla in Venn Passage. Later the primary anchorage would shift to the Nass River estuary.³⁵⁵

On April 10, 1829, Reverend J.S. Green³⁵⁶ described in his diary hostilities during the trade between the Kitkatla and the Haida which he had learned about from two chiefs belonging to the Shebasha tribe [Kitkatla Sebassa]:

about six weeks since, a party of the Kumshewa [Cumshewa Haida on the east side of Moresby Island] Indians from Queen Charlotte's Island, visited the Shebasha [Kitkatla] tribe for the purpose of trade. In the course of their negotiation a dispute arose, when the Shebasha [Kitkatla] men attacked the Kumshewa [Cumshewa Haida] party, and killed several of them. The residue fled, but in crossing over to their island others were drowned. This intelligence being communicated to the tribe, the Kumshewa men prepared to take vengeance. They immediately went over to seek redress, but, ere they arrived, the Shebasha tribe had abandoned their village, and started for this place. Their houses were demolished, and their property, which was left behind, carried off....

Green saw some of the injuries of the wounded Haida survivors.³⁵⁷

Following the terms of the 1825 Anglo-Russian Convention, the British were limited in their northward expansion along the coast to Portland Inlet. In order to secure the northern reach of British sovereignty, Captain Amelius Simpson in 1828 was dispatched up the coast. He described passing the Skeena River and described it as rich in salmon. The Skeena River was also visited by the Nisga'as for trade:

They [Nisga] also ascent it for the purpose of traffic, and procure from the Indians higher up a number of Beaver, who again procure them from Interior Indians who also speak of Whites being settled on their Lands which must of course be the Honble Companys Establishments.³⁵⁸

The description of the Nisga trading up the Skeena River or fishing there for that matter in the autumn, may have been possible, according to Dean, through reciprocal agreements for the Skeena River people to fish on the eulachon fisheries.³⁵⁹ As earlier reported by the maritime fur traders, Indians described as Nass, were reported fishing on the Skeena River. Simpson identified some of the trade goods which were used in the

The Informant was Joseph Morrison, Gitando.

³⁵⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 343-344.

³⁵⁶ Reverend Green was ordained in the American Congregational Church in 1827. He undertook a mission in Hawaii before traveling aboard the *Volunteer* on February 13, 1829 for the Northwest Coast during the peak of his career. Lillard, Charles, ed. *Warriors of the North Pacific: Missionary Accounts of the Northwest Coast, the Skeena and Stikine Rivers and the Klondike, 1829-1900*, (Victoria: Sono Nis Press) 1984, p. 29.

³⁵⁷ Lillard, Charles, ed. *Warriors of the North Pacific: Missionary Accounts of the Northwest Coast, the Skeena and Stikine Rivers and the Klondike, 1829-1900*, (Victoria: Sono Nis Press), 1984, pp. 48-49.

³⁵⁸ Simpson quoted in Dean, Jonathan, R., "These Rascally Spackaloids:" the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, *B.C. Studies*, 1994 (101): 48 (ft. 25).

³⁵⁹ Dean, Jonathan, R., "These Rascally Spackaloids:" the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, *B.C. Studies*, 1994 (101):48 (ft. 25).

local economy (and presumably traded to the interior groups) to include: beads, bracelets, dentalia which were purchased from the Newitti Kwakiutl, slaves, guns and rum.³⁶⁰

The benefits of the Nass River location for a post were described by Captain Aemelius Simpson on September 22, 1828:

the American Traders visit this Port generally in the Spring and say it is the most productive in land skins upon this Coast...The Indians say they Trade a number of them from other Indians higher up the River who again say they procure them from others further in the interior whom they have intercourse with Whites who come to them upon Horses.... The Americans know by the mode of Stretching the skins those from the interior from those of the Coast, the first are stretched rounds the latter long ways. ³⁶¹

In 1831, Captain Simpson was directed by John McLoughlin to transport Peter Skene Ogden and his party to the Nass River in the *Dryad* and the *Vancouver*. Captain Simpson died as a result of an illness in the fall of 1831, and Peter Skene Ogden replaced him as the superintendent of shipping on the Northwest Coast. Ogden was instructed to “examine Stikine River and endeavour to ascertain if there is a situation Eligible to erect and Establishment on its Banks about thirty miles from the ocean and also at Port Essington.”²⁶ The location of the Nass River Fort Simpson was established in the summer of 1831. It was near a large Indian village called *Ewen Nass*. ³⁶²

Throughout the early maritime trade and land fur trade, the trade in salmon between the native people and the maritime fur traders was described as insignificant. Salmon, reportedly weighing up to 30 to 40 pounds could be obtained by maritime fur traders for a “trifle” from the native people. Sockeye was so plentiful along the Nass River, that the fur traders on the *Vancouver* called it Squagon River, which is a corruption of a Haida word for sockeye salmon. Captain Amelius Simpson in 1828 also reported that salmon obtained from the Northwest Coast could be bought for a “mere trifle, principally leaf Tobacco in small quantities.”³⁶³

The first recorded trip by Europeans up the Skeena River appears in the HBC report of November 8, 1832. Donald Manson³⁶⁴ recorded his trip up the Skeena River which

³⁶⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 250.

³⁶¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 249-250

³⁶² Work, John, The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, British Columbia Historical Quarterly, pp. 18, ft. 23; 28, f. 57.

³⁶³ Gibson James R., Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, pp. 210, 211, 242.

³⁶⁴ Donald Manson was engaged by the HBC in 1817. He became a clerk in the Columbia District in 1827. In 1829 Manson went to Fort Vancouver then to Fort Simpson on the Nass River. He was in charge of Fort McLoughlin in 1834-9 and becoming Chief Trader at that post in 1837. Work, John, The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the

commenced October 20, 1832. On route from the Nass River along the coast Manson encountered two chiefs, Neeshoot [Neshot] and Cacus [Tsaqaxs] at Pearl Harbour, who informed Manson that their villages were about 15 miles southeast of Pearl Harbour.³⁶⁵ On October 29, 1832, Manson described “numerous parties” of native people scattered along the coast either fishing halibut or hunting deer: “in both avocations they seem’d most successful and to appearance the country is well situated for the latter arrival being a chain of flat low islands....” Manson reached the entrance of the Skeena River on November 1, 1832, where he reported several small villages of Pearl Harbour Indians:

in course of the day pass’d six or eight small villages of Pearl Harbour Indians employed taking the hookbile or full salmon which fish from the small quantity they had in their houses I do not consider are numerous in this River [Skeena].³⁶⁶ From these Indians I endeavor’d to know some information regarding the interior but all I could learn was that if I continued to ascend for seven days more I would find a large village which by crossing overland in five days more we should find whites....³⁶⁷

This reference to “whites”, likely referred to the Hudson’s Bay Company operations inland. Manson provided a general, if less than positive view, of the Skeena River on November 2, 1832: “with regard to its resources with the exception of salmon there is nothing to depend upon and even that article I am of opinion is not abundant given the extravagant price the natives ask for the few they have dried.”³⁶⁸

As Historian Dean has pointed out, if there was a well organized trade monopoly operating on the Skeena River at the time of Manson’s visit, Manson made no note of it. The HBC selected a site for a post well away from the Skeena River.³⁶⁹

The HBC post traders make frequent reference to the Pearl Harbour Indians. Pearl Harbour was about fifteen miles northwest of the Skeena River and 25 miles south of Portland Inlet. Chiefs Nieshot, Tsaqaxs and Legaic who appear frequently in the HBC post records were identified with Pearl Harbour.³⁷⁰ A map of Pearl Harbour dated

Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, p. 14, fn. 8.

³⁶⁵ Based on this distance, the location was likely Metlakatla.

³⁶⁶ Note Manson’s observation about the low quantity of salmon which is observed rather late in the fishing season i.e. November.

³⁶⁷ HBCA B. 201/a/2, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1832, Donald Manson Report, November 8, 1832.

HBCA B. 201/a/2, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1832, Donald Manson Report, November 8, 1832.

³⁶⁸ HBCA B. 201/a/2, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1832, Donald Manson Report, November 8, 1832.

HBCA B. 201/a/2, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1832, Donald Manson Report, November 8, 1832.

³⁶⁹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 252-253. A map showing general location of the villages along the Skeena River for the period 1831-1840 see Dean, Jonathan, R., “These Rascally Spackaloids:” the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, *B.C. Studies*, 1994 (101): 43, Figure 1. This map differs from the Claim Area.

³⁷⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993,

January 27, 1832 shows Pearl Harbour as 15 miles east by south from the northeast end of Dundas Island.³⁷¹ This is near or at Metlakatla.

A comparison of the ethnographic data with the historical record indicates that the two chiefs encountered by Manson were likely Nieshot (Neeshoot) who was the chief of the Gitzaxlaal [Gitzaxtets] and Cacus or Tsaqaxs who was chief of the Ginaxangiik. William Beynon, however had stated that the primary chief of the Ginaxangiik was Wiseks and that Tsaqaxs was in fifth position of ranking order. This difference in information between the historical record and the ethnographic record, suggested to Historian Jonathan Dean that Tsaqaxs had fallen in prestige in the intervening century.³⁷² This would mean that Beynon's narrative dated well after 1832.

In April 1832, presumably after the fishing and processing of eulachon at the Nass River, HBC fur trader Ogden reported that 1,500 people were assembling for a feast to which he was invited. Ogden described the feast house as holding 800 people, exclusive of women and slaves. Ogden also described the Indians during the feast as wearing masks especially one representing the sun. The performance was characterized by dramatic motions indicating the alternate setting and rising of the sun, followed by slaves bearing presents of sea otter skins and beaver to Ogden, HBC personnel and to other native people. The presents were furs, war dresses, slaves and "other property." Ogden also reported immense piles of meat and "northwest delicacies of all descriptions."³⁷³

Not long after establishing a post on the Nass River, the HBC decided to move. HBC fur trader and physician, W.F. Tolmie described the occupation of the site which would become the new Fort Simpson. On July 12, 1834, the HBC party on board the brig, *Dryad*, entered what was then called McLoughlin's Harbour (Tsimpshean Peninsula). Tolmie described a search for a suitable site by junior officers and the selection of the future site of Fort Simpson. Tolmie remained at the new Fort Simpson until October 22, 1834, where he collected plants along the shore of McLoughlin Harbour. Tolmie described the site:

Neither on the tract secured to the Hudson's Bay Co by Government Grant, nor immediately around it, nor yet as far as I can remember on any part of the frontage of McLoughlin Harbor was there in summer 1834 the slightest evidence of the existence, then or previously, of an Indian village. In the strictest meaning of the terms, the locality now owned by the Hudson's Bay Co, at Fort Simpson, was in 1834 covered to the water's edge by primeval forest undergrowth.³⁷⁴

pp. 252 fn. 21.

³⁷¹ HBCA G. 1/170. Pearl Harbour. A copy by Thomas Sinclair in January 27, 1832.

³⁷² Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit-Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 252 fn. 21.

³⁷³ Ogden, Peter Skene, Traits of American-Indian Life and Character by a Fur Trader, (London: Smith, Elder and Co.), 1853, pp. 57, 58, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67.

³⁷⁴ PABC MS-1077, Newcombe Family Papers, [AO1767 52 15 75], Miscellaneous Papers - W.F. Tolmie. Memorandum regarding the state of things at McLoughlin's Harbour N.W.C. Am. When the Hudson's Bay in July 1834 commenced removal thither of the Buildings etc. of Fort Simpson Nass Straits. No date [n.d.]. There is a copy of this Memorandum in Indian Affairs files. NAC RG 10, v. 3699, f. 16,682.

Tolmie also reported evidence of temporary occupation by Indians as an encampment during stormy weather. The only permanent resident was a Haida:

On the narrow peninsula jutting out from the mainland at Fort Simpson, connected with it by a sand bar, dry at low tide, and affording shelter from westerly winds to the Fort Anchorage, Indians journeying used temporarily to encamp in stormy weather finding safety on one or the other side according to the wind's direction. Only a Haida from Skidegate well known to American and British trading ship captains dwelt permanently outside the fort in summer 1834, as he had recently had a blood feud at home.

Liegeich [Legaic] head chief of the Tsimshian made occasionally a stay of a few days outside the Fort, as the friend of the newly settled Whites – Other Tsimshians came from their permanent village Luh-ko (place of the sand bar) in Pearl Harbour a few miles to the South, sometimes returning the same day, but generally encamping for a night on the beach.³⁷⁵

When first established at the new Fort Simpson in July 1834, Tolmie traded cedar bark from non Tsimshian Indians who spoke the Millbank Sound Heiltsuk [Bella Bella] language. Tolmie also commented upon meeting Legaic: "Ligeich [Legaic] Mr. Kennedy's father-in-law has been here for some days, & is set out with his followers for Port Essington (or Skeena River) tomorrow."³⁷⁶ Legaic's kinship connection with the HBC had evidently been established at the old Fort Simpson on the Nass River. Legaic was considered "an old man" in 1835.³⁷⁷

Tolmie also identified some items of local trade between native groups. On November 27, 1834, as Tolmie sailed south along the coast to establish a fort at (Fort McLoughlin) amongst the Bella Bella [Heiltsuk], he reported that the Bella Bella received: "dressed elk skin of great size procured from the Chimmesyan [Tsimshian] Indians." Tolmie reported other transactions between the Tsimshian and other groups such as that of June 29, 1835, when the Tsimshian arrived at Fort McLoughlin near Bella Bella: "The Chimmesyans [Tsimshian] give 15 elk skins for a slave boy about 12 or 14 years of age besides a small quantity of powder, ball, paint, Tobacco &c." On July 4, 1835, Tolmie reported that Legaic and a great number of his people had passed the day at the fort at Bella Bella:

causing a great stir. The Chimmesyan [Tsimshian] canoes lay in a row in front of the village & owing to the traffic carried on in Earshells, Oolaghans [eulachon] &c. there was as much noise & din almost as at a country fair at home. In the evening on departing they traded about a

³⁷⁵ PABC MS-1077, Newcombe Family Papers, [AO1767 52 15 75], Miscellaneous Papers - W.F. Tolmie. Memorandum regarding the state of things at McLoughlin's Harbour N.W.C. Am. When the Hudson's Bay in July 1834 commenced removal thither of the Buildings etc. of Fort Simpson Nass Straits. No date [n.d.]

³⁷⁶ Tolmie, William F., *The Journals of William Fraser Tolmie: Physician and Fur Trader* (Vancouver B.C: Mitchell Press), 1963, pp 287- 288.

³⁷⁷ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 59, 68, ft. 167, 71.

dozen beaver.³⁷⁸

Ear shells were either abalone, which have the shape of an ear and were used for making ornaments or Monterey shells from California brought by Euro-Americans.³⁷⁹

On his return to Fort Simpson for a few days in February 183[5], Tolmie found that the Tsimshian:

flitted from Pearl Harbour to McLoughlin's Harbor [Tsimspshean Peninsula] and had after their fashion erected on either side of the Fort their permanent residences. Some septs [clans] of the tribe had located on the peninsula aforementioned "luch ko kalamust" [lax Kw'alaams] or "Roseberry peninsula."³⁸⁰

Tolmie also stated that before settling on the location at the new Fort Simpson, the HBC had originally sought a location that would be nearer to "Point Maskelyne for the convenience of Kygarnie [Kigarnie Haida] & Tongasse [Tlingit] Indians..." Not finding a suitable location, the Hudson's Bay Company settled on the Tsimspshean Peninsula location. Maskelyne was in Portland inlet and named by Vancouver.³⁸¹ If the Tongass and Haida were regularly using the mouth of Portland Canal, they would be in the Claim Area.

Fort Simpson 1834

After Fort Simpson was established on McLoughlin's Harbour (Tsimspshean Peninsula) in 1834, the first native traders encountered by the fur traders were Chief Nieshot [Neshot] of Pearl Harbour who came with boards to build a house. The name Nieshot has been ethnographically identified as the Gitzaxlaal. Chief Cognete of the Nisga'a had arrived at Fort Simpson from a trading expedition to Skidegate on Graham Island of the Queen Charlotte Islands. Later the Cumchewa [Haida] arrived at the post to trade potatoes before going up to the Nass River to trade skins for rum. The Nisga'a chief, Cognete, had brought a number of items which he had salvaged from the old HBC fort on the Nass River. By November 1834, a Tongass [Tlingit] family resided at the post. This family provided food provisions like deer to the fur traders.³⁸² The HBC employed "Fort

³⁷⁸ Tolmie, William F., *The Journals of William Fraser Tolmie: Physician and Fur Trader* (Vancouver B.C: Mitchell Press), 1963, pp. 296, 313, 314.

³⁷⁹ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, p. 9.

³⁸⁰ PABC MS-1077, Newcombe Family Papers, [AO1767 52 15 75], *Miscellaneous Papers - W.F. Tolmie*. Memorandum regarding the state of things at McLoughlin's Harbour N.W.C. Am. When the Hudson's Bay in July 1834 commenced removal thither of the Buildings etc. of Fort Simpson Nass Straits. No date [n.d.]

³⁸¹ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 27 fn. 52; 30 fn. 66.

³⁸² HBCA. B. 201/a/3, *Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838*, November 14, 1834; Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 254, ft. 26. There was a guest house for visitors at Fort Simpson. Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 232. Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral,

hunters” and fishers who would hunt or fish specifically for the post. The Tongass [Tlingit] were frequently hired by the HBC as hunters.³⁸³ No mention is made of who provided the fish.

The establishment of a land based fur trade at Fort Simpson in 1834 favoured the emergence of a few prominent Coast Tsimshian leaders who came to act as middlemen in the trade between the Hudson’s Bay Company and various native groups. The most written about middleman in Tsimshian narratives and in the Hudson’s Bay Company records is Legaic. Since names are transmitted through lineages and it is names, not people that control property and privilege, several different people held the name Legaic. Paul Legaic, for example, appears to have been born in 1823 and died in 1868 at the age of 45. He had converted to Christianity, hence his Christian given name. His successor was also named Paul Legaic, who died in 1890.³⁸⁴

The Coast Tsimshian middlemen permitted non Tsimshian to trade food stuffs to the HBC, but in return sought tribute payments, or forced them to exchange their items for European goods directly from the Tsimshian. In this way the Tsimshian had access to food stuffs which they in turn could trade with others while on their trading stints for the HBC. The Cumshewa (“Kitiwas” Haida) traded dried halibut, herring spawn and seaweed to the Tsimshian inside the fort.³⁸⁵ The Heiltsuk [Bella Bella] were reported bringing herring spawn to Fort Simpson in the spring of 1842. The fur trader stated that herring spawn brought by the Heiltsuk was not worth preserving and that they: “set little or no value upon them themselves, as an article of food.” The Heiltsuk, however, bartered the herring spawn to the Tsimshian.³⁸⁶ The Tsimshian also collected their own herring spawn, but it is not known if they traded it to the post or elsewhere.³⁸⁷ The Masset Haida would trade potatoes to the Tsimshian for eulachon oil, blankets and baize.³⁸⁸ The Tsimshian would then trade the potatoes to the HBC for rum.³⁸⁹ James McDonald compiled items of the food trade which occurred at Fort Simpson from HBC files for selected years. These foodstuffs included: deer meat; salmon; halibut; grease; whale oil; potatoes; eggs; berries (dry cakes); cranberries (cakes); geese; ducks; smoked fish;

1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 254. The historical record contrasts with the ethnographic data which suggests that Legaic, through his marriage tie to one of the fur traders, Kennedy, had encouraged the HBC to establish a post at Fort Simpson on what was his camping area. See Marsden, Susan and Robert Galois, *The Tsimshian, the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Geopolitics of the Northwest Coast Fur Trade, 1787-1840*, Canadian Geographer, 1995, 39(2):176.

³⁸³ McDonald, James, Andrew, *Trying to Make a Life: The Historical Political Economy of the Kitsumkalum*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1985, pp. 378-379, fn. 1.

³⁸⁴ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 349, 363, 376.

³⁸⁵ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 15; Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 463.

³⁸⁶ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 382, f. 26, 457-458.

³⁸⁷ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, April 30, 1859.

³⁸⁸ Baize is a coarse woolen cloth.

³⁸⁹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 278.

porcupine; cod; smoked cod; crabs; seals; dry meat; swan; fresh meat; lynx meat; flounders; and small fish.³⁹⁰

During the period of the HBC establishment (ca. 1834), if not before, the Coast Tsimshian enhanced their role as middlemen in the trade between Europeans and interior Indians. Historian Clarence Bolt³⁹¹ has observed:

Many of the Tsimshian came to place less emphasis on such traditional activities as fishing, hunting and gathering, and instead to spend more time trading with other Indians for fur, meat, fish and potatoes, which in turn they traded to the Hudson's Bay Company for whatever European goods they desired.³⁹²

Therefore, not all food provisions brought to the HBC post were as noted, produced by the Coast Tsimshian. Fort Simpson received potatoes in September from the Cumshewa and Masset Haida who were en route to the Nisga'a, while the Tongass [Tlingit] and Tsimshian provided venison. The Sanya [Cape Fox Tlingit] Tlingit came to Fort Simpson with deer and halibut and the Kitkatla also provided provisions.³⁹³

It is also likely that the Coast Tsimshian were getting more food than they would have had to obtain through their own subsistence. That the Tsimshian transported not only European trade goods but native produced goods is reported by Garfield:

The coastal people brought trade goods from Fort Simpson and preserved sea foods which they bartered to the Babines for furs. It was probably as early as 1836 that Legeax [Legaic], a tribal chief at Fort Simpson, undertook to monopolize Skeena River trade with the coast, a monopoly which he maintained until about 1868.

Garfield also stated that the "demand for pelts was undoubtedly a factor which accelerated movement of Nass and Skeena River people to the coast where they were able to participate in the catch and the foreign trade goods."³⁹⁴

This barter in foodstuffs was "given over" to women after the land based fur trade became important and as the trade in furs had undermined the production of surplus foodstuffs.³⁹⁵ The bartering of marine resources appears in both the historical record and the Tsimshian narratives to be activities engaged in by individuals or small groups of women. A Tsimshian narrative entitled "the War of the Gixpaxloats and the Haida"

³⁹⁰ McDonald, James, Andrew, *Trying to Make a Life: The Historical Political Economy of the Kitsumkalum*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1985, p. 164, Table 2.

³⁹¹ Clarence Bolt is a history professor at Camosun College.

³⁹² Bolt, Clarence, R., *Conversion of the Port Simpson Tsimshian: Indian Control or Missionary Manipulation*, B.C. Studies, 1983 (57):40.

³⁹³ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit-Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 288.

³⁹⁴ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 7. This may apply to sea otter furs which is suggested by the movement to the coast for the "catch."

³⁹⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 378, 382.

reported by John Tate and recorded by William Beynon in 1954 provides the following information about trade (paraphrased):

At one time, a great number of Haida came to trade with the Hudson's Bay Company for their furs, land otter, sea otter, fur seals and bear skins. The Haida women used to trade in their foods for Tsimshian products, such as eulachon grease. These trades were given over to the women. The Haida women trade dried halibut for grease. This led to a dispute that the amount of halibut was not considered equal to the grease which in turn led to a major altercation between the Gixpaxloats and the Haida, a battle lasting all day, all night with many dead Haida. It was only stopped when Dr. Kennedy, who was in charge of the post, intervened.³⁹⁶

As noted, there was only one native family reportedly living at Fort Simpson in 1834 (apart from the individual Haida) and this family was a Tongass (Tlingit) who were hired to hunt for the HBC.³⁹⁷ It was in the summer of 1835 that the first reports appear in the HBC post reports of a trade with "Skeena Indians." It was the Pearl Harbour chief Nieshot [Noshoot or Neshoot], however, who controlled what was brought in to trade at the HBC fort at Fort Simpson (and not Legaic as often described in the Tsimshian narratives). The early involvement of Nieshot and presumably his followers, the Gitzaxtets [Gitzaxlaal] in the trade at Fort Simpson is further supported by Nieshot's son being hired by the HBC as a hunter for the post.³⁹⁸

On January 7, 1835, the Cape Fox Tlingit were described in the HBC reports as traveling down to Pearl Harbour. They returned to the post with deer and 40 dried salmon which they traded at the post. Since it was January, the Tlingit may have obtained the salmon from the Pearl Harbour Indians. The Pearl Harbour Indians also came to the fort with two deer to trade. They had a few halibut to trade, but the price was considered too high by the HBC.³⁹⁹ In February 1835, various Indians were reported selling a lot of dried salmon to the HBC at Fort Simpson.⁴⁰⁰

In the spring of 1835 there was a shortage of eulachon oil. HBC Chief Factor John Work wrote on May 30, 1835 that:

formerly the Americans [maritime fur traders] used to buy a great deal of this article [eulachon oil] and sell it elsewhere on the coast for furs, but as

³⁹⁶ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 232.

³⁹⁷ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, November 14, 1834.

³⁹⁸ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 255 ft. 30, 256.

³⁹⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, January 7, 1835; January 14, 1835.

⁴⁰⁰ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, February 3, 1835. Dried salmon was only good for a maximum of about six months, less, if the preservation was poor. Based on the time of year (February), the dried salmon were likely surplus from the amount stored as winter food. The Indians may have been trying to dispose of them at the post, while on route to the Nass fishery for fresh fish in the form of eulachon. The timing of the trade of dried fish to the post suggests that the Indians did not intentionally preserve a surplus of salmon for trade, until they knew they wouldn't need it for food.

this has been an indifferent fishing year the Oil is scarce and such high prices demanded for it that there would be no gain in buying it to sell elsewhere.⁴⁰¹

On June 3, 1835, Work reported that the Pearl Harbour Indians had arrived and traded a few halibut. However, Work reported on August 6, 1835 that he was unable to get the Pearl Harbour Indians to bring him fresh salmon: "they say it is too far to come with them." They could bring dried and half dried salmon.⁴⁰² The HBC preferred fresh salmon because they preserved salmon through salting.

On June 17, 1835, Work reported that the native trade was associated with violent confrontations between groups:

It is rumoured among the Indians that four of the Natives, who were off on a hunting excursion toward Skeena some time ago, killed 8 Indians from that place who were on their way here to trade. These ruffians returned with a good many beaver, though they had not been long absent, and it could not be conjectured where they had obtained them. The Chiefs are very much displeased as it will probably cause a war, so that they dare not go up that river to trade as usual, where they used to find a good many beaver.⁴⁰³

On June 28, 1835, Indians were reported fishing for halibut from Dundas Island. The Masset Haida were at Pearl Harbour in June 1835. The reason is not given, but they were probably trading potatoes. In July 1835, the HBC fur traders were receiving half dried salmon from the Pearl Harbour Indians and the Nass Indians. In fact the Nass Indians brought in too many dried salmon for the HBC's requirements.⁴⁰⁴

It was company policy for the HBC to issue a suit of clothes to persons they identified as "chiefs" either those recognized in their communities or created by the fur trade (also known as "trading post chiefs").⁴⁰⁵ By 1836, the HBC at Fort Simpson had issued suits to three Tsimshian, Tsaqaxs, Nieshot and Legaic. Legaic was employed by the HBC to provide furs, and would deliver letters between posts.⁴⁰⁶ In July 1835, Legaic was described by Chief Factor John Work, as one of the best Indians: "He is a principal man, and of weight and standing among the Natives, and Dr. Kennedy's father-in-law too, or I certainly would have had him severely punished on the spot, though it is likely it would have been attended by bloodshed." The occasion resulting in such harsh words by Work

⁴⁰¹ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, p. 43.

⁴⁰² Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 47, 63.

⁴⁰³ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, p. 52.

⁴⁰⁴ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, June 8, 1835; June 28, 1835; July 21, 1835; July 28, 1835, August 16, 1835.

⁴⁰⁵ These individuals provide furs and provisions to the post and may or may not be recognized chiefs of their own communities.

⁴⁰⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, March 2, 1836; July 27, 1837.

involved an incident in which Legaic was drunk and abusive.⁴⁰⁷

The HBC would obtain its own supply of salmon from a fishing location close to the post. On July 26, 1835, HBC Chief Factor John Work reported that there were plenty of salmon at the lower end of the bay a short distance of the fort and that only a lack of nets prevented him from fishing.⁴⁰⁸ On August 20, 1835, Work reported that: “we have not been able to procure any fresh salmon from the Indians this season owing to the quarrels among themselves.”⁴⁰⁹ Whether out of necessity or choice, in August the HBC staff caught 400 salmon in a short time in “the Little River” and salted them. The location of the Little River is not identified.⁴¹⁰ The HBC were not limited in their own fishing to the post, for in 1856, the HBC obtained provisions by hunting and fishing near Pearl Harbour and “in our bay” presumably Tsimpshean Peninsula adjacent to Fort Simpson.⁴¹¹

Despite the exchange of food provided by other native groups to the Tsimshian, the HBC had difficulty obtaining provisions from the Tsimshian. Duncan Finlayson, the Chief Factor at Fort McLoughlin (Bella Bella) informed John McLoughlin, the Chief Factor of the Columbia District on September 29, 1836 of the conditions at Fort Simpson in 1836:

The resources in the way of living which Fort Simpson affords, are Deer, Halibut, and Salmon, which however may be considered as precarious while our dependence is placed on the natives for providing them, as they entertain such hostile feelings towards one another that frequent and fatal disturbances arise which will prevent their fishing or hunting more than is barely sufficient for their daily subsistence.⁴¹²

Smallpox Epidemic 1836

In October 1836 smallpox again struck the native peoples of the Northwest Coast. The epidemic was carried on the American trading vessel *La Grange* from the Russian port of New Archangel (Alaska) to the Tsimshian and other groups.⁴¹³ On November 2, 1836, great numbers of Indians were reported dying. Legaic reported to the fur traders at Fort Simpson that numerous people were dead. Legaic’s wife died on December 1, 1836.⁴¹⁴ By the fall and early winter of 1836, Chief Nieshot of the Pearl Harbour Tsimshian had also

⁴⁰⁷ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 43, 71, 58.

⁴⁰⁸ Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 60, 61, 63, 67.

⁴⁰⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, August 20, 1835.

⁴¹⁰ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, August 19, 1835.

⁴¹¹ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, August 17, 1856.

⁴¹² Rich, E.E., ed. *The Letters of John McLoughlin, from Fort Vancouver to the Governor and Committee: first series 1825-38* (Toronto: Champlain Society), 1941, Appendix A, p. 324.

⁴¹³ 1836 and 1862 mortalities ranged from 1/3 to 2/3 of population. The geographical spread of smallpox of 1836-37 is illustrated in Boyd, Robert, *The Coming of the Spirit of Pestilence: introduced diseases and population decline among Northwest Coast Indians, 1774-1874*, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1999, pp. 129, 204.

⁴¹⁴ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, October 2, 1836; October 19, 1836; November 6, 1836.

died from smallpox followed by the news of the death on November 2, 1836 of Chief Tsaqaxs. Because the death of a chief made villages (“Houses”) vulnerable to incursion by other groups, the relatives of these two chiefs were under pressure to obtain the necessary wealth to feast the dead chiefs and elevate successors who could then reassert their claims to their local territories.⁴¹⁵ If a House could not afford to bury their dead by hosting and financing a mortuary feast, then a related House would do so and take control of and use part of that Houses’ territory. This will continue until the original house had repaid the other House in a feast and the territory is returned.⁴¹⁶

The heir apparent to the Tsaqaxs name was evidently unsuccessful raising the necessary witnesses for the necessary feast. The Nieshot name also dropped out of the picture for several years. This political reality created opportunities through vacant chiefly status within Houses, especially as an estimated third of the Tsimshian population would die from smallpox. This is also probably when chiefs like Legaic obtained wealth and new status.⁴¹⁷ Historian Jonathan Dean described Legaic as the “most pliant” of the chiefs for the HBC to control.⁴¹⁸

On or before 1836, there was a limited permanent native population residing at Fort Simpson. They were primarily Masset [Haida] and Tsimshian speaking people, possibly Gitzaxlaal. Fort Simpson would soon become a haven for survivors of the smallpox although the names of the groups are unknown.⁴¹⁹ Fewer than half the usual number of canoes set out for the eulachon fishery (340 canoes instead of 760 canoes) in 1837 as the year previous, likely attributable to the smallpox epidemic. Fur Trader John Work reported on October 20, 1838 that the Tsimshian population loss from the 1836 smallpox was approximately one third, but higher among neighbouring groups.⁴²⁰

Depopulation, aside from its foremost devastating effects to human life, also created new opportunities for greater social mobility as leadership positions opened. According to historian Jonathan Dean, deaths from smallpox between trading partners would have: “disrupted established trade ties, based on fictive (or real) kinship ties. Some villages or houses would have been displaced, and others would have had to re-establish trade prerogatives.”⁴²¹ Thus it was not until after 1836 that Legaic [Legex] took over the leadership and trading privileges which were previously held by Tsaqaxs and Nieshot.

⁴¹⁵ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 259-260.

⁴¹⁶ Roth, Christopher F., Goods, Names and Selves: rethinking the Tsimshian potlatch, *American Ethnologist*, 2002, 29(1):131.

⁴¹⁷ Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 14.

⁴¹⁸ Dean, Jonathan, R., “These Rascally Spackaloids:” the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, *B.C. Studies*, 1994 (101): 75, 76.

⁴¹⁹ Dean, Jonathan, R., “These Rascally Spackaloids:” the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, *B.C. Studies*, 1994 (101): 56, 57; Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 260.

⁴²⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 260 ft. 47

⁴²¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 262, ft. 50.

Legaic had also taken over the Gispaxlo'ots leadership⁴²² for when their trading partner, the Kaigani [Haida], arrived at Fort Simpson, they were taken to Legaic's house. This marks a significant change in political or trading relationships since the Kaigani [Haida] and the Gispaxlo'ots were formerly at odds.⁴²³

Like the earlier post 1770s smallpox epidemic, the 1836 epidemic would also have had the effect of eliminating information held by elders and potentially wipe out some *adawx* and other cultural knowledge. Depopulation would also contribute to new amalgamations of groups and territories.

Subsistence activities continued for the survivors. On April 26, 1837, Indians were described in a HBC fur trade report collecting herring spawn to dry for their winter provisions. Although the location was likely close to Fort Simpson, no trade in herring spawn was reported either to the post or between native groups.⁴²⁴ In the summer of 1837, the HBC declined to purchase salmon in trade from Indians because they were not thoroughly dried. There was evidently no shortage or demand for salmon by the HBC.⁴²⁵

Intergroup Hostilities and Slavery

Numerous "quarrels" like that reported on May 6, 1838 and July 8, 1838 between groups at Port Essington and the Masset Haida, diminished fur returns and was bad for HBC business.⁴²⁶ For obvious reasons, native groups were afraid to pass through areas where there was fighting between groups. Warfare not only interfered with trade but with the acquisition of food provisions.⁴²⁷ The HBC fur trader reported in 1838 that there was: "a great deal of predatory warfare among themselves [the Indians]." With the scarcity of furs, slaves became a valuable native commodity and were the "articles most in demand with the Inland Indians...."⁴²⁸

⁴²² The implication is that Legaic was not the leader of the Gispaxlo'ots but perhaps some other group. The Legaic name was earlier associated with a group known as the Lannacoan.

⁴²³ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 12, 261, 262, 263.

⁴²⁴ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, April 26, 1837. Beynon stated that the Metlakatla Tsimshian resented the Fort Simpson Tsimshian from coming to their shores to gather herring spawn: "even though they belonged to the same tribe. They regarded themselves as belonging to the Metlakatla Band and that the Port Simpson Band of tsimsiyan had their own reserve rights in which to gather herring spawn." American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. v, pp. 27, 28.

⁴²⁵ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, July 22, 1837.

⁴²⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1838-1840, May 6, 1838; July 8, 1838; July 9, 1838. The violent attacks between groups reported at Fort Simpson between 1834-40 are tabled in Appendix F of Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 643-645. The word "quarrel" ca. 1838 according to the Oxford English Dictionary meant "a violent contention or altercation *between* persons, or of one person *with* another; a rupture of friendly relations." It does not mean an argument as is commonly used today.

⁴²⁷ HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, July 2, 1837, July 8, 1837.

⁴²⁸ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, June 21, 1838; June 22, 1838; June 23, 1838.

Fur trade posts like Fort Simpson acted as magnates and put native peoples in contact with others with whom they may not have normally been in regular or non violent contact. The new contact often led to conflicts. Quarrels were regularly reported in the HBC records, such as in the fall of 1841 between the Tsimshian who had a fight with the Skeena River Indians which left four of the latter killed and others wounded. The origin of the quarrel was according to the fur trader: “about some trifling affairs regarding the trade.”⁴²⁹ The competition for furs also escalated into violence between native groups in 1841: “A Skeena River chief and six of his men went on a hunting excursion some distance in the interior were fallen on and killed by a neighbouring Tribe on whose hunting grounds they were encroaching....”⁴³⁰ Shortages of furs contributed to increased vigilance over hunting areas and predatory raiding for slaves which could be exchanged for furs.⁴³¹ On August 22, 1835, for example, the Tsimshian were observed taking canoes filled with slaves to the Tongass Tlingit. They returned to Fort Simpson with furs.⁴³² The Tsimshian had traded the slaves for furs.

Albert P. Niblack, U.S. Navy surveyor of Alaska in the 1880s, wrote a study of Indians of the Northern Northwest coast. He described slaves as the most important expression of wealth in the 1840s: “Formerly wealth consisted largely in the possession of slaves. Simpson⁴³³ estimates that in 1841 one third of the entire population of this region were slaves of the most helpless and abject description....” Niblack stated that the Tsimshian were the principals in this trade and traded southern Indian slaves to the Northern Tlingit and Dené [Carrier] for furs.⁴³⁴

Anthropologist Viola Garfield also noted that slave labour enabled the accumulation of a larger surplus which led to more intensive exploitation, greater specialization and artistic development. Slaves were necessary to estuarine traders to carry goods on long treks to inland suppliers. The Tsimshian also demanded and got a lot of slaves, some of which were used to transport their big trade in eulachon grease.⁴³⁵ Anthropologist Donald Mitchell who studied the Fort Simpson post journals, established a connection between the emergence of important post contact chiefs and the slave trade. He found chiefs like Sebassa, Shakes and Legeich [Legaic] were important figures in the slave trade and their association with slavery led to their power in conjunction with their position in the fur trade.⁴³⁶

⁴²⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, October 21, 1841.

⁴³⁰ PABC AB20si2. Fort Simpson Correspondence Outward, September 6, 1841-October 1844. August 2, 1844, John Work/W. Charles Dodd.

⁴³¹ See Donald, Leland, *Aboriginal slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America*, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1997, p. 114.

⁴³² HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838, August 22, 1835.

⁴³³ Governor Simpson of the HBC.

⁴³⁴ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890, p. 252.

⁴³⁵ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 27; Ferguson, Brian, *A Re-examination of the Causes of Northwest Coast Warfare, Warfare, Culture and Environment*, edited by Brian Ferguson, (New York, Academic Press), 1984, pp. 277, 280-281.

⁴³⁶ Mitchell, Donald, *Sebassa's Men*, in *The World is as Sharp as a Knife: An Anthology in Honor of Wilson Duff*, edited by Donald Abbott, (Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum), 1981, p. 86. Leland Donald documented the rise of predatory raiding for slaves to the fur trade see, Donald, Leland, *Aboriginal slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America*, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1997.

In the spring of 1838, Fort Simpson was occupied by: “a great many Indians of different tribes.” As HBC Factor Work noted on May 21, 1838, this would and did lead to skirmishes between groups like the Skidegate Haida and some groups of Tsimshian.⁴³⁷ The groups reported at Fort Simpson included the Kitkatla (Sebassa), Kitimat, Tlingit from Cape Fox, Kitlope [Bella Bella who spoke Haisla on Gardiner Canal] and Masset [Haida].⁴³⁸ An incident in which barter between a Tsimshian woman and a Haida woman at Fort Simpson soured was reported in the HBC journal on July 16, 1838. A Kigarnie Haida woman challenged the status of a Tsimshian woman by preparing to kill a slave. Instead of killing the slave, however, she did the next best thing, which was to “throw away property”, in this case European blankets, which were then torn up and distributed among the local Tsimshian who were “well pleased.”⁴³⁹

The HBC fur trader also reported an incident in which the Stikine chief, Quatkie, had insulted the Tsimshian chief, Legaic, by throwing a large copper away⁴⁴⁰ and later killed slaves. The fur trader described these acts as representative of: “a great deal of predatory warfare among themselves [the Indians]” and noted that slaves, in the absence of furs, were a valuable native commodity. Slaves were the: “articles most in demand with the Inland Indians....”⁴⁴¹

More detail about the relationship of quarrels to groups and wealth is provided in the HBC post journal for September 21, 1838:

They have a quarrel among themselves and as is customary with them on such occasions, they were going to kill a poor slave boy, on learning the circumstances we interfered and threatened to fire upon them if they plan to do anything of the kind on our grounds. They then tore in pieces blankets on each side and gave them away or as they call it, threw it away. These people are now poor and can ill afford such a sacrifice but such is their pride to show who can afford to throw away most that they strip themselves....slaves are of high value and killing one on each side....is a general thing among them when a quarrel is to be made up. ⁴⁴²

When groups were engaged in warfare, they did not trade. The Kigarnie Haida were reported on March 28, 1853 to travel to Sitka with potatoes, salmon and halibut where: “they obtain exorbitant prices for any food as they i.e. the Sitka people are afraid to move out on account of the Stikine people.”⁴⁴³ This would suggest that groups involved in conflict were unable to travel freely, not only to trade, but to obtain sustenance.⁴⁴⁴

⁴³⁷ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 262.

⁴³⁸ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840. June 4, 1838; June 17, 1838; June 18 1838. see also: HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, June 9, 1841; July 9, 1841.

⁴³⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, July 16, 1838, July 17, 1838.

⁴⁴⁰ The practice of throwing away or even destroying a copper, or killing slaves, or giving away property are viewed as insults to the rank and status or “face” of the person the act is directed at.

⁴⁴¹ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, June 21, 1838; June 22, 1838; June 23, 1838.

⁴⁴² HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, September 21, 1838.

⁴⁴³ HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, March 28, 1853.

⁴⁴⁴ As noted, the frequent violent attacks between groups reported at Fort Simpson between 1834-40 are tabled in Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -

Most incidents of barter between unrelated persons described in the historical records or the ethnographic record which involve marine resources appear to be personal and individual, that is, between persons rather than groups. There is also a high incidence of such exchanges involving women bartering for marine foodstuffs. For example, in a narrative attributed to A. Wellington recorded in 1914, Legaic's sister is described as going downriver to trade when her canoe was upset. Legaic was "angry at the people in the village who had refused to accompany his sister, and he chased them from the village."⁴⁴⁵ There are no other details about this trade, but it suggests the potential limited quantity of goods exchanged and the type of trade engaged in, namely by individuals. Garfield also stated that women could: "barter woven goods and preserved or fresh foods collected by themselves."⁴⁴⁶

In 1838, the HBC purchased eulachon oil from the Indians for use as engine oil for steamers like the *Beaver*. The HBC complained, however, that it was difficult getting supplies: "but like all supplies from Indians it is precarious and cant be depended upon."⁴⁴⁷ The fur trader was relieved to report on September 18, 1838 that a party of Tongass [Tlingit] arrived at Fort Simpson: "they are coming here to hunt deer we are glad as this is the season to salt meat when it is in best order."⁴⁴⁸ Where the Tongass were hunting deer is not described. HBC personnel would also hunt for deer themselves on Finlayson's Island and cut wood. The *S.S. Beaver* was also reported to stop at Finlayson's Island for wood supplies in the 1850s.⁴⁴⁹

On November 6, 1838, ten or twelve canoes from the Skeena River took up winter quarters at Fort Simpson. By November 16, 1838, however, a few canoes went to the Skeena River: "to take their winter quarters there."⁴⁵⁰ By 1839, a permanent resident native population was starting to remain at Fort Simpson. Archaeologist Andrew Martindale stated that this shift in settlement pattern lead to a gradual change in the seasonal cycle of Tsimshian. This shift was characterized as a trend toward settling at Fort Simpson during the winter instead of occupying their traditional winter villages at Metlakatla.⁴⁵¹ Many groups en route to the eulachon fishery on the Nass River would also stop at Fort Simpson. The Kitimat were reported to pass by on February 15, 1839 and the Kitkatla on March 25, 1839.⁴⁵²

Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, Appendix F. pp. 643-645.

⁴⁴⁵ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 40, file 32.

⁴⁴⁶ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 16.

⁴⁴⁷ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, September 4, 1838.

⁴⁴⁸ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, September 18, 1838.

⁴⁴⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, October 23, 1838; November 27, 1839; HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, May 10, 1855; October 6, 1855; July 3, 1858. HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, October 23, 1838; November 27, 1839; HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, May 10, 1855; October 6, 1855.

⁴⁵⁰ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, November 6, 1838; November 16, 1838; December 27, 1838; January 20, 1839; February 9, 1839.

⁴⁵¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contract Period*, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, eds. R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, (Vancouver & Toronto: UBC Press), 2003:25.

⁴⁵² HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, February 16, 1839; March

Another quarrel between the Kigarnie [Haida] and Legaic [Gispaxlo'ots] was reported at the Fort Simpson post on February 22, 1839. Although Legaic attempted to make peace with Chief Kow [Cowe] by giving him a large canoe, the Kigarnie chief did not respond in kind. Legaic retaliated by taking some Kigarnie as slaves. According to the HBC fur trader: "the Indians in making presents and giving away things always do so with the understanding of some time or other getting an equivalent in return."⁴⁵³ This observation underscores an important understanding about the nature of exchange in Tsimshian (and other Northwest Coast) societies. Material goods or "wealth" become valuable by being disposed of or "thrown away" and, exchange in the form of gift giving was expected to be reciprocal.

A few months later, on May 25, 1839, the HBC fur trader reported a serious incident over trading:

a serious quarrel took place between the Skiddigate [Skidegate Haida] and Chimsyan [Tsimshian] Indians. It appears that a Chimsyan, Elgeigh's [Legaic] son made some bargain with a Massette [Haida] who is with the Skiddigates [Skidegate] and when going away with his purchase the Massette man or his wife repented having made the bargain and wished to break it which Elgeighs [Legaic's] son ... without further ceremony the Massette man and his wife insulted and struck him. A serious cause immediately ensued the Massette man got knocked down and his head cut with a stone, arms were fired to and firing commenced on both sides....⁴⁵⁴

The "quarrel" continued into the next day when a slave girl belonging to the Skidegate was killed and two or three of their people were wounded. Others, like Cacax's [Tsaqaxs] people who arrived from Pearl Harbour joined the fight. There was more gunfire, multiple woundings, killing of women and slaves and taking of captives. Between five and eight Skidegate were killed. The Tsimshian were afraid to go sea otter hunting off Dundas Island, or to make any trading excursions for fear of falling in with their enemies. Many Tsimshian left in a great hurry for the Skeena River.⁴⁵⁵

As expected, on June 7, 1839, a large Haida war party was waiting to retaliate against the Tsimshian. Their presence reduced the Tsimshian stay at Fort Simpson. Despite the Tsimshian's hasty departure, the Haida war party stayed close to Finlayson Island as they lay in wait for any straggling Tsimshian. "Marauding" Haida were also reported at the Nass River on July 29, 1839. On September 13, 1840, the Kigarnie [Haida] were able to kidnap two Tsimshian near Birnie Island.⁴⁵⁶

In a narrative recorded by Barbeau, the Gilutss'aaw (Giludzar) went to Bernie Island for halibut fishing (*Larhka'iyawn*) where they encountered Haida raiders. The Tsimshian

25, 1839.

⁴⁵³ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, February 22, 1839.

⁴⁵⁴ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, May 25, 1839.

⁴⁵⁵ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, May 25, 1839.

⁴⁵⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, May 25, 1839; May 26, 1839; May 29, 1839, June 7, 1839; July 8, 1839, July 29, 1839; September 13, 1840. The Haida are frequently reported as being camped on Birnie Island in the 1850s. Birnie Island was named in 1836 by officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, after James Birnie, born at Aberdeen, Scotland, 1800. <http://srmwww.gov.bc.ca/bcgn-bin/bcg10?name=36377>

camps were down at Work Channel, which is also where the Tsimshian found Haida encamped. The Gilutss'aaw Chief Neeshlkinik said he would send canoes to Metlakatla to tell Legaic about it.⁴⁵⁷ The Haida (Kigarnie) were often reported to camp on Birnie Island in 1855-1859. In 1859, some thirty or forty Kigarnie Haida canoes were encamped there while on route to Victoria. The Masset Haida encamped on Finlayson Island.⁴⁵⁸ Both Birnie Island near the entrance of Port Simpson and Finlayson Island are in the Claim Land.

Other equally deadly quarrels were reported between the Tsimshian and the Skeena River Indians. In this case four of the latter were killed and others wounded. According to the HBC fur trader the: "quarrel originated about some trifling affairs regarding the trade."⁴⁵⁹

These examples in the historical record demonstrate the fragility of trade between individuals and its potential to escalate into violence. Compensation for wounding between native groups usually required a payment which could take the form of blankets, sheeting sails and elk skin robes.⁴⁶⁰ Trade goods were exchanged through various means, gifts, tribute, theft during raiding and in compensation "Wergild" or "blood money." The Gispaxlo'ots, for example, paid Nastow, a Kigarnie Chief 20 blankets in compensation for shooting his son "some years ago." Chief Nastow was still not satisfied.⁴⁶¹

The HBC personnel were not dependent on the Tsimshian for their food supply. The Tongass [Tlingit] would bring in fresh salmon from Clemencitty, which was then salted by the HBC. In fact, the amount of salmon the Tongass brought to the post, temporally exceeded the salt supplies of the HBC.⁴⁶² On July 24, 1839, the Cape Fox Tlingit brought 1,584 fresh salmon to the post.⁴⁶³

In the early winter of 1839, most of the Indians at Fort Simpson had departed to Sebassa [Kitkatla] for a "grand feast." The feast would involve the exchange of copper plates and beaver [skins] for slaves.⁴⁶⁴ These items, and probably eulachon oil (fine grade) and elk skins are consistently reported in the ethnographic record and historical records to constitute wealth for the Tsimshian.

By late November 1839, however, the Coast Tsimshian were described as "badly off" for the lack of eulachon oil. It is not known whether they had a supply of eulachon oil which had been dispensed with at Sebassa's feast or they had produced insufficient supplies in the spring. Two canoes of Nass people went to the Skeena River: "with lots of oil to trade with the Chimsyans [Tsimshian] who are it appears badly off for this luxury." The next

⁴⁵⁷ PABC Boas Collection, A 00267, Barbeau Files: The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In search of bounteous land by Marius Barbeau, pp. 194, 195.

⁴⁵⁸ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, August 9, 1855; July 15, 1856; October 14, 1857; April 27, 1858; April 27, 1858, July 12, 1859.

⁴⁵⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, October 21, 1841.

⁴⁶⁰ HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, January 7, 1842

⁴⁶¹ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, June 25, 1863. See Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffat (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS. May 27, 1860.

⁴⁶² HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, July 16, 1839; July 18, 1839.

⁴⁶³ HBCA. B. 210/a/5, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1840, July 24, 1840.

⁴⁶⁴ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, November 11, 1839.

day, two canoes of Tsimshian were reported traveling to the Nass River “on a trading expedition for oil dried berries....” On December 3, 1839, a few canoes from the Nass were again on route to the Skeena River with “lots of small fish [eulachon] grease.” And on December 27, 1839, another seven canoes of Nass people were bound for the Skeena River “with small fish oil.” Three canoes of Nass people in fact “passed the winter at Skeena.”⁴⁶⁵

Although the items the Coast Tsimshian may have exchanged for the eulachon oil or grease is not described in the HBC post report, it was probably furs. Several canoes from the Skeena River passed by Fort Simpson in January 1840, but had no furs for trade. If the Coast Tsimshian had already exchanged furs to the Nass Indians for eulachon grease, this may explain their lack of furs for trade.⁴⁶⁶

The eulachon fishery may not have always been reliable but it was profitable for the Tsimshian. The supply of eulachon grease was reported as poor in 1842 because the Nass River was blocked with ice. Perhaps because of this shortfall, over 13 large canoes of Tsimshian arrived at Fort Simpson in March 1842 to look for seaweed to eat.⁴⁶⁷

Legal Trading Prerogatives on the Upper Skeena River

By November 1840, Legaic had obtained exclusive privileges to trade on the Skeena River. According to the HBC post record: “no other gang of the Chym. [Tsimshian] Tribe being allowed to trade there arrived from Skeena River” They had arrived at Fort Simpson to take up their winter quarters: “the whole gang is at this place now.”⁴⁶⁸ The Skeena River route as a fur trade route became lucrative at this time which, as Historian Jonathan Dean notes, coincided with Legaic’s assumption of control over the Skeena River trade.⁴⁶⁹ Legaic controlled the fur trade of the Upper Skeena River but there is no mention of who (if anyone) controlled the lower Skeena River. Not all of the Skeena River was under Legaic’s control.⁴⁷⁰

The group or “gang” led by Legaic was known to the Fort Simpson fur traders as the “rascally spackaloids.” Dean suggested that the Gispaxlo’ots [spackaloid] had been quick to take advantage of the temporary decline of Tsaqaxs’ power, and to seize some of his prerogatives⁴⁷¹ which evidently included the upper Skeena River. On January 28, 1842,

⁴⁶⁵ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, November 17, 1839; November 18, 1839; December 3, 1839, December 27, 1839; February 23, 1840.

⁴⁶⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1838-1840, January 1, 1840; January 4, 1840; January 17, 1840; January 18, 1840.

⁴⁶⁷ HBCA. B.201/a/6. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-42, March 27, 1842, May 5, 1842, May 8, 1842. Ice was a problem on the Nass River in March 26, 1860. Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffat (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS.

⁴⁶⁸ HBCA. B. 210/a/5, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1840, October 2, 1840; November 14, 1840; Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 278.

⁴⁶⁹ Dean, Jonathan, “Those Rascally Spackaloids”: The Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832 to 1840, BC Studies, 1994 101:74-75.

⁴⁷⁰ Dean, Jonathan, “Those Rascally Spackaloids”: The Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832 to 1840, BC Studies, 1994 101 42, ft. 5.

⁴⁷¹ Note that *spackaloids* is Work’s rendition of Gispaxlo’ots for “the elderberry place people”. Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border

Legaic, who was often called the “Spackaloid chief” in the HBC records, and who had so recently obtained the trading prerogative over the upper Skeena River, died.⁴⁷²

According to Anthropologist Donald Mitchell, it is undeniable from the Hudson’s Bay Company records for the period after the 1830s, that Legaic [Legex] and his people, the Gispaxlo’ots had some kind of exclusive right to carry on the *fur trade* up the Skeena River and that Legaic became a principal chief. Mitchell placed this political change as occurring in the 1840s.⁴⁷³ This view is shared not only by Historian Jonathan Dean but also by Anthropologist James McDonald who said that the fur trade and contact with a market lead to the creation of new mercantile leaders, the concentration of wealth in their hands, consolidation of power of leaders, centralization of tribes around Port Simpson, and the use of European trade as a factor in intertribal politics.⁴⁷⁴ Historians like Dean who have examined the historical records in detail, doubt that the Gispaxlo’ots through their leader Legaic had a trading monopoly inland prior to the historical period:

Whether or not direct Gispaxlots trade ever extended this far inland, it is clear that by historical times they operated a monopoly of sorts over part of the *upper* Skeena River, and were one of the villages through whose hands passed the trade of the Babine and Wet’suwet’en Carriers on its way to the coast [emphasis added].⁴⁷⁵

Dean also cautioned that Legaic’s so-called trade monopoly, as it appears in the Tsimshian narratives, cannot simply be understood in Western terms. A monopoly did not mean “a complete shut-down of all but Gispaxlo’ots commerce, but *might* have consisted of titular control.” Even after the rise of Legaic which occurred in 1840, “strangers” from the interior continued to bring trade down the Skeena to Fort Simpson and the Nass valley continued as an important trade route.⁴⁷⁶

Dean clarified that this trade did “not regulate the movement of prestige goods along the coast.” Dean distinguished between a native trade in prestige goods, from that of European goods although both could be traded at the same time. The prestige goods which qualified as native trade in Dean’s view, were those which had importance in the feasting or potlatches. This included a downriver [Skeena River] trade in marmot pelts, berries and moose skins while the Gispaxlo’ots carried herring eggs, seaweed, grease (eulachon), dried halibut and other foods: “while marmot pelts and oolachen oil were

of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 278, 279, ft. 101.

⁴⁷² HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, January 28, 1842; Jonathan Ritchie, 1993 P. 381.

⁴⁷³ Mitchell, Donald H., Tribes and Chiefdoms of the Northwest Coast: The Tsimshian Case, in The Evolution of Maritime Cultures on the Northeast and Northwest Coasts of America, Ronald J. Nash, ed., Simon Fraser University, Department of Archaeology Publications 11, Burnaby, B.C. 1983, p. 64.

⁴⁷⁴ McDonald, James, Images of the Nineteenth-Century Economy of the Tsimshian, in The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984:43.

⁴⁷⁵ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 46-47.

⁴⁷⁶ Dean, Jonathan, “Those Rascally Spackaloids”: The Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832 to 1840, BC Studies, 1994 101: 77, 78.

used in feasting, these did not entail the entire range of prestige or ceremonial goods.”⁴⁷⁷

Anthropologist Marjorie Halpin noted that although Legaic was acknowledged as the highest ranking chief of the Lower Skeena River tribes at Fort Simpson, this was not associated with a political role.⁴⁷⁸ There was, based on historical accounts however, no confederation or leadership under an “autocratic Legaic” as described in the Tsimshian narratives. The villages continued to operate autonomously at Fort Simpson, if ranked, under a new tribal chief in the name of Legaic.⁴⁷⁹

As previously described, some of these marine products were likely received in tribute or trade by the Tsimshian in their middlemen role to European trade goods. Fort Simpson became a market place for the exchange of food items with the resident middlemen Tsimshian intercepting these foods and passing them on to others for greater profit.⁴⁸⁰

Although Archaeologist Martindale holds the view that Legaic [Legex] came to power not in the 1840s, as supported by Dean and Mitchell and others, but in the 1820s and 1830s, he relies solely on Tsimshian narratives as evidence for this earlier date and not the historical sources. This is despite his admitted difficulties with using the *adawx* for historical purposes.⁴⁸¹ Some writers like, Susan Marsden and Robert Galois have stated that the Gispaxlo’ots were the leading tribe among the Tsimshian from their trade prerogatives held in 1787 (which coincidentally approximates the first date of contact). There is no historical support for this statement and their supporting references for this interpretation refer to unidentified and therefore difficult to corroborate *adawx*.⁴⁸²

Regardless of the time period identified by any of these scholars, the rise in importance of Legaic and his trading abilities arose post contact, as a result of the introduction of the fur trade.

Migration and Settlement at Fort Simpson

The migration and construction of lodges near Fort Simpson by the Coast Tsimshian lodges had started in the late 1830s and continued until the early 1850s. This type of settlement was atypical of precontact Tsimshian settlement because members of more than a dozen lineages now lived together in one location. According to William Beynon,

⁴⁷⁷ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 46-47.

⁴⁷⁸ Halpin, Marjorie Myers, The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1973, p. 72, fn. 9.

⁴⁷⁹ Dean, Jonathan, R., “These Rascally Spackaloids:” the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, B.C. Studies, 1994 (101):76; Miller, Jay, Feasting with the Southern Tsimshian, in The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. 30.

⁴⁸⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 280, 306.

⁴⁸¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 358.

⁴⁸² Marsden, Susan and Galois, Robert, The Tsimshian, the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Geopolitics of the Northwest Coast Fur Trade, 1787-1840, Canadian Geographer, 1995, 39(2):171-172, 180 ft.15.

when the various Tsimshian groups moved to Fort Simpson, each of the village chiefs had to decide to move from their former winter quarters to Fort Simpson, or to appoint an heir to serve there in his stead. As a result, the previous winter villages fractured into several communities, and each of the leaders took on greater responsibilities as he delegated control to his nephews.⁴⁸³ The town chiefs, that is, leaders who moved to Fort Simpson became “tribal” chiefs, like the holder of the Eagle clan name of Legaic. The elevation of Legaic into a “tribal chief” was a result of the necessity of ranking each of the distinct groups who occupied the area around Fort Simpson.⁴⁸⁴

During the precontact period Coast Tsimshian lineages would not have shared a village, and would rarely have engaged in daily interaction. This is why internecine violent attacks, and attacks between different groups were recorded at Fort Simpson for the period between 1834 and 1840. These attacks have been tabled by Dean.⁴⁸⁵ Some groups like the Gispaxlo’ots had taken up winter residence at Fort Simpson by 1842, while others continued to lodge at their traditional wintering sites. By 1852, however, all of the Coast Tsimshian (ten named groups) seemed to be residing at Fort Simpson over the winter.⁴⁸⁶

Ethnographic data often presents a slightly different picture of Tsimshian settlement at Fort Simpson. After the establishment of the HBC at Fort Simpson, Garfield stated that the Skeena River and Metlakatla villages (“towns”) were “virtually abandoned and the people reassembled on the hereditary tribal camping grounds in the middle of which the Fort was built.”⁴⁸⁷ This ethnographic portrayal of the Coast Tsimshian migration to Fort Simpson is accurate only in the sense that the Tsimshian eventually migrated to Fort Simpson, although not all and not as soon as the post was established. There is also no historical evidence that the Tsimshian “reassembled” on their hereditary tribal camping grounds in the middle of Fort Simpson. This information is contrary to the information provided by W.F. Tolmie concerning the establishment of a post at Fort Simpson in 1834.

The first census of the Tsimshian residents at Fort Simpson was taken by the HBC in 1842: “we had been today begun taking an account of the Chymchian [Tsimshian] population, the whole amount to 2500 souls exclusive of several canoes left for Nass.” The Tsimshian were also reported to have 222 guns, 14 pistols, 762 canoes and 174 lodges.⁴⁸⁸ The number of lodges suggests a sizable winter occupation which indicates abandonment of former winter villages. The number of canoes suggests that very small numbers of people occupied a canoe, i.e. 3 people. The census suggests that Tsimshian households comprised an average of 14 persons, which corresponds to the size of an

⁴⁸³ In a matrilineal society like the Tsimshian, a male’s heir was his nephew, his sister’s son or brother.

⁴⁸⁴ Miller, Jay, *Feasting with the Southern Tsimshian*, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. 31.

⁴⁸⁵ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 643-645, Appendix F.

⁴⁸⁶ Mitchell, Donald H., *Tribes and Chiefdoms of the Northwest Coast: The Tsimshian Case*, in *The Evolution of Maritime Cultures on the Northeast and Northwest Coasts of America*, Ronald J. Nash, ed., Simon Fraser University, Department of Archaeology Publications 11, Burnaby, B.C. 1983, pp. 59, 60.

⁴⁸⁷ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 34.

⁴⁸⁸ HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842, February 22, 1842.

extended family (or clan segment), had less than one gun per household and one canoe for three people. By comparison, Archaeologist David Archer estimated that the Coast Tsimshian had a precontact population of between 5,000 to 8,000.⁴⁸⁹

Paul Kane, the self-styled “wandering artist” included an 1846 census of Northwest Coast Indians in his book, *Wanderings of an artist among the Indians of North America from Canada to Vancouver’s Island and Oregon through the Hudson’s Bay Company’s territory and back again*.⁴⁹⁰ Kane’s census provides more details of the HBC traders’ descriptions of the Chymshyan [Tsimshian]. Although the provenance of the 1846 census is not provided by Kane, the geologist George M. Dawson published part of this census as it related to the Haida in his Queen Charlotte Islands book of 1870. Dawson stated that he had received the census from Dr. W. F. Tolmie of the HBC but that the census had been made by John Work between the years 1836 and 1841.⁴⁹¹

The Tsimshian were described in the census as occupying the geographic area of: “Chatham’s Sound from Portland Canal to Port Essington, into which Skeena River falls, both mainland and neighbouring islands.” The Tsimshian were divided into four main divisions, the Nass, Chymseyans, Skeena and Sabassas Indians of which the Tsimshian (Chymseyans) were subdivided into ten named groups identified as the: Kis-pa-cah-laidy [Gispaxlo’ots]; Ket-lane [Gitlaan]; Kee-chis [Gitsiis]; Keen-ath-toix [Gitnadoix], Kit-will-coits [Gitwilgyoots]; Kitch-a-claith [Gitzaxlaal]; Ket-ut-sah [Giltss’aaw]; Ken-chen-kieg [Ginaxangiik]; Ket-an-dou [Gitando]; and Ket-wil-ei-pa [Gitwalksabae].⁴⁹² These names with various spellings correspond with the ethnographic identification of what have been referred to in the ethnographic literature as “tribal” names.⁴⁹³

In addition to the items listed in the 1842 census record, the Kane census shows the population by group and includes numbers of slaves which were owned by each named group. The Gispaxlo’ots had substantially the most houses (104) compared to the next largest group, the Gitlaan who had 29 houses, but who also had the largest number of canoes (157). The Ginaxangiik, however, had the largest number of guns (48). It is also evident how the Gitwalksabae who were identified as having only four houses, would later be reported in other sources as being extinct.

Also reported on the census were two groups of “Skeena Indians” who traded at Fort Simpson with the Tsimshian. They were identified as located on the “lower part of

⁴⁸⁹ Archer, David J.W., Kitkatla Heritage Inventory Project final Report, Department of Archeology, University of Calgary, Calgary/Alberta. Prepared for the Province of B.C., 1991, p. 22. This population likely included the Kitkatla.

⁴⁹⁰ Kane, Paul, *Wanderings of an artist among the Indians of North America from Canada to Vancouver’s Island and Oregon through the Hudson’s Bay Company’s territory and back again*, (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts), 1859, n.p. Census of Indian Tribes inhabiting the North-West Coast of America, for the year 1846.

⁴⁹¹ Cole, Douglas and Bradley Lockner, eds., *To the Charlottes: George Dawson’s 1878 Survey of the Queen Charlotte Islands*, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1993, p. 164.

⁴⁹² Kane, Paul, *Wanderings of an artist among the Indians of North America from Canada to Vancouver’s Island and Oregon through the Hudson’s Bay Company’s territory and back again*, (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts), 1859, n.p. Census of Indian Tribes inhabiting the North-West Coast of America, for the year 1846.

⁴⁹³ Kane, Paul, *Wanderings of an artist among the Indians of North America from Canada to Vancouver’s Island and Oregon through the Hudson’s Bay Company’s territory and back again*, (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts), 1859, n.p. Census of Indian Tribes inhabiting the North-West Coast of America, for the year 1846.

Skeena River ” and included the “Kee-chum-a-kai-lo” [Kitsumkalum] and the “Kit-se-lai.so” [Kitselas].⁴⁹⁴

In 1843, the HBC closed Fort McLoughlin which was south of Fort Simpson and which had served mostly the Heiltsuk, some Kitkatla and some Kwakiutl. They also closed the Durham post, north of Fort Simpson which had served the Taku Tlingit. The HBC replaced these closures with steamers like the *S.S. Beaver*, which would establish new trade rendezvous locations.⁴⁹⁵ These changes also led to the centralization of fur trading operations at Fort Simpson.

As noted, Legaic had died in January 1842. The Legaic name was taken up by a successor sometime after this and the new Legaic took over the Skeena River route. He is reported trading up the Skeena River on August 11, 1852 and returning September 5, 1852 with furs. The father of the newly appointed Legaic was probably a Kitkatla Tsimshian, for Legaic was described as visiting his father at Sebassas [Kitkatla].⁴⁹⁶

Legaic set off on various trading expeditions for the HBC such as that on May 25, 1855 when he returned on July 14, 1855. Canoes went out again on July 25, 1855 and August 3, 1855 and returned on October 8, 1855. Four canoes of Gispaxlo’ots set off on September 13, 1856 for the interior, lead not by Legaic, but an individual identified only as Couellar. They returned on October 25, 1856 with furs. Another expedition of eight or nine canoes would head for the interior on February 1857. The next expedition did not embark until July 1857 returning August 4, 1857, only to go out again on August 8, 1857 before returning September 7, 1857. The last trip of the year was destined to the Kitchlopes [Kitlope, now Haisla] village on October 8, 1857, which returned November 9, 1857.⁴⁹⁷ It is possible that the multiple trading trips recorded in the Tsimshian narratives associated with Legaic may refer to these trading expeditions for the HBC post which occurred in the mid 1850s or to earlier ones in the 1840s.

The increasing number of feasts or potlatches in the 1850s recorded in the historical records appears to have been held to reinforce chiefly trading prerogatives. According to Dean: the “relatively small number of these [feasts to declare trading prerogatives] held prior to 1840 indicate that no one chief had a firm enough hold on the trade routes of the Interior to validate a claim to a monopoly of access.”⁴⁹⁸ At a feast held on February 21, 1852, “Big Face” a member of the Gilutss’aaw⁴⁹⁹ gave away 200 boxes of eulachon oil.

⁴⁹⁴ Kane, Paul, *Wanderings of an artist among the Indians of North America from Canada to Vancouver’s Island and Oregon through the Hudson’s Bay Company’s territory and back again*, (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts), 1859, n.p. *Census of Indian Tribes inhabiting the North-West Coast of America*, for the year 1846.

⁴⁹⁵ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 382.

⁴⁹⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, August 11, 1852; September 5, 1852, January 11, 1853.

⁴⁹⁷ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, May 25, 1855; July 14, 1855; July 25, 1855; August 3, 1855, October 8, 1855; September 13, 1856; October 25, 1856; February 16, 1857; July 18, 1857; August 4, 1857; August 8, 1857; September 7, 1857; October 8, 1857; November 9, 1857.

⁴⁹⁸ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 279, 280.

⁴⁹⁹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian

Given the time of year, the oil was likely surplus from the previous year, because the eulachon fishery for 1852 did not start until March 1852. Big Face also distributed an estimated 500 elk skins and some coppers. Legaic reportedly also gave away a lot of cloth at this feast.⁵⁰⁰ On July 10, 1852, Legaic's "gang" reportedly bought a large copper from the Cumshewa [Haida] in exchange for 90 boxes of oil (eulachon), a large canoe, one slave.⁵⁰¹ In this example, the Tsimshian were giving a canoe to the Haida (and not receiving a Haida canoe as commonly described in the ethnographic literature). It is also evident that items of value or wealth for the Tsimshian like copper, were not exchanged for items like dried fish.

In or before 1853, Tsimshian at Fort Simpson were starting to leave for the larger markets of Fort Rupert (established 1849) and Victoria (1843). Some of the Tsimshian broke up the planks of their houses and sold the planks (172) and bark (100 pieces) to the Fort before they left.⁵⁰² By August 10, 1853, Fort Simpson was losing 100 Indians to trade centres at Victoria and Fort Rupert.⁵⁰³ This was the start of the migration of some of the Tsimshian to alternate locations like Fort Simpson and Fort Rupert to purchase and sell goods and to obtain employment in various types of work.

In the fall of 1853, James Douglas reported that there were 3,000 Northern Indians which included Tsimshian, Nisga'a, Haida, Tlingit and Heiltsuk in Victoria. The gold rush of 1858⁵⁰⁴ had dramatically increased the non native population in Victoria, which made the southern migration even more attractive to the Tsimshian. In 1859, the missionary William Duncan estimated that about 25% of the entire Coast Tsimshian population, that is 650 people, were either in Victoria or on their way to Victoria.⁵⁰⁵

George Hastings Inskip of the Royal Navy was master of the *HMS Virago*. In May 1853, the *Virago* sailed from the Queen Charlotte Islands to Fort Simpson where Inskip reported that there were natives from a great many other places visiting Fort Simpson, and which accounted for the high number of skins traded.⁵⁰⁶ Upon visiting some of the native "huts" at Fort Simpson (and comparing them with Indians [Haida] he was familiar with on the Queen Charlotte's Islands), Inskip commented that the:

natives were not at all sociable unlike those at any of the other places – they are not such a united lot as at Skidgates, Beaver Harbour [Fort Rupert Kwakiutl] &c. for here there are some of every tribe round which is the reason of their being numerous. Several of them left today for Sitka

Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 634.

⁵⁰⁰ HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, February 19, 1853; February 21, 1853.

⁵⁰¹ HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, July 10, 1852; Although the words oil and grease are commonly used to describe eulachon in the historical and ethnographic records, eulachon "oil" comes in different grades. MacNair, Peter L., Descriptive Notes on the Kwakiutl Manufacture of Eulachon Oil, Syesis, 1971 4(1-2):169-177.

⁵⁰² HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, March 10, 1853.

⁵⁰³ HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, August 10, 1853.

⁵⁰⁴ Victoria became the main distribution area of mining supplies and licenses. The gold rush was up the Fraser River.

⁵⁰⁵ Galois, R. M., Colonial Encounters: The Worlds of Arthur Wellington Clah, 1855-1881." B.C. Studies, 1997-1998, no. 115/116:114-115.

⁵⁰⁶ PABC MS-0705, George Hastings Inskip Papers. Master of the H.M.S. Virago 1851-1855, p. 321.

taking Fish oil for barter- it is astonishing how they wander about – some go from here to Victoria in fact no place they wish to visit is too far-.⁵⁰⁷

On July 11, 1853, Inskip described Legake [Legaic] as “the highest of the Chimseyan [Tsimshian] natives.”⁵⁰⁸

Inskip also observed on July 7, 1853 that two thirds of the Indians at Fort Simpson left for the Skeena River to catch salmon and that they had frequent fights:

Indians collect there from all parts just at this time the fish being in thousands – they dry them for their winter consumption – they frequently have desparate [sic] rows at this time & life is often lost. While we have been here two men have died suddenly- one while out fishing and another while at work at the Fort.... The look of depopulation is making rapid strides amongst them- when it is fine they dress themselves up in gay blankets &c directly in bad weather they go about in the old worn ragged ones- this causes rheumatism, colds⁵⁰⁹

Henry Trevan was also onboard the *Virago* and kept a journal. Trevan had been appointed surgeon in the Royal Navy on March 30, 1846 and on August 13, 1851 he was assigned to the *Virago*.⁵¹⁰ On May 19, 1853, while anchored at Fort Simpson, Trevan, like Inskip, reported finding great numbers of Indians and estimated a population of 2000. The Indians brought mats for sale, animal skins and fish. The *Virago* then departed for the Queen Charlotte Islands and elsewhere before returning to Fort Simpson on June 19, 1853. At this time, Trevan reported that one of the chiefs named Sweet William, [Chief Niesdoix] of the Gitwilgyoots,⁵¹¹ was giving a feast for his tribe. ⁵¹² Trevan described the Fort Simpson Indians including their subsistence practices and their hostilities:

the Indian tribes do not remain upon the same ground during the whole year. In the summer they resort to the principal rivers and the sea coast where they take and lay up large quantities of salmon for their winter consumption, returning to the smaller rivers of the interior during the cold season. There are about 12 tribes or rather portions of as many Tribes living in the immediate neighbourhood of Fort Simpson. They have each some recognized difference and are most of them in a constant state of warfare with each other. Gambling is a prevailing passion among them. In some tribes if a chief be ill, he causes one of his people to be shot, and if he recovers, it is attributed to the sacrifice. Sometimes a chief pretends to

⁵⁰⁷ PABC MS-0705, George Hastings Inskip Papers. Master of the H.M.S. *Virago* 1851-1855, p. 322.

⁵⁰⁸ PABC MS-0705, George Hastings Inskip Papers. Master of the H.M.S. *Virago* 1851-1855, p. 322.

⁵⁰⁹ PABC MS-0705, George Hastings Inskip Papers. Master of the H.M.S. *Virago* 1851-1855, pp. 325-327.

⁵¹⁰ NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. *VIRAGO* from January 1852 to December 1854.

⁵¹¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 634.

⁵¹² NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. *VIRAGO* from January 1852 to December 1854, pp. 297, 317.

madness and bites every one that falls in his way.⁵¹³ In filth and sensuality the Indians are in a most humiliating position. In some places they eat the dead bodies of their relatives. Cap. Stuart of the Hudson's Bay Company's Service who is now on board with us has seen them eat portions of the dead bodies after they had been in a state of putrefaction for months. Such an occurrence took place here not long since.⁵¹⁴

Trevan stated that Fort Simpson could attract about 14,000 Indians, from Nass, Sebassa, Queen Charlottes, and the Russian Territory.⁵¹⁵

While in port at Fort Simpson in June 1853, William Henry Hills, the paymaster onboard the *Virago* also kept a journal. He commented that a Haida named "Bearskin" and his party, who were from Skidegate (Queen Charlotte Islands) had come in a flotilla of canoes on the invitation of Chief Nestoya [Sweet William⁵¹⁶ or Chief Niesdoix of the Gitwilgyoots]. This chief had amassed some property and was desirous of rivaling Legake [Legaic] the head chief of the Tsimshian. Bearskin was invited to provide some "foreign content" to the festivities. Hills described Legaic in 1853 as a man of about 33 years old, and stated that it was through his wife "who is really the head Chimsian [Tsimshian] chief and by whom he holds his present leading station...." ⁵¹⁷

On July 4, 1853, Trevan also reported that there were a great many Indian feasts that day and that Chief Sweet William had become higher in the estimation of his people through his generosity:

The principal thing given was large quantities of rancid grease [eulachon]. In the distribution there was from time to time brawls (?) and contentions because some had more than others. Blankets were torn up and distributed in strips in fact all the wealth he has been saving for several years was distributed today. ⁵¹⁸

Trevan, like Hills, also stated that a tribe from Skidegate [Haida] had been invited to the feast (probably Bearskin and party). He also stated that one of Bearskin's "Indian ladies" recollected that the Tsimshian had taken one of her relatives captive when she was a

⁵¹³ This is a form of a ceremonialism known as the *Hamatsa* among the Kwakiutl but often described by Europeans as "arm biting." It was introduced to the Tsimshian probably from the Haisla and Heiltsuk in the early 19th century (Halpin and Seguin 1990:279). Fur trader and physician William Fraser Tolmie (1963:259) reported on December 28, 1833, that he had treated two Heiltsuk (Bella Bella) victims for wounds administered from arm biting.

⁵¹⁴ NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854, p. 318. The cannibalistic practices referred to appear to be borrowed from the Kwakiutl. Only shamans ate parts of corpses and this was for ritual purposes.

⁵¹⁵ NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854, pp. 320-321.

⁵¹⁶ Sweet William died on or before July 27, 1860. Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffat (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS.

⁵¹⁷ Mitchell Library, MS 1436/1. Hills, W. H. Journal on board H.M.S. Virago, Journal 12 October 1852 - July 1853. As previously noted, Legaic's father was likely a Kitkatla.

⁵¹⁸ NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854, pp. 326-327.

little girl. This led to an armed standoff between the groups.⁵¹⁹

On July 6, 1853, Trevan observed about 80 canoes setting off for their salmon fisheries and hunting grounds. They were not expected to return until November.⁵²⁰

In the same year, Captain Prevost of the Royal Navy was forced by bad weather to dock outside of Fort Simpson. Upon his return to London he described the Indians at Fort Simpson as living under what he called “barbaric conditions” to the Church Missionary Society. This information would, in due course lead to the missionary, William Duncan setting up a mission at Fort Simpson and “redeeming the natives.”⁵²¹

In February 1856, the HBC fur trader William McNeill reported that “up to one-half of the Tsimshian were expected to travel south...” that is, to Victoria. Historian Jonathan Dean stated that by the timing of the trips to Victoria this would have conflicted with the eulachon fishery: “This would seem to indicate that the Tsimshians were putting less emphasis on the pre-contact market, and more on those Euro American goods they could acquire in the South.”⁵²² In January 30, 1858, the Indians at Fort Simpson were reported to be short of food, a situation, which, according to the HBC report, was described as “usual.”⁵²³ This would suggest that any surplus food produced was not sufficient for sustenance, let alone trade, especially after the end of January.

In contrast, Fort Simpson was relying less on European trade goods for trade with the native people, but trading more native goods like eulachon and elk skins to other native groups.⁵²⁴ These items were used by the Tsimshian for feasts. Cacas (Tsaqaxs) for example, gave elk skins in a give-a-way feast on February 3, 1856.⁵²⁵ A few days later Legaic also had a give -a-way feast which reportedly included 200 elk skins and other property.⁵²⁶

No less than five new “large” houses were built in the camp at Fort Simpson in December 1856. The completion of each new house would involve the giving away of property. About a year later, on November 20, 1857, there were at least 20 new houses being constructed at the camp at Fort Simpson.⁵²⁷

Interest in the Skeena River by non natives was fueled after information circulated about

⁵¹⁹ NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854, pp. 326-327.

⁵²⁰ NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854, p. 328.

⁵²¹ Barnett, H.G., Applied anthropology in 1860, Applied Anthropology, 1942 (April-June):19.

⁵²² Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 522.

⁵²³ Perhaps because dried salmon preserved for the winter food had now run out or spoiled. HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, January 30, 1858.

⁵²⁴ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 523-524 .

⁵²⁵ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, February 3, 1856.

⁵²⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, November 19, 1855; February 3, 1856; February 3, 1857; February 8, 1857.

⁵²⁷ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, November 17, 1856; December 3, 1856; November 20, 1857.

a Skeena River chief named, *Ketih, buiki teue* who brought a piece of gold to Fort Simpson in the fall of 1852.⁵²⁸ Gold seekers were reported in the area and on the south end of Dundas Island on August 1859 and September 1859.⁵²⁹ The Haida were reported on Dundas Island in early May 1860. On May 23, a large fleet of Haida were on Birnie Island. The fur trader wrote: “The Chimsheyans seem unfriendly towards them.”⁵³⁰

Major William Downie was at Fort Simpson in September 1859 as he got ready to explore the Skeena River to Fort Fraser with a view to finding a passage for the Canadian Pacific Railway.⁵³¹ By the 1860s a number of independent schooners traded rum and later whiskey in exchange for furs from native people on the Northern Northwest coast. Sloops like the *Eagle* would trade eulachon grease on its way down to the Bella Bella [Heiltsuk] Indians.⁵³² Schooners were also going up the Skeena River and to Dundas Island like the *Emily Harris*, probably for prospecting purposes. These and others were reported in the HBC Fort Simpson records on August 28, 1863, September 9, 1863 and September 23, 1863. A schooner named the *Gold Hunter* started for Victoria but a party from the boat was going to house and winter on the Skeena River.⁵³³ Despite the competition, the HBC attracted trade from the Haida, Kitiata, Nisga’a, Tongass, Kitselas, Haisla and Kitkatla. The trade with schooners accelerated as did feasting and what was referred to by the fur traders as “medicine work” meaning ceremonies associated with the *Halait*.⁵³⁴ By this time blankets had become the standard of convertible currency.⁵³⁵

The Missionary William Duncan had arrived at Fort Simpson in 1857 and had taken a census of the Fort Simpson Indians which was completed by January 15, 1858. He reported 2,300 Indians.⁵³⁶ The Tsimshian population would be tragically reduced by yet another smallpox epidemic, this time in 1862. The majority of the 638 people reported dead between 1858 and 1889 were mostly attributed to this epidemic. William Duncan estimated that: “not fewer than 500, or one-fifth of the Tsimsheans [sic] at Fort

⁵²⁸ HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853, November 13, 1852.

⁵²⁹ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, August 5, 9, 10, 28, 1859; September 14, 1859.

⁵³⁰ Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffatt (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS. May 3, 1860; May 23, 1860.

⁵³¹ Downie arrived at Fort Simpson November 1859. He requested to live at the Fort on November 9, 1859. He left for Port Essington on May 27, 1860. Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffatt (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS.

⁵³² HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, April 18, 1864; Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 581, Table 14.

⁵³³ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, October 10, 1863.

⁵³⁴ Halait is the term for specific non-crest powers owned by Houses. Halait are dramatized by chiefs and successors in ceremonies. Halait names are the property and privilege of Houses or chiefs. Anderson, Margaret and Halpin, Marjorie, Potlatch at Gitsegukla: William Beynon's 1945 Field Notebooks (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press), 2000, pp. 21, 25, 27.

⁵³⁵ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, August 28 1863 September 9, 1863 and September 23, 1863; Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 577, 579; Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 25

⁵³⁶ HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859, January 15, 1858.

Simpson, have fallen...”⁵³⁷ Many Indians were afraid to come to the Fort.⁵³⁸

Migration to Metlakatla

In response to the epidemic, Duncan stepped up a plan to move his converts from Fort Simpson to the old winter village of Metlakatla. On May 27, 1862 his converts “constructed five “rough houses” and a tent. The converts comprised “nearly the whole of one tribe, called Keetlahn [Gitlaan], with two of their chiefs... between 300 and 400 souls....”⁵³⁹ The Metlakatla mission appears to have been established on abandoned sites of the former traditional winter village of the Gitlaan.⁵⁴⁰ Not long after the departure of the 400 or so Tsimshian to Metlakatla, a Haida received permission from the Tsimshian to build a house at Fort Simpson for the use of visiting Haida.⁵⁴¹ Previously, some Haida, including those from Masset camped at the Little island or Village Island, which is about a quarter of a mile west of Fort Simpson.⁵⁴²

Later, others would join the Metlakatla mission including Chief Legaic. According to Kitkatla Mission Historian, Eugene Stock, Paul Legaic was about 40 years old when he joined the Metlakatla mission. He took ill in 1869, and died on May 6, 1869 at the age of 55. Stock also stated that “a few of the Indians talk very good English, and many understand it, though they do not speak it.”⁵⁴³ Legaic’s first recorded trading trip as a partner to Duncan was in 1864.⁵⁴⁴

The population at Metlakatla doubled in five years and had representatives from nearly

⁵³⁷ Duncan, William, *The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla*, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871, p. 72; Boyd, Robert, *The Coming of the Spirit of Pestilence: Introduced Infectious Diseases and Population Decline Among Northwest Coast Indians, 1774-1874*, (Vancouver & Toronto: UBC Press; Seattle & London: University of Washington Press), 1999, p. 223.

⁵³⁸ Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffat (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS. July 31, 1862. The trade as a result was reported as poor.

⁵³⁹ Duncan, William, *The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla*, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871, p.71.

⁵⁴⁰ Galois, R. M., *Colonial Encounters: The Worlds of Arthur Wellington Clah, 1855-1881*. B.C. Studies, 1997-1998, no. 115/116:136, fn. 108. Garfield also stated that almost all of the Gitlaan went to Metlakatla. As did William Beynon state that the Gitlaan (Gyitlán) moved to Metlakatla almost intact. Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 9. Beynon, William, *The Tsimshians of Metlakatla, Alaska. American Anthropologist*, 1941 (43):83.

⁵⁴¹ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890, p. 374. Sketch plate lxx.

⁵⁴² Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 46, f. 125, 48.

⁵⁴³ Stock, Eugene, *Metlakatla and the North Pacific Mission of the Church Missionary Society* (London: Church Missionary Society), 1881, pp. 48, 53, 120; Duncan, William, *The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla*, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871, pp. 83, 101.

⁵⁴⁴ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 246 ft. 9; Beynon, William, *The Tsimshians of Metlakatla, Alaska. American Anthropologist*, 1941 (43):83.

every Coast Tsimshian tribe. Duncan established a trading store, and in 1864 bought a trading schooner called the *Carolina*. He also established a sawmill and various related stores. In the 1860s and 1870s commodities, including furs obtained from natives groups on the Nass River and the Queen Charlotte Islands were brought for sale to Metlakatla. The furs were finished and shipped to Victoria, along with barrels of eulachon oil, salted salmon and eulachon, dried berries, cedar timber, shingles and handicrafts.⁵⁴⁵

According to William Beynon, the move to Metlakatla brought change to the Tsimshian. Although the tribal and clan chiefs were still respected at Metlakatla, the economic responsibility owed to a chief was: “small and centers around social obligations... native names have been maintained, inasmuch as they protect certain exclusive hunting and fishing privileges as well as prestige, and the *yákw* feasts at which they are assumed have been kept up in a small way.”⁵⁴⁶ Duncan established the nuclear family as the independent economic unit and the former large lineage houses were replaced by small family houses as the concept of private property (instead of lineage property) developed.⁵⁴⁷ Duncan also banned the potlatch.

The remaining Tsimshian at Fort Simpson in 1863, who did not permanently go to Victoria or Metlakatla, continued their eulachon fishery, seaweed collecting, herring spawn and salmon fishing.⁵⁴⁸ Inter-group hostilities continued to be reported by the HBC in 1863. The Gitnadoiks appear in the 1863 HBC records as *Kit an doic*. The Tongass (Tlingit) Chiefs had arrived at the Gitando camp for a feast. On November 28, 1863, the chief of the Gitnadoiks, *Neeshwakes*, visited the different camps to invite the chiefs to a feast but his canoe was fired upon by the Gispaxlo’ots which lead to a “quarrel.”⁵⁴⁹ The Ginaxangiik appear in the HBC record on September 23, 1864 as *Kinakangeaks*. The Nass Indians were compelled to flee Fort Simpson as they were afraid of them. In August 1861, the Nass were also afraid of the Gitlaan plundering them of their trade goods as a result of the death a few days earlier of Nisladodas on the Skeena who drowned while poling his canoe up the Skeena River. Other altercations at Fort Simpson were reported between the Gispaxlo’ots, Gitando [*Kittandaws*] and Gitwalksabae on January 19, 1865.⁵⁵⁰

By the 1850s and 1860s, with the splitting of the Coast Tsimshian between Metlakatla, Fort Simpson and Victoria, the Tsimshian lost their middlemen position to the Nisga’a who took over as suppliers of furs to the HBC. Beginning in the 1850s, the HBC had employed a Nisga’a noblewoman named *Neshaki*, who was the wife of the HBC Chief Trader William McNeill, to conduct trade and transport furs from her village at Caxatan (Gitkateen?). She would continue to freight for the company on the Nass after Legaic had

⁵⁴⁵ Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 29.

⁵⁴⁶ Beynon, William, The Tsimshians of Metlakatla, Alaska. *American Anthropologist*, 1941 (43):83, 87, 88.

⁵⁴⁷ Bolt, Clarence, Thomas Crosby and the Tsimshian: Small Shoes for Feet too Large, (Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press), 1992, p. 24.

⁵⁴⁸ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, January 1, 1863; January 22, 1863, February 11, 1863; March 9, 1863; March 12, 1863; March 13, 1863; March 29, 1863; April 26, 1863; July 26, 1863; September 6, 1863.

⁵⁴⁹ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, May 19, 1863.

⁵⁵⁰ Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffat (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS. August 25, 1861, August 27, 1861; HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, September 23, 1864; January 19, 1865.

left to join William Duncan at Metlakatla in 1862. According to Dean: “By the middle 1860s Neshaki was even operating on the Skeena River, in Legaic’s ‘backyard.’”⁵⁵¹

The Schooner *Gazell* arrived at Fort Simpson from the Nass River in the spring of 1865 with about a ton of cod fish.” The codfish may have been taken from Works Channel since a person identified as Mr. W. Howe was reported to go there to catch cod fish on June 1, 1865. About 200 codfish were traded at Fort Simpson on June 6, 1865. The codfish were traded fresh as they were dried by people working at Fort Simpson on June 30, 1865.⁵⁵²

Three hundred canoes would leave for the eulachon fishery on March 9, 1866, which was less than half the number of 700 reported in the 1830s.⁵⁵³ On March 22, 1866, a canoe of Keettahns [Gitlaan] arrived from Nass with the first of the eulachon. On June 7, 1866, the Gispaxlo’ots were reported to have returned from the Queen Charlotte Islands where they were offering eulachon oil for sale to the Haida.⁵⁵⁴ On August 1, 1866, a number of Haida were reported around the camp buying up all the “Small Fish Grease” [eulachon] that they could get. In response to the great demand, the Tsimshian raised the price from two white blankets to five per single box of eulachon.⁵⁵⁵

The eulachon fishery continued although the number of persons participating in its harvest had declined since the 1850’s. With lower levels of eulachon oil, rum rose in importance as a ceremonial good.⁵⁵⁶

In 1867, William Duncan described the Tsimshian as divided into ten “tribes”: “the Keeshpokalhot [Gispaxlo’ots], the Keenakangeak [Ginaxangiik], the Keetsahclahs [Gitxaxlaal], the Keetwilgeeat [Gitwilgyoots], the Keetandoh [Gitando], the Keelotsah [Giltutss’aaw], the Keenahtohik [Gitnadoiks], the Keetseesh [Gitsiis], the Kitlan [Gitlaan], and the Keetwillukshebah [Gitwilsebwa].” The latter group was according to Duncan, “now nearly extinct.”⁵⁵⁷ This description corresponds to the names (if spelled differently) to that of the 1846 census and the ethnographic record.

Non- Native Settlement

In 1866, the HBC established a post at Hazelton (Hagwilget) and on the Nass River in an attempt to try to stop furs going down the Nass and Skeena Rivers to the whiskey

⁵⁵¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 280, 623. The location of the various groups in 1857 has been mapped. p. 257 map 8

⁵⁵² HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, April 28, 1865, June 6, 1865.

⁵⁵³ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 549, 563.

⁵⁵⁴ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, February 22, 1866; February 28, 1866; March 22, 1866; June 7, 1866.

⁵⁵⁵ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, August 1, 1866.

⁵⁵⁶ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 522, 559.

⁵⁵⁷ Duncan, William, The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871, pp. 1-2.

traders.⁵⁵⁸ By April 1869, 70 Gitksan became the first substantial party of interior people to reach the mouth of the Skeena River and trade furs at both Metlakatla and Fort Simpson. The Omineca gold rush of 1869-1870 further led to the decline of the old trading system up the Skeena River after Thomas Hankin, a former HBC clerk returned to the upper Skeena River as the first independent non Native trader in the region.⁵⁵⁹

Those bound for gold traveled up the Skeena River which was navigable after the ice melted in spring. Robert Cunningham, ⁵⁶⁰ then employed by the HBC, requested permission to establish a post at the mouth of the Skeena River to equip the prospectors. After this request was dismissed by his superiors at Fort Victoria, and after being refused a pay increase, Cunningham left the HBC in 1870 and established his own commercial enterprise at the mouth of the Skeena River. Through preemption Cunningham occupied a site near Woodcock's Landing in December 1870. Here Cunningham and others used Tsimshian guides to transport freight up the Skeena River. They also depended on fresh food from the Tsimshian. This new operation at Port Essington attracted a Tsimshian winter congregation. The Coast Tsimshian as they had at the HBC post, offered fresh deer and halibut in exchange for goods.⁵⁶¹

Ships carrying prospectors started to arrive at the confluence of the Skeena and the Ecstall River on the southern banks of the mouth of the Skeena River. This location took trade away from the Cunningham-Woodcock establishment; however, the Omineca gold rush was short-lived and ended in the mid 1870s. ⁵⁶²

More non natives were attracted by the new economic opportunities along the Skeena River soon and requested land at the mouth of the Skeena River and its forks. Preemption forms were filed on January 28, 1871, by Cunningham and Thomas Hankin. The land Cunningham preempted became the future town site of Port Essington (in 1908). Cuning soon established a cannery and sawmill and employed the Kitselas. ⁵⁶³ Cunningham had also requested a piece of land 170 miles up the Skeena River on December 12, 1870. A sketch shows this area to be at the point where the Hagwilget River runs into the Skeena River.⁵⁶⁴

After Cunningham had established a store, the HBC in 1871 sought their share of the trade and started going up the Skeena River in a steamer called the *Otter*. They also bought three lots from Cunningham at Port Essington for a small store, which would be known as "Skeena Post." The HBC closed this store in 1877.⁵⁶⁵

⁵⁵⁸ Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 76.

⁵⁵⁹ Galois, R.M., Colonial Encounters: The Worlds of Arthur Wellington Clay, 1855-1881, B.C. Studies, 1997-1998 (116-117):119, 122, 123.

⁵⁶⁰ Robert Cunningham was a former HBC employee and exiled missionary assistant to William Duncan. For a biography of Cunningham see Kerr, J.B., Biographical Dictionary of Well-Known British Columbians with a Historical Sketch. (Vancouver: Kerr & Begg), 1890.

⁵⁶¹ Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 72-74.

⁵⁶² Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 74.

⁵⁶³ Archer, David, J.W., A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, p. 60.

⁵⁶⁴ PABC GR 2013, Preemption Records 1870-1871 Skeena River, B-8691.

⁵⁶⁵ Large, R. Geddes, The Skeena: River of Destiny, Museum of Northern British Columbia (Surrey B.C.: Heritage House), 1996, pp. 37, 38; HBCA B.210/e/1. Post Reports, Fort Simpson

At the mouth of the Skeena River at Inverness (also known as Woodcock's Landing)⁵⁶⁶ a public inn had been established in the early 1870s to accommodate the miners. On the coast, Georgetown Mills in Big Bay on the coast near Fort Simpson was established as a commercial sawmill in 1874 followed by a cannery in 1876. Seven canneries opened between 1899 and 1902 and one was established on Ecstall Island in 1906. Another two were established across the Ecstall River from Port Essington. During the late 1800s and 1900s, five other canneries were built along Inverness Passage, two on Smith Island and four on the eastern shore of Telegraph Passage. There was in addition to the canneries, a sawmill near the mouth of Boneyard creek at the north end of Telegraphy Passage. An Icelandic community was established in c. 1913 at Osland on Smith Island.⁵⁶⁷

By the 1880s Port Essington's economy was dominated by the salmon canning industry and later in the 1920's, it became the canning centre of the lower Skeena River and principal port and commercial centre in the region. The canneries attracted Chinese, Japanese, "whites" and Coast Tsimshian to Port Essington. The establishment of Port Essington in 1871 and the development of the salmon canning industry from 1876 attracted some of the Metlakatla residents by offering summer work at the salmon canneries.⁵⁶⁸

Tsimshian fishing sites on the middle Skeena River were jeopardized as large numbers of fish were trapped by nets at the mouth of the river by the cannery operations. But as noted, the Tsimshian at least initially, were the prime participants in fishing for the canneries. The Tsimshian who worked at the canneries during the summer months could continue to collect and dry their fish for winter consumption: "When the summer salmon runs were poor, opportunistic groups, would travel south to work the hop fields around Puget Sound." The Coast Tsimshian were described as the "most opulent aboriginal group along the coast" for their ability to seize economic opportunities associated with fishing, canning and freighting around the lower Skeena River.⁵⁶⁹

The number of fish taken from inside the mouth of the Skeena River was higher than the fish taken from outside the fishing grounds. This is why, according to Historical Geographer D. Clayton, canneries established inside the mouth of the Skeena River: "and for this reason fishing stretched up the Skeena rather than out into the ocean...After 1897, fishermen, "advanced further out to meet the incoming fish" and the area fished greatly increased..."⁵⁷⁰

(Nass) 1886.

⁵⁶⁶ William H. Woodcock established at public inn to accommodate miners going to and from Omineca via the Skeena River. The site was known as Woodcock's Landing until 1876. After the establishment of a salmon cannery it became known as Inverness from Inverness Passage. Dawson, George, M., *The journals of George M. Dawson: British Columbia, 1875-1878*, edited by Douglas Cole and Bradley Lockner, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1989, p. 518, fn. 343.

⁵⁶⁷ Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp. 58, 60, 61.

⁵⁶⁸ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. ii, iii, 40.

⁵⁶⁹ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 56, 57.

⁵⁷⁰ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 112.

Until about 1901, the only fish canned was sockeye. With increased competition, canneries shifted to spring, chum, coho, humpback or pink and steelhead salmon. Until the early 1890s, the canneries on the Skeena River were nearly wholly dependent on aboriginal fishermen, most of whom were Coast Tsimshian. In 1881 there were over 100 Coast Tsimshian in Port Essington, but during the summer cannery season, this population increased to 600 people. By the early 1890s Japanese fisherman were brought to the Skeena from Vancouver and Victoria.⁵⁷¹

Other communities soon became established in response to riverboat traffic and railroad construction. Native villages shifted as people moved closer to canneries.⁵⁷² Indian Affairs Annual Reports for 1881 provide some information about the Tsimshian involvement in the canneries on the Skeena River: "At Skeena River there are two large canneries, consequently Indians from all tribes within a hundred miles visit the place, both with a view of obtaining lucrative occupation, as well as taking their own winter's supply of salmon for home consumption."⁵⁷³

Anthropologist James McDonald argues that the introduction of women to cannery work at the mouth of the Skeena was probably more disruptive to the Tsimshian economy for women were less able to combine traditional duties with canning fish. According to McDonald, women often replaced their home cooked fish with canned substitutes. Since most of the labor in the traditional processing of fish was drying: "the women may have found an advantage by buying the canned fish, which cost less in labour time, or by using the new technology at home, freeing time for wage labour. Canned fish and other commercially available food was already evident in homes in 1888...."⁵⁷⁴

With the discovery of gold at the Kitselas canyon in the 1870s, and the disruption to the native economy, the Kitselas village was abandoned with many people going to Port Essington and others downriver to the New Kitselas.⁵⁷⁵ Beynon stated that it was also after a trading post was established at Port Essington that the Kitselas moved down from the canyon onto what Beynon considered Gitzaxlaal territory. This is marked as within the Claim Area of Gitwilgyoots territory.⁵⁷⁶

Many members of the Kitsumkalum and Kitselas migrated from Kitselas Canyon to move their winter base to Port Essington. Many more came down river just for the summer months. They operated Cunningham's freighting and trading canoes along the Skeena River and from 1883- to the mid 1890s were considered the backbone of the cannery

⁵⁷¹ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 56, 57, 113, 116, 119.

⁵⁷² Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, p. 60.

⁵⁷³ HBCA B.201/e/1. Fort Simpson District Report, April 1, 1886; Dominion of Canada, Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended December 31, 1881, p. 153.

⁵⁷⁴ McDonald, James, *Images of the Nineteenth-Century Economy of the Tsimshian*, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. 48.

⁵⁷⁵ Allaire, Louis, George F. MacDonald & R. Inglis, *Gitlaxdzawk: Ethnohistory and Archaeology, in Skeena River Prehistory*, R.I. Inglis & G.F. MacDonald (eds.), Pages 3-166. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 87, Mercury Series, Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1979, p. 67.

⁵⁷⁶ American Museum of Natural History, *Papers of Philip Drucker*, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation* by William Beynon, Vol. V., p. 30.

work force. Cunningham entered into an agreement with the Kitselas in 1880 which allotted them three acres on the westward facing shore of the settlement. The lot was given for \$1 “for their own use for building purposes.” The Kitsumkalum were also permitted to settle there. By 1881, 113 Kitsumkalum and Kitselas were living on this “private reserve” which had become their winter and summer residence.⁵⁷⁷ The Kitsumkalum were fishing out of Port Essington with the Kitselas.⁵⁷⁸

The Kitsumkalum territory was in the Kitselas canyon region. James McDonald’s study of the Kitsumkalum notes that because groups had usufruct rights to resources in various locations, this restricts “the simple identification of a geographic area with a group.” McDonald then notes that just above the Gitlaan territory (marked on the plaintiffs Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map) was a place where the Kitsumkalum went for spring salmon or trout: “Elders said Kitsumkalum claim to this deep pool was stronger than that of the Gitlans’ even though it was on the latter’s territory. Thus, privileges were explicitly defined, and contingent upon intergroup arrangements.” McDonald also stated that the Kitsumkalum claimed the area above the Zimacord River, as a place where the Kitsumkalum went for spring salmon or trout.⁵⁷⁹ This would suggest that the area near the Zimacord River claimed by the Gitlaan is subject to a dispute with the Kitsumkalum.

After Cunningham and others preempted adjacent lots on the north arm of the Skeena River early in 1870, there was still confusion about whether or not the land had been reserved for the Coast Tsimshian. Edgar Dewdney of the Department of Lands and Works missed Cunningham’s preemption which was not surveyed until 1890 by A.L. Poudrier. British Columbia’s Superintendent of Indian Affairs, I.W. Powell did not visit the north coast until 1879 and most Indian reserves were not allotted until the mid 1880s.⁵⁸⁰

Many of the land preemptions were clustered around the mouth of the Skeena River and around salmon canning sites. Some lots were not settled but were used as fishing stations. Other lots situated on the islands circumscribing the Skeena River were used as bases for mining speculation, although a few lots were used for farming: “Most Tsimshian reserves were clustered along the banks of the middle Skeena and lower Nass,

⁵⁷⁷ Six years later in 1886, Cunningham attempted to denounce his agreement and regain the reserve. The Kitselas and the Kitsumkalum appealed to the Indian Agent, Todd, to contest Cunningham’s claim but as the land had not been set apart as an Indian reserve during the reserve allotment process, Todd could do nothing. The matter moved to the provincial courts. Cunningham lost and the Kitselas retained the land. Clayton stated that the details of the decision no longer exist but speculated that it was likely a ruling related to breach of contract. Clayton stated that the details of the decision no longer exist but speculated that it was likely a ruling related to breach of contract. Clayton stated that the details of the court decision no longer exists, but speculated that it was likely a ruling related to breach of contract. Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 60.

⁵⁷⁸ McDonald, James Andrew, *An Historic Event in the Political Economy of the Ownership of the Zimacord District*, B.C. Studies, 1983, (57):30.

⁵⁷⁹ McDonald, James Andrew, *An Historic Event in the Political Economy of the Ownership of the Zimacord District*, B.C. Studies, 1983, (57):34; McDonald, James Andrew, *Trying to make a life: the Historical political economy of Kitsumkalum* Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1985, p. 38.

⁵⁸⁰ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 53-54.

and their tributary rivers. They were few reserves around the mouth of the Skeena. Salmon canneries either owned or controlled the best fishing and timber sites in the region: “and Coast Tsimshian labour and technology was diverted from “traditional production” (the cycle of hunting, fishing, and gathering) into a “modern economy” of wage labour and material consumption. Coast Tsimshian groups were increasingly drawn from the Nass, Fort Simpson and Metlakatla, to work on fishing and canning contracts in the Skeena canneries.”⁵⁸¹ The Tsimshian actively participated in the development of the modern economy, notably the modern commercial fishery and in commerce and logging.⁵⁸² Robert Cunningham also built the first cold storage plant in 1892 and at Refuge Bay on Porcher Island just off the mouth of the river, he developed an Oil Reduction Plant which produced dogfish and herring oil. Prince Rupert became home of the foremost halibut fisheries with the addition of cold storage.⁵⁸³

In September 1881, Johan Jacobsen, a buyer of native artifacts, arrived at Port Essington in search of ethnographic pieces. He reported that “the majority of Tsimshian at Port Essington [Port Essington] had become Christians and were no longer using their original and interesting ethnological pieces.” Much of the Tsimshian pieces that Jacobsen was able to collect came from Cunningham’s store. Although Jacobsen was at Fort Simpson looking for ethnographic pieces to purchase, he stated that Fort Simpson was the first Indian village in which he bought nothing because “there was nothing to obtain.” ⁵⁸⁴

In 1882, William Duncan built a salmon cannery at Metlakatla and his native followers packed salmon for commercial purposes. These projects were partly funded by CMS [Church Missionary Society] funds and loans from the Colonial Government. The canning and sawmill companies were capitalized by the sale of shares to Metlakatla residents. ⁵⁸⁵

Indian Reserve Commissioner, P. O’Reilly reported to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs on March 25, 1882 about the type of fish relied upon by the Indians and that used by the canneries: “I ascertained that the fish made use of by the Indians is valueless for canning purposes, while on the other hand the fish used for canning is not appreciated by the Indians, nor do they rely upon it as an article of food other than for immediate use.”⁵⁸⁶ In a subsequent report to a conference between the Indian reserve Commissioners and the Indian delegates from Fort Simpson and the Nass River, in 1887 O’Reilly again stated that there were differences in the type of fish used by the Indians and the canneries:

⁵⁸¹ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 54, 55.

⁵⁸² Seguin, Margaret, *Introduction: Tsimshian Society and Culture*, in *The Tsimshian Images of the Past: Views for the Present* edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. xvi.

⁵⁸³ Large, R. Geddes, *The Skeena: River of Destiny*, Museum of Northern British Columbia, (Surrey B.C.: Heritage House) 1996, pp. 39, 163; Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 138.

⁵⁸⁴ Jacobsen, Johan Adrian, *Alaskan voyage, 1881-1883: an expedition to the northwest coast of America*; translated by Erna Gunther from the German text of Adrian Woldt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1977, pp. 12, 28.

⁵⁸⁵ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 33, 34.

⁵⁸⁶ LMRB Library, O’Reilly Minutes of Decision & Correspondence File 29858, vol, 3.

They were given the right to all streams which run through their reserves and every fishing ground pointed out by them, of every sort or kind, was reserved for them. There was some difficulty in doing this, as the fish of special value to the Indians the white men do not care for, therefore their interests do not clash....⁵⁸⁷

Most of the Indian reserves allotted to the Coast Tsimshian were allotted in 1881-1882, surveyed in 1887 and confirmed in 1892. Historical Geographer, Daniel Clayton prepared a sketch map which shows the location of reserves compared to the land preemptions.⁵⁸⁸ The Tsimshian selected numerous locations for reserves, many of which were fishing stations.⁵⁸⁹

In 1890, the Inspecting Officer of Fort Simpson described the Fort Simpson Tsimshian as well off, industrious and working in canneries:

The Indians are the most advanced in civilization of all others on the West Coast. They are very industrious and well-off, many having Bank accts. [accounts] in Victoria. They hunt Furs when prices are good, but for a livelihood they depend principally on labour, which is obtained at the Canneries and other industries established up the Alaskan Coast, and down along the whole Coast of British Columbia and Washington Territory. They are a strong, vigorous race, keen and intelligent, possessing good houses, well furnished and live in great comfort.⁵⁹⁰

Port Essington was a regular port of call for more than 10 steamships carrying freight, passengers, mail up and down the coast. Port Essington canneries drew the Tsimshian population away from Fort Simpson and away from furs. Commercial halibut packing plants were established by Euro-Canadians in the 1890s on Hecate Strait two on Stephens Island and one on Porcher Island.⁵⁹¹ By 1900, the Coast Tsimshian were no longer bartering furs but receiving money wages.⁵⁹²

Port Essington was not only an important salmon canning centre, it had become the chief provisioning and distribution centre for Coast Tsimshian settlements and canneries along the lower Skeena River⁵⁹³

All furs were purchased at Fort Simpson on a cash basis although many of the Indians at Fort Simpson took their furs to Victoria, Vancouver and Seattle: "when they got to the Fishing and Hop picking, on the Fraser and Columbia Rivers." G.R. Beeston, Inspecting Officer for the HBC stated that there were:

⁵⁸⁷ NAC RG 10, v. 3776, f. 37373-2. 1887-1889, p. 257.

⁵⁸⁸ Clayton, Daniel, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena*, B.C. Studies 1992: 94: 50-51.

⁵⁸⁹ Dominion of Canada. Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended 31st December, 1882, pp. 88-91, 118-120.

⁵⁹⁰ HBCA B.210/e/2. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1890. December 30, 1890, J. McDougall, Inspecting Officer for the HBC/Report, p. 12.

⁵⁹¹ Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, p. 63.

⁵⁹² Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, pp. 136, 137, 139, 176-177.

⁵⁹³ Clayton, Daniel Wright, *Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 60.

one or two Indian Stores but no other immediate competition. The competition which the Company has to meet is that which exists at Port Essington on the Skeena River and on the Fraser and Columbia Rivers, where the Indians go for fishing and Hop picking. The Canneries all keep fairly equipped stores and make payments to the Indians in goods as well as giving them advances. ⁵⁹⁴

Beeston also reported that:

the Indians are generally speaking, the best off that I have met. They have well built houses that would do for a large City, are generally well educated, have a form of Municipal Government, good educational facilities and religious instruction under the Methodist Church; earn large wages through the greater part of the year, while food, especially fish, is abundant.... ⁵⁹⁵

In 1905, the Prince Rupert town plot was laid out. It was incorporated as a city in 1910. Modern commercial fisheries in Hecate Strait did not begin until about 1910. A cannery was established in Tuck Inlet in 1913. ⁵⁹⁶

Migration to Metlakatla, Alaska

In 1887, Christian converts from Metlakatla had migrated to Annette Island, Alaska. Duncan had become estranged from his church and from Dominion officials due to their policy on aboriginal lands. He left the Skeena region with 600 native followers to establish the new Metlakatla in Alaska. By the time of his departure, however, more missionaries were established around the Skeena River, but not just to serve the Coast Tsimshian but for the growing communities of Chinese, Japanese and European peoples living and working in the area. ⁵⁹⁷

Duncan's converts selected an abandoned Tlingit site which they named Port Chester and later, New Metlakatla. This new Metlakatla community consisted of a much broader base of native representation than the old Metlakatla and included native people from Nass, the Upper Skeena (Gitksan) and Tsimshian from the Skeena village of Kitselas, Port Simpson and Kitkatla. Before Duncan moved to Alaska, the native people remaining at Fort Simpson invited Thomas Crosby, a Methodist to provide religious instruction. ⁵⁹⁸

⁵⁹⁴ HBCA B.210/e/5. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1900, Inspection Report, May/June 1900, pp. 6, 12.

⁵⁹⁵ HBCA B.210/e/5. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1900, Inspection Report, May/June 1900, pp. 6, 12.

⁵⁹⁶ Beattie, Alasdair, Wallace, Scott and Haggan Nigel, Report of the GTF Workshop on Reconstruction of the Hecate Strait Ecosystem. In Haggan, N, and A. Beattie (eds.) Back to the Future: Reconstructing the Hecate Strait Ecosystem. Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 1999, 7(3):7; Archer, David, J.W., A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, p. 59.

⁵⁹⁷ Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989, p. 40.

⁵⁹⁸ Beynon, William, The Tsimshians of Metlakatla, Alaska. *American Anthropologist*, 1941 (43):

Ethnographic Descriptions of the Tsimshian

In 1878, Geologist George Mercer Dawson started geological explorations of an outer island on the coast called “Gnarled Group” or Gnarled Islands located in Dixon Entrance.⁵⁹⁹ Dawson, who was not only a geologist but an ethnographer provided in his journal information about the origin of the Tsimshian, based on information he had obtained in 1878. He stated that the Tsimshian displaced the Tlingit only about 100 years ago:

The Chimseyan [Tsimshian] Indians are closely related to the Tinne [Dené or Carrier], & have in fact come down from the interior onto the Coast by the Skeena River. The Skeena is not the real Indian name of the river, which is differently pronounced, & the name Chimseyan [Tsimshian] means simply people from the Skeena. Mr. Hall here at the H.B. [Hudson’s Bay Company] post, who knows the Carrier language well finds many collateral or similar words between it & the Chimeseyan. The migration did not take place within the traditional memory of any Indians now living, but may not have occurred more than about 100 years ago [i.e. c.1778]. The Chimeseyan displaced the Tongas Indians [Tlingit], who now occupy the Coasts from the W. side of Portland Inlet to the Stickeen [Stikine]. Their country being Part of that of the Kaigani, or migrated Haidah [Haida] Indians. The Haidas have always been in the habit of resorting to the Nasse [sic] to fish the oolachen, the Chinseyans allowing them to do so, or rather fearing, or being unable to prevent them.⁶⁰⁰

Dawson also described White Cliff Island (which is east of Shattock Hill in the entrance to Big Bay) where he observed that some men were trying to establish a marble quarry.⁶⁰¹

While at Cumshewa Inlet on the Queen Charlotte Islands, Dawson witnessed the arrival of some Tsimshian Indians with canoes loaded with eulachon grease which they hoped to sell to the Haida: “The greater number of the occupants of the canoes were women, all fairly well dressed, and wearing clean blankets to make a good appearance on their arrival among strangers.” The Haida were also described as bringing canoes to Fort Simpson which they traded for the “coveted oolachen grease & other things in exchange.”⁶⁰²

In 1879, Dawson also wrote a report describing his exploration from Port Simpson to Edmonton. Dawson observed a small Indian village at the mouth of the Lakelse River which he described:

84, 86.

⁵⁹⁹ Dawson, George, M., *The Journals of George M. Dawson: British Columbia, 1875-1878*, edited by Douglas Cole and Bradley Lockner, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1989, pp. 1, 515.

⁶⁰⁰ Dawson, George, M., *The Journals of George M. Dawson: British Columbia, 1875-1878*, edited by Douglas Cole and Bradley Lockner, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1989, Journal p. 520.

⁶⁰¹ Dawson, George, M., *The Journals of George M. Dawson: British Columbia, 1875-1878*, edited by Douglas Cole and Bradley Lockner, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1989, p. 519.

⁶⁰² Cole, Douglas and Bradley Lockner, eds. *To the Charlottes: George Dawson's 1878 Survey of the Queen Charlotte Islands*, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1993, pp. 67, 129.

At the mouth of the Lakelse is a small Indian village, and evidences [sic] of a former more extensive one. Salmon run up the Lakelse, according to the Indians, in great numbers.

However, Dawson stated that the “favourite salmon fishing “stations were at the Kitselas canyon.”⁶⁰³ Dawson also provided information about navigation up the Skeena River:

The Skeena has been somewhat extensively used as a channel of communication between the Omineca mines and the coast for a number of years, but as the notes already given render evident, is by no means well adapted as an artery of trade. The large canoes that the Indians of the coast hollow from the cedar, are generally employed on the Skeena.” Dawson stated that canoes generally worked better than boats, but above the forks of the Skeena River: “the river is scarcely deemed navigable even for canoes. The ascent of the river in canoes requires the utmost skill, dexterity and strength on part of the crews. Paddling is of little use, and only resorted to in certain quiet reaches, or in crossing the stream... ⁶⁰⁴

The Skeena River usually opened for navigation⁶⁰⁵ during the last week in April 1867 and the river closed on the 13th of November, which was exceptionally early. The river is generally highest in July, deriving most of its water from the melting snow on the mountains.⁶⁰⁶

As previously noted, Albert P. Niblack, surveyor for the U.S. Navy obtained information about native groups around Dixon Entrance during his survey of Alaska in 1885, 1886, 1887. On the subject of trade, Niblack stated that: “in earlier days, previous to the advent of the whites, the trading was carried out less systematically and with more formality on account of the feuds between the different tribes.” Niblack continues this description by shifting from the past tense to the present (1880s):

The Indians of this whole region are expert traders. Every article purchased undergoes the closest scrutiny. Every defect is discovered and the value scaled down accordingly. If once a certain price is obtained for a commodity of theirs it is adhered to thereafter as the set price, and the knowledge of such value travels fast. Time and distance are unimportant factors in a bargain. If 200 miles farther on the price paid for a commodity is considerably greater, the distance is reckoned as nothing in going there to get the difference. On the other hand, in purchasing goods

⁶⁰³ Dawson, G.M., Report on an exploration from Port Simpson on the Pacific coast, to Edmonton on the Saskatchewan: embracing a portion of the northern part of British Columbia and the Peace River country, 1879., (Montreal: Dawson Brothers) 1881, pp. 11B, 13B.

⁶⁰⁴ Dawson, G.M., Report on an exploration from Port Simpson on the Pacific coast, to Edmonton on the Saskatchewan: embracing a portion of the northern part of British Columbia and the Peace River country, 1879., (Montreal: Dawson Brothers) 1881, p. 17B.

⁶⁰⁵ Some rocks were later removed from one or two of the rapids along the Skeena River to assist navigation of the River in 1891. HBCA B.210/e/3. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1891, January 3, 1891, J. Wrigley/R. H. Hall, HBC.

⁶⁰⁶ Dawson, G.M., Report on an exploration from Port Simpson on the Pacific coast, to Edmonton on the Saskatchewan: embracing a portion of the northern part of Columbia and the Peace River country, 1879, (Montreal: Dawson Brothers) 1881, pp. 18B, 19B.

from the traders, they show rare good sense in their selection of the better qualities, mere cheapness being in itself no recommendation. From the earliest times they have preferred articles of use to trinkets.⁶⁰⁷

Niblack described Tsimshian traders as traders of oil and grease: “The Tsimshian were the middlemen, and were, and are still, the great traders in oil and grease of which they prepare large quantities from the eulachon, seal blubber, deer and goat flesh.”⁶⁰⁸ Niblack also noted that shells were important in the trade between coast Indians and interior Indians. In the trade between the coast Indians and the interior Indians, the dentalium shell was valued by the latter who gave in exchange the abalone shell:

Amongst the coast Indians themselves, as stated, the sea otter skin was the basis of exchange, although the shell currency seems to have had a relative value. This latter lost its function when the whites began to import large quantities of shell later on.⁶⁰⁹

Although Niblack does not provide a date for this observation, since the maritime fur traders starting selling dentalium by about the 1820s, Niblack may be referring to this period.

It is within this lengthy historical context of changes to the Tsimshian, that Franz Boas, in 1886, the first professional anthropologist to describe Tsimshian culture would undertake fieldwork.⁶¹⁰ Boas’ fieldwork was actually with the Tsimshian when they were in Victoria. When Boas began his work in the late 19th century, the Tsimshian had been in contact with Europeans for over a century.⁶¹¹ Boas also did fieldwork on the Nass River in 1894. In his ethnography, Boas ignored the effects of European contact and his method of using myths to represent reality was criticized by Marius Barbeau⁶¹² and others.

On the subject of trade, Boas was brief. He stated that the coast tribes have always been great traders and their currency was dentalia, skins and slaves. For less valuable property, marmot skins were sewed together as currency: “the Tsimshian used to exchange olachen oil and carvings of mountain goat horn for canoes....”⁶¹³

In 1888, however, Franz Boas actually visited the Skeena River as a consultant to report on contemporary native conditions.⁶¹⁴ Boas kept a diary of his visit and in his entry for

⁶⁰⁷ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890. pp. 232, 233, 357.

⁶⁰⁸ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890, p. 338.

⁶⁰⁹ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890, p. 334.

⁶¹⁰ Boas did not reside in a Tsimshian community.

⁶¹¹ Bolt, Clarence, *Thomas Crosby and the Tsimshian: Small Shoes for Feet too Large*, (Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press), 1992, p. 4.

⁶¹² Halpin Marjorie, M. and Margaret Seguin, *Tsimshian Peoples: Southern Tsimshian, Coast Tsimshian, Nisga’a, and Gitksan* in *Handbook of North American Indians*, volume 7, *The Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, p. 283.

⁶¹³ Boas, Franz, *Fifth Report of the committee: appointed for the purpose of investigating and publishing reports on the physical characters, languages and industrial and social conditions of the north-western tribes of the Dominion of Canada*, 1889, p. 36.

⁶¹⁴ McDonald, James, *Images of the Nineteenth-Century Economy of the Tsimshian*, in *The*

June 21, 1888, described Port Essington:

Here the Skinar [Skeena] river is a wide arm of the sea, but it soon narrows farther upstream. Port Essington is larger than I expected. There are two salmon canneries. During fishing time there are at least twenty whites here. There are about forty Indian house and two churches, one Methodist and one High Church. The town is on a narrow, flat strip of coast.

Mr. Anderson, my ship's companion, introduced me to Cunningham, who put me up in a cabin at first, but today took me to live in the residence. Tsimshian is about the only language spoken here....⁶¹⁵

On June 25, 1888, Boas provided descriptions of the Tsimshian at Port Essington:

The little houses, or rather shanties, are as here indicated [a small sketch included].⁶¹⁶ There must be about six hundred Indians here, all of whom fish. Those who have enough money to rent a cabin live quite well, that is, for Indians. According to our standards, of course, they are dirty inside, but according to the Indians, nice and elegant. Outsiders live in larger cabins, in which several families are packed together. The fireplace is in the middle. Salmon hang above it to dry; foodstuffs, cans, or rather boxes of fat, and clothes are scattered all over; in short it is not exactly attractive. Others live in tents on the beach. Cunningham's store is the centre of the settlement, and there are always many Indians standing about. Stamps are used for money, so that the capital needed for trading is diminished and at the same time the Indians are forced to buy in one store. They are paid for the most part in stamps. Work starts at the cannery at 7 A.M. Two hundred Indians are used for processing the salmon, and Chinese solder the cans.⁶¹⁷

Boas wrote the first ethnographic reference to the importance of clans to the Tsimshian and to certain clans (and not tribes) having trading privileges:

The entire life of the individual, as well as the whole tribe, is governed by regulations which are based on the organization of the clans. Every clan is the owner of a part of the tribal territory in which it has the exclusive right to hunt, to fish, and to collect berries. In addition, certain clans have important trading privileges. Thus a certain Tlingit clan has the exclusive right of intercourse with the tribes of the interior. Only two years [ago] the Hudson Bay Company acquired a similar right concerning the Skeena River from a Tsimshian clan. The clans have different ranks, and the

Tsimshian, *Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, pp. 40-41.

⁶¹⁵ Rohner, R., *Ethnography of Franz Boas: Letters and Diaries Written on the Northwest Coast from 1886 to 1931*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1969, pp. 92-93.

⁶¹⁶ No sketch was provided.

⁶¹⁷ Rohner, R., *Ethnography of Franz Boas: Letters and Diaries Written on the Northwest Coast from 1886 to 1931*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1969, p. 94.

privileges arising from them are strictly enforced. Such privileges especially cover certain feasts which may be celebrated only by certain clans, the order of seating and of being served at common feasts, the services and tributes that have to be rendered, and similar things.⁶¹⁸

It is probable that Boas is referring to the trading privileges held by Legaic on the Upper Skeena River which have been dated in the historical record to originate about 1840. It is also important that Boas attributes the trading prerogatives to clans (and not “tribes”).

Despite its importance to the Coast Tsimshian economy, ethnographic descriptions of the summer fall salmon fishery in the Skeena River Valley are scarce. One of the reasons is that most Europeans and ethnographers stayed on the coast and by the time the ethnographers had commenced their work, many Tsimshian were not as reliant on the interior salmon fisheries for subsistence because of their involvement in commercial cannery operations and other wage labour. By the time the earliest professional ethnographers observed the Tsimshian, their culture had already been subjected to influences indirectly with Europeans ca. 1700 if not before, and after that, generations of traders, explorers, missionaries and settlers. Tsimshian culture precontact, had been altered from that described in the ethnographic literature.

The second professional ethnographer to study the Tsimshian was Marius Barbeau. He visited the Tsimshian only once in 1915, but continued to collect Tsimshian oral narratives using, as did Boas, the assistance of two Tsimshian⁶¹⁹ men, William Beynon and Henry Tate (who worked for Boas).

Barbeau collected enormous amounts of material mostly myths from 1915 to 1957 and much remains unpublished. His notes are, according to Halpin and Seguin, the “most significant resource for Tsimshian scholars.”⁶²⁰ It was Marius Barbeau's view in 1917, however, that information about social or material culture derived from myth and oral tradition: “can constitute only secondary evidence.” Barbeau stated that according to Franz Boas, the Tsimshian distinguished between two types of stories, myths (*ada'ox*, *adawx*) and tales (*malEsk*). However, Barbeau stated that more categories of narratives are discernable:

The cosmogonic, aetiological and hero myths, and the folk-tales – although not on par to the natives – are much of the same nature for historical purposes: they drift from tribe to tribe without becoming individualistic in their form and contents. Myths of origin of a clan, a crest, or the power of a chief, on the other hand, are more pregnant with local traits and mentality, notwithstanding their conventional and traditional plots. Accounts of a war, a battle or a migration are still more closely dependent upon a real occurrence and its effects upon the faculties of the witnesses that first handed them down. Vainglory, exaggeration

⁶¹⁸ Rohner, R., *Ethnography of Franz Boas: Letters and Diaries Written on the Northwest Coast from 1886 to 1931*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1969, p. 8. This comes from notes published by Boas under the title *Herr Dr. F. Boas: Über seine Reisen in Britisch-Columbien* (Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin, Verhandlungen) 16, 1889, pp. 257-68.

⁶¹⁹ They were Tsimshian through descent through their mothers. Their fathers were European.

⁶²⁰ Halpin Marjorie, M. and Margaret Seguin, *Tsimshian Peoples: Southern Tsimshian, Coast Tsimshian, Nisga'a, and Gitksan in Handbook of North American Indians*, volume 7, *The Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, p. 284.

and distortion at their worst cannot, here, entirely veil the reality. And an ethnographic sketch based on a large mass of many-sided narratives bearing on the history of the tribe would no doubt be realistic.⁶²¹

In 1914 William Beynon started contributing to the ethnographic record by providing anthropologist Marius Barbeau with texts and notes.⁶²² Beynon also acted as interpreter to the Royal Commission on Indians Affairs for the Province of British Columbia during a meeting on September 29, 1915.⁶²³ Although Beynon has been admired in the writings of anthropologists for his contribution on Tsimshian culture, little is made of the fact that he was the principal informant to most of the early ethnographies on the Tsimshian including that of Barbeau, Garfield and Drucker. Barbara Winter attempted to understand the biases Beynon would have worked under when he undertook his interviewing of Tsimshian informants. Winter noted that Beynon's emphasis on language was a primary focus, as were ritual, myth, social organization and historic events but that he did not collect large amounts of data on subsistence, land tenure, population and settlement patterns, early contact, non-ceremonial exchange and other subjects.⁶²⁴ These omissions are a significant omission to providing ethnographic data concerning precontact Tsimshian commercial trade in marine resources.

The third ethnographer to undertake fieldwork among the Tsimshian was Viola Garfield. She did fieldwork in Port Simpson in the summers of 1932, 1933 and 1935, and like her professor, Franz Boas, she did not write about behavior she observed but what she heard about from informants.⁶²⁵ Her work is considered as classic ethnography and is heavily cited by anthropologists. It is important to note that while Garfield appeared to have consulted some historical sources, in her original study she relies for the most part on memory culture, narratives and the works of Boas and Barbeau. Despite this limitation, Garfield was aware of the changes that occurred in Tsimshian culture and commented upon them.

Garfield also reported the rapid changes to the chieftainship brought on by contact including the dying out of traditional lineages, the removal of heirs from the village and ambitions by others for power. Garfield was only able to trace the genealogy of Chief *Sqa'gw.t* of the Gitando tribe for three generations while the Ginaxangiik tribe had eight chiefs in the last one hundred years with only one reported interruption to the lineage line. The motivation to maintain one's genealogy was economic:

There are still some fishing sites and hunting and trapping territories that used and bring their possessors money. These are jealously guarded and there have been family feuds in recent years over the taking of names

⁶²¹ Barbeau, C.M. Tsimshian Mythology, American Anthropologist, 1917, 19 (4):551, 552.

⁶²² Anderson, Margaret and Halpin, Marjorie, Potlatch at Gitsegukla: William Beynon's 1945 Field Notebooks, (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press), 2000, pp. 4-5.

⁶²³ INAC Library, Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of B.C. Nass Agency 1915, p. 29.

⁶²⁴ Winter, Barbara J., William Beynon and the anthropologists, Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 1984, 2:281, 284, 288.

⁶²⁵ Roth, Christopher F., Goods, Names and Selves: rethinking the Tsimshian potlatch, American Ethnologist, 2002, 29(1):125; Garfield, Viola E., Tsimshian Clan and Society, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):169.

which the privilege of control or exclusive use of such sites.⁶²⁶

Garfield described the role of Coast Tsimshian women bartering marine and other resources:

The women of the house prepared dried olachen which they sold to the Haida for used blankets, shirts and other small articles. These they then traded to the Nisga for groundhog skins, which they later exchanged for large trade blankets and moose and caribou skins.⁶²⁷

Women also gathered seaweed and dried it in cakes and sold it by the box: "During the summer the Haida came over to trade for olachen grease bringing canoes, halibut and potatoes. Canoes were not used as gifts, except by chiefs, but soapberries for a feast were often mixed in a canoe and they were valuable as trade articles....⁶²⁸

Garfield described different protocols involved in barter or trade:

While trading between distant villages or tribes provided an occasion for feasts, entertainment and gift giving, most trading was informal. Only when a copper shield was bought or sold was the transaction made the main occasion for a potlatch carried out with great formality.⁶²⁹

In Garfield's opinion (and that of others) the potlatch was an institution that:

permeated every aspect of Tsimshian life. It was the foundation of the economic system; the stimulus for accumulation of goods and one of the sources through which wealth might be acquired. Through the custom of distribution of wealth a complex exchange system was built up. The potlatch system was responsible for much of the emphasis on wealth ownership, both individual and group. The necessity for goods to be used in potlatching was a stimulus which motivated individuals and lineages to produce and acquire as much as possible. Potlatching was of fundamental social importance to every individual, since all significant changes in status were validated through the distribution of goods....⁶³⁰

It was also important to the potlatch and the concept of wealth that the food that was given during the potlatch or feast be obtained from one's own territories: "As each course was brought in it was announced as some native food from the territories of the chief. Soup was called seaweed from his site on Dundas Island; meat, grizzly bear from

⁶²⁶ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):184, 189, 194.

⁶²⁷ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):199.

⁶²⁸ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):199.

⁶²⁹ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):193.

⁶³⁰ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):216-217. While there is no doubt the potlatch was integral to the Tsimshian society, the potlatch has changed over time, and the elaborate materialist form it took post contact cannot be arbitrarily extrapolated backward to the precontact.

his Skeena hunting ground; dessert, the crabapples from his berry lands.”⁶³¹ This indicates that foods obtained from one’s territory (and not from other territories) were an important element in demonstrating one’s control over specific lands and resources. Garfield also found that potlatching in the 1930s “has lost much of its significance, lineage cohesion has become less important...”⁶³²

Of the few descriptions that may relate to an earlier time, Garfield notes that the first obligation of the Tsimshian was to its lineage and clan, and only second to a tribal village or tribal chief.⁶³³ This is probably because the tribal village or tribal chief were recent innovations on the part of the Tsimshian, emerging after the migration and residence at Fort Simpson starting in the late 1830s and continuing to the early 1850s.

On the subject of wealth accumulation, Garfield does not consider trade as a means to that accumulation:

In an economy where everyone had to produce the larger part of what he consumed and what he accumulated for distribution, vast stores of wealth in the hands of any one man were certainly rare. A chief could, through tributes and gifts from his tribesmen which did not incur return responsibility, accumulate much more than others of lesser rank.⁶³⁴

Garfield also noted that few of the natives knew the exchange value of goods previous to the introduction of white trade articles:

all insisted that values depended upon the relative status and ability of the traders. A chief expected to pay more for his purchases than commoners and also expected to receive more for what he sold. Naturally, scarcity was a factor. Olachen grease has always brought a higher price from the Haida than from Tsimshian tribes because they can get it only by trade. The fine canoes of the Haida were in demand among the Tsimshian, who admit they had no canoe makers to compare with the Haida.⁶³⁵

What this suggests is that any exchange depended not on the article, but on the status of the trader. This has been demonstrated in the HBC records which cite examples of individuals insulted by bartering that did not reflect their perceived status.

Garfield stated that before blankets were introduced by Euro-Americans, caribou and groundhog skins were the standards by which other articles were compared:

Bundles of forty caribou skins, and later blankets were used by chiefs as potlatch gifts. They were too valuable for most commoners to own. Horn

⁶³¹ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):213.

⁶³² Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):318.

⁶³³ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):318.

⁶³⁴ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 329. Appendix 1, exchange value of goods.

⁶³⁵ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 329. Appendix 1, exchange value of goods.

spoons, carved boxes and food dishes and tanned skins or furs were mentioned as common gifts. Dried fish, olachen grease, seaweed cakes and berries in grease are food products often mentioned as potlatch gifts. Cloth, soap, household utensils and dishes were favorite trade and potlatch goods after these came into common use.⁶³⁶

These were standards of value from which to compare others for the purpose of assessing the value of “gifts” rather than a standard of trade.

Although Garfield provided a list of exchange values, it includes items of both native and European manufacture which indicates that the values were influenced by the Euro-American economy. In addition Garfield refers to the Haida coming to barter with the Tsimshian at the “post” meaning Fort Simpson. Of the eight items which are listed as having exchange value, three were based on marine species: one caribou skin or forty groundhog skins was equal to one box of eulachon grease; one seaweed cake for one large martin or beaver skin; and ten groundhog skins for one box of seaweed cakes, forty groundhog skins for one large box of eulachon grease. One groundhog skin for one dried fish, herring or salmon, ten groundhog skins for one box of pressed seaweed cakes or one seaweed cake for one marten or beaver skin.⁶³⁷ These exchange “values” also demonstrate the small quantities exchanged.

Anthropologist H.G. Barnett did field work at Port Simpson in 1942. His publications, however, were few. Barnett unlike Garfield focused on change in the Tsimshian economy:

They [Tsimshian] gradually abandoned their aboriginal economic foundation, lost interest in exploiting their natural resources and, in time, renounced their economic self sufficiency. The market for their dried fish, oil, canoes, and berries was extremely limited; these things could not be traded to satisfy their newly acquired tastes for the white man’s products, so they became wage laborers, packing, gardening, and woodcutting to meet the needs of the fort.⁶³⁸

Social Organization

There is some confusion in the ethnographic record regarding Tsimshian social organization because the same term came to be used to describe different units. For example Boas called a social unit a clan when he meant a phratry and he used the term tribe when he meant a village. Garfield⁶³⁹ used tribe or local group for a village group, and Drucker called the House, a clan-local group. The only term used by all was the description of the family.⁶⁴⁰

⁶³⁶ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 329. Appendix 1, exchange value of goods.

⁶³⁷ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):329-330. Appendix 1, exchange value of goods.

⁶³⁸ Barnett, H.G., *Applied Anthropology* in 1860, *Applied Anthropology*, 1942 (April-June):29

⁶³⁹ Garfield called the phratry a clan or pte.x. She called the local group a tribe or village. Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):173, 175.

⁶⁴⁰ For a comparison of the terms see Table 5.5 in Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 112.

A local group is the social unit whose members traditionally assembled to pass the winter at a common village site. Local groups were the largest politically autonomous units of traditional Northwest Coast society. For the Tsimshian, Haida and Tlingit, this group was organized on matrilineal affiliation and was called the House. Houses were matrilineages of persons nominally related and typically dispersed among dwellings or households. These households joined to form villages.⁶⁴¹ Precontact, there was no political structural entity at a level higher than the local group or House. Therefore this would have been the highest level to exercise economic activities and coordinate exchange.

The largest unit of social organization, however, was the phratry of which there were four. They were named Wolf, Blackfish or Killerwhale, Raven and Eagle.⁶⁴² Membership in a phratry was inherited matrilineally, that is through one's mother's brother, and each named phratry was exogamous, which means each phratry member had to marry outside the phratry. This system of organization of the phratry system extended to neighbouring groups like the Haida, Nisga'a, Gitksan and Tlingit, with the difference being that these groups had only two phratries. They were named either Wolf and Eagle, Raven and Eagle (Haida), or Wolf and Raven (Tlingit). Since there were only two phratries for the Haida and Tlingit, these are generally called moieties or halves.⁶⁴³

It is probable that precontact the Tsimshian also had only two phratries. Social Anthropologists, Paula Rubel and Abraham Rosman suggest that the original social structure of the Coast Tsimshian was a moiety (two phratries) where a settlement is divided in half with one providing services to the other including exchange goods and feast goods and women. The greater wealth of the fur trade produced more complex structures and wealth was used to enhance the prestige of individuals.⁶⁴⁴ Halpin also noted that the two pair grouping: "may reflect an original moiety division shared by the Tsimshian and their two neighbours... In other words, the Tsimshian four-clan system may have developed from an earlier two-clan system."⁶⁴⁵ This would suggest that the precontact Tsimshian were organized into two phratries (or a moiety system).

Exogamy was linked to a belief in descent from common ancestors. Since marriage between phratries was proscribed, a man and his wife belonged to two different phratries

⁶⁴¹ Mitchell, Donald and Leland Donald, Sharing Resources on the North Pacific Coast of North America: The case of the Eulachon Fishery, *Anthropologica*, 2001, xliii, (1):32,33; Galois, R. M., Colonial Encounters: The Worlds of Arthur Wellington Clah, 1855-1881." B.C. Studies, 1997-1998, no. 115/116:110; Dean, Jonathon, R., The 1811 Nass River Incident: Images of First Conflict on the Intercultural Frontier, Native Studies, 1993, 13 (1) 100, fn. 5.
<http://www.brandonu.ca/Library/CJNS/13.1/dean.pdf>

⁶⁴² The names of Tsimshian nobles and their phratry affiliation are tabled in Appendix B of Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 632-634

⁶⁴³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 113.

⁶⁴⁴ Rubel, Paula G and Rosman, Abraham, The Evolution of Exchange Structures and Ranking: some Northwest coast and Athapaskan Examples. Journal of Anthropological Research, 1983, 39 (1):1-2, 20, 21.

⁶⁴⁵ Halpin, Marjorie Myers, The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1973, p. 62.

and two different lineages. Children belonged to the kinship group of the mother. Husbands and wives could not inherit from each other and children could not inherit from their fathers. Children spent most time in the house of their mother's brothers (maternal uncles). Women moved to their husband's house when they married.⁶⁴⁶

The local group (House) as noted, is the primary unit holding rights to resources sites. This local group was economically and politically autonomous. The next settlement larger than a local group is the winter aggregation of two or more local groups, "the unit that earlier ethnographers miscalled a "tribe." The term tribe properly used designates a political entity, and the winter village aggregations were not political entities. Drucker described the Tsimshian assemblage of nine winter villages at Fort Simpson as consisting of local groups who retained their identity "by having its house or houses and its political and economic autonomy."⁶⁴⁷

Tribe

Barbeau was probably the first to define the "tribe" for the Coast Tsimshian. He described the tribe as a "casual geographic unit" and the kinship groups based "on real or fictitious relationship, irrespective of locality or time." The tribe was:

essentially a local and accidental unit, occupying a definite expanse of territory and consisting of various families which considered each other as relatives or strangers and traced their origin to different localities and ancestors. Many tribes have disappeared in the past, leaving nothing but a name in the memory of the natives; and their surviving families have scattered at random, joining other tribes.⁶⁴⁸

According to Barbeau, the Tsimshian remembered a time when there were no members of the eagle phratry in four to seven of the nine Tribes.⁶⁴⁹

Barbeau defined the Tsimshian tribe as "a local agglomerate of families belonging to different phratries and clans, and in the course of time gradually assembled for political reasons."⁶⁵⁰ Based on Barbeau, Archaeologist Louis Allaire stated that Tsimshian villages were: "often abandoned and new ones established frequently, somewhat in contrast to the greater stability of the kinship and social groups that integrated so many other aspects of Tsimshian society. This situation of instability must have also conflicted with the economic importance of territorial integrity."⁶⁵¹

⁶⁴⁶ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, pp. 18, 23.

⁶⁴⁷ Drucker, Philip, *Ecology and Political Organization on the Northwest Coast of America*, in *The Development of Political Organization in Native North America, 1979 Proceedings of the American Ethnology Society*, edited by Elisabeth Tooker, American Ethnological Society, 1983, pp. 90, 91, 94.

⁶⁴⁸ Barbeau, Marius, *Growth and Federation in the Tsimshian Phratries*, *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Americanists*, 1915: 403, 404.

⁶⁴⁹ Barbeau, Marius, *Growth and Federation in the Tsimshian Phratries*, *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Americanists*, 1915: 403, 404.

⁶⁵⁰ Barbeau, Marius, *Growth and Federation in the Tsimshian Phratries*, *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Americanists*, 1915:406- 407.

⁶⁵¹ Allaire, Louis, *A Native Mental Map of Coast Tsimshian Villages in The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, pp. 82-83.

In the Tsimshian narratives a human or semi divine ancestor settled a new village and established a new lineage which preserved its relationship to the parent group through crests, names and myths. These narratives were not true origin myths in the sense that the settlements were linked to generation after generation of descendants and there was no strong tie between ancestor, locality and descendants.⁶⁵²

Susan Marsden⁶⁵³ who has extensively studied the *adawx*, has acknowledged that the nine so called Tsimshian 'tribes' of the modern period may not have used these terms to describe themselves in earlier times and may have changed their tribal composition by adding new houses over time. Marsden also noted that the Tsimshian use their current tribal names to speak of their past.⁶⁵⁴ It is thus important to consider in any ethnographic reconstruction of the Tsimshian that the nine modern named groups may or may not be the original named groups which occupied various fishing locations in the ethnographically defined Tsimshian territory during the precontact period. In fact, it may be more accurate to refer to the original occupants of fishing locations as clan segments who adhered to one of two or four phratries named Raven, Wolf, Eagle and Killerwhale.

Post contact settlements generally exhibited all four phratries but prior to the movement of the Tsimshian to Fort Simpson villages, they were only arranged into moieties (that is two phratries rather than four).⁶⁵⁵ Martindale has noted that contemporary Coast Tsimshian (and many anthropologists) call each of the named village groups "tribes" although they are not "tribal" in any anthropological sense. Martindale described the village group (local group):

Each village group was an autonomous entity, acting coherently in matters of economics, trade, feasting and war under a village group leader and his or her counselors. Each owned territory in common which was distinct from and contiguous with other village groups. Similarly, each was –co-residential, particularly in the winter when the Lower Skeena and Coastal groups repaired to winter villages in Metlakatla. However each village was composed of at least two clans (phratries), obligations to which cross-cut village group allegiance.⁶⁵⁶

A "village" physically consisted of houses or dwelling (*waabs*) although this term also applied to all persons of a matrilineage, whether they were residing in one dwelling or not.⁶⁵⁷ Martindale noted that Halpin and Seguin⁶⁵⁸ suggest that prior to contact, local

⁶⁵² Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 18.

⁶⁵³ In 2003, Susan Marsden was Registrar and Acting Director of the Museum of Northern British Columbia in Prince Rupert. Although Marsden has extensive experience working with the *adawx*, I do not accept the accuracy of her dating of *adawx* into the precontact period.

⁶⁵⁴ Marsden, Susan, *Adawx, Spanaxnox, and the Geopolitics of the Tsimshian*, B.C. Studies, 2002, 135: 104 ft. 13.

⁶⁵⁵ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 31. This is a point made early by Garfield.

⁶⁵⁶ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 112-115.

⁶⁵⁷ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p.

groups were dually divided into only two of the four phratries thus representing a moiety division similar to the Tlingit and Haida. The existence of four clans within a single group was common only after contact.⁶⁵⁹

The Tsimshian recognized four hierarchical forms of social status. Leaders and their families were considered high status, and called “real people” or nobility. The “real people” sometimes literally translated as “ripe people” were distinct from commoners, “other people” or lower class “unhealed” people. Slaves had no status and were considered property. All status levels and slaves could however, live in one House. As Martindale writes: “Nobles control the means of production while the lower classes’ labour, especially that of slaves, is exploited.”⁶⁶⁰ There are only three sources of labour in Tsimshian society, one’s self, one’s kin and one’s slaves.⁶⁶¹

The most comprehensive ethnographic description of the social organization of the Tsimshian is provided by Anthropologist Marjorie Halpin. She determined that the Tsimshian were divided into four groups: 1) Real people (*samg’ig’et*) or “Ripe people”, called Royal houses or royalty to refer to the Houses or lineages of chiefs. The Real people were subdivided into the Chief or “real person”, the Chief’s wife or wives, the children of the chief (called princes or princesses); the little nobility, persons who were potential successors to the chiefs but not nephews or adopted heirs; 2) the headmen of non chiefly lineages known as counselors; 3) the “unhealed” (or green as opposed to ripe) are people who never received any honours or have gone through ceremonies to obtain new names and which may include former members of chiefly status, but also “bastards, miscreants and the children of slaves.” The unhealed category can also include those who by their misbehavior or bad character fall into this class; and 4) slaves, who are war captives.⁶⁶²

According to Halpin, the unhealed people was more a description of moral or social condition than a status level and may reflect that category of persons who could not or would not accept the morality of Tsimshian society. This group was not so much a lower class as a deviant class that did not fit Tsimshian society. They were of doubtful origins, had no names, no crests, no myths and therefore no past. They did not participate in *halait* or potlatch and: “there was little to define them as Tsimshian, or even human.” Halpin would conclude that in general, the Tsimshian had two status levels, a chiefly and councilor level, and a slave and deviant class which were outside society. Distinctions between the two classes were maintained by, if not created by, the potlatch system.⁶⁶³

31.

⁶⁵⁸ Halpin Marjorie, M. and Margaret Seguin, Tsimshian Peoples: Southern Tsimshian, Coast Tsimshian, Nisga’a, and Gitksan in Handbook of North American Indians, volume 7, The Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, pp. 267-284, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990.

⁶⁵⁹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 115, ft. 6.

⁶⁶⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 116-117.

⁶⁶¹ Donald, Leland, Aboriginal slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1997, p. 137.

⁶⁶² Halpin, Marjorie Myers, The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1973, pp. 100, 101, 102, 103.

⁶⁶³ Halpin, Marjorie Myers, The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British

Kinship Obligations

The northern matrilineal societies like the Tsimshian, Tlingit and Haida encouraged reciprocity through their moiety/phratry system which allowed kin ties and exchange. Since the Tsimshian had developed at some unknown time a four phratry named system identified by crests of the Killerwhale, Raven, Eagle, and Wolf, which as noted, duplicated the two crest systems or moiety systems of the Haida and Tlingit, there was a social structure in place for the three distinct linguistic and cultural groups to sustain relationships with each other through affiliation to similar crest groups (i.e. those individuals who shared the same crest group assumed affiliation). These relationships were furthered by the shared practice of marriage exogamy in which individuals were proscribed from marrying within the same crest group (i.e. an individual from one crest group had to marry outside that crest group). Anthropologist Margaret Seguin for example has noted that there were relationships of support with phratry “brothers and sisters” in other villages and in foreign tribes.⁶⁶⁴

Historian Jonathan Dean notes how this kinship system limited trade between unrelated peoples:

While trade and diplomacy were possible beyond the limits of this sphere of kinship, the social and hence diplomatic mechanisms for ensuring peaceful interaction were often absent,⁶⁶⁵ thus making international relations an uncertain thing. Relations with non-kin seemed to have fewer considerations of fair-dealing in trade, and hostilities might escalate out of control, given the lack of organization of clan ‘opposites’ and brothers-in-law to act as go –betweens.⁶⁶⁶

Dean says further that trade grew out of pre-existing international clan relations (meaning clan relations with Tlingit, Haida or interior groups like Gitksan and Carrier).⁶⁶⁷ This means that any trade in the form of exchange or barter with outsiders, or rather, non kin was a dangerous often unsustainable business, because it had little means of diplomatic control other than escalating into hostilities. Examples of this escalation into violence are amply demonstrated in the HBC records.

In 1915 Barbeau had reported the importance of relatives when he stated that: “For any political reason a family may shift from one tribe to another, but under no circumstances can it disown its acknowledged relatives, wherever they may reside.”⁶⁶⁸ William Duncan noted the importance of the crests or clans for the Tsimshian: “the relationship existing

Columbia, 1973, pp. 104-105, 106, 107.

⁶⁶⁴ Seguin, Margaret, Introduction: Tsimshian Society and Culture, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. xii.

⁶⁶⁵ This is important to the theory put forth by Kipp and Schortman.

⁶⁶⁶ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 101, 221, ft. 64.

⁶⁶⁷ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 101, 221, ft. 64.

⁶⁶⁸ Barbeau, Marius, Growth and Federation in the Tsimshian Phratries, *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Americanists*, 1915:403, 404.

between persons of the same crest is nearer than that between members of the same tribe....” Those of the same crest, for example were described as honour-bound to provide property to those of the same crest.⁶⁶⁹ Clan or crest members are scattered among several villages and over a large geographic area. Houses who shared the same origins were expected to provide mutual aid,⁶⁷⁰ and in case of food shortfalls, a Tsimshian would seek and expect to obtain food staples from these Houses.

So important was the kinship connection between partners who exchanged items that kinship was initially extended to white traders. The HBC fur trader Kennedy had married Legaic’s daughter sometime after 1832. In the 1850s, fur trader William McNeil’s brother-in-law was a Kaigani Haida and his wife a Nisga’a, named Neshaki. Historian Jonathan Dean compiled data which illustrates the critical importance of marriage connections to trade. The Tsimshian postcontact clearly used strategic marriages to extend their trading influences.⁶⁷¹

Garfield stated that a chief usually had several wives each of whom came from other tribes “in order to have strong tribal connections.” Sebassa’s leading wife was a sister of Nispelas and the next wife was the sister of a Gitsiis. The number of sons from wives, however, led to succession battles for title.⁶⁷² Marriages were thus contractual arrangements between lineages which expressed friendship, political interest and provided a means to maintain wealth and social position.⁶⁷³

The importance of kinship was also represented on the ground at the Hudson’s Bay Company post at Fort Simpson. Although the Hudson’s Bay Company had a guest house to accommodate visiting native groups, ordinarily the Indians who were visiting the post were guests of their own clan [“gens”] at the Tsimshian village. Niblack, for example, stated that an Indian arriving at a strange village goes to the house of his own totem, crest or clan.⁶⁷⁴

Clan (phratry) members shared a feeling of kinship and expected hospitality, calling each other “relatives.” Crest or clan relationships overrode tribal affiliation particularly in times of war.⁶⁷⁵ Kinship was the common denominator for interpersonal relations in Tsimshian society.

⁶⁶⁹ Duncan, William, *The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla*, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871, pp. 2-3.

⁶⁷⁰ Anderson, Margaret and Halpin, Marjorie, *Potlatch at Gitsegukla: William Beynon’s 1945 Field Notebooks* (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press), 2000, p. 15.

⁶⁷¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, ‘Rich Men’, ‘Big Powers’ and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 248, 374, 597 Table 15; Work, John, *The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835*, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, pp. 43, 71, 58.

⁶⁷² Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 131.

⁶⁷³ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 23.

⁶⁷⁴ Niblack, Albert P., *The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia*, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. Washington, 1890, pp. 338, 374.

⁶⁷⁵ Halpin, Marjorie Myers, *The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1973, pp. 63, 64.

Precontact Kinship and Exchange

The principal anthropological work involving Northwest Coast Peoples on the subject of trade is Kalervo Oberg's work amongst the Tlingit. Oberg distinguished between gift exchange, which takes place between a network of social relationships, and barter or trade in which individuals seek their own advantage through bargaining, without the benefit of a social relationship. Oberg did field work among the Chilcat Tlingit in the early 1930s. He was trained in both economics and anthropology and was probably one of the first or second generation of Northwest Coast ethnographers to have a significant background in economics.⁶⁷⁶ Because of the lack of interest in his work and in Northwest Coast native economics his study was not published until 1973. Oberg distinguished between gift exchange, which takes place between a network of social relationships, and barter or trade in which individuals seek their own advantage through bargaining, without the benefit of a social relationship. Oberg concluded that barter did not exist among the Tlingit before European Contact.⁶⁷⁷

Kipp⁶⁷⁸ and Schortman provide a practical explanation for the importance of kinship in precontact societies to determine with whom one may exchange foods through a kinship idiom and through gift exchanges: "Failure to exchange goods was tantamount to renouncing bonds of kinship...." They note the importance of the "reciprocal nature of chiefly exchange, embedded in role obligations rather than the market...In the absence of specialized traders, luxury goods changed hands for reasons personal and political: as wedding gifts, funeral offerings, and other life-crisis gifts between 'kin' and also through reciprocal gift giving between leaders, as tokens of apology, invitation, treaty or alliance...A kinlike or ethnic bond would have cushioned the delayed returns and perpetual imbalances of reciprocal exchanges between distant partners."⁶⁷⁹

Kipp and Schortman also state that commercial market exchange would pose structural problems because it would disrupt the existing sociopolitical patterns: "The market does not displace chiefly gift-giving, but chiefs who are contacted by the expanding tentacles of a trade network soon find that they must play by the new rules in order to stay in the status game." This means that: "chiefs must restrict access to these goods by novel means. They must try to ensure that only *they* can pay the price. Status and wealth become linked all the more strongly, and new levels of coercion also come into play."⁶⁸⁰

Kipp and Schortman restrict the term "trade" to: "entrepreneurial behavior, a form of exchange qualitatively different from those entailed by personal obligation." They note

⁶⁷⁶ Donald, Leland, *Aboriginal slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America*, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1997, pp. 121-122.

⁶⁷⁷ Oberg, Kalervo, *The Social Economy of the Tlingit Indians*, Seattle: University of Washington Press; American Ethnological Society Monographs 55, 1973, pp. 67-133; Oberg, Kalervo, A Comparison of Three Systems of Primitive Economic Organization, *American Anthropologist*, 1943: 572-587.

⁶⁷⁸ Rita Kipp Professor is Professor of Anthropology and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences Sewanee Tenn.

⁶⁷⁹ Kipp, Rita Smith and Schortman, Edward M., The Political Impact of Trade in Chiefdoms, *American Anthropologist*, 1989, 91(2):373-374.

⁶⁸⁰ Kipp, Rita Smith and Schortman, Edward M. The Political Impact of Trade in Chiefdoms, *American Anthropologist*, 1989, 91(2):374-375. Some of these distinctions appear among the Coast Tsimshian, such as chiefs paying more for an article.

that many writers have used trade: “as broadly synonymous with exchange, using these terms interchangeably... The word, trade has been used to denote a wide range of exchange relationships, and there is little to distinguish between long distance trade embedded in interpersonal chiefly relations and trade for the market.” They state that it is imperative to observe the different ways “trade” appears in archaeological theories, and when discussing trade, scholars are frequently discussing different phenomena.⁶⁸¹

Kipp and Schortman also caution against seeing “trade” in every manifestation of goods that appears to cross distance or social boundary. This, they argue results in a failure to grasp the:

essence of reciprocal economies, that is, that people give and receive certain things, indeed most things, because this exchange is part of what defines their relationship.⁶⁸²

If all exchange is subsumed under the category of trade, then this misses the political and social significance of the exchange.⁶⁸³ For the Coast Tsimshian, kinship relationships influenced and/or contributed to exchange or trading partners, and these exchanges between kin were not commercial.

More recently, Economic Anthropologist Susana Narotzky determined that in non-market integrated societies, the economy is embedded in other social institutions which cannot be analyzed as a separate realm. The objective in these societies was:

to create and re-create social bonds through continuing transactions and exchange (circulation). Essential to this social bonding is the gift which creates an obligation to be returned that engages the recipients in reciprocal transactions. The gift is the transitional form of exchange placed in between total prestation such as the potlatch, in which the social group as a whole is involved in a phenomenon embracing religious, social and economic intent, and the pure contract of market exchange.⁶⁸⁴

What this means is that in non-market societies like the precontact Tsimshian, exchange has its structure in gift exchange and kinship. This is why trading prerogatives were with kin. The purpose and scale of the exchange may later be influenced by the fur trade, but initially it was to establish or continue social bonds. The significance of kinship⁶⁸⁵ obligations also reduced the development of commercial exchange, for barter was carried out within the kinship relationship. There is no anonymous exchange between persons, but exchanges established through social relationship. The various chains of exchange through barter were based on reciprocal ties and kinship obligations.

⁶⁸¹ Kipp, Rita Smith and Schortman, Edward M. *The Political Impact of Trade in Chiefdoms*, *American Anthropologist*, 1989, 91(2):372, 378, 380.

⁶⁸² Kipp, Rita Smith and Schortman, Edward M. *The Political Impact of Trade in Chiefdoms*, *American Anthropologist*, 1989, 91(2):372, 378, 380.

⁶⁸³ Kipp, Rita Smith and Schortman, Edward M. *The Political Impact of Trade in Chiefdoms*, *American Anthropologist*, 1989, 91(2):372, 378, 380.

⁶⁸⁴ Narotzky, Susana, *New Directions in Economic Anthropology*, (London: Chicago: Pluto Press), 1997, pp. 3, 42, 43.

⁶⁸⁵ Kinship was not merely a matter of preferential personal relationships, but was obligatory and embedded in a complex duties and expectations determined by their position in the kinship system.

Narotzky also described what may be applied to Tsimshian trading partnerships and standards of value. In generalized reciprocity: “goods are entangled in the social fabric in such a way that they appear as extensions of personal obligations and never seem to acquire the autonomy necessary for establishing equivalences of value.” The bonds are produced to establish a long lasting social relationship, and this is done through trading partners.⁶⁸⁶ By extension, commercial exchange is exchange where there is no kinship relationship between the partners in the transaction, except the purely economic. As Historical Geographer James Gibson has reported for the Northwest Coast, reciprocal presents may actually yield better value than barter.⁶⁸⁷

Ethnographic Examples of Exchange and Trade

Part 2 of Barbeau’s manuscript entitled *The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In search of Bounteous Land*, comprises what Barbeau calls “Adaoh [Adawx] or true tradition of the Tsimshian.” The narratives which Barbeau considered to be *adawx*, comprised over 100 narratives. It is apparent that some of the *adawx* refer to specific historical periods. In the *adawx* entitled: *A Fight Between the Haida and the Tsimshian at Port Simpson* the narrative occurs after 1833 when the Haida (Skidegate) came to barter halibut for Tsimshian eulachon grease and dried eulachon. This trade and dispute was between two fairly high ranking individual women over a low quantity of fish and oil.⁶⁸⁸

Reference is made in the narrative collected by Barbeau to Legaic’s Daughter Big-Fin (*Wee’naerh*) who was reported to have quarreled with a Haida woman during the course of barter. The bartering involved high status women who with some other women wanted to barter for dried halibut from the Haida. The quantity involved in the barter was described as a “bundle of halibut.”⁶⁸⁹ The altercation led to armed raids by the Haida. In another version, one of the women described in the barter, changes from Legaic’s daughter to that of Legaic’s daughter in law.⁶⁹⁰

The exchange was apparently barter between two individuals, was small scale (bundle of dried halibut) and personal. It also occurred at the fur trading post, indicating a post contact event. The barter was unsuccessful and resulted in an assault. If there was any kinship relationship between the two women, this is not provided. The assault then led to raiding, which was the real message of the narrative.

The narrative entitled, *A Trading incident between the Niskae [Nisga, Nass] and the Gitsahlaw’ts [Kitsela]* states that the upper Skeena River tribes wanted coast foods for moose hides, moose meat and furs. The items traded by the Niskae [Nisga’a] were identified as oolachen grease, dried halibut, herring spawn and seaweed (dulse). But as the description of trade mentions sleighs, the narrative likely dates to the post contact period, because sleighs were introduced by European traders in the early 1800s and were

⁶⁸⁶ Narotzky, Susana, *New Directions in Economic Anthropology*, (London: Chicago: Pluto Press), 1997, pp. 44, 45, 46, 47.

⁶⁸⁷ Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992, p. 116.

⁶⁸⁸ PABC Boas Collection A 00267, Barbeau Files: *The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In search of Bounteous land* by Marius Barbeau, p. 198 (halibut story).

⁶⁸⁹ PABC, Boas Collection, A 00267, Barbeau Files: *The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land* by Marius Barbeau, p. 199.

⁶⁹⁰ PABC, Boas Collection, A 00267, Barbeau Files: *The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land* by Marius Barbeau, pp. 200, 201.

introduced at the fur trade posts in the interior at Bear Lake, Fort St. James and Fort Babine (in the interior).⁶⁹¹

In this narrative the Nisga or Nass are described as expert box makers for grease. The narrative describes a Gitlaan going to a Nisga's village to buy boxes accompanied by some women in a canoe who bartered sea foods. Since a gun is later mentioned in the narrative, this narrative dates to the post contact period. However, the narrative also demonstrates that the scope of barter was small scale, personal and limited.⁶⁹²

In the narrative entitled *Legyaerh's [Legaic's] trading privileges on the Upper Skeena*, the Gispaxlo'ots trading privileges with the Upper Skeena: "were further expanded through the close association between Legyaerth (Legaic) the Eagle head chief, with the Hudson's Bay Company, who established their post (1833) on his camping grounds....." This narrative then incorporates Legaic introducing an umbrella to the Upper Skeena Indians.⁶⁹³

Haida canoes used by the Coast Tsimshian are mentioned in a narrative entitled *Legyaerh's Trading Privileges on the Upper Skeena*. This narrative refers to the period of the gold rush on the Skeena River: "it was during the gold rush on the upper Skeena (1872-1898) that Legyaerh [Legaic] and his tribesmen were much in demand, as they had large Haida canoes with which to navigate the river."⁶⁹⁴ It is possible that the Coast Tsimshian became reliant on Haida canoes post contact to transport goods up the Skeena River. This would coincide with the post contact introduction of tools to the Haida who manufactured canoes for barter.⁶⁹⁵

In this same narrative, reference is made to the Gispaxlo'ots making three trading trips up the Skeena River every year. The first trip was made the after eulachon grease season in the spring and was for winter pelts which were disposed to the HBC. The second trip was with fish eggs, seaweed and salt water foods for dried and smoked berries, and the last trip was for moose hides and dried berries. The hides were used for moccasins, gloves, winter cloaks and "as currency in the feasts."⁶⁹⁶ These trading trips by the Gispaxlo'ots were made in association with trading for the HBC. As noted in the ethnohistorical section of this Report, the HBC records cite numerous trips made by Legaic as a trader for the HBC. Garfield has also noted that trading trips would include both European and native produced goods, and the HBC demonstrates how native produced goods including marine resources like halibut, herring eggs, were given in barter or paid as tribute to the Tsimshian middlemen at Fort Simpson, in exchange for the opportunity to trade at the HBC post.

⁶⁹¹ MacDonald, George F., Kitwanga Fort report. (Hull, Que.: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1989, p. 22; PABC, Boas Collection A 00267, Barbeau Files: The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau, p. 204.

⁶⁹² PABC Boas Collection, A 00267, Barbeau Files: The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau p. 206.

⁶⁹³ PABC Boas Collection, A 00267, Barbeau Files: The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau, p. 209.

⁶⁹⁴ PABC, Boas Collection A 00267 The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau, p. 211.

⁶⁹⁵ This compares to the historical record in which Scouler stated that the introduction of European tools and the decline of sea otters contributed to the Haida trading potatoes, argillite "curiosities" and canoes.

⁶⁹⁶ PABC, Boas Collection A 00267 The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau, p. 213, 214.

Harriet Hudson of the Gitsalas [Kitselas], (age unknown) in 1948-1949 informed William Beynon that she heard a narrative entitled “*Gitrhawn trading privileges on the Upper Skeena*” from her mother in law who was an “old woman”, many years ago. Although this narrative describes the Kitselas and the Kitwanga, it incorporates information about Legaic and demonstrates how kinship is essential to the establishment of trading prerogatives. Gitrhawn, a Kitselas, had gathered together a lot of coast foods such as dried herring eggs, seaweed, dried halibut and clams and gave them to his niece to give them to the Kitwanga. Gitrhawn’s niece had married into the Kitwanga to a group called “Gitwengarh” or “People of the Rabbit”. The foods were described as “sea coast treats.” By this marriage, Gitrhawn obtained trading privileges to the Kitwanga.⁶⁹⁷

While visiting among the Kitwanga, Legaic wanted a slave woman and was bargaining for her when Gitrhawn taunted him: “We do not bargain when we want anything. That is why poor people should not try to butt in to trade with these people here. The only ones that are wealthy should come.”⁶⁹⁸ According to Garfield, Legaic [Legex] broke the Kitselas trade to the Kitwanga around 1836, which is postcontact.⁶⁹⁹

The Ginaxangiik are reported in the ethnographic records to have had a trade monopoly with the Chilcat Tlingit, who supplied them with copper and dancing blankets for canoes, slaves and caribou hides. But this relationship was not strictly mercantile because there was a kinship relationship between the trading partners. What is interesting about this lengthy narrative is that the transaction was characterized in the narratives as a “gift.” The copper shield was purchased with “gifts.” That there existed a kinship relationship becomes apparent when the Stikine chief stated:

Many of your headmen have married Stikine women and many of these I know must have children, and among your people my tribe has grown. We also have some from among your tribe who have married into mine, and you will see that you have people among my tribe and village.⁷⁰⁰

Some of the gifts that *Gyamk*, the Ginaxangiik reportedly brought were: “from his own territories on the Skeena.” The informant, Sam Lewis who told this narrative to Beynon stated: “Although this copper was considered a gift, it was a form of sale the gift making it more valuable; also it placed the Ginaxangiik somewhat in a position as being still under obligations to the Stikine people.”⁷⁰¹

⁶⁹⁷ PABC, Boas Collection A 00267 The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau, pp. 3-4.

⁶⁹⁸ Chiefs tried to establish reciprocal gift exchanges as the system of trading: “They were too proud to become commercial.” Gunther, Erna, *Indian Life: Indians of the Northwest Coast As Seen by the Early Explorers and Fur Traders during the Last Decades of the Eighteenth Century*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press), 1972, p. 126.

⁶⁹⁹ Allaire, Louis, George F. MacDonald & R. Inglis, *Gitlaxdzawk: Ethnohistory and Archaeology, in Skeena River Prehistory*, edited by R.I. Inglis & G.F. MacDonald, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 87, Mercury Series, Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1979, p. 71.

⁷⁰⁰ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, pp. 38, 41, 42, 43, 51.

⁷⁰¹ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, pp. 38, 41, 42, 43, 51.

William Beynon described how trading privileges were controlled by “tribal chiefs,” which, as a level of political organization, did not develop until post contact:

Trading privileges to other tribes were controlled by the tribal chiefs who exacted tribute from any excepting his own immediate family, for trading privileges to areas which were under his control. These rights were taken, by giving a feast and distributing wealth, their proclaiming the rights assumed at the feast. For instance Legex [Legaic],⁷⁰² the eagle clan head chief of the gis’pax lts [Gispaxlo’ots] tribe, had proclaimed to all the tribes that he had exclusive trading privileges to the Upper Skeena or gitksaen [Gitksan] and the *haqw lg t* [Hagwilget] tribes. This was adopted at a feast given by Legex [Legaic]. When any one was caught poaching they were severely dealt with (see trade wars). Nearly every tribe had trade privileges. These trading privileges were one of the economic revenues of each tribal chief. Other sources of income to the tribal chief were the use of his power in elevating initiates into the secret societies and social tribal elevations.⁷⁰³

Few if any ethnographers observed the type of exchange which occurred between Northern Northwest Coast groups. Ethnographer R. L. Olson obtained a description of trade from a Chilcat Tlingit informant named Joe Wright. The Tlingit were northern neighbours to the Tsimshian and some groups had trading partnerships with each other. Olson’s description, although referring to a post contact period of the Euro-American fur trade, provides information on the important gift and kinship component to “trade.”

Olson dates the description of the trade to the decades before the Klondike Gold rush (ca. 1860-70s). The trade before this period was described by Olson as “intermittent” and involved an exchange of dried fish and eulachon oil for furs and dressed skins. Olson stated that the coming of the fur trade: “stimulated this trade to a marked degree and at the same time brought about a change in the type of goods moving inland, European wares displacing fish and oil.”⁷⁰⁴

According to Tlingit tradition, the discovery of other groups by the Tlingit’s ancestors resulted in the Tlingit acquiring the right to trade with the group and the right to the trade route. These rights were passed from uncle to nephew and became part of the maternal clan. Although in theory members of other clans did not share these rights, in practice there were few restrictions on trade: “Those who belonged to the clans mentioned inevitably had blood relatives and relatives by marriage in the other clans and their requests to participate in the trading could not well be refused.” The leader was the chief of one of the clans owning the trade rights.⁷⁰⁵

Olson described this postcontact trading expedition as numbering one hundred men: three out of five men carried trade goods, one in five carried food, while the house chief

⁷⁰² Legaic seems to be always the example cited in the Narratives. As noted, Legaic appears not to have acquired such trading prerogatives until post contact and as a result of the fur trade.

⁷⁰³ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. 1, pp. 5, 6.

⁷⁰⁴ Olson, R.L., Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit, in Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, p. 211.

⁷⁰⁵ Olson, R.L., Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit, in Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, p. 211.

carried packs of special trade goods and luxuries. The bulk of the goods consisted of firearms, powder, shot, dress goods, blankets and iron tools.⁷⁰⁶

Each leader or House chief in the Tlingit party had a “trading partner” among the Athapaskan. These partners were of the same clan or at least the same moiety.⁷⁰⁷ Upon arrival, the householder of the village escorted his partner (and his party) to his house. The Tlingit gave all the packs (except his own and his food pack) to his partner saying: “Here my partner, these are for you.” The head of the household took them without looking at them and placed them in a storage room. This transaction is equivalent to a gift.⁷⁰⁸

Food was prepared for the trading party and then the Tlingit guest chief ordered one of his men to open the food pack. The pack contained exotic items like sugar, rice, tea and coffee. The Tlingit chief then cooked a meal for his hosts. After this, the entire village engaged in games and other social activities. Two or three days would lapse before the “trading” began. By this time the Athapaskan hosts had examined the packs which had been given to them unopened by the Tlingit chief upon his arrival. The two chiefs then again met in the household taking seats of honour. A son or nephew of the host chief then proceeded to pile furs in front of the Tlingit guest chief. When the host chief thought enough furs were placed there, he would say: “What do you say, partner?” if there was no answer, he put on more furs. According to Olson:

This was the crucial phase of the trading. On the one hand the host did not wish to offend his partner by appearing stingy and on the other the guest was careful not to seem greedy. When reluctance to give more furs became evident the guest chief went to his pack and took out such gifts as cloth shirts and dresses, bundles of leaf tobacco, vermilion, and so on, but carefully left other things in the pack.⁷⁰⁹

During the “trading” the young men were careful not to take part in the proceedings:

At best the young Tlingit were permitted to take along only a few articles of their own. These they might trade with the young men of the village, but this was done semi-secretly at meetings out-of-doors. Such unofficial exchanges often led to the formation of “partnerships” in later life.⁷¹⁰

Marriage was also an important feature of Tlingit trade: “Tlingit men often married women of the interior tribes for the sole purpose of securing greater trade advantages. Such women usually remained with their kinsmen and saw their husbands only once or

⁷⁰⁶ Olson, R.L., *Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit*, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, p.212.

⁷⁰⁷ They would be related by kinship.

⁷⁰⁸ Olson, R.L., *Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit*, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, p. 212.

⁷⁰⁹ Olson, R.L., *Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit*, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, p. 213.

⁷¹⁰ Olson, R.L., *Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit*, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, pp. 213, 214.

twice a year.”⁷¹¹

When the “trading” was complete, there was a feast. After the feasting everyone in the village assembled in the largest house of the village where the hosts were requested by their guests to teach them several songs. The Tlingit would take the songs back to their village and sing them during their festivals. After a day or two more, the Tlingit would prepare to return home, but not before being given food for the trip by their hosts. Olson noted that trading partnerships were “unknown” in the domestic trade which involved other Tlingit groups, but was strictly a practice between “foreign” groups.⁷¹²

The missionary, William Duncan also noted the kinship connections between trading parties of Indians from the Skeena River which included: “two men from the far interior, both married into the Tsimshian [Tsimshian]-speaking tribes on the river, and able to speak Tsimshian fluently.”⁷¹³

There is no indication that precontact Tsimshian society had professional traders or that Tsimshian villages produced specialized goods for trade purposes (despite references in the mythological literature attributed to Boas).⁷¹⁴ Garfield rejected Boas’ depiction of various Tsimshian villages producing specialized goods and trading them: “Though there are myth references to Coast Tsimshian village specialization in manufactures, there is no evidence of such specialization in recent generations.”⁷¹⁵

Precontact “trade” was personal and negotiated between kin structured relations on a phratry or clan basis of familial relationships. The production and distribution of material goods are organized by transactional principles distinctly different from market exchange.⁷¹⁶

Although Halpin and Seguin in their *Handbook* article on the Tsimshian state that shellfish and seaweed were obtained in trade by the Gitksan and upper Nass River people from people from the coast, they cite no verifiable references for this statement. They also do not make any reference to the Coast Tsimshian trading salmon. Halpin and Seguin state that the foods most valued by the Tsimshian were those that were scarce, seasonally available, required intensive labour and organization by a person of rank. They describe these as: European foods, grease [eulachon] and anything stored in grease.⁷¹⁷

The references to trading prerogatives between kin in the Tsimshian narratives parallels

⁷¹¹ Olson, R.L., Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, pp. 213, 214.

⁷¹² Olson, R.L., Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936, p. 214.

⁷¹³ Duncan, William, *The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla*, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871, p. 112.

⁷¹⁴ See Barbeau.

⁷¹⁵ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, pp. 16, 17, 66.

⁷¹⁶ Dalton, *Economic Theory and Primitive Society*, *American Anthropologist* 1961, 63:9.

⁷¹⁷ Halpin Marjorie, M. and Margaret Seguin, *Tsimshian Peoples: Southern Tsimshian, Coast Tsimshian, Nisga’a, and Gitksan in Handbook of North American Indians*, volume 7, *The Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, p. 271.

that of the neighbouring Tlingit, who have been cited as trading partners of the Tsimshian. De Laguna, stated that the Tlingit: “traded largely as gift exchanges between partners in the same moiety. From the Haida they received canoes and slaves.”⁷¹⁸ The Tlingit shared clan names with the Haida, and the Tsimshian shared two of the Tlingit clan names, Raven and Wolf.

Precontact Political Organization

Precontact, the household or House was the polity and there was no political organization above the household. The household was the unit of consumption and production. Salmon was the key resource, but secondary resources were significant. The relatively short storage life of dried salmon (about 6 months) was a limiting factor which affected the importance of spring resources of food. Wealth depended on producing a food surplus and there was a strong ethos against hoarding. In theory, House members had equal access to the household’s property. The elite only became more evident at the level of a village or region.⁷¹⁹

The prestige of a House (and its chief) depended on the productivity of the household’s estate particularly in the production of salmon resources. The household chief was the basic elite office on the coast. Theoretically, a house’s estate belonged to all free members of the house, but chiefs usually treated it as their own. Slaves were the only resource over which the chiefs exercised unambiguous power.⁷²⁰

The emergence of a post contact larger political unit such as that of a “tribe,” developed during the second half of the 19th century and was a response to conflict and depopulation and the fur trade. This led to the amalgamations of members of former local groups.⁷²¹ What Halpin has called a “tribal” chief is actually a village chief. Halpin says that the “tribal” chief was the chief or headman of the highest ranked house in the tribe (village), all of the houses of all four clans were arranged in a single or continuous rank under his. This chief ordered the annual movement to the Nass for eulachon fishing in the spring “but seems to have had few other direct and institutionalized economic functions.” Halpin is unequivocal that: “there were no supra-tribal organizations or confederacies of tribes among the Tsimshian.”⁷²²

The Tsimshian developed their lineage political leadership into village chieftainship: early in the eighteenth century. Sometime before the beginning of the nineteenth

⁷¹⁸ De Laguna, Frederica, Tlingit, in *Handbook of North American Indians*, volume 7, *The Northwest Coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990, pp. 208-209.

⁷¹⁹ Ames, K.M., *Chiefly Power and Household Production on the Northwest Coast*, in *Foundations of Social Inequality*, edited by T. D. Price and G.M. Feinman, (New York: Plenum Press) 1995, pp. 156, 159, 161.

⁷²⁰ Ames, K.M., *Chiefly Power and Household Production on the Northwest Coast*, in *Foundations of Social Inequality*, edited by T. D. Price and G.M. Feinman, (New York: Plenum Press) 1995, p. 162, 169, 170, 173.

⁷²¹ Drucker, Philip, *Ecology and Political Organization on the Northwest Coast of America*, in *The Development of Political Organization in Native North America*, edited by Elizabeth Tooker, 1979 *Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society*, American Ethnological Society, Washington, DC. 1983.

⁷²² Halpin, Marjorie Myers, *The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1973, p. 72.

century the village chieftainship had developed into a tribal chieftainship.⁷²³ The significance of this distinction is that political leadership precontact was limited to the lineage level or House level. During the protocontact period it developed into a village leader and post contact into a tribal chieftainship. Historian Jonathan Dean discussed this transition with respect to changes in settlement and seasonal cycle (as noted in this Report). The Tsimshian narratives, however, frequently and arbitrarily apply the post contact level of political organization of post contact leaders like Legaic, back in time and adopt with it the post contact level of organization (i.e. “tribes”). Even though the name, Legaic may have existed precontact, the political organization during the precontact period was limited to that of a lineage or House leader.

Although Garfield described the functions of Tsimshian leaders, this description mostly applies to or is confused with the post contact “tribal” chief.⁷²⁴ Garfield also emphasized the limited political authority of the tribal chief.⁷²⁵ This would suggest that there was no direct tribal chief control over the production of a surplus of salmon even when the tribal chief existed, i.e. post contact. A postcontact “tribal” chief had much more wealth, both hereditary and from his followers and patronage to dispense. The tribal chief received “tribute in food and goods from all tribal members, including trade goods and potlatch gifts.” Anthropologist Christopher Roth calls these tribal chiefs, paramount chiefs who received tribute from constituent houses including those of other clans.⁷²⁶

Anthropologist Jay Miller summarized Garfield’s descriptions of the change in political organization. The Tsimshian were unique in having developed their lineage political leadership into village chieftainship probably early in the 18th century (this is the protocontact phase ca. 1700+). Before the beginning of the 19th century, village chiefs developed into tribal chieftainship. Tribal chiefs of the Skeena villages appointed representatives from among their heirs to take over the role of chief of the new villages. A few senior chiefs immigrated (to the coast) and left leadership of the old villages (like the Skeena River villages) in the hands of successors. The 19th century was a period characterized by the splitting up of villages. At this late post contact stage, a tribal chief emerged and the tribal chief was regarded as the active leader.⁷²⁷

The existence of a “tribal” chief was a post contact development but has been arbitrarily extrapolated backwards in time by some scholars to represent the political organization during the precontact period. Caution is therefore necessary before attempting to extrapolate backwards in time to the precontact period from the ethnographic descriptions and by assuming that the political organization was the same as it was post contact. Precontact, there were no political roles at the village group level. According to Archaeologist Andrew Martindale, Coast Tsimshian political authority was a function of

⁷²³ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 33.

⁷²⁴ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, pp. 36, 37.

⁷²⁵ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 16, 35.

⁷²⁶ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 67; Roth, Christopher F., *Goods, Names and Selves: rethinking the Tsimshian potlatch*, *American Ethnologist*, 2002, 29(1):136.

⁷²⁷ Miller, Jay, *Tsimshian Culture: A Light through the Ages*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press), 1997, pp. 17,18. For the Garfield description see Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 33-34.

one's status in a lineage, which in turn was dependent on the prestige of the crests owned (and thus the resource territories owned).⁷²⁸ Precontact, there were no permanent polities beyond the household or House, although some households were as large as villages. There were certainly no tribal or paramount chiefs who controlled multiple villages.⁷²⁹

Property and Ownership

Territories according to Margaret Seguin belonged:

to a local segment of the phratry were administered by chiefs, each of whom inherited control over territory and ceremonial privileges with his name....Generally each phratry represented in a village had control over sites each of the available types of resources, such as salmon fishing sites, hunting grounds, and berry patches; but one local lineage segment often held the highest ranked names and controlled a larger territory.⁷³⁰

The members of a House, according to Garfield: "claimed the right to use sections of the surrounding land and shoreline which came to be recognized as their traditional territory."⁷³¹ Status or prestige among the Coast Tsimshian was reflected in ownership of incorporeal items such as crests, songs, dances etc. but also of territories which were attested to by an *adawx* and affirmed by witnesses at a potlatch. Ownership of rights to land was related to the ownership of crests. Martindale writes: "Crests were symbols which acted as title as well as making reference to an *ada'wx* which explained and legitimized the ancestral claim of a lineage to the territory..."⁷³² There was thus a correlation between high ranked individuals, powerful crests and valuable territories.

There is no consensus in the literature whether the lineage held land in trust for its members or whether the lineage leaders owned wealth outright. According to Martindale, the reality was somewhere in-between, since low ranking lineage members had to ask permission to use titled land but leaders could not refuse legitimate requests and leaders had little recognized political power to coerce others.⁷³³

Garfield also distinguished between the theory or normative rule about Tsimshian rights to territories and the actual practice:

In theory, rights to territories, property validated in potlatches and established by use and occupancy, were inalienable. Actually, there is

⁷²⁸ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 127.

⁷²⁹ Ames, Kenneth, M. *The Northwest Coast*, *Evolutionary Anthropology* 2003, 12:19, 20.

⁷³⁰ Seguin, Margaret, Introduction: Tsimshian Society and Culture, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. xii.

⁷³¹ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 175.

⁷³² Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 116, 118, 127-128. As Halpin has observed, it is names not people that control property and privilege. Halpin, Marjorie, *Feast Names At Hartley Bay*, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past; Views For the Present*, edited by M. Seguin, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984, p. 60.

⁷³³ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 116, 118, 127-128.

ample evidence that these rights did change hands even before the Whites arrived to disrupt former patterns. Rights extended as a temporary courtesy to newcomers sometimes became permanent through occupation. Failure to use an area was regarded as abandonment probably occurred more frequently in the nineteenth century than previously due to decimation of native populations and increased participation in new economic pursuits introduced by the Whites.⁷³⁴

Garfield makes the important point that territories changed ownership and were abandoned for various reasons including biological ones like epidemics. She also is quite specific in her use of the word “rights” to resources and that rights to exclusively use resources were owned and not the resources.⁷³⁵ Anthropologist Donald Mitchell also made this point:

Throughout the Northwest Coast, resource locations and any apparatus constructed for resource extraction were owned, and in virtually all cases were held by the few rather than the many. Ownership did not extend to the resource itself--salmon could not be owned-but it applied very much to streams, places where weirs could be erected, places where traps could be set, places where salmon could be dip-netted or speared.⁷³⁶

Despite the ownership of productive fishing locations:

access and use are extended to at least some who are not owners. The primary extension seems uniformly to have been to close kin, however this may be defined for the various groups, with a secondary addition being more distant kin, and a tertiary, a category of non- or perhaps very distant kin, that may be described as "anyone who asks."⁷³⁷

Archaeologist David Archer noted that:

Access to territories was commonly granted to others, either on the basis of kinship, or in return for a share of the products collected (Boas 1889:833; Garfield 1945:627). The resulting extensive network of kin relationships combined with trade ventures meant that territorial use was not necessarily exclusive to a particular tribe or household, nor even to the Coast Tsimshian.⁷³⁸

Although Archer refers to trade, he stated: “Nevertheless, since the volume of traffic

⁷³⁴ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p.14.

⁷³⁵ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 14.

⁷³⁶ Mitchell, Donald, *Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill*. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, p. 7.

⁷³⁷ Mitchell, Donald, *Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill*. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, p. 9.

⁷³⁸ Archer, David, J.W., *A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects*, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp 20, 21.

through the Coast Tsimshian territory undoubtedly increased as a result of the fur trade, it may not have been as extensive aboriginally as indicated in the early records.”⁷³⁹

Mitchell would conclude his discussion about ownership and access to fishing resources on the Northwest Coast, by reiterating that access to marine resources depended on who one knew:

In short, while the Northwest Coast's salmon riches were made available to a few in each community through acknowledged ownership of fishing locations and apparatus, others gained access to the region's foremost food resource through exercise of the rights and obligations of kinship or through appeal to the vaunted generosity of those in the owning class. Skill was not a significant factor affecting the outcome of daily work at the fishery once the salmon had begun their spawning runs. Those who were allowed by the owners to make use of the existing means did not even need to know how to build or place a weir or trap. For them, right of access was far more important than skill, and, of them, it could truly be said that doing well at the highly rewarding salmon fishery depended not on what you knew but who you knew.⁷⁴⁰

William Beynon, however, appears to make a practical distinction between access to coastal marine resources which was based on common use, and salmon, sea lion and berries which were not:

Each tribe have their own village sites and each individual group in the tribe house groups have their own individual hunting, berry, sea lion rocks and salmon rights. For other food gatherings such as oolachan, herring spawn, dulse (seaweed), clams, all other shell fish, halibut fishing, there were many tribal camps used in common by each tribe.⁷⁴¹

In describing property concepts relative to the eulachon fisheries at the Nass River, Anthropologists Mitchell and Donald underscore the importance of property with social relationships: A property relationship is not simply an owner and something owned, but all who might own the same thing: “Thus property relations are social relations between persons and property relations are one of the things that shape social life and structure relations between persons.”⁷⁴²

The eulachon fishery illustrates how native groups like the Coast Tsimshian could hold rights to resources in a variety of locations, not all of which fall into a conventional idea of geographically contiguous territory. Although Mitchell and Donald provide little concrete information, it appears that native groups maintained their rights by using

⁷³⁹ Archer, David, J.W., A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp 20, 21.

⁷⁴⁰ Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, p. 10.

⁷⁴¹ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemshian Nation by William Beynon, vol. 1, p. 5.

⁷⁴² Mitchell, Donald and Leland Donald, Sharing Resources on the North Pacific Coast of North America: The case of the Eulachon Fishery, *Anthropologica*, 2001, xliii, (1):29

them regularly and being prepared to fight anyone who trespassed. Such rights could be obtained through marriage, inheritance, gift or seizure, in the latter case, by specifically by killing the owner of the right. In this way, “outsiders” could obtain access to participate in the fishery. What was owned, Mitchell and Donald are careful to state, was the right to fish for eulachon at a particular portion of the fishing grounds. Rights to fish for eulachon, for example, did not extend to other rights to resources like salmon. But certain other rights came with the rights to take eulachon, like the right to put up a dwelling for the duration of the fishery and the right to collect firewood for the processing of oil or drying fish and for domestic purposes.⁷⁴³

Garfield described some of the Tsimshian practices relating to access to resources by the Tsimshian. A son could use areas belonging to a father during the father’s lifetime. Although a son could hunt, fish, trap and take what he wanted from this location(s) he could only take what he needed for his own use, but not for commodities used in a potlatch. The items for a potlatch were taken from one’s own resource locations. If in-laws visited a resource area of another in-law, they could be invited to use the area, but without permission, they were viewed as trespassers. A Tsimshian wife could gather what she needed for her family from her husband’s properties, but she also worked her lineage’s properties or borrowed from her husband’s properties to assist her own lineage. With consent, she could pick berries from her husband’s resource areas and give them to a brother or uncle for his potlatch. This use, however, was construed as a loan, which required return payment.⁷⁴⁴

The Coast Tsimshian had concepts of dispute resolution which Garfield described:

Situations involving property rights were settled by raids or by property payment. Trespassing on clan or lineage territory, burning a village, or stealing property from it, illegal use of songs, crests or other lineage privileges and insulting, injuring or killing a person were all causes for raids, and figure in many of the tales of conflict between tribes and between lineages. Feuds have been carried on for years and even generations before they were finally settled, usually by payment of property and an agreement that the long standing controversy be forgotten. Refusal to arbitrate or to accept the property compensation would reopen the feud.⁷⁴⁵

The right to a dwelling site could only be lost by abandonment, in which case it became the common property of the tribe and any group could build on it:

the transfer of the right to the use of natural resources coming from the traditional lineage territory to another lineage by gift or through seizure in payment of a debt was fairly common, but such methods of transfer did not extend to dwellings. Since sale of real property was unknown, neither

⁷⁴³ Mitchell, Donald and Leland Donald, Sharing Resources on the North Pacific Coast of North America: The case of the Eulachon Fishery, *Anthropologica*, 2001, xliii, (1): 30, 31, 32.

⁷⁴⁴ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 17.

⁷⁴⁵ Garfield, Viola E., Tsimshian Clan and Society, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 269

dwelling nor sites were transferred in that manner.⁷⁴⁶

New adherents to groups would have no territory but could, with consent, use the chief's territory.⁷⁴⁷

Territories

Anthropologist Christopher Roth described territory as the most fundamental House prerogative for it is the source of wealth in the form of feast food, seafood, seaweed, moose, berries etc: "which speak to the abundance of the territories' (both and sea)...."⁷⁴⁸

What is apparent about the areas occupied by Tsimshian local groups especially when compared to the Claim Area, is that the Tsimshian local groups occupied discrete localized parcels, mostly segments of tributaries of the Skeena River.⁷⁴⁹ These parcels were not used exclusively for various non mammal marine resource use, but included uses for lodges, hunting, fishing and gathering. Some areas show partial use, such as the west side of Dundas Island, northwest corner of Stephens Island or a small are of the North Arm of Works Channel. For some groups, the parcels were not contiguous and certainly not by "tribal" name designation (See Appendix C).

It is also apparent from ethnographic data that many rivers and creeks had fishing access over only part of the length of the water course (and not the whole tributary as indicated on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map). Martindale also included a list of locations which he considered to be common ground used by all Coast Tsimshian. They include several rivers and creeks such as: Donahue Creek, Georgie River, Kwinamass River 1/3, Hays Creek 1/2, Diana Creek, McNichol Creek, Moore Cove Creek, Oldfield Creek 1/2, Silver Creek, Klewnuggit Inl Creek, Kxgeal Creek, Northness Creek and Manzanita Cove Creek.⁷⁵⁰ These areas do not appear on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

Abandonment of Territories

Garfield stated with reference to the migration of the Coast Tsimshian to Fort Simpson: "When permanent residence was established on the coast some of the old tribal villages were abandoned, but rights to hunting and fishing territory on the Skeena are still retained."⁷⁵¹ Although twenty-five settlements were known to have been present in the 19th century, most sites were unsuited to modern conditions of travel, and only a few were still occupied. Permanent villages probably averaged less than a hundred

⁷⁴⁶ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3): 276, 290.

⁷⁴⁷ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 62.

⁷⁴⁸ Roth, Christopher F., *Goods, Names and Selves: rethinking the Tsimshian potlatch*, *American Ethnologist*, 2002, 29(1):135.

⁷⁴⁹ See for example, Map 10, colour coded territorial map, Beynon n.d. Plan 3, *American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker*, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation* by William Beynon.

⁷⁵⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 435-436; Appendix A.

⁷⁵¹ Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):175.

people...”⁷⁵² However, failure to use an area or resource was construed as abandonment and left it open for seizure by others.” Some territories became extinct. William Beynon attributed abandonment to the smallpox epidemic, and the migration of groups who followed Duncan to Alaska.⁷⁵³

The numerous migration narratives suggest movements and abandonment of various locales in the precontact and protocontact period. Some of these involved the taking up of land and resources formerly occupied by the Tlingit. In the postcontact period there was a gradual abandonment of fishing areas with the introduction of canneries and increasing importance on hunting areas. It is probable that areas selected for reserves for fishing purposes, were at that time selected for continued use.

Warfare would have been antithetical to free trade on the Northwest Coast. Warfare was however, common along the Northwest coast during the precontact period.⁷⁵⁴ Strategic places on major trade routes were fortified, held and besieged. ⁷⁵⁵ Some territories and access to resources changed hands. Archaeologist Paul Prince stated that precontact raiding food stores was a prominent cause of raiding and warfare in the Skeena area: “By raiding for food one can weaken an enemy.”⁷⁵⁶ The Gitsiis raided the Gispaxlo’ots and attempted to raid their village at *laxmasawle* in the Metlakatla passage.⁷⁵⁷

Various narratives describe the Skeena River as a route used to make war. The Gitlaan, lived on a place on the Zimacord River (*Ksangot*) that was difficult to get to and had a lookout on the Skeena River. The left side of the river was used by the Ganhada [Raven] clan of the Gitlaan under their chiefs *Niiyas*, *Yalap* and *Gemosox*.⁷⁵⁸

The Tsimshian feared and experienced Haida attacks up the Skeena River and along the coast en route to the eulachon fisheries at the Nass River. Some of these attacks would involve the stealing of “booty” which would likely include eulachon oil and captives for enslavement. Traditional narratives describe 12 Haida war parties on the Skeena River. Beynon described groups making their villages close to a mouth of a river but, “hidden by the curves of the shoreline so that they could defend themselves against sudden raids from the direction of the river mouths.”⁷⁵⁹

⁷⁵² Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, pp. 9, 10.

⁷⁵³ American Museum of Natural History, *Papers of Philip Drucker*, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation* by William Beynon, No. 37, plan iii, vol. v, p. 24; Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 122.

⁷⁵⁴ See Ferguson, Brian, *A Re-examination of the Causes of Northwest Coast Warfare*, Warfare, Culture and Environment, edited by Brian Ferguson (New York, Academic Press), 1984, pp. 274, 278, 279; and Maschner, Herbert D.G., *The Evolution of Northwest Coast Warfare*, in *Troubled Times: Violence and Warfare in the Past*, edited by Debra L. Martin and David W. Frayer, pp. 267-302, (Netherlands: Gordon and Breach Publishers), 1997.

⁷⁵⁵ Ames, Kenneth, M., *The Evolution of Social Ranking on the Northwest Coast of North America*, *American Antiquity*, 1981, 46(4):799.

⁷⁵⁶ Prince, Paul, *Ridge-Top Storage and Defensive Sites New Evidence of Conflict in Northern British Columbia*, *North American Archaeologist*, 2004 25(1):47.

⁷⁵⁷ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 133.

⁷⁵⁸ McDonald, James Andrew, *An Historic Event in the Political Economy of the Ownership of the Zimacord District*, *B.C. Studies*, 1983, (57): 26, 27.

⁷⁵⁹ Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987, p. 225;

War with the Haida was described as “almost perpetual” in one of the *adawx* collected by Barbeau.⁷⁶⁰ The Tsimshian would travel in large groups along the coast for protection from Haida attacks.⁷⁶¹ Beynon also described the lower Nass River as once being used as natural fortification used by all Nisga’a against Haida and Tlingit raids, “and even [against] the Tsemsiyen [Tsimshian] tribes ...” Kitimat raiders also:

often came to the Skeena overland to make raids upon the various Tsimshian [Tsimshian] villages on the Skeena and there great rivals being the gitsangelam [Kitsumkalum] people. On one raid they attacked the village of the eagle clan chief and took many captives among whom was the eagle clan chief’s sister....⁷⁶²

The early maritime fur records report violence and the existence of forts. The HBC is replete with frequent occurrences of what they called “quarrels” many of which resulted in wounding and death.

Precontact Potlatch

The literature on the potlatch is too extensive to go into detail in this Report. What is important is that the precontact potlatch was substantially different than that described in the ethnographic literature, which, for the most part, describes a post contact florescence. A Tsimshian potlatch (also referred to as a feast) was an occasion to express and validate a change in status through the taking up of hereditary rights, names and materials from myths presented in dramatic form. Participants increased their prestige, demonstrated their ability to accumulate wealth and: “cited their success as hunters and fishermen. Their ability to give the potlatch demonstrated that the beings of the spiritual world, the guardians of wealth had assisted them in their worldly efforts.”⁷⁶³

Anthropologists Philip Drucker and Robert Heizer state that the original (presumably precontact) potlatch among Northwest Coast groups:

developed gradually through a fusion of simpler concepts mutually compatible in function – gift exchange in marriage leading to a special relationship between affinal kin, a wealth system, concept of inheritance of rights associated with social status, and formal presentation to the heir at the mortuary rites in honour of a deceased chief. These expanded as the potlatch became more complex.⁷⁶⁴

MacDonald, George F. Kitwanga Fort National Historic Site, Skeena River, British Columbia: historical research and analysis of structural remains, Hull, Que., Parks Canada, 1979, pp. 11-12; American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon vol. viii, p. 57.

⁷⁶⁰ PABC, Boas A 00267 The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In Search of Bounteous Land by Marius Barbeau p. 200.

⁷⁶¹ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol., iv. pp. 33-35.

⁷⁶² American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. ix, p. 13; vol. viii, p. 27.

⁷⁶³ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, p. 45.

⁷⁶⁴ Drucker Philip and Robert F. Heizer, To make my name good, (Berkeley and Los Angeles:

The concept of currency in the form of trade goods, undermined the viability of the potlatch as a collective institution, for it changed its significance to individual rivalry between individuals.⁷⁶⁵ This is clearly demonstrated in the historical record.

Garfield also stressed the importance of how surplus food for potlatches and feasts, which were central to Tsimshian society, could be obtained from relatives:

During preparations for giving a potlatch, when great surpluses of food and goods are required, the Tsimshian host can “borrow” from his father or the father of any male member of the house; also from the wives of all the house members. They may borrow outright, returning the loan at the potlatch or they may request the right to fish, hunt or gather food on any of the lands belonging to the above people. In any case, they pay their indebtedness at the main potlatch, if they can afford to do so, If not at a later potlatch.... The Tsimshian consider it a special mark of friendship and courtesy to give the “borrower” the right to the best fishing site or the first berries.⁷⁶⁶

Groups needed to manage resources to build up a surplus for feasting, by mobilizing fellow group members using an ethic of sharing, reciprocity and relying on kinship obligations.⁷⁶⁷ Salmon would be given to guests at feasts because it was obtained from one's lineage resources, and with the giving of that salmon, one demonstrated one's wealth. The most valued fish were those that came from lineage controlled territories and those offered at feasts.

Anthropologist Robert Grumet stated that it was after the 1836 smallpox epidemic that the *haleyt* spirit power potlatches increased among the Tsimshian and Legaic came into prominence as a middle man in the trade and access to resources. ⁷⁶⁸ The introduction of fur trade goods increased the size, frequency and importance of the feasting and potlatch forms among the Coast Tsimshian. As the fur trade stimulated potlatching, so did trading associated with the fur trade stimulate the potlatch and feasts. The opportunities for feasts presented themselves with greater frequency as raiding, epidemics and new house building (such as that at Fort Simpson) increased the number of potlatches at Fort Simpson. In addition, the fur trade introduced new feasts, like rum feasts and rice feasts. During the 1850s, the Fort Simpson potlatches occurred almost nightly.⁷⁶⁹ Dean agrees with Grumet but disagrees with his dates and argues that it was during the 1850s that accelerated feasting occurred among the Coast Tsimshian at Fort Simpson. ⁷⁷⁰

University of California Press), 1967, p. 36. See Helen Codere's classic study of early potlatches among the Kwakiutl titled, *Fighting with Property*, (Germany: J.J. Agstin, Glückstadt), 1950 which is probably the first anthropological attempt to address the early practices of the potlatch.

⁷⁶⁵ Ringel, Gail, *The Kwakiutl Potlatch: History, Economics and Symbols*, Ethnohistory, 1979 26 (4):357. Although Ringel described the Kwakiutl potlatch, the historical effects on the potlatch are comparable to other Northwest Coast groups which practiced the potlatch.

⁷⁶⁶ University of Washington, Library, Special Collections, Viola Garfield Papers 1927-1976. *Ownership of Food-Producing Areas*, p. 8.

⁷⁶⁷ Donald, Leland, *Aboriginal slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America*, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1997, p. 302.

⁷⁶⁸ Grumet, Robert, S. *Changes in Coast Tsimshian Redistributive Activities in the Fort Simpson Region of British Columbia*, 1788-1862, Ethnohistory, 1975, 22(4): 305.

⁷⁶⁹ Grumet, Robert, S. *Changes in Coast Tsimshian Redistributive Activities in the Fort Simpson Region of British Columbia*, 1788-1862, Ethnohistory, 1975, 22(4):301, 304, 305, 311.

⁷⁷⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian

It was likely that precontact there would have been little motivation in Coast Tsimshian societies to accumulate more wealth than necessary to celebrate one's title or advance one's children. The demand for wealth or goods, within this situation, was inelastic. According to Historian Jonathan Dean:

as ceremonialism was founded on sacred concepts of legitimate behavior and social consensus, there was little motive to accumulate more wealth than was needed to celebrate one's title or advance one's children.⁷⁷¹

Potlatches or feasts in the post contact period and its assumptions of wealth and trade for wealth prestige can not simply be extrapolated backward in time. The combined increase in European trade good wealth to purchase native wealth combined with depopulation through disease, and increased house building at Fort Simpson, led to a dramatic increase in potlatches and feasts.⁷⁷²

Wealth

For the precontact Tsimshian, wealth was a commodity that derived from one's territories and could be distributed for prestige. The Tsimshian attached cultural importance to their ability and rights to obtain and display marine resources obtained from their own territories, for it reinforced their property and prestige prerogatives:

It was usual to announce to guests, for example, that they were invited to eat sockeye salmon from such-and-such a stream, which had been discovered, given to, or captured in war by an ancestor and transmitted to the incumbent head of the group. The public announcement and tacit recognition of the fact by the guest group, so to speak, legalized the claim.⁷⁷³

Wealth for the precontact Tsimshian included elk skins, coppers, slaves and canoes. The accumulation of wealth for a *yaakw* [feast] was accomplished through domestic organization of labour and specialization in production: "supplemented by a network of intertribal trade ties, facilitating the importation of exotic prestige goods utilized in feasting and haleyt displays".⁷⁷⁴ High status feasting foods (which were not food staples) create debt which was considered wealth. Subsistence production was diverted into non subsistence activities such as competitive feasting and in obtaining exotic trade items.

Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 446, 562; Dean, Jonathan, R., "These Rascally Spackaloids:" the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, B.C. Studies, 1994 (101): 77.

⁷⁷¹ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 622-623.

⁷⁷² Bolt, Clarence R., The Conversion of the Port Simpson Tsimshian: Indian Control On Missionary Manipulation, in B.C. Studies, 1983 57:41 also see Ringel on this point for the Kwakiutl and Grumet, Robert Steven, Changes in Coast Tsimshian: Redistributive Activities in the Fort Simpson Region of British Columbia, 1788-1862, Ethnohistory, 1975, 22(4):295-318.

⁷⁷³ Drucker, Philip, Cultures of the North Pacific Coast, (San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company), 1965, p. 56.

⁷⁷⁴ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, pp. 35, 42.

According to Martindale:

Debt is created by mechanisms, such as competitive feasting and trade for valuable exotic ornaments, which convert economic resources into social assets such as prestige...By creating debt, emerging elites can control the productive labour within their corporate groups and convert it to status and indebtedness from other corporate groups.⁷⁷⁵

Martindale also states that after contact with Europeans the Tsimshian were able to convert previously low value resources like fur bearing mammals directly into wealth through the fur trade. This enriched the prestige and wealth components while “devaluing the production of surplus subsistence resources.”⁷⁷⁶

Summary of Answers to Questions

1.1.1. Before and at the date of first contact with Europeans:

1.1.1.1. Who were the aboriginal people, if any, living on the west coast of British Columbia where the Skeena River joins it, and along the lower Skeena River and its tributaries (as outlined in maps attached to the Statement of Claim and Response to Particulars) (“Skeena Region People”)?

Summary Answer 1.1.1.1

Before and at the date of first contact with Europeans the aboriginal people occupying the west coast of British Columbia where the Skeena River joins it, and along the lower Skeena River and its tributaries were members of one of four phratry (clan) groups known by the eponym Killerwhale, Raven, Eagle or Wolf. At some undefined time during the protocontact period, that is during the period after indirect contact with Europeans, ca. 1700-1787, the date of contact with Europeans, the clan groups reorganized politically into ten or more named local groups.

Ten names survive in the ethnographic record, although there are more numerous settlement locations at the mouth of the Skeena River in Prince Rupert Harbour which may suggest an earlier occupation by groups identified in the ethnographic and archaeological record as Coast Tsimshian. There is also archaeological and ethnographic evidence pertaining to the early precontact and protocontact periods that Tlingit occupied some coastal areas, but not the Skeena River tributaries. The occupation of the coast at Prince Rupert Harbour is substantially older and more densely populated than the Skeena River tributaries.

The literature commonly identifies the named groups into two divisions based on location. Two groups of the Skeena Region Peoples which had both summer and winter territories on the sea coast were named Gitzaxlaal and Gitwilgyoots. The groups which had winter villages on the coast and summer territories on the lower Skeena River below

⁷⁷⁵ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 35, 36, 37.

⁷⁷⁶ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 41.

Kitselas canyon included: Gitsiis; Gitlaan; Ginaxangiik; Gitnadoiks; Gitando; Giltss'aaw; Gispaxlo'ots; and Gitwilseba. However archaeological evidence suggests that the Gispaxlo'ots, Gitando, Gitzaxlaal are not shown to have sites with houses or camp sites on the Skeena River during the late precontact period. In the contact period, however, all ethnographically identified groups except the Giltss'aaw, the Gitando, and the Gitnadoiks (or rather, the occupants of the areas ethnographically associated with these named groups) *are* shown to have village sites on the Skeena River.

- 1.1.1.2. What was the nature of the Skeena Region People's use, management and conservation of fish, shellfish and aquatic plants ("Marine Resources"), if any?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.2

The Skeena Region People used various fish, shellfish and aquatic plants (seaweed) for food, materials, ritual purposes and likely medicinal purposes. The fish species included: sculpin, sea perches, rockfishes, mussels, barnacles, ratfish, greenlings, cabezon, eulachon, herring, rock sole, arrowtooth and starry flounders, halibut, herring spawn, dogfish, other sharks, salmon, albacore and possibly cod.

The invertebrates included but were not limited to butter clam, native little neck clam, cockle, horse clam, bay mussel, and California mussel and others. At the lowest tide level were northern abalone, green sea urchin and giant sea cucumber. Aquatic plants included various types of seaweed like Eel grass, bladder wrack which are common shoreline species, and kelp.

The term conservation has conceptual problems when applied to the Skeena River Peoples (or any aboriginal people), for in its very general sense means prudent husbanding with the goal of future availability. The Skeena River Peoples attempted to attract marine resources by conjuring, ritual cleansing and other ritual observances. This method of conservation was based on an ideology of propagation. This means that the proper respect and ritual actions would lead to the future abundance of a species. The species selected for the most intensive ritual observances included salmon and eulachon. These were species which were also collectively harvested or processed.

Conservation in terms of ritual observances was applied to onshore resources like salmon and eulachon and less to offshore resources. Both offshore and onshore marine resource harvesting locations were subject to ownership and rights of access by a House. Some Coast Tsimshian owned halibut harvesting locations while others did not. No property concepts appear to have applied to cod harvesting areas. The onshore marine resources were managed more closely by the House owners because species such as spawning salmon, eulachon and herring required intensive preparation, harvesting and storage which involved the construction of fishing weirs and traps, rakes, fences, drying racks, spawn collection materials etc. Offshore resources like halibut required less direct management. Off shore marine resources caught on shore in traps made of rocks for example for salmon and other species, did not require dedicated attention. Although stone traps can last centuries, there are none extant in the Prince Rupert Harbour area. Off shore marine resources were primarily taken from shallow waters.

All production capabilities of significant schooling marine resources like salmon and eulachon were limited not exclusively by the abundance of the species, but by the capability to preserve these species.

- 1.1.1.3. Which of the Skeena Region People, if any, engaged in harvesting, processing and trade (“Use”) and/or commercial Use of Marine Resources?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.3

The Coast Tsimshian cultural practices of ownership of access to marine resources, kinship relationships through an extensive clan or phratry based system, obligatory kinship relationships, multiple forms of exchange such as dowry, gifts, feasts, etc. would have facilitated access to most marine resources. The exception is eulachon. These cultural practices would have reduced the necessity of exchange of marine resources in barter or commercial transactions or limited them to individuals established by kin. In the reported instances of “trade or barter” of marine resources between the Coast Tsimshian and other native peoples, the context is within its use value as food, gift, feast, tribute, or kinship- based barter, facilitated through a trading partnership.

- 1.1.1.4. Were the Use and/or commercial Use of Marine Resources integral to the distinctive culture(s) of the Skeena Region People?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.4

The harvesting of selected marine resources like spawning salmon was integral to the distinctive culture of the Skeena River Peoples for food and ceremonial purposes. The commercial use of marine resources was not integral to the distinctive culture of the Skeena River Peoples, who instead valued marine resources for their food and ceremonial value and associative social and political importance related to the potlatch or feast. The existence of property concepts associated with the ownership of access to certain marine resources like salmon and eulachon (although not all precontact groups had access to eulachon), the deposition of usufructuary rights to access marine resources, the use of marine resources for feasts and gifts, and the exclusion of most marine resources as “wealth” items which were exchanged, moderated against the importance of marine resources for commercial purposes. Commercial is defined as the exchange of large quantities of a marine resource to unrelated persons or persons outside a kinship network. The exception to the marine resources which had exchange value was eulachon grease. Often called a luxury good, it is debatable if it can be considered integral to the distinctive culture of the Skeena River Peoples, since not all precontact groups as identified in the archaeological record at Prince Rupert Harbour, had access to it. While it was a desirable commodity for food and exchange, it was often described as a luxury and used by elites to obtain other wealth related goods. Eulachon, which were preserved into grease, were not harvested or preserved from locations owned by the Skeena River Peoples, but from locations along the Nass River where they had usufructuary rights of access, along with many other native groups.

- 1.1.1.4.A If so, which particular Marine Resources were

integral to the distinctive culture of the Skeena Region people?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.4A

Spawning salmon which could be readily preserved for winter food was integral to the distinctive culture of the Skeena River Peoples. These species included pink, chum and coho salmon.

- 1.1.1.5. What was the nature of the socio-political organization of the Skeena Region People?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.5

The Skeena River Peoples were organized into Houses containing members from two to four matrilineal clans or phratries. Precontact the Houses likely contained only two clans but sometime during and after extensive migrations and displacements of peoples (including Tlingit), the socio-political organization came to be characterized by up to four clans. The House was the corporate territory holding group that has rights and responsibilities related to its ownership of names and crests. The Houses developed into the ten named groups described in the ethnographic literature which shared cultural, linguistic and ceremonial characteristics, but not political characteristics, some time in the protocontact period. The combination of population movement and amalgamation in the early 18th century brought the Skeena River Peoples together into ethnographically recognizable groups such as the ten named groups which have been called “tribes” by the Coast Tsimshian and by some anthropologists.

- 1.1.1.6. What were the distinctions, if any, between the Skeena Region People’s onshore and offshore use, management and conservation of Marine Resources?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.6

In the early and middle precontact period, there was much more reliance on a diversity of offshore shallow resources than in the late precontact period. The late precontact to early protocontact period marked a shift to more onshore use of resources up the Skeena River. The onshore marine resources were managed more closely by the Houses because species such as spawning salmon, herring and eulachon required intensive preparation, harvesting and storage which involved the collective construction of fishing weirs and traps, and the manufacture of rakes, fences, drying racks, spawn collection materials etc. Offshore resources in shallow water like halibut required less direct management and were individually harvested.

- 1.1.1.6.A What were the distinctions, if any, between the Skeena Region People’s use, management and conservation of Marine Resources as between fast-flowing and slower-moving parts of the Skeena River?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.6A

Although the Skeena River Peoples had “potential” access to salmon on the fast-flowing water of the main stem of the Skeena River, they intensively fished parts of the tributary streams. Precontact fishing technology which consisted of weirs and traps such as basket traps and dip nets, were not effective on the lower Skeena River. The gill net, which would allow fishing on the main stem of the Skeena River was unknown or unused precontact.

- 1.1.1.7. What were the Skeena Region People’s concepts of ownership that regulated access to or management of Marine Resources?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.7

Both offshore and onshore marine resource harvesting locations were subject to ownership and rights of access by a clan segment of the chief of a House. The ability to undertake the harvesting of marine resources depended upon ownership of hereditary rights that ensured access to the resources. Generally each clan segment had control salmon fishing sites. House elites claimed the right to use sections of shoreline which came to be recognized as their territory, which were attested to by an *adawx* and affirmed by witnesses at a potlatch. Ownership of rights to land was related to the ownership of crests. There is a correlation between high ranked individuals, powerful crests and valuable territories. There is no consensus in the literature whether the House held land in trust for its members or whether the lineage leaders owned wealth outright. Low ranking lineage members had to ask permission to use titled land but leaders could not refuse legitimate requests and leaders had little recognized political power to coerce others. Theoretically, rights to territories, property validated in potlatches and established by use and occupancy, were inalienable but in reality rights changed hands frequently as groups abandoned areas. Ownership did not extend to the resource itself, but it applied to streams, places where weirs and traps could be erected or where salmon could be dip-netted or speared. There were also distinctions between access to coastal marine resources which was based on common use, and those like salmon, (sea lion and berries) which were not. Eulachon, herring spawn, seaweed and clams and other shellfish, and halibut were used in common by the “tribal” groups.

- 1.1.1.8. What was the relationship, if any, between the Skeena Region People’s use and ownership of Marine Resources and use and/or access by other aboriginal groups?

Summary Answer to 1.1.1.8

Ownership of rights of access to productive fishing locations was controlled by House elites. The Skeena River Peoples held rights to resources in a variety of locations, not all of which fall into a conventional geographically contiguous territory. The Skeena River Peoples maintained their rights to access to marine resources by using them regularly and by being prepared to fight any one who trespassed. They also had to maintain the status of their lineage or House leader’s right to such resources upon his death or

succession through expensive potlatches. Other aboriginal users could obtain access to participate in the fishery by request, marriage, inheritance, gift or seizure, in the latter case, specifically by killing the owner of the right. Rights to the use of natural resources were transmitted from the traditional lineage territory to another lineage by gift or seizure in payment of a debt. This did not include dwellings. New adherents to groups would have no territory but could, with consent, use the chief's territory and resources.

1.1.3 In 2002:

- 1.1.3.1 What was the nature and extent of the Skeena Region People's occupation, migration and abandonment pattern between 1787 and 2002?

Summary Answer to 1.1.3.1

Some time after 1787 the Skeena River Peoples occupation of the interior Skeena River tributary locations by House clan segments moved closer to the Skeena River. Villages were established, which is physically demonstrated by smaller houses, the incorporation of European elements in the houses and by an increased number of houses. The migration to the shore of the Skeena River was attributed to the increasing importance of the Skeena River as a trade route for European and native products. Increased time was spent in the interior Skeena River areas for the hunting of land mammals and less on the gathering of berries. Between 1834 and the 1850s, the Skeena River Peoples migrated from their winter village at Metlakatla to Fort Simpson for the winter. The distance to their salmon fishing areas on the Skeena River was increased, but the salmon fisheries continued to be used, although not to the same intensity. This settlement pattern was followed by a late contact settlement and occupation period which limited the use of the interior areas for trapping and prospecting and other restricted uses as a larger aggregation formed around Fort Simpson (post 1834). The greatest number of postcontact sites is along the Skeena River and at its mouth. During the postcontact period, colonial phase, which Martindale identifies as 1840 to the present, there was a trend toward the abandonment of the Skeena River watershed. Much of this abandonment related to the Tsimshian being drawn into coastal urban centres such as Port Simpson.

By the late 19th century, the annual journey to the interior for subsistence food collection had become unnecessary. The number of habitation sites on the Skeena River valley between the late phase precontact period and the contact period declined showing abandonment of some interior sites during the late precontact to contact period. This was in response to the post contact fur trade when the value of the subsistence economy had diminished as the Skeena River Peoples shifted to the Skeena River to maximize their access and control over the Skeena River trade route. There is almost the same number of habitation sites in the contact period and the post contact period.

The Skeena River People's dependency on marine resources in the former interior areas was reduced as other foods brought by visiting groups, and food from the fur trading post at Fort Simpson and later schooners, became readily available. The areas along the tributaries of the Skeena River were increasingly used for hunting and trapping game animals for the European fur trade.

In or about 1862, a portion of the Skeena River Peoples, primarily from the Gitlaan named group, migrated back to Metlakatla to participate in a new mission economy established by William Duncan. The extent to which the Gitlaan and others continued to use their Skeena River areas is not known.

In the 1850s, many of the Skeena River people were traveling to Victoria, Fort Rupert and other locations south for trade and work. Some abandoned their homes by selling the wood to Fort Simpson. In the 1870s, many of the Skeena River Peoples moved to the canneries which were established at the mouth of the Skeena River. Their use of their former salmon fisheries probably reduced in intensity with the introduction of canned salmon and other store bought foods to the diet.

Indian reserves were not allotted until the mid 1880s. Most reserves were clustered along the banks of the middle Skeena River and lower Nass, and their tributary rivers. There were few reserves around the mouth of the Skeena. Reserves were established on or near locations of fishing locations which the Skeena River Peoples considered to be important at that time, but which the canneries did not. In 1887, the Skeena River peoples and others who had joined the mission at Metlakatla migrated to Annette Island in Alaska. The post 1900 period to the present the Skeena River Peoples became active participants in the development of the modern economy, notably the modern commercial fishery and in commerce and logging.

- 1.1.4.2. Was there any difference between the conditions and the identities of the Skeena Region People at Contact and in 2002 as discussed in answers to the questions in paragraphs 1.1.1..?

Summary Answer to 1.1.4.2

The conditions and identities of the Skeena River Peoples differed the most from the contact population as a result of depopulation from epidemics from smallpox in 1836, 1862. The groups which survived were amalgamated into their present named groups. One of the ten named groups, the Gitwalksabae became extinct on or before 1867. Representatives from several of the named groups migrated to Metlakatla in or before 1863 and became known as the Metlakatla Indians. They and others who joined them from the Skeena River Peoples and other native groups, migrated to Annette Island in 1887.

- 1.1.5. Did aboriginal groups other than the Plaintiffs, use, own or occupy, or claim ownership and occupation rights over any of:
- (a) the fisheries resource sites depicted on the map entitled, "Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map", Schedule "A" to The Plaintiffs' Amended Responses to Canada's Request for Further and Better Particulars dated May 4, 2004 and received by Canada on October 20, 2005; and
 - (b) the territories depicted on the map entitled, "Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft

Map", Appendix "A" to the Amended Statement of Claim filed on September 29, 2005?

[(a) and (b) will be collectively referred to as the "Claim Areas"]

Please provide your opinion considering the following time frames:

- 1.1.4.5 as of approximately 1787;
- 1.1.4.6 from 1787 – 1846;
- 1.1.4.7 as of approximately 1846; and
- 1.1.4.8 from 1846 to the early 1900's.

Summary Answer to 1.1.14- 1.1.4.8

There is little historical evidence to suggest who occupied the Claim Areas in 1787 other than the Skeena River tributaries and the Prince Rupert Harbour area. The ethnographic data suggests that on or before this time parts of the Claim Areas in the Dundas Island group and areas to the north and west of Work channel including the channel were used by Nass and Tlingit groups, some of whom may have later amalgamated with the Skeena River peoples.

In the period between 1787 and 1846 including 1846, the Dundas Island group, Finlayson Island, Birnie Island, Works Channel and areas to the north of the Channel identified in the Claim Area were used by groups other than the Skeena River People, including the Nass, Tongass, Haida and Kitkatla. There is also evidence that the Zimacord River was used and claimed by Kitsumkalum groups although the date for this use is not clear. The Tongass and Haida were at Fort Simpson in the 1830s, and multiple groups would camp in the Claim Area as they passed through the coastal waters en route to the Nass River or to trade at the post at Fort Simpson.

In the period 1846 to the early 1900s, the Dundas Island group continued to be used by Haida and Tongass. In 1881 the Kitsumkalum and Kitselas occupied land at the mouth of the Skeena River.

- 1.1.5. Did non-aboriginal people use, own or occupy, or claim ownership and occupation rights over any of the Claim Areas? Please provide your opinion considering the following time frames:

- 1.1.5.5 as of approximately 1787;
- 1.1.5.6 from 1787 – 1846;
- 1.1.5.7 as of approximately 1846; and
- 1.1.5.8 from 1846 to the early 1900's.

Summary Answer to 1.1.5.5-1.1.5.8

As of 1797, there is no indication that non aboriginal people used or claimed areas in the Claim Area.

Between 1787 and 1846 numerous maritime traders used resources in the Claim Area and the HBC established a post at Fort Simpson in the Claim Area. The Dundas Island group was also a frequent stopping place for maritime fur traders who would cruise between the Nass River and Port Essington, fish in the coastal waters and take resources like wood and water from the mainland.

In 1846, the HBC continued to occupy its post at Fort Simpson and use marine and other resources in the vicinity.

Between 1846 and 1900, the HBC post continued to occupy Fort Simpson and use resources in the vicinity and as far as Pearl Harbour. Numerous schooners started to trade and use resources in the Claim Area along the coast which included fishing for cod in 1865 in Work Channel. Land preemptions coincided with the development of numerous canneries of 1870s, primarily at the mouth of the Skeena River and this was followed rapidly by settlement in the Port Essington area and the islands.

Bibliography

Allaire, Louis, A Native Mental Map of Coast Tsimshian Villages in The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present, edited by Margaret Seguin, pp. 82-98. (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984.

Allaire, Louis, George F. MacDonald & R. Inglis, Gitlaxdzawk: Ethnohistory and Archaeology, in Skeena River Prehistory, R.I. Inglis & G.F. MacDonald (eds.), Pages 3-166. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 87, Mercury Series, Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1979.

Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map.

American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. I, III, IV, V, VIII, IX Map 10.

Ames, K.M., Chiefly Power and Household Production on the Northwest Coast, in Foundations of Social Inequality, edited by T. D. Price and G.M. Feinman, pp. 155 – 181, (New York: Plenum Press) 1995.

Ames, Kenneth, M., Economic prehistory of the northern British Columbia coast, Arctic Anthropology, 1998, 35:68–87.

Ames, Kenneth, M., The Evolution of Social Ranking on the Northwest Coast of North America, American Antiquity, 1981, 46 (4):789-805.

Ames, Kenneth, M., The Northwest Coast, Evolutionary Anthropology 2003, 12:19-33.

Anderson, Margaret and Halpin, Marjorie, Potlatch at Gitsegukla: William Beynon's 1945 Field Notebooks, (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press), 2000.

Archer, David J.W., Kitkatla Heritage Inventory Project final Report, Department of Archeology, University of Calgary, Calgary/Alberta. Prepared for the Province of B.C., 1991.

Archer, David, J.W., A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983.

Barbeau, C.M. Tsimshian Mythology, American Anthropologist, 1917, 19 (4):548-563.

Barbeau, Marius and William Beynon, Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare, edited by George F. MacDonald and John Cove, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987.

Barbeau, Marius, Growth and Federation in the Tsimshian Phratries, Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Americanists, 1915:403-408.

- Barber, Russell, J., and Berdan, Frances F., *The Emperor's Mirror: Understanding Cultures through Primary Sources*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), 1998.
- Barnett, H.G., Applied anthropology in 1860, *Applied Anthropology*, 1942 (April-June):19-33.
- Beals, Herbert K. (trans)., *Juan Pérez on the northwest coast: six documents of his expedition in 1774* (Portland, Ore.: Oregon Historical Society Press), 1989.
- Beattie, Alasdair, Wallace, Scott and Haggan Nigel, Report of the GTF Workshop on Reconstruction of the Hecate Strait Ecosystem. In Haggan, N, and A. Beattie (eds.) *Back to the Future: Reconstructing the Hecate Strait Ecosystem*. Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 1999, 7(3):1-27.
- Beynon, William, The Tsimshians of Metlakatla, Alaska. *American Anthropologist*, 1941 (43): 83-88.
- Bishop, Charles, Coast-Interior Exchange: The Origins of Stratification in Northwestern North America, 1987, *Arctic Anthropology*, 24(1):72-83.
- Bishop, Charles, The journal and letters of Captain Charles Bishop on the north-west coast of America, in the Pacific and in New South Wales, 1794-1799, edited by Michael Roe, (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press), 1967.
- Boas, Franz, Fifth Report of the committee: appointed for the purpose of investigating and publishing reports on the physical characters, languages and industrial and social conditions of the north-western tribes of the Dominion of Canada, 1889.
- Bolt, Clarence R., The Conversion of the Port Simpson Tsimshian: Indian Control On Missionary Manipulation, in *B.C. Studies*, 1983 57: 38-56.
- Bolt, Clarence, Thomas Crosby and the Tsimshian: Small Shoes for Feet too Large, (Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press), 1992.
- Boyd, Robert, The Coming of the Spirit of Pestilence: Introduced Infectious Diseases and Population Decline Among Northwest Coast Indians, 1774-1874, (Vancouver & Toronto: UBC Press; Seattle & London: University of Washington Press), 1999.
- Clayton, Daniel Wright, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, 1830-1920, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989.
- Clayton, Daniel, Geographies of the Lower Skeena, *B.C. Studies* 1992/94, 92:29-58.
- Cole, Douglas and Bradley Lockner, eds. *To the Charlottes: George Dawson's 1878 Survey of the Queen Charlotte Islands*, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1993.
- Coupland, Gary, Andrew R.C., Martindale, and Susan Marsden, Does Resource Abundance Explain Local Group Rank among the Coast Tsimshian? in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory* edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, pp. 223-248, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, (Hull: Canadian Museum

of Civilization), 2001.

Coupland, Gary, Bissell, Craig and Sarah King, Prehistoric Subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: Evidence from the McNichol Creek Site. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 1993, 17:59-73.

Coupland, Gary, Prehistoric Cultural Change at Kitselas Canyon (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1988.

Cove, John, J., Shattered images: dialogues and meditations on Tsimshian narratives, (Ottawa: Carleton Library Series), 1986.

Cruikshank, Julie, Glaciers and Climate Change: Perspectives from Oral Tradition. *Arctic*, 2001, 54 (4):377– 393.

Dalton, Economic Theory and Primitive Society, *American Anthropologist* 1961, 63:1-25.

Dawson, G.M., Report on an exploration from Port Simpson on the Pacific coast, to Edmonton on the Saskatchewan: embracing a portion of the northern part of British Columbia and the Peace River country, 1879, (Montreal: Dawson Brothers) 1881.

Dawson, George, M., The Journals of George M. Dawson: British Columbia, 1875-1878. edited by Douglas Cole and Bradley Lockner, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1989.

De Laguna, Frederica, *The Story of a Tlingit Community*. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology: bulletin 172. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1960.

De Laguna, Frederica, Tlingit, in *Handbook of North American Indians*, volume 7, The Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, pp. 203-228, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990.

Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit - Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993.

Dean, Jonathan, R., "These Rascally Spackaloids:" the Rise of Gispaxlots Hegemony at Fort Simpson, 1832-1840, *B.C. Studies*, 1994 (101):41-95.

Dean, Jonathon, R., The 1811 Nass River Incident: Images of First Conflict on the Intercultural Frontier, *Native Studies* , 1993, 13 (1):83-103.
<http://www.brandonu.ca/Library/CJNS/13.1/dean.pdf>

Dominion of Canada, Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended December 31, 1881.

Dominion of Canada. Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended 31st December, 1882.

Donald, Leland, Aboriginal slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1997.

Drucker Philip and Robert F. Heizer, *To make my name good*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press), 1967.

Drucker, Philip, *Cultures of the North Pacific Coast*, (San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company), 1965.

Drucker, Philip, *Ecology and Political Organization on the Northwest Coast of America*, in *The Development of Political Organization in Native North America, 1979 Proceedings of the American Ethnology Society*, edited by Elisabeth Tooker, pp. 86-96. American Ethnological Society, 1983.

Duncan, William, *The Missions of the Church Missionary Society, No. 2. The British Columbia Mission; or Metlakatla*, (London: Church Missionary House), 1871.

Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3. Log book of the Otter, Robert Kemp, Master.

Essex Institute Library, M-6-S6. 1809 H3., Log book of the Hamilton, Master, Lemuel Porter.

Ferguson, Brian, *A Re-examination of the Causes of Northwest Coast Warfare, Warfare, Culture and Environment*, edited by Brian Ferguson, pp. 267-328, (New York, Academic Press), 1984.

Fried, Morton, H., *The Notion of Tribe*, (Menlo Park, California: Cummings Publishing Co.) 1975.

Galois, R.M., *Colonial Encounters: The Worlds of Arthur Wellington Clay, 1855-1881*, B.C. Studies, 1997-1998 (116-117):105-147.

Galois, Robert, ed. *A Voyage to the North West side of America: the journals of James Colnett, 1786-89*, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2004.

Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966.

Garfield, Viola E., *Tsimshian Clan and Society*, University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, 1939, 7(3):167-340.

Gibson James R., *Otter Skins, Boston Ships, and China Goods: The Maritime Fur Trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785-1841*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University), 1992.

Goldschmidt, Walter, R., and Hass, Theodore, H., *Haa Aaní, Our Land: Tlingit and Haida Land Rights and Use*, edited by and with an introduction by Thomas F. Thornton, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, Sealaska Heritage Foundation) 1998 [1946].

Gough, Barry, M., *The Haida-European Encounter, 1774-1900: The Queen Charlotte Islands in Transition in the Outer Shores*, G.G.E. Scudder and N. Gessler, editors, 249-260, (Skidegate, BC: Queen Charlotte Islands Museum), 1989.

Grumet, Robert Steven, Changes in Coast Tsimshian: Redistributive Activities in the Fort Simpson Region of British Columbia, 1788-1862, *Ethnohistory*, 1975, 22(4):295-318.

Gunther, Erna, Indian Life: Indians of the Northwest Coast As Seen by the Early Explorers and Fur Traders during the Last Decades of the Eighteenth Century, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press), 1972.

Haggarty, James C., Zayas Island Archaeological Survey Project, The Midden, 1988, 20(3):1-6.

Halpin Marjorie, M. and Margaret Seguin, Tsimshian Peoples: Southern Tsimshian, Coast Tsimshian, Nisga'a, and Gitksan in Handbook of North American Indians, volume 7, The Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, pp. 267-284, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution), 1990.

Halpin, Marjorie Myers, The Tsimshian Crest System: A Study based on Museum Specimens and the Marius Barbeau and William Beynon Field Notes. Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1973.

Halpin, Marjorie, Feast Names At Hartley Bay, in The Tsimshian: Images of the Past; Views For the Present, edited by M. Seguin, pp. 57-64, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984.

HBCA B. 201/a/2, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1832, Donald Manson Report;

HBCA. B. 201/a/3, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1834-1838;

HBCA. B. 201/a/4, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1838-1840;

HBCA. B. 210/a/5, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1840;

HBCA. B. 201/a/6, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1841-1842;

HBCA. B. 201/a/7, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1852-1853;

HBCA. B. 201/a/8, Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal, 1855-1859;

Fort Simpson, Journal, 15 September 1859-31 December 1862, Kept by Hamilton Moffat (15 September 1859-30 September 1861) and W.H. McNeill (1 October 1861-31 December 1862), MS;

HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866;

HBCA B.210/e/1. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1886;

HBCA B.210/e/2. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1890;

HBCA B.210/e/3. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1891;

HBCA B.210/e/5. Post Reports, Fort Simpson (Nass) 1900, Inspection Report,

May/June 1900.

HBCA G. 1/170. Pearl Harbour Map. A copy by Thomas Sinclair in January 27, 1832.

HBCA., B. 11/e/1, Babine, Report on District 1822-1823.

Henry R. Wagner and W.A. Newcombe, eds., *The Journal of Jacinto Caamaño*. Translated by Capt. Harold Grenfell R.N., B.C. Historical Quarterly, October 1938, 2(3):189-222, (4):265-301.

Howay, F. W, ed., *Voyages of the "Columbia" to the Northwest Coast 1787- 1790 and 1790-1793*, (Oregon Historical Society Press), 1990.

Howay, F. W., *Potatoes: Records of Some Early Transactions at Fort Simpson, British Columbia*, *The Beaver*, March, 1929, pp. 155-156.

INAC Library, Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of B.C. Nass Agency 1915.

Inglis, Richard, I , MacDonald, George F., Introduction, in *Skeena River Prehistory*, R.I. Inglis & G.F. MacDonald (eds.), pp. 1-17. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 87, Mercury Series, (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada), 1979.

Ingraham, Joseph, *Joseph Ingraham's Journal of the Brigantine Hope on a Voyage to The Northwest coast of North America 1790-1792*, edited by Mark D. Kaplanoof, (Barre Massachusetts: Imprint Society), 1971.

Jacobsen, Johan Adrian, *Alaskan voyage, 1881-1883: an expedition to the northwest coast of America*; translated by Erna Gunther from the German text of Adrian Woldt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1977.

Jopling, Carol F., *The coppers of the Northwest Coast Indians: their origin, development and possible antecedents*, (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society), 1989.

Kane, Paul, *Wanderings of an artist among the Indians of North America from Canada to Vancouver's Island and Oregon through the Hudson's Bay Company's territory and back again*, (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts), 1859.

Kipp, Rita Smith and Schortman, Edward M., *The Political Impact of Trade in Chiefdoms*, *American Anthropologist*, 1989, 91(2):370-385.

Knight, Rolf, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Labour in British Colombia, 1848-1930*, (Vancouver: New Star), 1996.

Krech, Shepard, III, *The ecological Indian: myth and history*, (New York : W.W. Norton & Company), 1999.

Large, R. Geddes, *The Skeena: River of Destiny*, Museum of Northern British Columbia (Surrey B.C.: Heritage House) 1996.

Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map, August 2, 2005.

Lillard, Charles, ed. *Warriors of the North Pacific: Missionary Accounts of the Northwest Coast, the Skeena and Stikine Rivers and the Klondike, 1829-1900*, (Victoria: Sono Nis Press) 1984.

LMRB Library, O'Reilly Minutes of Decision & Correspondence File 29858, vol, 3.

MacDonald, George F. and Richard I. Inglis, An Overview of the North Coast Prehistory Project (1966-1980), *B.C. Studies*, 1980-1981 (48): 37-63.

MacDonald, George F. Kitwanga Fort National Historic Site, Skeena River, British Columbia: historical research and analysis of structural remains, Hull, Que., Parks Canada, 1979.

MacDonald, George F., Coupland, Gary and Archer, David, The Coast Tsimshian, ca. 1750. Plate 13. Historical Atlas of Canada. Vol. 1: From the Beginning to 1800. R. Cole Harris, editor, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 1987.

MacDonald, George F., Kitwanga Fort report. Hull, Que.: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1989.

MacDonald, George, Cove, John, J., Introduction, in *Tsimshian Narratives 2: Trade and Warfare*, edited by George F. MacDonald and John J. Cove, pp. vii-xxv, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization), 1987.

MacDonald, George, F., The Epic of Nekt: the Archaeology of Metaphor, in *The Tsimshian: Images of the Past, Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, pp. 65-81, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984.

MacNair, Peter L., Descriptive Notes on the Kwakiutl Manufacture of Eulachon Oil, *Syesis*, 1971 4(1-2):169-177.

Malloy, Mary, "Boston Men " *on the Northwest Coast: The American Maritime Fur Trade 1788-1844*, (Kingston, Ont.: Limestone Press), 1998.

Marsden Susan, Defending the Mouth of the Skeena: Perspectives on Tsimshian Tlingit Relations in Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory, ed. Jerome C. Cybulski, pp. 61-106, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001.

Marsden, Susan and Robert Galois, The Tsimshian, the Hudson's Bay Company and the Geopolitics of the Northwest Coast Fur Trade, 1787-1840, *Canadian Geographer*, 1995, 39(2):169-183.

Marsden, Susan, Adawx, Spanaxnox, and the Geopolitics of the Tsimshian, *B.C. Studies*, 2002, 135: 101-135.

Marsden, Susan, Review of Archival Materials for Information Pertaining to Tsimshian

Use and occupation of the Nass River Area Greenville to Kincolith Highway Section, in McDonald, Susan Marsden, Chris Roth, Charles Menzies, Tsimshian Traditional Use Study and Impact Assessment of the Greenville/Kincolith Road Project, pp. 1-27, (Victoria: Ministry of Transportation and Highways), 1997.

Martindale, Andrew and Jurakic, Irena, Northern Tsimshian Elderberry Use in the Late Pre-contact to Post-contact Era, *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 2004, 28:254-280.

Martindale, Andrew, R.C., A Hunter-Gatherer Paramount Chiefdom: Tsimshian Developments through the Contact Period, in *Emerging from the Mist: Studies in Northwest Coast Culture History*, edited by R.G. Matson, Gary Coupland and Quentin Mackie, pp. 188-212, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 2003.

Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999.

Maschner, Herbert D.G., The Evolution of Northwest Coast Warfare, in *Troubled Times: Violence and Warfare in the Past*, edited by Debra L. Martin and David W. Frayer, pp. 267-302, (Netherlands: Gordon and Breach Publishers), 1997.

McDonald, James Andrew, An Historic Event in the Political Economy of the Ownership of the Zimacord District, *B.C. Studies*, 1983, (57): 24-37.

McDonald, James Andrew, *Trying to make a life: the Historical political economy of Kitsumkalum* Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1985.

McDonald, James, Images of the Nineteenth-Century Economy of the Tsimshian, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, pp. 40-54, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984.

McNeary, Stephen, A., *Where fire came down: Social and Economic Life of the Niska*, Ph.D. thesis, Bryn Mawr College, 1976.

Miller, Jay, Feasting with the Southern Tsimshian, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, pp. 27-39, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984.

Miller, Jay, Moieties and Cultural Amnesia: Manipulation of Knowledge in A Pacific Northwest Coast Native Community, *Arctic Anthropology*, 1981, 18:23-32

Miller, Jay, *Tsimshian Culture: A Light through the Ages*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press), 1997.

Mitchell Library, MS 1436/1. Hills, W. H. Journal on board H.M.S. Virago, Journal 12 October 1852 - July 1853.

Mitchell, Donald and Leland Donald, Sharing Resources on the North Pacific Coast of North America: The case of the Eulachon Fishery, *Anthropologica*, 2001, xliii, (1):19-35.

Mitchell, Donald H., Tribes and Chiefdoms of the Northwest Coast: The Tsimshian Case, in *The Evolution of Maritime Cultures on the Northeast and Northwest Coasts of America*, Ronald J. Nash, ed., pp. 57-64, Simon Fraser University, Department of

Archaeology Publications 11, Burnaby, B.C. 1983.

Mitchell, Donald, Northwest North American Traditional Fisheries: Resource Abundance and the Relative Unimportance of Skill. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Edinburgh, Scotland, September 9-13, 2002, pp. 1-11.

Mitchell, Donald, Sebassa's Men, in *The World is as Sharp as a Knife: An Anthology in Honor of Wilson Duff*, edited by Donald Abbott, pp. 79-86, (Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum), 1981.

Moeller, Beverly B., Captain James Colnett and the Tsimshian Indians, 1787, *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 1966, 57(1):13-17.

Museum of Civilization, Beynon Field notes, v. 7, no. 99. The origin of the Name Tsimholgan.

NAC RG 10, v. 3776, f. 37373-2. 1887-1889, p. 257.

NAC, MG 24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854.

NAC, MG 29, series D. 8, v. 2. Report from Fort Kilmaurs by Brown for 1826.

NAC, MG24-F40, Henry Trevan fonds, Diary kept by Surgeon Trevan of H.M.S. VIRAGO from January 1852 to December 1854.

Narotzky, Susana, *New Directions in Economic Anthropology*, (London: Chicago: Pluto Press), 1997.

Niblack, Albert, The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia, in *Annual Report of the U. S. National Museum for 1888*. (Washington), 1890.

Nolan, R.W., The Utilization of Fish Resources by the Coast Tsimshian: Predicting Optimal Patterns of Exploitation, M.A. thesis, Trent University, 1977.

Oberg, Kalervo, A Comparison of Three Systems of Primitive Economic Organization, *American Anthropologist*, 1943: 572-587.

Oberg, Kalervo, *The Social Economy of the Tlingit Indians*, Seattle: University of Washington Press; American Ethnological Society Monographs 55, 1973.

Ogden, Peter Skene, *Traits of American-Indian Life and Character by a Fur Trader*, (London: Smith, Elder and Co.), 1853.

Olson, R.L., Some Trading Customs of the Chilkat Tlingit, in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A.L. Kroeber*, edited by Robert L. Lowie, pp. 211-214, (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1936.

PABC AB2osi2. Fort Simpson Correspondence Outward, September 6, 1841-October 1844.

PABC Boas Collection, A 00267 Barbeau Files: The Gwenhoot of Alaska, In search of bounteous land by Marius Barbeau.

PABC Boas MS 2102, A1413, Beynon notebook, B.F. 131.1, pp. 24, 28; Beynon notes, B.F. 418.2; B.F. 132.3, pp. 13 -15. An Adventure with Traders. The Informant was Joseph Morrison, Gitando; B.F. 49-1. Informant, Charles Nelson (n.d.)

PABC GR 2013, Preemption Records 1870-1871 Skeena River, B-8691.

PABC MS-0705, George Hastings Inskip Papers. Master of the H.M.S. Virago 1851-1855

PABC MS-1077, Newcombe Family Papers, [A01767 52 15 75], Miscellaneous Papers - W.F. Tolmie . Memorandum regarding the state of things at McLoughlin's Harbour N.W.C. Am. When the Hudson's Bay in July 1834 commenced removal thither of the Buildings etc. of Fort Simpson Nass Straits. No date [n.d.].

Portlock, Nathaniel, A Voyage Round the World; but more particularly to the North-West Coast of American: Performed in 1785, 1786, 1787 and 1788, in the King George and Queen Charlotte, Captains Portlock and Dixon., Wisconsin Historical Society Digital Library and Archives, 2003.

Prince, Paul, Artifact distributions at the Kitwanga Hill Fort: Protohistoric Competition and Trade on the Upper Skeena, in Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, pp. 249-268, Archaeological Survey of Canada Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001.

Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson, pp. 93-89, Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999.

Prince, Paul, Ridge-Top Storage and Defensive Sites: New Evidence of Conflict in Northern British Columbia, *North American Archaeologist*, 2004, 25(1):35-56.

Prince, Paul, Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C. Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998.

Reynolds, Stephen, The Voyage of the New Hazard, (Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press), 1970.

Rich, E.E., ed. The Letters of John McLoughlin, from Fort Vancouver to the Governor and Committee: first series 1825-38 (Toronto: Champlain Society), 1941, Appendix A.

Ringel, Gail, The Kwakiutl Potlatch: History, Economics and Symbols, *Ethnohistory*, 1979 26 (4):347-362.

Rohner, R. , Ethnography of Franz Boas: Letters and Diaries Written on the Northwest Coast from 1886 to 1931, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1969.

Roth, Christopher F., Goods, Names and Selves: rethinking the Tsimshian potlatch, *American Ethnologist*, 2002, 29(1):123-150.

Rubel, Paula G., and Rosman, Abraham, The Evolution of Exchange Structures and Ranking: some Northwest coast and Athapaskan Examples. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 1983, 39 (1):1-25.

Schalk, Randall F., The Structure of an Anadromous Fish Resource, in *For Theory Building in Archaeology: Essays on Faunal Remains, Aquatic Resources, Spatial Analysis, and Systemic Modeling*, edited by Lewis R. Binford, pp. 207-249, (New York: Academic Press), 1977.

Scouler, John, Observations on the indigenous tribes of the N.W. Coast of America, *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, 1841 (11): 215-250.

Seguin, Margaret, Introduction, in *The Tsimshian Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, edited by Margaret Seguin, pp. ix- xx. (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 1984.

Seguin, Margaret, Lest There be No salmon: Symbols in Traditional Tsimshian Potlatch in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, pp. 110-133, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984.

Stewart, Kathlyn and Frances L. Stewart, Prehistoric subsistence and Seasonality at Prince Rupert Harbour: History and Synthesis of Zooarchaeological Research in *Perspectives on Northern Northwest Coast Prehistory*, edited by Jerome C. Cybulski, pp. 173-202, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 160, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, 2001.

Stewart. Frances, L. The seasonal availability of fish species used by the Coast Tsimshians of Northern British Columbia, *Syesis*, 1975, 8: 375-388.

Stock, Eugene, Metlakatla and the North Pacific Mission of the Church Missionary Society (London: Church Missionary Society), 1881.

Stoffels, Denise, Background Report: Eulachon in the North Coast, Government of British Columbia, October 2001, pp. 1-7.

Tolmie, William F., *The Journals of William Fraser Tolmie: Physician and Fur Trader* (Vancouver B.C: Mitchell Press), 1963.

Trigger, Bruce G., *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered*, (Kingston: Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press) 1985.

Trigger, Bruce, G., Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:3-17.

UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 40, file 32; Box 42, file 57; Box 41, file 62. Box 41, file. 66 ; Box 41, file 73; Box 41, file 80.

University of Washington, Library, Special Collections, Viola Garfield Papers 1927-1976.
Ownership of Food-Producing Areas.

Vancouver, George, A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and round the world: in which the coast of north-west America has been carefully examined and accurately surveyed : undertaken by His Majesty's command, principally with a view to ascertain the existence of any navigable communication between the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans; and performed in the years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795, in the Discovery sloop of war, and armed tender Chatham, under the command of Captain George Vancouver, (London: Printed for John Stockdale), 1801, vol. IV.

Walbran, Capt. John T., British Columbia Coast Names, Their Origin and History, Vancouver, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1972.

Winter, Barbara J., William Beynon and the anthropologists, Canadian Journal of Native Studies , 1984, 2: 279-292.

Wobst, H. Martin, The Archeo-Ethnology of Hunter-Gatherers or the Tyranny of the Ethnographic Record in Archaeology, American Antiquity, 1978 43: 303-309.

Work, John, The Journal of John Work, 1835: Being an Account of his voyage northward from the Columbia River to Fort Simpson and return in the brig Lama, January-October, 1835, edited by Henry Drummond Dee, 1945, British Columbia Historical Quarterly.

Yale University Library, Samuel Furgerson, Journal, 1808-1811, Discovery and Settlement of Western North American, Collection of William Robertson.

Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

CURRICULUM VITAE

**14965 25A Avenue
Surrey, British Columbia
V4P 1N7
Tel: 604 541-7921
Fax: 604 541-9221
E-Mail: lovisek@telus.net**

JOAN A. M. LOVISEK

EDUCATION

Ph.D. (Anthropology/Ethnohistory)
McMaster University-1991
M.E.S. (Masters of Environmental Studies)
York University-1979
University of Toronto-1976
(Archaeology)
B.A. (Anthropology)
York University-1974

EXPERIENCE

Joan Lovisek has over 20 years experience in First Nation issues. Most of her consulting contracts over the last ten years addressed treaty/aboriginal rights, land claims, aboriginal land use and loss of use, and federal/provincial government policy.

1989- Present

Principal, Lovisek Research

Provides research consultation specializing in First Nation land claim issues involving ethnohistorical and anthropological research, analysis and review. This includes: original historical research; anthropological expert witness opinions; community consultation; oral history collection and assessment; analysis and consultation of claims for Specific Claims negotiation; pre-litigation research in the form of detailed historical reports; preparation of Statements of Claim; and management of historical document collections.

Lovisek has researched historical and anthropological

records in various archival repositories including: National Archives of Canada; Archives of Ontario; Royal Ontario Museum; Smithsonian Institute; Vassar College Archives; Glenbow Museum and Archives; Indian and Northern Affairs; Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat; British Columbia Public Archives; Saskatchewan Public Archives; Alberta Public Archives; Bancroft Library Berkeley; Hudson's Bay Company Archives; United Church Archives; Archives Deschâtelets; New York Public Library; and various other archival collections.

CLIENTS

2007 Grassy Narrows First Nation

Ethnohistorical research and consultation involving Treaty #3 interpretation in *Willie Keewatin, Andrew Keewatin Jr., and Joseph William Fobister (Grassy Narrows First Nation v. Minister of Natural Resources and Abitibi-Consolidated Inc.* (Ontario Superior Court of Justice)[Research in progress].

2006

Department of Justice (Department of Indian and Northern Affairs)

Research, preparation of expert opinion in case involving aboriginal title and rights to marine resources by the *Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band and Others v. The Attorney General of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia*.

Gillespie Renkema Barnett Broadway & Department of Fisheries and Oceans

Research and preparation of expert opinion of salmon fishing rights of Neskonalith Band in High Bar Band territory on the Fraser River in *R. v. Florence Emily Deneault at al; R. v. Barrett Deneault* (Trial – Kamloops 2006)

Department of Justice (Department of Indian and Northern Affairs)

Research, preparation of expert opinion, assistance in cross-examination, for case involving aboriginal title and rights to marine resources by *The Ahousaht Indian Band and Others v. The Attorney General of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia*. [Trial In progress].

2005 National Parks and National Historic Sites of Canada

Invited speaker on the subject of oral history/oral tradition in aboriginal litigation at a workshop on oral history for the National Historic Sites

Board, December 2, 2005, Ottawa.

Department of Justice Canada (B.C. Regional Office)

Preparation of seminar for Department of Justice and Department of Indian Affairs staff involving an overview of historical marine resource use by the Lax Kw'Alaams (Coast Tsimshian), June 2, 2005.

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Review of defence report and preparation of expert opinion report regarding Haida commercial use of spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*) in *Regina v. Michael Reginald Morrison and Eugene Davidson*. Trial cancelled after defendants plead guilty.

Department of Justice (B.C. Regional Office)

Preparation of seminar for Department of Justice and Department of Indian Affairs staff involving an overview of historical marine resource use by the Nootka (Nuu-chah-nult), March 30, 2005.

2004

Department of Justice (Revenue Canada)

Preparation of expert opinion for *James Walkus v. Her Majesty The Queen and Doreen Walkus v. Her Majesty The Queen Tax Court Appeal* regarding a claim by the Gwa'sala-Nakwaxda'xw First Nation to income tax immunity for income derived from fishing off reserve. Settled out of court.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Researched and prepared detailed report for legal counsel regarding the claim by the Washagamis Bay First Nation of Treaty 3 to an island (646P) in Lake of the Woods. The First Nation claimed that the island had been alienated from the reserve by flooding and subsequently patented by Ontario.

Missanabie Cree First Nation

Preparation of expert report including elder interviews for the Missanabie Cree First Nation in *Ontario Court of Justice Between Her Majesty The Queen in the Right of Ontario and Cathy Lynn Clement*. Case involves a moose hunting charge against a First Nation member in Northern Ontario. Settled out of court.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, Ontario Native

Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Research and preparation of detailed report for legal counsel regarding a claim by the Mississagi First Nation of the Robinson Huron Treaty to compensation for flooding on their reserve since 1850.

2003

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Researched and prepared expert anthropological opinion for *Regina v. Theodore David Douglas, also known as Sam Douglas, June Quipp and Lincoln John Douglas* concerning assertion of aboriginal territory of Pilalt Tribe of the Stol:0 Nation (Coast Salish) to the north shore of the Fraser River. (Trial Provincial Court of British Columbia (Surrey)).

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Preparation of expert anthropological opinion, in *R. v. Ida & Alfred George*, concerning a Carrier First Nation aboriginal right to sell salmon. Trial cancelled after defendants plead guilty.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, Crown Law Civil

Researched and prepared detailed report for legal counsel regarding the origin of the Pic River Band pre 1763 to 1850, the Band's relationship to other local aboriginal communities, land use patterns, and the direct or indirect participation by its members/progenitors in the negotiation and signing of the Robinson-Superior Treaty of 1850.

Missanabie Cree First Nation (Ontario)/Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) Historical Land Use Study (Treaty 9)

Preparation of a land use study for DIAND Specific Claims and the Missanabie Cree First Nation to assist both parties in compensation negotiations as part of a Treaty Land Entitlement Claim. Provided information obtained from historical evidence and Elder testimony to determine the types of land uses and geographical extent of the Missanabie Cree First Nation's territory from precontact to the present.

2002

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Research and preparation of expert anthropological opinion for Chief Percy Williams of the Kwicksutaineuk/Ah-kwa-mish Tribes (Kwakiutl First Nation) regarding aboriginal right to hunt seals. Judicial notice of opinion in Federal Court – Trial Division. Opinion uncontested by First Nation counsel.

Department of Justice (Department of Indian Affairs)

Research in response to Statement of Claim by Council of *Cheslatta Carrier v. HMQBC and AG of Canada* regarding aboriginal right to fish for food and ceremonial purposes in and around Cheslatta Lake. (Final preparation of expert opinion in abeyance).

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, Crown Law Civil

Preparation of pre-litigation ethnohistorical research report for *Whitefish Lake First Nation v. Her Majesty the Queen in the Right of the Province of Ontario and the Attorney General of Canada*.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General- Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Preparation of ethnohistorical research for legal counsel regarding various flooding issues pertaining to Shoal Lake and Lake of the Woods, Northwestern Ontario.

2001

Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Pacific) Canada

Ethnohistorical research of a precontact fishing issue relative to interior Plateau (Salish) First Nations. Provided expert opinion to counsel concerning precontact community fishing in the Fraser River by eight Interior Salish First Nations (Bonaparte Band, Whispering Pines Band, Skeetchestn Band, North Thompson Band, Nesconlith Band, Adams Lake Band, Little Shuswap Band, and Spallumcheen Band).

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Research and preparation of oral expert anthropological opinion in response to an application by the Heiltsuk Band in *R. v. Reid and Gladstone* to an aboriginal right to fish commercially for sablefish.

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Preparation of preliminary anthropological opinion in response to an application by a Tsimshian First Nation to harvest herring roe in Northern British Columbia. (Kitkatla Band and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Fisheries Management Coordinator – Prince Rupert).

Department of Justice (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)

Preparation of preliminary anthropological opinion in response to an application by a Coast Salish First Nation to harvest salmon in south central British Columbia. (Hwiltsum First Nation and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans)).

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Preparation of pre-litigation research for Ontario counsel regarding legislation relating to the flooding of several reserves in Treaty #3, Northwestern Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Provided ethnohistorical research to legal counsel and negotiators regarding reserve size adjustments in the Robinson Huron Treaty area ca. 1850.

2000

Kainaiwa (Blood Tribe) Tribe/Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) (Alberta) - Compensation Claim

Preparation of loss of use assessment for DIAND Specific Claims and the Kainaiwa Tribe for use in negotiation and resolution of a Specific Claim involving the surrender of 444 acres which were set apart under Treaty 7. The Indian Claims Commission mediated the study. To assess the compensatory value of the loss of traditional activities over the period 1889-1999, Lovisek undertook in-depth historical research and Elder interviews to identify, estimate and quantify losses experienced by the Blood Tribe. This included assessments of historical land use including commercial and domestic fishing, trapping activities, hunting activities, plant harvesting and spiritual use of resources.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) - Native Affairs Unit

Research, review of historical documentation and preparation of report and document collection concerning the evolution and overlap of the southern and eastern boundaries of the Robinson Huron Treaty (1850) in Ontario and the Williams Treaties (1923) boundaries.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Research, review and assessment of Robinson Huron Treaty claim involving intentions and understandings of the Crown and the First Nation regarding reserve allotment and boundary location of the Wahnapiatae Indian Reserve.

1999

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Research, review of historical documentation and preparation of report

and document collection concerning a road allowance involving four Treaty 3 First Nation communities in Northwestern Ontario.

1989-1998 Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research of Grand Council Treaty 3 (T.A.R.R.)

For almost ten years Lovisek provided research consultation to the twenty-three member First Nations of Grand Council Treaty 3 including: original historical research in all relevant archival collections; preparing detailed historical reports and Statements of Claims for Specific Claims purposes; organizing extensive document collections; and presenting findings to First Nation communities, legal counsel and conferences. Claims included: flooding, hydro rights of ways; Treaty land entitlement; highway rights of way; reserve survey boundaries; and self-government.

1998 Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Conducted historical research and prepared research report, document index and document collection concerning various road right of way issues affecting the government of Ontario and a Robinson Huron Treaty First Nation in northern Ontario.

1997-1998 Fishing Lake First Nation/Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) (Saskatchewan) - Traditional Activities Compensation Claim

Prepared loss of use assessment for DIAND Specific Claims and the First Nation for use in negotiation and resolution of a Specific Claim involving the surrender of 13,200 acres which were set apart under Treaty 4. The Indian Claims Commission mediated the study. To assess the compensatory value of the loss of traditional activities over the period 1907-1997, Lovisek undertook in-depth historical research and Elder interviews to identify, estimate and quantify losses experienced by the First Nation. This included assessments of land use including historical commercial and domestic fishing, trapping activities, hunting activities, medicinal plants and spiritual use.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Reviewed and assessed a Robinson Superior Treaty First Nation Statement of Claim for unextinguished aboriginal title in northern Ontario. Prepared assessment report advising Ontario of all relevant claim issues and identified appropriate historical records to address omissions in the historical facts.

Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General - Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS)

Reviewed and assessed a First Nation Statement of Claim for road expropriation in a Robinson Huron Treaty reserve community in

Northern Ontario ca. 1911. Prepared assessment report informing Ontario of all relevant claim issues and identified appropriate historical records to address omissions in the historical record.

1996 Rainy River First Nations/Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) /Ontario/ - Traditional Activities Compensation Claim

Prepared loss of use assessment for a tripartite study involving several Rainy River First Nations and the governments of Ontario and Canada for use in negotiation and resolution of a Specific Claim involving the surrender of six reserves (45,413 acres) which were set apart under Treaty 3. To assess the compensatory value of the loss of traditional activities over the period 1900-1995, Lovisek undertook in-depth historical research and Elder interviews to identify, estimate and quantify losses experienced by First Nation communities including historical commercial and domestic fishing, trapping activities, hunting activities, wild rice harvesting and spiritual use of resources.

Wauzhusk Onigum First Nation (Ontario) – Minerals Compensation Claim

Researched private papers and government documents into mining leases and business profiles of investors involved in mining on and near Sultana Island (Rat Portage I.R. 38B) for the Wauzhusk Onigum First Nation of Treaty 3. Research included collections at the Archives of Ontario; Manuscript Collections, Baldwin Room of the Metropolitan Toronto Library; Ontario Statutes and Policy; and Corporate Search at the Ministry of Consumer Relations.

Wauzhusk Onigum First Nation (Ontario) - Tourism and Recreation Compensation Claim

Researched Indian Affairs records for information pertaining to cottage and recreation leases and licensing agreements for *Dallas Maynard & Associates*, as part of a loss of use study for Wauzhusk Onigum First Nation and Specific Claims.

1992 Ontario Hydro/Onegaming First Nation

Provided research consultation to joint Onegaming/Ontario Hydro negotiating team. Prepared historical report including Elder testimony to document the historical impact of the occupation by Ontario Hydro of Sabaskong Bay Indian Reserve 35D, a reserve set apart under Treaty 3.

RELATED EXPERIENCE

1990-1991 McMaster University, Department of Anthropology

Anthropological study in historical cultural ecology which reconstructed traditional land use using an interdisciplinary historical database, oral

history and traditional knowledge. The study identifies several native land use patterns dating from precontact to 1850 in the Georgian Bay area of Ontario and documents the changes as a result of intertribal trade and the fur trade economy. The study focuses on the establishment of the precontact importance of fishing as a central feature of Algonquian social and political organization.

1984-1985 Historical Research Assistant, Royal Ontario Museum, Ethnology

Ethnohistorical research of documents pertaining to aboriginal agriculture on Manitoulin Island and Parry Island contained in Indian Affairs records for use and publication by the Curator of Ethnology (Dr. E. S. Rogers).

1983-1984 National Museum of Civilization (Urgent Ethnology Programme)

Designed a research project and collected ethnographic material obtained by interviewing and recording oral history from Elders of Moose Deer Point, Shawanaga and Wasaukasing First Nations regarding traditional land use. The archives of the Canadian Museum of Civilization retain the research materials.

1983 Cultural Ecology of Waswanipi Cree Game Management James Bay Cree (Quebec) Human Resources Survey

Researched and analyzed game harvest data provided by Cree hunters and trappers to establish baseline data against which future land productivity, personal income and nutritional status were measured. Project was in response to the terms of the James Bay Agreement. Analysis required research of bilingual records prepared by the Cree of their hunting and trapping harvests, and application of statistical measurements to determine game densities and caloric values. The research contributed to a publication by Colin Scott and Harvey A. Feit entitled *Income Security for Cree Hunters, Ecological Social and Economic Effects* (Montreal, Programme in the Anthropology of Development), 1992.

1981 South Lake Simcoe Conservation Authority, York Region, Ontario.

Directed a support study of the heritage resources including archaeological resources in York Region, Ontario. Organized an inventory of heritage resources through historical research and a public campaign which resulted in the donation of a historically significant property and library to the South Lake Simcoe Conservation Authority. Developed a policy paper respecting the conservation of heritage resources.

**1979-1983 York University (Geography)
McMaster University (Anthropology/Geography)**

Lectured and organized seminar groups for several university courses including: Introductory Anthropology, Regional Geography of Canada and Human Geography.

1979 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Office of Indian Resource Policy,

Prepared pre-litigation research and reports on various claim issues including *Attorney General for the Province of Ontario (Plaintiff) and the Bear Island Foundation*. Reviewed and assessed land claim submissions for historical accuracy.

PUBLICATIONS

In Press

Aboriginal Warfare on the Northwest Coast: Did the Potlatch replace Warfare? in *North American Indigenous Warfare and Ritual Violence*, edited by Richard Chacon and Ruben Mendoza, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press).

Human Trophy Taking on the Northwest Coast: An ethnohistorical perspective, in *The Taking and Displaying of Human Body Parts as Trophies by Amerindians*. Edited by Richard Chacon and David Dye, (New York: Springer Press).

- 2002 Subarctic Algonquians in *Aboriginal Peoples of Canada- A Short Introduction*, ed. Paul Robert Magosci, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 98-128. [Previously published in 1999].

Transmission Difficulties: The use and abuse of oral history in Aboriginal claims, in *Actes Du Trente-Troisième Congrès des Algonguinistes* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press), 251-270.

- 2001 The Ojibway vs. the Gerrymander: the Evolution of the Robinson Huron and Williams Treaties Boundaries in *Actes Du Trente-Deuxième Congrès des Algonguinistes* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press), 278-303

- 1999 "Subarctic Algonquians," *Encyclopaedia of Canada's Peoples* ed. Paul Robert Magosci, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 36-47. [Republished in 2002].

- 1998 The Lac des Mille Lacs Tragedy: Anatomy of A Century of Flooding, in *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims and Conflicts* ed. Jill Oakes, Rick Riewe, Kathi Kinew and Elaine Maloney, (University of Calgary: Canadian Circumpolar Institute), 129-140.

Rainy River: Heartland of the Grand Council Ojibway, *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims and Conflicts* ed. Jill Oakes, Rick Riewe,

- Kathi Kinew and Elaine Maloney ed. Jill Oakes, (University of Calgary: Canadian Circumpolar Institute) (with Leo Waisberg and Tim Holzkamm), 107-116.
- 1997 *Fatal Errors: Ruth Landes and the creation of the "Atomistic Ojibwa",* Anthropologica v. VXXXIX No. 1-2. (with Leo Waisberg and Tim Holzkamm), 133-145.
- Ojibwa Reservations as an "Incubus upon the Territory:" The Indian Removal Policy of the Province of Ontario, Canada 1874-1982, Papers of the Twenty-Seventh Algonquian Conference, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press) (with Leo Waisberg and Tim Holzkamm), 337-352.
- "Cultural Leprosy:" The Ojibwa and the "Aboriginal Ethnography" of Ruth Landes, Papers of the Twenty-Seventh Algonquian Conference (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press) (with Leo Waisberg and Tim Holzkamm), 164-179.
- 1995 *Deprived Of Part Of Their Living: Colonialism and Nineteenth Century Flooding of Ojibwa Lands.* Papers of the Twenty-Sixth Algonquian Conference (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba) (with Leo Waisberg and Tim Holzkamm), 226-239.
- Stout Athletic Fellows: The Ojibwa in Northwestern Ontario 1821-1871.* Papers of the Twenty-Sixth Algonquian Conference (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba) (with Leo Waisberg and Tim Holzkamm), 170-183.
- The Lac des Mille Lacs Ojibwa: Dammed and Diverted: An Ethnohistorical study,* Actes Du Vingt-Cinquième Congrès Des Algonquinistes, (Ottawa: Carleton University), 285-314.
- 1993 *The Political Evolution of the Boundary Waters Ojibwa Chief. Papers of the Twenty-Fourth Algonquian Conference* (Ottawa: Carleton University), 280-305.
- 1991 Ethnohistory of the Algonkian Speaking Peoples of Georgian Bay---Pre contact to 1850. Ph.D. Thesis, McMaster University.
- Abstract: The Algonkian speaking peoples of Georgian Bay occupied the shoreline and island environment of eastern Lake Huron, in Georgian Bay, between the French and Severn Rivers. They were likely the product of a constant cultural flux of peoples which came to occupy the shores and islands of Georgian Bay perhaps as early as 1200 A.D., although the archaeological evidence is problematic. This study attempts to piece together the ethnohistory of the Georgian Bay Algonkian by presenting an ethnographic account dating from precontact times to 1850. The presence of Algonkian speaking peoples in the Georgian Bay region has largely been neglected by ethnohistorians. Identified as convenient trading partners (Heidenreich 1971: 293), and economic dependents of the Huron (Trigger 1976, 1: 168; 1985: 205), the Georgian Bay Algonkian speaking peoples have been considered to have had little influence in the region (Jenness 1932: 276). It is not surprising that little is known about them. Culturally, they have been relegated to a rather ethnographically ambiguous position in Great Lakes culture history. By examining the archaeological, environmental and historical record this study argues that the Algonkian speaking peoples of Georgian Bay were strongly influenced by both their geographic and political position in an environment where year round subsistence was available from fishing, small game mammals, and corn (either traded or cultivated). This economy in turn, influenced their political and social organization. The extensive temporal depth of this adaptation is followed through an examination of regionally important historical influences, including a devastating war with the Iroquois, various fur trades, an

influx of native immigration, government sponsored settlement programs and land surrenders.

- 1979 Heritage Planning Research- Planning the Cultural Landscape, Masters, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University. Specialized in social impact assessment and cultural resource management (including archaeological sites).

CONFERENCE PAPERS

Problems of Proof: oral tradition in litigation. Paper presented at the 37th Algonquian Conference (Carleton University and the Museum of Civilization), October 2005.

The Gens des Terres: Ojibwa, Cree or a Distinct Aboriginal Group? Paper presented with Charles A. Bishop at the 37th Algonquian Conference (Carleton University and the Museum of Civilization), October 2005.

Conflict on the Plateau and Great Basin: Trading, Slaving and Raiding, manuscript, 2004.

Aboriginal Warfare on the Northwest Coast: the impact of the fur trade. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Conference, Problems in Paradise: Conflict and Violence Among the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, Chicago (November 19-23, 2003).

Northwest Coast Human Trophy Taking. Paper presented at the Society for American Archaeology, 69th Annual Meeting, The Taking and Displaying of Human Trophies by Amerindians, Montreal (April 3, 2004).

Oral History on Trial: Transmitting traditional or aboriginal culture? Paper presented at B.C. Studies Conference, University of British Columbia, May 2003.

Distinguishing the Aboriginal from the Traditional: Reassessing the evidence for the Midewiwin, 34 Algonquian Conference (Queen's University, Kingston), October 2002.

Transmission Difficulties: The use and abuse of oral history in Aboriginal claims, 33rd Algonquian Conference (University of California at Berkeley), October 2001.

Treaty Boundaries: The Ojibwa vs. the Gerrymander, 32nd Algonquian Conference (McGill University and McCord Museum), Montreal, Quebec, October 2000.

Delgamuukw: The future of oral history in land claims. Canadian Anthropological Society Association [CASCA]. University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, May 1998.

Headquarters of Heathenism: Ojibwa politics and the Midewiwin. 28th Algonquian Conference, Toronto, Ontario, October 1996.

Rainy River: Heartland of the Grand Council Ojibway Sacred Lands Conference [Co-presented]. Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 1996.

The History of Anishinabe Government: Grand Councils and Grand Chiefs. Treaty #3 Assembly. North West Angle, Minnesota, June 1995.

'Cultural Leprosy: ' The 'Aboriginal Ethnology' of Ruth Landes [Co-presented]. 27th Algonquian Conference. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, October 1995.

Ojibwa Reservations as an 'Incubus Upon the Territory': The Indian Removal Policy of the Province of Ontario, Canada 1874-1982 [Co-presented]. 27th Algonquian Conference. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, October 1995.

'The Principal Cause of Our Starving in Winter Time': Nineteenth Century Dams and the Disruption of the Ojibwa Economy in Northwestern Ontario [Co-presented] American Society for Ethnohistory Annual Meeting. Tempe, Arizona, November 1994

'They Have Skill to Hunt & Game on Which to Exercise It': Ojibwa Subsistence Economy and the Big-Game Collapse Hypothesis in the Boundary Waters Region of Northwestern Ontario [Co-presented] American Society for Ethnohistory Annual Meeting. Tempe, Arizona, November 1994.

'Stout Athletic Fellows': The Ojibwa During the 'Big-Game Collapse' in Northwestern Ontario 1821-71 [Co-presented]. Twenty-fifth Algonquian Conference. Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 1994.

'Deprived of Part of Their Living': Colonialism and Nineteenth Century Flooding of Ojibwa Lands [Co-presented]. Twenty-fifth Algonquian Conference. Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 1994.

Fact and Fancy in the Ojibwa Ethnographic Voice of Ruth Landes: A Critique of Landes' Contribution to Canadian Anthropology [Co-presented]. 21st Annual Canadian Anthropological Society Conference. Vancouver, British Columbia, May, 1994.

"Headquarters of Heathenism": The Boundary Waters Ojibwa of Northwestern Ontario Encounter Christianity. Canadian Anthropological Society Association [CASCA], York University, Toronto, Ontario, May 1993.

Lac des Mille Lacs "Dammed and Diverted: " Over A Century of Flooding Ojibwa Lands in Northwestern Ontario 25th Algonquian Conference. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, October 1993.

The Political Evolution of the Boundary Waters Ojibwa 1730 - 1873. 24th Algonquian Conference. Montreal, Quebec, October 1992.

Book Reviews

Haida Gwaii, Human History and Environment from the Time of Loon to the Time of the Iron People, edited by Daryl W. Fedje and Rolf W. Mathewes. *Canadian Book Review Annual* (in press)

When I Was Small – I Wan Kwikws: A Grammatical Analysis of St'át'imc Oral Narratives, by Lisa Mathewson et al. *Canadian Book Review Annual* (in press)

A Short History of the Indians in Canada, by Thomas King, (*Canadian Book Review Annual* (in press))

First Peoples in Canada, by Alan D. McMillan & Eldon Yellowhorn, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

The Whaling Indians: Legendary Hunters, by Edward Sapir and Morris Swadesh, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

Wahdqq Tehmi Long-Ago People's Packsack: Dene Babiche Bags- Tradition and Revival, by Suzan Marie & Judy Thompson, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

Healing Through Art: Ritualized Space and Cree Identity, by Nadia Ferrara, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

Musqueam Reference Grammar, by Wayne Suttles, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

Living Rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal Economic Resilience and Vision, by Wanda Wuttunee, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

Cassiar: A Jewel in the Wilderness by Suzanne LeBlanc, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

The Oriental Question by Patricia Roy, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2004)

The Double Twist: From Ethnography to Morphodynamics, edited by Pierre Maranda, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

Gatherings: The En'owkin Journal of First North American Peoples edited by Florene Belmore and Eric Ostroweidzki, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

Daughters of Copper Woman by Anne Cameron, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

Glass Teepee by Garry Gottfreidson, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

Faces in the Forest: First Nations Art Created on Living Trees by Michael D. Blackstock, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

Facing History: Portraits from Vancouver edited by Karen Love, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

Wildfire Wars: Frontline Stories of BC's Worst Forest Fires by Keith Keller, *Canadian Book Review Annual* (2003)

REPORTS AND MANUSCRIPTS

Draft Expert opinion regarding Aboriginal Title and Rights to Marine Resources

by *The Ahousaht Indian Band and Others v. The Attorney General of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia*, February 2006, 139 pp.

Expert opinion report, *R. v. Florence Emily Deneault at al; R. v. Barrett Deneault*, Re: Aboriginal right to fish for salmon in High Bar Band territory by the Neskonalith Band, (Kamloops, Gillespie Renkema Barnett Broadway & Department of Fisheries and Oceans), August 29, 2005, 59 pp.

Expert opinion report, *Regina v. Michael Reginald Morrison and Eugene Davidson*, Re: Commercial Harvest and Trade of Dogfish, (Vancouver: Department of Justice), March 22, 2005, 33 pp.

Conflict on the Plateau and Great Basin: Trading, Slaving and Raiding, Manuscript, 2004. [This paper was requested by and written for Dr. Richard Chacon, Department of Anthropology, Winthrop University, South Carolina. It is one of two peer reviewed papers accepted for publication in a book titled, *North American Warfare and Violence*, edited by Richard Chacon and Ruben Mendoza, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press). Due to editorial decisions related to the length of the book, this paper will not appear in this edition. It will be submitted for publication in a journal at some future date].

Expert opinion report for Ontario Court of Justice Between Her Majesty The Queen in the Right of Ontario and Cathy Lynn Clement (Maurice Law, Calgary, Alberta), December, 2004, 126 pp.

Draft expert opinion for *James Walkus v. Her Majesty The Queen and Doreen Walkus v. Her Majesty The Queen Tax Court Appeal* regarding a claim by a Northwest Coast Band to income tax immunity for income derived from fishing off reserve (Department of Justice for Revenue Canada) July, 2004, 63 pp.

Mississauga No. 8 First Nation Claim Relating to the Flooding of Reserve No. 8. (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 2004, 56 pp. Document Set.

Historical Report regarding Washagamis Bay First Nation Claim with Respect to Island 646P (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 2004, 71 pp. Document Set.

Anthropological opinion in *Regina v. Theodore David Douglas, June Quipp and Lincoln John Douglas*, 2003, 10 pp.

Missanabie Cree Land Use Study: Final Report (DIAND/Missanabie Cree First Nation), 2003, 153 pp. Maps, Document Set, Document Index.

Anthropological opinion in *R. v. Ida & Alfred George*, concerning precontact trading of salmon, 2003, 51 pp. Document collection and Index.

Pic River Band Claim to Unextinguished Aboriginal Title (Toronto: Ministry of the Attorney General, Ontario Crown Law Civil), 2003, 102 pp. Document Set.

Anthropological expert opinion in Chief Percy Williams and members of the

Kwicksutaineuk/Ah-kwa-mish Tribes regarding aboriginal right to hunt seals, Federal Court – Trial Division, August 2002, Department of Justice/Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 21 pp.

Whitefish Lake Indian Reserve No. 6 Flooding (Toronto: Ministry of the Attorney General Ontario Crown Law Civil), 2002, 187 pp. Document Set.

Additional Historical Research Concerning The Use, Occupation And Development Of Ash Rapids, And The Greater Winnipeg Water District's Application For, And Subsequent Approval Of, The Diversion Of Water From Shoal Lake And The Lake Of The Woods (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 2002, 75 pp. Document Set.

Preliminary Anthropological Opinion in Kitkatla Band and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Fisheries Management Coordinator – Prince Rupert (Department of Justice, Vancouver), Federal Court – Trial Division, 2001, 3 pp.

Anthropological Opinion, Salish First Nations (Bonaparte Band, Whispering Pines Band, Skeetchestn Band, North Thompson Band, Neskonlith Band, Adams Lake Band, Little Shuswap Band, and Spallumcheen Band), Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 2001, 13 pp.

Preliminary Anthropological expert opinion in Hwiltsum First Nation and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans), Federal Court – Trial Division, 2001, 3 pp.

Historical Research concerning the “Memorandum of agreement between the three Governments [Canada, Ontario and Manitoba] for a settlement of domestic problems” (1922 Tripartite Agreement) (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 2001, 105 pp. Document Set.

Robinson Huron Treaty Reserve – Adjustment Research (re: Fort William First Nation claim) (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 2001, 49 pp. Document Set, Document Index, Table.

Review, Assessment and Additional Research - Wahnapiatae First Nation Boundary Clarification Claim (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 2000, 101 pp. Document Set, Document Index, Map Set, Map Index.

Final Report Research Required on the Two Chain Allowance: Couchiching Reserve 16A and Stanjikoming Reserve 18C and the Two Chain Allowance Fronting these Reserves Treaty No. 3; Couchiching, Stanjikoming, Naicatchewenin and Nickikousemenecaning First Nations and the Two Chain Allowance Fronting Agency Reserve 1, Treaty No. 3; Couchiching First Nation and the Exchange of Two Chain Allowance Lands for Highway 11 Right of Way, Treaty No. 3. (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 1999, 177 pp. Document Set, Document Index, Map Set, Map Index.

The Robinson Huron Treaty Southeastern Boundary (Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough, Ontario), 2000, 62 pp. Maps, Document Set, Document Index, Map Set, Map Index.

Treaty Land Entitlement Seine River First Nation (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1994, 223 pp.

Seine River First Nation against Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index.

Road Appropriations Seine River First Nation (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1995, 191 pp.

Ontario Timber Policy in the Former Disputed Territory and Wabigoon First Nation 1885-1927 (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1995, 70 pp.

Wabigoon First Nation against Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index.

"Of No Value, Except to the Indians" - The Flooding of Wabigoon Indian Reserve 1873 - 1972 (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3) [with Leo Waisberg], 1990, 154 pp.

"Of Utmost Benefit To The Band:" Road Appropriations Rainy Lake I.R. 26A Nicickousemenecaning First Nation (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1995, 155 pp.

Nicickousemenecaning First Nation against Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index.

Lac des Mille Lacs Flooding 1873 - 1981 (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1991, 305 pp.

Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation against Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index.

Lac des Mille Lacs Historical Population For Treaty Land Entitlement (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1995, 86 pp.

"To Better The Lot Of The Indians Of The Province" Road Appropriations on Northwest Angle #37 Whitefish Bay Indian Reserve 34A (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1994, 222 pp.

Road Expropriations on Sabaskong Bay Indian Reserve 1873-1955 (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1991, 311 pp.

Ojibways of Onegaming against Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index

Road Appropriations and Boundary Dispute on Whitefish Bay Indian Reserve 1873 - 1978 (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1992, 303 pp.

Whitefish Bay First Nation against Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index.

Naicatchewenin First Nation- Flooding of Rainy Lake 17B (Kenora: Grand Council Treaty #3), 1998, 172 pp.

Naicatchewenin First Nation against Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada; Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario. Statement of Claim. Document Set, Document Index

Road Appropriations on Manitou Rapids Indian Reserve #11 1873 - 1965 (Kenora: Treaty and Aboriginal Rights Research, Grand Council Treaty #3), 1992, 262 pp.

We Have Kept Our Part of the Treaty: The Anishinabe Understanding of Treaty #3 (Kenora: Grand Council Treaty #3), 1995, 36 pp.

Indigenous Government of Treaty #3 Indians, (Kenora: Grand Council Treaty #3), 1991. (Pamphlet)

Review and Assessment - Begetikong Anishnabe Statement of Claim for unextinguished Aboriginal title (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 1997, 35 pp.

Review and Assessment - Mississauga First Nation Road Expropriations Statement of Claim (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 1997, 45 pp. maps.

Historical Background to the Lands Underlying Roads on Mississagi River Indian Reserve: 1850 - 1969 (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 1998, 82 pp. Document Set, Document Index.

Roads Traversing the Mississauga #8 Reserve and Related Issues: 1970 - 1998 (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat), 1998, 22 pp. Document Set, Document Index.

Preliminary Report Kainaiwa (Blood Tribe) 1889 Surrender Land Claim Traditional Activities Loss of Use Study, (Kainaiwa Tribe/DIAND), 2000, 225 pp. Maps

Fishing Lake First Nation Loss of Use Traditional Activities Final Report (DIAND/Fishing Lake First Nation), 1998, 318 pp. Maps.

Ontario Hydro Occupation of Sabaskong Bay Indian Reserve 35D. A Reconstruction of Events (1952-1992) For Consideration by the Ojibways of Onegaming and Ontario Hydro Consensus-Building Team (Nestor Falls,

Ontario: Onegaming First Nation and Ontario Hydro), 1992, 116 pp.

Rights of Passage: an Ethnohistory of the Georgian Bay Ojibwa (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization Archives), 1986.

Field Notes pertaining to genealogical information and the relationship between Parry Islanders and the Moskoko Indians who were at Port Carling, (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization Archives), 1984,

Final Report: A study of the changing perceptions of territory and land use by the native people of Parry Island Reserve by examining patterns of migration, settlement, subsistence, technology and genealogy (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization Archives), 1983.

Field Notes on Parry Island Reserve (Hull: National Museum of Civilization), 1983. [Also Ojibwa sound recordings 1982, 1983].

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Society for Ethnohistory
American Anthropological Association
Society for American Archaeology
The Champlain Society

Appendix B- Methods

Ethnohistorical Method

There are a number of difficulties both temporal and methodological in determining the exact nature of precontact Coast Tsimshian society. The first anthropologist to study the Tsimshian, Franz Boas, for example transcribed various myths influenced by over 100 years of European contact. The other major ethnographic source on the Tsimshian, Marius Barbeau was critical of Boas' methods of acquiring and recording information and on the value of myths to describe actual practices. The work of Boas' student, Viola Garfield was in the 1930s and even more remote from the precontact period. In addition, neither relied upon nor extensively consulted historical records to assess how Euro-American influences may have changed precontact Tsimshian society. Garfield, like many anthropologists and historians has assumed that information obtained from Tsimshian informants refers to the precontact period. They ignore most distinctions between the precontact and post contact periods and the intervening period between the precontact and the post contact, known as the protocontact or protohistorical historical period.

Ethnographic, historical and much of the archaeological record provide incomplete descriptions of exchange practices and behaviors. Neither source provides compelling evidence, but taken together using an ethnohistorical approach, inferences can be drawn and tested from an evidentiary base. By assessing the often "timeless" ethnographic descriptions to a chronologically organized historical record, it is possible to infer relative time periods when activities described in the ethnographic record as "traditional" (ethnographic) or even "aboriginal" (precontact) may have actually existed.

While it may be impossible to obtain a total picture of precontact Coast Tsimshian culture, there was at the time of the ethnographers some continuity with the past which may shed light on the nature of precontact. This is why reliable information about the precontact period can only be obtained through a critical assessment of the relevant archaeological, historical and ethnographic data while considering the scholarly literature.

One of the prime rationales for ethnohistory, is to correct and validate the ethnographic record, by subjecting ethnographic data to historical testing. The purpose is not to dismiss ethnographic data out of hand and not all elements of ethnographies, such as cultural belief systems, ceremonial activities, migrations or wars can be readily tested against historical sources. Some can be tested against archaeological evidence, but only after historical sources have been consulted. Most ethnographers, and particularly those of Boas, Barbeau and Garfield use salvage ethnography, which relies on the memories of elders to provide information about the past or what has been called "memory culture." The actual behavior referred to in the ethnography or (narratives) was rarely observed by either the informant or the ethnographer, because the information derives from memory. This is why ethnographies produce what has been called the "ethnographic present" to represent a pristine aboriginal time in the past. Garfield (and Wingert) in fact, explicitly stated: "There is also little historical depth to our data."⁷⁷⁷

⁷⁷⁷ Garfield, Viola E., and Wingert, Paul S., *The Tsimshian Indians and Their Arts*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1966, pp. 4, 8, ft. 2.

The classic ethnographies dealt with traditional subsistence economies portrayed in memory culture and not direct observation since many of the traditional activities were no longer practiced. Often what was called the indigenous economy was one which had emerged with the fur trade.⁷⁷⁸ As archaeologist Paul Prince has observed, the ethnographic record is not a good analogy for modeling precontact societies and interpreting specific material. After conducting archaeological work on the Upper Skeena River, Prince concluded that assertions for the long standing existence of the ethnographic pattern on the Upper Skeena have not withstood the tests to which they have been put to and seems to have been greatly influenced by indirect European contact (i.e. protocontact).⁷⁷⁹

Tsimshian Narratives

Many scholars seem to adopt an uncritical acceptance of the Tsimshian narratives as literally true. This is different from accepting that the narratives represent what a Tsimshian informant at a specific time and circumstance, related what was their belief of what happened in the past.

Just as the definition of the ethnographic present attributes a period of timelessness to the description of culture, a timeless view of trade or rather exchange, is created in part by poorly defining the term. It also arbitrarily leads to the acceptance of practices exclusive of their cultural or historical context.

As Historian Jonathan Dean has observed:

Most ethnographic material is mute on the nature of the pre-contact coasting trade, which had already been influenced by the maritime traders followed by the Hudson's Bay Company and Russian American Company well before the arrival of Franz Boas on the coast. Furthermore the academic preoccupation with the Gixpaxlots monopoly led by Legaic mirrored the Canadian interest in promoting river-based means of communication to bind the coast to the interior, and away from coastal connections with adjacent American territories in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.⁷⁸⁰

Anthropologist John Cove who worked intensively with the Tsimshian Narratives also stated that the most serious problem in the collection of the narratives or texts is that they were recorded: "outside of the normal contexts of narration. They were thereby more open to the intents of the narrators."⁷⁸¹ This is particularly significant for the *adawx* which by definition, relies on witnesses to confirm its reliability and which so few, if any in the vast corpus of narratives appear to have undergone this cultural test of validation.

⁷⁷⁸ Knight, Rolf, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Labour in British Columbia, 1848-1930*, (Vancouver: New Star), 1996, p. 43.

⁷⁷⁹ Prince, Paul, *Settlement, Trade and Social Ranking at Kitwanga, B.C.* Ph.D thesis, McMaster 1998, pp. 96, 178, 191.

⁷⁸⁰ Dean, Jonathan Ritchie, 'Rich Men', 'Big Powers' and Wastelands -- the Tlingit -Tsimshian Border of the Northern Pacific Littoral, 1779 to 1867, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1993, p. 47.

⁷⁸¹ Cove, John, J., *Shattered images: dialogues and meditations on Tsimshian narratives*. (Ottawa: Carleton Library Series), 1986, p. 44.

Anthropologist James McDonald who worked with the Tsimshian of the Zimacord District also expressed cautions about the use of Tsimshian narratives (which he called oral histories), especially when they were not witnessed during a feast:

Oral histories have a way of changing over time, especially when they are important and not subject to the scrutiny of public recitations provided by the context of a feast. It is during those events that the accuracy of the spoken version of history is accepted or challenged.⁷⁸²

These concerns question the use of the Tsimshian narratives as reliable information for the purpose of historical reconstruction, without corroborative data. Perhaps the best exemplifier of the importance of corroboration is Bruce Trigger, renowned scholar of ethnohistory and archaeology:

The use of oral traditions to understand historical events requires a detailed understanding of their derivation and a critical comparison of alternative versions of the same story (Vansina 1965). While oral traditions may provide a valuable record of former beliefs and values, caution is needed in interpreting that sort of information historically.

Anthropological research in North America and elsewhere indicates that tribal societies generally have little interest in conserving an accurate knowledge of the past over long periods of time for its own sake: What pass as historical traditions are often mythical charters explaining and validating current social relations and these change as social relations change. ... At least some of these oral traditions appear to have been heavily influenced by White historical narratives, missionary propaganda, and even anthropological publications (Hamell 1982:45). They also frequently reflect knowledge of periods later than those to which they are alleged to refer. In general, some kind of independent verification is required before such traditions can be accepted as accurate historical accounts.⁷⁸³

Ethnographic Present

As noted, the use of the ethnographic present “creates an impression of timelessness that cannot adequately account for cultural development as viewed in the archaeological record.”⁷⁸⁴ The ethnographic record, that is data collected from the memories of informants about an earlier (precontact) time, has been widely but uncritically accepted by ethnohistorians and archeologists. According to Prince:

Despite the intentions of early ethnographers, the ethnographic record

⁷⁸² McDonald, James Andrew, *An Historic Event in the Political Economy of the Ownership of the Zimacord District*, B.C. Studies, 1983, (57):36.

⁷⁸³ Trigger, Bruce G., *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered*, (Kingston: Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press) 1985, pp. 166-167.

⁷⁸⁴ Prince, Paul, *Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference*, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999:83.

cannot be assumed to represent an unchanged past, and it is subject to many biases. The ethnographic reconstructions were based largely on the memories and oral traditions of aged informants.... Memories, however, are faulty and the interview process involved several interpretive filters. They were often conducted by Native field workers without the ethnographers' presence. One field worker in particular – William Beynon – fed information to 4 ethnographers.... This reliance on a limited source of information potentially obscures variability and perpetuates a narrow view.

Prince also noted the limitations of Tsimshian oral traditions: “which function to legitimize the status quo, particularly the rights of individuals and groups to territories and resources as symbolized in totem poles.”⁷⁸⁵

There are inherent problems of extrapolating backwards from a timeless ethnographic present to the past which can lead to ethnographic circularity. As will be evident from this Report, much of the ethnographic work was undertaken after 1900 which was well after various disruptions to Coast Tsimshian culture introduced by fur traders, disease, missions, reserve allocations etc. had occurred. Archaeologist David Archer notes: “The attempt by early ethnographers to capture or salvage the “aboriginal way of life” undoubtedly includes elements produced by acculturation and includes what survived into the early 20th century.”⁷⁸⁶

The classic ethnographic accounts of traditional native economies and societies mainly describe conditions in the mid-nineteenth century. Academic concerns over the applicability of the ethnographic record to the past including the precontact period, however, are well documented. Archaeologist Martin Wobst has cautioned against the use of the “ethnographic present” to reconstruct past cultures.⁷⁸⁷

A thorough treatment of the limitation of ethnographic information alone to represent the past can also be found in the many works by Bruce Trigger. He explains the necessity for ethnohistorical method in reconstructing the history of aboriginal people:

Because Indian life had been altered so radically by European contact, ethnographic field work normally took the form of interviewing elderly native people, who claimed to remember what their ways had been like prior to change.

Trigger elaborates:

Nevertheless, ethnographers believed that working in this manner they could reconstruct a valid picture of what Indian life had been like prior to

⁷⁸⁵ Prince, Paul, Protohistoric Settlement and Interaction on the Upper Skeena in Long Term Perspective in *The Entangled Past: Integrating History and Archaeology*, edited by M. Boyd, J.C. Erwin and M. Hendrikson. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Chacmool Conference, (Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary), 1999:84.

⁷⁸⁶ Archer, David, J.W., A Heritage Overview Assessment of the Coast Tsimshian Territory In Relation to Proposed Development Projects, (Victoria: Heritage Conservation Branch), 1983, pp. 16, 18, 25, 38.

⁷⁸⁷ Wobst, H. Martin, The Archeo-Ethnology of Hunter-Gatherers or the Tyranny of the Ethnographic Record in Archaeology, *American Antiquity*, 1978 43:304.

the arrival of the White Man and that their ethnographies constituted a corpus of case studies that were useful for understanding the cultural similarities and differences of mankind. Only traditional ways of life were believed to be sufficiently integrated and self-sufficient for this purpose; Indian groups living under White domination were too "disrupted" to constitute valid units for comparison. ⁷⁸⁸

The description of this type of ethnography (as applied to the ethnography of Coast Tsimshian culture) was treated in what Trigger described as being in:

isolation from their historical context and as if they existed in an atemporal ethnographic present. The most striking element lacking from the original constitution of anthropology was history. This was no accident. Instead, it reflected the opinion prevailing among nineteenth century White Americans that history, which to them implied change and development, was a characteristic of White, but not of Indian societies. ⁷⁸⁹

Trigger specifically noted that Boas and his students (which would include Garfield): "continued to believe that, in general, Indian cultures had been unchanging prior to the arrival of the Europeans." ⁷⁹⁰

Trigger also defined the protocontact or protohistoric period:

In recent years, archaeologists and ethnohistorians have together become increasingly aware of the importance of what is has become fashionable to call protohistoric period (Noble 1969). This has been defined as the interval between the first evidence of European contact influencing a native culture however indirectly, and the beginning of the intimate and well-documented contact that characterizes the beginning of the historic period. ⁷⁹¹

As a result of ethnohistorical research: "European contact, either direct or indirectly had begun to transform the native cultures long before any significant information was recorded about them." ⁷⁹² Some of the results of the influence by Europeans include: the expansion of trade, a shift in warfare patterns, the elaboration of ritualism, and the expansion of political alliances following European commerce to such an extent as "to exceed in scale anything known or required in pre-contact times." ⁷⁹³

⁷⁸⁸ Trigger, Bruce, G., *Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present*, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:4.

⁷⁸⁹ Trigger, Bruce, G., *Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present*, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:4.

⁷⁹⁰ Trigger, Bruce, G., *Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present*, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:5.

⁷⁹¹ Trigger, Bruce, G., *Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present*, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:11.

⁷⁹² Trigger, Bruce, G., *Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present*, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:11-12.

⁷⁹³ Trigger, Bruce, G., *Archaeology and the Ethnographic Present*, *Anthropologica*, 1981, vol. xxiii, no. 1:12.

Documents

The documents used in this Report are generally divided into two major types: primary and secondary. Primary documents consist of documents composed by a person who was present at the time and place being described, and secondary documents are documents composed by a person who is collecting or commenting on the original information provided by primary documents. The distinction is analytic. The value of the primary document is to provide factual (although often incomplete and selective) data about the past. They are the best sources describing actual events, condition and activities. Secondary sources are valuable for providing interpretations. Because of the strengths and weaknesses of the data, ethnohistorians use both primary and secondary materials.⁷⁹⁴

The primary archival sources include the journals, logs, charts of early traders and later accounts of travelers and missionaries. In addition the descriptions of the Tsimshian culture by ethnographers and narratives and the secondary literature produced by scholars. To maintain historical perspective the findings are presented in this report as much as possible in chronological sequence.

⁷⁹⁴ Barber, Russell, J., and Berdan, Frances F., *The Emperor's Mirror: Understanding Cultures through Primary Sources*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), 1998, pp. 30-31.

Appendix C- Ethnographic Group Identities, Territories and Fishing Locations

Gilutss'aaw

The Gilutss'aaw [Gilludzars] were an interior group who only recently occupied the coast. The remains of their traditional village on the Lakelse River were seen by Dawson which suggests that their village had only recently (ie. pre 1880) been abandoned. The Gilutss'aaw occupied a thoroughfare area that extended from the terraces of the middle Skeena River southward to the Kitimat area and the Haisla area on Douglas Channel. According to Allaire, the Lakelse River and lake was their traditional home.⁷⁹⁵

The Gilutss'aaw were composed of Killerwhale and Raven clan segments and had territory on the *Kaxgels* river and lake. They held berry grounds in common. There was also an abundance of fresh water mussels on the Lake. Eels were also taken from this lake and dried. According to Beynon: "this was their stock in trade the dried eel as well as fresh (lo'ox) being a great delicacy among the tsimsiyan [Tsimshian] and gotten only at this lake." The lake was used in common by both clan segments. Beynon also described: "the foreign trading privileges of this tribe was with the Prince of Wales Island, Alaska Haidas."⁷⁹⁶ The lake referred to by Beynon is likely Lakelse Lake.

The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map attributes only the Lakelse River (not lake) as used by the Gilutss'aaw for fishing resources.

Ginaxangiik

Little is known about the Ginaxangiik who occupied a village at the mouth of the Exchamsiks River on the lower Skeena River. The Ginaxangiik appear in the historical record in the 1846 census. The Nass Indians were compelled to leave Fort Simpson as they were afraid of them.⁷⁹⁷ The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map shows this group as occupying the entire tributary of the Exchamsiks River, but there is little supporting evidence for this use.

Gispaxlo'ots

Wilson Duff stated that the Gispaxlo'ots used to be "a very small tribe, which amalgamated with different other tribes."⁷⁹⁸

According to William Beynon, the Gispaxlo'ots had no individual tributary on the Skeena River but had the entire body of the Skeena River as their hunting territory. Their village was situated on a little stream known as *Ksems* and the name of their village was "people

⁷⁹⁵ Allaire, Louis, A Native Mental Map of Coast Tsimshian Villages, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver:UBC Press), 1984:92. The lake may be contested by the Kitimat.

⁷⁹⁶ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsimsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. v, pp. 5, 7,12.

⁷⁹⁷ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, September 23, 1864; January 19, 1865.

⁷⁹⁸ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 40, file 32.

of the elderberry”.⁷⁹⁹ Beynon also stated that the Gispaxlo’ots had rights at Fillmore Inlet near Ketchikan Alaska to hunt and fish there. Fillmore Inlet had originally been Tlingit. Beynon states that the Gispaxlo’ots were near this vicinity fishing halibut when a party of Tlingit were on a war raid and captured a small group of Gispaxlo’ots, killing several but two who escaped. They reached a group of Gispaxlo’ots on route to the Nass River eulachon fishery, and the chief organized a retaliatory raid. The Tlingit later came in peace and offered to abandon the site to the family of slain men. This is how Fillmore Inlet came into the hands of the Killerwhale clan segment of the Gispaxlo’ots.⁸⁰⁰

According to Allaire, the Gispaxlo’ots kept a village on the Terrace area of the middle Skeena River in the vicinity of the Kitselas and Kitsumkalum village, and resided at Metlakatla and then Fort Simpson.⁸⁰¹ This location which has support in the narratives, does not agree with the plaintiff’s Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map.

Beynon’s informant Charles Nelson in an undated interview stated that the Kitsumkalum and Gispaxlo’ots were friendly, and that the Gispaxlo’ots had fishing and berry picking privileges at Gelom Lake (on the top of the terrace of the plateau).⁸⁰² Gelom Lake may be Kitsum*kalum* Lake. Beynon also stated that the Gispaxlo’ots territory went half way up the Kitamat River.⁸⁰³

Gitando

Based on information Beynon obtained in 1916 from Sam Lewis, Duff concluded that the Gitando were “more like the servants of the Gispaxlo’ots and when legex [Legaic] became chief after *nies’wanak* he even made slaves of them.” H. Johnson, another informant also stated that the Gitando at one time had not been a tribe and that they were treated as “servants” of the Gispaxlo’ots. Legaic would deny the Gitando water and would treat them as slaves. In particular Legaic would sell them as slaves for beads. The same narrative refers to groups fighting over hunting privileges.⁸⁰⁴ According to Duff, the Gitando had two winter villages at Metlakatla which he identified as no. 1. *’alaxtep* and no. 2 *ksayayu’m*. Duff did not provide an accompanying map showing these winter villages.⁸⁰⁵

The Gitando had a large village, *Kstos* on the Skeena River (which Duff identifies as No. 4), which was at the mouth of the Shames River “used until a short time ago (from 1927).” The Killerwhale clan segment had a village on the Exstew River near its mouth and this location may have been what Duff called the “tribal village.” The Gitando also had a common eulachon village at the mouth of the Nass River.

⁷⁹⁹ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. v. p. 17.

⁸⁰⁰ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. v, pp .19, 20.

⁸⁰¹ Allaire, Louis, A Native Mental Map of Coast Tsimshian Villages, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. 92.

⁸⁰² PABC Boas MS 2102, A1413, Beynon notes BF-49-1. Informant, Charles Nelson (n.d.)

⁸⁰³ PABC Boas MS 2102, A1413, Beynon notes, B-F 418.2

⁸⁰⁴ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 40, file 32.

⁸⁰⁵ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol iii, p. 17.

Duff described the territories of the Gitando as the Exstew and Shames Rivers and a small area opposite the mouth of the Exstew River. The Exstew River belonged: “almost completely to the ganhada [Raven clan]. The Shames was used in common by the whole tribe, who had a village at its mouth. The small area south of the river belonged to the gispawuwa’da [Killerwhale clan].” Duff also noted that some Gitando had privileges to fish at the Kwinamass River near the mouth of the Nass: “although they did not own it.” This privilege was obtained through the intermarriage with Nisg’aa who extended fishing privileges: “to their relatives among the git’ando [Gitando].”

The specific area used for fishing along the Exstew River was called *haitkdin*, meaning, “standing salmon trap (weir).” The location was a small stream off the Exstew River which yielded salmon as well as berries and game. A second creek, *kspesni*, was reserved for the Raven clan segment and shared by various houses (identified by Duff as V2 to d, VI, VIII and IX). This site was also used to harvest salmon, as well as for animals and berries. The Killerwhale clan segment’s fishing (and hunting and berry) territories were, according to Duff: “across the Skeena opposite the Exstew.” These locations are not marked on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

The Killerwhale *ge’tuk* Hosue (II) owned *ksado’atsk*, the first creek above the mouth of the Exstew River. Across from this was *ktsamgot*, which is marked by Duff as No. 12. The upper Exstew River was owned by various Raven clan segments.

The Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map identifies the entire tributaries of the Exstew River and Shames Creek as areas for fisheries resources used by the Gitando. Duff indicated that the tributaries comprised only part of the territories used by the Gitando for fishing resources. Duff for example, stated that the entire tributary of the Exstew River or *k’stos* was also used for hunting.⁸⁰⁶

Gitlaan

A part of the Gitlaan group was apparently of Haida origin. There are two separate versions of their migration, one claimed by the Gitxn [Gitlaan] group at Git’somgelam [Kitsumkalum] on the Skeena River (Kitselas canyon) and another version from the Nass River. The narratives note that a number of Kitimat warriors came overland to the Gitsomgelam [Kitsumkalum] village in a surprise raid when the men were away. The women were taken captive and one in particular was later taken as a Bella Bella wife. This woman was captured again by a Haida.⁸⁰⁷

Duff did not have sufficient ethnographic information to plot the Gitlaan territories on a map. The Gitlaan had chiefly Houses belonging to the Wolf clan and Raven clan. A Raven clan had emigrated from the Kwakiutl. The territorial area occupied by the clan segments that would comprise the Gitlaan “tribe” was near the Zimacord River. The Zimacord River is also claimed by the Kitsumkalum.⁸⁰⁸ The Wolf clan was the most recent clan segment to join the group and as a result, they had no exclusive territories on the Skeena River: “but their exclusive possessions were more on the coastal frontiers.” Another territory was called River of Wild Black Currants, *kso’ioxtons*, which was a

⁸⁰⁶ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 80.

⁸⁰⁷ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. 1., pp. 22, 37.

⁸⁰⁸ See: McDonald, James Andrew, An Historic Event in the Political Economy of the Ownership of the Zimacord District, B.C. Studies, 1983, (57): 24-37.

sockeye salmon creek. The village at the mouth of the Tsamgot [Zimacord] river was the central village of the Gitlaan, before they moved to Metlakatla. According to Beynon, the Gitlaan had become: “almost extinct among the tsimsiyan [Tsimshian] and in fact moved to Alaska in a body with Wm. Duncan when, he established his Mission at New Metlakatla.”⁸⁰⁹

The Gitlaan had migrated to the HBC post some time before 1842 and almost all moved to Metlakatla with William Duncan in 1863, before moving to new Metlakatla in Alaska in 1887. The extent of their use of territories on the Skeena River or elsewhere in Canada as a collective unit is not known from the literature.

The Gitlaan territories, especially near Zimacord appear to be in a disputed or overlap area with the Kitsumkalum. As such, parts of the area claimed on the Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map would be in dispute. The Gitlaan are shown on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map as only using resources on the main stem of the Skeena River in conjunction with the Gilutss’aaw marked as between points 8 and 9. There is no supporting ethnographic evidence for the usage of this area.

Gitnadoiks

The territories of the Gitnadoiks included the Gitnadoix River and the south bank of the Skeena River near its mouth. The territory was owned by two groups or clan segments of the original Gitnadoiks phratries, the Laxkibu (Wolf) and the Ganhada (Raven). The Ganhada (Raven) owned the lower part of the Gitnadoix River in the vicinity of the mouth of the Skeena River, and the Laxkibu (Wolf) owned the upper part of Gitnadoix River. The dividing line separating the two groups was the Laxkibu village of Laxp’sa [Laxpse] meaning “on clay.” This village was used as a fishing village by all Gitnadoix, and was the location for several important potlatches and the installation of a totem pole. The territory was formerly used by the royal Laxkibu House of Nestelex, which had become extinct but which formerly was the only royal House. Further upstream was a fishing village used in common by all Gitnadoix for salmon (marked as no. 3 on Duff’s sketch).

The Gispawudwada (Killerwhale) families including the chief owned no territories but were granted privileges by other families. At the mouth of the Gitnadoix River was a general village known as Gitnadoiks and marked as number 1 on Duff’s sketch. Ganhada (Raven) territory was used in common by the village for berry picking and salmon fishing. The area for hunting was owned by Ganhada (Raven) families which occupied the areas marked by Roman numerals vi, vii and ix on Duff’s sketch. Up the Skeena River from its mouth was the hunting territory which had been given by the Ganhada (Raven) to the Gispawudwada (Killerwhale) as compensation for performing burial services. This territory is marked as Roman numeral vi on the Duff sketch and was used for fur bearing animals, berries, sockeye, coho, humpback salmon, dog salmon and fresh water whiting. According to Martindale, Duff had sketched this information on a topographic map which shows for comparison, the location of contemporary Indian Reserves. In their interior river location on the Gitnadoix River, the Gitnadoix occupied nine household

⁸⁰⁹ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. iv, pp. 51, 57, 61; vol. v, p. 2.

territories which were identified by the Roman numerals I-IX. None of these locations are situated on the Skeena River. The Gitnadoiks village is shown in the area of two Indian Reserves (I.R. #74 and I.R. #76) and a second village, the Laxpse village (marked as 2 on the Duff sketch) is shown at or near I.R. #78. The site of a common fishing village (marked no. 3 on the Duff sketch) is located on or near I.R. 79, which is at the confluence of the Gitnadoix River and Magar Creek.⁸¹⁰ What this indicates is that this territory did not include the main stem of the Skeena River, but used parts of tributaries of the Gitnadoix River from which clan segments harvested salmon. It also indicates that the village locations and a common fishing village were part or adjacent to what would become allotted as Indian Reserves.

Houses controlled rights to land and resources. The village or clan, however, determined where these territories were and with whose territories they would be contiguous. Martindale noted:

Significantly, Duff mentions three areas where the village group owns common land, all around a significant economic resource. First is the general village Wilsaqasemint, "Where-grows-the-spruce" at the mouth of the river. Duff notes that there were common lands here for berry picking and salmon fishing. Secondly, a common fishing village is mentioned at the confluence of Magar Creek and the Gitnadoix River. The third common area was Leganganao, "Place-of-frogs," a wetland near the lake where red berries (high bush cranberries) and crabapples were abundant. There is no date to which Duff associates his conclusions, but there is evidence in his remarks of the change following European contact.⁸¹¹

Martindale concluded that this data likely refers to both earlier and post contact times.

The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map shows the Clay River as being part of the area used by the Gitnadoiks for fishing resources, but Duff shows only the rapids at or above the intersection of the Clay River and the Gitnadoix River as a fishing area.⁸¹²

Gitsiis

According to Beynon, the name Gitsiis means "people of the seal traps." The Gitsiis had a special trap to lure seals by using salmon bait and the traps were installed at Works Canal. The Gitsiis were considered the most coastal group compared to other Tsimshian groups and had many villages on the coast. Beynon described the Gitsiis as consisting of four clan groups of which the Raven, Wolf and Eagle clan segments were the result of Tlingit emigrations. Gitsiis territory appears to extend: "almost to the head of the Git'sis River on the Skeena." The Skeena village of the Gitsiis was on the Khyex River.⁸¹³

According to Beynon's informants, it was the Gitsiis who had observed the first

⁸¹⁰ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, pp. 119-120.

⁸¹¹ Martindale, Andrew, R.C., *The River of Mist: Cultural Change in the Tsimshian Past*, Ph.D. University of Toronto, 1999, p. 122.

⁸¹² UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 73.

⁸¹³ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, *Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation* by William Beynon, vol. iv, pp. 19-21.

(European) metal tools, which Beynon described as “copper” [*masin*] tools, which is probably a Tsimshian term for metal tools. This discovery by the Gitsiis is associated in the narratives with the first observation by the Tsimshian of other native people making canoes with metal tools [“metal axes”].⁸¹⁴ The “other” native people were probably Tlingit.

The Gitsiis also had a large area on Metlakatla Pass on the island of *laxwalgiyaps* which means “on high place.” There were also attempts by the Gilutss’aaw to drive them off, as well as references to earlier conflicts between groups when war leaders took over a lot of territory and created many villages.⁸¹⁵ This area is not noted on the Allied Tsimshian Tribes Traditional Territories Provisional Draft Map.

Many different groups were described as gathering invertebrates (cockles) adjacent to the Gitsiis village, presumably at Metlakatla.⁸¹⁶ The narratives told to Beynon also report that the Gitsiis were attacked by the Haida at Baker Inlet, on Greenville Channel while fishing for salmon.⁸¹⁷ This location is marked on the Lax Kw’alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map as Gitwilgyoots territory.

The Gitsiis are associated with two main tributaries of the lower Skeena River, the Kasiks and the Khyex, as well as sections on the main river itself. They only extended their territory northward according to Duff: “in fairly recent times and at the expense of Tlingit groups, to include all of Work Channel and Khutzeymateen Inlet. Their summer villages were on the Skeena, and like the other Tsimshian they had winter villages at Metlakatla and eulachon fishing villages on the lower Nass.” The activities of *Haimas*, a notorious outlaw of Tsimshian history : “was a member of the leading lineage of the Gitsiis (I), and the separate villages and territories he seized as temporarily occupied during his career⁸¹⁸ are shown on the Gitsiis territories.” The Gitsiis also gained territory over a small area on the Ecstall River as a compensation payment, and they lost some territory on the Exchamsiks River.

Duff identified by name several villages of the Gitsiis. The principal village at Metlakatla was *k’nu* and the principal Skeena River village was *t’sawe’naxtet* meaning, “point of shrubs.” This village had an estimated 10 houses. Herbert Wallace, the informant who provided this information to Beynon in 1926: “stressed that this [Skeena River village] was regarded as their permanent village. The houses were better than the one at Metlakatla. The tribe moved to Port Simpson according to Wallace: “at the time of the smallpox, about 40 years ago. In 1926 some remnants of the village could be seen, but much had washed away.” This village was not, however, the main village which was *tsewanlo’p*, meaning “point of rock,” which is marked as no. 3 on Duff’s map. It is located on the south shore of the Skeena River opposite the mouth of the Kasiks River.

⁸¹⁴ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. iv, pp. 23, 25.

⁸¹⁵ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. iv, pp. 25, 26.

⁸¹⁶ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol. iv, p. 27.

⁸¹⁷ American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon, vol iv, pp. 31-32.

⁸¹⁸ Duff added in superscript after the word career: “added considerably to.”

The movement to the other village (no. 2) brought the Gitsiis territories opposite and on the north side, which forms part of their other territories. The exception is a small parcel on the Ecstall River marked as I3 on the map. The village at Metlakatla was established by *Haimas* to be close to his father in an adjoining Ginaxangiik village. In later times this village was used by the Kitkatla chiefs of the Tsiyibasse [Sebassa] group. *Haimas* had numerous if temporary shelters including: Birnie Island; Kincolith, Baker Inlet; and Grenville Channel where he obtained salmon at Salmon River. This latter location is in Kitkatla territory south of the Skeena River. At this latter location, the place name changed because it was taken over by the Gitwilgyoots. Another location on the Kwinamass River, was claimed by the Gitlaan and Nisga'a. The Gitsiis eulachon fishing village was at the mouth of the Nass at Red Bluff.

The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map in contrast to Duff's map, shows all tributaries associated with the Gitsiis as being used for fisheries resources. Of those areas identified and mapped by Duff (as based on information derived from Beynon and in turn various Tsimshian informants), Baker Inlet, Grenville Channel is where *Haimas* obtained salmon from the Salmon River. This is now Kitkatla territory. There is a eulachon fishing village at Red Bluff (n.o. 14) which is in the Nisga'a or overlap area and which is not identified on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map. A place identified as I3 by Duff is a hunting and fishing area in Ecstall River: "There was a fish house at the mouth of the creek." This place is shown on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map as Gitzaxlaal not Gitsiis. Duff identified another fishing place as III 3, *Klaxmaxl* which is at the head of the Work Channel (and not the entire channel as shown on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map). The place identified as IV2 *ksamktahi* (Union Inlet and Union Lake) was used for hunting and salmon fishing by the Killerwhale House of the Gitsiis. This is an inlet and lake located off the mouth of the Work Channel and Portland Inlet and is included in a much larger area shown on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

Duff marked VIII on his map for *kwidzi'skat*, which was a tributary of the Khyex River which was used for fishing (and hunting goats, beaver, bear, marten and groundhog). It is not as illustrated on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map, which includes the entire Khyex River. The Wolf clan segment of the Gitsiis had exclusive rights only over *kwidzi'skat*, which was used for fishing and hunting.

Duff summarized the Gitsiis territory as being located on the Skeena River, with the Khyex River being mostly the property of the Raven clan segment. The Wolf and Killerwhale clan segments each owned a tributary. The Kasiks and Exchamsiks Rivers belonged to the royal ganha'da or Raven clan. This clan played a major role in the Gitsiis moving into the Work Channel area. The activities of the notorious outlaw leader *Haimas*, resulted in the acquisition of Khutzeymateen and Hidden Inlet, but the net loss by compensation was the Exchamsiks River.⁸¹⁹

Gitwalksabae

"In early times" the Gitwalksabae were subjects of Legaic of the Gispaxlo'ots. There was a second group called the *gispax'o'l*. The Gitwalksabae appear to have broken away from the Gispaxlo'ots and jointed the Gispax'o'ol, to then form the Gitando. The Gitando were also formerly a part of the Gispaxlo'ots. The Gitwalksabae were mostly divided between

⁸¹⁹ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 66.

the Gilitss'aaw and the Gispaxlo'ots. Although the Gitwalksabae were described as "more or less" independent they were also "mostly under the chieftainship of Legex [Legaic] and Niesawe. They had no chief of their own. These later left the village and divided themselves between the two tribes." Duff provided no map or information about marine territorial use by these groups.⁸²⁰ However, Beynon stated that the entire frontage on the Klaxkels [Lakelse River] up to Zimacord was formerly occupied by the Gitwalksabae. The Gitwalksabae passed this to the Gispaxlo'ots.⁸²¹

The Gitwalksabae were a local group or "tribe" at Metlakatla whose village adjoined the Gilitss'aaw with whom they were allies. The chief of the Gitwalksabae was a brother of the Gilitss'aaw chief. The Gitwalksabae were never large and were more a branch of the Gilitss'aaw. A surviving group under *Nishus* had a place in what became Gilitss'aaw territory. According to Beynon, the Gitwalksabae became extinct but the reason given in the tradition has a supernatural connection: "Some Gitwalksabae male youths were torturing dogs despite cautions by the elders of the tribe. The chief in fear moved to the Nass." There is a supernatural element to the narrative where the dogs apparently spoke to the youth who then dropped dead: "thus the whole tribe became extinct. The only ones to escape extinction were at the Nass River when it happened and they became Gilitss'aaw." ⁸²²

Since the Gitwalksabae appear in the HBC records on June 18, 1863,⁸²³ and were reported by Duncan in 1867, their extinction as a group appears to have occurred some time after these dates. Their marine use territories are absent from the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

Gitwilgyoots

Wilson Duff prepared a map which shows the Gitwilgyoots Territories.⁸²⁴ The Gitwilgyoots old villages were on the Skeena River, a short distance from the Gitsiis and marked by Duff on a map as No. 2. *laxtsuwanam ta'adszp*. This village is on the north side of the Skeena River, north and east of the Khtada River. The Gitwilgyoots moved from the locations marked by Duff as No. 2 to No. 3, which is across from the Khtada River but still on the north shore of the Skeena River. They had a eulachon village at No. 4. *t's'tsap* on the Nass River, but after a fight with the Gispaxlo'ots, moved across the Nass River to the opposite side to *laxte'ex*, which is marked as No. 5 on Duff's map.

The Gitwilgyoots occupied in common a number of villages or camps on Stephens Island and the northern tip of Porcher Island. Some villages were located off the north end of Stephens Island for hunting sea otters, and *laxkmangulap*, meaning "on spruce saplings" another island off Stephens Island was used by all the Gitwilgyoots to gather seaweed. Another village was on Stephens Island called *txaski nt* which Duff marked as No. 10. This is where the Gitwilgyoots gathered sea foods, herring eggs and seaweed and fished for halibut.

⁸²⁰ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 40, file 32.

⁸²¹ Beynon notes, B-F 418.2

⁸²² American Museum of Natural History, Papers of Philip Drucker, Box 7, folder 5, Ethnical and Geographical Study of the Tsemsiyan Nation by William Beynon vol. V, pp. 4-5, 8.

⁸²³ HBCA B. 201/a/9. Fort Simpson (Nass) Post Journal 1863-1866, June 18, 1863.

⁸²⁴ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 40, file 57.

An island northwest of Stephens Island marked as no. 11, *laxspasu'nt* was used during the summer for seaweed and fishing. According to Duff: "Between here and Dundas Islands was the best area for gathering seaweed and for hunting seals." Duff marked another general area for hunting and fishing as no. 12, which was on the south end of Stephens Island called *kgaxki'n*. Salmon was harvested at *tsemkunene't* meaning "place of mallards" which was on the north shore of Porcher Island. There was no creek at this location which was described as located on the Kitkatla "frontier." The Gitwilgyoots used a creek on the north shore of Porcher Island for sockeye salmon fishing and the gathering of herring eggs which Duff marked as No. 13. Another fishing location which Duff marked was No. 15, *kwoganxskixk*, meaning "place of eagles" which was used for fishing sockeye, humpback and coho salmon. It is also located on the north shore of Porcher Island. Seaweed was gathered at *wilaspaskage't*, which Duff marked as no. 17 on the map and is located on the north west shore of Porcher Island.

The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map shows a much larger area of marine territory surrounding Stephens Island, including a cluster of islands in Edye Passage which are not shown on Duff's map. In addition, the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map shows all of the marine area around Smith Island, De Horsey Island and Kennedy island, Telegraph Passage, including the east shore of Porcher Island to Ogden Passage as used by the Gitwilgyoots for fishing resources. This extent is also unsupported by Duff's findings. Duff stated that Kennedy Island, Smith Island and De Horsey Island, based on information obtained from Wallace in 1926: "were the common property of all the Tsimshian tribes," as presumably was the coastal area in the vicinity of Metlakatla farther north. Duff's information from 1915, however, indicates that a number of Houses claimed territory on the north bank of the river at its mouth, and even perhaps the islands named. There is some inconsistency in information on the location of the boundary between Gitwilgyoots territory and the "common" territory to the north which is indicated on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map as "owned jointly by all plaintiff tribes."

Duff indicates that most Gitwilgyoots villages or campsites on the Khtada River were used for hunting (and not marine resources as indicated on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map). Kumealon Inlet and lake (marked as III 1) was used for fishing (hunting and berry picking). This location is south of the Skeena River and is marked as being used by the Gitwilgyoots on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map. The creek opposite Kennedy Island had fish houses. Marked as VI on Duff's map, this creek appears to correspond with the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map, although the area of use on Duff's map shows a much smaller area. *Ksa'i.* or the McNeil River was used for fishing, (hunting and berry picking) and is marked as VII2 on Duff's map. This area is marked as the McNeil River on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map to include the entire tributary, whereas Duff marks it as a major part of the river, but not all of the river.

The location of XV which is marked by Duff as an island north of Stephens Islands is identified by Duff as used for seal hunting: "a seal rock north of Stephens Island, first found and claimed by way of this house. No one may go there without the consent of this house [Wolf clan]." The island is called *lax'ampxan* meaning, "island without trees."

Duff does not provide information corresponding to the areas marked on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map at Fork Creek or to an adjacent unnamed creek

on the opposite shore. In fact, Duff limited the fisheries areas used by the Gitwilgyoots when compared to that shown on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map. The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map, for example shows the southern side of the Skeena River including the Khtada River as used by the Gitwilgyoots which is not supported by the Duff findings.⁸²⁵

Gitzaxlaal

The Gitzaxlaal occupied the Ecstall River. According to Allaire, they originally came from Dundas Island but had no territories on the Skeena River.⁸²⁶

The Gitzaxlaal had one winter village at Metlakatla and their main summer village was at the junction of Ecstall River and Big Falls Creek which Wilson Duff has marked as No. 2 on his map. Spoksut was another village at Port Essington and located at the mouth of the Ecstall River (marked as no. 3 on Duff's map). Although the entire length of the Ecstall River is depicted as within the Gitzaxlaal area on both the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map and that prepared by Duff, Duff does not provide sufficient information to indicate that all of the Ecstall River was used by the Gitzaxlaal for fishing purposes.

The Gitzaxlaal also used a creek for sockeye salmon fishing in Pearce Inlet (canal) which is north of Portland Canal. This site, which Duff identifies as I4 on his map or *tkwa'a'ots* meaning "small wild carrots," is "now used by the Tlingit...." This site is not marked on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

The Scotia River or *tkutsi'on* meaning "small river" was a tributary off the Skeena River which was used for fishing (and berry station) and marked as I3 on Duff's map. This map shows the Gitzaxlaal territory to extend between Ecstall River and the Scotia River but is contiguous with the Skeena River only at mouths of those two tributaries. At a tributary running northeast from the Ecstall River, Big Falls Creek, was a place probably used for sockeye salmon. This is marked by Duff with the Roman Numeral III. This area was formerly territory associated with a Raven clan, but was given to the Killerwhale clan as a compensation payment. There is no mention of the usage of this tributary for fishing.

The Windsor River and the Ayton River are marked as fisheries sites on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map but there is no supporting references in Duff to these locations being used as fishing sites.

Duff also stated that there was a territory on the east side of Ecstall River that belonged to the Gitsiis called *ksa'odza*. This is not marked on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map. The territory was evidently given up by the Gitzaxlaal when one of them killed a white man. In retaliation the white man killed a Gitsiis. The Gitsiis were compensated by the Gitzaxlaal with this territory.

The Gitzaxlaal also had a eulachon fishing area which Duff identified on his map at Red Bluff (No. 4.). This location is not indicated as belonging to the Gitzaxlaal on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.

⁸²⁵ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 57.

⁸²⁶ Allaire, Louis, A Native Mental Map of Coast Tsimshian Villages, in *The Tsimshian, Images of the Past: Views for the Present*, ed. Margaret Seguin, (Vancouver: UBC Press), 1984, p. 93.

Duff also identified a number of villages or campsites on coastal areas that were used by the Gitzaxlaal. The Dundas Islands were used by all the Gitzaxlaal in common. Duff noted that he could only provide an approximate location based on the crude sketch map found in the Barbeau/Beynon field notes. One village or campsite called *ksgaxtet* and identified by Duff as no. 5 on his map, was apparently destroyed by the *wudste* [Tlingit?]. A camp called *laskwilwa't*, meaning “on where yellow cedar” which Duff marked as no. 6 on his map, was used to gather seaweed [*xagas*]. It is located at the southern end of Dundas Island. Clams were dug from a site called *'maxtndzagop* meaning “through waves” and marked as no. 8 on the Dundas Islands. It appears to be on the west side of Dunira Island. *Tkwildamlentk* meaning “ready canoe bow” and marked as No. 11 by Duff, was a village used to obtain sea foods and hunting and was used “recently by all the Tsimshian.” The fishing village of *wiluga'nis* meaning “where in dog salmon” was used only for dog salmon by the Gitzaxlaal and marked as No. 12 on Duff's map. It is located on the north inlet of Dundas Island.

Another fishing village, *xpe'ldo* meaning “deep precipice” was used for sockeye, dog salmon and humpback salmon, which were caught in traps. It is marked by Duff as No. 13 and is located on the east coast of Dundas Island. Duff identified *Laxki'i* or Green Island as no. 14 on his map and located it off the east coast of Dundas Island. It was used for halibut, (seals and gull eggs). Another camp for seaweed gathering was *lax'wnagago'k* which is marked by Duff as No. 15 and located on the northern tip of what appears to be Baron Island. *Laxtsemheoes* meaning “on in stumps” which is No. 17 on Duff's map, was a hunting and fishing village located off the southeastern coast of Dundas Island.

Duff identified no. 18 on his map for a fishing station which was used to catch humpbacks, steelhead trout and dog salmon. This station was called *ksago'tsa*, meaning “waters of fluid taken from the bladder of a porcupine” and was located on the southeast coast of Dundas Island. Duff identifies other villages or camps in the Dundas Islands, but these are either unrelated to marine resources or restricted to sea mammals. Duff also identifies but does not appear to show on his map an area marked as 15, *samknaho'n* meaning “place of salmon” to the south of Dundas Island as an area reserved for the Royal House for fishing and berries.

Comparison of Duff's maps with Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map

By comparing Duff's locations for fisheries resources with that of the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map, a much larger area of marine and land area is depicted in the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map as being attributed to fisheries use by the Gitzaxlaal than described by Duff's ethnographic sources.⁸²⁷ By comparing Duff's map with other sources, some areas in the Dundas Island group, which are attributed to the Gitzaxlaal would have been used or owned by the Tlingit during the precontact or protocontact period.

There seems to be inconsistencies concerning the depiction of areas for fishing resources and those areas identified on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map which includes other than fisheries resources like hunting, berry picking, campsites.

⁸²⁷ UBC, Museum of Anthropology, Wilson Duff fonds. Series 13, Tsimshian files, Box 41, file 62.

The Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map is misleading if it intends to represent a precontact or contact period of use. The geographical areas on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map includes not only fishing areas but includes other uses like hunting, gathering berries and other non fishing uses, when compared to the ethnographic descriptions provided in the Wilson Duff notes.

In all areas identified for fishing and associated with various named groups ("tribes") mentioned by Duff, there is no indication that the main stem of the Skeena River was used for fishing. This contrasts with various segments marked as points 1-9 on the Skeena River, which have been identified as used by various groups for fishing resources on the Lax Kw'alaams Fisheries Resource Site Map.