

8

Meanings of Mobility on the Northwest Coast

Paige Raibmon

414f3560f04fda98c19f30ee36292a3b
ebrary

Colonial situations are riven with contradiction and irony. Rhetoric and practice pull in opposite directions. Colonizers produce the circumstances that they decry. These so-called “tensions of empire” are characteristic of colonial settings around the world, and the Northwest Coast is no exception.¹ Testament to this can be found in the swirling diversity of meanings that accrued to various manifestations of movement on the late nineteenth-century Northwest Coast. In the decades following British Columbia’s entrance into Confederation, Aboriginal mobility became a marker of both colonial oppression and Indigenous resistance.² From the perspective of newcomers, the colonial era had ended, but for Aboriginal people it was entering a new and more intense phase.³ Aboriginal people engaged in new patterns of mobility, sometimes with volition, sometimes under duress. Skip Ray’s early and mid-career research emphasizes how, for two centuries, Aboriginal movement and migrations constituted a central characteristic of the fur trade in Rupert’s Land.⁴ On the Pacific Coast, too, after commerce in furs had ceased being the central point of contact between Native and newcomer, Aboriginal mobility became the vehicle for a range of activities as diverse as the seasonal round, feasting, wage labour, residential schooling, political protest, and flight from violence and the law. Aboriginal migrants and colonial observers attributed very different meanings to such activities. To many colonial observers, the movements of Aboriginal people seemed constant and ubiquitous. Colonial rhetoric cited Aboriginal mobility as justification for the appropriation of Aboriginal land. Missionaries and government officials juxtaposed stereotypes of shiftless, wandering Indians against an idealized image of civilized, sedentary farmers.⁵ Such evaluations of Aboriginal mobility were disingenuous on at least two counts. First, they overlooked the fact that colonialism had physically displaced, that is *moved*, Aboriginal people; and second, they ignored the highly mobile lives of the newcomers themselves. For Aboriginal people seasonal mobility was a means

414f3560f04fda98c19f30ee36292a3b
ebrary

to survival and an assertion of inherent rights. Aboriginal people shared some of their understandings of mobility with the McKenna McBride Royal Commission of 1913-16. They reported on forced displacements and expressed a fierce attachment to their territories. Their testimony suggests that they enacted this attachment, at least in part, through movement. The commissioners were ill-prepared to understand these mobile expressions of ownership and title; eighty years later, non-Aboriginal British Columbians have still not done enough to open their minds and ears to meanings of mobility that differ from their expectations. Given its prominence in both Aboriginal lives and colonial imaginations, mobility deserves historical analysis in its own right. In the spirit of initiating such analysis, this chapter offers an introductory commentary on Aboriginal mobility at the turn of the twentieth century.

Long before the arrival of Europeans on the Northwest Coast, Aboriginal people had – through their seasonal mobility – turned the 1,600-kilometre stretch of coastline between Puget Sound and the Gulf of Alaska into a maritime region. Aboriginal people traversed this region in their annual migrations to their fishing, sealing, and berrying grounds: they circulated through winter villages and summer camps to attend important gatherings and feasts, and they transported goods and slaves along trading networks that ran the length of the coast. By the late nineteenth century, international boundaries trifurcated this long-standing region into British Columbia and the American-owned territories of Alaska and Washington to the north and south, respectively. Still other colonial lines appeared that parsed the Indigenous world further still into Indian agencies, reservations (in Washington), and reserves (in British Columbia).

With the proliferation of colonial lines that were supposed to contain human movement, some patterns of Indigenous mobility expanded rather than contracted. From at least the 1850s, Aboriginal people from British Columbia and Alaska (then Russian America) had been travelling to Puget Sound, where they earned cash working in sawmills, in the sex trade, and at a variety of other occupations. In subsequent decades, opportunities for wage labour increased. Aboriginal people continued to travel far beyond the boundaries of their traditional territories to earn money at canneries, logging camps, fishing and sealing stations, hop and berry fields, and even world's fairs. Some crossed the Pacific on sealing expeditions to Japan and Hawaii.⁶ The movements of Nuu-chah-nulth from the west coast of Vancouver Island offer just one example. Many Nuu-chah-nulth, who had long hunted fur seals for food, began to work in the commercial pelagic seal hunt that took them on winter journeys from the Pribilof Islands to California.⁷ Then, in early summer, Nuu-chah-nulth families fanned out, moving between familial gatherings, hereditary fishing sites, and wage work

in Victoria, New Westminster, Steveston, and/or Washington Territory.⁸ The diaries of a Tsimshian man, Arthur Wellington Clah, describe a comparable pattern of movement on the north coast.⁹

This expanding circle of movement poses a bit of a paradox. Certainly colonial rhetoric promised the reverse. Lines on the map showed Aboriginal people relegated to an ever-shrinking land base. And colonial rhetoricians equated civilization with idealized images of sedentary yeoman farmers following agrarian lifestyles.¹⁰ Rural landownership was the cornerstone of the resettlement of British Columbia, and colonial land policy attempted to tie settlers to their pre-emptions by requiring continuous residence.¹¹ Missionaries and government officials, in turn, cited highly visible instances of Aboriginal mobility as evidence of the need for state and church intervention in Aboriginal lives. The deputy superintendent general for Indian affairs captured this sentiment in his annual report for 1898:

Cultivation of the soil necessitates remaining in one spot, and then exerts an educational influence of a general character. It keeps prominently before the mind the relation of cause and effect, together with the dependence upon a higher power. It teaches moreover the necessity for systematic work at the proper season, for giving attention to detail, and patience in waiting for results. It inculcates furthermore the idea of individual proprietorship, habits of thrift, a due sense of the value of money, and the importance of its investment in useful directions.¹²

Civilized Indians were to be sedentary ones. The Indian agent among the Cowichan, for example, believed that migratory labour encouraged improvidence and that agriculture was preferable to what he termed the "precarious help which may or may not be obtained from outside sources," such as hop field or cannery labour.¹³ The Indian agent from the west coast of Vancouver Island agreed, going so far as to express satisfaction when a smallpox outbreak in Victoria induced many Nuuchahnulth to refrain from travelling to work in the hop fields and canneries, despite the fact that they would be significantly poorer for the lack of wages. Financially, he admitted, they would be significantly worse off, but morally, he believed them much improved for staying closer to home.¹⁴ Wage-induced mobility was one thing. Such proponents of sedentarist ideology found mobility associated with the gatherings they called "potlatches" still more egregious. The missionary among the Kwakwaka'wakw decried travels that drew people away "for the purpose of receiving blankets," as he put it.¹⁵ He criticized the participants for the opportunity cost of such events: "Have they (say 200 able men among them) earned or produced \$2 per day, i.e. 1 cent per man during this stay? I believe not."¹⁶

Missionaries and government officials opposed Aboriginal mobility for practical as well as ideological reasons. Indian agents had difficulty inspecting their wards; teachers and missionaries had trouble filling schoolrooms and church pews.¹⁷ In order to keep pace with those they sought to administer, some agents and missionaries followed in the migratory wake of their Aboriginal charges.¹⁸ Colonial officials designed residential schools and boarding schools as an antidote for the uncivilized migrations of Aboriginal people. But the practice of removing children from their families in order to send them to school created a new circuit of Aboriginal mobility, one that became the most traumatic and disruptive force in the lives of many Aboriginal families across several generations.¹⁹ This was only one of the ways in which colonial practice engendered the Aboriginal movement that colonial rhetoric condemned.

Pro-agrarian rhetoric aside, colonial authorities enlisted Indian land policy in the cause of supporting the nascent capitalist economy and, in so doing, facilitated expanded patterns of Aboriginal migration. It was no accident that, as Aboriginal people entered the new economy, they overwhelmingly did so not as bosses but as workers. While pre-emption regulations tried to fix settlers to the land, Indian land policy worked in the opposite direction. Government officials in British Columbia implemented a reserve policy that relegated Aboriginal people to ever smaller and less arable pieces of land, with the explicit design of propelling Aboriginal people into the workforce and marketplace.²⁰ This policy served the interests of immigrants by opening up much of the province to non-Aboriginal pre-emption. Land was available for pre-emption as long as it was not a designated Indian reserve and did not contain "Indian improvements." This latter condition could be overcome if the said improvements had been "abandoned." Differential meanings of mobility produced conflicts over the definition of "abandoned," however, as the colonial discourse of mobility supported the interpretation of seasonal absences as abandonment.

Storekeepers and small businesspeople likewise benefited from the integration of Aboriginal people into the cash economy. Taken together, the cycles of labour and gift-giving were good for business. Labour provided the wages necessary to purchase the large amount of goods to be distributed at feasts. The fall conclusion of the hop season in Puget Sound, for example, was like an early Christmas for storeowners, when thousands of Aboriginal workers from the length of the Pacific coast began to spend their earnings.²¹ When it suited their bottom line, businesspeople intervened on behalf of their Aboriginal customers. In 1887, storekeepers in Nanaimo opposed the efforts of the Indian agent to evict an encampment of Lekwiltok and send them home to Cape Mudge.²² Whether Aboriginal customers bought goods for give-aways or for personal use made little difference to businesspeople who put their money in their cash registers.

Not least, government land policy bequeathed to the resource industry the gift of a large, mobile, and flexible labour force. The highly seasonal, resource-based economy depended upon migrant workers. As one reporter explained when the hops were almost ready to harvest: "The question of questions with the hop growers is, Will enough come? If so, will they arrive in time?"²³ One Washington hop farmer tried to answer this question by offering pickers two dollars "booty" (the equivalent of two days' wages) if they arrived by 1 September as well as by offering Indian agents a commission if they sent their wards to his farm.²⁴ Such expenses were worth this farmer's while: he had lost over a thousand dollars the previous year because he lacked the workers to begin the harvest on time. Fish canneries faced similar difficulties in securing enough labour at the right time. Canneries sometimes took proactive steps in order to secure enough workers for the coming season by effectively contracting them months in advance. In 1895, they distributed food and goods to families as an advance against their wages for the coming season.²⁵

Land policy was only one arm of the colonial law that helped fuel Aboriginal mobility. Many Aboriginal people found that they *had* to move around to find work because on-reserve economic opportunities were frequently denied them. When some Squamish who preferred not to go to work in the city established a gravel business on their reserve, officials quickly shut it down. In the words of Chief Mathias Joseph: "Just like that as if I was stealing my own gravel to make a living."²⁶ In this and other instances, the need to make a living facilitated inter-reserve and off-reserve mobility among the Squamish.²⁷ The gravel on the Squamish reserve was only one of many resources to which colonial policies restricted Aboriginal access. Aboriginal people were also forbidden from logging their reserves and selling the timber. This restriction eliminated what might otherwise have been potentially viable and profitable on-reserve businesses for many reserve communities. Aboriginal people throughout the province voiced their frustration about this policy to the McKenna McBride Commission.²⁸ Understandably, some Aboriginal people came to feel completely hamstrung, as though all options *except* migrant wage labour were futile. In the words of a Cowichan man, John Elliot:

The white people tell us that we Indians do not till the land, that we are a class of people who will not work. Now, if we were to go to work and grow stuff on our lands, we would not be able to find a proper market for our produce. The white men will not buy from us ... Besides, if we cultivate the land, where are we going to keep our cattle. There is not enough land on the Reserves, and no man with a small piece of land can make a decent living out of it. Then again, if our land is fenced in to keep the cattle off the roads, white people very often come down on fishing expeditions, climb over and break our fences, and, when spoken to, they say we have no right

here. It pays the Indians better to go fishing in the Fraser River, where they can some times make 600 or 700 dollars in a season, then it would to stay at home and try to farm the small pieces of land which they have. The land is altogether too small.²⁹

Aboriginal people confronted an accumulation of policies and practices that discouraged farming and restricted on-reserve businesses and resource harvesting. These policies and practices directly contradicted colonial rhetoric, which held that civilization would settle Aboriginal people permanently. But if this made colonial rhetoricians uneasy, it appeased investors, boosters, and industrial capitalists who worried about keeping much-needed seasonal workers close at hand. Non-Aboriginal bosses did not want to see their flexible labour force turn into an independent merchant class.

Employers received an addition to their potential employment rolls when, regardless of policy or the law, settlers took action to displace Aboriginal people directly. As John Elliot continued, "The white people come on our lands and shoot, telling us we have no title to the land. It is hardly likely then that the Indians will go to work and till the land."³⁰ White squatters in the Nass Valley attempted to drive Nisga'a inhabitants from their land at gunpoint.³¹ An Ahousaht man, Joe Didian Sr., faced threats first from a white settler and later from an Indian agent, who, rather than offering him protection, simply warned him that settlers were coming to burn down his house.³² The Indian agent passed on the same message to Kelsomaht chief Charlie Johnnie's community, where people fled (or, to use the term from the pre-emption legislation, "abandoned") their village of thirteen houses.³³ Johnnie's community was forced to relocate to an unprotected site that was prone to rough and treacherous water. This, in turn, hampered fishing efforts and required community members to make yet more migrations in order to make a living.³⁴

In some instances, Aboriginal people relied upon mobility to escape the threat of physical violence; yet, in other instances, mobility increased their vulnerability to violent displacement. Returning from fishing, wage work, or ceremonial events, Aboriginal people might find their houses occupied by white squatters who claimed to have pre-empted their land. In 1912, an Ahousaht man on Vargas Island returned home to find a white man, Mr. Hopkins, occupying his house.³⁵ Josephus, also an Ahousaht, was likewise displaced from his house and garden by a white settler.³⁶ Clearing land on the dense rainforest of Vancouver Island's west coast was (and is) no easy feat. From the settlers' perspective, the appeal of pre-emptions that included a standing house and clearing is easy to understand.³⁷ Aboriginal homeowners had further reason to worry that their houses might be entirely destroyed in their absence, as was the case with several Muchalaht houses

along the Gold River sometime in the early twentieth century.³⁸ The perpetrators of such destruction may have been vandals, squatters, or even settlers in search of accessible firewood. The latter was the case on Haida Gwaii, where immigrants saw, in seasonally vacant homes, the fuel they needed to keep their own houses warm.³⁹

Those inclined towards violent displacement were perhaps emboldened by the fact that, in British Columbia, pre-emptors could often precede surveyors by many years.⁴⁰ There was plenty of time to entrench and benefit from one's fraudulent claim before anyone finally, if ever, came to restore the legal order. This state of affairs has been aptly termed by one scholar as the "short arm of the law."⁴¹ It meant not only that conflicts were more likely to occur but also that, when they did, the parties involved had little recourse to formal structures. Government officials tended to instruct settlers to resolve disputes on their own, a practice that must have encouraged settler violence even as it opened avenues for the exercise of Aboriginal power (as Carlson's chapter in this collection so aptly demonstrates).⁴² Indeed, confrontation was sometimes the only way a settler could get a surveyor out to the pre-emption in question.⁴³ When Aboriginal victims of the ensuing violence complained to authorities, some Indian agents pleaded impotence in the face of settler aggression.⁴⁴ Perhaps settlers felt justified in their actions because the law required them to inhabit their pre-emption continuously or else face losing it.⁴⁵ Regardless, once a house was torn down or occupied by a white squatter, it must have been difficult for the Aboriginal owner to regain possession.

Legally, settlers could not pre-empt Indian reserves or improvements unless the land had been "abandoned" by Aboriginal people. But in a colonial world where "abandonment" could be read into seasonal absences or affected through violence, some of the most desirable lands on the west coast seemed up for grabs. Debates dating to the 1860s between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people over the definition of "settlement" continued through the turn of the twentieth century.⁴⁶ In 1915, for example, the Chilliwack City Council attempted to acquire reserve lands that it claimed had not been continuously occupied in recent years.⁴⁷ Members of the Courtney Agricultural Society on Vancouver Island similarly sought access to land that the Cowichan used on a seasonal basis. Speaking for the society, a Mr. Cameron stated that the land in question was

of no use to the Indians at the present time ... I would just like to say that I think the reason the chief has taken up his residence on that land is because he hears that the Agricultural Society wants it and he is afraid that some one is trying to "jump" the place on him. He has previously lived there only at such times as he came down for fishing.⁴⁸

Cameron missed the mark on at least two counts. First, he judged land used in service of the Aboriginal fishery to be “of no use to the Indians.” This is a critical error. Reserves throughout British Columbia were laid out to provide access to the fishery. It was a gross distortion to deny the legitimacy of reserve lands linked to fisheries; such a claim implicitly questioned the status of almost all of British Columbia’s coastal reserves.⁴⁹ Second, Cameron erred in casting the chief’s actions as opportunism. Settlers vying for land had long used this charge against Aboriginal people who took action in response to White encroachment.⁵⁰ If, as Cameron suggested, the chief had in fact recently taken up permanent residence on land previously used on a seasonal basis, then his actions seem better understood as a wise strategy to retain land rights threatened by the colonial regime. Repeatedly confronted with powerful non-Aboriginal judgments about land use, occupancy, and ownership, there can be little doubt that many Aboriginal people came to understand the vulnerability of unattended land. They built structures such as houses and fences and buried their dead, marking their ownership of the land in a language that colonizers understood.⁵¹ Colonialism increased the vulnerability of unattended lands, villages, and houses to an extent that must have given many Aboriginal people pause before departing on seasonal journeys. And once one was the victim of settler violence, seasonal wage migration and its attendant vulnerability became even more difficult to avoid. Lost property needed to be replaced, and that required some cash. People pushed off sites to which they had hereditary rights likely travelled to relatives who would agree to share their access. But if the displaced lacked this option, the wage economy might have been their only alternative.

These circumstances may seem explanation enough for why Aboriginal people incorporated migrant wage labour into their pre-existing trajectories of mobility. But if there was plenty of “push” behind much Aboriginal mobility, there was often a fair degree of “pull” too. The “prestige economy” on the Northwest Coast, in which elite status rested on the dual axes of heredity *and* wealth, predisposed coastal peoples to enter the wage economy.⁵² As one scholar argues, while the journeys of migrant workers were not without their perils, they were generally quicker and less risky avenues to wealth acquisition than were the three pre-existing options of manufacturing, trading, or raiding.⁵³ Through their incorporation into the capitalist economy, Aboriginal workers fed their own Indigenous economy of wealth distribution at events known in the colonial world as “potlatches” (but known more properly by Indigenous names among each First Nation).

In addition to facilitating the acquisition of wealth and prestige, labour migrations provided opportune locations for Indigenous gatherings. Labour camps were common settings for visits with extended kin, feasts, and gambling. These were old activities, but in the late nineteenth century they

were under new threat. Governments and missionaries attempted to suppress the potlatch in Canada and the United States. By combining Indigenous agendas with capitalist ones, Aboriginal migrants could perpetuate traditional practices while shielding themselves somewhat from the prying eyes of missionaries and Indian agents. This was true at canneries and hop fields alike, where workers incorporated feasts and gambling matches into their journeys.⁵⁴ Several times during the season of 1899, for example, Tsimshian Arthur Wellington Clah and his fellow workers at the Rivers Inlet cannery boarded steamers, taking their canoes in tow, and headed off to feasts, weddings, and other social gatherings.⁵⁵ Clah subsequently travelled from Rivers Inlet to the Washington hop fields, where one hundred people attended a Coast Salish feast held on the Hayes hop farm.⁵⁶ Labour camps likewise drew people together to play slahal and other gambling games.⁵⁷ Similar factors drew Aboriginal people to the hop yards north of the border in the Fraser Valley.⁵⁸ Gatherings that combined labour with Indigenous priorities were especially significant for Coast Salish elites who relied on intervillage audiences to legitimate their positions of privilege.⁵⁹ For the Coast Salish, travel had always been a prerequisite for maintaining high-status intervillage ties. Wage labour added a new variation to the trajectory of that age-old travel.

In some instances, Aboriginal travellers truly combined labour with cultural gatherings; at other times, they used labour merely as a pretense for travel. In early twentieth-century Washington, Indian agents attempted to prevent Aboriginal people from leaving their reservations unless they could produce proof of employment. Chief Squiquoi, or Billy Barlow, did not let this stand in the way of his desire to host a give-away feast in April 1904 on Whidbey Island. He simply distributed “jobs” as gifts and paid guests “wages” for their participation in the mortuary feast, putting them to work preparing the body, cooking, gathering fuel, and drawing water.⁶⁰ The roughly four hundred guests who attended likely included relatives from British Columbia, as Barlow was cousin to Charlie Wilson from Kuper Island in the Gulf of Georgia.⁶¹

In the context of colonial attempts to control Indigenous people, mobility itself became an expression of opinion. Aboriginal people “voted with their feet” for a variety of reasons. Some fled to avoid prosecution by the law. In 1884, for example, a group of Kyuquot confronted the local priest Father Nicolaye after he forcibly confined two pupils who had been absent from school. Some sixty community members entered the priest’s house and restrained him while they released the students. By the time the Indian agent reached Kyuquot, the so-called “ringleaders” and many others were conveniently away at the Washington hop fields.⁶² In other instances, international flight provided safety for those who fled charges ranging from

intoxication to murder.⁶³ Others fled the Church rather than the state. Squamish chief Simon Baker writes that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a time when “the church, you might as well say, ran the reserve ... The priests were in control ... Those who didn’t want to accept that environment left the community. A lot of them moved to the States.”⁶⁴ And still others, such as the Tsimshian followers of William Duncan, sought increased political freedom within the Christian faith by migrating from British Columbia to Alaska in 1887 (the subject of Neylan’s chapter in this volume). Yet, many such migrants no doubt learned, as did the Tsimshian, that their rights were not necessarily better protected on the other side of the border.⁶⁵

Migratory patterns that arose in the colonial context were not always an easy fit with Indigenous priorities and values. In the mid-1880s, a Nuuchah-nulth chief struggled to find guests to attend his daughter’s puberty feast. When he and his emissaries went to various villages and to the Steveston canneries to deliver the invitations, the Songhees, Saanich, and Cowichan declined his invitation because they were on their way to the hop fields.⁶⁶ These refusals were a significant insult.⁶⁷ In this instance, the mobility necessitated by the wage economy interfered with the traditional order. This Nuuchah-nulth chief was not the only one to confront such difficulties. A decade later, Kwakwaka’wakw chiefs noted a different sort of disruption to their way of life when they complained to the Indian agent that women from their communities travelled to Victoria for “illegitimate purposes,” implying that the women found work there as prostitutes.⁶⁸ Some of these women may well have worked in Victoria’s sex trade, but others likely worked at a variety of other pursuits such as cleaning houses or washing clothes. Regardless, these Kwakwaka’wakw men were unhappy about the women’s journeys and they sought a way to control them.⁶⁹

Aboriginal mobility in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the product of a concatenation of individual agency and structural coercion. The complexity of factors that shaped Aboriginal movement was rarely visible to non-Aboriginal observers. Colonial rhetoric about shiftless, wandering, uncivilized Indians was readily available and politically expedient. Few non-Aboriginal people had reason or motivation to look beyond this explanatory framework. The gulf between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal understandings of mobility was particularly apparent with regard to the all-important land question. Testimony from the McKenna McBride Commission is replete with examples of the inability or unwillingness of non-Aboriginal officials to hear what Aboriginal people were saying. Individual witnesses came from dozens of different First Nations from all corners of the province. Although they did not conspire at the time to present a unified front, read today, their testimony evinces a remarkable commonality of voice.

Again and again, Aboriginal witnesses to the McKeanna McBride Commission articulated notions of land and resource rights that were associated with mobility rather than negated by it. They testified that seasonal or even lengthier absences did nothing to alter their Indigenous title to the land. "How long is it since anyone lived in that house?" asked one of the commissioners. "Every year that man lives there. He lives there every year – he goes there for a part of the year," replied the Ahousaht witness.⁷⁰ A Klahoose witness offered a similar answer when asked whether there was "any person living there [on IR 9] all the year round?" "Yes. There are six people living there but they all come over here [to Squirrel Cove] in the winter time."⁷¹ Or, as Captain Jack, a "subchief" of the Mowachaht said, "What we have we want to keep, because we use them all the year round – perhaps not all the year, but sometimes there are families on them and at times the whole tribe frequent the one place."⁷² Witnesses repeatedly insisted that they lived on "every" reserve,⁷³ that they had more than one "home,"⁷⁴ and that they had "interest" in more than one reserve.⁷⁵ Such replies were as common as they were unintelligible to commissioners who conceived of residency in the singular.

The testimony of Chief Kieteer from Ahousaht typifies the point of view that confused commissioners even as it seemed commonsensical to the witnesses. Kieteer explained: "We stay all round these islands all the time; there are several houses on this side of the island where we stay out there for about two months in the year."⁷⁶ To the commissioners' ears this was an inherently contradictory statement: "all the time" did not mean the same thing as "two months in the year." But for Kieteer and other Indigenous witnesses who made similar pleadings, the phrases were not incongruous. Both phrases expressed the permanence of Aboriginal occupation: "two months in the year" meant two months *every* year; "all the time" did not mean every day of the year but every year since time immemorial. Entrenched over countless generations, to the Indigenous witnesses, these patterns of mobility were anything but signs of itinerancy.

Chiefs who spoke to the commission embedded their words within a much longer and deeper chronology than did either commissioners or settlers. As chief Sam from Semihamoo stated: "I got the land from my mother. If I did not have the land I would have nothing to eat or make my living out of. My people lived here all the time and I was raised here, and I think I am going to be here all my life – I would not leave this place at all."⁷⁷ Josephus, an Ahousaht displaced by an illegal pre-emption, stressed the ancestral nature of his claim:

Q: How long have those houses been there?

A: It is a long time ago since those houses were built. My forefather's house, my father's house, and my house are all over there ...

Q: Have the Indians been using that place as long as you can remember?

A: Yes, when I first saw the day I saw the houses over there – there were houses there before I was born. All the places where the Indians used to go there used to be houses over there.⁷⁸

Michael Inspring from the Nass Valley, who had been threatened at gunpoint by a pre-emptor, spoke with similar force about Nisga'a ownership rooted in the passage of generations:

And we know that this land belongs to us and that they have put up houses and the houses have rotted away. Some of our people have even died at this place and have graves here and if you want to see the graves we can point them out to you – this is another reason why we know that this land belonged to the Indians from time immemorial.⁷⁹

Chief Harry Peters of the Sam-ah-quam band went into greater detail, sharing the story of his people's original migration, which gave them ownership of their territory. Peters first validated the story with an "oral footnote": "My great grandfather he was the Chief of this country and my father he was Chief after him and he is now close to 100 years old so he knows everything that was going on before." Peters then proceeded to point out what must have seemed obvious to him, namely, the fact that he was not the newcomer in the room: "There is one thing I know – I don't come from any other nation I don't come from China or Japan – I know I was born right here, that is what I know." This statement further validated the story that he went on to recount:

414f3560f04fda98c19f30ee36292a3b
ebrary A long time ago during the flood, my father he knew about it and he told me and it was [sic] been told from one generation to the other so that history would never be forgotten. My father he is over 100 years old, he told me, and then we tell the others. There is one high mountain where two canoes were tied up – they were from Pemberton and one of these canoes got loose and was lost – we don't know whether they were drowned or what happened – Just one canoe was saved and after the flood, these people that were saved they went back to Pemberton again and that is where we originated from – that is the reason why I think we ought to own a little of this place. My father he did not tell me whether we would rent this place to the Government or not – that is what my father tells me all the time – I don't say that I own the whole of BC – I only want a little of it.⁸⁰

Essentially, Peters was saying the same thing as the Gitksan elder on the other end of the twentieth century: "If this is your land, where are your stories?"⁸¹ All of these men spoke of inheritances passed down through clear

lines of descent, not through land deeds but through oral narratives. They spoke of inheritances stretching across vast spans of time, and herein lies a clue that can help us hear what the commissioners could not. With ownership so deeply entrenched across generations and through time, changing patterns of mobility were like waves on the surface of a bottomless sea. Constantly shifting, constantly there, waves do nothing to change the nature of the sea itself.

This long sense of history also shored up Indigenous confidence that their presence on the land stretched permanently into the future. When told that a village site with standing houses had been pre-empted by a white settler, Chief Kieteer responded in the manner that one would expect of someone who planned to return: he asked about the condition in which his land would be left once the pre-emptor was gone.

Is this man that made this application for this land going to go and pull down the houses? Because I don't want the houses to be taken down by this man, and we are not going to pull these houses down. We used to live there a long time ago and our descendants we leave will live there after us, and they will live there all the time and in the future.⁸²

Without agreeing to the legitimacy of the pre-emptor's claim, Kieteer understood that the settler might be there for a while. This was the position of a pragmatist, not a defeatist. Even as he admitted the possibility that his land would be occupied, Kieteer thought ahead to the day that his descendants would reclaim and reoccupy their territory. He believed that the settler would eventually leave and that the land would be restored to its rightful possessors.

Kieteer's belief was rooted in historical precedent. Generations earlier his relatives from Nootka Sound had weathered the storm of the Spanish military occupation of their traditional village at Yuquot. In the 1780s, led by Chief Maquinna, they abandoned the village site that they had occupied continuously for thousands of years and moved south to seek refuge in Clayoquot Sound. By 1795, the Spanish had withdrawn, and Maquinna and his community returned home.⁸³ Kieteer had good reason to believe his people would once again outlast the newcomers.

For many Aboriginal people who spoke before the McKenna McBride Commission, as for Chief Kieteer, it was the white newcomers who seemed transient. As another Nuu-chah-nulth chief, also displaced at the hands of a pre-emptor, said:

The Indian is not like the whiteman. The whiteman comes around here and buys a piece of land and puts a house on it, and after living in it for 4 or 5 years, he sells it and makes more money than what he paid for it. The Indians don't do that – they want to keep the land where their houses are.⁸⁴

Chief Taku Jack from northwestern British Columbia likewise told the commission:

This is my own country and I want to keep it. A white man comes to a creek and gets gold out of that creek after a while he leaves it ... but we are not like that – we stay here all the time because the land is ours. It is no good for us to move out of this place because this is our country. We gave the names to the places around here and these old names came from our old forefathers and they are just named the same to this day – I don't think you believe me when I tell you I belong to this place.⁸⁵

Peneleket chief Hulburtson concisely expressed a similar point: “An Indian will stay in one place all the time, and his gets it after him.”⁸⁶ This was a world in which seasonal movements were entirely consonant with staying “in one place all the time.”

These patterns of seasonal mobility and resource use were historically long-standing, but they were not timeless. Among the Nuu-chah-nulth, for example, year-round occupation of major villages was the norm prior to the arrival of European pathogens. Depopulation necessitated the amalgamation of localized, self-contained groups into larger confederacies whose territories could not be exploited from any single location. From the early days of contact, then, mobility marked Indigenous attempts to spread their thinned numbers across the landscape in order to survive.⁸⁷ Rather than nullifying ownership, mobility was the idiom through which Aboriginal people exercised their ownership. Wage labour had since altered Indigenous trajectories of movement, but it had not changed the age-old relationship to territory that was affirmed each year when people moved throughout their territory and exercised their hereditary rights.⁸⁸

These expressions of land rights – deeply rooted in time and place – should not be as unfamiliar as they perhaps are. Non-Aboriginal immigrants – from places as far-flung as Ireland and China, for example – often migrated to North America with the intention of securing and retaining title to their ancestral lands at home. Part of the meaning of their mobility lay in attachment to land to which they would not return for decades, land to which they would sometimes return only in death.⁸⁹

Mobility itself was part of life for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people alike in turn-of-the-century British Columbia. Most immigrants were recent arrivals. Once in British Columbia, many of them continued to lead highly mobile lives.⁹⁰ The trajectories of movement for many of these settlers and workers were not entirely dissimilar from Aboriginal ones. Many “farmers” participated in a mixed economy of subsistence agriculture, commercial agriculture, hunting, gathering, and “off-farm” wage work in the

resource and government sectors.⁹¹ White settlers might easily have empathized with the hard-working Cowichan who planted grain in the spring before leaving for work in the canneries, returning home to harvest the crop in the interval before the hop-picking season in Washington drew them away again.⁹² The Saltspring Island farmer relied on this mobility no less than did the Cowichan one. Of course, in some instances, they were one and the same person: settlers married Indigenous women and together they led lives in which various meanings of mobility overlapped.⁹³

Not only was mobility a necessity for Aboriginal, non-Aboriginal, and mixed families alike, it was also a risk for all concerned. Like Aboriginal migrants who worried about the threat that would-be pre-emptors posed to the security of their land and houses, pre-emptors themselves hoped their claims would not fall prey to “canny land-watchers” while they were away earning much-needed wages at seasonal work.⁹⁴ There must have been instances when these similarities bred empathy, particularly when the ties of marriage and family bound Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people together. But the examples of settlers evicting Aboriginal people from their houses at gunpoint and of pre-empting reserve lands containing clearly visible improvements also remind us of the fact that similarity can just as easily breed contempt.

Common patterns of mobility notwithstanding, a crucial difference separated the experiences of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal migrants. Immigrant settlers basked in the unearned privilege of free or almost free land granted them by the pre-emption system. The holders of Aboriginal title to that same land had been denied that right since 1865. As one scholar notes of land policy in British Columbia from Douglas’ time through the early decades of the twentieth century, “provided that the land was to be used in all good faith, unlimited quantities might be had for practically nothing.”⁹⁵ Pre-emptors often took many years to pay for their allotments, if indeed they paid for them at all. Many pre-emptors never planned to pay for their pre-emption. Some used their initial pre-emption as a temporary stop while looking for the ideal piece of land. Others “abandoned” their pre-emption only to have it immediately pre-empted again by their children, thus effectively bequeathing the land to their heirs without ever paying for it.⁹⁶ And even if settlers did forfeit their pre-emption, they could easily acquire another somewhere else. Or, they could leave altogether and return to their native land.⁹⁷ The same could not be said for Aboriginal families who were *in* their native land and whose ties to the land extended back to time immemorial. Denied the possibility of acquiring “free land” within their own homeland, these families went to great lengths – and great distances – to maintain a hold on their traditional territories. It was this fact that so many chiefs attempted to convey to the royal commissioners.

Many immigrants to British Columbia, overlooking their own recent and often ongoing mobility, turned their faces from Aboriginal understandings of the relationship between mobility and land rights. Government officials used evidence of “itinerant Indians” to curtail and deny Aboriginal rights and title. They did so at the same time as the explicit violence of the settler frontier, and the more implicit violence of the capitalist one, propelled Aboriginal people into greater cycles of mobility over which they exercised less and less control. There is no question that mobility was a central component of Aboriginal people’s economic and cultural autonomy. Mobility was both a time-worn practice that endured through the colonial encounter and a new strategy for mitigating the colonial threat. But for colonizers, forgetful of their own migratory history, and insistent that the future and not the past was what mattered, Aboriginal mobility was a powerful justification for the resettlement of the West.

The legacy of this colonial past is with us still. It remains difficult for us to hear Aboriginal articulations of mobility and place. In her recent memoir, Helen Piddington, long-time resident of Loughborough Inlet on the central BC coast, takes note of the shell middens that mark the precontact Aboriginal presence in the inlet. She interprets the subsequent absence of year-round Aboriginal residents as evidence of a universal process: “so memories fade, connections to place blur and dissolve.”⁹⁸ She is not unsympathetic towards Aboriginal people; yet, in her assumption that Aboriginal connections to Loughborough faded away long ago, she unwittingly reiterates the colonial view, one shared by the McKenna McBride commissioners, that recognizable Aboriginal presence and title must come in the form of sedentary, year-round residency. The postcontact Aboriginal presence in Loughborough seems uprooted and migratory to her. As she puts it, “They all seem to have come from somewhere else – not people of this place.”⁹⁹ Having heard tell of a man known as “Loughborough Bill,” the “Chief of Loughborough,” she remains uncertain “whether he was part of a group or alone or even from this area,” and so she situates him beyond the bounds of her otherwise sensitive history of place. Yet, if we turn to the recollections of Chief Harry Assu from Cape Mudge, we learn that the fact that Bill may not have been a year-round resident of the inlet did not mean that he was not a *permanent* resident, nor did it mean that his proprietary interest was diminished. Loughborough Bill was not part of some distant past – he was a character in Assu’s twentieth-century lifetime. As Assu remembers, when people entered the inlet, Loughborough Bill would paddle out to meet them, calling out, “Who are you? Who is your father?” Only upon receiving a satisfactory answer, that is, upon hearing a name that linked the visitor to the genealogical geography of place, would Bill reply, “Oh, I see ... you can come in!”¹⁰⁰ Aboriginal lives in British Columbia have long been simultaneously

mobile and rooted.¹⁰¹ And for far too long, non-Aboriginal society has seen Aboriginal mobility as an erasure rather than an enactment of attachment and entitlement to place.

Notes

- 1 See for example, Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, eds., *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994); Nicholas B. Dirks, especially *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Nicholas B. Dirks, *The Hollow Crown: Ethnohistory of an Indian Kingdom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Cole Harris, *The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographical Change* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997); and Brett Christophers, *Positioning the Missionary: John Booth Good and the Confluence of Cultures in Nineteenth-Century British Columbia* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998).
- 2 This is a theme of my own work. See Paige Raibmon, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005).
- 3 This can be seen in part through the demographic shifts in the province in these decades. See Hugh Johnston, "Native People, Settlers and Sojourners, 1871-1916," in *The Pacific Province*, ed. Hugh Johnston (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1996), 166-67.
- 4 Arthur J. Ray, *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Hunters, Trappers, and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of Hudson Bay, 1660-1870* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), esp. 94-116; and Arthur J. Ray, "Bayside Trade, 1720-1780," in *Historical Atlas of Canada*, Vol. 1, *From the Beginning to 1800*, ed. Cole Harris, cart. Geoffrey Matthews (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), plate 60.
- 5 For an overview of these images in British Columbia, see Robin Fisher, *Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1774-1890*, 2nd ed. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1992), 73-94.
- 6 John Lutz, "Work, Sex, and Death on the Great Thoroughfare: Annual Migrations of 'Canadian Indians' to the American Pacific Northwest," in *Parallel Destinies: Canadian-American Relations West of the Rockies*, ed. John M. Findlay and Ken S. Coates (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), 82; John Lutz, "After the Fur Trade: The Aboriginal Labouring Classes of BC, 1849-1890," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, new series 3 (1992): 69-93; Rolf Knight, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Labour in BC, 1858-1930*, rev. ed. (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1996).
- 7 Earl Maquinna George, *Living on the Edge: Nuu-chah-nulth History from an Ahousaht Chief's Perspective* (Winlaw, BC: Sono Nis Press, 2003), 61-67.
- 8 Canada, Department of Indian Affairs [hereafter DIA], Annual Report (hereafter AR) 1882, *Sessional Papers* [hereafter SP] 1883, no. 5, 57.
- 9 Robert Galois, "Colonial Encounters: The Worlds of Arthur Wellington Clah, 1855-1881," *BC Studies* 115-16 (1997): 135-46; Arthur Wellington Clah, "Journals," 1877-1909, Library and Archives Canada [hereafter LAC], reels A-1706-1709 and A-1712-1714.
- 10 Cole Harris, *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia* (Vancouver: UBC Press: 2002), 275-78; Richard White, *Land Use, Environment, and Social Change* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992), 57, 117-18, 158. White rightly notes that this pro-agrarian rhetoric betrayed its promise not only to Aboriginal people but also to poor settlers/colonizers. In both instances, the idealization of the farmer went hand-in-glove with the capitalist production of wealth. See White, *Land Use, Environment, and Social Change*, 141.
- 11 R.W. Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural: Policy and Practice in the Settlement of Saltspring Island, 1859-1891," in *Beyond the City Limits: Rural History in British Columbia*, ed. R.W. Sandwell, 83-88 (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1999).

- 12 DIA, AR 1898, *SP* 1899, no. 14, xxi.
- 13 DIA, AR 1892, *SP* 1893, no. 14, xx.
- 14 DIA, AR 1892, *SP* 1893, no. 14, 235.
- 15 A.J. Hall to Church Missionary Society, 13 January 1879, "Original Letters, Correspondence, etc., Incoming 1882-1900," Church Missionary Society, LAC reel A-106. See also *Weekly Colonist* (Victoria), 19 March 1896, LAC, RG 10, file 6244-1, vol. 3628.
- 16 *Weekly Colonist* (Victoria), 19 March 1896, LAC, RG 10, file 6244-1, vol. 3628.
- 17 Pidcock, "Diary," 1 June 1888; A.J. Hall to Church Missionary Society, 16 March 1880, "Original Letters, Correspondence, etc., Incoming 1882-1900," Church Missionary Society, LAC, reel A-106, Marie Mauzé, *Les Fils De Wakai: Une Histoire des Indiens Lekwiltoq* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1992), 121; United States (Bureau of Education), "Report by Sheldon Jackson, General Agent of Education for Alaska," in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education Made to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1891-1892 with accompanying papers* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1894), 878; United States (Bureau of Education), "Report by Sheldon Jackson, General Agent of Education for Alaska," in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education Made to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1902 with accompanying papers* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1903), 1232-33; United States (Bureau of Education), "Education Report for Alaska," in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education Made to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1907 with accompanying papers* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1908), 394; 9 June 1911, Annual report of Cassia Patton and Jeannette H. Wright, Teachers, Sitka, to W.T. Lopp, US Bureau of Education, Seattle, School Files – Sitka, General Correspondence 1908-35, Record of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Alaska Division, RG 75, US National Archives, Alaska State Historical Library, AR-37, microfilm roll 23; July 1908, Annual Report of Dorothy Doyle, Teacher, School Files, "Haines 1908-1935," Record of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Alaska Division, RG 75, US National Archives, Alaska State Historical Library, AR-37, microfilm roll 8.
- 18 DIA, AR 1885, *SP* 1886, no. 4, 84; Tate Family Papers, 25-26 October 1897, 6 July 1898, 4 September 1898, 20 September 1898, 18 September 1899, 18 September 1901, 23 September 1901, 20 August 1902, 20 July 1904, 24 September 1905, 23 July 1905, 11 September 1905, 18 July 1906, 28 July 1907, 1 August 1907, 4 August 1907, 2 August 1908, 22 July 1909, 2 September 1909, 10 August 1911, 4 September 1911, 17 July-13 September 1913, 4 July 1914, 26 July 1914, 26 July 1914, 18 July 1915, 10 September 1915, 9 September 1916, 6 August 1917, 11 October 1917, 28 September 1919, 26-30 September 1920, 24 July 1921, 15 September 1921, 22 September 1922, British Columbia Archives [hereafter BCA].
- 19 John Lutz, "Seasonal Rounds in an Industrial World," and Jody R. Woods, "St. Mary's Roman Catholic Boarding School," in *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, ed. Keith Carlson, 62-69 (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre: 2001), plates 22 and 23.
- 20 Harris, *Making Native Space*, 87-90, 274, 278.
- 21 Michael A. Tomlan, *Tinged with Gold: Hop Culture in the United States* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 6; J.A. Costello, *The Siwash: Their Life, Legends and Tales, Puget Sound and Pacific Northwest* (Seattle: The Calvert Company, 1895), 165; "History of Snohomish County," Hops Vertical File, White River Historical Society, Auburn, Washington.
- 22 W.H. Lomas to I.W. Powell, 30 December 1887, Cowichan Agency Letterbook, 1887-89, LAC, RG 10, vol. 1354.
- 23 "Hop Fields of Puyallup and White River," *The West Shore*, 10, 11 (1884): 345. On the scarcity of labourers in the hop industry, see also John Muir, *Steep Trails*, ed. William Frederic Badè (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918), 257; "Sumner – Five Years Ago," *Puyallup Valley Tribune*, 16 September 1905, 2.
- 24 William Lane to W.H. Lomas, 26 July 1891, Cowichan Agency Incoming Correspondence 1890-91, LAC, RG 10, vol. 1337; William Lane to W.H. Lomas, 16 July 1891, Cowichan Agency Incoming Correspondence 1890-91, LAC RG 10, vol. 1337.
- 25 DIA, AR 1895, *SP* 1896, no. 14, 153.
- 26 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia (McKenna McBride Commission), New Westminster Agency (pt. 1, 1913), 42.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 28-29.

- 28 See, for example, *ibid.*, New Westminster Agency, 16, 292, 321, 311; West Coast Agency, 39, 63, 75, 51, 83, 86; Nass Agency, 56ff; and Cowichan Agency, 12, 145-46, 255, 271, 308.
- 29 *Ibid.*, Cowichan Agency, 46.
- 30 *Ibid.*
- 31 *Ibid.*, Nass Agency, 176-77.
- 32 *Ibid.*, West Coast Agency, 112.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 97-98.
- 34 *Ibid.* Such displacements were not limited to the coast but occurred in the interior too. See Harris, *Making Native Space*, 140-41.
- 35 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, West Coast Agency, 107-8, 116-17.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 116-17.
- 37 On the difficulty of clearing land, see, for example, Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural," 96; Richard Mackie, "Cougars, Colonists, and the Rural Settlement of Vancouver Island," in Sandwell, *Beyond the City Limits*, 133; and White, *Land Use, Environment, and Social Change*, 56.
- 38 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, West Coast Agency, 159-60, 161, 162. For another example, see New Westminster Agency, 122-23.
- 39 *Ibid.*, Queen Charlotte Agency, 43.
- 40 Bruce Stadfeld, "Manifestations of Power: Native Resistance to the Resettlement of British Columbia," in Sandwell, *Beyond the City Limits*, 37.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 34.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 43.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 38.
- 44 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, West Coast Agency, 97-98, 112.
- 45 Robert E. Cail, *Land, Man, and the Law: The Disposal of Crown Lands in British Columbia, 1871-1913* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1974), 15; Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural," 85-88.
- 46 Stadfeld, "Manifestations of Power," 35.
- 47 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, New Westminster Agency, 225-26, 236.
- 48 *Ibid.*, Cowichan Agency, 93-94. See also New Westminster Agency, 31-32
- 49 Douglas Harris, "Land, Fish, and Law: The Legal Geography of Indian Reserves and Native Fisheries in British Columbia, 1850-1927" (PhD diss., York University, 2005).
- 50 Stadfeld, "Manifestations of Power," 35-36.
- 51 *Ibid.*, 39-43.
- 52 Lutz, "Work, Sex, and Death," 84.
- 53 *Ibid.*, 85.
- 54 Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 103-9.
- 55 Clah, "Journals," 24 June, 30 June, 29 July, and 11 August 1899, LAC, reel no. A-1707.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 1 October 1899, reel no. A-1707.
- 57 Susan Lord Currier, "Some Aspects of Washington Hop Fields," *Overland Monthly*, 2nd series, 32 (1898): 544; Clah, "Journals," 9 and 16 September 1891, LAC, reel no. A-1713; Currier, "Some Aspects of Washington Hop Fields," 544; Clah, "Journals," 9 and 16 September 1891, LAC, reel no. A-1713.
- 58 Clah, "Journals," 1 October 1899, LAC, reel no. A-1707. See also Carlson, *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, 70.
- 59 Wayne Suttles, *Coast Salish Essays* (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1987), 209-30; Carlson, *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, 24-29, 32-33.
- 60 Van Olinda, "The Last Potlatch," Pamphlets – Indians of North America – Oregon and Washington, Special Collections, University of Washington.
- 61 R.J. Roberts, "Farm Diaries," 10 December 1886, BCA. Wilson was related to Barlow through his mother, who was from Whidbey Island. See *ibid.*, 1882.
- 62 DIA, AR 1884, SP 1885, no. 3, 100.
- 63 Myron Eells, *Ten Years of Missionary Work Among the Indians at Skokomish, Washington Territory, 1874-1884* (Boston: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1886), 100; DIA, AR 1884, SP 1885, no. 3, 98; DIA, AR 1884, SP 1885, no. 3.

- 64 Simon Baker, *Khot-La-Cha: The Autobiography of Chief Simon Baker*, comp., ed. Verna J. Kirkness (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1994), 8, 9.
- 65 "More injustice to Alaskans," *The Alaskan*, 28 April 1893, 3; John G. Brady to Elizabeth Brady, 2 November 1903, box 1, fol. 13, John G. Brady Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University; Alfred B. Atkinson and Fredrick Ridley to Sheldon Jackson, 5 December 1904, Sheldon Jackson Correspondence, Sheldon Jackson School Library, Sitka; "Status of Natives in Alaska" (ms), John G. Brady Papers, box 11, fol. 36, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University; Mark Hamilton to John Brady, n.d. (1901?), box 2, fol. 36, John G. Brady Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 66 Edward Sapir and Morris Swadesh, *Nootka Texts: Tales and Ethnological Narratives* (New York: AMS Press, 1978), 149, 151.
- 67 Ibid., 230.
- 68 Indians to R.H. Pidcock, 8 March 1895, LAC, RG 10, vol. 1648; R.H. Pidcock to A.W. Vowell, 20 March 1895, LAC, RG 10, vol. 1648; R.H. Pidcock to A.W. Vowell, 24 April 1895, LAC, RG 10, vol. 1648. The request for legislation was the second notice sent to Indian Superintendent Vowell in less than a month that discussed the declining influence of hereditary chiefs among the Kwakwaka'wakw. Unknown to A.W. Vowell, 25 February 1895, LAC, RG 10, vol. 1648C.
- 69 See Jean Barman, "Taming Aboriginal Sexuality: Gender, Power, and Race in British Columbia, 1850-1900," *BC Studies* 115-16 (1997): 237-66.
- 70 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia (McKenna McBride Commission), West Coast Agency, 117.
- 71 Ibid., New Westminster Agency, 207.
- 72 Ibid., West Coast Agency, 158.
- 73 Ibid., 29.
- 74 Ibid., Cowichan Agency (pt. 3), 53.
- 75 Ibid., New Westminster Agency (pt. 2), 457; 330-31, 336-37, 337-38, 457; (pt. 1), 31, 32.
- 76 Ibid., West Coast Agency, 110-11.
- 77 Ibid., New Westminster Agency, 76.
- 78 Ibid., West Coast Agency, 116-17
- 79 Ibid., Nass Agency, 176-77.
- 80 Ibid., New Westminster Agency (pt. 2), 370-71.
- 81 J. Edward Chamberlain, *If This Is Your Land, Where Are Your Stories? Finding Common Ground* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2004), 1.
- 82 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, West Coast Agency, 111.
- 83 Alan D. McMillan, *Since the Time of the Transformers: The Ancient Heritage of the Nuu-chah-nulth, Ditidaht, and Makah* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1999), 187.
- 84 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, West Coast Agency, 107.
- 85 Ibid., Stikine Agency, 21.
- 86 Ibid., Cowichan Agency, 144.
- 87 McMillan, *Since the Time of the Transformers*, 196, 197, 212, 213.
- 88 Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 109-10.
- 89 See, for example, Denise Chong, *The Concubine's Children: Portrait of a Family Divided* (Toronto: Viking, 1994); and Richard White, *Remembering Ahanagan: A History of Stories* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998).
- 90 Johnston, "Native People, Settlers and Sojourners," 165-204; Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural," 91; Mackie, "Cougars," 133; Harris, *Making Native Space*, 285.
- 91 Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural," 90-91.
- 92 DIA, AR 1890, SP 1891, no. 18, 105.
- 93 Jean Barman, *Maria Mahoi of the Islands* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 2004).
- 94 Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural," 88.
- 95 Cail, *Land, Man, and the Law*, xiii.
- 96 Sandwell, "Negotiating Rural," 91-95, 98-100.
- 97 Johnston, "Native People, Settlers and Sojourners," 165.

- 98 Helen Piddington, *The Inlet: Memoir of Modern Pioneer* (Madeira Park: Harbour, 2001), 21.
- 99 Piddington, *The Inlet*, 21.
- 100 Harry Assu with Joy Inglis, *Assu of Cape Mudge: Recollections of a Coastal Indian Chief* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989), 18.
- 101 For a sampling of how migration and identity have been configured over time among the Stó:lō, see Keith Thor Carlson, "Expressions of Collective Identity," in Carlson, *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, plate 8, pp. 24-33.