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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents data and analysis of historical research on the development of a population of mixed Aboriginal and European ancestry in the Timmins, Cochrane, and Abitibi region of northeastern Ontario. The key findings are that:

- Overall, the historical data and analyses presented in this report indicate that a potential for the development of a métis community existed in certain time periods throughout the region under study. This is particularly evident for the 19th century, when social indicators such as fur trade endogamy reflected an integration of métis in an occupational community. However, while it is possible that métis developed an ethnic identity within the context of that occupational community, historical records present no direct evidence of such an ethnicity.

- Although no consensus exists among ethnohistorians as to the tribal identity at contact of the Aboriginal bands occupying the region, this report favours an interpretation ascribing a Cree or proto-Cree tribal identity to these groups as most consistent with available geographic and social information on Aboriginal bands in northeastern Ontario and adjacent areas in Quebec. This interpretation must remain tentative, as later historical evidence indicates a mixture of Ojibwa and Cree in these bands, and limited intermarriage with Algonquins from western Quebec is also apparent.

- At contact in the mid-17th century, the bands followed a seasonal cycle of resource harvesting involving a semi-nomadic lifestyle. Larger summer bands established along river and lake shores subsisted principally from fishing, supplemented by hunting small game and collecting plant foods. In fall these bands would break up into smaller winter bands or micro-bands and remove to hunting grounds where subsistence was obtained principally from hunting of larger game:

  - By the 19th century this subsistence strategy was modified by the development of family hunting territories occasioned by the disappearance of large game from much of northern Ontario and Quebec. The family hunting territory institution remained in practice until the first decade of the 20th century, but had declined significantly by the late 1930s.

- Direct contact with Europeans in the region dates to the 1670s. The establishment of Fort Témiscamingue in 1679 and Fort Abitibi in 1686 marked the beginning of a continuous presence of French traders and coureurs de bois until the English conquest in the 1760s. With the establishment of an at Moose Factory by the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) in 1730, an English presence was also created in the area:

  - Although no region-specific data are available, it is virtually certain that French and
English traders and couriers de bois developed sexual relations with Aboriginal women in the late 17th century and during the first half of the 18th century. The lack of data concerning children of mixed descent suggests that they remained in the bands of their Indian mothers and were raised as Indians.

In the last quarter of the 18th century, intense competition between the newly created North West Company (NWC) and the HBC led to the establishment of numerous posts and outposts throughout the Abitibi region. Fur trade records from the period indicate that employees of both companies created a regional occupational (fur trade) community.

By the late 18th century and throughout the 19th century, fur trade records present abundant evidence of Aboriginal women resident at fur trade posts. These women fulfilled important economic and social roles at inland posts, including resource harvesting to supply posts with food reserves.

Relations between Aboriginal women and European company men eventually created a new class of post servants of mixed ancestry, born and raised in the fur trade community and culture. These métis eventually replaced English apprentices at HBC posts, and some were promoted to more senior positions within the regional administrative structure of the HBC. Records indicate that métis servants found employment in specialised occupations as interpreters, canoe builders and skilled hunters charged with provisioning posts.

Regional fur trade records present detailed evidence concerning the ongoing development of marital unions between Aboriginal women and European traders in the 19th century. HBC records present evidence of intermarriage between the métis offspring of these unions, allowing the tracing of several métis families throughout the region. An important characteristic of this fur trade endogamy is the connection of métis families to Albany and especially Moose Factory:

- Some families of mixed ancestry established their homes in the Abitibi region, resulting in a continuous presence over several generations, some of whom remained in the region well into the 20th century;
- Despite methodological problems associated with enumeration, the 1901 Census indicates a regional métis population numbering approximately 450 to 500 individuals, centred at three locales: Flying Post, Matagami, and North Temiskaming (however, the latter is outside the geographic parameters of this study).

No evidence was found that self-identifying métis in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region attempted to be formally included in Treaty 9 during negotiations at Newots, Fort Abitibi, Matachewan, Matagami and Flying Post in 1905 and 1906. Treaty 9 was motivated by two interrelated factors: petitions from Indians asking specifically to enter into treaty relations with the government, and; planned railway developments, requiring the
extinguishment of Aboriginal title north of the height of land marking the boundary of the Robinson Treaties of 1850:

> One petition dated June 1905 was written of behalf of Louis McDougall and originated from the Abitibi band. In this petition McDougall, although of partial European descent, identified himself as an Indian, as he had previously self-identified in the 1901 Census. He presented no objections to being elected as Chief of the Abitibi band following the negotiations of the Treaty.

> The Treaty 9 Commissioners were aware that some of the Indians living in the Treaty 9 area were of mixed ancestry. This biological fact in itself was not considered sufficient to exclude individuals from annuity paylists. As long as individuals self-identified as Indians, or were identified as Indians by others, and presented no objection to inclusion in the Treaty as Indians, they were registered on band lists.

> While three signatories of the Moose Factory petition in 1905 were likely related to families of mixed descent in the Abitibi region, the petition in itself is not indicative of métis self-identification in the Abitibi region.

Significant Euro-Canadian settlement in the region dates to the first decade of the 20th century, as railway construction and mining provided the impetus for immigration and development of the present-day towns of Timmins and Cochrane. The few published social studies of these towns present virtually no information on populations of mixed Aboriginal and European ancestry in the 20th century:

> However, an Internet search indicates that three main Ontario métis political organizations have been active in the region by establishing locals and recruiting members by the 1990s (Ontario Métis Aboriginal Association, Métis Nation of Ontario and Canadian Métis Council).
STUDY REGION
HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO: TIMMINS, COCHRANE AND ABITIBI REGION

1. **INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY**

*Praxis* Research Associates is pleased to submit a historical research report to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (hereafter 'the Ministry') pertaining to the formation and development of populations of mixed European and Aboriginal ancestry in the Timmins/Cochrane/Abitibi region of Ontario. This introduction outlines the background to the report and details the research requirements specific to this study.

1.1 **BACKGROUND**

The Ministry is dealing with a growing number of claims by individuals and groups asserting métis rights. A primary objective of this research is to provide the Ministry with the information necessary to understand the history of the development of populations and perhaps communities of mixed European and Aboriginal ancestry in the region surrounding the present-day towns of Cochrane and Timmins.

1.2 **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

This project comprises a study of populations of mixed European and Aboriginal ancestry in the historic fur trade region near Lake Abitibi. Adjoining portions of the present-day Ontario Districts of Cochrane, Timiskaming and Sudbury comprised a single inland fur trade district in which both European traders operated for over two centuries. For the purposes of this report, this study area is referred to as the ‘Abitibi region’ (see map at front). This report presents the results of the collection and analysis of historical evidence relevant to the following research questions, as set out by the Ministry:

- When did Europeans arrive in this region?
- When did Europeans first establish a semi-permanent or permanent presence in the region?
- What, if any, Aboriginal groups inhabited or made use of the region in the time frames referred to in the first two questions?
- What, if any, were the harvesting / hunting practices of these Aboriginal groups at the times referred to in the first two questions?
- What was the relative significance to these Aboriginal groups of any harvesting / hunting practices at the times referred to in the first two questions?
• Did a local population of mixed European / Aboriginal ancestry arise from contact with the local Aboriginal people(s)?

• If a local population of mixed ancestry did develop:
  > When did it do so?
  > What was the relationship between this mixed population and the local Aboriginal and European populations?
  > Did the local mixed population come to be seen as having some form of distinctive communal identity or existence?
  > Did the local population of mixed ancestry develop any distinctive traditions, customs, and practices, and if so, what were these?
  > What, if any, were the harvesting / hunting practices of these people?
  > What was the relative significance of their harvesting / hunting practices over time?
  > Did their harvesting / hunting practices originate in the pre-contact practices of the Aboriginal groups that occupied the area at the time of European contact and early settlement?

• If there was a local population of mixed ancestry, and this population did have some form of recognizable communal identity, how did this community respond to persons of mixed ancestry from outside of the above areas and vicinity who settled the region?

• What, if any, was the role of the local mixed and Aboriginal populations in the creation of Treaty 9, or any other treaties?

• When did “significant” European settlement occur in the region?

• What impact did “significant” European settlement in the above areas have upon the local population of mixed ancestry, its communal identity, distinctive way of life or any harvesting/hunting practices that may be attributed to this population?

• What has transpired with any local populations of mixed ancestry in more recent years, particularly in respect to any communal identity, distinctive way of life or harvesting / hunting practices that may be attributed to this population?
What "métis" organizations have been active in the above noted areas in recent years? What role have any such organizations played locally, and how have any such organizations related to one another and the broader local population of mixed ancestry?

This report includes complete lists of sources cited and consulted in the course of this assignment. An index of primary documents cited is provided in Appendix C. Documents are indexed chronologically and are cited within the text of this report by document numbers assigned accordingly (e.g., "Doc.#1"). A supplement to this report provides legal-size copies of all primary documents cited.

1.3 USE OF THE TERM "MÉTIS" IN THE REPORT

An overview by Praxis Research Associates of the literature relevant to métis in Ontario and to issues of métis identity generally reveals that criteria of métis ethnicity are multi-faceted and somewhat ambiguous, especially when considering the development of a distinct métis population in the Great Lakes region. No consensus exists concerning which criteria should be used in measuring métis identity, as an ethnic entity distinct from their heritage in either European or Aboriginal parentage. It is important to note that within the context of this academic debate, scholars such as Jennifer Brown (1987) have posited a distinction between small "m" métis – connoting mixed parentage but no ethnic identity – and capital "M" "Métis" – the name of an identifiable ethnic group. Because the latter spelling has potential political and legal implications, Praxis uses the more neutral spelling "métis" throughout the present report (except when spelled otherwise in direct quotations from other sources).

The following sections present the methodological approach used to meet the research objectives listed above, as well as a discussion of the methodological issues and limitations pertaining to this assignment.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

Praxis Research Associates has submitted three earlier reports to the Ministry pertaining to historic métis in Ontario, focusing on Wawa and environs, the Rainy Lake / Lake of the Woods region, and the Georgian Bay area (Praxis Research Associates 1999a; 1999b; 2000). To some extent in the current assignment, Praxis was able to apply similar data collection techniques and to forecast methodological issues and problems pertaining to the conduct of historical research on métis in Ontario. Data collection for this assignment was conducted as follows.

1.4.1 Published Primary and Secondary Document Search

Praxis Research Associates conducted a search and review of relevant secondary and published primary sources at the following holdings in Ottawa:
Carleton University Library (MacOdrum);

Ottawa University Library (Morisset);

National Library of Canada;

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada Library (INAC);

Claims and Historical Research Centre (located at INAC).

1.4.2 Archival Document Search And Review

PRAXIS Research Associates conducted an exhaustive search and review for relevant primary documentation at the following holdings:

- National Archives of Canada (Ottawa): Government Document Record Groups, Fur Trade Company Records, 1901 Census Records, Hudson’s Bay Company Archive microfilm holdings [MG20];

- Archives of Ontario (Toronto): Fur Trade Papers, Church Records, Cameron Papers, Donald McKay Papers, Photo Records of Treaty 9 Negotiations;

- Hudson’s Bay Company Archives (Winnipeg): Post Journals, District Reports, Lists of Servants, Biographies, Post Histories.

A Research Assistant (Karen Richter M.A. [Ph.D. - ABD]) was sub-contracted to review and collect data from all relevant Hudson’s Bay Company Archive microfilm holdings kept at the National Archives of Canada, Ottawa.

1.4.3 Internet Search

An Internet search was conducted to provide basic data on the existence of local organizations associated with the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), the Canadian Métis Council (CMC) and the Ontario Métis and Aboriginal Association (OMAA).

1.5 METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

A previous report pertaining to the historical development of a métis population in the Wawa region has thoroughly addressed the ethnohistorical issues and problems regarding the identification of persons of mixed European and Aboriginal descent in Ontario. That discussion provides an overview of the secondary literature relevant to métis identity according to criteria of self-ascription, other-ascription, cultural integrity, and social relations. The full discussion of indicators and criteria
of métis identity is not reproduced in this present report, and the reader is referred to Chapter 2 - Section 2.3 of the report: *Historic Métis in Ontario: Wawa and Environs* (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a).

However, there are two methodological issues specific to research on métis in the Abitibi region. The first issue regards the labels frequently used to identify métis servants in the Hudson’s Bay Company’s (HBC) Moose Factory accounts which listed servants in the fur trade district under study. The second issue concerns the 1901 Census records for this region, parts of which were enumerated in the Nipissing district of Ontario, while others were enumerated in the district of Pontiac, Quebec. These issues are fully discussed in the sections below.

1.5.1 Issues Related to the Identification of Métis in the Abitibi Region

The fur trade records examined for this report make only rare references to "half-breeds". Only the HBC “Servants Character Book 1822-1830” and George Simpson’s “Character Book, 1832” use the term halfbreed to describe servants' origins, as for example:

*Donald McKay, Halfbreed: Kenogamissee 1827-1830* (Doc.#57:69 [p.116])
*Mckay John. A halfbreed native of Temiscamingue.* (In Williams 1975:236)

The rare occurrence of the use of this term in other archival records means that the positive identification of métis must generally be made by examining lists of servants and tracing parentage when possible. One identifying feature of métis is the application of the term “native" to servants known to be the sons of European company men. Judd’s examination of HBC Servants’ Accounts leads her to the following conclusion about “native” employees:

> [A]n employee from Rupert’s Land was nearly always identified as ‘native’ in the record... because very few natives of Rupert’s Land at that time [ca. 1820s-1860s] were of European descent, and fewer still probably worked for the Hudson’s Bay company, it is reasonable to assume that ‘native’ employees were either mixed bloods or Indians. (Judd 1980:138)

The HBC Moose district ‘Lists of Servants’ and ‘Abstracts of Servants Accounts’ include a category of record entitled “Parish”, under which country-born servants of mixed parentage are identified as “native”, from “Hudson’s Bay” or from “Indian Country”. Early ‘Lists of Servants’ records on handwritten forms appear as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Date)</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Stations</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Beads, Charles</td>
<td>Labourer &amp;c</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay</td>
<td>...he is the son of one of our faithful natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cromer, Charles</td>
<td>Locum tenens</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay</td>
<td>at Frederick House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#11:0d,2d)
By the 1820s and thereafter, 'Abstracts of Servants Accounts' were completed on printed forms which contained additional columns, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Date)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Thomas, Rich'd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Albany H.Bay</td>
<td>Steersman</td>
<td>Abitibbi Riv'r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Garton, John</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Postmaster</td>
<td>Abitibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Friday, John</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Steersman</td>
<td>Kinogum'e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Docs.#33, fo.11; #74, fo.5d; #78, fo.7)

As Judd (1980:128) points out, "the exact meaning of 'parish' is not recorded" but concludes that it meant either the place of birth or the place where the employee spent his childhood. Judd, Brown and Long agree that parish of origin designations such as 'Native,' 'Hudson's Bay' or 'Indian Country' are indications of mixed ancestry (ibid.; Brown 1980b:152; Long 1985:141). Brown (1980b:158) concludes that the term 'Native-born' describes "unambiguously the mixed native fur trade population until the 1830s or 1840s" after which time significant numbers of country-born whites began to mature.

The present analysis assumes that "native", "Hudson's Bay" or "Indian Country" parish of origin provides a tentative indication of métis identity, but that positive identification — particularly from the mid-1800s onward — requires corroboration from other sources such as biographical data or post journal entries which strongly suggest or confirm mixed parentage.

1.5.2 Issues Related to the 1901 Census Specific to the Abitibi Region

The manner in which the Abitibi region was enumerated in 1901 makes for a difficult and inexact analysis of a métis population at the turn of the century. Much of the territory was "unsurveyed" or "unorganized"; Treaty 9 was not yet negotiated and significant settlement had not yet begun in earnest. An extensive search of the Census records revealed three "unorganized territory" enumerations with data on the region under study for this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Polling Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>92: Nipissing</td>
<td>s1 - Nairn, Lorne, Hyman &amp; unorg. territory</td>
<td>3 - Unsurveyed territory (includes Biscotasing, Matagami, Flying Post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>180: Pontiac</td>
<td>z - Unorganized territory</td>
<td>2 - North Timiskaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>180: Pontiac</td>
<td>z - Unorganized territory</td>
<td>4 - Indian Reserves (includes Abitibi, New Post, Mattagama Lake / Matagama Post-HBC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1901 census for Timiskaming (District 180 - Pontiac, Sub-District v) was also examined.
However, métis enumerated in that Sub-District mainly resided in Kipawa (Polling Division 1), just east of the town of Temiscaming, Quebec. As this area is outside the region under study here, and as none of the métis surnames were traceable to the fur trade records considered in this report, the Kipawa enumerations are not included in this present analysis.

It appears that enumerators who were within reasonable proximity to parts of this territory – whether in Ontario or Quebec – were assigned to enumerate the people who resided near HBC posts or Indian settlements. Hence, locations such as New Post and ‘Mattaqama’ Post were actually assigned to a Quebec enumerator covering the Indian Reserves near the Pontiac District, and the results were apparently “copied into [the] Ontario Book” at a later date (for example, see Doc.#91:15). Meanwhile, an Ontario enumerator visited “unsurveyed territory” which his margin notes indicate included Matagami, Biscotasing and Flying Post. Flying Post is separated into two sections, one noted as “Flying Post Region Indians” and the other as simply “Flying Post Region” (Doc.#88:11-12,17-18).

Moreover, the criteria and coding system by which an individual was identified as métis or Indian appears to have differed between the Ontario (English) and Quebec (French) enumerators, making demographic analysis difficult. For example, the Ontario enumerator tended to identify racial/tribal origin as either “Chippewa” or “Cree,” while the Quebec enumerator generally used the term “Algonquine”.

More crucial to the analysis of métis in this report, is the lack of coding consistency for colour and racial/tribal identification between the Quebec and Ontario enumerations. The Ontario enumerator for Nipissing unorganized territory consistently used the “Colour” code “R” (Red - Indian) for métis individuals, and under the “Racial or Tribal Origin” column elaborated on whether they were “Cree” or “Chippewa” and if either “FB” (French Breed), “EB” (English Breed), “SB” (Scotch Breed) or “OB” (Other Breed) (see for example, Doc.#88:11). Furthermore, the Ontario enumerations consistently code the children of a “Breed” parent also as “Breed”, even in cases where only one parent was coded as a “Breed”. Below is an example from the Nipissing unorganized territory enumerations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Racial/Tribal Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menisquawak</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Chippewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, Wessigok</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>OB*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* OB=Other Breed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#88:13)

Hence in the final tabulations for “Table XI: Origins of the People” (Canada 1902), it is presumed that the above would have been counted as 1 Indian and 3 Half-breeds. In a case where the household Head was Colour coded “W” (White) and his wife “R” with a Chippewa EB [English Breed] designation, their children were also Colour coded “R” and their Racial Origin listed as “Chippewa OB” (see for example, “Miller, James” in Doc.#88:10).
In contrast, the Quebec enumerator for the Pontiac unorganized territory coded métis individuals in the "Colour" column as "MA" (Métis Anglais), "ME" (Métis Écossaise) or MF (Métis Français), sometimes coding the children of such parents likewise but at other times coding the children as "R" (Rouge). The "Racial or Tribal Origin" column for such families was coded generally as "Sauvage", more specifically as "Algonquin" or "Ochippawa", and in several instances with the English term "Scotch Breed" or "French Breed." Examples of this inconsistency are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Racial/Tribal Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, Alex</td>
<td>ME*</td>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>Sauvage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Laiza</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Epouse</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Veronique</td>
<td>R*</td>
<td>Fille</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Alex</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Fils</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafrance, Xavier</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>Français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Flora</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Epouse</td>
<td>Ochippawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Rosa</td>
<td>MF*</td>
<td>Fille</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , John</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Fils</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrier, John</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>Algonquine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Marie</td>
<td>MA*</td>
<td>Epouse</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Alexandre</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Fils</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , Elizabeth</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Fille</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* B=Blanc; MA=Métis Anglais; MB=Métis Écossaise; MF=Métis Français; R=Rouge

Due to this inconsistent coding, the final tabulation of métis in the region (ie., Table XI - Origins of the People) may not factor in the offspring of métis parents. Consequently, the final tabulation likely presents an unreliable demographic portrait of métis in this region.

These two factors - 1) unidentified "unorganized territories", and; 2) enumerator inconsistencies regarding the identification of métis and their offspring - have resulted in an inconclusive analysis of the métis population in the Abitibi region at the turn of the century. As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5 (Section 5.4), it is impossible to compare the 1901 Census totals of Half-breeds in Table XI, with those counted on the actual enumeration pages. While some divergence is not unexpected, in this case the problem appears more severe than for other regions examined in earlier reports submitted to the Ministry (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a; 1999b; 2000).
2. ABORIGINAL OCCUPATION OF ABITIBI REGION: CA. 1660 – PRESENT

This chapter presents historical data and ethnohistorical reconstructions and interpretations concerning the identity and renewable resource harvesting practices of the Aboriginal (Indian) populations and groups inhabiting the Abitibi region from the period of contact with Europeans to the 20th century. Section 2.1 below focuses on data and interpretations concerning Aboriginal identity throughout the historical period. Section 2.2 describes harvesting practices of known Aboriginal occupants of the region, and the relative significance of different renewable resource harvests in a context of evolving resource management practices and land tenure throughout the fur trade era.

2.1 IDENTITY OF ABORIGINAL (INDIAN) OCCUPANTS

The body of anthropological and ethnohistorical publications concerning the study region presents conflicting opinions regarding the identity of Indian people(s) who lived at and in the environs of Lake Abitibi. That some debate exists concerning the identity of occupants in the early-contact period (mid-17th to mid-18th centuries) is not a problem unique to this region, as scholars have presented different opinions concerning the pre-contact and early contact location and extent of territory of certain Algonquian-speaking peoples, such as the Ottawa and Ojibwa (cf. Praxis Research Associates 1998a:15-30). However, the problem is more pronounced in the Abitibi region due to several discernable factors. These include the multiplicity of positions advanced by different scholars, the more endemic lack of reliable data concerning tribal identities, and to some extent, an English-French dichotomy (or English-Canadian and American vs. Quebec academic dichotomy) in the assignment of tribal identities to Aboriginal occupants of the region.

2.1.1 Positions from the Literature

The anthropological and ethnohistorical publications consulted and cited in this report present in total no fewer than six distinct positions and arguments concerning the tribal identity of Aboriginal groups in the Abitibi region at contact:

- The area was primarily occupied by Cree (Bishop 1972; Parent 1978; Viau 1995a);
- The area was primarily occupied by Ojibwa (Jenkins 1939);
- The area was primarily occupied by Algonquin (Chamberlain 1913; Couture 1983);
- The area was jointly occupied by up to four different tribal groups (Mitchell 1977);
- The Abitibi formed an independent tribal group affiliated with neither Cree, Ojibwa

nor Algonquin (Ratelle 1996; Trudelle 1937);

The Abitibi region appears as a social and cultural crossroads where tribal boundaries between Cree, Ojibwa and Algonquin cannot be determined (Day and Trigger 1978; Bishop 1981; McNulty and Gibert 1981).

The multiplicity of positions presented in the literature rests with assumptions concerning tribal identity at contact that are derived from later historical evidence documenting the geographic extent of different tribal territories, or with assumptions concerning the validity of Aboriginal group names identified in early-contact European documents.

Some differences in material culture existed between Algonquins, on one hand, and Ojibwa and Cree groups on the other, but soil conditions in northeastern Ontario (and the boreal forest environment generally) which are poorly conducive to the preservation of artifacts, have prevented even some larger items of material life, such as house structures, to have survived in the archaeological record (Wright 1994:26-27). For example, the early-contact (early 17th century) Algonquin of the Ottawa valley and southwestern Quebec were known to erect longhouses in summer months (Day and Trigger 1978:796), while the more mobile northern Ojibwa and Cree lived in smaller conical lodges (Rogers 1978:765). The Algonquin also relied more extensively than the Ojibwa on the practise of a limited type of agriculture (Day and Trigger 1978:795), while the Cree lived exclusively from hunting, fishing and gathering of wild foods. Several Algonquin harvesting practises were shared with the Iroquoian Huron, with whom some Algonquin bands were known to trade regularly (ibid.).

The main differences in tribal identity between Algonquin, Ojibwa and Cree rested with non-material social characteristics (e.g., the Algonquin and Ojibwa had different clans, while the Cree had none; Algonquin, Cree and Ojibwa spoke different languages, etc.) which do not appear in the archaeological record. While some differences in the way of life of Algonquin-speaking peoples are discernable between large regions of northern Ontario, the exact tribal boundaries between Algonquin, Ojibwa and Cree peoples cannot be determined by archaeological evidence (Wright 1994:35-37).

2.1.2 The Early-Contact Historical Record, 1660-1750

One attribution of Algonquin tribal identity to the Abitibi Indians by Quebec ethnohistorian Yvon Couture (1983) appears to be based on a misreading of a Jesuit Relation from 1640. Couture (ibid.:86) claims that the author of this document, Father Vimont, describes the Aboriginal inhabitants living between the upper Ottawa River and James Bay as follows:

*Ce pays est habité par les Algonquins proprement dits, et des branches de leur famille tels les Nipissirins (Nipissings), les Timiscimi (Timiskamingis), les Ouitingami, les Ouachegami, les Michtiamou, les Oiturbi et les Kırstímons (Cris).*
Apart from the fact that no reasonably clear phonetic or orthographic variant of Abitibi appears in this statement, verification of Vimont's description in the Jesuit Relations (Thwaites 1959[18]:228) indicates that the Father did not attribute an Algonquin identity to either the Nipissing or to the other groups or 'nations' mentioned above. The English version, a direct and literal translation of the French, lists the groups as seemingly independent and distinct peoples:

_Leaving the River des Prairies' when it turns directly to the North, that we may go to the Southwest, we come to Lake Nipisgin, where the Nipisrimiens are found. These have upon their North the Timiscimi, the Outimagami, the Ouachelgami, the Mitchitamon, the Outurbi, the Kiristinon, who live on the shores of the North sea wither the Nipisrimiens go to trade. (Ibid.:229)_

The first recognizable mention of Abitibi Indians in early French records is found in a Jesuit Relation for 1659-1660, where a people named Outabibibek is described as having been recently attacked and defeated by an Iroquois raiding party (Thwaites 1959[45]:233). The account in which the Abitibi are mentioned is a lengthy description of a two-year journey by an Algonquian Indian convert named Awatanik, as he travelled from Green Bay (on Lake Michigan) through northern Ontario to the coast of James Bay, and then southeasterly to Tadoussac, at the juncture of the Saguenai and St. Lawrence rivers.

Awatanik provided Father DuRillettes, the probable author of this Relation (Kenton 1954:301), with considerable information on the identity and relative locations of many Algonquian groups living from the Lake Superior region to the James Bay region and the extent and effects of Iroquois raiding parties in northern Ontario (Thwaites 1959[45]:217-225). The account of Awatanik's travel along the coast of James Bay and his journey to the Tadoussac area presents early historical data on Cree groups, harvesting conditions and practices, as well as testifies to the tentative geographical knowledge of the French of travel routes from New France to Hudson Bay:

_Let us follow our guide, who, after wintering in the place I have just described, left it in the following spring. Advancing by short stages because of his family, who accompanied him, after covering about a hundred leagues' distance, he arrived at_

---

1 This is the Ottawa River. The quote precedes a long enumeration of Aboriginal groups living along the shores of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron that has been presented in previous reports prepared for the Ministry (cf. Praxis Research Associates 1998a:19, 2000:9). Father Vimont had obtained this information from a 1634 voyage by explorer _coureur de bois_ Jean Nicolle travelling along the northern shore of Lake Huron from the Nipissing to the Winnebago (ibid. 1998a:19). Nicolle likely did not visit the groups or nations living north of the Nipissing and probably relied on Nipissing informants for their identification and enumeration. Since no Jesuit missions were established north of Lake Nipissing, Vimont's information on these peoples was then at least third-hand.

the great bay of the North, along which he found various Algonkin Nations\(^2\) who have settled on the shores of that sea.

This bay is Hudson Bay, of which we have just been speaking...

On his way, he met with various Nations whose names have already been recorded. He noticed especially the Kilistimow, who are divided among nine different residences, some of a thousand, others of fifteen hundred men; they are settled in large villages, where they leave their wives and children while they chase the Moose and hunt the Beaver... After visiting these tribes, our man betook himself to the Pichibounik, a people dwelling at the entrance to the Bay, whether the Hurons and Nipisirinon formerly were wont to go to trade; and whence they procured a great abundance of Beavers in exchange for hatchets, cleavers, knives, and other commodities, which they carried thither. During a certain part of the year, the abundance of Deer is still greater in these regions than that of Beavers; indeed, it is so enormous that they provision themselves therewith for a year – either by smoking the flesh, which is their most usual method, or by letting it freeze. For toward those Northern regions nothing decays or become tainted during the greater part of the year...

But let us not leave our Guide, who is coasting along the entire Bay. It does not fare ill with him, for he declares that he has no lack of game, large and small; and that a man in his company killed one of those white Bears of which we made mention. We did not learn from him whether its flesh is as good as that of the wild Geese, Swans, and Ducks that are found in the same region in the month of May, as well as countless numbers of little tufted birds and swallows, and likewise martins, white hares, and black foxes. If powder for hunting runs short, one can resort to fishing for trout and salmon, which those Savages well know how to catch, not with lines, but with the harpoon simply.

After our Algonkin had visited all the Nations surrounding the Bay... he left the seacoast to proceed inland and seek a road to Tadausac, through vast forests which were unknown to him. As he was advancing... he learned of the three Rivers, one of which leads straight to our village of three Rivers. This route he would not take, although it is much shorter and surer, but, at the same time, much more exposed to the Iroquois. The two other Rivers flow into Lake St. Jean, whence the river Saguené

---

\(^2\) Father Druillettes is the using the term “Algonkin” in its broadest sense to include all members of the Algonquian language family, from Micmac, to Montagnais, Cree, and Potawatami peoples (cf. Praxis Research Associates 1999:18-21). In this account, titled Of the Condition of the Algonkin Country, and of Some New Discoveries, Druillettes describes this country as “extended over five or six hundred leagues of forest” (Thwaites 1959[45]:217). He also explains that the entire shore of Lake Superior has become “lined with Algonkin Nations” (ibid.:219), identifies Awatane as an “Algonkin” from the lake of the Quinipagoua (i.e., the Winnebago at Green Bay; ibid.:233), and reports more Algonquin Nations having retreated to James Bay following Iroquois raids (ibid.:219).

takes its rise. He chose the more remote of these two Rivers as the safer one, the other being not very far from the country where three Nations were overthrown by the Iroquois, two or three years ago, and compelled to seek a refuge with other more distant ones. The names of these latter are the Kepatawagomachik, the Outabitibek, and the Ouakowiedwok. (Ibid.:225-233)

In this document, as with later references from the 17th century, the Abitibi (as the Outabitibek) are not identified with a broader tribal group, such as the Killistinos (Cree), who are spread among nine “villages” (perhaps summer bands) around the shores of James Bay.

The Abitibi appear later in the Jesuit Relations as Tabitibi (Thwaites 1959[61]:269), and this orthographic variant is also adopted by French military leader Greysolon du Lhut in his 1684 journal entry describing Indian groups who had promised to come to trade furs at his new Lake Nipigon post (Mangry 1888[6]:51). This post was built by the French, along with a handful of others (notably at Lake Timiskaming), in order to discourage Indian traders in northern regions from taking their furs to recently constructed Hudson’s Bay Company posts, at that time strategically situated at the mouths of several rivers (notably Albany and Moose) flowing over long distances in what is now northern Ontario. Greysolon du Lhut’s entry referring to the Abitibi also fails to assign them a tribal affiliation, and mentions them in distinction to several other groups, including (again) the Cree:

...all the Savages of the North trust me very much, and on this basis I can promise you that not one of the Savages will be going down to trade with the English on Hudson Bay in the next two years. They all promised me this and are bound to their promise by the presents I gave them. The Killistinos, the Assinipoualacs, the Peoples of the Fir Trees, the Oopenens d’Achelliny, the Outoulouby and the Tabitibis, who comprise all the nations to the west of the North Sea, have promised me that they will come next spring to the fort I had built at the River Manne, at the end of Lake Alemipigon, and next summer I will have another built in the country of the Killistinos, which will block their way entirely. (Ibid.)

Du Lhut’s journal is one of the first historical documents to make reference to Aboriginal groups living in the northern interior region of Ontario by generic terms, one of which (People of the Fir Trees) is not directly derived from an Aboriginal name. The second term, Oopenens d’Achelliny, is a French orthographic variant of what may have been an Ojibwa name designating “People of the Interior” or “People of the Woods”, usually written as O’pimittish Ininiwak by English authors in the 18th century (McNulty and Gilbert 1981:211, 215).

A French military expedition to James Bay in 1686 led by Pierre de Troyes which travelled through Lake Abitibi and reached Moose Factory via the Abitibi River, produced several records documenting the journey (see Chapter 3). The otherwise detailed journal kept by de Troyes, however,

3 These are Assiniboine Indians, likely occupying the Rainy River region in the late 17th century (Praxis Research Associates 1999a:iii).
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provides few clues as to the tribal identity of Indians encountered at different locales during the journey. A cursory reference is made to Abitibi Indians, but with the exception of a few friendly (converted) Iroquois met along the upper Ottawa River, Aboriginal individuals and groups are almost always simply referred to as “Indians”, with no mention of band or tribal names (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971; Jaenen 1996).

By the early-mid 18th century, the Abitibi, still frequently written as Tabitibis or Tabittibis, are mentioned in conjunction with references to yet another generic term, Têtes de Boule (“Round Heads”), which is itself often associated with a French language equivalent to “People of the Interior”, Gens des Terres (McNulty and Gilbert 1981). One French document dating to 1736, by Maray de La Chauvegnie, equates Tabittibis with Tête de Boule in one sentence, but later distinguishes them from that group:

*The Tabittibis are one hundred warriors. At the mouth of the Themiscaming they are twenty warriors. At the head of the Lake, twenty are domiciled. These Indians are what are called Tête de Boule who amount to over six hundred in the Northern country... the Abittibis and the Tête de Boule come here [River Ounepigon⁴].* (Broadhead 1855[9]:1053-1054, in Marois and Gauthier 1989:160)

McNulty and Gilbert (1981:212) add that by the 1750s, Têtes de Boule or Gens des Terres Indians were trading at Fort Temiscamingue regularly.

It is doubtful that either Tête de Boule or Gens des Terres formed tribal groupings in and of themselves. McNulty and Gilbert’s specific historical research on these names concluded that for the period 1680-1820:

*Historical documentation... is so scanty that one can hardly say anything certain about them except that they hunted, trapped, traded, and moved about between the Upper Great Lakes and Trois-Rivières. Their family and larger social organization, religion and linguistic traits are undocumented for this period. (Ibid.)

Descriptions of Gens des Terres met at Michipicoten by trader/explorer Alexander Henry in 1762, suggest that they were affiliated with neither Ojibwa or Cree tribal groups:

*On reaching the trading-post, which was an old one of French establishment, I found ten lodges of Indians. These were Gens Des Terres, or O'pimitith Inniquaw, of which nation I have already had occasion to speak. It is scattered all over the country between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Lake Arabuthlow, and between Lake Superior and Hudson's Bay. Its language is a mixture of those of its neighbours, the Chipeways and Christinaux...* (Henry 1966:215-215)

Henry’s journal indicates that he was accompanied on his voyage to Michipicoten by an Ojibwa interpreter, and also claimed that he first met a Cree band only when his travels finally brought him to Lake Winnipeg in 1775 (ibid.,246-247). While he describes the Gens des Terres as a “nation”, the vast territory within which they live, and the fact that no positive tribal affiliation can be established for them, seems to suggest these people are independent and autonomous bands. Rare descriptions of their way of life support this interpretation. In one passage, Henry (ibid.,60) states that the “wandering” O’pimittish Ininiwac are:

...a peaceable and inoffensive race, but less conversant with some of the arts of first necessity than any of their neighbours. They have no villages: and their lodges are so rudely fashioned, as to afford them but very inadequate protection against inclement skies. The greater part of the year is spent travelling from place to place, in search of food. The animal, on which they chiefly depend, is the hare. This they take in springs. Of the skin, they make coverings, with much ingenuity, cutting it into narrow strips, and weaving these into a cloth, of the shape of a blanket, and of a quality very warm and agreeable.

Later he adds:

Such is the inhospitality of the country over which they wander, that only a single family can live together in the winter season; and this sometimes seeks subsistence in vain, on an area of five hundred square miles. They can stay in one place only till they have destroyed all its hares; and when these fail, they have no resource but in the leaves and shoots of trees, or in defect of these, in cannibalism. (ibid.,214-215)

The lack of positive identification of tribal affiliation of the Abitibi in early historical records, combined with the association, either direct or implied, of Abitibi with groups of people known only under generic terms from the late 17th century to the mid-18th century, has led ethnohistorians to develop multiple and conflicting claims concerning to their tribal identity. The next section reviews the different positions advanced in the literature and the arguments and assumptions upon which they are based.

2.1.3 Ethnohistorical Reconstructions of Tribal Territories

Two reserves are comprised within the region encompassing Timmins, Cochrane and the Ontario side of Lake Abitibi: the Wahgoshig First Nation, located on the southern shore of Lake Abitibi and on the southern periphery of the study region, the Matachewan First Nation. Both communities are primarily comprised of Ojibwa and Cree members (ONAS 1992:126,230). Reserves and Aboriginal communities found within the Abitibi-Temiscamingue region of the Province of Québec have primarily Algonquin members (Couture 1983:29, 85; Hessel 1993:1). Since there is no evidence suggesting that the Ontario-Québec border was drawn along tribal territorial divisions, factors responsible for the Cree-Ojibwa and Algonquin alignment must be determined on different historical grounds.

The question of the historic tribal identity of Abitibi Indians has usually been approached through attempts at determining the geographic limits of the territories occupied by bands belonging to the three main tribal groupings found in northeastern Ontario and western Quebec, i.e., the Cree, the Ojibwa and the Algonquin. In this line of research, once a limit is roughly determined, the Abitibi are then assigned a corresponding identity or affiliation either by logical deduction or through the application of the direct ethnohistorical method (assuming continuity into the past of characteristics found at the time of research).

However, as indicated in Section 2.1.1 above, one of the positions presented in the ethnohistorical literature is that the delimitation of Cree / Ojibwa / Algonquin tribal boundaries in the early contact period cannot be drawn with any exactitude. A review of evidence concerning the extent of Algonquin territory by Day and Trigger (1978:792) locates an exact eastern tribal boundary separating the Algonquins from the Montagnais (the Saint Maurice River), but cautions that:

*Culturally, as well as linguistically, the Algonquins closely resembled their nearest neighbors to the west, the Nipissing and Ottawas, more than the Montagnais to the east. It is unclear how far north the Algonquins extended, or whether, at the time of contact, the various bands living in the Lake Timiskaming and Abitibi region should be classified as Algonquin, Cree, or Montagnais.*

Hönigmann's (1981:218) review article on the West Main Cree (Cree living to the south and west of James and Hudson Bay) from the *Handbook of North American Indians* presents a map of their 19th century territory with a boundary ranging about 200 miles inland from the coastline (see Map A.1). The resulting territory encompasses the Moose River proper and a portion of its main tributaries, including the Mattagami and Abitibi Rivers, but ends before reaching Lake Abitibi. McNulty and Gilbert (1981:210) argue that different groups encompassed within the expression *Gens Des Terres*, such as the *Tête de Boule* found trading at Lake Temiscamingue in the 18th century, and the more easterly *Attikamègue* near the headwaters of the St. Maurice River, were:

*... essentially the same linguistic and cultural group known and reported under different names according to their point of trade.*

Two review articles on the Ojibwa (Rogers 1978; Rogers and Taylor 1981) presented in the *Handbook* do not cover the Abitibi region: one article on Southeastern Ojibwa focuses on the Lake Huron / Georgian Bay and southern Ontario areas, while another on Northern Ojibwa focuses on northwestern Ontario. Finally, a *Handbook* article focusing specifically on the issue of Cree and Ojibwa territories in the 17th and 18th centuries by Bishop (1981:158) argues that:

*For the seventeenth century, it is not possible to determine the exact geographical demarcation between Cree groups living near Lake Superior and the neighboring non-Cree groups, the Ojibwa and Algonquin proper to the southeast and the Siouan-speaking Assiniboin to the southwest.*
Nevertheless, a map identifying the approximate location of the main Aboriginal groups named in early historical sources implies an identification of the Abitibi as either Ojibwa or Cree, or perhaps proto-Ojibwa or proto-Cree⁵ (ibid.:159; see Map A.2).

An alternative possibility to the proto-tribal identity hypothesis is presented by Ratelle (1996:44), who argues that the Abitibi, along with the Timiskaming, Temagami and Nipissing, formed their own distinct tribal entities in the 17th century (see Map A.3). This position rests on adopting a literal interpretation of early historical sources describing these groups as 'nations' that are comprised of several bands. As Ratelle (ibid.:57-58) remarks, early records referring to these groups do not associate them, socially, culturally, or politically, with the Algonquin (or for that matter with the Ojibwa or Cree). Although at present the Abitibi and Timiskaming have been incorporated “in the Algonquin nation within the territory of Quebec”:

_The Attikamegue... Abitibi, Temiskamingue and Nipissing bands were recognized as Algonquin by neither the Amerindians nor by the French...(ibid.:59-60)_

The weakness of this position is that the names ‘Abitibi’, ‘Temiskamingue’, and ‘Nipissing’ are place-names: they refer to the large lakes frequented by a number of bands and may not reflect social and political divisions among northeastern Algonquin peoples (cf. Bishop 1981:158).

In the early 20th century, some anthropologists tended to classify the Abitibi, Timiskaming and Nipissing with Algonquins, although groups between Lake Abitibi and James Bay were considered ‘Saulteaux-Ojibwa’ closely related to the Cree-Montagnais division of the Algonquin language family (Chamberlain 1913:201). Jenkins (1939:2), for example, considered the Abitibi as an “offshoot” of the Ojibwa. In essence, according to these authors, bands north of Lake Abitibi were mixed Ojibwa-Cree, while those south of the Lake were either mixed Ojibwa-Algonquin, or were considered to belong to a division of Algonquin peoples labelled ‘Upper Algonquins’.

This latter position is taken by Couture (1983:117-159), who nevertheless acknowledges that bands south and north of Lake Abitibi have historically witnessed considerable intermarriage with Ojibwa and Cree (ibid.:47, 86, 158). Couture’s map of the Algonquin territory includes the entire Lake Abitibi area and reaches north nearly to James Bay (see Map A.4). Some of Couture’s ethnohistorical evidence, however, is incorrect: a statement attributed to Father Vimont, author of a 1640 Jesuit Relation, in which he claims that groups north of the Ottawa River belonged to branches of the Algonquin family, is false (Thwaites 1959[18]:229). Finally, while Couture (1983:16-18) acknowledges that the use of the term Algonquin is problematic in ethnohistorical research, his analysis tends to uncritically accept any evidence suggesting the largest possible tribal territory for this group.

---

⁵ The prefix 'proto' in this context implies a possibility that the Abitibi, along with certain other groups in the boreal forest encompassed under the expressions Gens des Torres and Tête de Boule, may have lacked broader tribal identities in the early-contact period. In this hypothesis, such groups developed tribal affiliations through intermarriage during movements and migrations associated with the expansion of the fur trade in the 18th century.
Although Bishop (1981) questioned whether a clear boundary could be established between Ojibwa and Cree tribal territories, he presented a map depicting such a boundary in an earlier publication (1972:61), which places Lake Abitibi clearly within Cree-occupied lands (see Map A.5). This is the position adopted by Parent (1978:11,14, 16-17) in his systematic reconstruction of Aboriginal territories in Québec. Parent attempts to delineate the early 17th century territories of the main Indian Nations in the Province on the basis of two assumptions. First, he postulates that all people belonged to distinct ‘nations’, which were respectively comprised of member ‘tribes’, that were in turn comprised of several bands (*ibid.*,5). Second, he assumes that each ‘nation’ was comprised of persons who spoke a common language and who occupied one or more hydrographic basin(s), i.e., interconnected river and lake systems (*ibid.*). The geographic limits of these hydrographic basins are thus assumed to form the boundaries of the respective ‘nations’.

Lake Abitibi is located north of the main height of land separating rivers flowing into James Bay from those flowing south and southeast to the St. Lawrence (Asselin and Gourd 1995:199; Mitchell 1973:31; Lee 1974:7; see Maps A.6 and A.7). It forms part of the vast James Bay hydrographic basin, which Parent (1978:11,14) concludes was therefore occupied almost entirely by the Cree Nation (see Maps A.8 and A.9). Indirect evidence that this height of land had some significance to Aboriginal peoples at contact comes from the word ‘Abitibi’ itself, which translates as ‘middle waters’ (Trudelle 1937:13; Geographic Board of Canada 1913:1). However, while Parent’s analysis of early-contact nation territories is internally logical and consistent, Parent provides no direct evidence that the 17th century Abitibi formed part of a Cree ‘nation’.

Viau (1995a:101) resists labelling the Abitibi as Cree but argues that some evidence exists to demonstrate that they likely had closer cultural and social ties with known Cree groups than to Algonquin groups, while the reverse applies to the Timiskaming:

*Des amérindiens ont déjà avancé qu’au moment de l’arrivée des Européens, le territoire des Algonquins aurait englobé la région de l’Outaouais et aurait peut-être compris celle de l’Abitibi-Témiscamingue. Ce présupposé mérite aujourd’hui d’être nuancé, car les données puisées dans la cartographie et les textes historiques disponibles pour la période de contact ne le confirment que partiellement. En effet, les recherches ethnohistoriques récentes tendent plutôt à indiquer que si, au XVIIe siècle, les Témiscamingues ont de affinités culturelles indéniables avec les*

---

6 Parent’s analysis is problematic in several other respects. His selection of hydrographic basins to form ‘nation’ territories appears somewhat arbitrary in several cases, notably the Timiskaming nation, which is geographically part of the Ottawa River basin, and which should, on this basis, form part of the Algonquin ‘nation’ (perhaps having the status of a ‘tribe’). Instead, the Timiskaming are assigned as their own ‘nation’. There is no historical evidence that the Timiskaming and the original Attikamégues, for example, were comprised of several ‘tribes’. Parent’s hypothesis that each tribe formed a distinct political entity controlling a specific territory within a nation, leads him to postulate that one Attikamégue tribe could prevent another from crossing its territory to go trade at French posts. There is no evidence that the ‘Upper Algonquin’ acted this way towards the ‘Lower Algonquin’, although considerable evidence exists to the effect that some Algonquin bands charged ‘tolls’ to other Aboriginal trading parties (e.g., the Huron) taking their furs down the Ottawa River to French posts on the St. Lawrence.
Algonquins et les Abitibis, ces derniers sont plus probablement apparentés aux Cris de la Baie James.

In essence, Viau (ibid.: 103-104) posits that the proto-Cree identity of the Abitibi would stem from their closer contacts with northern neighbors, the Monsonis (Moose Factory Cree) located downriver from the Abitibi, rather than with Algonquins occupying the headwaters of the Coulonge, Duroïne and Gatineau rivers (on the southern side of the height of land). Contact with Cree groups would only have intensified following the establishment of HBC trade posts at Fort Rupert in 1668 (originally Fort Charles), Moose Factory in 1673 and Fort Albany in 1679 (ibid.: 130-131).

Viau, however, notes the existence of clans among at least some of the historic Abitibi, and the practice of clan exogamy (a cultural rule prohibiting marriage between members of the same clan):


The date of existence of clans among the Abitibi is not specified, but since the Cree lacked this type of social organization (Honigmann 1981: 221), the presence of totems or totemic groups is strong evidence that the Abitibi as a whole cannot be considered Cree. Viau (1999a: 145) later argues that the full development of tribal groups and associated historic tribal territories was encouraged by the expansion of the fur trade to inland regions of northern Ontario (and Québec), which involved movements and migrations of bands and accelerated intermarriage. It is in this context, he argues, that the historic Abitibi acquired a partial Ojibwa membership and its predominant mixed Ojibwa-Cree character:

Le commerce des peaux amène d’autres groupes algonquiens voisins et démographiquement plus nombreux, tels les Ojibwés qui habitaient au nord du lac Huron et à l’est du lac Supérieur durant la période de contact, à se scinder en sous-groupes et à délaisser leur territoire ancestral pour se relocaliser à proximité des lieux de traite afin d’obtenir eux aussi leur part de dividendes dans les échanges avec les allophones. L’attrait exercé par les marchandises européennes les pousse notamment à investir les régions de l’Abitibi-Témiscamingue... Dans ce contexte, on ne se surprendra pas de constater que les Abitibis et les Témiscamingues de la période de contact sont relayés par les Ojibwés et les Algonquins au XVIIIe siècle. (Ibid.: 145-146)

It appears that the existence of clans among the Abitibi would likely stem from contact and intermarriage with incoming Ojibwa as the latter expanded their territory through migration and their involvement with the fur trade intensified.
2.1.4 The Identity of the Abitibi following European Contact

The preceding review indicates that no clear majority opinion exists in the literature concerning the tribal identity of the Abitibi at the time of contact with Europeans, (ca. the mid-1600s). Some ethnohistorians have preferred to avoid addressing the issue altogether, simply referring to the Abitibi by their band (or regional) name, while others have implied that were socio-politically independent of the broader tribal entities neighboring their territory (the Cree to the north, and the Algonquin to the south/southeast).

The early historical record presents no direct evidence that would tie the Abitibi socially and politically to the Cree, Ojibwa or the Algonquin, although it is also clear that the Abitibi were in contact with many regional bands, some which were clearly affiliated with these tribal groups. For example, by the mid-17th century the Nipissing were either travelling through Lake Abitibi to the Abitibi River, or using another of the Moose River’s tributaries (probably the Mattagami River), to travel to Cree territory to exchange European goods for furs. In the first half of the century Algonquin bands living in what is now western Quebec were important middlemen in the French fur trade (Day and Trigger 1978), bringing furs collected in part from neighboring peoples to trade posts along the St. Lawrence, including Trois Rivières and Tadoussac, the latter situated in Montagnais territory.

Early records also indicate that the Abitibi, or some of their members, journeyed to French and English fur trade posts established regionally (see Chapter 3). In fact, what may be the earliest recorded mention of the Abitibi describes them as having relocated to “more distant nations” after being defeated by an Iroquois raiding party in the late 1650s. By 1684 some Abitibi may have journeyed as far west as Lake Nipigon to meet with Greyfuson du Lhut, although as Chapter 3 will show, a French trade post had been in operation at Lake Timiskaming since 1679, and the French expedition to James Bay by the Chevalier De Troyes would actually construct another post on Lake Abitibi in 1686. By all available accounts, De Troyes was the first European to record his travel through the Lake Abitibi region, but his journal makes brief mention of the Tabbatibis and other references to Aboriginal groups encountered on the way to James Bay identify them generically as “Indians”. The fact that no records have survived from local French fur trade posts, and that few missionaries travelled through the region in the early-contact period, have contributed to maintaining a dearth of European knowledge concerning the Abitibi (Jenkins 1939:1).

The inclusion of the Abitibi within the wide and generic rubric Gens des Terres from the late 17th century into the mid-18th century has contributed to their relative obscurity. Social and cultural information concerning the Gens des Terres from Alexander Henry who had personally dealt with Algonquin, Ojibwa and Cree during his travels as fur trader and explorer, suggests that these Indian

---

De Troyes’ lack of concern with recording social or cultural information about Aboriginal peoples is explained by the fact that he was leading a military expedition intent on taking over English fur trade posts on James Bay (Jennex 1996:221). In order to maintain stealth and an element of surprise, the expedition even took the unusual step (for the time period) of avoiding using Indian guides (ibid:222).
groups were neither Ojibwa nor Cree. Their dialect, described by Henry as a mixture of Ojibwa and Cree, is consistent with the notion that these bands lived at the periphery of Ojibwa and Cree territories (Jenkins 1939:2). If Cree territory in fact reached to the main height of land separating rivers flowing into James Bay from those flowing towards the St. Lawrence, then Lake Abitibi was by definition located near the (southern) periphery of this territory. However, the fact that the lake is on the northern side of the height of land is not sufficient evidence to proclaim a Cree identity to the Abitibi, nor is the presence of Algonquin communities in the Québec counties of Abitibi-Témiscamingue by the 19th century sufficient evidence to proclaim the early-contact Abitibi as Algonquin.

In fact, other evidence from the early to mid-19th century up to the early 20th century suggest that the Abitibi were by this time predominantly composed of Ojibwa and Cree, although some intermarriages with Algonquin from western Quebec had taken place by the late 1800s. A missionary dispatched to Lake Abitibi in 1839 was chosen in part due to his knowledge of Saulteaux (a dialect of the Ojibwa language) which according to Trudelle (1937:34) was "about the same" dialect as that spoken by the "savages" of Lake Abitibi.

Several HBC post journal entries for Matawagamingue between 1824 and 1837 describe members of a "Squirrel band" and particularly of a "Horse Tribe" as relatively regular traders in this period. Since "Squirrel" and "Horse" are probably clan names, these references are unlikely to refer to Cree. The first mention of the "Squirrels" appears in an entry dated September 27, 1824, which simply states that "Ten Canoes of the Squirrel band arrived they brought very few ratskins" (Doc.#41:29). On June 1, 1825 "Two of the Horses returned after being absent about a fortnight but they brought nothing" (Doc.#45:1).

From an ethnohistorical perspective these references are obscure: they are presented as casual statements by their author, who is seemingly assumed to know these groups, although the post journals made no references to them prior to 1824. No information on the tribal identity of either group is presented in the records for 1824 and 1825, although by August 27, 1827, a more detailed entry presents the 'Horses' as forming a distinct 'tribe':

> Several Indians arrived / a party called the Horses, they seem to be a distinct tribe from any of the Indians resorting to this establishment. There are seven Brothers of them, their lands to be Westward of this they frequently deal with the petty traders that resort about & near Lake Huron. They are indifferent hunters their lands are miserably poor. On account of their being so near the traders of Lake Huron we are under the necessity of differing on our general mode of trade, we sell our goods something cheaper to them than to the other Indians that resort to the establishment, & give a few more gratuities. (Doc.#50:1d)

Five additional entries involving the 'Squirrels' or 'Horses' were documented for this assignment, four of which only record trading activities (Docs.#52:2; #60:18; #55:4d; #61:15). One entry dated May 1, 1833 repeats that the Horse Tribe lives near Lake Huron:
Two of the Horse Tribe arrived with tolerable hunts. These are Indians from the borders of Lake Huron tolerable Hunters it is only mild treatment & a few gratuities that will keep them out of the hands of the Opposition in that quarter. They brought me the value of 300 martins in good furs. (Doc.#59:14d)

Neither group appears in records of posts north of Matawagamingue, and references to them disappear altogether by the late 1830s. While these people were probably Ojibwa, any definitive tribal identification remains elusive due to the paucity of information on these groups. By the late 1800s the Ojibwa were clearly a mixed tribal group at Matawagamingue, as evidenced by an HBC District Report indicating that “The tribal name, & there seems to be only one distinct tribe in this district, is called indifferently, Ojibiway [sic] or Saulteux [sic]” (Doc.#80:2).

Meanwhile, the Abitibi District Report for 1885 points to a mixture of ‘Algonquin / Ojibwa’ and Cree throughout the region:

The Indians of this District are of the Algonquin and Cree tribes. Those living to the south of the post (latitude 48° 49' N) are of the Algonquin or Sotto tribe and those to the north are mixed with the Crees of Hudson’s Bay. The Indians of this post are increasing in number, they are a strong healthy race numbering about 400 souls. (Doc.#81:2)

Although the author (Thomas Anderson) refers to a presence of ‘Algonquin’ in the quote above, he equates them with the ‘Sotto’, likely a mis-spelling of Saulteaux, a synonym for Ojibwa. While some Algonquin may have intermarried into the Abitibi band by the late 1800s, the majority of the population was likely a mixture of Ojibwa and Cree. For example, the HBC post manager at Abitibi at the time Treaty 9 was negotiated (1905-1906), a Mr. Drever, was described by Treaty Commissioner Samuel Stewart as having:

... lived among the Indians for many years and has a thorough knowledge of both the Cree and Ojibway languages. He is also an authority on all matters relating to the manners and customs of the Indians... (Doc.#99:157)

It is extremely unlikely that the HBC would have dispatched a post manager to a predominantly Algonquin area unless he was at least partly fluent in that language. The additional facts that clans existed among the Abitibi, and ethnologist Jenkins’ comment that the Abitibi are an ‘off-shoot’ of the Ojibwa, together provide strong contextual evidence that the Abitibi had absorbed a significant number of Ojibwa at least since the 19th century.

In the absence of additional and more conclusive ethnohistorical evidence, the Abitibi at contact appear to consist of a group bands living at the margins of Cree territory who are either politically independent of Cree, or who have perhaps a proto-Cree identity. Through increasing involvement in the fur trade, which served in part to develop and crystallize Ojibwa and Cree tribal identities, the Abitibi came to absorb (through intermarriage) a significant number of Ojibwa, resulting...
in a mixed Ojibwa and Cree membership. While it is possible that some Algonquin from western Quebec also intermarried into the contemporary Abitibi band (now the Wahgoshig First Nation in Ontario), the lack of historical documentation of this phenomenon on the Ontario side of the lake indicates that such intermarriages were few in number at that latitude.

2.2 RENEWABLE RESOURCE HARVESTING PRACTICES

This section presents ethnohistorical data documenting the subsistence harvesting activities of the Abitibi. Since the involvement of regional Aboriginal people in the fur trade is covered in Chapters 3 and 4, this aspect of renewable resource harvesting is essentially omitted here, although one correlate of this involvement, the development of family hunting territories, is discussed below.

2.2.1 Subsistence Harvesting

At contact, the Aboriginal inhabitants of the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region followed a seasonal cycle of renewable resource harvesting generally similar to that of historic northern Ojibwa and Cree groups (northern Algonquians) living in the boreal forest of northern Ontario (Winterhalder 1983). Ray and Freeman (1978:14-15) point out that some regional differences existed in group size throughout northern Ontario and that these differences correlated with ecological conditions:

*The size of the social groupings varies spatially and seasonally, reflecting changing resource conditions. The largest settlements were formed during the warmer summer months. In the forest region, camps were generally established at good fishing sites where as many as two to three hundred people might gather... During the winter, food supplies were more limited, forcing the Indians to scatter into smaller bands and micro-bands... The groups usually comprised at least two adult male hunters and their families. In the better game hunting areas, several hunters and their families might join together. Thus winter bands in the woodlands commonly ranged from ten to thirty persons.*

Regional differences are also acknowledged by Bishop (1994:278), who provides a population estimate for northeastern Ontario:

*All the Northern Algonquians hunted, fished and gathered berries... Population density and group size depended on the types and abundance of food resources. The widest variety of natural resources existed in the south, and demographic density was naturally highest there. Thus, while the Ojibwa may have occupied a relatively smaller geographic area than the Cree, they had a higher population density. An estimate of some 5000 Ojibwa between the north shore of Lake Superior and the French River at the time of contact is a reasonable inference from the limited historical data... A tentative figure of perhaps 3000 persons [for the Cree] is suggested. If this is indeed accurate, then the Cree, assuming that they occupied the*
entire region to the Hudson Bay Coast, would have had a very low overall population density. The Algonquian-like peoples north of Lake Nipissing and west of the Quebec border may have numbered no more than 600 persons and perhaps had a density comparable to that of the Cree. (Insert and emphasis added)

The Cree were generally more mobile than the Ojibwa, in the sense that bands and winter hunting groups moved more frequently, and these groups tended to have larger harvesting territories. Peoples living in the more northerly portions of the boreal forest lived a generally more difficult life than southerly peoples as resources were more precarious and availability was less predictable:

Resources were usually insufficiently concentrated in a given area to permit long-term occupation of a site. They apparently also placed a heavier emphasis on free-ranging game - moose and caribou - except in summer when they could fish. Beaver may also have been taken when other resources were scarce or difficult to obtain. (Ibid. 280)

Moose and Caribou were generally hunted by the Abitibi from late fall to early winter, and then again in later winter months. Other large game hunted included deer, black bear and even wolves (Viau 1995a:110). Various smaller game, and in the fur trade period, the meat of fur bearing animals supplemented the winter diet (Bishop 1994:281). The main species of smaller game and fur bearers included otter, fox, lynx, beaver, porcupine, and various hare (Viau 1995a:110). The Abitibi also hunted certain birds, principally the eagle, loon and duck (ibid.).

Specific data on the harvesting cycle and practices of the Abitibi Indians are provided by Viau (Ibid:108-115) and Jenkins (1939). The overall resource harvesting cycle of the Abitibi conformed to that of northern Algonquian peoples generally. Summer months featured a greater range as well as a more reliable and more abundant supply of resources than winter months. Accordingly, the yearly life of the Abitibi followed a seasonal cycle of population concentration and dispersal: larger summer bands (from May to August) would typically break up into small winter bands or even smaller social units termed winter hunting groups by late summer or early fall (September) and live a dispersed life until late spring, when they would typically re-form into the larger band at a pre-determined meeting place (Viau 1995a:108-109). The winter life of bands or hunting groups, based heavily on hunting, was nomadic, i.e., characterized by frequent movements and relocations of groups, whereas the summer months, involving a heavy reliance on fishing, permitted the larger bands to live a more sedentary existence. The overall yearly cycle of the Abitibi therefore involved practising a semi-nomadic way of life (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1998b:5-10).

The winter bands, or winter hunting groups, were comprised of two to three extended families and rarely exceeded 20 persons (Viau 1995a:108). Following the dispersal of the larger summer band, each winter hunting group typically travelled to a habitual hunting ground, within which they would largely confine their harvesting activities, as long as sufficient game were available to ensure the subsistence (relative well-being) of the group. Winter bands also practised fishing, particularly in times when large game were scarce, although this was clearly a secondary activity (in importance and
preference) to hunting large game or snaring smaller animals. Each winter hunting group’s grounds was known by other groups and well identified. As opposed to the situation found in other regions of northern Ontario during the 19th century, in the early-contact period hunting grounds were not considered as the private property of individual hunting groups, and members of other winter bands could harvest game on each other’s grounds in times of need (game scarcity, famine), by obtaining permission of the ground’s occupants (ibid.).

Data on the extent of land use by Aboriginal inhabitants west of the present towns of Cochrane and Timmins are not available. However, the Indians who congregated on Lake Abitibi in the summer months hunted over a total territory (centred on the lake) approximately 140 miles wide by 160 miles long, or 22,400 square miles (Jenkins 1939:2). The Harricana River, the Abitibi River, and the height of land between lakes Abitibi and Timiskaming served as the approximate eastern, western and southern boundaries of the Abitibi Indians’ territory (ibid.:3; see Map A.10). By the late 19th century this territory had become divided into 40 “family hunting grounds” (ibid.:28-31), an institution developed from involvement in the fur trade which is discussed in more detail below.

By late spring or early summer, winter hunting groups would reunite at a location pre-determined at the end of the previous summer, and reconstitute summer bands that typically numbered about 100 persons (Vieu 1995a:109). The location for re-grouping was invariably at or in proximity of a river or lake shore, since fishing would now provide the main vehicle for seasonal subsistence (ibid.). Each summer band had its own name and its own traditional territory, over which the band as whole claimed exclusive rights to resources (ibid.). Jenkins (1939:23) suggests that in the early-contact period the entire Abitibi “tribe” may have gathered at one point, but such a high concentration of people seems unlikely on archaeological and ecological grounds (cf. Marois and Gauthier 1989).

Some of the key areas where summer bands congregated included the confluence of the La Sarre River and Lake Abitibi, nearby Lake Obakki, the shores of the Harricana and Turgeon rivers, in addition to several locations around Lake Abitibi itself (Jenkins 1939:23). Summer bands supplemented their diet (consisting of numerous fish species) by collecting wild fruits and vegetables, including strawberries, raspberries and particularly blueberries, which could be found in abundance in the Abitibi region (Vieu 1995a:113). Different types of berries would often be dried and saved for winter (ibid.). Jenkins (1939:25) adds that wild carrots would be harvested as well as berries.

As with other northern Algonquian peoples, the economy of the Abitibi was essentially egalitarian and the society was marked by an absence of socio-economic class stratification. However, economic production was regulated according to a sexual division of labour:

---

8 Jenkins does not specify a northern boundary proper, but his map of family hunting grounds shows that the total territory of the Abitibi ended well inland of the southern shore of James Bay.

9 The word ‘tribe’ is Jenkins’ term. The use of this term to refer to the group of Abitibi bands is questionable, as the discussion in Section 2.1 demonstrates.
Chaque sexe a ses propres activités économiques, ses propres outils, et ses propres gestes techniques. Les grandes chasses et les grandes pêches saisonnières sont le plus souvent pratiquées par les hommes, alors que la cueillette des produits végétaux demeure une activité féminine. (Vian 1995a:113)

The hunting of large game, often involving collective (hunting group or band) efforts, and the organization and planning of seasonal hunting and fishing activities were either exclusively male or male dominated harvesting pursuits. However, women often took part in fishing, assisted collective hunting efforts and occasionally hunted and snared game when necessary.

Occasionellement, les femmes apportent leur contribution dans les activités de prédation en participant à de grandes chasses collectives à titre de rabatteurs ou en prenant part à des expéditions de pêche. Néanmoins, elles se consacrent avant tout à la préparation des produits de la chasse et de la pêche en vue de leur consommation immédiate ou de leur conservation. La division du travail n'a rien de strict et d'inégal. Aucun sexe n'est désavantage. Les femmes ne sont pas des tâcherons et le fardeau de la production ne repose pas uniquement sur les épaules des hommes. Chaque sexe a ses responsabilités, contrôle ses conditions de travail et est à l'aise dans son rôle. Rien, toutefois, ne l'empêche d'effectuer les tâches essentielles de l'autre si une situation particulière l'exige. (Ibid.)

2.2.2 Family Hunting Territories

Field research undertaken by William Jenkins in the summer of 1937 specifically aimed at collecting data on the nature and scope of harvesting activities of the Abitibi, indicated that resource harvesting had become regulated under a system of family hunting territories by the 19th century. This economic institution developed throughout northern Ontario and Québec among the Ojibwa, Cree, Montagnais and Algonquin in response to changing ecological conditions associated with the evolution of the fur trade (Leacock 1954; Bishop 1970, 1974; Morantz 1978). The family hunting territories represented a modification of Aboriginal land tenure practices in response to changed harvesting strategies. Winter bands or hunting groups in the 19th century were forced to focus harvesting efforts on the hunting and snaring of small game and fur bearing animals following a widespread depletion of the large game (specifically caribou and moose) on which they had formerly relied for their subsistence.

The disappearance of large game from most of northern Ontario, beginning in the second decade of the 19th century and lasting until the 1890s, forced winter bands to break up into smaller social units in order to pursue smaller game. At this time, fishing also increased in importance in winter months. This shift in harvesting strategy involved significantly decreased mobility of winter bands and hunting groups, and co-operative bonds between hunters also weakened as harvesting became more individualistic (Bishop 1970; cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1998b:36-42). As winter hunting activities largely came to be confined within trapping territories, boundaries of former hunting ranges were redefined and tracts of land came to be viewed as being under the ‘ownership’ of
particular trappers. As hunting and trapping remained organized along kinship lines (sons normally hunted with their fathers or male consanguines), over time the ownership of particular tracts of land would normally become passed on between successive generations of the same extended family.

The extent to which resources (including game) within particular family hunting territories came to be viewed as the private property of those territories’ owners, is a phenomenon that seems to have been subject to considerable variety throughout northern Ontario. Overall, individual proprietorship, the size of territories, and enforcement of territory boundaries against trespassers likely varied according to the prevalence of different species in different regions. Research conducted by Speck (1915) on the family hunting territories of the Timiskaming indicated a strong sense of proprietorship and rigid enforcement of territory boundaries, whereas more relaxed and tolerant attitudes towards ‘trespassers’ were apparent among the Berens River Ojibwa (e.g., Hallowell 1949). Enforcement of boundaries also generally relaxed as large game gradually returned to northern Ontario by the early 20th century, as Bishop (1970) documented for the Osnaburgh area.

Jenkins’ research at Abitibi in the late 1930s indicated that although trapping remained the single most important occupation of the Indians (and hunting second in importance, followed by fishing and gathering), the family hunting territory institution, in practice until the first decade of the 1900s, had largely dissipated by the time of his fieldwork. He reported that:

_In the old days, each family had its own family hunting grounds. When a man died his land was passed on to his widow or eldest son. The father was the head of the family and took full responsibility. He assigned the sections of his hunting grounds to his sons for hunting. Trespass on an Indian’s lands was resented and the killing of a fur-bearing animal would lead to trouble._ (Jenkins 1939:29)

Through interviews with hunters and trappers, Jenkins was able to obtain information on the location and approximate size of the family hunting territories in existence in the early 20th century, which he presents in map form (reproduced for this report as Map A.10). Data on family names, including band of origin of family territory owners, showed that three owners were identified as being of mixed Indian and European descent (_ibid._:30-31), while additional family names (e.g., Polson, MacDougall) on Jenkins’ list can be historically linked to individuals and families of mixed descent (see Chapter 5).

The following chapter examines early-contact history of the region under the French fur trade period, and the early establishment of the Hudson’s Bay Company on James Bay, prior to the formation of the North West Company.
3. THE EARLY FUR TRADE ERA, CA. 1660-1750

This chapter examines the early period of the historical development of a European presence in the Abitibi region. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the nature and extent of possible involvement by regional aboriginal inhabitants in the early 17th century fur trade, which remained exclusively under French control until the second half of the century. This is followed by a discussion of French exploration and establishment of trade posts in the region, in the context of competition with English posts built on James Bay beginning in 1670 with the formation of the Hudson’s Bay Company. The last section of the chapter presents evidence concerning the formation of a population of mixed European and Indian descent up to the end of the French fur trade period in the mid-18th century.

3.1 THE ABITIBI REGION IN THE FRENCH TRADE PERIOD, 1600-1670

Before 1650, the closest French fur trade posts to the Abitibi region were located along the St. Lawrence (Voorhis 1930). The French fur trade operated throughout the 17th century under a succession of monopolies, as different companies obtained royal charters over time to trade in furs in the colony of New France (Eccles 1972). The oldest and most important of the French trade posts on the St. Lawrence was Tadoussac, established at the juncture of the Saguenay and St. Lawrence in 1599-1600 (Ray 1988:338; Trigger 1985:172). Samuel de Champlain’s Habitation at what is now Québec City, established in 1608, also served as a trade post, although of relatively minor status. Two other important St. Lawrence River posts were built in addition to Tadoussac, at Trois Rivières in 1634 and Montreal in 1642 (Ray 1988:338).

An analysis of the spatial development of the Hudson’s Bay Company fur trade south and southwest of the Hudson Bay coastline by Ray (1974, 1978), presents a model involving zones of local, middleman, and indirect trade that generally fits the spatial structure of the St. Lawrence-based French fur trade. For example, the posts at Tadoussac and Québec, located well within Montagnais territory, attracted not only local Montagnais bands, but also Algonquin trading parties from the Ottawa valley and western Québec region. These Algonquin bands acted as important middlemen in the first decades of the 17th century by collecting furs from more distant peoples to the west and northwest (Trigger 1985). Montagnais also acted as middlemen between the French at Tadoussac, and Cree inhabiting areas inland from the eastern shore of James Bay (ibid.). According to Ray’s (1974) analysis of the spatial structure of the early HBC fur trade, and from historical evidence by Trigger (1985) for the French St. Lawrence trade, Aboriginal middlemen typically attempted to maintain their status and role in the fur trade by actively discouraging and preventing peoples from whom they obtained furs, from travelling through their territory to trade directly with Europeans.
3.1.1 The Abitibi Region as an Indirect Trade Zone, 1600-1670

A practice followed by both Montagnais and Algonquin bands aimed at discouraging direct trade between the French and more distant Aboriginal peoples was to levy 'tolls' as trading parties travelled through their territories (Trigger 1985:181, 314). These 'tolls' required a trading party to leave behind either a portion of their furs or European goods they were bringing back to their bands. In other cases, middlemen attempted to prevent direct contact by providing vague and nebulous information concerning the location of certain places, or by exaggerating travelling difficulties or risks of attack by Iroquois, to both French explorers and Aboriginal traders (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 2000:27, 29-30)\(^\text{10}\). A specific incident experienced by Champlain in 1613 with an Algonquin band at Allumette Island illustrates the tactics sometimes resorted to by middlemen groups to prevent direct contact between the French and more distant bands.

Samuel de Champlain's 1613 expedition down the Ottawa River not only resulted in failure to reach Huronia, but also met with an Algonquin refusal to allow him passage north in search of the 'North Sea' (James Bay), of which he had first heard while at Tadoussac in 1603 (Couture 1983:86). The establishment of a trade and military alliance between the French, Montagnais, and Algonquin in the first decade of the 1600s had encouraged the French and Algonquin to develop a practice of exchanging young boys so that they could learn each other's respective languages and customs and act as interpreters and cultural intermediaries. The French boys and young men who experienced this process of cultural and linguistic immersion were called *truchements* (Jacquin 1996:38). To that effect, Champlain had assigned Nicholas de Vignau to the *Kichesipirini* Algonquin Band in 1611 (*ibid*). After spending the winter with his Algonquin hosts, Vignau returned to France the following year and informed Champlain that he spent part of his winter travelling well beyond *Kichesipirini* territory with neighbouring Nipissing people, eventually reaching a large salt-water sea (Couture 1983:86). The route to this sea, according to Vignau, was by means of the Ottawa River (*ibid*).

After Champlain's attempt to reach Georgian Bay via Nipissing country had been discouraged by the *Kichesipirini* Chief (named Tessout), he inquired about travelling to the North Sea and stated his intention to negotiate a military and trade alliance with the Nipissing. Following a band council meeting to discuss these plans, Tessout attempted to dissuade Champlain from contacting the Nipissing, claiming that they were both dangerous sorcerers and cowards who would prove useless

---

\(^{10}\) Several examples of this type of discouragement are documented for the Algonquins. The French were first informed of the existence of Georgian Bay / Lake Huron, the existence of the Huron Confederacy, and of the physical possibility of reaching it via the Ottawa River, in a 1535 voyage by Jacques Cartier to Montreal. However, Cartier's Algonquin informants only provided him with "inconsistent and confusing" accounts of the location of this "Freshwater Sea" (Coyne 1903:xii). Although Algonquin traders were travelling to Tadoussac as early as 1603, it was only by 1609 that the first Huron trading party was allowed by the Algonquin to reach the St. Lawrence (Trigger 1985:175). This permission was granted as the Huron promised to join a raiding party against an Iroquois village organized by the French and involving Algonquin warriors. An attempt by Champlain to reach Huronia in 1613 via the Ottawa River was aborted at Allumette Lake, after his Algonquin hosts emphasized the travel difficulties that lay ahead (Coyne 1903:xii). A second attempt by Champlain in 1615 to travel to Huronia was eventually successful after the same Algonquin band, now requiring military assistance from the Nipissing, Huron, and the French against intensifying Iroquois raids, agreed to let him through after he promised them military help (Trigger 1978:349, 1954:48).
as military allies (*ibid.*:89). Sensing that the repeated discouragements of his travel plans by Tessouat amounted to deception, Champlain angrily threatened to withdraw his military support of their band. He further denounced the supposed travel hardships to Nipissing country as deliberate exaggerations, pointing out that Vignau (who had accompanied him) had travelled to Nipissing with relative ease (*ibid.*:90).

A tense and potentially violent confrontation followed involving Vignau, Champlain and Tessouat, in which Vignau was physically grabbed by Algonquin and accused of lying about visiting the Nipissing. Vignau at first swore that the story of his travels to the North Sea was true. The *Kichesipirini* then challenged him to prove it, threatening to kill him should they be able to demonstrate his account as false. When Champlain later threatened to strangle Vignau himself if his travel route should prove erroneous, the *truchement* recanted, indicating that he had never travelled further north than Morrison Island on the Ottawa (*ibid.*:90-91). Champlain abandoned the idea of reaching the North Sea via an inland route, and no further attempt to lead a formal French expedition to James Bay via the Ottawa would be made for 73 years.

In hindsight, it is extremely doubtful that Vignau either lived among the Nipissing in 1611 or travelled to James Bay. While two elements of his story would be proven true later in the 17th century (the Nipissing traded with Cree groups near James Bay, and the Ottawa is part of a possible route to them), Vignau could have obtained this general information from the *Kichesipirini*, who were in regular contact with Nipissing and traded with them as middlemen, despite their claims insinuating the contrary to Champlain. Although Vignau’s recanting was only obtained under the pressure of extreme threats, his claim to have reached James Bay lacks credibility in that he apparently never provided any details as to how he supposedly got there. Tessouat’s challenge to provide those details went unanswered. As the 1686 De Troyes expedition would report, the route involves a number of unique elements that Tessouat could have drawn upon to assess the truth value of Vignau’s story: the Ottawa river leads only part way to James Bay; the route involves numerous portages, some of which are exceedingly difficult even by *coureurs de bois* standards; the height of land between Lake Timiskaming and Lake Abitibi forms an unmistakable landmark; Lake Abitibi is very large; and additional difficult portages await travellers on the Abitibi River, prior to its juncture with the Moose River (cf. Kenyon and Turnbull 1971).

Considering the political context in which the *Kichesipirini* interacted with the Nipissing, Vignau’s claim to have lived and travelled with them becomes implausible. Chief Tessouat’s band council clearly did not want Champlain, i.e., the French, to develop any direct formal relations with the Nipissing or any other peoples living beyond their territory. Therefore, it seems incredible that they would have allowed Vignau, a Frenchman under their hospitality, whom they knew would report directly to Champlain to leave their band and reside with one of the very people they wished to keep away from the French.

The few references to Abitibi/Timiskaming region traders bringing furs to posts at Québec, Trois Rivières, and Tadoussac in the first half of the 17th century suggests that they might have been subject to similar roadblocks by Atikamegues and Montagnais bands if they had attempted to reach
the St. Lawrence via rivers and lakes east and southeast of James Bay (cf. Trigger 1985, 1994). To the extent that the Aboriginal inhabitants in the Abitibi region were involved in the French trade prior to 1650, they were likely restricted to an indirect trade zone (cf. Ray and Freeman 1978).

The main historical difference with Aboriginal trade patterns under the French period in the 17th century, and the patterns described for the Ojibwa and Cree southwest of Hudson Bay in the early 18th century, is the fact that the French trade developed in a context where various Algonquian peoples were already at war with the Five Nation Iroquois Confederacy by the first decade of the 1600s (Day and Trigger 1978:793; Couture 1983:91). Periodic Iroquois raids against Algonquian trading parties on the Ottawa and St. Lawrence disrupted supplies of furs and European goods, and led to the formation of military and trade alliances between several Aboriginal nations, such as that between the Algonquin and Montagnais (cf. Trigger 1985). While impeding the expansion of an inland French trade post network, the fur trade wars motivated the French to broaden their political and military alliances with different Aboriginal nations, and this sometimes disrupted the economic status and role of peoples already involved in the French fur trade.

This is exactly what the Algonquin experienced following the development of direct contact between the French and the Huron in Georgian Bay after 1615 (Day and Trigger 1978:793). Following delicate political negotiations with Champlain, the Algonquin allowed small brigades of couriers de bois to accompany Huron trading parties as they journeyed to and from Georgian Bay along the Ottawa River to St. Lawrence trade posts. The size and political organization of the Huron Confederacy quickly allowed it to replace the Algonquin as the main middlemen in the French fur trade, a position they would maintain until the 1640s (Vial 1995b:127; cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 2000:30-38). It is from this time period that French records describe Nipissing trading expeditions to the James Bay region, as the Nipissing became a key trading partner of the Huron (e.g., Thwaites 1959[18]:229). The Huron confederacy, demographically reduced by European-introduced diseases, and racked with political factionalism by the mid-1640s, was eventually destroyed by a series of Iroquois attacks between 1648 and 1650 (PRAXIS Research Associates 2000:45).

After the last surviving Huron had either fled from their homeland on Georgian Bay or been absorbed within the Five Nation confederacy as war captives, the Iroquois embarked on a rapid series of deeper raids and attacks against Algonquian groups living to the north of Huronia (likely proto-Ottawa or proto-Ojibwa bands), the Nipissing, other proto-Ojibwa bands along the north shore of Lake Huron, and against the Algonquin living throughout the Ottawa and western Quebec (ibid.; Day 1978; Day and Trigger 1978:794). The attacks against the Algonquin were sufficiently intense to force them to disperse (albeit temporarily) from their homeland between 1650 and 1675, with most bands or family groups relocating well to the northeast, near Montreal, Trois Rivières, and even Lac St. Jean (ibid.). Long-distance raids were conducted intermittently deep into northern Ontario and Québec by the Five Nations between 1650 and 1667, when a temporary truce was established between the French and the Iroquois (Vial 1995b:128-129; PRAXIS Research Associates 2000:46). Peace was of short duration, however, and Iroquois resumed occasional long-distance raids, including attacks in the Timiskaming and Abitibi region into the late 1680s (Couture 1983:93). A permanent
peace with the Iroquois would only be negotiated by 1701 (ibid.).

3.1.2 French Knowledge of the ‘Upper Country’, 1650s-1670s

Regions that are now southern and eastern Ontario temporarily came under Iroquois control after 1650, forcing the French and their Aboriginal trading allies to either circumvent the Ottawa River or face likely attacks by raiding parties (Couture 1983:93). By the mid-17th century the French had developed a term, les Pays d’en Haut or the ‘Upper Country’, to designate the vast lands to the northwest of their St. Lawrence trading post network leading up to James Bay (Jaenen 1996). The still poorly known river and lake systems of the Upper Country might offer an alternate transportation route to the fur-rich areas known to exist north and west of Lake Huron, and to this effect French fur traders began to rely more intensively on independent traders, the coureurs de bois, to seek furs among Aboriginal bands living in remote regions (Vial 1995b:129). The extent to which the coureurs de bois travelled in this period is obscured by their general lack of record-keeping practices (Jacquin 1996).

By the late 1650s, Jesuit missionaries were beginning to report on the extent of social disruption including forced relocations of various Algonquian peoples occasioned by Iroquois warfare, and the information they received, usually second or third hand by Aboriginal converts, included descriptions of travel routes used by refugees. In 1657-58 a compendium of ‘new’ ‘Routes to the North Sea’ was published in the Jesuit Relations, identifying five distinct river and lake systems in Québec and Ontario leading to James Bay (Thwaites 1959[44]:239-245). Since the Aboriginal place-names cited in this document are unrecognizable except by triangulation with other Jesuit Relations documents, Jaenen (1996:193-194) re-wrote the description of the routes using modern toponymy. The first route led from Tadoussac to Lake St. Jean via the Saguenay, and then from the Ashuapmouchouan River to Lake Mistassini and the Rupert River. The second route, from Trois Rivières, followed the St. Maurice to Lake Mattagami and the Nottaway River. The third followed the Ottawa to Lakes Timiskaming and Abitibi, up the Abitibi River and the Moose River. The original Jesuit Relations document described this as the route followed by the Nipissing, who could thus reportedly reach James Bay in fifteen days. The Jesuits considered Lake Nipissing to be approximately 150 leagues (450 miles) from the ‘North Sea’ (Thwaites 1959[44]:243). The fourth route followed the French River to Georgian Bay and the northern coast of Lake Huron, to the eastern coast of Lake Superior to the Michipicoten River, and the Missinaibi River to the Moose River (Jaenen 1996:193). The last route followed the coast of Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon, and from there either the Ogoki River or perhaps the Kenogami River to the Albany River. The author of the original Jesuit Relations document humorously cautioned readers that “The above routes are more difficult to travel than the highroad from Paris to Orleans” (Thwaites 1959[44]:245).

The Jesuit Relations of 1659-60, as discussed in Chapter 2, included a document presenting an extensive description of the relocations of different ‘algonquin nations’11 to Lakes Superior and

---

11 As already indicated in this report, the term ‘algonquin’ in this document was used in its most inclusive sense to refer to many different peoples whose languages belong to the Algonquian language family.
James Bay as a result of Iroquois raids. This document, titled *Of the Condition of the Algonquin Country, and Of Some New Discoveries*, also described the journey of a recent convert named Awatani who travelled throughout the area between Lake Superior and James Bay, following its coast to its eastern shore and then returning inland to reach Tadoussac. It is in this account that what may be the first clear reference to Abitibi Indians appears in European records. The Abitibi are described as having relocated to unspecified more distant regions from their traditional territory after being defeated in an Iroquois attack. According to the timeline provided in that document the (temporary) relocation of the Abitibi would have taken place in 1657 or 1658 (Vian 1995b:129).

By 1659, two seasoned and now famous *couriers de bois*, Radisson and Des Groseillers were officially exploring the northern shore of Lake Superior and were informed by Cree groups of the rich fur country existing between Lake Superior and James Bay (Vian 1995b:130). Although Radisson claimed to have visited this country and travelled to James Bay in 1650, doubt has been cast as to the truth of his account (Ray and Freeman 1978:24; Jaenen 1996:193). When Radisson and Des Groseillers returned to Montreal with a large supply of furs obtained from (Lake Superior region) Cree, they were arrested and fined for having broken a colonial policy that prohibited unlicensed trade with Indians outside New France (Ray and Freeman 1978:24). Returning to France, their efforts to convince the French government of developing the fur trade in the Hudson and James Bay region fell on deaf ears. The French discovery and exploration of the Mississippi in the 1660s led colonial officials, including fur traders and missionaries, to focus their efforts at expanding colonization efforts in the Great Lakes area and what is now the American mid-west, instead of the 'Upper Country' and James Bay (Vian 1995b:130). In what is now a well-known story, Radisson and Des Groseillers, discouraged at French colonial indifference to develop the fur trade in the north, eventually took their plans to English merchants. The latter organized a tentative trade expedition to Hudson Bay in 1668, establishing Fort Charles (Rupert House) on the eastern shore of James Bay. Two years later, a royal charter formally created the Hudson’s Bay Company, granting it title to all the lands whose rivers drained into Hudson (and James) Bay.

Overall, historical data indicate that the Abitibi region remained relatively poorly known by the French until the establishment of the HBC on James Bay. In fact, by the early 1660s the French were still uncertain as to whether the North Sea, whose existence they had known about for several decades, was actually connected to Hudson Bay (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:5). For example, one of several digressions in the 1659-1660 Jesuit Relations document describing Awatani’s journey to James Bay, involves convoluted speculation that Lake Superior may near the Sea of China (Thwaites 1959[44]:221). The author then speculates that all of the (then) known Seas - China, Pacific, North, etc, may in fact form nothing but one great sea:

*For we learn from these peoples [Indians at the western end of Lake Superior] that they find the Sea on three sides, toward the South, toward the West, and toward the North; so that, if this is so, it is a strong argument and a very certain indication that these three Seas, being thus contiguous, form in reality but one Sea, which is that of China. For, - that of the South, which is the Pacific sea and is well enough known, being connected with the North sea, which is equally well known, by a third Sea, the*
one about which we are in doubt, – there remains nothing more to be desired than
the passage into this great sea, at once a Western and an Eastern Sea. (Ibid.:221-
223; insert added)

Despite the bold claims made in this Relation and the assumption that second or third-hand
information about the proximity of Lake Superior to three seas was geographically correct, the
northern portion of the Pacific Ocean had not yet been explored by Europeans and the Northwest
Passage was centuries away from discovery.

In the late 1650s and 1660s tentative efforts at exploration of remote northern regions were
largely confined to the Lake Superior region, and French authorities were still relying on second-hand
information from Aboriginal sources for knowledge of travel routes to James Bay and of the identity
of Aboriginal inhabitants of the "Upper Country". A rare official (recorded) attempt to travel one of
the five routes to the North Sea (the first described above, from Tadoussac to Lake St. Jean and
eventually to the Rupert River) was made by Jesuit Fathers Dablon and Drulletes in 1661, but the
expedition was forced to turn back shortly after crossing the height of land separating the French
colony from James Bay (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:5). While in principle it is possible that the region
may have been occasionally visited by Montreal-based coureurs de bois in the 1660s, no evidence was
found to support this, and historical accounts of French exploration of the region implicitly negate

3.2 ENGLISH-FRENCH COMPETITION IN THE UPPER COUNTRY, 1670-1750

The establishment of HBC posts at the mouth of the Rupert River in 1668, at Moose Factory
in 1673, and Fort Albany by 1679 had immediate noticeable impacts on the French fur trade, which
still operated from posts on the St. Lawrence. The Cree on James Bay who until the arrival of the
English were largely restricted to indirect trade zones, exchanging furs for European goods with
Aboriginal middlemen, now found themselves in local trade areas (Ray and Freeman 1978:50; see
Map. A.11).

In Ray’s (1978:26-28) spatial analysis of the development of the HBC trade, a local trade
zone extended to the point inland from the Hudson and James Bay coasts where band members could
easily make several trips per year to posts. The middleman zone defined a region further inland where
trading parties could safely make one trip every year to a given post (ibid.). According to this model,
the Aboriginal inhabitants in the Abitibi Region were now positioned to act as middlemen in the
English trade, which until the second half of the 18th century, remained centred at posts situated on
the Hudson and James Bay coastline (Ray 1978; Ray and Freeman 1978:50).

According to Ray (1978) and Ray and Freeman (1978) the shift from living in indirect trade
zones (in the French period) to either local or middleman trade zones following the establishment of
HBC posts presented several practical advantages to Aboriginal traders. Two common advantages for
the new local traders and middlemen was they now had access to both a greater range of

European manufactured goods, as well as a more regular supply of goods than they had formerly experienced when dealing either with Aboriginal traders or coureurs de bois under the French period. Direct trade opportunities also meant that HBC goods were typically less expensive, in that fewer furs were required to obtain the same or similar goods than through other Aboriginal middlemen or coureurs de bois operating from French posts. Overall, the establishment of the HBC in the 1670s seriously threatened the French trade, since it partly shifted the entire axis of the fur trade from its former west-east orientation, to a new south-north orientation, reducing the volume of furs reaching the St. Lawrence (Ray 1974:5-13).

3.2.1 The Initial French Response, 1671-1685

Within less than three years following the establishment of Fort Charles at the mouth of the Rupert River on the eastern coast of James Bay the French colonial government dispatched an expedition led by Jesuit Father Albanel, in part to obtain first-hand information on travel routes to James Bay, but also to lay a French claim to James Bay "by setting up a coat of arms of the King of France as tokens of French sovereignty" (Ray and Freeman 1978:29). At the time, Fort Charles was the HBC's sole trade post and operated only seasonally, owing to a lack of administrative organization and supply system. When Albanel reached the Fort in the summer of 1672 he found it already abandoned for the season, although the Cree indicated to him that the English had operated the post during the previous winter (*ibid*).

When Albanel planted the French coat of arms on the shore of James Bay, this was hardly the first claim by France to these lands. Jesuit Fathers Dablon and Druillettes had proclaimed this ten years earlier when they aborted their attempt to reach the Bay shortly after crossing the main height of land separating James Bay from the colony (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:5). Albanel's actions, however, were a direct challenge to England's claim and marked the beginning of a claims dispute between England and France that would only be resolved by the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht.

The English ignored the French coat of arms and built Moose Factory in 1673. In an early attempt to intercept the growing number of Indians now travelling north to James Bay, the French countered that same year by building Fort La Tourette deep inland (by French standards) at the outlet of Nighthawk Lake on a branch of the Abitibi River (Jaenen 1996:193). If this information is accurate, Fort La Tourette was located in the vicinity of present-day Timmins (cf. *PRAXIS* Research Associates 1999a:39). However, no information was found on the operations of this post, other than a statement that it was also "sometimes called Fort St. Germain after the trader who stationed himself there to intercept Native fur brigades going to Hudson's Bay Company posts" (Jaenen 1996:193). Since the 1686 De Troyes expedition made no attempt to reach Fort La Tourette, it is assumed that the latter operated for only a very short time. St. Germain himself had clearly returned to the colony by 1686, since he was recruited at Montreal to act as "captain of the guides" for the de Troyes expedition (*ibid.*:223). It is possible that Fort La Tourette may have operated for one season only, either owing to lack of supplies due to its remoteness from Montreal, or perhaps as the result of the disbanding of the Compagnie des Indes Occidentales in 1674 (*ibid.*:197).

---

The Compagnie des Indes Occidentales, which held monopoly rights to the French fur trade since 1664, was replaced by the Compagnie de la Ferme which undertook the construction of Fort Témiscamingue in 1679, as the HBC expanded its operations with the establishment of Fort Albany that year. Although south of the region under study in this report, Fort Témiscamingue represented the first relatively large and multi-year presence of a French fur trade post near Lake Abitibi. Fort Témiscamingue remained open as the Compagnie de la Ferme restructured in 1680, due to unprofitability.

Throughout the 1670s, apart from facing growing competition by the HBC, the French fur trade as a whole was experiencing financial difficulties due to the fact that the market for beaver was “glutted” in France (Ray and Freeman 1978:31). Following a number of impromptu arrangements to keep the trade operating in New France through the Compagnie de la Ferme, a new firm called the Compagnie du Nord was created in 1682, with specific aims at developing the fur trade in the Upper Country (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:16)\textsuperscript{12}.

The Compagnie du Nord’s royal charter (confirming its right to monopolistic control), issued in 1685, presented an ambitious mission statement:

\begin{quote}
Royal intentions were that the Compagnie du Nord should play an imperial role in establishing France’s claims to possession of the northern regions, conduct a profitable trade in the interest of colonial merchants, bind the northern Algonkian bands to a French alliance, and eradicate English commercial activities and territorial claims on New France’s northern frontier. (Jaenen 1996:197)
\end{quote}

The company would put this plan into immediate effect by financing (to a large extent) a military-led expedition to James Bay to capture the HBC trade posts established on James Bay \textsuperscript{13}. This expedition, led by regiment Captain Pierre (Chevalier) de Troyes, would mark the first trip taken by colonial officials through the Abitibi region and lead to the construction of the first trade post on Lake Abitibi.

\textsuperscript{12} The Compagnie de la Ferme’s restructuring involved obtaining a trade monopoly of the new southwestern territories of New France, while the Compagnie du Nord was to focus its operations on northern and northwestern regions (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:16). Both companies continued to operate until 1700, when the Compagnie du Nord was formally dissolved and a new venture, the Compagnie de la Colonie took over the Compagnie de la Ferme (Jaenen 1996:200).

\textsuperscript{13} The formal, written instructions to de Troyes, which have survived in archival records (cf. Jaenen 1996:222-228) did not emphasize that his primary goal was to capture English posts. Instead de Troyes was charged with the tasks of building a post among the Abitibis, to search for, arrest and ‘punish’ illegal (unlicensed) \textit{coureurs de bois} throughout the James Bay region, specifically Radisson, who is described as a traitor. At Fort Albany he is to demand the release of several \textit{coureurs de bois} captured by the English, although there is a brief reference to the fact that he is expected to ‘take’ this post (Jaenen 1996:226). Detailed and explicit directions to capture all of the HBC posts on James Bay by force might have been interpreted by England as an act of war (cf. Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:22-23).
3.2.2 The Expedition of Pierre de Troyes of 1686 and Aftermath

Pierre de Troyes' expedition to James Bay was described in his instructions as a "detachment" of 105 men, consisting of several military officers, 30 soldiers, 60 Canadians, and a Jesuit priest, Father Silvye (Jaenen 1996:223). The expedition was to reach James Bay from Montreal by following "the route to the Themiskamingues, and from there by the Abitibi to the bay of the north" (ibid.; see Map A.12).

Three records of the expedition have survived to provide details of its journey to James Bay, including the attack and capture of HBC posts; two of these accounts are by de Troyes and Father Silvye (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971; Jaenen 1996). In addition, a deposition by HBC Governor Henry Sergeant, who was temporarily captured by de Troyes, is found reprinted in Kenyon and Turnbull (1971), providing an English perspective on the actions of de Troyes at that location. These documents provide very few details on the identity and activities of Aboriginal groups encountered along the way to James Bay, other than presenting general references to "Indians" or "natives" and occasional mention of "Abitibi" at the lake of the same name. In a sense this is not surprising since the expedition was not concerned with contacting Aboriginal residents or documenting their way of life. These records, however, provide rare data on the size and personnel of the French post at Timiskaming, and of the intended purpose of the post constructed at Lake Abitibi.

The expedition left Montreal on March 20, 1686 and after several extended stops and detours travelling up the Ottawa, reached the Timiskaming post nearly two months later, according to de Troyes' journal:

_The eighteenth we left in the morning and did not stop in spite of a storm which lasted almost the whole day, until we arrived at the post of the gentlemen of the Compagnie du Nord. It is situated on an island in Lake Themiskamingue. This island might be a half league around and is between two rapids coming from a small river called Metabec Chouan [Montreal River] in the native tongue, from which several natives came forth to trade with us. There were fourteen Frenchmen in this company post who were no less pleased by our arrival than we were, and both parties celebrated by firing their muskets._

_The nineteenth and the two days following the weather was very trying. Messrs. De Ste. Helene and d'Hyerville used the time along with Mr. de St. Germain to set in order the affairs of the old and new company concerning merchandise and peltries that were in the storehouse, and appointed Sr. Sibille [Jean Sebille] to give account of everything to the company. We left him four men to take care of the trading, with very little provisions. Messrs. Guillet and Villedieu remained behind for three days to go to the Nepissingue, a native nation, to have canoes made and sent out to Montreal. As for us we traded for some of the local natives to replace those we had and that we left there because they were too heavy and cumbersome for the rest of our journey..._ (Jaenen 1996:238; inserts and translation original)
As indicated in Chapter 2, this height of land marked the southern boundary of the hunting territories of the Abitibi in the early 20th century, as documented by Jenkins (1939). It is quite possible that this large and unmistakable geographic feature might also have marked the boundary of Cree tribal territory, although the records of the de Troyes expedition make no reference to this issue (the tribal identities of the "Indians" or "natives" encountered were not recorded).

The expedition arrived at Lake Abitibi on June 2 (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:62). According to de Troyes' journal, the construction of the trade post occupied his men for three days:

> On the third and the two following days, I had the fort built on a small rise which is twenty-three feet above the water level. The fort was constructed of posts and flanked by four small bastions... The sixth I left Sr. de Cerry in the command of the fort with a complement of three men. (Jaenen 1996:243-244)

Although de Troyes left four men in charge of the Abitibi post as he departed for Moose Factory, his instructions indicated that upon completion of the expedition's duties, the post was to employ a total of eight men (Jaenen 1996:225). Fort Abitibi appears to have been a relatively small post, considering the short time required for its construction.

The remainder of the journal describes the difficult trip to Moose Factory via the Abitibi, and the capture of that trade post (on June 19, 1686), along with those of Fort Charles (July 3) and Albany (July 26). The number and difficulty of portages required throughout the expedition's voyage convinced de Troyes (and later convinced colonial authorities) of the impracticality of attempting to use the Ottawa-Timiskaming-Abitibi route as a regular supply and communication route between Montreal and James Bay (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:37). The French were obligated to follow the same route used by the HBC, the sea route through Hudson's Bay to supply their new northern posts with provisions and trade goods, and to ship furs for export to Europe. While under French control, the James Bay posts were renamed: Moose Factory became Fort Saint-Louis, Fort Charles was now Fort St. Jacques, and Fort Albany went by the name of Fort Sainte Anne (Vieu 1995b:133). Although the English attempted to regain possession of their Hudson Bay posts, they remained under French control and operation until at least the mid-1690s.

Fort Témiscamingue however, was shut down and the original structure was likely destroyed after an Iroquois raid in 1688 in which all personnel were killed (Paquin 1979:32; Couture 1983:93; Vieu 1995b:134). The fate of the Abitibi post is somewhat unclear. Couture (1983:93) suggests that the Iroquois went on to attack this post as well, while Vieu (1995b:134) and Paquin (1979:32) are silent on the issue. Vieu's (1995b:139) later assessment of the volume of trade in the Abitibi region in the 1710s describes the Abitibi post as nearly inactive between 1713 and 1720, at which time Fort Timiskaming was re-built by the French, but this in fact suggests that the post was officially open. Voorhis (1930:26) also described the Abitibi post as being:

> ... regularly operated by the French from 1686 to 1763, and all their trade with James Bay to the Treaty of Utrecht 1714[sic], and after that Treaty, their local
trade, passed through this fort for a period of 77 years.

It is quite possible that the Abitibi post survived an Iroquois attack in 1688, and remained open after the closing of the Timiskaming post by attaching itself (as an outpost) to Fort Saint-Louis (old Moose Factory). The transfer of coastal trade posts on Hudson Bay to the English after 1713 would then have isolated Fort Abitibi until the re-construction of Fort Timiskaming in 1720, explaining its moribund state in this period.

According to Viau (1995b:134-135), French traders remained active to some extent throughout the overall Abitibi-Timiskaming region in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, mainly by the operations of posts established in the Outaouais (northeast of the Ottawa River). By the mid-1690s, however, the French fur trade was experiencing another severe economic crisis due to an over-supply of peltries in French markets (Jaenen 1996:275). The French fur trade in North America underwent comprehensive re-structuring, in which many posts were closed and the old licensing system was abolished in 1796 (Viau 1995b:134). When the licensing system would be re-established in 1716 after a recovery of French fur markets, the Hudson and James Bay trade had since been returned to HBC control through the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht (ibid.:134).

3.2.3 The French and English Trade in the First Half of the 18th Century

Québec historians agree that the re-establishment of Fort Témiscamingue in 1720 involved a thriving fur trade business lasting into the late 1750s (Viau 1995b:136-140). Paquin (1979:32), for example, indicates that the new post shipped an average 13,500 pounds of furs each year to Montreal until the English conquest forced its closure in 1761. However, Viau (1995b:139) points out that little to no French fur trade activity appears to have been carried out on Lake Abitibi proper between the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, and the re-opening of the Timiskaming post.

According to the terms of that Treaty, France agreed to relinquish all claims to Hudson and James Bay, but the actual boundary between New France and Rupert’s Land remained contested (ibid.:135). While the English and the HBC claimed title to lands up to the main height of land (south of Lake Abitibi) this boundary was unacceptable to French colonial officials since it prevented French fur traders from access to the best furs. To that effect, a French outpost of Fort Timiskaming was constructed on the upper Abitibi River in 1730, which remained in operation at least until 1757 (ibid.:139-140). Along with the original post on Lake Abitibi, which in 1757 is described as “dependent” on Fort Timiskaming (Voorhis 1930:26), the latter had two outposts operating in the Abitibi region between 1730 and 1763.

The French fur trade in the 1720-1760 period involved significant changes in its mode of operation compared to that of the 17th century. Frustrations with illegal trade activities and abuse of alcohol as an item of trade by long-established couriers de bois led to the replacement of these contracted, independent traders by trade company employees (voyageurs), beginning in 1726 (ibid.:137). Approximately 12 to 18 voyageurs were assigned to the Timiskaming post by 1730, to work on a seasonal basis (ibid.:138). Also working from the Timiskaming post was a new class of
employee called hivernant. Viau (1995b:139) describes the hivernants as relatively specialized and educated employees (so termed in reference to the fact that as opposed to voyageurs, they remained at a post over the course of winter) who could tend to post account books. By 1730 Fort Témiscamingue likely employed three or four hivernants, so that including its chief trader, the post likely had a minimum permanent staff of four to five employees in addition to the voyageurs charged with supplying its Abitibi outposts.

The re-establishment of Moose Factory by the HBC in 1730 created a fur trade context in the Abitibi region that was unique in northern Ontario, in that the proximity of French and English posts entailed a process of direct competition for furs. The French posts established in more western regions of Ontario, for example at Lake Nipigon (in 1684) and later at Michipicoten (1714), intended to intercept Indians engaged in long-distance travels to the HBC posts but were only partly successful in this endeavour. Their distance from HBC posts did not prevent the formation of Aboriginal middlemen groups, who could easily by-pass French establishments by collecting furs from more distant bands living in indirect HBC trade zones (Ray and Freeman 1978: 50-51).

In the Moose Factory region, Ray and Freeman note that the proximity of competing French trade establishments in the first half of the 18th century “prevented the development of any significant indirect trade region” (ibid.:51). In effect, the lack of indirect trade regions implies a lack of Aboriginal middlemen, which is exactly what French traders were reporting by the early 1720s:

_Au début des années 1720, la traite des fourrures commence à prendre une nouvelle tangente. Les intermédiaires amériques sont presque tous disparus du commerce français. Les chasseurs ont de plus en plus tendance à porter eux-mêmes les fourrures aux comptoirs les plus rapprochés. La traite entraîne une régionalisation progressive des bandes amériques autour des postes._ (Viau 1995b:136)

Additional evidence of direct English-French competition in the Abitibi region in the early 18th century is found in the construction of an HBC outpost for Moose Factory at the junction of the Moose, Missinaibi and Mattagami Rivers in the summer of 1730 (ibid.:139). According to Viau the competition was sufficiently intense that French traders were considering recruiting Aboriginal warriors to launch a military offensive against the James Bay HBC posts in the 1730s and 1740s.

These plans, however, were not implemented, possibly because regional Aboriginal traders were realizing that the English-French competition benefitted them materially, as they could either trade their furs locally, or perhaps even play off the English and French against one another and obtain better prices for their furs. This is exactly what would occur in more westerly inland regions of Ontario in the second half of the 18th century, when the North West Company (NWC) established a trade network which forced the HBC to expand its operations into the interior by creating its own network of posts (Ray 1974; Ray and Freeman 1978; cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1998b:28-32).

In sum, the available historical data demonstrates that a permanent presence of Europeans in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region can be dated to the late 17th century, and that contacts

between Aboriginal residents and those Europeans intensified significantly by the early-mid 18th century. The following section describes the development of Aboriginal-European interactions and the likely formation of a two generations of mixed ancestry prior to the mid-18th century.

3.3 DEVELOPMENT OF A POPULATION OF MIXED DESCENT, 1670-1750

The examination of the historical development of the fur trade presented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 demonstrates that Aboriginal inhabitants of the Abitibi region of northeastern Ontario were in direct contact with Europeans (both French and English) by the 1670s. While the distance of St. Lawrence trade posts largely precluded the possibility of any significant presence of coureurs de bois up to the 1660s, historians agree that these contracted, independent traders were active throughout the Lake Abitibi region by the next decade. This section begins by reviewing available evidence concerning their presence and extent of interaction with the Aboriginal bands they encountered. The discussion then shifts to an analysis of available evidence concerning the social and cultural status of a population of mixed European and Indian ancestry up to the period of English conquest.

3.3.1 The Coureurs de Bois

One of the key differences between the operations of the French and English fur trade is that the former took their trade directly to Aboriginal bands in their respective territories, while the HBC attempted to attract Aboriginal trappers and traders to their posts by offering a greater range of better quality goods (Ray and Freeman 1978:183). This should not be interpreted to mean that no trade in furs took place at French posts along the St. Lawrence. Very likely the majority of furs exported to France and Europe from the St. Lawrence in the 17th century were obtained by trade conducted at Tadoussac, Québec, Trois Rivières and Montreal. However, since the very beginning of the regular St. Lawrence trade after the construction of Tadoussac in 1599-1600, the French realized that the majority of furs brought to their posts were not of local origin. The larger shipments were being brought by trading parties formed by individuals belonging to non-local bands, who were acting as middlemen for fur hunters living in even more distant (and poorly known) regions.

Although the middleman trade was welcomed, French traders quickly developed a perception that the Aboriginal fur producers living in what appeared to be the richest fur-bearing lands were beyond their reach in part because they were being blocked by middlemen groups. Middlemen also tried to charge more for the same type and quality of furs than local Aboriginal fur traders. Therefore, in an effort to avoid becoming completely dependent on middlemen, French traders began a practice early in the 17th century of sending out traders equipped with trade goods to barter for furs with Aboriginal bands residing at considerable distances inland from the St. Lawrence (Ecobes 1972; cf. Trigger 1985:285; Vial 1995b:129).

The individuals who came to take this role in the 17th century were typically contracted workers recruited from the lower classes of the French colony.
The majority of them were soldiers, accustomed to a rough life, or lower-class youths in the trading company. Only one, about whom little is known, was identified as a member of the nobility. The young men, in particular, must have had little access to the more substantial comforts of European life and in the normal course of events must have been severely limited in opportunities for advancement. They were often treated scornfully and even brutally by their superiors at Quebec. (Trigger 1985:196)

The individuals contracted to travel to Indian bands to collect furs tended to view the fur trade as providing them with a potential for career advancement, and perhaps even to eventually rise to a middle-class status and lifestyle upon returning to Europe (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 2000:34).

Although later commonly referred to by historians as coureurs de bois, it is significant to note that this expression only started to become used by French colonial officials in the mid-1600s (Saunders 1940:125). Throughout the first half of the 17th century documents typically refer to them simply as engagés. By the time the expression coureurs de bois began to appear in French records by the 1650s, this class of fur trade workers had already acquired a poor reputation in colonial society, and especially in the colonial government, mainly through the writings of missionaries. From its inception, the expression invoked pejorative connotations (Saunders 1940:125).

Since the early 17th century the two main groups of French missionaries, the Récollets and later the Jesuits, complained to colonial administrators that engagés and truchements were actually impeding their efforts at religious conversion by engaging in ‘debauchery’ and ‘licentiousness’ while living among Aboriginal groups (Ecles 1972:42). A more pressing concern to fur trading companies and colonial administrators involved reports that some engagés exhibited little loyalty to their employers or to France, by trading furs obtained from Aboriginal groups to the English. This accusation was brought against perhaps the best known coureur de bois of the early 17th century, Etienne Brulé. Labelled as a traitor by Champlain in 1628, Brulé was to spend the rest of his life in ‘exile’ among the Huron (Trigger 1978:109).

In an effort to better regulate the operation of the fur trade and to police the trade activities of the coureurs de bois, the colonial administration developed a licensing system in 1654 under which persons leaving the settled regions of the colony were required to obtain permits, or congés. This licensing system, however, was subject to periodic abuse and corruption and as Saunders (1940:125) remarks, “was reformed, abandoned, and reformed time and again throughout the French period”. When operational the licensing system distinguished those persons who went into the woods ‘legally’ from those who went ‘illegally’, i.e., without congés. Over the course of the second half of the century, the term coureurs de bois was often used by colonial officials to designate persons roaming the woods without licenses, adding a connotation of illegality to the already well established immorality associated with this expression.

---

14 A specific meaning for this term was developed in the French military in the 16th century to designate soldiers who had freely and voluntarily joined the army (cf. Robert 1972:576)
3.3.2 The Coureurs de Bois in the Upper Country

The historical sources reviewed for this assignment indicate that coureurs de bois (legal and/or illegal) were most certainly active in the Abitibi region by the 1670s (cf. Ray and Freeman 1978:30). According to Kenyon and Turnbull (1971:10):

The pattern of French trading developed by the 1670s was that of sending out traders annually from the colony to the pays d'en haut the “up country” lying beyond the rapids to the west and north of Montreal, to bargain and barter with the Indians, exchanging trade goods – muskets, powder and ball, copper and brass kettles, knives, hatchets, blankets and tobacco – for the furs the Indians obtained from the wilderness. Brandy was traded too, much against the wishes of the clergy, for the Indians, unaccustomed to intoxicants, were debauched by them.

The construction of Fort La Tourette on Nighthawk Lake (near Timmins) in 1673 almost certainly involved the assistance of coureurs de bois. While the little surviving information concerning this post suggests it may have been permanently staffed by only one trader (St. Germain), its distance and isolation from Montreal would have required that other fur trade employees oversee the transportation of its supply in trade goods, as well as the return of furs. The existence of only one permanent trader at La Tourette does not preclude the possibility that the Fort employed seasonal traders which was in essence the nature of coureurs de bois employment.

A similar context would apply to the construction and operation of Fort Témiscamingue in 1679. Information about its personnel from the expedition of Pierre de Troyes in 1686 indicates that Fort Témiscamingue was significantly larger Fort La Tourette. It is unknown, however, if the 14 Frenchmen found at the post by de Troyes were all permanent post employees, or if some of these persons were regional coureurs de bois recalled to the post in anticipation of its change in management. The reference by de Troyes to the individual named Cognac, described by him as returning to Quebec, suggests that he may have been an engagé of the post (i.e., a “legal” coureur de bois).

The official instructions provided to de Troyes present clear evidence that coureurs de bois had been operating between Fort Timiskaming and the James Bay region. This document contains two distinct statements indicating that French officials suspected a number of coureurs de bois of illegally trading with the English. One directive instructed de Troyes to ‘punish’ any coureurs de bois he may find along his journey, and a second directive ordered him to drive them out of the James Bay region. Near Fort Albany in particular, de Troyes was to look specifically for Radisson who for the
second time was accused of treason against the colonial government.\footnote{Radisson had fallen in and out of favour with the French government several times throughout his career as explorer and fur trader (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971). Ironically, when returning to the good graces of the colonial government after having helped create the HBC in 1668, Radisson provided financial backing and organizational support for the formation of the Compagnie du Nord, under whose auspices the de Troyes expedition was now directed to arrest him. Radisson had returned to working for the English by 1684 after being frustrated with the levies he was required to pay to the Compagnie de la Ferme under French colonial law (Jaenen 1996:199). Along with Étienne Brulé earlier in the century, he and several other individuals provided a stereotypical, pejorative image of the couriers de bois as untrustworthy.}

As soon as Monseur de Troyes has assured himself of his post I will inform him as rapidly as possible about the small establishments there might be of Frenchmen or of others along the shores of the bay, as especially of the one at Rivière des Saviennes which can only be thirty or forty leagues from Chechouannes [Fort Albany], at which post we know the traitor Radisson is to make a base at the expense of the colony for all these little posts established by the deserters and thieves like himself. Monseur de Troyes will seize them and especially the said Radisson. He can render no greater service to the King in this country than to put us in a position to make an example of all these robbers and couriers de bois by punishing them according to the rigours of the ordinances...

Monseur de Troyes will remember that his diligence must be directed to establishing the post he will have taken and to putting it in a state of great security against the Insults that could come from the strangers, thieves and some natives. And after having cleaned out the Bay as much as he can of all the couriers de bois, thieves and others, and made an inventory of all the provisions which he will leave in the hands of sieurs de Ste. Henaine and d’Hiberville who will remain in the fort where one of them will take command. (Jaenen 1996:226)

The problem of illegal trade (to the English) by couriers de bois in the James Bay region would persist throughout the first half of the 18th century, as evidenced by occasional references in Moose Factory journals to receiving furs from French traders between 1733 and 1760 (Ray and Freeman 1978:177, 183-187; Mitchell 1977:12).

3.3.3 Relations with Aboriginal Women

The couriers de bois are notoriously described by many fur trade historians as ‘womanizing rogues’. A typical assessment of their behaviour is provided by Kenyon and Turnbull (1971:10):

The couriers de bois was a hard-drinking wench with a lust for commercial gain, who took to the life of the woods with a will. He plied the Indians with drink, he slept with their women, he supplied them with the goods their economy rapidly became dependent upon, setting up commercial rivalry between tribes which frequently led to intertribal warfare.
Although writing specifically about the situation in the Upper Country, Kenyon and Turnbull's description of the conduct of the *coureurs de bois* is actually culled from a number of complaints and accusations presented to colonial authorities by French missionaries throughout New France's colony and hinterland during the 17th century. No specific data about actual relationships between *coureurs de bois* and Aboriginal women in the Abitibi region in the late 17th century appears to exist, so any historian attempting to address this issue must engage in some speculation and extrapolate probable behaviours from recorded information on *coureurs de bois* documented for other regions. The reason for this dearth of information is simply that no missionaries were established in the Abitibi region in the 17th century, and missionaries were the only source of information on the social mores of *coureurs de bois* in the hinterland (Trigger 1968:119).

Since the *coureurs de bois* themselves typically produced no records or journals documenting their lives and activities in the woods, original historical documents presenting information on the latter are restricted to two sources: correspondence and memoranda by French colonial officials, and reports and letters by French missionaries. The tendency of government officials in the second half of the 17th century to restrict the use of the term *coureurs de bois* to individuals roaming the woods illegally (without congés or licenses) virtually guarantees that any mention of *coureurs de bois* in colonial records will be pejorative. Similarly, since the *coureurs de bois* did not conform to the ideal Christian standards that missionaries were attempting to impart on prospective Aboriginal converts it is not surprising to find that their letters and reports present the fur traders in a bad light (Ecoles 1972:42). In brief, the only two sources of documentary information on the *coureurs de bois* can be considered hostile sources.

The extent to which *coureurs de bois*, and later voyageurs or even fur traders generally engaged in sexual relations with Aboriginal women in the Abitibi region in the 17th and 18th centuries cannot be determined with any certainty, although it is reasonable to conclude that the activity was likely a common practice. Throughout the French fur trade hinterland region, *coureurs de bois* either engaged in casual sexual relations with Aboriginal women, or developed longer-term relations with individual women by marrying them according to the custom followed by their society (Jacquin 1996).

The latter practice came to be referred as *le mariage à la façon du pays*, a practice that developed in a context in which either the *coureur de bois*, or the Aboriginal band he traded with, or both, wished to enter into more permanent economic relations. Aboriginal peoples in northern Ontario and Québec lived in bands and societies in which kinship (family relationships) formed the key element of social organization. In the 17th century *coureurs de bois* were invariably European (French) and lacked consanguinal ties (relationship by 'blood' or descent) to Aboriginal bands. Therefore, one of the few vehicles permitting the integration of a *coureur de bois* into an Aboriginal kin group was by marriage, i.e., affinally.

Jacquin (1996:169) describes a French-Ottawa marriage *à la façon du pays* as follows:

*Lorsqu'un Français négocie avec les Outaouais, il prend pour le servir une de leurs*
He adds that these relationships were essentially formed out of economic values held by Aboriginal band members regarding sexual divisions of labour in band societies, as well as by economic benefits to bands resulting from regular access to trade goods:

Dans une société où la division du travail entre les sexes est contraignante, ils se moqueraient d'un homme qui, hors d'une grande nécessité, ferait quelque chose qui doit être fait par une femme; seul l'état conjugal permet de profiter du travail et du savoir-faire d'une femme, créa des liens de réciprocité qui apportent l'assurance de la sécurité et l'avantage de privilèges économiques. Les Indiens regardent les préoccupations d'ordre sexuel comme secondaires, ils cherchent à faire entrer le courreur de bois dans le cercle de la parentalité, mais l'union doit se contracter suivant les traditions de la tribu et le courreur de bois n'échappe pas à cette règle. (Ibid.:169-170)

That courreurs de bois were required in this context to follow Aboriginal customs and values was taken as evidence by some missionaries that Frenchmen coming into contact with Indian society not only failed to help assimilate them into French culture and society, but in fact tended to become assimilated themselves into Indian societies and cultures. One late 17th century official commented that:

It was long believed that it was necessary to draw Indians near us to Frenchify them; there is every reason to acknowledge it was a mistake. Those who have approached us have not become French, and the French who frequented them have become savages. (Peterson 1981:14)

More recent evaluations of the interactions of courreurs de bois within Aboriginal societies suggests that their apparent adoption of Aboriginal cultures was usually superficial or situational and borne from practical necessities of the trading relationships (Trigger 1985:196-197). This assessment, however, must be tempered by the fact that most 17th century courreurs de bois are poorly known. Those for whom historical records provide personal details were clearly involved in the fur trade for personal gain and do not appear to have identified their personal interests with those of the Aboriginal groups with whom they interacted and lived.

Those courreurs de bois who mastered Aboriginal languages, learned Aboriginal customs and
who became successful hunters were probably well-respected in Aboriginal bands, and likely derived satisfaction from this considering their poor treatment and low social status in colonial society (ibid.). Nevertheless the work of a coureur de bois was based on the economic exploitation of Aboriginal fur producers, and success in this endeavour offered opportunities for career advancement in the fur trade and the possibility of upward class mobility upon return to Europe. Some coureurs de bois are known to have ended their lives in Aboriginal societies, while others simply ‘disappeared into the wilderness’. In several documented cases they did so after being charged with either treason or desertion by French authorities (cf. Praxis Research Associates 2000:46, ff.20). Since they faced a death sentence upon conviction for such crimes it is not surprising that some opted to live in the hinterland rather than returning to the colony (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:22). Finally, while some coureurs de bois and hivernants developed longer-term relationships with Aboriginal women by marrying à la façon du pays, ethnohistorians posit that the majority of sexual relationships were casual as few coureurs de bois attached themselves to a single Aboriginal group or band for long periods (cf. Praxis Research Associates 2000:41).

Frenchmen were not the only fur trade employees having sexual relations with Aboriginal women in the late 17th century. During the take-over of Moose Factory by the de Troyes expedition on June 11, 1686, the French found two Indian women in the private quarters of HBC personnel. According to the deposition of Henry Sergeant, documenting the surprise attack:

The 10th of June Mr. Bridgar left his Factory at Hayes Islands purposeing for Rupert River on what errand I know not having noe such orders from me takaing with him all the Officers in the Country as Brownson, Garland, Norbury, Outlaw, Miners, and Oake. The next morning as day appeared being 11 of June as above expressed the French Surprised the Factory where found therein Two Indian Women One in Anthony Dowrages Cabbin whoame Bridgar left Chiefe and the other in John Fortnam’s. (Kenyon and Turnbull 1971:106)

Henry Sergeant was at the time Governor of the HBC, visiting the James Bay posts.

According to Van Kirk (1980:173), de Troyes’ take-over of the HBC posts on James Bay was the key event that convinced the Company to implement a strict policy forbidding European women at their posts. This policy, to remain enforced until the 19th century, was developed as the result of the ordeals suffered by Sergeant’s (British) wife and her (British) companion in 1686 as these two women had accompanied him to James Bay:

The only exception to this absence of European wives from the fur trade scene was an ill-starred experiment on the Bay in the 1680s when the wife of Governor Henry Sergeant and her companion Mrs Maurice had been allowed to come out to Albany. The experience of the two British women had been frightful; not only had they to endure the harsh climate and primitive conditions, but they were subject to the French overland attack on the Hudson’s Bay Company posts in 1686. Mrs Sergeant was nearly killed in the attack on Albany, and the London Committee conjectured...
that her husband’s concern for her safety had made him reluctant to mount a spirited defence of the fort. Mrs Maurice suffered even greater hazard. In the summer of 1685, her father had anxiously demanded that his daughter be sent home, but the ship on which she sailed was lost in the ice. The survivors, while wintering at Fort Charles, were caught up in de Troyes’ attack and Mrs Maurice was wounded… In the light of these events the London Committee came to the conclusion that white women at their posts would constitute a burdensome nuisance. Sergeant and his “parcell of women” were recalled and a resolution was passed forbidding any female passage to Hudson Bay. (Ibid.; quotation marks original)

Following the permanent return of the HBC to James Bay after the Treaty of Utrecht, the banning of European women at posts led many employees in the 18th century to develop semi-permanent relationships with Aboriginal women:

Had it been possible for traders to bring out their wives… it is doubtful whether intermarriage with native women would have been so extensive or marriage à la façon du pays so widely accepted. (Ibid.)

According to Van Kirk (Ibid.:174), during the 18th century some of the senior HBC post personnel stationed on James Bay for extended periods developed “double families”:

This phenomenon of the “double family” was not unusual among eighteenth-century Hudson’s Bay Company officers; several others such as James Isham and Andrew Graham married British women when they went home on furlough but then returned to the Bay to their native wives. A husband, far away in Rupert’s Land, might take another woman to assuage his loneliness…

While no statistical data exist enabling any estimate of the extent to which European-Aboriginal marriages or unions à la façon du pays occurred between the late 17th century and the mid-18th century, historians agree that these practices were relatively common-place in the fur trade hinterland regions. The following section examines the likely development of a population of mixed European and Indian descent in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region up to the mid-1700s.

3.3.4 The First Generations of Mixed Descent

The continuous presence of European fur traders in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region beginning in the late 1600s virtually guarantees that some children of mixed descent were born to Indian women prior to the English conquest. However, consistent with earlier reports focusing on historic métis in other regions of Ontario (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a, 1999b, 2000), no direct references to persons of mixed descent could be found in historical documents for the region under study in this report for the 17th and early 18th centuries.

As explained in the earlier reports cited above, there are two basic factors contributing to this
dearth of data. The first factor concerns the fact that French colonial society was less organized around racial lines than along occupational lines segmented by social class. Since lifestyle and occupation, as opposed to race, were the principal determinants of social status, it is not surprising that authors considered the partial Indian ancestry of individuals as a largely irrelevant social issue (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a:40-43, 2000:58-59). The second factor contributing to the lack of references to persons of mixed ancestry in historical records from this period, is that children born of French or English fathers and Indian mothers typically remained with the latter in their respective bands and societies and were not a visible presence in the colony.

The historical and ethnohistorical literature reviewed for this assignment presents a complete consensus regarding the fate of children born of European fur traders and Indian mothers in the 17th century. The point is made by Giraud (1986[1]:227) in his seminal study of the métis. Jaenen (1976:164) states:

[French-Indian] marriages were usually between a French man and a native woman, not between French women and Amerindian men. Therefore, although the children of such unions were, in European terms, French by paternity, they were raised in the native way of life by their native mothers.

Jacquin's (1996:168) study of the coureurs de bois comments that children of mixed marriages never remained in the custody of their fathers. This appears certain in the case of coureurs de bois, since the latter's role in the fur trade required constant movement over vast distances.

Early 18th century HBC records present little information on children of mixed descent. By the middle of that century, however, Van Kirk (1980:95) considers that a "large mixed-blood" population had probably developed in bands living close to coastal posts. However, she adds that:

It is almost impossible to identify many of these children because so many were absorbed into the Home Guard bands. In the annals of the Hudson's Bay Company during this period virtually no distinction was made between Indian and mixed-blood. (Ibid.)

As with French-Indian marriages, the fact that children of mixed English-Indian unions were raised by their mothers contributed to making such children "invisible" in historical records of the period, resulting in a "serious underestimation" of the probable number of such children (Ibid.:96).

Overall, neither historical records nor historical analyses for the late 17th century to the mid-18th century suggest that persons of mixed European and Indian descent developed a distinct social identity. The context in which children of mixed unions were born and raised suggests that they were viewed by Europeans as well as by the respective bands in which they lived as full band members sharing the tribal identification of their mothers. Over time, as suggested by Van Kirk's (Ibid.:97) data for the late 18th century, it is quite possible that children of mixed descent became increasingly aware of their partial European ancestry, while continuing to be absorbed into the Indian way of life.
While the potential may have existed for these individuals to begin to develop an incipient sense of distinct social identity, the lack of specific data on this phenomenon precludes any definitive conclusions from being established.

The following chapter examines the development of a population of mixed ancestry following the English conquest.
4. THE ABITIBI FUR TRADE REGION, 1784 - 1890

The establishment of Frederick House in 1784 by the Hudson's Bay Company marked the beginning of intense competition in the Abitibi region between the HBC "English" and the "Canadians" represented mainly by the North West Company. This chapter traces the history of inland expansion of fur trade posts by the NWC north from Fort Timiskaming, and by the HBC south from Moose Factory. This expansion quickly developed both economically and socially into a regional fur trade involving seven post locations along the Abitibi River system. Analyses focus on the social relations among inland posts, the role of Aboriginal women at these posts, and the occupational profile of a subsequent class of servants of mixed ancestry within the region. These discussions provide the fur trade context for a more detailed analysis in Chapter 5, of the development of a regional fur trade community in which a population of mixed ancestry was significant.

4.1 THE REGIONAL FUR TRADE CONTEXT

4.1.1 Competition and Inland Expansion of the Fur Trade, 1784-1821

By the late 1770s, Canadian-based fur trade companies, as well as French and early British "Pedlars" were operating directly in the interior region around Lake Abitibi, forcing the Hudson’s Bay Company to compete by expanding inland from Moose Factory (Judd 1980:129; cf. Rey 1988:342). Pedlars were free traders from Montreal, French and English Canadians who traded en derouine after the British conquest of New France. Pedlars tended to build informal posts inland, developing intimate trade dealings with local Indians which Brown suggests carried over to relationships with Indian women (Brown 1980a:82-83). Little has been written about the Pedlars, although it appears they were a hardy brand of trader, experienced inland travellers willing to live if necessary, "on fish or raw oatmeal and water" (Mitchell 1977:29). Although the Pedlars' trade activity was independent and unorganized, they posed serious competition to the HBC:

*About the year 1773 the Canadian traders from Montreal... had become so numerous and indefatigable at the head of the rivers which led to the Hudson's Bay Company settlements that trade of the latter was in a great measure cut off. The Indians being supplied with everything at their own doors had no occasion to paddle several hundred miles to the Company's forts. (In Voorhis 1930:21)*

In response, HBC headquarters in London sent a surveyor, Philip Turnor, to scout for potential post locations in the interior around Lake Abitibi. In 1779, Turnor encountered one of the Canadian inland trading establishments, reporting that it consisted of three larger trading houses and ten smaller dwellings, each of the latter also being trading houses by virtue of "every one of their men being a trader" (in Brown 1980a:82).
A variety of small Canadian fur trade companies and independent Pedlar operations continued to compete in the region over the next several years, and in the winter of 1788 no less than five Canadian settlements were reported on Lake Abitibi (ibid.:31). According to Voorhis (1930:19), the North West Fur Trading Company was formed in 1783 as a direct result of the rivalry over the inland trade, creating a united front of private traders opposed to the expansionist efforts of the HBC. By 1790 the main players in the fur trade rivalry in the Abitibi region were the North West Company’s Timiskaming posts and the Hudson’s Bay Company inland posts ruled by the Council at Moose Factory (Mitchell 1977:37). This rivalry existed continuously and intensively until the coalition of the two companies in 1821 (Voorhis 1930:23).

In 1784 Turnor established a temporary HBC post at Frederick House, its purpose to compete with the Canadians, apparently in conjunction with requests from Abitibi Indians who had asked that a post be established further inland from Moose Factory.16 The Company’s original intent was to build a post on Lake Abitibi where the Canadians were already well established. However, Turnor was warned by local Indians that large game (deer) was scarce there, and the post was established at the junction of the Abitibi and Pusquachama (Frederick House) rivers, “a strategic site in the centre of the Abitibi Indians’ lands” (Mitchell 1977:26-27). A year later a more permanent post was built on the south east shore of Lake Waratowaca (Frederick House Lake) where the fishery was more productive.17 From the Moose Council’s perspective, Frederick House was an expensive post to supply and disappointing in terms of fur returns, but nevertheless proved to be a “thorn in the flesh” of James Grant and his Canadian operation out of Fort Timiskaming (ibid.).

In 1792 the Canadians built a post on Devil’s Island in Frederick House Lake, just offshore from the HBC post. The Moose Council countered this move in 1794 by establishing two new posts in the area, one on Lake Abitibi18 (by George Gladman) and another on Kenogami Lake (by John Mannall). Within months the Canadians retaliated by sending Donald McKay (Sr.) to build a trading house on Lake Matawagamingue, 30 miles southwest of the new Kenogami post (Mitchell 1977:41,48). In 1800 MacKay was sent to establish another post on Groundhog Lake, named Flying Post by the Canadians, but known as Kakatoosh (Kukatosh) by the HBC men.19 When MacKay was sent to Fort Timiskaming in 1804, Angus Cameron became master of Matawagamingue and shortly after George McBride took over management of Flying Post (ibid.:94).

16 Source: HBCA Post History - Frederick House.

17 This site, along which the Ontario Northland Railway and the highway from Timmins to Iroquois Falls run today, is marked with a plaque erected in 1959 by the Historical Branch of the Public Archives of Ontario (Source: AO, Historical Plaque, 25 July 1959: “Cochrane District - Frederick House, 1785-1821”).

18 Although the HBC had apparently frequented Lake Abitibi off and on since the British conquest of 1763, between 1794 and 1796 the Company established a permanent house and rebuilt the old De Troyes fort (Voorhis 1930:26).

19 Since at least 1784, the Canadians had operated a post situated up the west branch of the Montreal River on Lake Mistinikok called “Lange de Terre” and in 1788 this post was under the management of Æneas Cameron. According to Mitchell (1977:68), after Flying Post was established in 1800, record of the Lange de Terre settlement disappears and the post was presumably abandoned.
As neither company was profiting from the fierce competition in the area, in 1812 Richard Good of the HBC and Alexander McDougall of the NWC came to an arrangement at Abitibi which resulted in the Canadian’s abandonment of their post on Devil’s Island on Frederick House Lake, and the HBC’s withdrawal from Abitibi House. However, a year later all of the residents at Frederick House were massacred (see Mitchell 1973). The post was never re-established on any full-time basis, and the only HBC post which remained active in the area was Kenogamissi (Mitchell 1977:84). Subsequently in 1814 the Moose Council ordered Good to establish a HBC post at Matawagamingue. According to Mitchell (ibid.:94), during the last years of the Canadian trade the centre of opposition between the two companies in the district shifted from Lake Abitibi to the Mattagami River sector. After amalgamation in 1821, the Kenogamissi post was abandoned apparently in favour of developing Matawagamingue and Flying Post, although the district remained known as Kenogamissi until the 1890s.

The post establishments described above only highlight the competitive fur trade activity which occurred inland during the years between 1784 and 1821. In reality, a number of companies and independent traders set up trading houses in the Abitibi region, many of which were temporary players in the continuous jostle to control the trade in the area. As well, both the HBC and the NWC moved their posts from one location to another on Lake Abitibi and elsewhere, making for a sometimes confusing history of the fur trade in this region during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. What remained constant was the intensity of trade activity in a relatively small area, the interconnectedness of the various posts established in the area, and the continuity of characters living, working and moving among the different post locations within that area. There also existed a longevity of fur trade activity; as Voorhis (1930:26) points out, Lake Abitibi posts were in continuous operation for more than 200 years, from 1686 when De Troyes built the first fort, to 1922 when the HBC post was discontinued and superseded by La Sarre where the railway station was built. Following is a brief account of the development of the fur trade after amalgamation in 1821, including the establishment of two new posts in the 1860s.

4.1.2 Hudson’s Bay Company Fur Trade after Amalgamation, 1821-1890

From 1821 until the 1860s, fur trading in the Abitibi region remained relatively stable under the Hudson’s Bay Company administration. Three permanent posts continued to operate: Abitibi, Matawagamingue and Flying Post. The region did not prove to be very productive; fur returns were low, both Indians and post personnel suffered from shortages of game and fish, and transportation between these inland posts and Moose Factory remained a problem. Throughout this period, the HBC shifted its district and department boundaries in an attempt to better deal with these and other problems, and the posts around Lake Abitibi were frequently assigned to different district headquarters. Abitibi House, for example, was the main post in the district of the same name for six years immediately after amalgamation. It then came under the Moose district administration until 1876, at which time it was reassigned to the Timiskaming district.

Meanwhile, a new wave of independent traders were entering the area from two directions. In the 1830s, lumbermen and small traders from the east began to enter the area via the Ottawa River,
pushing further north every year. At the same time, a second wave of competition came from the Lake Huron area, including associates of prominent Penetanguishene merchants such as Andrew Mitchell, as well as several half-breed offspring of NWC traders (Mitchell 1977:158; cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 2000). In the 1850s, Penetanguishene merchant Alfred Thompson outfitted an independent trader named “Dukis”\(^{20}\) to penetrate the region and he soon became the HBC’s most persistent and successful rival in the Kenogamissi district (Mitchell 1977:215). Matachewan outpost was established by the HBC in 1865 expressly to oppose “Ducas”; in 1888, the Company bought out Ducas and the post continued to operate until 1920.\(^{21}\)

Two years after Matachewan was established, the HBC built New Post (also called “Long Portage Post”) on the east bank of the Abitibi River, about 100 miles north of Lake Abitibi. Established as “a frontier guard or buffer against Abitibi and Kinogumisssee”, this post was built by John Garton to entice the Abitibi Indians northward, to meet the further threat of rival traders to the south, as well as to serve as a supply depot for Abitibi House\(^{22}\) (cf. Mitchell 1977:207; cf. Long 1985:142).

### 4.1.3 Social Relations Within and Between Posts

The nature of the inland fur trade together with the state of records which have survived from this period, do not allow for any comprehensive study of a single post population. Indeed the records indicate that any study of this fur trade community requires a regional perspective, as the activities of one post were intimately tied to the activities of another. For example, the post journals of Kenogamissi, Matawagamingue, and Flying Post refer to frequent communication between these posts, including visits by men and their families for both business and social purposes.

Even rival posts record instances of social hospitality. Despite repeated journal entries recording ruthless opposition between NWC and HBC men, instances are also recorded in which rivals were received with cordiality. For example, when Gladman visited Timiskaming in 1794 as part of his mission to establish HBC posts around Lake Abitibi, he was treated to an “excellent table” hosted by Grant and Cameron of the NWC fort. According to Mitchell (1977:47) this hospitality was due in part to, “the need to be neighbourly amid harsh physical surroundings and on the delight in company, no matter whom, of men living in isolation.”

Instances are also recorded in which rivals depended on each other to avert starvation,

\(^{20}\) Spelling variations of this name include ‘Ducas’ and ‘Dukis’. Orthographically this name is similar to “Dokis”, the name of the Nipissing chief who was a signatory to the 1850 Robinson-Huron Treaty. Although Michel Dokis was of French/Indian mixed ancestry, he identified as anishnaabe. Also, the Berton Report states that Dokis “traded with the Indians in the neighbourhood of Lakes Nipissing and Temagaming” (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a:79). It is highly probable that the independent trader referred to in the HBC Matachewan records as Ducas, is the Nipissing chief Michel Dokis.

\(^{21}\) Source: HBCA Post History - Matachewan.

\(^{22}\) Source: HBCA Post History - New Post.
providing each other with food when absolutely necessary. For example, at Matawagamingue during the winter of 1816–1817, the NWC master Angus Cameron recorded several instances in which HBC men came begging for assistance:

**Sund 15th [December 1816].** I had a visit from two of the Hudson’s Bay men today who made me an offer of their Service... they say that its utterly impossible for them to live in the HB service owing to the usual cause their being totally destitute of Provisions, the men eight in number here and at the neighbouring post were sent off a Hunting the beginning of this month without any sort of European provisions whatever, most of them strangers in the country and ignorant of the method of snaring Hares the only thing there is to Hunt in this Country... they are persistent they are all doomed to starve without I give them assistance... (Doc.#25)

**Sund 2nd March [1817].** Mr. Kellock the HB Clerk came over today and told me that Death was Staring him in the face if I would not have the Humanity to supply him with a little provisions he was reduced to the Dreadful situation of Starving at my door but if I would supply him with provisions for three days he would endeavor to reach their other House... after making consideration I judged it best to give him provisions for three days to carry him out of the way. (Doc.#27)

Mitchell indicates that in the NWC’s Timiskaming district – an area which overlaps to a great extent with the Abitibi region being discussed here – long winter evenings afforded a good deal of daily leisure and potential social activity among post personnel. Men who had formed connections with Indian women “could enjoy the comforts of such family life as the wilderness and their duties allowed” (Mitchell 1977:90). Social gatherings around Christmas, New Years and other holidays at these inland posts followed a pattern similar to that described for posts and outposts in other regions (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a, 1999b). These events generally included personnel from rival posts and perhaps Indians from the area who could make the journey to the post (Mitchell 1977:89). During Christmas 1815 over New Years 1816 at Matawagamingue, Cameron recorded his use of such occasions to “spy” on his English opposition, indicating that business concerns were never far from the surface of social life at rival posts:

**Satur. 23rd. [December 1815] ...the English as well as our men came Home from their Hunting Ground to pass the Holy Days at the House. Arrived Mr. Grant from Kinogamisi...**

**Mond. 25th. Christmas Day we passed as cheerfully as our Situation could admit. Two of the HB men came over from one of them I received a great deal of very useful information regarding the English proceedings at Kinogamisi of their past as well as Future [sic]... (Doc.#22)

**Monday 1st Jany 1816. We diverted ourselves dancing and (?) &c. as usual New Years day. My English Spy came over and informed me that one of their men is gone since Thurs last by way of the Flying Post after Indians.**
Tues. 2nd. Early this Morning Mr. D. McKay started with Robillard for Frederick House to annoy [sic] the HB people there... same time I set out with Latreille after the Fellow thats gone to the Flying Post. (Doc.#25)

After amalgamation, post journals from the Abitibi region continue to record social events, now absent of any Company conflict although ‘class’ rivalry between the English and Canadians remained evident. New Years Day 1823 at Abitibi House was characterized as follows:

The first day of the New Year passed as usual among the Winterers; in fighting and squabbling fortunately for our quiet the two Canadians are among the few of their countrymen of the same class who are not addicted to liquor. (Doc.#34:5)

Dances during the Christmas/New Years season continued to be a tradition at Abitibi House in 1911 and at least until 1916:

December 30 [1911] ...Dance at Tom Polsons tonight.

1912 Jan.1 ...Indians had a Dance at Tom Polsons.

December 1915 - Friday 24th ... went across to Tom’s [Polson] this afternoon. The Old widows getting their ration. St. Nicholas boxing [buying?] toys.

Christmas. Fine cold day playing gramophone...

Friday 31st. ...Arrivals for New Years day are as follows. Peter Cecil, wife and child. C. Pierce’s wife and girl. an old Lady. Joe and Johnnie Burnard Kishaininy. Chas Beads.

New Years day Saturday 1st. ...Teatrocis, wife, mother & son arrived at Tom’s, and came over at 10 o’clock and there was dancing in the [breeze?]. Chas Beads played his violin and Washwa assisted with a tom-tom lay way gan.

Monday 3rd. Tom gave a dance last night and everybody went they danced till 4 AM. (Doc.#106:3,105)

Social life at and among these posts included relations with Aboriginal and/or métis women. As residents, these women played an important economic role at the posts, details of which are discussed in the section below.

4.2 ABORIGINAL WOMEN IN THE ABITIBI REGION FUR TRADE

The majority of Abitibi region post journal references to Aboriginal and/or métis women were
entered in the context of their resource harvesting and other fur trade related activities. Evidently, from the journal keepers' perspectives, the significance of these women to the post economy was the contribution they made to the food stores or fur production. According to Brown, the socio-economic roles of Indian women in their own societies were recognized as advantageous to the fur trade as early as the 1700s:

[E]conomic motives also began to lead Hudson's Bay traders into further involvement in these alliances, as they discovered that Indian women... could make substantial contributions to the trade. [...] 

[T]hey certainly demonstrated to the Britishers the contributions they as Indian women could make to the profits and expansion of the fur trade as guides, interpreters, and intermediaries, and to trade-related activities such as preparing pelts... The aid of such women was more explicitly recognized in company records as time went on. [...] Later eighteenth-century records emphasized with increasing openness the importance of Indian women's contributions both on journeys and at the posts. [...] 

Economic considerations, then, as well as social and sexual motives, encouraged the Hudson's Bay men to accept offers of Indian women and to permit them in the posts. The Indian families involved also expected economic rewards... (Brown 1980a:64-66)

By 1800, many traders' daughters made substantial contributions similar to those made by their Aboriginal mothers. These daughters also acquired language and social skills useful to their trader relatives, both Aboriginal and European.

There are numerous documented instances of the contributions by individual women and by women as a collective at Abitibi region fur trade posts. On an individual basis, women resident at posts engaged in a variety of resource harvesting activities including hunting, trapping, fishing, and maple sugar production. The earliest documentation of women's contribution to post subsistence in the Abitibi region are contained in journals dating to the early 1800s.

Fishing was a primary activity assigned to women by post managers. From Cameron's point of view, the Aboriginal woman with whom he associated - and who he identified only as "M" - was better at fishing than were the men at Matawagamingue. On October 6, 1815 he "sent M up the River to Set Nets as the men never catch any Fish. I suppose they do not Set in the right places" (Doc.#22). When Richard Good was managing Kenogamiessi, frequent journal entries document the contribution made by the wives of Charles Beads and Joseph Turner, as well as his own wife. Entries in October 1812 indicate that these women all assisted their husbands during the fall fishery (Doc.#20: 2-3). In August 1818, Peter Spence's wife accompanied him "with 3 Nets to try for Suckers" (Doc.#30:4). In August 1819, James Kellock and his wife "set 5 Nets in hopes of getting a few fish" (Doc.#31:11).
It was not unusual for these women to go fishing on their own, often for several days at a time. In July 1817, "Mrs Tumor came home from the lower part of the Lake where she was fishing this some time..." (Doc.#28:1d). That same fall, Andrew Stewart sent his "wife off to [Waweyonot?] with three Nets to try there for a few fish" where she stayed for two days (Doc.#28:4d-5). There is some evidence that operating a post fishery was part of these women's annual harvesting cycle. Mrs. Tumor is recorded to have been at "Waweyotan" again in August 1819, but returned "complaining they cannot get fish there" (Doc.#31:10). At Matawagamingue in September 1827, the wife of Thomas Richards went camping taking several post children with her: "Mr. McKay's little girls who are encamped a little distance from this with Richards Wife brought me a few fish" (Doc.#50:2).

Fishing and camping by post women - who often took their children with them - continued well into the middle and latter half of the 19th century. At Flying Post during the winter/spring of 1846, "Valentine [Saunders] and his Wife went up the river to Camp for a couple of nights" (Doc.#69:16d). In March 1848, Saunders' wife was apparently camping alone with her children, as Saunders is reported to have gone off to see her. In early April she started for the new sugaring place they had discovered together (Doc.#71:11d-12). At Abitibi House in July 1852, William Polson wrote that, "My wife and family went of [sic] to Set Nets" at a fishery where they stayed for four days (Doc.#73:3). Polson's journal contains frequent references to his wife fishing. There is only one instance of a wife who did not share her catch with other post residents, an entry for the Matachewan journal in the late 1870s: "Mother Friday came in today with a keg of fish for herself of course" (Doc.#76:20 October 1873).

Hunting, trapping and snaring of small game were harvesting activities also regularly practised by post women. As shown in Angus Cameron's Matawagamingue journals from 1815-1819, his country wife "M" actively hunted and fished to help provision the post. Despite numerous references to "M" snaring rabbits, Cameron did not document her total catch in his "Recapitulation of Hares Caught" during the winter of 1814. However, it is likely that her catch may have been included in the numbers recorded for Cameron, whose total of 658 Hares is by far the largest number caught, over one-third of all Hares caught at the post (Doc.#22:folio following 3 April 1815). Another account of the post's total "Hare Hunt" in 1816 again credits Cameron with a number well beyond that of the other men at Matawagamingue (Doc.#25:margin note beside 27 April 1816). On December 13, 1815 Cameron sent "M" to check his cat snares, where "she found one" and on April 15, 1816, a fisher was caught "in the Trap M set on Thursday Last" (Docs.#22 & #25). "M" also trapped beaver and martins (Doc.#27: 21 February & 10 March 1817).

At Kenogamissi, "Betsy Kellock was home today with 10 rabbits" on December 19, 1815 and in January and February 1820, James Kellock wrote that "My Wife brought 8 Rabbits from my snares" and several days later that he caught "Nine Rabbits & My Wife got six" (Docs.#23:11d; #31:49). In August 1823, William "Polson's woman killed 7 Muskats, 3 Ducks, & 1 Pigeon" at Abitibi (Doc.#36:2). Polson's wife was also considered "an excellent hand at dressing Beaver Skins" (Doc.#53:17). The Matawagamingue journals from the late 1820s document the subsistence contributions made by the wives of Donald McKay Jr. and Thomas Richards; each of these women
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*PRAXIS Research Associates, 2001: Historic Métis in Ontario – Timmins/Cochrane/Abitibi*
snared hares, hunted partridges, trapped martins, and spent time in the sugar bush (Docs.#52:1d-2d,3d,5; #50:12,15). On November 14, 1827 for example, “Richards Wife brought me a large Beaver in meat” (Doc.#50:7d).

Company men’s wives also accompanied their husbands on supply trips to Moose Factory, although whether they were engaged to assist in guiding, interpreting or provisioning is not stated. In June 1803, Kenogamissi post master Philip Good included “two Women” in the canoe he dispatched “for the Fort with the Trade” (Doc.#8:3). There is one instance of a post woman making a tent to be used for camping a distance from Kenogamissi post. The entry for September 3, 1818 states, “Mr. Turnor and Wife making a Tent” which they completed the following day (Doc.#30:5). Finally, snowshoe repair was women’s work: at Abitibi in September 1823 the postmaster, “Employed the Old Woman to Lace or Net a Pair of Snow Shoes” (Doc.#36:4d). In August 1826, he again “Employed the Old Widow to Lace Snow Shoes” (Doc.#48:5d).

Brown (1980a:73) states that in some cases, Aboriginal mothers and métis daughters worked side by side to help provision the post to which they belonged. For example, in June 1809, Moose Factory received 88 pounds of fish “from Mrs. Good and Mother” (in ibid.). Only rare examples are found in the Abitibi region post journals. An entry at Abitibi House dated August 29, 1823, states that “Polson’s Wife and her Mother went to [Shibannagogue?] River to make Bear Traps” (Doc.#36:2). At Timiskaming on November 17, 1824, “Mr. McKay’s Woman with her mother & children” arrived at the Fort, apparently from Matawagamingue where Donald McKay Jr. was then posted (Doc.#39). The reason for their visit is not stated, although the journal indicates that they stayed for several days.

In addition to individual contributions by post women, there is also evidence of collective activities pursued by the group of women who resided at the posts. This is consistent with evidence reported on for other posts, for example, at Rainy Lake (Praxis Research Associates 1999b). The difference between women’s collective activity at a post like Rainy Lake and those in the Abitibi region is one of size only: Rainy Lake supported a much larger post population, and consequently “the women of the fort” constituted a larger collective. In the Abitibi region, collective harvesting activity or other post employment may have consisted of as few as two women, depending on the post or outpost.

In contrast to entries about an individual woman’s activity which are generally stated after the fact and imply that she had acted independently, collective harvesting and other tasks are more often described within a context of command by the post manager. That is, post women as a group were considered to be under the authority of the post manager in ways similar to that of hired company employees. Abitibi region post journal entries in which “the women” were sent to harvest or reported to be engaged in repairing nets or snowshoes are identical in wording to those in which company men were ordered to perform different post-related tasks. This suggests that these women residents were defacto, if not official servants of the post. Rather than merely fulfilling the role of wife and mother for their husband and children, these women were considered members of these small post communities with consequent responsibilities to the post as well as to their own families.

A number of examples of women’s collective activity are contained in the Abitibi region post journals. For example, at Abitibi in March 1809, Richard Good sent two women out for an extended hunting trip:

*Sent my Wife & Rob’t Gill’s Wife out a tenting through the woods for the purpose of catching Rabbits. As I can never catch but one rabbit a night from my (70) Snares at home, and No place being within the limits of the House for Snares to be attended properly for catching Rabbits they being so scarce this Season – Not only with us but its a general complaint by all the Natives that have visited here since the season set in.*

[...one week later...] *Our Wifes who went off the 4th Inst. came home complaining of poverty having catch [sic] but 18 Rabbits since they went off.*

(Doc.#16:5-5d)

On March 14th, Good again “sent the Women out a tenting” and on the 24th, Robert Gill was sent to collect whatever game they had caught, returning with 25 rabbits. The women stayed at their tent until the 31st when they “came home to day having struck their Snares, they producing [illegible] little or nothing these 3 days past. they bro’t only 8 Rabbits home” (Doc.#16:5d-6). In the fall of 1818 at Matawagamingue, Cameron noted:

*I saw the English women going [to the Fishery]... The English women [my men] tell me have encamped at the Fishing & Set their nets, they must be looked after as there is Indians expected in that direction. I therefore sent off the men immediately.*

(Doc.#25:17-18 October 1816)

Making and mending fishing nets was a job sometimes allocated to women as a group. The Abitibi journal entry for 19 June 1794 states, “...the people and Indians employed as Yesterday, and the Women in making Netts for us” (Doc.#2:2). On 1 March 1811, the post manager at Abitibi reported:

*Have had a Couple of Nets of 3 Shains each made by the Women during the Month. They have had also employ enough in keeping Old Nets & Snowshoes in repairs.*

(Doc.#19:10)

Entries about snowshoe netting and repair almost always refer to women as a group, as evidenced by the following excerpts from journals dated 1810 to 1822:

*Abitibi House, 29 November 1810: ...the Women have been occupied during this Month Netting Snowshoes for the use of the Residents, and making a Couple of Nets of 3 Shains each for House service.* (Doc.#19:5)

*Kenogami, 28 November 1812: ...[The men] getting Birch for hatchet [halves?]*,
& Snowshoe frames, turning the latter and getting the same Netted (which was performed by our Women)... (Doc.#20:3d)

Matawagamingue, 7 December 1815: ...The women knitting [sic] Snowshoes. (Doc.#22)

Abitibi House, 7 November 1822: ...The women likewise are employed in making shoes and mitts for the winter. (Doc.#34:3)

Abitibi House, 11 November 1822: ...the women are Netting snowshoes. (Doc.#34:3d)

Finally, an activity for which no references to individual women are made, is that of wapap or spruce gum production. A newspaper account written in 1879 by a Timiskaming voyageur named "Sha-Ka-Nash" explains the importance of this substance in making canoes water tight:

In making ready for the trip two large four and a half fathom birchbark canoes are carefully gone over with spruce gum to repair all the leaks and cracks that may be in them. (Doc.#107:1)

Several instances are documented of women collecting and making wapap at posts in the Abitibi region, and it is in this context that the only reference to "women of the establishment" was found in the Matawagamingue post journal23 for May 1828:

Wednesday 21st: ...The women went for Wapap...

Thursday 22d: ...The Women of the establishment out gathering Gum...
(Doc.#52:7, emphasis added)

The entry for May 26th reports, "Mr. McKay repairing one of the large canoes" presumably using the spruce gum collected by the women a few days earlier (Doc.#50:16d). Again in August the "Women" are reported to be "making Wapap" (Doc.#52:12). At Flying Post on July 18, 1845 the post manager wrote that "there now remains at the place three old widows only who are amusing and supporting themselves by collecting gum and Fish" (Doc.#69:4d). It is uncertain if these are women resident at the post that is, wives of former company men or if they were older Aboriginal band members from the area who decided to spend the summer near the post.

In sum, evidence of the certain presence of women at Abitibi region posts and of their
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23 There exist two copies of post journals for Matawagamingue 1828. One is held at the Archives of Ontario (Doc.# MUI391, Box 7-9, Item 1) and another is held at the Hudson's Bay Company Archives (HBCA B.124/a/5). The handwriting is similar and one may be the post manager's second copy of the original, but which is the original is unknown. Although the journal entries report the same events, the wording is not exact. For the May 22, 1828 entry, only the AO copy refers to "the women of the establishment" (Doc.#52). The HBCA copy simply states, "Women gathering gum" (Doc.#50:16d).
membership within the small post communities, presumes the biological and socio-economic setting necessary for children of mixed ancestry to be both born and raised in the fur trade post culture and environment. That the women at these posts were marital partners to company men is confirmed by evidence presented in Chapter 5. While there exist only rare references to children actually being born at these posts, data from Moose Factory records suggest that a new class of fur trade servants of mixed ancestry grew from these marital relations. This new class of ‘native’ servants is discussed in detail below.

4.3 OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE OF MÉTIS IN THE ABITIBI REGION FUR TRADE

As in other regions of the fur trade, métis offspring of company officers and servants found a niche in the inland fur trade that provided them with increasing opportunities for careers within the NWC and HBC. This section focuses on the development of a new class of “native” servants and the important role they and their families played, particularly as provisioners of posts in the Abitibi region during the 19th century. A final section on voyageurs shows that in contrast to other geographic regions where métis generally occupied this niche, the inland fur trade posts generally relied on local Indian men (or men who identified as Indians and practised a hunter/trapper lifestyle) to paddle their canoe brigades.

4.3.1 “Native-Born” Servants in the Abitibi Region Fur Trade

As outlined in Chapter 1 (Section 1.5.1), this analysis assumes that “native”, “Hudson’s Bay” or “Indian Country” parish of origin provides a tentative indication of métis identity (other- ascription), but that positive identification — particularly from the mid-1800s onward — requires corroboration from other sources. This section reviews such corroborating data about native-born servants in the Abitibi region, and provides a discussion of their role in the inland expansion of the fur trade.

Brown states that as early as the 1780s and 1790s, a new class of servants began to develop at the main Forts on Hudson’s Bay:

*A class of company sons of mixed descent emerged who were described neither as English nor as Home Indians, but instead as “natives of Hudson’s Bay.” Anglicized to some degree and having some fur trade skills, numbers of these youths began to be employed intermittently and sometimes permanently by the company. They kept their British surnames and were included on the same servants’ lists as British-born personnel.* (Brown 1980a:159)

According to Brown (*ibid.*, 160), one of the “best documented cases” of this new class comes from Moose Factory where John and Thomas Richards were born in the 1790s to William Richards, a company surgeon from Wales. Thomas Richards was stationed at Abitibi in the early 1800s, and during the 1820s he was at Mattawagamingue.
[Abitibi Post Journal, 1807]: Residents now Here are... Thomas Richards Jun'r, Tho's Knight & Jno. Knight Labours [sic], the 3 latter are Natives.
(Doc.#15:3d)

[Matawagamingue District Report 1824-25, Personal]: Thomas Richards. This man is a Native of the Country about 40 years of age.
(Doc.#42:6)

Typically such native-born sons occupied relatively low ranks in the fur trade companies. John and Thomas Richards' descendants continued in similarly low ranks as post servants and dependents, and according to Brown, twenty or so children and grandchildren were on record in the Moose Factory register from the early 1800s to 1840s. The history of the Richards family in the Abitibi region fur trade is described in detail in Chapter 5 (see Section 5.2).

Brown also documents the niche these native-born youths filled within the posts, supplanting an older category of company servant. In its first decades, the HBC had commonly brought out young apprentices from England who matured and learned trades while serving the company. By around 1800, such apprentice roles were increasingly being filled locally. In 1803, John Thomas wrote of the crucial role métis servants played at the new inland fur trade posts:

*The services of... Native Youths are becoming every year more & more conspicuous... they are almost out sole dependence both for supplying & supporting the Inland Stations, as well as otherwise opposing the Canadians.* (In Brown 1980a:164)

John Thomas' post journal records at Moose Factory from 1780 to 1813 contain references to a new category of servant referred to as "Factory Boys". The use of this term to differentiate the native-born from European apprentices is a clear example of "other-ascription", an indicator of outsiders labelling mixed-blood individuals as socially distinct (see PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a:22-24). That this term is found in post journals from the Abitibi region demonstrates that it achieved fairly wide-spread use as a label for young native-born company servants. Whether the application of this label translated into a degree of métis self-identification among 'Factory boys' (who later became 'company men') is not known. However, it is certainly possible that such labelling nurtured a sense of distinctiveness from their European counterparts, one which perhaps originated from obvious genealogical differences.

The Kenogamissi journal for 1803, for example, lists "John Knight a Factory Boy" as a new member of the post complement (Doc.#9:1). In 1812, "Rich'd Thomas a Factory Lad" was sent along with the Canoes transporting furs from Kenogamissi to Moose Factory, while "Harry Lawson (a Factory Lad)" stayed behind as a resident labourer at the post (Doc.#20:1d). From the late 1790s onward, children were much mentioned and often named as they acquired locally needed skills and trades and contributed in various ways to subsistence and other work at Moose Factory (Brown 1980a:163).
Already in 1815 at Kenogamissi for example, five of the ten servants (including the post manager) stationed at that post were “Native” (Doc.#24:1d-2). According to Morantz (1980:48), initially the native servants performed general labouring tasks but by the 1840s they were involved in all aspects of the company’s operations. She asserts that: “It is unlikely the inland posts would have succeeded without the special skills gained from their Indian heritage” (ibid.). During the height of inland competition in the early 1800s, there is some indication of resentment towards the active involvement by native-born men in the fur trade:

[Abitibi 1809]: Mr. Tho’s Frazier threatened to Hughy Cooper that if John Knight took any more Skins from the Natives that he should take [them] from him again – alledging that as he was not an European that he had no right to intercept the Natives. (Doc.#17:4d)

By 1825, the HBC was having difficulty filling its complement of recruits from either Canada or Europe. Faced with shortages, Governor George Simpson reversed his initial position against hiring mixed bloods, and considered engaging young ‘halfbreeds from Red River’ (Judd 1980:131). In 1830, post managers were given permission to hire local métis on seven-year contracts as apprentices:

*The boys, not to be younger than fourteen years, could not be employed with their fathers or in the districts in which their families lived. [...] As time went on the company began to rely more and more heavily on local Indians and mixed bloods to fill its recruitment quotas. (Ibid.:139)*

Appareantly, post managers were also permitted to hire Indian labourers on a temporary contract basis. In 1786 “an Indian who understands English” was employed by the HBC at Frederick House (Doc.#1:19d). An important skill required by trading posts which apparently only a local Indian could provide, was that of regional guide. During the winter of 1845-1846 Donald Grant commented on the difficulty of collecting furs from trappers due to the lack of knowledgable guides:

[December 19, 1845]: Valentine [Saunders] & Tom [Moore] returned without seeing any Indians, they went to where the Ind’s promised to be at this or about this time but no signs of them were visible – it is a most awkward circumstance that no Guides are kept about this Place & the men know the Country little further than the end of their Snare paths.

[January 3, 1846]: ...the want of proper guides render every attempt to visit the Ind’s abortive, as most of the good hunters are 7 & 8 Days Journey from the Establishment & its impossible that men can find their way for such a distance through a strange country. (Doc.#69:15d,16d)

At Abitibi in 1828, Thomas Fraser contracted “the Indian Baptiste” to assist in the fall fishery. Once the fishing season was over, Fraser “discharged him and sent him to his hunting ground”
Considering Fraser’s references to “the halfbreed Indian” and to other Indians with names such as Baillie and LaFlit, these are perhaps examples of métis men who chose to identify solely with their mothers’ heritage, while maintaining their fathers’ names (Doc.#53:2d,16d-17). 25 Alexander McDougall, and Louis and Andrew McDougall of the next generation present another probable example of mixed-blood offspring who chose an Indian lifestyle (cf. Morantz 1980:48). 26 Evidence that men of mixed ancestry chose lifestyles consistent with either their Aboriginal or European heritage, may indicate that their genealogical make-up was less important than was their career (or lifestyle) preference. This in turn suggests that métis employees in fur trade companies identified themselves in occupational terms, as opposed to racial or ethnic terms. In the early period at least, being métis may simply have meant greater choice of career opportunities, although in the minds of Hudson’s Bay Company officers, identity as a “half breed” usually translated into fewer chances for promotion.

Long (1985:141) states that by the mid-1840s, two-thirds of the servants and one third of the officers in the service of the HBC in the James Bay coastal region were men of mixed ancestry (cf. Morantz 1980:48). By the 1860s, summer employment in the Company was very important for both Indians and mixed-bloods; York Factory and Moose Factory provided the greatest number of jobs where a “sizeable mixed-blood labor force was employed on a permanent basis to assist with warehousing, shipping, trade good manufacturing and repair, as well as ship building and repair activities” (Ray 1988:345). By the 1890s, seventy-two percent of the one hundred employees in the Moose district had ‘Hudson Bay’ listed as their parish of origin (Long 1985:141). The extent to which this group of employees possessed a sense of distinct self-identity is not known, although the sheer numbers suggest the possibility that these men may have recognized their membership within a distinct class of company servants. Although the number of men stationed at the inland posts was small in comparison to Moose or Albany Factories, they were in continual communication with the

24 At Matachewan in 1873, there are references to collecting furs from “Baptiste’s tribe”, to the opposition Ducas employing “Michel Baptiste” for the winter, and to “Baptiste & eldest Son” arriving to get debt for furs (Doc.#76:14 March 1873; 18 October 1873). It is not known if there was a relationship between the Baptiste referred to in the Abitibi journals in the 1820s and the Baptiste mentioned in the Matachewan journals in the 1870s. A “Michel Batiste” was a signatory to Treaty 9 signed at Matachewan on June 20, 1906 (Doc.#102:311).

25 Donald Grant at Flying Post also refers to a trapper identified only as “the half breed.” In August 1844 “the halfbreed came in with a few Rats” and Grant hired him for several days to repair a damaged canoe. Later in October, “the Halfbreed” made several visits to the post bringing “a few Hares and Fish” (Doc.#68:2-2d,5).

26 Mitchell (1977:234-2355) suggests that this Alexander McDougall (Jr.) was the métis son of a Scottish-Canadian NWC trader of the same name who served at Fort Abiibi from the late 1780s until 1816. Mitchell presumes that McDougall Sr. – although never married – had children, as the names Alexander, John, George, Amable, Louis and Michel McDougall appear in later years both in the Abitibi area and around Grande Lacs (ibid.). Fur trade records and the 1901 Census (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4) suggest that the McDougalls self-identified as Indian, not métis. The Abitibi post journal in 1852 recorded on July 7 that “Alexander McDougall [arrived] with 7 Beaver, 2 Otters” and again on August 9 that “Alexander McDougall and Andrew Kistabush went off to their lands” (Doc.#73:2,4). The list of Treaty 9 signatories at Abitibi includes Louis Sr., Andrew & Lou (Jr.) McDougall (Doc.#102:311). In 1911 and 1912, Andrew McDougall and Louis McDougall Jr. are both mentioned within the context of hunting, although it appears Andrew may have been contracted by the HBC on a seasonal basis (Doc.#106:3,12,19).
Forts, and in many cases came from families which originated there (see Chapter 5).

There are numerous examples of 'native-born' servants stationed at posts in the Abitibi region throughout the 19th century. While several of these cases will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, an indication of the extent of the métis presence in the inland fur trade will be provided here. There is evidence of native-born company men in the Abitibi region from 1804 onward. Between 1804 and 1805, for example, eight men native to Hudson's Bay are recorded at Frederick House, Abitibi or Kenogamissi posts: Charles Beade, John Knight and his brother Thomas Knight, Charles Cromer, Thomas and William Richards, John Thomas and Joseph Turnor (Docs.#11 & #13).

Immediately after amalgamation in 1821, the majority of servants at inland posts were Canadians: the 1822 Accounts list seventeen French Canadians at Abitibi and Kenogamissi, in contrast to only three 'native' men (Doc.#33). However, amalgamation also meant that many of the formerly opposing posts and the manpower to operate them were no longer necessary. Calculating that each district had nearly double the number of men needed to maintain it, George Simpson embarked on a campaign to drastically reduce the number of salaried servants (Judd 1980:130). These cutbacks and the increasing difficulty in engaging new Canadian and European recruits in subsequent decades, altered the balance between native and non-native employees. The number of 'native' servants increased slowly, and in 1860 nine of the fifteen men in the Abitibi and Kenogamissi districts were from "Indian Country" (Doc.#74).

The largest number of HBC employees in the Abitibi region are recorded in the late 1860s and 1870s, possibly due to the intensified competition at the time as a result of encroaching independent traders from the south. It was during this time that the HBC established two new posts, Matachewan and New Post. The Accounts for 1871 show a total of 28 servants engaged in the Abitibi and Kenogamissi districts, 21 of whom were from "Indian Country" (Doc.#75). In 1875, 29 men were engaged in these districts, of which 15 were from "Indian Country" (Doc.#77). In addition, three men were stationed at New Post, William Corston being the only 'native' servant there (Doc.#77:7). In the 1880s, the number of servants engaged in the Kenogamissi district (which now included Abitibi) was again reduced to about 15 men; between 9 and 11 of the men engaged during that decade were "Native" (Docs.#78 & #82). The complement at New Post remained at 3 men, and Accounts for 1880 and 1886 show that 2 of these were "Native" (Docs.#78 & 82).

Métis servants at the inland posts were employed at a variety of tasks, many of which were classified under the rubric general labour (eg., gardening, firewood gathering), but some of which involved skills particular to their mixed cultural heritage. As in other fur trade regions, there is evidence of métis employed as interpreters in the Abitibi region. For example, Joseph Turnor, labelled a "Linguist" was stationed at Kenogamissi in 1801 (Doc.#7:1). William Polson — "a Native of this Country" — maintained the position of "Interpreter" at Abitibi from 1822 to 1840, after which time he was promoted to Postmaster there (Docs.#38:4d-5; #33:24; #64:14). In 1880, Thomas Moore from "Indian Country" was hired as an interpreter for one winter at Matachewan (Doc.#79:1 January 1880; cf. Doc.#75:11).
There also exist instances of métis as master canoe-builders. Generally a skilled canoe-builder was not stationed at one of the smaller inland posts, but when circumstances required it, someone was sent from Moose Factory or from another post nearby. The earliest example found in the journals examined for this report is Joseph Turnor, likely the métis son of surveyor Philip Turnor (Long 1985:139). Cameron’s Matawagamingue journal for 1817 recorded that one of his men had discovered that the HBC servant “Tumor” was “coming to Kinogamisi to mend a Canoe to go to the factory” (Doc.#27:31 March 1817). Turnor remained at Kenogamissi when in 1818 the HBC journal recorded that he was repairing a canoe: “Mr Turnor & family went up to the Lake to make Snowshoe frames, and to get some Watape, and Gum for repairing a Canoe...” (Doc.#30:5).

While Donald McKay was in charge of Matawagamingue, he was able to provide services as a canoe-builder. Journals record McKay “repairing one of the large Canoes” in May 1828, and in 1829, “Mr. McKay finished a large new Canoe capable of carrying or showing upwards of thirty Pieces or Packages” (Docs.#50:16d; #54:28d). However, at Matawagamingue in 1830, master canoe-builder “James King a Half Breed” was sent by Alex McDonnell to assist in the construction of several canoes (Doc.#55:4-4d). Both Frederick and Walter Faries assisted King, and by 1846 Walter Faries was himself a skilled canoe-builder (Doc.#70:2d).

Resource harvesting skills were particularly valuable to the survival and maintenance of inland posts, and fur trade records document numerous examples of this task being performed by métis men (and women, as shown above). The contributions made by métis men as post provisioners are presented in greater detail below.

4.3.2 Country Food Resources and Métis as Post Provisioners

The focus of this section is on the types and extent of resource harvesting by métis stationed at fur trade posts. Rather than provide an exhaustive account of such activity as evidenced in journal entries too numerous to cite here, the aim is to analyse the main characteristics of such activity supported by examples of each. This section also provides an overview of the relatively poor state of country food resources in the Abitibi region, and the resulting challenge among employees to provision their posts.

Mitchell provides a description of resource harvesting in the relatively resource-poor region during the early 1800s prior to amalgamation:

...the Timiskaming posts depended largely on fish and rabbits... Generally each post possessed a dependable fall fishing station, which supplied the bulk of fish salted in kegs for winter use. But at Matawagamingue the station lay at a considerable distance, involving much labour in bringing the fish home, while at Flying Post there was apparently no such thing as a fall fishing nor good fishing at any time.

According to the season and the circumstances, the Canadians used nets, seines, or hook and line, and caught principally whitefish, perch, yellow pickerel, and lake

trout, which they called ‘sturgeon’. During the winter they fished through the ice. Winter was the best time for rabbits, when their paths could easily be traced in the snow, and men were sent out camping to snare them, as well as to trade with the Indians. Partridges were also available in winter but, like the rabbits, they were very ‘dry’ food, requiring the addition of fat to make them nourishing. In later years, however, even the men sent out after Indians had to be furnished with imported food.

In summer the fish usually failed and imported provisions were issued to the servants remaining at the posts. At times black bears were numerous and provided a special treat for Indians and traders alike. The wild berries on which they fed were also picked and dried for winter use. The Flying Post, however, is the only one where wild rice is mentioned as an addition to the menu. Wild ducks and geese appeared on the inland rivers and lakes towards the end of March and were back again in the fall, but the geese were few in number compared to those on the Bay, where they formed such a valuable part of the diet and were salted for winter use. Pigeons were plentiful at Fort Timiskaming and Fort Abitibi, although they are not mentioned at the other posts. Perhaps they were off the principal migratory path but in view of the birds’ vast numbers and wide distribution there must have been some. Certainly nothing which would provide food for the pot was overlooked and at Matawagamingue even loons were not despised. (Mitchell 1977:88)

The scarcity of provisions and at times near starvation circumstances at some inland posts has been briefly discussed above (Section 4.1.3). The importance of rabbits as a source of food at these posts is demonstrated in part by Cameron’s practice of keeping an exact count of hares caught during the winters of 1814-15 and 1815-1816 (Docs.#22 & #25). Mitchell confirms that a situation of game-food scarcity continued throughout the region into the mid-1800s:

The acute lack of hares at Fort Timiskaming continued during the 1824-25 free season and it was the same story all over the James Bay country. Many of the Abitibi Indians had to leave their lands and go where they could catch fish, while a number of Matawagamingue Indians died of hunger.

[In the 1840s, the Oblate mission at Abitibi could operate] only for a few weeks during the summer. At that time the Indians could maintain themselves, chiefly by fishing, without exposing their families or the post to starvation. (Mitchell 1977:137,180)

Mitchell’s findings are echoed in the post journals examined for this present report. These journals provide numerous references to hunting and fishing attempts by Aboriginal and métis women at the posts (see above), and almost daily references to resource harvesting by post servants. Although métis servants are frequently and consistently referred to as engaged in hunting and fishing, the post journals clearly demonstrate that such activities were shared by all post residents, as shown in the following examples from Kenogamissi:
[January 1796]: Sent Taylor and Wishart to the head of the lake to hunt, also Thompson and Moore to Wawayorstun for the same purpose. I'm obliged [sic] to send all the Men out, as but few Rabbits are to be caught now nigh the House. (Doc.#3:10d)

[February 1816]: Jno. Louttit being better in health returned to Mr. James Kellock's Tent to renew his occupation of hunting the only dependence every one has for his livelihood; and Jno. Beads & D. Morwick were over Ranges of Snares for the purpose of getting something for their Meals at nights as there is not a morsel to give them in the House except one Keg of Salt Fish, which I would wish to preserve to the last extremity. Not a Rabbit was caught by either of them. (Doc.#23:18)

The relative scarcity of food game meant that everyone had to contribute to the post provisions. Hence, it cannot be argued that hunting and fishing were activities exclusive to a métis class of servants. However, it might be argued that métis servants possessed superior skills as a result of being raised in a fur-trade/subsistence culture and environment. It was perhaps the critical need for experienced hunters at inland posts where environmental pressures were greatest, that the "special skills" to which Morantz (1980:48) refers came into play.

If frequency of post journal entries is an indication of an individual's role as a primary post provisioner, then William Polson filled this crucial role at Abitibi during the 1820s to 1840s. It is not uncommon to find multiple entries on a single page in Abitibi journals referring to Polson's harvesting activities. For example, a single folio from the Abitibi journal for July 1826 lists three such instances:

[July 20] Polson killed 4 Ducks & 2 Pidgeons. Got 46 LaNesh from the Nets.

[July 23] Polson & the Indian Akoche went to set Nets at [Okanassie?] River.

[July 24] Polson Came home early this Morning with 81 LaNesh. (Doc.#48:2)

In 1852 when William Polson was post manager at Abitibi, his son John apparently assumed duties as a major post provisioner. Again multiple references to his resource harvesting activities appear at times mentioned up to five times on a single folio:


[November 12] John Polson and Thomas got 2 Rats. (Doc.#73:10)
As these entries demonstrate, the Polsons were certainly not the only persons hunting and trapping, and the harvest was generally poor. Numerous other examples of métis as post provisioners exist in the journals of posts in the Abitibi region throughout the 19th century (eg., Docs.#65:4d-5; #69:11,14d; #71:11d).

Throughout the 1820s at Abitibi, the Polson family was frequently out tenting either to exploit the fall fishery or to hunt and trap at a winter camp. In the fall and winter of 1822, for example:

[October 25]: Polson & family arrived in the evening from the fishing place having procured in all about eleven kegs.

[November 22]: Polson and his family went away to hunt hares, he takes up his quarters this year opposite Good's island.

[December 6]: Polson and his wife came to the house with one hundred hares.

[December 10]: Polson & family went back again to their hunting grounds.
(Doc.#34:2d, 3d-4)

The operation of such hunting and fishing camps a distance from the post was one of the more important activities taken on by métis servants and their families. In an effort to secure provisions at better hunting and fishing grounds, they might live at camping sites for days or even seasons. Regular trips between the post and camping sites were made in order to re-stock the post's food stores. Morantz (1980:49) states that one of the characteristics of "the life-style of these mixed-blood servants" is "that they hunted to provide for the post and for their families who often did not live at the post but camped nearby." In addition to procuring country food for other residents at the post, the Abitibi region post journals also indicate that camping was sometimes a necessary means of relieving the post of several mouths to feed. The examples presented below illustrate such camping or "tenting" activity by company men confirmed as métis in Moose Lists of Servants and stationed at Abitibi region post journals during the 19th century.

At Abitibi in February 1809, brothers John and Thomas Knight set up a winter camp together (Doc.#16:4d; cf. Doc.#21:5). That September, they were ordered to established the post's annual fall fishery:

Sent Tho's Knight and John Knight to build a Lodge at the Fishing Fall, for the convenience of them during the time of Tittameg Spawning at which time there is always someone staying there procuring and Salting Fish for Winter Use.
(Doc.#17:3)

At Kenogamissi in November 1812, three men – including Joseph Turnor – were instructed to clear land at a portage site "after which they will stay and hunt their Livelihood having victualled them their weekly Allowance" (Doc.#20:3-3d). At Kenogamissi in 1820, "John Spence went off to Tent"
(Doc.#31:48; cf. Doc.#32:1d). In October 1828, Polson and his family “went to the Southern fishing Place to set nets for the White Fish when they will spawn” and “Charles Beads and his Family went to the Fishing Place at White Fish River” (Doc.#53:8d-9).

At Matawagamiguinge in November 1827, “[Thos.] Richards & family off to encamp in the woods, to endeavor to make out a livelihood hunting Hares” (Doc.#50:6d). Chief Trader Hugh Faries at Matawagamiguinge sent both of his sons and their families out to camp:

[May 4, 1836]: Frederick & Wife I sent up to Minisinaqua to try to procure a living.
[May 7, 1836]: Walter’s family went up to the Rapid to remain sometime setting Nets
[May 12, 1836]: Walter’s family returned from the Rapid.
(Doc.#60:17-17d)

While Valentine Saunders was at Flying Post in the 1840s, he and his family were also sent away to camp:

[January 1846]: Valentine & his Wife went up to the River to Camp for a couple of nights. (Doc.#69:16d)

[March 1848]: Saunders Family returned yesterday from their snaring ground.
(Doc.#71:11d; cf. Doc.#64:15)

At Matachewan in 1872, a man also by the name of “Saunders” returned with his “partner... they have done well [hunting]” (Doc.#76:30 March 1872).

4.3.3 Indian Voyageurs

Unlike fur trade regions along the Great Lakes or further west in the Lake of the Woods area where Canadian and métis voyageurs manned the fur brigades, inland posts around Lake Abitibi primarily depended on local Indian men to paddle the canoes to and from Moose Factory or Fort Timiskaming:

Indians were used as inland canoeists in the 1770s. Owing to chronic manpower shortages, they probably continued to participate in inland transport throughout the competition period [to 1821]. During that time the company also hired a limited number of half-breeds. (Judd 1980:138)

The North West Company mainly recruited French Canadians from Quebec. However, according to Ray (1988:343), these men had to be supplemented with Indians, many descending from Iroquois near Montreal, and métis who generally served as general labourers at the posts or as paddlers on the canoe brigades (cf. Mitchell 1977:34). The HBC Abitibi post journal for July 1811 documents the arrival of “4 Iroquois who have come with Supplies to my Opponents” (Doc.#19:15).
Immediately after the coalition of 1821, George Simpson revealed that the northern council preferred Canadian servants most of whom were apparently French-speaking. However, some were Iroquois from St. Regis, Two Mountains, and Sault Saint-Louis. The voyageur recruits also apparently derived in later years from somewhat different ethnic roots as Iroquois and mixed-blood Iroquois and French became more prominent (Judd 1980:136-7). References to Iroquois voyageurs under contract with the HBC in Abitibi region post journals are rare. One entry in the Abitibi journal for January 24, 1823 notes that, “Yesterday the two half-breeds, the Iroquois and [Meacaputch?] &c came to the house with about 2 packs of Beaver” (Doc.#34:5d). Another in the Flying Post journal for September 24, 1844 records: “The Iroquois came in with some excellent Pike fish which I had salted for Winter Storing”. (Doc.#68:4d).27

Abitibi region post journal references to “voyagers” characterize this occupation as seasonal, journey-specific, and one filled by local Indian men who traded at these posts. In 1825, District Chief Trader Alexander Christie explained the reasons for hiring local Indians as voyageurs:

As several Indians failed in their Winter hunts, owing to the extreme severity of the season, they were of course destitute of clothing and other necessaries and to give them an opportunity of procuring such, I determined on employing them with the disposable men, in bringing up from Temiscamingue the supply of liquors, and Provisions, forwarded from Canada, which for this season precluded the necessity of engaging the Montreal Voyagers in the upper country. I do not mean to infer from this that Indians can at all times be engaged to transport the Canada goods hither from Temiscamingue, but when such can be conveniently done, it certainly is advisable to do so as the Indians are not only the cheapest carriers, but by employing them prevents in a great measure their killing the Beaver at an improper season. (Doc.#42.2d-3)

The Matawagamingue District Report for 1828 added that each season “about twenty [Indian voyageurs] are generally required, ten towards Moose & ten to Temiscamingue” (Doc.#51:1d; cf. Doc.#50:1).

Voyaging took place in June and July, at which time a distinct pattern of activity developed at the posts. The Indian voyageurs arrived a day or two before the departure date at which time they were given a pre-payment of liquor as well as provisions for the journey. The fur packs and provisions

---

27 The HBC journals generally paint a negative picture of their presence in the Abitibi region where they apparently competed as independent traders or as middle-men for other independents. From the HBC’s viewpoint, the Iroquois posed a threat to their hoped-for monopoly after amalgamation in 1821. A letter from Angus Cameron at Temiskaming in 1824 contained a warning to his superiors: “A Canoe with letters arrived from Abitibi. Mr. Fraser is much alarmed by a [band?] of Iroquois who are pilaging [sic] the Indians Lands” (Doc.#40:19 September 1824; cf. Doc.#43:2d,3d). Another letter in 1825 expressed Cameron’s increasing concern about the Iroquois encroachment in the Abitibi interior: “...four Iroquois past here on the 15th July apparently with the intention of going to plunder the Abitibi Indians Lands and destroy the Beaver” (Doc.#40:4 June 1825).
were prepared and loaded onto canoes, and weather permitting they departed the morning after all was ready. Each canoe was generally manned by at least one HBC steersman and/or middleman, plus several Indian paddlers. For the next several weeks life at the post was very quiet, as only a few servants remained behind. However, a few days prior to the canoes’ return the wives and children of the Indian voyagers began to congregate at the post awaiting the arrival of their men. When the journey was completed, the voyagers were again paid in liquor and tobacco and soon after they and their families returned to their hunting grounds. Accounts from 1818, 1828 and 1829 demonstrate this pattern:

[NWC - Matawagamingue Post Journal, 1818]:
June 18: The Indian voyagers are gathering about

June 19: I repaired another of the Canoes & the Indians gummed them all, I marked the Packs there being 43 in Number. Got matters ready for the Voyage.

June 20: Finished loading & gave their Rum to the Voyagers &c.

(Doc.#29:18-21 June,1818)

[HBC - Matawagamingue Post Journal, 1828]:
June 18: The remainder of the Voyagers arrived – they got their voyaging liquor.

June 20: Sent of [sic] a Canoe for Temiscamingue to meet the People from Canada with our supplies – 1 Canadian 11 Indians crews of 2 Canoes.

June 26: Old Sabourin & several women arrived waiting for their relations the Voyagers.

June 28: More families arrived waiting for their husbands who are employed in Voyaging for us – we loose part of their Summer hunt – almost all the Indians of the Post are employed. (Doc.#52:9-9d)

[HBC - Flying Post Journal, 1829]:
July 10: About ten O’clock this morning the Big Canoe arrived at last, notwithstanding the bad weather they have had ever since they left Matawagamingue. The Goods are in good order – Paid all the Voyagers and those who had furs for trade, and gave everyone a little liquor & Tobacco for their nights entertainment.

July 12: Early this morning the Indians began to decamp. (Doc.#56:2)

Company men always commanded the brigades and the Flying Post journals provide several
examples of métis steersmen in charge:

[July 7, 1836]: At about midday two Canoes arrived from Matawagamingue with the Outfit (F. Faries Commander) in good order everything as dry as touch-wood. Gave the Indians their usual [regale?] of Rum, Provisions & Tobacco. (Doc.#62:1d)

[July 9, 1842]: About 4 P.M. two large canoes in charge of Valentine Saunders and Charles Beads arrived with the current Outfit. (Doc.#66:2d)

[July 12, 1844]: Two large Canoes arrived this evening from Matawagamingue, Manned by three of the Company's Servants, and 7 Indians, with the outfit for this Post. (Doc.#67:1)

While some of the company men who commanded canoe brigades can be identified as métis, the evidence from post journals indicates that voyageur was not an identifying feature of métis ethnicity in the Abitibi region.

This chapter has outlined the fur trade context in which Aboriginal and métis men and women came to be associated with fur trade posts in the interior region along the Abitibi River system. While at first glance the early period of inland expansion seems characterized by transient post personnel, closer examination reveals that a core group of men established, managed and re-located the posts. In both the HBC and the NWC records which have survived this period, names such as Turner, McKay, Thomas, Good, Moore, Faries, Polson and others appear repeatedly, creating a picture of a regional community of traders in intimate interaction with the local Aboriginal people. Some of these same names appear at the later posts of Matakewan and New Post. As will be discussed in the next chapter, these interactions produced fur trade families of mixed European/Aboriginal ancestry which comprised a significant sector of the regional fur trade population.
5. A REGIONAL FUR TRADE COMMUNITY

This chapter focuses on the development of a regional community comprised of fur trade company personnel and their families working and living among seven post locations proximal to present-day Timmins and Cochrane, Ontario. Interaction among these posts produced fur trade families of mixed European/Aboriginal ancestry which were not necessarily restricted to any one post, but which instead formed part of a regional fur trade population. This is partly attributed to the fact that the inland posts were relatively small, each having only a few (sometimes only 2 or 3) resident servants. Unlike Moose Factory which supported a large fort population, an inland post might support as few as ten persons including women and children. Hence, in contrast to previous reports on historic métis which present evidence of “post communities” — eg., at Rainy Lake (Praxis Research Associates 1999b) — the evidence here suggests that in the Timmins/Cochrane environs, a “regional fur trade community” may have developed.

Evidence of the development of a population of mixed ancestry is traced over a 110 year period from ca. 1790 to 1901. The chapter begins with detailed accounts of unions between European men and Aboriginal women, followed by an analysis of fur trade endogamy in the region. This is followed by the positive identification of métis families which appear to have made the Abitibi region their home. An analysis of the 1901 Census data regarding a métis population in the region concludes this chapter.

5.1 EVIDENCE OF EUROPEAN/ABORIGINAL UNIONS

The Cree Homeguard Indians of the coastal areas of Hudson Bay were apparently the first to introduce English fur traders to the practice of lending or exchanging wives and daughters as a means of establishing economic and social bonds. In 1743 James Isham reported on the crucial role of Cree ‘contractual’ expectations involving the exchange of their women, a practice which had probably evolved as early as the French occupation of the Moose, Albany and York Fort areas from 1697 to 1714 (Brown 1980a:60-62). In 1779 surveyor Philip Turnor reported to London that their bachelor officers in the interior were continually pressed to accept gifts of women:

...were they not to keep a Woman... above half the Indians that came to the House would offer the Master their Wife though he was to make the Indian a present for his offer the Woman would think herself slighted... [but] very few Indians make that offer when they know the Master keeps a woman. (In Tyrrell 1934:274-275)

Long (1985:139) speculates that Turnor himself took an Indian woman as his partner, and fathered a son Joseph Turnor Sr., who was employed as a lad at Moose Factory in 1810. There are several other documented liaisons between Indian women and fur traders in the Timiskaming/Abitibi region during this early period. Aeneas Cameron who became associated with the North West
Company in the 1780s had an Indian country wife at Fort Timiskaming, and their daughter reputedly married Chief Factor Allan McDonell (Mitchell 1977:234; Brown 1980a:89). During one of his travels in the region in 1790, Cameron noted the presence of two Indian women at the HBC Frederick House. Donald McKay, a Nor’Wester who wintered in the Timiskaming/Abitibi area (possibly Launge de Terre) in the 1790s is also known to have had a country wife (Brown 1980a:81-82). McKay’s “girl” assisted him by snaring rabbits, net fishing, and trapping martens (eg., Doc.#5: 27 January 1799). Two years later McKay recorded that a fellow winterer by the name of Liné also had a “girl” (Doc.#5:17 January 1801).

Up until at least 1830 when John George McTavish brought his Scottish bride to Moose Factory, it can be assumed that any “marriages” entered into by fur trade employees were with Aboriginal women in the earlier years, and in later years with Aboriginal or métis women. Indeed, McTavish had a country wife (Nancy McKenzie, or Matooskie) and children waiting for him at Moose when he introduced the first white woman to the fort (Williams 1975:157). For decades, however, it appears that Mrs. McTavish remained an exception to the rule in the Moose district. According to Long (1985:141), it was not until 1870 following the union with Canada that the presence of “some European or Canadian ladies” began to change Moose society. Nevertheless, most Company men continued to marry native women. As late as 1886, of fourteen marriages performed at Moose Factory, five were between European Company men and Aboriginal or métis women (ibid.).

The North West Company passed a resolution in 1806 in which partners were forbidden from permitting either officers or other servants to take Indian wives on pain of a fine of £100 (Mitchell 1977:160). The motivation behind this resolution was the potentially serious implications for the fur trade, in the form of métis sons with strong ties to local Indian bands who might choose to oppose the Company as independent traders. Another major concern about marriages to Indian women was the financial burden placed on the Company of growing post populations, particularly in poorer districts such as Timiskaming/Abitibi. It should be noted, however, that the NWC resolution did not exclude marriage to the métis daughters of company men, as the company “did not wish to make it impossible for these daughters to find husbands compatible with their mixed backgrounds and upbringing” (Brown 1980a:97).

However, as Mitchell (1977:160) points out and as evidenced in the post journals to be discussed below, the number of métis who bore the names of their trader-fathers in the Abitibi region when the NWC and HBC merged in 1821, proved the rule ineffective. In 1825, the HBC attempted to regularize such marriages by forbidding any officer or servant to take a woman without binding himself to support her and their children both during his stay in the country, and after his departure. A letter copied in the Flying Post journal, dated July 17, 1826 signed by the district’s Chief Trader

---

28 By 1831 Nancy was married off to another Company man, “quickly bundled out of sight” to avoid embarrassment (Williams 1975:157). The incident was considered scandalous by other officers, and it caused long-term friction between McTavish and many of his contemporaries. The same was true for George Simpson when he arrived at Red River in 1830 with his new bride Frances, while his country wife Margaret Taylor was also quickly married off to another Company man.

---

Alexander Christie, documents the extension of this rule to inland posts in the Abitibi region:

I now desire you will strictly prohibit the men under your command, from any improper connection, or intimacy, with the Indian women, such irregularities cannot be allowed. (Doc.#44:5d)

At Matawagamingue in 1825, Donald McKay (Jr.) discharged two Canadian men on grounds that they had formed improper relations with Indian women:

Saturday 25 [June 1825] ...Amable Belair and Pierre Duplante Servants – the two latter were this day discharged from the service solely on account of their profligate habits by forming a connexion with Indian Women contrary to established rules. (Doc.#45:3)

While the definition of “improper behaviour” is not provided, it may be that it referred to sexual relations by Company men who did not agree to support these women or the children resulting from the relationship. The long-term consequences of country unions later abandoned by European traders was made obvious to Donald Grant, postmaster at Flying Post, when he discovered in 1845 that the daughter of a former servant was now an orphan:

[Apisabots?] Widow came in & Informed me of [Awenince’s] Widows Death, this event throws a poor little Girl on the world said to be the Daughter of a Man named McLeod who was once at this post – a Servant to the Hon’bl Company – I should think it just and proper for the [Honourable Company] to detain part of such men’s wages for the support [sic] of such unfortunate Children. (Doc.#69:15)

Despite this financial responsibility now attached to country marriages, Mitchell (1977:160-1) documents an increased tendency on the part of HBC servants in the Timiskaming district to marry local Aboriginal and métis women. Opposition to such unions nevertheless continued, and at Abitibi in 1826 it was recommended that a servant, Joseph Bisson (Bilson?) be refused permission to marry:

...according to my opinion I should think that he has rather too much assurance in asking the Governor (last summer at Moose Factory) permission to take a woman and saying that I never offered any objection to his doing so when it was well known to him if it was referred to me that he would not be allowed to take one. In this Post is impossible for a Man to perform his duty when he has a Wife. She would constantly be a burden upon the Post and his family would be an unavoidable expense. In short the place is too poor in respect to subsistence for any man to pretend that he could support a Wife independently of the Company. (Doc.#46:3)

The growing tendency to marry local women was also severely criticized in 1835 by Angus Cameron who, ironically, had relations with Indian women during his years in the country (see below). Nevertheless, Cameron’s letter revealed some aspects of the HBC’s objections toward relations with
local women at this time which, in Mitchell’s (1977:161) view, were to permanent relationships as opposed to casual ones, and to the custom as it applied to servants, not officers.

Following are examples of post journal entries which indicate marital unions between Company men and Aboriginal women in the Abitibi region. These examples provide direct evidence which both adds to and confirms the data presented in Chapter 4 regarding the presence and role of women at the posts. Indeed, it is probable that the role of such a woman as wife to a company man and mother to his métis children was the primary reason for her presence at the post, while her economic contribution to the post was secondary.

The data on marital unions are organized chronologically by post (dates in parentheses indicate the years each post was in operation).

**FREDERICK HOUSE** (1784-1821): The Frederick House journals contain almost no direct references to men with Aboriginal wives, although it is known from other records that several of the HBC and NWC men who worked at Frederick House Lake had Indian mates. As a full-time post location, Frederick House was short lived – less than 20 years – its operation put to a quick end by the massacre in 1813. During these years, the HBC post employed only a small complement of 3-4 men and experienced a high turnover of personnel. While the NWC post on Devil’s Island was apparently more stable and better established, no records from this post have been found.

Scattered entries in the HBC post journals provide only a glimpse of marital relations at Frederick House. In June 1801, Richard Good “and an Indian Woman arrived [at Frederick House] on their way to Abbitibi from Kinoogoomisee” (Doc.#6:1). Good was temporary post manager at the HBC Frederick House in 1800 and again in 1802. In June 1804, “the wives of John Thomas [and] Thomas Richards” returned to Frederick House with their husbands who had supervised the supply canoes from Moose Factory (Doc.#12:2d). Joseph Turnor – the possible métis son of HBC surveyor Philip Turnor (who founded Frederick House in 1794) – was appointed charge of Frederick House in 1805, and records repeatedly show that Turnor worked and travelled together with “his family” (eg., Doc.#20:1). George McBride, the NWC master at Frederick House Lake during the early 1800s, is also known to have had an Aboriginal wife and métis offspring (Mitchell 1977:237). Entries in the Abitibi post journal for September 1810 record that “Charles Beads & his Wife came from Frederick House for a Supply of flour”, returning there the following day (Doc.#19:3d-4).

Evidence that some family life must have developed at the post is found in Good’s report after investigating the massacre at the HBC Frederick House in 1813; the bodies of one man and three children belonging to the post were still missing (Mitchell 1973:33). After 1813, Frederick House was operated intermittently until the amalgamation in 1821. In 1817 James Kellock was sent to Frederick House for the winter, accompanied by his wife (ibid.:29). They continued to winter there until at least 1819; an entry in the Kenogamissi journal for May 14, 1819 states that “Mr. Jms. Kellock and his wife arrived from Frederick” (Doc.#30:24d).

---

29 Source: HBCA Search File - Frederick House.
KENOOGAMISSI (1794-1822): At Kenogamissi, several HBC post journal entries indicate the presence of wives and families. Again, there are almost no entries during the first years of this post’s establishment, although the post manager in 1796, John Mannall is known to have married an Aboriginal or métis woman at some point. “Mrs Mannall” reportedly helped provision Moose Factory with fish in 1808, perhaps while her husband was there on business (Brown 1980a:73). By 1812 Richard Good was master at Kenogamissi, and several journal entries refer to his wife and family:

Oct 17th...Self, Wife & Harry Lawson went to the fishing place, where the fish resort to spawn in hopes of procuring some.

Oct 23. Friday. Mr. Rich’d Good & family... arrived from the Factory...
(Doc.#20:2-2d)

By this time, journal entries more frequently document the activities of Company men and their families. In the space of four folios covering the period from October 19 to December 24, 1812, the journal keeper at Kenogamissi refers six times to the activities of Charles Beads and Joseph Turnor and their wives:

Oct. 23... Charles Beads and his Wife arrived from the Factory...

Oct 26... Sent ...Charles Beads and his Wife up to the fishing Fall...

Oct. 28... Sent Joseph Turnor and his Wife and John Kirkness to the Fishing Place...

Oct. 29... Charles Beads and his wife came home with 14 Rundlets of salted fish...

Nov.28... On the 26 last sent Charles Beads and his Wife out a Tenting...

Dec. 19... Dispatched Wm. Stanger back to Joseph Turnor with whom he is going to stay with, and by whom I sent a month’s flour for himself and partner.
(Doc.#20:2d-4)

Entries about Joseph Turnor and his family are frequent in the post journals for the remaining years of the HBC’s presence at Kenogamissi. For example, in summer 1817 “Mrs. Turnor” stayed near the post sharing some of her fish catches, while her husband was away at Moose Factory (Doc.#28:1d). For part of their time there, it appears that Turnor and his family wintered at an outpost called “Wyaskash” (Doc.#30:25). Turnor is listed as a servant in the 1820 District Report, and it is likely that he stayed until 1822 when the post was abandoned after the amalgamation of the HBC and NWC (Doc.#32:1d).

In July 1815 James Kellogg “& wife” arrived from Moose Factory to spend the year at Kenogamissi (Doc.#23:1d). Charles Beads left soon after to make a supply trip to Moose, while a “John Beads” – possibly his métis son – stayed on at Kenogamissi where he was employed for the
summer. In December 1815, “Betsy Kellock” – either James’ wife or a métis daughter – brought home ten rabbits (Doc.#23:11d). Frequent entries in the 1817 journal refer to Kellock and his wife engaged in various hunting activities, primarily snaring of rabbits (Doc.#26:14d-15). Entries from 1816-1818 indicate that John Grant – the NWC master at Kenogamissi during this time – also had a wife and family (Docs.#23:25; #28:23). Peter Spence, the HBC master in 1817-20 also made occasional journal entries about his wife, particularly in regard to her fishing and rabbit snaring activities (Docs.#28: 4d-5; #30:4; #31:49).

**ABITIBI HOUSE** (1794-1929): The earliest journal record of an HBC Company man at Abitibi who may have had an Aboriginal mate is dated August 11, 1797 when post manager Robert Folster “and an Indian Woman proceeded for the Fort in a Small canoe” (Doc.#4:2). On May 10, 1790 Folster noted that “a Canadian Clerk and his wife went of [sic] after Belly” who had been sent to follow another “Canadian and Indian” to Frederick House, for “fear that they should see more Indians and Entice the Furs from them” (Doc.#4:12d). Both the HBC and NWC spent considerable time and energy following each other in an attempt to thwart each other’s collection of furs from Indians, and it appears that men frequently brought their wives along. The reason for their presence on such trips is never stated, although it is possible that these women were members of bands from whom the traders hoped to collect furs, and that their presence would help entice that trade. Possibly these Aboriginal wives were also useful as local guides. In May 1807, Canadian “Mr. Charles Laplant (his Wife) & 2 Men of Our Opponents” were spotted travelling “down the River... to Indians Ground”; two HBC men followed their canoe for two days before returning home to Abitibi (Doc.#14:11). Richard Good, the Abitibi post manager at this time, and his “Wife” journeyed together to Moose Factory in 1807 (Doc.#15:3). Robert Gill, another HBC man at Abitibi House during this time, is also recorded to have had a wife (Doc.#16:5). By 1810, Richard Good’s journal entries refer to his “family”, as do entries about “Thos. Richards Junr. & his Family” (Doc.#19:2d).

After amalgamation, several new names begin to appear in the Abitibi post journals. Perhaps the most significant is William Polson, whose family name can be traced in the Abitibi area into the mid-1900s. Polson – a halfbreed born in Easmain – was hired as interpreter at Abitibi House in 1821, was promoted to Postmaster in 1841, and in total lived at Abitibi well over 25 years. The first entry referring to the Polson family at Abitibi House occurs in November 1822 when “Polson & family arrived in the evening from the fishing place having procured in all about eleven kegs” (Doc.#34:2d). Another entry in January 1823 records that, “Polson & wife went to examine their Cat-snares” (Doc.#34:5d). In July 1825, Polson, his wife and their youngest daughter became “very sick”; the little girl died and was buried at Abitibi House (Doc.#43:3d). Polson and his family are mentioned frequently in the Abitibi House post journals and, as was discussed in Chapter 4, evidence indicates that he and his wife were the leading provisioners of country food for the post.

Also after amalgamation and the permanent closing of Frederick House, the Charles Beads family took up residence at Abitibi House. On October 7, 1828, “Charles Beads and his Family went to the Fishing Place at white fish River” (Doc.#53:9). This family also appears to have been engaged as provisioners, as indicated in a December 1828 entry that they “came home from Tenting” (Doc.#53:16d). By the 1850s journals show that both Polson and Beads had sons who worked with
them at Abitibi House:

Monday 1 November 1852 ... Charles Beads his Son and Thomas and Neechee went of for [Sheeter?] for Canoe to Otter Lake...

Sunday 7th ... John Polson got 2 Rats.

Wednesday 10 ... John Polson got 2 Rabbits.

Saturday 13 ... I [Polson] went with my Boys to See a few Traps. Got nothing.

(Doc.#73:9d:10)

No journal records from Abitibi House have survived for the years 1830 to 1850. From 1851-1853, the Irish clerk Robert Hamilton was post manager and although the 1852 journal refers to “my wift” there is uncertainty about the identity of the journal keeper. William Polson may have been in charge of this duty and certainly the frequent references to hunting and fishing by a wife and family are consistent with this interpretation. Another gap in the Abitibi House record exists from 1853 to 1911. Post journals from 1911 to 1921 also contain references to men, their wives and families, but these are more significant for their record of second and third generation Company men at Abitibi, the most recognizable being Tom Polson, Philip Polson, William Beads and Charley Beads (Doc.#106:12,17,19,33).

MATAWAGAMINGUE (1815-1885): Both NWC and HBC post journal records are available for Matawagamingue. NWC journals are available for the years 1815-1819 when Angus Cameron was the post manager, and these records are now part of the Cameron Papers held at the Archives of Ontario (AO MS209). Mitchell (1977:160-1) states that Cameron had relations with three Indian women during his stay in the Abitibi/Timiskaming region, and evidence of at least one of these unions is contained in his Matawagamingue journals. Numerous entries about “M” – often in a noticeable script which stands out on Cameron’s written page – describe the hunting and other activities of a woman who belonged to the post:

[1815] Sund 26th [February] ... M went to see her Traps at Shitataming and found a Grey Fox caught in one of her Traps, but no martins.


Mond 27th [March] ... M visited the lines where she found 4 Pikes caught. She also caught 7 hare in the old snares.

Frid 19th [May] ... I sent M to set nets where the Carps spawns.

Frid 6th [Oct] ... I sent M up the river to set Nets as the men never catch any Fish. I suppose they do not set in the right places. (Doc.#22)
Cameron's frequent and familiar references to this woman and none other are indicative of an intimate relationship. In 1819 there is evidence that he trusted her enough to leave her in charge of the post while he was away:

*I am sorry to hear that Mr. McBride was here during my absence and of course much disappointed at not being at home. The following Indians came... they had furs to the amount of 166 Martin which M traded with them.* (Doc.#29:13 March 1819)

"M" and Cameron were together until at least 1824 when Cameron's journal entries at Timiskaming continued to record her harvesting activities: "M went off to the Sugar place opposite to the Fort"; "M killed 2 Martins & a Mink" and "M caught a fox" (Doc.#39:2 April, 17 & 23 November 1824).

While at Matawagamingue, Cameron also recorded the presence of "the HB Clerk's lady", likely the country wife of James Kellock who managed the HBC post there during its first winter (Doc.#22:28 January 1815). Cameron's difficulty in conversing with Kellock's wife "as she does not speak much English & does not understand the Indian language of this country at all" suggests that this woman was not from one of the local Indian bands, but accompanied Kellock from another region where he had worked previously. Like Cameron's "M", Kellock's wife hunted and fished for her post: "the English Clerk passes every morning before my door to visit a little bit of a snare path that his wife made for him" (Doc.#22:31 March 1815). Kellock left Matawagamingue for a year, but returned with his family for outfit 1816-1817. In February 1817 Cameron reported that eleven men, plus women and children were resident at the HBC post, which had insufficient provisions for this large a group (Doc.#27:1 February 1817). At one point, Cameron noted, Kellock "sent his wife here to beg some provisions from me" (Doc.#27:28 February 1817). Kellock was replaced by George Budge during the second HBC outfit (1815-1816) at Matawagamingue, bringing a family with him also. One Sunday in 1816 Cameron invited "Budge & his Family to Dinner with us" (Doc.#25:18 February 1816). On April 1, "Mr. Budge's Wife came & Traded 6 Martins for [leather?]" (Doc.#25).

After amalgamation, the HBC appointed Donald McKay (Jr.) – the halfbreed son of Donald McKay Sr. – as Clerk at Matawagamingue.\(^{30}\) Matawagamingue journals indicate that Donald McKay (Jr.) also had an Aboriginal wife and family:

*Monday 10th [March 1828] ... Mr. McKay out setting Snares all day – & himself & woman brought home 12 Hares and 2 Partridges in the evening...*

\(^{30}\) Source: HBCA Search File - Matawagamingue, p.4. Also, John McKay is referred to in Cameron's Timiskaming journal 1824-1825 (Doc.#39). John and Donald Jr. were brothers, both the halfbreed sons of Donald Sr. who established the NWC Matawagamingue post in 1794 (Mitchell 1977:236). The HBC Matawagamingue journal for outfit 1824-1825 also refers to an Angus McKay (Doc.#41:29). In 1823 Angus was described as "a winterer from Matawagaming" after which time he is referred to in the Flying Post journals as a servant there (Doks.#37:1; #44:1). A District Report from Flying Post in 1826 indicates that Angus McKay was then retiring "after a service of seven years, during which time he has conducted himself to the satisfaction of employers" (Doc.#47:5). The identity of Angus is uncertain, although he was probably a relative, and possibly the son of Donald McKay Jr. 

Tuesday 18th ...McKays wife caught 2 Martins and 2 Hares. (Doc.#52:1d-2)

In early April 1828, “Mr. McKay & family [went] off to make Sugar at the S. West end of the Lake” (Doc.#52:3d). An entry dated June 19, 1828 indicates that McKay and his wife had three children (Doc.#52:9), and in 1829 the family grew as “Mr McKay’s woman [was] brought to bed of twins – two little Girls” (Doc.#54:28-28d).

Thomas Richards, a labourer at Matawagamingue at this time, also had a wife and family:

Friday 25 [April 1828] ...I sent Thomas Richards & his Wife up to Lake Minisingqua for a few days to endeavor to procure a living and having nothing for him to do here at present.

Thursday 26 [June 1828] ...Taqua & one of her Daughters arrived they had a few rats. Richards two Daughters came with them. (Doc.#52:5,9-9d)

When Richards had to travel to Moose Factory for supplies in September 1828, his wife apparently left the post to stay with her band:

Thomas Richards wife went off with her children with the Indians untill her husband’s return. (Doc.#54:6d)

Hugh Faries was the post manager of Matawagamingue from 1827-1837, and while there are no entries with direct reference to his wife, frequent references are made to his grown métis sons Walter and Frederick who worked at the post and had families of their own:

April Wednesday 2 [1828] ...Walter Faries chopping wood...

Saturday 9 [August 1828] ...Walter my son Caught 6 Muskrats. (Doc.#52:3d,12)

Oct’r 7 Monday [1835] ...My son Walter who remained in charge here during my absence...

10th Sat [October 1835] ...I sent down Frederick Faries... to make the Fall Fishery at the entrance of Kinogumissi Lake...

Wednesday 4 [May 1836] ...Frederick and Wife I sent up to Minisingqua to try & procure a living to save Provisions & little to do at present at the establishment...

Thursday 12 [May 1836] ...Walter’s family returned from the Rapid... (Doc.#60:8,17,17d)
In 1837 Chief Trader Hugh Farries and his family left Matawagamingue and departed for Canada. The post was left in the charge of Richard Hardisty who brought a family with him. In May 1838 Hardisty engaged an Indian to escort “two of my children” on route to the school recently established at Red River (Doc.#63:19d). In 1847 another of Hardisty’s sons was sent to school at Red River (Doc.#70:17d).

During Hardisty’s management (1837-1848), both Walter and Frederick Farries and their families stayed on at Matawagamingue. The only other Company man with an Aboriginal wife and family on record during these years was Valentine Saunders:

Sunday 24 [Jan 1847] ...Valentine Saunders’ youngest Child died this Morning while its Mother was on way to the House with it from her Tent about five Miles from here.

Tuesday 26 ...In the Afternoon had a Grave dug, in which Valentine Saunders’ child was buried. (Doc.#70:15)

An Inspection Report provides indirect evidence of families resident at Matagami in 1890: the “Men’s House” was designed so that it could “contain two families, with a separate apartment for single men”.31

**FLYING POST** (1800-1914): Journals for Flying Post are available for the years 1823-1848. The first documented indication of relations between company men and Aboriginal women at Flying Post during Outfit 1826-1827 when John McRae received a letter from district Chief Trader Donald McKay:

...give good instruction to the men likewise, don’t allow any women to stay about the house you know what mischief it cause you have only to give a good flogging to one by that means you will soon get quit or drive them off. (Doc.#49:5d)

Other than this entry, there are almost no records of women at Flying Post. This does not mean that company men with Aboriginal wives and families were not resident there, as records show that individuals such as Donald McKay (Jr.), Frederick Farries, and Charles Beads all spent time at Flying Post (Docs.#65:2,4d; #66:3). In the 1840s, Valentine Saunders was also employed at Flying Post, and entries about his wife and family are the only direct evidence of domestic households there.32

_January 1846 - Mon.5th ...Valentine & his Wife went up the river to camp for a couple of nights._ (Doc.#69:16d)

---

31 Source: HBCA Search File - Matawagamingue, p.11.

32 One journal entry implies that Saunders had more than one wife, but as all other entries about his wife are in the singular, this may be a writing error by the journal keeper (Donald Grant): “February 1846 - Fri. 13th ...Valentine went to bring home his wives who had gone a few days ago, to his old Share path up the river. I believe they were not very successful” (Doc.#69:19).
March 1848 - Sat 25 ... Saunders went to see his wife.

Tues. 31 ... Saunders Family returned yesterday from their snaring grounds.

April 1848 - Mon 3 ... Saunders wife started to the New Sugary & I have given him two or three Days to help her & set his traps in proper order. (Doc.#71:11d-12)

In September 1844, Faries recorded the season’s potato harvest, stating that “two women” assisted in taking up 60 bushels; however, there is no indication whether these women were residents of the Flying Post (Doc.#68:4d).

An Inspection Report dated 1890 indicates that several families were then resident at Flying Post. The “Men’s House... occupied the Servants, one of whom is married and the other single” (Doc.#84:3). A list of “Personal” shows that the Post-Master Angus McDonald was “married, but his family is not with him”, while “Jas. R. Moore, Guide” was “married, with two children” and “Geo. Pott, Steersman” was also “married, with 2 children” (Doc.#84:8).

**Matachewan** (1865-1920): Less than four years of post journals are available for Matachewan, and entries referring to Company men with wives and families are rare. Furthermore, at this point in the fur trade history, it is not impossible that men’s wives were from Canada, and it cannot be assumed that women at the post were Aboriginal or métis. However, names of men which appear in the Matachewan journals during these years indicate that children of European/Aboriginal unions which were formed in the Abitibi region in earlier years, continued to be active in the fur trade. In 1871 “W. Richards” and “W. Faries” arrived at Matachewan with a despatch from Matawagamingue (Doc.#76:18 August 1871). A man referred to only as “Saunders” was employed at the post in 1870 (Doc.#76:28 November 1870). The journal entry in 1872 reporting his return to the post, probably from a hunting or fishing trip, indicates that he may have had an Aboriginal wife: “Saunders & partner returned; they have done well” (Doc.#76:30 March 1872). Another HBC servant at Matachewan by the name of “Friday” apparently also had a wife. References to “Madame Friday” and an entry which reports that she “moved away to Baptiste’s tent to make a fishing” and that “she came in with a keg of fish” a few days later, may indicate that she was métis (Doc.#76:17 & 20 October 1873). Finally, an Inspection Report dated 1890 indicates that two men – James Mowat, Clerk and Joseph Tapie, Steersman – each had wives and families living with them at Matachewan (Doc.#85:8).

**New Post** (1867-1926): There are no journals available for New Post. Other records such as District Reports etc., do not contain any data regarding unions between European men and Aboriginal women. However, a history of the post indicates that three generations of McLeods –

This may be a reference to the Michael Baptiste hired temporarily by Ducas in 1873, or it may refer to Baptiste Levine who is also mentioned frequently in the Matachewan post journals. This latter man appears to have been an independent trapper who camped with his family not far from the post. The French Canadian name combined with lifestyle in the bush suggests that “Baptiste” was a métis man who identified more closely with his Indian heritage. Madame Friday’s stay with his “tribe” may indicate that she was related to this family (Doc.#76).

probably métis – lived and worked at New Post; this will be discussed in greater detail below.  

In addition to evidence of marital unions at the individual level, there is also strong indication at the family level of intermarriage between fur trade families in which a métis son married a fellow-traders’ métis daughter, or a traders’ daughter married a European company man. This endogamous marriage pattern among fur trade families is discussed in the following section.

5.2 FUR TRADE ENDOGAMY

‘Fur trade endogamy’ is the label historian Jennifer Brown (1980a:70) applies to the pattern of intermarriage that occurred between fur trader families. Brown suggests that this pattern was a major influence on the changing social character of both the Hudson’s Bay and North West Companies in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, one that was firmly established by the mid-1800s. A kinship and marriage chart illustrates this pattern ca. 1760-1820 (reproduced as Figure 5.1, following page).

Brown cites examples of fur trade endogamy, several of which involve families from the Abitibi region posts discussed here. One example is the marriage between George Moore and Emma Good (shown at the bottom of Figure 5.1), about whom Brown documents the following:

When... the Methodist missionary George Barnley formally married the native born Emma Good to George Moore in December 1841, at Moose Factory, he noted that they had already “been united according to the custom of the Country since June 1816. (In Brown 1980a:51)

George Moore (Jr.) was the métis son of George Moore Sr., a “Canoe builder” stationed at Moose Factory but who was involved in the HBC’s inland expansion to Abitibi in 1794 (Docs.#11:1d; #2:1). Possibly Thomas Moore, a labourer at Kenogami in 1796, was also a relative (Doc.#3:7d). George Moore (b) is listed as a bowsman at Kenogami in 1819 at which time he had a wife (Docs.#31:11; #32:1d). In the winter of 1824, Moore – “a Native of the Country about 30 years of age” -- was a guide at Matabawamigwe, reportedly “an expert hand in the Canoes” (Docs.#41:1; #42:6). Moore had been the guide for the canoe brigade which brought Richard Good -- his father-in-law – to Matabawamigwe from Moose Factory in the autumn of 1824 (Doc.#41:1).

34 Source: HBCA Search File - New Post.

35 There were at least two HBC men with the name “George Moore”, and so records show (a) and (b) to differentiate them. Both George Moores are listed on Brown’s kinship chart reproduced in this report (Figure 5.1). George Moore Sr. – probably (a) – appears as a contemporary of Richard Good on the chart. Long (1985:141) indicates that George Sr. was a Moose Factory halfbreed. George Moore (b) is referred to in the Kenogami post journal for 1819, as “George Moore Jun’t” (Junior). Simpson recorded that in 1832, Richard Good was “about 55 Years of Age” (in Williams 1975:209). Chronologies of service (from which one can extrapolate age differences) found in the post journals and district reports are consistent with the assumption that Good was the father-in-law of George Moore (b).
Figure 5.1
Kinship and Marriage Connections: Albany & Moose Factories, 1760-1820
(Source: Brown 1980a:75 [Figure 3])

▲ = Hudson's Bay company employees
Note: The two charts intersect with the couple whose names are italicized (Margaret Moore : Thos. Richards)

Richard Good was a senior trader employed at posts in the region throughout the inland expansion period. In 1798 he was the Assistant post manager at Kenogamissi, after which he temporarily took charge of Frederick House in 1800. Good was in charge of Abitibi House from 1802-1811, returning to Kenogamissi as post manager from 1812-1816, after which time it appears he left the region permanently to serve at Moose Factory. As demonstrated in Figure 5.1 above, Good definitely had a country wife (Sarah) and children, one of whom was a daughter Emma who married George Moore, Jr. à la façon du pays in 1816 (probably at Kenogamissi). As shown below, descendants of the Moore family remained active in the Abitibi region fur trade well into the 1890s.

The fact that the Abitibi region was sparsely populated throughout the fur trade period, increases the likelihood that traders and their children would find mates from within that group. The other group from whom mates could be found was composed of the local Aboriginal bands. The high degree of mobility between these small posts and Moose Factory would likely not have changed this pattern, as most of the Abitibi region traders were originally from the Moose area, having transferred south during the years of competition and inland expansion (see Chapter 4, Section 4.1.1).

An important characteristic of fur trade endogamy evident in the Abitibi region, is the connection to fur trade families from Moose and Albany Factories. The evidence presented below indicates that the Moose Factory fur trade community in particular was the source of endogamous marriage patterns evident in the Abitibi region. For example, an examination of Doc.# biographical marriage patterns evident in the Abitibi region. For example, an examination of biographical marriage files reveals that between the years 1804-1819, three of four consecutive post managers at Kenogamissi were related through the Moose Factory Thomas family either by birth or by marriage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kenogamissi Post Manager</th>
<th>Relationship to Thomas Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1804-1812</td>
<td>Son of John Thomas (Sr.), Chief at Moose Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816-1817</td>
<td>Married to Frances, daughter of John Thomas Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817-1819</td>
<td>Married to Charlotte, daughter of John Thomas Sr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: HBCA Biography - Thomas, John Sr.)

Many of the surnames on Brown’s chart are also listed in Abitibi region post journals, including Richards, Moore, Thomas, Good, Flett, Stewart, Spence, Knight, Gladman, Vincent and Linklater (see Figure 5.1). The interconnection of these family names through marriage and by association at inland fur trade posts provides a substantive example of the dynamics of fur trade endogamy in the Abitibi region throughout the 19th century. The following accounts include some discussion of subsequent generations of most of these families, a subject that will be elaborated on in Section 5.3 which details additional examples of families of mixed ancestry in the Abitibi region.

Richards: The Richards family was active in the Moose Factory fur trade for at least four generations. The first, William Richards, had two native-born sons, Thomas and John, each of whom had native born children who entered the HBC service (Brown 1980a:160). The Moose Factory List of Servants for 1804 lists the following Richards family members, representing the second and third generations:
Names
Richards, Thomas Sr.
Richards, Thomas Jun.
Richards, William
(Doc.#11:2d)

Stations
Boat Steersman
Canoeman
Canoeman

Parish
Hudson's Bay
Hudson's Bay
Hudson's Bay
Hudson's Bay
Hudson's Bay

While it can only be presumed that Thomas Sr. and his brother John married either Aboriginal women or the métis daughters of fellow fur-traders, there is direct evidence that their sons married into other Hudson's Bay fur trade families (see Figure 5.1). Thomas Richards Jr. married Margaret Moore, the métis daughter of George Moore Sr. William Richards (the son of John) married Eleanor Thomas, the native-born daughter of John Thomas (Sr.), Chief at Moose Factory.

Cousins Thomas Jr. and William Richards both spent time in the Abitibi region at inland posts. Post journals from Abitibi House between 1807 and 1810 record the presence of both men (Docs.#14:11; #15:3d). While little is known about William, there is frequent mention in journals and other records of Thomas Jr. For instance, in 1810 “Tho’s Richards Jun.’r & his family... arrived from the Factory” after a summer respite, to resume residence at Abitibi House (Doc.#19:2d). During the 1820s, Thomas Richards and his family lived at Matawagamingue where in November 1827 for example, they all went “off to encamp in the woods, to endeavor to make out a livelihood hunting Hares” (Doc.#50:6d; cf. Docs.# 41:1; #44:1; #52:2d). Thomas Jr.’s brother, John (Parish: “Indian Country”) also remained active in the fur trade, as late as 1860 John Richards is listed as a Steersman at Moose Factory, with 52 years of service with the HBC (Doc.#74:12).

From 1852 to 1872, a Thomas Richards was the Postmaster at Matawagamingue, but it is highly unlikely that this individual is the same as Thomas Jr. discussed above, who in 1825 was listed as age 40 (Doc.#42:6). While unconfirmed, it is probable that the Thomas Richards recorded in journals and servants accounts for this later period, represents a fourth generation of the Richards fur trade family, and possibly the son of Thomas Jr. and Margaret (Moore) Richards. In both the 1860 and 1870 ‘Abstracts of Servants’ Accounts’, Thomas Richards is listed as a Clerk from “Indian Country”, stationed in the Kinogamissi District (Docs.#74:5; #75:5). In 1865, the responsibility of keeping a check on the activities of independent trader “Ducas” in the Abitibi area was passed to “Thomas Richard” who was then in charge of the Kenogamissi District with headquarters at Matawagamingue. By 1875, this Thomas Richards was a Clerk at New Brunswick (Doc.#77:5).

Between 1860-1887, several more Richards are listed whose records of years of service with the HBC indicate a fifth generation of this fur trade family:

36 Also, HBCA Search File - Matawagamingue, pp.8-9.
Second on the list above, William Richards, apparently began his career in the Kenogamiessi District, where in 1871 he is listed as a labourer with 6 years service (Doc.#75:12). William is mentioned in the Matachewan post journal on August 18th, 1871, when “W. Richards... arrived this evening with the packet from Matawagamigue” to which post he returned three days later (Doc.#76:18-21 August 1871).

Moore: As stated above, Thomas Richards Jr. married Margaret Moore. Margaret was the métis daughter of George Moore Sr. (and Mary Truthwaite), and sister to George Jr. who married Emma Good (see above; see also Figure 5.1). In 1824, George Moore Jr. and Thomas Richards were guide and steersman respectively, on the trip from Moose Factory to Matawagamigue where these brothers-in-law and their families resided for that winter (Doc.#41:1).

The marriage between Emma Good and George Moore Jr., the career of Emma’s father Richard Good as well as that of George Moore Jr. are described above and will not be repeated here. However, by the 1840s, Doc.# records show that a possible third generation of the Moore family was active in the fur trade, including at posts in the Abitibi region. In 1840, Joseph Moore – then age 23 and the probable son of Emma and George Jr. – was listed as a labourer in the HBC Kinogamiessi District (Doc.#64:13). Possible younger sons Thomas and Philip Moore are listed as servants in 1850; Thomas (age 23) was working as a labourer in the Kenogamiessi district along with Joseph (then age 32), while Philip (age 21) was an apprentice at Timiskaming (Doc.#72:11). Between the years 1841 and 1845, both Joseph and Thomas Moore are frequently mentioned in the Flying Post journals, for example:

[1841] ....Joseph Moore employed in gathering dry wood...; ...[arrived] a Half-sized canoe manned by John Corrigal, Thomas Moore and an Indian... (Doc.#65:2,4d)

[1842] ....Joseph Moore... hoeing & cleaning potatoes... (Doc.#66:3)

[1843] "...Thomas Moore arrived here this evening from Matawagamigue... [he] is to remain at this place" [for the summer]... (Doc.#66:19)

[1844] ...Mr. [C.T.?] Hardisty arrived from Matawagamigue/ ... in a Small Canoe manned by Thomas Moore and an Indian... (Doc.#68:3)

[1845] ...J. Moore & Saunders to visit Indians...; ...Moore & Valentine visited their Shares... (Doc.#69:11d,14d)
Both Joseph and Thomas are listed as active servants in the Kenogamissi District for the 1850-51 Outfit, but Accounts for Outfit 1860-61 indicate that Joseph had by that time transferred to Moose Factory (Docs.#72:11; #74:11).

Thomas stayed in the Kenogamissi District until at least Outfit 1886-87, when the Accounts list Thomas Moore (A) as a Clerk with 45 years service (Doc.#82:5). A letter from Matawagamingue dated 19th May 1879 addressed to “Thos. Moore, Flying Post” indicates that he was in charge of that post (Doc.#79). Another letter from J.C McRae, Matawagamingue dated 1st January 1880 demonstrates that Moore’s son Thomas was also active in the region: “I was under the necessity of hiring Thomas Moore, son of Mr Moore of Flying Post, for the winter to act as interpreter at Matachewan” (Doc.#79). The elder Thomas stayed at Flying Post until at least 1890, as indicated in “Personal” section of the Inspection Report for that year:

_Thos. Moore, (a), Clerk, 64 years of age; 48 years’ service; widower without encumbrances; ...a splendid Indian trader for the Interior of the country, where he has been all his life._ (Doc.#84:7-8)

In 1892, “Thomas Moore (a) took over the post of Matagami and remained in charge there until his retirement in 1898”. 38

Thomas (b) and James were already engaged as HBC servants in the late 1860s, as indicated in the Servants Accounts for Outfit 1871-72; six of the eight Moore men listed as active HBC servants may represent a fourth generation of the Moore family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Moore, James</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>Moose factory</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Stoper</td>
<td>Eastmain</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joseph B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>App. Laborer</td>
<td>Moose factory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>App. Blacksmith</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>N.Brunswick</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>App.Laborer</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#75:11)

It appears that three of these men – George, Joseph (B) and William – continued to be active in the fur trade well into the 1880s; in 1886 Joseph (B) is listed as a guide in the Kenogamissi District (Doc.#82:11). William Moore listed above as an apprentice blacksmith at Moose Factory may have been one of the signatories to the “halfbreed petition” in 1905 (Doc.#100, see Chapter 6). Another two Moore men – one with a family – are listed in the 1890 Inspection Report for Flying Post (where Thomas Moore (a) was in charge):

---


Thos. Moore, (b), Indian runner, 28 years of age; an old Servant re-engaged; unmarried...
Jas. R. Moore, Guide, 32 years of age; 15 years' service; married with two children...
(Doc.#84:8)

The Moore family presence in the Abitibi region is also evident in the 1901 Census: in total four Moore households identified as métis were enumerated in the Matagami and Flying Post areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Region (Ont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore, James</td>
<td>Chippewa EB*</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Matagami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, William</td>
<td>Cree SB*</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Trapper</td>
<td>Matagami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, James R.</td>
<td>Chippewa EB</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>HBC Employ.</td>
<td>Flying Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Joseph</td>
<td>ME* Algonquin</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Matagama Post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BB=English Breed; SB=Scottish Breed; ME=Métis Écossais
(Docs.#88;10,12; #92.n/p)

James R. Moore enumerated as an HBC employee in the 1901 Census is the same individual listed in the 1890 Flying Post Inspection Report cited above. The birth dates of James and Joseph are consistent with the records of the Moore men listed in the Moose Abstracts of Servants Accounts for 1871 (see above), suggesting that these also are the same individuals as those employed with the HBC at that time. Finally, it should be noted that the 1901 enumeration of Joseph Moore at “Matagama Post - HBC Algoma Ontario” is followed by the remark that both he, his wife Mary and their two oldest children were born in Abitibi (Doc.#92.n/p).

Thomas: Another of the Richards family – William, son of John – married Eleanor Thomas, the daughter of John Thomas Sr., HBC Chief at Moose Factory (see Figure 5.1). Eleanor’s brother, John Thomas Jr. married an Aboriginal woman named Meenish (or Mary), and served the Company as an inland trader in the early 1800s. Frederick House journals from 1802 and 1804 announce the arrival of “John Thomas... from Moose Fort” (Docs.#12:2d; #16:3). From 1804 to 1812, John Jr. was in charge of the Kenogamissi post. Little else is known about John Jr. – who died in 1816 – but it appears he was not a very successful trader. He began his career as a “Canoeeman” and was promoted to “Inland Trader” by 1810, but even John Sr. remained doubtful of his abilities, writing the following account about his son:

Requests £40 annum for 3 Years. I can advance nothing in his favour but his sobriety and zeal for his Employers Interest for he has availed himself so little of the

---

39 If the 1890 Inspection Report is accurate, this Thomas (b) is likely not the same as the Thomas B listed in the 1871 Accounts, who at that time already had 9 years of service with the HBC. If they were the same individual, he would have begun his career with the HBC at 8 years of age. However, it is possible that the Inspection Report has incorrectly recorded his age, a possibility considering he is described as an “old servant re-engaged”. In this case, the 1871 and 1890 records refer to the same man, an interpretation supported by the fact that both are listed as “Thomas (b) (rather than Thomas (b) and (c)).

40 Source: HBCA Biography - Thomas, John Jr.

opportunity he has had of getting instruction that I find it necessary to prevent him an [increase?]; tho he is my son I this candidly state the disadvantages he labors under ... which gives me doubt whether the Hon'ble Board will allow him the advantages attached to a Trader. (Doc.#18:3d; cf. Doc.#11:2d)

The same 'List of Servants' for 1810 also accounts for another son of John Thomas Sr., a "Writer" (Account Books) by the name of Charles (Doc.#18:3d-4). A probable grandson of John Sr., Richard Thomas, was engaged as a "Steersman" on "Abbitibbi River" in the 1820s (Doc.#33:11). 41

The only other possible reference to the Thomas family in the region is found in an Abitibi House journal entry for 1852, stating: "...Thomas Sawing Posts for the new house" (Doc.#73:1d). However, it may be significant to note that Jenkins (1939:30) documented the existence of a Thomas family hunting ground in Abitibi territory in 1937. The only adult member of that family listed is Ranken Thomas, but the band of origin is identified as "½ Abitibi & ½ White." Jenkins adds that Thomas was listed on the Hudson's Bay Company rolls at La Sarre as among the Indians who traded there, but that data on the location of their grounds were unavailable.

As indicated earlier, another two of John Thomas Sr.'s daughters – Frances and Charlotte – married Company men, each of whom spent part of their careers in the Abitibi region. Frances married Andrew Stewart who worked at Kenogamiessi in 1812, and acted as post manager there for the 1816-17 outfit (Doc.#20:1). 42 Charlotte married Peter Spence, an Orkney man who served as a clerk at Matawagamique in 1816, and as District Master at Kenogamiessi from 1817 to 1819. 43 Spence's Kenogamiessi post journal for 1818 indicates that he and Charlotte were there together: "Self and Wife went down to [Waweyerston?] with 3 Nets to try for Suckers" (Doc.#30:4). Their son John was also at Kenogamiessi employed as a labourer during this time: "Jno. Spence employed as usual"; "John Spence went off to Tent" (Docs.#31:11,48; #32:1d). In 1822, the Abitibi House journal indicates that John Spence was stationed at that post (Doc.#34:3). Although the District Report for Abitibi in 1888 lists a "John Spence, labourer, 4 years service..." in its 'Personal' section, it is unknown if this man is a descendant of Charlotte (Thomas) and Peter Spence (Doc.#83:4).

The biography of John Thomas Sr. indicates that several members of his extended family moved to Canada with him when he left Moose Factory in 1814, including members of the Peter Spence family, but also individuals about whom a family connection is unexplained:

When [the Thomas'] left Moose in 1814, the group consisted of John Thomas Senior, Charles, wife and child, Peter Spence, wife and three children, Thomas Knight, John Knight, Mary Knight, Henry Thomas, son of John Thomas, 3 Grandchildren of John

41 Also, HBCA Biography - Thomas, John Sr.
42 Also, HBCA Post History - Kenogamiessi.
43 Sources: HBCA Post History - Kenogamiessi; HBCA Biography - Spence, Peter Sr.
Both the surnames Knight and Vincent are shown on Brown’s kinship chart (see Figure 5.1), and these families are discussed below.

**Knight:** The “Thos. Knight” shown on Brown’s chart, first husband to Sarah who later married Richard Good, was likely the “Late Surgeon Knight” referred to in the 1810 Moose Factory List of Servants in which his sons Thomas and John are listed (Doc.#18:3d). It is possible that Thomas and John stayed with their mother under the care of her second husband Richard Good. Thomas Knight, for example, was working under Good when the latter was in charge of Abitibi House in 1803; Good “Sent... Thomas Knight to fetch a Tracking Line” (Doc.#10:5d). John Knight, described as “n Factory Boy” spent the summer of 1803 at Kenogamissi, having travelled there under the protection of Philip Good and John Thomas (Doc.#9:1). Both brothers were at Abitibi during the years that Good was master there, and post journal entries indicate that the brothers generally were stationed at the same place, and frequently worked together as a team:

[Abitibi 1807]: Residents now Here are... Thomas Richards Jun’y, Tho’s Knight & Jno. Knight Labours [sic], the 3 latter are Natives. (Doc.#15:3d)

[Abitibi 1809]: ...Tho’s Knight and John Knight to build a Lodge at the Fishing Fall. (Doc.#17:3)

[Abitibi 1810]: Tho’s Knight, Jno Knight... arrived from the Factory. (Doc.#19:2d)

[Kenogamissi 1812]: ...arrived from the Factory; [the] Crew consisted of... Tho’s Knight, Jn. Knight... (Doc.#20:1)

The Kenogamissi District Report for Outfit 1813/14 tells of their departure to Canada, as indicated in the John Thomas Sr. biography:

**Thomas Knight (a Native 26 years of Age):** Sober, honest and obedient, assiduous in procuring Furs; has a little Education. Skilful in Canoes, at hunting and fishing - has serv’d the Comp’y Ten years viz.; 1 at New Brunswick, 1 Kenogamisee & 8 at Abitibie. Quitted the Service June 22nd and gone to Canada.

**John Knight (a Native 23 years of Age):** Like his Brother in abilities, has serv’d the Comp’y faithfully 10 years - Viz. 6 at Abitibia, 3 at Kenogamisee and one at the Factory – quitte[d] the Service June 22nd, gone to Canada. (Doc.#21:5)

Why the young Knight brothers joined the Thomas family in their move to Canada in 1814 is unclear.
Any family relation is by marriage only, and a distant one at that.\(^{44}\) It is possible that there was some other family relationship not evident in the data collected for this assignment. Another possibility is that the care of Surgeon Knight’s sons by John Thomas Sr. was the result of some non-familial commitment to a fellow officer’s offspring. Or perhaps the Knights’ departure to Canada was coincidental with that of the Thomas family, and not due to any connection to them.

**Vincent:** A “son of Mr. Vincent, Chief at Albany” also left for Canada with the Thomas group in 1814. “Mr. Vincent” may refer to Thomas Vincent shown on Figure 5.1, whose son John married Charlotte Thomas, possibly a granddaughter of John Thomas Sr., the Chief at Moose Factory. Little data is available about the Vincent family. In 1832, Governor Simpson characterized a John Vincent as “a halfbreed about 38 years of age has been 16 years in the Service...Stationed in Albany District” (in Williams 1975:233). The records from 1868 indicate the presence of a James Vincent, “a newly engaged clerk” who took over management of Matachewan, and continued in charge until the autumn of 1873.\(^{45}\) The Moose Abstracts of Servants’ Accounts for 1871-72 show a James Vincent stationed in the Kenogamissi District, a Clerk from “Indian Country” (Doc.#75:5).

### 5.3 FAMILIES OF MIXED ANCESTRY IN THE ABITIBI REGION

The above discussion of fur trade endogamy also provides data on families of mixed ancestry who at one time or another lived and worked in the Abitibi region, but whose family connections generally are traced back to Moose Factory. The focus of analysis will now turn to those families of mixed ancestry who likely considered the Abitibi region as home. The criteria used to determine Abitibi region families, consist of several generations of these families residing almost exclusively within the region under study in this report. However, as pointed out in Chapter 4, when post managers were given permission in 1830 to hire local métis on seven-year contracts as apprentices, they were instructed that these young men “could not be employed with their fathers or in the districts in which their families lived (Judd 1980:139). Consequently, records show that the métis sons of company men in the Abitibi region, were often stationed elsewhere in the department, perhaps at Moose Factory, Albany Factory or Rupert’s River. Nevertheless, sufficient data has been collected to present a discussion of eight métis family names which can be traced in the Abitibi region for several generations: McKay, Beads, Faries, King, Polson, McBride, Saunders, and McLeod.

**McKay:** Archival records referring to the McKay family in the Abitibi region cover only a 55 year period, from 1785 to 1840. However, secondary data indicates (Mitchell 1977:236). In 1785, Donald McKay (Sr.) was the NWC master at Langue de Terre (near Frederick House) and his brother

---

\(^{44}\) The Knight’s half-sister Emma Good married into the Moore (George Jr.) family, which was connected by marriage to the Richards family (Margaret Moore m. Thomas Richards). This family was connected again by marriage to the Thomas family (William Richards m. Eleanor Thomas, daughter of John Thomas Sr.).

\(^{45}\) Source: HBCA Search File - Matachewan, pp.1-2.
Angus was there as clerk. Born in Montreal of Scottish parents, they had another brother Neil who was also serving in the Timiskaming fur trade about this time (ibid. 28). Mitchell’s biography of the McKays states that while all three brothers spent time in the Timiskaming district, only Donald spent his life there (ibid. 235-6).

Donald McKay Sr. established both Matawagamingue (1794) and Flying Post (1800) for the NWC. Except for a brief charge at Abitibi from 1806-07, the rest of his career was spent as master at Fort Timiskaming where he died in 1820. Two halfbreed sons, Donald Jr. and John also served as clerks in the Abitibi region under both the NWC and HBC.46

The description of Donald McKay Jr. in Simpson’s character book, 1832, indicates that Donald Sr. married an Aboriginal woman from the Abitibi region, and as a result established important alliances with principal men of local bands:

_McKay Donald. A Timiskaming half breed about 40 years of age, has been 21 years in the Service. An active useful Man at Kenogumissie, to the Indians of which place he is related and with whom he has much influence. Would be very troublesome if in the hands of opposition and therefore retained in the Service altho not steady, fond of Liquor, and given to falsehood. Stationed at Kenogumissie. (In Williams 1975:217)_

Donald Jr. apparently joined the NWC in 1807, entering the service of the HBC in 1821. At the time of Simpson’s entry, he was in charge of Flying Post. In Simpson’s general report to the London Committee in August 1832, he elaborated on McKay’s history in the region, and the potential risks of losing him to opposition:

_This man is a halfbreed, born and brought up in the District... he knows the whole country well, is related to the principal Indians in the District, and is a very active bustling fellow. In order to guard against [his opposition to HBC] to a certain degree, I have authorized Mr. Faries to make a proposition to him... which I should not have done in any other circumstances. (Ibid.:fn. #4)_

Donald Jr. had served at Matawagamingue from at least 1815 when post journals announce his arrival “with the amt. of 85 Martins which he procured from the English Indians” (Doc.#22:22 May 1815). In 1816-17, he was apparently working with McBride at Flying Post (Doc.#27:1 January 1817). After his father died in 1820, Donald McKay Jr. was appointed master at Matawagamingue, the area where he spent most of his life, eventually becoming head of the Kenogamiessi River district. He was an active hunter, and as indicated in Chapter 4, a skilled canoe-builder as well. As discussed earlier (Section 5.1), Donald McKay Jr. had a wife and family with him at Matawagamingue. His son

46 It should be noted that despite the fact that these sons will have been born in the Abitibi / Timiskaming area, the Moose Abstracts of Servants Accounts identify their parish of origin as “Hudson’s Bay”, an indication that this term was used as a synonym for “native” or “country-born” (Doc.#58:10).
James is on record in 1850 as employed at Fort Timiskaming (Mitchell 1977:112,236).

John McKay served mainly at Fort Timiskaming retiring in 1847/48. However, during the 1820s, he spent some time at Matawagamingue:

[1824] Mr. Christie and Mr. R. Good arrived... from Moose Factory. The crew of their Canoe were four men for this post viz. George Moore /Guide/ Thomas Richards Steersman George Rivers and John McKay middlemen Amable Belair /and the Indians/ ...the above with Mr. J.W. Robins Clerk and Pierre Duplante and Xavier Blay are the residents for the winter at this post. (Doc.#41:1)

John's fur trade career was less illustrious than that of his brother Donald Jr., but Simpson nevertheless viewed him as a threat should he chose to oppose the Company in the Abitibi region:

McKay John. A half breed native of Temiscaming. About 40 years of Age - 20 odd Years in the Service... is only retained in the Service as he would be troublesome in opposition from his knowledge [aff] the country and influence over the Principal Indians in the District to whom he is related. (In Williams 1975:236)

John's only son Henry was employed at Nipissing where he died in 1851 (Mitchell 1977:236). John’s daughter Isabella was married à la façon du pays to a Hudson’s Bay chief factor, Joseph Beleye; they had several children whose lay baptisms were recorded in the Moose Factory register between 1817 and 1822 (Brown 1980a:138).

While there are several McKay men listed in the Moose Abstracts of Servants accounts from 1875 to 1886, these individuals are all identified as from Scotland, and are thus not of the McKay family with a history in the Abitibi region (Docs.#77:5,10; #78:5,9; #82:5,10).

Four McKay families were enumerated in the Flying Post region in the 1901 Census, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Racial/Tribal Origin</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Region (Ont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKay, Henry</td>
<td>Chippewa SB*</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Trapper</td>
<td>Flying Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay, George</td>
<td>Chippewa SB</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Trapper</td>
<td>Flying Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay, Albert</td>
<td>Chippewa SB</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Trapper</td>
<td>Flying Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay, Donald</td>
<td>Chippewa OB*</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Trapper</td>
<td>Flying Post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SB=Scotch Breed; OB=Other Breed

(Doc.#88:11-12,18)

The fact that each of these households is identified as métis, and that all are trappers in the Flying Post region suggests that they were members of the extended family descending from fur trader Donald McKay Sr.

Beads: Archival records provide 112 years of history of at least three generations of the Beads.

family in the Abitibi region, from 1804-1916. Morantz cites this family as an example of divergent career paths taken by mixed-blood siblings who leaned toward either their European or Aboriginal heritage:

...sons of some British traders entered the service of the company. Not all did though; many chose to live an Indian life and settled among the coaster families. There are cases such as the Beads family where one brother (Thomas) joined the company while the other (Chizzo) remained a hunter. (Morantz 1980:48, parentheses original)

The earliest archival record of the Beads family collected in the course of research for this present report, is in the Moose Factory List of Servants for 1804. The entry lists Charles, already at least a second-generation, country-born Beads family member:

Beads, Charles; Station: Labourer, &c.; Parish: Hudson’s Bay.

Remarks: By decision of the Father and the Youth himself, have placed this young Man in the Books. He is son of one of our faithful Natives, has been employed this last year as one of the Companys Servants and proved himself of essential service...
(Doc.#11:0d-1)

At the time of this entry, Charles was about 16 years of age. The identity of Charles’ father is not provided, but the reference to him a ‘faithful native’ indicates that he may have been mixed-blood himself. As Morantz’ data about Thomas and Chizzo in the quote above is dated 1839, it is possible that these men were the sons of Charles (Morantz 1980:48, fn. #21).

There are numerous entries about Charles Beads, his wife and family in the Abitibi region post journals beginning in 1810. Beads served at Abitibi House, Frederick House, Flying Post and Kenogamissi (Docs.#19:3d; #20:2d; #53:9; #66:2d). In 1815, a John Beads is also listed as a winterer in the Kenogamissi district, and may have been a brother to Charles (Docs.#23:1d; #24:1d). By 1850, four Beads men of the next generation were involved in the fur trade:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Beads, Charles</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>Abitibi</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>App’ce.</td>
<td>Lake Sup’r.’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Thomas J.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Steersman</td>
<td>Rup River</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>App.Laborer</td>
<td>Abitibi</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>App.Laborer</td>
<td>Albany Riv.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Docs.#64:7; #72:5)

In 1852, post journal entries indicate that Charles and his son, probably Joseph, were working at

---


Abitibi together:

...Charles Beads his son and Thomas and Neechee went of [sic] for Sheeter [?] for Canoes to Other Lake [..] Charles Beads and is [sic] crew came with the sides [?] for Canoes... (Doc.#73:3d:9d)

In the 1860s, Thomas J. Beads was a Postmaster in the Rupert River district, but Servants Accounts for the 1870s show that William Beads remained in the Abitibi region employed as a guide (Docs.#74:4; #75:7; #77:7). The Personnel records for Abitibi House in 1888 and again in 1899 show that William Beads made Abitibi his home:

[1888] Wm. Beads, labourer and canoe builder, [50?] years of age, in service all his life... a faithful old servant. (Doc.#83:4)

[1899] William Beads, Carpenter and Canoe Builder; 66 years of age, married, 50 years Service... A very good work man, but will probably soon be past work. (Doc.#86:8)

In 1901, the Census for Abitibi (Indian Reserve) enumerated the households of William Beads referred to in records cited above, as well as a William Beads Jr., but in both cases their origin was identified as Indian, not métis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour / Origin</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Region (Quebec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beads, William Jr.</td>
<td>R* / Algonquin</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Abitibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads, William</td>
<td>R / Algonquin</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Abitibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* R=Red (Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#90:5)

Post journal entries from Abitibi House in 1912 refer to William Beads working as a guide, although whether the reference is to William Sr. or Jr. is not specified: "...Wm Beads... and the two prospectors started for Whitefish after noon" (Doc.#106:12). Between 1913 and 1917, Abitibi journal entries also make references to a younger "Charley Beads":

[May 1913]: ...Charley Beads fixing platforms...

[April 1915]: ...Charley Beads from Whitefish called, stayed a short time...

[New Years Day, 1916]: ...there was dancing... Chas Beads played his violin... (Doc.#106:33,90,105)

The 1901 Census for William Beads (Sr.) lists a son Charley, then age 26 (Doc.#90:5).

Faries: Over eighty years of the Faries family history in the Abitibi region can be traced through archival records, beginning in 1799 and up to 1887. Hugh Faries was born in Montreal,
began his career in the fur trade with the NWC, and after amalgamation became a Chief Trader for the HBC. When Simpson described him in his 1832 Character Book, Faries was age 56 and considered a senior trader “of the old School” (in Williams 1975:189). At the time of Simpson’s entry, Faries was in charge of the Kenogamissi district, “liked by Indians [and] respected by his people” (ibid.). He was appointed Chief Factor in 1838, but retired two years later.

A “Mr. Faries” – presumably Hugh – is mentioned in Donald McKay’s journal of 1799 (Doc.#5:30 & 31 January 1799). However, it was not until 1827 when Faries was in charge of the district at Matawagamigunque that substantial information about his life and his family is revealed (Doc.#50:1). At this point, Hugh already had a grown son Walter who was also a servant of the Company, as well as a younger son Frederick, both of whom lived and worked with their father in the district (Docs.#50:7d; #52:3d; #54:19d). In 1835, Hugh left his son Walter in charge of the post while he was away on business and later sent his son Frederick to “make the Fall fishery” (Doc.#60:8). Both Walter and Frederick were married and had families with them at Matawagamigunque where much of their time was spent helping to provision the post:

...Frederick & Wife I sent up to Minisinaqua to try to procure a living.
...Walter’s family went up to the Rapid to remain sometime setting Nets. (Doc.#60:17-17d)

When Donald McKay (Jr.) retired and moved to Canada, Frederick Faries was temporarily appointed in charge of Flying Post:

[July 1836]: I [McKay] took my departure for Canada leaving everything in good order to the charge of Fred’k Faries according to instructions from his Father.

[Oct 1836]: This Post had been in the charge of Frederick Faries since Mr. Donald McKay left this on the 17th of July. (Doc.#62:2)

He was stationed at Flying Post as a steersman and guide until at least 1846, after which time mention of Frederick Faries and his family disappears from the post journals in the Abitibi region (Docs.#64:9; #66:19; #70:2d).

However, it appears that Walter Faries lived in the region for the remainder of his life and his name still appears in the Moose Abstracts of Servants’ Accounts for 1880:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Faries, Walter</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>Kinogam’i</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#78:7)

A letter from J.C McRae at Matawagamigunque in January 1880 confirms the family’s residence in the region up to that time, although their son William was then stationed in Albany:

---

Mr. [MRS.? illegible] Walter Faries desires me to ask you to let his [her] son William Faries have the sum of £7 in his [her] account for O’t 1879 & a Yearly sum of £5 to commence in O’t 1880 & to continue until further notice.
(Doc.#79:1 January 1880; cf. Doc.#78:7)

Walter was apparently a valuable servant at Matawagamingue and for a time in 1830 he informally apprenticed under master carpenter and boat builder, James King, also “a halfbreed” from “Indian Country” (Doc.#55:3,4-4d, see below). In the 1840s entries about Walter refer to his work as a canoe builder and carpenter, including building a coffin for his fellow worker’s dead child:

[July, 1846]: Walter Faries & Valentine Saunders getting Pine for Canoe Gannels”;
“Walter Faries employed at Canoe building”

[January, 1847]: Walter Faries making a Coffin for Valentine Saunders’ Child...
(Doc.#70:2d,15)

Between the 1860s-1880s, third and fourth generations of Faries appear in the Moose Lists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Serv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Faries, Angus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>App. Laborer</td>
<td>EastMain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Faries, Patrick</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>Moose Factory</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Faries, Richard</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>Kinogumisee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Moose Factory</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Faries, John</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Walter/b/</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Sloopier</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Faries, George</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Hudson's Bay</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Docs.#74:7; #75:8; #77:8; #78:7; #82:8)

Of these nine descendants only Richard Faries was stationed in the Abitibi region. Furthermore, it appears he left the Company’s service shortly after, as his name does not appear on lists for 1875 and onward. Long indicates that Richard joined the clergy, although whether he served in the Abitibi region is not stated:

As missions became established after 1840, another vocational niche was created for James Bay’s population of mixed ancestry. Bilingual catechists and clergy were needed to assist their European supervisors... Clergy of mixed ancestry like... Richard Faries were unable, however, to rise above the rank of archdeacon. (Long 1985:139-40)

Although the list above shows that Angus and Patrick Faries were stationed elsewhere, a letter from J.C. McRae at Matawagamingue in 1884 indicates that some connection with the Abitibi region remained. When McRae was in need of a guide to be stationed in his district, he wrote:

I suggested one of the two Farieses, Angus or Patrick, asking the only two men I knew of who would be capable of replacing Linklater, as guide (Doc.#79:2 January 1884)

Finally, fourth generation William R. Faries (Walter /b/ on the list above) lived in Moose Factory in the late 1970's, when John S. Long interviewed him on matters regarding Treaty 9 and fur trade company families (Long 1985:143, 159-endnote #23). A "Walter Ferris" – likely the same individual – acted as interpreter for the Treaty 9 Commission at Matachewan (Doc.#104:42-43, see Chapter 6). The Faries surname is not listed in any of the 1901 Census enumerations for the Abitibi region.

King: James King, was temporarily stationed at Matawagamingue in 1830, apparently seconded to Hugh Faries who was in need of a carpenter:

James King a Half Breed whom Mr. Alex McDonell was kind enough to assist me with he being a carpenter and wintered these two last years at Temiscaming.  
(Doc.#55:4-4d)

King was 32 years of age at the time, and his main duty at Matawagamingue was to build a boat (Docs.#55:3, 4-4d; #58:9). James King was still with the HBC in 1860, and throughout the 1860s -70s, several other King men are also listed in the Moose Servants’ Accounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs. Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>King, James (A)</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Moose Factory</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>King, James (B)</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Albany Riv.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>King, John</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>App. do.</td>
<td>Moose Factory</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>King, Alexander</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>App.Carpenter</td>
<td>MooseF.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>Kinogumissee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#74:8; #75:9)

While little else is known about the King family from Doc.# records, one purpose for including them in this discussion of métis families in the Abitibi region, is the presence of five King households in the 1901 Census (Unorganized territory - North Timiskaming):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour / Origin</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King, Robert</td>
<td>ME* / Cree</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>Cultivateur [Farmer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, John Sr.</td>
<td>ME / Cree</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Carpentier [Carpenter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, James</td>
<td>ME / Algonquine</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Cultivateur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, James Sr.</td>
<td>ME / Algonquine</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, John</td>
<td>ME / Algonquine</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Cultivateur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MÎ=Métis Ecossais,  
(Doc.#89:4-6)

Robert, John Sr. and James Sr. appear to be the same men listed in the Servants Accounts cited
above. Birth dates of these men suggest that they may have been brothers, possibly the sons of James King who was at Matawagamigwe in the 1830s, seconded from Fort Timiskaming. The two younger Kings – James (Jr.) and John – likely represent a third generation of Kings that can be traced in the area. It is significant to note that all five King households were enumerated in the same Polling Division in which several Polson and McBride households – also HBC métis families – were enumerated (see below). Post journals from Abitibi House in 1912 record members from each of these families arriving together, probably from Timiskaming:

*Indian Agent arrived today. Paid treaty and left about 5:30 in afternoon. Philip Polson, Jas. King & Angus McBride brought him up.* (Doc.#106:17)

**Polson:** Mitchell (1977:217) considers William Polson the “first bona fide settler on Lake Timiskaming” an event that took place in 1856 after a long career in the Abitibi region fur trade. Post journals provide an account of the Polson family for almost a century, from 1822-1916. However, prior to that time, it is known that William Polson was a “Hudson’s Bay boy who had defected to the Nor’Westers on the Bay in 1804 and then spent most of his fur trade life at Fort Abitibi” *(ibid.; cf. p.126).* Apparently William’s two sons and his son-in-law, Angus McBride (see below) were also involved in the Abitibi region fur trade *(ibid.)*.

William Polson was the métis son of a European named William Paulson.48 The 1822 Abitibi District Report described him as

*A Native of the country, aged 35 Years, served 16 Years... A quiet, sober, and industrious Man useful as an assistant and interpreter.* (Doc.#35:7d)

His wife at this time was the sister of “Capascoos” the Abitibi Indian accused of committing the massacre at Frederick House in 1813 (Mitchell 1973:33).

In addition to his interpreter duties, Polson together with his family played an important role as provisioners for the residents at Abitibi House, mentioned frequently in post journals in relation to fishing, hunting and trapping activities (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.2). From 1841-1852 Polson was the Postmaster at Abitibi, after which time he served at Timiskaming until his retirement in 1857. However, Polson’s son John apparently stayed at Abitibi, and in 1852 there are frequent entries about John Polson’s hunting successes (eg., Doc.#73).

The Abitibi journals for the remainder of the 19th century have not survived and little else is known about the Polson family during this time. However, the Moose Abstracts of Servants for 1875 list Thomas Polson, a labourer in Abitibi district having served one year (Doc.#77:12). This record identifies Thomas’ parish as “Canada” perhaps because this is where William – likely his grandfather – and family had now settled (on Lake Timiskaming). There exists a record of Thomas Polson, as well as a Philip Polson, at Abitibi up to 1916:

---

48 Source: HBCA Biography - Polson, William Jr.

[New Years 1912]: Dance at Tom Polson’s tonight.

[1912]: ...Philip Polson, Jas King & Angus McBride brought [the Indian Agent] up.

[1913]: Tom Polson went to Whitefish to meet train.

[1915]: Went to Whitefish with Tom Polson for mail.

[New Years 1916]: Tom gave a dance last night.

Both Thomas and Philip Polson are enumerated in the 1901 Census, as well as three other Polson households all residing in the Polling Division labelled “Unorganized territory - North Timiskaming” in the Pontiac district of Quebec:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour / Origin</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polson, William</td>
<td>ME* / Algonquin</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Chasseur [Hunter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polson, Joseph</td>
<td>R* / Algonquin</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Chasseur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polson, Thomas</td>
<td>ME / Algonquin</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Cultivateur [Farmer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polson, John</td>
<td>ME / Algonquin</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Cultivateur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polson, Philip</td>
<td>R / Algonquin</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Journalier [Labourer]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ME=Métis Écaissé; R=Red (Indian)

For reasons not known, three of the Polson households identified as métis while two identified as Aboriginal (R [Red]).

In 1937, Jenkins (1939:30) located hunting ground in the Abitibi territory (see Map A.10). The adult members of that family included and their band of origin is identified as “North Temiscaming”.

McBride: Although relatively little data was found about the McBride family, the data available spans a 109 year period from 1803 to 1912. Nor’Wester George McBride was engaged at various posts in the Abitibi region from 1800 to 1822 (Mitchell 1977:217, 236-7; Vian 1995b:156).49 The Frederick House post journal for 1803 identifies him as, “George McBride the canadien master.”50 McBride was occasionally mentioned as a colleague of Cameron in the latter’s Matawagamingue journals of 1816-1818, at which time McBride was in charge of the NWC Flying Post (Docs. #25:19 September 1816; #27:1 January 1817 & 10 June 1817; #29:20 May 1818). When Donald McKay Sr. died at Fort Timiskaming in June 1820, McBride left Flying Post to take charge

49 Also, HBCA Biography - McBride, George Henry.

50 Source: HBCA Search File - Frederick House, p.19.
at the Fort (Mitchell 1977:112).

George’s métis son Angus McBride married Elizabeth Flora Polson the daughter of William Polson, providing yet another example of fur trade endogamy in the Abitibi region. Angus served intermittently in the Timiskaming district throughout the mid-1800s, ending up as the master of New Post during the winter of 1868-1869.51 The Moose Abstracts of Servants’ Accounts for 1860-61 identify him as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>yrs/service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>McBride, Angus</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Postmaster</td>
<td>Temiscaming’e</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#74:5)

Abitibi journals from 1912 record that: “Philip Polson, Jas King & Angus McBride brought [the Indian Agent] up”, indicating that a third generation of McBrides remained in the Abitibi region well into the 20th century (Doc.#106:17). That the Philip Polson and Angus McBride mentioned in the 1912 journals were related as members of the Polson extended family (possibly cousins) is supported by evidence from the 1901 Census which lists Angus McBride Sr. and his wife Flora, as well as a 37 year-old son named Angus (plus three daughters). In total, three McBride households were enumerated as métis in the same Polling Division as were the King and Polson households discussed above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour / Origin</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McBride, Angus [sr]</td>
<td>ME* / Chippewa</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride, Thomas</td>
<td>ME / Chippewa</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Cultivateur [Farmer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride, William</td>
<td>ME / Chippewa</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Cultivateur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#89:3-4)

Saunders: Valentine Saunders has been referred to in passing in connection with several Abitibi region fur trade families discussed above. Through his long involvement in the fur trade during the mid-1800s, Saunders along with his wife and family apparently had close associations with both the Moores and the Faries. Post journal entries frequently mention Saunders working and hunting together with members of these latter two families at Matawagamingue and Flying Post:

[1836]: Walter [Faries] & Saunders off in quest of Indians. (Doc.#60:18)

[1837]: Mr. Chief Trader Faries & family took their departure for Canada - they were accompanied from here to Temiscaming by Walter Faries, Valentine Saunders and 3 Indians. (Doc.#63:3)

[1845]: J. Moore & Saunders to visit Indians; Moore & Valentine visited their

---

51 Source: HBCA Biography - McBride, Angus.

[1846]: Walter Faries & Valentine Saunders getting Pine for Canoe Gunnels.
(Doc.#70:2d)

Valentine Saunders is listed in the 1840-41 Moose Abstracts of Servants Accounts, a native of Hudson's Bay who at that time had served seven years in the Kenogamiessi district (Doc.#64:15). The same Accounts also list a James, [Peter?] and Thomas Saunders, all born in the parish of "Hudson's Bay", but stationed in either New Brunswick or Ruperts River districts (Doc.#64:15). However, a decade earlier, a John Saunders is listed, also born in the parish of “Moose H.Bay”, and who in 1830 was an apprentice in the Kenogamiessi district (Doc.#58:13). Peter Saunders is listed in the same 1830-31 Accounts, but was stationed as a Middleman in the Ruperts River district (Doc.#58:13). Valentine stayed with the Company in the Kenogamiessi district until the 1880s, by which time descendants of the Saunders family were also employed there:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Saunders, James</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>M.Factory</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Saunders, John</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>App. Cooper</td>
<td>Moose factory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Saunders, James B</td>
<td>Indian Country</td>
<td>App. Laborer</td>
<td>Kinogumisee</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>N.Brunswick</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Saunders, George</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>App. Laborer</td>
<td>Kinogum'e</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Docs.#72:12; #74:12; #75:12; #78:10)

Although data collected in the course of this assignment does not allow a certain identification of the family relationships between these Saunders men, the fact that two Saunders of the next generation – James B and George – were stationed in the Kenogamiessi district may indicate that these were sons of Valentine. The Flying Post District Report for 1890 indicates that an outpost in the region may have been under the charge of a Saunders descendant:

[General] 2. There are two Out-posts, one at Root Post about 20 miles North of this, watching Murray and Loughrin who have a Post there, managed by one Saunders.
(Doc.#84:9)

The 1901 Census does not list any Saunders households in the Abitibi region, although a "John Sanders" family is identified as a "Chippewa SB [Scotch Breed]" at Biscotasing Station (Doc.#88:2).

McLeod: Although relatively little data about the McLeod family is available, spanning an 83 year period from 1835-1918, this evidence does show that two to three generations of McLeods lived in the Abitibi region. The earliest mention of a McLeod in the post journals occurs in 1835 when "one of Mr. McKays men McLeod arrived" at Matawagamingue (Doc.#60:8). This was likely William McLeod, then a servant at Flying Post (Doc.#62:2). William McLeod had at least one child by an
Aboriginal woman, as evidenced by the orphaned “daughter of a Man named McLeod who was once at [Flying] Post”, the unfortunate incident lamented on by Donald Grant in 1845 (Doc.#69:15).

In the 1850s, a servant by the name of “Angus McLeod” is mentioned in the Abitibi post journals (Doc.#73:1d). The Moose Abstracts of Servants’ Accounts for 1875 list two McLeods born in “Indian country” and stationed in the Abitibi region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>McLeod, Alexander</td>
<td>Ind’n Country</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>Abitibi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>George /b/</td>
<td>Ind’n Country</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Kinogum’s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#77:10)

Alexander McLeod was in charge of New Post at this time, reported to have “showed every indication of good management”.52 “Alex. McLeod, clerk, [50?] years of age, [15?] years service, married, two children” is still listed under “Personal” in the Abitibi District Report for 1888 (Doc.#83:3). McLeod and his family were enumerated in the 1901 Census for the Flying Post Region; identified as “Chippewa SB [Scotch Breed]”, the “occupation” column indicates that he was still under “HBC Employment” (Doc.#88:12). In 1906 Alexander McLeod acted as the interpreter for the Treaty 9 negotiations at Flying Post (Doc.#102:300; see Chapter 6).

In 1886, three younger McLeods are listed as apprentices with the Company, one at New Post and the other two in the Moose district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yrs/Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>McLeod, John</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>New Post</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>Moose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#82:10-11)

William McLeod listed here at Moose Factory, and George McLeod (b) listed in the 1875 Accounts above may have been two of the signatories to the 1905 “halfbreed petition”, indicating that George (b) was also employed at Moose Factory by that time (Doc.#100; see Chapter 6).

New Post was inspected in October 1914 by which time John McLeod, listed as an apprentice there in 1886, was the post manager. This is likely the same individual enumerated at New Post in the 1901 Census as “John McClaude [ME - Métis Ecossaise]” (Doc.#91:1p). John McLeod was succeeded at New Post in 1918 by [5.21][53] It is uncertain if this George McLeod is the same person identified as a Moose Factory halfbreed in the 1905 petition (Doc.#100).

53 Also, HBCA Search File - New Post, pp.4-5.

5.4 1901 CENSUS: MÉTIS POPULATION IN THE ABITIBI REGION

The above analysis has demonstrated the value of the 1901 Census in determining the long-term residence of several métis families in the Abitibi region. However, as discussed in Chapter 1, two factors result in an inconclusive demographic analysis of the métis population in this region at the turn of the century: 1) unidentified "unorganized territories," and; 2) enumerator inconsistencies regarding the identification of métis and their offspring. Despite these methodological problems, the data available on the métis population in 1901 are presented in Table 5.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province / District / Sub-D. / Poll.Div.</th>
<th># métis enumerated</th>
<th># métis/Table XI</th>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario / 92: Nipissing / s1 / 3 - Nairn... &amp; Unorg. Terr.</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscotasing CPR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matagami Region</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying Post Region/Indians</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Wahnapea/ Vermillion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsurveyed territory</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec / 180: Pontiac / z / 2 - Unorg.Terr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Timiskaming</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec / 180: Pontiac / z / 4 (Indian Reserves)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abitibi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Post (Ont.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matagama Post (Ont.)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec / Unorganized Districts: Abitibi, Ashuanipi, Mistassini</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "# métis enumerated" represents a count of individuals coded as "Breath" from the actual enumeration pages. The "# métis/Table XI" is the official total from the "Table of Origins", Volume 1: Population (Canada 1902).

Sources: Docs #88; #89; #90; #91; #92.
Canada 1902:332-335; 378-379; 392-393.

Enumerations for Timmins and Cochrane are not shown on the table above, as the locations of these present-day towns were within unorganized territory at the time. Many of the locations enumerated in the unorganized territory of the Nipissing sub-district were at Canadian Pacific Railway Stations where new pockets of population had recently developed. Margin notes on enumeration pages indicate that the "Unsurveyed Territory" included the following CPR stations: Straight Lake, Pogamasing, Munro's Siding, Metagama, Eureka Lake, Duchesnay, and Ramsay. The townships of
Moncrieff and Harty are also listed and several pages of unsurveyed territory enumerations are for unspecified locations.

The Flying Post enumerations were taken at two locations, one entitled “Flying Post Region Indians” and the other (appearing 5 enumeration pages later) entitled “Flying Post Region”. Schedule 2 – “Buildings and Lands” – locates the first around [Middle Branch?] Spanish River and Opeepeeway Lake just several miles north of the CPR Railway near Biscotasing. This area is approximately 70 miles (115 km.) south of Timmins and of the present-day Flying Post Reserve. However, several HBC employees were enumerated here – including Alexander J. McLeod, the Postmaster from 1892-1901 – confirming that the post location (maintained at it’s original site on the Groundhog River, 50 mi./80 km. southwest of Timmins) was also included in this Census region.  

The second set of Flying Post enumerations are vaguely located in Schedule 2 as “Waters Flying Post Region” and while it is possible that this represented the area around present-day Flying Post Reserve (where the Ivanhoe meets the Groundhog River, 45 mi./70 km. due west of Timmins), this remains unconfirmed.

The Matagami region was also enumerated in two sections, and by two different enumerators, one in Ontario (Nipissing - “Matagami region”) and the other in Quebec (Pontiac - “Mattagama Lake / Matagami Post HBC”). These enumerations apparently covered two parts of the same local region, and it is likely that the Quebec enumerator visited the Indian Reserve while the Ontario enumerator visited the rest of the region. Both enumerators seemed to have visited the HBC post at Matagami (formerly Matawagamingue), as James Miller, the Postmaster from 1898-1908 appears on both lists.

Overall, the 1901 Census indicates that between 450-500 métis individuals lived in the Abitibi region. Within the Nipissing, Ontario sub-district of “Nairn, Lorne, Hyman and unorganized territory”, the métis enumerated in Upper Wahnapetea and Vermillion waters and in the unspecified unsurveyed territories, identified mainly as Chippewa or Algonquin “Breed”, and most family names appear to be of Aboriginal origin (eg., Waugayezick, Neagoneyabo, Wessegas). This contrasts sharply with métis enumerated in Biscotasing, Matagami, and Flying Post where the majority of

---

54 Also, HBCA Post History - Flying Post.
55 The pages recorded by the Quebec enumerator are variously titled, as follows: first page, “Avisy Rock on Mattagama Lake Ontario”; second page, “Mattagama Post - HBC Algoma Ontario”; third and fourth pages, “Mattagama Algoma Ontario” (Doc.#92). It is presumed here to refer to Mattagama Lake / Matagami Post (formerly Matawagamingue).
56 In the Ontario enumeration, James Miller is listed together with Hanna his “Chippewa BB” wife and 9 “Chippewa OB” children (Doc.#88:10-11). The Quebec enumerator lists James Miller with his “ME” wife Ammy, and 7 “ME” children (Doc.#92:n/p). Although there are some minor differences between the two enumerations (eg., variants of given names), the similarities are striking and indicate that this family was enumerated twice. A final count of métis in the Matagami region must take into account that Miller’s wife and seven of his children were counted twice.
57 Also, HBCA Post History - Matawagamingue.
surnames are of French, Scottish or English origin (eg., Isaac58, Langevie, Restoul, Friday, Ward, Linklater, Moore, McKay). As demonstrated above, a significant number of these European family names can also be linked to the fur trade in the Abitibi region. The majority in this latter group identified their Aboriginal origin as “Chippewa”, the remainder identifying as “Cree.”

The métis enumerated in the Nipissing unorganized territory represented almost 25% of that sub-district’s total population. The vast majority (85%) of that métis population lived in the “unorganized territory” parts of the sub-district, which included the fur trade areas of Flying Post and Matagami. Occupations of the métis men included: Trapper (60); HBC Employee (5); Lumbermen (4); Railway Trackmen (2); Miscellaneous trades, eg., carpenter, teacher, clergyman (7).

The “unorganized territory” of the Pontiac District examined here is titled “Indian Reserves - Quebec” and includes Abitibi, plus two HBC posts in Ontario, New Post and Matagami. A different census form was used to enumerate these “Indian Reserves”, and no column exists for profession or occupation. Hence this type of information is not available for Abitibi, New Post or Matagama.

At Abitibi, the HBC post was evidently also enumerated, as Robert Skene the Clerk in charge from 1900-1902 is listed here.59 Although identified as “District 180, Sub-district 2, Polling Division 4”, it is possible that in Table XI, this population is tabulated under the “Unorganized Districts” of Quebec for which a total of 49 métis is recorded (Canada 1902:392-393). Thirty-nine individuals were coded as MB in the enumeration pages for Abitibi, New Post and Matagami Post. However, as indicated above, several households descending from known métis fur trade families were coded as R (eg., Beads), and as was the case with North Timiskaming, in several cases children of métis parents were also coded as R. Taking into account individuals from these latter categories, it can be speculated that the métis population totalled a maximum of 58 persons, broken down as follows: Abitibi (19); New Post (8); Matagama Post (26).

At Abitibi, the Quebec enumerator identified 95% of the population as Algonquin in racial/tribal origin, including the minority who identified as métis. The remaining 5% consisted of 17 Cree individuals and 7 Europeans. The only household to completely identify as métis at Abitibi is William Ellsion, his wife and three children. As mentioned above, two Beads households were enumerated at Abitibi, but are coded “R”, as are four McDougall households.60 A Henry Dokis family is also listed, and it is possible that this family was related to “Ducas” or “Dukis”, the independent

58 A William Isaac household was enumerated as “Cree FB” and “Chippewa FB” at Matagami, and Albert Isaac plus a Widow Isaac household were enumerated as “Chippewa OB” at Flying Post. A probable relative, John Isaac, was one of the signatories to Treaty 9 at Flying Post on July 16, 1906 (Doc.#102:312).

59 Source: HBCA Post History - Abitibi.

60 The 1901 Census for Abitibi (Indian Reserve) enumerated the following McDougall households, all of which identified as “R” (Rouge) “Algonquin”: McDougall, Andrew (age 36, wife +4 children); McDougall, Louis Jr. (age 44, wife +2 children); McDougall, Louis Sr. (age 70, wife +2 children); McDougall, Michel (age 60, wife +1 child) (Doc.#90). The first three men listed here were signatories to Treaty 9 at Abitibi on June 7, 1906 (Doc.#102:311).
trader who activities prompted the HBC to establish Matachewan Post in 1865 (Doc.#90:10).

New Post had a very small population of only 37 individuals in 1901, of which 8 identified as métis. The Scottish HBC Clerk, Christopher Jobson, was married to a “Métis Écossaise” woman who along with their son are coded ME. The only family entirely coded ME is that of John McClaude. This is possibly a variant of McLeod, and HBC records show that a John McLeod (“native of the country”) was the post manager at New Post from 1911-1918 (ibid.). The racial/tribal origin of the New Post population was as follows: Cree (21); Algonquin (15).

At Mattagama Lake / Matagama Post, the population again is identified as mainly Algonquin in racial/tribal origin. Of 140 individuals enumerated, only five individuals identified as Cree. The few families coded as ME or MF had mainly European family names, for example, Groux, Restoul, Moore, and Miller.

In the unorganized territory of North Timiskaming (Pontiac District, Québec), the métis enumerated also had family names of mainly European origin (eg., Lapointe, McBride, Polson, King). The majority of this group identified their Aboriginal origin as Algonquin, several identified as Chippewa, and only a few as Cree. Although Table XI lists a total of only 47 métis in the “Unorganized territory” of Pontiac District, 62 métis individuals coded as ME (Métis Écossais) or MF (Métis Français) were counted on the enumeration pages. This number is skewed, as several of the children of métis parents were coded as “R” (Rouge) rather than as ME or MF. If such children and if individuals with fur trade family names (known to have descended from métis fur traders – eg., Polson) are added to the number of individuals actually coded ME or MF, the total number of métis in the sub-district of unorganized territory - North Timiskaming could be as high-as 107. The occupational profile of these métis men included: 9 Farmers; 6 Hunters/Trappers; 6 Labourers; 1 Carpenter.

The methodological problem of enumerator inconsistency makes it impossible to know for certain if the codes for “Colour” and “Tribal/Racial Origin” are indicative of self-identification. Enumeration instructions stated that the “heads of families, households and institutions are required to furnish the enumerator with all particulars regarding every person in the family, household or institution” (Canada 1902:xviii, no.43). This implies that the Census intended for persons to self-identify their colour and racial origin. However, the extent to which individual enumerators’ explanations of colour and racial/tribal categories influenced people’s answers cannot be known. However, if individuals were coded strictly according to how they self-identified, then the 1901 enumerations are suggestive of a sense of capital “M” Métis ethnicity in some local regions. Two localities within the Abitibi region stand out as possible foci for métis community:

1. The first and most probable locale of métis ethnicity is the Flying Post region in which 127 individuals self-identified as “Chippewa Breed” (total of both the “Indians” and the “Region” enumerations). That this number includes Abitibi region fur trade métis family names such as

---

61 Also, HBCA Post History - New Post.

Moore, McKay, and McLeod lends an historical element to their residence in this area. Furthermore, the southern part of this region was near Biscotasing Station, where fur trade métis family names such as Linklater, Friday (and perhaps Sanders) were enumerated. This area is within 50-80 miles (~75-130 km.) southwest of Timmins.

2. A second possible locale of métis ethnicity is Matagami, although results here are less conclusive as this area was covered by two different enumerators. However, it appears that these enumerations represent two parts of the same region, as members of the extended Moore family — an Abitibi region fur trade family — were enumerated at each, and HBC postmaster James Miller and his family appear on both lists. Taken as a whole, 45 individuals self-identified as métis in the Matagami/Mattagama region, approximately 60 miles (~100 km.) south of Timmins.

There is a third locale of probable métis ethnicity at North Timiskaming, but this area is outside the study region (100 mi. / 160 km. southeast of Timmins). However, it should be noted that of the 62 persons who self-identified as Métis Ecossaise or Métis Français, the majority of these can be traced to well-known fur trade families from Abitibi region posts, most notably the Polson, McBride and King families.
6. PARTICIPATION OF REGIONAL MÉTIS IN TREATY 9

This chapter examines the nature and extent of involvement of persons of mixed European and Indian ancestry in the creation of the only Treaty applicable to the region under study, Treaty 9, negotiated in 1905 and 1906. Section 6.1 presents a brief review of the historical context leading to the negotiations of this Treaty. This is followed in Section 6.2 by a more detailed examination of the activities of the Treaty Commissioners in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region both during the original negotiations of Treaty 9 in 1905-1906 and also during subsequent negotiations with the Quebec portion of the Abitibi post band in 1908. The chapter concludes with a discussion and critical analysis of historical research focusing on a petition by Moose Factory “half-breeds” for Treaty inclusion received by the Indian Affairs Department on September 15, 1905.

6.1 THE IMPETUS FOR TREATY 9, 1905-1906

Historical analyses of the development of Treaty 9 (1905-1906) agree that two interrelated factors contributed to its drafting and negotiation:

- Petitions from Ojibwa and Cree living north of the height of land marking the northern boundaries of the Robinson-Superior and Robinson-Huron Treaties of 1850, specifically asking to enter into treaty relations with the Federal Government, and;

- Recognition by the Federal (and Provincial) Governments for the need to extinguish Aboriginal title in northern Ontario as economic development initiatives, principally railway construction, were being planned and implemented (Long 1985:144; Morrison 1986).

A detailed review of the historical context leading to the drafting of Treaty 9 was submitted in an earlier report prepared for the Ministry (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c). The key issues and events will only be sketched briefly in this section, although particular attention will be paid to documents discussing the issue of “half-breed” inclusion.

Beginning in the 1880s, some of the Ojibwa bands living north of the Robinson-Huron Treaty area petitioned the Federal Government for admission into treaty relations (Long 1985:114; Morrison 1986:1-3). The construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway line north of Lake Huron had temporarily disturbed game, but longer-term impacts of an increased non-Aboriginal population north of the height of land became a growing concern for resident Ojibwa (and Cree) groups. In particular, the railway had opened the region to an influx of non-Aboriginal trappers who were accused of over-harvesting fur bearing animals by both local Indians and HBC post managers (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c:14). An growing number of bands north of the height of land were experiencing increasing economic hardships as the fur trade industry was in decline and seemingly less capable of
providing the cornerstone of band self-sufficiency that had characterized Aboriginal life for well over a century (ibid.).

Bands living in the vicinity of this height of land, as well as those living in more westerly regions of what was to become the original Treaty 9 area, in several cases had relatives living in other bands that were signatories to either the Robinson Treaties of 1850 or to Treaty 3, negotiated in 1873 (Morrison 1986:2,15). Many (future) Treaty 9 Indians were well aware that treaties offered economic benefits to signatories, such as compensation for surrender of title to lands and annuities, as well as some measure of protection or control of non-Aboriginal encroachment through the provision of reserved lands. Although keenly aware that treaties had specific boundaries, the Indians north of the height of land probably could not understand why they had been excluded from the terms of the Robinson Treaties or of Treaty 3. Indian petitioners looked to enter into treaty relations as a means by which to return some economic stability to their way of life.

By the beginning of the 20th century the Department of Indian Affairs was well aware of their requests and officials were beginning to press for treaty-making north of the height of land. However, an agreement between the Federal and Ontario governments dating back to 1894 — related to the settlement of Provincial boundary disputes and jurisdictional issues — stipulated that the negotiations of any new treaties would require the concurrence of the Ontario government. Both levels of government entered into discussions relating to the design and drafting of a treaty north of the height of land beginning in 1900 (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c:14-22).

The petitions received by the Federal government up to that point, either in writing or verbally during the distribution of annuity payments, had been submitted by individuals identified as "Indians" or "Indian Chiefs" (Morrison 1986:1-26). Correspondence from Ontario and Federal government officials in the early stages of discussion regarding what was to become Treaty 9 only refer to Indian inhabitants of the region north of the height of land. For example, a letter dated April 9, 1900 by E.B. Borron, a Provincial Stipendiary Magistrate for northern Ontario, informed Attorney General J.M. Gibson of the regional differences in tribal identity of Indians throughout the region to be included in treaty. Borron also identified differences in priority for treaty-making throughout the region between the height of land and James Bay:

... it may be well to explain that the Indians living on and near the coast of James Bay are "Crees" and those inhabiting the Provincial Territory between the Watershed and the flat belt of country lying to the south of the Bay are almost entirely Ojibways. As it is the territory lying more immediately north of the Height of Land which will be first required for railroads, settlement or other purposes, it will be with these Ojibway Indians that a Treaty or Treaties must first be

---

62 In present dollars the value of Treaty 9 annuities ($4.00) is insignificant at individual levels. However, at the beginning of the 20th century in a context in which individuals remained on the land year-round, and household monetary expenditures were largely limited to goods available at HBC posts, the total amount of annuity money received by a family was significant. It provided a source of income independent of the fur trade and could help off-set increases in the prices of store-bought goods (cf. Morrison 1986:50).
negotiated. The conclusion of Treaties with the “Crees” must in my opinion be postponed until later on. Again, of these Ojibbeways Bands [sic] the first to be treated with should be those whose hunting-grounds are situated for the most part on the Missinaibi and Mattagami branches of the Moose River and the tributaries thereof. (Doc.#87:3-4)

Borrón’s letter clearly indicated that considerable basic work remained to be done in order to determine the feasibility of treaty negotiations with many bands:

... it is not at all certain that Treaties can be arranged, or at any rate concluded with all the bands alluded to this season, nor is it possible to predicate before hand what their demands may be. If I could see and talk over the matter with some of the Chiefs and principal men this summer, when they come in to the H.B. Company’s Posts to trade, I should be able to report more definitely as to the probable terms on which treaties can be made... (Doc.#87:4)

Borrón concluded his letter by referring to potential difficulties in determining treaty membership at the extreme easterly and westerly portions of the region under consideration:

We find for instance - near the Eastern Boundary - the Hudson Bay Company’s Post called Abitibi, at which between three and four hundred Indians congregate during the summer. The boundary line never having been run or extended northwards from the Height of Land it is impossible as yet to say how many of these Indians are domiciled in Ontario, and how many are inhabitants of the Province of Quebec. (Doc.#87:5)

As Federal and Provincial officials continued to discuss the form of the treaty throughout 1901, Clifford Sifton, then Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs received a new petition from the Osnaburgh HBC post, dated December 12 and written on behalf of “Isaiah Poo-yah-way, George Waburaishking and other Indians”, complaining of non-Aboriginal encroachments (mineral exploration and survey expeditions), and asking to enter into treaty relations (Doc.#93). The Superintendent-General passed this petition along for comment to Indian Commissioner J.A. McKenna by the end of January 1902, who replied back to Sifton on February 22, adding new suggestions for consideration in treaty negotiations (Doc.#94). Noting the relative proximity of Osnaburgh to Treaty 3, which had featured a ‘half-breed’ adhesion in 1875, McKenna suggested that the government response to Indian requests should be preceded by consideration of the resolution of any ‘half-breed’ claims.63

I note that the communication from the Indians describes the territory as being in

63 Morrison (1986:27) also points out that McKenna had recently negotiated Treaty 8 in 1899. This Treaty, covering northern portions of western Provinces and as well as a southern portion of the present Northwest Territories, had featured a significant population of métis.

Ontario and Keewatin, while the maps submitted show the territory as being in Ontario and Quebec, the main portion being in the former Province.

I mention this because in extinguishing the aboriginal title in the territory covered by Treaty Three there has been an apparent inconsistency. The territory is partly in Ontario and partly in Keewatin and a portion extends into Manitoba. The Halfbreed Claims Commissions of 1885 [illegible] and the Department of the Interior recognized the Halfbreeds of the ceded portion of Keewatin as North West Halfbreeds. There was therefore no course open for me but to do likewise. The consequence is that Halfbreeds living on the Keewatin side of the English River are recognized as having territorial rights and get scrip, scrip which they may locate in Manitoba or any part of the North West Territories, while the Halfbreed on the Ontario side who naturally comes and makes claim has to be told that he has no territorial rights. We must take care to avoid the perpetuation of this.

Therefore I would at once say that the suggested extinguishment of Indian title should stand until the settlement of Halfbreed claims is completed, so that we may start with a clean slate in that respect. Then to avoid as far as possible the appearance of inconsistency, I would suggest that the extinguishment be confined to Ontario and Quebec and be made in the form of an adhesion to the Robinson Huron Treaty, with any alterations which difference in conditions may make desirable. If the treaty extended to Keewatin influences would at once be put in operation to lead many of the people classed as natives to set up claims to white blood, to declare that their habitat was in Keewatin and to demand scrip instead of treaty. On the other hand if we keep out of Keewatin, all of the people who are really living the life of aborigines will come into Treaty. (Doc.#94:1-2)

McKenna’s comments on the relationship between descent and way of life would later prove to be an issue during and shortly after the negotiations of Treaty 9, as will be seen in Section 6.264.

McKenna’s suggestions were rejected as discussions and Federal-Provincial negotiations concerning the drafting of the new treaty developed by 1903 (Morrison 1986:27-28). A last suggestion recommending recognition of potential half-breed claims was presented in a memorandum from Frank Pedley, Deputy-Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs to his superior Clifford Sifton,

---

64 It is doubtful that McKenna is implying any type of causal relationship between an individual’s biological descent and his/her culture. Instead McKenna is alluding to observations that persons who self-identified or were identified by others as being of mixed Indian and European ancestry tended to follow what were considered at the turn of the century ‘non-Indian’ lifestyles, for example, based on wage employment at HBC posts. People self-identifying or identified by others as ‘Indians’ tended to live on the land by hunting, fishing, collecting and trapping. However, as Section 6.2 will show, the Treaty 9 Commissioners admitted into treaty many individuals who, although biologically of partial European descent led what appeared to be ‘Indian’ lives, and who apparently self-identified or were identified by others as ‘Indians’. Other individuals also of partly European descent who self-identified as half-breeds and who live ‘European’ lifestyles involving wage employment at HBC posts, were excluded from the Treaty.
on August 17, 1903, Pedley reviewed McKenna's suggestion of an adhesion to the Robinson-Huron Treaty of 1850, finally rejecting it on the following grounds:

The treaties that have been made by the Department since the early seventies have followed practically the same form, indicative of a well-defined and clear-cut policy in this regard, and I suggest it would be wiser to continue this policy with necessary restrictions rather than fall back upon the form and terms that governed the treaties made in early days, which would have to be done in case of adhesion; adhesion, as I understand it, generally takes place when the times, conditions, persons and places are so closely connected that the original treaty and the adhesion may be considered as one and the same transaction. I would, therefore, recommend that an independent treaty be made... (Doc.#95:3-4)

Pedley went on to recommend a maximum annuity of $4.00 per head, reserve locations to be chosen by Indians, provision of day-schools, etc., i.e., treaty provisions generally consistent with those of previous Post-Confederation 'numbered' treaties. He added that:

... if any claims be made by half-breeds as distinguished from Indians, the Province to grant 160 acres to each of such persons in fee simple under conditions that will admit of land being located in advance of surveys and being taken possession of at once, as without such conditions, owing to the remoteness of these persons from surveyed lands, the grant would be of little use to them, this government to assume the cost of making the treaty and of supporting day-schools; the Ontario government to assume the cost of surveying the reserves. (Doc.#95:5)

While many of Pedley's recommendations would be adopted into the final draft of Treaty 9, his memorandum to Sifton appears to present the last mention of potential inclusion of half-breed provisions in the Treaty. When Pedley wrote to the Ontario Commissioner of Crown Lands on April 30, 1904 to outline the main provisions of Treaty 9, no mention was made of 'half-breeds' or 'half-breed' rights (Long 1985:146). A schedule of the Aboriginal population considered to reside in the future treaty area listed only "Indians" according to the trade posts at which they congregated (Doc.#96).

Long (1985:146) adds that prior to the beginning of the Treaty 9 expédition:

Joint orders-in-council and an intergovernmental memorandum of agreement, drafted in June 1905, similarly failed to mention half-breed interests. Thus the treaty commissioners were apparently dispatched without any instructions for handling half-breed claims.

It is correct that neither Order-in Councils approving the final drafting of Treaty 9, and empowering the Commissioners to negotiate the Treaty with bands having hunting grounds north of the Albany River, nor the text of Treaty 9 made any reference to half-breeds. However, Long's statement is
somewhat misleading as it implies that the Commissioners would not have known how to handle 'half-breed' claims or requests for inclusion in Treaty. As will be discussed in more detail in Section 6.3, Long's statement is intended to provide an explanatory framework for the seemingly inconsistent and arbitrary conduct of the Treaty Commissioners regarding inclusion of 'half-breeds' at different negotiation locales in the Treaty 9 territory, specifically Fort Albany, Moose Factory and Abitibi. That Orders-in-Council and the text of Treaty 9 referred only to 'Indians' actually provided the Treaty Commissioners with specific instructions: they were only empowered to negotiate the Treaty with Indian bands, and could only register individuals self-identifying or identified by others as Indians on treaty paylists (cf. *PRAXIS* Research Associates 1999c:21-22).

As indicated in their Treaty Report for 1905, the Commissioners' approach to handling misunderstandings of government intentions or treaty provisions involved giving explanations that were directly based on the text of Treaty 9. For example, at Fort Hope, when one of the Indian representatives misunderstood that Treaty 9 was to result in signatory bands receiving cattle, farm implements, seed grain and other farming tools, the Commissioners immediately corrected him and pointed out that "none of these issues were to be made, as the band could not hope to depend upon agriculture as a means of subsistence" (Doc.#102:287). The Commissioners described more generally in their 1905 Treaty Report that their approach to explaining provisions involved a close reading of statements included in the text of Treaty 9:

... as the undersigned wished to guard carefully against any misconception or against making promises which were not written in the treaty itself... (Doc.#102:287)

As a rule, the Treaty 9 Commissioners, as with earlier post-Confederation treaty commissions, were not empowered to deviate from their instructions by offering provisions other than those contained in the text of treaties. As Morrison (1986: 31) pointed out, the term 'negotiation' can only be used loosely to describe the nature of discussions between the Treaty 9 Commissioners and the Indian band representatives at the different HBC post locations in 1905-1906, since all of the terms of the Treaty had been identified prior to the departure of the Treaty 9 expedition. The same rules applied during the adhesion to Treaty 9 in 1929-1930. For example, when the Indian representatives at Trout Lake asked to have their annuities set at $5.00 per capita (when the Treaty stipulated a maximum $4.00), the Commissioners had to explain that it was beyond their power to grant a higher annuity (*PRAXIS* Research Associates 1999c:49-50).

Six days prior to the departure of the Treaty 9 expedition from Ottawa (on June 30, 1905), a petition written by Adam Burwash the Indian Agent of the North Timiskaming Agency, on behalf of Abitibi Indians, presented a request for their inclusion in Treaty as follows:

*I beg to introduce to you Louis McDougall, John Chechabesh, and Mrs. Chechabesh from Abitibi. These two Indians are considered the most prominent of the Abitibi Indians. They wish to have a talk over affairs at Abitibi, about having a treaty, securing a Reserve, having a Chief, and so forth. Mrs John Chechabesh will act as interpreter she has very good English.*

These two Indians have been doing all they can to prevent liquor being brought to Abitibi and urging the Indians to not make use of it, so far as I can learn they are prohibitionists. (Doc.#97)

This petition presents good evidence of the contrast between the self-identification and other-identification of many Aboriginal residents of Treaty 9, and the objective facts of their biological descent. Although clearly identified in this petition as an ‘Indian’ and ‘prominent Indian’, Louis McDougall, who would become elected Chief of the Abitibi Band in 1906, was of partly Scottish descent, a fact apparently noticed by Treaty Commissioner Duncan Campbell Scott on a caption of a photograph he took of McDougall after the negotiations (Long 1985:147). The following section examines the extent to which individuals of mixed descent were involved in the Treaty 9 negotiations of 1905-1906.

6.2 THE NATURE OF MÉTIS PARTICIPATION IN TREATY 9

The negotiation of Treaty 9 differed significantly from the negotiation of previous treaties in Ontario, in that it featured a mobile expedition of government Commissioners. In all earlier treaties and land surrenders in the Province, negotiations had taken place at a central location selected by the government as a convenient meeting place to which relevant bands and their representatives were required to travel to meet with government officials. For example, both Robinson Treaties were negotiated at Sault Ste. Marie in 1850, requiring that chiefs from the Thunder Bay area as well as the Lake Nipissing area undertake long-distance journeys. Treaty 3 was negotiated at North West Angle on Lake of the Woods in 1873, again requiring chiefs and principal men from bands located at considerable distances to undertake long travels to meet with the appointed government negotiators.

The negotiation of Treaty 9 involved arrangements with the Hudson’s Bay Company to provide guides and voyageurs for the Treaty Commissioners to travel throughout the treaty territory and initiate separate negotiations with bands gathered at the various main HBC posts located between the height of land and the Albany River, from Osnaburgh at the western end of the territory, to the Abitibi post at the eastern extremity65 (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a:31-37). The three Commissioners included two Federal government appointees, Duncan Campbell Scott and Samuel Stewart of the Indian Affairs Department, and one Ontario government representative, Daniel MacMartin, a lawyer from Perth (Morrison 1986:31). The Commissioners left Ottawa by train for Dinorwic (near Dryden) on June 30, 1905, which was to serve as the point of departure for the expedition to reach Osnaburgh. At Dinorwic the expedition party, staffed by HBC guides and voyageurs would assemble their supplies and begin their canoe travels throughout northern Ontario. The party would leave from Sandy Lake, travelling to Lac Seul, and by the Root River reach Lake St. Joseph. From there the expedition was to follow the Albany River to James Bay, proceeding southward along its western shore to Moose Factory, from which it would take an inland route southward by following the Moose and Abitibi Rivers to Lake Abitibi. Arrangements for negotiations

---

65 In fact, the Abitibi HBC post was located a few miles within the Province of Québec, as will be seen below.

had been made with the HBC to provide facilities in the following order: Osnaburgh, Fort Hope, Marten Falls, Fort Albany, Moose Factory, New Post, and Abitibi (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c:31)

6.2.1 The Treaty Expedition Members, 1905-1906 & 1908

The Treaty Report for 1905 identifies only the principal members of the expedition, which in addition to the Commissioners, consisted of A.G. Meindl (medical doctor), James Parkinson and J.L. Vanasse (R.C.M.P.) and James Swain, "an old Albany river guide and mail carrier, who is thoroughly familiar with the many difficult rapids of this river", as the head man or lead guide (Doc.#102:285). Although no information is presented in this document as to the social identity or biological descent of these members, it is reasonable in this historical context to assume that Meindl, Parkinson and Vanasse were non-Aboriginal.

The diary of Commissioner Samuel Stewart, however, provides much more detailed information on the full membership of the expedition, including the identity of James Swain and other party members as the expedition travelled through its scheduled route for 1905. At Dinorwic, Stewart described the HBC voyageurs crew to take them along to Osnaburgh as follows:

> Three of the Indians who were the members of our crew also attended the [church] service. One of these, "Jimmy" Swaine we were informed was to be our head guide, another was to be our cook, Harry Black from Mississabie and the third was Isaac Rich, a stout-built half-breed who had been over the route to James Bay...
> (Doc.#99:7-8)

A later entry written July 3rd, the day of the departure for Lac Seul described the complete expedition as consisting of "nineteen persons, seven white men and eleven Indians" (Doc.#99:9). In old voyageur tradition, the head guide Jimmy Swaine, was fond of music and had brought a fiddle along for entertainment during the trip, as Stewart quickly discovered the next day:

> Our head guide Jimmy Swaine came to the front in a new role at this portage. He had brought a fiddle with him of which he was inordinately proud. With this he laid himself out to entertain both whites and Indians by playing Red River jigs, and the other dance music, as well as hymn tunes with many variations of his own.
> (Doc.#99:18)

Isaac Rich, the only member of the expedition explicitly labelled a half-breed, is identified in a later entry as the son of an HBC post assistant at Fort Abitibi. Upon reaching that post, Stewart would write:

---

66 This adds up to 18 persons, not 19 as stated by Stewart. Although many other possibilities exist, Stewart may have forgotten to cite Isaac Rich as a 'half-breed' if he intended to distinguish him from both the whites and Indians comprising the expedition party.
There we were welcomed by Mr. Drever in charge of the post, as well as by his assistants, McKenzie and Rich. The latter was particularly pleased to see us as one of our canoe men, Isaac, was a son of his whom he had not seen for several years. (Doc.#99:155)

Isaac Rich’s father was likely happy to meet with the expedition to get news about his son, who was no longer with the Treaty party when it reached Abitibi.

The original voyageurs crew was comprised of HBC employees working within the Company’s Albany district, i.e., they were guides and canoe men experienced with travel along the Albany River. The original crew accompanied the expedition only to Moose Factory at which point a new group of voyageurs was assigned. This new crew was attached to the HBC Moose District, and experienced with travel along the Moose River and the difficult Abitibi River. As Stewart describes leaving from Moose Factory:

_We were up early in order to complete our preparations for departure. We had to engage a new crew here to take us as far as Fort Abitibi and our friends of the HBC gave us good assistance in getting the right kind of men._ (Doc.#99:105)

Later diary entries describe this crew as comprised solely of ‘Indians’ and the new head guide assigned to party is identified as Simon Smallboy (Doc.#99:107,109-110,118).

In sum, the available information on the Treaty 9 party for 1905 indicates that only one member of the HBC voyageurs crew, Isaac Rich, was métis. Stewart’s few journal entries describing Rich ambiguously refer to him as both an ‘Indian’ and a ‘halfbreed’. No information is available as to Isaac Rich’s self-identification, or as to how Stewart discovered Rich’s partial European descent.

The Treaty 9 expedition was originally scheduled to include Fort Abitibi in its negotiation itinerary for 1905, but cumulative delays encountered along the trip resulted in its late arrival at the post. As explained in the 1905 Treaty Report, the Commissioners had expected that most Abitibi Indians would have left the post for their hunting grounds by the time they reached it (Doc.#102:291). Although “a few Indians” were still waiting for them, the absence of the majority of the trading post band, including its “most influential Indians” forced negotiations to be postponed until the following summer (Docs.#102:291; #104:1). The last actual negotiations of the expedition in 1905 were therefore concluded at New Post, as discussed in Section 6.2.3 below.

The 1906 trip involved returning southward from Lake Abitibi and then proceeding westward along the vicinity of the height of land marking the northern boundaries of the Robinson Treaties. As with the 1905 expedition, Treaty negotiations were held at HBC posts, in the following order: Abitibi, Fort Matachewan, Mattagami, Flying Post, New Brunswick House, and Long Lake (Praxis Research Associates 1999c:37-39; Doc.#104). Again the HBC provided the party with voyageurs, although Stewart’s diary for 1906 indicates that as opposed to the previous year, the 1906 trip featured four permanent canoe men, identified as Harry Black, W. H. Dunnett (?), Joe Bernaway (?) and Walter
Ferris (Doc.#104:2).

Stewart’s 1906 diary does not provide a breakdown of the total party membership by racial background, as was the case with his diary for the previous summer. However, 1906 entries concerning the trip to Abitibi and the beginning of the return voyage from Abitibi to Fort Matachewan suggest that the majority of voyageurs were ‘Indian’, as reflected by brief references such as “two of our young Indians ran the last of the three rapids with the canoes at the risk of their lives”; “We took lunch at the foot of the third rapid...while the Indians repaired the canoe”, and; “Our young Indians ran the rapid in their canoe, a very dangerous and difficult undertaking” (Doc.#104:15,31). However, a lone entry describing part of the journey to Fort Matachewan indicates that some of the voyageurs were métis:

_We next ascended the river the river about ten miles to the foot of Indian rapids. Here everything had to be portaged a distance of about a quarter of a mile. On this portage we found the black flies awaiting us in myriads, and they made us pay toll before leaving them. One of our half-breed paddlers on being asked whether he knew the mosquitoes and flies to be worse, replied No I never did, and then added “they could not be worse, there would not be room for any more”._ (Doc.#104:38)

The last information on the 1906 party membership describes the new canoe men for the trip to Flying Post as consisting of “our three Mattawa Indians, one from Mattagami and twelve from Flying Post” (Doc.#104:80). Stewart added regarding the Flying Post Indians that:

_Three of the latter were mere boys, and we had doubts of their ability to perform the services required of them. These doubts, however were soon dispelled as every member of the crew from Flying Post proved to be energetic, competent and obliging._ (Doc.#104:80)

Overall, Stewart’s diary entries concerning the voyageurs in 1905 and 1906 suggest that he viewed the terms ‘Indian’ and ‘halfbreed’ as essentially interchangeable. This is perhaps best exemplified by his description of Isaac Rich as both an ‘Indian’ canoe man and a halfbreed son of the Abitibi HBC post assistant manager. The fact that the 1906 diary consistently describes the crew from Abitibi to Fort Matachewan as comprised of ‘Indians’, and then presents only one reference to the fact that the crew included ‘halfbreed’ paddlers, suggests that Stewart held a casual view of the issue of partial European descent of the voyageurs: that some of the ‘Indians’ were biologically of mixed or partial European ancestry was a common phenomenon, and Stewart’s diary suggests that he expected readers to have this knowledge.

A reproduction of a photograph of the 1906 Treaty expedition is included in Appendix ‘B’ to this report. Captioned ‘Poling – Abitibi River’, the photograph was taken by Duncan Campbell Scott and form part of the James Bay Indian Treaty Tour Photographs, 1905-1906 collection held at Archives of Ontario (AO C295-2-0-2 S 7567 [A-1803]). In addition to showing the difficulties of canoe travel on portions of the Abitibi River, the photograph presents a clear representation of the
voyageurs crew wearing traditional sashes. Again, however, this data is ambiguous since the sashes might have been worn as part of voyageurs dress, while some crew members might have also worn them as symbols of métis identity (cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1999a).

While the official round of Treaty 9 negotiations was concluded at Long Lake in 1906, Stewart was in fact to return to Abitibi in 1908 to negotiate the inclusion of the Québec portion of the Abitibi post band in the Ontario reserve. During his ‘solo’ travels on Lake Abitibi and vicinity, Stewart befriended one of his canoe men, Bazille McDougall, who was certainly related to elected Abitibi Band Chief Louis McDougall as will be seen below. During this trip, Stewart’s party consisted of three other canoe men identified as Frank Lemaitre, William John and Thomas Turner (Doc. #104:142-143). While John’s and Turner’s identities or descent are not specified, Frank Lemaitre is later described as a friend of Bazille’s and “one of the descendants of the hated Iroquois” (Doc. #104:189), although Stewart indicates that old animosities between Iroquois, Cree and Ojibwa had long been buried and forgotten.

Stewart’s first meeting with Bazille McDougall was somewhat awkward as he was required to bail him out of the Matheson jail for having been found in possession of liquor:

On going to look for my men I found that one of them, Bazille McDougall, was under arrest for having intoxicants in his possession. His trial was to take place at 1:30 p.m., and until his case was decided, Bazille’s services would not be available. I was informed by the other men that Bazille was the only member of my crew who knew the route to the post and that they could not therefore start without him. I had this fact represented to the Sheriff who had come up from Liskeard to try a number of cases, and before whom Bazille was to appear, and this led to my guide being allowed out on suspended sentence when his case was brought to trial. (Doc. #104:141-142)

A later entry in Stewart’s 1908 diary provides considerable information on Bazille’s family background, obtained from the HBC post manager at Fort Abitibi, a Mr Drever:

The negotiations at Abitibi in 1906 involved a jurisdictional problem as the Commissioners were empowered to negotiate the Treaty only with those Indians in the post band who had hunting grounds in Ontario. This presented a different situation to that which applied along the Albany River in 1905, where an Oicer-in-Council had been issued allowing the Commissioners to include into treaty, Indian bands with hunting grounds north of the Albany which at the time formed the northern boundary of the Province. Along the Albany, the Commissioners established separate treaty annuity paylists distinguishing ‘Ontario Indians’ (having hunting grounds south of the River) from ‘Dominion Indians’ (having grounds in the Keewatin District of the Northwest Territories), in order to determine the financial responsibilities of the respective levels of government (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c:45). At Abitibi in 1906, the Commissioners were required to separate those Indians having hunting grounds in Ontario from those having hunting grounds in Québec and could only promise the latter that an effort would be made to request the Québec Provincial government to provide them with a reserve of their own. As the Québec government refused to consider this option, Stewart was dispatched to Abitibi in 1908 to present a proposal whereby the Ontario portion of the band would accept the Québec Indians onto their reserve as the Federal government agreed to grant the latter annuity payments (Ibid.; Doc. #104:131-134).

Mr Drever informed me that Bazille’s grandfather was a Scotchman in the service of the HBCo. who had married an Indian woman, and whose sons had also married Indian women. This Scotchman had many times been heard by his children to sing the songs of his motherland; and altho [sic] the children had not learned to speak their father’s native language they did learn to sing the tunes he sang. These tunes continued to be handed down, although the present generation of McDougalls use for singing these songs a jargon of words neither Scotch nor Indian, it would appear from Bazille’s effort that they had preserved the air all right. At all events, Bazille’s singing was much enjoyed by all the members of our party. (Doc.#104:151-152)

Although Bazille McDougall worked as a canoe man for the HBC, a final entry from Stewart’s diary describes his hunting knowledge in an anecdote relating unfortunate episodes in which he found himself stranded on Lake Abitibi due to high winds:

Bazille informed me that he had twice been wind-bound on the lake, once for ten days, and another time for fourteen days. On both occasions he had run short of provisions and had with difficulty kept himself alive by snaring a few birds and rabbits. (Doc.#104:178-179)

Stewart’s diary, however, presents no information on Bazille McDougall’s self-identification, and while he was clearly of partial European descent, Stewart neither describes him as ‘Indian’ nor ‘halfbreed’. The following section examines the available evidence concerning involvement by persons of mixed ancestry in the negotiations of Treaty 9 at the locales established within the study region.

6.2.2 Participation in Treaty 9 Negotiations, 1905-1906 & 1908

There are five locations within the study region in this report where formal negotiations of Treaty 9 took place: New Post, where negotiation occurred in 1905, Fort Abitibi, and towards the southern and southwestern periphery of the region, Matachewan, Mattagami and Flying Post where negotiations were conducted in 1906. The Treaty Reports filed by the Commissioners and the diaries of Samuel Stewart and Daniel MacMartin indicate that the negotiations of Treaty 9 at these locations did not include any formal representation of local métis by individuals self-identifying as such. No evidence could be found that groups of mixed ancestry attempted to present formal claims for Treaty inclusion to the Commissioners at these locales.

---

68 It is possible, although not certain at all, that this ‘jargon’ may have been Michif, a hybrid or creole language ascribed to métis.

69 Additional negotiations took place at Abitibi in 1908 related to the treaty inclusion of the Quebec portion of the post band.

70 The diary of Duncan Campbell Scott was also reviewed but found to contain no relevant data for this project.

The Treaty expedition reached New Post on August 19th, 1905, after travelling along the Moose and Abitibi Rivers following previous negotiations at Moose Factory. The Treaty Report filed by the Commissioners described New Post as a "small and comparatively unimportant post of the Hudson’s Bay Company", although its area apparently comprised "excellent hunting country" (Doc.#102:290). This document summarizes the nature and extent of negotiations as follows:

The New Post Indians, although few in number, are of excellent character and disposition. They met us with great friendliness. The treaty was concluded on Monday, the 21st, and the Indians were at once paid. The reserve question was also discussed, and the location finally fixed as shown by the schedule of reserves. One of the leading Indians, Essau Omakess, was absent from the reserve during the negotiations. He, however, arrived during the time the payments were being made, and signified his approval of the action taken by his fellow Indians. He was subsequently chosen unanimously as chief of the band. (Doc.#102:291)

By this point in the expedition (with the exception of Fort Abitibi, which presented unique jurisdictional issues), the Commissioners had negotiated the Treaty at five different locales, and their descriptions of Treaty 9 negotiations in both reports and diaries become increasingly brief. Specifically, the descriptions tend to focus on the outcome of discussions and omit details of the preliminary procedures followed to set up formal negotiation meetings.

As reviewed in an earlier report submitted to the Ministry (PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c:48-49), at all locales in 1905 and 1906 (and during the adhesions in 1929-1930) the same set of procedures were followed. After a formal arrival at a HBC post, the Treaty Commissioners were introduced by the HBC post manager to the Aboriginal population that had congregated there in anticipation of the negotiations. The Commissioners then made a formal speech outlining the purpose of their presence to the Aboriginal population, which was translated in either Ojibwa or Cree, depending on the local language, by either the HBC post manager, or local missionaries, or both. Indian bands where then instructed to select their own representatives to meet with the Commissioners to negotiate the Treaty. Typically, these negotiations took place inside one of the HBC buildings comprising the trade post compound. The negotiations at each post involved local interpreters, again either the HBC post manager or a local missionary (in some locales both assisted each other in interpreting the Treaty). The explanation of Treaty terms and provisions typically took about two hours, as suggested by the diary of Daniel MacMartin who regularly recorded the beginning and ending times of the discussions. Band representatives were encouraged to ask questions concerning Treaty provisions, and were granted whatever time they requested to deliberate Treaty terms on their own. Finally, the concurrence of all representatives was sought (and obtained) prior to the signing of the Treaty.

The diaries of Samuel Stewart (Doc.#9:126) and Daniel MacMartin (Doc.#98:34) indicate that the negotiations at New Post deviated somewhat from the usual reliance on non-Aboriginal interpreters. John Luke, one of the Band representatives chosen to negotiate the Treaty, and a signatory of Treaty 9, acted in that capacity throughout the morning of the 21st. According to
MacMartin’s diary the negotiations involved the following points of discussion:

... three of the representatives, Indians of the band assembled in council... had the terms of the treaty explained to them also the object of same, that the King had sent them a present of $3 per capita for the present year and an annuity for all time of $4. provided they accepted the terms of the treaty, also a reserve of tract of land would be set aside and surveyed in the near future for their sole use and benefit, that they were not obliged to live on same, were also allowed to hunt and fish where they pleased, that they were to elect a chief who would advise the band for the 3 years or until a successor was elected in his seat. The chief would be presented with a flag and an emblem of office and reminder that he and his band had agreed to become good citizens, and to obey the laws of the land... They were then asked thro’ John Luke... if they wished to ask any questions or say anything in reply. Angus Weensuk, replied that they accepted the terms as stated and did not wish to through [sic] any obstacles in the way - they were satisfied, the treaty was signed at 10:55 a.m. - the Indians then departed and when the paylists were completed, commenced paying the Indians in the afternoon carefully counting each family as it appeared before the paylist. (Doc.#98:34)

Samuel’s Stewart’s diary presents the following version of events:

Our first duty as usual was to meet with representative Indians and the following were chosen to confer with us, viz., Angus Weensuk, Win Gull, and John Luke... As usual, the point on which the Indians desired full information was as to the effect the treaty would have on their hunting and fishing rights. When assured that these would not be taken from them, they expressed much pleasure and their willingness to sign the treaty which was accordingly done... With the assistance of the representative Indians, lists were prepared of the New Post Indians so that payments might be made in the afternoon. (Doc.#99:126-127)

As indicated in Section 6.2.1 above, the negotiations at Fort Abitibi were postponed to the summer of 1906 owing to delays encountered by the expedition and the absence of most of the Indians from the post. The negotiations at Abitibi were to be interpreted by the HBC post manager Mr. Dreever, described in Stewart’s diary as having “a thorough knowledge of both the Cree and Ojibway languages” (Doc.#99:157).

The Treaty Report filed after the conclusion of Treaty 9 negotiations explains the problems the Commissioners expected at Abitibi owing to their lack of jurisdiction to include Québec Indian members of the post band:

On June 7... a meeting was called for the afternoon... Some difficulty was anticipated in negotiating the treaty at Abitibi owing to the peculiar position of the Indians who trade at that post. The post is situated a few miles within the Province of Quebec,
and the majority of Indians who trade there belong to that province. It was natural for the Indians to conclude that, as it was the Dominion government and not the provincial government that was negotiating the treaty, no distinction would be made between those hunting in Ontario and those hunting in Québec. The commissioners had, however, to state that they had no authority to treat with the Quebec Indians, and that the conference in regard to the treaty could only be held with those whose hunting grounds are in the province of Ontario. (Doc.#102:297)

The description of the actual treaty negotiations presented in the Report was copied word for word from the diary of Samuel Stewart and states:

The conference with the Ontario Indians proved to be highly satisfactory. When the terms of the treaty were fully explained to them through Mr. George Drever, who has a mastery of several Indian dialects, Louis McDougall, Jnr., one of the principal men of the band, stated that they were satisfied with the conditions offered and were willing to faithfully carry out the provisions of the treaty. They would also rely upon the government keeping its promises to them. The band hoped that the reserve to be set apart for them would include as great and extent of lake frontage as possible. The other Indians being asked whether they were all of like mind with the spokesman in regard to the treaty, replied that they were, and that they were willing that representatives of the band should sign for them at once. The treaty was accordingly signed by the commissioners and representative Indians, as well as several witnesses who were present at the conference.

In the forenoon of June 8, payments of annuities were made with great care, in order that only those Indians whose hunting grounds are in Ontario should have their names placed on the list. The commissioners are satisfied that in the performance of this duty they were successful.

In the afternoon an election of chief and councillors was held, which resulted in Louis McDougall, Jnr., being chosen as chief and Michel Penatouche and Andrew McDougall as councillors. (Doc.#102:298)

The Treaty Report goes on to state that the Quebec Indians also chose their own reserve site, after the Commissioners had promised to request one for them to the Quebec government (Doc.#102:298). The diary of Samuel Stewart adds that the Quebec Indians elected a separate chief and councillors, and that further payments were issued to Ontario Indians on June 9th as the latter “just arrived” to the post (Doc.#104:25-26).

The rejection by the Quebec government of the request for a reserve for the Quebec portion of the Abitibi post band led to Samuel Stewart’s return in 1908 to propose their inclusion onto the Ontario reserve by the Ontario signatories in exchange for extending annuities to the Quebec Indians (Doc.#104:133-135). These negotiations were again interpreted by Mr. Drever (Doc.#104:166).
Stewart indicates that the meeting involved “almost every adult male member of the two sections of the band” and adds:

Several of the Indians spoke expressing their pleasure that the band was to be put on a common footing. One Quebec Indian, however, was inclined to doubt the wisdom of the agreement as he thought it might lead to jealousies in the future. He feared that, although the Ontario Indians were now prepared to admit the Quebec Indians to a share in the reserve, the time might come when they would repent of this action. The Ontario Indians protested strongly against this view being advanced, as they said they were all of one mind in desiring that their brethren be admitted to all the benefits of the treaty, including a share in the reserve. They asked that a vote be taken, and on this being done, the terms of the agreement were unanimously accepted. (Doc.#104:165-167)

Report descriptions concerning Matachewan, Mattagami and Flying Post present these 1906 Treaty negotiations as routine and uneventful matters. The brevity of these accounts may suggest that the Commissioners were dealing with bands increasingly willing to accept treaty terms as they neared the southern region of the Treaty area. The complete description of events at Matachewan simply states:

A conference was held with the Indians on the afternoon of the 20th [of June]. As usual, the terms of the treaty were fully explained, and an opportunity given to the Indians to ask any questions regarding any matter on which further information was desired. Michel Baptiste, on behalf of the Indians, said that the terms of the treaty were very satisfactory to them, and that they were ready to have representatives of the band sign at once. (Doc.#102:299, insert added)

Samuel Stewart’s diary provides the only additional detail that “Walter Ferris” acted as interpreter” (Doc.#104:42-43).

The negotiations held with the Mattagami Post Indians in 1906 are described in the Treaty report as follows:

...gave a cheerful hearing to the terms of the proposed treaty, which was fully explained to them through Mr. Miller, who acted as interpreter. They like the other Indians visited, were given an opportunity to ask any questions or to make any remarks they might desire with reference to the propositions made to them.

The Indians held a short conversation among themselves, and then announced through Joseph Shemake, one of their number, that they were fully satisfied with the

---

71 As indicated in Chapter 5, this individual’s surname may actually have been ‘Faries’ and he may have been connected to a family of mixed ancestry.

terms of the treaty, and were prepared to have it signed by representatives of the band. The treaty was, therefore, at once signed and witnessed. (Doc.#102:299)

Only a brief description is provided of the negotiations held at Flying Post on July 16th, 1906:

The Indians were assembled on the morning... and the terms of the treaty were fully explained through Mr. A.J. MacLeod, Hudson's Bay officer, who acted as interpreter. Isaac, one of the leading Indians, speaking for the band, said that they thankfully accepted the benefits offered by the treaty and were willing to observe its provisions. The treaty was, therefore, duly signed and witnessed. (Doc.#102:300)

The historical documents describing Treaty 9 negotiations in the study area make no allusion to any involvement of 'halfbreeds' in formal negotiations, and treaty paylists identify only 'Indians'. However, as per the analysis presented in Chapter 5, other documents clearly demonstrate that by 1905 a significant proportion of Aboriginal residents of the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region of northeastern Ontario had partial European descent.

It seems certain that the Treaty 9 Commissioners were aware that at least some of the Aboriginal band members registered on paylists as 'Indians' had partial European ancestry. The best example in the Abitibi region involves the McDougalls, whose partial Scottish ancestry was demonstrably known to both Samuel Stewart and Duncan Campbell Scott. According to both Long (1985:147) and Manore (1985:12), Scott recorded this fact with in regard to Louis McDougall, who was elected chief of the Ontario Abitibi band.

More general evidence suggesting that the Commissioners should have suspected partial European ancestry of some Treaty 9 band members is found in the relatively common occurrence of European surnames on paylists and even among the 'Indian representatives' who negotiated the Treaty. In addition to the McDougalls, Indian signatures for various locales between 1905 and 1906 include the names: Joe and William Goodwin, William Whitehead, William Coaster, Charlie and Patrick Stephen, Andrew Wesley, Samuel Scott, John Jeffries, John and Andrew Luke, Michel Batisse, and Jimmy Pierce (Doc.#102:309-311).

Long (1985) and Manore (1985) however, have presented arguments to the effect that the Treaty 9 Commissioners, lacking instructions on how to handle 'halfbreeds' or 'Métis', arbitrarily classified some as 'Indians' and included them in Treaty 9 paylists. These authors then claim that the Commissioners rejected other 'halfbreeds' or 'Métis' on equally arbitrary terms, such as for example, that they did not live 'Aboriginal' lifestyles. The following section presents a critical examination of their arguments as they apply to the study region.

6.3 THE 'HALF BREEDS' OF TREATY 9: A RE-EXAMINATION

The historical documents and literature reviewed for this assignment indicate that there is only
one location in the 1905-1906 Treaty 9 territory at which local métis made a formal representation for explicit recognition and inclusion in the Treaty: Moose Factory, in 1905. Although this locale is technically beyond the geographic limits of the study area, the historical analyses of the Moose Factory petition by Long (1985) and Manore (1985) lead these authors to argue that halfbreeds were included into Treaty 9 at Abitibi. While the fate of the Moose Factory halfbreed petition is beyond the terms of reference of this study, this section alludes to the circumstances underlying its writing as part of a critical assessment of arguments by Long and Manore concerning the Abitibi signatories.

Although neither the 1905 Treaty Report nor the diaries of Treaty 9 Commissioners make reference to being presented with a formal claim by métis while negotiating Treaty 9 at Moose Factory, a petition signed by five ‘halfbreeds’ from Moose Factory was received by the Ontario Government on September 15, 1905 stating:

_We the undersigned half breeds of Moose Factory, beg to petition the Government of Ont. For some consideration, as we are told by His Majesty's Treaty Commissioners that no provision is at present made for us. We understand that script [sic] has been granted to the half breeds of the North West Territory._

_We have been born & brought up in the country, and are thus by our birth and training unfit to obtain a livelihood in the civilized world. Should the fur traders decide at any time not require our services we should be obliged to support ourselves by hunting._

_We therefore humbly pray that you will reconsider your present arrangements and afford us some help._ (Doc.#100)

The petition is signed “Andrew Morrison, George McLeod, William McLeod, William Moore and William Archibald”. As indicated in Chapter 5, George and William McLeod and William Moore were likely extended family members of the McLeods and Moores stationed at posts in the Abitibi region in the 1800s. While additional research is necessary to determine the motivating factors behind this petition by “Moose Factory halfbreeds”, on its face it suggests a distinct sense of métis self-identification, one closely tied with the fur trade. The extent to which it reflects self-awareness of métis ethnicity among extended family members remaining in the Abitibi region cannot be assessed by the Moose Factory petition. No petitions are on record from self-identifying métis at Abitibi region posts.

A post-script signed by J. G. Mowat (the HBC post manager) adds “The above represent various absentees at Charlton & on HBC vessels” (Doc.#100). A letter on November 21, 1905 indicates that the petitioners’ families comprised twenty-five or thirty people (Doc.#103). According to the petition, its authors made a formal request to the Treaty 9 Commissioners to be granted scrip under Treaty 9 during negotiations at Moose Factory, which was rejected. According to Long (1985:147), corroborating evidence for this is found in Moose Factory parish records, where Reverend T. Bird Holland wrote concerning the distribution of annuities that: “Treaty money...was
paid on Thursday the 10th [of August 1905] to or for 340 persons, halfbreeds not included”.

Long (1985:146-148) and Manore (1985:9-10) argue that the rejection of the half-breed request for Treaty inclusion at Moose Factory by the Commissioners was illogical, considering that they had recently admitted a number of “halfbreeds” into Treaty 9 at Fort Albany. According to Long (1985:146):

*When the Treaty No. 9 commissioners visited Fort Albany on August 3, 1905, they admitted 375 native people into the treaty. Among these were over thirty halfbreeds, who thereby obtained Indian status. We may refer to them as Indian halfbreeds - halfbreeds by origin, Indians by decree of the commissioners. S.21 ten years old in 1905, stated in 1978 that four distinct Company families were admitted to treaty at Fort Albany - the Loutitts, Faries, Hunters and Linklaters. They shared close ties of kinship.*

Peter Loutitt, Willie’s stepfather, was a forty-five year old widower with five children. Peter was a former blacksmith and cattlekeeper for the HBC, and was of Scottish-Cree ancestry through his father and French-Cree through his mother. He had just married Mary (Wesley), widow of George Faries...

Sixty-nine-year-old labourer Patrick Faries, descended from a North West Company trader, and reported by the 1881 census to be of Cree-Irish origin, was admitted to the treaty along with his wife Jane (Mark), their daughters, and four grandchildren (Willie, his brothers James and George, and his sister Jane).

John Hunter, a thirty-eight-year-old carpenter and son of an Orkneyman, was admitted with his wife Sarah (Linklater) and their eight children.

George Linklater, forty-one years old, post master at Attawapiskat and described as of Scottish-Cree origin, was admitted with his second wife Margaret (Faries) and two children. His brother James, age twenty-nine, steward at Fort Albany, was likewise admitted with his wife Charlotte (Linklater) and two children.

Long summarizes these Fort Albany ‘Indian halfbreeds’ social characteristics as including:

...mixed racial origins, a family tradition of employment with the HBC, membership in the English-speaking congregation of the Anglican church and domicile. All resided north of the Albany River, outside the Province of Ontario. (Ibid.:146-147)

Manore (1985:9-10) paraphrases Long’s argument, adding that the halfbreeds were “Metis”:

*At Fort Albany, over thirty Metis were admitted into the treaty. These Metis were members of the families of Faries, Hunter, Linklater and Loutitt. All were fur-trade*
company families, and all shared close ties of kinship with the Cree. Peter Louttit and his five children were admitted to the treaty. Peter had served as a blacksmith and cattlekeeper for the Hudson's Bay Company. His father was of Scottish-Cree ancestry and his mother, Mary Wesley Faries, was French-Cree. Patrick Faries, descended from a North West Company trader, was admitted along with his wife Jane (Marc), their daughters and four grandchildren. John Hunter, a descendant of an Orkney man, was also admitted to Treaty along with his wife Sarah (Linklater) and their eight children. George Linklater, the postmaster at Attawapiskat, and his brother James, the HBC steward at Fort Albany, were admitted to the Treaty along with their families.

Between Long's use of the term 'halfbreed' to designate the Aboriginal individuals of partial European ancestry, and Manore's re-wording of 'halfbreed' into 'Metis', this aboriginal population analytically shifts from being ascribed an implicit but systematic 'other-identification', to being implicitly acknowledged as a distinct ethnic and political group72.

Long (1985:147) argues that the rejection of the Moose Factory halfbreed petition by the Treaty 9 Commissioners was illogical since:

_They could not have been excluded simply by virtue of their mixed racial origins, since the federal treaty agents acknowledged that halfbreeds were admitted at Fort Albany. It would have been illogical to exclude them on the basis of their employment with the HBC, since this was not a criterion at Fort Albany._

He then presents another seemingly inconsistent treatment by the Commissioners by stating that:

_After leaving Moose Factory, the treaty commissioners visited Abitibi where Duncan Scott photographed the halfbreed Louis McDougall, admitting him to treaty while remarking on the man's Scottish ancestry in the photograph's caption. (Ibid.)_

Manore (1985:12) states the following concerning Abitibi:

_There, as at Fort Albany, halfbreeds were admitted into the Treaty. For example_,

---

72 It is actually unknown if Manore (1985) was aware of the semantic implications of using the word and spelling 'Metis' as defined by Jennifer Brown (1987). Her stated reasons for using the term is that:

_"the term "Metis" is used whenever possible because it is the most generally accepted term in use today. However, the terms "halfbreed", "fur trade company descendant", and "white status" are also used. All four terms, for the purposes of this Research Report, are synonymous. (Manore 1985:3)"

It is therefore possible that Manore's use of the word "Metis" was based on simple reasons of political correctness. However, there remain obvious semantic differences, involving significant social implications, between describing an individual as a fur trade company descendant and a member of the Mètis Nation.

---
*Louis McDougall, recorded by D.C. Scott as a Metis of Scottish ancestry, was admitted into treaty.*

She adds that following Abitibi, “there were no more references to the Metis during the negotiations” *(ibid.)*. In a strict sense, there is no evidence that any such references were ever made.

These authors attempt to create a controversy where none existed. The seemingly ‘illogical’ conduct of the Treaty 9 Commissioners at Moose Factory is, in fact, completely consistent with their instructions concerning the negotiation of the Treaty and the admissibility of different Aboriginal groups into that Treaty. The Commissioners were simply not allowed to improvise and modify, or add or drop provisions from the written text of the treaty. They could not offer annuities above $4.00 per capita, they could not admit the Quebec portion of the Abitibi band into the treaty in 1906, they could not confine harvesting rights to reserves (as was misunderstood by Indian representatives at Fort Hope), and could not offer reserves that featured 100 miles of water frontage along the Albany River (also as requested by the Indian representatives at Fort Hope, and Marten Falls *(cf. PRAXIS Research Associates 1999c:54).* The Commissioners could not issue scrip or recognize formal requests for inclusion by halfbreeds because the terms of Treaty 9 simply did not include or acknowledge such provisions, as was later explicitly pointed out in a letter by J.D. McLean to the Ontario Treasury Department, dated September 23, 1905 *(Doc.#101).*

The diaries of Samuel Stewart present conclusive evidence that the Treaty 9 Commissioners were aware that some of the Aboriginal individuals in the Treaty 9 territory were of partial European descent. Isaac Rich, who accompanied the party along the full length of their trip on the Albany River and in fact to Moose Factory, was known to be the son of an Abitibi HBC assistant post manager. Although Stewart used the term ‘halfbreed’ in reference to Isaac Rich, he also classified him as one of the ‘Indian canoe men’ in the same sentence. A much later journal entry by Stewart suddenly refers to ‘halfbreed paddlers’ after consistently describing the same canoe men as ‘Indians’. During his 1908 expedition to Abitibi, Stewart befriended one of his canoe men, Bazille McDougall, and wrote extensively about his family background, clearly identifying him as being of partial European ancestry. Interestingly, however, Stewart’s diary never features the term ‘halfbreed’ in reference to Bazille McDougall.

In pure biological terms, Bazille McDougall was not a *half*-breed but was a *quarter*-breed, as was Louis McDougall, Jr., who was elected Chief of the Ontario Abitibi band in 1906. Although neither Long (1985) nor Manore (1985) specify the exact extent of European ancestry of the Fort Albany and Moose Factory ‘halfbreeds’, it is virtually impossible that all of the individuals and families they name were pure biological *half*-breeds. In a sense, this issue is completely irrelevant, since biology does not determine culture, and the degree of biological descent does not determine an individual’s self-perception or social identity in any ‘causal’ sense. Ironically, this is exactly the implication stemming from Long’s and Manore’s analyses, although likely unwittingly. The mere fact that these authors can retrace a partial European descent to many Aboriginal families at Fort Albany, in itself says nothing about these individuals’ self-perception and sense of social identity. Neither authors present any data describing how the Fort Albany ‘halfbreeds’ perceived themselves in 1905.

or how they presented themselves to the Treaty 9 Commissioners during their establishment of annuity pails. Long (1985:146) only informs a reader that the Commissioners classified them as 'Indians'.

Apparently, the Fort Albany 'halfbreeds' did not object to being classified as Indians, since neither Long nor Manore actually suggest otherwise. In fact Long presents some evidence suggesting that some of the 'halfbreeds' at Fort Albany were included on Treaty 9 pails at the request of other Aboriginal persons that Long classifies as 'Indian':

_A descendant of the Indian halfbreed Peter Louttit suggested that his father was admitted to treaty at Fort Albany at the request of the other Indians to whom he was related. It is true that some of the Indian half-breeds were closely related to the Wesleys and Marks, two leading Indian families - but so were some of the Moose Factory halfbreeds. (Ibid.:147)_

This raises the question of how the 'halfbreed' Louis McDougall presented himself to the government. While his partial European ancestry may have been known to Duncan Campbell Scott, Louis McDougall had identified himself as an Indian to the Department of Indian Affairs Agent at North Timiskaming when presenting his petition for the treaty inclusion of the Abitibi Band in June 1905. This agent apparently knew him, or knew of him by describing McDougall as one of the "most prominent Indians" of that Band. Louis McDougall also self-identified as an Indian in the 1901 Census (see Section 5.4). He seemingly presented no objections to being elected as chief of the Ontario Abitibi Indian Band in 1906. The Treaty 9 Commissioners would have no grounds on which to consider him as unqualified for admission into the Treaty.

Long also presents an interesting suggestion that the Moose Factory 'halfbreeds' may have been excluded from Treaty 9 because they did not want to be included into the 'Treaty as 'Indians':

_A descendant of the Indian halfbreed George Linklater speculated that his Moose Factory counterparts “didn’t want in” to the treaty. (Ibid.)_

If this speculation is correct, it would then appear that the Treaty 9 Commissioners were prepared to admit into treaty any Aboriginal persons who wanted inclusion into the treaty under the terms specified by that treaty, regardless of the fact that they may have been of partial European descent. Self-ascription and other-ascription were the key criteria used by the Commissioner to admit individuals into the treaty, as long as these persons were prepared to abide by the terms and provisions specified.

In sum, while persons of mixed ancestry were clearly included in Treaty 9, and some within the study region acted either as interpreters or representatives of bands, there is no historical evidence indicating that self-identifying Métis attempted to be included in the treaty or petitioned for distinct settlement in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region. The following chapter examines developments taking place in this region during the 20th century.
7. TIMMINS AND COCHRANE IN THE 20TH CENTURY

This chapter covers the post-treaty period during which significant European settlement and industrial development occurred at Timmins and Cochrane and their environs. The focus of analysis is on the evidence (or lack thereof) of métis participation in the development of these towns, and the extent to which métis may have comprised a noticeable segment of the growing ‘urban’ population. Only indirect and rare references to métis in the region were found in Indian Affairs records for the mid-1900s. Also discussed in this chapter is the existence of métis organizations in the area, such as locals of the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), the Ontario Métis and Aboriginal Association (OMAA), and the Canadian Métis Council (CMC). Publications by these and other organizations (eg., Ontario Métis and Non-Status Indian Association – OMNSIA) provide quantitative projections of métis populations in the Timmins/Cochrane region, and an analysis of this data concludes the chapter.

The chapter is brief, as there exist few local histories of either of these towns. Research for this assignment located only one local history of Cochrane. Three histories and one academic study of Timmins and the Porcupine district were found to have some relevant data. However, virtually no mention is made of métis in any of these publications, although passing comment is found in some histories about the role of Aboriginal people in the area’s past. Likewise, public data from métis organizations provide only general overviews and highlights of more recent trends in métis demography for the region.

7.1 REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND IMMIGRATION

Significant European presence in the Timmins/Cochrane area followed the construction northward of the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway (T&NO) in the first decade of the 1900s. Although some farming pioneers had homesteaded in territory north of Lake Timiskaming as early as the 1880s, little had been done to explore the potential or to develop resources and settle these northern regions (Marwick 1950:4). Some forestry in the Abitibi/Timiskaming regions had already begun to be developed since the 1860s (Riopel 1995:178). Agricultural possibilities together with the results of E.M. Burwash’s geological survey 1896 regarding the mining potential north of the height of land, prompted the government to look more closely at the north as a new area of settlement and development (Lions Club 1937:24). Systematic surveys were commissioned and in the face of failing to lure any private interests to build a railway line north to “New Ontario”, the provincial government embarked on its own policy of opening up a transportation system to aid colonization. At the 1902 session of the Ontario legislature, an act was passed authorizing the Government to proceed with building its own railway (Marwick 1950:5).

Railway construction began in 1902, with the line starting at North Bay and its first intended destination to be at New Liskeard at the north of Lake Timiskaming. In 1904 major discoveries of silver were made in the North Timiskaming region, and the government was further encouraged in
the profitability of extending the railway further north (Lions Club 1937:26). The towns of Cobalt, New Liskeard and Haileybury developed during this time as a result of a flurry of mining activity and the railway’s construction to that point (Riepel 1995:192). By the time the line reached New Liskeard in 1905, surveys had determined the route of the Canadian National Railway through Ontario’s northland, and the Ontario government decided to locate an intersection point for the T&NO. In 1906, T&NO tracks reached McDougall’s Chute, a place “so named after a trapper who ran his lines from that spot” – probably of the McDougall family mentioned in Chapters 5 and 6 (Marwick 1950:7). This place was later renamed Matheson and in 1907 a minor gold discovery was made nearby at Night Hawk Lake (ibid.; Lions Club 1937:27).

The point chosen for the T&NO to intersect with the CNR was ‘Northland Post’, or present-day Cochrane. The track line to Cochrane was completed in 1909 and the town was incorporated in 1910 (Lions Club 1937:27; Marwick 1950:10-11,71). It was at this point that large numbers of settlers began to arrive in Cochrane lured by the provincial government’s offer of inexpensive agricultural land. Many of the newcomers worked on the railway line in the winter, and farmed during the summer (Marwick 1950:129). Fur trade post journals from Abitibi House in 1915 recorded that, “Lot of Settlers got of [sic] train at Whitefish” (Doc.#106:90)

The railway junction and subsequent growth of Cochrane as a commercial centre did not go unnoticed by fur trade posts in the area. Summaries of inspection reports on New Post in 1913 and again in 1916 comment on the competition created with the town of Cochrane during this period:

*The result of New Post... show a great falling off in the amount of fur secured compared with Outfit 1913... A number of New Post Indians went into Cochrane last winter and sold their furs, the prices they obtained being 100% above our Tariff.*

*[In 1916] the company was forced to pay ‘very high prices’ for furs at the post to prevent the Indians taking their furs to the railroad, and that the very difficult river transport either from Moose or down the river from Cochrane was a very great drawback to the post.*

Meanwhile, additional gold and nickel discoveries adding to the lure of the region. In 1909, a major vein gold was discovered in “the Porcupine” as the region around present-day Timmins was known, and a rush ensued (Lions Club 1937:29-30). Although local histories such as that by the Timmins Lions Club discuss in detail the infrastructure development which surrounded the early period of construction and operation of mines in the area, there is no mention of the use of local labour in these pursuits. For example, much of the cross-country transportation to the rail lines occurred via canoe, dog sled and snowshoes, but at no time is there any mention of local métis or Aboriginal guides and paddlers (cf. ibid.:30-34).

Two other secondary industries were developed as a result of mining activity: the timber /

---

73 Source: HBCA Search File - New Post, pp.4-5.

---

pulp and paper industry and the development of hydro-electric power stations. In 1910, a sawmill was built on the bank of Mattagami River and a contract was let to the Porcupine Power company for development of a dam at Sandy Falls (ibid.:35-36). By this time three small towns had sprung up around the mining centres: Golden City, Shuniah, and South Porcupine. However, in 1911 a forest fire destroyed the latter two towns, prompting Noah Timmins – the president of Hollinger mines – to initiate a grand housing plan across from the mine site at Miller Lake. The town of Timmins was incorporated in 1912. Apparently nascent tourism was also developing during this period, and at Abitibi House post journals record two such visits by groups from Toronto:

[September 3, 1912]: A party of young tourists from Toronto called here on their way to Matheson.

[August 13, 1914]: Six tourists passed here on their way to North Temiscaming. They came from Matheson. (Doc.#106:19,77)

Although fire also wiped out Cochrane, Iroquois Falls, Porquois Junction, Ramore and Matheson in 1916, the centres were re-built and by 1926, discoveries of copper ore in the Kamiskotia area instigated a new influx of immigrant miners and support workers to the region (Lions Club 1937:44-46). According to Vasiliadis (1989:114), European travel agents were directing immigrant individuals to Canada and specifically to the Northern Ontario region in ever increasing numbers throughout the 1920s. Immigrants came in large groups from home villages and regions in Finland, Yugoslavia, Norway, Sweden, Italy and other countries:

In the period 1910-1920 immigration to Timmins was 1,194 but in the period 1921-1930 it almost doubled to 2,071... the actual numbers were even greater because the census was inaccurate. The immigrants were reluctant to have themselves officially enumerated and they would often go to extremes to avoid the census taker. (Ibid.:115)

Apparently official records do not accurately reflect the actual number who arrived in Timmins, because many of these individuals believed they would stay in Canada only temporarily, arriving here with the intent of earning enough to buy land back in the home country (ibid.). However, by the mid-1930s, six thousand men were employed year-round by the various mines (Lions Club 1937:49).

The study by Vasiliadis (1989) demonstrates the extent to which “ethnic enclaves” developed in the Timmins area as a result of this influx of immigrants. His examination of “interethnic competition” between the Anglo-Saxons, French Canadians, Finnish, East Europeans, Croatians; and Italians includes only brief mention of “a small pocket of Native Indians southwest of Timmins on the shore of the Mattagami River”. Vasiliadis explains his reasons for not including the Native Indian group in his study:

They were winter residents; women and children staying in the settlement while the men went on their trappers. In summer they moved up the river. The Indian
population has never been of significant importance in the Porcupine Camp since
the reservations were far removed to the south and north and few Indians settled
in the camp itself. (Vasilaidis 1989:118)

Vasilaidis’ table of ethnic population figures shows only a handful of “Indian-Eskimo” individuals in
Timmins between 1931 and 1951, and none in 1961-1971 (ibid.:344, Figure 10). There is virtually
no mention of any mixed Aboriginal-European population or métis enclave in his study.

7.2 EVIDENCE OF MÉTIS IN INDIAN AFFAIRS RECORDS, 1930s - 1950s

There are only indirect and scant data from available Indian Affairs records about persons of
mixed ancestry in the area between the 1930s and 1940s. This data refers to individuals, and does not
provide any demographic information about a métis population at this time. A Treaty 9 Annuity list
for 1938 includes only four names from the New Post Band; no other bands from the study region
are listed. The number of persons in each family can be calculated by dividing the $4.00 per person
annuity into the total amount received by each household head, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>(# persons/household)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Archibald</td>
<td>New Post</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Moore</td>
<td>New Post</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos. Sutherland</td>
<td>New Post</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. John McLeod</td>
<td>New Post</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Doc.#108)

A total of 10 individuals from New Post appear on this list. The appearance of
members of these families with a métis history in the Abitibi region
fur trade, had become band members.

Records of commutation (relinquishment of Indian status in exchange for a lump sum payment
of $40.00) from the 1940s provide bits of information about the presence of métis in the area, as
some women were eligible for commutation because they were married to whites or ‘half-breeds’
(Doc.#110). These records also include names of individuals with connections to métis fur trade families in the Abitibi region. Despite the fact that commutation provisions were not an original part of Treaty 9, Indian Affairs presented the following argument to Ontario authorities that such provisions should be implemented:

...to permit commutation to an Indian woman married to a white man may assist in
the process of her assimilation into the white population by removing the last tie with

74 The Quebec-Timiskaming reserve was created in 1853 (Vian 1995b:153). In 1911, populations on reserves created
in the region as a result of Treaty 9 were: Matagami (89); Flying Post (92); Matachewan (89); Abitibi (278); New Post (34)
(Doc.#105).

the band of which she was formerly a member. It is also thought that such
commutation would be financially profitable for the Province of Ontario, by reason
of the fact that the commiting of income is requested by Indian women at the time
to marriage. It is to be noted that generally, Indian girls marry when very young.
(Doc.#110:2).

Indian Affairs added that although the initial expense might be “beyond normal” due to retroactive
claims, thereafter the cost would be minimal as “annual white marriages” among Indian women were
“not numerous” (Doc.#102:2).

At Abitibi in 1941, about 15 “red tickets” were to be distributed to “Indian women married
to Whites and to half-breeds” (Doc.#109). At Matachewan in 1943, Indian Agent Marleau indicated
that “five Indian women of that band would probably commute immediately if they knew they could
be paid” (Doc.#111). The only member of Matachewan eligible for enfranchisement was a “Wm.
Friday” — also a known fur trade name (Doc.#111). Of the Abitibi Ontario band, another five women
were considered for commutation, three of whom were married to white men, one was married to
“S.21 half-breed”, and the fifth to a non-status Indian (Doc.#112). Another list
includes “S.21, an Indian from Abitibi” the widow of a man from “outside the band
(Doc.#113). Records were found for nine other women from Abitibi and Matachewan who commuted
between 1947-1952 (Doc.#114).

Although these records indicate that some of the women who commuted did so because they
married half-breed men, there is no information about other métis or about the existence of a métis
community in the region.

7.3 DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS, 1970s - 1990s

Four contemporary studies of métis and non-status Indians in Ontario were consulted for this
assignment:

> A survey conducted for the Ontario Ministry of Recreation and Culture (1979);

> A profile of native people in Ontario compiled by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship
and Culture (1983);

> A study of characteristics and identity of Ontario métis by Peters et.al. (1991), and;

> A profile of métis drawing on Statistics Canada data (Normand 1996).

Of these studies, only two presented statistical data on populations applicable to the Timmins,
Cochrane and Abitibi region of northeastern Ontario (Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation
1979; Peters et.al 1991). Two important qualifications apply to any interpretation of the data from
these studies. First, the 1979 study was not restricted to self-identifying métis but also included non-status Indians. Second, the regional breakdown of Provincial statistics in the two studies involves geographic areas much larger than the region under consideration in this report.

The 1979 survey of métis and non-status Indians reported a total survey population 5,444 for Ontario, of which 819 resided in the study’s Cochrane region (Ministry of Recreation and Culture 1979:9). The Cochrane region included 5 communities: the towns of Cochrane and Timmins, Mattice, Moose Factory and Moosonee, and most statistics presented in this study were not broken down to community-specific levels (ibid.:27,31).

The Cochrane region population was reported as forming 15% of the total métis and non-status Indian population surveyed in Ontario (ibid.:9). The total Cochrane region population comprised 280 households. The economic activity of the adult population (aged 20-65 years), showed that, of a total population of 452 individuals, 350 persons were in the labour force, representing a labour force participation ratio of 77% (ibid.:10). The Cochrane region labour force included 282 employed individuals, and 68 unemployed individuals, resulting in an unemployment ratio of 19.4%. The survey’s definition of ‘unemployment’ differed from that used by Statistics Canada, as it included any persons “not gainfully employed”, who may not have been actively looking for wage employment. Also, the labour force statistics excluded adult women classified as ‘housewives’. In the Cochrane region, 97 adult women were reported in this category, representing 21.4% of the adult population of working age. Only 5 adults did not report their economic activity. Labour force statistics broken down by community for the Cochrane region indicated that the largest concentrations of métis and non-status Indians resided in Moose Factory and Moosonee, which together accounted for 75% of the region’s total labour force (ibid.:24).

More recent population figures by Peters et.al. (1991:2) and Normand (1996:13) place the total Ontario métis population at 12,680 and 12,055 respectively. This represents approximately 10-11% of the national Aboriginal population. The study by Peters et.al. (1991) involved a survey of OMNSIA (Ontario Métis and Non-Status Indian Association) locals, and presented a regional breakdown of Provincial population figures. Relevant to this report is the fact that an OMNSIA local was identified for the town of Cochrane (ibid.:15). Cochrane was included in OMNSIA’s “Zone III”, involving locals at Elk River, Foleyet, Gogama, Matachewan, Moose Factory, Moosonee and Ramore. The region comprised by Zone III significantly exceeded the geographical parameters of this study. Overall, Zone III was described as comprising between 4 to 5.9% of the provincial métis and non-status Indian population, although the southeastern section of this Zone, including the area between Lakes Timiskaming and Abitibi, involved a population bracket comprising between 2 and 3.9% of the Provincial population (ibid.).

7.4 MÉTIS POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

Consultation of The Canadian Atlas of Aboriginal Settlement (Gabriel Dumont Institute 1994) and an internet-based search indicate that the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region is
represented by three major métis political organizations: The Ontario Metis Aboriginal Association (OMAA), the Canadian Metis Council (CMC) and the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO).

OMAA locals were established in three communities included within the scope of this study: Matachewan, Cochrane and Timmins (Gabriel Dumont Institute 1994:21). OMAA is the oldest of the three métis organizations active in the study region, being founded originally as OMNSIA in 1971 (OMAA Website). The organization underwent a name change in 1987 to reflect changes in the legal status of approximately 20% of its membership following Bill C-31. OMAA claims to represent about 200,000 Indian and Métis peoples living off reserve in Ontario. Administratively, OMAA is comprised of five Zones, in which locals operate at community levels. According to the Website the Zones and locals are autonomous organizations:

Each Zone has an annual assembly at which delegates from its affiliated locals elect a Board of Directors and three-member Executive Committee. OMAA, in turn, has an eighteen member Board of Directors, composed of the three executive officers of each of the five Zones, and the three executive officers of OMAA. (OMAA Website)

The main objectives of OMAA include economic development, self-government, health, education, employment, procurement and “other areas related to socio-economic well-being and independence.” The position of the organization regarding renewable resource harvesting is that:

...the Métis’ attachment to the land is reflected in their firm insistence that their members’ natural resource harvesting traditions are not subject to federal or provincial regulation, but rather to the community’s own conservation laws and regulations. (Ibid.)

A detailed description of community conservation laws and regulations is not provided at the Website.

An MNO Métis Council is also active in Timmins, as the MNO Webiste describes elections and features photographs of new Timmins Metis Council members elected on March 20, 2000. The MNO is a relatively recently formed organization dating to 1994 “at a delegates meeting that brought together Métis from nearly 100 Ontario communities” (MNO Website). The MNO claims that it offers “the most legitimate was in Ontario for Métis people to be recognized” and that:

Today, over 380 communities are included in the MNO Registry, the only registry of Métis in Ontario recognized by the historic Métis Nation, and represented by the Métis National Council. (MNO Website)

The organization offers a vast range of social and economic programs to its members in addition to political representation. The MNO’s legitimacy is claimed to derive from the strict criteria implemented in registering its members:
Unlike organizations which issue cards to anyone who claims to be Métis, MNO applicants must supply proper genealogical documentation and proof of Aboriginal ancestry. (Ibid.)

One of the many goals of the MNO is the stated pursuit of métis hunting and fishing rights (ibid.).

The CMC is the most recently created organization active in the Cochrane region. Although a national organization, the CMC was originally the “Southwestern Region Métis Council” operating in Region 9 of the MNO. The Council split from the MNO for undisclosed “number of reasons” and proclaims that “accountability in all matters” towards its constituents is of “prime importance”. The Cochrane District local was not linked to the CMC main’s Website as of the time of writing this report, but a reference to this local appeared on the site’s “Announcements” section (CMC Website). Under this section is featured an advertisement for a local trapping course taught by Randy Mopooye. A link established to its own Website, features several photographs of wilderness and hunting and trapping activities conducted in the Peter Long Lake region. The Announcements section of the CMC Website also features a brief summary of the Powley Case and appeals, and cautions its members to refrain from exercising perceived harvesting rights until the CMC receives a legal opinion on the outcome of the Powley appeal:

...we ask that you refrain from exercising these rights until we have a legal opinion on the matter, at which time we will begin the process of issuing “licenses” for harvesting to our members. These licenses will identify you as Métis and, along with your CMC card and a copy of the written opinion from our lawyer, prevent you from any legal difficulties.

We are also contacting MNR for an opinion, which we will pass on to you. (Ibid.)

The statement ends with a reminder that “CONSERVATION is the key” and that members should only harvest what they need.

The following chapter presents the major research findings from the data presented and analysed throughout this report.
8. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter highlights the major findings established from the historical and ethnohistorical data and interpretations regarding the development of a population of mixed Aboriginal and European ancestry in the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region of Ontario. Methodological issues which affect the relative strength or weakness of conclusions are presented within the specific context of findings where such issues are relevant.

- Overall, the historical data and analyses presented in this report indicate that a potential for the development of a métis community existed in certain time periods throughout the region under study. This is particularly evident for the 19th-century, when social indicators such as fur trade endogamy reflected an integration of métis in an occupational community. However, while it is possible that métis developed an ethnic identity within the context of that occupational community, historical records present no direct evidence of such an ethnicity.

8.1 ABORIGINAL OCCUPATION AND HARVESTING PRACTICES

No consensus exists in the ethnohistorical literature concerning the tribal identity of the Aboriginal bands that occupied the Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi region at the time of contact with Europeans in the early 1670s. At least six different positions are presented by different ethnohistorians, including speculations that the Abitibi were Cree, Ojibwa or Algonquin. Some authors claim that all three tribal groups may have occupied the area, while others consider that the Abitibi formed an independent tribe. Finally, others still claim that tribal boundaries cannot be determined for this region.

- This report considers an interpretation that the Abitibi were either comprised of Cree bands, or bands having a proto-Cree identity in the mid-16th century, as more plausible than alternative positions. However, this interpretation must be qualified as tentative. This position involves a necessary reconstruction of tribal identity since European records from the early-contact period present no positive tribal identification of the Abitibi:

  - The interpretation is favoured since it appears to be consistent with most available geographic and social information on Aboriginal bands throughout northern Ontario and Quebec for the time period; such data, however, present only indirect evidence and the argument for a Cree or proto-Cree identity must remain speculative;

  - Later historical evidence suggests that bands in the region experienced a gradual incorporation of Ojibwa members, beginning either in the late 18th century or early 19th century;
By the time Treaty 9 was negotiated in 1906, bands on the Ontario side of Lake Abitibi were predominantly comprised of Cree and Ojibwa, although a few Algonquin from western Quebec had intermarried in the Abitibi post band.

- The Abitibi and other bands living in the study region followed a seasonal cycle of renewable resource harvesting involving a semi-nomadic lifestyle. In summer, relatively large bands, numbering perhaps 100 members, were usually established on lake and river shores and lived principally from fishing, supplemented by hunting small game and collecting wild foods. Each summer band had its own name and traditional territory over which the band as a whole claimed exclusive rights to resources.

- By fall, the summer bands would break up into smaller bands or even 'micro-bands' comprised of members of one or two extended families, rarely exceeding 20 people. These groups would remove to winter hunting grounds, pre-determined and negotiated with other bands during summer months:

  - The main subsistence activity of winter bands in the early contact period involved the hunting of large game, principally moose, caribou and deer, which was supplemented by fishing;

  - Although winter bands usually confined harvesting to habitual areas as long as resources were available, there is no evidence suggesting that winter bands claimed exclusive rights to harvest resources on specific tracts of land in the early contact period;

  - By the late 19th century, and lasting into the first decade of the 20th century, resource harvesting practices were regulated through a system of 'family hunting territories', developed throughout northern Ontario and Quebec in response to changing ecological conditions (principally the disappearance of large game);

  - Field research among the Abitibi band documented the existence and approximate location of 40 family hunting territories during the early 20th century, although this research indicated that enforcement of harvesting rights within territory boundaries had relaxed by the 1930s;

  - A request by the Abitibi band representatives to Treaty 9 Commissioners in 1906 that the Abitibi reserve include as much water frontage as possible may signify that fishing provided the main means of subsistence in the early 20th century. However, field research in the late 1930s ranked trapping and hunting as more important than fishing in the overall economy of the Abitibi band.
8.2 ABORIGINAL-EUROPEAN CONTACTS IN THE EARLY FUR TRADE ERA

- The historical evidence reviewed for this assignment suggests that contact with Europeans likely took place in the early 1670s as St. Lawrence (Montreal) based French _coureurs de bois_ extended their travels beyond Lake Timiskaming. Up to that time during the 17th century, the Abitibi and neighbouring bands near Cochrane and Timmins were participating in the French fur trade only indirectly, through other Aboriginal groups who occupied intermediate regions between Lake Abitibi and the St. Lawrence, and who acted as middlemen.

- Historical evidence indicates that the French were vaguely aware that the Ottawa River provided a possible travel route to the "North Sea" (James Bay) as early as 1613, when Samuel de Champlain proposed to undertake such a journey to some of his Algonquin allies on Allumette Island. The Algonquins discouraged him from these travel plans, and no formal French exploration of the route was attempted for another 73 years.

- Local Aboriginal contacts with _coureurs de bois_ in the Abitibi region took place in a context of direct competition between the French and the English for control of the fur trade. The establishment of a trade post on James Bay in 1668, leading to the creation of the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) in 1670, motivated the French to build a small post, Fort La Tourette on Nighthawk Lake near present-day Timmins in 1673. That same year the HBC built Moose Factory. Although Fort La Tourette likely only operated for a short time, the French constructed a relatively large inland post, Fort Témiscamingue in 1679, from which _coureurs de bois_ almost certainly travelled to the Lake Abitibi region in search of furs. The establishment of this Fort marks the beginning of a continuous presence of French fur traders until the English conquest in the 1760s:

  - Another French Fort was built at Lake Abitibi in 1686, as part of a military expedition led by Pierre de Troyes, to capture the HBC posts built on James Bay. The success of this expedition led to French control of the regional fur trade until the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht, which allowed the HBC to resume operations on James Bay;

  - As evidenced by de Troyes’ formal instructions and by HBC post journals, some _coureurs de bois_ were engaged in ‘illegal’ (unlicensed) trade between Lake Abitibi and Moose Factory in the late 1670s and early-to-mid 1680s; between the ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’ _coureurs de bois_, as well as the possibility of travel to the English at Moose Factory, the regional Aboriginal bands were likely in regular contact with European traders at this time;

  - Although Fort Témiscamingue was destroyed by an Iroquois attack in 1688, the French apparently continued to operate Fort Abitibi, possibly through Fort St. Louis (as Moose Factory was renamed after 1686). The return of the James Bay posts to the English in 1713 isolated Fort Abitibi until a new Fort Témiscamingue was constructed in 1720;
Between 1713 and 1763 the French and English were involved in direct competition for furs in the Abitibi region, as each side constructed outposts to encourage Indians to trade with them exclusively; instead, this likely allowed Indian fur traders to play off French and English posts against each other.

Although no specific data were found for the Abitibi region, more general historical analyses of interactions between coureurs de bois and Aboriginal for the Pays d’en Haut (or “Upper Country”) indicate that sexual unions almost certainly developed between French traders and Aboriginal women beginning in the 1670s:

As revealed by the de Troyes expedition, HBC employees at Moose Factory were themselves involved with Aboriginal women by 1686;

Since this military expedition convinced the HBC to forbid English women at posts, it is likely that relations with Aboriginal women resumed following the return of the Company to James Bay in the early 18th century.

Most sexual relations between European traders and Aboriginal women in the late 17th century and up to the mid-18th century were probably casual and temporary. However, it is likely that some involved more permanent relationships, designated as mariages à la façon du pays. With some HBC employees, this latter practice led to the development of a phenomenon in the 18th century in which employees held ‘double families’ (a European family in England, and an Aboriginal family at or near their post in the James Bay region).

Virtually no information specific to the Abitibi region was found concerning the development and social status of children of mixed ancestry that resulted from either casual or more permanent relationships between European traders and Aboriginal women. Although it is virtually certain that children of mixed ancestry were born in the region between the late 1600s and throughout the first half of the 1700s, they most likely remained within the respective Indian bands of their mothers and were raised as Indians.

It is possible that children of mixed ancestry developed a social awareness of their European paternity, although no evidence was found to suggest that were socially distinguished within bands on this basis in the first half of the 18th century.

8.3 INLAND EXPANSION OF THE FUR TRADE

In the last quarter of the 18th century, competition for furs between independent traders, the North West Company (NWC) and the HBC prompted expansionist efforts into the interior between Fort Timiskaming and Moose Factory. This inland expansion set the context for the development of a regional fur trade population in the Abitibi region of present-day Ontario.
In 1783 the NWC was formed as a united front of independent traders ("Pédiars") and small private fur trade companies opposed to the HBC. Between 1792 and 1800, both companies established posts in the Abitibi region, at Frederick House Lake, Lake Abitibi, Kenogamissi Lake, Groundhog Lake (Flying Post), and Lake Matawagamingue;

The amalgamation of the HBC and NWC in 1821 marked the beginning of a relatively stable fur trade in the Abitibi region. Three posts remained in operation: Abitibi House, Matawagamingue and Flying Post. By the mid 1800s, a new wave of independent traders was penetrating the interior, and the HBC established additional posts at Matachewan in 1865 and at New Post in 1867.

Fur trade records indicate that the men employed at the inland posts established in the Abitibi region formed a regional fur trade community. Individual post populations were small, and there was extensive travel and communication between posts. Evidence indicates that the inland traders formed a social as well as economic community, often out of necessity. This was due to the harsh physical environment and the isolation in which traders lived for most of the year:

Even rival posts in the early 1800s record instances of social hospitality. Traders visiting a post location were invited by their opponents for meals. Christmas and New Years parties included both NWC and HBC men resident at a post location. There are also instances of a rival trader providing food to his starving opponents.

After amalgamation in 1821, post journals continue to record social events, and often men wintering at outposts, as well as Indian trappers who chose to make the trip, met at the main post for special celebrations.

8.4 ABORIGINAL WOMEN AT ABITIBI REGION POSTS

There is abundant evidence of Aboriginal and/or métis women resident at fur trade posts in the Abitibi region, dating to the late 1700s and throughout the 1800s. These women fulfilled important social and economic roles at these inland posts. They also provided the female element and context necessary for the procreation of post families:

Post journals document numerous instances of individual women engaging in a variety of resource harvesting activities including hunting, trapping, snaring, fishing, and maple sugar production. It appears that a woman’s harvest was directed at supplementing post provisions, as well as to feed her post family if she had one.

There is also evidence of collective activities pursued by the group of women who resided at any one post. The "women of the establishment" were frequently ordered
to establish snaring or fishing camps, to make and repair nets, to gather watiap (spruce gum) for canoe repairs, and to lace and repair snowshoes.

- Overall, the evidence suggests that women were considered members of the small post communities with consequent responsibilities to the post as well as to their families.

8.5 OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE OF MÉTIS IN THE ABITIBI FUR TRADE

- The relations between Aboriginal women and European company men at trade posts created a new class of servants of mixed ancestry, born and raised in the fur trade culture and environment. Despite some methodological challenges in positively identifying métis servants, evidence suggests that they comprised a significant component of the inland fur trade population:

  - Documented cases of 'native born' company servants begin to appear around the 1790s at Moose Factory. Records listed their parish of origin as 'native', 'Hudson's Bay' or 'Indian Country', and scholars agree that in the absence of the term 'halfbreed', such designations generally infer mixed ancestry;

  - Métis youths eventually replaced the supply of apprentices whom the HBC had formerly brought out from England. The use of the label "Factory Boys" (or "Lads") to differentiate native-born from European apprentices is a clear indicator of "other ascription", and instances of the use of this term are found in Abitibi region post journals. Whether and the extent to which this labelling translated into a sense of métis self-identification among these young men is not known. However, "other ascription" is considered to be a necessary factor in emerging ethnic identities;

  - There are numerous documented cases of native-born servants stationed at posts in the Abitibi region throughout the 19th century. In the face of increasing difficulty in recruiting men from Europe after amalgamation, the HBC increasingly looked to locally born men to fill their post complements. An analysis of Servants Lists and Accounts demonstrates that by the 1860s, the majority of company men at the inland posts were métis. For example, records for 1871 show that out of a total of 28 men stationed at Abitibi region posts, 21 were from "Indian Country."

- Métis offspring of company officers and servants found a niche in the inland fur trade in which they could capitalize on superior skills gained through their mixed Aboriginal and European heritage:

  - In addition to general labour around the posts, Abitibi region journals document métis servants employed at specialized tasks that required skills these men may have
exelled in as a result of their mixed Aboriginal/European upbringing. For example, there are records of métis servants as interpreters, canoe builders, and skilled hunters;

- Although the evidence indicates that the resource-poor environment demanded that all men stationed at inland posts engage in some subsistence harvesting, the records also suggest that in some cases, métis servants were primary post provisioners. William Polson and his family at Abitibi stand out as one such case. The critical need for experienced hunters at inland posts where environmental pressures were greatest may have highlighted the benefits of the specialized skills some métis men possessed;

- There are numerous instances of métis servants and their families setting up temporary hunting and fishing camps at more productive sites a distance from the post. Here they would live for days or weeks, harvesting resources aimed at helping to provision the post;

- Unlike fur trade regions along the Great Lakes or further west in the Lake of the Woods area, evidence from Abitibi region fur trade records suggest that the occupation of voyageur was not an identifying feature of métis ethnicity:

  - Records indicate that inland posts depended on local Indian men to paddle the canoes to and from Moose Factory or Fort Timiskaming. French-Canadian and métis voyageurs were apparently unavailable, and local trappers were considered “cheap” labour, although they and their families also benefited from the payment of provisions and other goods. Voyaging was seasonal, journey-specific employment;

  - Company men – often métis – always commanded or supervised the canoe brigades, making sure the fur packs arrived at their destination and returning to the post with provisions from the fort. However, the label voyageur was not applied to such men.

8.6 ABORIGINAL / EUROPEAN MARITAL UNIONS

- A detailed examination of available journal records from each NWC and HBC fur trade post in the Abitibi region demonstrates that company men at each were involved in à la façon du pays, or common-law marriages. References to the-country wives and families of company men are found in the journals for Frederick House, Abitibi House, Kenogamissi, Matawagamingue, Flying Post, and Matachewan:

  - Early records from fur trade posts in the Abitibi region provide evidence that European company men were involved in marital relations with local Aboriginal women. References to a company man's “woman,” “lady” or “girl” appear only in the earliest journals from the late 1700s and early 1800s;
By the first decade of the 1800s, these women are referred to as men’s “wives” and it is this term that is most commonly used thereafter. There are numerous references also to their families, sons and daughters who will have been mixed blood. There are only rare references to children being born at these posts and it is impossible to know the degree to which families were indigenous to the region;

As well around this time some of the company men were themselves métis, and there are numerous references to their country wives who will have been Aboriginal or métis, and to their families. However, not all of these marriages originated in the region, as some men will have brought their wives and families with them from a previous posting.

8.7 FUR TRADE ENDOGAMY AND ABITIBI REGION MÉTIS FAMILIES

- There exists evidence of intermarriage between the offspring of these fur trade unions. Moose Factory records provide instances of this pattern of ‘fur trade endogamy’, and post journals indicate that members of such families were at inland posts in the Abitibi region;

- A kinship and marriage chart created by Jennifer Brown (1980a, reproduced in this report as Figure 5.1) traces the connections between several fur trade families in Albany and Moose Factories. From this chart, the following surnames can also be traced to the Abitibi region fur trade: Richards, Moore, Good, Thomas, Spence, Stewart, Knight, and Vincent. Although some marriages were between métis sons and daughters, the endogamous group was comprised of Aboriginal, métis and European individuals connected to the fur trade;

- An important characteristic of fur trade endogamy evident in the Abitibi region is the connection to fur trade families from Albany and especially Moose Factory. The evidence presented in this report indicates that the Moose Factory fur trade community in particular was the source of endogamous marriage patterns evident in the Abitibi region. This is a direct result of the expansion of HBC trade into the interior from Moose Factory.

- Fur trade post journals also indicate that for some families of mixed ancestry, the Abitibi region was home. Direct evidence of ‘native born’ identity has been combined with data indicating the presence of several generations of a family within the Abitibi region. As a result of this analysis, the following eight métis family names are considered as “Abitibi region families”: McKay, Beads, Faries, King, Polson, McBride, Saunders and McLeod. Several of these families remained in the area well into the 20th century:

- Of these eight families, descendants of four were enumerated in the region in the 1901 Census: McKay, King, Polson, and McBride. Descendants of the Moore family (listed
above in connection with fur trade endogamy) were also enumerated in the region in 1901. The majority of members of these families identified as “Breed” or métis;

> Two households of the Beads family were enumerated at Abitibi in 1901, but both identified as Aboriginal (“Red” - Algonquin);

> There were no Faries found in the 1901 Census, but a Walter Ferris acted as interpreter for the Treaty 9 Commissioners at Matachewan in 1906. There were also no families with the name Saunders in the 1901 Census, although a “John Sanders” is listed as métis at Biscotasing Station;

> Abitibi post journals from 1912 to 1915 indicate that descendants of the Polson, McBride and King families were still active in the region. Finally, a publication dated 1937 documents the Polson family hunting territory in the North Timiskaming district.

### 8.8 1901 CENSUS RESULTS

- Despite methodological problems, the 1901 Census provides a general portrait of the Abitibi region métis population as one comprised of approximately 450-500 métis individuals:

  > Two factors result in an inconclusive demographic analysis of the métis population in this region at the turn of the century: 1) unidentified “unorganized territories”, and; 2) enumerator inconsistencies regarding the identification of métis and their offspring. The problem of enumerator inconsistency makes it impossible to know for certain if the codes indicating métis are indicative of self-identification.

- If individuals were coded strictly according to how they self-identified, then the 1901 enumerations are suggestive of a sense of capital “M” Métis ethnicity in two, perhaps three local areas:

  > The first and most probable locale of métis ethnicity is the Flying Post region in which 127 individuals are identified as “Chippewa Breed.” That this number includes Abitibi region fur trade métis family names such as Moore, McKay, and McLeod lends an historical element to their residence in this area. This area is within 50-80 miles (~75-130 km.) southwest of Timmins;

  > A second possible locale of métis ethnicity is Matagami, although results here are less conclusive as this area was divided between two different enumerators. Members of the extended Moore family – an Abitibi region fur trade family – were enumerated in both divisions. Taken as a whole, 45 individuals self-identified as métis in the Matagami region, approximately 60 miles (~100 km.) south of Timmins;
A third locale of probable métis ethnicity is in North Timiskaming, but this area is outside the study region (100 mi. / 160 km. southeast of Timmins). However, it should be noted that of the 62 persons who self-identified as métis, the majority can be traced to well-known fur trade families from Abitibi region posts (e.g., Polson, McBride, King).

8.9 INVOLVEMENT OF MÉTIS IN TREATY 9

- Only one treaty was negotiated in the region under study: Treaty 9. The Treaty 9 negotiations involved a travelling expedition of government commissioners who negotiated with bands congregated at numerous HBC locales between the height of land forming the northern boundary of the Robinson Treaties of 1850, and the Albany River over the summers of 1905 and 1906. The negotiations specific to the study region were conducted in 1905 at New Post, and in 1906 at Abitibi, Matachewan, Matagami, and Flying Post. One of the three Treaty Commissioners, Samuel Stewart, returned to Abitibi in 1908 to conclude additional negotiations for inclusion of the Quebec portion of the band in the Ontario reserve.

- Examination of the historical context in which Treaty 9 was negotiated indicates that the Treaty was motivated by two interrelated factors: (1) A growing number of Indian bands were petitioning the Federal government specifically to enter into treaty relations; (2) The development and planned expansion of railways in northern Ontario led the Federal and Ontario governments to realize a need to extinguish Indian title to lands between the northern boundaries of the Robinson Treaties and the Albany River:

  - Petitions written on behalf of Indian bands between the late 1880s and 1905 specifically asking for a treaty indicates that petitioners were generally familiar with the provisions of treaties and perceived potential benefits from treaty inclusion;

  - This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that members of bands living in proximity to long-established treaty regions (the Robinson Treaties of 1850, Treaty 3 of 1873) had relatives living in treaty areas who were subject to the provisions of these treaties.

- Some historical evidence shows that during a preliminary stage of consultation regarding the form in which the treaty should be drafted, government officials discussed the potential issue of whether "halfbreeds" should be recognized and whether the treaty should first focus on negotiating potential halfbreed claims. These discussions and considerations occurred at a very early stage of Federal-Provincial negotiations concerning the legal form in which a new treaty was to be developed, and the potential content of its provisions. At this point in Federal-Provincial negotiations, officials were unsure as to whether the treaty should involve an adhesion to the Robinson Treaties of 1850, or follow the formula set by the post-Confederation "numbered" treaties.
As it became clear that the latter approach should be followed, references to ‘halfbreeds’ or formal inclusion of halfbreeds into the Treaty were dropped and the drafts of Treaty 9 referred only to recognition and inclusion of Indians;

No evidence was found that the government received any formal petitions by self-identifying métis individuals asking for inclusion in Treaty 9, or for separate settlement of métis claims, prior to final drafting of the Treaty and the beginning of negotiations in 1905;

Only one petition asking for treaty inclusion appears to have been written on behalf of Aboriginal residents of the region under study in this report. This petition, written on behalf of Louis McDougall and other members of the Abitibi band in June 1905 clearly identifies him and the other petitioners as ‘Indians’ and ‘prominent Indians’.

A review of the diaries of Treaty Commissioner Samuel Stewart describing the journey undertaken by the Treaty 9 expedition and the negotiations that occurred at different HBC posts demonstrates that the Treaty Commissioners were aware that some of the Indians throughout the Treaty region were of partial European ancestry:

A few diary entries referring to ‘halfbreed’ members of the HBC voyageurs crew guiding the expedition along its itinerary alternatively identify these members as part of the ‘Indian’ crew of canoe men, suggesting that the term ‘halfbreed’ was used casually to allude to the fact that some Indians had partial European ancestry;

Although presenting somewhat ambiguous evidence of other-identification, the diary entries referring to ‘halfbreeds’ present no data on self-identification of Indians having partial European ancestry.

Biological descent in itself was not considered as sufficient grounds by the Treaty 9 Commissioners to disqualify persons from inclusion on Treaty 9 Indian annuity paylists. As long as individuals self-identified as ‘Indian’ or were identified by others as ‘Indian’, or presented no objection to being classified as ‘Indian’, they were included on paylists by the Commissioners.

There is only one location where individuals self-identifying as ‘halfbreeds’ were apparently excluded from Treaty 9, and subsequently petitioned the government for a distinct settlement of their claims: Moose Factory, in 1905. Although this community is beyond the geographic scope of this report, the context in which the petition was drafted was reviewed in order to critically assess claims by two historians that the Treaty 9 Commissioners had admitted ‘halfbreeds’ into Treaty at other locations, including Abitibi:

The fact that some individuals who were signed on paylists, or in other cases who negotiated the Treaty with government Commissioners, can in hindsight be identified
through historical or genealogical research as having partial European ancestry, is not sufficient to present them as 'halfbreeds' at the time of the Treaty negotiations;

- Louis McDougall, described as a 'halfbreed' by two historians, presented himself as an Indian to the Indian Agent of North Timiskaming, who wrote a petition of his behalf in June 1905. Louis McDougall had also self-identified as an Indian in the 1901 Census, and presented no objection to being elected as Chief of the Abitibi band following the signing of Treaty 9;

- While three signatories of the Moose Factory petition were likely related to families of mixed descent in the Abitibi region, the petition in itself is not indicative of métis self-identification in the Abitibi region.

8.10 TIMMINS AND COCHRANE IN THE 20TH CENTURY

- The present-day towns of Timmins and Cochrane experienced significant development after the construction of the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway in the first decade of the 20th century. Industrial activity focusing on forestry development had begun in the Province of Quebec portion of the Abitibi and Timiskaming region in the 1860s, but this industry was in decline by the early 1900s and economic development shifted to colonization programs based on farming and agricultural settlement. The discovery of minerals and mining potential in the first decade of the 1900s encouraged additional railway development plans on the Ontario side, leading to an influx of immigration at Timmins beginning in 1909;

- Few studies have focused on Timmins and Cochrane in the 20th century, and study of their histories of immigration and ethnic relations focuses entirely on European or Euro-Canadian groups;

- Virtually no information exists describing local Aboriginal groups or those of mixed ancestry in these towns between the signing of Treaty 9 in 1906, and the formation of métis political organizations in Ontario beginning in the 1970s;

- An Internet search of métis organization Websites indicates that three distinct organizations have become active in the Timmins and Cochrane region by the mid-1990s, by establishing locals: OMMA (the Ontario Métis Aboriginal Association), the MNO (the Métis Nation of Ontario) and the CMC (Canadian Métis Council). Each of these organizations has presented views and positions regarding perceived renewable resource harvesting rights on their Websites.
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<td>Journal Author: Andrew Stewart &amp; Peter Spence</td>
<td>B.99/a/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1818-1819</td>
<td>Northwest Company - Matawagamigque Journal</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Cameron Papers)</td>
<td>MS209, Reel 2, Item 3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1818-1819</td>
<td>Kenogamissi Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Peter Spence</td>
<td>B.99/a/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1819-1820</td>
<td>Kenogamissi Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: James Kellock</td>
<td>B.99/a/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc. #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source/Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1819-1820</td>
<td>Kenogamissi - Report on District Report Author: James Kellock</td>
<td>HBCA B.99/e/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1822-1823</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal Journal Author: John McRae</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1822-1823</td>
<td>Abitibi - Report on District Report Author: John McRae</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1823-1824</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal Journal Author: Thomas Fraser</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1823-1824</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal Journal Author: John McRae</td>
<td>HBCA B.70/a/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Abitibi - Report on District Report Author: Thomas Fraser</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/e/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Temiscaming Journal (Cameron Papers)</td>
<td>AO MS209, Reel 2, Item 3-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1824-1825</td>
<td>Letterbook - Temisicaming (Cameron Papers)</td>
<td>AO MS209, Reel 2, Item 3-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1824-1825</td>
<td>Matawagamingue (Matagami) Post Journal Journal Author: Richard Good</td>
<td>HBCA B.124/a/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1824-1825</td>
<td>Matawagamingue (Matagami) - Report on District Report Author: (Alexander Christie?)</td>
<td>HBCA B.124/e/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1825-1826</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal Journal Author: Thomas Fraser</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1825-1826</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal Journal Author: John McRae &amp; William J. Robins</td>
<td>HBCA B.70/a/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1825-1826</td>
<td>Matawagamingue (Matagami) Post Journal Journal Author: Alexander Christie</td>
<td>HBCA B.124/a/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Abitibi - Report on District Report Author: Thomas Fraser</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/e/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Flying Post - Report on District Report Author: John MacRae</td>
<td>HBCA B.70/e/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1826-1827</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal Journal Author: Thomas Fraser</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1826-1827</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal Journal Author: John McRae &amp; William J. Robins</td>
<td>HBCA B.70/a/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1827-1828</td>
<td>Matawagamingue (Matagami) Post Journal Journal Author: Hugh Farins</td>
<td>HBCA B.124/a/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc. #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Matabagamiingue (Matagami) - Report on District</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: Hugh Faries</td>
<td>B.124/4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Chief Trader's Journal, Matabagamiingue Post,</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Feb. - 19 Aug. 1828</td>
<td>MU1391, Box 7-9, Item 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1828-1829</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Thomas Fraser</td>
<td>B.1/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1828-1829</td>
<td>Matabagamiingue (Matagami) Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Hugh Faries</td>
<td>B.124/4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1829-1830</td>
<td>Matabagamiingue (Matagami) Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Hugh Faries</td>
<td>B.124/4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1829-1830</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Donald McKay</td>
<td>B.70/4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1822-1830</td>
<td>Servants Character Book</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.34/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.135/g/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1832-1833</td>
<td>Matabagamiingue (Matagami) Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Hugh Faries</td>
<td>B.124/4/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1835-1836</td>
<td>Chief Trader's Journal, Matabagamiingue Post,</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Feb. - 25 July &amp; October, 1835 - 27 May 1836</td>
<td>MU1391, Box 7-9, Item 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1836-1837</td>
<td>Matabagamiingue (Matagami) Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Hugh Faries</td>
<td>B.124/4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1836-1837</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: James Cameron</td>
<td>B.70/4/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1837-1838</td>
<td>Matabagamiingue (Matagami) Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Hugh Faries &amp; Richard Hardisty</td>
<td>B.124/4/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.135/g/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1841-1842</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Alexander Finlayson</td>
<td>B.70/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1842-1843</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Alexander Finlayson</td>
<td>B.70/4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1843-1844</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Alexander Finlayson</td>
<td>B.70/4/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1844-1845</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Donald Grant</td>
<td>B.70/4/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1845-1846</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Donald Grant</td>
<td>B.70/4/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PRAXIS Research Associates, 2001: Historia Métis in Ontario – Timmins/Cochrane/Abitibi*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc. #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1846-1847</td>
<td>Matawagamingue (Matagami) Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA B.124/a/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Richard Hardisty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1847-1848</td>
<td>Flying Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA B.70/a/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Donald Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1852-1853</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Author: Robert Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1870-1874</td>
<td>Port Matachewan Fur Trade Journal</td>
<td>MU7484, Item 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1879-1884</td>
<td>Letterbook kept at Matawagamingue Post, 1 Jan. 1879 - 25 May 1884</td>
<td>MU1391, Box 7-9, Item 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Matawagamingue (Matagami) - Report on District</td>
<td>HBCA B.124/a/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: Thomas C. Rae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Abitibi - Report on District</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/e/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: Thomas Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Moose - Abstracts of Servants Accounts</td>
<td>HBCA B.135/g/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Abitibi - Inspection Report</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/e/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: E. Hardisty &amp; E.K. Beeston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Flying Post - Inspection Report</td>
<td>HBCA B.70/e/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: [E.K. Beeston]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Matachewan - Inspection Report</td>
<td>HBCA B.311/e/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: [E.K. Beeston]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Abitibi - Inspection Report</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/e/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Author: E.K. Beeston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1900 April</td>
<td>Letter from E.B. Burcon</td>
<td>AO RG4-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>To: J.M. Gibson, Attorney General of Ontario</td>
<td>File 1900, No.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc. #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source/Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Fourth Census of Canada 1901 District 180: Pontiac (Quebec) Sub-District z: Unorganized Territory Polling Division 2: North Timiskaming</td>
<td>NAC 1901 Census - Reel T-6539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Fourth Census of Canada 1901 District 180: Pontiac (Quebec) Sub-District z: Unorganized Territory Polling Division 4: Indian Reserves - Abitibi</td>
<td>NAC 1901 Census - Reel T-6554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Fourth Census of Canada 1901 District 180: Pontiac (Quebec) Sub-District z: Unorganized Territory Polling Division 4: Indian Reserves - New Post</td>
<td>NAC 1901 Census - Reel T-6554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Fourth Census of Canada 1901 District 180: Pontiac (Quebec) Sub-District z: Unorganized Territory Polling Division 4: Indian Reserves - Mattagama Post</td>
<td>NAC 1901 Census - Reel T-6554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>December 12 Petition Re: Indians at Osnaburgh request treaty because mineral explorations taking place and white men are building on lands they wish to retain.</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3033 File 235,225, Pt.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>February 22 Report by J.A.J. McKenna Re: Recommendation that half-breed claims should be resolved before Indian title is extinguished by treaty.</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3033 File 235,225, Pt.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>August 17 Memorandum from F. Peabody Re: Summary of departmental correspondence re: legalities of treaty making in northern Ontario, provincial involvement and terms of the proposed treaty (No.9)</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3033 File 235,225, Pt.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>August 17 &quot;Schedule of Population&quot; List of Aboriginal populations living in &quot;unceded portions of Ontario&quot;</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3033 File 235,225, Pt.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>June 24 Petition submitted by A. Burwash, Indian Agent, North Temiscaming Re: Indians residing at Abitibi wish to enter into treaty</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3033 File 235,225, Pt.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Treaty 9 Diary - Daniel G. MacMartin, Commissioner, Treaty 9. (Excerpts)</td>
<td>QUA MacMartin Papers, Miscellaneous Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc. #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source/Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>September 15 &amp; 18</td>
<td>Cover letter &amp; Petition of &quot;half-breeds of Moose Factory&quot; Re: Request to Ontario Government for consideration and/or scrip re: Treaty 9</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3093 File 289,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Letter from J.D. McLean, Indian Affairs To: Ontario Treasury Department Re: Treaty 9 Commissioners did not have power to deal with half-breed claims</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3093 File 289,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>November 21</td>
<td>Letter from Frank Pedley (DSGHA) to Colonel Matheson Re: Treaty 9 Halfbreed petition - represents 25-30 people.</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3093 File 289,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>January 20</td>
<td>Cover letter &amp; List of Reserves and number of Indians on Pay-list, Treaty 9.</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 3161 File 365,009-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1911-1921</td>
<td>Abitibi Post Journal Journal Author: D. McKenzie</td>
<td>HBCA B.1/a/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>&quot;A Canoe Trip to Port Temiscamingue in '79&quot; by Sha-Ka-Nash (Newspaper Account - <em>The Haileyburian</em>, April 13-20, 1933)</td>
<td>AO MU1391, Box 7-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>January 11</td>
<td>Memorandum (Treasury Office) and Paylist Re: Treaty 9 Annuities</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 8595 File 1/1-11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Letter from Indian Agent, Notre Dame du Nord Que. to P.R.L. MacInnes, Secretary, Mines and Resources Re: Treaty tickets for Indian women married to whites and to half-breeds</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 6881 File 371/28-3, Pt.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>February 13</td>
<td>Letter from T.A. Crerar to Provincial Treasurer Re: The James Bay Treaty / Treaty No. 9 - Commutation: &quot;annual white marriages... are not numerous&quot;</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 8595 File 1/1-11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>November 3</td>
<td>Report from Indian Agent Marleau, Sturgeon Falls Re: Treaty No.9 Indians, 5 women would probably commute immediately</td>
<td>NAC RG10, Volume 8595 File 1/1-11/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc. #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Report from Indian Agent Lariviere, Abitibi</td>
<td>NAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>Re: Treaty 9 woman (Mrs. Joseph McKenzie) married to half-breed to be considered for commutation</td>
<td>RG10, Volume 8595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>File 1/1-11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Report from Indian Agent Lariviere, Abitibi</td>
<td>NAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 25</td>
<td>Re: Mrs. Tom Polson, an Indian from Abitibi married to a man outside the band, to be considered for commutation</td>
<td>RG10, Volume 8595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>File 1/1-11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1947-1952</td>
<td>Requisitions for Cheques, Indian Affairs</td>
<td>NAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Commutation payments to Treaty 9 women</td>
<td>RG10, Volume 8595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>File 1/1-11/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>