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This thesis is based mainly upon field work among the Cree community at Rupert House, Quebec, in the summer of 1961.

I have documented the present range in the composition and activity of production and consumption groups and indicated change over the last sixty years. This description is set in the frame of major changes that have occurred in the habitat and the external social environment. The nature of the transitional taiga-tundra biome is delineated. Changes in the manner and extent of its exploitation are described. Certain changes in the plant community have led to the replacement of herd caribou by solitary moose; this in conjunction with new tools has allowed for decrease in the size of trapping-hunting groups. Nevertheless, trapping-groups have remained larger, on the average, than the nuclear family. This is due to the still desirable aid and cooperation of more than one adult man while trapping.

Country foods are shown to play a major role in consumption despite the decline in the utilization of certain resources. It is suggested that the importance of country food has been underestimated by some writers who have not fully appreciated the use of fur animals for food.

The Rupert House community retains the features of a trapping society despite the fact that this source provides the smallest proportion of community income. The reason for this is
that trapping still is the major source of income for close to half of the commensal groups. This situation serves to emphasise the unequal distribution of wage labour and the differential income within the community. Yet, even those families which do receive significant amounts of wage income are dependent upon trapping for necessary additional increments. Furthermore, by far the largest amount of country food and nearly all of the strategic meat is taken while trapping. During late fall and winter, trapping is the only important productive activity that can be undertaken.

There are two features which characterise Rupert House social groups today: 1. the smallness of consumption groups, which ideally and most usually are limited to a nuclear family, and 2. the relative fluidity in membership of trapping groups. The effects and demands of ecology are not uniformly reflected in all facets of community life or social organization. The organization of production groups shows the necessary adjustment to the economy and environment much more clearly than does the organization of consumption groups. A third distinct grouping intermediate to commensal and productive groups exists in the form of spring and summer residential units. These units arise when people are most free to arrange themselves as they wish and not as it is economically necessary to. Summer residence units show more clearly than any other the extra commensal arrangements which families would like to maintain. A few extensions through post marital residence or through sibling coresidence does not affect the basically nuclear character of even summer residential groups.
The establishment of virtual band endogamy from an earlier condition of a 20%+ rate of inter band marriage is traced through parish records. It is suggested that the seeming unimportance and disappearance of extended kin relations at Rupert House today may be an adjustment to endogamy. No findings were made in the mechanisms or adaptive advantage in the establishment of endogamy.

A very marked difference in the income and standard of living of Rupert House commensal groups was found to exist. A common administrative belief that some sort of parity between such groups is established by the variable exploitation of different resources and through extensive sharing was found to be untrue.

The overall picture of local social organization is one of marked simplification during the last forty years due to new productive techniques and new Hudson's Bay Company transport and operation policies. A former elaborate social hierarchy of White Hudson's Bay Company officers, Metis artisans and intermediaries, Indian workers, and trappers has given way to a clear-cut division of White administrators and Indian trappers.
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Between June 13 and August 30, 1961, I carried out field work in the east James Bay area for the National Museum of Canada. The general terms of the study were to carry out a general social and economic survey of the Cree community at Rupert House, Quebec, and to document changing relationships of the community to the environment in the last sixty years with emphasis on the question of family hunting territories.

After ten days at the National Museum in Ottawa, spent in familiarising myself with unpublished material on the general area, I proceeded to Moosonee, Ontario (end of steel for the Ontario Northland Railway and the regional shipping, administration, and service centre for James and Hudson Bay communities). On June 13 I flew to Rupert House on a bi-weekly, one hour, $12.10, Austin Airways flight.

My accommodations were initially provided by Mrs. Maud Watt, Quebec Fish and Game warden and long time resident, in her house. After a week I was able to secure a cabin for myself. This arrangement proved very much more conducive to fruitful discussions, interviews, and visiting in general. I had expected to rely heavily upon participant-observation, living with an Indian family if possible. I had found this technique eminently satisfying and successful during an earlier (1957 - 1958) nine-month stay among urban-poor Yoruba in the close packed
native wards of Lagos and Ibadan. I soon found that, because of the housing pattern, the people, and my semi-official position, participant observation would not be feasible at Rupert House and that I would be forced to rely upon fairly formal interviews, usually with the aid of an interpreter, and more personal discussions with certain select individuals.

I had thought that a brief genealogical survey and a study of the history and present social organization of the local canoe factory would prove to be the easiest and most innocuous points of entry to an overall community study. As it turned out, the local people were supremely uninterested in talking about or generalising upon kinship behaviour. Despite common advice for anthropological field work, genealogy was the most delicate of topics. Illegitimacy was at some point dispersed through many families and was considered shameful, at least in the presence of Whites. Difficulty arose also in the case of the canoe factory. The Indian foreman took a strong stand against what he interpreted as spying or just plain snooping; this made my discussions with the Indian workmen extremely difficult and what information that was gathered came finally from secondhand sources.

Fortunately, the terms of my research plan and what was required of it allowed me to concentrate on fairly objective phenomena—productive techniques, income, group membership and location. Wherever possible, I attempted to break down more
complex phenomena into groups of operational indicators. For example, when asking about former aid between trapping groups belonging to different bands I restricted myself first of all to the individual's own experience and used standardised criteria, i.e., was game shared to the same degree, more, less, with other trapping groups of same band and different band? What of fur, ammunition, capital equipment? (Incidentally, the general answer was that formerly aid was solely dependent on which group was closest and which needed help the most.) Such indicators measure what they say they measure, the difficulty is whether they adequately represent the significant features of a given phenomenon. While questions concerning ethnic character, a system of values, or even the norms behind specific roles are important, my belief was that considering my inability to speak Cree, the shortness of my stay, the general reserve so characteristic of Cree communities, and the fact that this trip was my first in the area, the most productive strategy would be to concentrate primarily upon a limited range of fairly clear cut behaviour; behaviour concerned immediately with production and distribution. In marginal subarctic communities, under conditions of pacification and reduced epidemological vectors behaviour concerned with the mobilization of subsistence goods is likely the prime determinant of stability or change. Under the earlier conditions, but for slightly longer runs, behaviour concerned with getting sufficient mates may be of almost equal importance for population survival and social stability or change.
For the ethnographic aspect of the study I hoped to collect sufficient material to allow for something comparable to the average Northern Affairs Research monograph. R. W. Dunning's "Social and Economic Change Among the Northern Ojibwa" served as a general, overall ethnographic guide. In that part of my study concerned with a comprehensive look at family hunting territories, I attempted to make my findings as strictly comparable to Eleanor Leacock's "The Montagnais Hunting Territory and the Fur Trade" as possible. Her's is the fullest and best summation of the problem and strict comparability is especially important for this question.

The data (some) gathered in this area and some initial discussion of their relevance and implications is here restricted to an appendix. While these findings might be fragmentally introduced under all of the thesis chapters, they make most sense when treated as a whole, directed to the problem which organised the gathering of this data. The amount of data collected in this sphere and their integration with earlier and other published findings demand an extensive separate study. I therefore propose to give but a brief indication of my findings at Rupert House, saving a fuller discussion and analysis of this topic for a later study.

My interpreter and principal informant at Rupert House was Willy Wiestchee, a man of twenty-nine who had spent twelve years of his childhood in a Toronto sanitorium. Although he was
young and badly crippled he engaged in a wide range of the hunting and trapping activities. Since he was the most proficiently bilingual individual in the community and since he was quite conversant with the community life and was ready to discuss it, his services were invaluable. One of Willy Wiestchee's close friends, John Blackned, a successful sixty-five year old trapper, proved to be the most concise, interested, dramatic person I met. If one could record and translate his life history as he told it one would have a powerful and revealing biography. My two prime older informants were Mathew Cowboy (85) and Harriet Whiskeychan (82). Both of these people had led long active lives; but, while they still had a great deal to recount, their memories were fading with illness and confinement. I found it easier, quicker, and more reliable to talk to someone in his fifties or sixties whenever possible. Apart from Willy Wiestchee, my primary informants for current social and economic organization were Sydney Georgekish, 38, and Louisa Diamond, 37. Although both were considerably acculturated they belonged to very active hunting and trapping groups and were pleasant and knowledgeable. About a half dozen older men were interviewed from two to six times each. Almost every household was talked to at least once in a house-to-house survey.

I was initially somewhat perturbed by the fact that the local people didn't want to talk to me and in fact occasionally constructed strategems to avoid my visit. This behaviour was in marked contrast to my Nigerian experience. The response
of the people at Rupert House was not personal, I like to think, but rather directed toward all White meddling. Initial interviews were almost always strained and forced, being conducted only because the interviewee was too polite to refuse me. Later, interviews with my more regular informants became more free, but I was at no time integrated into the community. Towards the end of my stay incipient visiting relations were established between myself and some of the families.

When I arrived at Rupert House I was loathe to consider establishing ties based on gifts or money. Nevertheless, I soon found that a general largesse and gifts to specific informants was the most rapid and economic method of proceeding. In the local frame of ethics this now seems quite proper; the relationships weren't markedly stigmatized by the taint of money. In the same vein, using a paid, regular interpreter, while commercial, did give me a continuing relationship with a fairly important person. Furthermore, there was a general feeling throughout the community that since I was paying Willy Wiestchee to interpret it devolved upon community members to talk to me, in order that Willy retain his income. While I feel that there are more satisfying and productive field situations I also now believe that money, gifts and persistent questioning even when not welcomed may be necessary and sufficient given certain field conditions and certain types of problems.
The interesting thing about the White community, the biggest in the immediate area (nine White adults and two children) is that each person (or family) is the agent and representative of a different powerful organization or governmental department whose policies often do not jibe and indeed often conflict. In addition, personality conflicts between these agents under the socially close quarters often result in a most factional arrangement of this subgroup. My relations to this subgroup were, in general, formally polite. In view of my later experiences in neighbouring communities, I feel that the fewer the number of Whites the easier it is to work with a community. Despite this feeling, I believe that some of the older residents of these small White communities can be of immense help in giving clues to past and present case histories. Mrs. Maud Watt, for instance, has been in the area for over forty years. Often such Whites have been in a position to gather and record more information about the community as a whole than most of the local people themselves.

On August 6, I, my interpreter, and two companions proceeded to Eastmain (approximately ninety miles north) by canoe. While field conditions at Eastmain were considerably better than at Rupert House I nevertheless restricted myself to an eleven-day stay. Interviews were made with select individuals. The pattern of questioning was as similar to that carried out at Rupert House as possible. On August 19 I flew directly east from Rupert House, one hundred miles up the Rupert River, to the trading post at
Nemiscau. The population size, economics, and mobility of the Indians at Nemiscau turned out to be very different from those at either Eastmain or Rupert House. There was a phenomenal difference in the warm, expressive, and independent character of the people of this band. Nemiscau is the most isolated post of the entire region. This is reflected in the richness of indigenous myths and magic. While my initial stay was made in order mainly to collect comparisons for Rupert House, I now intend to do additional field work solely at Nemiscau.

On August 30 I left Nemiscau for Moose Factory. This ended my summer's field trip.
CHAPTER I

HABITAT AND ECOLOGY

1. Topography and Climate

The community of Rupert House is situated near the southeast tip of James Bay, 78°45' West and 51°30' North, about 500 air miles northwest of Montreal. It stands at the mouth of the Rupert River, which formerly served as the major artery for a number of inland posts.

The topography of the whole area is quite level. The land slopes gently upward from sea level to 400 to 600 feet elevation at the inland boundaries of the band territory, 50 to 60 miles up the Rupert River from the post. Except for aerial surveys, the whole region has been only sketchily mapped. Local hunters can usually point out numerous and sometimes major errors in the largest scale maps that now exist of the area, this applies to relief contours as well as the location of streams and lakes. While granites compose the basic rock, much of the area is covered with a 50 to 100 foot layer of fine clay, deposited by pre-glacial seas. The land, now relieved of its glacial weight, continues to rise, recovering evermore area from the shallow bay.

The immediate coast front, from a few hundred feet to about a mile inland, remains somewhat enriched by the actions of
sea and ice—a greater variability of ecotomes exist here than immediately inland, scoured rock outcrops, sand hills, pockets of mixed soil. Directly behind the coast is a zone of extremely flat terrain broken by numerous shallow and meandering streams. Despite these streams, the even terrain, combined with the impervious nature of the clay surface has produced extensive tracts of badly drained muskeg. This zone extends inland from the coast to a variable distance of 30 to 50 miles. As one proceeds farther inland a more varied and broken topography develops—rock outcrops, low ridges, more definite water channels. Lakes, which are neither large nor numerous in the first inland zone, become deeper, larger, and more numerous. This change is quite gradual (Nemiscau, 90 miles up the Rupert River from the coast is still only 750 feet above sea level). Despite the low slope gradient, extensive faulting has produced numerous rapids in most rivers. Rivers vary considerably in their rate of flow, their size, and number of rapids. These differences have major importance for local transportation and the availability of winter fishing sites.

There are five major rivers passing through the Rupert House area; from north to south, the Jack, Pontax, Rupert, Broadback and Nottaway Rivers. The Rupert River can be used to reach as far inland as Lake Mistassini, about 300 river miles east. The Nottaway is an equally long and navigable river but one which was not as extensively used for inland transport. The Pontax River is used extensively for transportation within the
area trapped by Rupert House people. Rapids make it unfeasible to use the mid and upper reaches of the Jack and Broadback Rivers for transportation but the lower reaches of these two watercourses provide the only coastal sites where winter fishing, through the ice, can be carried out. All the other rivers have a series of rapids near their mouths. These rapids remain open over winter. They produce broken ice pans which float beneath the frozen surface of the downstream river and carry away nets which have been set through the ice.

Rupert House lies within the belt of subarctic climate, those lands "where the mean temperature is not higher than 50 F. for more than four months of the year and where the mean temperature of the coldest month is not more than 32 F." The summers are short, mainly July and August, but quite hot. The nearest Federal meteorological station, at Moosonee, gives these temperature readings:

Station: Moosonee, Ontario

Mean temperature: dry bulb readings; degrees fahrenheit.

Period: 1941 - 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be remembered that these are average monthly temperatures, that actual temperatures fluctuate sharply by time of day, from day to day, and from one year to another. While temperature ranges are not available for the Moosonee station, an approximate
idea of their extremes can be gotten from readings taken at Cochrane, the next nearest meteorological site. But, whereas Moosonee very closely approximates the conditions found at Rupert House post, those of Cochrane, approximately 100 miles south, is more continental, somewhat more severe, and closer to the conditions in the interior of the Rupert House band territory.

Station: Cochrane, Ontario

Monthly temperature range; in degrees fahrenheit.

Period: 1925 - 1946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The precipitation records for Moosonee likely parallel the Rupert House conditions closely. Only figures for long-term averages are available. Furthermore, it is to be expected that Rupert House post and Moosonee because of their proximity to the winter pack ice (which in 1961 blocked James Bay until late June) have a somewhat different precipitation schedule than the inland areas.

Station: Moosonee, Ontario

Average monthly precipitation; in inches.

Period: 1906 - 1946

The upper row of figures refers to the total amount of precipitation, both rain and snow, for that month. Ten inches
of snow is considered equivalent to one inch of water. The lower figure refers to that part of the total precipitation that is snow (in inches of snow).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freeze up and break up are the two most important and dramatic seasonal changes. Modes of transportation and hunting-trapping techniques change radically with the freezing of the waterways. Frosts occur by mid-September, snow falls and remains throughout October. These events herald the beginning of another natural year to the local people. On approximately November 10 the weather turns very cold and within four or five days the rivers, lakes and swamps are covered with a thick sheet of ice. One can now travel safely by sled or toboggan over the former water surfaces (which, of course, are level and bush free). Freeze up rarely varies more than a week from the usual date.

The next period is demarcated by Christmas or New Year. Many people now concentrate on trapping fine fur until Christmas, bringing in these pelts to the post and buying additional supplies at the end of December. This is the time when fur prices are at a premium. In early January the weather becomes extremely cold. Most of the beaver trapping is at present done during this coldest period in January and February. In the past, when groups frequently were dependent upon subsistence hunting on a day-to-day
basis, these were dangerous months. Poor clothing and malnutrition in addition to cold weather would often force a group to 'hole up' in their camp for a week and more at a time.

March becomes progressively warmer and around April 1 the sun begins to rapidly melt the snow. Throughout the end of April rotten ice and extensive pools formed by the melting snow make travel impossible. In the past, these weeks often brought groups close to starvation. Breakup is a slower process than freeze up; it is not until the middle of May that the rivers are sufficiently free of ice pans to make travel by canoe feasible. With May begins the cool, pre-summer spring, but occasional snow flurries are not unusual. During these wet periods (May and June) most children and many adults have continual colds, some fairly serious. This is the period when epidemics of children's diseases are most likely to catch hold—whooping cough and pneumonia are still dangerous, especially in those communities without a resident nurse. This situation is greatly aggravated by the greater concentration of population on the post.

Summer is mainly restricted to July and August. Hot, humid, and lazy days are followed by cool, and sometimes chilly nights. While certain rises and coastal sites, the Rupert House post being one, are relatively fly free, the bush and stream banks swarm with clouds of voracious flies and mosquitoes.
2. The Plant Community

If one flies over the area in summer the impression created is that the terrain below is one vast, very good, abstract painting. Like a good abstract the forms and colours, seen only from this perspective and never from the ground, have meaning and show causal relationships. As in an abstract, one must bring some understanding to bear. From the open, brown and yellow green of the tamarack muskeg flickers a constant glitter of water, as if these colours had been speckled over a mirror. Bands of darker trees filligree the yellow green, showing where slight rises or hidden drainage streams allow stands of spruce. The larger streams and rivers are swathed in borders of woody brown and green and are spotted by rapids. The major trails are easily discernible from the air as they etch across the canvas. While the basic components of this biome are few and repetitive, there are very few fields that are uniform. A small patch of muskeg from the air, will appear to be composed of radiating waves or lines of forces, the pulsating texture so reminiscent of some Canadian impressionists. These are the density and height gradients of muskeg growth set by the micro drainage differentials of this small patch.

The eastern and south eastern sections of the band territory become more truly wooded; the glimmer of water is restricted to definite lakes and streams, a level of 500 to 700 feet is reached. The merging and fluidity of the first zone,
which composes over one-half of the total band territory and wherein the majority of the population trap, gives way to a true northern Canadian taiga.

Vegetation maps generally characterise the entire region as spruce-hemlock taiga. As I have already pointed out, this is not exactly true for the Rupert House area. Tamarack, because of its high water and alkaline tolerance, is the only tree that grows in severe muskeg. Even so, in the most swampy areas, tamarack becomes shrub-like and very sparse. These sparse and bare stands are associated with a thick rich carpet of mosses and lichen spreads, which can flourish here but not where it must compete with denser forest growth. Such swamps are the winter feeding grounds of the woodland caribou herds.

As one approaches rises and higher ground, dwarf tamarack gives way to full size tamarack which first merges with and then gives way to spruce. All the banks and anti clines of the rivers and larger streams are dominated by spruce. Hemlock, as far as I could determine by enquiry, is completely absent from the whole area. Spruce demand comparatively well-drained soil. The average maximum size for tamarack varies from two to three inches diameter and eight to ten feet height for the muskeg variety to four to five inches and fifteen to twenty feet for the larger phenotypes. Mature spruce, under these conditions average six to eight inches in diameter with a height of thirty to thirty-five feet.
Poplar, willow and birch copses line the clines of the larger stream and river banks and the sides of ponds and lakes. These trees are usually found in the immediate vicinity of lakes and streams for they demand considerable water yet effective drainage as well. Birch is now exceedingly rare near the coast, (the nearest grove to Rupert House is at the mouth of the Broadback River) although it is more common in the interior and southern zones of the band territory. In the past, when birch bark was of greater importance, for canoe coverings, utensils, tenting etc., numerous birch items came from the people of the inland bands, whose territories contained more and better quality birch stands. The actual wood itself is favoured in the manufacture of wooden utensils and arrows because birch is the hardest wood in the vicinity.

Tamarack, because of its toughness and resilience was favoured for the making of bows and is now used in snowshoe and sled manufacture. Spruce is the most usual firewood while willows are used wherever flexibility and springyness are an asset. Willow bark is still used for dying but spruce root fibers have not been used as thread for over a generation. Poplar branches are the prime beaver bait. Isolated groves of dwarf cedar are located up and down the coast and on some of the highest rises and river banks in the first inland zone. The ribs of the locally manufactured canoes were made exclusively from this cedar but over-exploitation has reduced the groves to one of
marginal value. Because of the distance of the groves from Rupert House, the local canoe factory is even planning to import semi-finished ribs because the local people do not feel that the price paid for cedar shakes is worth the time it takes to get them. Finally, occasional stands of Jack pine occur on the infrequent sand hills spotted near the coast.

Lush growths of grasses and weeds lie on the narrow flats bordering rivers and streams. These and the prolific water plants that develop during the summer provide the favoured summer feeding ground for moose, and to a lesser extent, caribou (which are driven to the water during this time by clouds of bloodthirsty deer flies).

From mid-July to early August wild strawberries, salmon berries, and rose hips ripen; wild currants are available throughout August, while early September brings in blueberries. Cranberries, which ripen in late September are kept fresh and edible in the snow and can be picked to provide a fresh delicacy throughout the winter (if one can find a patch). Only blueberries grow in sufficient concentration and profusion to make preservation feasible; dried blueberries and blueberry capote, as well as the blueberry ingredient in fish and meat pemmican, were important in the recent past but not today. All the other berries are picked casually for snacks. Strawberries are especially enjoyed and the location of rich patches will be an important determinant in deciding the location of occasional picnic-like outings that are carried on in the summer.
3. The Animal Community

Beginning about 1900 and reaching a peak in the early 1920's numerous and extensive fires swept the area, especially the more wooded zones on the east and south of the band territory. This had great importance for the population structure of large game. The Rupert House area was originally the juncture for Ungava barren ground and woodland caribou herds. Some of the chief differences between these two sub species is the larger individual size of Ungava caribou, their larger herds and the longer and more regular character of their migrations. This sub species was of course seasonal in the area, appearing only in winter, while the woodland caribou were resident throughout the year. Woodland caribou make migrations of less than fifty miles during a year. The basic subsistence staple for caribou is moss. Caribou are therefore dependent upon a tundra or north taiga climax biome since an adequate layer of moss takes about twenty years to develop.

The aforementioned fires eliminated large tracts for use by caribou and at the same time opened extensive new niches for moose (that were penetrating the borders of this area in their continuing expansion over the continent). Moose, like deer, are a sub climax animal par excellence. They can neither survive in dense woods nor in open plains; they are animals of the margins, dependent upon brushy fields and secondary forest. The main diet of moose, although there is considerable seasonal
variation, is shrubs and leaf foliage. While moose and caribou do not directly compete for subsistence resources, there being only a minor overlap in their respective shrub and moss eating patterns, the continuing replacement of caribou by moose is indirectly dependent upon moose demography. Heavy moose populations feed so intensively as to maintain the more open, secondary and sub climax nature of a biome. This of course makes the reestablishment of caribou populations much more difficult.

While moose and deer populations compete directly for the same resources, the northern location of this area and the ubiquitous summer swamps have disallowed the spread of deer, a strictly dry land animal. Caribou have only recently begun to reappear in any number throughout the area. These are primarily woodland caribou, the Ungava barrens species having been decimated almost to the point of extinction by more northern hunters.

This game replacement pattern has relevance for the activity and organisation of the Indian groups dependent to some degree upon hunting. Caribou and moose have quite different behaviour patterns and these of course must be reckoned with when hunting.

Caribou are herd animals while moose are solitary animals. Caribou are notoriously stupid and easily hunted creatures--their actions are highly predictable; they can be
herded and driven in any direction by just a few men. They constantly group up, even when attacked by man. If a hunter or hunters can manage to bring down the lead animal the rest of the herd mill about aimlessly (for up to a minute or two) until a new leader is established. Even after a number of their members have been shot, a caribou herd will often just move a short distance and group up. The larger number of animals together make caribou easier to detect and to follow, although their manner of stationing guard animals makes them difficult to stalk.

Moose, on the other hand, usually travel alone for most of the year although females will often be accompanied by their calf or yearling. Four or five moose-yarding together in winter conditions will be an uncommon and maximum concentration. Moose are, furthermore, extremely erratic. This makes stalking and trailing somewhat more difficult. When disturbed a moose may move rapidly out of the entire vicinity, often completely out of the distance the hunter can cover. There are only two features, of lesser importance, in which moose are less adaptive than caribou -- when frightened they travel shorter distances each day (one and a half to two miles) which makes it more feasible to follow old moose trails than those of caribou, and moose respond to calls during the mating season whereas caribou do not. However, moose are not only more suited to the recently developed biome of the area but also are generally a more effective species in an environment containing armed hunters.
The importance of these differences and the species replacement to the local hunting arrangements are several. With the formerly used muskets it was absolutely essential that there be groups of at least four or five hunters available to shoot caribou.

With muskets, it was necessary to either drive the animals into an ambush where hunters were waiting or to stalk only the guard animals. Muskets did not have sufficient range and were too slow in loading for a single hunter to get more than one animal at best. At least one, and usually two men were needed to drive the animals, and as many to ambush them as possible.

The mother-in-law of one of my informants (David Salt) had gone out on a number of such drives herself. One way in which the firing speed of muskets was increased was by placing a number of balls in the mouth and dropping this shot immediately upon the powder. The spittle usually kept the ball sufficiently in place so that the weapon could be fired. The time needed to put in wadding and tamping was thus obviated. But for this same reason it was necessary to be all the closer to the target; such a load would be even moderately accurate at only a short distance. Numbers of early on-the-spot anthropological notes refer to the understandably sloppy and inefficient way in which Cree used their weapons, usually laying the answer at the door of some irrational value or characteristic. Obviously, had they
understood the behaviour of the hunted animals and the techniques available to the hunters in adapting, reasons would have been clear.

Although the introduction of rifles has very radically changed this pattern it is still desirable to have more men on a caribou hunt than when hunting moose. This animal replacement, when combined with the new weapons, has most decidedly led to the possibility of smaller hunting-trapping groups.

Another aspect of the change is that in caribou hunting a successful kill gives more animals and more meat than the hunters and their families can immediately use. Meat can of course be left to freeze in winter or can be smoked in other seasons, but this is only done with some part of it. The larger amount of meat obtained on most caribou kills, as opposed to moose kills, makes it more possible and more advantageous to share game with members of other trapping-hunting groups. While the same ethics of sharing apply (even now) to both moose and caribou, it is most often that caribou is shared, simply because there is nearly always enough of it to last the hunter and to go around to other groups as well. It is also my guess that sharing would be reinforced by the greater fluctuation of success and failure that occurs in caribou hunting as opposed to moose hunting.

Finally, it seems likely that in the past the importance and greater prevalence of caribou must have favoured separate hunts for these large game animals. Because moose stay closer to watercourses where most of the trapping is done, one is more
likely to run across a moose while trapping than a caribou. This makes it unnecessary to carry on as many separate hunts (although separate hunts for moose do still occur).

Caribou are most common just inland from the coast and throughout the more open areas of the first inland zone. While some were recently taken on the very outskirts of Rupert House, the immediate vicinity is badly overhunted for these animals. Moose do not appear on the coastal margins or in the muskeg area of the first inland zone; they do, however, inhabit all the reaches of the Nottaway system down to the mouth and the entire southern and southeastern sections of the Rupert House territory.

Brown and black bears are scattered throughout the region, in the wooded sections and along the larger rivers. While the bear meat is eaten, it is the autumn fat which is especially prized as a winter supplement of cooking tallow. The fur is valued for ornaments and bedding. The bear is the only animal to which ritual actions are applied. He is a powerful creature, more human than any of the other animals, and to be respected. Before a hunter shoots one, or takes one from a trap, he speaks to it. After the animal is skinned, its skull and claws are nailed to a tree so that no dogs or other animals can violate them. Until recently a special ritual in skinning was observed, the hunter having to skin and clean the bear within his own tent, making certain that due respect was carried out. These procedures are no longer common for men under thirty.
The James Bay Cree were until recently a good example of an extant generalized hunting and gathering population; i.e., "those peoples dependent for sustenance on a wide variety of foods obtained by hunting and collecting methods in patterns which change seasonally and among whom food storage and preservation are of little or no consequence" (J. B. Birdsell, 1958, *Evolution*, vol. 12). One aspect of this low socio-economic level is the large dependence upon small animals for sustenance. This fact was crucial to earlier discussions of territorial organization in this area. My finding indicates that small animals which could not be conserved, which indeed are subject to marked natural cyclical change (especially rabbits and grouse) were at times and in certain coastal locations, more important for subsistence than beaver. In distinction to Leacock's findings for the Montagnais of the recent past, I found small game, fish, and birds to be of greater importance as a food source at Rupert House in the immediate past than large game.

Hares are distributed throughout the entire band region. They are generally much less numerous in swampy and muskeg areas than in open woodland. The coastal margins and an area extending some miles inland are particularly rich in rabbits. The southern reaches of the band land, especially the upper Nottaway systems, are purportedly not heavily populated by rabbits; other statements lead me to believe that the relative abundance of larger game in this area makes dependence on and interest in small game less
than their actual numbers allow. Nevertheless considerable variation in the number of small game animals exists between the trapping areas assigned to different men. Present poorer families (where the adult trapper through some handicap is not able to effectively participate in beaver trapping and who is therefore dependent more on subsistence activities to supplement fine fur earnings) still rely to a considerable extent on this game. In the past, rabbit skins also provided the material for much of the clothing—rabbit yarn vests and jackets, caps, and even leggings were common as were rabbit yarn blankets and sleeping robes. Now only some small children wear these, complaining loudly if forced to wear them after school age.

The only methods used in taking rabbits is by setting snares on the runways. The snares can be left in the same location for numerous catches. The setting and clearing of snares is usually done in conjunction with some other activity, gathering firewood, getting water, hunting for birds. This often falls to the women, especially in the winter when the men may be away. In some sections rabbits can be trapped continually without marked decline in the numbers taken, in others, high initial catches rapidly diminish to where lines must either be moved a considerable distance or snaring discontinued.

The cyclical increase and decline of the rabbit population establishes directly the secondary fox cycles (fox being the main predator of rabbits) and indirectly, tertiary grouse-
partridge cycles (these birds being the main alternative prey of foxes). Such cycles occur every six to eight years. There is evidence that the cycles of a particular animal are staggered across the country—it would be of importance if it were also found that the high points in small game cycles are also staggered within an area the size of Rupert House band. If this were the case then it would seem to be of additional value to have mechanisms to redistribute personnel to take advantage of these foreseeable fluctuations in the subsistence base. Additionally, such cycles were of great importance when the fox pelts brought high prices.

Pheasant, partridge, grouse, and spruce grouse are resident in the area throughout the year. Ptarmigan are found most usually from November to April. These birds are present on every trapping section but they are most plentiful, most accessible, and most important on the coast. Separate hunts are not usually made for these animals—they are shot while the hunter, or his wife is carrying out some other activity. They are taken with 22's or occasionally shotguns but sometimes they are found in the rabbit snares. In the past nets and separate snares were a more common method of hunting these small birds. Numerous statements of my older informants were to the effect that 'there would often be only a 'partridge' or two for food in a camp'. A number of my informants actually hunted such birds with bow and arrow within their adult life. Even in the late 1920's ammunition was often too scarce or too costly to be used
for such game. Earlier muskets did not lend themselves well to such hunting. A few of the poorest groups, those still very dependent upon subsistence hunting, take special measures to get a large enough number of these birds to make preservation worthwhile. One man told me of baiting a certain choice spot and repeatedly using an elevated drop net to catch them. But, on the whole, it has been a very major change which has made small birds a minor supplement in the present food store.

Migratory birds, geese and ducks, form an important and increasing part in the local economy, both in terms of food and in terms of cash income derived from employment at the seasonal tourist hunting camps in the area. The local categories are Canada geese, wavies (snow and blue geese) and ducks (mallard, pintail, blacks, woodpecks). Canada geese arrive, going north, towards the end of April. This is the principle goose hunting season and the time when most birds are killed and when most people are out in goose camps. Ducks begin to arrive at this time also. After about two weeks, in early May, the first flights of blue geese begin to appear.

The wide, shallow, tidal flats and the extensive coastal and estuary marshes of the James Bay region purportedly provide some of the richest feeding grounds in Canada. The densest concentration of the aforementioned birds occurs here in spring and to a lesser extent in fall. Although these migrations also occur over the inland territories the numbers are
considerably smaller and more scattered. This fact may have considerable relevance to the trend toward all trapping groups being in the post or on the coast during this time, especially if taken in conjunction with the falling spring muskrat prices.

Towards the end of May ducks and geese have substantially moved north and fanned out. However some Canada geese, blue geese, and ducks are in the area throughout the summer (blues being restricted to the coast while some Canadas and especially ducks scatter inland). Again in the fall, from early September to early October, these birds congregate in the coastal marshes and estuaries preliminary to their migration south. Very considerable hunting activity takes place then too, both by those Indians employed by the tourist camps and those remaining at the post. The mouth of the Rupert River is one of the finest locations for such hunting and most active males are able to shoot some birds. Inland trappers do not leave the coast until after this season.

Many northern Canadian Indian groups, particularly the Athabascans, rely heavily upon fish to meet their subsistence needs (and especially those of their dogs). Contrarily, in Rupert House a noticeable decline in the importance of fishing has taken place. This is due to the increased emphasis placed upon duck and goose hunting and upon the greater amount of store food it is now possible to buy. Smoked fish was once a staple preserve but has now been generally supplanted by flour.
As the Indians say, "We like to eat fish once in a while but we can always eat bannock." Geese and ducks moreover can now be kept in the H.B.C. freezer at Rupert House. This fresh flesh is much relished and some is available throughout the year to those remaining at the post. Nevertheless, I do not want to underestimate the contribution fish makes to the overall food supply of the band, for it is considerable. Fish provides the main fresh meat for June, July, and August. Fishing is still a major activity for the older but active males and for the poorer families who hunt on the coast. In addition, most trapping groups do some fishing (from two weeks to throughout the whole season) while on their trapping territory.

All fishing is done by net. The only exception is a crippled young man who uses a rod; he is also the only one who will speak only English. The method seems to be the same for all species. In open water, poles are driven into the bottoms of rivers or on tidal flats. The net, 75 to 100 feet in length, is tied between the poles, and floats attached. The tide or river current carry the fish into the nets. They are all gill nets. Two or three nets are set per family. Women occasionally clear the nets but it is the men who usually set and shift them. In the past, women were much more active in fishing than now; they seem to have frequently operated nets while out in the trapping camps. While nets are made solely by women, some men do repair their own. After freeze up nets can be set under the ice in fish lakes and at some river locations. This is
nevertheless hard and time-consuming work and in any case is not feasible at Rupert House because of ice pans drifting below the frozen surface.

Trout and Whitefish are prevalent in the rivers and streams from after break up until mid-June. From mid-June to mid-August relatively few fish are found in the rivers, mainly perch and suckers. Whitefish and suckers begin to move up the rivers in early August; suckers decline through the middle of the month and in later August runs of spawning Whitefish crowd the rivers. Whitefish and Jackfish are the most commonly caught during late summer, fall, and winter. Trout and Jackfish are the dominant species of the scattered fish lakes that are used by trappers in winter. River sturgeon are taken during the summer months (particularly on the Nottaway River) but they do not have the commercial importance for the Rupert House band that they do for the people at Nemiscau. The size and concentration of sturgeon and the lack of wage alternatives for Nemiscau people make an Indian Agency fish haul flight to outside buyers feasible.

There is some variation in the time when the various species are present in different rivers. This tends to draw people from the post to scattered river and coastal sites where fish can be caught during the summer. For instance, there are a few locations on the lower Broadback and Nottaway Rivers where trout and perch can be caught in mid-July and where the Whitefish runs begin somewhat earlier than elsewhere. On the coast, the
only sites where fishing through the ice is feasible are at the mouths of the Jack, Pontax, and Cabbage Willows Rivers (all others have ice pans, formed by nearby rapids, floating under the pack ice).

Whitefish, trout, and perch are the favoured fish for human consumption. Jackfish is considered too boney and suckers too soft and are now usually given to the dogs. The food requirements of dogs owned by the local people are not to be underestimated. Quantitative studies done for a Dogrib community suggest that it takes about twice as much fish to feed a family's dog team as it does to feed the family; this in an area where fish is the basic human staple. Throughout the summer, Rupert House dogs must be fed an oatmeal mush and even during the winter oatmeal supplements must be available for them. For the poorer families this is a not inconsiderable outlay in cash and supply weight. Formerly the entire band would move nine miles up the Rupert River to Smokey rapids for the heaviest Whitefish runs in late August, late September. Improved natural basins on the rapids acted as fish traps from which the fish were pulled by drag nets and nets attached to poles. Blueberries were also gathered in large quantities and smoked and dried fish as well as fish pemmican was manufactured. Supposedly large quantities of undried fish were given to those who, for various reasons, had to remain at the post, no payment being asked or given. Now, most fish that is distributed is sold within the community, although gifts of fish do occur to the poorer members.
The primary resource, for Rupert House as well as for most of northern Canada, is the fur bearing animal population. Until the very recent advent of Euro-Canadian interest in the mineral, hydro and pulp wood potentials of these areas and a concern to extend some of the essential state services into the north, the sole reason for White entrance and residence was for the acquisition of furs. We know that what counts as a strategic resource in any given society depends upon the means the group has for exploiting the environment. Equally it depends upon what the group can do with it once they have extracted it. In this regard, one cannot overemphasise the importance of distantly established fur prices in the definition of what is important in the faunal environment. Unfortunately, the very obviousness of this fact has tended to discourage closer analyses of the more specific implications operative upon the native communities.

Fur bearing animals are classed as fine fur, i.e. mink, fisher, marten, otter, lynx, fox, ermine, muskrat, or as beaver. There is a marked difference in the organisation of beaver trapping activity and fine fur trapping activity. This was the case even more in the past with restricted credit and wooden traps than it is today. Beaver trapping demands a great deal of strenuous work and demands sustained bursts of heavy activity. Furthermore, considerably more credit is needed for food and other supplies and greater self-sufficiency demanded for groups that travel the longer distances south and east where the beaver are more plentiful.
From the point of view of community income, mink and beaver are at present by far the most important fur bearers. Most generally, beaver are of greatest importance to those who trap inland and mink for those who trap near the post and along the coast. While some of each of the fur bearers will be taken in every zone, it is generally true to say that the inland areas are richer in all such animals (except foxes) and a greater variety of them is taken there. Marten is fairly uncommon but can be taken very near the post; it is the only animal other than beaver to which a quota applies. Fisher has been wiped out in the area during the last forty years. Lynx are occasionally taken throughout the whole band area but seem to be most frequently trapped by those groups who work the interior woodland zones—possibly this is more closely correlated with setting traps for other animals restricted to this zone. Otter are found almost exclusively in the lakes and larger streams in the south and east of the band territory. Weasel and muskrat are likely spread over the entire territory and are even likely increasing. They have nevertheless declined in importance because of the low price offered and the inadvertitious time (just before and during break up) when they can be trapped. Still, muskrat remains of considerable importance to the poorer, older, or handicapped trappers who try to take whatever they can get. Because of this, muskrat is of strategic importance where these people happen to hunt (the coastal and proximate inland zones and the lower reaches of the bigger rivers) regardless of its
objective distribution. Fox-red, cross, and silver, are very much concentrated on the coastal margins and to a lesser extent on the adjoining open muskeg zone. While fox prices have plummeted to the bottom of the market, they were, until 1930, an exceptionally valuable fur resource even though an extremely fluctuating one. The numbers of fox are mainly dependent upon the cycles of their rabbit and small bird subsistence base; cycles in these also caused cycles in the fox population. In addition, fox prices fluctuated considerably. The chance of taking a silver fox for a time seems to have induced numerous people to remain on a fur-poor coast where they would otherwise have tried to trap more inland. Mink seem to be taken throughout the whole area but are considerably more important around the coast and near the post where the lack of any other valuable furs makes their exploitation more necessary. Since the total catch depends upon how much time, effort and care is spent upon moving and setting traps, it can be understood that even the much overtrapped area around the post can be made to yield greater per square mile returns by those who have no other resources to exploit.

Beaver have, of course, historically been the fur of the entire Indian area. They have been the vital concern of traders and the people of the area for 300 years. All beaver trapping is now done in the months after freeze up and before break up, and being heavily concentrated in the months of January and February. Some of the poorer families may try to trap part
of their beaver quota before Christmas so that they can bring in the pelts for additional credit at that time. Some groups who have not been able to get their full quota in the winter months will continue trapping their beaver during March but this is unusual.

A great variability of trapping methods exist, especially for beaver trapping. These differences in techniques seem to be adjustments to both the specific micro habitat that is being exploited and the needs and capabilities of the particular trapper. One of the simplest and easiest methods is to break open the ice above a beaver runway, place in willow or poplar branches as bait, and plant a trap among them so that after a few wary reconnaissance runs the beaver will push into it. Another method, recently introduced, which is more selective of the beaver it takes, is a frame of wire snares. Stake surrounds are driven through holes chopped in the ice; these imprison the beaver in their lodge. A single opening is left for the beaver to move through. Into this is fitted a frame with snare of different sizes; these are of such a size to allow the smaller beaver to pass through unharmed while yet catching and drowning the larger ones. Since the runways have been staked off earlier, the beaver congregate in their lodge until the hunters are ready and begin hammering at the top of the lodge. As the beaver rush out they are caught in the snares. Yet another method is to stake off the runways, place a net across
an opening in the dam, and drive the beaver out of the lodge and into the net. The advantage here is that young beaver can be taken from the net, tied, and replaced after the parents have been taken. Finally beaver were occasionally taken by staking off most of the tunnels leading from the runways into the stream or lake banks, and stationing persons at those tunnels that were left unstaked. The animals are then chased out of their lodge. As they entered the tunnels remaining open the people on watch drop down stakes and the trapped beaver then removed. These techniques all have their individual modifications and while an individual will know of all of these, and may even have tried a number of them during earlier trapping, he will develop and maintain a technique he feels most suitable for himself as an independent, adult trapper.

It is important to understand that with quotas, the actual cash value of the total beaver furs taken in a year will depend upon the size and quality of those animals taken. Therefore, it is of double importance, for longer run conservation and for the value of the immediate haul, to be able to get only mature, prime beaver.

All other fur bearers are now taken by variously set steel traps. It must be remembered that it takes four or five years of active participation in trapping to learn the actual techniques well enough so that one can actually maintain oneself. This is besides the continual immersion in a society
where discussion of hunting and trapping are ever going on. Despite this, numerous people just never do get the knack of trapping effectively. This points up the fact that there has been significant differences in the ability of different families to exploit the environment; while these differences are less important when game and furs are numerous and prices are high they become crucially important during a period of scarcity of animals or a price depression.
CHAPTER II

THE EXTERNAL AGENCIES, TODAY AND YESTERDAY

The James Bay area is notable in Canadian history as being the region of initial British penetration into Canada; an extensive chain of Hudson Bay Company posts with connected British military support were established before 1700. Rupert House is indeed the first Hudson Bay Company post, established in 1668. More importantly, the entire area east of James Bay fell into a trade and administrative backwater after the 1760's, when fur trade and British expansion concentrated on Canada west of Hudson Bay (at least in the north). The Hudson's Bay Company was the legal political and juridical power over all of northern Canada and the prairie provinces until these areas were ceded to the Confederation of Canada in 1869. Federal control over the northern Quebec existed nominally until 1912 when the same nominal administration of this area was taken over by the Quebec provincial government. To all intents and purposes the Hudson's Bay Company was left in effective control of these regions until the end of World War I. Until the end of the 1920's, it was economic rather than political-administrative expansion into the fringes of this region which effected the relatively drastic changes that occurred. Even in this perspective, most important and rapid changes have occurred in the whole northern Canadian region through the expansion of Federal government services and welfare payments beginning in the mid-1940's.
We here then have a cultural Cul de Sac where social conditions for the Indian population until 1904, when a large competing trading company (Revillon Bros.) moved into the area, had remained about the same as they were in 1750. This pre-1920 period is within the active lifetime of many of the older members of the community. It can be seen that a documentation of these conditions would be of considerable ethno-historical interest, it being of crucial importance to recover such information now while the older people were still alive and mentally alert.

A brief look at the material and technological changes that took place at Rupert House during the period of trading company competition (1906 - 1936) will give us some understanding, at least feeling, for the magnitude of this area's former cultural isolation. It is to be noted that while the tools, equipment and techniques are intimately connected (structurally integrated and functionally adjusted to etc.) with the local Indian society, the local society was dependent on the outside for their supply. While the external presence cannot be easily overlooked in some phenomenon like, let us say, the operation of the Indian Agency, it is sometimes held that because individual Indians make decisions on what and how to use certain externally-produced items, they therefore control such objects. While this may be true for these individuals for the short run, it certainly does not apply to whole populations over longer periods. Goods that are externally produced must be introduced into the area and can
often be controlled by the external agencies. For instance, modern arms and equipment were just not introduced into the area by the Hudson's Bay Company until they were forced to do so by the first serious competition they had had in the area since the time of the French. Before 1900, profits could be equally or even better maintained by selling only antiquated merchandise, which was initially cheap to purchase and which had to be replaced at a much faster rate than later goods.

**Equipment and material goods introduced since 1900**
(First date when initially introduced, second date when fully replaced earlier item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date in or after</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. repeating rifles</td>
<td>1906, 1920</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. shotguns, .22's</td>
<td>1920, 1930</td>
<td>Vanished, been replaced or markedly declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. canvas covered canoes</td>
<td>1902, 1918</td>
<td>Muskets, powder, shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. steel traps, snare wire</td>
<td>1900, 1930</td>
<td>Birch bark canoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. tenting canvas</td>
<td>1890, 1905</td>
<td>Wooden deadfalls and spring traps and twine snares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Harness dogs</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Caribou and birch bark tenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. outboard motors</td>
<td>1925, 1948</td>
<td>Hunting dogs (small breed unsuitable for hauling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. continual increase in amount and range of western clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hide clothing and rabbits' skin yarn clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. continual increase in the amount and range of western foods, especially for babies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decline of preservation of local foods after 1940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traders

(a) The Hudson's Bay Company at Rupert House

At the beginning of the period with which we are concerned, 1900 to 1960, the Hudson's Bay Company post at Rupert House was a centre of considerable importance. It was the sub-district headquarters for most inland Cree posts east of James Bay: Waswanipi, Mistissini, Nemiscau, Nitchequon, and later Neosqueskau. (Michiskun, an earlier post in the vicinity of Waswanipi had been closed in the late 1890's but had operated under the direction of Rupert House.) Rupert House was important as a fur trading post in its own right and also as a collection and transhipment centre for all goods moving in and out of the aforementioned posts. It is important for the wider relevance of this thesis that such situations were not uncommon in northern Canada. J. W. Anderson, the former James Bay district manager for the Hudson's Bay Company and familiar with the area since 1910 writes:

The trading post was therefore an establishment of varying size, depending on the one hand on the size of the Indian population and on the extent and productivity of the surrounding country and on the other hand on the variety and extent of the ancilliary services. Some trading posts were actually operated not primarily for fur trading but as transhipment points on one or other of the fur trade transportation routes. (Anderson 1961: 46)
Anderson reports that in 1912 Rupert House was only somewhat smaller than Moose Factory, which was the Hudson's Bay Company administrative centre for the James Bay area and, along with York Factory, the most important entreport in eastern Canada for Hudson's Bay Company goods.

It appears that a fairly elaborate social hierarchy existed and that wage labour (with partial payment in goods) was of very considerable importance to the local population. On top of the hierarchy were the 'officers' of the company: the 'master' (post manager), the accountant, fur buyers and clerks, and apprentices, in that order. Gentlemen of the Anglican clergy also fell into this category, somewhere below the 'master', I presume, since the position of the Hudson's Bay Company as protector of the faith was of long standing. Below this class came the 'Company Servants', artisans, intermediaries and actual house servants in approximately that order. This strata was composed of Orkney islanders, Metis, and Indian. The majority of post artisans had originally been imported by the Hudson's Bay Company from the permanently depressed north Scottish areas because of the low wages that could be contracted there, because a surplus of skilled labour existed owing to the fact that the company had established early connections there for provisioning since it was the first and last port of call for England-Canada Hudson's Bay Company ships. A representative sample of such tradesmen could be found at Moose Factory and to a lesser extent at Rupert
House: carpenters, boatbuilders, blacksmiths, sailmakers, coopers. In the early nineteenth century these were predominantly White occupations and the Hudson's Bay Company imported in addition, gardeners, herdsmen, teamsters, and even labourers. By the turn of the century this practice had decreased and by 1910 the company, at least in the James Bay area, was recruiting mainly apprentices for company 'officers' abroad. It seems as if the artisan group had through intermarriage become intermingled with the Metis and were then considered as part of the local population. By this time most gardeners, herdsmen and labourers were of Metis or Indian stock, as were the interpreters, mail runners, and all of the actual house servants. When Anderson arrived at Rupert House in 1912 there were fifteen Whites (Hudson's Bay Company officers, two of their wives, and the Anglican missionary) while, "The permanent native staff and their families numbered about sixty, while the Indians of Rupert House who were off hunting and trapping during the winter season, would add a further 350, this giving a population of around 400 to 450 souls." (Anderson 1961: 49).

Even more important for the effect of wage labour upon the community was the fact that a very considerable amount of temporary employment existed during the summer. Building maintenance would be carried out, freighting of goods up the Rupert River would go on from late spring to early fall, a considerable amount of labour would go into the hay harvest for the local
cattle. Quoting again from Anderson:

This hay work gave employment to Indian men too old for the river work and to the growing boys who were too young. Thus, with the young lads and old men on the haying, and the able bodied voyageurs on the river, the whole male population was gainfully employed, (underline mine) which was good for morale.

(Anderson 1961:52)

Arrangements were made with the managers of the posts at Eastmain and even Fort George for the temporary employment of Indians of these posts; the managers would select able-bodied men from their communities who had either not been able to pay their previous year's credit or who were in great need. Eastmain and Fort George were considerably poorer than Rupert House; while cattle keeping and maintenance of buildings existed at these posts no inland freighting took place from them and the selected people travelled to Rupert House by canoe and sloop for the summer haymaking.

The canoe factory which gradually developed in Rupert House from 1902 onward as a response to need for sturdier and bigger freighting canoes on the Rupert inland route expanded to manufacture most of the canoes used by Indians in the James Bay area. This is the only remaining semi-permanent employment hiring a significant number of the local people.

Credit was extremely important to trappers. The amount of credit which the Hudson's Bay Company postmaster would advance
to an individual or family set the distance which this group could go inland after furs and how long they could stay away from the post without needing to return to exchange furs for additional supplies. The method of advancing such credit was tied to the previous performance of the trapper. A man with a fairly consistent record of high catches might be carried on high, yet nevertheless reduced, advances after a poor year but after then his credit would be one-half of the total fur value of his previous year's take. While the turn of the century was a period of increasing fur prices the fall advances for a large percentage of the community, those trapping on or near the coast, was only $50. Those trapping inland got advances of generally $200 to $300. The fur prices increased from before 1900 until the end of World War I. These were the years when certain pelts, mainly those of silver fox but also those of certain quality marten, brought in fabulous prices. Before the spread of domestic fox farms a silver fox pelt, if of prime quality, might by itself bring the trapper twice the value of his entire annual fur haul. Through the 1920's, fur prices went into a general decline, although intensified trapping techniques and more effective tools partially offset the effect of this shift. Nevertheless, with the decline in the number of fur bearers, especially the beaver in the Rupert House region, a fall in community income set in. The wage payments going into the community from the company acted as a crucial buffer between the people and starvation.
During the 1920's, many of the inland bands began to shift their centre of operation to Mistassini and Waswanipi, these posts in turn had since 1916 begun to transport more and more of their goods from railway points in northern Quebec. In 1926 the last fur brigade to Mistassini from Rupert House went inland; after that only the relatively small post at Nemiscau was supplied from Rupert House. The loss of income to the people at Rupert must have been considerable.

Although fur prices had been generally high, increasing wage, operating, and transport costs and the competitive bidding of Revillon Brothers that kept cost of furs up had brought about considerable deficits for many posts. Rupert House was one of these. In 1927 the order went out that all posts would have to stand on their own, to show a profit or close. The days of a vast network of interconnected posts, supported by the overall profit of this great empire had drawn to a close. Maude Watt, the wife of the then post manager, related how this upper echelon policy decision immediately affected Rupert House. The first thing to go was the stable of animals that had been kept on the post, about ten draught animals, four milch cows, plus sheep and goats. A tractor was later brought in to replace the horses and oxen, canned milk and meat to replace the others. This of course removed the necessity of both haying crews and someone to care for the animals. Freighting had already been discontinued inland and only a small crew was used to bring goods
to Nemiscau. By this time many of the artisans had already left Rupert House, some to take advantage of opportunities in the northern Quebec and northern Ontario communities that were nearing the area. The railhead reached Moosonee in 1932 and in one stroke effectively linked the James and Hudson Bay region to Canada for the first time. Others seem to have just disappeared from the scene as new shipping, storing, and manufacturing techniques made their occupations unneeded. For instance, the cooper who was of great importance in a time when the majority of meats were preserved and stored in salt brine and when molasses and other goods were kept in barrels, was superfluous when bags and cases and cardboard cartons dominated the scene. Similarly, more goods were finished when they arrived; so much for blacksmiths, sailmakers and so such. These artisans had been able to continue as long as they did only because of the unfinished nature of so many products of the earlier time, because the isolation of these posts made it advisable to have men to manufacture and repair anything that might be needed from whatever could be scrounged up locally, and because of a definitely colonial vision prevalent in the earlier Hudson's Bay Company which saw the development of a civilized, well-rounded economic and class structure as the factor that differentiated the Company from 'fly by night fur peddlers'. In any case, the remainder of these could no longer be supported by the deficit-ridden post. The same applied for the majority of the house servants, which had numbered about six or seven permanently
employed at the time the Watts arrived in 1920. This must have been a very dramatic time. I imagine that many of the old time traders felt like the colonial administrators presiding over and directing the dissolution of an empire to which they had adjusted their expectations. Undoubtedly, most of these managers did have a real concern, even if it was paternalistic, for the Indians in their charge. Here now, in a few years at some posts, the imperial structure of the Company Post of the past changed into the northern store of today.

(b) Revillon Brothers

The entry of a large, well-backed and well-organized competitive trading company into the area was stimulated by the steady rise in fur prices on the world market. It was felt that the economic niche that could formerly sustain only one company would now sustain two. While personal relations between the local staffs of the two companies seemed to have often been friendly, the history of these two rival companies was one of marked commercial competition.

Revillon Brothers entered the James Bay area in 1904, trading from schooners. In 1906 a post was established at Rupert House. At about the same date, posts were set up at most of the James Bay Hudson's Bay Company posts (since nearly all Indian bands were already centred around trading posts during the summer). In some cases, as at the inland location of Nemiscau,
the Revillon Brothers' decision to establish a post and tap the more distant source of furs before the trappers brought it all the way to the coast and delivered it into the hands of the Hudson's Bay Company, resulted in a counter action by the Hudson's Bay Company, with both of the companies establishing posts where there had formerly been none. Having a post closer to one's hunting and trapping ground is, of course, a considerable convenience to more distant trappers. It also raises his productivity and effectiveness since the time it takes to travel to the post for supplies may be reduced by two and more months per year. (This is no longer as important or even as true as it was in the past--air freighting, supply drops, and motorized canoes have considerably broadened the range and ease of transportation.)

Not only did the organization and operation of the competing traders (which at that time represented the sole external agency) accommodate itself to afford greater conveniences and allow greater effectiveness by local trappers, but also it resulted in a marked increase in the price of furs paid locally, the amount of credit that was advanced, and the range of goods that were introduced for sale. In the case of introduction of new and more effective trade goods (a list of the most important has been given above), only restrictive covenants between the two companies could have halted their introduction. The earlier monopolistic era where the Hudson's Bay Company could decide what and how much of what it was going to sell gave way to a
period of intense competition for the furs the Indians trapped. New and better equipment, either on credit or in trade, offered the best way of getting the furs before one's rival did. Not only were prices paid for furs locally advanced under competition but also the amount of credit that would be advanced to individual trappers (and the number of individuals obtaining credit) increased. Giving more credit to more people was to operate as a means of securing a claim on furs in advance of their being trapped.

Along with the general increase in goods an income through trapping/trading which resulted from the Revillon-Hudson's Bay Company competition there came an additional upswing in wage labour. The era and location determined the same supply, transport and maintenance problems for Revillon as for the Hudson's Bay Company. For thirty years, that is, during most of the period of Revillon presence in the area (1906 - 1936), two hierarchies of paid labour officers, intermediaries, artisans, seasonal labour and canoe transport workers, existed at Rupert House. While the personnel of the Revillon was smaller than that of the Hudson's Bay Company it was still considerable. Some idea of the importance of wage labour at this time can be gained from the fact that Revillon brought in six French-Canadian families to freight their goods into inland posts, because horse freight in winter was less expensive than canoe freighting and because there was a shortage of labour throughout the late spring and summer.
(Although this procedure was employed for almost a decade, it proved too costly en toto, wage labour payed to Indian canoeemen in the summer, even if it were more costly than alternate methods, provided the crucial margin whereby most of those involved paid off their winter debt. The company which did not provide enough of such seasonal employment would often find that its trappers would continually fall behind in debt.)

The entry of a competing trading company not only forced the Hudson's Bay Company to introduce progressively more and better trade goods and to raise the prices paid for pelts, but also diminished the degree of dependence of the Indians upon the Hudson's Bay Company—which formerly had been absolute. Whereas the local Hudson's Bay Company factor had been to all intents and purposes the chief of the community, making and enforcing a wide range of social and political decisions, his power and sanctions lying in his ability to curtail or cut off credit or purchases, he now became only one of two agents of trade. As I mentioned earlier in the section, the Hudson's Bay Company manager still maintained the status of a powerful colonial administrator even after the entry of Revillon Brothers, but there was now an effective opportunity to opt out of his control. Even the control that the Hudson's Bay Company did continue to exert over those Indians (the majority) that continued to trap/trade for the Company was somewhat moderated for fear of losing furs to the competition. Each company could
yield the stick of credit restrictions and the carrot of wage labour (especially in preferred work). It could to that extent direct the lives of the Indian people. Some of this direction was concerned to the benefit of the company; some was presumably for the benefit of the Indians themselves, and yet other direction stemmed from the psychological needs of the post managers themselves.

With the collapse of fur prices and the post's importance as a transport and sub-district centre the resultant retrenchment policy made more important than ever that each post get as many furs as possible. In this way did the Company become dependent to some greater degree upon the Indian trappers. The wage labour plums, especially those interpreter-intermediary variety, were pruned away by economising. A quid pro quo relationship was established by the beginning of the 1930's. The same external forces that created the new Hudson's Bay Company-trapper relation broke the financial holdings of the Revillon Company. From 1930 to 1936 this company was only nominally separate from the Hudson's Bay Company; in 1936 Revillon Brothers holdings throughout the north were formally transferred to the Hudson's Bay Company. The Hudson's Bay Company had shown again that with the fluctuating fur animal populations and with the unstable world market in pelts, only a group with a vast amount of capital to tie itself over periods of loss and with a perfected organisation can survive over the long run. Even the Hudson's Bay Company fur trade nearly
went under in the depression years. The Indian cosmology that saw the Hudson's Bay Company as perpetual, as continuing where other traders came and left (a view which was then and is now considered as indicative of Indian naivete by many Whites) was again proven correct. The only reason that those people that had worked and trapped/traded with the Revillon Company were not disadvantaged after the collapse of that Company was that the Hudson's Bay Company too had collapsed to the extent that it could not offer wage income to its own people.

During the period of Revillon presence in the area (1906 - 1936) a number of small free traders also were established for varying periods throughout the James Bay area (but not at Rupert House). A Moose Factory treaty Indian operated three of his own stores along both shores of James Bay. He too was forced back to a single store, which he now operates himself at Moosonee (with late hours, pawn shop services and with solely Indian customers).

Church and State

(a) The Missions

While the Hudson's Bay Company as the imperial agent of Britain has had a long-standing history of connection and support of the Anglican church, missions and clergy being in the area from the time of establishment of trade, Rupert House has been incorporated into the Diocese of Moosonee only from 1872. From
this date until present Anglican Church ministers have almost continually been in permanent residence at Rupert House. Parish records begin at this date, baptisms and the calculation of the age of older people were only begun at that time. Until the mid-1920's, the inland posts that were serviced by Rupert House were included in this parish. The minister resident at Rupert House tried to make an annual trip in and out of these interior posts once a year, going in and coming out with the Rupert House canoe brigade. The sporadic diary kept by these ministers gives considerable insight into the sort of men they were, the sort of world they saw, and the sort of individual they imagined would read their diary. I continue to be amazed and puzzled by the action of the present minister at Rupert House, an ordained Albany Cree, who not only opened these diaries to me but also specifically encouraged me to read them. The entries show a persistent and deep isolation from and ignorance of the Indian community by past missionaries that is truly spectacular. More often than not, the whole gamut of racist slogans sprang easily from the missionary's pen. In one not untypical instance a minister refers to the head of an impoverished family as a "worthless, lazy, good-for-nothing"; it appears mainly because the post manager has informed him that the man has not paid off his winter debt. In another case, the missionary, "...ingrained dishonesty and lack of trustworthiness of Indians," mainly because he has not been able to collect loans he has made to certain community members.
Missionaries seem to have been rotated every two or three years. This fact and the missionary's divorce from the keystone of the society, hunting and trapping/trading (which the Hudson's Bay Company officials were intimately concerned with and knowledgeable about) seem to have placed the minister always in a precarious and unstable position vis-a-vis the Indian community. There was no strategic reason why the missionary should be in the community. He himself possessed no means of sanctions other than personal complaints to leading Indians in the community and sermons from the pulpit. Numerous entries in the diary seem to show that the minister was frequently the butt of jokes by the Indian community. The sanctions open to him were obviously not enough since once the Hudson's Bay Company withdrew its support of Anglican edicts, 'offenses' became common and Indian leaders claimed they could do nothing about them. For instance, the Hudson's Bay Company formerly punished the breaking of the Sabbath through hunting by curtailing, indefinitely, purchases of ammunition by the offender.

The Anglican mission operated a school for Indian children from its first permanent entry into the post until the late 1940's. I have no data on what was taught or how but mention is made of enrolment figures of ten, twelve and thirteen children for the band of 350 - 400. 'Indian' and 'White' (i.e., Metis and children of Company servants) were taught on alternate days. Despite this, a surprisingly large number of the middle-aged people today can compose readable (with some imagination) notes
in English. It may have been that in some places the individual Anglican missionaries may have acted as watchdogs, keeping a check on excesses by overzealous Hudson's Bay Company men, (as is sometimes the case today) but there is no indication of this on any data obtained at Rupert House.

The Catholic church entered the West James Bay area in 1927. In 1940 approximately a very sizeable mission was built at Rupert House. A priest has been resident in the community since that time. During the 1930's some families paddled over 200 miles up the coast to send their children to the Catholic residential school at Fort George--even now many families believe the Catholic school provides better education than the government system. Such movement no longer takes place and the Indian Agent discourages attendance at private schools.

Despite its relatively long presence at Rupert House, the Catholic mission has won no formal adherents. Relations between the present Anglican minister and Catholic priest are restrained, but formerly heated encounters occasionally ensued over who would be in attendance to ease a dying person's last hours.

The entry of formal government into the area has been even more recent. No treaty has been formally signed. Indian Agents made no more than their annual health check visits to the post until the late 1930's.
A residential school was in operation at Moose Factory by the early 1930's with some Rupert House children in attendance but it was as recently as 1950 that the Indian Affairs Branch took over the operation of the Rupert House summer school. In 1953 a winter day school was constructed and staffed by the Branch at Rupert House. At present, a child who proceeds past the Grade Six level must travel to southern or central Ontario for further training (the Branch paying all expenses).

Apart from actual relief and welfare payments, the biggest government-induced change at Rupert House has been due to the introduction of a nursing station in the early 1950's. This combines T.B. checking, maternity, innoculation, and home visit services. The staggering rate which death levied upon infants, adolescents, and adults until recently has now been cut back to just above national standards. The people, despite (or maybe because of) their long history of high mortality are not and had not been calloused to death. They have quickly and firmly seized the benefits and procedures of supplemented diets, of hospital delivery, of innoculation. Death by tuberculosis, so terribly common in the past, is now rare. The pool of infection has already been greatly cut back by constant checking, early discovery and swift cure at a southern hospital--the stream of people who until recently returned from years at a sanitarium has now dwindled to a trickle. The nursing station is considered to be the most uniquely non-Indian of the White agencies by the local people. It is also the agency which receives the most unambiguous approval of Indians.
The White Community and the External Agencies Today

The White community at Rupert House consists of nine adults and two children; a couple at the nursing station, a couple with two children at the Indian Day School, another couple as well as a single clerk at the Hudson's Bay Company, Mrs. Maude Watt at the Provincial Fish and Game Station, and a Roman Catholic priest at the Catholic mission. A Pentacostal group was in the process of establishing a mission when I left; this was to be run by a White man and his wife. It is not a large community, but a powerful one.

Between break up and freeze up a stream of administrators (Indian Affairs Branch people, Quebec provincial authorities, R.C.M.P., Health and Welfare Department supervisors), surveyors, and some tourists pass along the coast.

The permanent (or at least semi-permanent) White community is structurally interesting. It is quite different from any coherent White community 'down south'. It is, in fact, a community of colonial administrators (without the difficulties of a nationalist movement). Each couple or individual represents and carries out the policies of some powerful external agency—church, government department, or company. This makes every man a boss, or at least an incumbent for the role of 'protector and benefactor of the Indians', a role which in fact all Whites, with the exception of the Hudson's Bay Company staff, openly compete for. Here, as in most colonial administrator sub groups,
no great solidarity exists. Given that the externally produced policies of various agencies do not coincide (although local reinterpretation is in constant operation), given that the actual agents are frequently changed, added that personality conflicts seem to become severe in this social milieu, it is not surprising that this is an extremely factional group. Of the fifteen possible visiting relationships only two are of any significance, the Roman Catholic priest to Mrs. Watt (the total Catholic population) and the nursing station couple to the Hudson's Bay Company manager and his wife.

The relationship between the White and Indian communities is one of unbridgeable distance. While the priest, the school teacher, and the nurse occasionally attempt socials in the nature of basic education classes, only Mrs. Watt receives any social calls from Indians. These are usually by the older, formerly more acculturated and important people, especially women, and even these visits are rigidly restricted to the back door and kitchen. The usual methods Indians use in dealing with Whites are passive statements of needs, disassociation, and playing dumb—the classical defense mechanisms of a subjugated people. There is, nevertheless, a marked difference in the degree to which these mechanisms are applied—they are most elaborate for Whites who seem to be important but whose exact position is not known. They become considerably less as the role and reactions of the White are deciphered or when his position is without power.
While social pressure can only be directed against one Indian by other Indians, the White agencies have very real direct and indirect economic and political power over the local community. The school can exert considerable influence on the dress, behaviour, and location of most school-aged children. This is especially noticeable at Rupert House because the present teachers feel imbued with a missionary zeal of Canadianizing the Indians. In this respect they have replaced the Anglican mission. Moral persuasion can be backed up on the teacher's part by threats to have family allowance payments held up or more commonly by writing reports pertaining to the advisability or inadvisability of further assistance for certain families to the responsible Indian Agent in Moose Factory. As the Indian Day School is run by the Indian Affairs Branch it is true in a sense to say that the teacher is (or can become) the permanent representative of that body at Rupert House.

The nursing station has similar access to the Indian Agent. Moreover, the nurse in charge can make decisions that radically affect the family or community. She can demand increased rations for sub-marginal families, arrange for hospitalization in Moose Factory (free plane trip and all), or send a man out for mental observation. Parenthetically, three cases of severe psychosis occurred at Rupert House and Eastmain during my stay. The benefits of medicines and hospitalization are now completely accepted. Only premature births and births
on the trap line are now delivered outside of the nursing station. This gives the nurse very considerable prestige and influence if she chooses to use it, either in the sphere of treatment or standards of living.

The Anglican mission, now staffed by a Cree minister from Albany, is the one external agency accepted as 'Indian'. The minister is easy going and has given up the pressure tactics of his White predecessors. Despite the rise of band solidarity, this minister is one of the most respected members of the community and allegedly holds considerable internal political power. Some economic inducements lie in the hands of the Anglican mission; building maintenance and the distribution of bales of used clothing.

While the Roman Catholic priest seems to be quite accepted by the people, the religion is nevertheless considered foreign. The mission is actually of greater economic importance to the Indian community than the Anglican mission. The Roman Catholic priest grows about five acres of potatoes during the summer. Since with his tractor and training he can grow them more cheaply than anyone else, and since only he has storage facilities to keep potatoes over winter, nearly all potatoes eaten come from his plot. The Roman Catholic mission also provides wage work during winter as well as in the spring and summer.
(b) The Hudson's Bay Company, Mrs. Watt, and Beaver Conservation

The Hudson's Bay Company and Mrs. Maude Watt (in her composite capacity as Provincial Fish and Game Warden, long-time resident, and friend of various regional administrators) have such wide influence over the Indian community that I shall describe them in a separate sub-section.

While the Hudson's Bay Company has relinquished the almost monolithic power that it formerly held at Rupert House, a change symbolised by the designation of former 'posts' as 'northern store', its sway is still considerable; in the parlance of the Indians, both young and old, the Hudson's Bay Company manager is 'The Boss'. The Hudson's Bay Company establishment maintains the main radio communication to the outside, operates the post office, dispenses the rations allotted by the Indian Agent, provides and controls the largest source of reliable seasonal employment, and, most important, determines how much credit shall be advanced each individual to outfit for the coming trapping season. To a degree which I could not determine, the manager can even select what sorts of goods are bought on this credit--this seems to occur more frequently with those with the smallest amount of credit. Although the Hudson's Bay Company manager does attempt to operate the mail and radio communication in separation from his company role, he is aware of at least the general outlines of all communications of local
people with the outside. While Indians could use these channels to the detriment of the Hudson's Bay Company, i.e., mail orders, complaints to external authorities, the sheer fact that the local manager would have to handle them and would be able to act in other spheres with this knowledge, would seem to make such steps extremely onerous. Further, the separation of these roles is dependent upon the individual manager's outlook; such separation as exists at Rupert House is not found at all company posts. In the case of issuing rations, the manager is again merely carrying out the pre set directions of others. In this case it is the Indian Agent, but the fact that the manager alone carries out the sheer physical dispensation of these goods, in his office, maintains an important sense of obligation on the part of the local people.

Hudson's Bay Company wage labour consists, apart from the two permanent native clerks, of building maintenance, cutting firewood, loading and unloading the summer supply ship, and work in the local canoe factory. On the whole, the manager does not intervene directly. Hiring and supervision of the canoe factory, a piece work operation employing twelve men from early April to mid-September, is given over an Indian foreman; longshoring the supply ship is directed by the senior native clerk. The other smaller jobs are distributed by the manager himself, mainly to those who have not been able to pay off their earlier debt and need additional credit for the coming year.
While the present manager practises a marked restraint in direct intervention in the lives of individual Indians, the very considerable feeling of dependence and obligation which the local people have can act as a reserve any manager can use for persuasion.

In addition to a feeling of dependence, there is a very real dependence upon the credit allowed by the manager to individual trappers. The size of the credit is generally set by the former performance of the trapper; usually at half the value of the past year's fur take is advanced, but the manager can increase or decrease this allowance as he sees fit. The size of the credit very largely determines how long a trapper can stay out on his trap line before returning to the post with furs to exchange for more supplies. It determines, generally, what sort of activity will be carried out by the trapper during the early months of the trapping season. Someone receiving a small credit allowance must take a range of furs quickly before his cash supplies run out, while those with larger credit can operate on a longer run plan and division of activity that allows better adjustment to the opportunities of the environment. In extreme cases, a trapper who had produced badly for a number of years would not be given enough credit to penetrate to and remain in the more distant zones of the band area--this even if he had a government allotment quota in one of these zones. A young man entering the status of 'adult
trapper' must of course receive a sufficient rating before he can obtain and support a wife. Advances of such credit are by no means automatic. An adult man who loses a sufficient credit rating must either eke out an existence by whatever he can trap from around the post, whatever odd jobs he can get, and subsidies, or move to a White community in search of work. This also is not infrequent.

The establishment of government-controlled beaver quotas and territories (jointly operated by the provincial Game Department and Indian Affairs Branch) is, along with the introduction of welfare payments, the demarcation points of recent history, in the eyes of the local people. The establishment of this quota-territory system is superficially known to numbers of people in Canada but the actual dynamics of this event seem to be beclouded by the continuing presence of some main characters involved and by the still active rivalries and cross interests of the parties concerned.

The history of the establishment of the first beaver preserves in this area is an excellent example of the basic importance of external agencies, their organization and policies in the formation of inter-agency factionalism, and other local structural phenomena. While certain persons, their ambitions and capabilities, may influence the local scene or initiate actions that are later sustained and carried through to one degree and in some form or another, the real staying power
can only come from external agencies. On the other hand, the example of the establishment of the beaver preserves also shows the importance of local reinterpretation of centrally established policy at the regional level.

Mrs. Maude Watt was born and raised in Mingan, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, an intensely French-Canadian and anti-English area. After five years at Fort Chimo with her husband, a Scottish Hudson's Bay Company factor, the couple was posted at Rupert House in 1920. During the 1920's a combination of encroaching White trappers, development of more favourable transport routes, decline of fur prices and fur animals, forced a continual retrenchment of Rupert House's earlier strategic position. In 1927 a Hudson's Bay Company order was formulated which impelled all posts to become financially self supporting or to close. Drastic measures were taken but the Rupert House post still did not maintain itself in the following year. Action was not immediately taken by the company in ordering the post to close. The fact that it was the first established Hudson's Bay Company post gave it a traditional importance that merited some consideration. Nevertheless, the writing seemed to be on the wall.

The Indians at this time around the James Bay area were falling into a sub marginal, subsistence hunting condition. Some combination of a concern for the Indians and for their own future (it is impossible to give an accurate weighting of these
factors in the accounts that were available to me) determined the Watts to hammer out and pursue a policy at Rupert House separate from that ordered by the Hudson's Bay Company. The manner in which this was done was to take advantage of Mrs. Watt's friends and acquaintances in the Quebec nationalist circles, which at the time were beginning to have considerable power in provincial politics. The upshot was that a 13,000 square mile beaver preserve was established by the provincial government around Rupert House with Mrs. Watt named as the local supervisor and game warden. This entire operation was conducted without the knowledge of the Hudson's Bay Company (who did not hear of the matter until the bill was passed in the provincial legislature). The immediate Hudson's Bay Company reaction was to demand that the Watts give up their control of the beaver preserve or face termination from the company service. Since such termination would have been fairly sure had they actually given up their control, the Watts not only hung on but continued to urge the provincial government to increase the territory covered by beaver preserves. The long standing rivalry between the Hudson's Bay Company and French Canada was at the time coming to a new head; with the expansion of the national economy into the northern Quebec mining area the provincial government saw greater reason and opportunity to demonstrate its effective control over the north. The Hudson's Bay Company fearing that a rapid expansion of provincially-controlled lands would put its fur resources of that area in the
hands of a hostile agency, acquiesced to the Watt's arrangement (and, if I infer correctly, offered some sort of an understanding that they would remain in charge of the Rupert House post as long as they wished). In the next few years, the Hudson's Bay Company began to acquire administrative control of new areas set aside for beaver preserves. The company was not one to be caught off base a second time. Nevertheless, by the mid-1930's, fur and beaver conservation had become an issue in which federal and various provincial authorities were involved and where individual or private company actions were discouraged.

The importance of this example is twofold. One, it shows the differences that can exist between the different levels of one agency (let alone when there is more than one involved in the situation). The policy established by the Hudson's Bay Company in their Winnipeg headquarters was one of 'no conservation experiments and maintain traditional Hudson's Bay Company spheres of control'. The regional outlook of Hudson's Bay Company headquarters in James Bay was 'attempts at beaver conservation yes, but not at the expense of weakening Hudson's Bay Company's influence over the area'. Finally, the local Rupert House policy was 'beaver preserves to be established even if this entails dependence upon the Quebec government'. The second proposition that I wish to exemplify is that while there can be local deviance from the established policy (and there has been and is a constant stream of men from various agencies who strike out on their own in the north, leave, or are fired for
disobedient behaviour) this will not be effective in modifying the policy of the external agency at all or even in modifying the local power and policy structure over a longer run unless such deviant action is of interest to and backed by another external agency. Watt would have been immediately released and the beaver conservation scheme abandoned unless the interest of the Quebec government (or some other agency whose writ could be made to run in the area) existed and its support obtained.

The beaver allotment system as it operates now is as follows: about two-thirds of the nuclear or extended families have received tracts of land delineated on a master map of the area. Quotas are set so as to allow trapping only the natural increase of that tract's beaver population. Great variation exists in the size and richness of these tracts (six to about ninety beaver quota) and a considerable change in the relative number of trappers per recipient family has taken place. Ideally, the tracts were to provide fur resources to the holding families in perpetuity but in practice, numbers of young men have had to be placed on the lands of others because their original family land could not support them. Even the richest lands cannot now sustain many more trappers and still produce an acceptable income. There is in fact a strong feeling on the part of the dispensing authorities that the holders of the richer lands should not be overly burdened by having persons from insufficient tracts placed on their lands.
Each year the head tallyman of a territory (the man who nominally holds the trapping ground) must report the number of untrapped lodges remaining on his territory. On this basis next year's quota is assigned. This tally is recorded by Mrs. Watt. She also collects the actual beaver furs, ships them to a provincially administered auction in Montreal, and distributes the cheques received in the summer. Her son runs the beaver and game section of the regional Indian Affairs Branch headquarters in Moose Factory. He decides, on surveying tallies which territories would bear more trappers. Allegedly, no man or family who traps his land fully is forced to accept other trappers by the Indian Affairs Branch, but 'suggestions' are made to the holder of some larger and/or richer territories by Hugo Watt (the Indian Affairs Branch Fish and Game Supervisor) that they take in some other trappers. It is the case for all the Indian people of this area, except a very few self-reliant or deviant persons, that a suggestion on the part of a government official or Hudson's Bay Company post manager amounts to a command.

It does seem to be the case that the holder of a territory will have the largest voice in determining exactly who will be placed on what was formerly his land.

Many of the Indians contribute one or two of their yearly beaver furs to the operation of the local community hall (the J. S. C. Watt Memorial Hall). This is maintained and controlled through these proceeds by Mrs. Maude Watt.
Contact With Other Communities

The Rupert House Indians categorize others as either 'English', 'French', or 'Indian'. 'Scotch' seems to be a major subdivision of 'English' and some people recognise other European nationals as different. The category of 'Metis' is not distinct from that of 'Indian' but a major subdivision of 'Indian' seems to be 'Part Indian'. In short, the local people seem to categorize other groups as much by their way of living as by their racial makeup. The terms 'Cree', 'Neskapi', and 'Montagnais' are not known to them; 'Ojibwa' is. They refer to themselves solely as 'Indians'; when asked to distinguish themselves from other Indian groups they say that they are 'Rupert House Indians', the primary distinction between all other Indians being their post of residence.

No contact exists with the people of the inland posts of Mistassini and Waswanipi, the coastal posts of Fort George and Paint Hills or with the west James Bay posts. About four or five families trapping on the northern and eastern margins of the Rupert House area camp with people from Eastmain and Nemiscau. Actual visiting from one of these posts to another is rare; one young man from Eastmain visited Rupert House; a Nemiscau party stopped at Rupert House to take back a canoe; a Nemiscau girl stayed at the Rupert House nursing station during the summer. One Rupert House family occasionally visits Eastmain in the summer, the woman being born there and the man having spent much of his active life at Eastmain.
There is a very considerable movement of Rupert House people back and forth from Moose Factory—to look for work, to visit, to obtain hospitalization. About one-half to one-third of the active adult men spent some time in Moose Factory last year working or looking for work. About a half of these men took their families with them. Numbers of young men and women have already left Rupert House for permanent residence at Moose Factory. This is usually dependent upon some fairly permanent employment there or marriage to someone so employed.

Rupert House acts as a sort of reserve to which jobless men can return and where fatherless children can be left. But there is no inflow of men or women originally from other posts. In general, Rupert House people who permanently establish in Moose Factory or who marry either a Moose Factory person or someone from one of the other James Bay posts resident at Moose, have largely cut themselves off from the Rupert House community and must make a go of it where they are. The once common process of shifting effective band affiliation applies now only to a one-way direction to Moose Factory. Three fairly large Rupert House commensal groups are at present in the last stages of a gradual transition to the Moose band. In addition to this movement, a smaller number of people, usually young single men or newly married couples have made very abrupt shifts by immigrating to the northern Ontario mining towns and to the Chibougamou, Quebec area.
CHAPTER III
ECONOMIC AND PRODUCTIVE ORGANIZATION

The economy of Rupert House has changed drastically in the last twenty-five years. The self-reliance of a half-starved and half-frozen group of hunters-trappers has given way to the acceptance of family allowance payments, old age assistance, and rations. As might be expected, many of the earlier social adjustments to a marginal hunting society have been modified--let us hope forever, as do those Indians who have experienced both situations.

National welfare payments have had a very great importance in changing the economic base and opportunities of this northern society, more so than the recent increase in wage labour, because of the strategic distribution of these payments. As Mathew Cowboy (85), one of my principal informants would tell you, "in the old days children and old people couldn't do anything. Now they can take care of themselves. Even little babies get something." To 'do something' or 'to take care of oneself' is to be able to contribute to the economic support of whatever commensal group one is intimately connected with. To be a good hunter and trapper is still the major criteria of the manhood ideal and still of considerable importance in courtship, but the persistent demand is to bring in the goods by trapping, wage labour, or however. Nevertheless, despite recent changes
in the economic base and despite those changes in technology and external social environment mentioned in the earlier chapters, the Rupert House band still retains a basically hunting and trapping way of life. This is an obvious but important fact to constantly bear in mind when considering this society. Some of the regional directors and staff of powerful White agencies, who actually should know better, will seriously contend that the all overriding and determining economic base of the Indian groups in the area is subsidy payment.

While subsidy payments may in fact make up the largest single source of income, it is what the people do, what they work at, what area of their economy they actually control (to some degree) and can manipulate that has by far the greatest effect upon how they arrange their movements, groupings, and activities. In the following chapter I shall elaborate upon some of the modifications allowed by recent subsidy payments so eloquently alluded to by Mathew Cowboy. But Rupert House in 1961 is still a hunting-trapping society, distinct from both the pristine and post contact hunting-trapping societies of the past but equally distinct from White trappers and their communities.

1. Income: subsidies, wages, trapping

The total income for the people of Rupert House band in the period September 1, 1960 to August 31, 1961 was
approximately $111,350. Of this, $42,500 or 37.5 per cent came from subsidies, $43,000 or 40 per cent came from wages and $26,000 or 22.5 per cent came from trapping. This gives a per capita annual income of approximately $225 or $1,392 per commensal group. The annual income ranges from a high of $4,380 in a ten person commensal group (that of the nursing station attendant) to a low of $550-$600 for an eight person commensal group (that of a sickly young man with a fertile wife). These figures become somewhat more significant when we realize that the prices of consumer goods are approximately 50 per cent higher at Rupert House than in the southern metropolitan areas and that, in addition, active trappers must earmark a certain portion of their income for the acquisition and maintenance of capital equipment. On the other hand, a variable but always considerable amount of the food eaten is country food and the living conditions dispense with utility and rent payments.

(a) Subsidies

The introduction of subsidy payments has undoubtedly been the major event in the community's recent history. These payments are not only important because of their amount and strategic distribution but also because emergency rations guarantee survival security. It must be remembered, nevertheless, that these welfare payments (a preferable term) are primarily those available to all Canadian citizens and that the additional rations and relief are proportionally small and considerably
lower than what would be received by similarly impoverished White families farther south. This fact is understood but not accepted by most of the administrators in the area.

The welfare payments consist of federal Family Allowance ($18,000), Old Age Assistance ($14,520), and Indian Affairs Branch permanent rations to widows, cripples and destitutes ($7,350). Family Allowance payments (calculated at $7 per month per child under sixteen years) are made twelve months of the year to the 230 children under sixteen who remain at Rupert House (at least nominally attending the day school there if between eight and sixteen years of age) and for two months of the year to thirty-seven children who attend residential school. The $55 per month federal Old Age Assistance is paid to twenty-two people in the community. Twenty-one persons receive permanent rations. These range from $22 per month for cripples to $70 per month to two widows with dependants. Such rations are paid as credit deposits at the local Hudson's Bay Company store. While the present manager does not greatly concern himself with how these deposits were spent, other managers have and do take it upon themselves to see that the recipient uses his or her ration money to purchase 'wholesome, sensible food'.

It is a fairly common belief among Whites of the area that Indian families can and do live substantially from Family Allowance and rations. To the best of my knowledge, most
families use all of the Family Allowance, plus some additional funds for food and clothes for their children. Most families buy a wide range of western goods for babies and children—evaporated milk, baby foods, bottles, bibs and bunting. With local prices for such articles, this does not allow much scrimping for even the youngest recipient. Only a few of the poorest families and those with a very large number of children use part of the Family Allowance payments to buy food for adults. This is considered improper, both by those who are forced to do so and those who are not. This topic is one of the very few spheres about which an outsider (like myself) can hear of overt gossip employed as sanctions.

The size of the Old Age Assistance payments and the more limited needs of the recipients allow of a considerably wider sharing or distribution of such funds as compared to Family Allowance. The position of the aged and widows has undergone considerable change since the advent of such payments; it has changed from that of dependant to that of one able to distribute a modest largesse. The twenty-two recipients of Old Age Assistance and the two women receiving widows' allowances can and usually do support themselves and one or two other persons additionally. Those so supported are usually grandchildren (most frequently illegitimate or children of a widowed son or daughter's first marriage), adopted children, or the children with whom the recipient happens to be residing.
(b) Wages

The importance of and reliance upon wage labour has had a fluctuating history at Rupert House. During the first quarter of this century it likely played a proportionally more important role than even today. During the late 1920's, the 1930's, and much of the 1940's it was negligible. Wage labour became increasingly important from the late 1940's to the present as government establishments moved into the area. Actually, much of the wage payment is directly connected with the construction and maintenance of social service establishments and is in a way a subsidy itself. This is particularly true of Indian Affairs Branch projects which are basically a sort of paid community development. Many of these projects are neither particularly necessary nor desired by the local people. The projects operate primarily to pump money into a community which needs help and are calculated to inculcate an ethic of having 'to work for what you get'.

A variety of sources of wage income exist. The largest source, $10,320 per annum, comes from permanent employment at one of the White agencies at Rupert House. Seven persons are so employed: a caretaker at the nursing station ($320 per month), a native clerk at the Hudson's Bay Company ($180 per month), a labourer for the Hudson's Bay Company ($100 per month), a janitor and handiman at the Indian Affairs school ($75 per month), a handiman at the provincial Fish and Game
Department buildings ($65 per month), a cleaning woman for the Fish and Game houses ($60 per month), and a cleaning woman at the nursing station ($60 per month).

The remaining sources of wage income are seasonal or temporary. In the case of employment in the Hudson's Bay Company canoe factory, by the tourist goose hunting camps, and to a considerable degree for summer maintenance work by the other White agencies on the post, a man once hired and found acceptable will be asked to return each season. While these arrangements give a certain security and predictability of income to some of the men, i.e., those who manage to get into these wage positions, the arrangements also operate to increase differences in income within the community. It is mainly the 'good' Indians (industrious) who are asked to work. Industriousness is most frequently measured by Whites by the amount of furs a man brings in. While a poor trapper or one with a poor trapping territory may attain a status of 'good worker', it is considerably more difficult than for those who already can rely upon a 'good' trapping income as well.

Guiding for the three tourist goose hunting camps in the Rupert House band area employs about twenty men. These men usually take their wives and children along to the tourist camps. Payment is mainly to the men as guides but a certain amount of the income from this source comes as rental paid to the guides for the use of their canoes and motors. The payment
for the period when these camps operate, approximately September 10 to October 10, ranges from $100 per man to $225 per man. Most men clear about $150 to $175 during this time—provisions are provided by the camps. The wives may make $40 to $50 by plucking the geese the tourist hunters shoot.

The Indian Affairs Branch projects during the year September 1960 to September 1961 consisted of cutting timber and sawing it into lumber for the repair of the existing Indian houses and the projected construction of others, building a permanent dock (which was carried away once by high water before its construction was completed and which was badly damaged by ice in the spring of 1962), making a road around the village, and clearing and seeding a small potato garden. These projects employed from five to twenty-five men at different times. The total income from these projects was $9,315, ranging from $500 for the road to $4,565 for the cutting of lumber.

The Hudson's Bay Company canoe factory employed twelve men between April 10 and September 20. Wages are paid on a piecework basis and the actual day-to-day management of the factory is left to an Indian foreman. The operation of this factory has relevance to an understanding of internal political control and will be discussed in the following chapter. The total income to the community from this source was $5,000, ranging from $350 to $450 per man per season.
Nine men, six of them with their families, flew to Moose Factory during the spring and summer in order to find employment there on the construction of an R. C. A. F. base. About half of them left the post very soon after finishing their beaver trapping. The chief of the band, Malcolm Diamond, found employment on the construction site near Moosonee in early April. Despite earning a fairly good salary, which brought him more in two and a half months than his entire year's trapping, he returned to the post in early June when most of the band members were in. It appears that it is difficult to validate positions of community leadership if one is heavily dependent upon wage labour. The income from outside employment ranged from $100 per season for an adult man with a large family who was cutting firewood at Moose Factory, to $1,500 for a young, single trapper (the son of a fairly effective trapper) who worked on the construction site throughout most of the summer. The total income from this source was $4,400.

Irregular employment and seasonal maintenance work for the White agencies included painting and repair of buildings, construction of various small sheds, digging a well and water reservoir (for the Fish and Game warden's house), cutting, hauling, and splitting firewood, and loading and unloading the summer supply ships. The wages paid out by the various agencies for this sort of work ranged from $145 per year for the Anglican mission to $930 for the Hudson's Bay Company. Two men were the
most ever employed by the Anglican mission while approximately twenty-five men were used for one or two days in unloading the supply ship. The total income from this source was $1,905.

Apart from the seven permanently employed persons, all wage activity is seasonal and does not significantly conflict with trapping-hunting activity; indeed, arrangements usually prevail that allow even the permanently employed to engage in goose hunting. With the exception of the Indian Affairs Branch projects, cutting firewood, and unloading the supply ship, most wage opportunities are pretty well preempted—even the irregular work. Each agency has a number of men to whom it offers its part time work. While a few extra workers may sometimes be needed, this is fairly infrequent. A very considerable number of men, from a third to a half, especially the younger men, have absolutely no opportunity for wage labour. Nearly all positions of permanent employment appear desirable to Rupert House people. The qualifying rider is that wage employment that entails close and constant supervision and contact with Whites is found unpalatable. Also, as has been mentioned, permanent wage employment does generally militate against a position of community leadership. It is not clear to me whether this restriction comes from the subordinate position under Whites inherent in most positions of permanent employment for Indians or from the alienation that such a permanently employed person would have from the trapping way of life.
While the most pleasant sort of work, for the local Indians is undoubtedly that of guiding at the goose camps (which is looked upon as a sort of holiday with pay), most adult men will choose such employment that offers longer term economic security if there is an alternative. Since employment at the canoe factory depends upon working past the beginning of the goose season, those men who have had the opportunity to work in either the factory or the goose camps have had to choose. It is most significant that after some experimentation a few years ago most men have decided to seek employment in the canoe factory, if possible. This despite the fact that the wage per month is only about half that of the goose camps and the work much less enjoyable. The reason for their choice is that the total seasonal income per man will be higher in the canoe shed. Still, an important factor that must be taken into consideration when estimating the significance of this decision is that the canoe shed offered an unusual degree of independence from White supervision for Indian workers.

(c) Trapping Income

Trapping income is of two kinds, that paid for the actual furs and wages paid by the Indian Affairs Branch to the tallyman on each trapping territory for his work each year in counting and mapping the remaining beaver lodges. On this count the next year's quota is set.
Twenty-eight men received the $50 per annum tallyman wage—a total of $1,400.

The average trapping income is $300 per trapper, which is also approximately the modal trapping income. The furs taken amounted to from $5 to $75 per season for inexperienced adolescent trappers and from $50 to $1,025 per season for adults.

The community then retains the features of a trapping society despite the fact that this source provides the smallest proportion of the total community income. The reason for this is that trapping still is the major source of income for close to a half of the commensal groups. This fact serves to emphasize the unequal distribution of wage labour and the differential income within the community. Furthermore, even those families that do receive significant wage income are dependent upon trapping for necessary additional income. Finally, trapping and hunting is the only productive activity that can be undertaken in the band area for over one half of the year. Even cripples do some trapping during the fall and winter. Hunting, trapping, and even fishing are not rigidly distinguished by the Indians. When out in 'the bush' one either hunts and traps or hunts and fishes. To some of the poorer families hunting and fishing are economically as important as the fur catch. By far the greatest part of their winter food comes from subsistence hunting-fishing, flour being the only additive. It would be too expensive for most families to remain on the post all year, even if a man were able to operate
a trap line effectively by himself. All food for the family would have to be bought.

2. Expenditures and Consumption

The most obvious and most important feature of consumer economics at Rupert House is that the people are poor, that they use all of their annual income before the year is up, and that all trappers, even the richest, must contract debt with the Hudson's Bay Company in order to obtain their supplies for the winter trapping season. The clothing, bedding, and camp utensils of the poorest could be duplicated in any large city dump. The personal belongings of the richest families approach those of people living in badly depressed rural areas (although such rural areas would have many services and opportunities not available at Rupert House).

While the estimates of community income and the income of select families could be fairly easily and accurately determined (the only area of indeterminacy being that of trapping income) accounts of expenditures were much more difficult to come by. The people themselves know the specifics of their buying in recent months but do not generally know the overall picture of where their money is going. The only exception is that people usually can recount nearly every item in their winter supply and outfit list. This gives an accurate account of their consumption of cash goods over a variable winter period. Budgeting for the
spring and summer months operates like this: after the main fur haul is in or when the fur cheques have been paid a credit is built up with the Hudson's Bay Company. One then buys those things which are not immediately necessary for subsistence. At each transaction the balance of the account is asked for; as this declines the purchases are restricted first solely to food (and items for babies and infants when the Family Allowance cheques come in) and then only to the cheapest foods. Under such conditions the accurate methods of determining the distribution of annual expenditures are to have access to Hudson's Bay Company accounts or to observe selected family expenditures throughout the year. Neither of these procedures were open to me.

(a) Food

From discussions with my older informants, it is clear that the main expenditures before World War I were for clothing and capital equipment, guns, tools, ammunition, canvas, twine,—"Whatever we had left over we would take in food, never very much" said Mathew Cowboy. During the 1930's the final collapse of fox prices and the prohibition of beaver trapping created an efflorescence of subsistence hunting. Little food could be paid for. Nevertheless, the overall trend since the beginning of the century (or, more exactly, from the entry of Revillon Brothers into the area in 1904-1906) has been the increasing importance of cash food in the diet and budget. This
trend has been tremendously strengthened by the advent of welfare payments and government presence in the area. Cash food is now the largest single item in the family budget. This holds true for every family from whom I obtained a supply list, from rich to poor. While the poorer groups spend a relatively larger percentage of their income on food it is smaller, absolutely, than that of the better off trappers.

While the trend to greater use of and dependence upon cash foods has been noted for most Indian groups, the alleged corollary, i.e., that these groups are basically independent of local foods, does not obtain at Rupert House. I estimate that approximately sixty to sixty-five per cent of the food eaten annually is obtained from local resources. It is my guess that some observers have underestimated the degree of exploitation of the environment still obtaining by noting the decline in the importance of large game animals (which are still of considerable importance inland) and disregarding the importance of fur animals for food. At Rupert House, people eat absolutely every animal taken, no matter how large or how small or what the primary reason for taking it be--bear, mink, and skunk (which is unintentionally caught in traps set for other animals). The only animals in the area not eaten, to my knowledge, are frogs (which are used by young boys to throw at girls), eagles and hawks, which are shot for sport, and dogs, which are thrown in the bush when they die. All other animals, birds, and fish are used for food--if not
for humans then for dogs. It is true that the few younger men who have started trapping alone, i.e., either by themselves or without their families but in the company of another man, do say, "Sometimes we see moose tracks, but we don't follow them when we're trapping—we don't have the time." But they add, "We can live on beaver, or rabbit when we haven't got beaver." Besides, these men often go on a separate hunt for large game after finishing trapping. Consider the relative importance of country food to cash food for the commensal group of Sydney Georgkish. The period covered is from October 20 to February 20; the group consisted of Sydney (38), his wife, and four children nine to one years of age. The biggest bulk of the cash food was taken on the winter supply outfit. About a quarter more food is bought at Christmas. Food is nearly the only item bought at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Foods</th>
<th>Country Foods (in pounds of meat that is utilized for food)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 lbs. flour</td>
<td>26 beaver - 900 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 lbs. sugar</td>
<td>5 otter - 50 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 lbs. lard</td>
<td>6 muskrat - 12 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 lbs. baking powder</td>
<td>100 rabbits - 150 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 lbs. tea</td>
<td>60 grouse - 30 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 lbs. rolled oats for dogs</td>
<td>2 caribou (shot by himself) - 250 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 caribou (given by neighbouring trapper and shared with partner) - 185 lbs. (S.G.'s portion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bear (shared with trapping partner) - 105 lbs. (S.G.'s portion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cash Foods - 850 lbs. (not including tea, baking powder and condiments)

Total Country Foods - 1,682 lbs.
The following chart gives some idea of the total amount of country food used by the Rupert House band. The actual take is certainly higher than that recorded. Small and more uncommon animals such as squirrels, weasels, and whiskeyjacks and loons were not included—loons give up to four pounds of meat per bird. Furthermore, I was not given a full count of large game taken by some Indians; possibly for fear that a quota on these might result. I know of a moose and two caribou which were taken which were not mentioned to me. These have been added to the count. Undoubtedly more than one bear was taken in the band territory during the year. The moose and caribou taken during the spring from after break up to August 30, 1961 are not included; these likely amount to from five to ten animals.

Birds, Game and Fur Animals Taken, Rupert House Band  
September 10, 1960 to May 10, 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Utilizable (*) weight per animal in pounds</th>
<th>Total poundage of utilizable meat, in pounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large game:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 moose</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 caribou</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bear</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total large game meat:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,660 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fur animals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 beaver</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 muskrat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 mink</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 otter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>Utilizable (*) weight per animal in pounds</td>
<td>Total poundage of utilizable meat, in pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 marten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 lynx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 fox</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total fur animal meat: 29,050 lbs.

Birds and small game:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Utilizable (*) weight</th>
<th>Total poundage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,960 geese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,400 grouse</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 ptarmigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and partridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total bird and small game meat: 16,500 lbs.

Total amount of country food taken September 10, 1960 to May 10, 1961 (not including fish): 66,210 lbs.

Fish have not been added to the winter food catch.

While there is a wide difference in use of this resource, from no winter fishing at all to enough winter fishing to bring in as much food as game, most families do obtain at least 100 lbs. of fish in the winter. More important, those groups with dog teams must either fish to feed the dogs or purchase and carry rolled oats for dog food mash. An increasing number do feed their dogs mainly on mash.

*Taken from Edward S. Rodgers, "An Analysis of the Hunting Group-Territory Complex among the Mistassini Indian and Neighbouring People," Ph.D. thesis, University of New Mexico, 1958, p. 52. Rodgers estimates of 55 pounds of meat per beaver appear far too high for the Rupert House animals; only the very largest would give so much meat. Thirty-five pounds per animal seems to be a more reasonable figure.*
Fish attain considerable importance from break up until the end of June. At this time they provide the main country source of protein—about six to eight pounds of fish per two net family seems usual, but there is a great day-to-day variation. July and August are flour months. Fish are very plentiful during September but are only extensively exploited during the beginning of that month. Between May 10 and September 10, 1961, with the exception of about six weeks in July and August, approximately twenty to thirty families had their nets down each day. This gives an overall average of 175 pounds of live fish per day. About half of this weight is in suckers and jackfish, which is fed to dogs, and about forty per cent of the fish for human consumption is reduced in cleaning and cooking. The average daily community consumption of fish during these months is about fifty pounds per day, or approximately 5,500 throughout the season. To this figure we can add about 1,000 to 1,500 pounds of fish that are brought in from the summer fishing sites along the coast. Geese make up the principal item of diet during the fall and spring goose hunts.

Unfortunately, no data could be obtained from the Hudson's Bay Company regarding the total amount of food bought by the community during the year. While there is certainly more cash food used by the people when they are on the post, one basic adjustment to the shortage of country food at that time is just eating less. This held to be the case by the Whites and by
the Indians themselves. This alleged seasonal downward adjustment seems, from unsystematic discussions about daily diet at different times of the year, to be actually the case.

While local Whites usually like to believe that a parity in subsistence income exists, that Indians 'get it one way or another', this is unfortunately just not the case. Those who have a good territory and trap relatively many beaver not only can afford to buy more cash foods but also have large quantities of beaver meat at their disposal. (They also are usually in good locations to shoot large game.) While the poorer trappers do take many more fish, geese, and rabbits than those trappers with better beaver sections, such small game cannot make up for the difference between six and sixty beaver carcasses.

(b) Capital Equipment

The community's tangible assets are almost totally in the form of equipment used to maintain a living by hunting and trapping. Every active man above the age of twenty, married and unmarried, owns at least one canoe. Even the crippled men who are still active own one. Every active man (except one) who heads a commensal group owns at least one outboard motor. Often an older motor is also available for emergencies or to use for spare parts. Literally every man and older boy has a gun of some sort; most of the better trappers own a heavy rifle, a .22, and a
shotgun. Any family which doesn't have at least this combination of firearms is handicapped. Indeed, it is desirable to have a shotgun for every member of the group that goes goose hunting so that the total kill can be increased. There is an average of forty to fifty traps per commensal group. Beaver traps are the most expensive and least numerous; smaller traps make up the bulk. Only some families have a bear trap or two. Not only does the number of traps per family vary from about twenty to one hundred, but also the condition of these traps from new to almost useless.

It can be well imagined how important these capital items are for the Indian people. A badly leaded rifle or .22 can mean the difference between getting a moose or not, leaking canoes mean wet supplies and bedding; old canoes can break open on treacherous water. Old, unreliable motors mean wasted days, often at times when there are resources which will only be temporarily available. Paddling, besides being hard work, results in upset schedules. Old traps may not be triggered by cautious animals or may be broken from their anchor chains and dragged off by the dying animal.

A great deal of pride is taken in owning new and better equipment. This is indeed the major sphere of investment. A younger man will try to build up his stock of such goods while a middle-aged man will try to improve his. The normal way of proceeding is to wait for a year when one's trapping take has
been good. The larger item is bought after the winter advance has been repaid. No one holds the 'surplus' money (or credit) over the summer in order to buy next year's winter supplies without an advance. The chances would be that any 'surplus' intended for improvement of the stock of capital equipment would trickle away over the summer into extra food, clothing and small luxuries. The difference and range of wealth (or poverty) within the community is well illustrated by the lists of goods owned by three select commensal groups.

1. John Blackned (64)—commensal group consists of John, his wife, and two unmarried sons in their mid-twenties. John Blackned has been a consistently good trapper throughout his life although he has been increasingly incapacitated in the last few years. He is definitely one of the richer men in the community, one of the few who own their own houses—his is the biggest in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 foot canoe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 foot canoes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 foot canoes in the bush</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 horsepower motor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automatic shotgun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy rifle (30.06)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22s</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'game getter' gun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish nets</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tent coverings from last year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tarp</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radios and dry cells</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewing machine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portable stoves</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 traps</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2 traps</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3 traps</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4 traps (beaver traps)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pair snowshoes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toboggans</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moose hides</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tent coverings from last year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the old church organ.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Sydney Georgekish, an average commensal group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 foot canoe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1/2 horsepower motor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rifle (30.30)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pump shotgun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22 pump shotgun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 radio and dry cell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 fish nets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1/2 horsepower motor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tarps</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 No. 1 traps</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 beaver traps</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See last section of chapter)

3. David Salt—This represents what is likely the poorest still active group. There are two active hunters/trappers, David (65) and his son Joseph (23). For a fuller description see the last section in this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 foot canoe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pump shotgun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22 pump shotgun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 small traps</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 beaver traps</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 fish nets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewing machine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tarps</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R. W. Dunning (Social and Economic Change Among the Northern Ojibwa, p. 44) has estimated that the average annual capital depreciation for each adult trapper amounts to approximately $140. This figure seems to closely approximate that for Rupert House today. The only adjustment I will make is in shortening the estimated period of use of some items; with this in mind I would place the annual depreciation figure at $160. In addition to capital depreciation, all active trappers must continually replace a stock of material goods in order to hunt or trap; ammunition, tenting, tools, twine and wire etc. These goods average about $75 to $100 per commensal group per year. In addition, sixteen trapping groups chartered a total of twenty-one flights to their main camps, at an approximate cost of $85 per trip. While this expense is considered partially as a
luxury, it does allow a fuller exploitation of coastal resources and wage opportunities which would otherwise be closed to hunters who trap inland and who would have to leave the post early in fall to reach their territories.

My interpreter used about forty gallons of gas per year, which at $1.25 per gallon totalled $50. This was purportedly considerably more than used by most single men but about average for heads of commensal groups.

The costs of carrying on trapping are rarely recognized by local Whites. Capital depreciation, winter outfit (here used to designate those material goods such as ammunition, matches, twine, etc. that are fully expended in the course of a season), and gas amount to approximately $275 per adult trapper per year, or $360 per year if a plane is used to freight in goods. While there is variation in this sphere, as elsewhere, these figures are about minimal for averages. A young single trapper would spend a little more than half this amount. The same material goods are used in both subsistence hunting and in trapping. This means that a commensal unit of an older active couple, an unmarried active son, and let us say a few smaller children, would require $400 to $450 per year to maintain capital goods and buy the winter outfit and gas. This figure would not include the cost of the winter food supply and clothing. People must trap in order to maintain the goods that allow subsistence pursuits.
Those groups that do not obtain the necessary minimum income, and there are a number, depreciate their equipment, maintaining it only by ration issues of canvas and occasional gifts of ammunition from community members. With old equipment it is doubly difficult to operate effectively.

(c) Clothing and Sundries

It is of vital importance to have sufficient and proper clothing in this sub-Arctic environment. Hide clothing has long since been replaced; even the parents of the oldest community members used mainly cloth clothing. Rabbit yarn jackets, and bedding, formerly of considerable importance, are now restricted mainly to smaller children. Considering the climate, the stock of clothes now bought by an average family is surprisingly (pathetically) meagre. Clothing is subjected to heavy wear and tear—sparks, continual wear during day and night, rubbing against brush. The quality is usually quite poor, especially for summer clothes. It does not last very long. "Last year George bought a parka, one of those good thirteen dollar ones. He won't need another one till next year," said Mrs. George Diamond. While the Hudson's Bay Company does carry a small stock of higher quality and higher priced parkas, trousers, and shirts, most goods are of a second run, bargain basement quality (a thirteen dollar parka at Rupert House certainly would be). With local markup and local income, the people can afford little else.
The largest outlay for clothes is made during the purchase of the fall and winter outfit. The greatest amount is usually spent for the male head of the commensal group. The wife receives from a half to two-thirds the amount of her husband's clothes; adolescent boys, slightly less than the mother, and remaining smaller children together approximately as much as the mother. Any active unmarried members of the commensal group are expected to buy their own clothes, although clothes are one of the main forms of gifts involving cash goods.

All the hide (moose and caribou) at a family's disposal usually goes into mitts and mocassins for the family. In this way the cost of footwear, which would be considerable, is eliminated. Mocassins are also considerably more comfortable and practical than shoes in the winter. A man will need a pair of rubber boots or a cheap pair of waders almost every spring. Frequently there is not enough hide to make mocassins for summer use--one man can use up to six pairs in a year. In that case, running shoes must be bought for every member of the family.

Winter clothes are worn throughout the spring and often through the summer (long underwear is replaced by drawers and jackets are not worn). By this time these clothes are usually well patched and rather ragged and threadbare. Summer clothes, especially children's clothes are bought sporadically any time after the beaver cheques are paid, in late spring.
The only expenditures which can be regarded solely as luxuries are tobacco for men and women, beer brew supplies for men, and candies and gum for children. Even for the most affluent this does not constitute a significant part of the budget. My interpreter summed up the situation rather nicely, "We like to make life as easy as we can. It is still hard." And it is. After buying better equipment, 'surplus' income goes into better clothing for the family. It makes a man happy to wear better quality clothes and to see his wife and children wearing new sweaters and frocks. Buying canned meat and canned fruit during the summer, extra candles and new cooking pots more frequently, using extra gas to go on picnic-like excursions, expending boxes of shells in shooting at hard to hit animals, are all part of better living. None of these uses of a higher income is distinct from the purchase of necessities. It is only a matter of degree.

The expenditures of the Goerge Diamond family may give some understanding of overall consumer economics. The expenditures are the full winter supply and outfit lists. This group did not come into the post for additional supplies during the winter. These figures can therefore be taken as accurate and all inclusive for the period October 5, 1960 to March 10, 1961. The commensal group consists of George Diamond (38), his wife (37), and four children (1 to 5 years). The winter trapping group was additionally composed of the Diamond's eldest son, Lawrence (19), his wife (18) and their baby. In regards to food,
this younger commensal group is self-supporting. In the summer time these two commensal groups move in with George Diamond's parents, another separate commensal group, who until last year trapped along with George. During July and August 1961 five of George Diamond's children, from seven to sixteen years of age, returned home from residential school.

Winter Supplies and Outfit—for five months, October 5 to March 10; two adults and five children; a somewhat richer than average family, George Diamond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 lb. flour</td>
<td>1 man's coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 lb. sugar</td>
<td>3 pair trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 lb. lard</td>
<td>3 pair stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 lb. tea</td>
<td>1 heavy underwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 lb. baking powder</td>
<td>1 man's hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 lb. salt</td>
<td>1 woman's parka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 pkgs. currants</td>
<td>1 skirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 lb. rolled oats</td>
<td>2 pair bloomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 lb. coffee</td>
<td>2 pair stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 case canned milk</td>
<td>1 woman's sweater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 children's trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 pair children's stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yard duffel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 yards flannelette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 yards cotton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food total</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing total</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luxuries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. candy</td>
<td>$ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 boxes biscuits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 carton gum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. tobacco</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 carton cigarettes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxuries total</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Winter Supplies and Outfit,
George Diamond family (continued)

Outfit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box 30.30 shells</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxes 303 shells</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxes .22 shells</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw blades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Files</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box shot gun shells</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coils snare wire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls No. 5 twine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls No. 9 twine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarps</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxes candles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doz. boxes matches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove pipes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$145</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the winter supply and outfit expenditures, George Diamond flew his family and that of his married son into their distant trapping territory. The cost was approximately $110. Since he was employed at the Rupert House canoe factory from April 15 to September 20, he did not use a great amount of gas—about twenty-five gallons ($31.00 worth). During the spring and summer period about seventy-five per cent of his monthly wage of $85 was spent on food, in addition to most of the Family Allowance cheques. George Diamond contributed approximately $100 worth of assistance in the form of clothing and capital equipment, in addition to paying the full air charter, to his recently married son. He had an unusually bad trapping year, being able to take only thirty of his quota of fifty-six beaver. For this year he was depreciating his capital equipment.
Approximate* Annual Expenditures of George Diamond Commensal Group, September 1, 1960 to August 30, 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter food, 5 months</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer food, 7 months</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter clothing</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer clothing</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter outfit (includes most of the equipment used in year, except shot gun shells for spring and fall goose hunts).</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air charter</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to son</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,339</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate* Income of Group for Same Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trapping income:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beaver</td>
<td>$ 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine fur</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage employment, canoe factory for five months:</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare payments, Family Allowance</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Division of Labour

Specialization and division of labour exists only at an elementary level. Whereas there was formerly considerable craft specialization, for seasonal, intermittent, and permanent work, such distinctions have largely vanished. Apart from the native clerk at the Hudson’s Bay Company and one man who is reputedly an experienced carpenter, most men can and do perform the same

*Figures for winter food, outfit, and clothing, for air charter and gas are probably accurate, as are the income figures for wage employment and welfare payments. Trapping income is an estimate made from the number and kinds of animals taken. It likely does not vary more than $50 from the correct figure (it is an underestimate, if anything). Other figures are based on a compilation of scattered reports, observation and recollections gathered in conversations with the family. The totals may be from $100 to $150 more than recorded here, small additional expenditures could easily account for this. Irregular employment during early April or late September could have covered this.
general sorts of tasks. The exception is that most of the younger men and boys who have just returned from extensive schooling or hospitalization outside require a number of years' practice in order to trap. It is a general belief among both Indians and Whites that the number of young men who cannot trap and who have little opportunity to learn trapping is increasing. Important individual differences in trapping/hunting ability do exist and there are some persons who are known for their ability to repair outboard motors, interpret, make snowshoes, etc. The prime criteria of differentiation, here as in most other societies, are age and sex. These attain an even greater importance where the only other basic distinction is between White administrators and non-White administered.

The homogeneity of roles that exists for men applies also for women; all females past early adolescence can prepare pelts and hides and all of the tasks incumbent on adult women. Again, there are individual differences in competence--unmarried younger women are usually inefficient in making clothes and fish nets, doing decorative work, such as beading, and in carrying out their part in the manufacture of locally used items, such as webbing snowshoes. (Some do occasionally surpass even their mothers.)

A man's economic role is primarily that of hunter and trapper. Women are basically concerned with tasks ancillary to the hunt and in maintaining a family and camp.
## Division of Labour by Sex--Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Men</strong></th>
<th><strong>Women</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trapping, beaver and fine fur animals and occasionally rabbits.</td>
<td>Snaring rabbits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting large game and geese.</td>
<td>Occasionally shooting grouse and ptarmigan around camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing, setting and clearing nets.</td>
<td>Sometimes clearing nets (especially widows).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and repairing locally-produced items (generally of wood),</td>
<td>Making that part of an item that requires knotting and braiding cordage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toboggans, sleds, snowshoes, spoons, paddles, tools, etc.</td>
<td>webbing snowshoes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchering and skinning.</td>
<td>Flensing, scraping, softening, smoking hides, preparing fur pelts, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occasionally skinning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing motors, guns, lanterns, etc. and building and repairing</td>
<td>Setting up tents. Making and mending mocassins, mitts, rabbit yarn jackets,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houses and canoes. Setting up tents.</td>
<td>blankets, and cloth clothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating outboard motors and handling dogs.</td>
<td>Feeding dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing decorative work, beading, embroidery, wool tassels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housework for Whites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing all wage labour except menial housework for Whites.</td>
<td>Chopping and splitting firewood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting and hauling in lengths of firewood.</td>
<td>Making and repairing fish nets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and repairing fish nets.</td>
<td>Cooking and washing for family, caring for infants and small children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even this sexual division of labour is not as rigid and exclusive as that of many non-industrial societies. Hunting and trapping under rigorous northern conditions, with attendant crises and individual differences, does not allow for irrevocably distinct roles. In most spheres, a man or woman knows how to carry out the other's task, though not as efficiently. Exceptions are that most women could not now trap beaver or hunt large game with even moderate success and men, on the other hand, would lose considerable value on pelts if they attempted to prepare them themselves. The price of the fur is greatly dependent upon the quality of the dressing. There is individual adjustment to these roles; some of the best trappers will aid their wives while some of the worst will not. Making and mending clothes is most exclusively the domain of women, yet the biggest brawler in the village often did his own sewing—all men would patch their clothes if out in the bush alone. The only comment which I heard that defined a sphere improper for men concerned cooking, yet men cook for themselves while on a trip alone and in the village when they want tea or a snack while their wives are busy elsewhere. Differences in role are usually explained in terms of practicality rather than appropriateness. "Men don't dry skins. We wouldn't have time to trap." One will frequently see a man and his wife repairing a fish net together during the lazy summer, but during the fall goose hunting season it is solely the women who work on the nets. It is usual for a man to help his wife in most of her chores if she is ill, aged or in the advanced stages of pregnancy.
Each family member is expected to contribute as much effort and material support to the group as he or she can. When Walter Blackned returned to the post in March 1961, he was dragging a sled loaded with a canoe partially filled with freight. His wife pulled a toboggan piled with baggage (in which sat the youngest child, a boy of four who could not yet walk on snowshoes). Two older boys, eight and ten years respectively, were pulling smaller toboggans loaded with baggage.

In the past, during the first two decades of this century, women frequently went with the men to trap beaver lodges. Some women set traps for fine fur themselves. There are some remembered cases, occurring at the turn of the century, where women participated in caribou drives. Despite the removal of women from involvement in hunting/trapping, it seems that whereas the male sector of activity has been lightened by improved technology, the female sector has become additionally burdened by more children. The local Whites, who find the present division of labour suitably similar to the former Euro-American ideal, are likely correct in holding that women work harder (i.e., more) than men.

Certain changes have occurred very recently. A number of younger and middle-aged married men now regularly prepare baby bottles, and feed and change babies. In some cases these men are among the more powerful community members. Chopping and
splitting firewood and hauling water is more frequently done by men now—at least during the summer. But when a young man who came to Rupert House from Moose Factory to visit with his parents-in-law carried the baby while walking with his wife, the village consensus was that he was being overly 'English'.

Age is a vital criterion in determining what an individual can and will do. Formerly, children and aged were even more in the status of dependants than they are today. Milk was not to be had for babies. Extra supplies had to be earmarked for children, who often became weakened by poor nutrition and had to be dragged on toboggans. Old people could not be left on the post since they had to remain with the productive group in order to receive food—many men recalled pulling their aged parents in from the trap line by toboggan.

At present, the efficiency of trapping groups has been heightened. Aged can be left on the post, where they subsist on ration or old age payments. The whole family can be flown into a main winter camp from which only the older children and active men depart for short trapping expeditions. While I do not wish to underestimate the amount of work that children do, this is very largely expended in transporting, learning how to trap, and helping to maintain the camp. (While walking ten to fifteen miles through soft snow, chopping and placing the poles used in sets and planting traps is undoubtedly a heavy task for an eleven or twelve-year-old boy, it nevertheless
detracts rather than adds to the efficiency of the units, for the father is slowed down in travelling and must expend time in teaching his son how and where the trap is set.) Girls are immediately useful to the mother once they start helping.

The specific age at which children and adolescents enter and leave the various stages of activity through which they pass depends upon relative position in the family, sex and age of other siblings, the individual character and makeup of parents and child. The prime factor that determines when an older man will retire from trapping is his acquiring a permanent ration or old age assistance. An older man occasionally retires from active trapping before receiving income security because his wife or he himself finds they are no longer strong enough for sustained winter work or because he has given his beaver quota to a son who could not get one for himself. Persons receiving old age assistance no longer trap but often spend a considerable amount of their time in services to their children, grandchildren, or adopted kin. Men may make and repair canoes and wooden articles while older women may care for their offspring's children.

Division of Activity by Age

**Local Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Infants' and 'Small Children'</td>
<td>Maximum permissiveness allowed for both; nothing required but learn not to require mother; older children still help them in dressing, getting meals, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Categories</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Children', 6 - 9, 10 or 11</td>
<td>Begin learning how to trap; go out and watch older boys and father but do not actually trap until 11. Occasionally haul water, split wood, and run errands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Boys' and 'Girls' 11 - 16 or 17</td>
<td>Boys become active but still inefficient trappers, end of period marked by when boy gets his first beaver quota. Does not produce locally used items or repair capital goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Boys' and 'Girls' (young men and women) 16 - 21, 22, 23</td>
<td>Men attain full active status during the middle of this period, enter seasonal wage employment if possible. Difference from adult hunters/trappers now due largely to individual differences. Many such younger men are more capable than their fathers, especially in the strenuous hunt after large game, and in this activity sometimes partially support their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Men' and 'Women' from time of marriage to time of retirement from trapping.</td>
<td>As described in the chart on division of labour by sex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Division of Activity by Age (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Categories</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Older Men and Women'</td>
<td>Reduced capability at hunting and trapping, greater reliance on sons or sons-in-law to maintain game income. May give beaver quota to son and only trap fine fur from camp, or locate wife on post and concentrate on fine fur, geese and fish on sites near post.</td>
<td>Carry out same activities as before but at a very much reduced load.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Old People'</td>
<td>Locate on post; fishing and hunting trips off post are engaged in by most of the men as an enjoyable part of life as long as possible. Aid children and grandchildren.</td>
<td>Cook, prepare hides, and make mocassins for husband. Aid children and grandchildren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Yearly Economic Cycle

The economic and natural year is held to begin in early or mid-September. At this time the tourist goose hunting camps in the area open and those employed as guides leave the post for the duration of the open season, until October 10. At the same time, late August and early September fish runs become heavy. The poorer families leave the post for sites where fishing can be carried on until the middle of September. At this time the fall goose season begins and literally every active man and adolescent participates. Those who have not established themselves in fishing-goose camps make excursions from the post.
Most men are out in such camps for at least a few three or four day spells, plus the daily hunting around the post. Almost a half of the families stay the duration of the goose season in coastal camps ranging up to twenty-five miles from the post.

Poorer families may return to the post for a day or two for supplies after the end of the goose season, or may go directly to their fall trapping camp, sending a member in to the post to pick up the supplies needed. The richer trappers who work the more distant territories, both those who have been at the tourist goose camps and those that have remained at Rupert House, are at the post to purchase their winter outfit by the middle of October. They leave for their trapping territories immediately after this has been done, between October 15 and October 20. Chartered planes are now frequently used to move the trapping group and its supplies to the inland camps, especially if they intend to remain till early spring and have left late in the season. The return trips from the trapping camps and movement while on location in the bush is always by sled or toboggan. The poorer groups cannot of course afford the cost of chartered aircraft. They use canoes and toboggans in movements to and from their locations.

A very marked distinction in social groups appears in October. Those that have limited finances operate from a separate fall trapping camp and concentrate on trapping for fine
fur and subsistence hunting. Those with greater credit go directly to their winter area. A few men, mostly those that trap without their families, remain on the post, hunting and trapping out of the post on one or two day excursions. They do odd jobs for White agencies or lay up firewood and otherwise prepare their dwellings so that the family that will remain behind when they leave after New Year will not be too greatly handicapped by the absence of the men. During later October and early November all groups which are out on the trapping sites establish their main camps, survey their area, and try to lay in a stock of meat. A one or two week period may be spent checking the area and looking for bear and moose. Trapping begins in mid-November and continues until Christmas. At this time, about December 20, the people on the fall trapping camps come into the post to exchange their furs for additional supplies. About half of the families in the fall trapping camps remain on the site while the men come into the post and return in a few days with supplies. Individuals from the more distant trapping territories may come in singly later during the winter (January or February) and return to their camps taking out supplies by toboggan.

After Christmas every active trapper is out on a winter trapping camp. Those persons who concentrate solely on beaver trapping (about six or eight men), do this during January and February. The composition of fall trapping camps changes
by additions and subtractions as groups readjust, coalesce and split. Generally, more groups are now operating and more men trapping. The more distant groups are not greatly affected by changes at this time. They more or less retain their original composition. But a little under a half of the coastal groups readjust.

Towards the end of February and in early March the distant groups come in from their winter trap lines. The coastal groups bring in their entire families for reprovisioning.

March is a slack month, a time when men may visit Moose Factory for odd jobs or may go out into a still different territory to hunt for moose or caribou. Towards the beginning of April another shift occurs; new groupings appear in preparation for the spring goose hunt. Some of those men who have been in the interior hunt with those that have spent the winter near the coast. These spring groups leave when travel over the ice is still relatively easy, spend the latter half of April and early May hunting geese, and return after break up allows a relatively easy passage by canoe. Work in the canoe factory begins in early April (April 10 this year). Those so employed cannot of course go out to the spring goose camps.

Maintenance work and irregular labour begins toward the end of May. Those who do not find some employment on the post will make fishing trips of from two to seven days duration. During
June, July, and August wage labour becomes of singular importance—these are the flour months. Bannock is usually the staple, the side dish, and the condiment. Summer pelts are not saleable, hunting is generally poor (hunters are too tightly clustered around the post and are handicapped by the closed season on large game), fishing is very marginal. Fish are scarce during the months of July and August. Most Rupert House people do not even bother to set nets in the river at this time. Worthwhile fishing sites are restricted to two coastal locations and the inland fishing lakes. An enforced (and enjoyed) leisure exists for the unemployed men during this season. Visits to brothers, sisters, and children at Moose Factory are most frequent during this period, both for men and women. Subsidized community projects are both most viable and most necessary at this time.

Despite the fluctuations in the activity and location of the men, most adolescent and active married women carry on a full schedule of cooking, cleaning, net repair, fur preparation, making and mending clothes and child care, every week, every month, every year.

Towards the end of August the wind turns colder again and the cycle begins anew; always with differently composed groups, going to somewhat different locations, and shifting somewhat differently during the coming year.
5. Economic Activity of Three Selected Commensal Groups

The fluid membership and seasonal changes in activity of productive groups and the considerable differences in goods and activities between groups, especially between those working the more distant beaver tracts and those subsisting on the coast, have already been mentioned. A description of the yearly round of three actual commensal groups, a poor, an average, and a richer group, will serve to flesh in the generalizations and statistical abstracts already given.

(a) A poor commensal group--David Salt

This group consists of David Salt (64-66), his wife Daisey (45-50), a grown son, Joseph (23), and another son, Robert (5). David is of Metis extraction. His parents were fully employed servants of either the Hudson's Bay Company, Revillon Brothers, or the Anglican missions of Rupert House and Eastmain. In this tradition, David did only very little trapping as a youth, only enough to supplement wage labour. Throughout his middle years he held a fairly important position as dog team courier for the East James Bay Hudson's Bay Company posts. This service was discontinued by the Company after World War II, leaving David, at 47, completely dependent upon hunting and trapping for the first time in his life (a time when one is neither retentive nor active enough to learn and practise trapping effectively). This dramatic personal event
has wider relevance in that it was exactly the sort of thing that happened on a mass scale during the late 1920's and early 1930's. Two men, unrelated to David, took him into their camps for two and four years respectively as a gesture of friendship and in order that he be able to survive.

David Salt is then a marginal and not too skillful trapper, heavily dependent upon subsistence hunting. But this situation is not unique; some lack skill, some are partially crippled, others have been enfeebled by illness (the scars of T.B. are not so easily removed as its memory is from the minds of children). David has experienced radical downward mobility and is near the end of his active hunting life. It is only his difficulty in establishing his qualification for old age assistance which halts his retirement to the post. It is significant to note that his two eldest sons from his first wife, Isiah and Billy Salt, are the two highest paid wage earners on the post yet seem to contribute nothing to their father's welfare. Another son by the first wife is employed as a clerk for the Hudson's Bay Company at Chibougamou and has not been in communication with his father for many years. Only the youngest son of the first wife, Ronnie Salt, a marginal trapper himself, gives aid and services to his father. There seems to be little community aid given. The feeling exists that while the sons' actions are somewhat reprehensible the Indian Affairs Branch and the Hudson's Bay Company will never let David and his family
starve. When asked why the sons do not help their father, most people give a reply that approximates, "Well, I guess they need their money, too." The self-sufficiency forced upon this family may be somewhat extenuated because David's wife is from Eastmain, where David lived many years, and because of his maintenance of former Metis mannerisms of civility. Nevertheless, the same 'independence' is generally expected of all of the Rupert House poor.

The family left the post in mid-July 1960 to eke out a living at a summer fishing site on the mouth of the Pontax River (thirty to thirty-five miles north of Rupert House). David is one of the few active men who does not have some sort of outboard motor, so the group spent three days paddling their eighteen foot canoe (which was in serious need of repair and unusable during summer 1961) up the coast. The cash supplies taken for the three adults and one child on this six week fishing expedition were minimal: 25 lbs. flour, 7 lbs. lard, 10 lbs. sugar, 1 l/2 lbs. tea. The reason for this removal from the post was to reduce the expenditures that would have had to been made for cash food, for everyone enjoys the companionship that post living provides.

A camp with canvas covered wigwam and drying racks is established in two or three days; after that the main activity is fishing. The family used three nets, two of two-inch mesh for whitefish and one of one-inch mesh for suckers and smaller
fish. The nets are moved almost every day by the two adult men. They are cleared in the late afternoon or early evening and the wife spends her evenings and the following mornings cleaning and drying the fish. Each net will have to be repaired and dried at least twice during the six week period (they are old nets and have been made of cotton rather than nylon twine). This entails about four days' work per net. Additionally, there may be two or three days in a week when it is too windy to go fishing. Summer is, except for women, the most leisurely season.

The fishing expedition not only provided nearly all the food for this family throughout the period but it also allowed the stockpiling of three and one-half milk boxes of dried-pressed whitefish (about 200 fish). David claims that for similar periods he has been able to stockpile up to twice as many fish. These fish, when interspersed with dried goose, cash foods, and fresh fish and game, acted as storeable supplies that were eaten during the whole of the fall and winter season.

The family returned to the post at the end of August. It has a 10' by 16' tent permanently set up on the post and their unportable goods, such as a spring bed and mattress, some chests and benches, are stored there for their return. This is the usual procedure for those still living in tents on the post during the summer. All have wooden doors which are locked
upon leaving; thievery, which would nevertheless be easy, is extremely rare. Locks are to keep dogs and prying children out. The family remained on the post for two weeks and then left in mid-September for the first stage of their fall and winter hunt. They proceeded by canoe to a location eighteen miles north of Rupert House, to coastal marshes just on Boatswain Bay.

David and his adult son hunted Canada and Blue geese there. They hunted together on calm days and separately when the bad weather broke the main flocks into smaller covies. They took nearly 100 geese between late September and October 20. About a half of these were eaten immediately, thirty were smoked whole and twenty split and dried. So preserved, the geese lasted, interspersed with other foods, until after New Year. Grouse, spruce grouse, pheasant and ptarmigan are also taken during this period but these are eaten immediately.

On October 20 the family moved their camp one and a half miles south to a more protected point on the Sherrick Mount gutway. They built their winter camp here, a substantial camp with a log wigwam and cut firewood. This operation busied them until the first week in November, when David and Joseph began trapping fine fur ("When I'm sure the mink is prime"). This sort of trapping did not take them more than, at most, two days journey from their main camp. Often they returned from the
trap line on the same day they left. The father and son generally went out on the lines together. There is considerable concern among all the trappers, but especially among the older and partially incapacitated, that an accident may occur; a broken leg or a gun wound, which for a man alone would prove fatal. It is also considered highly desirable to have someone in the camp who can go into the post in case of a sudden illness; the knowledge that the nurse at the Rupert House nursing station can, and in the past has, procured a plan to fly in the severely ill is a great comfort to these self-reliant hunters.

Around Christmas David came into the post to trade the fine fur pelts for an additional advance on supplies. This trip is a winter day's run over the hard frozen streams and marches by well-fed dog team. Fine fur prices are highest about this time, a lucky fact for those with small credit and needing further supplies in December. But this situation does demand concentration upon fine fur trapping early and upon the necessity of returning to the post before New Year. Further, the arrangement is that a trapper should pay off part of the earlier debt before Hudson's Bay Company advances more--those that have done badly in fall are even more restricted during winter because of a still more reduced stock of supplies. After a few days on the post David returned with supplies to his family at their main winter camp.
After New Year and throughout January and early February the father and adult son concentrated upon beaver trapping. This trapping consisted of three trips of about a week's duration each to where the beaver lodges are located. David used two No. 4 traps and took four beaver while his son used three No. 4s and caught three beaver. The wife remained in the main camp and cared for the young child. A few lynx, weasel, and fox were also taken. Many fox escaped—the traps being old and rusty, the fox could break the anchor chain and drag the trap away with him. David returned to the post for additional supplies in mid-February, trading three of his freshly taken beaver pelts for an additional advance. This was repeated in early April when he traded three more beaver pelts. The pelts of both father and son were used to buy supplies for the whole family.

Effective trapping ended when their beaver quota was filled in mid-February. After that time, especially throughout March, the emphasis was on subsistence snaring and hunting—rabbits, pheasant, grouse, ptarmigan. During late winter, in February, Joseph managed to kill four caribou, which he had tracked alone for three days. This gave the group a considerably higher standard of nutrition than they usually had. David's youngest married son, Ronnie Salt, who had been trapping on the mid Pontax River during winter, joined his father in mid-March, along with his wife, four young children and an adolescent
nephew [brother's son]. The early spring was given over to muskrat trapping, subsistence hunting, and the spring goose hunt in April. The two families returned to the post for the summer on May 2, after break up.

David and his family went out on a two to three week fishing expedition in late May and June and had just returned to the post when I arrived on June 13. When I left the area, on August 29, 1961, this group, enlarged by Joseph Salt's new bride, had already decamped for an autumn fishing site near Sherrick Mount.

This group is extreme in its dependence upon generalized subsistence hunting and fishing and the continuing importance of food preservation. It has likely less subsidy aid than any of the other poor families and stays out in the bush longer than any other. Fluidity of membership is not as noticeable here as in most groups that operate near the post. It is nevertheless an approximation of the present poor and the poor conditions of the immediate past.

(b) An average commensal group--Sydney Georgekish

Sydney Georgekish has a reputation for being one of the most industrious and reliable people in the local community. He is also particularly independent and at ease in his relation to Whites. In a sense he and David Salt are quite similar, both have developed an unambiguous role in relation to Whites, but
whereas David's is that of the acculturated man of the past, Sydney's is that of the future, of an economically poor but not servile ethnic minority. At present most Indians maintain neither of these coherent and unambiguous attitudes but rather hold components of each. Sydney is neither as dependent upon wage labour as some (he is not employed in the Hudson's Bay Company canoe factory nor has he had any permanent job either in Rupert House or outside), nor is he completely divorced from wage employment. He once spontaneously told me, "Maybe the mines will open up here. Somebody said that the government wants to build a dam. We Indians will have to find work. Trapping is finished."

The commensal group consists of Sydney (38), his wife Agnes (31), and six children aged 11, 9, 7, 6, 3, and 1 years respectively. During the summer the family stays on the post in a 12' by 16' tent. Sydney occasionally cuts cedar ribs to be sold to the canoe factory. This takes him away from the post once or twice in a summer for seven to ten days. Sometimes he gets a few days or a week of temporary employment on the post and often he does a week or two of guiding for some survey or tourist party.

Around September 10, 1961, Sydney, his wife, and the three youngest children went to Blackwoods tourist goose hunting camp about ten miles north of Rupert House. Sydney has been employed as chief guide there for somewhat over five years. This
is considered the most enjoyable work to be had and the pay, five to six dollars per day, plus food, plus a dollar or two per day as rental for the guide's canoe and motor, is undoubtedly the best payment for time available. All of the camps in the area rehire the same men each year, on the stipulation that they hold themselves ready and available for the entire tourist goose season. Most of the men working at these tourist camps are married and take their wives and children along. The wives are mainly occupied in cooking for their husbands and in caring for the children but they do make some extra money by plucking geese for the tourists. The whole situation is quite pleasant for the Indians in that they are earning, they are doing easy, enjoyable work, and they have sufficient opportunity to hunt for themselves.

Sydney's three oldest children, Elsie (11), Gilbert (9), and Harry (7), remained on the post with Sydney's mother and his wife's parents. They were enrolled in the Rupert House day school. While Sydney intends to send his children to the residential school at Moose Factory (because he believes the better education there will allow them to compete more effectively in the conditions that are to come) he wishes to gradually acclimatise them to school. Many of the children that are sent to the boarding school soon become estranged from their parents, despite being very lonely for them. A few families have accepted this separation and estrangement as a sad yet incontrovertible factor in their childrens' advancement; others have
counted the cost to be too high. Sydney hopes for some compromise.

Sydney, his wife, and the three youngest children returned from Blackwoods camp on October 15. The two school-aged boys who had been attending day school at Rupert House while the family had been on the goose camp were withdrawn. This pattern of schooling, with regular attendance in early fall and after February (with an occasional week or two out during a period of illness or spring goose hunting) is quite usual. The eldest daughter, Elsie (11) remained on the post, staying with Sydney's mother. A pre-school-aged daughter, Linda (3), stayed on the post with her mother's parents. This Georgekish family, now composed of Sydney, his wife, Gilbert (9), Harry (7), William (6) and Bertie (1), left the post for their fall and winter camp.

Sydney went directly to his beaver tract, a territory on one of the tributary streams on the mid-Nottaway River about seventy to eighty miles south of Rupert House. Sydney had arranged to fly in with John Wiestchee (mother's brother's son) whose commensal group for that winter season consisted of himself, his wife and two younger children. Despite being a maternal cross cousin, the relation which Sydney observed with John Wiestchee was one of 'friend'. John Wiestchee had been allotted the right, by Maude Watt and her son, to trap on the territory of the family that 'held' the tract adjoining Sydney's on the west
and southwest (a number of other trappers had already been placed on the 'family tract' in the last few years). The 'holders' of this tract, who have the right to specify where on the territory the beaver lodges allotted to someone new may be taken, delimited John Wiestchee's sub-territory on the side facing Sydney Georgekich's tract. Since John had not trapped in the general vicinity before and as Sydney was familiar with the whole area (note, not with just his own tract), it was decided that Sydney would "help him out". John Wiestchee was to stay in Sydney's main camp, trapping with Sydney for everything except beaver (which had to be taken alone on the adjoining section) until John had become familiar with the area. During the first one or two years it is quite important to have someone familiarize a new man to a territory. This is especially true when game and furs are scarce. This is the sort of dependence which in the past sustained the power of the trapping boss, the head of that family which had been in the area the longest, while other attached groups were either new or just passing through. (It would be of considerable interest to see the day-to-day mechanics of this dependence as it operates today.) It is of interest to note that at least two of Sydney's brothers trap areas close and adjoining his, yet neither of these fraternal groups make camp with each other or even cooperate in movement to the trapping grounds. This situation speaks even more strongly of the lack of fraternal solidarity when we know that one of these brothers is a bachelor and traps completely alone while the other is a
widower and traps only with his one adult son.

Two charter trips, at $72 per flight, by Norseman aircraft (Austin Airways) were required to ferry the two families out to the main camp. This is a trip which would necessitate about ten days' travel by canoe. It is possible, at this late post goose hunting season, that the family might be caught some distance from the intended destination by freeze-up if canoe were used (especially for groups that worked even more distant territories). The trip by aircraft took approximately one hour. My interpreter, Willy Wiestchee, once said, "We Indians don't care so much about money; as long as we can pay, we like to make it as easy for ourselves as possible. It's still hard work you know." The goods of both groups were mixed in both flights. The relative weight of each outfit was not determined and the proportional payment by each man was prearranged (seemingly with some eye toward the immediate ability to pay). John Wiestchee paid $92, although he seems to have had the smaller load, while Sydney Georgekish paid $52.

It took about four days to set up the main camp. Fish nets were immediately set in the river about one-quarter mile from the camp. Only two nets were taken because this group carries out fishing activity for only about two weeks intensively. Almost no fishing through the ice is done because it is hard work, especially for women alone. Sydney feels he can rely upon cash foods and other game resources, that the amount of fish to
be taken does not warrant the effort, and that while bannock and meat are always appreciated, fish is a very tiresome diet. "Fish is okay once in a while but if I could catch goose in my nets I would go fishing all the time," said Sydney. It is interesting to note that while Sydney had intended to set snares for small subsistence game throughout the winter, he forgot to load the coils of snare wire which were intended for John Wiestchee and himself. "These things happen--lots of stuff going on the plane--it's easy to forget," he said. I can't imagine anybody forgetting twenty years ago.

John Wiestchee took along one net of three-inch mesh. The same size net was used for jackfish, whitefish, perch and trout. Allegedly, the most suitable size of net is determined by the area in which one is fishing rather than the time of year.

Between October 27 and November 10 the two men went on a combined bear and moose hunt and a survey of the beaver lodges on their adjoining sections. It is to be noted that had Sydney taken a bear or moose on the adjoining section, that worked by John Wiestchee but nominally held by another family, no claim could have been made upon him by the nominal holders. The only claim that could have been made upon him even by John Wiestchee would have been that of hospitality and cooperation with a trapping partner.

A bear was killed in early November when the two men were on Sydney's territory. It is considered most desirable to
take a bear at this time. They are heavy with pre-hibernation fat which is much needed for winter cooking. It allows conservation of store-bought lard. Later, when beaver are being taken, beaver tallow can be rendered for the same purpose. The bear meat and fat were shared between Sydney's and John's families, with Sydney taking somewhat more. He also retained the bear skin, valued as a sleeping robe. No hard and fast rules obtain for such sharing; distribution varies with the personalities involved, their needs, and the immediate conditions of their location, supply, and opportunities. Much as in Canadian society. As neither a moose nor caribou was taken, there was a considerable shortage of hide for making moccasins. Sydney's family still had a half moose hide from the previous year but thereas Sydney would have usually used four pairs of moccasins during winter and fall he now had to make do with only two pairs. "My wife keeps fixing them till they fall apart."

Just before freeze-up the main camp was moved about half a mile to a warmer and drier location. A split pole teepee for winter habitation was made by each of the families in about two days.

Some mink traps were set at the end of October and during the first days of freeze-up. Freeze-up lasted about one week at this location and while one could cross the more shallow creeks after a day or two it was only on November 12 that the main river could be crossed safely by toboggan. Fine fur trapping continued
until the first week in December. Traps are set so that the men, who were going out on the line together, could return to the main camp on the evening of the same day they left, although occasionally they were kept out for two days. While most of this fine fur trapping took place on Sydney's territory, each man kept the furs taken in his own traps. Sydney was using ten mink traps, and later, ten beaver traps. Unfortunately, I did not think to ask how many traps John Wiestchee was using when the two were on the line together or what his take was as compared to Sydney.

Some traps are set for fine fur throughout the winter but once beaver trapping has started the main effort is concentrated upon that. Sydney started hunting his beaver earlier than those groups which operate near the coast. He began beaver trapping in the first week in December. This activity required more distant penetration of the territory. Each expedition to trap beaver lasted about a week— one in early December, one in mid-December, another in early January, and the last in late January and early February. During this beaver trapping each of the two men went to their respective sections alone. The women and children of both remained in the main camp. While most trappers prefer not to trap alone, it was necessary to do so here as the quotas of each man lay in different territories. The arrangement whereby at least two adult women remain with the children is preferred to either having a single family alone (because of the danger of illness or accident) or to taking the
family from one beaver lodge to another (which would be time and energy consuming). Sydney travelled to the post to pick up some extra supplies on December 20 and returned just after Christmas. He made this trip alone, dragging the supplies back by toboggan. The time it took to make this two way trip, almost 200 miles in a little over four days, shows the importance of weather and snow conditions in effective distance from one point to another.

Both of Sydney's brothers were operating in the general vicinity after Christmas. Even though they did not establish main camps but merely passed through, they did not stop in at the Georgekish-Wiestchee camp. There was allegedly no ill feeling and it was half expected that they might stop by for a week or two as they frequently did in the past. Another brother, Alex Georgekish, who has a wife and children, works a section which also connects with Sydney's territory, but Alex works his section out of a main camp established by James Blackned (his father-in-law). Other groups, who do not regularly work an adjoining section, have occasionally passed through the area in the past and stayed a while at Sydney's camp. This did not happen last year. George Shekabo (the nominal holder of the territory to which John Wiestchee was assigned) had his camp ten miles to the southwest of Sydney's. Sometime in late January he and his son killed nine caribou about mid way between the two camps. The son first came to Sydney's camp "to see if I had meat". The next day the father came and brought three of the nine caribou
for Sydney. It is usual for a hunter who has made a large kill to share a considerable proportion of this with one other group, despite the fact that the killing group would seem to be able to use all the meat taken. Very often, as in this case, the total carcass is given, hide and all, even though there is nearly always a shortage and a market within the band for hides.

On February 5 Sydney shot two caribou himself. While he shared the meat with John Wiestchee he kept the hides for himself. On February 15 both families returned to the post by toboggan. Everybody pulled his weight, except the youngest child, who rode in his mother's toboggan.

Sydney had taken twelve mink, five marten, and one otter during the fall and winter in addition to his full quota of twenty-six beaver. In addition, he had caught fifty rabbits in October and November and another fifty in December plus about twenty partridges throughout the season. (I do not know whether he was able to borrow snare wire, whether twine was used, or whether this small game was shot with a .22.

During early March Sydney and John went moose hunting about twenty miles up the Rupert River on the beaver territory of John's father. Sydney claims that it would have been quite proper for him or anyone else to purposefully set out to hunt on anyone else's territory and that he only decided to hunt on Philip Wiestchee's tract because of reports of moose seen around there and because John Wiestchee knew the area well. They saw
moose tracks but no moose. Sydney's family remained on the post in their permanent tent while John's family moved into the Indian Affairs Branch house which it shares with the wife's parents. On April 1 Sydney took his wife and those children that had accompanied them on the winter camp about twenty miles north of the post to a point on the mid Pontax River near the main camp of Ronnie Salt (who had moved to his father's camp on the coast about three weeks before). Sydney was one of the few people who attempted the spring goose hunt any distance at all from the coast. They stayed at this site throughout April and May, returning on May 30. John Wiestchee left his family on the post and went goose hunting for about three weeks with another and unrelated group of men on the coast north of Rupert House. Sydney combined fishing, hunting, and goose hunting. The family (two adults and four children) took along 125 lbs. of flour, with the requisite lard to make bannock, plus some small quantity of sugar and canned milk. While in this camp they managed to kill about forty geese but only twenty rabbits and very few small birds. Intensive fishing was only carried out for a week.

Sydney had been employed for about a week during March in bringing in logs that are milled at the community sawmill and used by the Indian Affairs Branch in the construction and repair of Indian houses. During June and July he was infrequently employed, for an aggregate of about two weeks, in obtaining cedar ribs for the canoe factory, in maintenance work for the Provincial Fish and Game building. During late July and early August
he worked about ten days guiding for a provincial geological survey (a well paid job). Apart from a few days spent on each of a few bear hunts—fishing trips, Sydney spent the summer unemployed. His family lived from cash foods, bought on credit, on the post. Despite the cost, very few would like to leave the post during the summer for subsistence hunting. For the men there is, in addition to the attraction of companionship, the possibility that some unexpected employment may turn up, or one of the more regular jobs will be vacated by its holder.

When I left the area Sydney was preparing to send his two oldest children to the residential school in Moose Factory and was just waiting around for the tourist goose season to open. A plan of his to sub-contract for all services at the Blackwoods hunting camp had fallen through.

(c) A richer commensal group--Bertie Diamond

The permanent tent of Bertie Diamond and his family was the closest dwelling to the shack in which I stayed during my field trip. The wife and the two older boys were occasional visitors while the nine-year-old daughter brought her playmates around daily to eat bannock and jam and bounce on my safari cot. The guests at the husband's beer drinking parties, while not visitors, always passed by my porch on their way home. Bertie's older brother, the chief (Malcolm Diamond) lived on the extreme other end of the village. Bertie explained his somewhat isolated
tent site (there were three tents and two houses on that end of the village separated from the main body of dwellings by a gap of 300 yards) by saying that there was too much noise, dogs barking, children yelling, and too many disturbances in the close-packed Indian houses. While it may be quite coincidental, I noticed that some of the most effective trappers were located at extreme ends of the settlements at Eastmain and Nemiscau. No overt or covert hostility was displayed but I often wondered if the continual beer drinking parties may have been an indication of some sort of political factionalism. The former chief and one of his councillors also were great brewers until their political demise. The Bertie Diamond household is not noticeably better off than many; they merely have a summer tent and not a house, and they do not have the stock of capital goods that older but consistently productive trappers like John Blackned have. But it does have a community-wide reputation for affluence. This affluence is mainly demonstrated by the fact that the family can subsist on purchased foods when it desires, and not only bannock and jam but corned beef and mandarin oranges. The men wear new and fairly expensive work clothes. Bertie has only rarely sought summer employment, and this was the only family to return to the post by aircraft.

The commensal group consists of Bertie Diamond (38), his wife Josephine (36), the eldest son Luke (18), Jack (+), and Sinclair (1). In addition, there is Eddy Diamond (16) who was
entering the tenth grade in a residential high school at Sault St. Marie and who is home for a little less than two months in the summer, and Mary Diamond (9) who is at the residential school at Moose Factory. Mrs. Diamond obviously misses these two children considerably, but she says of Eddy, "He wants to go on in school. We don't see him much but maybe he can get a job when he's finished. Hunting is a hard life." This from the wife of the most successful trapper in the community.

The family spent the first two weeks of September 1960 fishing from or near Rupert House. Neither Bertie nor Luke is employed at any of the goose camps and they are therefore free to leave the post as early as they wish, either to hunt at one of the fall goose sites or to move to their trapping territory. Despite this opportunity the family remained on the post until October 20, hunting geese at the mouth of the Rupert River from mid-September until their departure. While Bertie would likely accept employment at the goose camps (it is enjoyable and somewhat independent work) it is part of his affluence that he remains on the post as long as possible, makes it as easy for himself and his family as possible, and is not dependent upon jobs that require being under the immediate supervision of Whites or their foremen. During later September and in October the eldest son was occasionally employed on the construction gangs building the new dock, an Indian Affairs Branch development project.
The beaver territory worked by this commensal group lies about 110 miles southeast of Rupert House, on the headwaters of the Nottaway River. The family flew into the area on October 20. Two other trappers who were placed on Bertie's section recently and who were to stay with him in the same main camp chartered a flight in separately and arrived in the following few days. These two men were Jimmy Whiskeychan (29), (Bertie's brother's son-in-law), with his wife and three children and Clarence Wiestchee (35) (supposedly unrelated), who had left his wife and children on the post.

The Diamond family established their first fall camp near the river where their plane landed. This was done merely as a matter of convenience. The goods are on the shore and the site allows ready access to the water for the two remaining weeks of canoe travel. No one did any fishing. "There are no fish there," said the wife. (Later conversations indicated that it was considered uneconomic by this richer group to fish rather than that there were no fish to be caught.) The father and son spent the last week in October and the first week in November hunting for moose alone. The family had no stock of hides at all. During this period the father was able to kill two moose. While the group can use three hides per year for moccassins and babiche, Mrs. Diamond felt that they had managed without too great difficulty with the two that they took. Jimmy Whiskeychan and Clarence Wiestchee went out together setting some fine fur
traps and surveying parts of their beaver sub sections, while Bertie and Luke Diamond were hunting. The wives and children of the two families remained in camp together throughout the fall and winter trapping seasons. While some services and much of the game taken is shared among the persons of both the groups, (Clarence Wiestchee was incorporated into the Jimmy Whiskeychan family) cash supplies and aid in trapping is very limited.

Bertie and Luke spent little time or effort in trapping for fine fur, even in the period before Christmas. The father had a quota of fifty beaver and the son one of ten. This not only demanded a considerably longer period for beaver trapping but also allowed of leaving the other fur resources untapped if the group so desired. The two began trapping beaver toward the end of November. They continued on expeditions to their beaver lodges lasting six to ten days until the middle of February. At that time they had taken their full quota of sixty beaver. While they did set traps for fine fur animals, this was usually done during the periods Bertie and Luke were resting between trips to the beaver lodges. The duration and number of their trips away from the camp were greater than for most other trappers but also periods of inactive rest in the main camp were more than those of most others.

The two other trappers, Jimmy Whiskeychan and Clarence Wiestchee also concentrated upon beaver trapping, although they did put greater emphasis upon hunting for large game and fine
fur than the Diamonds. None of these groups concerned themselves to any extent with snaring rabbits or grouse.

None of these trappers went in to the post during the trapping season for additional supplies. Jimmy Whiskeychan, his family, and Clarence Wiestchee decamped for the post on February 10. They moved in by foot and dog-powered toboggan. (While having dogs lightens the load that has to be pulled, both on the trips in to the post and out to the beaver lodges, additional money must be used to buy dog food if continual and extensive fishing is not engaged in. A full grown dog will need three to four average sized fish or from one to one and a half pounds of oatmeal per day if he is working. A team of three to four dogs, which is about the efficient minimum, will eat as much oatmeal as was formerly used by the whole camp. The Diamonds feed their dogs on oatmeal exclusively since they do no fishing.)

In the middle of February Bertie Diamond set off by toboggan for the post. On reaching Rupert House, which was the nearest point for radio communication, he chartered an Austin Airways Norseman and flew out to bring his family in by plane.

During March Bertie worked for about two weeks with the former chief, Frank Maar, the most skilled artisan on the post and formerly the most acculturated Indian, on a contract to tear down some old Hudson's Bay Company buildings and set up a
wind charger. He did not attempt to get irregular employment at any time over the rest of the summer, possibly because he then had fur cheques or because all other employment that summer was under the direction of Whites or their formen. Luke Diamond was irregularly employed for an aggregate of about three weeks from March to September 1961—helping unload the Hudson's Bay Company supply ships, bringing in logs for the Indian Affairs Branch housing project, building the Hudson's Bay Company native clerk's new house. Both Bertie and Luke participated in the spring goose hunt from the post, during April and early May. The family did not set up a temporary camp along the coast. Two fishing-berrying trips of about one week's duration each took place in July. The family had hoped to go on more of these trips with their two children that returned from residential school in early July but severe outbreaks of measles and whooping cough struck most children. Apart from the sporadic activities mentioned, the two active men in the group were inactive throughout the spring and summer. They had no plans other than the fall-winter hunt when I left the area.
CHAPTER IV

DEMOGRAPHY AND RESIDENCE PATTERNS

1. The Population

During my stay, the Indian population of Rupert House numbered 494 persons (including 24 who were transitional to the Moose Factory band). Of these, 258 were males and 236 females. This, then, is a group which is only somewhat larger than a viable population isolate, i.e., a group whose numbers are large enough to maintain the random balance of males to females necessary if mates are to be found for everybody (or almost everybody) within the group. Dunning (Social and Economic Change Among the Northern Ojibwa, p. 167) would place the minimum number for such a viable isolate at about 380 people. While the Rupert House group is about 100 persons greater than this minimal figure the importance of this margin is greatly reduced by the fact that a disproportionate bulk of the population is still below the marriageable age. Over half of the population, 266 of the 494 total, is under sixteen years of age.

The disproportionately young demographic structure of the population would indicate a recent and rapid population increase. Furthermore, nursing station records report 203 births and only 63 deaths in the period 1947 to 1957. This gives an increase of 140 persons on a base of from 350 to 400 (a forty percent increase in one decade). Both Indians and Whites believe
there has been a great rise in the number of children in the community since the end of World War II. While findings in social organizational spheres tend to support this view, statistics gathered from the Rupert House parish records of birth and death seem to call for additional formulations. In short, these records show that an at least equal (if not greater) rate of increase has obtained since 1906 at Rupert House. (Fairly full records go back to 1876 but these were examined only for marriage statistics.) A personal diary of the missionary in charge of the Anglican mission in 1911 places the Rupert House Indian and Metis population at 392. Parish records show 647 births and 297 deaths between the years 1906 and 1946. (See charts 1 and 2.) This would give an increase of 350 persons on an approximate population base of 370 for a forty-year period. One explanation of why this earlier and larger increase is not reflected by a larger population at Rupert House than exists at present is that, conceivably all cases of birth were recorded but that all cases of infant mortality were not. This answer does not seem likely. My impression on reviewing the records was that infant mortality was as accurately reported as any other data. Furthermore, the Indians at that time seemed to have been deeply impressed by the tenets of the Anglican church and would not have prejudiced the salvation of their or their infants' souls by overlooking baptisms or last sacraments. There are frequently pathetic little notes on the margin of death records, for example, "Died three weeks after birth, baptised by the mother
before death." Another, and more reasonable, explanation is that whole families have been moving out of Rupert House post, usually to Moose Factory and south, throughout the whole period. Given a population base of about 370 in 1906, an approximate 350 person increase between 1906 and 1946, and a population of approximately 310 in 1946 (present population of 494 minus 140 increase between 1947 and 1957 minus 14 per year increase 1957 to 1960 inclusive), there would seem to have been a net emigration of 410 persons, or about ten per year.

If the continual population increase as indicated by the parish records is correct, it is to be explained why none of the local people are aware of this trend and why the demographic structure at present is as disproportionately youthful as it is. Furthermore, reports from other Indian groups across Canada indicate that rapid population rise is basically a post-World War II phenomenon. There is considerable impressionistic data that most Metis families left the area during the 1920's and 1930's. Furthermore, the increase in the number of the Moose Factory band would more than account for the emigrants from Rupert House. It seems, impressionistically again, that emigration out of the entire area has been operative, families from Moose Factory moving farther south and people from the James Bay posts taking their place.

There is a slight preponderance of males in each age bracket up to the 55 year mark, after that a slight preponderance
of females. (See Chart 3) There are 18 allegedly marriageable men over 18 years of age (from 18 to 41 years) but only 6 marriageable women (ranging from 18 to 25 years of age). Nine people, 6 men and 3 women are badly crippled and will not be able to find mates. About 4 or 5 men in their active years are somewhat disabled but have been able to find and support wives. The community contains 15 widows (from 58 to 85 years of age) and 5 widowers (from 48 to 85 years of age). The earlier condition where large numbers of people were left widowed in their active years and where remarriage of those widowed usually took place, has given way to a pattern nearer the Euro Canadian one. Death now usually dissolves marriages after the active and reproductive life span has finished. The widowed person does not remarry.
CHART 1

BIRTHS, AS RECORDED IN RUPERT HOUSE'S PARISH BAPTISM RECORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Illegitimate</th>
<th>Per Cent Illegitimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906-1916</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1926</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1936</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1946*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1956</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Year 1941-1944
Illegible—estimates based 10/6 of remaining years in range (also illegitimacies for that time).

In 1960 there were 31 born, 5 of whom were illegitimate or 16.1%.
# Chart 2

## Numbers and Ages of Deceased, as Recorded in Rupert House's Parish Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Period</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under age 5</td>
<td>Over age 5</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>Modal age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1916</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1926</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1936</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1946</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1956</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Nursing Station Records. "10 Year Period, 1947-1956 inclusive:

- Births = 203
- Deaths = 63

Natural Increase = 140 in 10 years
## CHART 3

**AGE/SEX DISTRIBUTION OF PRESENT RUPERT HOUSE POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Total:** 494
2. Social Groupings: Commensal, Residence, and Trapping Groups

There are two features which characterise Rupert House social groups today; the smallness of consumption groups, which ideally and most usually are limited to a nuclear or stem family, and the relative fluidity in membership of trapping groups. The effects and demands of the ecology are not uniformly reflected in all facets of community life or social organization. The social organization of production groups (i.e., trapping groups) shows the necessary adjustments to the economy and environment much more clearly than does the organization of consumption groups.

(a) Commensal Groups

The commensal group, defined as that unit which consistently shares its income to provide the subsistence needs: food, shelter, clothing, for its members has been reduced to either the nuclear family or to a group which by adoption or incorporation of grandchildren approximates the size of nuclear families. I have estimated there to be eighty-one such commensal groups in the 494 member band, giving an average of 6.1 persons per commensal group. The existence of each commensal group was separately established. It would be of course meaningless to merely divide the band population by the number of nuclear, stem or extended families. Nevertheless, it turned out that most commensal groups either were or approximated such families. The
methods of determining what the boundaries and what the membership of a commensal group were, were by no means rigid. For while these groups are small there is a considerable variation in their internal consumption patterns. In one family an illegitimate child of the mother may be supported part of the year by the mother and part of the year by her parents. One of the younger children may be favoured by one of its grandparents and eat half of its meals with them (and also receive clothing, doing such services as cleaning and washing for these grandparents). An adolescent boy may spend much of his time and eat many of his meals with his sweetheart, or may be closely associated with his father's parents. In estimating where a commensal group existed, I first asked of a woman, or a closely associated group of women, and those people she consistently cooked, washed, and mended clothes for. Observation was of course impossible for any substantial number of such groups so direct questions, to the people concerned or to my interpreter, had to be relied upon. An unmarried trapper living with his parents was always considered of that commensal group. In certain cases it was necessary to decide whether certain members (in one case, a widowed man and his two adolescent sons who were attached to the man's sister's family) were basically pooling their resources in so far as the subsistence consumption was concerned or whether they were merely paying for and resident with the group from which it obtained certain housekeeping services. My criteria for deciding the boundaries of a commensal
group have somewhat overemphasized, if anything, the size and cohesion of such groups and slightly underestimated the number of persons effectively unintegrated into commensal groups.

Commensal groups ranged in size from one person (a widowed Metis, employed by the Hudson's Bay Company whose sons have left the community) to eleven persons (a nuclear family of thirteen which has two children additionally living with their paternal grandfather). The mode is eight persons per commensal group.

Despite the fluidity and overlap in membership of some persons in commensal groups (certainly the rigidity of membership usual for Euro-Canadian families does not exist) these are the most stable units of the society. When the supporting members of the commensal group are resident with some other unit, while the husband is out goose hunting, fishing or trapping and the family has, for some reason, remained on the post, the persons of this group may become merged, to varying degrees, with some other commensal group. Even in such a case the original commensal groups remain conceptually distinct, to be reconstituted when the supporting members return.

The major reasons for individuals being detached from their commensal group for part of the year are economic or education. Thirty-seven children are sent to residential school. These are mostly from groups that trap inland and are away from
the post for four to five months. As far as I could gather, if a family does not have active grandparents who stay on the post, it is likely that it will be unable to find anyone to care for its children. This fact says a good deal for the shallowness of kin ties. Children who are sent to residential school are away not only for the four to five month duration of their parents' absence but for the whole ten-month school year. While parents would like to have their children with them after they leave the trap line, they console themselves by the fact that education at the residential school is superior to that obtained at the Rupert House day school and that this may give their children a better chance on the outside.

Another way in which the members of a commensal group are separated is when a woman falls ill or becomes pregnant. (Since the establishment of the nursing station almost no children have been born on the trap line. If a woman is to have a child during the duration of the trapping period, she remains on the post, being delivered by the nurse.) Older women are often less able to take the rigors of trapping than their husbands. A man and his active sons will in such cases continue trapping a tract by themselves. A premium then develops for trapping nearer to the post. This allows of frequent visits to the wife. Heavy chores of which the older woman is incapable are done at that time by the men. Usually, such groups, husband, active sons, wife and children, will be together for part of the fall trapping period and/or for the spring goose hunt.
I have defined the kin composition of commensal groups as follows:

(a) Nuclear: a couple and their biological children (although not necessarily all of them) and the children of any unmarried children still part of that commensal group.

(b) Composite: (i) adoptive--a couple with or without children plus at least one adopted child.

   (ii) stem--a nuclear family with one surviving parent of either the husband or wife.

(c) Extended: a nuclear commensal group extended by the continuing membership of a son or daughter's nuclear family.

   --virilocal extended
   --uxorilocal extended

(d) Multiple: a group composed of any more complex kin arrangements or of the additions of friends or trapping partners.

Of the eighty-one commensal groups, fifty-one are nuclear, eighteen are composite (eleven adoptive, six stem and one adoptive and stem); two are extended (one virilocal extended and one uxorilocal extended) and nine are multiple. The nuclear family is now the most general basis of consumption units. This is both the fact and the ideal. Despite the fluidity and overlap, the ongoing readjustments and variable arrangements, nuclear families are the core of the overwhelming majority of commensal groups and set the pattern for the others. Composite commensal groups are in operation and composition very much like nuclear families. The most usual type was where grandparents adopted an illegitimate grandchild or where a couple with no children
(or with only adult children) had adopted a distantly or unrelated child. Stem families also did not differ markedly from nuclear families in operation, except in one case, where the husband's widowed mother dominated the household. The extended commensal groups are anomalies, due to personal compatibility and economic necessity. The multiple commensal groups did differ somewhat in operation from that of nuclear families. These multiple groups often seemed to be aggregates of the isolated, unaffiliated, and unimportant members of the community. These units more closely approached residence groups in operation than other forms of commensal groups; economic and cooperative convenience in services rendered by members to each other rather than extensive sharing of subsistence goods seemed to be the key. One such group was composed of three totally unrelated people who pooled some resources to share a house; another was composed of a widow, one of her illegitimate children, one of her daughter's illegitimate children, a young granddaughter, adopted from her son, and the widow's bachelor brother.

(b) Residence Groups

Residence groups are defined as composed of those persons who live under the same roof, either in a house or tent, during the summer. The significance of this unit is that such residential groups are more or less together for approximately a half of the year, in spring and summer. That is, for the period that is spent on the post. These units are recognized by
the local people, although they are definitely considered less primary than the commensal groups. (A person may be described as of such and such a family or as living in such and such a dwelling.) Furthermore, these are the groupings which arise when people are most free to rearrange themselves as they wish and not as it is economically necessary. These groupings show more clearly than others the extra commensal arrangements which families would like to maintain.

Apart from the spring goose hunt and occasional spring and summer fishing and hunting expeditions, all summer residence is on the post. People like the company of others and the benefits of settlement life, even if they enjoy going on short expeditions for country food and certain local resources (cedar and birch) during the summer. While there is a heavy dependence upon cash foods, especially lard and flour, at this season and while it would allow a better diet and income if people shifted to one of the richer coastal fishing sites, no one does so. This would result in scattering people in small pockets at distances from the post and from each other. "I work all winter. Summer is my holiday time," said Anderson Jolly. Nevertheless, Anderson would be most willing to work on the post during the summer, and in fact tried to obtain employment. The basic element of a holiday seems to be companionship with more people.
There are seventeen standard four-room Indian Affairs Branch houses tightly packed in one location. The appearance is much like the Japanese relocation centres that flourished during World War II. Fifteen smaller cabins were either built by Indians themselves or bought from the Hudson's Bay Company at nominal prices when the company decreased its holdings. These are scattered throughout the village. The Anglican mission and the nursing station have an Indian residence each attached. From one end of the village to the other, a distance of about a half mile, are scattered thirty tents.

There are, then, sixty-four summer residence units for eighty-one commensal groups, or an average of 1.3 commensal groups per residence unit. The general picture is that of one commensal unit per tent or private house and two commensal units per Indian Affairs Branch house. Fifty-one residence units have only one commensal unit, twelve residence units contain two commensal groups, and two residence units contain three commensal units. Nearly all the tent dwelling groups are composed of only one commensal unit. This is because of the obvious limitations of tent living and also because of the policy of Indian Affairs of detailing houses to the larger (and therefore often extended) residence groups. (The acquisition of an Indian Affairs Branch house also puts a family under pressure to extend residence to affines.) There is, furthermore, a disproportionate number of younger couples living in tents. There are two double tents which contain two and three
commensal groups respectively and one standard sized tent with two commensal groups. The other eleven residence units with more than one commensal group are all houses.

Parenthetically, there are no Indian dwellings which have fences; children, dogs, and groups of roaming adolescents cut back and forth in front of, behind, and around the houses. Only the graveyards, and all the White residences, are encircled by fences.

The residence units with more than one commensal group are usually extensions through marriage. Five are virilocal extensions; six are uxorilocal. One residence group is composed of both an uxorilocal and a virilocal extension. Finally, the two remaining extended residence groups are composed of commensal groups, the leaders of which are friends.

While the basis of commensal groups is the pooling of resources for subsistence needs, the basis of residential groups is the pooling of services and cooperation in summer and spring activities. While the separate commensal groups of one residential unit will own their own fish nets, one person will check the fish nets of both. This saves time, effort, and expense. While there will be some sharing of a catch, especially if the haul is very disproportionate, it is not unusual to see members of one commensal group in an
extended residence unit eating the trout taken from their nets (sometimes by a member of the other commensal group) while members of the other commensal group eat the much less tasty pickerel taken in their nets. Services such as hauling firewood, bringing in scarce woods to those of the residential group that remain on the post, baby sitting for one or the other of the commensal groups in the residence unit that wishes to go on a short fishing expedition, cement the commensal groups of the extended summer residential units.

Still, just as the nuclear family is the most usual form of the commensal group, the single commensal group is the most usual form of the residential group. Apart from extension through post-marital residence of children, there is absolutely no grouping of residences by kinship. Closely related persons live scattered, seemingly in random fashion, throughout the village. There are no cases where brothers set up tents beside each other. The Diamond brothers have typical fraternal arrangements. These four adult trappers, who work contiguous trapping grounds near the headwaters of the Nottaway River, live scattered throughout the whole village, one family at either end and the two remaining families in between, one on the far southern end of the village and one directly in the centre. Co-residential groups composed of a core of brothers that spend winter and summer clustered together, on the trapping camps and on the post, do just not exist at Rupert House.
3. Trapping Groups

Last year there were thirty-three separate trapping groups containing fifty-six or fifty-eight commensal units. (In two cases it was impossible to decide if separate commensal units existed). There were an average of 1.6 commensal units per trapping group. It must be understood that separate commensal units out on the trap line are somewhat different than those I have earlier defined. In point of fact it is the case that often a commensal group is represented on the trap line by just one or two active men, in the trapping camp of another family. While there is a much greater sharing of goods and services between commensal groups and such representatives of other commensal groups, most of whose members have remained behind, than is usually the case between full commensal groups, nevertheless, the major cash outlays and incomes are sustained during this time by the representatives alone. Therefore I have considered them separate as defined before.

The average length of stay 'out in the bush', trapping and hunting, was 4.4 months per commensal unit and 4.5 months per active trapper. (The differences stem from the fact that some active trappers returned their families to the post and went back on the trap line to fill their quota.) The range of time spent out trapping was from one month (a single trapper whose wife could not accompany him and who became ill at Christmas) to nine and a half months (the largest trapping group
of twenty people who are isolated on Charlton Island and who are dependent upon the Hudson's Bay Company supply steamer for transportation). At least 200 people were in the winter trapping camps. There were twenty to thirty others who additionally spent a short period on a late fall or early spring trapping camp but these have not been included in the statistics because their stays were more of the nature of short visits to active members of the commensal unit who were already in the bush before and stayed there after these others left. There were eighty-two active trappers. The average number of people in a trapping group was 5.9, ranging from one per group to twenty per group. The mode approximated six persons to a trapping group. There were 2.5 active trappers per trapping group, ranging from one to six per group. This gives a ratio of one active trapper to 1.2 dependants out on the trap line. This ratio is only a third of that found by Hallowell for other Algonkian groups about twenty years ago (1 to 3.3 and 3.5). This suggests that trapping is becoming a more commercialised productive activity for the Rupert House people with a greater percentage of the dependants remaining back at the post. Alternately, I would suggest that the much smaller ratio at present day Rupert House also indicates the recent population explosion, that a large number of the dependants that are not out on the trap line but are supported at the post are children that go to the day school. There were sixty-five pre-school-aged children along but only fifteen school-aged children on the
trapping camps. All of the women on the trap line camps were wives of active trappers. There were no adolescent girls who helped the adult women. Only three persons out of the 200 were aged, non-active dependants. In the past, trappers were responsible for moving and caring for nearly all the children, adolescents, and ambulent aged in the band. This must have slowed movement and added considerable inefficiencies as far as trapping alone is concerned.

While the average number of commensal units per trapping unit was 1.6, the numbers ranged from one to four. (Eighteen trapping groups had only one commensal unit, nine had two commensal units, four had three commensal units, and one trapping group had four commensal units—two trapping groups had either two or three commensal units.) Further, it must be remembered that the composition of trapping groups is fluid from fall to spring of one trapping season. Only seventeen of the thirty-three trapping groups maintained their original composition throughout the season. The groups that remained unchanged were mainly the more distant ones, including all of the groups which did not come to the post in the middle of the season for additional supplies.

The trend mentioned by Dunning, for the Pekangekum Ojibwa, of increasing co-residence and cooperation between brothers, both on and off the trap line, is not present at Rupert House. Only one of the thirty-three trapping groups has
its active trappers composed of brothers and their families alone. A much more common organisation is that of a father and his active but unmarried sons or with possibly a married son and his family (thirteen of the thirty-three groups). (See Chart 4.) Nevertheless, the preponderance of groups are composed of active trappers who are quite variously related or not related at all. My interviews with the older informants indicate that such a situation existed also in the recent past.

There are, therefore, some doubts as to the generality of Steward's hypothesis that in hunting and gathering bands there is an adaptive premium in having male progeny remain in the locality of their father or attached to his group after marriage. It is the case that numbers of ecological reasons favour an economic arrangement where there are at least two active trappers in each group but this in no way demands that these persons be closely related if related at all. While it would seem that the simplest and most 'natural' way of extending a group would be through the cohesion of parents and offspring or through the solidarity of brothers, numerous real conditions inveigh against it. A son may want to get married when there is not enough resources on the land that his father is trapping to support both the father's family as it then exists and that of the young man as well. The father of the bride may be more handicapped than ego's father and a condition of marriage may be a period of uxorilocal residence, which
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becomes more or less permanent, or a young hunter may have the possibility of getting a larger independent credit allowing him to trap in the more distant regions while his father is restricted, because of credit and dependence upon subsistence hunting, to coastal regions. These and other specific economic problems seem to disallow the establishment of the classical patrilineal extensions of solidarity which are so important for other hunting groups. This tendency to disregard even close kin relations as the axis of important social groups, the productive groups, was even more pronounced and for more clearly ecological reasons when subsidy payments and wages did not allow of alternate adjustments to the environment.

4. Marriage and Kinship

Next to data on internal political factionalism and cases of disputes, information on marriage and kinship was most difficult to obtain. Illegitimacy was scattered throughout the group so thoroughly that nearly every family was either consanguineally or affinally involved with one or a number of cases of illegitimate birth. Illegitimacy was not any more palatable to the people because of its high incidence, as some Whites claimed. Even my closest informants were not disposed to describe most cases of illegitimacy. Most illegitimate children were described as offspring of later unions. (Some cases were consistently mentioned. It is not clear what, if any, similarity existed in the positions of these people in the community.)
While parish records show a steady rise of illegitimacy from 1906 to present, such figures cannot be taken as indicative of increasing social breakdown. The statistics include those illegitimate births where the couple is later married and those where the mother remains unmarried or marries a male other than the genitor of the child. Certain sanctions for marriage have decreased; until the early 1920's the Hudson's Bay Company factor and his wife, in conjunction with the Anglican mission, used considerable pressure to see that pregnant, unmarried girls married their child's genitor before giving birth. I was told of situations, in one case by the person involved, where the Hudson's Bay Company factor arranged marriages for persons who he felt should 'settle down' (in the case related to me, considerable pressure was put on the unwilling girl's parents). The missionary continued in this role, but with less effect and fewer levers of influence, until the late 1940's. (The intermittent diaries of transient missionaries from 1901 to 1948 were most illuminating.)

Not only do Indians feel that illegitimacy is considered shameful by Whites, but they also seem to feel this way themselves. My impression is that the only acceptance they allowed illegitimacy is that typical of depressed White groups, an ethic of, "That's life. It's the rich (read 'Whites') that get the pleasure; it's the poor (read 'Indians') that get the blame."
There is a very marked distaste for having children by another genitor reside with a couple and their children. This applies to children of remarried widows as well. I would estimate that a good two-thirds of children with such a background are either shunted off to grandparents, to more distantly related persons, or to unrelated persons. In such adopting families, these children often attain a servant-like status, the word 'servant' actually frequently being used. So much for the myth of the band being one big family.

Everyone claimed that abortion, infanticide or even contraceptive techniques just did not exist at Rupert House. Adultery was supposedly extremely rare and negligible. There was not any gossip of recent cases and those hinted at occurred more than thirty years ago. Considering the high incidence of adultery in both more acculturated and more isolated neighbouring bands, the lack of cases of adultery reported to me at Rupert House may be mainly indicative of Indian solidarity and feelings of propriety.

I doubt that any society has no techniques of abortion and contraception. As for infanticide, I can only say that during my stay the recently born daughter of an unmarried sixteen-year-old girl died. Two of my women informants said, rather pointedly, "It wasn't sick at all before. It just died." In another case, a year-old illegitimate child of a twenty-one year old woman who was about to marry someone not
the genitor of the child, suffocated during the night.

In going through the parish records on marriage, it was my impression that the age of first marriage had declined significantly in the last half century. (It was impossible to quantifiably verify this because of the habit of missionaries frequently entering such phrases as 'of full age' or 'over 30' under the age rubric.) It is the belief of older people that persons are marrying much younger now than formerly. Harriet Whiskeychan (82) said, "When I was a girl, people waited till they were grown up before they got married. Many men were over 30 before they got married. Now they marry when they're just children." The average age of first marriage for the decade 1946-1956 was 22.5 for men and 18.8 for women.

A variable period of increasingly stable cohabitation often precedes actual marriage. Divorces and separations, frequently mentioned by Dunning for recent Pekangekum marriage, do not occur at Rupert House, although marriages contracted by Rupert House people while resident at Moose Factory or more distant centres do occasionally fail. In such cases, some of the person's children, or he or she himself, return to Rupert House. It appears extremely unlikely that a man or woman who was once married will be able to establish a relationship of relatively stable cohabitation with someone else thereafter. This now applies to persons separated and those widowed. (That is, unless the widowed person be quite young and unencumbered by
children.) A number of widows and widowers now in their later middle age have not remarried in the ten to fifteen year period since the death of their spouse.

The vast majority of marriages at Rupert House are still finally decided by parents. It is usual for a young man to court a girl until they are mutually decided on marriage. Such courting invariably involves sexual relations. Such relations may often be permitted to continue by the parents even though they do not favour marriage. Certain families keep a strict control of their daughters, especially those of school age. If they very strongly disapprove of their daughter's lover, they will keep the girl under constant watch.

The next stage is for the young man to ask his parents to arrange the marriage. If they approve they will proceed to the girl's family. It is most unusual for the girl's parents to initiate arrangements. In a number of cases the grandmother of either the boy or girl objected so strongly that the marriage was not carried through. There is only one case which I know of where a man overrode his parents' objections and carried through the marriage on his own. It is of interest to note that nearly all younger married and unmarried younger men claim they did or will contract their own marriage themselves alone, even in cases where it is blatantly obvious that the parents arranged the marriage. At the inland post of Nemiscau
younger men still hold that, "I don't know who I'll marry. I think people will know what to do with their daughters."

Likely the most striking change in Rupert House social arrangements in the last thirty to forty years has been the establishment of virtual band endogamy. This parallels the virtual collapse of trade relations with neighbouring posts and the decline of the privileged economic position of Rupert House. Previously, over sixteen per cent of marriages contracted by Rupert House persons involved mates from inland and north coastal posts. (See Chart 5.) This figure, tabulated from parish records, is undoubtedly too low a percentage. There were to my knowledge, numerous cases where some unmarried siblings followed their brothers and sisters when they married into another post. These younger siblings usually married into that band after a few years of residence. Since they were by that time recorded as being a member of their adopted post, the actual interband migration through marriage is not accurately reflected. It seems that, formerly, there was a disproportionately greater number of women marrying from north coastal posts into Rupert House and Rupert House women inland. The last inter-band marriages of which I know involved Rupert House and Nemiscau families in the late 1940's. While there is an unabated movement of men and women in marriage out of Rupert House, nearly all of it is to Moose Factory; there is no movement into the post by marriage. Generally, once one now marries out one stays out.
## Chart 5

### Movement in Flow of Women by Marriage: As Indicated by Parish Records at Rupert House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Rupert House</th>
<th>Eastmain</th>
<th>Nemiscau</th>
<th>Maswanipi</th>
<th>Neoskawsa</th>
<th>Mistassini</th>
<th>Moose Factory</th>
<th>Michikan</th>
<th>Total Women Marrying in</th>
<th>Per cent of Women Marrying in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876-1886</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1896</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1906</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1916</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1926</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1936</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1946</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1956</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Inland:** 8

**Total from Coast:** 14

### Movement in Flow of Men by Marriage: As Indicated by Parish Records at Rupert House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Rupert House</th>
<th>Eastmain</th>
<th>Nemiscau</th>
<th>Maswanipi</th>
<th>Neoskawsa</th>
<th>Mistassini</th>
<th>Moose Factory</th>
<th>Michikan</th>
<th>Total Women Marrying Out</th>
<th>Per cent of Women Marrying Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876-1886</td>
<td>As</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1896</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 Y2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1906</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1916</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1936</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1946</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1956</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Per cent of marriages with one partner from outside:</td>
<td>47/288 = 16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Inland:** 24

**Total from Coast:** 3
Adults now hold that, "It's better to marry somebody from your own post. You can be close to your people (parents, siblings, friends)."

There is allegedly no kin determined preferential marriage. Men are strongly against marrying a woman older than themselves (even if she is relatively attractive, strong and healthy). Girls dislike marriages with men more than four or five years older than themselves. Boys and girls spoke constantly about who was who's sweetheart and who was in love with whom, but nobody, younger or older people included, would generalize about preferable sorts of mates. As far as I can gather, for the potential spouses themselves, an individual's status within his or her age and sex group is a crucial factor in desirability. For the parents of these potential spouses, having the characteristics of a good provider or workmate are more important.

Supposedly, all people who can trace any consanguineal kin relation between themselves are not supposed to marry. This myth is strongly adhered to; people will tell you, "No, it doesn't happen." It seems that kin connections can be conveniently forgotten. During my stay, a marriage occurred between second cousins, a man and his father's father's brother's son's daughter. Even though the names of both parties were Hester, everyone denied a relation. Marriages between parallel or cross cousins are equally proscribed and in fact do not seem to occur.

The most striking aspect of kinship relations among the Rupert House band is their absence.
The recognition of kinship ties does not normally extend beyond maternal and paternal grandparents, uncles and aunts, first cousins, and members of the immediate biological family. No distinctions are anywhere made between maternal and paternal consanguineal relatives. Cross and parallel cousins are referred to by the same term. The behaviour and relationship norms of kinship categories are vague and fluid; one's paternal uncle may greatly be concerned in the support and rearing of one of his brother's children and be quite distant to those of another brother. All those outside of the genealogical circle already mentioned are primarily considered as 'friends'. Lateral extensions are shallow, as might be expected, and even lineal extension does not amount to much. Some persons cannot even identify all dead grandparents, much less great grandparents. That such a situation is by no means inherent of a hunting-trapping society, even this society, is demonstrated by the fact that genealogical connections can be ferreted out and traced through if the situation warrants it. Then, travelling to Eastmain with my three Indian companions, kinship connections were established between these people of different posts without too great difficulty. It would appear that some sort of kinship connection, even if distant, helps to cement the relationship and cooperation of two persons or groups that have come together for pragmatic reasons to begin with. The kinship connections are real, but after the fact. Further, while this is common process the world around, the difference here is that such a recognition
of kinship connections does not determine what the relations between the two shall be. It will only strengthen what arrange-
ment is already in operation.

5. Political Organization and Band Membership

One of the most noticeable aspects of the Rupert House Indian community is its lack of supra family or supra trapping group organisation, either formal or informal. While some such organisation undoubtedly exists, it is in itself important that all discussions by local people concerning an internal power structure tend to deny its presence. The ethic which all Indians attempt to preserve is, "No Indian tells any other Indian what he can do. We Indians have to help each other."

The only formal internal political structure is that which has been instituted by an external agency—the Indian Affairs Branch. A band chief and two councillors are elected every three or four years. In most of the neighbouring communities the present chiefs are the same persons that were first elected into office when the regional Indian Affairs Branch demanded chiefs after World War II. The position is just not important enough to usually make it worth while to change chiefs. But, the situation at Rupert House shows how factionalism can be present or can develop in a nominally homogenous Indian group and how a chief may be of some importance after all.
The first chief of Rupert House was a Metis who had been one of the more acculturated and most acceptable to the Indian Affairs Branch and to Mrs. Watt. For whatever reasons, the local community decided to elect him by acclamation, possibly for what they expected he could get out of the Whites. It appears that soon after this the then elected chief assured Mrs. Watt that the Indian community would help finance the building and maintenance of a memorial community hall by the contribution of one or two beaver pelts per trapper. It appears that this was done without the consent of all the community members. As the costs turned out to be somewhat higher, in the long run, and the services a good deal less than had been expected, numerous local families joined those others who had not supported the idea originally. While Mrs. Watt was in much too powerful a position to be dislodged by the local Indians, a new chief was elected. This new chief, the present one, speaks only a few words of English. When talking to important Whites he takes a person fluent in English with him. When in the presence of unimportant Whites he does not attempt to communicate or speaks through his thirteen-year-old son. This seems to be a clear shift in community reaction to White dominance, a still modulated but effective switch from collaboration to Indian consolidation. The new chief is, further, an effective speaker and his main influence over the community lies in the way he cajoles the members. While the chief does have
control over the distribution of jobs on some of the Indian Affairs Branch projects, he is under sufficient community surveillance and individual family pressure that he cannot use this means of influence inordinately for bestowing or withholding personal rewards. The foreman in the Hudson's Bay Company canoe factory, who is given considerable freedom in choosing and hiring men, has a means of inducement open to him which is more real if also limited to fewer people than that of the chief. (There is a turnover of three or four workers every three or four years at the canoe factory.)

Certain cliques of family heads exist. The focus of these is usually a more than averagely successful and 'wealthy' man who buys and brews beer. Beer drinking, with its intimations of illegality, the resultant in group out group feelings (doors are frequently latched shut when a drinking party begins. The persons involved try not to attract the attention of others) seems to be a good vehicle of political expression for an excluded ethnic minority. The present chief is involved in one of such drinking groups. (There is usually a core of men who always drink together, a wider group of persons who may occasionally join for a drink, and a group which will never be seen drinking with a certain clique.) The former chief was the centre of one such brewing group, being the biggest brewer in the village, until he was deposed. He now drinks with a second group which seems to centre around the native clerk at
the Hudson's Bay Company. A third stable and important group of drinkers centres around the chief's brother, Bertie Diamond, my next door neighbour.

While there seems to be evidence to suspect political activity relevant for the band as a whole, the most obvious and likely the most important sort of political organisation involves that of the extended trapping groups. In the past, when trapping groups were larger and more extended, when they spent most of the year off the post and when there were no external agencies to come to their aid, the leadership of trapping groups was more important, effective and formal than today. Formerly, a combination of shamanistic knowledge, of better knowledge of a hunting/trapping area, of a bigger credit that allowed aid to other attached persons, made the head of one family the 'trapping boss' of a unit of two to four families. At present, most, but not all, trapping groups have a trapping boss. This is usually the oldest active man of the group that was allotted the trapping rights in that section. His most clear-cut power lies in being able to decide where anyone placed on his section by the government will take the quota given him. Actually, his influence may extend considerably farther or not at all, depending upon the personal capabilities of the leader. Everything depends upon his good judgement, of the benefits that are to be gained by acting upon his suggestions and experience. He must convince the other families of the
wisdom of his actions. In any case, it is only in such spheres in which the various families of the trapping group cooperate that the trapping boss attempts to direct people; i.e., dates of departure and arrival at communal camps, transportation, distribution of the families over the land and resources and the degree to which a certain resource will be saved or exploited.

Generally, the political importance of political organisation at the band level has not yet developed while the political organisation of lower level groups has decreased in importance. Nuclear families have become more distinct. As for the band as a whole (as for the area as a whole), the occupational distinctions between Indians have been eradicated. The former importance of Metis as intermediaries and straw bosses for the Whites has vanished. (Even men who were formerly in the Metis group are now considered 'Indian' by Indians and most Whites.) There is now a fairly homogenous ethnic minority; a 'have not' minority which is administered by 'have' Whites. This is the way the Indians feel. It is also the true situation.
CHAPTER V

COMPARISONS AND SUMMARY

A vast body of literature exists on Canadian woodland people. Some of it is published, some unpublished, and much of it is hidden on the shelves of various libraries, government departments, and research institutes. A drawing together of this material into an overall survey has yet to be begun. Still, the fuller relevance of any particular study can only be seen in relation to the trends operative in other similar communities.

While it is impossible to attempt even a limited survey here, a few comparisons with neighbouring communities and with some other woodland groups will be valuable. The material and sources are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Field Worker</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastmain, P.Q.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>R. Knight</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Nemiscau, P.Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attawapiscat</td>
<td>1947-1948</td>
<td>J.J. Honigmann</td>
<td>&quot;Foodways in a Muskeg Community&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Field Worker</td>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekangekum</td>
<td>1954-1955</td>
<td>R.W. Dunning</td>
<td>&quot;Social and Economic Change Among the Northern Ojibwa&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac la Martre, N.W.T.</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>J. Helm and N. Lurie</td>
<td>&quot;The Subsistence Economy of the Dogrib Indians of Lac la Martre, N.W.T.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdrift, N.W.T.</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>James van Stone</td>
<td>&quot;The Economy of a Frontier Community, a Preliminary Statement&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we analyse the income for the three neighbouring posts of Rupert House, Eastmain, and Nemiscau, we find that a very wide variation in the composition of income exists. At Nemiscau we find trapping income to be of prime importance, wage income being almost negligible; at Rupert House, wages have far surpassed trapping as a source of income; at Eastmain, subsidy payments are the most important, although wage labour and commercial fishing are growing.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Trapping (%)</th>
<th>Wages (%)</th>
<th>Subsidies (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rupert House</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>$111,350</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmain</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>41,385</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemiscau</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>32,330</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It does not seem that we can meaningfully speak of "the economy of 'bush' posts" or posts of a particular region. While
it is likely more adequate to characterize a particular community as having a basically 'trapping' or 'wage' or 'trapping-wage' etc. economy, this, too, has its difficulties. Important differences for social organisation and acculturation exist in the kinds of wage labour that are engaged in. For instance, permanent employment and wage labour outside the community bring in the largest slice of wage income at Rupert House but is small at Eastmain and non-existent at Nemiscau. At these two latter posts, the main and growing source of wage payment is commercial fishing.

As I have indicated earlier, it is likely best to make a distinction between what activities provide the largest sources of community income and what activities are most common and most under the control of the local people themselves. It is felt that the latter sphere will set the basic roles and expectations.

Of course, the present standard of living and the current social system are maintained only by carrying out all the major activities. The utilization of country food is still important in all the posts in my sample. While it is an important problem, the decline in the use of country food is frequently overestimated. Even Honigmann suggests that an increased use of cash foods may only serve to bring about a decrease in the utilization of country foods. Although a certain decline has undoubtedly taken place at Rupert House, country foods still
provide a large proportion of locally consumed commestibles—
despite the unprecedented importance of cash and wage labour.

A comparison of game consumption between Attawapiscat,
1947-1948, where very little wage labour existed, and Rupert
House, 1960-1961, shows very little difference in the importance
of country food. This despite the fact that Attawapiscat was
considered to be extraordinarily dependent upon subsistence
hunting.

Consumption of Country Foods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large game</td>
<td>10,700 lbs.</td>
<td>20,660 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fur animals</td>
<td>13,000 lbs.</td>
<td>29,050 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits and</td>
<td>11,650 lbs.</td>
<td>6,700 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks and geese</td>
<td>41,375 lbs.</td>
<td>9,800 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>27,700 lbs. (estimate)</td>
<td>32,200 lbs. (estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104,425 lbs.</td>
<td>98,250 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>470 persons</td>
<td>470 persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Capita Consumption per Annum:

226 lbs.                          213 lbs.
Unfortunately, Kerr gives no data for game consumption during 1947-1948.

There is considerable variation in the utilization of country food within Rupert House. One family relied upon fish and game for probably over seventy per cent of its food; trappers with good beaver sections likely consume over twice the 213 lbs. per annum average while those people who stay on the post or trap from the post likely obtain much less than this average. The differences within a community and the deficiency of fresh food for certain band members is well documented by Honnigman.

While the game consumption of Rupert House still provides an absolutely necessary increment of food, it compares poorly with that mentioned for other bands. Rogers reports that the country food used by the thirteen member Mistassini trapping group with which he lived totaled seventy per cent of all the food consumed, averaging 1,000 lbs. per capita per annum. Dunning mentions that sufficient fish was available in certain Pekangekum camps to provide year-round subsistence. Beaver and large game would seem to have provided even greater per capita food than at Rupert House. Helm and Lurie report that the 110 people of Lac la Martre, and their voracious dogs, consumed forty-seven tons of fish, 11,000 lbs. of rabbit (estimate) and over 8,000 lbs. of caribou.
While such catch-consumption figures make the Rupert House band look like mere dilettants at hunting-fishing, it is important not to overlook differences in the habitat. Smaller game consumption may not mean a declining concern with game but merely a persistent shortage of food animals. In this regard, it is important to note the specific sorts of animals that a people rely upon. For the Mistassini group, large game provided by far the most important source of food. Fur animals were most important at Rupert House, while at Attawapiscat over forty per cent of the game consisted of ducks and geese. Lac la Martre was mainly dependent upon fish; Snowdrift upon fish and caribou.

For those people now heavily dependent upon fish, it is fairly safe to assume that before the advent of commercial fish nets, this source of food was not available to them in anywhere near current quantities. (In the Big Trout Lake, Ontario, area, hook and line fishing was not extensively replaced by nets until a little over fifteen years ago.) Moreover, for those people whose trapping activity revolves about beaver, an increase in trapping in no way decreases the amount of time spent in hunting for food animals. Beaver are indeed very good food animals. An increase in the number of beaver available and taken may actually increase the total amount of country food secured even though less time is spent hunting large game. After all, three or four beaver will yield more meat than a full grown caribou.
The fact that the meat of all fur animals is eaten has at times been overlooked by some writers who rigidly distinguish trapping from hunting and who make an increase in one a decrease in the other.

Frequently, certain facts only become evident after some rough quantification and tabulation has been made. First, let us look at the cash income of our sample woodland communities. (Apart from my own field data and that of Dunning and Honigmann, the totals have been pieced together from scattered references within the studies concerned. I believe, nevertheless, that they are approximately correct. No reliable totals could be derived from the Lac la Martre study. Rogers, also, does not deal with this.)

The low subsidy proportion of Rupert House in 1947-1948 is due to the fact that no payments other than Family Allowance were made. Trapping was extremely good and beaver prices high for the first years after the beaver preserves were opened.

While the data in the Lac la Martre study are not adequate for a close estimation of the subsidy proportion, five family averages seem to indicate that here, too, subsidy payments average between thirty-five to forty-five per cent of the community income.
Annual Cash Income of Various Woodland Communities

(in dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Trapping</th>
<th>Subsidies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rupert House, 1960-61</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>111,350</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmain, 1960-61</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>41,385</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>14,975</td>
<td>19,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemiscau, 1960-61</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>32,330</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>13,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupert House, 1947-48</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attawapiscat, 1947-48</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekangekum, 1954-55</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>52,600</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>21,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdrift, N.W.T., 1959-60</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>9,000 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac la Martre, N.W.T.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistassini</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of cash income that comes from subsidy payments in nearly all cases hovers around forty per cent.
Many writers have remarked that subsidy payments are a form of income that can be relied upon. This is most desirable in economies which fluctuate greatly and where important sources of income decline catastrophically in some years. While this stabilizing effect does seem to obtain and is much appreciated by the local people, a second assumption often made about subsidies does not hold. White administrators and local White residents frequently take the position that subsidy payments, including and particularly rations, act to create a general parity of income between different communities. It is believed that subsidies make up for lack of wage labour opportunities and depleted environments. If this were actually the case we should expect to see a much higher percentage subsidy payment in those communities where the per capita income is below average.

There are quite large differences in the per capita income between the communities in my sample ($140-$245). Such differences might still exist even if the effect of subsidy payments were toward establishing some sort of parity. But this cannot be the role of subsidy payments when they make up the same proportion of income for richer and poorer settlements. In effect, it would appear that the role of subsidies is to balance short run fluctuations within any one community, to maintain 'richer' communities at their level and poorer ones at their's.
In estimating the actual value of the per capita income of various communities, it is essential to know the prices of goods sold there. Unfortunately, of the studies in my sample only Dunning's lists the prices of goods at Pekangekum. Nevertheless, one thing is clear, a low per capita income is not balanced by low prices. In the three communities with which I am myself familiar, prices were lowest at Rupert House (which had the highest per capita income, $225); prices were slightly higher at Eastmain ($200 per annum), and prices were at least fifty to seventy-five per cent higher at Nemiscau ($207 per annum). The differences between prices in Canadian metropolitan areas and in bush posts varies largely by the weight and quality of the item; at Nemiscau, tobacco is about the same price as down south but flour is twenty cents per pound and gas $2.50 per gallon. It appears that food and clothing which are most extensively used by the local people also show the greatest price differential. This is because such goods are initially low cost and often heavier staples—per pound transport costs show up most vividly on these. Posts where prices are high (primarily due to long distance air freighting but also related to the Hudson's Bay Company policy of adding high per capita overhead costs, Hudson's Bay Company buildings and staff, on a low turnover) are also those most likely to be isolated from sources of wage labour. In addition, the more isolated a community, the more difficult it will be for it to secure relief projects and emergency rations.
It is of interest to note that along with rising prices, the per capita income of Rupert House has actually declined by $20 per annum between 1948 and 1961. This does not indicate a general trend in the decline of the standard of living. It shows, rather, the extent to which boom years (1946-1950—see Chapter II) can boom.

Between 1948 and 1961 Rupert House has seen a major shift in the composition of income. Wages have increased from $7,000 per annum to $43,000 per annum; trapping has decreased from $63,000 per annum to $26,000 per annum, while subsidies have increased from $12,000 per annum to $42,000 per annum. While wage labour is still a relatively small proportion of the total income in many of the other settlements, the desire for such seems to be widespread. Helm and Lurie report that many men stayed on the Lac la Martre post on the chance that contractors would fly in, as they had the winter before, for men to work on road construction. Moreover, they claim that one of the main reasons for the rapid concentration of families at the post site was the wage labour connected with the construction and maintenance of a day school. Nan Stone describes a similar situation for Snowdrift. Men were most favourably inclined towards wage labour and often remained on the post in hopes of getting some employment (although certain forms of sweated labour was not greatly desired, even these wage opportunities were taken).
It seems that generally the returns for effort expended in trapping are disproportionately small when compared with wage labour. For instance, one of the better trappers at Rupert House, who had a relatively rich trapping section, earned more in two months of comparatively easy wage work at Moosonee than he did all winter trapping. Similar situations are reported in many of the studies. Only Dunning reports a lack of interest in and importance of wage labour. This may be due more to the long standing and continuing unavailability of work at Pekangekum than to actual preferences for trapping and/or trapping returns. It may also be that in the seven to fifteen years which have elapsed since some of these studies were completed, the demand for wage work has become more persistent and vocal.

The effect of subsidy payments is not merely to raise the general standard of living. As Dunning has shown, the introduction and increase of subsidy payments has been instrumental in changing crucial areas of the social system. Aged and incapacitated members who were formerly dependants, who had to be taken along to the trapping camps in order that they could be provided for, have now achieved an independence of their own. Trapping units can now be of a much more effective composition, the physically less able can maintain themselves on the post with cash foods purchased with the welfare payments. This also applies, to a lesser extent, to the wives and children of middle-aged trappers.
While my findings at Rupert House support those of Dunning in regard to the increasing number of people resident on the post, divergent trends are evident between the various communities in regards to the size and composition of trapping groups.

At Pekangekum, it appears that the size of co-residential groups is increasing and the importance of kinship growing. Rogers also reports the continuing importance of relatively co-residential groups (trapping groups) of three to four nuclear families. It is his thesis that the size of trapping groups is primarily set by the ecology of the people; i.e., the methods they have in extracting a livelihood from the resources at their disposal. He believes that group size is an ecologically determined phenomenon while the development of restricted trapping territories is an independently determined acculturative one.

Of the eight communities surveyed here, only at Snowdrift and Lac la Martre do the men leave their families on the post and go out trapping in ones and twos. Such a pattern is clearly impossible if the families must be constantly provided with country food, but now that subsidy payments play a large role in all northern communities we may ask why the differences in the trapping pattern have developed. The answer lies, I believe, in the combination of two factors: 1. differences in the concentration and richness of trapping grounds in different
regions and 2. the distance these grounds are from the post. I would propose that men of all the northern communities would like to have their families with them while trapping but will find it difficult to move them from one trapping location to another if the fur animals are scattered. Further, if their trapping grounds close enough to the post to all frequent trips in (for conjugal visits, to bring in supplementary fresh food, to extend credit by the sale of fur) then they will be even more likely to leave their families behind. On the other hand, if their trapping grounds are at distances from the post that preclude frequent visiting and/or if the fur animals on their trapping grounds are concentrated to the extent that trappers will be able to take them while operating out of one or two main camps, then the trappers will be more likely to take their families with them.

The above factors seem to be important determinants of the size and mobility of production (trapping) groups at Rupert House. In order to extend this answer to the other communities, we would have to know considerably more of the densities of fur animals and the distances covered each year by trappers. Nevertheless, it is significant to note that the two communities in the sample where nearly all men trap without their families (Snowdrift and Lac la Martre) have relatively poor and thinly scattered fur resources. Moreover, these fur animals are mainly ones which provide little meat (mink, marten, otter). Beaver are
restricted to five per adult trapper. The advantage of supplying a family with regular fresh meat taken from fur animals, as is the case for inland Rupert House groups, does not exist here. Additionally, we are told that the men of both of these communities trap close enough to the post to make visits in every ten to fourteen days. Finally, they report that they have decided to leave their families on the post since the advent of subsidy payments but would prefer to have their wives and children with them in the bush if transportation and living conditions were not so difficult.

It may well be that the use of aircraft in taking in trapping groups will further help preserve the extended family pattern if the aforementioned conditions are favourable.

At Rupert House, the extended co-residential units (trapping groups) in the winter camps are adjustments to the requirements of a trapping economy, the tolerance of the ecological conditions, and 'human' desires common throughout many of the northern communities. When this productive activity ceases, a social organisation develops which is based on then more clearly defined and more numerous commensal groups.

Nemiscau seems to be intermediate between Mistassini and Rupert House; three family residential groups are not uncommon for winter trapping groups but these break up into their composite commensal groups (usually a little larger than a
nuclear family) upon reaching the post. During spring hunting and for summer fishing, co-residential groups as big as but different from the trapping groups develop.

It may well be that similar seasonal shifts in the size and composition of co-residential groups will develop in other woodland communities as the periods of production and consumption become more definitely demarcated.

One of the most striking changes in Rupert House social organisation has been the establishment of community endogamy. In the past, over twenty per cent of the marriages contracted by Rupert House people involved partners from other posts. (The sixteen per cent figure derived from parish records is demonstrably too low.)

No such marriage has taken place in over ten years. People who marry out, in effect stay out. One of the weak points in my data is exactly what the sanctions are preventing persons from contracting marriages across posts. Neither do I know what the initial mechanisms were in establishing this change.

Dunning reports that endogamy has also become recently established at Pekangekum. This has become feasible only since a viable population isolate has been reached. Such a population isolate would only allow endogamy to develop. The reason for its actual development must still be explained.
Mistassini contains more than enough people to maintain a viable population isolate, yet marriage with other groups continues—with my knowledge, at least to Nemiscau. At Nemiscau itself, a very high rate of inter-band marriage still obtains, as it does at Lac la Martre and Snowdrift. These latter three communities are all under 200 persons. Kerr and Honnigman do not deal with marriage arrangements, unfortunately.

It is Dunning's proposition that people usually prefer to marry someone of their own society (meaning 'community'); someone they know. A very marked and general process in inter-band (or settlement) contact has taken place throughout the north. Canoe freighting, which formerly brought people of many posts together has ceased; concentration of people around posts and away from band boundaries has increased. Aircraft have made posts effectively closer to the White bases of operation than to their own neighbouring communities. This marked decrease in contact between communities has undoubtedly decreased the opportunities for inter community marriage.

Yet all of these seem to be but partial answers. Answers in preference, even if they fall back on structural or cultural uniformities, leave much unanswered. Man's preferences and his cultures are plastic enough, especially over time, so that they may be modified if it is beneficial to his survival. What the adaptive value of endogamy is under current northern conditions has yet to be answered. It may be that a tightly knit
group is less susceptible to conflict. It may be that pressure on resources militates against the acceptance of anyone from outside the group (whose boundaries have been established by other processes).

Given the establishment of endogamy, two opposite effects seem to have been fostered at Pekangekum and Rupert House. Dunning reports that, with Ojibwa social structure (cross-cousin category marriage), endogamy has resulted in an elaboration of kinship principles. Kinship regulations help maintain the division for any one person between 'those families I can marry into and those I can't.' This, allegedly, is more necessary in an endogamous group than one in which marriage with other communities takes place.

At Rupert House, where both cross and parallel cousin marriage is prohibited (to at least second cousins), the establishment of endogamy seems to have helped suppress the operation of kinship principles. It seems convenient and even necessary to forget actual kin ties if marriage partners are to be found. During my stay two second cousins (parallel) were married. Most younger people appear to have only a very tenuous knowledge of the categories of any but the most immediate kin.

One of the values of a comparative method is that it allows us to more clearly see what traits and processes are specific to a particular group and what are general to numbers of groups.
The rapid and radical simplification of social organisation which occurred at Rupert House toward the end of the 1920's is unparalleled in any of the other groups in the sample. The Metis-Indian which existed there until that time presented a classical class hierarchy of different statused roles, requiring different behaviour and abilities, and entailing wide differences in power and security. While such a situation was not unique, it was probably limited to a few major administrative-transhipment posts which had developed well before World War I.

At present, discrete differences in class, in class culture, and in the roles of adult men have vanished. There are likely only two positions that could not be filled, interchangeable, by nearly all of the adult men— that of the native clerk and that of the canoe factory foreman. While the desirability of various activities differs in the eyes of the local people (relating to the income, ease, and independence connected with the activity), the requirements for carrying them out can be fulfilled by almost all the men. Furthermore, none of these activities is of permanent enough duration, except the two mentioned, to develop into true status differences.

There are, of course, differences in prestige; good trappers and poor, hard workers and idlers, but the former power differentials have largely vanished with the differences in roles.
Along with the development of a homogeneity of roles has come greater differences within the present roles. With the formalization of trapping territories by the government, the differences between people who work rich tracts and those who work poor have sharpened and become more rigid. Because of the differences between territories, some adult men now have a quota of fifty-five beaver while others have a quota of four.

The increasing desire and availability of durable goods in which 'extra' money can be invested has cut down on the amount available for aid and redistribution. The fragmentation of owning groups to approximately the size of nuclear families, while generally favoured, has also emphasised the separateness of such groups from one another.

It would be of extreme interest and importance to see if similar divergencies in income are taking place for other woodland communities. In the survey of Canadian woodland peoples that is yet to be written, this question will undoubtedly be asked.

It may be an unacademic, yet fitting question to ask, what lies in the future for these people, for them and for the children who are now being conceived?

One thing is certain. The people have no desire to return to the past, to teepees, and open fires and things out of western movies. To them, the past is too real. It is the
time of starvation and illness and death. Neither do they want a return of the former power of the Hudson's Bay Company. They have tasted a small measure of the independence that comes from some assured security. The nursing station, the radio contact with Moose Factory, the Indian Agency emerging rations. All these things have greatly helped in lifting the constant anxiety about sheer survival which still hangs heavily in the recollections of adult men.

It is not much that they want: jobs, some security of income, a chance to live a little better and not be forced into the strenuous rounds of trapping and hunting when they are not able. Many parents, often the better trapping families, hope that their sons will escape the system through a schooling which will enable them to get a job outside. In short, their desires are much like those of depressed ethnic minorities in general, with the exception that for the people of Rupert House, even the strongest wish is coupled with a modulated 'maybe', with readiness to accept defeat. These are the people of Rupert House.

And their future? The future of the people as a whole lies completely in the hands of Canadian national policy, its administrators, and the White economy of the surrounding regions. We can probably be sure that our government will not allow conditions of famine and disease to return. In this regard, the people have already entered a new era. Also, welfare projects
and subsidy payments will gradually increase. Welfare officials will be in closer touch with the community. This will mean fewer families on a mere subsistence level, fewer cases of nutriential diseases, fewer children with no stockings to wear. In short, it means that the community will slowly pull itself into the bracket of depressed White areas. Its rate of progression past that stage will then be completely dependent upon the absorptive and expansive capabilities of the economy of that region. Since the conjunction of government policy and regional economics has not been spectacularly successful in the past in alleviating certain depressed sections of the national economy and society, this level may well be the indefinitely permanent future of most Rupert House children.

Those outside persons who can view the Indian people and their situation with patience, kindness, and concern, but yet think in terms of two and three generations for the achievement of some solid gains likely approximate the ideal of present administration.

But for those who see in each human group a random distribution of potentialities, for those who would mourn and rage for untried poets, potters, and dissenters aborted for decades into native clerks and practical nurses, for them, the Indian people of Rupert House are better forgotten.
APPENDIX I

THE QUESTION OF FAMILY HUNTING TERRITORIES

Current theories concerned with family territoriality disagree on when private property rights over land were established in various northern Indian societies, but they generally agree that such private control would exist after such societies were in long term contact with and integration in a trapping-trading economy. The situation which I will describe has important theoretical implications in that 250 years of contact with a strongly property oriented English colonial society and integration in a trapping-trading economy has not led to the development of indigenous private property rights over strategic resources. I will show that animal conservation and private control of lands was absent or negligible until beaver conservation and allotment quotas were recently established by the Hudson's Bay Company, and government fiat. I will also document the tenuous control and use of lands even now.

I have elected to remain as close to Leacock's (The Montagnais Hunting Territory and the Fur Trade, 1955) field approach and operational criteria as possible. The material in the field was collected with the aims in mind of as close a comparison to Leacock's material as possible. Leacock's work was chosen because it is the best summary of the various positions to date and because her theoretical underpinnings are the most sophisticated.

Essentially, the two basic positions are these. Speck claims that private ownership, control and use of strategic resources (the fur and game animals of a particular tract of land), because of the desirability and possibility of animal conservation, under conditions of population pressure, became established in the indigenous Algonkian societies where beaver (an allegedly easy to conserve animal) was abundant. Leacock counters that, historically, population pressure did not exist for most Algonkian groups and that dependence upon conservable animals (particularly beaver) was nowhere as important as dependence upon migratory large game. Leacock's alternative explanation of presence of private family hunting tracts is that they developed, somehow, as responses to the opportunities of personal gain to particular effective families in the trapping-trading economy introduced by the Whites. Her thesis is that private ownership of strategic resources is only a post contact acculturative phenomenon and that the degree of private control and ownership over strategic resources is directly proportional to the degree of integration in a trapping-trading economy. The operational indicators used, implicitly, by Leacock are as follows:
A. **Degrees of dependence upon a fur exchange economy.**

1. Amount of food bought and the size of the winter supply list.
2. Number of traps owned and/or worked.
3. The amount of time spent away from the post trapping and hunting.
4. Percentage of time spent away from the post that is used for trapping.
5. Whether trap line trails and cabins are built or not.
6. Whether families are taken along trapping-hunting or not.
7. Whether game takes priority over immediate trapping activity.

B. **Degree of private control over resources.**

1. Cohesion and composition of trapping groups.
   
   (a) Size of group.
   (b) Genealogical composition: numbers of patrilateral relatives, matrilateral relatives, affinal relatives, and unrelated members in a trapping group.
   (c) Fluidity of group membership.
   (d) Co-residential contiguity in months per year.
   (e) Degree of sharing within this group and across such groups.

2. Trespass regulations and the rigidity of boundaries.
   
   (a) Only marked or all beaver lodges in a tract covered.
   (b) Boundaries delimited by agreement of only contiguous trapping groups, by the intervention of all community members, or by the intervention of the Hudson's Bay Company post manager.
   (c) Trespass countered by remonstrances only, by withdrawal of aid, by community pressures, by magic, or by force.

3. Number and kinds of resources enclosed by trespass regulations.
   
   (a) None.
   (b) Beaver alone.
   (c) Fur bearing animals alone.
   (d) Fur bearing animals and large game.
   (e) All fur and food animals.
   (f) All resources.
Leacock, for reasons I will not go into here, would consider increasing dependence upon trapping to be indicated by increasing use of cash foods, by greater use of cash clothes and equipment, by an increasing proportion of the time spent off the post used in trapping, by increasing capitalization of trapping tracts, by the development of non-familial hunting patterns, and by decreasing concern with hunting.

Her indicators for increasing private control over trapping tracts are the decreasing size of productive (trapping) groups, the increasing kinship relation of trapping group members (from unrelated, to affinally related, to matrilineally related, to patrilineally related, in that order of increasing cohesion), the increasing stability of trapping group membership, decreasing sharing across such groups, increasing inclusiveness as to ownership (all beaver houses in a tract, whether marked or unmarked would belong to a family in a system with greater private control over land than one where only marked lodges belonged to the 'owning' family), greater exactness of boundaries and wider knowledge of them, increasingly effective means of sanction against trespassers, and increasing inclusiveness as to what is contained in those territories.

A. Degree of dependence upon a fur exchange economy, Rupert House, 1900-1961.

1. The amount and variety of foods bought and the size and content of winter supply lists has greatly increased in Rupert House in the last sixty years. My oldest informants held that during their early active life, 1900 approximately, the main cash outlay throughout the year and on the winter supplies was for ammunition and hardware followed by expenditures for cloth and clothing. Store bought food was only a minor item in the yearly cash purchases. What food was bought was restricted to flour or oatmeal, lard or tallow and some baking powder—the ingredients of bannock, nothing more. While the amounts of such food bought varied considerably from 75 to 500 lbs. of flour for a family of six, a general average seems to have been 200 to 300 lbs. for a commensal group of six to eight persons over a nine to ten mon period. Nearly all informants held that cash food, even though used as a supplement alone, ran out in late December, January or early February. A statement by one of my main informants, Mathew Cowboy (85), sums up this period very well: "As long as we had matches and ammunition we were all right." (The 'all right' is not to be taken too literally since actual starvation was not infrequent and most groups came close to starvation at least once in their trapping history).
At present, food expenditures are the biggest item in the annual budget; clothing is a major item but a very secondary one. Ammunition does not now make up an important proportion of the yearly or winter supply list expenditures. The winter supply lists now include a wide range of foods, beans, rice, spaghetti, dried fruit, dried milk, tea, coffee, and cocoa. In addition, the cash food staple, flour, is taken in considerably larger quantities—approximately 500 lbs. of flour, plus the additionally larger amounts of lard are usual for an averagely active commensal group of six persons for a period of four and a half months.

While the evidence clearly shows a greater use of and dependence upon cash foods today than formerly, it must not be forgotten that even in the past, those groups that trapped the more distant and richer beaver territories needed and could take a larger supply of food with them. Correlated with the rising importance of packaged, cash foods, has been the decline of local food preservation. Fair amounts of dried whitefish, smoked geese, and moose and caribou jerky and pemmican were formerly made. The amounts of these at least equalled or surpassed the amount of cash food preserves taken into the bush, being more important for the coastal families than those inland. Today only a few of the poorest groups both to preserve any significant amount of country food.

2. All of the older people to whom I spoke had used some steel traps even in their boyhood. The major change has been that now only steel traps are used; the deadfalls and wooden traps which were formerly additional methods of taking fine fur animals have been abandoned. Apparently steel traps were first used for beaver trapping, the average active trapper supposedly had no more than five to ten steel beaver traps. Building up a stock of steel traps was formerly no mean undertaking (as distinct from Leacock's characterization of the Montagnais). By the 1920's all use of wooden traps had given way to steel ones. At present, each trapper averages forty-three steel traps. About one-third of these are the large beaver traps; the rest are No. 1, 2, and 3 traps. One man has as many as 100 traps. A number of active men have none at all.

The trend (with traps as with other capital items) clearly shows an increased concentration of activity in trapping and a greater dependence upon purchased capital equipment.

3. & 4. Whereas the average trapping-hunting season once lasted from eight to ten and a half months, the usual stay is now only four and a half months. People usually combined a much longer
period of fall and spring hunting and fishing away from the post with some trapping during those periods. (See Chapter III, section 5—David Salt's trapping/hunting pattern.) At present, a much more limited period exists in which fur acceptable to the Hudson's Bay Company can be taken (November to March). The spring muskrat hunt is not very important because most people feel that the low price now paid for muskrat does not warrant the added hardships of spring trapping and the risk of losing even very temporary wage labour by being away from the post. Similarly, much less concern is given now to taking fine fur after the price drops at the end of December or in early January. Fishing and hunting during the trapping period is now of somewhat reduced importance. In short, people stay out in the camps for a shorter time and generally concentrate more on the trapping while they are there.

5. Trap line trails and trap line cabins were neither built in the past nor are built now. Some families, nevertheless, have somewhat elaborated wooden teepees which are used for three or four years. All families spend a considerable effort to establish a permanent winter camp. Strong tent frames, wood floors, and sod embankments are constructed. Nevertheless, this sphere would indicate that the Rupert House (similarly the east James Bay Cree) people have not integrated themselves as fully to a trapping economy as some of the more western Indians (D. Jeness on Fort Nelson Slave) or the Seven Islands Montagnais mentioned by Leacock.

6. It is somewhat hard to decide when some groups have their families on the trap line and when not. With a number of cases, the wives and children of certain men did stay on the trap line, but only for a relatively short period. In any case, there were only nine of the thirty-four trapping groups, maximally, which did not contain families. Further, these nine groups contained only twenty-one people, one-tenth of the total number of persons in all trapping groups. This would seem to indicate that the Rupert House community has not gone as far as most similar groups in rearranging their social organisation from one predicated by a generalized hunting and gathering base to one favoured by a trapping economy.

7. In the past, no chance to take a food animal was let pass. All trapping activity would be set aside if it was thought that a moose or caribou could be taken, if fresh tracks were seen. The present day position is that most of the groups will attempt to take larger game if it does not demand too extensive tracking. Most of the poorer families still will set aside any trapping at the possibility of taking a large animal. But, the overall trend is to a less intense and exhaustive exploitation of the game resources and less anxiety about letting game escape. Nevertheless, the single hunter who has a very good chance of
taking a moose and does not because he has enough store foods and does not want the extra work of skinning and transporting a moose carcass is still looked upon as rather negligent.

To sum up, points 1. and 2. show that a very considerable dependence upon the fur exchange economy has developed within the last sixty years. Points 3., 4., and 7. also demonstrate an increasing dependence upon trapping-trading, although ambivalent trends are present. Point 6. indicates the majority of people following an earlier, subsistence hunting pattern, but with change toward a White trapper pattern beginning. Only point 5. shows no dependence upon a trapping economy. This lack of trails and cabins may also be due to the more extensive territories covered by Rupert House trapping groups and to the fact that log teepees serve as well as cabins for those with restricted locations.

All in all, by Leacock's criteria and compared to the various groups she discusses, the Rupert House community is pretty well integrated and dependent upon a fur exchange economy. It is of prime importance to realize that this integration and dependence has occurred only in the last two decades, after a 250 year history of continual trapping and trading (as well as hunting).


1. Cohesion and composition of the productive group.

The size of productive groups has become markedly smaller and their composition more restricted to immediate kin or members of a nuclear family. Trapping groups of three and four nuclear and stem families, once common, are now only found in one or two parts of the most isolated zones of the band area. Unrelated members, affines, and matrilaterally related kin, while still common, are proportionally declining in trapping groups. While the occurrence and importance of 'unrelated' friends trapping together and helping each other is not to be underestimated (see Sydney Georgekish, Chapter III, section 5), and while exclusive and defensive groupings of brothers have not developed, the ideal of the nuclear family as a self-sufficient consumption unit is being constantly underlined. This does not allow the continuance of the early trapping group organisation, which operated to maintain the families of a trapping group in much the same manner as a large extended family. The degree of sharing within and across trapping groups is also declining. Formerly, all manner of cash goods (that which there was) would be given as aid within and across different trapping groups; clothes, ammunition, old but still useable capital equipment, store bought foods.
These goods were even occasionally given and received from supposedly unrelated members of other 'bands'. Country food was frequently shared by / with members of other bands who met on the trail. All informants agree that, formerly, the main criteria of sharing and aid was need, ability to help, and geographic nearness.

At present, almost no contact is made with people of other bands. Sharing and aid within the Rupert House community has focused more on the transfer of certain country foods (fish, a large game for the widest but not overall distribution, beaver carcasses to trapping partners, and geese only occasionally to primary relations) while only minimal sharing of cash goods now occurs — gifts of clothing or tobacco to poorer siblings or grandchildren. Nevertheless, in all of these aspects the Rupert House trapping groups even now much more closely approximate the aboriginal conditions than those of White trappers. The modal trapping group still contains eight persons, usually a family or two, and not just a couple of adult brothers or a man and one or two of his adolescent sons trapping without a family and regarding it as an occupation, separate from other spheres of living.

Movement in and out of the trapping groups is still frequent and attests to a fluid concept of privately-held resources.

2. Trespass regulations and boundaries.

There was a universal agreement among my informants that before beaver territories and quotas were established, 'A man could hunt anywhere he wanted to and no one could stop him.' They mean by this that all tree and berry resources, all fish and small game, all large game, all fine fur, and even all beaver that were found could be taken by whoever found them, wherever he found them. Men could and did move and trap through the locations of numerous other camps. I have collected some cases where a number of different families trapped the same area serially in the course of ten years. Other life histories record men trapping in numbers of widely separated zones within and without the present band area, working different tracts in each zone over a period of years. Numbers of other cases record groups starting out with their winter destination undecided, groups which could not reach their planned destination, and still other groups which after trapping in an area during early fall decided to try other locations. All of these phenomena would of course be impossible under a system of restricted tract holdings. The only actions that counted as trespass or stealing of fur were actually taking an animal from another man's trap or trapping beaver from a house which had been found and marked by someone else. Boundaries were in no way determined or known.
An extremely important change was made with the introduction of government and Hudson's Bay Company beaver territories. The demarcation point in discussions by local Indians about former trapping is the establishment of the beaver preserves and the creation of allotment quotas and prescribed beaver territories by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Indian Affairs Branch. Apart from the fact that there is no indication of the internal development of family trapping territories before their creation by external agencies, local people themselves always point out that there was no way in which such a system could have been enforced or created by Indians themselves. "Nobody thought about conserving animals. We had to take everything we could get," said John Blackned, "Besides, if you conserved some animals where you were trapping, hoping that there would be more next year, somebody might just come along and clean them out. There was nothing you could do about it."

While it has been the general opinion of the Hudson's Bay Company 'Old Northern Hands' that the Cree maintained beaver conservation through family property rights over land, and that this was destroyed only by the inveighing of unscrupulous competitors in fur trade, they also hold that twenty years after the advent of competition, and some years after the collapse of Revillon Brothers in the area, the concept of family territories was exceedingly difficult to sell to the Indians. J. W. Anderson, James Bay District Manager for the Hudson's Bay Company during the period (who was almost the post manager at Mistassini when Frank Speck did his initial study of family territoriality), reports that James Watt had to constantly demonstrate the theory of beaver conservation to the Rupert House people and that the initial beaver restrictions were indeed kept enforced only by the determined and coordinated efforts of all local White agencies. (Demark, D. E., 1948.) These are facts which even by themselves, are certainly not in keeping with an earlier indigenous system of family trapping territory. At present, we still find that fish, small game, large game and even any fur bearing animals other than beaver can be and are taken on other men's beaver territory.

By Leacock's criteria, trespass regulations and hunting tracts, bounded or otherwise, were in no way existent before established by external agencies. Even now no community or individual pressures have developed to deal with trespass on the government quota tracts. The only recourse is to convince a government official, either Mrs. Watt or her son, of the actual occurrence of such a trespass and hope that they will take action.
3. Numbers and kinds of resources enclosed by trespass regulations.

Since there were no trespass regulations in the past, there was, of course, no restricted resources. The case today has already been mentioned. There is, nevertheless, some point to discussing this category of Leacock's. We can more emphatically see the degree of difference in private control of rights over resources between the Rupert House community and that of other real and hypothetical groups. Some of the earlier discussions of Speck describe Alonkian political systems which supposedly had very rigidly defined private tracts in which all resources mentioned in my outline were included and which were defended, allegedly by strong community pressure. Trespassers could be killed. There would seem to be good sociological reasons to doubt that such a face to face society could survive internal killing and good ecological reasons to doubt that a biological population maintaining rigid territories under northern conditions, could survive as a population, period.

My findings seem to bear out Leacock's thesis that the private or family hunting territory was not aboriginal, or at least, disappeared under early trapping/trading relations, possibly to which no writer subscribes. It, further, is evident that some greater concentration upon trapping has become the trend for the Rupert House community. But, as distinct to Leacock's findings, there has not been a related shift towards greater, more tightly organised private control of the land. What changes there have been in this direction, and they are important, have been strictly by the Hudson's Bay Company and government fiat. Further, it was the case that the Rupert House community was in close contact with and dependent upon (if not for food then for the more important tools) a trapping/trading system for over two centuries without a private property system of rights over strategic resources developing.

In sum, it is my view that all prominent discussions dealing with territoriality among northern groups fail to separate mechanisms of establishing traits from those of maintaining them and fail to deal adequately with the long range minimums that, rather than the averages, set limits. Specifically, I believe that in the longer run, numbers of kinds of fluctuations in the ecological-economic base of this society disallowed the establishment of private property over strategic resources. Therefore, while my findings and theoretical position generally agree with those of Eleanor Leacock, I must emphasise the conclusion that it is not so much integration with a money economy that leads to or even allows private control for over productive resources but rather the creation of a regular and reliable means of survival for most, if not all, of the population. If this is the case then it is rather the degree of
integration in a money economy, or degree of survival security that this produces than mere integration with a money economy as such which is important. I hold that it is the case that such long run survival security was not forthcoming throughout the 250 year trading history which explains the failure of family territories to develop here. Since such security seems to be now established, it may well be that these societies will move on to a new level of organisation, although the rapid replacement of the importance of trapping and hunting in many communities as a means of livelihood by wage labour may well leave such resources open for communal exploitation (the great bulk of a community moving on to a yet different level of organisation before the previous one has become established).

I also propose that control over lands may have been more and less private depending upon the changing richness of the animal populations. Extending this position to show the equally important nature of fluctuations in the external environment, i.e., posts opening and closing, fur prices increasing then dropping, trade routes changing, subsidiary employment rising and falling, I hope to indicate certain examples of the non-unidirectional nature of private control over land under northern conditions. I tentatively propose a hypothesis for test among other groups and societies; societies that fulfill two conditions, that they operate on a small subsistence margin and that they undergo periodic fluctuation in their economic base, will not be able to maintain long term private property rights over strategic resources.

The basis of these conclusions and hypotheses for Rupert House and their validation, modification, or rejection must of course await a presentation and elaboration of the collected data I have here only outlined.
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