

**A HISTORICAL PROFILE OF THE JAMES BAY AREA'S
MIXED EUROPEAN-INDIAN OR MIXED EUROPEAN-INUIT COMMUNITY**

Prepared for:

Department of Justice Canada
Under Contract No. 4500049343

Submitted to:

Project Technical Authority
Austin Lawrence, Research Analyst
284 Wellington Street EMB 6258
Ottawa ON K1A 0H8
(613) 957-2811

Submitted by:

Gwen Reimer, Ph.D. and Jean-Philippe Chartrand, M.A.
PRAXIS Research Associates
6352 St. Louis Drive
Ottawa ON K1C 2Y1

March 14, 2005

© HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA,
on behalf of the Minister of Justice, 2005.

STUDY AREA:
JAMES BAY / MOOSE FACTORY REGION
(Source: Flannery 1995)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAP OF THE STUDY AREA.....		frontispiece
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....		iv
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Research Objectives.....	1
1.2	Research Methodology.....	2
1.2.1	Archival Document Collections.....	3
1.2.2	Literature Review.....	5
1.3	The Moose Factory Mixed-Ancestry Database.....	6
1.4	Methodological Note: Indicators of Mixed-ancestry in the Historical Record	6
2.	HISTORY AND DEMOGRAPHY OF MOOSE FACTORY AND ENVIRONS.....	12
2.1	Historical Overview of Moose Factory.....	12
2.2	Demographic Profile, 1700-1901.....	19
2.3	Mixed-Ancestry Database, 1803-1905.....	25
3.	ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RELATIONS AT MOOSE FACTORY.....	28
3.1	Economy and Occupations at Moose Factory.....	28
3.1.1	The Domestic Economy.....	28
3.1.2	Occupations of Mixed-Ancestry HBC Servants, Apprentices & Boys	40
3.2	Moose Factory Society: Women, Children and Families	48
3.2.1	Women of the Establishment	48
3.2.2	Marriage Patterns	54
3.2.3	Families, Dwellings and ‘Neighbourhoods’	58
3.2.4	Children and Education.....	65
3.3	Post-script: Moose Factory into the 20 th Century	73
4.	BRITISH, CANADIAN AND ONTARIO PRESENCE IN JAMES BAY	75
4.1	Hudson’s Bay Company Domination	75
4.2	1870 Transfer to Canada and 1889 Extension of Ontario.....	79
4.3	Treaty No. 9, 1905-1906.....	85
4.3.1	The 1905 Petition for Scrip from “Half Breeds of Moose Factory”	91

5.	INTERPRETING THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE: ETHNOGENESIS AND “EFFECTIVE EUROPEAN CONTROL”	98
5.1	Ethnogenesis	98
5.1.1	Intermarriage and Descent	98
5.1.2	Social, Economic and Cultural Distinctiveness	101
5.1.3	Geographic Proximity	105
5.1.4	Ascription of Ethnic Status	107
5.2	“Effective European Control”	109
5.2.1	Permanent European Settlement	109
5.2.2	Establishment of European and Canadian Government	112
5.2.3	Enforcement of Law and Government Policy	114
5.2.4	Treaty No. 9	115
6.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	118
	PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES CITED	120
	A. Primary Sources	120
	B. Secondary Sources	123
	APPENDIX A: DOCUMENT INDICES	
	Index A: Moose Factory Post Journals	
	Index B: Moose Factory Lists/Abstracts of Servants	
	Index C: Moose Factory District Reports, Correspondence, Minutes, Etc.	
	Index D: Mission Records	
	Index E: Government Records	
	APPENDIX B: MOOSE FACTORY MIXED-ANCESTRY DATABASE	
	APPENDIX C: EXPANDED RESEARCH QUESTIONS (Justice Canada, 10 September 2004)	

TABLES

Table 1	Demographic Data for Moose Factory, 1803-1901	20
Table 2	Baptisms by Parentage, 1852-1893.....	22
Table 3	1881 Census: Origins	23
Table 4	1901 Census: Origins	24
Table 5	1901 Census: Households	24
Table 6	Early Record of Mixed-Ancestry Sons	26
Table 7	Mixed-Ancestry Men with Birth Dates in the 18 th Century.....	26
Table 8	Generations of Mixed-Ancestry Families	27
Table 9	Mixed-Ancestry HBC Clerks and Postmasters, 1821-1892.....	47
Table 10	Marriages by Identity, 1874-1908	58
Table 11	Baptisms Performed by HBC Officers, 1817-1835	76
Table 12	Death Records kept by HBC Officers, 1822-1823.....	77

FIGURES

Figure 1	Annual Subsistence Cycle of the James Bay Cree	13
Figure 2	Hierarchical Structure of Hudson's Bay Company Trading System at Moose Factory.....	46
Figure 3	Moose Factory Site Plan 1901	64

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents historical evidence relevant to two main issues: the possible ethnogenesis of a mixed-ancestry community in the Moose Factory area, and; issues of “effective European control” in the James Bay region. The main findings are summarized below.

! **Historical Overview of Moose Factory and Environs**

- The West Main or “Swampy” Cree were the original inhabitants of the Moose River region. They lived by hunting, trapping and fishing according to an established seasonal cycle. In 1672, Jesuit Charles Albanel acknowledged the Cree as the occupiers of this territory since “time immemorial.”
- < In the fur trade period, Cree who lived near the coast established a semi-permanent pattern of summer residence at posts, and became known to Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) men as “homeguard Indians.” Cree who lived further inland and maintained a more traditional seasonal cycle were known as “uplanders.”
- < In 1670 Charles II of England chartered the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), granting a trade monopoly and title to Rupert’s Land. Moose Factory was first established in 1673, followed by a period of conflict between French and English fur trading interests. In 1686 Moose Factory was captured by the French, returning to British ownership in 1713.
- < In 1730 a new (permanent) fort was built by the HBC at Moose Factory, marking the beginning of an era of permanent British presence in the region. Thereafter Moose Factory grew in importance and in 1810 became the headquarters for the newly formed HBC Southern Department.
- < In 1821 the HBC and North West Company (NWC) merged under the British company. Moose Factory was confirmed as the port of entry for the Southern Department and seat of its governor. The HBC post at Moose Factory continued to operate into the 20th century.
- < Missionaries first arrived in the west James Bay area in 1672 when Jesuit Charles Albanel travelled to “Hutson’s bay” [sic] together with French trader and explorer Denis de St. Talon. However, a permanent religious mission was not established at Moose Factory until 1840.

! **Ethnogenesis** – Evidence of possible ethnogenesis amongst the historic mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory is examined according to four criteria:

- < evidence of intermarriage and descent;
- < evidence of social, cultural and economic distinctiveness;
- < evidence of geographic proximity, and;
- < evidence of ‘other-ascribed’ and ‘self-ascribed’ ethnic status.

There exists historical evidence in all four areas. This data on the mixed-ancestry population of Moose Factory becomes evident beginning in the mid-18th century and continues into the early 20th century.

! **Evidence of Intermarriage and Descent**

- < Country marriages were the most common, if not only form of marital union at Moose Factory prior to the 1830s. The earliest record of these types of unions found in post journals are references to an HBC man and “his woman and son” dating to 1750.
- < There is direct historical evidence that country marriages between European and Cree persons were formally recognized as “mutual contracts” with specified dates of union. Country marriages were certified by Rev. George Barnley in the 1840s. For example, George Moore and Emma Good who had been “united according to the custom of the Country since June 1816” were officially married in December 1841, and; George McPherson and Isabelle Okewukumigikwa who had been “united by mutual contract from August 1, 1833” were “lawfully united in matrimony” in July 1842.
- < References to marriages in Moose Factory post journals from 1750 to 1850, and in Rupert’s Land records from 1830s-1860s, include examples of intermarriage between European, mixed-ancestry and Cree persons, as well as instances of mixed-ancestry endogamy. However, no conclusions can be drawn about patterns of marriage from these early sporadic references and incomplete records.
- < The complete Diocese of Moosonee record of 150 marriages between 1874 and 1908 provides more conclusive evidence of marriage patterns in the late 19th century, as follows: Mixed-Ancestry/Mixed-Ancestry: 11 (7.3%); Mixed-Ancestry/“Indian”: 12 (8.0%); Mixed-Ancestry/European: 9 (6.0%); European/ “Indian”: 1 (0.7%). Of the 51 marriages among members of the Moose Factory post population, 36 (70%) involved mixed-ancestry brides and/or grooms. Of these 36 marriages, eleven (30.6%) are positively identified as endogamous (mixed-ancestry/mixed-ancestry). Six of these endogamous marriages were between sons and daughters belonging to eight prominent mixed-ancestry families identified at Moose Factory. While the majority of marriages were between men and women whose residence was Moose Factory, there are instances of intermarriage between nearby post-communities, eg., Michipicoten, Abitibi, Fort

George, Whale River, Fort Hope, and the Revillon Frere Moose River Post.

- < Although the 1750 journal entry referring to Robert Pilgraim and “his woman” does not name their son, it provides positive evidence that children of country marriages were born by at least the mid-18th century. The earliest record of named individuals of European descent are found in the 1803-1804 Lists of Servants. Adult “Native servants” are named, whose birth dates in the mid-18th century can be calculated from age data provided in later records: Thomas Richards, Sr., born ca. 1765, and; George Moore, Sr. (a), born ca. 1776. By this time, Cree wives and mixed-ancestry children were common in fur trade communities in the James Bay region.
- < The earliest examples of individuals with mixed Cree and European names were found in 1834 Moose Factory “Petty Accounts” where the “Children of Dec’d Geo. Atkinson” are listed as follows: “Atkinson George Jun’r, Atkinson Thomas, Hannah alias Pinaitchiquaes, Mistuskoskish, Charlotte alias Kaukumishew.” Diocese baptism records beginning in 1852 record numerous “Indian Adults” with Christian given names and Cree surnames. A post journal entry in 1855 refers to: “Hanna Ward daughter of Ouskeegee, one of the Indians hunting for this Factory.”
- < The earliest evidence of second generation mixed-ancestry children dates to 1785 when Thomas Richards Sr. fathered his son Thomas Richards Jr. A second example dates to 1796, when George Moore Jr was born to George Moore Sr. Historical records list the “parish” for of these four men as “Hudson’s Bay.” By 1794, school books were sent from London to the James Bay district “for the purpose of teaching the children of your Factory to Read.” The 1799-1800 post journal’s numerous references to children demonstrate that they lived at the Fort where they were socialized into post culture.
- < The data base of mixed-ancestry individuals and families appended to this report documents eight prominent mixed-ancestry families who lived at Moose Factory from two to four generations. Of the 300 individuals listed in the database, 169 (56%) belong to one of these eight families. Of the 108 mixed-ancestry persons enumerated in the 1901 Census, almost all (98-99%) are the immediate relatives of one of these eight families. Twenty-seven individuals (25%) are connected by birth to the Moore, McDonald or Turnor families whose mixed-ancestry origins at Moose Factory can be traced to the 18th century. Another 40 individuals (37%) are related to the Linklater, Morrison and Swanson families whose mixed-ancestry origins can be traced to the early 19th century. The remainder (35%) are members of the McLeod and Udgaarden extended families.

! Evidence of Social, Economic and Cultural Distinctiveness

- < The historical record indicates that hunting and fishing skills acquired by mixed-ancestry males from their Cree extended families, seems to have developed into an occupational niche at Moose Factory for a temporary period of perhaps 50 years, from the late 1700s to the mid-1800s. By the 1870s it is evident that mixed-ancestry men mainly used their hunting and fishing skills to provide for their own families, rather than for the post population as a whole. In part this was likely the direct consequence of the growing number of families at Moose Factory, and a social evolution into a ‘company settlement’ in which the nuclear family formed the logical economic unit. As well, mixed-ancestry men increasingly acquired skills as a result of the Company’s Apprentice policy and the opportunities available to sons of servants to engage in a variety of trades associated with Moose Factory’s role as a shipping depot.
- < The earliest records of servants’ “capacity” and rank beginning in 1803, show that mixed-ancestry men occupied the role of canoe-men and canoe builders, skills possibly learned from Cree family members. In 1804, of fourteen mixed-ancestry servants at Moose Factory and its inland posts, eight were canoe-men; in 1810, eight of ten mixed-ancestry servants were canoe men; as experts in canoes, these men were described as “essential” particularly to the inland trade. The annual district report in 1823 indicates that “halfbreeds” were known also to be skilled “Winter messengers or Packetters.” The period of inland expansion with its requirement for additional men correlates with the emergence of a recognition that mixed-ancestry offspring were integral but distinct parts of fur trade society.
- < Roles based on skills originating in Cree ancestry extended also to an early occupational niche as hunters and fishermen in order to procure country-food for consumption by the post population. While Moose Factory post journals in the mid 1700s indicate that “homeguard” Cree were the main provisioners, by 1800 the country-food was being provided mainly by mixed-ancestry men such as George Moore and Joseph Turnor. On occasion, mixed-ancestry men were sent to camp a distance from the post in order to hunt, taking their wives and country families with them. For instance, in October 1799, “Geo. Moore & his wife gone in a canoe to Wayway Creek to tent there & trap and hunt.” Journal entries from the 1830s-40s indicate that this pattern of mixed-ancestry men as primary post-provisioners continued for at least the next two decades.
- < It was also common practice at Moose Factory for HBC men and their country-born sons to work together at the post, and in some cases, fathers were allowed to formally apprentice their sons: in 1817-18 William Corrigan and his son Jacob operated the Hannah Bay post; in 1822-23 George Moore Sr. apprenticed his son George Moore Jr. in boat-building. “Native Youths” were apprenticed in trades, but mixed-ancestry “Boys” also assisted in hunting and fishing for the post. References to “the Boys” appear in Moose Factory post

journals at least as early as 1793.

- < By the mid-19th century, post journals portray the Moose Factory domestic economy as the equal responsibility of all servants at the post, with little evidence to indicate any occupational niche filled by mixed-ancestry men. For example, mixed-ancestry men were as likely to be working with cattle, as they were to be out hunting and fishing. Many journal entries for 1870-71 document domestic economic activity that is family-oriented, indicating a continued shift from communal efforts to provide food for the post population, to individual efforts by servants to provide for their own family. Entries in winter months particularly emphasize the extreme time and energy required to maintain post families with respect to housing, heating, and eating.
- < Another skill possessed by mixed-ancestry employees was their fluency in both Cree and English. Their bilingualism frequently placed mixed-ancestry men into interpreter duty, for both the post and later for missionaries. However, the position was not unique to mixed-ancestry servants. Records show that some European men became fluent in the dialect spoken by their Cree spouses: for example, in 1824-25, Orkneyman William Corrigan filled the capacity of interpreter at Moose Factory. Evidence of locally-born individuals with European last names being fluent in Cree dialects is found in Moose Factory Abstracts of Servants for 1824-25, when William Donald (born 1787 at “Moose, Hudson’s Bay”) is listed in the capacity of post interpreter. In the 1840s and 1850s, missionaries relied on several mixed-ancestry men and women as interpreters for their ministry.
- < The historical evidence confirms that the predominant language at Moose Factory among mixed-ancestry peoples was English, and there is no indication of the development of a Cree/English pidgin. English primers were sent to Moose Factory in 1794. In 1840, Barnley held a morning school to teach post children to read, separate from afternoon religious instruction among the Indians (assisted by an interpreter). In the 1880s, Diocese correspondence is clear that individuals at the post spoke English and that most “above the age of nine or ten [is able] to read it,” while Cree families made “intelligent use of our translated books into their respective tongues.” Rev. John Horden, the missionary particularly interested in language and translation, makes no reference to a mixed vocabulary or trade language in use at Moose Factory. A report in 1889 states that the principal mission station and school at Moose Factory enrolled about 40 pupils in the English school, and about 60 in the Indian school.
- < In terms of social class, the historical evidence indicates that mixed-ancestry men remained predominantly in the “Servant” class as canoe-men, sailors, sloopers, guides, interpreters, boatbuilders, carpenters, joiners, blacksmiths, coopers or general labourers. Several were promoted to positions of postmaster or clerk. Of

the 122 mixed-ancestry men whose occupations can be traced in the HBC employee lists, nineteen (15.6%) reached the clerk or postmaster class, and none (0%) reached the officer class.

- < The evidence suggests that mixed-ancestry children were not trained for anything but labouring or tradesmen's jobs for which extensive formal education was not a prerequisite. After the 1821 merger, the HBC ranking system was more strictly defined between servant and officer. With a lack of competition, the HBC considered mixed-ancestry employees less important in terms of promotion to the officer class, in part because they were able to acquire only the rudiments of education, and because the overseas governor under the new regime considered them "merely fit for voyaging." The historical data presented in this report confirms that mixed-ancestry men mainly occupied "the lower rungs of the company hierarchy."
- < Mixed-ancestry women also experienced class differences when European women were first introduced to Moose society. In 1830 Chief Factor John George McTavish brought his Scottish bride to Moose Factory. The McTavishes were offended by social overtures from the other women of the establishment and their husbands, creating racial and class tensions. Chief Factor and Mrs. McTavish left Moose Factory in 1835, but in 1843, Rev. George Barnley brought the second European woman into Moose society. Mrs. Barnley also stirred resentment among local wives because she assumed an "unpleasant tone of superiority."
- < It is significant to note that church marriages performed by Barnley coincide with a change in journal entries' references to Cree and mixed-ancestry women of the establishment from "my woman" to "wife." Nevertheless, journal entries from the 1850s indicate that local women continued to be placed on a lower social scale than Euro-Canadian women who were awarded the title of "Lady" or "Mrs."

! **Evidence of Geographic Proximity**

- < The Hudson's Bay Company habitually transferred its employees – European and mixed-ancestry – between posts within the Moose Factory district, within the Southern Department and further afield to the Northern Department. In the 19th century, retired mixed-ancestry servants were encouraged to move to the Red River Settlement or to Canada. The post journals and lists of servants examined in this study show that mixed-ancestry servants were transferred within the district to inland posts, and to other districts such as Albany and Lake Superior.
- < The evidence demonstrates the interconnection of mixed-ancestry family names throughout the James Bay and inland region, the result of HBC expansion, transfer of servants, and intermarriage. Names such as Moore, Thomas, Linklater,

Richards, Vincent, Knight, Beads and Polson are documented at Fort Albany, and at inland posts such as Abitibi House, Kinogamissi, Matawagamingue, New Post, etc. Ethnohistorians agree that an important characteristic of “fur trade endogamy,” is the connection between families within the James Bay region as a whole.

- < Unique to the mixed-ancestry employees, was the HBC policy established in 1837 to apprentice the 15-year-old sons of servants outside their father’s district. That this directive was enforced to some extent is evident in subsequent post journal entries: in 1840 the son of John Louttit from Abitibi was apprenticed at Moose Factory, as was the son of Walter Faries from Matawagmingue in 1855. However, numerous entries about HBC men and their sons working together at Moose Factory suggest that the regulation was not always fully enforced.
- < Beginning in at least the first quarter of the 19th century, the historical record shows that HBC mixed-ancestry men were building separate dwellings for their families on Moose Factory land and with Company time, manpower and equipment. For example, in 1817-1818 George Moore built a house for himself and his family. In 1822 Charles Beads built a “small House” with the help of two fellow mixed-ancestry men (George Moore and Thomas Richards). By 1827, Chief Factor Christie noted there were several “people who have Families and live in detached houses.”
- < One historian argues that this mixed-ancestry housing pattern at Moose Factory was “an expression of their way of life.” The evidence presented in this report confirms a trend toward separate dwellings for servants with families was well established by the latter half of the 1820s. By the late 1830s the existence of a growing “settlement” at Moose Factory was in many ways considered to be natural and normal.
- < The site map of Moose Factory dated 1901 and building descriptions contained in the 1895 District Report may indicate the existence of a mixed-ancestry ‘neighbourhood’ on the northeast side of the fort where 27-28 separate dwellings are shown. Eleven dwellings were Company houses occupied by servants, and 16-17 belonged to “homeguard” Cree families. Triangulation with the 1901 Census suggests that the mixed-ancestry families enumerated in buildings 114-131, correspond with the buildings marked on the northeast side of the fort site plan, where separate family dwellings and garden plots had been established beginning in the 1820s.
- < At most, it can be argued that this cluster of dwellings represented an ‘occupational neighbourhood,’ one that happened to be comprised mainly of mixed-ancestry fur trade employees. The buildings were owned by the Company

and intended for Company men. However, it is important to keep in mind that since at least the 1820s, these men introduced separate family-dwellings to the Factory. Mixed-marriage and mixed-ancestry families were the impetus for a new residential cluster on the northeast side of the Factory site, at times to the dismay of the Company. Nevertheless, it is impossible to determine from the historical evidence, the extent, if any, to which these families consciously chose to live next to other mixed-ancestry neighbours, or to which this proximity engendered a separate sense of community or ethnic identity.

! **Evidence of ‘Other-ascribed’ and ‘Self-ascribed’ Ethnic Status**

- < In the Moose Factory Records, the earliest use of the term “Native” as a reference to mixed-ancestry is found in the 1803 “List of Servants” where Joseph Turnor and Thomas Richards, Jr. are identified as from the parish of “Hudson’s Bay” and along with Thomas Knight and William McDonald are described as “native Youths.” The following year, Charles Beads is described as “one of our faithful natives” and his parish is identified as “Hudson’s Bay.” Moose Factory fur trade records rarely employ the term “halfbreed.” The earliest instance of this term occurs in the District Report for 1822-23, in which George Moore, Jr., Thomas Richards, and William Saunderson are each identified as “halfbreed.” In 1823-24, Charles Beads is listed as a “halfbreed, an excellent canoe man & winter traveller.” That Thomas Richards and Charles Beads were identified as “Native” in 1803-04, and as “halfbreeds” in 1822-24 corroborates the notion that these terms were synonymous in the study region, and that both are historical indicators of mixed-ancestry at Moose Factory.
- < The difficulty in determining if the mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory was an ‘ethnic community’ lies in the impossible separation of this group from the ‘post community.’ From the first post journal when Moose Factory was re-established in 1730, entries demonstrate a clear distinction between the establishment population, and the “homeguard” population. By at least the 1790s, journal entries begin to distinguish between “Indian women” and “the women,” the latter inferred to mean the women of the establishment. It is also in the late 18th century that children are mentioned alongside these women.
- < Demographic analysis concludes that the post community essentially evolved into a mixed-ancestry community. By 1830 the complement of HBC men at Moose Factory was over 30% mixed-ancestry, growing to over 50% by 1890. The 1881 Census enumerations indicate that over 65% of the post population was mixed-ancestry, and a decade later, the 1901 Census confirmed that Moose Factory was almost 85% mixed-ancestry.
- < Most mixed-ancestry individuals and families appear to have been heavily

influenced by the Europeans due to their often lifelong and multi-generation connection with the Hudson's Bay Company. That Europeans accepted their mixed-ancestry offspring as their own is evident not only from the numerous journal entries about children in everyday life cited in this report; it is also evident in the ceremonial rites of baptism and death. Records show that these children were christened with their British fathers' name and buried in the "European burial ground" rather than in the Indian graveyard. However, not all mixed-ancestry individuals identified with their European ancestry. There is historical evidence that some at Moose Factory chose to live a Cree life and settled among the "homeguard" families.

- < The 1901 Census is the earliest possible indicator of self-ascription by mixed-ancestry individuals at Moose Factory. Enumerators were instructed to record the "colour" and "origin" of persons as self-identified, but the extent to which enumerators imposed their own codes cannot be known. However, that some members of the same extended families (eg., Turnor) identified differently – some "Métis Ecossaise" (mixed-ancestry) and others "Rouge" (Indian) – supports the notion that at least some degree of self-identification was exercised in the 1901 Census.
- < The 1905 Moose Factory "half Breed" petition represents the first direct evidence of self-ascribed mixed-ancestry identity distinct from European or Cree identities. The refusal by the Treaty Commissioners to admit families onto the treaty payroll on grounds that their lifestyle was not "Indian" enough, may have either ignited or crystalized a self-recognized cultural difference between mixed-ancestry families and their Cree relations. The distinctly mixed-ancestry way of life at Moose Factory was, by act of the treaty, politicized in a way unprecedented in their two-hundred year history at the fort. This event, it can be argued, generated something more than a fur trade post community – it defined a mixed-ancestry community.

! **"Effective European control"** – Evidence of "effective European control," including also such control by Canadians in the James Bay territory, is examined according to four criteria:

- < evidence of permanent European settlement;
- < evidence of the establishment of European and Canadian government;
- < evidence of enforcement of law and government policy, and;
- < evidence of treaty-making and issuance of scrip.

! **Evidence of Permanent European Settlement**

- < Permanent presence of the British-based fur trade in the Moose River region

began in 1730 with the establishment of the new HBC fort at Moose Factory.

- < Beginning in 1794, the Hudson's Bay Company began an education program for the children of its servants in Rupert's Land, sending 50 primers for "the children of your Factory". In 1806, the HBC London Committee sent "School Instructions" providing a standard set of regulations to be followed by all "Chief Factories" for "children belonging to each post Settlement with its Inland posts." By 1808, Moose Factory listed David Robertson as the first official school master at that post. At the beginning eight children attended the school, all of whom were mixed-ancestry, the sons and daughters of HBC men and their country-wives. Although the children of Cree leaders were also welcome, there is no evidence that any attended in this early period. A school house was completed in 1810.
- < In 1840 a permanent mission was established at Moose Factory with the arrival of Rev. George Barnley of the Wesleyan Missionary Society. Almost immediately, church marriages were performed, the school was reorganized with an enrollment of 18 mixed-ancestry children from the post, and religious instructions for "homeguard" Cree began. Barnley ministered at Moose until 1847. In 1851, Rev. John Horden and his wife became the resident missionaries at Moose Factory, under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society (Church of England). Horden translated biblical texts into Cree syllabics, and presumably taught school at the post as well. By 1889, the mission school at Moose Factory had an enrollment of about 40 pupils in the English school, and about 60 in the Indian school
- < The Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) constructed north of the Great Lakes in the 1880s effected political and economic changes in the region south of Moose Factory. The railroad prompted several Moose Factory Cree families to relocate to Missanabie and Chapleau. It also prompted the HBC in 1902 to move its distribution warehouses from Moose Factory Island to Charlton Island and to shift its headquarters to Winnipeg. Finding itself with surplus workers, the HBC dismissed twelve servants who, with their families, went south to the railroad line to find work.
- < In 1905, Duncan Campbell Scott used part of his time at Moose Factory to inspect facilities for a residential school. After Treaty No.9, the Dominion government was responsible only for the education of treaty beneficiaries in the territory, and the Diocese of Moosonee, who operated the school at Moose Factory, was directed to the Ontario government for assistance for "half-breed children." The boarding school established in 1906 accepted "25 half breed children" for whom no educational benefits were available under Treaty No. 9.
- < In 1903 The Revillon Freres Trading Company set up a trading post at the mouth

of the Moose River, the present site of Moosonee, where a small company town quickly developed. Several of the families who had recently left the HBC to find work at the railroad, returned to work at Moose. The Revillon Freres operation diminished during the 1920s, when animal populations were low due to over trapping, partly a result of an influx of white trappers.

- < The Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway line reached Moosonee in 1932, marking the beginning of a railway town. Moosonee became the predominant distribution centre in the area. As a result, the HBC moved its docks to Moosonee. In the 1920s a reserve was established on Moose Factory Island. The Department of Indian Affairs set up its regional office on the Island. Provincial government offices are located across the river, in Moosonee.
- < In 1948 the office for the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests was established at Moosonee. The Moosonee area was apparently classified “unorganized territory” until the year 2000. However, since 1968 the Moosonee Development Area Board provided services to the town similar to those of municipalities.

! **Evidence of the Establishment of European and Canadian Government**

- < The HBC held de facto economic control throughout Rupert’s Land, including the James Bay region for most of the 18th and 19th centuries. The Company also had complete civil jurisdiction over its employees, ruling the behaviour of its personnel by a set of regulations established by the Council of Rupert’s Land and Committee in London. Company officers held the authority to marry, christen, and bury. Records show that the HBC also exercised criminal jurisdiction in matters that involved their property or personnel. Even after Rupert’s Land became part of Canada in 1870, and later of Ontario in 1889, the Moose Factory district remained “the domain of Indians, Hudson’s Bay Company traders, and missionaries.”
- < In 1868, the Hudson’s Bay Company surrendered Rupert’s Land to Britain and in 1869 a “Deed of Surrender” was signed over to Canada. In 1870 an Order-in-Council confirmed the HBC territory as the possession of the Dominion of Canada. The Dominion exercised its sovereignty over the new territory mainly by imposing custom taxes on British goods entering the port of Moose Factory.
- < For the next twenty years, negotiations, litigation and arbitrations between Ontario and the Dominion aimed at defining the northern and western boundaries of the province. In 1878 arbitrators awarded to Ontario the territory north to the English and Albany Rivers. The province proceeded to establish its authority by appointing stipendiary magistrate E.B. Borron to superintend the northern portion (District of Nipissing). From 1880 onward, Borron made “annual forays” to

Moose Factory, which he considered the territory's "capital". Borron's view was that Ontario should not contest the de facto rule of the HBC "since it appeared to suffice for the needs of the country." Borron advised the province not to interfere "until we are in a position to provide a really sufficient substitute," and in the meantime to secure the cooperation of HBC officials by commissioning them as provincial justices of the peace. The province began gradually to assert its authority.

- < The *Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889* established the boundaries of the Province of Ontario west to Lake of the Woods and north to the Albany River, a vast region including Moose Factory and environs.
- < Treaty No. 9 signed in 1905, signalled a formal relationship between the Cree inhabitants of the James Bay region and the Federal and Provincial governments. In the 1920s following the establishment of the Moose Factory Island reserve, Federal government agencies overtook the HBC as the main administrative unit at Moose Factory, taking responsibility for education, health and welfare. The Department of Indian Affairs also set up its regional office on the Island. For the most part, Provincial government offices were located across the river, in Moosonee.

! **Evidence of Enforcement of Law and Government Policy**

- < The Hudson's Bay Company was the first European institution to exercise criminal jurisdiction in the James Bay territory. However, the Company did so only in regards to criminal matters that involved their property or personnel. The earliest recorded incident of criminal justice in the Moose Factory region pertains to the Hannah Bay massacre in 1832, when 10 people were murdered by a Cree man and his sons. The HBC undertook what it believed was its right to exercise an "act of justice" by searching out and executing the perpetrators. In 1890, E.B. Borron referred to the Hannah Bay incident as an example of early "Crime and the Administration of Justice" in the James Bay territory.
- < The first official census in the James Bay region was conducted in 1881. A total population of 494 "Indian" and European (eg., "Scotch") persons were enumerated at Moose Factory. An analysis of the "Country/Province" and "Origin" identifiers used in the 1881 Census indicates that 68 individuals were of mixed-ancestry.
- < In 1883 Ontario appointed HBC officers as provincial justices of the peace; Chief Factor James Cotter was the first magistrate at Moose Factory. William Broughton, who was appointed justice of the peace at Fort Albany in 1883, later became Chief Factor at Moose from 1892-1902.

- < The earliest record of state policing in the region is dated to 1925 when the RCMP established a detachment at Moose Factory, staffed by one constable and administered from Toronto. In 1929, a special constable was added to the force. In 1930, the majority of the RCMP's patrol work, which was done "in company with the local Indian agent" was "chiefly concerned with the condition of the Indians."

! Evidence of Treaty-making (Treaty No. 9)

- < Historians agree that two interrelated factors contributed to the drafting and negotiation of Treaty No. 9. First, 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 asked to enter into treaty relations with the Dominion government. Second, both the Federal and Provincial governments recognized a need to conclude a treaty in northern Ontario as economic development initiatives, principally railway construction, were being planned and implemented.
- < The aftermath of the *St. Catherine's Milling* decision in 1888, legislation in 1891 followed by Orders-in-Council in 1894 established an agreement between the Dominion and Ontario stipulating that the negotiation of any new treaties within provincial boundaries would require the concurrence of the Ontario government. The Treaty No. 9 Commission included two representatives of the Dominion (Samuel Stewart and Duncan Campbell Scott) and one representative of Ontario (Daniel G. MacMartin). Stewart authored the official 1905 volume of the Treaty No. 9 report.
- < The *James Bay Treaty - Treaty No.9* was signed by the Moose Cree leaders on August 9, 1905. An Order in Council dated February 13, 1907 approved the recommendation to ratify the James Bay Treaty No.9 and approve and confirm the listed reserves. Two reserves were listed for the Moose Cree, as follows: 1) "Moose Factory an area of 64 square miles" and; 2) "Moose Factory Crees at Chapleau 160 acres."
- < Stewart's diary makes reference to two mixed-ancestry men within the context of the Treaty negotiation: John George Mowat and George McLeod. Both men and their families are enumerated as "Métis Ecossaie" in the 1901 Census. J.G. Mowat signed the Treaty No.9 document as a witness, and also added a post-script to the 1905 "half breed" petition. George McLeod was the interpreter for the Treaty meeting on the morning of August 9, 1905, and was one of the five signatories to the "half breed petition."
- < A petition for scrip, signed by five "half breeds" from Moose Factory, was made

to the “Government of Ontario” in the autumn of 1905. This petition represents the first direct instance of self-ascribed mixed-ancestry identity distinct from European or Cree identities. Documentation from November 1905 explains that “they were refused treaty by the Commissioners on the ground that they were not living the Indian mode of life.” This implies that mixed-ancestry families presented themselves for inclusion within the treaty, but were ascribed an identity other than “Indian.”

- < In 1906 Ontario offered to address the “claims of certain half-breeds at Moose Factory” by allowing each family 160 acres of land reserving minerals; to be selected in the District in which they at present reside, such selection not to interfere with Hudson’s Bay posts, or Indian Reserves, or lands to be required for railway purposes or for town sites as it may be some time before the district in question is surveyed. No evidence was found to indicate if the offer was implemented, or why it was not acted upon.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents detailed historical evidence and ethnohistorical analyses on the subject of mixed-ancestry populations in the James Bay region, with specific focus on Moose Factory, Ontario. A map of the study area is presented on the frontispiece to this report.

This chapter outlines the project objectives, details the research methodology in meeting these objectives, and discusses the main methodological issues related to the identification of mixed-ancestry populations in the historical record.

1.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Primary and secondary sources are examined in order to address research questions specific to the possible ethnogenesis of an historic mixed-ancestry community, and “effective European control” including also such control by Canadians, in the study area. This project has two fundamental research objectives:

- ! To identify, chart and date the ethnogenesis of any mixed European-Indian/Inuit population in the James Bay / Moose Factory region, describing and documenting distinctive cultural practices, customs or traditions of the mixed European-Indian/Inuit population in the James Bay / Moose Factory region, particularly as these relate to the identity of mixed-ancestry peoples as distinct from European or Indian/Inuit groups;
- ! To describe and document indicators of when “effective European control” in the area might have been established.

These objectives have been operationalized through a search of approximately 130 archival document files (indexed in Appendix A), for the following types of historical evidence:

- ! **Ethnogenesis**
 - < Evidence of miscegenation and mixed marriages in the study area;
 - < Evidence of a culture distinct from local Cree or Inuit and local European culture;
 - < Evidence of people occupying a geographic area, economic role and/or social niche apart from local Cree, Inuit or Europeans; and,
 - < Evidence in the historic record of a recognized local group labelled as “Métis” or a similar label of ethnicity.

! “Effective European Control”

- < Evidence of permanent settlement by those of European ancestry and identification in the study area;
- < Evidence of the establishment of local French, British or Canadian government, and;
- < Evidence of the enforcement of laws or government policy upon Indian or Inuit peoples in the study area;
- < Evidence of finalized treaties or issuance of scrip.

The organization of this report follows the general outline of research questions and topics listed above. Chapter 2 provides a brief chronological overview of the history of the James Bay Cree, the fur trade history at Moose Factory, and the political history leading up to Treaty No.9. This chapter also presents a demographic profile of the region from 1803 to 1901, and introduces the “Mixed-Ancestry Database” compiled for this project (Appendix B).

Chapters 3 and 4 present the primary (archival) historical documentation collected and reviewed for this project. Chapter 3 presents evidence relevant to the issue of ethnogenesis, and Chapter 4 documents the evidence related to issues of “effective European control” in the region. Both of these chapters are organized according to topics generated by the nature and substance of the data, and in terms of key events and social phenomena unique to the history of Moose Factory. While each topic is generally addressed chronologically, the chapters as a whole follow a topical, rather than a chronological format.

Chapter 5 of this report, provides interpretations of the historical evidence according to the eight topics listed above. Footnoted within the discussion of these broader issues are references to specific questions posed by Justice Canada in the list of “Expanded Research Questions” (September 10, 2004; see Appendix C).

1.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research presented in this report relies mainly on primary (archival) documentation, supplemented by data and interpretations offered by other historians only where necessary. The approach to documenting an historic mixed-ancestry population is taken from experience by PRAXIS Research Associates in conducting similar types of projects relevant to “historic métis communities” in Ontario, from a recent publication by Reimer and Chartrand (authors of this report), and from the seminal work of fur trade historians such as Jennifer Brown, Jacqueline Peterson, Carol Judd, Sylvia Van Kirk, Olive Dickason, John Long, and Harriet Gorham (see “Secondary Sources”).

The time and scope of the project did not allow an exhaustive search and review of all of archival document collections potentially relevant to a post with the prominence and longevity of Moose Factory (see Chapter 6, “Recommendations for Future Research”). Nevertheless, document collection was systematic and focussed on what is determined to hold the key historical evidence relevant to mixed-ancestry ethnogenesis in the west James Bay region.* The various types of archival collections reviewed in the course of research for this project are briefly described in the sections following. Detailed indices of primary documents cited are provided in Appendix A, organized into five document sets. Primary document citations in the report are identified by document numbers assigned to each (listed in Indices A to E).

1.2.1 Archival Document Collections

Archival data collection was conducted at the following institutions:

- ! National Archives of Canada (NAC): Ottawa
- ! National Library of Canada (NLC): Ottawa
- ! Hudson’s Bay Company Archives (HBCA): Ottawa (available at NAC)
- ! Archives of Ontario (AO): Toronto
- ! General Synod Archives (GSA): Toronto
- ! Queen’s University Archives (QUA): Kingston

A brief overview of the primary document collections reviewed for this project is provided below.

- ! **Fur Trade Records** (HBCA) [Document Indices A, B, C]
 - < Moose Factory Post Journals [Document Index A]: Journals were sampled at 10-year intervals for the period 1730-1850, and 5-year intervals for the period 1850 - 1900. However, most journals dated during the 1870s through to the 1890s consist mainly of weather reports and contain no data relevant to the project objectives. In addition to a systematic sample review of post journal entries cited in secondary sources and noted as relevant to mixed-ancestry life at Moose Factory were also collected.
 - < Moose Factory Lists of Servants and Abstracts of Servants Accounts [Document Index B]: These records were sampled at approximate 5-10 year intervals, for the years 1805-1890. Lists and Abstracts document both the identity and the number of mixed-ancestry servants, as well as overall post populations. These records were key to the compilation of the “Mixed-Ancestry Database” (Appendix B).

* Public History Inc. (PHI) was sub-contracted to review archival records and to collect relevant documentation, under the guidance of PRAXIS Research Associates. We wish to acknowledge the excellent work performed by PHI with respect to file review, data collection, transcription, database compilation and indexing.

- < Moose Factory Reports on District [Document Index C]: All 34 Reports on District available for Moose Factory (1814-1829, 1885-1901) were reviewed. These Reports provide general descriptions of post activity over the previous outfit (HBC fiscal year), including narratives about the Indian population and character notes on each post employee. Several reports also provide demographic and census information.
- < Correspondence, Minutes of Council and London Office Records [Document Index C]: Time did not allow for a systematic review of these records. However, several key documents were identified in the course of secondary source reviews, and these have been incorporated into the analysis where relevant.

! **Mission Records** [Document Index D]

- < Jesuit Relations: These document Albnel's first journey to the James Bay region in 1672 and his contact with the Moose River Cree.
- < Anglican Mission Records (AO/GSA): Baptism, Marriage and death records for Moose Factory, dating from 1817-1908. The Journal of Rev. John Horden (1851-1857) is also contained in this set of records.

! **Census Records** (NAC) [Document Index E]

- < 1881 Census, "Eastern Rupert's Land - NWT": The 1881 Census enumerates age, country/province of birth, origin (eg., "Indian" or "Scotch") and occupation for each individual at Moose Factory. Triangulation with HBCA Abstracts of Servants Accounts for the same year allowed for the positive identification of mixed-ancestry individuals and families, and allowed a comparison of population segments ("homeguard" Cree, mixed-ancestry and European) at Moose Factory during this time.
- < 1901 Census "Unorganized Territory" - Pontiac (District 180): The 1901 Census provides detailed enumerations of the Moose Factory population – particularly the mixed-ancestry population – immediately prior to Treaty No.9. Enumerators were instructed to code individuals according to "Colour" and ethnic or racial "Origin," including "Breeds," the term used for persons of mixed-ancestry. Although Moose Factory was in the Nipissing District of Ontario at the time, an enumerator from Quebec took the Census (recorded in French).

! **Treaty 9 Records** (NAC; AO; QUA) [Document Index E]

- < Treaty No. 9 Correspondence (NAC): Pre-treaty correspondence files contain

population information and discussions between the Dominion and Ontario regarding “half breed” admission into the Treaty. Some survey records are also contained in correspondence files.

- < Diaries of Treaty 9 Commissioners (NAC; QUA): The diaries of Treaty No. 9 Dominion Commissioners Samuel Stewart and Duncan Campbell Scott and Ontario Commissioner Daniel G. MacMartin were reviewed for those dates when the Commission was at Moose Factory (August 9-12, 1905).
- < Treaty No.9, The James Bay Treaty (NAC): Original and typescript copies of the Treaty list the date and signatures of the Commissioners, Cree Signatories and witnesses to the Treaty in 1905.
- < Petition of Certain Half-Breeds of Moose Factory, 1905 (NAC/AO): Of greatest significance in the collection is the file: “Petition of Certain Half-Breeds of Moose Factory for Scrip and/or Consideration and Applications to be placed on the Paylists, 1905-1910.”
- < MNR Indian Land Files (ONAS/AO): Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Indian Land Files were reviewed for relevant information on Treaty No.9 negotiations, the Moose Factory Half-Breed Petition in 1905, E.B. Borron’s 1890 report recommending that a treaty be concluded in Ontario’s north, and survey records.

! **National Library** (*Sessional Papers*) [Document Index E]

- < RCMP Annual Reports: These were reviewed for the years 1925-1930, and provide information on the first police detachments at Moose Factory.
- < Indian Affairs Annual Reports: These were reviewed, but did not contain relevant information on the mixed-ancestry population in the Moose River region in the post-Treaty period.

! **Published Primary Records**

- < The Hudson’s Bay Record Society and the Champlain Society have published several volumes of historical records relevant to this project, including the entire HBC post journal for 1783-84, as well as correspondence records and journals of, for example, Philip Turnor. The editors’ footnotes and introductions to these volumes provide a wealth of information about Moose Factory and individuals who worked there during the 18th and 19th centuries (see “Primary Sources - Published”).

1.2.2 Literature Review

A comprehensive search and review of secondary literature was conducted for material relevant to mixed-ancestry populations in the James Bay region. The secondary literature can be generally categorized according to two main topics:

- Cultural History: Publications and reports relevant to the fur trade and mission history of Moose Factory and/or James Bay;
- Political History: Publications and reports relevant to the transfer of Rupert's Land to Canada in 1870 and to the impetus, negotiation and aftermath of Treaty No.9 in the early 20th century, especially as these events affected populations living in Moose Factory and James Bay regions.

Relatively few publications are directly relevant to the research objectives of this project. However, several key publications were essential to the identification of relevant primary documentary sources. Sources relevant to general issues of ethnogenesis among mixed-ancestry peoples in North America were also reviewed, as listed in the "Sources Consulted" bibliography at the end of this report.

1.3 THE MOOSE FACTORY MIXED-ANCESTRY DATABASE

Appendix B is a spreadsheet (MS Excel®) containing the key information produced from a total of 37 archival documents collected in the course of this project. The purpose of the data base is to positively identify mixed-ancestry individuals who at any time resided at Moose Factory, and to trace them and their families over a 100 year period. The database begins in 1803, the earliest date at which HBC Lists of Servants are available. The database ends with the list of "half breeds of Moose Factory" who signed the 1905 petition.

The majority of documents used in this database are HBC Moose Factory Lists of Servants and Abstracts of Servants Accounts. As well, several HBC District Reports which list and identify servants and "Apprentice Boys" are also included in the database. Both the 1881 Census and 1901 Census are also accounted for. Finally, Anglican Church marriage records are incorporated into the database as well.

By compiling the data from these records in a single database, it is possible to triangulate a single identifier from one source with different identifiers from other sources. It allows for greater certainty in positively identifying mixed-ancestry individuals, the determination of their approximate or exact date of birth, length of residence at Moose Factory or mobility among the various posts in the district, and relationships between mixed-ancestry individuals.

The results of this database with respect to tracing generations of mixed-ancestry families

are specifically discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.3 of this report. However, the database is referred to throughout other sections of the report.

1.4 METHODOLOGICAL NOTE: INDICATORS OF MIXED-ANCESTRY IN THE HISTORICAL RECORD

The neutral term “mixed-ancestry” is used here to denote individuals and families who, in the historical record, are indicated to be of both European and Indian or Inuit descent. The English, Scottish or other European identity of traders is most readily confirmed in HBC “Lists of Servants” and “Abstracts of Servants’ Accounts.” These records list each employee’s “Parish” of origin, such as Orkneymen from “Stromness” or “Birsay,” Englishmen from “St. Martin in the fields” and Scandinavians from “Norway.”¹ In post journals, European traders were seldom identified as such, although occasional references are made to “Englishmen” or “the English.”²

References to “Indians” or Cree are generally found in the post journals and district reports and fall into two distinct groups. The “home Indians,” “homeguards,” “Factory Indians” or “Moose Indians” were Cree who lived near the Factory in spring, summer and autumn and who hunted and fished for to help provision the post, also working as canoe-men, guides, gardeners and general manual labourers. Cree who lived further inland from James Bay and who maintained a more distant and strictly trading relationship with Moose Factory were referred to as the “upland Indians,” “uplanders” or “inlanders.”³ So, for example, the post journal entry for April 21, 1794 states that: “Four Canoes of Homeguards & two of Uplanders came in.”⁴

Most scholars agree that by the late 18th to early 19th century, a separate identity was being ascribed to mixed-ancestry persons and families.⁵ Jacqueline Peterson asserts that the

¹ For example, Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1 (“Allen Clousten - Stromness”; “John Flett - Birsay”); Document B-10: HBCA B.135/g/1 (“Richard Hardisty - St. Martin in the fields”; “Erland Erlandson - Norway”).

² For example, Document A-9: Rich, E.E., *Moose Fort Journals 1783-85* (London: The Hudson’s Bay Record Society, 1954), 41,44.

³ Bishop, Charles A. “The First Century: Adaptive Changes among the Western James Bay Cree between the Early Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries.” In: *The Subarctic Fur Trade: Native Social and Economic Adaptations*, ed. S. Krech, III (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1984), 35, 37; Judd, Carol M. “Sakie, Esquawenoe, and the Foundation of a Dual-Native Tradition at Moose Factory.” In: *The Subarctic Fur Trade: Native Social and Economic Adaptations*, ed. S. Krech, III (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984); Judd, Carol M., “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory, 1730-1981: A Socio-Economic Study,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 6, no.2 (1982), 66; Morantz, Toby. “The Fur Trade and the Cree of James Bay.” In: *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference*, eds. C.M. Judd and A.J. Ray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 46-47. Glover, Richard. “Introduction.” *Letters from Hudson’s Bay, 1703-40*, ed. K.G. Davies (London: Hudson’s Bay Record Society, 1965).

⁴ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fo.18.

⁵ For a detailed examination of mixed-ancestry ‘other-ascription’ and ‘self-ascription’ in fur trade records for

distinctiveness of mixed-ancestry peoples in the Great Lakes area was fully apparent to outsiders by the early decades of the 1800s when racial terms began to be used to classify Indians separately from “halfbreeds” or “métis.”⁶ Jennifer Brown’s study of the histories of HBC offspring in northern Ontario suggest that an important shift away from the simple dichotomy of choice between English and Indian identity began to occur as early as the 1780s and 1790s. An occupational class of company sons of mixed descent emerged who were described neither as English nor Scottish, nor as “home Indians”, but rather as “natives of Hudson’s Bay.”⁷ Carol Judd points out that “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. It is generally agreed that in HBC records, parish of origin designations such as “Native,” “Hudson’s Bay” or “Indian Country” are indications of mixed-ancestry for two reasons: 1) in the fur trade record these are distinct from the designation of “Indian,” and; 2) they identify persons with European names born and/or raised in fur trade country at a time when only women of Indian ancestry were present in the region.⁸ It is important to note that in other types of records – government reports such as that by E.B. Borron in 1890, for example – the term “natives” generally refers to the Cree population of the area.⁹

In the Moose Factory fur trade records, the earliest use of the term “Native” as a reference to mixed-ancestry is found in the 1803 “List of Servants” where Joseph Turnor and Thomas

Ontario, see Reimer, Gwen and JP Chartrand. “Documenting Historic Métis in Ontario.” *Ethnohistory* 51, no.3 (2004), 567-607; See also: Gorham, Harriet. “Families of Mixed Descent in the Western Great Lakes Region.” In: *Native People, Native Lands: Canadian Indians, Inuit and Metis*, ed. Bruce Alden Cox (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1987), and; Payment, Diane P. “Plains Métis.” In: *Plains, Volume 13, Part 1, Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. R.J. DeMallie (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), 675-676.

⁶ Peterson, Jacqueline. “Many Roads to Red River: Métis Genesis in the Great Lakes Region, 1680-1815.” In: *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Métis in North America*, eds. J. Peterson and J.S.H. Brown (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1985), 39. Note: The term “half breed” is presented in various forms, as a single term (“halfbreed”), hyphenated (“half-breed”) and two words (“half breed”). In some historical records, there is capitalization of either “Half” or “Breed” or both. The forms used in this report match those found in the primary record cited or discussed (in quotations).

⁷ Brown, Jennifer S.H. “Linguistic Solitudes and Changing Social Categories.” In: *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference*, eds. Carol M. Judd and Arthur J. Ray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980):159; cf. Payment, “Plains Métis”, 666.

⁸ Judd, Carol M. “‘Mixt Bands of Many Nations’:1821-70.” In: *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference*, eds. Carol M. Judd and Arthur J. Ray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 128; cf. Brown, “Linguistic Solitudes”, 152; Long, John S. “Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families: Northeastern Ontario’s Halfbreeds, Indians, Petitioners and Métis.” In: *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Metis in North America*, eds. J. Peterson and J.S.H. Brown (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1985), 141.

⁹ Document E-11: Borron, E.B. “Report on the Basin of Moose River and Adjacent Country belonging to the Province of Ontario.” *Ontario Sessional Papers* No.87 (1890), 82.

Richards, Jr. are identified as from the parish of “Hudson’s Bay” and along with Thomas Knight and William McDonald are described as “native Youths.”¹⁰ The following year, Charles Beads is described as “one of our faithful natives” and his parish is identified as “Hudson’s Bay.”¹¹ Later records often provide more detail in identifying parish, distinguishing for instance whether Hudson’s Bay-born servants were from Moose or Albany.¹²

The term “halfbreed” was first used by North West Company (NWC) Canadians who apparently recognized mixed-ancestry individuals as members of a distinct social and racial category in the first decades of the 1800s.¹³ Moose Factory fur trade records rarely employ the term “halfbreed.”¹⁴ The earliest instance of this term occurs in Chief Factor Thomas Vincent’s District Report for 1822-23, in which George Moore, Jr., Thomas Richards, and William Saunderson are each identified as “halfbreed.”¹⁵ In 1823-24, Charles Beads is listed as a “halfbreed, an excellent canoe man & winter traveller.”¹⁶ That Thomas Richards and Charles Beads were identified as “Native” in 1803-04, and as “halfbreeds” in 1822-24 corroborates the notion that these terms are synonymous and that both are valid as indicators of mixed-ancestry at Moose Factory.

Additional forms of “other ascription” of mixed-ancestry youth at Moose Factory include “Apprentice Boys” and “Factory Lads.” In the 1826-27 District Report, Alexander Christie listed five “Apprentice Boys (Natives of the Country) who receive clothing and provisions”, including James Beads, John Brown, John Flett, Peter Saunders, and Philip Turner.¹⁷ Post journal entries

¹⁰ Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1, fos.2d-3.

¹¹ Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2, fos.0d-1.

¹² See for example, Document B-10: HBCA B.135/g/1 (“Henry Lawson - Moose H. Bay”; “John Linklater - Albany H. Bay”).

¹³ Gorham, “Families of Mixed Descent in the Western Great Lakes Region”, 40-41.

¹⁴ Variants of the term “half-breed” found in Moose Factory journals, correspondence and reports from 1822 through to 1900 include: “halfbreed” and “halfbreeds” in the 1822-23 District Report (Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fos.5d,6d.); “Half Breed Native” in the 1840-41 Post Journal (Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.14); “half breeds” and “natives of the country” in John Horden’s Journal for 1851 (Document D-7: GSA MF 78-13 (A88-89), 19 November & 23 December 1851.); “half caste” in a letter from George Simpson to Horden in 1854 (Document D-8: GSA MF 78-13 (A88-89), 21 July 1854.); “half-castes,” “Scotch half-breeds” and “half-breed women” in Borron 1890, quoting from his 1883 and 1884 reports (Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 84-85, 92-93), and; “halfbreed” in the 1900 Moose Factory Post Journal (Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fos.75d-76).

¹⁵ Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fos.5d-6.

¹⁶ Document C-7: HBCA B.135/e/12, fo.3d.

¹⁷ Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fo.1d.

referring to “the Boys” appear at least as early as 1793.¹⁸ As will be discussed further in connection with community life at Moose Factory, the increasing frequency of references to “the Boys” indicate that by 1800 they were an integral segment of the post population.¹⁹ The majority of post journal references to “the Boys” are generic, and except for records such as the 1826-27 District Report cited above, these boys are usually not named. However, usage of the phrase “the Boys” is consistent throughout the HBC records, implying a particular group of locally resident youth who belonged to the post. As will be discussed below, post journals also make similar references to “the women” who belonged to the post community. When named, the boys are identified as the sons of HBC employees at Moose Factory or posts within the Moose Factory district. All evidence points to “the Boys” as a locally distinct group of mixed-ancestry youth in the earliest stage of their fur trade careers.

In contrast to other-ascription, few examples of individuals identifying themselves as mixed-ancestry are evident in the historical record for Moose Factory. The two main sources for such evidence of self-ascription are: 1) census records, particularly the 1901 Census, and; 2) petitions which have survived within government document groups.

Both 1881 and 1901 Census records are valuable tools for the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory. In 1901 in particular, the government of Canada appeared interested in issues related to immigration and to racial and ethnic demographics across the country. The fact that the 1901 Census included “Breed” or “Métis” origins reflects an official acknowledgement that such mixed populations existed in Canada. Enumerators were given detailed instructions on how to code families of all ethnicities (according to colour, and to racial or tribal origin). A separate code was designated for persons of mixed European/Cree parentage. This code “B” (“Breeds”) or “M” (Métis) was further categorized to differentiate between for instance, French Breed (“FB” [MF - Métis Francais]), English Breed (“EB” [MA - Métis Anglais]), and Scotch Breed (“SB” [ME - Métis Ecossaise]). Enumerators were also instructed to indicate the tribal origin of a “Breed’s” Indian descent – for example “Cree FB” – but such exacting codes were seldom employed.²⁰

The 1901 Census records are significant in that they are presumably based on individuals’ self-identification. That is, individuals with the code “ME” are presumed to have told the enumerator that they were of mixed Scottish and Indian origin. Enumeration instructions stated that the “heads of families, households and institutions are required to furnish the enumerator

¹⁸ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.2,3d,4d.

¹⁹ A review of the complete post journal for 1799-1800 reveals over 80 references to “the Boys” engaged in a variety of provisioning and other manual labour activities for the post (Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87).

²⁰ Canada. *Report of the Fourth Census of Canada 1901: Volume I: Population* (Ottawa: King’s Printer, 1902), xviii.

with all particulars regarding every person in the family, household or institution.”²¹ 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, but there is some suggestion that feedback between other- and self-ascription occurred. Enumerator inconsistency supports this suggestion, as evident in the Quebec enumerations at Moose Factory where children of mixed-ancestry families are coded in two different, and unexplained methods. In some families the children of mixed-ancestry parents are also coded as “MA” or “ME” while at other times such children are coded as “R” (Rouge). For example, the children of William Millor (ME) and his wife Willimina (ME) are both coded as “ME.” However, in the enumeration of the family immediately following, the three children of Andrew Morrison (ME) and his wife Emilie (ME) are coded as “R.”²²

In the 1881 Census, the enumerator (possibly the HBC Chief Factor James Cotter) identified men, women and children according to their fathers’ origin.²³ Mixed-ancestry children born to a European father and Indian mother retained their father’s “Origin.” For example, the six children of Norman McDonald (Country/Province: Scotland; Origin: Scotch) and Eliza (Country/Province: N.W.; Origin: Indian) are enumerated as: Country/Province: N.W.; Origin: Scotch.²⁴ Hence, it can be assumed that individuals are most likely mixed-ancestry if their “Country/Province” is listed as “NW” (Northwest), their “Origin” is identified as “Scotch,” “Irish,” “English,” or “Norwegian” and they belong to families where one parent was born in the North West Territories or is identified as “Indian.” At this time, only two women at Moose Factory appear to have been of purely European descent: Elizabeth Morrison was an Irish woman from Ireland (married to Thomas Morrison the post Foreman identified as “Native” in HBC records, i.e. mixed-ancestry), and Frances Cotter who was “Scotch” from Ontario, the wife of Chief Factor James L. Cotter.²⁵

Finally, petitions and letters also prove useful in analysing mixed-ancestry self-ascription. In the Moose Factory historical record, the key document indicating mixed-ancestry self-ascription is the petition signed by five “half breeds of Moose Factory” (representing 25-30

²¹ Canada *Report of the Fourth Census of Canada 1901*, xviii, no.43.

²² Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554), 19 [Household #124 and #125].

²³ E.B. Borron stated in his report on Moose River that the “Dominion census of 1881 was obtained by enumerating all the families which traded at each of the Hudson’s Bay Company’s posts...” (Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River”, 82-83).

²⁴ Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel C-13286).

²⁵ Document B-18: HBCA B.135/g/63.

people) and submitted to the Treaty 9 Commissioners in 1905.²⁶ This petition and its significance with respect to mixed-ancestry ethnogenesis is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4 of this report.

²⁶ Document E-25: ONAS MNR Land File 186,220; Document E-26: NAC RG10, Volume 3093, File: 289,300.

2. HISTORY AND DEMOGRAPHY OF MOOSE FACTORY ENVIRONS

2.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF MOOSE FACTORY

This brief chronological outline of Moose Factory provides a broad historical context for the more detailed descriptions and analyses that follow in the remainder of the report. As the discussion below is intended as a preliminary overview, it relies on secondary sources, supported with a few examples from primary documents.

The Aboriginal people occupying the Moose River region (see frontispiece) on the west coast of James Bay at the time of European contact were first known by variants of the term “Monsonis,” later called the “Moose Factory Cree” or “Moose Cree.” The Moose Cree were a band of “Swampy Cree” or “West Main Cree” classified as such in the *Handbook of North American Indians* to distinguish them from the Cree who lived on the east coast of James and Hudson’s Bay.²⁷ E.B. Borron observed in 1880 that:

The Indians on or near the Coast of James’ Bay belong to the Swampy Cree tribe, and speak a dialect of the Cree languages.²⁸

Historical evidence indicates that Europeans made first direct contact with James Bay Cree when Henry Hudson traded with an Indian in the region during his voyage in 1610-1611. From the 1640s onward, French traders and missionaries gained considerable indirect knowledge of the James Bay Cree from Algonquian middlemen. Bishop notes, for example, that *Jesuit Relations* dated in the 1640s and 1650s describe “Kilistinons” (Cree) who “dwell on the rivers of the north sea” (James Bay).²⁹

Certainly by the 1670s several French explorers, traders and Jesuit missionaries had visited the southern James Bay region. However, little cultural information about Moose Cree specifically or West Main Cree generally is available from those early years. Prior to the fur

²⁷ Honigmann, J.J. “West Main Cree.” In: *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 6 - Subarctic*, ed. J. Helm (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1981), 217. It should be noted that on occasion, Moose Factory post journals document the presence of Inuit, but such instances appear to have been sporadic and temporary, and by one or two individuals. In the winter of 1830, for example, there were two “Esquimaux who reside in the Kitchen” (Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fos.21d,25). However, Indian Affairs correspondence dated in 1911 reported “25 Eskimos living on Charlton Island [near Moose Factory], who are practically Indians, speaking the Cree language and living the same life” (Document E-40: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 1 March 1911).

²⁸ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River”, 75.

²⁹ Bishop, Charles A. “Ojibwa, Cree and the Hudson's Bay Company in Northern Ontario: Culture and Conflict in the Eighteenth Century.” In: *Western Canada: Past and Present*, ed. A.W. Rasporich (Calgary: McClelland and Stewart West, 1975), 25. Bishop cites *Jesuit Relations*: Vol.18, 229; Vol.44, 325; Vol.46, 249.

trade, historians and anthropologists surmise that Cree lived by hunting, trapping and fishing according to an established seasonal cycle, living in semi-permanent bark and skin lodges, and travelling by canoe and larger boats when open water allowed, and by snowshoe and toboggan in winter months (see Figure 1).³⁰

Figure 1
Annual Subsistence Cycle of the James Bay Cree

Source: Flannery, *Ellen Smallboy*, xiv.

Traditionally, Moose Cree households consisted of two related families (eg, headed by brothers or men married to sisters), or larger extended family units. Bands were composed of several extended families, and band leadership was spread among men with expertise in various areas of knowledge and skill.³¹ Borron remarked upon Cree social organization in his 1880 report:

³⁰ Flannery, Regina. *Ellen Smallboy: Glimpses of a Cree Woman's Life* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), xiii-xv; Honigmann, "West Main Cree."; Bishop, "Ojibwa, Cree and the Hudson's Bay Company in Northern Ontario."

³¹ Honigmann, "West Main Cree," 219-221.

I am informed that the Indians in the greater portion of this territory are not divided into bands, nor have they any chiefs. Family ties would appear to form the principal, if not only bond or union.³²

Missionaries first arrived in the west James Bay area in 1672 when Jesuit Charles Albanel travelled to “Hutson’s bay” [sic] together with French trader and explorer Denis de St. Talon.³³ In 1686 several Jesuits established a small mission at the mouth of the Albany River, leaving again in 1693. Protestant (Wesleyan) missionaries later attached themselves to the Moose Factory post, where church marriages, baptisms and burials were performed. Roman Catholic Oblates began mission activity at Moose Factory in 1847.³⁴

The fur trade in the west James Bay area began in 1673 when Moose Factory was established by the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), followed shortly by York Factory in 1679. In 1686 Moose Factory was captured by the French, returned to British ownership in 1713, and a new fort was built by the HBC in 1730.³⁵ After 1730, Moose Factory grew in importance and in 1810 became the headquarters for the newly formed Southern Department. In 1821 when the HBC and NWC merged under the British company, Moose was confirmed as the port of entry for the Southern Department and seat of its governor.³⁶ In all, Moose Factory remained in continuous operation for over 200 years.

By the late 1770s, Canadian-based fur trade companies, as well as French and early British “Pedlars” (free traders) were operating directly in the interior region around Lake Abitibi, forcing the Hudson’s Bay Company to compete by expanding inland from Moose Factory.³⁷ Although the “Pedlars” trade activity was independent and unorganized, they posed serious competition to the HBC.³⁸ In response, HBC headquarters in London sent a surveyor to scout for

³² Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 77.

³³ Document D-1: *Jesuit Relations* Vol.56:185-187; cf.14-15,203,303.

³⁴ Honigmann, “West Main Cree,” 218; Long, John S. “The Reverend George Barnley and the James Bay Cree. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 6, no.2 (1986).

³⁵ Rich, E.E. *Hudson's Bay Company 1670-1870*. Vol. 1: 1670-1763 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart,1960), 61-62, 80-1; Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 66.

³⁶ Glover, “Introduction” to *Letters from Hudson’s Bay*, xxv-xxvi; Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 75.

³⁷ Judd, “Mixt Bands of Many Nations,” 129; Ray, Arthur J. “The Hudson’s Bay Company and Native People.” In: *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol.4: History of Indian-White Relations*, ed. W.E. Washburn (Washington: Smithsonian Institution,1988), 342.

³⁸ Voorhis, Ernest. *Historic Forts and Trading Posts of the French Regime and of English Fur Trading Companies* (Ottawa: Department of the Interior, 1930), 21.

potential post locations in the interior.³⁹ According to Voorhis, the North West Fur Trading Company (NWC) 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.⁴⁰ By 1790 the main players in the fur trade rivalry in the inland region were the North West Company's Timiskaming posts and the Hudson's Bay Company inland posts ruled by the Council at Moose Factory.⁴¹ Between 1784 and 1800, inland posts were established by both companies at Frederick House Lake, Kinogamissi Lake, Lake Abitibi, Lake Matawagamingue, and Groundhog Lake (Flying Post). This rivalry existed continuously and intensively until the coalition of the Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Company in 1821.⁴² From 1821 onward, fur trading in Moose Factory district remained relatively stable under the Hudson's Bay Company administration. According to Mitchell and Long, this stability was shaken somewhat in the 1850s and 1860s with a new influx of independent traders from Canada (eg., Penetanguishene), and the subsequent establishment of additional fur trade posts inland at New Post and Matachewan.⁴³

Glover notes that in the early period, most of the hunting for the fort was done by "homeguard" Cree, from whom European traders quickly learned the necessary skills to hunt for themselves.⁴⁴ The establishment of inland posts brought with it a new role for the "homeguard" Cree. Beginning in 1784, Cree men and women were hired to travel with HBC traders and remain with them to assist in the support of these isolated posts:

1784 June 14th - ...dispatch'd Mr. Turnor [and 11 men]... with 7 Indian men and 6 Women, in two Batteaux and 4 large Canoes and 4 small do. for Abbitiby to establish a settlement there [Frederick House]; (4 men to return after they have assisted up with the goods).⁴⁵

In subsequent years, Cree families assisted in canoeing cargo to maintain the inland posts:

³⁹ The HBC surveyor was Philip Turnor. Later HBC records show that Turnor sired a well-documented country family connected with Moose Factory for several generations. See Brown, Jennifer S.H. *Strangers in Blood: Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1980), 82.

⁴⁰ Voorhis, *Historic Forts and Trading Posts*, 19.

⁴¹ Mitchell, Elaine A. *Fort Timiskaming and the Fur Trade* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 37.

⁴² Voorhis, *Historic Forts and Trading Posts*, 23.

⁴³ Mitchell, *Fort Timiskaming*, 158, 207, 215; Long, "Treaty No.9," 142.

⁴⁴ Glover, "Introduction" to *Letters from Hudson's Bay*, xvii.

⁴⁵ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 52.

1794 June 30th - About 3 PM dispatched Mr. John Mannall, John Slater, Thomas Moore, and Andrew Thompson, and 24 Indians male and female in seven large canoes and one small one loaded with Good, Provisions and stores, for establishing a settlement on Kinnogummesee Lake.

1798 September 29th - ...in the afternoon Mr. G. Gladman, the Carpenter & Rawbone, their wives & two Children set off in a very large Canoe for Micawbanish, at the same time Mr. Mannall, And'rw Thompson, Three Indians & their wives and two Children took their Departure for Kinogummissie in two large Canoes...⁴⁶

Following the HBC/NWC coalition of 1821 and until 1863, furs from the Lake Superior and Lake Huron districts were collected annually at Michipicoten, taken north to Moose Factory and then on to England. Supplies for these districts on the Great Lakes were brought back along the same route.⁴⁷ Occasional entries in Moose Factory post journals allude to this trade route connection with Michipicoten.⁴⁸

Moose Factory's need to engage "homeguard" Cree "for the Transport of Goods" continued throughout the 19th century.⁴⁹ The "equal" relationship that developed between the "white servants and the natives" participating on these journeys was commented on by E.B. Borron in 1882:

The Indians, with their families, generally gather at the posts soon after the ice leaves the rivers, bringing the furs they have succeeded in getting during the winter. Most of the able-bodied men are employed from one to three months during the summer, taking furs to Moose or Albany factories, and bringing back the supplies needed at their own posts. These voyages or trips are usually made in canoes or boats. Sometimes this brigade, as it is called, consists of forty or fifty men. The brigade is accompanied by one or more officers and the white servants, usually Orkneymen, at the posts. The white servants and the natives work together, eat together, and associate together, on equal terms. Even the officers often take part in the conversation, and describe or explain to the Indians, in their

⁴⁶ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fo.24; Document A-14: HBCA B.135/a/86, fo.1; cf. Document A-12: HBCA B.135/a/82, fos.2d,21; Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fo.26d.

⁴⁷ Weiler, John M. "Michipicoten; Hudson's Bay Company Post, 1821-1904" In: *Three Heritage Studies*, ed. David S. Melvin (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1980), 19.

⁴⁸ For example, in 1840 the Sloopmaster at Moose Factory married a woman from Michipicoten (Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.14d).

⁴⁹ Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fo.7.

own language, matters which they would otherwise know nothing at all about.⁵⁰

Because of its location on the Bay, Moose Factory was especially important to the Company as a shipping depot. It was due to the huge man-power required at ship time, that the HBC management at Moose Factory was compelled to support its large population, and to maintain good relations with the “homeguard” Cree. In 1900 a “Report on Transport: James Bay District” provides an explanation of the “large establishment” at Moose Factory in light of its role as the Port of Entry and Supply Depot for Moose, Albany, Rupert’s House, Fort George and Whale River:

The bulk of [the costs] is expended to pay the hired hands, servants and indians [sic] at Moose Factory, the upkeep of which Post on the extensive plan as at present followed is warranted solely on account of this Transport work.... [Because the Moose River is too shallow for a fully loaded supply ship, it must be lightened 20-30 miles away from the Fort]... To complete the work of landing say 600 tons and loading on the usual quota of Returns and ballast in three weeks required the services of 60 men as a minimum, and 3 schooners, 2 scows, and a steam tug. Ordinarily the number of men is from 70 to 80 and other smaller craft are also engaged. Moose had grown to be the settlement it is by a succession of Officers in Charge deeming it necessary, in order to ensure the attendance of this shiptime gang, to keep a permanent staff twice as large as could possibly be justified at any other Season of the year, and to secure the goodwill and services of the Indians at whatever expense, yielding to their every caprice and finding them employment through the summer a work quite unremunerative...⁵¹

Throughout the fur trade period, local Cree trapped furs for the traders. By the mid-1700s, they were accustomed to and partly dependent on fur trade companies’ supply of European goods and over time, some Cree families formed semi-permanent attachments to the post. According to Bishop, Cree who lived along and near the Moose River, and those from within a 150 mile radius of Fort Albany formed the original groups who, after the early 1700s, came to be known as “home Indians” or “homeguards,” providing important provisioning services (eg., goose and deer hunting) for the post, and as noted above, providing valuable assistance at ship time.⁵² As noted above, Cree who lived further inland but who traded at the Factory were known as the “upland Indians,” “uplanders” or “inlanders”. For example, Alexander Christie’s report for 1828-29 differentiates between the “Indians who belong to this place” and “the Indians who occupy the more distant parts of the district”, emphasizing the important role played by the “homeguard” Cree:

⁵⁰ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 82. Borron is quoting from his 1882 report.

⁵¹ Document C-23: HBCA B.135/e/33, 4-7.

⁵² Bishop, “The First Century,” 35, 37.

When the navigation opens they cheerfully agree to leave their lands and work in the boats... leaving their wives and children at fishing stations, who when unsuccessful receive a supply of provisions from the Factory. [...] ...other duties required of them is duly performed until such time as they are sent to attend the Autumn goose hunt for the purpose of procuring provisions for the [service?] of the district, and to lay up as much as possible for the support of themselves and families for the Winter.⁵³

Cree men, women and children were all engaged within the “homeguard” role:

[E]mployment has been provided for the most effective Indians in procuring hay, and other domestic Duty about the Factory, while the others, with the women & children were sent to fishing stations along the Coast.⁵⁴

Throughout the 19th century, the “homeguard” Cree were considered indispensable to the operation of Moose Factory, as stated in the report for 1886:

... it must be borne in mind that we are absolutely dependent on the homeguard Indians for the whole of the summer work. Indians do the voyaging, make the hay, fetch home the rafts of logs, gather ballast for the ship – a very considerable piece of work – load and unload the ship and the country vessels, besides many smaller jobs. Any stoppage therefore arising from discontent or other causes would have serious consequences...⁵⁵

The fur trade records indicate a relatively peaceful and symbiotic relationship between the “homeguard”, the uplanders and the traders, violent incidents such as the murder of two families at the Hannah Bay outpost in 1832 demonstrate that at times, serious tensions existed.⁵⁶ As will be discussed in a later section of this report, the Hannah Bay massacre also marks the first recorded use of British common law in the James Bay region, resulting in the execution of five (Cree) men found guilty of the murders.⁵⁷

⁵³ Document C-11: HBCA B.135/e/21, fos.4-5.

⁵⁴ Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fo.7.

⁵⁵ Document C-19: HBCA B.135/e/25, 2-3.

⁵⁶ In addition to fur trade records reviewed here, see also: Francis, Daniel, and Toby Morantz, *Partners in Furs: A History of the Fur Trade in Eastern James Bay 1600-1870* (Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983), 158-160; Long, “Treaty No.9”; Long, John S. “‘No Basis for Argument’: The Signing of Treaty Nine in Northern Ontario, 1905-1906.” *Native Studies Review* 5, no.2 (1989), 19-54.

⁵⁷ Document A-23: HBCA B.135/a/138, fos. 1-10.

As this report will document, Moose Factory supported a relatively large post population of both European descent (mainly English and Scottish men) and “Indian” descent (“homeguard” Cree men, women and children). In 1890, Borron commented on the mixed-ancestry segment of the Moose Factory population:

Those persons of mixed race or blood in this territory, are the offspring of Indian mothers and English, Scotch or Scandinavian fathers, and subsequent intermarriages.⁵⁸

Increasingly, Moose Factory also employed mixed-ancestry sons and supported mixed-ancestry families. In the historical record, mixed-ancestry individuals and families are commonly distinguished from “Indians” or “Orkneymen” for example, using identifiers such as “Native” (i.e. native of the country, or of Hudson’s Bay) or “half-breed” (see Section 1.2.2).

In 1870 Rupert’s Land was transferred from the Hudson’s Bay Company to Canada, including the James Bay region. However, it was not until 1905 that the Canadian government sent commissioners to treat with the Cree of James Bay, which led eventually to the signing of Treaty No. 9).⁵⁹ At this time, a petition from five “half breeds of Moose Factory” was submitted to the Treaty Commissioners. As these “half breed” families had not been admitted to the Treaty payroll, they formally petitioned to receive either land or scrip.⁶⁰ A reserve for the Cree of Moose Factory was surveyed in 1912.⁶¹ The first RCMP detachment at Moose Factory was established in 1926.⁶²

2.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE, 1700-1901

Table 1 provides a demographic overview of the post complement at Moose Factory or in the region from 1803 to 1891, and the total population enumerated in the 1881 Census and 1901 Census. These figures show that between 1803 and 1891, the proportion of “Native” or mixed-ancestry employees increased from 10% to over 50% of the contracted workforce at the Factory. The Census figures demonstrate that when women and children are included, the

⁵⁸ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 75

⁵⁹ Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Volume 1851, Reel T-9941, http://www.collectionscanada.ca/02/02010504_e.html *Indian Treaties and Surrenders (Nos. 404-539) 1742-1906: Indian Affairs’ Consecutive Number 539 - “James Bay Treaty; Treaty No.9.”*

⁶⁰ Document E-25: ONAS - MNR Land File 186,200; Document E-26: NAC RG10, Volume 3093, Reel C-9667, File: 289,300.

⁶¹ Documents E-41, E-42, E-43: NAC RG10, Volume 3171, Reel C-11334, File: 412,065. *Treaty No. 9 - James Bay Agency - Correspondence Regarding the Survey of the Moose Factory Reserve* (1912).

⁶² Document E-45: RCMP Annual Report (1926), 43, 89.

mixed-ancestry population represented 65% to 84% of the post community in 1881 and 1901 respectively. The following is a detailed examination of these quantitative results, incorporated into a discussion of qualitative demographic information regarding the Moose Factory and western James Bay region.

Bishop states that it is “impossible to know how many Indians may have lived along or near the Moose River” in the early 1700s, but from brief historical descriptions in HBC archives, estimates that the Cree who formed the “homeguard” numbered at least 50 persons.⁶³ In the mid-18th century, the Moose Factory journal stated that 80 Indian “men women and children” came in “in order to hunt for the Factory” (i.e. “homeguard” Cree).⁶⁴

⁶³ Bishop, “The First Century,” 35.

⁶⁴ Document A-4: HBCA B.135/a/20a, fo.20d (March 29, 1750).

**Table 1
Demographic Data for Moose Factory, 1803-1901**

Year	Record Type	Reference	Post Employees (Men) at Moose Factory	Mixed-Ancestry Men #	% of Total
1803	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/1	42 (including inland) ⁶⁵	4-6	9.5-14.3%
1804	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/2	46 (including inland)	14	30.4%
1804	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/3	33 (including inland)	6	18.2%
1806/07	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/4	35 (including inland)	8	22.9%
1807	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/5	71 (including inland)	12	16.9%
1808	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/6	74 (including inland)	13	17.6%
1809	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/7	81 (including inland)	12	14.8%
1810	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/8	40 (including inland)	10	25.0%
1814/15	List of Servants	HBCA B.135/f/9	17	2	11.8%
1821/22	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/1	88 (including inland)	20	22.7%
1824/25	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/6	34	7	20.6%
1829/30	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/11	28	9	32.1%
1834/35	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/18	43	12	27.9%
1839/40	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/23	37	15	40.5%
1844/45	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/28	37	15	40.5%
1849/50	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/33	48	19	39.6%
1854/55	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/38	45	17	37.8%
1860/61	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/43	44	19	43.2%
1865/66	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/48	33	14	42.4%
1869/70	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/52	42	17	40.5%
1874/75	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/57	46	19	41.3%
1879/80	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/62	33	15	45.5%
1880/81	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/63	36	16	44.4%
1884/85	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/67	39	17	43.6%
1891/92	Abstracts/Servants	HBCA B.135/g/74	38	20	52.6%
			Total Population	Mixed-Ancestry	
1881	1881 Census	NAC Reel C-13286	494 (104 + 390 "Indians")	68	
1901	1901 Census	NAC Reel T-6554	575 (129 + 446 "Indians")	108	

During the period of inland expansion, beginning in 1784 and into the early 1800s, the post complement (employees) ranged from 39 to 88 men.⁶⁶ By the early 1800s, evidence suggests

⁶⁵ The number of men employed at Moose Factory and the several inland posts it managed (eg., Frederick House, Abitibi House, Matawagamingue, Flying Post, Kinogumissi).

⁶⁶ In 1784/85, 39 men were listed at Moose Factory and its dependencies (Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 72-73); See Table 1 for the numbers of men at Moose Factory and its inland posts between 1803-1821.

that the “homeguard” Cree population had increased to over 100 at Moose Factory. In 1826 Alexander Christie reported that “36 Indians” belonged to his District.⁶⁷ Christie’s added remark that of these there were “only 16 who may be engaged for the transport of Goods” indicates he was referring to Cree men who trapped, hunted and manned canoes for the post. This is confirmed in Christie’s report for 1827-28 where he specifies that his counts of “Indians” refer to the number of “hunters”:

At the Post of Abitibi there are 70 Indians, at Moose 26, at Hannah Bay (Goose Tent) 11 which makes a total of 107 Hunters, including youths above 14 years of age. Besides these, there are several widows and young women who make tolerable hunts in a year when Martins are plentiful.⁶⁸

At this point, the Moose Cree “homeguard” numbered 37 “Hunters” (men) in total. If each “hunter” represented a family of four (adult male, his wife and two children), the “homeguard” population at Moose Factory in the mid to late 1820s might be estimated at 140-150. At the same time, the post employee complement averaged 25 men plus several “Apprentice boys” identified as “Natives of the Country.”⁶⁹ That each of these boys was the son of an adult servant presently employed at Moose Factory indicates that some men had country families. Hudson’s Bay Company census records from districts elsewhere in Ontario, but in the same general time period, indicate that post populations averaged more than twice the number of permanent employees.⁷⁰ Applying this formula to the Moose Factory complement suggests a total post population of 55-60 persons of Euro-Canadian, Cree and mixed descent in the 1820s.

Baptism records indicate 7-9 births per year among the post population, and 13-22 births per year among the Cree population. Two complete sets of Anglican baptism records are available for analysis: 1) August 8, 1852 to June 28, 1858, and; 2) May 11, 1890 to May 30, 1893.⁷¹ From 1852-1858, 328 baptisms were performed in the James Bay area, including Moose Factory, Albany, Hannah Bay, Rupert’s House, and inland posts. While about 15% of these earlier baptisms were of adults (18 adults at Moose Factory), a total of 120 children were

⁶⁷ Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fo.7.

⁶⁸ Document C-10: HBCA B.135/e/19, fos.4-4d.

⁶⁹ Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fo.1d; also Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6; Document B-12: HBCA B.135/g/11.

⁷⁰ These HBC census records identify the number of employees, women and children attached to the Lac la Pluie (Rainy Lake) and Lake Superior (Michipicoten) districts (HBCA B.105/a/6: Lac la Pluie, 1818; B.129/e/5,6,7,9,10: Lake Superior District, 1828-1833).

⁷¹ AO F978 MS 192: Moose Factory - St. Thomas the Apostle Anglican Church, Baptisms (see Document D-9).

baptized at Moose Factory in the six-year period from 1852-1858. The 1890-1893 records show a total of 108 baptisms, all children, of which 94 were performed at Moose Factory. Table 2 categorizes these children by parentage.

Table 2
Baptisms by Parentage, 1852-1893

<u>Moose Factory Children</u>	<u>Baptisms 1852-1858</u>	<u>Baptisms 1890-1893</u>
HBC parentage	43 (7 per year)	26 (8-9 per year)
Cree parentage	<u>77</u> (13 per year)	<u>68</u> (22-23 per year)
TOTALS:	120	94

Source: AO F978 MS192 (for examples, see Document D-9)

By 1881, the total population in the Moose Factory environs was 494, composed of 390 Cree and 104 mixed-ancestry and European post employees and their families.⁷² The 1881 Census distinguishes the origins of the Moose Factory population as shown in Table 3 below. Those individuals whose “Country/Province” is listed as “NW” (Northwest) and whose “Origin” is identified as “Scotch,” “Irish,” “English,” or “Norwegian” and belong to families where one parent was born in the North West Territories or is identified as “Indian” are considered likely to be mixed-ancestry.⁷³ Based on these criteria, there were 68 mixed-ancestry individuals belonging to 17 mixed-ancestry households at Moose Factory in 1881. There are also several individuals and/or families with known mixed-ancestry family names (eg., “Turnor”) but who are identified as “Indian.”⁷⁴ At minimum, mixed-ancestry persons represented 14% of the total population, and 65% of the non-Cree Moose post population.

⁷² Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel C-13286); Photocopies of the 1881 Moose Factory enumerations are almost illegible; however, most of the information is legible on the microfilm reader and a transcript has been made for pages 16-20 which list families who comprised the post population (included in the key document set). Pages 1-15 list the “Indians” living in the Moose Factory region but who did not belong to the post population per se.

⁷³ See Chapter 1 for the rationale behind using these criteria to determine mixed-ancestry individuals and families. There are several children – those of James Cotter for instance – whose Country/Province is “NW” and whose origin is, for example, “Irish”, but who are not mixed-ancestry. Hence the estimated number of mixed-ancestry persons at Moose in 1881 is lower than the number of persons born in the Territory but with European origins.

⁷⁴ Samuel Turnor’s family is coded “R.” His occupation is not fully legible but appears to be “[Assistant?] to secretary.” Because this family is listed immediately prior to the list of HBC families, Samuel Turnor may have been employed at the Factory, where he likely also resided. However, it cannot be positively determined that this family of eight were members of the post population (Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory [NAC Reel C-13286]: Family #87).

The growth of the Cree “homeguard” and upland populations was remarked upon by James Cotter in his 1885 report. Cotter states that between 1858 and 1885, the Indian population had grown from 258 to over 400, and that “about 80” hunters now traded at Moose Factory:

It is very certain that the Indians here are on the increase. Every year the births exceed the deaths. Even in 1883 when Whooping cough carried off so many, there were more births than deaths. I would place the number of Indians here at a little over 400 souls. In the year 1858, according to a Census taken then, & of which I have the figures now before me, their number was 258.⁷⁵

Table 3
1881 Census: Origins

<u>Country/Province</u>	<u>Origin</u>	<u>1881 Enumerations</u>
N.W. (North West Territories)	Indian	390 (79.0%)
N.W.	Scotch, English, Irish, Norwegian	84 (17.0%)
Ontario	Scotch, English, Irish	4 (0.8%)
Scotland, England, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, India	Scotch, English, Irish, Norwegian, Swede	<u>16</u> (3.2%)
TOTAL POPULATION 1881:		494

Source: NAC Reel C-13286 (Document E-5)

In 1891, the Moose Factory post population was equivalent to four family members to each adult male. Inspector S.K. Parson counted 35 male employees, 28 wives and 75 children for a total post population of 138, adding that most married servants had their own “separate houses to live in built at the Company’s expense.”⁷⁶ Detailed descriptions and site maps of Moose Factory for 1895 and 1901 show 32 domestic dwellings for post families.⁷⁷ The 1901 district report stated that the population continued to grow:

The population at Moose in July was 571, 193 being Company’s employees and their families. There is a good deal of crowding, the sanitation of the place is most defective, the amount of sickness of late dreadful.⁷⁸

These population figures are consistent with 1901 Census enumerations of 575 persons at

⁷⁵ Document C-18: HBCA B.135/e/23, fo.1d, 3d.

⁷⁶ Document C-21: HBCA B.135/e/29, 38-42.

⁷⁷ Document C-22: HBCA B.135/e/32; Document C-24: HBCA B.135/e/34.

⁷⁸ Document C-23: HBCA B.135/e/33, 7.

Moose Factory, as identified in Table 4.⁷⁹

Table 4
1901 Census: Origins

<u>Colour</u>	<u>Racial or Tribal Origin</u>	<u>1901 Enumerations</u>
“R” (Rouge)	Cree	446 (77.5%)
“ME, MA, MN” (Métis)	Cree	108 (18.8%)
“B” (Blanc)	Ecossaise, Anglaise, Norvegiene	<u>21</u> (3.7%)
TOTAL POPULATION 1901:		575

Source: NAC Reel T-6554 (Document E-18)

The total number of households at Moose Factory in 1901 was 102, categorized as shown in Table 5. Twenty-two households are positively identified as mixed-ancestry, either through “Métis:Métis” marriages, or “Métis:Rouge,” “Blanc:Métis” or “Blanc:Rouge” marriages. In addition, one household (George Turner) is identified in previous records as mixed-ancestry (Appendix B).

Table 5
1901 Census: Households

<u>Colour (Head + Wife)</u>	<u>Households 1901</u>	<u>Building/Family #</u>
Métis + Métis	11	114,116-117,119-120,124-126,131, 184-185
Métis + Rouge	5	121,127,128,187,189
Blanc + Métis	5	115,118,122,130,186
Blanc + Rouge	1	173
Blanc + Blanc	4	112,113,123,191
Rouge + Rouge	76	111,129,132-172,174-183,188*,190, 192-212

Source: NAC Reel T-6554 (Document E-18)

E.B. Borron reported that the size of the population varied greatly according to season, indicating that in 1880, approximately 300 “homeguard” Cree resided at the Factory during the summer only:

The position of Moose Factory, as regards ocean and river navigation, and the fact

⁷⁹ Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

that it possesses a larger population than other place in the territory, namely, about four hundred and fifty souls during the summer season, and one hundred and fifty during the winter, point to it as the proper place for such public offices as may be necessary in the meantime.⁸⁰

Borron observed a considerable degree of mixed-ancestry among the “native” population:

[I]n my first report, 1879-80... I stated “that a large proportion of the natives appeared to have more or less European blood in their veins.” A more general knowledge of the population has confirmed this opinion. The European element is almost entirely Scotch, English and Scandinavian. There are very few French, Metis or half-breeds in the territory.⁸¹

In 1890, Borron estimated the Moose Cree population at 395.⁸² During the previous decade, several Moose Factory Cree families relocated to Chapleau and Missanabie when the transcontinental railway was constructed through those areas in the 1880s.⁸³ Nevertheless, as the 1881 and 1901 Census figures show, the Cree population at Moose Factory grew somewhat. By 1911 however, the population on the Moose Factory Reserve was reduced to 320, and Moose Factory Cree living at Missanabie and Chapleau numbered 57 and 73 respectively.⁸⁴

2.3 MIXED-ANCESTRY DATABASE, 1803-1905

The database of mixed-ancestry persons associated with Moose Factory between 1803-1905 includes just over 300 individuals. Records show that as early as the 1780s, Moose Factory was experiencing a second generation of mixed-ancestry sons (Table 6).⁸⁵ In addition to the five men listed in Table 6, fifteen individuals have known birth dates in the last half of the 18th century, as listed in Table 7. Together, these twenty men represent first and/or second generation mixed-ancestry sons of fur traders to be enlisted in the Company in the Moose area. Considering that the Moose Factory was permanently re-established in 1730, there could very

⁸⁰ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 79.

⁸¹ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 82.

⁸² Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 93.

⁸³ Long, John S. “Historical Context.” In: *Ellen Smallboy: Glimpses of a Cree Woman's Life*. Regina Flannery (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), 71; cf. Preston, Richard J. “James Bay Cree Culture, Malnutrition, Infectious and Degenerative Diseases.” In: *Actes Du Trente-Deuxieme Congres Des Algonquistes / 32nd Algonquian Conference*, ed. J.D. Nichols (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2001), 375.

⁸⁴ Document E-39: NAC RG10, Vol.3161, File 365,009, 20 January 1911.

⁸⁵ Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1; Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2; Document B-10: HBCA B.135/g/1.

well have been other mixed-ancestry sons and daughters born prior to 1765, but no records exist to indicate that they became members of the post community at Moose, or that they were ascribed any form of mixed-ancestry identity.

Table 6
Early Record of Mixed-Ancestry Sons

<u>Date of birth (est.)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Origin (Father [if known])</u>
1765	Richards, Thomas, Sr.	Hudson's Bay
1785	Richards, Thomas, Jr.	Hudson's Bay (Thomas Richards, Sr.)
1788	Richards, John	Hudson's Bay (?Thomas Richards, Sr.)
1776	Moore, George, Sr.	Hudson's Bay
1796	Moore, George Jr.	Hudson's Bay (George Moore, Sr.)

Source: see Appendix B.

Table 7
Mixed-Ancestry Men with Birth Dates in the 18th Century

<u>Date of birth (est.)</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Father (Origin) [if known]</u>
1765	Richards, Thomas, Sr.	
1776	Moore, George, Sr.	
1778	Thomas, John (Jr.)	Chief Factor, John Thomas (England)
1780	Cramer, Charles	
1782	Robertson, John	
1784	Turnor, Joseph	Philip Turnor, Surveyor (England)
1785	Richards, Thomas, Jr.	Thomas Richards, Sr. (Hudson's Bay)
1786	Truthwaite, Jacob	
1787	Beads, Charles	
1787	Donald, William	
1788	Richards, John	[possibly Tho. Richards, Sr. (Hudson's Bay)]
1788	Knight, Thomas	Surgeon, Knight
1788	McDonald, William	
1789	Polson, William	
1790	Knight, John	Surgeon, Knight
1796	Moore, George Jr.	George Moore, Sr. (Hudson's Bay)
1797	Vincent, John	
1797	Gladman, Joseph	
1799	King, James	
1799	Lawson, Henry	

Source: see Appendix B.

There is a total of 68 surnames listed in the database, of which eight stand out as

mixed-ancestry extended families resident at Moose Factory for two or more generations. Table 8 lists three extended families that can be traced over four generations, three families traced over three generations, and two families traced for two generations. Of the 108 mixed-ancestry persons enumerated in the 1901 Census, all except one or two individuals are the immediate relatives of one of these eight families.⁸⁶ Twenty-seven individuals are connected by birth to the Moore, McDonald or Turnor families whose mixed-ancestry origins at Moose Factory can be traced to the 18th century. Another 40 individuals are related to the Linklater, Morrison and Swanson families whose mixed-ancestry origins can be traced to the early 19th century.

Table 8
Generations of Mixed-Ancestry Families

<u>Surname</u>	<u>Number of Persons Traced</u>	<u>Number of Generations (Dates)</u>
McDonald	21	4 generations, 1788-1901
Moore	16	4 generations, 1776-1905
Turnor	18	4 generations, 1784-1901
Linklater	19	3 generations, 1823-1901
Morrison	23	3 generations, 1817-1905
Swanson	17	3 generations, 1819-1901
McLeod	38	2 generations, 1862-1905
Udgaarden	17	2 generations, 1862-1901

Source: see Appendix B.

Of additional interest with respect to Tables 7 and 8 is that many of the surnames listed here are also found in fur trade records for Fort Albany, and for the inland posts that were essentially an extension of Moose Factory. Research by Brown and by Reimer and Chartrand on mixed-ancestry populations in these districts demonstrate the interconnection of family names throughout the James Bay and inland area, the result of HBC expansion, transfer of servants, and intermarriage. Names such as Moore, Thomas, Linklater, Richards, Vincent, Knight, Beads and Polson are documented not only at Moose Factory, but also at Fort Albany and at inland posts such as Abitibi House, Kinogamissi, Matawagamingue, New Post, etc. These authors conclude that an important characteristic of what Brown terms “fur trade endogamy,” is the connection between families within the region as a whole.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554); William Loutit Millor was first married to Margaret McDonald; the two Millor children enumerated in 1901 will have been from this first marriage, and hence related to the McDonalds. No connection could be found for Millor’s second wife, Wilhemina Ritch, apparently born in Albany.

⁸⁷ Brown, *Strangers in Blood*, 51,75; Reimer and Chartrand, “Documenting Historic Métis in Ontario,”

3. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RELATIONS AT MOOSE FACTORY

HBC post journals document everyday life at fur trade settlements, emphasizing activities and events related to the daily operation of the post, often with minimal commentary on actual fur trade transactions. Hence, where available these journals provide a wealth of data on the local or domestic economy, society and culture at any particular post. For Moose Factory, there are 194 post journals spanning the years 1730 - 1941. A systematic sample of these journals at five and ten-year intervals reveals patterns, trends, and changes with respect to social interaction, occupation, marriage, and family life at Moose Factory for a 200-year period.⁸⁸ This chapter examines the role of mixed-ancestry individuals and families in the domestic economy, society, and community life, relying mainly on post journals, but supplemented also by excerpts from annual district reports and other relevant historical documentation.

3.1 ECONOMY AND OCCUPATIONS AT MOOSE FACTORY

Section 3.1.1 below presents historical evidence relevant to domestic activities at Moose Factory focussing on the role of “homeguard” Cree, mixed-ancestry, and European men and women in providing the post with its daily food. This is followed in Section 3.1.2 with a description of the “official capacity” filled by mixed-ancestry HBC men, in order to determine the extent to which they filled an occupational niche.

3.1.1 The Domestic Economy

The complement of a fur trade post was based on a principle of self-sufficiency, and because of local circumstances, self-contained as well. Moose Factory was not only a “bay-side” business office for the British fur trade, but also had to manage a domestic economy for its own survival.⁸⁹ Subsistence analyses of entire journal sets – 1783-1784 and 1799-1800 – have been conducted by tracking instances of “homeguard” Indians providing country food and instances of HBC men hunting and fishing for the fort throughout a full HBC year or “Outfit.”⁹⁰ Summary

582-586.

⁸⁸ Moose Factory post journals dating from 1730-1850 were sampled at approximate 10-year intervals (11 journals reviewed in full). Post journals dating from 1850-1910 were sampled at approximate five-year intervals (7 journals reviewed in full). The rationale for this sampling technique was based on the availability of journals in these two time-periods (fewer journals are available for the 1850-1910 period), and the need to closely examine features of the mixed-ancestry population in the decades just prior to the signing of Treaty No.9.

⁸⁹ Rich, “Introduction” to *Moose Fort Journals*, xxvi.

⁹⁰ 1783-1784 Post Journal: HBCA B.135/a/68, In Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 7-70 (Document A-9). During the Outfit of 1783-1784, John Thomas was Chief at Moose Factory and 38 men worked under him either at the Factory itself, or at one of its outposts (eg., Hannah Bay, Frederick House). Rich’s list of men at the end of the

analyses have also been conducted for partial journals dating to the 1850s and 1870s.⁹¹ Excerpts from daily journals and annual district reports in the intervening years supplement the analyses of these four Outfits, providing data with respect to continuity and change in the domestic economy from the late 18th century and throughout the 19th century.

This type of analysis shows both the importance of subsistence hunting and fishing in the daily life of the Factory community, and the roles played by the different social and cultural segments of that community. In general, there existed a seasonal pattern in which the “homeguard” Indians were employed as provisioners during the spring, summer and fall. During the winter when the Indians were at their trapping grounds, HBC men (and their families) took over the responsibility for provisioning the post community. However, as the discussion below will demonstrate, over the years the character of the domestic economy changed, as did the definition of the roles for, and the division of labour between European servants, mixed-ancestry servants, and “homeguard” Cree.

Journal excerpts from the time Moose Factory was re-established in 1730 demonstrate that HBC men operated fishing nets and prepared tents for “Goose Time.”⁹² It was primarily the “homeguard” Cree, however, who actually hunted the geese in spring and fall:

1730 September 19- 29 - The Indians Brought home... Geese.

1731 April 15 - May 7 - Came in Indians to hunt Geese for us.

1742 May 17-18 - the natives Geese hunting [...] took 3 bottles [of brandy] to treat our home guard on the plantation.

1749 November 10 - The carp’tr & caulker employed framing a small house about 15 foot long & 9 foot broad to place one in each marsh about 24 mile from the

journal does not indicate “Parish” or other identifying information, and it is impossible to determine if any were mixed-ancestry (Ibid., 72-73). 1799-1800 Post Journal: HBCA B.135/a/87, fos.1-41 (Document A-15). John Thomas was again the Chief at Moose Factory during the Outfit of 1799-1800. There is no “List of Servants” for this year, but the 1803 list shows a total of 42 men including those stationed at inland posts; 4-6 of these men were “Native” of Hudson’s Bay (Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1). These Outfits were selected for this type of analysis primarily for reasons of convenience. The 1783-84 journal has been transcribed and published, and hence is easy to read. As well, it was at this time that Moose Factory expanded its operations into inland regions. Editorial footnotes by Rich are also useful in the analysis. The 1799-1800 journal was chosen because of the dramatic increase in entries about mixed-ancestry personnel, women and children at the post. As the relevant pages photocopied comprised the majority of the journal, it was decided to copy the remainder in order to allow for a full picture of life at Moose Factory at the turn of the century.

⁹¹ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163 (Post Journal 1855-1856); B.135/a/183 (Post Journal 1870-1871). Approximately half of each of these journals were copied due to the abundance of evidence relevant to this project, making it possible also to elicit the nature of the domestic economy during these periods.

⁹² Document A-1: HBCA B.135/a/1, fos.2d-5, 19-21; Document A-3: HBCA B.135/a/11, fo.64d.

Fort to salt geese in, it being a general complaint when I was here before & the same complaint subsists still that if natives are obliged to go so far for to kill Geese that half their time is lost in bringing those Geese to the Fort & when there it is difficult to get them away again.

1750 May 19 - Got all the Hunting Ind's from the Fort, we have had above 2000 Geese kil'd.

1764 October 21-26 - All the Hunters came in from the N'ward informing us the Geese were about all gone. [...] All the Indians are gone to their winter Quarters Except for three or four old men & women who I shall employ in Catching rabbits & fish.⁹³

The importance to the HBC of the “homeguard” Cree as goose hunters during this period is evidenced in the military-style ranks accorded to Cree leaders, such as “the Captain” and “the Lieutenant of our Goose Hunters.”⁹⁴

In the autumn of 1783 and spring and summer of 1784, over 80 journal entries refer to “homeguard” Indians hunting geese, catching fish (including from the old men and women who stayed at the fort during winter), and bringing in rabbits, ducks and partridges. For example, on October 12, 1783 John Thomas was informed that “700 Geese from the Hannah Bay hunters” had been received, and that “the Indians were at a stand for want of Powder &ca.”⁹⁵ In general, country food brought in by Indians is specified as such in journal entries (“Recd. Fish and Rabbets from Indians”; Rec'd three Rabbets from an old Woman”), in contrast to fish and meat from HBC men which are simply recorded by the amount caught (“Recd. 6 Methy and 4 Rabbets”).⁹⁶ The role of “homeguard” Cree as provisioners was particularly important in the summer months, especially August and September, when the HBC men were occupied with duties related to Moose Factory as a shipping depot.⁹⁷ There is no indication in journal entries from 1784 that “homeguard” men and women assisted the HBC men in such domestic summer jobs duties as planting and harvesting the Factory gardens or “Mowing grass and making Hay.”⁹⁸

⁹³ Document A-1: HBCA B.135/a/1, fos.2d-3,19-21; Document A-3: HBCA B.135/a/11, fo.64d; Document A-4: HBCA B.135/a/20a, fos.9d-10, 24d; Document A-6: HBCA B.135/a/39, fos.7d-8d.

⁹⁴ Document A-6: HBCA B.135/a/39, fo.2; Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fo.12.

⁹⁵ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 10.

⁹⁶ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 8,18. Since at least 1750, journal entries distinguished HBC men who hunted for post provisions as “our Hunters” (Document A-4: HBCA B.135/a/20a, 19d).

⁹⁷ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 66-70.

⁹⁸ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 49,59,63.

In the winter of 1783-1784, the main provisioning activity undertaken by HBC men was hauling “the Seine,” ice fishing “from our hooks” and day-hunts near the Factory.⁹⁹ Between November 10 (when the last “homeguard” families left for their winter trapping grounds) and April 15 (by which time they had returned with their fur trappings and to assist with the spring goose hunt), there are daily entries referring to HBC men being sent out to hunt and fish.¹⁰⁰ HBC men were also sent out on hunting excursions further afield. For example, in November 1783, men were sent to “Tent” at hunting and fishing locations distant from the Factory:

1783 November 4 - [Sent] George Donald & Andrew Beckie to the Whaway Creeks, and Edwd. Clousten and Thoms. Arrowsmith to Butlers creek, where they are to Tent and catch Partridges, Rabbits and Fish.

1783 November 6 - sent M. Tate and Henry Burnie to the South shore to snare Rabbits, and hunt Partridges &c.¹⁰¹

There is little data to indicate the identity of the HBC hunters and fishermen, but at this point most appear to be European. Footnotes by Rich identify Henry Burnie as an Orkneyman; George Donald was from Westminster, England; Edward Clousten was from Stromness, and; Thomas Arrowsmith’s origin is not provided but he became known as “a good hunter.”¹⁰² Of added interest is that no work, including hunting or fishing, was performed on Sundays when men were required to attend “Divine Service,” although on occasion an emergency interrupted this day of rest.¹⁰³

The journal covering Outfit 1799-1800 is remarkably different in its content than that of 15 years previous. References to women, children and “the Boys” are dramatically increased, and it is quickly apparent that family members were now an integral part of the post economy. The fact that both the 1783-1784 and 1799-1800 journals were written by the same individual – John Thomas – supports the notion that real changes in post community life at Moose Factory had occurred in this 15-year period. As well, however, Thomas’ seniority in the Company and official acknowledgement of family life at fur trade posts (eg., schoolbooks for children were sent in 1794), may also have relaxed attitudes toward what was appropriate content in daily journals.

The 1799-1800 journals contains relatively few entries referring to “homeguard” Indians

⁹⁹ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 14,16.

¹⁰⁰ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 15; cf.36-37;40-41,48.

¹⁰¹ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 15.

¹⁰² Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 10/fn.2,3; 13/fn.3; 15/fn.2.

¹⁰³ Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 63.

as provisioners, in comparison to the journal of 15 years earlier. There are only 25 references to Indians providing country food: 17 refer to Indians participating in the fall and spring goose hunts, now apparently their main contribution to the post's provisions.¹⁰⁴ Another 8 entries refer to fish and other kinds of country food brought in by Indians. In contrast, there is a total of 121 references to HBC men hunting and fishing for post provisions. The main provisioners included George Moore and Joseph Turnor – both confirmed as mixed-ancestry – as well as Joe Johnson, Lawson, and Chilton.¹⁰⁵ On occasion, men who were sent to camp a distance from the post in order to hunt, took their wives and country families, for instance:

1799 October 29 ...Geo. Moore & his wife gone in a canoe to Wayway Creek to tent there & trap and hunt.¹⁰⁶

The 1799-1800 journal also contains frequent entries about “the women” providing country food, especially fish and rabbits, for example:

1799 November 25 ...the Women brought 11 Rabbits from their snares.

1800 July 17 ...the Women set off for their fishing Tent in the evening.

1800 August 16 ...Geo. Moore brot 31 lb. fish & one of the women brot a Sturgeon of 58 lb. weight.¹⁰⁷

That these entries refer to women who belonged to the post community is evident in the consistent use of the phrase, “the women,” distinct from references which specify an “Indian woman” or “Indian men and women.”¹⁰⁸ Some entries imply that while post women provided first for their families, they were expected to also supply some country food to the post for general use:

1800 June 28 ...The Women find Fish so scarce that they can get little more than they require for their families, brot only 11 lb.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fos.1d-4d,20d-25d.

¹⁰⁵ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fos.4d,8,9,16,34d,38d.

¹⁰⁶ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.4d.

¹⁰⁷ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.7,31d,34d.

¹⁰⁸ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.25d.

¹⁰⁹ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.29.

Indeed, references to women as members of the post community increase generally in the 1799-1800 journal, totalling 37 entries. At no time, however, are these women named, and the nearest identification is found in entries noting a woman as someone's wife, as quoted in the case of "Moore and his wife" above.

In many entries, Chief Thomas notes that Company men took one or more Apprentice Boys ("the Boys") with them to assist in hunting excursions, for example on October 29, 1799:

Mr. Lawson & Geo. Banks gone to the N'th Bluff fishing &tc, two of the Boys went with 'em & brought the Boat back.¹¹⁰

Positive evidence that these "Boys" were the mixed-ancestry sons of Company servants is provided in the 1803 Moose Factory List of Servants, where both Joseph Turnor and Thomas Richards are identified as "Native Youths," and where others like them are described as indispensable to the inland trade:

The services of these native Youths are becoming every year more & more conspicuous. Two of em are now locum tenens at two of the Inland settlements, and they have had a very principal hand in giving the Inland places their supplies [sic]. In short they are almost our sole dependence both for supplying & supporting the Inland stations, as well as otherwise opposing the Canadians.¹¹¹

While the HBC documents are not explicit about how a "native Youth" acquired his subsistence skills, it can be surmised that he learned to hunt and fish from his mother and her Cree family, as well as from having been raised within the economic and social environment of the post itself.

In total, the 1799-1800 journal makes 81 references to variants of "the Boys" within the context of work or other activities around the post. Examples follow:

1799 November 11 ...Joe Turnor & two of the little boys were clearing the Path round the head of the Island.

1800 February 17 ...Joe, Tom, & the younger ones were angling for bait for our Methy hooks.

1800 February 21 ...Allen Clousten finished Tyloring & had one of the lesser boys to turn the grind stone for his grinding.

¹¹⁰ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.4d. References to "the Boys" appear in Moose Factory post journals at least as early as 1793; see Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.2,3d,4d.

¹¹¹ Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1.

1800 March 31 ...the Boys were at their Snares & brot 2 Rabbits.
1800 June 16 ...the Boys were employed in the Gardens, washing the Goose Shed,
&tc, &tc.¹¹²

Reference to “the Boys” are distinct from entries which refer to “Indian lads.”¹¹³

In addition to entries about “the boys”, the 1799-1800 journal also makes numerous (26) references to children, providing some insight into their socialization into post culture and the importance of learning to procure country food:

1800 January 8 ...Lawson, Self & the children angled about 56 lbs. Trout at Maidman’s Creek.

1800 January 9 ...the Women & children angled about 14 lbs Trout.

1800 May 24 ...the Boys & children raked the rubbish off the plantation together.

1800 May 30 ...the Boys & children did several little necessary jobs about the Fort.

1800 June 6 ...Many little Summer Birds have been pick’d up by the Children supposed to have perished by the last cold weather.¹¹⁴

A decade later, most post journal entries related to subsistence provisioning indicate that HBC men and their families – mainly of mixed-ancestry – spent prolonged periods of time hunting and fishing for country food for the post. Thomas Richards Sr. and Jr., Charles Beads, Joseph Turnor and William Leask are frequently mentioned within this provisioning context:

1809 October 18 - Thos. Rich’d’s Sen’r was sent off for North Bay to Winter and hunt.

1809 December 4 - Three Men & two Dogs with Charles Beads to fetch Rabbits from the Tent in N’th Bay & my son Chas. Thomas & Joe Turnor to Tent & hunt partridges at N’th Bluff.

¹¹² Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.5d,14d,19,27d.

¹¹³ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.19d; cf. Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fo.3d.

¹¹⁴ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fos.10d,25,26,26d. It is likely also that as the main shipping depot, Moose Factory received food supplies from England. An analysis of account books would be necessary to confirm the type and extent of such food supplements; however, time has not allowed an examination of the Moose Accounts.

1810 January 29 - Thos. Richards Jun'r set off for his Tent at N'th Bluff & Jack Richards set to his Tent at E'tward.

1810 March 12 - T. Richards Jun'r & Leask went off to their tent again.

1810 April 19 - Thos. Richards Sen'r & Family came home from the Fishing Tent.¹¹⁵

For each of the seven men named in these journal entries, their parish is listed as “Hudson’s Bay” in the 1810 List of Servants.¹¹⁶ Considering that ten of the forty men employed at Moose Factory and its inland posts in 1810 were mixed-ancestry, it is significant that seven of these mixed-ancestry men appear to fill the occupational niche of post provisioner. However, at times of food scarcity, any and all able HBC men were sent to hunt or fish:

1810 April 21 - Early this morning dispatched those who came home yesterday to the Marsh again & with them Thomas Ormand & two of the Boys as the present state of our stock of Provisions renders it absolutely necessary to send everyone that can possibly be spar'd & can use a Gun.¹¹⁷

By 1809-10, the Factory also operated a farm that included cattle, sheep and gardens.¹¹⁸ At this time and over the next few decades, the main provisioning activity in which “homeguard” Cree are mentioned is related to the spring and fall goose hunt.¹¹⁹

Almost immediately after amalgamation of the NWC and HBC in 1821, Chief Factor Thomas Vincent reported on the number of men now needed to winter at Moose Factory, adding that:

Two halfbreeds would also be requisite as Winter messengers or Packetters, but their residence at the Factory would hardly be felt as a burthen as they might be sent out to a hunting of fishing tent.¹²⁰

Subsequent journal entries indicate that this pattern of mixed-ancestry men as primary

¹¹⁵ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fos.4,8,13,14d,17,21d; cf. fos.18d,25.

¹¹⁶ Document B-8: HBCA B.135/f/8.

¹¹⁷ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fo.21d.

¹¹⁸ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, eg. fo.22.

¹¹⁹ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fos.3,26d; Document C-10: HBCA B.135/e/19, fos.4-4d.

¹²⁰ Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fo.6d.

post-provisioners continued for at least the next two decades:

1830 January 25 - Ths. Richards and family returned to the Saw mill. He is to be employed there during the week hunting partridges and turning Snow shoe frames.

1831 February 27 - Ths. Richards and his daughter down from the Sawmill with 49 partridges which is the produce of this weeks exertions.

1840 June 18 - John Richards and his Wife brought a Sturgeon from the Lines Wt. 25lbs which is the first one since they commenced to attend them.

1840 December 31 - Geo Moore [Jr.] and Jas. Morrison returned from their Tent at "My Lords ridge" with 5 Rabbits, 2 Pheasants and 5 Pr of Snowshoe frames.¹²¹

By the 1850s, post journals indicate that Moose Factory relied not only on country-food procured by its own men, but also on produce from well established gardens – mainly potatoes stored for winter use – and cattle herds which provided a ready supply of fresh beef.¹²² As well, journal entries begin to document "liberty" given to married men in order to hunt for their own families:

1851 February 10 - Jas. Saunders this day to himself providing wood for his family.

1851 April 30 - Three Apprentices allowed to hunt this day & J. Richards & James Saunders for two days.

1851 May 12 - Mr. Swanson went to hunt in the Marsh for 3 days, of course for his family.¹²³

Overall, the majority of journal entries about the post domestic economy for Outfit 1855-56, relate to the various provisioning tasks assigned to the post servants, with relatively few entries about Indians helping the HBC men.¹²⁴ The exception was the fall and spring goose hunts which continued to rely on the "homeguard" Cree to bring in enough geese to be salted and stored for the coming months.¹²⁵ The post's country food diet was also supplemented by small

¹²¹ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.20d,25d; Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.5d,32d.

¹²² Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 2,45,58.

¹²³ Document A-25: HBCA B.135/a/155, fos.28,36,37d.

¹²⁴ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163.

¹²⁵ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 33-37,47,82-88.

and large game occasionally brought in by Indian trappers, as well as by “old women” and “widows” who lived near the Factory and regularly supplied rabbits in exchange for post goods.¹²⁶ On occasion, “homeguard” Cree individuals were hired specifically to hunt or fish for the Factory.¹²⁷ “Homeguard” Cree were also variously employed during the spring and summer months doing “odd jobs around the Establishment,” assisting with digging, planting and hoeing garden plots, harvesting the hay fields and even tending cattle.¹²⁸

Robert Miles’ journal entries for Outfit 1855-56 portray the Moose Factory domestic economy as the equal responsibility of all servants at the post, with little evidence to indicate any occupational niche filled by mixed-ancestry men. For example, mixed-ancestry men were as likely to be working with cattle, as they were to be out hunting and fishing:

1855 August 23 - ...a son [Patrick] of Walter Faries engaged as App’ce. for the Place as Ass’t. Cattle Keeper.

1855 October 20 - William Linklater [b] cut a yearling Bull & two Bull calves.

1856 May 12 - Sent Jos’h. Green with one of our Indians to hunt Geese.¹²⁹

Indeed, journal entries indicate that the English-born clerk, William Swanson, was in charge of the main fall fishery:

1855 October 25 - ...our other people went with Mr. Swanson to seine fish, they caught 6 Bushels.

1855 November 12 - ...Eleven men with Mr. Swanson at the seine & caught 22 Bushels fish.¹³⁰

Unlike the 1799-1800 journal, entries documenting mixed-ancestry men and their families being sent to “Tent” for extended periods of time to hunt and fish, were not found in the 1855-56 journal. Nor does the 1855-56 journal document provisioning activities by “the women” or “the children.” On rare occasion, Chief Factor Miles makes note of “Boys” engaged in

¹²⁶ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 11,50,55,59,63,71,82.

¹²⁷ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 26,38,87.

¹²⁸ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 2,5,16,17,21-22,88-89.

¹²⁹ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 27,45,87. The Abstracts of Servants Accounts for 1854-55 list the Parish for each of these men as “Indian Country” (Document B-15: HBCA B.135/g/38).

¹³⁰ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 47,51.

provisioning activities, in part, at least, as a form of recreation and/or education:

1855 October 1 - "Our three young Gentlemen & Mr. Vincent the Schoolmaster went on a hunting excursion to the Marsh where they have liberty to remain for a week."¹³¹

Men were also increasingly given "liberty" to go off and hunt specifically for their families:

1856 May 2 - Philip Turnor & John Richards asked liberty to hunt for their families this day & tomorrow which was granted.

1861 May 11 - All the men & Indians employed as yesterday with the exception that 5 men were allowed to go to the north to hunt game.¹³²

By Outfit 1870-71, post journal entries portray a settlement as dependent on garden produce, pigs and cattle herds as it was on country food procured through goose and other hunting, as well as fishing. In addition to annual goose hunts, "homeguard" Cree were now employed during summer months working in gardens, repairing fences, cleaning grounds, herding cattle, working in the hay field, etc.¹³³ Chief Factor James Clousten explained that an increased amount of work was being given to "homeguard" Cree during the winter of 1871 as well:

1871 January 31 - Lavalle with a party of Indians were sent to Charles Island to haul part of the logs to the Sawpit there & the rest to the bank. I have thought it advisable to employ these Indians for two reasons - one is that it will save our animals a good deal of hauling and some of them are not in very good working condition, and the other reason is that the Indians can do nothing at present in hunting and I wish to help them a little in this way.¹³⁴

Occasional entries indicate that Cree continued to bring in rabbits, partridges and other small game to the post.¹³⁵ In the 1860s and 1870s, numbers of Cree men were also employed to assist in large fishery operations, or an individual Cree might be hired by the Chief Factor "to fish for

¹³¹ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 38.

¹³² Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 82; cf.58; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fo.24d; cf.25,25d.

¹³³ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.9,10d,13,20d,28d,30,44d-45.

¹³⁴ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.33.

¹³⁵ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.29d,35.

the Company.”¹³⁶

Many of Chief Factor Clousten’s entries for Outfit 1870-71 document domestic economic activity that is family-oriented, indicating a continued shift from communal efforts to provide food for the post population, to individual efforts by servants to provide for their own family.¹³⁷ Indeed, journal entries in winter months particularly, emphasize the extreme time and energy required to maintain post families with respect to housing, heating, and eating (see discussion of family life, below). Toward the end of the 19th century, the notion of “liberty” to hunt for one’s family was “customary”:

1893 May 1 - All hands had Saturday to hunt.

1894 April 28 - Gave all hands this day & tomorrow to hunt for themselves.

1895 April 30 - Gave one half the men their customary two days hunting as they were unable to get off before the River broke.¹³⁸

References to post-wide country-food provisioning occur rarely in journals from 1870 onward, and indicate that mixed-ancestry and European servants alike were involved:

1870 September 15 - Joseph Turnor & son & four Indians went to North Bluff to hunt.

1870 October 24-25 - Four men were employed in the morning repairing seine, and about 11 A.M. J. Rutherford and 4 men went to haul it. They got 1½ Barrels. [...] The same men who were seining yesterday went again to day and caught 3½ Barrels fish.

1900 April 17 - Geese seen from the place 3 or 4 times. First Goose killed & brought in by G. McLeod’s Son Willie. 10 Geese in all shot by different parties today.¹³⁹

More often, provisioning activities for the post as a whole were related to domestic animals, the

¹³⁶ Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fos.10d-11a; Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.43d.

¹³⁷ See for example, Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.21d,36.

¹³⁸ Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fos.8d,19,37d; cf.44d,82.

¹³⁹ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.20d,24d; Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fo.77. Turner was mixed-ancestry; Rutherford was Scottish (Document B-16: HBCA B.135/g/43; Document B-17: HBCA B.135/g/52). G. McLeod and his son Willy were mixed-ancestry (Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory [NAC Reel T-6554]).

hay field (to feed the cattle), and potato harvests:

1870 September 20 - ...all other hands... assisted by Indian women, taking up potatoes in the lower field.

1870 September 21 - All hands except Jas King, the Storemen & cowherd taking up potatoes. They finished the lower field by breakfast time and then commenced the upper field.

1870 September 26 - Finished taking up potatoes. the crop in largest ever produced, being 1758 bushels, and they are of excellent quality.

1870 November 22 - The two Blacksmiths, James Morrison and Thos. Swanson employed in Killing and cutting up pigs. Four pigs have given 895 lb. meat & 38½ lb. lard.¹⁴⁰

Several of the private dwellings also had gardens attached, and once the Factory potato crop was harvested, “homeguard” Cree and post personnel were employed “taking up potatoes for the families.”¹⁴¹

3.1.2 Occupations of Mixed-Ancestry HBC Servants, Apprentices and Boys

The preceding section documents the changing roles of mixed-ancestry men and boys in terms of provisioning the Moose Factory post population with country food. Hunting and fishing skills acquired by mixed-ancestry males from their Cree extended families, seems to have developed into an occupational niche for a temporary period of perhaps 50 years, from the late 1700s to the mid-1800s. By the 1870s it is evident that mixed-ancestry men mainly used their hunting and fishing skills to provide for their own families, rather than for the post population as a whole. In part this was likely the direct consequence of the growing number of families at Moose Factory, and a social evolution into a ‘company settlement’ in which the nuclear family (in a separate dwelling, see below) formed the logical economic unit. As well, mixed-ancestry men increasingly acquired skills as a result of the Company’s Apprentice policy and the opportunities available to sons of servants to engage in a variety of trades associated with Moose Factory’s role as a shipping depot. Following is an examination of occupations (other than provisioning) and ranks held by mixed-ancestry men at Moose Factory.

The earliest records of servants’ “capacity” and rank from 1803-1815, show that mixed-ancestry men occupied roles of canoe-men and canoe builders, skills possibly learned from Cree family members. In 1804, of fourteen mixed-ancestry servants at Moose Factory and

¹⁴⁰ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.21-21d,27; cf. fos.26d,28d-29,30,45d.

¹⁴¹ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.21d.

its inland posts, eight were canoe-men, including George Moore who remained the resident canoe builder at Moose for decades (since at least 1803).¹⁴² In 1810, eight of ten mixed-ancestry servants were canoe men.¹⁴³ As experts in canoes, these men were described as “essential” particularly to the inland trade, for example:

Gill, Robert - Canoe man and assistant Boat builder (1804 Remarks: ...he like the rest of the Native youths has been very usefull & they all have been of essential service to the Trade...)

Turnor, Joseph - Canoe man (1804 Remarks: ...he has been of essential service to the trade.)

Richards, Thomas Sr. - Boat Steerer (1805 Remarks: ...he has been actively and profitably employed with other of the Native Servants in protecting the Trade besides like the [?] to conveying cargo Inland.)¹⁴⁴

In 1810, it was noted that Joseph Turnor was “like all the rest of the Native Youths a good canoeman.”¹⁴⁵ In 1806, a second generation of the mixed-ancestry Richards family joined the Company as a canoe-man:

Richards, Thomas Sr. - Boat Steerer

Richards, Thomas Jr. - Canoe man (1806-07 Remarks: Requests 22[^] ann'm [22 pounds Stirling per annum] for 3 yrs; he is a usefull [sic] active lad in a Canoe and deserving encouragement.)¹⁴⁶

From 1803-1815, the remainder of mixed-ancestry servants at Moose Factory are listed as general labourers, except for Chief Factor John Thomas' sons John Jr. and Charles who were promoted to “Inland Trader” and “Writer,” respectively.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴² Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2.

¹⁴³ Document B-8: HBCA B.135/f/8.

¹⁴⁴ Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2; Document B-3: HBCA B.135/f/3.

¹⁴⁵ Document B-8: HBCA B.135/f/8.

¹⁴⁶ Document B-4: HBCA B.135/f/4.

¹⁴⁷ John Thomas Jr. was promoted from canoe-man to Inland trader (Master at Kenogumissisi) in 1807 (Document B-5: HBCA B.135/f/5); he was demoted to “labourer” in 1814 for being “given to liquor and inclined to be lazy” (Document B-9: HBCA B.135/f/9). Charles Thomas is listed as “Writer” beginning in 1808 (Document B-6: HBCA B.135/f/6).

Another skill possessed by mixed-ancestry employees was their fluency in both Cree and English. Their bilingualism frequently placed mixed-ancestry men into interpreter duty, for both the post and later for missionaries. At Moose Factory, mixed-ancestry men who filled the position of post interpreter included William Donald and Jacob Truthwaite in the 1820s, William Polson in the 1830s, and Joseph Turnor in the 1860s.¹⁴⁸ However, the position was not unique to mixed-ancestry servants. Records show that some European men became fluent in the dialect spoken by their Cree spouses: for example, in 1824-25, Orkneyman William Corrigan filled the capacity of interpreter at Moose Factory.¹⁴⁹

Between 1840 and 1846, Rev. George Barnley depended on mixed-ancestry men and women to interpret for him during his afternoon religious instruction sessions with the Cree. A total of eight interpreters worked with Barnley at Moose Factory, including (in order of employment): 1) Joseph Turnor; 2) Old George Moore; 3) his daughter-in-law Emma Moore; 4) George Moore Jr.; 5) John Richards; 6) William Linklater Jr.; 7) Archibald Linklater; 8) Thomas Richards. In 1846, the latter announced his intention to marry, and Barnley wrote to Governor Simpson regarding another more suitable interpreter for the mission at Moose Factory:

1846 September 7 - I saw a son of Mr. Spencer's, a lad of an amiable disposition about 17, & the consideration that he understood a dialect spoken very extensively in my circuit.¹⁵⁰

In the 1850s, Rev. John Horden also depended on mixed-ancestry persons to interpret for his ministry:

1851 August 26 - In the afternoon had the interpreter, a half breed who understands Indian tolerably well but is no scholar.¹⁵¹

From Chief Factor Vincent's annual district report in 1823, it is apparent that "halfbreeds" were known also to be skilled "Winter messengers or Packetters."¹⁵² For the winter of 1827, Chief Factor Alexander Christie provided a job description of the three labourers (Orkneymen¹⁵³) and five Apprentice boys (mixed-ancestry):

148 Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6,18,43.

149 Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6.

150 Document C-17: HBCA D.5/18, fo.218. This "lad" is John Spencer (b), Parish: Indian Country (Document B-14: HBCA B.135/g/33).

151 Document D-7: GSA MF 78-13 (A88-89), 26 August 1851.

152 Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fo.6d.

153 William Johnstone (a), John Moar (d) and James Morwick; Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fo.1;

The principle employs of the few laboring servants and the Apprentice boys during the winter were felling & collecting logs required for the new sloop, and stores, as well as cutting and sledging home firewood sufficient for the Winters consumption, and to serve until hauling becomes practicable next Autumn.¹⁵⁴

An earlier description of the multitude of odd jobs performed by “the Boys” is provided by John Thomas in 1798:

– the larger Boys at times (as it is remarked in the course of the Journal) are sent round the Fox Guns, rabbit snaring &tc., Gill’s son is now Framing a Boat, they likewise attend on Chief’s Tables, lead the hauling Cattle, & in short are employed in any little offices they are capable of.¹⁵⁵

In 1829-30 the “Boys” are mentioned several times “turning” the stores of potatoes in February, measuring the remaining stock of potatoes in April, “clearing away Rubbish from about the Workshops” and planting potatoes in May.¹⁵⁶

In the early 19th century, it was common practice at Moose Factory for HBC men and their country-born sons to work together at the post, and in some cases, fathers were allowed to formally apprentice their sons:

1817-18 District Report - Corrival Jacob No.2 - Labourer - Son of Mr. William Corrival. Has been resident at Hannah Bay with his Father these two years past. He is only 16 years of age yet.

1822-23 District Report - George Moore (Sen’r). Getting on in Years... he is however still useful as a Canoe builder and fisherman & occasionally to steer a Boat up to the Portages... George Moore (jun’r). A smart, active young man (halfbreed). A good guide & foreman.¹⁵⁷

In the 1829-30 post journal, George Moore (A) and his son (George Moore B) are frequently

Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6; Document B-12: HBCA B.135/g/11.

¹⁵⁴ Document C-8: HBCA B.135/e/17, fos.3-3d. The Apprentice boys are named and identified as mixed-ancestry on fo.1d.

¹⁵⁵ Document A-14: HBCA B.135/a/86, fo.10d.

¹⁵⁶ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fos.22,25,25d,33,38d,41d,42.

¹⁵⁷ Document C-5: HBCA B.135/e/4, fo.11d; Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fo.5d.

mentioned together within the same entries, for example:

1830 March 18 - ...the Boat builders Geo. Moore Sen. and his Son with two horses sledged home firewood.¹⁵⁸

However, by the late 1830s, the number of “boys” had apparently increased to the point where it was resolved that, to reduce the number of indigent dependants at HBC posts, boys at fifteen years of age be taken into the service as apprentices and sent to a distant post for employment. The Moose Factory Minutes of Council state that if the father did not agree he would be fired:

That no lad be permitted to remain with his family when exceeding the age of 15, but that he be then received into the Service as an apprentice labourer or Tradesman and sent to the Northern Department for employment therein; and if the parent does not consent to this arrangement, that he be removed from the Service. That the Indenture or Engagement of such apprentice be fore a Term of 7 years at the following rate of Wages (£8-15).¹⁵⁹

That this directive was obeyed to some extent is evident in two cases from 1840, and another from 1855:

1840 June 21 - A Youth (the son of the Guide John Loutit) is also amongst the party [arrived from Abitibi], being sent down in order that he may be engaged as an apprentice.

1840 June 22 - T. [Thomas] Atkinson (a youth who has been long fed & clothed at the Expense of the Company but is this Season taken into the Service as an Apprentice labourer) attends upon the Officers rooms.

1855 August 23 - This evening two Indians in a small canoe arrived here from Matawagamingue bringing a son of Walter Faries engaged as App'ce for the Place as Asst. Cattle Keeper.¹⁶⁰

However, numerous entries about HBC men and their sons working together at Moose Factory suggest that the regulation was not always fully enforced. Nor did the type of work these mixed-ancestry fathers and sons perform together, belong in any particular “niche.” The 1870-71 journal provides several examples:

¹⁵⁸ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.28d; cf. fos.30d,32d,38.

¹⁵⁹ Document C-14: HBCA B.135/k/1, 189-190[fos.95-95d]; cf. Francis and Morantz, *Partners in Furs*, 156.

¹⁶⁰ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.6d-7;cf.fo.15d; Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163:27.

1870 July 11 - James King & son at Mens House.

1870 September 15 - Joseph Turnor & son & four Indians went to North Bluff to [hunt Beaver?].

1870 September 30 - James King's Sons putting weather boarding on the passage between the mess house & Kitchen.

1870 October 24 - James King & one of his sons [John] in joiners shop.

1871 January 4 - John Richards assisted by John Richards the apprentice, hauling his firewood.¹⁶¹

After the 1837 directive, journal entries began to distinguish between "Apprentices" and "the Boys" suggesting either that some sons of servants were not forced to take on apprentice positions elsewhere, or that references to "the Boys" now referred to those under the age of 15. Examples include:

1840 November 9 - ...with the assistance of a little Boy (P. Moore) attending the Cattle...

1840 November 16th - 3 Apprentice Youths Crop cutting & splitting firewood.

1855 June 4 - Norman McDonald, two App's an Indian & two Boys with the plough commenced planting potatoes.

1870 December 5 - Two men hauling manure for P. Turner, assisted by T. [Green?] & G. Linklater (apprentice) – Magnus at store work assisted by J. Richards apprentice.

1894 April 24 - The kitchen boy shot one [goose] today at the wood pile.¹⁶²

By 1891, the number of sons taken on as apprentices at Moose Factory was in the minds of some, a "burden" on the Company:

¹⁶¹ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.9,20d,22,24d,31; cf.29d.

¹⁶² Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.28,28d; Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 2; Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.28d; Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fo.19d. Differentiation between "Apprentices" and "Boys" is not always clear-cut. For example, G. Linklater is identified as an apprentice on December 5, 1870, but the journal entry for December 12 refers to "the boy Linklater" (Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.29).

...The great number of mechanics is due in a great measure to the objectionable practice of taking on so many of the servants' children as apprentices, who when out of their time are sometimes retained as mechanics at Moose or sent to Albany or Rupert's House at both of which places apprentices are also engaged as mechanics and who become a burden upon the posts.¹⁶³

Nevertheless, journal entries documenting the odd jobs performed by "the Boys" at Moose Factory continue through to the 20th century:

1904 March 21 - A. Morrison & G. McLeod with the two boys at the boat.

1904 April 28 - A. Morrison & one of the Boys breaking down the "Galley."¹⁶⁴

Figure 2
Hierarchical Structure of Hudson's Bay Company Trading System at Moose Factory

¹⁶³ Document C-21: HBCA B.135/e/29:44. The term "mechanics" used by Parsons may refer to general labourers.

¹⁶⁴ Document A-31: HBCA B.135/a/189, fos.90,92,93.

Source: Judd, "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory", 77.

After the HBC and NWC amalgamated in 1821, the HBC restructured their ranking system into "classes" of commissioned officers, clerks, postmasters, and servants. Judd has reconstructed the hierarchical structure of the HBC trading system at Moose Factory for both the pre- and post-1821 periods (see Figure 2 below).¹⁶⁵ Simpson's "Character Book" of 1832 categorizes men above the Servant rank in the following order: First Class (Chief Factors); Second Class (Chief Traders); Clerks, and; Postmasters. It is only in the last two categories that Simpson characterizes several men as "half breed."¹⁶⁶

Beginning in the 1830s, the Abstracts of Servants Accounts reflect this new hierarchy, listing men according to their rank. The only mixed-ancestry man listed who may have reached the officer class is George McLeod (b) who, at the time of the treaty in 1905, was (temporarily) in charge of the Moose post.¹⁶⁷ However, rough calculations from abstracts between 1821 and 1892 (at 5 year intervals) shows that in the Moose Factory district overall, 17 to 40% (mean = 27%) of clerk and postmaster positions were held by men of mixed-ancestry (Table 9).

Table 9

¹⁶⁵

Judd, "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory," 77. Judd does not list specific HBC records for her reconstruction of the hierarchical structure of the HBC trading system at Moose Factory. Her discussion indicates that she relied on the Moose Factory Lists of Servants (HBCA B.135/f/1-9, pre-1821 period), Abstracts of Servants Accounts (HBCA B.135/g/1-74, post 1821 period), and HBC Governor's Papers (eg., HBCA D.4/87).

¹⁶⁶ Document C-13: Williams, Glyndwr, ed. "The 'Character Book' of George Simpson, 1832." In: *Hudson's Bay Miscellany, 1670-1870* (Winnipeg: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1975), 169,187,200,229,232,233.

¹⁶⁷ The treaty diaries of Samuel Stewart and Daniel MacMartin both identify J.G. Mowat as the man in charge of Moose Post in August 1905 (Document E-21: NAC RG10, Vol. 11399, File 1, 95; Document E-22: QUA MacMartin Diary, 28). However, HBC records show that Geo. McKenzie was the Chief Factor at Moose from 1902-1907. Stewart's diary indicates that McKenzie was at Charlton Island at the time of their visit, and it appears that Mowat was temporarily in charge. Stewart's diary entry for August 10 states that Mowat lived in officers' quarters, where the Commissioners dined that night (Document E-21: NAC RG10, Vol. 11399, File 1, 102). Mowat was in full charge of Moose Factory from 1912-1914; see Arthur, Eric et.al. *Moose Factory 1673-1973* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973 [1949]), 14-15.

Mixed-Ancestry HBC Clerks and Postmasters, Moose Factory District 1821-1892

<u>Year</u>	<u>Clerks & Postmasters</u>	<u>Mixed-Ancestry (%)</u>
1821-22	31	7 (23%)
1824-25	25	8 (32%)
1829-30	35	13 (37%)
1834/35	37	12 (32%)
1839/40	30	12 (40%)
1844/45	25	8 (32%)
1849/50	24	4 (17%)
1854/55	29	6 (20%)
1860/61	36	10 (28%)
1865/66	23	5 (22%)
1869/70	25	8 (32%)
1874/75	24	6 (25%)
1879/80	20	5 (25%)
1884/85	23	4 (17%)
1891/92	22	6 (27%)

Source: Appendix B.

Judd has conducted a similar quantitative analysis of “Native” employees in the Moose Factory district, concluding that mixed-ancestry employees experienced a “marked loss of economic opportunity, a closing down of access to the more prestigious economic classes.”¹⁶⁸

At Moose Factory, most mixed-ancestry men remained in the “Servant” class as canoe-men, sailors, sloopers, guides, interpreters, boatbuilders, carpenters, joiners, blacksmiths, coopers or general labourers. Several were promoted to positions of postmaster or clerk. Of the 122 mixed-ancestry men whose occupations can be traced in the HBC employee lists, nineteen (15.6%) reached the clerk or postmaster class.¹⁶⁹

3.2 MOOSE FACTORY SOCIETY: WOMEN, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

3.2.1 Women of the Establishment

The earliest mention of women at Moose Factory is from accounts of De Troyes’ attack on the original British fort in 1686 after which the French found two Indian women in cabins

¹⁶⁸ Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 78.

¹⁶⁹

Appendix B, “Moose Factory Mixed-Ancestry Database.”

belonging to HBC men.¹⁷⁰ In the post journals from the post newly established in 1730, the earliest entry referring to women associated with the Moose establishment, is found in the 1735 account of the fire that destroyed most of the Factory buildings:

1735 December 26 - The Cookroom was on fire from top to bottom & had [?] through the top of the Oven. We had one Indian Girl burned in the Factory that we see no more of here.¹⁷¹

Women from among the “homeguard” Cree will have become as familiar with life at Moose Factory as did the men. In August 1738, Richard Staunton and George Howy reported to their superiors that he had little control over the “Indian women which was too common amongst the Englishmen.”¹⁷² From the earliest journal entries, it is apparent that not only Cree men, but entire families came to the post each spring and fall for the goose hunt. The “homeguard” are referred to generally in the plural – “Indians” – or as “families”:

1731 April 15 - May 7 - Came in Indians to hunt Geese for us.

1742 May 17-18 - the natives Geese hunting [...] took 3 bottles [of brandy] to treat out home guard on the plantation.

1764 August 29 - Six families of the Hunters came in who Brought a few Summer Goods, also six sides of dried [sic] Deers Flesh, some fresh Beaver, & one large [Seal?]... sent ‘em down to the Marsh tomorrow to Hunt.¹⁷³

That “homeguard” Cree sometimes left elderly men and women at the post for the winter, is further evidence that families spent the summer months together at Moose Factory. These elderly Cree supported their residence at the post by supplementing country-food provisions:

1764 October 26 - All the Indians are gone to their winter Quarters Except for three or four old men & women who I shall employ in Catching rabbits & fish.

1765 June 25 - Rec’d from our old men and Women, 1 Porcupine, 74 lb fish & 9

¹⁷⁰ Rich, *Hudson’s Bay Company 1670-1870, Vol. I*, 214.

¹⁷¹ Document A-2: HBCA B.135/a/6, fo.2. For a full account of the fire and reconstruction of Moose Factory, see Glover, “Introduction” to *Letters from Hudson’s Bay*, xlv-xlvii.

¹⁷² Document C-1: “Letter 70,” in *Letters from Hudson’s Bay, 1703-40*, ed. K.G. Davies (London: Hudson’s Bay Record Society, 1965), 271.

¹⁷³ Document A-1: HBCA B.135/a/1, fos.19-21; Document A-3: HBCA B.135/a/11, fo.64d ; Document A-6: HBCA B.135/a/39, fo.1; cf.1d-3d.

rabbits.¹⁷⁴

In the winter of 1793, Chief Factor John Thomas decided to build a more permanent house for those Cree who remained at the post:

1793 November 14 - December 1 - Yoked the cattle to haul some timber to the spot where we propose building a log tent for the Indians. [...] Cooper and one hand building a log tent for the Indians.¹⁷⁵

During this early period, journal entries occasionally reveal that HBC men had married into “homeguard” Cree families:

1742 May 16 - Old Mucatoon, father of the rabbit skin guard... wanted his son-in-law Augustin Frost to goe [sic] by land... & to take another weeks pleasure with his family who are a Common occurrence to the Factory... the old Man & Frost... contrived their Measures for another Country journey which is all Frost’s delight to be with them, but I have other material work for him in making Mortar.¹⁷⁶

Journal entries from the mid-18th and into the early 19th century refer to the Cree or mixed-ancestry spouse of an HBC man as “my woman” or “his woman” and imply that these women were being integrated into Moose Factory’s social organization:

1750 September 3 - Mr. Rob’t Pilgraim, his woman and son with Capt. John Fowler went a Board the Long boat with all Mr. Pilgraim’s goods to goe [sic] to the Sloop which lay at anker [sic].

1772 September 16 - ... my [Chief Factor Eusebius Kitchen’s] own Woman.

1776 October 13 - Mr. Atkinson, Sloop Master went for Eastmain to fetch His Woman.

1819 February 25 - My [Hannah Bay Post Master William Corrigan’s] woman and Jacob [their son] brought 1 B. skins, 7 Martens Skins and 12 [lb?] Venison from Nanaskis Son’s tent.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Document A-6: HBCA B.135/a/39, fos.7d-8d, 31; cf. 28d,31d.

¹⁷⁵ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.6,7.

¹⁷⁶ Document A-3: HBCA B.135/a/11, fos.63d-64.

¹⁷⁷ Document A-5: HBCA B.135/a/20b, 3 September 1750 [no folio #]; Document A-7: HBCA B.135/a/52, fo.3; B.135/a/58, 13 October 1776 [no folio #]; Document A-18: HBCA B.135/a/121, fos.19d-20,42. (Note that the

An exception to this labelling is found in journal entries from 1795 which refer to the spouse of George Moore as “his wife:”

1795 July 30 - George Moore & his Wife arrived with Micawbanish [Indians?].

1797 August 10 - PM three canoes arrived from Micawbanish... Persons returned in these canoes are [7 HBC men] and George Moore & his Wife... They brought down the remainder of the Furs.¹⁷⁸

As noted above, by at least the 1790s, journal entries begin to distinguish between “Indian women” and “the women,” the latter inferred to mean the women who belonged to the post community. Examples of these two types of references to women in journals dating to the 18th century, include:

1793 October 8 - Received fish from the women.

1794 February 14 - An Indian woman brought some fish in.

1794 November 8 - The women returned to their Tent at Maidman’s Creek.

1795 August 26 - Went with one of the Boys in a Canoe and fetched some more Fish from the Women, a Family of home Indians and two from Hannah Bay brought two or three Summer Skins.¹⁷⁹

It is also in the late 18th century that children are mentioned alongside these women, as in the following entry by Chief Factor John Thomas:

1797 July 27 - With the assistance of the Women and Children, I got some of the Hay out of the way and raked before the Rain came on.¹⁸⁰

Although most references to children are made in the context of schooling (see below), entries noting children working alongside “the women” (presumably their mothers) are found in 19th

1776 entry implies that employees were allowed Company time to “fetch” their spouse.)

¹⁷⁸ Document A-12: HBCA B.135/a/82, fo.25d; Document A-13: HBCA B.135/a/84, fo.35. (The frequent association between George Moore and the Micawbanish Indians likely indicates that Moore managed an outpost among this group. It is also possible that Moore was related to them either by blood or marriage.)

¹⁷⁹ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.3,12; Document A-12: HBCA B.135/a/82, fos.7,28.

¹⁸⁰ Document A-13: HBCA B.135/a/84, fo.33d.

century post journals as well:

1810 September 10 - Thos. Richards Jun'r, Thos & John Knight and William Leask together with two women and their Children set off with supplies for Abbitibbi and to reside there.

1829 October 1 - Eight Men with sixteen Women and Children were digging up potatoes in the field of which 208 Bushels were brought home and put into the Vault.¹⁸¹

By 1810, entries referring to “the women” are common-place. Several entries indicate that the Chief Factor assigned various tasks to “the women” just as he would other servants under his charge. The implication is that as members of the post community, women were now expected to contribute in supporting that community:

1810 February 3 - the School Master, Boys & some of the Women were at Maidman's Creek angling, but with little success.

1810 June 5 - all the Women are now off Fishing.

1810 June 13 - ...the Water had become so shoal that 'twas found necessary to examine the ripples previous to their bringing down these last Rafts & those that did this business (i.e. the Women & one of the Boys) floated them down...

1810 June 18 - set the Women to work to restretch & clean the Furs rec'd yesterday.¹⁸²

In instances when the article “the” is absent and the context is not clear, it is difficult to determine with complete confidence whether entries refer to women who belong to the post community, or to women from “homeguard” Cree families residing at Moose Factory from spring to fall:

1830 July 30 - 10 Women employed on the Hay field.

1840 September 14-25 - About 10 girls, Women & Boys had been engaged in the forenoon shaking out the hay. [...] the same Girls & Women as Yesterday were in the field turning it &tc. [...] 11 Women & Girls to the Eastward, turning & picking Hay. [...] the Hired Women Haymaking same as yesterday. [...] 9 women & girls assisting in the Field. [...] The same 10 women & Girls also employed as

¹⁸¹ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fo.38d; Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.3d.

¹⁸² Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fos.13d,27d,28d,29; cf. fos.7d,9,13,14d,32,33.

before.

1851 January 22 - Two women cutting out Tracking shoes.

1871 May 16-18 - Two Indian lads heating & carrying water for women who are washing the mess house. [...] the two Indian lads still employed heating and carrying water for the women washing the house they have now finished the officers house and have only the Dairy & Kitchen to wash tomorrow.¹⁸³

The first European woman was “introduced” into Moose Factory society in 1830 by Chief Factor John George McTavish who arrived with his “Scottish bride.”¹⁸⁴ The McTavishes apparently snubbed the other women of the establishment and the mixed-ancestry families of other HBC men, creating racial and class tensions. In commenting on the situation in 1831, Governor Simpson reverted to the use of “squaw” in reference to country-wives:

1831 August 15 - I am perfectly amazed at the folly of Beioley in attempting to thrust his [infernal?] Squaw upon the acquaintance of Mrs. McTavish and understand that the other ladies of Moose are [violent?] and indignant at being kept at such a distance, like wise their husbands, the young [Gentlemen] particularly I understand are open mouthed about it, especially the fellows at Brunswick. The greater distance at which they are kept the better...¹⁸⁵

Chief Factor and Mrs. McTavish left Moose Factory in 1835. In 1843, Rev. George Barnley (Wesleyan Missionary Society) brought the second European woman into Moose society:

1843 January 14 - The Rev'd. Barnley... is much respected, and continues most indefatigable in his endeavours to inculcate religious principles amongst both native and Europeans, he is however of opinion, that with the assistance of a pious European Lady for a wife, he would be of much greater benefit amongst the population, more particularly the females.

¹⁸³ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.51d; Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.21d-22d; Document A-25: HBCA B.135/a/155, fo.26d; Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.43d.

¹⁸⁴ Williams, “Introduction” to “The ‘Character Book’ of George Simpson,” 157-158 (see also Document C-13, 171). McTavish was in charge of York Factory until 1829. He had a mixed-ancestry country wife, Nancy McKenzie (or *Matooskie*) who was later married off to another Company man, and they were “quickly bundled out of sight” to avoid embarrassment. 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; Simpson’s country wife Margaret Taylor was also quickly married off to a Company man.

¹⁸⁵ Document C-12: HBCA B.135/c/2, 74.

1843 May 12 - I have received a communication from Rev. Barnley requesting any good offices to obtain a passage by the ship of this season for a lady from England with a view of making her his wife.¹⁸⁶

According to Judd, Mrs. Barnley also stirred resentment among local wives, as well as their husbands, as Barnley and his wife assumed an “unpleasant tone of superiority.”¹⁸⁷

Aside from Mrs. McTavish and Mrs. Barnley, it almost certain that all other wives were either Indian or mixed-ancestry at this time. They were also country-wives. However, a change occurred in 1840 with the arrival of Rev. Barnley at Moose Factory, and the solemnization of marriages in the church (see below). It is significant to note that these marriages coincide with a change in journal entries’ references to women of the establishment. Rather than “my woman” or “the women,” journal entries tend to refer to an HBC man’s spouse as “wife”:

1840 June 17th - “Late in the evening certain of the Albany Indians, Shawaiwetum & Wapastue &tc with their Families, relatives of the Blacksmith’s Wife, made their appearance again here - as usual of late Years, their assigned reason for coming is the same as hitherto, Viz. a Desire to see their relatives.”¹⁸⁸

Journal references to “wife of” were most commonly used in entries recording a birth:

1850 September 29 - the wife of Mr. Sloopmaster Swanson was safely delivered of a daughter this afternoon.

1851 May 19 - About two O’clock this afternoon the wife of Wm. Linklater was safely delivered of a daughter.¹⁸⁹

However, there is some evidence that local women continued to be placed on a lower social scale than Euro-Canadian women who were awarded the title of “Lady” or “Mrs.”:

1856 January 9 - The Lady of the Rev’d Mr. Horden this morning safely delivered of a daughter.

¹⁸⁶ Document C-15: HBCA D.5/8, fo.28; Document C-16: HBCA D.4/28, fo.37.

¹⁸⁷ Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 81-82; Judd cites a letter from C.F. Miles to George Simpson dated 30 June 1847 (HBCA A.11/46).

¹⁸⁸ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.5-5d.

¹⁸⁹ Document A-25: HBCA B.135/a/155, fos.16d,38d.

1870 August 16 - Mrs Cotter had a son today both mother & child doing well.¹⁹⁰

Nevertheless, mixed-ancestry and Cree women continued to form the majority of wives at Moose Factory throughout most of the 19th century. In 1884 Borron reported:

Many of [the servants of the company] are Scotchmen or Scotch half-breeds. As long as they remain unmarried they can live, and even save money. Few, however, do this; the far greater number marry Indian or half-breed women. The single ration [received from the company], together with what the wife may be able to add by fishing and hunting, suffices the young couple for a while. But as child after child is born, the annual pittance of wages is drawn upon not only for clothing but for food... And when the families are large and chiefly girls, they are, I fear, very sorely pinched to live... There is no employment for women, and as to getting out of the country to seek it elsewhere it is simply impossible.¹⁹¹

3.2.2 Marriage Patterns

Marriages at Moose Factory were performed in three ways: 1) “B la façon du pays,” or in the custom of the country, by which a man and woman consented to a common-law union; 2) civil ceremonies performed by the Chief Factor of the HBC post, and; 3) church ceremonies according to the Church of England liturgy.

Prior to 1830, customary or country marriages were the most common, if not only, form of marital union at Moose Factory. Indicators of these types of unions are found in references to an HBC man and “his woman”:

1750 September 3 - Mr. Rob’t Pilgraim, his woman and son.

1776 October 13 - Mr. Atkinson, Sloop Master went for Eastmain to fetch His Woman.¹⁹²

In 1779, the HBC surveyor Philip Turnor explained that “the Indians that came to the House” encouraged liaisons between their women and the traders, and that if “country wives” were not taken, trade would suffer.¹⁹³ In 1819, Chief Trader Jacob Corrigal, then the Post Master at

¹⁹⁰ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163:61; Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.16. The wife of Chief Factor James Cotter, Frances, was born in Ontario (Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory [NAC Reel C-13286]).

¹⁹¹ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 84-85.

¹⁹² Document A-5: HBCA B.135/a/20b:3 September 1750 [no folio #]; Document A-8: HBCA B.135/a/58:13 October 1776 [no folio #].

¹⁹³ Glover, “Introduction” to *Letters from Hudson’s Bay*, xxv-xxvi; cf. Tyrrell, J.B., ed. *Journals of Samuel*

Hannah Bay wrote a letter referring to “My woman and [son] Jacob.”¹⁹⁴ In the 1840s, Rev. George Barnley certified several such country marriages of couples in the HBC Southern Department:

[1841] Dec’r 20th - This is to certify that on this date George Moor (Jun’r) was lawfully united in Marriage to Emma Good (They having been united according to the custom of the Country since June 1816) by me [George Barnley, Wesleyan Missionary, Rupert’s Land].

This is to certify that George McPherson, batchelor of Martins falls, southern Department, Rupert’s Land, and Isabelle Okewukumigikwa of the same place (having been united by mutual contract from August 1, 1833) were lawfully united in matrimony this 3rd day of July 1842 by me [George Barnley, Wesleyan Missionary].¹⁹⁵

By the 1830s, civil unions were performed by the Chief Factor, who apparently held the legal authority to certify marriages. In 1837, for example, Chief Factor George Keith married the following couples:

1837 May 11 - This is to certify that this date Philip Turner was lawfully married to Jane Chisholm Boland by me, George Keith, Ch. Factor and Member of Council of Rupert’s Land.

1837 July 29 - This is to certify that this date James King was lawfully married to Sophia Garton by me, George Keith, Ch. Factor and Member of Council of Rupert’s Land.¹⁹⁶

In 1840, within days of Rev. Barnley’s arrival at Moose Factory on June 3, church marriages were being performed. However, the Chief Factor maintained the power to determine whether or not his men were permitted to marry:

1840 June 18 - This evening Wm. Isbister the Cattle Keeper made application to

Hearne and Philip Turnor (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1934), 274-275.

¹⁹⁴ Document A-18: HBCA B.135/a/121, fos.19d-20,42.

¹⁹⁵ Document D-5: AO F978 MS311 (Reel 2), 20 December 1841; Document D-6: AO F978 MS161, 3 July 1842. According to Brown (*Strangers in Blood*, 51) the 1841 marriage was performed at Moose Factory. It is uncertain if the 1842 marriage took place at Moose Factory, or if Barnley travelled to Martins Falls.

¹⁹⁶ Document D-5: AO F978 MS 311 (Reel 2), Marriages 1829-1852. For both of these marriages, the grooms are positively identified as mixed-ancestry (see Appendix B: Mixed-Ancestry Database). The brides’ surnames (Boland and Garton) suggest they are also mixed-ancestry, but is not confirmed in records collected here.

be allowed to marry Betsy Turnor (One of Jos'h. Turnor's daughters) which I of course had no objection to on understanding that the Young Woman & her Parents were all consenting parties, and between 7 & 8 pm they accordingly were married according to the English Church Liturgy, Mr. Barnley reading the appointed Service.

1840 August 4 - In the evening Mr. Wm. Swanson and Frances Robertson (one of the two young women mentioned on the 20th Ult'o. as arriving from Michipicoten) were married according to the Church of England forms, the Rev'd. Mr. Barnley officiating.¹⁹⁷

An example of a marriage refused is found in the 1855 journal when Chief Factor Robert Miles rejected the proposal of one of his men to marry an "Indian":

1855 August 19 - In the church today the Rev'd Horden published bands of marriage between James McPherson, one of the Hon'ble Company's Servants at this Factory, & Hanna Ward daughter of Ouskegee, one of the Indians hunting for this Factory, whom the Rev'd Gentleman forbid in the name of C.F. Miles as being not permitted by the public regulations of the Service.¹⁹⁸

Other instances of marriages at the Factory include:

1855 September 5 - This morning was married by the Rev'd John Horden by special Licence Mr. John Garton, Postmaster of Abitibi to Miss Mary Spencer daughter of Mr. John Spencer of Fort George Eastmain District. The happy couple took their departure after breakfast in the Canoe which came yesterday and we must hope they will enjoy a pleasant Honeymoon as they proceed to their destination of Abitibi.

1860 June 4 - Patrick Faries was married this afternoon to an Indian girl.

1860 July 2 - Young James King was married to Betsy Elson today about 5 P.M.

1860 October 26 - Norman McDonald was married to an Indian girl today.

1860 May 21 - Isaac Hunter one of our Sailors was married this afternoon to

¹⁹⁷ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.5d,14d; cf.1d.

¹⁹⁸ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 26. Time did not allow for an in-depth analysis of the ramifications of the HBC policy to restrict European-Indian marriages. Future research could more closely examine existing Moose Factory marriage records to determine if, for example, mixed-ancestry endogamy increased as a result of this policy.

Isabella McDonald a relative of Mrs. Swanson.

1863 June 23 - Mr. Hamilton was married to Miss [Ann] Miles this morning & started in the afternoon for E'main.

1864 April 29 - Gunder [Udgaarden] the Officers servant was married this afternoon to old Jos. Turnor's youngest daughter.¹⁹⁹

The marriages listed above include examples of both intermarriage between European, mixed-ancestry and Cree persons, as well as instances of mixed-ancestry endogamy. However, little can be said about patterns of marriage from these sporadic references found in the course of reviewing a sample of post journals, and from incomplete marriage records spanning the 1830s-1860s for all of Rupert's Land. However, from the time the Anglican Diocese of Moosonee was formed in 1872 under the Bishopry of Right Rev. John Horden, marriage records for Moose Factory are complete. Table 10 categorizes the identity of the bride and groom in the continuous record of marriages from 1874 to 1908.²⁰⁰

Of the 51 marriages among members of the Moose Factory post population, 36 (70%) involved mixed-ancestry brides and/or grooms. Of these 36 marriages, almost a third (30.6%) are positively identified as endogamous (mixed-ancestry : mixed-ancestry). Six of these endogamous marriages were between sons and daughters of the eight prominent mixed-ancestry families identified in the previous chapter (section 2.3). Finally, almost all of the 51 Moose Factory marriages were between residents of the HBC post community; only four were marriages to residents of other posts, including Whale River (#84), Fort Hope (#114), Fort George (#115), and the Revillon Frere Moose River Post (#137).

Table 10
Marriages by Identity, 1874-1908

<u>Identity</u>	<u>Number of Marriages (%)</u>
"Indian" = "Indian"	99 (66.0%)
Mixed-Ancestry : Mixed-Ancestry	11 (7.3%)

¹⁹⁹ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 30-31; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fos.1,3d,11a,25; Document A-28: HBCA B.135/a/180, fos.4,37.

²⁰⁰

Document D-10: AO F978 - GS 862287. "Indian" individuals are indicated as such in the "Father's rank or occupation" column of the marriage registry, as are several of the European individuals. Other European individuals and all of the mixed-ancestry individuals have been identified by using the database (Appendix B).

Mixed-Ancestry : “Indian”	12	(8.0%)
Mixed-Ancestry : European	9	(6.0%)
Mixed-Ancestry : Identity uncertain	4	(2.7%)
European : “Indian”	1	(0.7%)
European : European	<u>14</u>	(9.3%)
TOTAL MARRIAGES, 1874-1908	150	

Source: AO F978 - GS 862287 (Document D-10)

3.2.3 Families, Dwellings and ‘Neighbourhoods’

One of the earliest ‘official’ remarks on the presence of country-families at Moose Factory is found in Joseph Beioley’s district report for 1817-18:

Flett John - Blacksmith... He has a large family dependent on him for support and consequently finds great difficulty in laying up a little for his and their maintenance in his old age.²⁰¹

That same year, George Moore built a house for himself and his family.²⁰² In 1822 Charles Beads built a “small House” with the help of two fellow mixed-ancestry men (George Moore and Thomas Richards).²⁰³ By 1827, Chief Factor Christie noted there were several “people who have Families and live in detached houses.”²⁰⁴

It appears that other HBC posts were also experiencing an increase in the number of dependant families. Regulations were passed to curb desertion and non-support of country families. In 1827 the Moose Factory Minutes of Council record that the wages of those men with country families will be garnisheed:

That all officers or servants of the company having women or children and wishing to leave the same in the Country on their retirement therefrom be required to make such provision for their future maintenance, more particularly for that of the children as circumstances may reasonably warrant and the means of the individual permit.

²⁰¹ Document C-5: HBCA B.135/e/4, fos.12-12d

²⁰² Document A-17: HBCA B.135/a/119a, fo.27; cf. Document A-19: HBCA B.135/a/122, fo.15.

²⁰³ Document A-20: HBCA B.135/a/125, 34.

²⁰⁴ Document A-21: HBCA B.135/a/130, 12 December 1827 [no folio #].

That all those desirous of withdrawing the same from the country be allowed every facility for that purpose and none be allowed hereafter to take a woman without binding himself down to have 1/10th of his annual wages in the hands of the Company as a provision for his family in event of Death or retirement from the country.²⁰⁵

This regulation had limited effect. The 1829-30 post journal contains several entries regarding new accommodation for men with families, for example:

1829 September 17 - Three carpenters began to prepare timber for building a small House for the accommodation of some of the People who have families.²⁰⁶

In 1843 Chief Factor Christie wrote to Governor Simpson that families continued to increase in number, and recommended that construction of detached housing be discontinued:

1843 January 14 - The number of families at this place, are very considerably increased of late years; and it would be very desirable could some method be adopted for the more larger families, being removed to other stations in the Country; or allow them to withdraw for Canada, or Red River (going to the latter they are so far on their way to the Columbias) - as their contracts expire, and after the removal of these family men, that no more detached dwelling Houses be permitted, substituting only a range of House for Single men, or those with small families, nearer to the place from which the men could be more readily assembled when occasion might require.²⁰⁷

Simpson replied to Christie, reiterating in part, at least, the necessity of the 1827 regulation:

1843 May 12 - We cannot allow Pierre Robillard with his large family to proceed to Red River without means, but as he seems to be a useful man & his family can be easily maintained at a fishing station, he may be retained in the District. [...] We cannot allow European servants to quit the district without taking their families with them, & none except men with large families can be allowed to proceed to Canada.²⁰⁸

Post journal entries show that from the 1820s onward, mixed-ancestry HBC men not only built new homes for their families, but were given Company time and manpower to do so:

²⁰⁵ Document C-9: HBCA B.135/k/1, 76 [fo.38d]; cf. Francis and Morantz, *Partners in Furs*, 156.

²⁰⁶ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.1; cf. fos.4d,13,16d,18,20d.

²⁰⁷ Document C-15: HBCA D.5/8, fo.28.

²⁰⁸ Document C-16: HBCA D.4/28, fos.33d-34d.

1855 September 22- John Richards allowed time to build a house for himself out of an old building we gave him.

1860 November 9-24 - 4 of the married men plastering their houses. [...] Philip Turnor & Norman McDonald were plastering their houses. [...] Philip Turnor & 4 men were clapboarding the gables of his house. [...] Philip Turnor & 4 men clapboarding his house, King and 4 men fastening up double windows.

1864 May 11 - 23 - Jas. King working at new house for himself. [...] J. King & two men working at his new house. [...] J. King with two lads at his house. [...] J. King with Faries & T. Swanson working at his house.

1895 June 17 - July 15 - A. Faries & Wm. McLeod making repairs &tc in Robt. Turner's house. [...] Fraser repairing his house, Angus Faries & Wm McLeod (a) repairing R. Turner's House. [...] Albert Swanson with Richard S. & Wm McLeod & 2 Indians putting new foundation under his house. [...] C. Fraser & [Iserhoff] making beds for themselves.²⁰⁹

Increasingly from the 1850s onward, journal entries refer to the allowance of Company time and equipment for the personal use of family men. The majority of these entries are about men replenishing firewood to heat their homes. Although these entries are found throughout the year, the week between Christmas and New Year's Day was a time of large-scale firewood collection for family use, a tradition that began at least as early as 1829:

1829 December 24-28 - The Men who have families and live in separate houses were allowed this day to procure firewood for themselves. [...] The people who live in detached Houses were permitted to assist their Families in getting Home firewood and the labouring people at the place were also assisting some of those to procure wood.

1855 December 26 - Holidays for servants during which however they cut firewood for the Houses who have families.

1860-61 December 26 - January 7 - Men allowed a holiday, some of the married men were carting firewood for their own use. [...] Magnus Linklater was carting home his firewood. [...] blacksmith allowed the use of the animals today for carting his firewood. [...] James Morrison carting his firewood. [...] Norman McDonald carting firewood for himself. [...] James Linklater hauling his firewood today. [...] King assisted by 4 men hauling his firewood. [...] 4 men carting

²⁰⁹ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 35; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fos.11b-12; Document A-28: HBCA B.135/a/180, fos.38d-40d; Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fos.40-41.

firewood for John Richards.

1870 December 26-31- McBean hauling his wood today with oxen & horses. [...] Philip Turnor hauling his wood today. [...] Jas. King hauling his wood today. [...] Jas. Morrison hauling today. [...] Albert Swanson hauling today. [...] Rutherford hauling today.²¹⁰

The Christmas and New Year season was also a time of “Regales” for Moose Factory “resident families”, and journals indicate that “homeguard” Cree families were not excluded:

1850 December 24-31- The Servants of the Post & the resident families on the Island were Served out the usual Xmas Regales. [...] The Servants & Resident families served their usual Regales.

1855 December 25-31 - The Servants’ Resident families & Indians served out the usual Regales for Xmas day [...] Holidays for servants during which however they cut firewood for the Houses who have families [...] Servants & families served their usual New Year Regales.

1860 December 22 - Several Indians came in today for the holidays.

1904 January 2 - Yesterday being the beginning of a new year was attended with the usual reception of servants & Indians - Very orderly... Indians nearly all ready to leave for hunting grounds.²¹¹

Two reports in 1890 characterize the non-Cree populations of Moose Factory and other post settlements in the James Bay region as a collection of fur trade families. The first is a letter to Joseph Wrigley, the HBC Commissioner in Winnipeg, from Chief Factor Joseph Fortesque, whose concern is not only the number of families, but their interconnectedness to the Cree trappers:

²¹⁰ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.16d; Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 59; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fos.14d-15; Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.30d. At Christmas 1870, the only activities recorded during the entire week were the men hauling their own wood; each day, a different man was allowed use of the oxen and horses to haul wood to their houses (cf. Document A-28: HBCA B.135/a/180, fos.21d-25, December 1863).

²¹¹ Document A-25: HBCA B.135/a/155, fos.24d-25; Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 59; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fo.14; Document A-31: HBCA B.135/a/189, fo.85d. Other holidays celebrated over the years were Guy Fawkes Day (November 5, 1783 - Document A-9: Rich, *Moose Fort Journals*, 15), and St. Andrews Day (November 30, 1860 - Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fo.12d). On April 23, 1794 a fine spring day “was given up to the men, and they shot at the Target as usual, and after diverted themselves at Cricket foot ball & other Recreations” (Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.18-18d).

1890 February 1 - I regret to say most of the men sympathize with them [the Indians], and especially with the ones here, with whom both they, and the servants at Albany are connected by blood and marriage ties – Every servant (except apprentices) both here and there being intermarried, with each other and the coast Natives, we are beginning to feel the effects of a policy, which to escape temporary difficulties in recruiting in time past, has only opened the way for greater, now that the numbers have increased so largely that employment in the Service, cannot be found for the surplus.²¹²

Borron's observations are more objective, but confirms the nature of fur trade society in the region as family-oriented:

The Hudson's Bay Company have nearly 20 fur-trading establishments [in the territory north of the height of land], various called "factories," "houses," and "posts." In addition to the natives who trade there, the company have officers, clerks, mechanics and servants at the more important posts, and an officer and servant at even the smallest. These are generally Englishmen or Scotchmen – for the most part married and the fathers of families.²¹³

S.K. Parson's Inspection Report for 1891 counted five buildings "divided into two compartments and occupied by two families of married servants" and another ten buildings "accommodating only one family of married servants." This amounts to 20 families. The "Men's House" was suitable for the single servants, but scarcely used "as nearly every man at the place is married and has a separate house." Like Fortesque, Parson was of the opinion that the number of men and families now being supported at the Factory was a "burden" on the Company:

Of the 29 men, only 2 besides the apprentices are unmarried and most of them have separate houses to live in built at the Company's expense...²¹⁴

The District Report for 1901 includes a site map of Moose Factory showing all buildings at the settlement (see Figure 3). The buildings are numbered as per descriptions contained in the 1895 District Report. Five of the HBC servants' log dwellings are located on the southwest side of the Factory site near the mission buildings. It is possible that these are the duplexes described by Parsons in 1891 (above). Another eleven log dwellings are located on the northeastern side of the site, and each appears to have a large garden associated with the house. Dwelling #61 (no garden) is described as "Indian Property. Indian Servants' House" and is surrounded by five unmarked dwellings, identified as "Indian Shanties, not numbered on Plan." Two or three other

²¹² Document C-20: HBCA D.20/58, fo.274.

²¹³ Document E-11: Borron, "Report on the Basin of Moose River," 92.

²¹⁴ Document C-21: HBCA B.135/e/29:1,4,43.

unmarked dwellings are located among the northeast Servants' houses plus another eight are located along the "Edge of clearing."²¹⁵

In total, the northeast 'suburb' of Moose Factory consisted of 27-28 dwellings, 11 of which were Company houses occupied by servants, and 16-17 of which belonged to "homeguard" Cree families. Unfortunately, HBC records do not name the servants living in these dwellings, and it is not possible to determine if they might represent a mixed-ancestry 'neighbourhood.'

There is some support for the notion of 'neighbourhood' when the 1901 site plan is compared with the 1901 Census enumerations (Table 5).²¹⁶ If the assumption that the enumerator visited dwellings proximal to each other holds true, mixed-ancestry families were concentrated in two locations: 1) buildings #114-131, and; 2) buildings #184-189. That the missionary Rev. Holland lived in building #191 may indicate that the latter five families also lived in the vicinity of the mission on the southwest side of the fort. Indeed, there are five "Servants Houses" shown in that location on the site plan (#10-14). Census households #112-114 were occupied by the HBC Chief Factor (William Broughton), the foreman (Allan Nicolson) and the clerk (possibly John G. Mowat); dwellings for men in these positions were located in the centre of the Factory site (#18,20,21). Thus it remains possible that the mixed-ancestry families enumerated in buildings 114-131 were in the 'neighbourhood' to the northeast of the fort where separate family dwellings and garden plots had been established beginning in the 1820s (site plan #51-62).

²¹⁵ Document C-22: HBCA B.135/e/32, 3-4; Document C-24: HBCA B.135/e/34.

²¹⁶ Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

Figure 3
Moose Factory Site Plan 1901

Source: HBCA B.135/e/34 (Document C-24)

3.2.4 Children and Education

By the 1790s it is clear that the Governor and Committee of the Hudson's Bay Company in London were fully aware of school-age children belonging to their servants in Rupert's Land. In order to encourage these children to enter the service as adults, the London Committee began an education program in 1794. Instructions were received by "Geo. Gladman & Council, Eastmain Factory," the gentlemen in charge of the district that included Moose Factory:

1794 May 29 - Item 21. We have sent you fifty Primers, or Spelling Books, for the purpose of teaching the children of your Factory to Read, and very much hope, you will make a proper Use of them.²¹⁷

Four years later, John Thomas reported that the books were indeed being put to "proper use" at Moose Factory, although it is unclear who was instructing the students:

1798 December 18 - In order to avoid daily repetition concerning the boys & other children, I shall here remark that except when their Services are required out Doors, they are at kept at their Books.²¹⁸

In 1806, the HBC London Committee addressed the issue of school masters:

1806 May 31 - Item 14. Wishing to cultivate as much as possible an intimate connection with the natives all over the country, to facilitate your Intercourse with them, which must of course prove advantageous to the Company, we have thought it would be advisable to instruct the children belonging to our Servants in the principles of a Religion and teach them from their Youth reading, writing, arithmetic & accounts which we should hope would attract them to our Service & in a few years become a small colony of very useful hands. We regret that the nature of the Country & Service prevent some insuperable difficulties against sending our Minister who would be fully adequate to the Object we should have in view. We think however that there would be less difficulty in sending out persons merely to serve as Schoolmasters & we desire to be informed in reply of your opinion on the facility & utility of this arrangement. If we should find encouragement to determine on the [Measure?] we should want to be informed of the number of Children there are on your Establishment. Whether those Inland would be sent down for a few Years to remain at the Factory till they could be entered in the Company Books as Apprentices or other any other determination? You will give us any Information on this subject in order if the plan be adopted to

²¹⁷ Document C-2: HBCA A.6/15, fo.105d.

²¹⁸ Document A-14: HBCA B.135/a/86, fo.10d.

put it under proper Regulation.²¹⁹

Later that same year, the Committee sent “School Instructions” providing a standard set of regulations to be followed by all “Chief Factories” for “children belonging to each post Settlement with its Inland posts:”

The children of the Servants in actual Employ will be admitted without distinction at the Age of 5 Years complete. [...]

They will be retained during 7 Years from the time they are admitted (or till they have completed their Education and [can be] employed in the Service of the Company) if their Father does not quit the Service for any other employ. [...]

Altho’ it is the intention of the Committee to afford the same Education to all the Children of their Servants in Hudson’s Bay [...]

Should other of the Chiefs of the Trading Tribes friendly to the Company express a decided wish to entrust any of their Children to the Chief of the Factory for the purpose of Instruction in the objects proposed, the Committee recommend to the Council the admission of them, conceiving that it will be a means of cultivating the Friendship & Goodwill of the Parents & Children [...]

...there may be however on the first establishment some Children of more advanced ages than what is above specified who may be willing to partake of the same Instruction; the Committee leave it at the discretion of the Council to admit those who may appear to deserve it. [...]

When out of School the Children should be employed as their ages will allow, in useful habits [...]

The Children’s writing books are to be sent home annually that the Committee may judge of their progress.”²²⁰

By 1808, Moose Factory listed the first official school master at that post:

Robertson, David - Acting School Master (Remarks: We think him sufficiently qualified to fill this station for the present, and the experience he has gained in a long residence in the Country will render him otherwise useful.)²²¹

²¹⁹ Document C-3: HBCA A.6/17, fos.76-76d.

²²⁰ Document C-3: HBCA A.6/17, fos.119-120d.

²²¹ Document B-6: HBCA B.135/f/6. Prior to his appointment as school master, Robertson was master at

Robertson continued as school master at Moose until at least 1810, with the following remarks:

Robertson, David - Acting School Master (Remarks: Promises to fulfill his duty with assiduity & perseverance.)

Robertson, David - Schoolmaster (Remarks: Requests to return next year if the Hon. Board mean to continue with their [benefice?] towards the children at Moose. I would beg leave to propose that the School master should act in the dble [sic] capacity of Schoolmaster & Steward - I have included in the packet Box specimens of the children's progress and a list of the present school noticing the interruptions occasioned by want of men & other circumstances.)²²²

The pattern by which children were educated was apparently irregular and secondary to the main operations of the post. John Thomas' remarks regarding "interruptions occasioned by want of men & other circumstances" is more fully explained in post journal entries for 1810. One of the problems was that men were needed to build a school house, meaning that the school master was called upon to take on some of the builders' tasks:

1809 September 28- the Steward & an assistant Cieling [sic] the School house, one preparing the Boards for Do. [...] School Master acts for the Steward who is at work on the School house.

1809 December 18 - the Smith making Hinges for the school house writing Desks, the Steward continued to fill up his vacant time in finishing it.

1810 May 12 - The School master acts as steward, the Steward being gone Inland with the New Brunswick Boats, as is also the Man who acts as Chiefs Servants, one of the Boys there fore attends the Table, at these busy times the School cannot be regularly attended, to Day the Children were instructed again.

1810 May 13 - The Boat-builder & mate were employ'd Weather boarding the New School House.

1810 August 6 - The School Master began teaching the Children again which many unavoidable interruptions & circumstances have almost totally prevented for above three months past, this is the first the New School House has been officially occupied.²²³

Hannah Bay from 1803-1807. His "Parish" was Eire.

²²² Document B-7: HBCA B.135/f/7; Document B-8: HBCA B.135/f/8.

²²³ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fos.2,9d,24d,25,34.

During the 1809-10 Outfit, Robertson held classes for eight mixed-ancestry children:

1809 November 2 - the School master resumed his function & began teaching his little school which consists of four Boys and four Girls Viz. Henry & Richard Thomas, George Moore & Henry Lawson, Harriot & Elizabeth Vincent, Katharine Thomas & Frances Thomas, the School house not being complete the Governor's Room is as heretofore the School Room.²²⁴

He also spent considerable time with "the Boys" participating in hunting, fishing and other jobs at the Factory. Whether or not these boys were his students is unclear, but it is apparent that Thomas expected the school master to contribute to post provisions and perhaps to take charge of "the Boys" in these types of tasks:

1809 October 6 - the School Master & two of the Boys were down at the Goose Bluff.

1809 December 8 - the School Master & boys were at Maidman's Creek angling & brot 57lb Trout.

1810 May 15 - The School Master, Tailor, Cattle Keeper & Boys Salted Geese.

1810 July 9 - The School Master & Boys set the Sturgeon Nets again.

1810 July 16 - School Master & Boys assisting in the Warehouse packing [?] and preparing the Sturgeon Nets for setting tomorrow.²²⁵

Little is said in journals regarding the school in the years between 1810 and 1840. Entries from 1820 and 1830 stating that repairs were made to the school house indicate that the education program did continue.²²⁶ However, abstracts of Servants for the years 1821-1830 do not list any employee in the capacity of schoolteacher.²²⁷

In 1840, the Company was able to sponsor a clergyman at Moose Factory to continue the

²²⁴ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fo.5d. Judd suggests that the four "Thomas" children were the grand-children of John Thomas, arguing also that only a select few children were educated. It is unlikely that there were only 8 children of school age at Moose Factory at this time. (Judd, "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory," 73).

²²⁵ Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fos.3,8d,25,31d,32; cf.3d,4,5,12d,14d.

²²⁶ Document A-19: HBCA B.135/a/122, fo.10; Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.39d.

²²⁷ Document B-10: HBCA B.135/g/1; Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6; Document B-12: HBCA B.135/g/11.

education of children as well as to provide religious instruction to both Company and Cree families:

1840 June 3 - A little after mid-day a Canoe from Abitibbi arrived with 8 packs of Musquash from that Part, being manned by 1 Servant (Audubon) and 5 Hired Indians, and having on board a passenger the Rev'd Geo. Barnley of the Wesleyan Missionary Society who under the patronage and by desire of the Governor and Committee of the Hon'ble Company has been sent to this department by the said Society for the purpose of affording to the Native the Blessings of religious Instruction and Education by the Rev'd Gentleman.²²⁸

That Sunday and the following, Chief Factor Beioley noted that Rev. Barnley performed "Divine Service... at which the majority of the Persons – Men, Women & Children belonging to the Establishment attended."²²⁹ As well, Barnley almost immediately established a new school routine; enrollment had grown to eighteen school age children:

1840 June 15 - This forenoon the School was opened and attended by 15 Females of various Ages and 3 Boys between 8 & 15 Y'rs of age. The Rev'd Mr. Barnley teaching them or hearing them read, from ½ past 11 O'clock & until 1 O'clock. – In the afternoon the Indians at the place assembled in the temporary Chapel & attended to what the Rev'd Gentleman was pleased to say to them [...] the same course as adopted today is to be continued every day this week except Saturday."²³⁰

In the 1850s, Rev. John Horden was the resident missionary at Moose Factory, and while it is uncertain if he taught the school, there is some indication he provided instruction to both Cree and mixed-ancestry children:

1851 December 23 - In the evening invited children to tea, twenty-six were present, Indians & half breeds.²³¹

Governor Simpson encouraged Horden's ministry, believing that previous efforts at education had yielded a receptive population of both Cree and mixed-ancestry individuals:

²²⁸ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.1d.

²²⁹ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.2-2d,4.

²³⁰ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.4d.

²³¹ Document D-7: GSA MF 78-13 (A88-89), 23 December 1851. Moose Factory baptism records indicate that 77 Cree children and 43 HBC post-community children were baptized during Horden's ministry between 1852-1858 (see Section 2.2).

1854 July 21 - I am glad to hear that the Mission under your charge is proceeding so satisfactorily as to require enlarged accommodation for the congregation. I have always considered the Moose station a one of the most promising in the country, the population, Indian and half caste, are orderly and intelligent and well disposed to receive instruction, so that I have no doubt you derive much satisfaction from the success of your labours among them.²³²

The Moose Factory school continued to receive support from the Company, and while there are few details, journals document that the school house was repaired and maintained into the 1890s:

1870 November 7-25 - the joiners employed making desks for School house. [...] the joiners, who having finished working for the school house, were employed making a shed. [...] two men employed sawing firewood for school. [...] the wood haulers had to drop hauling and went to saw wood at the schoolhouse, along with the two men previously employed at that.

1871 April 24 - John King and his brother working in joiner shop glazing windows for mess building and in the afternoon working at forms for school house.

1894 January 22 - 4 [men] cutting wood for Church & school.

1894 November 21 - One [man] hauling firewood to school house.²³³

Correspondence between the Diocese of Moosonee and the Dominion government also provide a glimpse into the life and education of children at Moose Factory in the final decades of the 19th century. In 1879 the Diocese indicated that their school aimed to teach “every child, whether European, half-caste, or Indian” to read and write in their own language.²³⁴ Correspondence in 1887 boasts the missions’ success in education among the local populations:

At all these [HBC/trade] stations not only are religious services regularly attended to, but schools are likewise diligently carried on, and so successfully that I don’t think there is a single individual in the diocese speaking English above the age of nine or ten who is unable to read it, while there are few families among the native

²³² Document D-8: GSA MF 78-13 (A88-89).

²³³ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.26-27d,40d; Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fo.16, November 21, 1894 [no folio #].

²³⁴ Document E-3: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 17 February 1879.

tribes... in which there are not some members able to make an intelligent use of our translated books into their respective tongues. [...]

Throughout the Diocese the number of children under instruction is about 350; the children of the Indian hunters receive the greater attention during the Summer, the children of the residents at various stations in Winter.²³⁵

A report in 1889 states that the principal mission station and school at Moose Factory had an enrollment of about 40 pupils in the English school, and about 60 in the Indian school.²³⁶

The distinction between “Indian” and “English” students was commonly raised in Diocese correspondence, and likely reflects two very different aspects of their work in the James Bay region. It also presents a repeated form of “other-ascription” toward mixed-ancestry children belonging to the Moose Factory post community. An 1892 letter from the Bishop’s Chaplain at Moose Factory highlights this distinction by applying the term “whites” to refer to mixed-ancestry children:

Meanwhile the education of children, both Whites and Indians, has been going on steadily for years... At Moose F’t, e.g., there is a day school conducted by the Bishop & his assistants, where all the children of both colours, of school age come in great numbers. The result is that almost every Indian that comes to Moose can read & write in their own language, many of them have been taught a little English, & all the White, or mixed race of children have received a good common education. [...]

We cannot possibly furnish the children of the “Whites” with that standard of education that they should have if they are to take their place with those of the same class in life in the rest of Canada unless you enable us to procure the proper teachers & books. [quotation marks original]²³⁷

In his 1890 report, E.B. Borron included a summary of the mission accomplishments at Moose Factory, noting the educational benefits of Barnley and Horden’s ministry there, particularly with respect to Cree syllabics:

The Moose mission was commenced by the Wesleyans about the year 1838, who sent to Moose Factory the Rev. G. Barnsley [sic], who laboured nine years at

²³⁵ Document E-7: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 19 August 1887. This letter states also that, by this time, six of the seven clergymen in the diocese were “Native” including Rev. E. Richards at Moose Factory.

²³⁶ Document E-10: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 27 August 1889.

²³⁷ Document E-13: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 15 September 1892.

Moose and elsewhere in the country very indefatigably, meeting with considerable success and baptizing a large number, both of Indians and half-castes... in 1851 Mr. and Mrs. Horden were sent to Moose under their auspices [Church Missionary Society] [...] One great cause of advancement was the translation of large portions of the Scriptures into the Indian language... all written in a syllabic character [...] The mission continued to grow and prosper [...] The number of [Church of England] communicants at Moose is 105.²³⁸

Indeed, a letter from Chief Factor Fortesque to the HBC Commissioner in Winnipeg in 1890 confirms that most of the men working at Moose Factory could, at this time, read and write:

1890 February 1 - [With respect to changing Indian tariff for labour and fur tariffs, Fortesque recommends that] a sheet tariff at this [standard] rate need to be annually posted in the men's house, for every man and Indian who could read to consult (and most of them can do so).²³⁹

At the time of Treaty No. 9 in 1905, six of the ten Cree signatories signed the treaty in Cree syllabics.²⁴⁰ One of the treaty commissioners, Duncan Campbell Scott, reproduced part of a Cree syllabic address in his 1906 article published in *Scribner's Magazine*.²⁴¹ As well, Samuel Stewart, another treaty commissioner, was impressed with the "James Bay Library" which supplied books to "Officers of the Posts" in the Southern Department: "The library is a very good one and new books are constantly being added to it so that the officers are well supplied with reading matter."²⁴²

However, E.B. Borron was less impressed with the quality of education offered at Moose Factory, and recommended that the Ontario Government establish a central school at Moose Factory:

I do not know what the Hudson's Bay Company has done to promote education in other parts of the vast territory, over which it so long held almost undisputed sway, and from which, it is believed, to have realized in former times at least such

238 Document E-11: Borron, "Report on the Basin of Moose River," 92-93.

239 Document C-20: HBCA D.20/58, fo.275.

240 Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Vol.1851, No.539 - Treaty No.9 (Reel T-9941): IT436, frame 4 (copy of original); IT440, frame 5 (typewritten copy).

241 Document E-33: Scott, Duncan Campbell. "The Last of the Indian Treaties." *Scribner's Magazine* XL, no.5 (1906), 582.

242 Document E-21: NAC RG10, Vol.11399, File 1 (Reel T-6924), 103-104.

enormous profits. In this territory it does not appear to have done much. Even at Moose Factory – the principal trading post and centre of population – where the Company has ruled for two hundred years, and where still everything may be said to be owned by, and where everyone dependent upon the Company, I am not aware that it has granted or is now granting any aid to assistance, whatever, toward education the Indian children or even the children of its servants and officers.

It is true that of late years a small school house has been built at Moose Factory and that the Church of England missionaries have devoted as much time as they could well spare, from other duties, to teaching the children both of the Indians and of the Europeans... but the education thus afforded will not enable even the Indians, to become anything more than hunters, trappers or voyageurs, and falls far below that obtainable by the poorest white children in any other part of the country.

Such of the Company's officers, as can afford to do so, send away their children to England, Scotland, or to far distance parts of Canada to be educated. [...]

The best and most central point for a school in Moose Factory, and it should be a good school. It can itself furnish, I am told about 100 pupils in the summer and about half that number during the winter. But in addition to these, I have no doubt children would be sent to it, from the other trading posts in that department.²⁴³

In large part, Borron held the Hudson's Bay Company – which held “undisputed sway” in the territory – accountable for the weak state of education in the Moose Factory region.

After Treaty No. 9, a boarding school was established at Moose Factory and in the winter of 1907 there was “an average attendance of 55 scholars including the boarders, which means an average attendance of 25 half breed children.”²⁴⁴

3.3 POST-SCRIPT: MOOSE FACTORY INTO THE 20TH CENTURY

The Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) in the 1880s had political and economic ramifications for the Cree and mixed-ancestry populations of James Bay. As indicated in Chapter 2, several Moose Factory Cree families relocated to Missanabie and Chapleau when the transcontinental railway was constructed through those areas.²⁴⁵ The railway also prompted the

²⁴³ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 90. Borron's commentary above is relevant also to issues of “effective European control” of the James Bay region (see Chapter 4).

²⁴⁴ Document E-34: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 11 February 1907

²⁴⁵ Long, “Historical Context,” 71. Indeed, in 1886, Chief Factor James Cotter reported that “...six of my

Hudson's Bay Company in 1902 to move its distribution warehouses from Moose Factory Island to Charlton Island, shift its headquarters to Winnipeg and reduce its staff.²⁴⁶ Duncan Campbell Scott commented on the effects of these changes as he observed them in 1905:

Moose Factory was until lately the seat of the Anglican Bishop of Moosonee [sic], but that glory and part of the trading glory has departed; the bishop has gone to "the line," as the Canadian Pacific Railway is called, and the Hudson's Bay Company has removed its distributing warehouse to Charlton Island, fifty miles out in the Bay.²⁴⁷

Long documents that in 1902, missionaries met, upriver from Moose Factory, "43 men, women and children of HBC servants, who had been given a passage to the line." These men had been dismissed as surplus workers and sent up to the railroad line to find work." However, with the establishment of the Revillon Freres at Moosonee, some of these servants and their families returned to work at Moose Factory or Moosonee.²⁴⁸

The Revillon Freres Trading Company, the major French rival of the British HBC, set up a trading post at the mouth of the Moose River in 1903, now the present site of Moosonee. The TASO studies on Moose Factory and Moosonee in 1991 report that "a small company town quickly grew up" at the Moosonee location.²⁴⁹ The Revillon Freres operation diminished during the 1920s, when animal populations were low due to over trapping, partly a result of the influx of trappers from outside the region. In 1926, the Revillon Freres sold 51% of its stock to the HBC. In 1932, the Revillon post became the end of the line on the new Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway:

[This] marks the end of a trading company town and the beginning of a railway

hunters did not come - of these six, four took their furs to Missinabaie... the higher tariff at Missinabaie has been the cause of my losing a good deal of fur besides that belonging to the four hunters above mentioned. I have it on best authority that other Indians attached to this post took considerable quantities of fur there allured by the higher prices given," adding that "the Boatmen hearing of high wages on the CPR line, now within ten days of us, struck for more pay" (Document C-19: HBCA B.135/e/25, 1-2).

²⁴⁶ Preston, "James Bay Cree Culture," 375.

²⁴⁷ Document E-33: Scott, "The Last of the Indian Treaties," 581.

²⁴⁸ Long, "Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families," 143; Long cites the *Moosonee Mailbag* 2 (October 1902) 9: 142-143; see also: Manore, Jean. *Moose Factory Metis Land Claim* (Toronto: Ontario Native Affairs Unit, 1988), 6.

²⁴⁹ Stephenson, Kate. *The Community of Moose Factory: A Profile (TASO Report, Second Series, No.2)* (Hamilton: McMaster University, Program for Technology Assessment in Subarctic Ontario, 1991), 8-9; Stephenson, Kate. *The Community of Moosonee: A Profile (TASO Report, Second Series, No.3)* (Hamilton: McMaster University, Program for Technology Assessment in Subarctic Ontario, 1991), 7-9.

town. With the convenience and economy of rail freight, Moosonee became the predominant distribution centre in the area, surpassing Moose Factory. The HBC bought out the remaining shares of Revillon Freres and moved its docks to Moosonee, where freight was loaded for transport to more northerly parts.²⁵⁰

In the 1920s a reserve was established on Moose Factory Island, and government agencies overtook the HBC as the major source of economic activity in Moose Factory. The Department of Indian Affairs set up its regional office on the Island, and according to the TASO report, federal government activity in the James Bay region is still based in Moose Factory. Provincial government offices are located across the river, in Moosonee.²⁵¹

²⁵⁰ Stephenson, *The Community of Moosonee (TASO No.3)*, 9.

²⁵¹ Stephenson, *The Community of Moose Factory (TASO No.2)*, 9.

4. BRITISH, CANADIAN AND ONTARIO PRESENCE IN JAMES BAY

4.1 HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY DOMINATION

Prior to the fur trade, West Main Cree inhabited the Moose River region. As noted in Chapter 2, Cree lived by hunting, trapping and fishing according to an established seasonal cycle. In 1672, Jesuit Charles Albanel acknowledged that Cree gathered in this territory since “time immemorial”:

Upon the point to the Westward the Kinistinons are settled; and, upon the bay, the Mataouakirinouek and Monsounik, each nation being separated from its neighbors by large rivers. The people of the sea dwell toward the Northeast on the river Miskoutenagasit [Eastmain or Slude River] – the name of the place visited by us, situated twenty leagues along the sea; it is a long rocky point at the fifty-first degree of latitude, where from time immemorial the Savages have been wont to gather for purposes of trade... Three days' journey into the depth of the bay, toward the Northwest, is a large river called by some Savages Kichesipiou, and by others Mousousipiou, 'Moose river,' on which are many nations...²⁵²

Although the fur trade in the west James Bay area began in 1673 when the Hudson's Bay Company first established a post at Moose River, this foreign presence was interrupted over the next half century by conflicts between the English and the French. It was the re-construction of Moose Factory in 1730 by the HBC that introduced a permanent European presence among the Cree of the Moose River region. Over the next two centuries, the HBC held a near monopoly over trade in the region, despite challenges by opposition French and later independent traders. Furthermore, as the administrative centre of the HBC's southern department, Moose Factory held sway over a larger post and “homeguard” population than did smaller posts inland.²⁵³

As noted in the previous chapter, E.B. Borron held the Hudson's Bay Company accountable for the weak state of education in the Moose Factory region. Toward the beginning of his report section titled “The Social Condition of the Natives and Others,” Borron unequivocally stated that in his opinion, the HBC continued to hold *de facto* economic control in the region:

The position of the natives of this territory in relation to the Hudson's Bay Company and its officer has, therefore, been for many years and still continued to be, a position of absolute subservience and dependence.²⁵⁴

²⁵² Document D-1: *Jesuit Relations* 56, 203; cf. 185-187,303.

²⁵³ See Chapter 2, “History and Demography of Moose Factory and Environs,” above.

²⁵⁴ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 75.

The Company had complete civil jurisdiction over its employees with respect to marriages, education of school children, and the career options of apprentice boys, ruling the behaviour of its personnel by a set of regulations established by the Council of Rupert's Land and Committee in London. Company officers held the authority to marry, christen, and bury. The previous chapter cites examples of marriages in 1837, officiated by George Keith the Chief Factor of Moose Factory (see section 3.2.2).²⁵⁵ As well, HBC officers performed baptisms, an official capacity that appears to have pertained mainly to children of Company personnel, although one baptism in 1835 names what is likely a Cree father ("Piquitchisseg", see below). Table 11 lists examples of baptisms performed by HBC officer between 1817 and 1835.

Table 11
Baptisms Performed by HBC Officers, 1817-1835

<u>When Christened</u>	<u>Child's name</u>	<u>Parents Names</u>	<u>By Whom Baptized</u>
1817 April 6	Mary Fletcher	Joseph Beioley & Isabella, Daughter of the late Mr. John McKay of [?]	Geo. Gladman
1818 July 15	Isabella	Jacob Truthwaite & Elizabeth Vincent	Jos. Beioley
1818 March 22	Charlotte	Charles Beads & Eleanor Lawson	Thomas Vincent, Gov. S. Dept.
1830 June 9	Roderick	Nicol & Elizabeth Finlayson	J.G. McTavish, C.F.
1835 July 12	Elizabeth Saunders Lamphier	Piquitchisseg, Jane Lamphier	Geo. Keith C.F. & Member of Council Rupert's Land

Source: AO F978 MS311, Reel 2 - Baptisms, 1815-1850; MS 161 - Baptisms, 1780-1850 (Documents D-2, D-4)

With respect to burials, death records prior to 1840 when Rev. Barnley arrived at Moose Factory, do not indicate who officiated at funerals. However, one of the original graveyards at Moose Factory described by Arthur *et al* as "an ancient resting place of the Company servants and their families" reveals that formal burials with headstones were performed as early as 1802. For example, the headstone of "Mary Thomas" records the tragic death of an eleven year old girl, likely the mixed-ancestry daughter of John Thomas, the man in charge of Moose Factory at the time:

²⁵⁵ AO F978 MS311, Reel 2 - Marriages, 1829-1852 (for examples, see Document D-5).

Mary Thomas,
 born July 23rd, 1791
Lost among the ice together with an indian family
 Octobr. 24th. 1802,
*From sudden death good lord deliver us.*²⁵⁶

Moose Factory death records listed Indian deaths separately from those of Company families, and distinct from where young Mary Thomas' headstone was found, Indian burials were in the "Indian grave yard."²⁵⁷ Death records kept in earlier years, were presumably recorded by the Chief Factor. Table 12 lists records from 1822-23 which involved mixed-ancestry families (including one individual identified as a "half Breed") at Moose Factory.

Table 12
Death Records kept by HBC Officers, 1822-1823

<u>Date</u>	<u>Deaths and Burials</u>
1822 October 27	Jacob Henry. Son of George & Mary Moore born 13 th April 1821 - buried the following Day.
1822 December 25	Margaret. Daughter of Charles & Elianor Beads - buried 27 th Dec. 1822.
1823 March 6	James Cromartie. half Breed Labourer, son of [blank] Born [blank] - buried 7 th March 1823.

Source: AO F978 MS161 - Moose Factory - Deaths and Burials, 1811-1894 (Document D-3).

The HBC also exercised jurisdiction over criminal matters that involved their property or personnel. The earliest recorded incident of criminal justice in the Moose Factory region pertains to the Hannah Bay massacre in 1832, when 10 people were murdered by a Cree man and his sons. The report on the incident is contained in the 1832 Moose Factory post journal, organized in three "narratives:" 1) a narrative of the discovery and initial investigation of the crime in late January to early February; 2) a report on the interrogation of family members of the accused in March, and; 3) an account of the execution of the murderers in April. Following are excerpts from

²⁵⁶ Arthur, et al., *Moose Factory 1673-1973*, 19-20. Mary may have been the "infant daughter" Thomas referred to in the following post journal entry in 1793: "John [Johnston] behaved in a most indecent manner to an Infant daughter of mine, which incensed me so far as to induce me to thrash him with a Stick that happened to lay in my way" (Document A-10: HBCA B.135/a/79, 10 August 1793).

²⁵⁷ Document D-3: AO F978 MS161, September 1843.

the report demonstrating the method by which the Company pursued this criminal case.

Narrative by William Swanson (January-February 1832):

[On January 20, 1832, three Indians came to Moose Factory and reported] that a family of Rupert's River Indians, Quapicay and sons had forcibly obtained possession of the House at Hannah Bay, shot an Indian and his wife, also two children, and from the report of Fire Arms in the House, they had every reason to suppose that Mr. Wm. Corrival the officer in charge there, and his wife were then or would be murdered. [...]

[Swanson was sent with eleven men to investigate, and on the 26th arrived at the Hannah Bay post where] in our approach we passed, at about 30 yards distance from the House, the Body of a woman, it was the wife of one of the Indians who escaped to the Factory, she had been strangled, and her infant with its throat cut, was laid in her arms. The Body of an Indian Lad was found near the door of the House. After considerable search we found the Bodies of Mr. Corrival, his wife, the Indian Manask, his wife, and an Indian Lad.²⁵⁸

Swanson and his team continued to Rupert's House to deliver a letter to Joseph Beioley, in which McTavish instructed the latter to continue the search for the perpetrators. On Swanson's return trip to Moose Factory, he and his men found another two bodies near the Hannah Bay site, one of an Indian lad, and another of the young adopted daughter of the Corrivals. In March, Beioley conducted an interrogation of family members belonging to "the four Indian men accused of the murder of Mr. Wm. Corrival at Hannah Bay, and of eight or nine other Individuals." Both a daughter-in-law and son-in-law "acknowledged that [Quappukay and his sons] had been the perpetrators of the murders." Beioley's narrative reveals one possible motive behind the crime:

Narrative by Chief Factor Beioley (March 1832)

[G]ross mental Delusions and local Superstitions, such as their being ordered by the Spirit above to do what they had done. [...] The Spirit above threatened and assured them that except they obeyed they should have all their Children taken from them, that what was required of them was merely the Life of one English man.²⁵⁹

Oral histories collected by Morantz suggest that Corrival's lack of generosity to the "starving and naked" Cree hunters and their families also played a role.²⁶⁰

²⁵⁸ Document A-23: HBCA B.135/a/138, fo.1-4d.

²⁵⁹ Document A-23: HBCA B.135/a/138, fos.5-7d. William Corrival was born ca. 1768 in Kirkwell, Orkney (Document B-12: HBCA B.135/g/11).

²⁶⁰ Morantz, "Oral and Recorded History in James Bay," In: *Papers of the 15th Algonquian Conference*, ed. W. Cowan (Ottawa: Carleton University, 1984), 181-182; Francis and Morantz *Partners in Furs*:158-160.

The final “Narrative by William Swanson” in April 1832 is an account of the execution of the perpetrators. Both Swanson and Beioley with a crew of men were sent “in search of the Indians who murdered the people at Hannah Bay.” On April 6 they found the first two men, Stacemen and his son, who were secured in a Tent while the search continued. Shortly afterward, Swanson located Quapicay and his fifteen year-old son whom they “immediately shot and we returned to the Tent where the same act of justice was dealt out to Staceman and his son.”²⁶¹

In his sub-section on “Crime and the Administration of Justice”, E.B. Borron referred to the Hannah Bay incident as an example of the HBC’s response to criminal behaviour:

So far as my information goes, I think I am warranted in saying that, while the Hudson’s Bay Company’s officers in this territory have been prompt to punish any crime committed against the company’s property or servants, they have, as a rule, kept themselves entirely aloof from the disputes, feuds, and quarrels of the Indians, whether as individuals, families or bands. [...] Forty-seven years ago, (1832-33) one of the few outrages on record occurred at Hannah Bay Post...²⁶²

A letter in 1890 from Chief Factor Fortesque (Moose Factory) to J. Wrigley (HBC Commissioner, Winnipeg) reported an incident in which an individual was suspected of theft and private with Cree trappers. By this time however, the region was under Ontario jurisdiction, and Fortesque reveals that since the territory no longer belonged to the HBC, he did not have the power to prosecute:

The man in question avers that he was [relayed] by Mr. Broughton, or at any rate left with his full knowledge, a statement I shall enquire into but in any case I am unable to interfere magisterially, not holding a Commission of the Peace, either for Ontario or Quebec in both of which Provinces the District lies. Should you deem it advisable for me to hold either or both I leave the matter with you for application to the proper quarter.²⁶³

Fortesque’s reference to application for a “Commission of Peace” refers to Ontario’s appointments of provincial justices of the peace from 1882, as will be discussed further below.

4.2 1870 TRANSFER TO CANADA AND 1889 EXTENSION OF ONTARIO

In 1869, the Hudson’s Bay Company surrendered its title to Rupert’s Land, and in the

²⁶¹ Document A-23: HBCA B.135/a/138, fos.9-10.

²⁶² Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 78-79.

²⁶³ Document C-20: HBCA D.20/58, fos.274-274d.

following year the territory was admitted into the Dominion of Canada.²⁶⁴ Section 14 of the 1870 Order in Council addresses “claims of Indians:”

Any claims of Indians to compensation for lands required for purposes of settlement shall be disposed of by the Canadian Government in communication with the Imperial Government; and the Company shall be relieved of all responsibility in respect of them.²⁶⁵

“Schedule C” of the Order contains the “Deed of Surrender” agreed to on November 19, 1869; Annexed to this schedule is a list of land acreages to be retained by the HBC according to section 2 of the Deed: “The Company to retain all the posts or stations now actually possessed and occupied by them or their officers or agents.” One hundred acres was retained at Moose Factory.²⁶⁶

Correspondence between the Diocese of Moosonee and Dominion officials in the 1880s and 1890s demonstrates the local tension that came with Dominion control over the James Bay area. In 1879 the Diocese wrote to Sir. John A. Macdonald requesting a grant of £200 a year for educational purposes, explaining that to date, the school at Moose Factory had been supported by a small grant from the HBC plus mission donations through the Church of England.²⁶⁷ The Dominion government refused to assist the school.²⁶⁸ Correspondence from the Bishop of Moosonee in August 1887 described the James Bay population’s sense of isolation from the rest of Canada, a reality that further heightened complaints about the high custom taxes imposed since union with the Dominion. The Bishop was particularly critical of the lack of Dominion financial support in the region:

With Canada proper it has but little communication in account of the great physical difficulties existing in our rivers, which are our only means of inter-communication, there not being a mile of road in the whole Diocese. Our receipt of letters is limited to two or three times a year. For our supplies of dry goods, food and other necessaries we are dependent on the HBC annual Ships. [...]

²⁶⁴ Document E-1: *Rupert’s Land Act, 1868*: 31-32 Victoria, c.105 (U.K), 31st July 1868 (http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/rpl_1868.html); Document E-2: *Order of Her Majesty in Council Admitting Rupert’s Land and North-Western Territory into the Union* (At the Court of Windsor, 23rd June, 1870), including Schedule C - Deed of Surrender, 19 November 1869 (http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/rlo_1870.pdf).

²⁶⁵ Document E-2: *Order, 1870*, S.14.

²⁶⁶ Document E-2: *Order, 1870*, Schedule C - Deed of Surrender 1869 (annexed schedule - “Moose Factory”).

²⁶⁷ Document E-3: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 17 February 1879.

²⁶⁸ Document E-4: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 24 June 1879.

The amount of Customs duties collected in N. and S. Moosonee is a very considerable sum... The Indians in all the other Dioceses in the Ecclesiastical Diocese of Rupert's Land receive considerable grants from Government for Educational purposes, while as yet, Moosonee... has received no grant from Government, either for Educational, or any other purpose whatever.²⁶⁹

A month later, Indian Affairs Deputy Superintendent General Vankoughnet recommended to Sir John A. Macdonald that educational grants be made to the Diocese of Moosonee:

There would appear from the Bishop's letter to be seven Schools in operation in the Diocese of Moosonee, but that all the pupils are Indians, is doubtful. It may however, be safely concluded that the majority of them are of Indian extraction. The undersigned is of the opinion that a recommendation might be made to parliament to grant assistance to the extent of \$400.00 per annum to each of these schools. He would state in the above connection that in his opinion the Education of the Indian children in the unceded portions of the Territories would be an excellent prelude to the making of Treaties with the Indians.²⁷⁰

By the *Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889*, the Province of Ontario was expanded west to Lake of the Woods and north to the Albany River, a vast region including Moose Factory and environs.²⁷¹ The 1889 Act was the result of 20 years of negotiations, litigations and arbitrations between Ontario and the Dominion aimed at defining the northern and western boundaries of the province. In 1878, arbitrators awarded to Ontario, territory west to the Northwest Angle and north to the English and Albany Rivers. The province proceeded to establish its authority over the territories by appointing two stipendiary magistrates: E.B. Borron was appointed to superintend the northern portion (District of Nipissing). From 1880 onward, Borron made annual trips to Moose Factory.²⁷²

Borron's 1890 report is a compilation of his previous reports to the government of Ontario, providing the context for his recommendations now that the territory was legally in the province's possession. Although his section dealing with the "Social Condition of the Natives and Others" focuses on the role of the Hudson's Bay Company (as quoted above), Borron also comments on the effects of customs duties (tariffs) introduced in 1872 just after Rupert's Land

²⁶⁹ Document E-7: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 19 August 1887.

²⁷⁰ Document E-8: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 22 September 1887.

²⁷¹ Document E-9: *Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889*: 52-53 Victoria, c.28 (U.K.) 12th August 1889 (http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/coba_1889.html).

²⁷² Zaslow, "The Ontario Boundary Question," In: *Profiles of a Province: Studies in the History of Ontario* (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1967), 109-111.

became Canadian territory:

The tariff, more particularly that part of it which imposes fifty cents custom duty on each barrel of flour imported from England, is not at all popular, nor likely to become so in this country, the people of which are taxed heavily and receive no benefit whatever in return.[...]

It is only since the Hudson's Bay Company sold their exclusive rights of trade, etc., to the Dominion that the natives and other inhabitants of this territory have been burdened with any custom duties. It will be easily understood, therefore, that the present high tariff, increasing as it does the price of all the necessaries of life, is exceedingly grievous to them.

It is the more keenly felt inasmuch as although the sum of \$100,000 at least has already been collected from them at the port of Moose Factory alone, nothing whatever has been expended by the Dominion Government, whether for public works, postal facilities, support of schools, missions, medical attendance, or in any other form or way calculated to advance their comfort and welfare. In fact their closer connection with the Dominion of Canada, so far from resulting in any benefit to them, has been an unmitigated evil. [...]

The proper remedy for this injustice is to make Moose Factory and York Factory free ports until connected by railway or otherwise with the rest of the Dominion.²⁷³

Borron's section on "Crime and the Administration of Justice" emphasized Ontario's obligation now that the territory was under provincial jurisdiction, recommending that a jail-house and other public offices be centralized at Moose Factory:

The administration of justice and the preservation of law and order in this territory, having now devolved on the provincial Government and Legislature, it is proper and becoming that this duty should in future be performed, not only in an effective but in a regular and constitutional manner.

In addition to the steps already taken by the Government in this direction, it is indispensable to the administration of justice in even its simplest forms, and for offences of the simplest nature, that a lock-up, and other such necessary buildings, should be erected at Moose Factory. [...] Provision should also be made for the appointment of at least one constable. The position of Moose Factory... point to it

²⁷³ Document E-11: Borron, "Report on the Basin of Moose River," 76,83-84.

as the proper place for such public offices as may be necessary in the meantime.²⁷⁴

Based on earlier recommendations by Borron, Ontario appointed HBC officers as provincial justices of the peace. On May 20, 1882 James L. Cotter (Chief Factor) was commissioned as the first Ontario Justice of the Peace at Moose Factory, and William Broughton was commissioned as Justice of the Peace at Fort Albany.²⁷⁵ Broughton later held the office of Chief Factor at Moose Factory from 1892-1902.

The earliest record of policing in the region is dated to 1925 when the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) established a detachment at Moose Factory, staffed by one constable and administered from Toronto.²⁷⁶ In 1928, the RCMP Commissioner made special mention of “Constable W.V.C. Chisholm’s patrols from Moose Factory to Rupert’s House, and long the east coast of James Bay and Hudson’s Bay.”²⁷⁷ The following year, a special constable was added to the force.²⁷⁸ In 1930, Constable E.S. Covell indicated that the majority of the RCMP’s patrol work, which was done “in company with the local Indian agent” was “chiefly concerned with the condition of the Indians.”²⁷⁹

Borron also addressed Ontario’s civil duty to its new northern territory, recommending full provincial control over education and health:

There is a neat little school house at Moose Factory, but no school master. The people, however willing, being unable to pay the salary, or anything like the salary, that would be necessary to get a competent teacher... if the Provincial Government could aid and assist in the establishment of a good school at Moose Factory, I do not know of anything that would give more general satisfaction. [...]

The only place between Albany Factory and Whale River on the coast, and between the coast and the height-of-land whereat a doctor is stationed, and where medical advice, surgical assistance, or even suitable medicines can be obtained, is Moose Factory... To families thus situated, and even to some of the natives at

²⁷⁴ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 79.

²⁷⁵ Document E-6: AO RG53-21, Book 238, fo.127; cf. Zaslow, Morris. “Edward Barnes Borron, 1820-1915: Northern Pioneer and Public Servant Extraordinary.” In: *Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, eds. F.H. Armstrong, et. al (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 303.

²⁷⁶ Document E-45: RCMP Annual Report (1926), 43, 89.

²⁷⁷ Document E-46: RCMP Annual Report (1928), 47, cf. 113.

²⁷⁸ Document E-47: RCMP Annual Report (1929), 112.

²⁷⁹ Document E-48: RCMP Annual Report (1930), 103-104.

these isolated posts, where it is impossible to obtain proper medical advice or assistance, however urgent the necessity, a hospital at Moose Factory would frequently prove an unspeakable blessing.²⁸⁰

Since the western James Bay region was placed under Ontario jurisdiction, the issue of school grants first directed at the Dominion government, were now re-directed to the province. A letter to E. Dewdney, Minister of the Interior in 1892, indicates that the Diocese had still not received any assistance or benefit from the Canadian government:

The customs dues collected at Moose Fort from 1872-86 inclusive amounted to \$152,500.00... the Moose F't revenue alone is now some \$20,000 per annum.

The Gov't, taking this large sum out of the hard earned wages of Missionaries & Indians, has done absolutely nothing in return. We have no roads, mails, or police, & not a cent has been received towards schools, etc.

Such treatment is almost, probably quite, unprecedented. Taxation in any shape is always supposed to be balanced by some sort of protection & benefit. [...]

We are Canadian citizens, so your imposing duties upon us would seem to sho, & it is only right that you should take care that our children have the opportunity of becoming intelligent & profitable citizens, as elsewhere. [underline original]²⁸¹

Government House of the North West Territories located in Regina replied, refusing the Diocese's request by arguing that "Moose Fort is in Western Ontario" and that educational assistance should be applied for from that province. The letter concluded by stating that "such a grant is made only to those Schools that are frequented largely by white children or children descendant from white parents."²⁸²

In 1893 Indian Affairs in Ottawa awarded grants of \$200 per annum to the Moose Factory school and other schools in the Moosonee Diocese citing "precedents for giving Governmental aid to schools at which non-treaty Indians are taught."²⁸³ However, after Treaty No.9, the Dominion government was responsible only for the education of treaty beneficiaries in the territory, and the Diocese was again directed to the Ontario government for assistance for "half-breed children:"

²⁸⁰ Document E-11: Borron, "Report on the Basin of Moose River," 78,91-92.

²⁸¹ Document E-13: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 15 September 1892.

²⁸² Document E-14: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 18 October 1892.

²⁸³ Document E-15: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 2 November 1892; Document E-16 : NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 5 August 1893.

An application for a grant for educational advantages provided for half-breed children, and elsewhere in the province of Ontario, should be made to the Education Department, Toronto. As Mr. D.G. MacMartin who was the Ontario Commissioner for Treaty No.9 is acquainted with the situation at that post with reference to half-breeds, as well as Indians... it might be well to refer to Mr. MacMartin in your communication to the Ontario Government.²⁸⁴

Borron had in fact directly addressed the issue of treaty in his report to Ontario in 1890, stressing that Ontario's material interest in the territory required the "speedy conclusion of a satisfactory treaty with these Indians:"

The Provincial Government is charged with the preservation of the peace, and the protection of life and property in this territory. If these Indians become exasperated at the continued neglect of the Dominion Government, they may be tempted to take the law into their own hands, and deal very summarily and severely with trespassers on their hunting grounds... Such a state of matters may lead to deplorable consequences and not only put the Province to a great deal of trouble and expense, but retard settlement and the development of the resources of the territory. Thus it will be seen that the Province of Ontario has a very direct and material interest in the speedy conclusion of a satisfactory treaty with these Indians. [...]

Now that this territory has undoubtedly come under the jurisdiction of the provincial Government, I have every confidence that all needful provision will be made for the preservation of law and order, and to promote the well-being of its inhabitants.²⁸⁵

Also in 1890, Borron proposed legislation to protect the rights of "natives of this territory:"

In the first place (if within the power of the Provincial Legislature), a law should be enacted to protect the rights of the natives of this territory, in respect of the game, fish and fur-bearing animals on their hunting grounds. Such a law should strictly prohibit both white men and other Indians from hunting, fishing or trapping on "unsurrendered territory" north of the height of land; or, at all events, without a special license so to do from the proper authority.²⁸⁶

284

Document E-35: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 26 February 1907.

285 Document E-11: Borron, "Report on the Basin of Moose River," 86,94.

286 Document E-11: Borron, "Report on the Basin of Moose River," 88.

4.3 TREATY NO. 9, 1905-1906

Historians generally agree that two interrelated factors contributed to the drafting and negotiation of Treaty No. 9. First, 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 asked to enter into treaty relations with the Dominion government. Second, both the Federal and Provincial governments recognized the need to conclude a treaty in northern Ontario as economic development initiatives, principally railway construction, were being planned and implemented.²⁸⁷

By the beginning of the 20th century Indian Affairs officials were beginning to press for treaty-making north of the height of land. The aftermath of the *St. Catherine's Milling* decision in 1888, legislation in 1891 followed by Orders-in-Council in 1894 established an agreement between the Dominion and Ontario stipulating that the negotiation of any new treaties within provincial boundaries would require the concurrence of the Ontario government.²⁸⁸ Section 6 of *An Act for the settlement of certain questions between the Government of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian lands* states:

That any future treaties with the Indians in respect of territory in Ontario to which they have not hitherto surrendered their claim aforesaid, shall be deemed to require the concurrence of the Government of Ontario.²⁸⁹

As a result of the 1894 agreement, the Treaty No. 9 Commission included two representatives of the Dominion – Samuel Stewart and Duncan Campbell Scott – and one representative of Ontario – Daniel G. MacMartin.

Because of the vast territory and difficult travel conditions, the Treaty No.9 negotiations required two summer journeys, the first in 1905 and the second in 1906. Negotiations at Moose Factory were completed during the first summer; the Treaty Commissioners arrived at Moose on Tuesday, August 8, and stayed until Saturday, August 12, 1905. Each of the three commissioners kept diaries, detailing their accounts of events during those days. These are transcribed below,

²⁸⁷ Morrison, James. *Treaty Nine (1905-1906), The James Bay Treaty* (Ottawa: Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1986); Macklem, Patrick. "The Impact of Treaty 9 on Natural Resource Development in Northern Ontario." In: *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equity, and Respect for Difference*, ed. Michael Asch (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1977), 100-102; see also: Long, "Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families" (1985); Long, "No Basis for Argument" (1989).

²⁸⁸ Macklem, "The Impact of Treaty 9," 104-106.

²⁸⁹ Document E-12: *An Act for the settlement of certain questions between the Government of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian lands, 1891* (SC, 54-55 Victoria, chap.5 [10th July 1891]); Document E-17: AO RG4-32, File 403/189 - Federal and Provincial Orders-in-Council, 1894.

beginning with the diary entries by Samuel Stewart, who later authored the official 1905 volume of the Treaty No. 9 report²⁹⁰, based almost verbatim on the following diary entries:

8th August - ...reached Moose Factory at 10:00 a.m. We were welcomed by Mr. J.G. Mowat in charge of Moose Post... Moose Factory has quite a history and many points of interest are to be seen there...

Our tents were put up close to the H.B.Co. Officers quarters, which are situated on a butt overlooking the River and Bay.

During the afternoon we received a visit from Bishop Holmes who was also accompanied by Rev. J. Bird Holland, Curate, Mr. Oxley in charge of the Mission School, and Miss Johnson, nurse in charge of the hospital...

9th August - Mr. Mowat, with the assistance of Bishop Holmes, had interested [himself?] in securing for us a meeting of representative Indians. We accordingly met in the morning in a large room placed at our disposal by the H.B.Co. Geo. McLeod one of the H.B. Officials acted as interpreter being assisted occasionally by Bishop Holmes and Mr. Mowat.

The Indians who had been chosen to confer with us seemed remarkably intelligent and deeply interested in the subject to be discussed. When the points of the treaty were explained to them, they expressed their perfect willingness to the terms and conditions. Frederick Mark, who in the afternoon was elected Chief, said that the Indians were all delighted that a treaty was about to be made with them; they had been looking forward to it for a long time, and were glad that they were to have their hopes realized, and that there was now a prospect of law and order being established among them. John Dick remarked that one great advantage the Indians hoped to derive from the treaty was the establishment of schools wherein their children might receive an education. George Tappaise said they were very thankful that the King had remembered them, and that the Indians were to receive money, which was very much needed by many who were poor and sick. Suitable responses were made to these gratifying speeches by the Commissioners and Bishop Holmes, and the treaty was immediately signed. [...]

10th August - We began to pay the Indian early in the day and with the assistance of Mr. Mowat to identify those who presented themselves for payment, completed this duty early in the afternoon (342 pay'd). We could not but be impressed with the fact that the Moose Factory Indians were the most completely dressed and, in every way an apparently better class of Indians than those we had met up to this

²⁹⁰ Document E-29: Canada. *The James Bay Treaty: Treaty Number Nine* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1964 [1905]) [Treaty report by Samuel Stewart, http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/trts/trty9/james_e.html], 7-8.

time.

During the evening the Indians informed the Commissioners that they had elected the following Chiefs and Councillors: Frederick Mark, James Job, Simon Quatchequam and Simon Cheena. As they were to have their feast in the evening, it was decided to present the flag to the Chief on that occasion. [...]

On the 10th we received an invitation to take dinner at Mr. Mowat's house which was gladly accepted by the whole party. The gathering proved to be an exceedingly pleasant one. The house occupied by Mr and Mrs. Mowat was built in 1832, and was for many years occupied by Sir. [George Simpson.] [...]

12th August - We were up early in order to complete out preparations for departure.²⁹¹

Of interest in Stewart's diary are his references to two mixed-ancestry men within the context of the Treaty negotiation. First, the commission was welcomed by "Mr. J.G. Mowat", presently in charge of Moose Factory. Mowat signed the Treaty No.9 document as a witness (see below).²⁹² The second mixed-ancestry man mentioned by Stewart is "Geo. McLeod" who "acted as interpreter" for the Treaty meeting on the morning of August 9, 1905. More significantly, McLeod was one of the five signatories to the "half breed" petition and Mowat signed a postscript to that petition (see below).²⁹³ John George Mowat and his wife Agnes Jemima (nee Linklater) were both identified as "ME" in the 1901 Census, as were George McLeod and his wife.²⁹⁴

Daniel MacMartin's treaty diary provides an account comparable in detail to that of Stewart, and also mentions Mowat, but not McLeod:

Wednesday, 9th August - At 10 a.m. the representative members of the band to the number of 10, were assembled in an upper room of the H.B. Storehouse, it was then explained to them that the King had sent his representatives to them to make a treaty... It was also explained that it was the usual custom to provide a feast for them after the treaty was signed and that Mr. Mowat the H.B. Company's Agent would provide them with all necessary for their feast... They were then asked of

²⁹¹ Document E-21: NAC RG10, Vol.11399, File 1, 95-105.

²⁹² Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Vol.1851, No.539 - Treaty No.9, IT436, frame 4 (copy of original); IT440, frame 5 (typewritten copy); Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

²⁹³ Document E-25: ONAS MNR Land File 186,220; Document E-26: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300.

²⁹⁴ Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

they had anything to say - Fred Monk replied that they had long wished to enter into treaty, that they concurred in all that had been said...

10:30 a.m. The treaty was signed. In the afternoon the pay lists were carefully gone into and prepared.

Thursday, 10th August - At 10:30 the Indians were called up in families carefully counted and paid in cases where sickness prevented any of the family from attendance, in addition to statements of the parent or parents the H.B.Co. Agent, also the Curate of the mission, testified to the correctness of the number of families and as to the number of same missing. In the evening the band before sitting down to their feast announced that they had elected Fred Monk [Mark] as chief, James Job, Simon Quachquam and Simon Cheenas, councillors...

Friday, 11th August - ... At 10:30 a.m. - the chief and councillors assembled in the Dom. Commissioner's tent and after a short discussion granted them the following reserve -

Reserve Moose Factory

In the Province of Ontario, beginning at a point on the east shore of Moose River at south Bluff Creek, hence south 6 miles on the east shore of French River and of sufficient depth to give an area of 66 square miles. [...]

Saturday, 12th August - ...left the Post with flags flying...²⁹⁵

Finally, Duncan Campbell Scott's diary is less detailed, and seemingly more concerned with matters of residential and day schools at Moose Factory:

Wednesday Aug. 9 - Made Treaty in the morning. Made out list in aft. Inspected mission property. Hospital, Bishops House [etc.] with few alterations will make suitable boarding schools - recommend grant for alterations and equipment and per capita Grant - 25 or 30 pupils @ \$60 - send some books, charts, etc. for day schools. Recommend Grant for building new day-school, say \$500. Send [?] by Revillon Freres [?] for Rev. T.B. Holland, Moose Factory [...?...]]

Reserve Moose Factory

In the Prov. of Ont. beginning at a point on the East Shore of Moose River at South Bluff [Creek?] - thence south six miles on the East Shore of French River and of sufficient depth to give an area of 66 square miles. [Reserve Fort Albany...]

²⁹⁵ Document E-22: QUA Miscellaneous Collection, MacMartin Papers - "Diary of a journey to N.W.T. in 1905 (re: Indian treaty)," 28-31.

Thursday Aug. 10 - Paid Ind. from 10 to 11. Election of Chief & flag [presented?].
Friday Aug.11 - Inspected Mission property for school purposes.

Friday Aug.11 - Reserve Question Settled. Send Rev. Mr. Holland for Moose & Albany, forms for report of attendance & statistics - the annual statement.

Sat. 12 Aug. - Left Moose Factory 12:30...²⁹⁶

As recorded in each of the three diaries, the James Bay Treaty - Treaty No.9 was signed by the Moose Cree leaders on August 9, 1905, as follows:

Signed at Moose Factory on the ninth of August 1905 by His Majesty's Commissioner and the Chiefs and headmen in the presence of the undersigned witnesses after having been first interpreted & explained.

Witnesses
George Moosonee
Thomas Clousten Rae, C.T. H.B.Co.
John George Mowat, H.B.C.
Thomas Bird Holland, B.A.
James Parkinson

Duncan Campbell Scott
Samuel Stewart
Daniel George MacMartin
Simon Smallboy (his X mark)
George Tappaise (his X mark)
Henry Sailor (signed in Cree syllabics)
John Nakogee (signed in Cree syllabics)
John Dick (signed in Cree syllabics)
Simon Quatchewan (signed in Cree

syllabics)

John Jeffries (signed in Cree syllabics)
Fred Mark (signed in Cree syllabics)
Henry Utappe (his X mark)
Simon Cheena (his X mark)²⁹⁷

An Order in Council dated February 13, 1907 approved the recommendation to ratify the James Bay Treaty No.9 and approve and confirm the listed reserves. Two reserves were listed for the Moose Cree, as follows: 1) "Moose Factory an area of 64 square miles" and; 2) "Moose Factory Cree at Chapleau 160 acres."²⁹⁸

²⁹⁶ Document E-23: NAC RG10, Vol.1028, 25-28. (Scott's diary was written in pencil and is almost completely illegible on the microfilm copy; the quotes here are transcripts taken from the original diary.)

²⁹⁷ Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Vol.1851, No.539 - Treaty No.9, IT436, frame 4 (copy of original); IT440, frame 5 (typewritten copy).

²⁹⁸ Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Vol.1851, No.539 - Treaty No.9, IT439, frame 2.

The survey of the Moose Factory Reserve took place in 1912. However, just prior to the surveyor's arrival, the Moose Factory Cree petitioned the Indian Department in Ottawa requesting a change of location:

[1912 October 2 - "Diocese of Moosonee" letterhead]

Will you kindly lay before the Minister of the Interior the following request from the Moose Factory Band of Indians.

When the Treaty was made with us, a reserve on French Creek was given us about 9 miles south of Moose Fort. We find on examination that the above reserve is a poor one, not suitable for wood or farming. The wood has been largely cut down or destroyed and the land is too stony for agricultural purposes. Besides there is very poor hunting there. The arrangements were too hurriedly made & did not give us time to investigate.

We much prefer & do hereby apply for a reserve extending from North Bluff to [Wavy] Creek, about 9 miles N.W. from Moose Fort along the Coast towards Albany. This is most suitable for all purposes...

Yours sincerely, Richard Wamestigoosh, Chief; David Cheena, Simon Cheena, Fred. Mark, Councillors.²⁹⁹

Indian Affairs replied that "This Department has no objection to the proposed change, but the Province of Ontario was also a party to the said treaty."³⁰⁰ However, Aubry White, the Deputy Minister of the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests quickly refused the request, stating that "we do not see, nor is there anything before us to show why the Reserve should be changed from the location in which the Commissioners fixed it."³⁰¹ Although Indian Affairs in Ottawa asked Ontario to reconsider, the Moose Factory Reserve #68 was surveyed at the French River location; Moose Factory reserve #1 on Moose Factory Island was confirmed in 1956.³⁰²

4.3.1 The 1905 Petition for Scrip from "Half breeds of Moose Factory"

The issue of claims made by mixed-ancestry groups during treaty negotiations was not new to either the Dominion or Ontario. In 1875, Indian Affairs agreed to an adhesion to Treaty

²⁹⁹ Document E-41: NAC RG10, Vol.3171, File 412,065, 2 October 1912.

³⁰⁰ Document E-42: NAC RG10, Vol.3171, File 412,065, 7 October 1912.

³⁰¹ Document E-43: NAC RG10, Vol.3171, File 412,065, 10 October 1912.

³⁰² Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS). *Akwesasne to Wunnumin Lake: Profiles of Aboriginal Communities in Ontario* (Toronto: Ministry of Citizenship, 1992), 146-147.

No.3 by “Half-breeds of Rainy River and Lake.”³⁰³ Subsequently, considerable discussion took place within the Indian Department regarding such claims. For example, in 1902, Indian Commissioner J.A. McKenna suggested preparations for Treaty No.9 should include consideration of “Halfbreed” claims:

I note that the communication from the Indians describes the [Treaty No.9] territory as being in 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 Halfbreeds 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.³⁰⁴

McKenna’s recommendation for a “Halfbreed” adhesion to the Robinson-Superior treaty was rejected, but in 1903, the Deputy-Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, Frank Pedley, suggested that land grants be made to “half-breeds” with claims in the Treaty No.9 territory:

... 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

³⁰³ A copy of the 1875 adhesion to Treaty No.3 can be located in AO Irving Papers - MS 2574, 30/36/03, 1-3.

³⁰⁴ Document E-19: NAC RG10, Vol.3033, File 235,225, Pt.1, 22 February 1902.

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.³⁰⁵

While no such provision was incorporated into the official Treaty No.9 document, Pedley's recommendation was later taken up by the province of Ontario (see below).

The Treaty No.9 commissioners were apparently dispatched without any instructions for dealing with potential "half breed" claims. Nevertheless, according to Long, several mixed-ancestry families were allowed on the Indian payroll during negotiations at Fort Albany, including some of those with links to Moose Factory such as the Faries and Linklaters.³⁰⁶ However, at Moose Factory, mixed-ancestry families of the same name were not included on the treaty pay list. Documentation from November 1905 explains that "they were refused treaty by the Commissioners on the ground that they were not living the Indian mode of life" (see below).³⁰⁷ This implies that mixed-ancestry families presented themselves for inclusion within the treaty, but were ascribed an identity other than "Indian" by the Treaty Commissioners.

The historical documents and literature reviewed for this study indicate that Moose Factory is the only location within the 1905-1906 Treaty 9 territory at which a mixed-ancestry group made a formal representation for explicit recognition and consideration within the context of the treaty. A petition signed by five "half breeds of Moose Factory" was made to the Government of Ontario in the autumn of 1905:

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 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 at any time not require our services we should be obliged to support ourselves by hunting.

³⁰⁵ Document E-20: NAC RG10, Vol.3033, File 235,225, Pt.1, 17 August 1903.

³⁰⁶ Long, "Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families," 146.

³⁰⁷ Document E-30: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 21 November 1905. Both John Long and Jean Manore have presented lengthy arguments regarding why "halfbreeds" at Albany were allowed into the Treaty, and those at Moose Factory were not. These arguments are tangential to this report, and will not be repeated here (Long, Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families," 146-155; Manore, Jean. *Moose Factory Metis Land* [1988]).

We therefore humbly pray that you will reconsider your present arrangements and afford us some help.

[Signed] Andrew Morrison
George McLeod
William McLeod
William Moore
William Archabald

The above represent various absentees at Charlton & on HBC Vessels.

[Signed] J.G. Mowat³⁰⁸

The petition represents the first recorded instance of self-ascribed mixed-ancestry identity distinct from European or Cree identities.

Although neither the 1905 Treaty Report nor the diaries of Treaty 9 Commissioners make reference to being presented with a formal mixed-ancestry claim while negotiating Treaty No.9, there is evidence that the petition was personally presented to the Commission sometime between August 9-12 while they were at Moose Factory.³⁰⁹ The fact that both George McLeod (petition signatory) and J.G. Mowat (petition witness) had personal contact with the Treaty Commissioners, establishes at minimum, an opportunity for mixed-ancestry representatives to present them with the petition. Later correspondence also provides strong indicators. For example, a letter from Indian Affairs in 1907 states that “Mr. D.G. MacMartin who was the Ontario Commissioner for Treaty No.9 is acquainted with the situation at that post with reference to half-breeds.”³¹⁰ However, Treaty Commissioners were not instructed to offer treaty provisions or to issue scrip to “half breeds.” Hence MacMartin, Stewart and Scott will have submitted the petition from the “half breeds of Moose Factory” to authorities on their return to Ottawa and Toronto.

Ontario officials promptly returned to Ottawa the petition from “certain half-breeds” at Moose Factory, with a note stating that “although the petition mentions the Government of

³⁰⁸ Document E-25: ONAS, MNR Indian Land File 186220. This document is handwritten and appears to be the original petition. A typewritten version attached to Indian Affairs’ cover letter, 18 September 1905 has “COPY” clearly written at top (Document E-26: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300). Both versions are undated.

³⁰⁹ Duncan Campbell Scott’s 1906 publication in *Scribner’s Magazine* provides considerable information about “half-breed” voyageurs hired for the treaty journey in 1905, including the crew who took the Commission from Moose Factory to Abitibi. However Scott makes no reference to “half-breed” claims made during treaty negotiations (Document E-33: Scott, “The Last of the Indian Treaties,” 575-576;582).

³¹⁰ Document E-35: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 26 February 1907.

Ontario, the petitioners probably mean the Government of the Dominion.”³¹¹ Indian Affairs insisted it was “properly addressed,” adding:

The Treaty 9 Commission to whom the Petition was presented had no power to deal with Halfbreed claims [without] the Province of Ontario, [that] the Petitioners, therefore, referred for action to the Provincial Treasurer was [?] conversant with the terms of the James Bay Indian Treaty.

The petition is returned herewith.³¹²

Hereafter, the Provincial Treasurer A.J. Matheson decided to look into the matter, requesting Indian Affairs to send information on the number of “Half breeds in Treaty No.9.” In November 1905 Deputy Superintendent General Frank Pedley reported that the petition represented 25-30 people who were not admitted to the treaty pay list because they were not living “the Indian mode of life:”

I find that the only halfbreeds in Treaty No.9 are those interested in the petition which was forwarded to your Secretary on the 23rd of September last. These families comprise perhaps twenty-five or thirty people. They were refused treaty by the Commissioners on the ground that they were not living the Indian mode of life. The only thing which might be done for these people is to admit them into the Indian treaty if you thought advisable to do so; but of course, as they are residents of the Province and would come under the same category as the rest of your Indian adherents of Treaty No.9, and would be paid by your Government, it is a matter which you will have to decide. The Treaty Commissioners promised to bring the matter before you for consideration.³¹³

It appears little attention was paid by the Ontario government and the following March, Indian Affairs requested that Matheson respond to the petition before “the Inspector next visits Moose Factory” as it was probable that “he will be asked by the halfbreeds how your Government proposes to deal with their application.”³¹⁴ Matheson replied on April 2, 1906 that 160 acres would be offered to each of the “half-breeds:”

...as to the claims of certain half-breeds at Moose Factory for consideration, this

³¹¹ Document E-27: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 21 September 1905.

³¹² Document E-28: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 23 October 1905 (portions of this letter are illegible).

³¹³ Document E-30: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 21 November 1905.

³¹⁴ Document E-31: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 19 March 1906.

Government would be prepared to allow these half-breeds, the number not estimated being over fifty, 160 acres of land reserving minerals; to be selected in the District in which they at present reside, such selection not to interfere with Hudson's Bay posts, or Indian Reserves, or lands to be required for railway purposes or for town sites as it may be some time before the district in question is surveyed.

The only object that can be obtained at present is to satisfy these men that the Government is prepared to give them reasonable consideration of their claims to this extent.³¹⁵

Unfortunately, there is a gap of three years in the correspondence contained in this document file, and any action taken by the Ontario and/or Dominion governments is uncertain. Correspondence dated in 1909 suggests that from the petitioners perspective, no action whatsoever was taken. By 1909, at least one of the mixed-ancestry petitioners tired of waiting, and William Archibald requested that he and his family be placed on the Treaty payroll as "Indians." A letter from Indian Agency Inspector J.G. Ramsden in September 1909 indicates that the "half-breed question" at Moose Factory remained unresolved:

Wm. Archibald of Moose Factory desires to be placed on the Indian Band list. He states that he and family appeared before the Commissioners in 1905, that all their names and ages were taken and consideration promised.

His wife's people all on list he states.

The half-breed question at Moose will have to be dealt with. I would like some instruction with reference to this question.³¹⁶

The reply from Indian Affairs to Ramsden's request for instruction, simply referred him to the 1905 and 1906 correspondence cited above.³¹⁷ As well in 1909, Indian Affairs engaged in correspondence regarding the case of James Loutitt, currently living in Dinorwic (Dryden, Ontario), but related by marriage to the Linklater family on the Indian list at Fort Albany. The correspondence in this file ends with a letter dated January 29, 1910 in which the Indian Department in Ottawa reiterates Ontario's position:

³¹⁵ Document E-32: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 2 April 1906. Matheson does not state in this letter that "half-breed" individuals, as opposed to heads of families or the group of 50, were entitled to 160 acres. However, Pedley's memorandum in 1903 clearly states that the Province would grant 160 acres "to each of such [half-breed] persons" (Document E-20: NAC RG10, Vol. 3033, File 235,225, Pt.1).

³¹⁶ Document E-36: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 8 September 1909.

³¹⁷ Document E-37: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 20 September 1909.

...regarding the case of James Loutitt, I beg to inform you that the Department has made inquiry of Mr. Ramsden in the matter. This man is entitled to 160 acres of land at Moose Factory which will be allotted to him when the survey is made by the Ontario Government. When he receives a patent for the land he will be in a position either to sell or work it. I may add that the Ontario Government does not issue scrip to half-breeds.³¹⁸

Post-treaty correspondence from the Church Missionary Society also draws attention to the issue of claims by the mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory. The boarding school established in 1906 taught “25 half breed children” for whom no educational benefits were available under Treaty No. 9. Consequently the Bishop of Moosonee wrote to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs to enquire about grants for these children:

So far the half-breeds have received no consideration such as they have in the North West Territories. It does not therefore seem unreasonable that the Gov’t should provide a necessary means for the secular education of their children. Will you kindly let us know the proper quarter we ought to apply for an increase in this Grant & oblige.³¹⁹

Again, the matter was referred to Ontario jurisdiction:

An application for a grant for educational advantages provided for half-breed children, and elsewhere in the province of Ontario, should be made to the Education Department, Toronto. As Mr. D.G. MacMartin who was the Ontario Commissioner for Treaty No.9 is acquainted with the situation at that post with reference to half-breeds, as well as Indians, and as the Ontario Government has already recognized the half-breed claims by granting 160 acres each, it might be well to refer to Mr. MacMartin in your communication to the Ontario Government.³²⁰

According to Long and Manore, there is little documentation regarding the outcome of demands made by the “half Breeds of Moose Factory” in 1905. Correspondence from James Dobie regarding his survey of the Moose Factory Indian Reserve in 1912 makes no mention of “half breeds” requesting that land grants be surveyed.³²¹

³¹⁸ Document E-38: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 29 January 1910.

³¹⁹ Document E-34: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 11 February 1907

³²⁰ Document E-35: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 26 February 1907.

³²¹ Document E-44: NAC RG10, Vol.3105, File 309,350-3, 20 October 1912; cf. Long, “Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families,” 150, endnote 40.

5. INTERPRETING THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE: ETHNOGENESIS AND “EFFECTIVE EUROPEAN CONTROL”

This chapter provides interpretations of the historical evidence presented in previous chapters of this report, as the data relate to two main issues: ethnogenesis of a mixed-ancestry community in the Moose Factory area, and; issues of “effective European control” in the James Bay region. The interpretations presented here take into account the opinions of other historians who have published accounts of the mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory, weighing these against the historical evidence documented in this report. For reference purposes, the specific questions posed by Justice Canada (as listed in Appendix C) are footnoted within the discussion of these broader issues.

5.1 ETHNOGENESIS

The following interpretations of the historical data with respect to possible ethnogenesis among the mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory, rely in large part on the criteria developed by Reimer and Chartrand in their 2004 publication “Documenting Historic Métis in Ontario.”³²² The four criteria presented in that publication accord fairly closely to those outlined by Justice Canada, addressing the following subjects:

- 1) intermarriage and descent;
- 2) unique social, cultural and economic patterns;
- 3) geographic proximity, and;
- 4) ascription of ethnic status.

There exists historical evidence in all four areas. This data on the mixed-ancestry population of Moose Factory becomes evident beginning in the mid-18th century and continues into the early 20th century.

5.1.1 Intermarriage and Descent

Country marriages were the most common, if not only form of marital union at Moose Factory prior to the 1830s. The earliest record of these types of unions found in post journals are references to an HBC man and “his woman” dating to 1750:

1750 September 3 - Mr. Rob’t Pilgraim, his woman and son.³²³

³²² Reimer and Chartrand, “Documenting Historic Métis in Ontario,” 582-597.

³²³ Document A-5: HBCA B.135/a/20b, 3 September 1750 [no folio #]; cf. **Question 1.b)** “Was inter-marriage,

This entry also provides evidence that children were produced by these unions by at least 1750.

There is direct historical evidence that country marriages between European and Cree persons were formally recognized as “mutual contracts” with specified dates of union. Early records of marriages at Moose Factory and elsewhere in the HBC Southern Department, clearly state that country marriages were certified by Rev. George Barnley in the 1840s. The earliest example of a country marriage is that of George Moore and Emma Good who had been “united according to the custom of the Country since June 1816,” and who were officially married by Barnley on December 20, 1841.³²⁴

References to marriages in Moose Factory post journals from 1750 to 1850, and in Rupert’s Land records from 1830s-1860s, include examples of intermarriage between European, mixed-ancestry and Cree persons, as well as instances of mixed-ancestry endogamy. The refusal of a marriage application in 1855 between “James McPherson, one of the Hon’ble Company’s Servants at this Factory, & Hanna Ward daughter of Ouskeegee” is evidence that unions between European HBC men and Cree women were still desirable.³²⁵ However, no conclusions can be drawn about patterns of marriage from these early sporadic references and incomplete records.³²⁶

The complete Diocese record of 150 marriages between 1874 and 1908 provides more conclusive evidence of marriage patterns in the late 19th century, as follows: Mixed-Ancestry/Mixed-Ancestry: 11 (7.3%); Mixed-Ancestry/“Indian”: 12 (8.0%); Mixed-Ancestry/European: 9 (6.0%); European/ “Indian”: 1 (0.7%).³²⁷ Of the 51 marriages among members of the Moose Factory post population, 36 (70%) involved mixed-ancestry brides and/or grooms. Of these 36 marriages, eleven (30.6%) are positively identified as endogamous (mixed-ancestry/mixed-ancestry). Six of these endogamous marriages were between sons and daughters belonging to eight prominent mixed-ancestry families identified at Moose Factory (see section 5.1.3 below). While the majority of marriages were between men and women whose residence was Moose Factory, there are instances of intermarriage between post-communities,

or were common law relationships (i.e. “country wives”), between Europeans and Aboriginal peoples present in the area? When did these unions produce their first children, by birth or adoption?”

³²⁴ Document D-5: AO F978 MS161, 20 December 1841.

³²⁵ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 26.

³²⁶ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 30-31; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fos.1,3d,11a,25; Document A-28: HBCA B.135/a/180, fos.4,37; cf. **Question 1.i**) “What level of intermarriage... did the people of mixed-ancestry in this area have with groups of Aboriginal people, Europeans and other communities of people of mixed-ancestry during the early period?”

³²⁷ AO F978 GS 862287 - Moose Factory: Anglican Mission Marriages, 1874-1908 (see Document D-10).

eg., Michipicoten, Abitibi, Fort George, Whale River, Fort Hope, and the Revillon Frere Moose River Post.³²⁸

Although the journal entry referring to Robert Pilgraim (quoted above) does not name his son, it provides positive evidence that children of country marriages were born at least as early as 1750. The earliest record of named individuals of European descent are found in the 1803-1804 Lists of Servants. Adult “Native servants” are named, whose birth dates in the mid- 18th century can be calculated from age data provided in later records: Thomas Richards, Sr., born ca. 1765, and; George Moore, Sr. (a), born ca. 1776.³²⁹ The headstone of “Mary Thomas,” born in 1791 and died in 1802, is almost certainly the mixed-ancestry daughter of John Thomas, the man in charge of Moose Factory at the time.³³⁰ Indeed, Judd offers the professional opinion that John Thomas “took his position of command at a time [1782] when Indian wives and mixed blood (called halfbreed) children were beginning to be recognized as natural adjuncts to the fur trade.”³³¹

The earliest examples of individuals with mixed Cree and European names were found in 1834 Moose Factory “Petty Accounts” where the “Children of Dec’d Geo. Atkinson” are listed as follows:

Atkinson George Jun’r
Atkinson Thomas
Hannah alias Pinaitchiquaes
Mistuskoskish
Charlotte alias Kaukumishew³³²

Baptism records beginning in 1852 record numerous “Indian Adults” with Christian given names and Cree surnames.³³³ A post journal entry in 1855 refers to: “Hanna Ward daughter of

³²⁸ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.14d; Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 30-31; Document D-10: AO F978 - GS 862287, #84, #114, #115, #137.

³²⁹ Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1; Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2. The age of Thomas Richards Sr. is not recorded; however, his son Thomas Richards Jr. is age 37 in the 1821 Abstracts (Document B-10: HBCA B.135/g/1); estimating that the father was at least age 20 when his son was born, the year of birth is ca. 1765. George Moore (a) is age 48 in the 1824 Abstracts (Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6); cf. **Question 1.a)** “When was the first person of European descent recorded in the area?”

³³⁰ Arthur, et al., *Moose Factory 1673-1973*, 19-20.

³³¹ Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 71.

³³² Document B-13: HBCA B.135/g/18; cf. **Question 1.c)** “When do examples of individuals with mixed Aboriginal and European names appear?”

³³³ For examples of “Indian Adults” baptized with Christian names, see Document D-9: AO F978 MS192.

Ouskegee, one of the Indians hunting for this Factory.³³⁴

The 1799-1800 post journal's numerous references to children, demonstrate that they lived at the Fort, where they were socialized into post culture.³³⁵ By 1794, school books were sent from London to the James Bay district "for the purpose of teaching the children of your Factory to Read."³³⁶ The earliest evidence of second generation mixed-ancestry children dates to 1785 when Thomas Richards Sr. fathered his son Thomas Richards Jr. A second example dates to 1796, when George Moore Jr was born to George Moore Sr. Historical records list the "parish" for of these four men as "Hudson's Bay."³³⁷

The data base of mixed-ancestry individuals and families appended to this report documents eight prominent mixed-ancestry families who lived at Moose Factory from two to four generations. Of the 300 individuals listed in the database, 169 (56%) belong to one of these eight families. Of the 108 mixed-ancestry persons enumerated in the 1901 Census, almost all (98-99%) are the immediate relatives of one of these eight families. Twenty-seven individuals (25%) are connected by birth to the Moore, McDonald or Turnor families whose mixed-ancestry origins at Moose Factory can be traced to the 18th century. Another 40 individuals (37%) are related to the Linklater, Morrison and Swanson families whose mixed-ancestry origins can be traced to the early 19th century. The remainder (35%) are members of the McLeod and Udgaarden extended families.³³⁸

5.1.2 Social, Economic and Cultural Distinctiveness

Overall, the historical evidence indicates that hunting and fishing skills of mixed-ancestry men, possibly acquired from their Cree extended families, seems to have developed into an occupational niche at Moose Factory for a temporary period of perhaps 50 years, from the late 1700s to the mid-1800s. By the 1870s it is evident that mixed-ancestry men mainly used their hunting and fishing skills to provide for their own families, rather than for the post population as a whole. In part this was likely the direct consequence of the growing number of families at Moose Factory, and a social evolution into a 'company settlement' in which the nuclear family formed the logical economic unit. As well, mixed-ancestry men increasingly acquired skills as a result of the Company's Apprentice policy and the opportunities available to sons of servants to

³³⁴ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 26.

³³⁵ Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fos.10d,25,26,26d. cf. **Question 1.b)** "Where did the children reside?"

³³⁶ Document C-2: HBCA A.6/15, fo.105d.

³³⁷ Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1; Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2; Document B-10: HBCA B.135/g/1; cf. **Question 1.b)** "When did mixed-ancestry children of these unions first have their own children?"

³³⁸ Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

engage in a variety of trades associated with Moose Factory's role as a shipping depot.

The earliest records of servants' "capacity" and rank beginning in 1803, show that mixed-ancestry men occupied roles of canoe-men and canoe builders, skills acquired, perhaps, from their Cree heritage. In 1804, of fourteen mixed-ancestry servants at Moose Factory and its inland posts, eight were canoe-men; in 1810, eight of ten mixed-ancestry servants were canoe men; as experts in canoes, these men were described as "essential" particularly to the inland trade.³³⁹ The annual district report in 1823 indicates that "halfbreeds" were known also to be skilled "Winter messengers or Packetters."³⁴⁰ Judd concludes from her research on the period of inland expansion that there was then an emerging recognition that "the sons and daughters of fur traders [were] integral but distinct parts of fur trade society."³⁴¹

This occupational role based on skills possibly acquired through these men's Cree ancestry, extended also to their early role as hunters and fishermen in order to procure country-food for consumption by the post population. While post journals in the mid 1700s indicate that "homeguard" Cree were the main provisioners, by 1800 the country-food was being provided mainly by mixed-ancestry men such as George Moore and Joseph Turnor. On occasion, mixed-ancestry men were sent to camp a distance from the post in order to hunt, taking their wives and country families with them. For instance, in October 1799, "Geo. Moore & his wife gone in a canoe to Wayway Creek to tent there & trap and hunt."³⁴² Journal entries from the 1830s-40s indicate that this pattern of mixed-ancestry men as primary post-provisioners continued for at least the next two decades.³⁴³

It was also common practice at Moose Factory for HBC men and their country-born sons to work together at the post, and in some cases, fathers were allowed to formally apprentice their sons: in 1817-18 William Corrigan and his son Jacob operated the Hannah Bay post; in 1822-23 George Moore Sr. apprenticed his son George Moore Jr. in boat-building.³⁴⁴ "Native Youths" were apprenticed in trades, but mixed-ancestry "Boys" also assisted in hunting and fishing for the post. References to "the Boys" appear in Moose Factory post journals at least as early as 1793.³⁴⁵

³³⁹ Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2; Document B-8: HBCA B.135/f/8; cf. **Question 1.g)** "What does the historical record say about the early activities of peoples' of mixed-ancestry in area?"

³⁴⁰ Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fo.6d.

³⁴¹ Judd, "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory," 74.

³⁴² Document A-15: HBCA B.135/a/87, fo.4d.

³⁴³ Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.20d,25d; Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.5d,32d.

³⁴⁴ Document C-5: HBCA B.135/e/4, fo.11d; Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fo.5d; Document A-22: HBCA B.135/a/135, fo.28d

³⁴⁵ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.2,3d,4d.

However, by the mid-19th century, post journals portray the Moose Factory domestic economy as the equal responsibility of all servants at the post, with little evidence to indicate any occupational niche filled by mixed-ancestry men. For example, mixed-ancestry men were as likely to be working with cattle, as they were to be out hunting and fishing.³⁴⁶ Many journal entries for 1870-71 document domestic economic activity that is family-oriented, indicating a continued shift from communal efforts to provide food for the post population, to individual efforts by servants to provide for their own family; entries in winter months particularly emphasize the extreme time and energy required to maintain post families with respect to housing, heating, and eating.³⁴⁷

Another skill often possessed by mixed-ancestry employees was their fluency in both Cree and English. Their bilingualism frequently placed mixed-ancestry men into interpreter duty, for both the post and later for missionaries. However, the position was not unique to mixed-ancestry servants. Records show that some European men became fluent in the dialect spoken by their Cree spouses: for example, in 1824-25, Orkneyman William Corrigan filled the capacity of interpreter at Moose Factory.³⁴⁸

Evidence of locally-born individuals with European last names being fluent in Cree dialects is found in Moose Factory Abstracts of Servants for 1824-25, when William Donald (born 1787 at “Moose, Hudson’s Bay”) is listed in the capacity of post interpreter.³⁴⁹ In 1846, Rev. Barnley relied on several mixed-ancestry men and women as interpreters, and hoped to hire full-time, “a son of Mr. Spencer’s, a lad of an amiable disposition about 17, [on] the consideration that he understood a dialect spoken very extensively in my circuit.”³⁵⁰ In 1851, Rev. Horden also depended on a “half breed” to interpret for his ministry.³⁵¹

However, the historical evidence confirms that the predominant language at Moose Factory among mixed-ancestry peoples was English, and there is no indication of the

³⁴⁶ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 27,45,87. The Abstracts of Servants Accounts for 1854-55 list the Parish for each of these men as “Indian Country” (Document B-15: HBCA B.135/g/38).

³⁴⁷ See for example, Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.21d,36.

³⁴⁸ Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6.

³⁴⁹ Document B-11: HBCA B.135/g/6; cf. **Question 1.d** “When was the first evidence of locally-born individuals with European last names being fluent in Aboriginal languages?”

³⁵⁰ Document C-17: HBCA D.5/18, fo.218. This “lad” is John Spencer (b), Parish: Indian Country (Document B-14: HBCA B.135/g/33).

³⁵¹ Document D-7: GSA MF 78-13 (A88-89), 26 August 1851.

development of a Cree/English pidgin. English primers were sent to Moose Factory in 1794.³⁵² In 1840, Barnley held a morning school to teach post children to read, separate from afternoon religious instruction among the Indians (where he used an interpreter).³⁵³ In the 1880s, Diocese correspondence is clear that individuals at the posts spoke English and that most “above the age of nine or ten [is able] to read it,” while Cree families made “intelligent use of our translated books into their respective tongues.” Rev. John Horden, the missionary particularly interested in language and translation, makes no reference to a mixed vocabulary or trade language in use at Moose Factory. A report in 1889 states that the principal mission station and school at Moose Factory enrolled about 40 pupils in the English school, and about 60 in the Indian school.³⁵⁴

In terms of social class, the historical evidence indicates that mixed-ancestry men remained predominantly in the “Servant” class as canoe-men, sailors, sloopers, guides, interpreters, boatbuilders, carpenters, joiners, blacksmiths, coopers or general labourers. Several were promoted to positions of postmaster or clerk. Of the 122 mixed-ancestry men whose occupations can be traced in the HBC employee lists, nineteen (15.6%) reached the clerk or postmaster class, and none (0%) reached the officer class (Appendix B).

Judd suggests that “select” groups of officers’ children were educated in the early period, but that in general, “mixed blood children were usually not trained for anything but labouring or tradesmen’s jobs for which extensive formal education was not a prerequisite.”³⁵⁵ Her interpretation of the evidence is that after the 1821 merger, the HBC ranking system was more strictly defined between servant and officer, and “the chain of command in the fur trade hierarchy became more entrenched.” Judd concludes that with a lack of competition, the HBC considered mixed-ancestry employees less important in terms of promotion to the officer class, in part because they were able to acquire only the rudiments of education, and because the overseas governor under the new regime considered them “merely fit for voyaging.” Certainly the historical data presented in this report confirms that mixed-ancestry men mainly occupied “the lower rungs of the company hierarchy.”³⁵⁶

Mixed-ancestry women also experienced class differences when European women were first introduced to Moose society. In 1830 Chief Factor John George McTavish brought his

352 Document C-2: HBCA A.6/15, fo.105d.

353 Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.4d.

354 Document E-3: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 17 February 1879; Document E-7: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 19 August 1887; Document E-10: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 27 August 1889; cf. **Question 1.e)** “When is the first record of an Aboriginal-European pidgin or Michif being spoken as a mother tongue?”

355 Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 73.

356 *Ibid.*, 75-76.

Scottish bride to Moose Factory. The McTavishes were offended by social overtures from the other women of the establishment and their husbands, creating racial and class tensions.³⁵⁷ Chief Factor and Mrs. McTavish left Moose Factory in 1835, but in 1843, Rev. George Barnley brought the second European woman into Moose society. They stayed until 1847.³⁵⁸ Mrs. Barnley also stirred resentment among local wives because she assumed an “unpleasant tone of superiority.”³⁵⁹ However, it is significant to note that church marriages performed by Barnley coincide with a change in journal entries’ references to Cree and mixed-ancestry women of the establishment from “my woman” to “wife.”³⁶⁰ Nevertheless, journal entries from the 1850s indicate that locally-born women continued to be placed on a lower social scale than Euro-Canadian women who were awarded the title of “Lady” or “Mrs.”³⁶¹

5.1.3 Geographic Proximity

The Hudson’s Bay Company habitually transferred its employees – European and mixed-ancestry – between posts within the Moose Factory district, within the Southern Department and further afield to the Northern Department. In the 19th century, several mixed-ancestry servants retired to the Red River Settlement or to Canada.³⁶² The post journals and lists of servants examined in this study show that active mixed-ancestry servants were transferred within the district to, for example, to inland posts and to posts in other districts such as Fort Albany or Rupert’s House. They were also sent elsewhere within the Southern Department, to Michipicoten in the Lake Superior district, for example.

Indeed, ethnohistorical research by Brown and by Reimer and Chartrand demonstrate the interconnection of mixed-ancestry family names throughout the James Bay and inland area, the result of HBC expansion, transfer of servants, and intermarriage. Names such as Moore, Thomas,

³⁵⁷ Williams, Glyndwr. The ‘Character Book’ of George Simpson, 157,171 (see Document C-13); Document C-12: HBCA B.135/c/2, 74; cf. **Question 2.g**) “When was the first woman of European ancestry (i.e. not of mixed-ancestry) settled in the area?”

³⁵⁸ Document C-15: HBCA D.5/8, fo.28 (Letter from Chief Factor Alexander Christie to Governor George Simpson); Document C-16: HBCA D.4/28, fo.37 (Reply from Simpson to Christie).

³⁵⁹ Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 81-82; Judd cites a letter from C.F. Miles to George Simpson dated 30 June 1847 (HBCA A.11/46).

³⁶⁰ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.5-5d; Document A-25: HBCA B.135/a/155, fos.16d,38d.

³⁶¹ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 61; Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fo.16.

³⁶² For example, in 1834 George Moore (a) retired to Red River (Document B-13: HBCA B.135/g/18); cf. **Question 1.i**: “What level of... migration or cultural contact did the people of mixed-ancestry in this area have with groups of Aboriginal people, Europeans and other communities of people of mixed-ancestry during the early period?”

Linklater, Richards, Vincent, Knight, Beads and Polson are documented at Fort Albany, and at inland posts such as Abitibi House, Kinogamissi, Matawagamingue, New Post, etc. These authors conclude that an important characteristic of what Brown terms “fur trade endogamy,” is the connection between families within the region as a whole.³⁶³

Unique to the mixed-ancestry group of HBC men, was the HBC policy in 1837 to apprentice the 15-year-old sons of servants outside their father’s district.³⁶⁴ That this directive was enforced to some extent is evident in subsequent post journal entries: in 1840 the son of John Louttit from Abitibi was apprenticed at Moose Factory, as was the son of Walter Faries from Matawagamingue in 1855.³⁶⁵ However, numerous entries about HBC men and their sons working together at Moose Factory suggest that the regulation was not always fully enforced.³⁶⁶

Beginning in at least the first quarter of the 19th century, the historical record shows that HBC mixed-ancestry men were building separate dwellings for their families on Moose Factory land and with Company time, manpower and equipment.³⁶⁷ For example, in 1817-1818 George Moore built a house for himself and his family.³⁶⁸ In 1822 Charles Beads built a “small House” with the help of two fellow mixed-ancestry men (George Moore and Thomas Richards).³⁶⁹ By 1827, Chief Factor Christie noted there were several “people who have Families and live in detached houses.”³⁷⁰

The site map of Moose Factory dated 1901 and building descriptions contained in the 1895 District Report may indicate the existence of a mixed-ancestry ‘neighbourhood’ on the northeast side of the fort where 27-28 separate dwellings are shown (Figure 3).³⁷¹ Eleven dwellings were Company houses occupied by servants, and 16-17 belonged to “homeguard” Cree

³⁶³ Brown, *Strangers in Blood*, 51,75; Reimer and Chartrand, “Documenting Historic Métis in Ontario,” 582-586.

³⁶⁴ Document C-14: HBCA B.135/k/1, 189-190 [fos.95-95d]; cf. Francis and Morantz, *Partners in Furs*, 156.

³⁶⁵ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.6d; Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 27.

³⁶⁶ Document A-29: HBCA B.135/a/183, fos.9,20d,22,24d,31; cf.29d.

³⁶⁷ Document A-26: HBCA B.135/a/163, 35; Document A-27: HBCA B.135/a/175, fos.11b-12; Document A-28: HBCA B.135/a/180, fos.38d-40d; Document A-30: HBCA B.135/a/188, fos.40-41.

³⁶⁸ Document A-17: HBCA B.135/a/119a, fo.27; cf. Document A-19: HBCA B.135/a/122, fo.15.

³⁶⁹ Document A-20: HBCA B.135/a/125, 34.

³⁷⁰ Document A-21: HBCA B.135/a/130, 12 December 1827 [no folio #].

³⁷¹ Document C-22: HBCA B.135/e/32, 3-4; Document C-24: HBCA B.135/e/34, 11.

families. Triangulation with the 1901 Census.³⁷² suggests that the mixed-ancestry families enumerated in buildings 114-131 (Table 5), correspond with the buildings marked on the northeast side of the fort site plan, where separate family dwellings and garden plots had been established beginning in the 1820s.

Judd argues that this mixed-ancestry housing pattern at Moose Factory was “an expression of their way of life.”³⁷³ Consistent with the evidence presented in this report, Judd notes that the trend toward separate dwellings for servants with families was well established by the latter half of the 1820s. By the late 1830s the existence of a growing “settlement” at Moose Factory was in many ways considered to be natural and normal.³⁷⁴

At most, it can be argued that this cluster of dwellings represented an ‘occupational neighbourhood,’ one that happened to be comprised mainly of mixed-ancestry fur trade employees. The buildings were owned by the HBC and intended for Company men. However, it is important to keep in mind that since at least the 1820s, these men introduced separate family-dwellings to the Factory. Mixed-marriage and mixed-ancestry families were the impetus for a new residential cluster on the northeast side of the Factory site, at times to the dismay of the Company. Nevertheless, it is impossible to determine from the historical evidence, the extent, if any, to which these families consciously chose to live next to other mixed-ancestry neighbours, or to which this proximity engendered a sense of ethnic identity. Certainly if ethnogenesis did occur, the close proximity of multi-generation mixed-ancestry extended families will have been a contributing factor.

5.1.4 Ascription of Ethnic Status

In the Moose Factory Records, the earliest use of the term “Native” as a reference to mixed-ancestry is found in the 1803 “List of Servants” where Joseph Turnor and Thomas Richards, Jr. are identified as from the parish of “Hudson’s Bay” and along with Thomas Knight and William McDonald are described as “native Youths.” The following year, Charles Beads is described as “one of our faithful natives” and his parish is identified as “Hudson’s Bay.”³⁷⁵

Moose Factory fur trade records rarely employ the term “halfbreed.” The earliest instance

³⁷² Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

³⁷³ Judd, “Housing the Homeguard at Moose Factory: 1730-1982,” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 3, no.1 (1983), 24.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 30.

³⁷⁵ Document B-1: HBCA B.135/f/1, fos.2d-3; Document B-2: HBCA B.135/f/2, fos.0d-1.; cf. **Question 1.f** “When was the first record of any of the various terms used to describe Métis or Michif (in English, French or an Aboriginal language) people used in the area? Under what circumstances and in what context?”

of this term occurs in the District Report for 1822-23, in which George Moore, Jr., Thomas Richards, and William Saunderson are each identified as “halfbreed.”³⁷⁶ In 1823-24, Charles Beads is listed as a “halfbreed, an excellent canoe man & winter traveller.”³⁷⁷ That Thomas Richards and Charles Beads were identified as “Native” in 1803-04, and as “halfbreeds” in 1822-24 corroborates the notion that these terms are synonymous and that both are indicators of mixed-ancestry at Moose Factory during this period in the James Bay area.

The difficulty in determining if the mixed-ancestry population at Moose Factory was an ‘ethnic community’ lies in the impossible separation of this group from the ‘post community.’ Certainly, as Judd agrees, the Moose Factory establishment was almost from its beginning, a “social unit.”³⁷⁸ From the first post journal when Moose Factory was re-established in 1730, entries demonstrate a clear distinction between the establishment population, and the “homeguard” population. By at least the 1790s, journal entries begin to distinguish between “Indian women” and “the women,” the latter inferred to mean the women of the establishment.³⁷⁹ It is also in the late 18th century that children are mentioned alongside these women.³⁸⁰

A demographic analysis (Table 1) concludes that the post community evolved into largely a mixed-ancestry community. By 1830 the complement of HBC men at Moose Factory was over 30% mixed-ancestry, growing to over 50% by 1890. The 1881 Census enumerations indicate that over 65% of the post population was mixed-ancestry, and a decade later, the 1901 Census confirmed that Moose Factory was almost 85% mixed-ancestry.

Most mixed-ancestry individuals and families appear to have been, as Morantz concludes, “heavily influenced by the Europeans” due to their often lifelong and multi-generation connection with the Hudson’s Bay Company.³⁸¹ That Europeans accepted their mixed-ancestry offspring as their own is evident not only from the numerous journal entries about children in everyday life cited in this report; it is also evident in the ceremonial rites of baptism and death. Records show that these children were christened with their British fathers’ name and buried in the “European burial ground” rather than in the Indian one.”³⁸² However, not all mixed-ancestry

³⁷⁶ Document C-6: HBCA B.135/e/11, fos.5d-6.

³⁷⁷ Document C-7: HBCA B.135/e/12, fo.3d.

³⁷⁸ Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 74.

³⁷⁹ Document A-11: HBCA B.135/a/80, fos.3,12; Document A-12: HBCA B.135/a/82, fos.7,28.

³⁸⁰ Document A-13: HBCA B.135/a/84, fo.33d.

³⁸¹ Morantz, “The Fur Trade and the Cree of James Bay,” 48-49.

³⁸² Arthur, et al., *Moose Factory 1673-1973*:19-20; cf. “Indian grave yard” (Document D-3: AO F978 MS161, September 1843).

individuals identified with their European ancestry. There is historical evidence that some at Moose Factory chose to live a Cree life and settled among the “homeguard” families.³⁸³ For example, both the 1881 Census and 1901 Census list members of the extended “Turnor” family identified as “Indian.”³⁸⁴

The 1901 Census is the earliest possible indicator of self-ascription by mixed-ancestry individuals at Moose Factory. Enumerators were instructed to record the “colour” and “origin” of persons as self-identified, but the extent to which enumerators imposed their own codes cannot be known. However, that some members of the same extended families (eg., Turnor) identified differently (some “Metis Ecosaise,” others “Indian”), supports the notion that at least some degree of self-identification was exercised in 1901.³⁸⁵

The 1905 “half breed” petition (see below) represents the first direct evidence of self-ascribed mixed-ancestry identity distinct from European or Cree identities. The refusal by the Treaty Commissioners to admit families onto the treaty payroll on grounds that their lifestyle was not “Indian” enough, may have been a major factor in igniting or crystalizing a self-recognized cultural difference between mixed-ancestry families and their Cree relations. The distinctive fur trade post way of life followed by mixed-ancestry people at Moose Factory was, by act of the treaty, politicized in a way unprecedented in their two-hundred year history at the fort. This event, it can be argued, generated something more than a fur trade post community – it defined a mixed-ancestry community.³⁸⁶

5.2 “Effective European Control”

If and when “effective European control” was established in the study region is addressed according to the following four criteria:

- 1) permanent European settlement;
- 2) establishment of European and Canadian government;
- 3) enforcement of law and government policy, and;

³⁸³ Morantz, “The Fur Trade and the Cree of James Bay,” 48.

³⁸⁴ Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel C-13286); Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

³⁸⁵ Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

³⁸⁶ Judd comes to much the same conclusion in her 1982 publication “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 82-83.

4) Treaty No.9.

Each of these four topics is discussed separately below.

5.2.1 Permanent European Settlement

Although the fur trade in the west James Bay area began in 1673 when Moose Factory was first established by the Hudson's Bay Company, a permanent British presence in the area did not begin until 1730. The period between 1673 and 1730 was characterized by a series of conflicts between the French and English fur trading interests: in 1686 Moose Factory was captured by the French, returned to British ownership in 1713, and a new (permanent) Factory built by the HBC in 1730.³⁸⁷ Thereafter Moose Factory grew in importance and in 1810 became the headquarters for the newly formed HBC Southern Department. In 1821 when the HBC and the Montreal-based North West Company (NWC) merged under the British company, Moose was confirmed as the port of entry for the Southern Department and seat of its governor.³⁸⁸ The HBC post at Moose Factory continued to operate into the 20th century.

Beginning in 1794, the Hudson's Bay Company began an education program for the children of its servants in Rupert's Land, sending 50 primers for "the children of your Factory".³⁸⁹ In 1806, the HBC London Committee sent "School Instructions" providing a standard set of regulations to be followed by all "Chief Factories" for "children belonging to each post Settlement with its Inland posts."³⁹⁰ By 1808, Moose Factory listed David Robertson as the first official school master at that post.³⁹¹ At the beginning eight children attended the school, all of whom were mixed-ancestry, the sons and daughters of HBC men and their country-wives. Although the children of Cree leaders were also welcome, there is no evidence that any attended in this early period. A school house was completed in 1810.³⁹² In 1840 the missionary George Barnley took over responsibility for school teaching, by which time enrollment had grown to eighteen school age children.³⁹³ By 1889, the mission school at Moose Factory had an enrollment

³⁸⁷ Rich, *Hudson's Bay Company 1670-1870*, 61-62, 80-1; Judd, Carol M. "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory," 66; cf. **Question 2.a)** "When was the first trading post established in the area?"

³⁸⁸ Glover, "Introduction" to *Letters from Hudson's Bay*, xxv-xxvi; Judd, "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory," 75.

³⁸⁹ Document C-2: HBCA A.6/15, fo.105d; cf. **Question 2.h)** "When was the first school established? Were people of mixed-ancestry sent to this school?"

³⁹⁰ Document C-3: HBCA A.6/17, fos.76-76d; 119-120d.

³⁹¹ Document B-11: HBCA B.135/f/6.

³⁹² Document A-16: HBCA B.135/a/98, fos.5d,34.

³⁹³ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fo.4d.

of about 40 pupils in the English school, and about 60 in the Indian school.³⁹⁴

In 1905, Duncan Campbell Scott used part of his time at Moose Factory to inspect facilities for a residential school.³⁹⁵ After Treaty No.9, the Dominion government was responsible only for the education of treaty beneficiaries in the territory, and the Diocese of Moosonee, who operated the school at Moose Factory, was directed to the Ontario government for assistance for “half-breed children.”³⁹⁶ The boarding school established in 1906 accepted “25 half breed children” for whom no educational benefits were available under Treaty No. 9.³⁹⁷

Missionaries first arrived in the west James Bay area in 1672 when Jesuit Charles Albanel travelled to “Hutson’s bay” [sic] together with French trader and explorer Denis de St. Talon.³⁹⁸ However, it was not until 1840 that a permanent mission was established at Moose Factory with the arrival of Rev. George Barnley of the Wesleyan Missionary Society.³⁹⁹ Almost immediately, church marriages were performed, the school for mixed-ancestry post children was reorganized, and religious instructions for “homeguard” Cree began. Barnley ministered at Moose until 1847. In 1851, Rev. John Horden and his wife became the resident missionaries at Moose Factory, under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society (Anglican). Horden translated biblical texts into Cree syllabics, and presumably taught school at the post as well. In 1872 he was appointed Bishop of Moosonee, a position in which he served until his death in 1893.⁴⁰⁰

The Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) constructed north of the Great Lakes in the 1880s prompted several Moose Factory Cree families to relocate to Missanabie and Chapleau.⁴⁰¹ It also resulted in a decision by the HBC in 1902 to move its distribution warehouses from Moose Factory Island to Charlton Island and to shift its headquarters to Winnipeg.⁴⁰² Finding itself with

³⁹⁴ Document E-10: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 27 August 1889.

³⁹⁵ Document E-23: NAC RG10, Vol.1028, 25-28.

³⁹⁶ Document E-35: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 26 February 1907.

³⁹⁷ Document E-34: NAC RG10, Vol.6203, File 467-1, Pt.1, 11 February 1907; cf. **Question 2.j)** “When were the first people sent to residential schools from the area? Were people of mixed-ancestry sent to these schools?”

³⁹⁸ Document D-1: *Jesuit Relations* 56, 185-187; cf.14-15,203,303.

³⁹⁹ Document A-24: HBCA B.135/a/145, fos.1d,4d,5d,14d; cf. **Question 2.i)** “When was the first permanent religious mission or church site established?”

⁴⁰⁰ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 92-93; see also, “Summary of the Anglican Diocese of Moosonee” (AO F978, MS311, Reel 1).

⁴⁰¹ Long, “Historical Context,” 7; Document C-19: HBCA B.135/e/25:1-2.

⁴⁰² Document E-33: Scott, “The Last of the Indian Treaties,” 581; Preston, “James Bay Cree Culture,” 375.

surplus workers, the HBC dismissed twelve servants who, with their families, went south to the railroad line to find work.⁴⁰³ In 1906 Duncan Campbell Scott also commented on the effect of the CPR on the James Bay area:

Moose Factory was until lately the seat of the Anglican Bishop of Moosonee [sic], but that glory and part of the trading glory has departed; the bishop has gone to “the line,” as the Canadian Pacific Railway is called, and the Hudson’s Bay Company has removed its distributing warehouse to Charlton Island, fifty miles out in the Bay.”⁴⁰⁴

In 1903 The Revillon Freres Trading Company set up a trading post at the mouth of the Moose River, the present site of Moosonee, where a small company town quickly developed.⁴⁰⁵ Several of the families who had recently left the HBC to find work at the railroad, returned to work at Moose.⁴⁰⁶ The Revillon Freres operation diminished during the 1920s, when animal populations were low due to over trapping, partly a result of the influx of white trappers. The Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway line reached Moosonee in 1932, marking the beginning of a railway town. Moosonee became the predominant distribution centre in the area. As a result, the HBC moved its docks to Moosonee.⁴⁰⁷ In the 1920s a reserve was established on Moose Factory Island. The Department of Indian Affairs set up its regional office on the Island. Provincial government offices are located across the river, in Moosonee.

In 1948 the office for the Ontario Dept. of Lands and Forests was established at Moosonee.⁴⁰⁸ The Moosonee area was apparently classified “unorganized territory” until the year 2000. However, since 1968 the Moosonee Development Area Board provided services to the

⁴⁰³ Judd, “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory,” 85; Long, “Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families,” 143.

⁴⁰⁴ Document E-33; Scott, “The Last of the Indian Treaties,” 581.

⁴⁰⁵ Stephenson, *The Community of Moose Factory (TASO No.2)*, 8-9; Stephenson, *The Community of Moosonee (TASO No.3)*, 7-9; cf. **Question 2.e** “When was the area first opened for European settlement? When was the first recorded European-sponsored settlement? Were people of mixed-ancestry included in the settlement? Under what circumstances?”

⁴⁰⁶ Long, “Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families,” 143; cf. Manore, *Moose Factory Metis Land Claim*, 6.

⁴⁰⁷ Stephenson, *The Community of Moosonee (TASO No.3)*, 9; cf. **Question 2.m** “When was a road, stagecoach line or railway first built through the lands in the area?”

⁴⁰⁸ Shearer, John. “History of Moosonee,” (<http://www.pinetreeline.org/other/other28/other28h.html>, 1969); cf. **Question 2.o** “When did commercial resource extraction, other than in furs or trade undertaken by fur trade companies, begin in the region? What organizations and ethnic groups carried out the trade?”

town similar to those of municipalities.⁴⁰⁹

5.2.2 Establishment of European and Canadian Government

Prior to the fur trade, West Main Cree occupied the Moose River region, living by hunting, trapping and fishing according to an established seasonal cycle. In 1672, Jesuit Charles Albanel described the Cree as the occupiers of this territory since “time immemorial.”⁴¹⁰ The Hudson’s Bay Company was granted a trade title by Britain for all of Rupert’s Land in 1670. An argument can be made that the HBC held *de facto* economic control throughout Rupert’s Land, including the James Bay region.⁴¹¹ The Company also had complete civil jurisdiction over its employees, ruling the behaviour of its personnel by a set of regulations established by the Council of Rupert’s Land and Committee in London. Company officers held the authority to marry, christen, and bury.⁴¹² The HBC also exercised criminal jurisdiction in matters that involved their property or personnel (see section 5.2.3, below). Even after Rupert’s Land became part of Canada in 1870, and later of Ontario in 1889, historians describe the Moose Factory district as remaining “the domain of Indians, Hudson’s Bay Company traders, and missionaries.”⁴¹³

In 1868, the Hudson’s Bay Company surrendered Rupert’s Land to Britain and in 1869 a “Deed of Surrender” was signed over to Canada. In 1870 an Order-in-Council confirmed the HBC territory as the possession of the Dominion of Canada.⁴¹⁴ The Dominion exercised its sovereignty over the new territory mainly by imposing custom taxes on British goods entering the port of Moose Factory.⁴¹⁵

⁴⁰⁹ Town of Moosonee. “Administration” (<http://www.townofmoosonee.homestead.com/admin.html>, 2004); cf. **Question 2.n**) “When was a local legislature and/or municipal government established for the area? When did the local court first sit?”

⁴¹⁰ Document D-1: *Jesuit Relations* 56, 203; cf. 185-187, 303.

⁴¹¹ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 75.

⁴¹² AO F978 MS311, Reel 2 - Moose Factory: Marriages, 1829-1852 (see Document D-5); Baptisms, 1815-1850 (see Document D-2); AO F978 MS161: Moose Factory - Deaths and Burials, 1811-1894 (see Document D-3).

⁴¹³ Zaslow, “The Ontario Boundary Question,” 109-111.

⁴¹⁴ Document E-1: *Rupert’s Land Act, 1868*; Document E-2: *Order... Admitting Rupert’s Land and North-Western Territory into the Union, 1870* & “Schedule C - Deed of Surrender, 1869”; cf. **Question 2.b**) “When did the legal transfer of land from private suzerainty to the Dominion crown take place in the area?”

⁴¹⁵ Document E-7: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 19 August 1887; Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 76, 83-84.

For the next twenty years, negotiations, litigation and arbitrations between Ontario and the Dominion aimed at defining the northern and western boundaries of the province. In 1878 arbitrators awarded to Ontario the territory north to the English and Albany Rivers. The province proceeded to establish its authority by appointing two stipendiary magistrates: E.B. Borron was appointed to superintend the norther portion (District of Nipissing). From 1880 onward, Borron made “annual forays” to Moose Factory. Zaslow summarizes Borron’s early view as one in which Ontario should not contest the rule of the HBC “since it appeared to suffice for the needs of the country.” Borron advised the province not to interfere “until we are in a position to provide a really sufficient substitute,” and in the meantime to secure the cooperation of the company officials by commissioning them as provincial justices of the peace. Borron gradually began to suggest a more active provincial role in the territory and thus “the traditional order began to deteriorate and the province began gradually to assert its authority.”⁴¹⁶ By Imperial legislation – the *Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889* – the boundaries of the Province of Ontario were legally recognized as extending west to Lake of the Woods and north to the Albany River, a vast region including Moose Factory and environs.⁴¹⁷

Treaty No. 9 was signed at Moose Factory in 1905, signalling a more formal relationship between the Cree inhabitants of the James Bay region and the Federal and Provincial governments (see Section 5.2.4 below). In the 1920s following the establishment of the Moose Factory Island reserve, Federal government agencies overtook the HBC as the main administrative unit at Moose Factory, taking responsibility for education, health and welfare. The Department of Indian Affairs also set up its regional office on the Island. For the most part, Provincial government offices were located across the river, in Moosonee.⁴¹⁸

5.2.3 Enforcement of Law and Government Policy

The Hudson’s Bay Company was the first European institution to exercise criminal jurisdiction in the James Bay territory. However, the Company did so only in regards to criminal matters that involved their property or personnel. The earliest recorded incident of criminal justice in the Moose Factory region pertains to the Hannah Bay massacre in 1832, when 10 people were murdered by a Cree man and his sons. The HBC undertook what it believed was its right to exercise an “act of justice” by searching out and executing the perpetrators.⁴¹⁹ In 1890, E.B. Borron referring to the Hannah Bay incident as an example of early “Crime and the

⁴¹⁶ Zaslow, “The Ontario Boundary Question,” 109-111.

⁴¹⁷ Document E-9: *Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889*.

⁴¹⁸ Stephenson, *The Community of Moose Factory (TASO No.2)*, 9.

⁴¹⁹ Document A-23: HBCA B.135/a/138, fos.1-10.

Administration of Justice” in the James Bay territory.⁴²⁰

After 1870, the Dominion exercised its sovereignty over the new territory mainly by imposing custom duties on British goods entering the port of Moose Factory. The Dominion also undertook to enumerate its new citizens in the territory. The first official census of in the James Bay region was conducted in 1881. Although the territory had been transferred from the HBC to Canada in 1870, the 1871 Census enumerated only as far north as Timiskaming (Nipissing North). The 1881 Census enumerated a total population at Moose Factory of 494 “Indian” and European (eg., “Scotch”) origins.⁴²¹ An examination of the “Country/Province” and “Origin” identifiers used in the 1881 Census indicates that 68 individuals were mixed-ancestry. Borron explained that the “Dominion census of 1881 was obtained by enumerating all the families which traded at each of the Hudson’s Bay Company posts, and, as many of these were situated either on or near the boundary.”⁴²²

Other than this, life remained much the same in the James Bay region, the cause of much complaint by those paying the Dominion’s high customs.⁴²³ Zaslow reports that Borron also called for pressure on the Dominion government “to cease scandalously neglecting their interest, and to give the people some service in return for the taxes it drew from them.”⁴²⁴

In 1882 Ontario commissioned two HBC officers as provincial justices of the peace. Chief Factor James L. Cotter was the first Justice of the Peace at Moose Factory. William Broughton was appointed Justice of the Peace at Fort Albany; he later became Chief Factor at Moose Factory from 1892-1902.⁴²⁵

The earliest record of state policing in the region is dated to 1925 when the RCMP established a detachment at Moose Factory, staffed by one constable and administered from

⁴²⁰ Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 78-79.

⁴²¹ Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel C-13286).

⁴²² Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 82-83; Document E-5: Canada, 1881 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel C-13286); cf. **Question 2.d** “When was the name of the first resident of the area who was an Aboriginal person recorded in an official record? (For example, Census record, RCMP or NWMP record, etc.) Under what circumstances?”

⁴²³ Document E-7: NAC RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362, 19 August 1887; Document E-11: Borron, “Report on the Basin of Moose River,” 76,83-84.

⁴²⁴ Zaslow, “The Ontario Boundary Question,” 109-111.

⁴²⁵ Document E-6: AO RG53-21, Book 238, fo.127; cf. **Question 2.c** “When was the first RCMP officer (or NWMP officer) or deputized officer of the Crown in the area? Under what circumstances?”

Toronto.⁴²⁶ In 1929, a special constable was added to the force.⁴²⁷ In 1930, the majority of the RCMP's patrol work, which was done "in company with the local Indian agent" was "chiefly concerned with the condition of the Indians."⁴²⁸

5.2.4 Treaty No. 9

Historians agree that two interrelated factors contributed to the drafting and negotiation of Treaty No. 9. First, 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 asked to enter into treaty relations with the Dominion government. Second, both the Federal and Provincial governments recognized a need conclude a treaty in northern Ontario as economic development initiatives, principally railway construction, were being planned and implemented.⁴²⁹

The aftermath of the *St. Catherine's Milling* decision in 1888, legislation in 1891 followed by Orders-in-Council in 1894 established an agreement between the Dominion and Ontario stipulating that the negotiation of any new treaties within provincial boundaries would require the concurrence of the Ontario government.⁴³⁰ The Treaty No. 9 Commission included two representatives of the Dominion (Samuel Stewart and Duncan Campbell Scott) and one representative of Ontario (Daniel G. MacMartin). Stewart authored the official 1905 volume of the Treaty No. 9 report.⁴³¹

The James Bay Treaty - Treaty No.9 was signed by the Moose Cree leaders on August 9, 1905.⁴³² An Order in Council dated February 13, 1907 approved the recommendation to ratify

⁴²⁶ Document E-45: RCMP Annual Report (1926), 43,89.

⁴²⁷ Document E-47: RCMP Annual Report (1929), 112.

⁴²⁸ Document E-48: RCMP Annual Report (1930), 103-104.

⁴²⁹ Morrison, *Treaty Nine (1905-1906), The James Bay Treaty*; Macklem, "The Impact of Treaty 9," 100-102; Long, "Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families" (1985); Long, "No Basis for Argument" (1989); Zaslow, "The Ontario Boundary Question," 109-111.

⁴³⁰ Document E-12: *An Act for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian lands, 1891*; Document E-17: AO RG4-32, File 403/1894 - Federal and Provincial Orders-in-Council, 1894; Macklem, "The Impact of Treaty 9," 104-106.

⁴³¹ Document E-9: *The James Bay Treaty: Treaty Number Nine* [Treaty report by Samuel Stewart], 7-8.

⁴³² Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Vol.1851, No.539 - Treaty No.9, IT436, frame 4; IT440, frame 5; cf. **Question 2.1**) "When did local Aboriginal people first treaty with a government? Was a community of mixed-ancestry people a party to the treaty? If yes, how and in what context?"

the *James Bay Treaty No.9* and approve and confirm the listed reserves. Two reserves were listed for the Moose Cree, as follows: 1) “Moose Factory an area of 64 square miles” and; 2) “Moose Factory Cree at Chapleau 160 acres.”⁴³³

Stewart’s diary makes reference to two mixed-ancestry men within the context of the Treaty negotiation: John George Mowat and George McLeod.⁴³⁴ Both men and their families are enumerated as “Metis Ecosaise” in the 1901 Census.⁴³⁵ J.G. Mowat signed the Treaty No.9 document as a witness, and also added a post-script to the 1905 “half breed” petition. George McLeod was the interpreter for the Treaty meeting on the morning of August 9, 1905. He was also one of the five signatories to the “half breed petition.”

A petition for scrip, signed by five “half breeds of Moose Factory,” was made to the Government of Ontario in the autumn of 1905.⁴³⁶ This petition represents the first direct instance of self-ascribed mixed-ancestry identity distinct from European or Cree identities. Documentation from November 1905 explains that “they were refused treaty by the Commissioners on the ground that they were not living the Indian mode of life.”⁴³⁷ This implies that mixed-ancestry families presented themselves for inclusion within the treaty, but were ascribed an identity other than “Indian” by the Treaty Commissioners. As noted above (section 5.1.4), the refusal by the Treaty Commissioners to admit families onto the treaty payroll on grounds that their lifestyle was not “Indian” enough, may have been the major factor in a politicization of how mixed-ancestry people at Moose Factory viewed themselves and their way of life.

In 1906, Ontario offered to address the “claims of certain half-breeds at Moose Factory” by granting each person “160 acres of land” reserving minerals.⁴³⁸ No evidence was found to indicate if the offer was implemented, or why it was not acted upon.

433 Document E-24: NAC RG10, Series A, Vol.1851, No.539 - Treaty No.9, IT439, frame 2.

434 Document E-21: NAC RG10, Vol.11399, File 1, 95-105.

435 Document E-18: Canada, 1901 Census - Moose Factory (NAC Reel T-6554).

436 Document E-25: ONAS, MNR Indian Land File 186220 (handwritten original); Document E-26: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300 (typed copy).

437 Document E-30: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 21 November 1905.

438 Document E-32: NAC RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300, 2 April 1906.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Time did not allow for an exhaustive review of all historical documentation relevant to a profile of the mixed-ancestry population in the James Bay region. Following is a brief outline of topics suggested for future research.

1. The research presented here focuses almost solely on the mixed-ancestry community at Moose Factory, and touches only briefly on the connections between post-populations in the greater James Bay region. Additional research into the fur trade and mission records for Fort Albany, in particular, may reveal patterns of mixed-ancestry endogamy, occupational mobility, kinship networks and descent, that are not discernable from the local focus on Moose Factory as provided in this study. Furthermore, there exist HBC post journals and account books from Fort Albany for the years 1692 to 1729, the time period when Moose Factory was not operational. Additional research into the kinship ties between families at inland posts (eg., Abitibi) and Moose Factory would likewise complement a broader “regional” view of mixed-ancestry populations in this part of northern Ontario.
2. There exists a considerable volume of baptism and marriage records from the Diocese of Moosonee, covering most of the 19th century. These records contain genealogical data that are valuable with regard to mixed-ancestry marriage patterns and kinship ties both at Moose Factory and in the greater James Bay region. The project time-line allowed for only a cursory examination of these Diocese records.
3. The present analysis is based on a selective sample of HBC records. For example, Moose Factory post journals are sampled at ten-year intervals up to 1850, and at five-year intervals for the latter half of the 19th century. A thorough review of all post journals would provide a more complete picture of the various segments of the post population, including women, children, and mixed-ancestry employees. Such a review would also allow for a more comprehensive analysis of family life, social organization, and cultural characteristics that may more concretely define the way of life of a mixed-ancestry community at Moose Factory.
4. The Abstracts of Servants of Accounts were also sampled at five year intervals. While this was an efficient method in light of the project time frame, gaps were evident when constructing the mixed-ancestry database. A complete review of these lists of servants would allow for a more confident analysis of mobility patterns, including mixed-ancestry men and their families who retired to the Red River settlement. These records also contain lists of “Annuitants” sometimes providing information on the whereabouts of their country wives and children. Time did not allow for this latter type of data to be incorporated into this present study.
5. HBC correspondence records, minutes of council, and London Committee (headquarter)

records, were reviewed only when citation from secondary sources warranted the collection of such documentation. These types of fur trade records remain a largely untapped source of data on HBC policy with respect to social relations between employees and local populations, and with respect to the types of issues Chief Factors dealt with in this regard.

6. None of the HBC account books were reviewed for this present study. These records can provide detailed information on the consumption patterns of the various segments of the post population (eg., comparing that of European officers versus mixed-ancestry servants with families). Account records may also reveal a clearer view of the nature and degree of trade with “homeguard” Cree for food provisions. Finally, the type of data recorded in account books would allow for a more precise quantitative analysis of provisioning roles than currently presented in this report.

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES CITED

A) PRIMARY SOURCES

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Canada, *Sessional Papers* 1925-26 - 1929-1930, Vol.III. RCMP Annual Reports, 1926-1930.

—. Statutes. *An Act for the Settlement of questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian Lands*. SC, 54-55 Victoria, chap.5, 1891.

Anglican General Synod Archives (GSA). *MF 78-13 (A88-89) Journal of John Horden (Bishop of Moosonee), 1852-1893*.

Archives of Ontario (AO). *F978 Church Records Collection*:

MS 161 Moose Factory - Anglican Mission: Baptisms, 1780-1850; Marriages, 1826-1858.

MS 161 Moose Factory - Methodist Mission: Register of Baptisms, 1840-1847; Register of Marriages, 1843-1844.

MS 192 Moose Factory - St. Thomas the Apostle Anglican Church: Register of Baptisms, 1852-1893; Register of Burials, 1851-1906.

GS 862287 Moose Factory - St. Thomas Anglican Church: Marriage Register, 1874-1908.

MS 311, Reel 2 Diocese of Moosonee, Register of Moose Factory and its Dependencies, Containing Baptisms, 1815-1850; Marriages, 1829-1852, and Deaths, 1811-1894, (Series III).

—. RG4-32, File 403 (1894) A.G.O. [Attorney General's Department]: Agreement between Canada and Ontario for settlement of certain questions (respecting Indian Lands). 6 February 1894 - 23 October 1899.

—. RG53-21, Book 238, Folio 127 Commissions for Justices of the Peace, Ontario, 1882.

Hudson's Bay Company Archives (HBCA)

A.6/15; 6/17 *London Office Correspondence*, 1794, 1806.

B.135 *Moose Factory (Ontario), Post Number B.135*

B.135/a/1-190 Post Journals, 1730-1912

B.135/c/2 Correspondence Inward, 1831

B.135/e/1-34 Reports on District, 1814-1901

B.135/f/1-9 Lists of Servants, 1803-1815

B.135/g/1-74 Abstracts of Servants Accounts, 1821-1892

B.135/k/1 Minutes of Council, 1827, 1837

HBCA, continued.

D.4/28; 5/8, 5/18; 20/58 *Governor's Papers and Commissioner's Records*, 1843, 1846, 1890.

National Archives of Canada (NAC), *Department of Indian Affairs*

RG10, Vol.3680, File 12362 Diocese of Moosonee - Bishop Requests Grants for Educational Purposes, 1879-1898.

RG10, Vol.11399, File 1 Samuel Stewart (Treaty No.9 Commissioner), "The James Bay Treaty 9. Places visited by the Commissioner, Summer of 1905."

RG10, Vol.1028 Duncan Campbell Scott (Treaty No.9 Commissioner), "Journal of James Bay Treaty Trips, 1905-1906."

RG10, Vol. 1851, No.539 James Bay Treaty; Treaty No.9 - Copy of original Treaty; Orders-in-Council; typescript copies (Reference Nos. IT436, IT439, IT440)

RG10, Vol. 3093, File 289,300 Treaty No.9 - Petition of Certain Half-Breeds of Moose Factory for Scrip and/or Consideration and Applications to be placed on the Paylists,1905-1910.

RG10, Vol. 6203, File 467-1, Pt.1 James Bay Agency - Moose Factory Residential School (Church of England), General Administration, 1907-1911.

RG 10, Vol. 3171, File 412,065 Treaty No.9 - James Bay Agency - Correspondence regarding the Survey of the Moose Factory Reserve, 1912.

RG10, Vol.3105, File 309,350-3 James Bay Agency Survey of Treaty No.9: Reports, 1912.

RG10, Vol. 3033, File 235,225, Pt.1 Treaty No.9 The James Bay Treaty - Reports, correspondence, Drafts, memorandum, Order in Council, 1901-1906.

— *Census Records*

NAC Reel C-13286 Census Return 1881, Moose Factory: Eastern Rupert's Land - Territories NWT, District 192, Sub-district 99.

NAC Reel T-6554 Census Return 1901, Indian Reserves: Moose Factory - James Bay: Quebec District 180, Pontiac; Sub-district Z4, Unorganized Territory.

Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS). *Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) Land File 186,220*: Petition of "half breeds of Moose Factory" (handwritten original), 1905.

Ontario, *Sessional Papers* No.87, "Report on the Basin of Moose River and Adjacent country belonging to the Province of Ontario." By E.B. Borron, Stipendiary Magistrate, 1890.

Queen's University Archives (QUA). *Miscellaneous Collection, MacMartin Papers*: "Diary of a Journey to N.W.T. in 1905 (re: Indian Treaty)," by Daniel G. MacMartin (Treaty No.9 Commissioner), 1905.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

Canada. *Report of the Fourth Census of Canada 190: Volume I: Population*. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1902.

—. *The James Bay Treaty: Treaty Number Nine*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1964 (1905); Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/trts/trty9/james_e.html, 1984.

—. *Order-in-Council, 1870: Rupert's Land and North-Western Territory Order*; (including Schedule C: Deed of Surrender, 1869), http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/rlo_1870.html)

Davies, K.G., ed. *Letters From Hudson's Bay, 1703-40*. London: The Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1965.

Rich, E.E. *Moose Fort Journals 1783-85*. London: The Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1954.

—. *Hudson's Bay Company 1670-1870 - Volume 1: 1670-1763*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1960.

Scott, Duncan Campbell. "The Last of the Indian Treaties." *Scribner's Magazine* 40, no.5 (1906):573-583.

Tyrrell, J.B., ed. *Journals of Samuel Hearne and Philip Turnor*. Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1934.

United Kingdom, Statutes. *Rupert's Land Act, 1868*. 31-32 Victoria, c.105 (U.K.), http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/rpl_1868.html.

—. *Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889*. 52-53 Victoria, c.28 (U.K.), http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/coba_1889.html

Williams, Glyndwr. "The 'Character Book' of George Simpson, 1832." In *Hudson's Bay Miscellany, 1670-1870*. G. Williams 151-236. Winnipeg: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1975.

B) SECONDARY SOURCES

- Arthur, Eric, Howard Chapman, and Hart Massey. *Moose Factory 1673-1973*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973 [1949].
- Bishop, Charles A. "Ojibwa, Cree and the Hudson's Bay Company in Northern Ontario: Culture and Conflict in the Eighteenth Century." In *Western Canada: Past and Present*, edited by A.W. Rasporich, 150-162. Calgary: McClelland and Stewart West, 1975.
- . "The First Century: Adaptive Changes among the Western James Bay Cree between the Early Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries." In *The Subarctic Fur Trade: Native Social and Economic Adaptations*, edited by S. Krech, III, 21-53. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1984.
- Bond, C.C.J. "The Hudson's Bay Company in the Ottawa Valley." *The Beaver* Outfit 296 (Spring), 1966.
- Brown, Jennifer S.H. *Strangers in Blood: Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1980.
- . "Linguistic Solitudes and Changing Social Categories." In *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference*, edited by Carol M. Judd and Arthur J. Ray, 147-159. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Flannery, Regina. *Ellen Smallboy: Glimpses of a Cree Woman's Life*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.
- Francis, Daniel, and Toby Morantz. *Partners in Furs: A History of the Fur Trade in Eastern James Bay 1600-1870*. Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983.
- Glover, Richard. "Introduction." In *Letters from Hudson's Bay, 1703-40*. edited by K.G. Davies, xiii-lxviii. London: The Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1965.
- Gorham, Harriet. "Families of Mixed Descent in the Western Great Lakes Region." In *Native People, Native Lands: Canadian Indians, Inuit and Metis*. Bruce Alden Cox 37-55. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1987.
- Honigmann, John. "West Main Cree." In *Handbook of North American Indians: Volume 6 - Subarctic*. J. Helm 217-230. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1981.
- Judd, Carol M. "Mixt Bands of Many Nations': 1821-70." In *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference*, edited by C.M. Judd and A.J. Ray, 127-146. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

- . “Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory, 1730-1981: A Socio-Economic Study.” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 6, no.2 (1982): 65-88.
- . “Housing the Homeguard at Moose Factory: 1730-1982.” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 3, no.1 (1983): 23-37.
- . “Sakie, Esquawenoe, and the Foundation of a Dual-Native Tradition at Moose Factory.” In *The Subarctic Fur Trade: Native Social and Economic Adaptations*, edited by S. Krech, III, 81-97. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984.
- Long, John S. “Treaty No.9 and Fur Trade Company Families: Northeastern Ontario's Halfbreeds, Indians, Petitioners and Métis.” In *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Metis in North America*, edited by J. Peterson and J.S.H. Brown, 137-162. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1985.
- . “The Reverend George Barnley and the James Bay Cree.” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 6, no.2 (1986): 313-331.
- . ““No Basis for Argument”: The Signing of Treaty Nine in Northern Ontario, 1905-1906.” *Native Studies Review* 5, no.2 (1989): 19-54.
- . “Historical Context.” In *Ellen Smallboy: Glimpses of a Cree Woman's Life*, edited by R. Flannery, 65-75. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.
- Macklem, Patrick. “The Impact of Treaty 9 on Natural Resource Development in Northern Ontario.” In *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equity, and Respect for Difference*. edited by M. Asch, 97-134. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997.
- Manore, Jean. *Moose Factory Metis Land Claim*. Ontario Native Affairs Directorate. Toronto, 1988.
- Mitchell, Elaine Allan. *Fort Timiskaming and the Fur Trade*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Morantz, Toby. “The Fur Trade and the Cree of James Bay.” In *Old Trails and New Directions: Papers of the Third North American Fur Trade Conference*, edited by C.M. Judd and A.J. Ray, 39-58. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- . “Oral and Recorded History in James Bay.” In *Papers of the 15th Algonquian Conference*, edited by W. Cowan, 171-191. Ottawa: Carleton University, 1984.
- Morrison, James. *Treaty Nine (1905-1906): The James Bay Treaty*. Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian and Northern Affairs. Ottawa, 1986.

- Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat (ONAS). *Akwesasne to Wunnumin Lake: Profiles of Aboriginal Communities in Ontario*. Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat, Ministry of Citizenship. Toronto, 1992.
- Payment, Diane Paulette. "Plains Métis." In *Handbook of North American Indians: Volume 13, Part 1 - Plains*, edited by Raymond J. DeMallie, 661-676. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 2001.
- Peterson, Jacqueline. "Many Roads to Red River: Métis Genesis in the Great Lakes Region, 1680-1815." In *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Métis in North America*, edited by J. Peterson and J.S.H. Brown, 37-71. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1985.
- Preston, Richard J. "James Bay Cree Culture, Malnutrition, Infectious and Degenerative Diseases." In *Actes Du Trente-Deuxieme Congres Des Algonquinistes / 32nd Algonquian Conference*, edited by J.D. Nichols, 374-384. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2001.
- Ray, Arthur J. "The Hudson's Bay Company and Native People." In *Handbook of North American Indians: Volume 4 - History of Indian-White Relations*, edited by W.E. Washburn, 335-350. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1988.
- Reimer, Gwen D. and Jean-Philippe Chartrand. "Documenting Historic Métis in Ontario." *Ethnohistory* 51, no.3 (2004): 567-607.
- Shchepanek, Michael J. "Trading Posts of the Moose-Michipicoten Trade Route." *Canadian Geographical Journal* 82, no.2 (1971): 66-69.
- Shearer, John. "History of Moosonee," John Shearer, <http://www.pinetreeline.org/other/other28/other28h.html>, 1969.
- Stephenson, Kate. *The Community of Moose Factory: A Profile (TASO Report, Second Series, No.2)*. McMaster University, Program for Technology Assessment in Subarctic Ontario. Hamilton, 1991.
- . *The Community of Moosonee: A Profile (TASO Report, Second Series, No.3)*. McMaster University, Program for Technology Assessment in Subarctic Ontario. Hamilton, 1991.
- Town of Moosonee. "Administration," <http://www.townofmoosonee.homestead.com/admin.html>.
- Voorhis, Ernest. *Historic Forts and Trading Posts of the French Regime and of English Fur Trading Companies*. Ottawa: Department of the Interior, 1930.

- Weiler, John M. "Michipicoten; Hudson's Bay Company Post, 1821-1904." In *Three Heritage Studies on the History of the HBC Michipicoten Post and on the Archaeology of the North Pickering Area*. edited by David S. Melvin, 1-63. Toronto: Historical Planning and Research Branch, Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1980.
- Zaslow, Morris. "The Ontario Boundary Question." In *Profiles of Province: Studies in the History of Ontario*, 107-117. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1967.
- . "Edward Barnes Borron, 1820-1915: Northern Pioneer and Public Servant Extraordinary." In *Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Ontario*. edited by F.H. Armstrong, H.A. Stevenson and J.D. Wilson, 297-311. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.