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1.0 INTRODUCTION

In May 2004 the Waneta Expansion Power Corporation requested Randy Bouchard and Dr. Dorothy Kennedy to compile a report providing background information relating to First Nations’ aboriginal interests and traditional use in the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project (WEP) area, located at the confluence of the Pend d’Oreille and Columbia Rivers adjacent to the Canada/United States border (see Figure 1).

1.1 Report Objectives

The objectives of this report are to summarize and analyze the known and available ethnographic, ethnohistoric and linguistic background information pertinent to First Nations’ aboriginal interests and traditional use in the area of the WEP. This report relies mainly on the extensive research already compiled on behalf of Columbia Power Corporation by Bouchard and Kennedy between 1998 and 2000, the analysis of which has been presented in the comprehensive report entitled First Nations’ Ethnography and Ethnohistory in British Columbia’s Lower Kootenay/Columbia Hydropower Region (Bouchard and Kennedy 2000[reprinted in April, 2005]).

While no new research has been undertaken, the present report re-focuses and expands upon those sections of the voluminous 2000 work that are relevant to the Waneta area. The present study includes additional information obtained by Bouchard and Kennedy during the course of their more than 35 years of research in this region, some of which is contained in the following reports and publications: Kennedy and Bouchard (1975; 1998); Bouchard and Kennedy (1984a; 1985); and Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy (1980).

1.2 Report Structure

This report is comprised of six sections. Section 1.0 sets out the context of this report, lists its objectives, and identifies the First Nations whose cultural history has been investigated. This first section also includes a short discussion of “traditional use sites,” i.e. places of cultural significance to aboriginal people. As well, Section 1.0 contains a brief review of contemporary First Nations’ claims to lands and resources within the study area.

Section 2.0 provides a literature review of the available sources of information that we have considered in our review of First Nations’ aboriginal interests and traditional use in the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area.
Section 3.0 describes specific aboriginal land use that occurred in the immediate environs of the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project, and presents an identification of flora and fauna that are culturally significant to First Nations and are found, or are likely to be found, in the vicinity of the WEP site.

Section 4.0 presents the Conclusions of this report, while Section 5.0 lists the sources cited within the preceding sections as well as the Appendices.

Appendices A through C provide supplementary cultural and ethnographic summaries of those aspects of aboriginal society that are important for the consideration of traditional land use in the Waneta area. Appendix A provides a description of the use of sturgeon-nosed canoes and horses as transportation by the Lakes and Kutenai First Nations in this region of the Columbia Basin. Appendices B and C provide general cultural and ethnographic summaries of the Lakes and Kutenai First Nations respectively.

1.3 Linguistic and Cultural Affiliations of Claimant First Nations

This section discusses the linguistic and cultural affiliations of the Okanagan-Colville, Lakes and Kutenai, all of whom claim aboriginal interests in the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area.

1.3.1 Okanagan-Colville Linguistic and Cultural Affiliations

The term "Okanagan-Colville" — sometimes called “Colville-Okanagan,” or just “Okanagan” — is used to describe the language known by these Native people as nsilxtsin, which means 'people's speech' (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:238). Okanagan-Colville is one of the several related languages comprising the Interior Salish division of the Salishan language family. The seven Interior Salish languages can be divided on the basis of lexical and structural similarities into two groups: a northwestern (northern) group consisting of Lillooet, Thompson and Shuswap; and a southeastern (southern) group consisting of Okanagan-Colville, Columbian, Coeur d’Alene, and Kalispel (sometimes referred to as “Spokane-Kalispel-Flathead”) (Kinkade, Elmendorf, Rigsby and Aoki 1998:51-52; Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade 1998:4; Kroeber 1999:4-5). The Okanagan-Colville language has, prior to the 1970s, been inconsistently

---

1 The Okanagan-Colville terms appearing in the present report are transcribed by Bouchard in the practical writing system he developed for this language in the early 1970s, with the assistance of the late Larry Pierre of Penticton (Bouchard and Pierre 1973). A description of this writing system is published in Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy (1980:158-160) and also in Bouchard and Kennedy (1984b:95-97). Native terms not transcribed by Bouchard are indicated with double quotation marks; English translations are indicated with single quotation marks.
Figure 1: Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project and Surrounding Territory
identified by several names, including “Okanagan” (spelled “Okanogan” in Washington State),
or by a more potentially-misleading term, “Colville.” Linguist Tony Mattina referred to this
language as both “Colville-Okanagan” and “Colville” in the early 1970s (Mattina 1973).
Subsequently he tended to use the term “Colville-Okanagan” more often (eg. Mattina 1980;
1987). We ourselves initially used the term “Okanagan” to refer to the entire language (see, for example, Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:ii). But since 1979 we have used the term “Okanagan-
Colville” (Bouchard and Kennedy 1979:6-7).

The term “Okanagan-Colville” has the advantage of denoting the principal names of the two
major dialect groups of which the language is presently comprised, and reflecting, through its
spelling, the fact that the same language is spoken on both sides of the Canada-United States
border.2

We have identified seven Okanagan-Colville dialects: Northern Okanagan, spoken by Native
people living in villages along Okanagan Lake and the Okanagan River drainage; Similkameen
Okanagan, spoken, at least since the early 1700s, by people residing along the Similkameen
River drainage system; Southern Okanagan, spoken along the lower Okanogan River in the
United States; Methow, spoken by people living along the Methow River, who are interrelated
with speakers of the Columbian language; Sanpoil-Nespelem, spoken by those whose villages
extended along the Columbia River from Grand Coulee to Rogers Bar and along the Sanpoil
River and lower Spokane River; Colville, along the Columbia River from near Northport south
to Rogers Bar, and in the Colville Valley; and Lakes, spoken by people residing (or formerly
residing) along the Columbia River from Northport to Revelstoke, including the Arrow Lakes
and Slocan Lake areas.3

Present-day speakers of Okanagan-Colville indicate that in the past, clearly-recognized
linguistic differences among all these dialects existed.4 However, at the present time, because
the language is spoken by relatively few people, the only significant dialect difference which
appears to remain is between the "Colville" dialect continuum (Sanpoil-Nespelem, Colville,

---

2 For use of the term “Okanagan-Colville”, see: Carlson (1972); Thompson (1976); Bouchard and
Kennedy (1979); Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy (1980); Bouchard and Kennedy (1984a); and Kennedy and

3 Others have slight variances in the number of dialects they distinguish. For example, Kinkade et al.
(1998:51, 57) identify six dialects, omitting Similkameen Okanagan as a separate dialect, and classifying it as a
subvariety of Northern Okanagan, while Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade (1998:67) identify eight dialects, four
of them northern (Head of the Lakes, Vernon, Penticton, and Similkameen) and four southern (Lakes-Colville-
Inchelium, San Poil-Nespelem, Southern Okanagan, and Methow).

4 The original Lakes dialect was apparently very similar to the Colville dialect spoken by the people living
to the south of the Lakes. James Teit (1907-1910) wrote on May 20th, 1909 that the Lakes and Colville dialects
were very similar, with Lakes being distinguished by the "exceedingly slow and measured" manner in which it was
spoken.

In Canada, speakers of the Okanagan dialect comprise the seven British Columbia First Nations (Bands) forming the “Okanagan Nation Alliance” and living on Indian Reserves located from as far south as the International Boundary to as far north as Douglas Lake, as follows: Lower Similkameen Indian Band; Upper Similkameen Indian Band; Osoyoos Indian Band; Penticton Indian Band; Westbank First Nation; Okanagan (Head of the Lake) Indian Band; Upper Nicola Indian Band.

In the United States, speakers of this language are members of the Okanogan, Methow, Nespelem, Sanpoil, Colville and Lakes “tribes” who comprise five of the twelve tribes identified collectively as the "Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation" (CCT) who live in northeastern Washington State.

The Northern Okanagan have no name to distinguish themselves from the Southern Okanogan; the Native term ukwnákín (meaning 'ukwnakin ["Okanagan"] people') refers to all those Okanagan-Colville-speaking First Nations people living along the Okanagan River drainage from Vernon in the north to Brewster (in Washington State) in the south, an area encompassing both "Northern Okanagan" and "Southern Okanogan." The word ukwnakin, from which the term ukwnákín is derived, is said to identify an ancestral home site, although there is little agreement on its location (Dawson 1892:6; Curtis 1911:7:65; Teit 1930b:198-199,264; Spier 1938:73; Bouchard and Kennedy 1984b; Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:251).

Culturally, the Okanagan-Colville are classified as part of the Plateau Culture Area (Kennedy and Bouchard 1985:1208-1210; 1998:238-252; Walker 1998:1-7).

---

5 One of the first written identifications and transcriptions of the term ukwnakin was recorded in an 1811 account written by Northwest Company fur trader Alexander Ross, who identified the "Oakinacken" [ukwnakin] as one of the twelve "tribes" of the "great Oakinacken nation." Ross noted that the "Oakinacken tribe" resided "nearly in the centre" of the overall territory of the "Oakinacken nation" but gave no further information as to where this "tribe" was actually living (Ross 1849:286-290). Subsequent transcriptions of ukwnakin from various sources include: “Teek-a-nog-gan;” “Okanánkans;” “Okanawagan;” “Okikananes;” “Okinugen'es;” “Okaná 'gèn;” and “WEkanaqa 'n” (Dawson 1892:6; Teit 1930b:198-199,264; Spier 1938:73; Curtis 1911:7:65; Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:251).

6 The recent Plateau Volume of the Smithsonian’s Handbook of North American Indians (Walker 1998) has adopted arbitrary cultural boundaries that group together speakers of the Northern Okanagan, Colville and Lakes dialects of Okanagan-Colville and discuss them altogether in one article (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998), while a second article (Miller 1998) discusses a grouping comprised of speakers of the Southern Okanagan, Methow, and Sanpoil-Nespelem dialects of Okanagan-Colville, together with the Sinkayuse, Wenatchee, Entiat and Chelan who speak dialects of another Interior Salish language, Columbian.
1.3.2 Lakes Linguistic and Cultural Affiliations

"Lakes" is one of the dialects of the Okanagan-Colville language (as discussed above). The core territory of the Lakes people in the 18th century extended along the Columbia River between Revelstoke and the vicinity of Northport, Washington (located approximately seven miles [11 Km] south of the Canada/US border),\(^7\) and included the Arrow Lakes and Slocan Lake areas (Bouchard and Kennedy 1985; Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:238-240). Hence, the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area lies within this core territory.

The "Lakes" Indians acquired this English name from the fur traders who reached this area of the Upper Columbia in the early 1800s. The name was bestowed because this group's territory, defined by the waterways on which they travelled, was centred in the Arrow Lakes region.

The Lakes people's own name for themselves in the Okanagan-Colville language is *sngaytskstx* which translates as ‘Dolly Varden people.’ This term, *sngaytskstx*, is derived from the word *gaytskst*, which is the Okanagan-Colville name for the Dolly Varden char (*Salvelinus malma*), a fish for which the Arrow Lakes region was noted (Bouchard and Kennedy 1985:6; Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:251).\(^8\) This same fish has recently been reclassified as *Salvelinus confluentus*, known commonly as the “bull trout” (Hildebrand 1999:pers.comm.).\(^9\)

Numerous transcriptions of the term *sngaytskstx* appear in the ethnohistoric record to identify the Lakes Indian people. The fur trader Alexander Ross, who worked for the Northwest Company, seems to have been the first person to record an identification of the Lakes people by a transcription of their Native name. In September 1821, Ross compiled a map of the overall

---

\(^7\) Most of the Okanagan-Colville Native consultants we interviewed in the 1970s-1980s indicated that Kettle Falls was the historical dividing line between the Lakes and Colville.

\(^8\) When anthropologist and linguist William W. Elmendorf in September 1935 first recorded the term for the Lakes people as "*sina ‘itksktx*", he incorrectly wrote that its translation was ‘people at headwaters’ (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:1). A likely explanation for this error is that Elmendorf confused its translation with a translation for the very next Native term he wrote on that same page of his notes—"*o’kinajin*" (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:1). "*O’kinajin*" is Elmendorf’s transcription of the Okanagan-Colville term *ukwnakín* which means 'ukwnakín [anglicized as “Okanagan”] people' and refers to all those Native Indian people living along the Okanagan River drainage from Vernon in the north to Brewster (in Washington State) in the south (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:251). Moreover, ‘people at headwaters’ is a plausible translation of *ukwnakín*, as our Okanagan Native consultants over the years have explained that the general meaning of *ukwnakín* is related to ‘upper end/upper waters.’

\(^9\) It was anthropologist Verne Ray’s (1932:11) opinion that “*a’itckst*” [gaytskst] referred to “a small speckled fish of the upper Columbia river,” whereas Teit (1930b:199) believed that “*a’t tcEkst*” [gaytskst] was the “lake trout” which he identified as “*Salvelinus namaycush*”? However, fisheries biologist Larry Hildebrand (1999:pers.comm.) points out that the lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) is not found in the Arrow Lakes, or in Slocan Lake, or in Kootenay Lake.
Columbia Basin region which identified the Lakes people as the “Sin natch eggs” (Ross 1821; Wheat 1958:107). George Simpson, the Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, referred to them as "Sinachicks" when he travelled through the Arrow Lakes in 1824 (Merk 1968). Hudson's Bay Company men John Work and William Tolmie also transcribed the name, Work recording it as "Sinaecht" in 1830 (Work 1830), and Tolmie as "Sinahoiluk" in 1864 (Tolmie 1864). A member of John Palliser's 1857-1860 Exploration Expedition transcribed the name as "Sanihk" (Spry 1968:480). Charles Wilson, a member of the British Boundary Commission who gave a paper on the tribes in the boundary area to the Ethnological Society of London in 1864, referred to these people as "Sinuitskistux" (Wilson 1866:275-332). An 1870 report by William P. Winans to the American Secretary of the Interior transcribed the name as "Sen-i-jextee" (Winans 1870b). The Jesuits of the St. Regis Provincial Mission variously used the words "Snaichist" or "Snaichisti" between 1879 and 1893 (Saint Regis Mission House Diary 1879; 1893).

The term sngaytskstx was also transcribed by anthropologists and ethnographers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. George Dawson called the Lakes the "S-na-a-chikst" (Dawson 1892:6). Franz Boas transcribed their name as "Snaai’tckstq" (Boas c.1900). Among the transcriptions used by James Teit were: "Snāi’ tcEkstEx" or "Snrai’ tcEkstEx" (Teit 1910-1913) “Senijextee” (Teit 1914:284); and “Snai’ tcEkst” (Teit 1930b:199). James Mooney referred to them as the "Senijextee" (Mooney 1896:732), and Edward Curtis transcribed the name as "Sīnūaitskstūk" (Curtis 1911:64). Elmendorf (1935-1936) used the term "Sina’itskstx." The late Verne Ray’s transcription of the term was "Sna’itckstk" (Ray 1936b:120).

While we have transcribed the name for the Lakes people as “sn̓ayckstx” (in the International Phonetic Alphabet) in our recent article on the Northern Okanagan, Lakes and Colville (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:251), we transcribe this term as sngaytskstx in virtually all our other work, including the present report.10

Culturally, the Lakes are classified as part of the Plateau Culture Area (Kennedy and Bouchard 1985:1208-1210; 1998:238-252; Walker 1998:1-7).

---

10 Paula Pryce (1999) transcribes sngaytskstx as “sinixt”, following the use of this transcription by the contemporary Lakes people who are centered at Vallican in the Slocan (Sinixt/Arrow Lakes Nation 1999). Other recent works in which the transcription “sinixt” is used, include: Morran (1999; 2000a; 2000b); and Delehanty Pearkes (1999; 2000a; 2000b; 2002).
1.3.3 Kutenai Linguistic and Cultural Affiliations

The Ktunaxa (Kutenai) people speak the Kutenai language. Most linguists identify Kutenai as a "linguistic isolate" meaning that it is not related to any other known language (Kinkade et al. 1998:49-52). However, linguist Lawrence Morgan, who has studied the Kutenai language since the late 1960s and whose Master’s thesis and Doctoral dissertation are both on the Kutenai language, is of the opinion that “Kutenai is remotely and genetically related to the Salishan languages” (Morgan 1991:494).

Two major social divisions of Kutenai—“Upper Kutenai” and “Lower Kutenai”—are recognized. These distinctions, which correspond with two slightly divergent dialects of the Kutenai language, are made with reference to the course of the Kootenay River. Upper Kutenai is spoken along the upper course of the Kootenay River both in British Columbia and Montana, whereas Lower Kutenai is spoken along this river’s lower course, both in B.C. and Idaho (Morgan 1991:3; Brunton 1998:225). The dividing line between Lower and Upper Kutenai has been identified as Kootenai Falls, near Troy, Montana (Coues 1897:2:709-710; A. Smith 1984:24, 29-30).

“Kutenai” is an anglicization of the term “kotonáwa”, a word used by the Blackfoot to refer to the Kutenai people. Apparently the term “kotonáwa” is based on a root “kotóna-” which itself may ultimately be derived from the Kutenai word “ktunaxa家族（written as “Ktunaxa”）.

11 The term transcribed as “Ktunaxa” has been used by the Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Tribal Council since about 1990 (see the explanation of this term that follows). Although “Ktunaxa” is now a widely-used popular term in British Columbia, most linguistic and ethnographic studies continue to use the spelling “Kutenai” (often spelled “Kootenai” in the United States). Another spelling, “Kootenay”, appears in geographical names in British Columbia, and is widely known. In the present report we will use both “Kutenai” and “Ktunaxa,” although we use “Kutenai” most often; there have been literally dozens of spellings of this term since it was first recorded in the early 1800s.

12 At one time, all the language families of the Northwest Coast and Plateau culture were classified into one of three “phyla”: Na-Dene, Algonkin-Wakashan and Penutian. These phyla are no longer accepted as valid by most linguists. Kutenai, which was formerly classified within the Algonkin-Wakashan group, is now considered to be a language isolate on the Plateau (Foster 1996:81). Numerous other scholars have also identified Kutenai as a linguistic isolate. For example, Horatio Hale, who served as ethnologist with the United States Exploring Expedition which explored parts of the Oregon Territory in 1841, concluded that “Kitunha” [Kutenai] was one of the languages he encountered which could not be grouped with any others into a language family (Hale 1846:535). J.W. Powell’s 1891 classification and map of the Native languages of North America north of Mexico also classified “Kitunahan” as an isolate (Powell 1891:Table 3). More modern studies which classify Kutenai as a linguistic isolate include: Voegelin and Voegelin (1965); Campbell and Mithun (1979); Goddard (1996); and Brunton (1998) (but see also Lawrence Morgan’s comments on this subject, which follow).

13 Morgan adds that “some issues relating to the origins of the Kutenai language can be held open for further academic discussion.” But Morgan also notes that other issues are, in his view, “absolutely clear at the present time and offer only one possible conclusion” (Morgan 1991:494).
“Ktunaxa” and “ksanka” are the two words in the Kutenai language which are used to describe the Kutenai people as a whole, as well as the language. The Montana Kutenai in particular use the word “ksanka” while other Kutenai people generally use the term “ktunaxa”. (Morgan 1991:1-2).

According to Morgan, two possible etymologies have been recorded for the term “ktunaxa”. One, suggested by Boas, relates to a verb meaning ‘to go out into the open’ (Boas and Chamberlain 1918:344). A second etymology for “ktunaxa” was suggested to Morgan by one of his Kutenai linguistic consultants, and relates to a verb which means ‘to eat lean meat’ (Morgan 1991:2). Still another etymology relates to a verb meaning ‘to pull a hide legging over the nose of a canoe’ (Schaeffer 1935, in, Brunton 1998:236).

The exact relationship between the terms “Ktunaxa” and “ksanka” is not certain, although there appears to have been a correlation between “ksanka” and the Lower Kutenai. For example, Turney-High recorded that all Kutenai, and particularly the Lower Kutenai, used the term “sán’ka” to describe themselves. The Lower Kutenai, according to Turney-High, “invariably use this term and never consciously or unconsciously use any of the ktunáxa or tunáxa derivatives.” He noted that the Upper Kutenai sometimes used the ktunáxa term (Turney-High 1941:12). Much the same information was noted by Curtis, who did his field work more than thirty years before Turney-High. Curtis (1911:119) said that the proper name of the tribe is “Ksánka”, although “Kitunáha” was heard among the northern band. Anthropologist Bill Brunton notes that Montana Kutenai (which he spells as “Kootenai”) use the term “ksanka” for both “themselves and for all Kootenais.” Brunton states as well his view that “it is possible that ksanka originally applied only to the Lower Kootenai while ktunaxa applied to the Upper Kootenai” (Brunton 1998:236).

Several subgroups or “bands” have been identified within the larger Upper Kutenai and Lower Kutenai social divisions of the Kutenai. For the purposes of the present report, however, we need only to be concerned with the Lower Kutenai of the Creston, Kootenay Lake, and lower Kootenay River region as far south as the U.S. border. The Kutenai name for this subgroup of the Lower Kutenai is transcribed in Brunton’s (1998:226) article as “G’k’aq’ faha ku.”

---

14 The meaning of the term “ksanka” is even more obscure. Turney-High’s consultants, interviewed in the late 1930s, no longer knew what the term “sán’ka” meant. Even the oldest said that it was an obsolete term whose meaning was forgotten. Turney-High’s consultants, both Upper and Lower Kutenai, were, however, insistent that the term did not mean “Flatbows”, or “Slender Bows”, a translation which had previously been given for the term (Turney-High 1941:12). Paul Baker, who did field work with the Lower Kutenai in the 1950s, secured some admittedly uncertain definitions of the term from his consultants. One said that the tribe referred to itself as “san’ka,” and stated that “if you saw an arrow sticking straight up in the ground this would be ‘san’ka’. He could give no further explanation of the meaning. Another consultant, Louie White from Creston, thought that “san’ka” meant ‘something standing up.’ Others translated it as meaning ‘bones’, or ‘bad bones’ (Baker 1955:10). Brunton (1998:236) translates the term as meaning ‘standing arrow.’
This term has been translated as ‘people of the lake’ (Chamberlain n.d.), ‘swamp people’ (Schaeffer 1935, in Chalfant 1974b:51), or ‘meadow people’ (Brunton 1998:226). Another Kutenai term, “yaqan nukiy” (‘the people where the rock is standing’), has recently been provided to identify the “Lower Kootenay band near Creston” (Ktunaxa-Kinbasket Tribal Council 1999). Culturally, the Kutenai are classified as part of the Plateau Culture Area, as are the other groups discussed in the present report (Walker 1998:1-7; Brunton 1998:223-237).

1.4 Contemporary First Nations’ Claims to the Waneta Area

The proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area is within territory claimed by several contemporary First Nations. What follows is a description of these claims, as presented by the First Nations,¹⁵ themselves, both in correspondence to the Columbia Power Corporation and in other documents that have been made available.

The Lakes Tribe is one of the twelve tribes identified collectively as the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CCT) based in Nespelem, Washington. Relying on Verne Ray’s (1936b) map, the CCT delineates Lakes (sngaytsktstx or Sinixt) territory to include the following: the Kettle River drainage; the Columbia River from below Kettle Falls, Washington, up to the Big Bend above Revelstoke; the Arrow Lakes; the Slocan River and Slocan Lake; the Kootenay River from its confluence with the Columbia at Castlegar up to and including the West Arm of Kootenay Lake; the west side of Kootenay Lake north from the West Arm; and also Trout Lake and the Lardeau and Duncan Rivers. The CCT also cites James Teit’s (1910-1913; 1930b) delineation of Lakes territory, which is less expansive than Ray’s. In any case, the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area is within both Teit’s and Ray’s definition of Lakes territory. Moreover, the CCT’s Business Council has taken the position that they are the only entity representing the Lakes Tribe’s interests—including issues pertaining to aboriginal title and rights—on both sides of the U.S./Canada border (Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation 1998a; 1998b; 1998c).

The Okanagan Nation Alliance (ONA), formerly the Okanagan Tribal Council, which represents the Lower Similkameen, Upper Similkameen, Osoyoos, Penticton, Westbank, Okanagan (Head of the Lake) and Upper Nicola Bands/First Nations, claims an overall territory that includes the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project lands.¹⁶

---

¹⁵ The term “First Nations” is not used in the United States, where indigenous groups most often refer to themselves as “Tribes” or sometimes “Nations.”

The contemporary Sinixt (\textit{sngaytskstx})/Arrow Lakes Nation, based in the Slocan, relies largely upon anthropologist Verne Ray’s (1936b) delineation of Lakes territory. Thus, the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project lands fall within their claimed territory (Sinixt/Arrow Lakes Nation 1999).

Also claiming the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area is the Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Tribal Council (KKTC) which represents the Ktunaxa Nation and Kinbasket peoples and is comprised of the Lower Kootenay, Tobacco Plains, St. Mary’s, Columbia Lake and Shuswap Bands. The KKTC’s (1993) map of Ktunaxa Nation traditional territory includes the west side of the Columbia River, all the way from the U.S. border northwards alongside the Arrow Lakes to the Big Bend, and east to the Continental Divide. A more recent Ktunaxa Nation map delineates an even more expansive traditional territory (Ktunaxa Nation 2004). As well, the Ktunaxa Nation filed a document in March 1998 in the Federal Court of Appeal which included the assertion that the Arrow Lakes region, “whatever other designation it may have, falls within the aboriginal territory of the Ktunaxa Nation,” thus inferring shared exclusivity of aboriginal title with some other group(s) (Ktunaxa Nation 1998).

1.5 Places of Cultural Significance

One of the purposes of this report is to document locations in the immediate environs of the WEP of any place of cultural significance to the aboriginal groups who traditionally used this area, and to present the recorded ethnographic, ethnohistoric and linguistic data indicating what made these sites culturally significant.

Our own wide-ranging experience, as well as that of other researchers who have been actively engaged in compiling land and resource use data, has been that place names are a good indicator of locations imprinted with cultural significance. While place names are not the only indicator of lands considered culturally significant by aboriginal people, we and others have found that place names reflect cultural principles which illustrate a people’s cognitive relationship with these broader surroundings. Tilley (1994:18) clearly notes this when he says: “without a name, culturally significant sites would not exist, but only as a raw void, a natural environment.” Thus, an accurate rendition of place names, together with the data indicating the salience of a place’s traditional use, enhances understanding of indigenous peoples’ perceptions and experience of place and their broader environmental relationship to the surrounding areas.

Culturally-significant places are sometimes referred to as “Traditional Use Sites,” identified by the acronym “TUS” which also refers to “Traditional Use Studies.” The various agencies of the B.C. Government which facilitate Traditional Use Studies recognize the significance of named places as a measure of identifying aboriginal people’s use of specific areas.
In Washington State and throughout the United States, culturally-significant places are referred to as “Traditional Cultural Properties.” The U.S. National Park Service’s bulletin entitled *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties* defines Traditional Cultural Properties as places having significance to a community on the basis of the role the place or property plays in that community’s historically-rooted beliefs, customs and practices. Places or properties deemed to qualify as traditional cultural properties in the United States can be registered and accorded protection by legislation (Kennedy 2002:12).

It should also be noted, however, that First Nations have a relationship with much broader territories than the specific sites identified by name. They used and occupied lands that we refer to commonly as their “traditional territory.” Their use of such territory was not necessarily to the exclusion of other indigenous people, but this territory did contain a particular group’s winter villages and customarily-used resource-harvesting sites. In the present report, when we speak of a specific area being within the “traditional territory” of a certain people, we mean that the area was used primarily by these people and that they and other tribes regarded it as their territory. Indigenous people associated with other tribes may have used the same area, provided they made their presence and amicable intentions known, or travelled there as guests of the resident First Nation. While incursion into a neighbouring First Nation’s territory and exploitation of their resources was not uncommon, when done without permission it often resulted in forceful retaliation.

While some site-specific information concerning First Nations knowledge and use of the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area exists (see Section 3.0), it is very likely that additional information about this area has been lost forever. This reflects limitations in the available recorded ethnographic data. Some important early ethnographic work was done among the aboriginal peoples of the west Kootenays, but this research took place decades after considerable shifts in primary settlements had occurred, with a consequent diminution in First Nations use of the project study area.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

We have included two separate literature reviews in this section. One covers the Lakes (sngaytskstx or Sinixt) and Okanagan jointly, because both groups speak related dialects of the Okanagan-Colville language, and both groups have been discussed together in ethnographic and linguistic works. There is a separate discussion for the Kutenai, who speak a language that is totally different from Okanagan-Colville.

2.1 Lakes and Okanagan Literature Review

While several comprehensive ethnographic studies have been made of the Lakes and Okanagan, none of them provides a detailed picture of traditional First Nations use of the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area (WEP). It should be noted, however, that this is a reflection of the limited ethnographic information available for this area, rather than the scope or quality of these studies themselves.

The available literature concerning the Similkameen Okanagan (of the Similkameen River area) and Northern Okanagan (of the Okanagan River/Okanagan Lake areas) provides virtually no information about traditional use by these groups of the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area. This is because historically, these groups had an extremely limited presence in this study region, apart from their social and possibly political relations with the Lakes (sngaytskstx).

James Teit (n.d.; 1898-1910; 1907-1910; 1910-1913; 1914; 1917; 1930b) has provided the most comprehensive body of ethnographic data on the Okanagan-Colville generally, although he sometimes describes Okanagan-Colville culture in relation to that of the Thompson. In comparison, early ethnographic works on the Okanagan by Edward Curtis (1911) and Charles Hill-Tout (1911) contain much less data. Susan L. Allison (1892) recorded data on the Similkameen Okanagan, and Leslie Spier’s (1938) study of the Southern Okanagon also contains original Northern Okanagan data. Norman Lerman's comprehensive ethnographic work among the Okanagan, apart from a brief report on the winter dance (Lerman 1954), remains in his unpublished field notes (Lerman 1952-1954). Overviews of Northern Okanagan compiled by Douglas Hudson (1986; 1990) are based mostly on earlier ethnographies, but do contain some data he elicited around 1980. Peter Carstens (1991) and J.H. Christie and Robert de Pfyffer (1990) document Northern Okanagan social history, and David Wyatt (1998) has published an overview of the Nicola-Similkameen who were the original, non-Salishan inhabitants of the Similkameen River and Nicola River areas. Our 1984 study (Bouchard and Kennedy 1984b) includes original data focusing on Similkameen Okanagan knowledge and use.
Native people speaking the Lakes dialect of the Okanagan-Colville language did utilize the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area traditionally. However, the Lakes people underwent a demographic transition during the middle of the 19th century, which saw them shift their primary settlements and the focus of their subsistence activity south, to the vicinity of Kettle Falls, Washington. By the early 1870s, when the Colville Indian Reservation was established in Washington State, most of the Lakes people were living south of the Canada/US border. Still, the Lakes continued to use and occupy the Waneta area for several decades after this period of demographic transition, and some Lakes people — often intermarried with members of other tribes — maintained a few settlements in the area (see section 3.1). The more systematic Lakes use of Waneta and the surrounding area was severely lessened by the time ethnographers began to study these people in the early 20th century.

Major ethnographic studies of the Lakes have been undertaken by James Teit, Verne Ray, W.W. Elmendorf, and Bouchard and Kennedy. James Teit includes Lakes ethnographic data within both his published Okanagan-Colville studies (Teit 1914; 1930b) and his unpublished field notes (Teit n.d.; 1910; 1910-1913). His Lakes information was recorded in 1909 from the Lakes woman Antoinette Christian and her family, who lived at the settlement at Brilliant, at the mouth of the Kootenay River. The information Teit recorded included a list of old Lakes villages and principal camps, as well as some material on resource use.

Beginning around 1930, the late Verne Ray conducted substantial fieldwork among the Lakes and other Okanagan-Colville groups (Ray 1931-1944; 1932; 1933; 1936a; 1936b; 1937; 1939; 1954; 1975; 1976; 1977). His Lakes consultant was James Bernard, who was born around 1850 and was Chief of the Lakes people from early in the 20th century until his death in 1934. Ray also recorded a list of villages and principal camps that was independent of Teit’s, and provided general information about Lakes resource use.

In 1935 and 1936, the late W.W. Elmendorf undertook Lakes (and Spokane) fieldwork, although the results of this work were never published (Elmendorf is much better known for his monumental studies of the Twana/Skokomish Coast Salish). Elmendorf’s principal Native consultant was Nancy Wynecoop, a Lakes woman who was born around 1865, and who lived on the Spokane Reservation. Elmendorf elicited some information about Lakes settlements which he considered to be supplemental to Teit’s data. As well, Elmendorf recorded a significant amount of social, cultural and political information, including data concerning the Lakes’ relations with their neighbours, and their use of specific fish, animals and plants. Since Elmendorf never published his Lakes material, this work is much less well-known than the work of Teit or Ray.
We conducted Lakes fieldwork in the 1970s and 1980s, resulting in several reports (Bouchard and Kennedy 1979; 1984a; 1985; 2000; [Reprinted April 2005] Kennedy and Bouchard 1998). Our most knowledgeable Native consultants on the Lakes were aboriginal people who were born in the early 1900s and were all members of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation in Washington State. A major focus of our research was land and resource use. As well, we were specifically interested in finding out about the presence of the Lakes people in British Columbia.

The autobiography of an aboriginal writer, Mourning Dove (Christine Quintasket), who was of Lakes ancestry, has been edited by Jay Miller (1990) and contains some previously-unrecorded data.

Ethnohistoric studies of the Colville and/or Lakes were undertaken by David Chance (1973; 1986), and Christopher Turnbull (1977) in conjunction with their archaeological investigations. Okanagan ethnohistoric studies include works by Duane Thomson (1978; 1985; 1990) and Elizabeth Dolby (1973).


Significant ethnohistoric information about the Okanagan-Colville people generally begins with the arrival of the fur traders in and after 1811. The journals of David Thompson (Glover 1962; Belyea 1994); Ross Cox (Cox 1957) and Alexander Ross (Ross 1821; 1849; 1855) are the most significant published early fur trade sources.
Detailed information from the 1820s onward appears in the records of the Hudson's Bay Company, particularly the reports of Samuel Black (Black 1823-1825), John Work (Work 1829; 1830), James Bissett (Bissett 1868), Jason Ovid Allard (n.d) and the Fort Colville Journals of 1830-1831 (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). Catholic missionary sources are also good sources of Lakes information, particularly for the mid-19th century (Demers 1839a; 1839b; De Smet [1842-1848]; Blanchet 1878; Saint Regis Mission 1879, 1893; Caruana 1882; Diomedi 1893; Chittenden and Richardson 1905; Burns 1966; Warner and Munnick 1972). In 1847, the artist Paul Kane provided both information and sketches about the Colville and Lakes (Kane 1974; Harper 1971). Charles Wilkes (1844), George Gibbs (1855) and Charles W. Wilson (1866; 1970) describe aboriginal culture and provide census data from the 1840s-1850s. Lakes census data from 1870 was compiled by William P. Winans (1870a).

Descriptions of Lakes and Northern Okanagan people are found in several exploring journals of the mid-1860s (British Columbia 1866; 1869). Reports made during the 1860s from British Columbia officials who visited Lakes territory also provide valuable information about settlement and subsistence activities (Cox 1861; Dewdney 1865b). Dawson’s Geological Survey of 1888-1889 (Dawson 1890), and his unpublished diary of 1889 (Dawson 1889) also provide useful material on the Lakes.

Agent R.L.T. Galbraith’s correspondence (Galbraith 1902a-e; 1907a-b; 1908a-g; 1910a-b; 1917; 1918) is among the most essential sources on the Lakes people that is found within the voluminous Record Group 10 collection from Canada’s Department of Indian Affairs. Early 20th century testimony from Lakes and Okanagan aboriginal people can be found in the transcripts of evidence of the 1912-1916 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs (Royal Commission 1914; 1916) and in Department of Indian Affairs Records (Christian 1912; 1914; 1915a; 1915b). Information about the Lakes is also scattered in many different regional newspapers in the late 19th and very early 20th centuries.

Collections of Okanagan-Colville mythology, some of which include Native language texts, have been compiled by: Charles Hill-Tout (1911); James Teit (1917); Marian K. Gould (1917); Mourning Dove (1933); Verne Ray (1933); Josephine Shuttleworth (1936-1938); Eileen Yanan (1971); Randy Bouchard (1978); Anthony Mattina (1985); and Harry Robinson and Wendy Wickwire (1989; 1992). Frank Flynn (1976) and Wolfgang Jilek and Louise Jilek-Aall (1974) have analyzed unpublished Okanagan-Colville mythology in English translation.

Topical studies include: Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy (1980), Gabriel (1954), and Watkins (1970b) on ethnobotany; Kennedy and Bouchard (1975) on Colville fishing; Bouchard and

A 1999 book by cultural anthropologist Paula Pryce, entitled ‘Keeping the Lake’s Way’: Reburial and the Re-creation of a Moral World among an Invisible People, focuses on the contemporary efforts of Lakes people living at Vallican in the Slocan to protect skeletal remains in their aboriginal homeland while asserting their traditional connection to Lakes territory. Though Ms. Pryce relies extensively on the research and analysis we presented in our 1984 and 1985 reports (Bouchard and Kennedy 1984a; 1985), she presents an alternative hypothesis concerning Lakes settlement patterns.19


Linguistic research among the Okanagan-Colville, including the compiling of word lists, texts, dictionaries, grammars, and pedagogical materials has been undertaken by: George Gibbs (1877:248-264); A.S. Gatschet [1885]; Franz Boas (c.1900); J.M. LeJeune (1897); James Teit (1908); Donald Watkins (1970a); Randy Bouchard (Bouchard and Pierre 1973; Bouchard, Pierre and Louie 1973); Anthony Mattina (1973; 1980; 1985; 1987; Mattina and Jack 1990); Nancy J. Mattina (1996); Ivy Doak (1983); and James Somday (1980).

17 A recent report by anthropologist Lillian Ackerman — an ethnographic overview and assessment of existing information relating to the Native populations of the Franklin D. Roosevelt area in Washington State — summarizes Bouchard and Kennedy’s (1984a) place names data and reviews and assesses that study (Ackerman 1996:48-72).

18 The term ‘‘traditional ecological knowledge’’ (‘‘TEK’’) has been applied in recent years to the ethnographic documentation of indigenous knowledge systems pertaining to the natural world (see Fowler and Turner 1999). Since the mid-1970s, this type of ethnographic documentation has been a focus of Bouchard and Kennedy’s research, not only among the Okanagan-Colville but also throughout other areas of the Plateau as well as the Northwest Coast.

19 Pryce’s 1999 study has been reviewed by Schroeder (2000) and by Bouchard and Kennedy (2001).
2.2 Kutenai Literature Review

Several comprehensive ethnographic studies have been made of the Kutenai. However, most of this Kutenai research has focused more on the Upper Kutenai than on the Lower, who are of much greater salience to the present report. The known and available studies do not provide a comprehensive view of traditional Lower Kutenai land and resource use.

Material relating to the Kutenai was compiled by George Dawson in his 1883 travels among them, and by Franz Boas during the course of his 1886-1888 research (Boas 1890; 1905). Boas’ linguistic map, compiled in 1928, is also of importance (Boas 1928). Together with A.F. Chamberlain (see below), Boas compiled and edited an important collection of Kutenai myths (Boas and Chamberlain 1918).

Anthropologist Alexander F. Chamberlain, in 1891, was the first researcher to conduct systematic inquiries among the Kutenai. His published reports (eg. Chamberlain 1893; 1905; 1909) and unpublished notes and manuscripts (eg. Chamberlain n.d.a-n.d.f) are an important source of Kutenai ethnographic and linguistic information.

A list of Kutenai subgroups was compiled by Edward Curtis between 1907 and 1909 from his original fieldwork (Curtis 1911), as part of his multi-volume ethnographic treatment of indigenous North Americans. Curtis gave brief locational information about each group (Curtis 1911:118), and provided some additional data. While an appendix (Curtis 1911:173-174) indicated animals that were used for food, it was presented in tabular form without detail about particular locations where these animals were taken, or any other type of information.20

James Teit did not publish any systematic ethnographic information about the Kutenai, but he did record some material relating to Kutenai settlement and land use in his unpublished fieldnotes (Teit 1907-1910; 1910-1913). Teit also elicited data from the adjacent Lakes and Shuswap groups which are important in defining the western boundary of the Kutenai (Teit 1898-1910; 1909; 1910; 1910-1913). As well, Teit gathered Kutenai material during his studies among the Coeur d’Alene and Flathead, published in 1930 (Teit 1930b). Information on the Kutenai who lived east of the Rockies appears in Teit’s (1930a; 1930b) published materials and in his unpublished notes (including Teit 1910-1913).

---

20 Curtis’ chart is also slightly problematic because the identification of whether the animal was eaten is made not for the Kutenai individually, but for a ‘‘group’’ of three Tribes, the Yakima and the Klickitat being the other. Consequently, identifying particular animals as having been eaten by the Kutenai on the sole basis of Curtis’ s chart is problematic, given that the reference could well indicate their use by other Plateau groups, as well.
Claude Schaeffer conducted field work among the Kutenai between 1935 and 1937 to prepare a 1940 doctoral dissertation on the Kutenai subsistence quest (Schaeffer 1940). The dissertation is useful for information on the subsistence practices themselves, although the amount of detail is very limited, and the information is presented in a way that makes it virtually impossible to verify. Schaeffer also compiled detailed information on the Kutenai subgroups. The actual data are available only in Schaeffer’s unpublished fieldnotes, which are held in the American Museum of Natural History in New York, and in the Glenbow Museum and Archives, Calgary, Alberta (we have not had the opportunity to review these fieldnotes). However, Schaeffer’s fieldnotes were used extensively in a 1950s study by Stuart Chalfant (Chalfant 1974b), and Chalfant’s lengthy excerpts from Schaeffer have been utilized in the present report as a substitute for the original notes. Schaeffer wrote several subsequent articles on the Kutenai, including an article on their use of bears and bear ceremonialism (Schaeffer 1966) and a posthumously-published article on the issue of Kutenai migration from east of the Rockies (Schaeffer 1982).

Verne Ray studied groups adjacent to the Kutenai rather than the Kutenai themselves (Ray 1936b; 1939; 1942), but his information assists in defining Kutenai boundaries through defining the boundaries of their neighbours. Ray’s 1942 study indicates resources used by the Kutenai, although it appears to be more reflective of Upper Kutenai resources.

In 1939-1940, Harry Holbert Turney-High conducted a significant field research study among the Kutenai (Turney-High 1941). His Kutenai consultants included both Upper and Lower Kutenai, and his study contains proportionately more Lower Kutenai material than most of the other Kutenai studies as a result. Turney-High’s work is generally considered to be the most complete Kutenai ethnography based substantially on original field research, although some gaps in the material do exist, and the accuracy of some of the information he recorded has subsequently been questioned.

Carling Malouf has written extensively about the Kutenai. However, his emphasis has largely concentrated on Kutenai people within the United States, not Canada. His study done for the Indian Claims Commission was focussed on American Kutenai, and says very little about the Canadian Kutenai. Likewise, other articles by Malouf (Malouf 1952; Malouf and White 1953)  

21 Schaeffer’s fieldnotes are composed primarily of Upper Kutenai material. These fieldnotes are identified as having been prepared in 1935. In the preface to his dissertation, Schaeffer indicated that his 1935 fieldnotes were compiled at Tobacco Plains, and were on the economic life and material culture of the Upper Kutenai. Schaeffer in 1937 made brief visits to the other groups, including the Lower Kutenai at Bonner’s Ferry and Creston. But even following the completion of this later body of data, Schaeffer noted that most of the field data only related to the Upper Kutenai (Schaeffer 1940:3).

22 Malouf compiled a very detailed resource use map which identified ‘‘favorite hunting and gathering places’’ and indicated the principal species taken (Malouf 1974:138). Unfortunately, it only covers the
provide very useful material about the Flathead Lake Kutenai in the United States, but nothing useful about the groups near the present study area.

Like Malouf, Stuart Chalfant undertook a study of the Kutenai in the 1950s for the Indian Claims Commission; his was done on behalf of the American federal government (Chalfant 1974b; Indian Claims Commission 1954). Chalfant’s focus, like Malouf’s, was thus on the Kutenai in the United States, and relatively little information was given about the Kutenai on the Canadian side of the border.

The late Allan Smith’s comprehensive 1984 Kutenai study was focused specifically on the region around Lake Koocanusa, an artificial lake behind the Libby Dam on the Kootenay River (A. Smith 1984). This lake is primarily in the United States, and the area around Libby was the focus of Smith’s inquiries. While Smith does survey the literature which discusses the Canadian Kutenai as well, his emphasis is on the Upper Kutenai, not the Lower, and though he does present some material on the Lower Kutenai, it is not comprehensive. But Smith does provide a very thorough review of the boundaries of traditional Kutenai territory.

One study which explicitly focuses on the Lower Kutenai was done by Paul Baker in 1955 (Baker 1955). Baker spoke with both Creston and Bonner’s Ferry people (and identified his consultants throughout his text). As Baker was a sociologist, the focus of his inquiry was largely contemporary. The amount of material on traditional land use is limited, and generally not site-specific.

Olga Johnson’s study (Johnson 1969) relies substantially on Turney-High, but also supplements his work and other published sources with additional material gathered herself through interviews with Kutenai elders.

Bill B. Brunton’s recent article on the Kutenai includes some of his own original field work dating from the 1960s, but is principally a literature review (Brunton 1998). Similarly, Deward Walker’s (1978; 1985; 1994) overviews of Kutenai ethnography and ethnohistory are primarily from the literature.

Although A.F. Chamberlain (n.d.c) compiled an early, unpublished ethnobotanical study of the Kutenai, based on his fieldwork in the early 1890s, the most comprehensive source on Kutenai plant use is Hart, Turner and Morgan’s unpublished 1980 monograph (Hart, Turner and Morgan 1980). The amount of site-specific Lower Kutenai information compiled in this latter report is very limited however. Nor is there site-specific Kutenai plant information in a southwestern Montana area and provides absolutely no information about Kutenai resource use in British Columbia.
recently-published ethnobotany booklet compiled under the auspices of the Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Tribal Council (Keefer and McCoy 1999).

The 1984 Preliminary Report written by Justus Simonetta Development Consultants on behalf of the Kootenay Area Indian Council (Justus Simonetta 1984) is weak. The research upon which the report was based does not appear to have been comprehensive, and there appears to have been little, if any, attempt made to assess the information that was obtained. A 1980 Kutenai resource inventory report done in connection with the southeast portion of the Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline (Teneese, Jacobs and McCoy 1980) did not consider areas as far west as the present study area.

Historian David Chance’s study of the Kootenay Fur Trade and its establishments between 1795 and 1871 was, like Smith’s study referred to above, undertaken in connection with the Lake Koocanusa project (Chance 1981). Chance’s study is an extremely detailed examination based on ethnohistoric sources, and contains an ethnohistoric examination of the Kutenai in relation to the fur trade. We have reviewed many of the same sources that Chance has relied on, including the accounts of: Peter Fidler (MacGregor 1966); David Thompson (1811;
Elliott 1918; 1920; Glover 1962; Belyea 1994); Alexander Henry (Coues 1897); Ross Cox (1957); John McLeod (1822-1823); George Simpson (Merk 1968); Alexander Ross (1825; 1855); John Warren Dease (1827); John Work (1830; Elliott 1914); Francis Heron (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831); and James Douglas (1835).

Some ethnohistoric accounts generated independently of the fur trade are also significant sources of Kutenai material, including materials compiled by Father P.J. De Smet (1863; 1906; Chittenden and Richardson 1905) who ministered to the Kutenai in the 1840s. Descriptions of the Kutenai were also provided by members of several exploring expeditions which passed through or near Kutenai territory in the 1850s: George Gibbs (1855),23 John Palliser (Spry 1963; 1968); Thomas Blakiston (1858); Augustus Thibodo (1940); James Hector (Hector and Vaux 1861); William Hamilton (1900) and Charles Wilson (1866; 1970). Arthur Fenwick’s (n.d.) memoir recalling his activities among the Kutenai in the 1880s contains useful information. W.A. Baillie-Grohman, a big-game hunter and pioneer settler in the Kootenay District, wrote extensively about his experiences, and provided much material about the Kootenay Lake area in 1882 (Baillie-Grohman 1907; 1918). His observations about topics directly related to Kutenai hunting are of particular value.

---

23 Gibbs’ published 1855 report, which is a well-known early study on the Native groups of Washington, obtained the majority of its Kutenai material from Father De Smet. We have also reviewed Gibbs’ own unpublished field notebooks (Gibbs 1853-1856; [1854-1855]; [1854-1857]; [1855-1856] from this period (which are much less well-known), but they contain very little additional Kutenai information other than the material in the published report.
A number of reports prepared by federal and provincial officials in the 19th and early 20th century have proven useful for the purposes of the present work. These include: William Cox’s (1861) account of his trip to the Kootenay River/Columbia confluence; and Edgar Dewdney’s (1865a-d) and Walter Moberly’s (1866) explorations throughout this region. Arthur Farwell made a first-hand examination of the Kutenai in 1883 (Farwell 1884). Indian Reserve Commissioner Peter O’Reilly’s original Minute of Decision (O’Reilly 1884) contains valuable information about the Kutenai groups. Robert Galbraith, a long-time resident who later became the Kootenay Indian Agent in the late 19th century, wrote several important accounts based on his investigations of the aboriginal people living at the mouth of the Kootenay River (Galbraith 1902a-e; 1908a-e; 1910a-b) and also gave useful testimony about the range of the Kutenai in testimony before the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs (1914). Valuable information about Lower Kutenai use and occupancy of the Creston area is also provided in Royal Commission of Indian Affairs’ (1914; 1916) documents.24

A number of local histories contain Kutenai material, including works by: Clara Graham (1963; 1971); R. Islip (1971); Harold Webber (1973); Fred Smyth (1938); E.L. Affleck (1976a; 1976b; 1976c; 1978); Wynndel Heritage Group (1986); Procter-Harrop Historical Book Committee (1988); and John Norris (1995). An unpublished manuscript on the Kutenai held by the Creston District Historical and Museum Society contains some site-specific data on Lower Kutenai land use (Ross [c.1980]).

Kutenai place names are found on a map likely prepared on behalf of the Ktunaxa-Kinbasket Tribal Council around 1995 (Anonymous [c.1995]). Similar Kutenai place names information is found as part of a Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Tribal Council-sponsored ethnobotanical booklet (Keefer and McCoy 1999:55-56), and also appears, together with some site-use data, in travel writer Chery Coull’s (1996) guide book to aboriginal B.C.

Linguistic materials concerning the Kutenai language include word-lists by George Gibbs (n.d.) and Angus McDonald (1856), a dictionary, word-lists and grammatical materials by A.F. Chamberlain (n.d.a; n.d.b; n.d.d; n.d.f; 1909) and works by: Lawrence Morgan (1976; 1980; 1991); Paul Garvin (1948a-c; 1951; 1953; 1954); Campbell and Mithun (1979); Michael Foster (1996); Ives Goddard (1996); and, Kinkade, Elmendorf, Rigsby and Aoki (1998).

24 Some additional information is provided in the surviving early records of the Kootenay Indian Agency (Kootenay Agency Letterbooks [1896-1919]). However, no volumes before 1896 remain extant, the surviving volumes are not in the best of condition, and no files of the Agent’s incoming correspondence have been preserved at all. Notwithstanding, the existing records do provide some information about Lower Kutenai resource use outside the Reserves at Creston.
3.0 SITE-SPECIFIC TRADITIONAL USE INFORMATION RELATING TO THE AREA OF THE WANETA HYDROELECTRIC EXPANSION PROJECT

The Lakes (Sinixt), the Okanagan Nation Alliance, and the Kutenai currently claim aboriginal interests in the area of the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project (WEP).

It is evident from the cultural summaries of these groups (see Appendices B and C of the present report) that they depended upon hunting, fishing and gathering for acquiring food and materials, and that some of these resources may have been obtained in the Columbia River/Pend d’Oreille River confluence area in the vicinity of Waneta.

Known and available land use data relating to specific sites throughout the Lower Kootenay/Columbia region were summarized previously in our comprehensive report entitled *First Nations’ Ethnography and Ethnohistory in British Columbia’s Lower Kootenay/Columbia Hydropower Region* (Bouchard and Kennedy 2000 [reprinted in April, 2005]). That study showed how the Columbia River was a central part of the aboriginal peoples’ waterborne communications and transportation system, facilitating travel between the Arrow Lakes — part of the heartland of aboriginal sngaytskstx (Lakes) territory — and Kettle Falls, the second largest salmon fishery on the Columbia. The locations of several villages and camps, as well as specific resource procurement sites were identified in this area, indicating the cultural significance of this region to the sngaytskstx people who lived here, for the wealth of resources it provided. Other aboriginal groups — the Okanagan, Kutenai (Ktunaxa) and Shuswap — sometimes entered sngaytskstx territory, either to visit and trade with the sngaytskstx, to pass through en route to visit another resource site or aboriginal group, or to hunt and fish with the sngaytskstx in their territory. Such use of the area may have increased subsequent to the relocation of many sngaytskstx people south of the US/Canada border, a process that began in the early 19th Century.

The first part of the present Section (3.1) begins by setting out the known and available information relating to the specific use of the Waneta area for traditional cultural pursuits. A context for these activities is provided through a discussion of traditional activities in the region between Waneta and Northport, to the south, at the Fort Shepherd site to the northwest of Waneta, and in the Beaver Valley area to the north of Waneta. This is followed by Sections 3.2-3.5 which review species of flora and fauna found, or likely to be found, in the vicinity of the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project, and which are of cultural significance to the Okanagan-Colville — especially the Lakes people within this larger grouping — and to the Kutenai.
3.1 Pend d'Oreille River Mouth/Waneta and the Surrounding Region

The area of the Pend d'Oreille River mouth, located on the east side of the Columbia River, immediately north of the Canada/US border, is known in the Okanagan-Colville language as nkw’lila7 (possibly meaning ‘burned area’). Nkw’lila7 refers specifically to an important aboriginal settlement formerly located at the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille River, and more generally to the lower area of this river as well.

The term nkw’lila7 was known in the 1970s-1980s to all of our Lakes consultants (all of whom are now deceased): Mary Marchand; Charlie Quintasket; Julia Quintasket; Louise Lemery; and Joe Barr. Other transcriptions of this same Okanagan-Colville term for this place include: “nkulilu” (Gatschet 1885); “nkoli’la” (Teit 1930b:209); and, “nquli’la” (Ray 1936:125). None of these other sources provided a translation of nkw’lila7.

Lakes elder Mary Marchand said that the lower area of the Pend d'Oreille River was utilized by the sngaytskstx or Lakes people, but referred to the people farther up the Pend d’Oreille River as kęłspílmx which means ‘Kalispel people’ in the Okanagan-Colville language. According to Mrs. Marchand, the "border" between the sngaytskstx and the Kalispel was at Metaline Falls [located in Washington State, about 40 Km (25 miles) eastward up the Pend d'Oreille River from where it empties into the Columbia, and about 16 kilometres (10 miles) south of the Canada/US border].

Independent confirmation of Mary Marchand’s Lakes/Kalispel boundary statement is provided in one of James Teit’s (1910-1913) unpublished territorial maps where he draws the boundary line between Lakes and Kalispel — along the Pend d’Oreille — through Metaline Falls. Additional, partial confirmation of this boundary comes from anthropologist Stuart Chalfant who wrote in the early 1950s that the Kalispel fished “as far down [the Pend d’Oreille] as Metaline Falls” (Chalfant 1974a:225). Chalfant (n.d.) also indicated this boundary at Metaline Falls on a map he prepared for the Indian Claims Commission.27

25 Due to a typographical error, the location of the Pend d’Oreille River mouth was incorrectly identified in our 2000 report as being on the “west” side of the Columbia (see Bouchard and Kennedy 2000:143). This error was corrected in the April 2005 reprinting.

26 Teit (1930:211) gave the term “nkolē’latk” as the Lakes name for the lower Pend d’Oreille River, stating that it was derived “from the name of a place at the mouth.” Likely Teit was transcribing the Okanagan-Colville term nkw’lila7’ïtkw meaning ‘nkw’lila7 – water,’ although his transcribing this term as “nkolē’latk” suggests the Spokane-Kalispel-Flathead suffix for ‘water’ (-åtkw) rather than the Okanagan-Colville suffix for ‘water’ (-ìtkw).

27 However, a recently-published summary of Kalispel ethnography by anthropologist Sylvester Lahren (1998:283-284) — based primarily on the late Allan Smith’s Kalispel research — places the Kalispel boundary farther down the Pend d’Oreille River, at the place where the Salmo River flows into the Pend d’Oreille. The Salmon/Pend d’Oreille confluence is about 3 Km (approximately 2 miles) north of the Canada/US border, and
Reports differ concerning the exact site of the village at *nkw’lila7*, and some confusion is caused by the fact that a non-aboriginal settlement known as “Waneta” was located on the north side of the Pend d’Oreille mouth, and another non-aboriginal settlement called “Boundary” was located on the south side.

Mary Marchand, whose mother was born at *nkw’lila7*, said that the village site was situated between the present-day border crossing station (located just south of the Pend d’Oreille river mouth), and the south bank of the River, itself. Teit (1930b:209), on the other hand, stated that the village site was located "just above" (north of) the Pend d’Oreille River mouth, while Ray (1936b:125) said it was "about a mile" above the Pend d’Oreille mouth. Because there has been so much disturbance of the land in this area around the river mouth, it may never be possible to determine the original village site’s exact location.

*nkw’lila7* was a significant village site, according to James Teit (1930b:209) who reported that "many people are said to have lived here formerly, and there are some very old burial grounds near by." Several other sources also refer to old graves at the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille. Graham (1963:154) reported a statement by Matthew Hill, who came to the Pend d’Oreille valley in 1892, that skulls were found in a sand bank “at Waneta” where builders were excavating for a hotel built in 1894. Undoubtedly this was a reference to the Waneta Hotel, built in 1893 – 1894 about “three or four hundred yards” south from the railway bridge across the Pend d’Oreille river mouth (Graham 1963:154; E. Turnbull 1988: 26-27; Beaver Valley and Pend d’Oreille Historical Society 1997:30; Reeves 2002:240). Teit (1898-1910) indicated in a May 20th, 1909 letter that he had been told there was an “old Indian graveyard” at *nkw’lila7* and that a “good many skeletons…and grave goods” had been uncovered here when a house was being built. He added that “the people living here think that there are more burials remaining which are not disturbed.” While Teit did not state this house’s — and therefore this graveyard’s — location in his 1909 letter, he did state elsewhere that the village and associated burial grounds of *nkw’lila7* were located just north of the Pend d’Oreille mouth (Teit 1930b:209). It is therefore likely that the site referred to was the same place where in 1895 several dwellings were indicated; this was immediately north of the north side of the Pend d’Oreille River mouth (British Columbia 1895). These dwellings comprised the non-aboriginal settlement known as Waneta.

Ray’s (1936b:125) information concerning *nkw’lila7* was that this village “numbered four or five families throughout the year” and that “the berry fields and salmon grounds at Northport [about 11 Km or 7 miles south of the Canada/US border] were conveniently at approximately 17 Km (about 10 miles) east upstream from where the Pend d’Oreille empties into the Columbia.
hand” (see also the discussion below).

Mary Marchand identified nkw’ilaʔ as a former sngaytstx winter village and a place where her maternal grandparents lived. She noted that her mother, whose name was pelisiti (“Felicity”), was born here. As well, Mary Marchand said that among the others who lived here was an old man named nyagtink (whose English name she did not know). However, she added that no one had been living here since her mother’s time (i.e. before 1900). Mary Marchand also recalled that there was good salmon fishing at the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille itself.

Information about aboriginal people at the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille River is also provided in ethnohistoric sources, one of which recorded that the Lakes people asserted control over the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille, and the right of passage from the Columbia up to the upper Pend d’Oreille. A. V. Wilson, a Wells Fargo manager, reported that in July 1855 he had been prevented from going from Fort Colville up the Columbia to the gold mines on the lower part of the Pend d’Oreille River. Wilson stated that:

Gregora, 1st chief, and Landre 2nd chief of the Lake Indians in the British possessions, came to the fort. Pierre Jerome [Chief of the Colville, who also objected to Wilson’s passage] then had a talk with them, and told me that I could not go any further (Wilson 1855).

Wilson said that these aboriginal people were opposed to any Americans entering this river until a Treaty was made with them, that they would prevent him by force from going to the mines, and that, as a consequence, he abandoned his planned trip (Wilson 1855).

John Sullivan, a member of the Palliser expedition, observed in September 1859 that gold miners were using both sluices and pans to work the flats and bars of the lower Pend d’Oreille,

28 Julia Quintasket and Louise Lemery also knew these people identified by Mary Marchand.

29 Gold had been discovered on the Pend d’Oreille River in 1854 by Joseph Morrell, a teamster employed by Chief Trader Angus MacDonald of the Hudson Bay Company’s Fort Colville (Oakshott 1960:6).

30 Descriptions of the Pend d’Oreille mouth/lower Pend d’Oreille River had been provided earlier, in 1817, 1824, 1827 and 1830. However none of these sources referred to aboriginal people living at this site at those times, which suggests the village was occupied seasonally. In May 1817, the trader Ross Cox, travelling up the Columbia, described the mouth of the “Flat-head River” — as he called the Pend d’Oreille — in some detail, but made no observations about aboriginals here at that time (Cox 1957:274). HBC Governor George Simpson, travelling down the Columbia in October 1824, also described the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille, yet made no reference to Natives there at that time, either (Simpson 1824-1825:23d). John W. Dease of Fort Colville reported in April 1827 the following concerning the “Flat Head” [Pend d’Oreille] River: “stupendous cataracts, water falls, etc. renders it impracticable in the lower parts” (Dease 1827). Similar observations were reported in April 1830 by John Work of Fort Colville: “The lower part of the Earring [Pend d’Oreille] River is impassable for crafts…” (Work 1830).
from its mouth up to the Salmo river confluence. Presumably the miners travelled on foot along the river, but so seldom had this route been used that Sullivan’s comments suggesting there was a trail along the north side of the lower Pend d’Oreille focussed mostly on its very bad condition (Spry 1968: 481, 584-585).

In September 1862, Roderick Finlayson reported that “there is a trader now established on the east side of the Columbia at the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille River nearly opposite Shepherd [Fort Shepherd], who managed in course of last Spring to trade about 500 Martin [marten] skins from the Lake Indians…” (Finlayson 1862a). This is very likely a reference to an American man named Richard Fry who, together with his sngaytskstx wife, Justine “Su-steel,”31 was said to have established a trading post at the mouth of the Pend d’Oreille in 1860. Fry and Justine reportedly stayed here until the spring of 1864 (Putnam n.d.; 1954:7; Fry family n.d.).

The discovery of gold in 1864 at Wild Horse Creek in the East Kooteneays brought additional exploration activities to the lower Pend d’Oreille. While a rough trail had been constructed under the direction of the HBC early in 1864, including a section along the north side of the lower Pend d’Oreille (Martin 1920), it was Edgar Dewdney in 1865 who completed this trail’s construction. Some of the Chinese miners who had been working the gold diggings at the Pend d’Oreille mouth in the summer of 1864 were hired in the summer of 1865 to build that section of the “Dewdney Trail” that followed upwards alongside the lower Pend d’Oreille (Tolmie 1864; Titley 1999:15). This mining activity and trail-building work likely contributed to the destruction of aboriginal sites.

Ray’s (1936b:125) statement that “the berry fields and salmon grounds at Northport were conveniently at hand” to the Waneta village was a reference to the settlement now called Northport, located about 11 Km (7 miles) south of the Canada/US border. In earlier times, sngaytskstx (Lakes) winter villages were situated on either side of the Columbia at Northport.32 The presence of archaeological remains from numerous aboriginal campsites located along both sides of the Columbia River between Northport and the border (Chance 1967) also attests to the

---

31 Justine “Su-steel” was born in 1842 and died in 1918 (Fry family n.d.). Justine’s father was a Lakes Okanagan-Colville man named Harry “Swasticken” (Fry family n.d.) [also spelled “Soqu-stik-en” (Putnam 1954:7)], and her mother, Hariette, was also Lakes (Fry family n.d.). Justine was reportedly from a village “where the Lake Indians from farther north spent their winters” that was said to have been located across the Columbia River from what later became Old Marcus, Washington [just upriver from Kettle Falls] (Putnam 1954:7). Very likely this reference is to the village at the place called lhektsin (an Okanagan-Colville term meaning ‘brushy area at edge; mouth’), now inundated, on the former north bank of the Columbia River, directly across from Old Marcus. This village was well known as a place where the Lakes people wintered. Mary Marchand noted that her grandmother’s parents used to winter at lhektsin (Bouchard and Kennedy 1984a:387-388).

32 The information that follows on the aboriginal use of the area between Northport and Waneta is summarized from our 1984 monograph (Bouchard and Kennedy 1984a:409-416).
productivity of the area.

The Okanagan-Colville name for the general area of Northport is nts ‘ets ‘erísm, meaning ‘having kingfishers’. According to Teit (1930b:210), Northport was one of the main Lakes villages in this region of the Columbia. Elmendorf (1935-1936) noted that the Lakes chief lived at Northport until about 1890. The settlement on the west side of the Columbia River at this point was occupied well into the early 1900s, after which the residents moved to the Colville Indian Reservation. Jesuit priests in 1906 were still referring to the “few Lakes Indians” living around Northport, and our Lakes consultants in the 1970s-1980s recalled the names of several sngaytskstx people who used to live here.

Sngaytskstx people also occupied settlements located on the west side of the Columbia in the vicinity of Sheep Creek, known as yumtsn, which enters the Columbia approximately 8 Km (about 5 miles) south from the Canada/US border, and also near Goodeve Creek, whose confluence with the Columbia is about 7 Km (approximately 4.5 miles) south from the border. Both of these places were also occupied by Lakes people well into the early 1900s. Our Lakes consultants identified several sngaytskstx people who lived at the Sheep Creek village, and Jesuit records noted there were “about 25 Lake Indians” in this area in 1906. A local non-aboriginal man recalled seeing in 1909-1910 a cottonwood canoe made by an elderly Lakes man living just upstream from Goodeve Creek, and implied that such canoes were once a common site in this area (see also Appendix A.1 of the present report).

Archaeologists have excavated numerous burials from the river banks in the area between Northport and Waneta, as well as from an island near the mouth of Sheep Creek. The absence of trade goods found in association with these latter burials, despite the numerous artifacts present, has led archaeologists to conclude that these sites were dated prior to 1810.

Not far from the village site at Waneta was Fort Shepherd, a Hudson’s Bay Company post built in 1856-1857 about 1.6 Km (1 mile) north of the Canada/US border and on the west side of the Columbia. This Fort was built so that the HBC could continue their trade in this region when it was expected that Fort Colvile would be closed by American authorities. No aboriginal name for the site at Fort Shepherd has been recorded.

Soon after its construction, Fort Shepherd became the headquarters for several hundred sngaytskstx (Lakes) people. John Sullivan, who was at the fort in September 1859, reported that he:

arrived at Fort Shepherd on the evening of the 13th. At this place I engaged three Sanihk [sngaytskstx] Indians and despatched two more of the same tribe in search of the only Indian who was said to know the country that I was about to
explore (Spry 1968:480). 33

When Fort Shepherd was temporarily closed between 1860 and 1863, it was left in the care of the sngaytskstx people and remained a centre for them. W.G. Cox reported in April of 1862 that Lakes Indians "with their families always pass the winter months near the Fort." After the Hudson’s Bay Company reopened Fort Shepherd, it continued to be an important centre for the Lakes. Jason Ovid Allard, who ran the post between 1866 and 1870, reported that "200 to 300 men and women and children" camped in the Fort’s vicinity. William Winans, the Colville Indian Agent in what is now Washington State, reported in 1870 — the last year that the Hudson’s Bay Company operated Fort Shepherd — that it was the principal place of rendezvous of the Lakes (sngaytskstx) people. After the fort closed, it was again left in the care of the sngaytskstx. Fort Shepherd burned to the ground in 1872 (Cox 1862; Finlayson 1862b; 1870; Winans 1870b; Allard n.d.; Turnbull 1959:43-47).

Only Teit recorded that a village once stood at the site later occupied by Fort Shepherd. His identification, however, was less than certain:

It seems that there was an old village near the site of old Fort Shepherd, on the west side of the Columbia, a little north of the international line, and old burials are reported near here. Some informants, however, had no knowledge of a village having been here (Teit 1930b:210).

Archaeological remains at this site, however, do indicate that it was utilized in prehistoric times.

The comments of a Beaver Valley resident, Bill Grieve, suggest there was some aboriginal use of the Fort Shepherd area well into the 1900s:

There used to be some Indians, nearest I know, down at Fort Shepherd Bay, on the upper side where them rocks are, across the river. There used to be a family lived there, fishing (Beaver Valley and Pend d’Oreille Historical Society 1997:95-96).

Although Mr. Grieve did not identify these aboriginal people at Fort Shepherd, possibly he was referring to Alex Christian, a well-known sngaytskstx man. Alex Christian was identified living

---

33 Sullivan was going east, with the Palliser expedition, in the direction of Kannenaskis Pass, so he would likely have been looking for a Flathead/Pend d’Oreille Indian person as a guide, although he never explicitly identified the guide’s ethnicity, either in the journal or in his dairy. The diary entry for September 18th, 1859, when the guide joined the party, noted that ‘‘Mr. Margary arrived in the evening, bringing the guide and a Kootanie Indian’’ (Sullivan, in Spry 1968:585). This suggests that the guide was not Kutenai, but does not otherwise indicate his ethnicity.
at Fort Shepherd by a man named Jim Burrows, born in 1908, who had come in 1914 to the Columbia Gardens area, located below where Beaver Creek enters into the Columbia. In response to an interviewer’s question in 1978, “Do you remember seeing any Indians?” Mr. Burrows replied:

Not around here too much. I knew one guy, who used to take me fishing down at the Columbia River. He lived way over at Fort Shepherd. Alec they called him — Alec the Indian. He was kinda a one-eyed fella. Small guy. He used to borrow my dad’s rifle all the time and shoot deer, and he’d bring us up a big roast or leg of deer, or some nice fish that he’d caught in the river. He lived there all by himself, for years. After a while he got married or had a woman living with him; and it wasn’t too long after that I heard he had passed on. . . He’d come across in a canoe — kinda homemade canoe — and he’d tie it up and walk up to our place and get vegetables and things, and bring us some nice fish (Beaver Valley and Pend d’Oreille Historical Society 1997:27,32).

While no indigenous place names have been recorded for the Beaver Valley/Beaver Creek area, located on the east side of the Columbia about 8 Km (5 miles) upriver from Waneta, the use of this area by the Lakes people has been documented. Clara Graham (1963:242-243), who lived in the early 1900s along upper Beaver Creek, recorded information that Beaver Creek was used for hunting by the “Senijextee” [sngaytskxt, Lakes] people.

Mrs. Graham wrote that according to Native legend, a “Senijextee” Indian chief was killed by a bear or caribou while hunting in the valley of Beaver Creek. She added that this chief’s people “then set fire to the country and for many years they stayed away” but that around 1900, a few families returned in the fall to hunt. Mrs. Graham continued:

The last remnant of these people had a camping ground about twelve miles upstream from the mouth of Beaver Creek and, during their occasional visits to the region, set up their shelters at this spot, built a little willow fence to keep their half dozen or so ponies out of an adjoining meadow which belonged to the owner of the land, and spent a few days hunting (Graham 1963:242-243).

If Clara Graham’s distance estimate is correct, the area of this Lakes encampment in the early 1900s would have been just up Beaver Creek from the place called Ross Spur, and just downriver from Graham’s parents’ s place near the Benton Creek confluence.

Salmo pioneer Rollie Mifflin (1958:47) described how “Colville” (by which he actually meant Lakes)34 Indians in the early 1900s “following a custom of their ancestors” used to travel by

---

34 There is no doubt that the ‘‘Colville’’ Natives recalled by Salmo pioneer Rollie Mifflin were actually Lakes people. Mifflin (1958:47) described in detail how, in the fall of 1900, he saw a ‘‘Colville’’ Native man — Joe Paul and his son, Gregory Paul — for the first time at Salmo. According to Mr. Mifflin, Joe and Gregory Paul were from ‘‘the Colville Indian Reservation near Kettle Falls.’’ This is the same Joe Paul and Gregory Paul who
horseback through the Beaver Valley on their way to Salmo. Mr. Mifflin (1958:47-50) wrote that these Natives used to come to this general area “to trap beaver, mink, muskrat and any other fur-bearing animals they might find” and that they “sold cayuses to prospectors, livery stable operators and to others who might want or need pack or saddle horses.”

3.2 Some Culturally-Significant Plants Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

Recorded data on plant foods used traditionally by aboriginal people in the upper Columbia River region comes primarily from ethnographic information. The ethnohistoric records that make occasional specific references to fishing and hunting places are of less use in identifying the use of plants, because few early non-aboriginal observers had any knowledge or appreciation of the role of plants in the indigenous diet. In 1824, for instance, George Simpson remarked that the sngaytskstx or Lakes survived on the "few roots they collect in the fall" (Simpson 1824-1825). Ethnographic evidence shows that Simpson’s conclusion was mistaken, however, as ethnobotanical data clearly shows that the collection of these foods began in the early spring and extended until late in the fall.

While information on how plants were used is generally strong, especially for the sngaytskstx, information about where they were obtained is not. Very significant plant gathering areas where people went for important plants like huckleberries and Saskatoon berries are recorded in the ethnographic and ethnohistoric literature, and some of these areas have been recorded in the Arrow Lakes/Upper Columbia region. However, none have been reported for the specific area of the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project.

Data contained in the following charts of culturally-significant plants found, or likely to be found, in the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area have been summarized from the known and available ethnographic literature, including: Teit (1930); Elmendorf (1935-1936:1); Ray (1975); and Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy (1980) for Lakes information, and, for Kutenai data: Chamberlain (n.d.c); Schaeffer (1940); and Hart, Turner and Morgan (1980).

were known to Mary Marchand as Lakes people, and who, she told us, lived “somewhere around the Arrow Lakes.”
The list of plants discussed has been compiled using the species lists previously prepared by biologists for the Keenleyside and Brilliant hydroelectric expansion projects, and in consultation with staff of Pandion Ecological Research Ltd. (Machmer 2004: pers. comm.)

Table 1. Some Culturally-Significant Plants Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
<th>Lakes</th>
<th>Kutenai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain huckleberry (<em>Vaccinium membranaceum</em>)</td>
<td>Possibly the most important plant food for the Lakes people; a Lakes myth depicts this berry’s origin. Gathered in large quantities and eaten fresh with meat; partially dried, crushed and formed into cakes; or fully dried.</td>
<td>Some sources say this is one of the most important food plants for the Kutenai, although other sources disagree. Berries dried and made into cakes and often eaten with fish oil condiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa lily (<em>Calochortus macrocarpus</em>)</td>
<td>Eaten after steam cooked.</td>
<td>Bulbs eaten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowbell (<em>Fritillaria pudica</em>)</td>
<td>Underground corms eaten fresh after steam cooking.</td>
<td>Bulbs dug and eaten fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger lily (<em>Lilium columbianum</em>)</td>
<td>Underground corms eaten fresh after steam cooking.</td>
<td>Bulbs eaten raw or cooked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow avalanche lily (<em>Erythronium grandiflorum</em>)</td>
<td>Underground corms eaten fresh after steam cooking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian potatoes (<em>Claytonia lanceolata</em>),</td>
<td>Underground corms eaten fresh after steam cooking or boiling.</td>
<td>Corms dug, cleaned and boiled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsamroot (<em>Balsamorhiza sagittata</em>)</td>
<td>Roots steam cooked and eaten fresh.</td>
<td>Young bud stems peeled and eaten in spring; tap roots peeled and eaten raw or roasted; roots boiled and used as a poultice for bruises, cuts and wounds, especially those on the hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow parsnip (<em>Heracleum lanatum</em>)</td>
<td>Gathered in the spring, peeled and eaten raw.</td>
<td>Young leaf stocks eaten in spring after being peeled; roots used for eye medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter-root (<em>Lewisia rediviva</em>)</td>
<td>Steam cooked or boiled and eaten fresh, or dried for storage and then boiled.</td>
<td>Dug, peeled, and sun-dried; made into dry cakes and then boiled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon berries or serviceberries (<em>Amelanchier alnifolia</em>)</td>
<td>While the Lakes recognized two varieties of Saskatoons, other Okanagan – Colville groups</td>
<td>Especially important berry to the Kutenai; berries dried and made into cakes or eaten fresh with a fish oil condiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Species</td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>Kutenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chokecherry (<em>Prunus virginiana</em>)</td>
<td>Fruits eaten, dried in cakes.</td>
<td>One of the most significant fruits for the Kutenai. Picked, mashed and sun-dried in cakes for later use. Infusion of stems and roots drunk for diarrhoea or stomach ache.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild strawberries (<em>Fragaria vesca</em>)</td>
<td>Berries partially dried and then crushed and formed into cakes with saskatoon berries. The &quot;runners,&quot; or stolons, were also gathered and used for tying and binding.</td>
<td>Gathered and eaten fresh or dried for future use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Gooseberries (<em>Ribes irriguum</em>)</td>
<td>Berries were comparatively hard to dry, so the Lakes would gather them in May and June and eat them green. Sometimes they were made into cakes, either alone, or mixed with other berries, especially Saskatoon berries. The tarter gooseberries added flavour to the neutral Saskatoon berries.</td>
<td>Usually eaten fresh; spines used in making fish hooks for catching small fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soapberries (<em>Shepherdia canadensis</em>)</td>
<td>The berries were commonly whipped with water into a pinkish-white foam known as &quot;Indian ice cream&quot; which was usually sweetened with strawberries or saskatoon berries.</td>
<td>Used to make Indian ice cream; leaves used to make tea; decoction of boiled bark used for eyewash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince’s Pine (<em>Chimaphila umbellata</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decoction used as eyewash; tea used for kidney troubles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild raspberries (<em>Rubus idaeus</em>)</td>
<td>Either eaten fresh, dried or used for juice.</td>
<td>Gathered and eaten fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimbleberries (<em>Rubus parviflorus</em>)</td>
<td>Seldom dried completely; the root</td>
<td>Gathered and eaten fresh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plant Species recognized at least eight varieties. Berries either partly dried and pounded or fully dried, then placed in Indian hemp bags for winter storage, or in wooden or bark tubs for summer use. The dried berries are very sweet, and were commonly mixed with other foods or used as a sweetener.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
<th>Lakes</th>
<th>Kutenai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue elderberries (<em>Sambucus cerulea</em>) (^{35})</td>
<td>Berries crushed into juice, and pulp discarded. The juice would be heated in a cooking basket before being used. Used the stems to inflate animal intestines to be used as food containers.</td>
<td>Berries eaten; elk whistles made from hollowed stems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon grape (<em>Berberis aquifolium</em>)</td>
<td>Inner bark of the stems and roots produces a bright yellow dye, used for colouring basket materials, mountain goat wool, and porcupine quills; roots, bark and branches were variously boiled and used for various medicinal purposes, including an eyewash, a tonic, and a blood purifier.</td>
<td>Fruits were eaten; roots used to make tea drunk for kidney medicine and as a diuretic, and used as a medicine for sore eyes; yellow dye made from roots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild rose (<em>Rosa woodsii</em>)</td>
<td>Hips picked and eaten fresh; leaves applied directly to bee stings; protective agents against bad spirits.</td>
<td>Rosehips eaten; infusion of fruits rubbed on body for aching bones; tea of stems used for diarrhoea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow (<em>Salix bebbiana</em>)</td>
<td>Branches used to make fish traps, basket hoops, hide stretchers and canoe frames and twisted into a strong rope. Inner bark shredded into a cottony substance used for diapers, sanitary napkins and wound dressings; poultice for cuts made from the inner bark.</td>
<td>Bark stripped and twisted into rope; good fuel for smoking meat and buckskins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Spray (<em>Holodiscus discolor</em>)</td>
<td>Known as ironwood, it was used to make digging sticks, arrows, heads of fish spears, bows, sticks for gambling games, drum hoops, baby cradle covers and other items. The leaves were dried, then pulverized, and the powder used to heal sores.</td>
<td>Used for arrow shafts and digging sticks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallow Ninebark (<em>Physocarpus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) Biologist Marlene Machmer (2004:pers.comm.) reports that blue elderberries grow in profusion within the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project area and that the plants are productive and old.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
<th>Lakes</th>
<th>Kutenai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>malvaceus</em></td>
<td>Used for making bows.</td>
<td>Information not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buckbrush</strong> (<em>Ceanothus sanguineus</em>)</td>
<td>The sapwood underneath the bark was dried, pulverized and rubbed on sores. The bark could also be dried, powdered and applied directly as a poultice for burns.</td>
<td>Infusion of leaves drunk for TB, coughs, or kidney trouble; stems boiled for shampoo; solution used for cleaning sores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waxberry</strong> (<em>Symphoricarpos albus</em>)</td>
<td>Berries used, along with the branches and leaves, by being boiled into a brew which would be drunk as a physic, to clean out the system; also mashed and used as a poultice for children’s skin sores, or to relieve itching. The branches were tied together to make brooms.</td>
<td>Tea made from branches used for menstrual disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devil’s Club</strong> (<em>Oplopanax horridum</em>)</td>
<td>Medicine for a dry cough.</td>
<td>Boiled for medicinal tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horsetail</strong> (<em>Equisetaceae spp.</em>)</td>
<td>Stems used as sandpaper, to polish bones and sandstone pipes. Stems also used to wash children’s skin sores and areas affected by poison ivy, and, taken internally, used to stimulate the kidneys, and to treat colds, backache, lumbago and other ailments.</td>
<td>Stems used as sandpaper to polish stone pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lodgepole Pine</strong> (<em>Pinus contorta</em>)</td>
<td>The cambium layer was scraped from the tree, then rolled up and stored to be eaten raw or fresh; also used as a medicine for stomach ulcers and general tonic; poles used for tipi poles.</td>
<td>Cambium layer scraped off in the spring and eaten raw. Medicine for consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ponderosa Pine</strong> (<em>Pinus Ponderosa</em>)</td>
<td>Cambium considered better eating than the cambium from lodgepole pine. Medicinal uses of this plant were similar to that of the lodgepole pine; wood used for poles and general construction.</td>
<td>Cambium layer scraped off in the spring and eaten raw; stored for short periods by rolling into balls and storing these with green leaves. Gum applied as a poultice to cuts, sores and infections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Species</td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>Kutenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trembling aspen (<em>Populus tremuloides</em>)</td>
<td>Used for underarm deodorant and anti-perspirant; brew used as bathing water by people with rheumatism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black cottonwood (<em>Populus balsamifera</em>)</td>
<td>Wood used as a fuel for smoking hides, and to make light dugout canoes, salmon weirs, and boards for flattening the heads of children; ashes used as a shampoo and a rough soap; resin from the scales was used as glue, and also mixed with other pigments to make paint; bark made into barrels to store food, and to line food storage pits to keep out gophers.</td>
<td>Cambium eaten in spring; dry wood used for fuel when tanning hides; firewood; making bowls; medicinal tea made from bark; leaves used as poultice for bruises, sores and boils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper birch (<em>Betula papyrifera</em>)</td>
<td>Bark used for canoes and cooking baskets.</td>
<td>Bark used to make canoes, baskets and other containers, and cradles; wood used for fuel; inner bark boiled and used as medicine for sore eyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Fir (<em>Pseudotsuga menziesii</em>)</td>
<td>Saplings used to make tipi poles, spear shafts and other items; boughs used as roofing for temporary shelters and for bedding; boughs placed on floor of sweathouses, and also used to scrub the body during a sweatbath.</td>
<td>Sap chewed as gum; wood used for making snowshoes; rotten wood used for baby powder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canby’s Lovage (<em>Ligusticum canbyi</em>)</td>
<td>Root used for colds and coughs; general internal medicine; used for those who have lost consciousness, especially in ceremonial situations.</td>
<td>Important medicinal plant for colds, heart problems, tooth aches, and styptic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Some Culturally-Significant Animals Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

Considerable information has been recorded about the seasonal hunting round of the sngaytskstx (Lakes) and the Kutenai. Some of this information is summarized in Appendix B.1 of the present report. The pursuit of deer, elk, goat and bear, among others species, was a central aspect of Lakes and Kutenai subsistence activities, and to some extent continues to supplement their diet. Both First Nations also ate fish and plants, but meat was of considerable economic significance.

The known and available ethnographic data do not indicate which animals were traditionally hunted by the Lakes or the Kutenai specifically in the Waneta area. Thus, the chart below lists some species that were (or are) of cultural significance to the sngaytskstx and to the Kutenai and are found or are likely to be found in the general environs of the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project. The chart summarizes the ethnographic information about these animals, as reported in the known and available literature. Some of this summarized information is from Bouchard, Kennedy and Cox (1998b:118-152).

The list of animals discussed has been compiled using the species lists previously prepared by biologists for the Keenleyside and Brilliant hydroelectric expansion projects, and in consultation with staff of Pandion Ecological Research Ltd. (Machmer 2004:pers. comm.)

36 A preliminary study of Kutenai hunting territories said to be of importance to contemporary Kutenai people was made as part of the 1984 Justus Simonetta Report, undertaken on behalf of the Kootenay Indian Area Council. That report identified twenty-four tributary drainages within the western Kootenay River system as being important for contemporary hunting (Justus Simonetta 1984:11). The Rover Creek drainage is the only identified contemporary Kutenai hunting area that is even remotely near the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Projecta area. But the Rover Creek drainage lies southeast of the Kootenay River below the West Arm, and drains into the Kootenay River just below Bonnington Falls, and is over 60 Km (40 miles) distant from Waneta.
Table 2. Some Culturally-significant Animals Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Species</th>
<th>Lakes</th>
<th>Kutenai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mule deer (<em>Oedocoileus hemionus</em>), and white-tail deer (<em>Odocoileus virginianus</em>) [Latter found at higher elevations]</td>
<td>Important game animal; hunted in considerable numbers for food, as well as for their hides, bones, fat and horns. Sometimes hunted with dogs and killed with bow and arrows; herding them over bluffs; caught in snares placed on their trails during migration, stalked in snow by hunters on snowshoes, and shot at night by hunters staked out at salt licks. Roasted and dried for winter use.</td>
<td>Important game animal; hunted for food, as well as for hides, bones and fat. Communal deer drives, use of fire surrounds, or use of dogs to bring animals to waiting hunters; deer stalking along the river banks by individual hunters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou (<em>Rangifer tarandus</em>) [Formerly in area]</td>
<td>Formerly an important game animal to the <em>sngaytsksxt</em>. Unlike deer, caribou were not taken in communal hunts, and individual hunters shot them with bow and arrow, or in later years, with guns; hunters would also drive caribou into a lake, where men in fast bark canoes would club or shoot them.</td>
<td>Caribou formerly hunted by the Kutenai. Hunted in April; meat eaten and fat highly prized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain goat (<em>Oreamnos americanus</em>) [Found at Higher Elevations]</td>
<td>Very important to the <em>sngaytsksxt</em> people in former times; mountain goat considered to be the Lakes people’ s ‘‘emblem’’ and was used for ceremonial purposes. Hunted in their habitat at higher elevations, for meat, hides and horns.</td>
<td>Considered to be a good food, but animals were hard to hunt and found at high elevations. Stalked by individual hunters. Meat used for food. Hides used for robes and blankets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black bear (<em>Ursus americanus</em>) and grizzly bear (<em>Ursus arctos</em>)</td>
<td>Deadfalls baited with fish or venison were used to kill bear; during the winter, hibernating bears were dragged out of their dens and killed. Skins used to make robes and leggings, fat valued as a type of all-purpose elixir, being used as hair tonic, as cures for earaches, corns and other ailments, and as a condiment in cooking, and bones were used to make things like scrapers, dishes, and sewing awls.</td>
<td>Hibernating animals were smoked from their dens, while in the fall they were shot along the rivers, and in summer taken in a fire surround. Bears were eaten and the fat was particularly valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote (<em>Canis latrans</em>)</td>
<td>Coyotes were hunted in the old days to use their pelts for robes and fur caps.</td>
<td>Smoked from their dens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal Species</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lakes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kutenai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cougar</strong> (<em>Felis concolor</em>)</td>
<td>Formerly hunted using deadfall traps, and commonly killed with bow and arrow by hunters who would stake out their tracks; meat eaten; skins and bones used.</td>
<td>Snared using a spring pole device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muskrat</strong> (<em>Ondatra zibethica osoyoosensis</em>)</td>
<td>Formerly caught using snares or bow and arrow, or more recently with traps; muskrats were good eating at any time of the year, and their pelts were prized, because like the beaver’s pelt, they were water-resistant.</td>
<td>Caught for its pelt, but could be boiled after being skinned. Eaten by some contemporary Kutenai people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marten</strong> (<em>Martes americanus</em>)</td>
<td>Formerly caught in deadfalls baited with dried salmon, trapped for its pelt.</td>
<td>Trapped for pelt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mink</strong> (<em>Mustela vison</em>)</td>
<td>Trapped using dead-fall traps.</td>
<td>Trapped for pelt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Badger</strong> (<em>Taxidea taxus</em>)</td>
<td>Hunted for both the fur and the meat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weasel</strong> (<em>Mustela erminea</em>)</td>
<td>Hunted, principally using the same type of deadfall trap used to catch marten and similar animals. Weasel pelts were also considered to be expensive fur; used for hair braids; tobacco pouches were often made from weasel skin.</td>
<td>Trapped for pelt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skunk</strong> (<em>Mephitis mephitis</em>)</td>
<td>Killed for its fur; scent gland used as medicine.</td>
<td>Driven from their dens with smoke and then dispatched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groundhog, also known as marmot, whistler and woodchuck</strong> (<em>Marmota spp.</em>)</td>
<td>Both plentiful and easily obtained using snares or shot, or by flooding their dens; meat eaten and fur used for robes and blankets.</td>
<td>Drowned out of their holes. Easy to shoot late in the summer when they are considered to be excellent food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbian ground squirrel</strong> (<em>Spermophilus columbianus</em>)</td>
<td>Flesh was eaten.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rabbit and hare</strong> (<em>Leporidae spp.</em>)</td>
<td>Snared; rabbits were eaten, and their fur was used.</td>
<td>Snared with a spring pole or dragged from the burrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porcupine</strong> (<em>Erethizon dorsatum</em>)</td>
<td>Seems to have been a food of last resort, being clubbed for food when no other game was available, or when the hunters had not had a successful hunt.</td>
<td>Famine food.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Some Culturally-Significant Birds Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

Of the approximately 95 birds that we have identified among the Okanagan-Colville (including the Lakes), sixteen were used for food. Birds were shot with a bow and arrow, killed with snares, or occasionally, clubbed. A snare consisted of a noose made of mountain goat’s hair cord or deer back sinew attached to the end of a slender pole.

The Kutenai were active hunters of waterfowl, so much so that Turney-High (1941:43-44) noted they ate almost every bird they could shoot, sometimes holding communal shoots to acquire a good supply. In 1891, Chamberlain recorded the Kutenai names of 90 birds from a man named “AmElũ” while they were sitting “beside the camp-fire on the banks of the Kootenay River.” “AmElũ” later recalled four more bird names (Chamberlain n.d.b).

Ducks and their eggs were a staple part of the diet of both the sngaytskstx and the Kutenai. Parts of birds were utilized also in witchcraft, such as love charms.

No information was found in any of the available ethnographic or ethnohistoric material reviewed which is sufficiently site-specific to indicate which particular species of birds were hunted within the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project lands. What follows is a brief discussion of culturally-significant birds found or likely to be found in the Waneta area, summarized from Bouchard, Kennedy and Cox (1998b:153-155).

The ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) was a popular food among the Lakes and Colville. Only Turney-High among the Kutenai ethnographers makes explicit mention of this bird being hunted.

Both the Lakes and the Kutenai hunted the spruce grouse (*Canachites canadiensis*) or “foolhen.” These birds were often snared with a forked stick with a loop at the end, or they could be clubbed with sticks.

Blue grouse (*Dendragapus obscurus*) used to be commonly eaten by the Okanagan-Colville, who trapped these birds with snares or shot them with a bow and arrow.

While the Lewis’ Woodpecker (*Asyndesmus Lewis*) was used for ceremonial purposes by the Okanagan-Colville, they did not consider it to be edible.
The Okanagan-Colville believed that the western bluebird (Sialia mexicana) brought happiness to people, because they were one of the first small birds that showed up in the spring.

3.5 Some Culturally-Significant Fish (and Freshwater Shellfish) Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

Early 19th century ethnohistorical sources (eg. Work 1830) indicate that significant amounts of salmon ascended the Columbia River and reached the Arrow Lakes region, although these sources very seldom identify particular species.

Three of the five Pacific salmon species frequented the upper Columbia system, prior to the building of numerous dams along the river. The species considered most significant by the Colville and Lakes was the King (Chinook) salmon (Oncorhynchus gorbuscha), which ascended the Columbia River in June, and continued its run until August. The Colville and Lakes held their “first salmon ceremony” for this fish, and it occupied a significant position in their mythology (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:4-5; 1998:242). The other two species of salmon which ascended the upper Columbia were the sockeye (O. nerka), which came in July, and the coho (O. kisutch), which came in October and November. Both of these species were considered to be of less economic value than the Chinook, and were ancillary to the Chinook fishery (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:5). However, no salmon have been able to get to the Waneta area of the Columbia River since the completion of the Grand Coulee Dam circa 1940.

Lakes elder Mary Marchand told us that in earlier times there was a salmon fishery in the vicinity of Waneta.

Other fish (and freshwater shellfish) of economic importance to the Lakes (and to the Colville or sxwey7lh7p) were found throughout the region between the general vicinity of Kettle Falls and the Arrow Lakes area. A number of these species continue to be found here, and are discussed in the chart that follows. The species discussed in this list (with the exception of freshwater shellfish) follow the listing of fish species observed in the Waneta area between 1900-1994 and 2001, as compiled by Golder Associates (2002:14).37 Some of the discussion that follows is summarized from Bouchard, Kennedy and Cox (1998b:162-173).

---

37 We acknowledge, with thanks, the assistance provided by Lynn Westcott, a biologist in Golder’s Castlegar office, who provided us with a copy of this species list on 11 August 2004.
Table 3. Some Culturally-significant Fish (and Shellfish) Found or Likely to be Found in the Waneta Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fish Species</th>
<th>Lakes</th>
<th>Kutenai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon (<em>Acipenser transmontanus</em>)</td>
<td>Little data exists concerning the Lakes people’s use of this species, although it was formerly economically important to their southern neighbours, the Colville (<em>xwely7lhp</em>). When the Colvilles butchered sturgeon, a set ritual was always followed—the head was removed, and hung in a tree, facing east. The Colvilles used the sturgeon’s stomach ritually; it was cut open, washed and then smoke-dried. During the winter dances the host would distribute pieces of the sturgeon’s stomach to all the singers at the dance. It was believed that all the people who ate the stomach would become ‘good providers,’ because it was believed that the sturgeon gathers in its stomach a bit of all the food in the river.</td>
<td>Considered a reasonably important food fish for the Lower Kutenai, who caught it in the Kootenay River draining the south end of Kootenay Lake, and in the lower end of the Lake, itself, during the fish’s spawning season in the fall. Only very skilful men ever attempted this; sturgeon were fished for by still line fishing in teams of two. As one man slowly pulled in the hooked fish on the line, his partner would wait in a canoe for the fish to rise to the surface and would then spear it. The fish would then be taken back to camp where its meat would be distributed around the camp circle under the direction of the Fish Chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake whitefish (<em>Coregonus clupeaformis</em>)</td>
<td>Martin Louie associated this fish with the Arrow Lakes, but added that lake whitefish were sometimes seen in the Columbia River</td>
<td>Whitefish have been identified as one of the 3 most important fish to the Kutenai, although we have not been able to confirm if the species they caught was the lake whitefish or the mountain whitefish, or both [Chamberlain (n.d.b:272-273) identified two types of whitefish]. Immense quantities of whitefish were caught and dried for winter use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain whitefish (<em>Prosopium williamsoni</em>)</td>
<td>Caught both in the spring and the fall by the Colville.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokanee (<em>Oncorhynchus nerka</em>)</td>
<td>Caught in large numbers and dried for winter use.</td>
<td>Kutenai use of kokanee not certain, although reports do exist of Kutenai catching kokanee in Kootenay Lake and West Arm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largescule sucker (<em>Catostomus macrocheilus</em>); Longnose sucker (<em>Catostomus catostomus</em>); Bridgelip sucker (<em>Catostomus columbiaus</em>)</td>
<td>Six distinct species of suckers (<em>Catostomus spp.</em>) were recognized by the Colville. Martin Louie identified the largescale sucker as <em>kîwîx</em>, a term that also refers to ‘any sucker’; he used the term <em>sxwiyásulh</em>, meaning ‘always-going fish,’ to refer to a fish that is similar in colour to <em>kîwîx</em>, although they are torpedo-shaped and slightly shorter, averaging about fourteen</td>
<td>The Kutenai caught and ate two types of suckers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fish Species | Lakes | Kutenai
--- | --- | ---
inches. The Colvilles thought these were a "sick fish" and never ate them. *Kw’ek’müs* ("bunched up face") is likely the longnose sucker. It is slightly fatter than *kixwlix*, and grows to about twelve inches in length. They were taken in both the Columbia River and its tributaries. *Pept’gpa7skn*, ‘puckered up mouth,’ is likely the species known as bridgelip sucker. It grows to about eight inches in length, and is also found in the Columbia River. *Seseríws*, meaning ‘stripes in middle,’ is a small cylindrical sucker which is believed to be the species known as ‘mountain sucker’ (*Catostomus platyrhynchus*). The Colville fished for them in lakes. Suckerfish, as well as being eaten, had mythological significance for the Okanagan-Colville; Martin Louie told a legend of how Suckerfish jumped from the Upper World, smashing every bone in his body. However, each of the Animal-People donated a bone to repair him, and these donated bones can still be seen in the carcass of suckerfish today. | Traditionally fished by the Kutenai, although the known and available evidence for this is not extensive.

Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentis*) [formerly identified as ‘Dolly Varden char’ (*Salvelinus malma*)] | This fish’s name is strongly associated with the Lakes; the tribal term *sgaytsksx* [which means ‘bull trout (Dolly Varden) people’], the Lakes’ name for themselves, is derived from *gaytsks* meaning ‘bull trout [Dolly varden char].’ Ethnographic and ethnohistoric accounts of Lakes people taking this fish are not extensive. | Traditionally fished by the Kutenai, although the known and available evidence for this is not extensive.

Freshwater shellfish (*Margaritifera margaritifera falcata*), and, (*Anodonta spp.*).³⁸ | The late Albert Louie told us that freshwater shellfish were often eaten by the Colville (*sxyweyi7lp*) in winter when other fresh food was not available. Given that freshwater shellfish have been found in archaeological sites throughout the Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake area (Bouchard and Kennedy). | Traditionally fished by the Kutenai, although the known and available evidence for this is not extensive.

---

³⁸ We collected several specimens from numerous shell remains of freshwater shellfish we found in 1978 while undertaking place names and land use research. This was at the mouth of Quillisascut Creek, which enters the east side of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly the Columbia River) about 15 miles south from Kettle Falls, Washington, and is in the territory of the Colville (*sxyweyi7lp*). Scientists at the Royal B.C. Museum in Victoria identified these specimens as *Anodonta spp*. Subsequently archaeologist David Chance provided additional examples of freshwater shellfish that he had obtained from archaeological sites throughout F.D.R. Lake, and the RBCM scientists identified them as *Margaritifera margaritifera falcata*, which is consistent with the identification of the more common shellfish found throughout Plateau archaeological sites. When we showed both types of shellfish to our Colville and Lakes consultants, they all identified them with only one Okanagan-Colville term, *skw’ekw’er’ina7* (Bouchard and Kennedy 1984a:340-341).
Fish Species | Lakes | Kutenai
--- | --- | ---
1984a:302, 340-341), which extends to within a few miles of the Canada/US border, it can be assumed these shellfish were eaten by the Lakes people, as well. Moreover, we understand that freshwater shellfish can presently be found at the mouth of the Kootenay River, across from Castlegar (Oussoren 2004:pers.comm.). But we do not know if freshwater shellfish existed or are still found in the environs of Waneta,
4.0 CONCLUSIONS

This report has examined First Nations’ aboriginal interests and traditional use in the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project (WEP) area, situated at the confluence of the Columbia River with the Pend d’Oreille River in eastern British Columbia, immediately above the Canada/United States border.

Research based on a wide variety of sources — including the present authors’ more than 35 years of research with Okanagan-Colville — has revealed that the Waneta area is of cultural significance to the sngaytkstx (Lakes). The sngaytkstx are Okanagan-Colville-speaking First Nations people whose descendants now reside mostly on the Colville Indian Reservation in Washington State.

Prior to the early 1900s, the Lakes people occupied a settlement in the Waneta area known as nkw’lila7 in the Okanagan-Colville language. The location of this aboriginal village may have varied over the years, as reports differ on its precise location. Thus it is not possible to make an exact determination of the aboriginal village’s location at Waneta based on ethnographic and ethnohistoric data alone. Two sources place this village site on the north side of the Pend d’Oreille River mouth, which may place it within the “secondary terrestrial study area” designated by the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project. Other sources indicate graves and a village site location just south of the Pend d’Oreille mouth.

Beginning in the mid-1800s, however, mining and trail building activities and, later, construction projects resulted in considerable disturbance to the general environs of Waneta, including the area of the WEP. Given the extensive land disturbance in this area, it may never be possible to physically determine the location of the aboriginal village at Waneta.

A second aboriginal Lakes village may have been located at the site where the Hudson’s Bay Company built Fort Shepherd in 1856-1857, about a mile north from the Canada/US border and on the west side of the Columbia River. Sngaytkstx (Lakes) people lived around this fort and became custodians of the structures when the post was not in periodic operation. Though Fort Shepherd closed for good in the 1870s, sngaytkstx people are believed to have resided here after that date, including Alex Christian who is reported to have lived here in the early 1900s. Several communities of sngaytkstx people continued living in the area along the Columbia River from the border south to Northport, in Washington State, until around 1910, when the remaining few settled on the Colville Reservation.
Archaeologists working in Washington State along the Columbia River between the Canada/US border and Northport have documented numerous aboriginal campsites and recovered human remains. Ethnographic documentation attests to the productivity of this area, as well. Earlier ethnographic reports indicate that the Waneta area was convenient to salmon fisheries and berry grounds situated along the Columbia River, and to hunting grounds in the nearby hills.

Subsequent to the southward move of many of the *sngaytskstx*, which began in the late 1820s and continued into the early 1900s, members of other First Nations, some of whom were former enemies of the Lakes, began visiting the upper Columbia River seasonally for harvesting resources. While documentation about this non-*sngaytskstx* use of the general region is scant, none of the known and available sources places these activities in the location of the WEP lands.

This report has also identified species of flora and fauna of cultural significance to the Lakes (including the Okanagan-Colville generally) and to the Kutenai that are found, or are likely to be found, in the WEP area.

However, while site-specific harvesting locations for some of these species have been recorded in the Arrow Lakes/Upper Columbia region, only one such location has been reported for the area of the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project lands. This harvesting location is a Lakes (*sngaytskstx*) salmon fishery that existed at the Pend d’Oreille/Columbia confluence prior to completion of the Grand Coulee Dam circa 1940.
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APPENDIX A: USE OF "STURGEON-NOSED" CANOES AND USE OF HORSES BY THE LAKES AND LOWER KUTENAI FIRST NATIONS

This Appendix discusses the use of "sturgeon-nosed" canoes (Section A.1) as well as the use of horses (Section A.2) by the Lakes and Lower Kutenai.

A.1 Use of "Sturgeon-Nosed" Canoes

This region of the Columbia Basin, with its rugged land mass broken by marine waterways, was country made for the canoe, and not the horse. The canoe was thus the principal traditional means of transportation. The type of canoe used in this region was also distinct and as it is common to the First Nations whose land use is described in this report, is thus presented here instead of in the individual summaries.

The primary type of canoe employed was a small pine canoe, known to have been built and used only by several groups, including the Lakes and the Lower Kutenai. The comparative use of the pointed bark canoes among these people and the Amur of Siberia was the focus of an article by Otis T. Mason (1901). On the Plateau, this canoe has become known as the "sturgeon-nosed" canoe on account of its distinctive pointed ends, which resembled the nose of a sturgeon, and which rested flat on the water's surface. The name for this canoe in the Okanagan-Colville language is tl'iyi7, which means 'bark canoe.' Its importance to the Lakes is suggested by the fact that the name for the white pine (Pinus monticola), which grows in the Arrow Lakes and Kootenay areas and whose bark was used to make these canoes, is actually derived from the word for the canoe itself. The Okanagan-Colville name for this tree is tl’i7álekw, which literally means ‘bark canoe wood’ (Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy 1980:29). The Kutenai refer to this same canoe as “yáktsō ’mēL” (Chamberlain n.d.a).

Several early explorers and traders described this canoe, commenting on both the uniqueness and utility of its construction. Alexander Ross provided one of the first such descriptions, in 1825:

At the water's edge we saw and examined a birch canoe of rather singular construction, such as I had never seen in any other part of the country, but used by the Natives here; for I saw several of the same make when I passed this place two years ago. Both stem and stern...lie flat on the surface of the water, and terminate in a point resembling a sturgeon's snout (Ross 1855:169-170).

A second description from 1825 has also been recorded. The trader Samuel Black, intrigued with the design of this canoe, commented in his diary that:
These canoes round bottomed and pointed prows inclining the point to the surface of the water and look in the water like an animal or moose without horns...pointed at both ends like a short Proboscus...(Black 1823-1825).

Further details of the canoe’s construction were recorded in 1827 by the botanist David Douglas. He described the bark from which the body of the canoe was made as "Pinus canadensis," a reference to the species now known as the white pine (Pinus monticola). Douglas also indicated that this bark was sewn with the roots of "Thuya" (Thuja plicata), the western red cedar, and that the seams were gummed with pine resin. As well, Douglas commented on the lightness of the design, indicating that a canoe large enough to carry six people and their provisions was light enough to be carried on their shoulders (Wilks 1959:250).

The artist Paul Kane in October 1847 described and sketched the canoes of the ‘‘Indian chief of the lakes’’ and his family, just north of the Arrow Lakes. He recorded that:

The chief, with wife and daughter, accompanied us in their canoe, which they paddled with great dexterity, from ten to fifteen miles. They make their canoes of pine bark, being the only Indians who use this material for the purpose; their form is also peculiar and very beautiful. These canoes run the rapids with more safety for their size, than any other shape (Harper 1971:127).

The canoes sketched by Kane had two paddlers (Harper 1971:222: Fig. 120).

In 1859, Dr. James Hector provided a detailed description of these canoes, being used by a group of Lower Kutenai he encountered. He described the canoes as being ‘‘of a most singular shape’’ and said that:

They are made of a large sheet of the bark from a particular kind of spruce-fir, which is sewn up at both ends, but sloping outwards at each end, so as to form a conical point. The length of the bottom is therefore, about 10 feet, while the space within the gunwales is only about seven feet. They are sewn and gummed together, and have light gunwales and ribs of split willow. They carry a fair load for their size, and are most easily paddled by one person, who, sitting at the extreme end, sinks one conical point that acts as a tail, while the other is canted out of the water. The round smooth surface then presents the smallest possible resistance to the water. The point, being strongly bound with wattle, will stand a severe blow, and therefore acts like a beak to ward off the rocks in running rapids. From their shape, they are, of course, more easily upset than any other kind of canoe; but in skilful hands are well adapted to the work (Hector, in Spry 1968:465-466).

These nimble canoes were also effective in ascending rapids as well. In 1866, James Turnbull, who was ascending the Kootenay River rapids past its mouth in a bark canoe, noted that he
‘met with a party of prospectors who were endeavouring to get up the river; they have been 3 weeks getting so far; had they bark canoes they would have made the trip in 5 days’ ’ (Turnbull 1866:24).

Information about how the sngaytskstx people traditionally constructed these sturgeon-nosed canoes has been recorded, particularly by Elmendorf (1935-1936:I:8-8a), and by Arrow Lakes pioneer C.J.C. Slade (1970) who observed Arrow Lakes Band member Louis Joseph making a canoe in 1911 and made notes about how the canoe was constructed:

The rough part of the bark was shaved off with a sharp axe or drawknife. The bark was then split endwise, carefully peeled off, and turned inside out. It was oiled with deer tallow to prevent it from cracking in drying. The ends were folded together and the seams sewn with the inner bark of cedar. The seams were sealed with a mixture of deer tallow and jack-pine pitch. Gunwales and thwarts were put in, and laced into place with cedar bark. I cannot remember if there were any ribs, but thin strips of split cedar were put in the bottom to act as floor boards (Slade 1970).

Elmendorf (1935-1936:I:8-8a) also recorded additional details of traditional canoe construction — he reported that the outside of the canoe was marked on the ground with stakes and the poles used for the gunwales were fastened to these stakes. Next, the willow ribs were fastened to the gunwales using willow bark twine. The bark was then sewn onto the outside of the ribs. An additional layer of bark was fastened less securely onto the outer side of the craft. All seams were "glued" with warm pine pitch. On the bow end of the canoe, the bark was folded over rings of willow and extra layers, shaped into a point and sewn. The stern end was usually constructed in the same manner, although it was sometimes made square, according to Elmendorf's consultant. The flooring of the canoe as described by Elmendorf was different than the one observed by Slade. Instead of split cedar strip flooring, a frame of woven willow poles was placed in the bottom of the canoe and covered with loose grass to sit on (Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:8-8a).

Both Elmendorf and Slade recorded that the bark was cut in a single sheet from a tree, which was felled in the spring when the sap was running (Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:8-8a; Slade 1970).

In 1909, James Teit had a traditional canoe custom-built by the sngaytskstx people living at Brilliant at the mouth of the Kootenay River, to fill an order from a Berlin museum. Teit commissioned the canoe in May 1909, after determining that the white pine bark was then in the proper condition for peeling. The canoe was ready when Teit returned in July 1909, at which time he reported that it was nineteen feet long — large enough, he stated, to accommodate two men while fishing or one man and his baggage when moving camp (Teit 1898-1910). It seems however, that even at the time Teit was commissioning this sturgeon-
nosed canoe in 1909, new technology was displacing traditional technology in its manufacture. While the fact that he was still able to have a traditional canoe manufactured indicates that Lakes canoe-builders were still making them, Teit observed that in 1909 most of their canoes were covered with oiled canvas rather than bark (Teit 1930b:248).

A principal advantage of these canoes was their relative ease of repair. When a bark canoe was damaged, it could be patched with a piece of the flexible bark taken from a white pine sapling and glued in place using a mixture of pine gum and deer tallow (Slade 1970). Teit (1930b:248) reported that the patches were sewn in place and then pitched. Culturally-modified trees that had pieces of bark removed for this purpose could be seen at various locations around the Arrow Lakes, according to Slade (1970).

Prior to building a canoe, sngaytskstx men held a ceremony which included dancing, fasting, and sweatbathing, the latter activity undertaken to make them more "peaceable and agreeable" and to help focus "all faculties on canoe building." Elmendorf was told that "if canoe went wrong" subsequently, this was an indication that one of the canoe builders had been guilty of incest or other improper behaviour (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:19).

It appears that dug-out canoes existed among the sngaytskstx, but the paucity of references suggests that they were rare, and whether or not they were traditionally built by the Lakes people themselves has not been recorded. Elmendorf referred to "wooden canoes not for travelling—for transporting heavy goods—roughly made—determined by the shape of the tree" but provided no further information (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:8a). However, historian David Chance provided a non-aboriginal person's account of a Lakes man named "Isaac" who made a dugout canoe circa 1909-1910. At the time, "Isaac" was living near the mouth of what is now known as Goodeve Creek, on the west side of the Columbia River about 5 miles south of the Canada/U.S. border. Chance’s non-aboriginal consultant reported that:

Isaac made a dugout out of cottonwood about 16 ft. long and 2.5 ft wide with pointed prow and stern . . . He [the local non-aboriginal resident] implied the existence of several dugouts in this area in the early part of this century (Chance 1967:77).

---

39 "Isaac" is very likely the same man identified by our Lakes consultants as "Old Isaac", also known as nkwltu?tsin or spa7agmix (Bouchard and Kennedy 1984a:401, 412-414).
Traditional paddles were commonly about 1.2 metres (4 feet) long with a long, broad blade and rounded end. A flattened knob at the top end formed the hand grip which was slightly hollowed out where the points of the fingers rested (Teit 1930b:248).

A.2 Use of Horses

For the Lakes (sn̓g̓aytskstx) and the Lower Kutenai, the canoe was the principal means of transportation. Horses appear to have been secondary in importance to both groups until late in the 19th century. The Lakes did not begin to keep horses until their demographic shift to the south. Teit recorded that:

the Lake people, except a few in the south, never adopted horses, as their country was unsuited to them. The Lake tribe had no chance to become a horse people as long as they occupied their own territories. The few horses they employed were procured from the Colville (Teit 1930b:249).

This is consistent with the observations of Ross Cox in the second decade of the 19th century, who remarked that the sn̓g̓aytskstx had no horses at that time (Cox 1957:265).

While the Upper Kutenai, who made much greater use of the Plains, attached great importance to horses, several ethnohistoric sources indicate that the Lower Kutenai had few or none. In December 1825, John Work noted that a party of Lower Kutenai arrived at the Flathead post on foot, because they had no horses (Elliott 1914:190-191). Work also listed the ‘‘Lower tribe or Flatbow Kootanies’’ among those groups who had few or no horses, and who travelled either by canoe or by land (Work 1830). Baillie-Grohman (1907:258) said that when he first came to the area in 1882, the ‘‘Flatbows on the British side possessed no horses whatever.’’ Even when the Lower Kutenai eventually acquired horses, these were not of the quality of those possessed by the Upper Kutenai, and were of course far fewer in number. Turney-High’s Kutenai consultants said that the relative horselessness of the Lower Kutenai was a deterrent to their taking part in the buffalo hunt (Turney-High 1941:71). They said that it required a ‘‘five-mile horse’’ to hunt buffalo successfully, meaning that the horse had to be of high

---

40 Bonner’s Ferry people told Turney-High that it required a ‘‘five-mile horse’’ to hunt buffalo successfully, that is, an animal that was of sufficient quality to keep the rapid pace of stampeding buffalo for five miles. Only the very richest men among the Lower Kutenai had such race horses (Turney-High 1941:36). Indeed, Turney-High was told by his Lower Kutenai consultants that ‘‘they got bad automobiles almost as soon as they acquired fine horses’’ (Turney-High 1941:71).
enough quality to keep the rapid pace of stampeding buffalo for five miles. Only the very richest men among the Lower Kutenai had such race horses, and these were acquired only at a comparatively recent date (Turney-High 1941:36). Indeed, the Lower Kutenai told Turney-High that ‘’they got bad automobiles almost as soon as they acquired fine horses’’ (Turney-High 1941:71).
APPENDIX B: CULTURAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION — THE LAKES (SN\textit{G}AYTSKSTX) FIRST NATION

This Appendix provides a cultural and ethnographic summary for the Lakes (Sngaytskstx or Sinixt) First Nation with respect to those aspects of aboriginal society that are important for the consideration of aboriginal traditional land and resource use in the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project (WEP) area.

The present summary includes information on the following: subsistence practices (Section B.1); dwellings (Section B.2); social and political organization (Section B.3); demography (Section B.4); and religion (Section B.5).41

B.1 Subsistence

\textit{Hunting}

Since meat was the principal staple in the traditional Lakes (\textit{sngaytskstx}) diet, the crafts and organization of hunting were particularly important to their society. While hunting is recorded as having taken place widely throughout \textit{sngaytskstx} territory, their very best hunting grounds were located around the upper part of old Upper Arrow Lake, and the area to its north, around Revelstoke. Teit noted that the area above Revelstoke was used for hunting and trapping by both the \textit{sngaytskstx} and the Shuswap [Teit 1909:455, 462; 1910-1913; but see also Bouchard and Kennedy 2000 (Reprinted in April, 2005): 67-73].

\textit{Sngaytskstx} territory was recorded as being very rich in meat and fur bearing mammals during and before the mid 19th century. The Fort Colvile fur traders in the 1820s and 1830s reported that Lakes people brought in the furs and hides of caribou, mountain goat, mountain sheep, beaver, muskrat, marten, lynx, fox, fishers, and rabbits, besides bear and deer. Deer was the most important food mammal to the \textit{sngaytskstx}. Not all such large game animals found in nearby regions were present in \textit{sngaytskstx} territory however. Elk and moose wandered into the area, but only occasionally. And neither antelope nor buffalo were ever known to be found there. Grizzly bears were more common. Ray noted that grizzly bears were found in "the mountainous regions above the lakes" where they were hunted as game animals (Ray 1975:136).

---

41 Some cultural features of the Lakes are common to all groups who are members of the present Okanagan Nation Alliance, although those high-lighted in the following discussion relate particularly to the Lakes. For cultural summaries of other Okanagan-Colville groups see Kennedy and Bouchard (1998) and Miller (1998).
Considerable information has been recorded about the *sngaytskstx* seasonal hunting round. Teit reported that the Okanagan-Colville had four great hunts: in spring for deer and mountain sheep; in late fall for deer, sheep, elk and bear; in midwinter for deer; and in late winter for mountain sheep (Teit 1930b:247). Ethnohistoric documents record that deer was the most common large ungulate around the Arrow Lakes, where they were very plentiful in the early 19th century. They were the most important mammal to the *sngaytskstx* economy, and were hunted widely throughout their territory. The earliest records describe the Lakes hunting deer in considerable numbers for food, as well as for their hides, bones, fat and horns. The largest Lakes deer hunts took place in the fall (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:7). Both mule deer (*Oedocoileus hemionus*), and white-tail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), the latter of which was found at higher elevations, were actively hunted. Hudson’s Bay Company trader John Work noted in 1823 that the Lakes hunted a very tasty type of small dark grey deer that they called "Shwua," and which had donkey-like ears (Work 1823). The contemporary scientific identification of this animal is not known. Later, Work reported that both "blacktail and common long tail chiveux [sic]” were common around the Arrow Lakes (Work 1830). Botanist David Douglas, who visited the Arrow Lakes in 1827, observed horns and skins of black tailed and "red deer" [white-tailed deer] in the Aboriginals’ possession (Wilks 1959:249).

Early 19th century observers recorded several deer hunting techniques employed by the *sngaytskstx* people; some of these sources indicated the importance of dogs in hunting. The Hudson’s Bay Company’s William Kittson reported in 1831 that the venison traded by Fort Colvile was of poor quality, and attributed this to the aboriginal peoples’ practice of chasing the deer with dogs (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). In 1847, the artist Paul Kane received detailed information from "the chief of the lakes" about the importance of the dogs in deer hunting, and how they were used. Kane recorded that:

> A small species of dog was tied to the bushes near his lodge, to prevent them from hunting on their own accord and driving away the deer. The chief told me that when disposed to hunt with them, he had only to find a fresh deer-track, set his dogs on it and lie down to sleep, as they never fail to find the deer, and turn them back to the place where they had left him lying. We saw some of these dogs, apparently on the track of some deer, full twelve or fifteen miles from the chief's lodge (Kane 1974:229).

The Lakes people’s skill at hunting is also apparent in the trading statistics kept at Fort Colvile, the Hudson’s Bay Company post at which the *sngaytskstx* regularly dealt. These records have survived for the years 1827-1828 (Work 1830) and 1830-1831 (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). On the whole, the statistics compiled by Fort Colvile do indicate that, relative to other aboriginal groups who traded at the fort, the Lakes were very significant hunters and trappers, particularly of beaver. These statistics do not, however, indicate *where* any of the skins traded were obtained. Jason Ovid Allard, who commanded the Hudson’s Bay Company post at Fort Shepherd in the late 1860s, particularly associated Chief Gregoire’s tribe (the Lakes) with the post, and noted that marten, foxes, wolverine, muskrat, bear, mink, weasels and marmots were the most common pelts brought in at that time (Allard n.d.). But he did not note where the furs were taken either.
Dogs were also sometimes used to drive the deer down to the water. Samuel Black recorded this technique in 1825, when, after he shot a deer along the shores of the Lower Arrow Lake, a Native man soon came up and claimed the deer, on the grounds that his dogs had driven the deer down to the water (Black 1823-1825).

Sometimes the deer were hunted without dogs, particularly at night. Elmendorf recorded the use of a technique in which some of the hunters themselves would herd the deer towards other hunters, who were positioned where they could shoot the animals as they approached. Sometimes the deer were herded towards the river where men in canoes would be waiting with bows and arrows. Elmendorf (1935-1936:1:2) indicated that this type of hunting was often done around midnight. The late Colville elder Martin Louie told us that this technique of driving deer towards the water was called *snpelstítkwm*. He indicated that the Arrow Lakes was the only place in this region where the *sn̓gaytskt̓x* could get deer this way, because the lakes were too wide for the deer to swim across and escape before they could be killed.

Ray also recorded that during the deer migration in the autumn, Lakes hunters would drive the deer into channels which would force them over bluffs, so that they would all be killed by the fall. The hunters would drive the deer down a runway and towards a bluff. The animals did not leave the runway, because a row of hunters was positioned on one side, and a "barrier" formed by stakes and bent saplings, all of which contained the hunters' scent, was positioned on the other. When the animals reached the end of the runway, the hunters closed in and drove them over the bluff (Ray 1975:137).

As well, Ray recorded that deer were hunted by being driven through narrow passageways where they could be shot more easily, caught in snares placed on their trails during migration, stalked in snow by hunters on snowshoes, and shot at night by hunters staked out at salt licks (Ray 1975:137, 139, 140).

Deer hunting drives required the cooperation of a large number of men under the direction of one leader, who was chosen by common consent and selected for his hunting ability.

Preparation of these hunts lasted several days and included sweatbathing (to remove the hunters' scents) and the eating of certain foods barbecued by the men themselves. During this preparation the hunters remained isolated from all women (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:79).

Women accompanied the hunters on the hunt itself if the hunters were to be away for more than a few days, as often hunting trips lasted several weeks (Ray 1975:138). Temporary sweathouses would be built at each hunting camp, so that the hunters could bathe and eliminate
their human scent. The hunters' clothes and hunting utensils would also be washed in a
decoction of herbs (Ray 1975:138-139). Sometimes during the hunt, a freshly killed deer would
have to be left momentarily while the pursuit of others continued. When this happened, the
hunter would throw an article of clothing bearing his scent on it, to prevent an animal from
eating the meat before the hunter had the opportunity to retrieve it (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:43).

Caribou, like deer, were plentiful in the Arrow Lakes region and more plentiful here than in the
other territory of Okanagan-Colville speaking peoples (Teit 1930b:242). Ray was told that
caribou could be hunted in the "plains" around the Arrow Lakes, around the lower end of Trout
Lake, and the area north of the Kootenay River and West Arm of Kootenay Lake between the
Slocan River and Kootenay Lake (Ray 1936b:126: 1975:136). Teit elicited information that
caribou hunting grounds were situated around Nakusp, on the east side of the Lower Arrow
Lake, and around Caribou Lake, to the west of the narrows separating the two Arrow Lakes
(Teit 1930b:209-210). According to Teit (1908-1920), Shuswap people from Spallumcheen
sometimes came down the Fire Valley [Inonoaklin Creek] trail to Lower Arrow Lake where
they hunted caribou in the fall, before returning home for the winter.

Even though caribou were common, the sngaytskstx hunted them differently than deer. Unlike
deer, they were not taken in communal hunts, and individual hunters shot them with bow and
arrow, or in later years, with guns. Martin Louie also emphasized that caribou were found in
Arrow Lakes country, although he told us that one of the ways the sngaytskstx people hunted
them was like the way they hunted deer. This was by driving them into the Arrow Lakes, where
men in fast bark canoes would club or shoot them. Mr. Louie said that his grandfather had
participated in these caribou hunts on the Arrow Lakes, and had told him that if the hunters
were not careful the caribou would kick the canoe, and then the hunters would be swimming
alongside them!

David Douglas, who observed caribou meat in Lakes people’s camps in 1827 (and referred to
the animal as "reindeer"), noted that these animals could easily be killed during periods of deep
snow (Wilks 1959:249).

Mountain goat, and to some extent, mountain sheep, were found in the mountains surrounding
the Arrow Lakes. Mountain goat were clearly very important to the sngaytskstx people
traditionally, as Elmendorf’s Lakes consultant told him that the mountain goat was considered
to be the Lakes’ ‘‘emblem’’ and was used for ceremonial purposes (Elmendorf 1935-
1936:II:55; 3:6). Ray recorded a camp situated somewhere on the Lower Arrow Lake that was
a centre for mountain goat hunting in March and April (Ray 1975:140). Very little information
has been recorded about the hunting techniques the sngaytskstx used to hunt either mountain
goats or mountain sheep, although Ray was told that mountain sheep were taken by being
driven over cliffs (Ray 1975:140). In the 1930s, two Kalispel men, Blind Paul and Sherwood,
provided information to Allan Smith on Lakes traditional goat hunting techniques. Smith recorded that:

> The Kalispel never hunted goats by using the technique the Lakes were said to have employed. According to Sherwood, the Lakes pursued goats around over the cliffs with a long pole until they get them in a place from which they could not escape. They put the pole under them and pried them off the cliffs so that they would [fall and] be killed. The Lakes hunted for mountain goats considerably; they liked the meat (A. Smith 1950:240).

Ethnohistoric data also indicate that both sheep and goats were hunted for food, and for their horns and hides. When Gabriel Franchere met aboriginal people on the shores of the Arrow Lakes in 1814, he observed Lakes women spinning blankets and capes from the wool of "mountain sheep" [mountain goat] (Thwaites 1904:VI:349). A supply of the wool of "mouton Blanche," which was likely mountain goat, was seen by David Douglas in 1827 (Wilks 1959:251). Two years later, John Work stated that mountain goat wool was woven into "a kind of coarse blanket":

> This wool is twisted into threads with kind of distass [sic] and woven or rather plaited with the hand into the size required, when finished it has something the appearance of a coarse horse rug (Work 1829).

In 1909, Teit also noted that the sngaytskstx people living at the mouth of the Kootenay River formerly made goat hair blankets on looms (Teit 1898-1910). Lakes elder Mary Marchand told us that the Lakes people used to hunt either mountain sheep or mountain goat to get wool to make blankets, and recalled that to the best of her knowledge Charlie Norbert was the last Lakes person to get one of these animals.

Both the black bear and the grizzly bear were hunted by the sngaytskstx. The black bear seems to have been more important economically, although the grizzly bear had greater ceremonial and spiritual importance. Bear were the specific objects of traditional hunts by the sngaytskstx, rather than opportunistic targets which would be picked off if encountered. Teit (Teit 1930b:242) recorded that bear used to be more plentiful in the territory of the Lakes than in the territory of any of the other Okanagan-Colville speaking groups. According to Ray, black bears were hunted particularly in "the regions of lakes", as well as in mountain meadows where the bears fed. He said that grizzly bears were found in "the mountainous regions above the lakes" where they were hunted as game animals (Ray 1975:II:136).

Indian Agent Galbraith indicated in 1902 that the aboriginal people living near Fern Creek (on what would become the Oatscott Reserve) were usually away from their homes in the summer “hunting bear in the mountains” (Galbraith 1902b). Sngaytskstx hunters also obtained bear in
the vicinity of what Water Branch Records now call Balfour Creek, near Syringa Creek below the lower end of Lower Arrow Lake. Castlegar local historian Harold Webber (1973:90-91) recorded a story of sngaytskstx member Alex Christian’s 1916 bear hunting trip to what was then known locally as ‘‘Irrigation Creek,’’ and which was subsequently known as Berry Creek and Balfour Creek. Moberly also recorded in 1865 that an area along the Illecillewaet River was a ‘‘favorite Indian hunting ground for cariboo and grizzly bears’’ (Moberly 1865b).

Several techniques by which the sngaytskstx hunted bears in this area have been recorded. Ray indicated that, in the spring, deadfalls baited with fish or venison were used to kill bear, and described the type of deadfall used. He also indicated that during the winter, the aboriginal hunters would drag hibernating bears out of their den, either by hand or by means of a rope tied around the animal’s head. He said that they were never smoked out (Ray 1975:139-140). Martin Louie also described for us the deadfalls that were used. He said, as well, that both black bears and grizzlies were sometimes shot with bows and arrows, and that special long, large arrows were used, which could double as spears if the bear closed before the hunter had time to use his bow. Dogs were also used to hunt black bear, but not grizzlies, which would just kill the dogs, Mr. Louie added.

The importance of the bear to the sngaytskstx was demonstrated by the practice of bear ceremonialism intended to bring further good fortune in bear hunting. Walter Moberly recorded the Lakes’ practice of this ceremonialism in 1865, stating that after the bear was killed:

the Indians skinned him, secured all the choice pieces and his head, and returned to the camp, where they had such a gorge that I could not get them away that day. They stuck his head on a pole, decorating it with such white and red cotton rags as they could collect from their tattered clothing telling me that if they did not do so they would have no luck (Moberly 1885:47).

Martin Louie told us that after a black bear was killed, the hunters would immediately sing a traditional song for the bear, and that he had seen some old aboriginal people, including his grandfather, cry when singing the song. Mr. Louie also recalled that many years ago, after the bear’s head was skinned to be eaten, charcoal had first to be placed on its forehead, in accordance with the bear’s legendary “make-up.” The late Albert Louie also knew of the songs sung while the bear was being butchered, and the practice of the painting of the head with charcoal.

Little information has been recorded concerning the Lakes’ hunting of elk or moose. Both Teit

---

43 Similar bear ceremonialism has also been recorded among other Okanagan-Colville groups (Teit 1930b:291; Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:241).
(1930b:242) and Ray (1975:136) reported that elk and moose were scarce in sngaytskstx territory. John Work recorded in 1830 that at that time, some elk were present in the region, but neither he nor any other source of which we are aware describes how the sngaytskstx hunted them (Work 1830). Ray stated that both elk and moose were called with a whistle made from the stems of either elderberry of "rhubarb" [cow parsnip, Heracleum lanatum] (Ray 1975:142).

Information about where smaller fur-bearing mammals were trapped traditionally is very sketchy. Indian Agent Galbraith indicated in 1902 that the Arrow Lakes people trapped marten, fisher, beaver, wolverine and mink\(^{44}\), but described the location of the trapping only very generally as being around “Arrow Lake and vicinity” (Rossland Miner 1902).

Some evidence suggests that the stretch of the Columbia between Castlegar and the Pend d’Oreille River may have been a particularly important trapping ground. A non-aboriginal who visited the well-known Lakes man, Alex Christian, at an unidentified time between approximately 1900 and 1920, in a cabin Mr. Christian used while trapping the Champion Lakes region east of the Columbia River, observed that he had taken large number of beaver, marten and muskrat pelts (Webber 1973:87).

The area at and north of the upper end of old Upper Arrow Lake also seems to have been an important trapping ground. Father Pierre Jean De Smet’s map of the Plateau region of the 1840s identifies as “Riv. aux Castors” [Beaver River] a river some distance above old Upper Arrow Lake north of two high mountains. The mountains are very likely Mount Mackenzie and Ghost Peak, and the “Beaver River” the present-day Illecillewaet River, immediately south of present day Revelstoke (De Smet [1842-1848]). De Smet’s name certainly suggests that the Illecillewaet may have been a strong trapping ground.

The area around the Northeast Arm of Upper Arrow Lake was also an important trapping area. “Cultus Jim” and the Christian family are known to have come up here to trap in the 1890s and earlier (Kootenay Mail 1894c; 1895a).

The most comprehensive source indicating early trapping, and to a lesser extent, hunting, is the trading statistics kept by the Hudson’s Bay Company post at Fort Colville, where the sngaytskstx regularly traded, and where the Lower Kutenai also frequently went. Fort Colville’s records provide comprehensive statistical records of the types of animals that were hunted and trapped by the aboriginal groups who traded there. These statistics must be used with some caution as an indication of which animals were obtained traditionally, since the hides obtained were trapped primarily to satisfy the demand of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Nevertheless, the

\(^{44}\) Coyotes and mountain lions were also identified as being trapped by these Arrow Lakes hunters, but this trapping seems likely to have been done for predator bounties (Rossland Miner 1902).
returns provide a very good indication of the type and volume of animals available in the territories of identified groups, as well as their facility at hunting certain types of game.

Unfortunately, only a few of these early trade records have survived. The 1830-1831 Fort Colvile journal recorded the trade of the Lakes, Lower Kutenai and Kalispel, but no other journals from this post are known to have survived. Fort Colvile trading statistics which make differentiations between the trade with specific aboriginal groups were also reported for the years 1827 and 1828, and were recorded in an 1830 report by John Work.

Work’s 1830 report listed Fort Colvile’s trade during the years 1827 and 1828, and differentiated the trade by separate Aboriginal groups. Ten such groups were identified: Lake Indians; Kettle Fall Indians [Colville], Sinapolish [Sanpoil]; Spokans; Awlhearts [Coeur D’ Alene]; Earring Indians [Kalispel and Pend d’Oreille]; Flatbows Kootany [Lower Kutenai]; Kootanies [Upper Kutenai]; and Nez Perces, as well as “Freemen,” independent non-aboriginal traders. The statistics provided for the Lakes, the Lower Kutenai, and the Kalispel/Pend d’Oreille are noted in the Table that follows:

---

45 These Fort Colvile journals, unlike the fur traders’ reports of two decades earlier which identified the “Lake” Indians as Lower Kutenai, clearly refer to the Lake(s) Indians as meaning the Arrow Lakes Okanagan-Colville-speaking people. The Fort Colvile Journal also identified, as a separate group from the Lake Indians, the “Arc Plattes,” [Flatbow] (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831) a term which was used to identify the Lower Kutenai. Moreover, the journal describes the “Lake” people as close friends of the Kettle Falls (Colville) Indians, which the Kutenai most certainly were not. The journal recorded that on June 28th, 1830, “the Kettle Falls and Lake Indians commenced a grand dance which is to last three days” (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). As well, the journal recorded in August 1830 that the Lake Indians “have as usual passed most of the summer at the Falls.” In December 1830, the journal recorded that the “Lake Indians” had intended to pass the winter at Kettle Falls, and while some of them went up the Columbia River with the Okanagan, most of them were detained at the post because of bad weather (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). Neither ethnographic nor ethnohistoric sources record that the Lower Kutenai customarily spent much of the summer at Kettle Falls, unlike the Arrow Lakes people, who did so regularly. John Work, in his 1830 report, also indicates that the group known as the Lake Indians were the same group known as the “Sinaeteht” /sn̓gatstskstx/ (Work 1830).

46 The group identified in Heron and Kittson’s journal is the “Pend Oreille Indians.” However, the Kalispel are not identified separately. Since the Hudson’s Bay Company used various transcriptions of the term Pend d’Oreille to refer to both the Kalispel and the Pend d’Oreille, and since the Kalispel were much more proximate to Fort Colvile than the Pend d’Oreille, who lived further east, it is likely that most of these ‘‘Pend d’Oreille’’ who were trading at Colvile were in fact Kalispel.

47 Like Heron and Kittson, John Work used the term Pend d’Oreille to refer to both the Kalispel and Pend d’Oreille, and explicitly indicated this in his report (Work 1830). While the Kalispel lived closer to Fort Colvile, it would have generally been more convenient for the Pend d’Oreille to have traded at Flathead Post, east of Lake Pend d’Oreille. It is thus likely that most of the people identified by Work as Pend d’Oreille were in fact Kalispel.
Table 4. Some of the Commodities Traded from Lakes, Lower Kutenai and Kalispel/Pend d’Oreille at Fort Colville, 1827-1828 (Work 1830)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lake Indians 1827</th>
<th>Lake Indians 1828</th>
<th>Lower Kutenai 1827</th>
<th>Lower Kutenai 1828</th>
<th>Kalispel/Pend d’Oreille 1827</th>
<th>Kalispel/Pend d’Oreille 1828</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Skins</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears, Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears, Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears, Grizzly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castorun (pairs)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martens</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musquash [Muskrat]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkskins</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiveu [Deer]</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venison, Fresh</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data clearly indicate that the *sngaytskstx* were strong and regular providers of beaver, an association which was also noted by the traders in the journals themselves. Marten also seem to have been fairly common in the territory trapped by the Lakes people, relative to the other groups. However, while significant numbers of muskrat were trapped by the *sngaytskstx*, relative to some other groups, it was the Lower Kutenai and the Kalispel, not the Lakes, who were the principal suppliers of muskrat to Fort Colville. While the number of bear skins traded was limited, it is noteworthy that the Lakes did trade more bear than any other group. Also of interest is the fact that the traders purchased significant amounts of fresh venison from the Lakes people, which strongly suggests that the *sngaytskstx* were resident around the fort in the late 1820s\(^ {48} \) for significant periods of time, hunting on behalf of the traders (this fact, as well, is confirmed in the journals, themselves).

\(^ {48} \) For comparison, the 1827 and 1828 amounts of fresh venison supplied by the “Kettle Fall Indians”
These statistics corroborate other statements by traders that in the early 19th century, the country of the *sngaytsks*tx was well stocked with beaver (Dease 1827; Ross 1855:171-172), and that the *sngaytsks*tx soon became known to the fur traders at Fort Colvile as the best beaver hunters who frequented the fort (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). The HBC's demand for furs definitely increased the scope of the *sngaytsks*tx beaver hunting, although the extent of their beaver hunt prior to the fur trade period is not known. The earliest recorded evidence from this region, provided by David Thompson in 1811, strongly suggests that a fall beaver hunt had not previously been part of the traditional subsistence pattern of the Lakes people. Snow was already deep on the ground in the Arrow Lakes region in October 1811 when Thompson met an Aboriginal man and his family out hunting. When Thompson enquired if the snow was unusually deep, the man replied that he did not know, because he "never left the village at this season but now many of them would leave it to hunt furs, to trade" (Glover 1962:385).

Ray (1975:II:141) recorded that beaver were either snared or taken with a deadfall. Indeed, Martin Louie told us that no special places were frequented, because beaver, known as *s*t*ux*, were fairly common; Albert Louie said that beavers were found from the Upper Arrow Lakes south down the Columbia River.

Albert Louie told us that beaver fur was valued for clothing because it was water-repellant and wind-proof; Martin Louie said that beaver skins were used to make blankets.

Groundhogs may have been the favourite small game hunted by the *sngaytsks*tx in aboriginal times. Jason Ovid Allard (n.d.) observed at Fort Shepherd in the late 1860s that marmots, now better known as “groundhogs”, were thoroughly enjoyed by the *sngaytsks*tx people (Allard n.d.). Frequent references to marmots being taken as food in ethnohistoric documents suggest that they were both plentiful and easily obtained. Ray noted that marmots were "taken by drowning out," i.e flooding them out of their holes (Ray 1975:141). Muskrat, rabbits and marten were also hunted by the *sngaytsks*tx. Snares were made for killing rabbits, although sometimes they were dragged from their holes (Ray 1975: 140-141).

When circumstances permitted, the *sngaytsks*tx made use of virtually all the parts of the animals they killed. Responding to a question from Hudson's Bay Company headquarters in 1829 concerning the aboriginal people’s use of animals for other than their meat, John Work at Fort Colvile replied:

The hair, horns and hoofs are sometimes thrown away as useless, but no other part of the animal is suffered to be lost even the bones are pulverized to extract every particle of fat from them (Work 1829).
When time was short, or the sngaytsksxtx were travelling, they might be less selective. Walter Moberly recorded that when the Lakes guides hired on his 1865 exploring expedition shot a caribou, they "quietly cut off the best pieces, broke his legs to get the marrow, which they ate raw," and left the remainder (Moberly 1885:47).

When the Lakes people were in camp, surplus meat could be prepared to preserve it for winter. Venison was preserved for winter by roasting chunks of it before a fire, then pounding the chunks on a rock into flat sheets. The flattened slabs were then threaded onto a long stick and hung over a fire to remove any extra moisture (Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:7).

**Fishing**

Even though more meat than fish was eaten by the sngaytsksxtx, fish still comprised a significant portion of their diet. The principal traditional Lakes fisheries were not on the Arrow Lakes, but at Kettle Falls and the mouth of the Slocan River. Nevertheless, the data indicate that Arrow Lakes was a significant fishery. A fishery has also been identified in the vicinity of the proposed Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project.

The most important traditional Lakes fishery was at Kettle Falls, located on the Columbia River in Washington State, although Lakes people are recorded as having fished in the more northerly parts of their territory, particularly on the Arrow Lakes, Trout Lake, Slocan River and Lake, and the confluence of the Kootenay River with the Columbia (Curtis 1911:64; Teit 1930b:250; Kennedy and Bouchard 1975). The Kettle Falls, now inundated by Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake which was created by the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, are located approximately 25 miles (about 40 Km) south from the Canada/U.S. border. Each summer the sngaytsksxtx would travel to the Kettle Falls fishery and join the Colvilles and several other aboriginal groups from the Plateau region to catch the Chinook and coho salmon which attempted to ascend the falls.

The most important anadromous species to the sngaytsksxtx was the spring or Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) which ascended the Columbia River in June, and continued its run until August. The fishery on the Arrow Lakes appears to have taken place in August, after the Kettle Falls and Slocan fisheries had ended. In August 1859, John Palliser remarked that there were no Indians on the Kootenay River, as they had all gone to fish in the Arrow Lakes (Spry 1968:475). The sngaytsksxtx held their "first salmon ceremony" for the Chinook salmon, and it occupied a significant position in their mythology (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:4-5; 1998:242).
The other two species of salmon which ascended the upper Columbia were the sockeye \((O. \text{nerka})\), which came in July, and the coho \((O. \text{kisutch})\), which came in October and November. The \textit{sngaytskstx} considered both of these species to be of less economic value than the Chinook, and were ancillary to the Chinook fishery (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:5). Other fish of economic importance found in the Arrow Lakes include Dolly Varden char [now known as \textquote{bull trout} \((Salvelinus \text{confluentus})\)] (Hildebrand 1999:pers.comm.), sturgeon, and several species of trout.

Early 19th century historical sources indicate that significant amounts of salmon reached the Arrow Lakes region, although these sources very rarely identified particular species. Many of these same sources also remarked that the salmon observed were of relatively poor quality (G. Simpson 1824-1825; E. Simpson 1826; Work 1830).

We do not conclude from this that the Arrow Lakes was a poor fishery however. While the salmon these men observed were undoubtedly in very bad shape, we consider it much more likely that their conditions reflects the time of year they were observed. Coincidentally, the two Simpsons and Work all recorded their observations of Arrow Lakes salmon in October, when the salmon present in this region of the Columbia were in their very last stages of life.

These sources recorded that the dead and dying salmon were being collected by the aboriginals for their winter stores.\(^49\) Since the poor quality of these observed salmon is likely related more to the time of the observation, rather than to the distance travelled to reach this area, it is unlikely that the salmon present this far up the Columbia earlier in the year were in the same condition. Indeed, when in April 1825 Alexander Ross was commenting on the salmon from a point on the west side of Lower Arrow Lake, he made no reference to the poor quality of these fish, noting that \textquote{the waters are, apparently at least, more productive than the land, for the salmon and other species of fish peculiar to the country sported about in every direction} (Ross 1855:167).

Several places on the Arrow Lakes have been recorded as notable aboriginal fishing areas. Teit identified Nakusp, near the lower end of the east side of Upper Arrow Lake, as a noted fishing place for \textquote{lake trout} [likely Dolly Varden char, or as it is now known, bull trout] as well as salmon (Teit 1930b:209). Teit was also told that a kokanee fishery was centred at a place

\(^{49}\) Ethnographic information says pretty much the same thing. Martin Louie told us that after Chinook had spawned, they were picked up by hand from the river shore by the Colville (\textit{sgweyi7lhp}) people. The spawned-out Chinook were then bled and eviscerated, and the fish was hung from a tree limb using a hole pierced through the tail end. The air-dried fish would remain on the tree throughout the winter, and any person who needed salmon could take it down. It was always boiled before being eaten (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:59). Spawned fish were also used in other ways. Their skin was peeled off and boiled, to make a glue equivalent which was known as \textit{ma7t} (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975:65).
named "Xaték'en", at a creek on the upper end of Lower Arrow Lake, below Burton (Teit 1930b:209). Another aboriginal kokanee fishery was observed and recorded at Galena Bay at the beginning of the 20th century (Harrison 1961a; 1961b). South of the Arrow Lakes, a creek at Trail was also identified ethnographically as being abundant in kokanee (Bouchard and Kennedy 1985:43).

Aboriginal salmon fisheries were recorded in the 1860s along the very lowest part of old Lower Arrow Lake, and on the stretch of the Columbia between the old outlet to Lower Arrow Lake and the site of present-day Castlegar. In 1861, Magistrate W.G. Cox reported that Shields Creek, across from Syringa, was a salmon fishery used by the Native people (Cox 1861). James Bissett observed aboriginal people fishing at the mouth of the Kootenay River when he visited the site during the first week of August in 1868, and noted that on the lower part of Lower Arrow Lake "the lake appears to be teeming with salmon from the sea, and with trout" (Bissett 1868).

Father Pierre Jean De Smet may also have recorded a salmon fishery at the Akolkolex River, above the north end of old Upper Arrow Lake. His map of the Plateau region from the 1840s identified "R. aux Saumons" ["Salmon River"] as a river flowing into the east side of the Columbia above the north end of the same lake. Like the Akolkolex, which is the only substantial river in this area, the river on De Smet's map has several branches in its upper regions (De Smet [c.1842-1848]).

While considerable data has been recorded about the significance of the area around Brilliant, just east of Castlegar, as a traditional aboriginal fishery, much less information has been recorded about a fishery at Castlegar itself. However, Verne Ray did record the existence of an unnamed fishery settlement which was located:

at the site of the present town of Castlegar, near the fork of the Kootenay River and Lower Arrow Lake [and] was important for both spear and line fishing. There was a rapids here, which aided the fisherman (Ray 1936b:127)

Ray did not explicitly identify this site as a salmon fishery. However, his reference to fishing being done here with a spear as well as a line indicates that salmon was likely the quarry.

Sturgeon were also fished in the Arrow Lakes. In 1825, Alexander Ross was told by a "Sinatcheggs" [snaygatskt] chief he met at the south end of Upper Arrow Lake that "the lakes abound with sturgeon and other fish; so that we live well and are at peace with all men" (Ross 1855:172). The former economic importance of sturgeon to the Lakes people was also noted by our aboriginal consultants who stated that when the sturgeon was butchered, a set ritual was always followed — the head was removed, and hung in a tree, facing east (Kennedy
and Bouchard 1975:2).

**Fishing Techniques**

The older ethnohistoric sources contain information about the techniques used to take fish at Kettle Falls. It seems that during the early Chinook run, in early and mid-June, there was heavy reliance upon the spear, likely because the water was still too high to allow for the use of a basket trap.

David Thompson observed that during the month of June 1811, despite the scarcity of food in the Indian camp, only one man was employed spearing fish at Kettle Falls and he could catch no more that eleven fish per day (Glover 1962:336). The use of only the spear to procure this early run was also noted by Lieutenant Johnson, a member of Wilkes’ United States Exploring Expedition, who visited the Kettle Falls fishery in mid-June 1841 (Wilkes 1844:483).

By late June, the water at Kettle Falls had usually descended enough to allow use of basketry traps. If it had not, then enough salmon to feed all the aboriginal people who had congregated at the falls could usually not be obtained. The Fort Colvile Journal of July 1st, 1830, reported the consequences of the river's remaining unusually high that year:

> The River falls but slowly. Salmon are very numerous in the river but owing to the higher waters, a basket cannot as yet be set to catch them at the Falls, and the Indians with spears cannot kill so many as will afford one meal a day to their large Camp... (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831).

The fall in the water level made possible the use of the basketry trap, and consequently a massive increase in the size of the catch. The 1830 Fort Colvile journal recorded that by July 14th that year, the basketry trap was in place, with the result that "the Indians at the falls get upwards of two hundred salmon some days in their basket, but seldom less than one hundred" (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831).

John Work in 1829 observed and described these basketry traps used at Kettle Falls:

> The baskets are of an oblong form of different sizes according to the situation where they are to be used. Sometimes ten feet long four or five feet wide and as deep; they are suspended in a favourable situation in the falls, where the salmon in attempting to leap the cascade jumps into the basket (Work 1829).

Several of these basketry traps were in use at the main falls. Verne Ray also recorded that the *sngaytskstx* had a site between Hayes Island and the river bank where they used a huge basketry trap to do most of their fishing. Near this basketry site, several individual fishermen speared salmon or fished with a line, and guests received their distribution of fish (Ray 1975:129-130).
Estimates of the amount of salmon caught at the Kettle Falls fishery vary, as they refer to observations made in different years and at different times of the year. All the estimates are large, however. Fur trader Ross Cox, in chronicling his adventures along the Columbia River in 1814, remarked that the aboriginal people at *La Chaudière* [Kettle Falls] “take vast quantities of salmon which they dry and preserve for use during the winter and spring months” (Cox 1957:189). In 1841, Lieutenant Johnson recorded that the basket was raised three times during a twenty-four hour period and frequently contained three hundred fish (Wilkes 1844:472). In July of 1846, Father DeSmet observed the basket being checked about seven or eight times in a day, and noted that each time it contained about 250 salmon (Chittenden and Richardson 1905:II:482). Paul Kane wrote in the summer of 1847 that the chief's basket trap would average about 400 fish daily, and the chief told him that he had taken as many as 1700 salmon, weighing an average of 30 pounds each, in the course of one day (Kane 1974:219).

The "chief" to which Paul Kane referred was the "salmon chief," who presided over the handling of the communal basketry trap and the distribution of the salmon, and who was said to possess the special knowledge necessary to induce the salmon run if it appeared to be weak (Kane 1974:216). Kane reported that in 1847 the salmon chief at Kettle Falls was "See-pays," whom he termed the ‘‘Chief of the Waters’’ (Harper 1971:123). This was very likely the same person described by John Work in 1829 as "Supess the good salmon spearer" (Work 1829a). By the 1850s, a man known as "kikenekwe", who Joset first identified as "Chief at Kettle Falls in the summer", had become the salmon chief and retained this position until his death in the mid-1890s (Joset n.d.).

Kane recorded that the salmon chief maintained his basket for a month, and distributed the proceeds of the catch among all the people. Kane then indicated that:

> After the expiration of one month, the Salmon Chief abandons his exclusive privilege, as the fish are getting thin and poor, and allows all who wish it to take them. For this purpose some use smaller baskets made like the chief; others use the spear, with which they are very expert, and an ordinary spearman will take easily as many as 200 in a day; others use a small hand net in the rapids, where the salmon are crowded together and near the surface. These nets are somewhat like our common landing-nets, but ingeniously contrived, so that when a fish is in them, his own struggles loosen a little stick which keeps the mouth of the net open while empty; the weight of the salmon then draws the mouth like a purse, and effectually secures the prey (Harper 1971:124).

Several accounts of the ceremonial eating of the first salmon taken in a trap have been 50

---

50 Johnson reported this information, but did not actually observe the basket being used himself.
recorded. Elmendorf (1935-1936:1:7) recorded that the first salmon caught by the Lakes was cooked and eaten by all the men present at the fisheries. Ray described a ceremony that was held for the first salmon only, and was performed by the salmon chief alone, who sat by the river, watching, singing and praying. Apparently there was no dancing. According to Ray, the first salmon caught in the trap was eviscerated and boiled or roasted and then served to those who were present at the trap. The bones were then collected and thrown back into the river (Ray 1975:133). Our Colville (sxweyi7lhp) consultants described for us a third version of this ceremony, in which the first male and female salmon taken in the trap were prepared by two women and served to all the people present at the fishery site, beginning with the village leaders. The bones were ceremoniously thrown back into the river (Kennedy and Bouchard 1975).

Various taboos were observed at Kettle Falls to avoid offending the salmon. Children, widows and widowers were not permitted near the traps. Menstruating women were not allowed to associate with the fishermen, walk near the fishery, or eat fresh salmon. Swimming and smoking were not permitted above the fishery and water had to be obtained downstream from the fishing activities. The people believed that violating any of these taboos would cause the fish to disappear. Ray noted that "women were permitted to be present but not to touch the fish until they had been removed from the place of distribution" (Ray 1975:132).

Other rigid restrictions concerning the fishery were noted by David Thompson in July, 1811, and he concluded that some of the taboos which he first thought to be simply superstitions were entirely practical. Thompson stated that:

experience has taught them the delicate perceptions of this fish, even a dog going to the edge of the water, the salmon dash down the Current, and any part of one of them being thrown into the water, they do not return until the next day, especially if blood has been washed; in spearing of them, if the fish is loose on the Spear and gets away, the fishing is done for that day. . .I looked upon a part of the precautions of the Natives as so much superstition, yet I found they were not so; one of my men, after picking the bone of a Horse about 10 AM carelessly threw it into the River, instantly the Salmon near us dashed down the current and did not return until the afternoon; an Indian dived, and a in a few minutes brought it up but the fishery was over for several hours (Glover 1962:335-337).

At the Kettle Falls basketry trap, the salmon were distributed equally to everyone present. The fish were not cut up for distribution, as was practised by the Sanpoil to the southwest, but were given out one after another (Ray 1975:134). Paul Kane indicated in 1847 that the salmon chief distributed an equal share of the salmon catch to all the people, including small children. Kane further noted that during the month that the basketry trap was in place, the salmon chief controlled both the fishing and the distribution, after which time it was open to everyone (Kane 1974:218-219).
Structures were built at the Kettle Falls fishery that were used both for shelter and for drying the salmon. Paul Kane described such a structure he observed in 1847:

The lodges are formed of mats of rushes stretched on poles. A flooring is made of sticks, raised three or four feet from the ground, leaving the space beneath it entirely open, and forming a cool, airy, and shady place, in which to hang their salmon to dry (Harper 1971:123).

These same structures had also been described in 1811 by David Thompson:

This Village is built of long sheds of about twenty feet in breadth by from thirty to sixty feet in length, they were built of boards which somehow they had contrived to split from large Cedars drifted down the River, partly covered with the same and with Mats, so as to withstand the Rain; each Shed had many poles for smoke drying the Salmon as they have no salt (Glover 1962:335).

Several weirs have been recorded ethnohistorically in sngaytskstx territory further up the Columbia from Kettle Falls. The best description was provided by Alexander Ross, who noted and described a stone weir at the mouth of the Kootenay River in the spring of 1825:

It is rendered still more remarkable by a dike of round stones, which runs up obliquely against the main stream, on the west side for more than one hundred yards in length, resembling the foundation of a wall; it is nearly as high as the surface of the water, and is clearly seen at low water. On the opposite or east side is a similar range, of less extent. These are evidently the work of man, and not destitute of ingenuity; we supposed them to be a contrivance for the purpose of catching fish at low water: they are something similar to those used by the Snakes during the salmon season. At the upper end both ranges incline to the centre of the river, where they nearly meet (Ross 1855:165).

William Kittson noted the presence of a sngaytskstx weir at the mouth of the Slocan River in 1826, but did not describe its construction (Kittson 1826).

The most common type of technique used by early sngaytskstx fishermen to catch small fish, like trout in streams, was a conical basketry trap. Nancy Wynecoop described this style of trap to Bill Elmendorf who wrote in his field notes that "all the small streams in L. country had one in them". Elmendorf further noted that cords were attached to the mouth of the trap and fastened onto either bank of the stream to keep the trap positioned in a spot where there was a small waterfall or rapids (Elmendorf 1935-1936:II:22a). Ray reported that these funnel-shaped traps were individually owned, and that any fisherman owning such a trap was free to retain the entire catch for himself. Box-type traps were also constructed by Lakes fishermen; the smaller ones were owned individually while the larger ones were usually the property of several
fishermen (Ray 1975:134-135). Line and spear fishing were also practiced by the sngaytskst on the rivers (Ray 1936b:126-127).

Teit described the sngaytskst people’s methods for lake fishing, which entailed the use of long baited set lines provided with floats and sinkers. Trolling lines, either dragged from canoes or thrown from the shore, were also common. In the spring, large nets were pulled through the water between two canoes. Gill nets and drag nets of various sizes were also employed in lake fishing (Teit 1930b:246).

**Gathering**

A comprehensive description of the use of plants for food and medicine by Okanagan-Colville-speaking people, including the Lakes, can be found in our monograph — co-authored with botanist Dr. Nancy Turner — entitled *Ethnobotany of the Okanagan-Colville Indian People of British Columbia and Washington State* (Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy 1980).

Plants were gathered by the Lakes people in the vicinity of the Arrow Lakes, although exact gathering locations were seldom recorded, and plants were also frequently not fully identified in the ethnohistoric literature. Hudson’s Bay Company Governor George Simpson remarked in 1824 that the sngaytskstx survived on the "few roots they collect in the fall" (G. Simpson 1824-1825). He provided no further detail however. Alexander Ross recorded that Lakes people presented him with berries and roots in 1825 during his trip through the Arrow Lakes, but he did not identify the species of plants (Ross 1855:174).

Some gathering sites around the Arrow Lakes that have been recorded include the upper part of Upper Arrow Lake, at Arrowhead, and the lower end of Upper Arrow Lake, both of which areas were known to be good huckleberry-picking sites (Teit 1930b:209). Lakes elder Mary Marchand told us that her grandmother used to go to the head of Upper Arrow Lake each summer, as the huckleberries (*Vaccinium membranaceum*) were plentiful here. Teit (1930b:209) also recorded a site near Arrowhead, at the former upper end of Upper Arrow Lake, that was a noted area for digging tiger lily bulbs (*Lilium columbianum*), another favored food of the Lake peoples. According to Nancy Wynecoop, Elmendorf’s sngaytskstx consultant, the Lakes people dug these bulbs in July and August (Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:26).

Several sites on and south of the Arrow Lakes have also been recorded as important places to gather Saskatoon berries (*Amelanchier alnifolia*), also known by their American name of serviceberries. These places included Galena Bay, on Upper Arrow Lake, and a place identified

---

51 As well, ethnographic evidence shows that Simpson’s conclusion was mistaken, as ethnographic plant foods data clearly show that the collection of these foods was not limited to the fall, but rather began in the early spring and extended until late in the fall.
by Teit as being “at a creek on the west side of Columbia River, close to Trail.” Teit and others specifically indicated that “this was a center for gathering service berries” (Teit 1930b:209; K. Johnson 1964:171).

Black tree lichen (Bryoria fremontii), better known as ‘‘black tree moss,’’ was gathered from lodgepole pine and ponderosa pine trees, as well as larch (tamarack) and Douglas-fir trees (Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy 1980:10). David Douglas observed aboriginal people gathering lichen in April of 1827 at the upper end of Lower Arrow Lake, and commented that the lichen was made into "a sort of bread-cake in times of scarcity" (Wilks 1959:250). Captain John Nelson recalled seeing aboriginal people come to pick Saskatoons and Oregon grape berries (Berberis aquifolium) at Galena Bay in the early 20th century (Harrison 1961a; 1961b). In 1861, Magistrate W.G. Cox observed that wild strawberries (Fragaria vesca), a popular food among the sngaytskstx (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:31-31a), and Oregon grape were very common near Shields Creek, on the southern part of Lower Arrow Lake (Cox 1861).

B.2 Dwellings

Semi-subterranean pit houses, i.e. permanent dwellings found in winter villages, are known to have been used traditionally by many of the more northerly Plateau peoples such as the Thompson and Shuswap. The use of such dwellings by the Lakes (sn gaytskstx) has also been recorded, as late as the first part of the 19th century.

In 1909, when James Teit recorded his Lakes data, none of the oldest living sn gaytskstx had themselves lived in this type of dwelling. However, Teit’s oldest sn gaytskstx consultant, Antoinette Christian, recalled that many years earlier her mother had lived for some time in one of these houses, and had heard her mother describe them. Most of these pit houses were quite small and inhabited by only one or two families. The pit was dug in dry, sandy soil to a depth of one to two metres, and the entranceway was at the top (Teit 1898-1910; 1930b:226-227).

Mat lodges, both circular and oblong, were widely used by Northern Okanagan and Colville peoples by the early 19th century, and appear to have been the most common type of dwelling used by the sn gaytskstx at this time. Both circular and oblong mat lodges were observed and described by John Work when he descended the Arrow Lakes in October 1823:

One of the lodges was of oblong form and constructed with poles and the external covering cedar bark, this appeared to be not only a dwelling but also a kind of a store as considerable quantities of dried salmon and other articles were

---

52 See Turner, Bouchard and Kennedy (1980:11-14) for a description of the gathering and processing of black tree lichen.
deposited here. The other lodge was of a circular form composed of poles covered with kind of mats made of bullrushes sewed together (Work 1823).

The first structure that Work described was later identified by Teit as the "square or square-topped lodge." This lodge's framework was comprised of four main poles that converged somewhat, forming a square or slightly oblong smoke-hole. The base of the lodge was generally circular, although some may have been slightly square. Some of these structures were said to have been constructed almost exactly like the underground house, but above ground and with much lighter materials. Mats were used to cover the structure in the summer months. During the winter, for greater warmth, these dwellings could be covered with a layer of poles, brush and large sheets of bark, instead of mats. Cedar bark, peeled in the spring, was the bark most often used (Teit 1930b:227-228).

The floors of these dwellings were sometimes excavated to as much as half a metre (about 1.6 feet) deep, and covered with layers of fir boughs, grasses and rush mats. A long fire pit with logs on either side was built directly on the ground in the centre of the house. The outer door was covered with a coarse, woven grass mat with horizontal supporting slats. An inner door several feet inside the house was hung with a finer grass or buckskin doormat. These square-topped lodges could be about nine metres (approximately 30 feet) long, and could be inhabited by all the families in the village. Each family possessed its own roofing materials and roofed over a section for itself. Men and women had separate entrances at either ends of the house.

Nancy Wyncoop, Elmendorf's sngaytskstx consultant, said that the use of these entrances by the stipulated gender was enforced so severely that a woman was "in danger of being killed" if she lifted the man's entrance covering (Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:4-5,66).

The circular mat lodge that Work described in 1823 has also been identified and described ethnographically (Teit 1930b:227; Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:5a). Generally, such lodges were small and usually occupied by one or two families. The mats were laid on a circular framework of poles, with three poles usually being used. In the summer only one layer of tule mats would cover the framework, but in the winter, as many as four would be used. When the lodges were well covered, they were warm, and offered good protection from the rain and snow.

In earlier times, the sngaytskstx used long or oblong-shaped lean-tos, which could be of considerable length (Teit 1930b:227; Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:5). These long lodges were constructed as temporary shelters used at fishing camps or to accommodate visitors; they were useful because they could house many people, and required fewer mats than would tents housing an equivalent number of people. Only a single layer of mats was generally used to cover the structure. When more comfort was required, two of these lodges could be built face to face and the ends filled with in with poles, over which brush and mats were laid. Fires were built along the open front. This type of lodge was seldom used in the winter. Teit was told in
1909 that among the *sngaytskstx*, this type of lodge went out of use a long time ago (Teit 1930b:227-228).

One widely-used small structure was the sweathouse. Apparently, among the *sngaytskstx*, men and women had separate sweathouses (Elmendorf 1935-1936:I:69-70; Ray 1939:133). They were used both for cleansing and for therapeutic purposes (Elmendorf 1935-36:1:80). A description of sweatbathing was recorded by John Work in 1829:

> Closing themselves up in a kind of oven/ in which hot stones are placed and water thrown upon them till they are in a profuse sweat and immediately plunging into cold water is very common both with the sick and those who are in good health. Both cold and warm bathing are much used, to effect the latter, a hollow of a sufficient size is made close to the river side, and filled with water into which hot stones are thrown till it be heated to a sufficient degree (Work 1829).

Hunters would also construct temporary sweathouses at hunting camps, where they would bathe and rub themselves with certain herbs to rid themselves of their human scent (Elmendorf 1935-36:1:79). Sweatbathing continued throughout the year. In the winter of 1886-1887, Edouard Picard saw the *sngaytskstx* man known as “Cultus Jim” sweatbathing near Revelstoke during a winter cold spell. He had to cut through the ice to plunge into the frigid water (Picard 1926).

Small separate lodges were also constructed for specific female uses, including childbirth, seclusion of young or menstruating women, and quarters for elderly women chaperoning young people. Teit reported that the menstrual huts were always conical, quite small, and usually made of fir brush, or mats. He noted that many of the *sngaytskstx* huts were covered with bark, and the floors of their huts were covered with cedar or hemlock boughs (Teit 1930b:228-229).

### B.3 Social And Political Organization

Individual *sngaytskstx* villages, or clusters of villages, were comprised of autonomous households linked to each other by kinship, exchange, association and geographical proximity. The kinship system has been described as bilateral without lineages (Walters 1938; Anastasio 1972) although the existence of nonunilinear descent groups has also been suggested (Ackerman 1994). Membership in these villages was very flexible, and some individuals would move freely between different summer and winter camps (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:247).

---

53 This is the same man who would later be shot to death at Galena Bay in a well-known incident in 1894 which was perceived by non-Natives in the area at the time as the consequence of the aggressive defence by ‘‘Colville’’ people of their traditional right to use of property around Upper Arrow Lake (see Bouchard and Kennedy 2000:79-80).
These households formed named communities or "bands" under the direction of a "chief" (known as *ilmixwm* in the Okanagan-Colville language). Ethnographic data on the *sngaytskstx* indicate that the people all recognized a single person among them as head chief. No evidence has been recorded which would indicate the existence of separate divisions among the *sngaytskstx*, each with their own head chief. Teit stated that "I found no trace of divisions among the Lakes. They were divided in small bands each having a chief and a main headquarters. (Like the bands of the Shuswap & Thompson)" (Teit 1907-1910).

Similarly, little evidence exists that the head chief of the *sngaytskstx* owed a higher allegiance to another leader within a broader confederacy, or that the linguistic commonality of the Okanagan-Colville language was reflected in the existence of a functioning political structure, which incorporated the speakers of the language within it. Although Teit (1930b: 263) was told of a Head Chief of all the Okanagan-Colville, he thought that the Lakes might be excluded, due in part to some of their families being nomadic.

Some contemporary Okanagan-Colville people hold the view that the Lakes were among those groups formerly under the jurisdiction of a Head Chief whose residence was at the head of Okanagan Lake (see Maracle et al. 1993-1994:9).

Recorded data on the chief's role and authority indicates that the chief's function was apparently to guide, arbitrate and judge, roles that required influence and respect rather than to exercise absolute rule. A highly-esteemed and generous chief attracted a large following, which increased the economic and political strength of a village.

Details on how the traditional *sngaytskstx* political structure operated have been recorded ethnographically. The Head Chief was assisted by a council comprised of a number of subchiefs, each appointed by their local groups. The Council — referred to by a term meaning 'those who think' — would meet with the *sngaytskstx* Head Chief every evening during the winter. Any *sngaytskstx* member could be present and could speak at these meetings, but would not officially be considered to be a member of the council (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:76-78). The information recorded by Ray led him to draw a somewhat different conclusion about the nature of the council, and he saw it as being more under the chief's control. He stated that it was "largely an instrumentality of the chieftainship and its size and membership was determined by him" (Ray 1952: 147). Furthermore, Ray stated that while the council of men (and sometimes women) had the duty of advising the chief whenever he chose to meet with them, the chief had the authority to determine the ultimate decision. Tribal assemblies were held less frequently. These were the chief's opportunities to consider public opinion and a great deal of discussion would be heard before decisions were made, by acclamation (Ray 1952:147).
Some Lakes people talked about a special pole with a mountain goat's head on top of it that was present at each sngaytksx council meeting. This was evidently the Lakes' "totemic" symbol statement; sngaytksx elder Nancy Wynecoop referred to as "the Lakes animal" and suggested that the goat was a form of crest used to identify these people as being Lakes (Elmendorf 1935-1936:III:6).

Not a lot of data has been recorded about the exact limitations of a sngaytksx chief's abilities to enforce his authority over recalcitrant individuals, or the extent and means of his authority to discipline individual sngaytksx people guilty of hurtful actions against the broader community. The council reportedly heard the "confessions" of "wrong-doers"; those sngaytksx who were accused of transgressions against other sngaytksx who did not confess, were tied up during the council meeting and kept tied up until they confessed. Stealing and adultery were regarded as serious infractions, and, at least in the historical period, were punished by whipping (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:76). Ray also reported that whipping took place, and indicated that it was administered with anything from a stick to a throng of braided rawhide (Ray 1952:145).

The role of whipping as a component of chiefly authority among the Lakes in the mid-19th century was noted by Jason Ovid Allard, an officer at Fort Shepherd in the late 1860s. Allard recalled that the sngaytksx Chief Gregoire:

had a fine type of social organization and did not hesitate to have some of his warriors publicly whipped, if they broke any of the rules he established for the conduct of his people (Allard n.d.).

The chief would admonish the wrong-doers and lecture the people about tribal solidarity, but would not personally administer the punishment; the whip would actually be wielded by one of the headman from the transgressor’s village (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:76). The antiquity of flogging as a traditional sngaytksx punishment is questionable, however.

Ethnohistoric evidence strongly suggests that whipping was not practised by the Lakes before contact with non-aboriginals at the beginning of the 19th century, but that the practice was introduced following contact with the Hudson's Bay Company, which regularly used whipping as punishment for some offences (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831). Historian David Chance, in his assessment of the administration of punishment in the Colville District, concluded, largely from an 1829 report prepared by John Work of Fort Colville, that flogging was probably an introduced practice, albeit one which was introduced early enough to have been practised traditionally (Chance 1973:96-98). John Work, responding to a long questionnaire prepared by and for Hudson’s Bay Company officials in London soliciting data about the aboriginal people who used the fort, submitted details on the criminal justice and the
execution of punishment by stating that the authority of the chiefs was very limited, and that no formal justice system existed. Work added that redress for wrongs was not punished collectively, but was an individual affair:

Each man addresses his own wrongs, sometimes by the assistance of his friends. If the offender be too powerful or too brave for the injured party, the offence must pass unnoticed (Work 1829).

Work noted that while the chief played an important role in the righting of wrongs by an individual, this role took the form of conciliator and mediator, rather than disciplinarian. Work reported that:

when, in quarrels, a murder is committed, the chief and men of influence interfere to make peace and the murderer makes some atonement by way of presents to the relatives of the deceased... (Work 1829).

Significant crimes less serious than murder were, according to Work, usually punished only by the offender’s social loss of face. Work said that “a thief though detested is seldom punished and no other means taken to prevent his depredations but keeping a good watch on their property” (Work 1829).

John Work was generally an incisive and accurate observer of Native people. If he is correct in his conclusion that corporal punishment had not previously been indigenous to the sngaytskst, and since subsequent evidence indicates that the chiefs began flogging transgressors, it is very likely that this practise was adopted after contact with the Hudson’s Bay Company. Work’s evidence indicates that before the introduction of corporal punishment, the chief usually played no direct role in disciplining offenders. Exactly how the chief would enforce authority and maintain control without engendering a fear of punishment is not certain. Work’s information, stating that thieves were seldom punished, does intimate that a type of higher sanction might occasionally be used against the true pariahs in the community. Sn gaytskstx mythology commonly refers to people being punished by expulsion from the group, and in the absence of corporal punishment, it is likely that the Chiefs resorted to this practice to deal with offenders where peacemaking was neither possible nor appropriate.

Given Work’s evidence that chiefs tried to mediate between the wrongdoer and the injured party, it appears that a principal role of the chief was the role of peacemaker. When a murder was committed, if the chief mediated successfully, the injured family could be atoned with presents; if he was not successful, a reprisal death would likely occur (Ray 1952:146). Occasionally, a murderer would flee to live as a slave among the Shuswap or Kutenai; he would not be welcome among the neighbouring Colville, who viewed the murder of a
sngaytskstx person as "killing one's own brother," due to the Colville's close association with the Lakes (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:71).

Effective chiefs had the ability to exercise personal charisma. An example of Chief Gregory's charisma is illustrated in an incident reported by Ray:

A large number of people had gathered at Marcus, in southern Lakes territory, for trading purposes. The group included Lakes, Spokane, Kalispel, Coeur d'Alene, and Kutenai. During the progress of a gambling game a bitter dispute developed between a Lakes and a Spokane. The Lakes loaded his gun while the Spokane boasted, "what do you intend to do with that gun? You know my body is made of iron and nothing can hurt me." "Yes, I know," the Lakes answered, but raised the gun and fired, killing his adversary. A second Spokane rushed up and he too was killed. Now the Spokane drew knives and killed the Lakes gunman. The two sides retired for reinforcements and shortly thereafter faced each other again.

Now Gregory, the Lakes chief, stripped off his clothing and walked between the two opposing lines. The Spokane shouted for his death, saying that the score would thereby be evened. But Gregory spoke: "You say that nothing but my death will stop you from fighting." Turning to his own people he continued, "There is nothing to stop you from fighting except your own willpower." Then to all,"When I lie dead, the sun will disappear behind the clouds; there will be no sun. Deep darkness will prevail. No one can know for sure how long it will remain dark. There will be no children, no crippled old folk. I do not wish to frighten you. But if you do not drop your arms, the trail will be opened. The sun will slowly disappear. The old blind people will have a night to sleep. Then the trail will open. We shall have no more bloody days until the end of our time. You can kill me if you will, but if you drop your arms, there will be no more bleeding. We shall have an open trail." It is said that the antagonists dispersed (Ray 1939:36).

Chieftainship among the sngaytskstx generally lasted for the chief's lifetime. Upon the death of a chief, succession was normally based on patrilineal descent but the people were permitted to select any person of their choice if the qualifications of the deceased chief's sons were not considered to be worthy (Ray 1952:143). Usually, however, the appointee was a son, brother, or even son-in-law of the former chief. The new chief was chosen by a council comprised of all the sub-chiefs (Elmendorf 1935-1936:1:76).

Female chiefs of the Lakes do not seem to have been common, and none of their names have been recorded in the records which have survived from 1830 onwards. Nevertheless, Ray's consultant James Bernard, who was in his 80s when interviewed in 1931, spoke of women having been chiefs in the past. He particularly knew of one female chief of great renown. Ray
subsequently recorded that the:

Oldest chief remembered by Bernard was a woman. Name not Known. She is said to have been the only chief who could keep her people from fighting. Usually one tribe demanded the death of as many members of the other tribe as had been killed of their own people. This went on and on. But this woman chief stopped such retaliation (Ray 1952:149fn).

This woman was reputedly the mother of Gregoire, who succeeded her (Ray 1952:143). Gregoire is known to have been the sngaytskstx chief in 1839, although the time he ascended to the chieftainship is not known, and he may have been the chief for some time before this. His mother would thus have been the chief in the early 19th century.

Gregoire or Gregory is the sngaytskstx chief about whom we have the most information. His Native name was k’esawílx. He was also known — and was remembered in the 1970s-1980s by our sngaytskstx and Colville (sxweyi7líhp) consultants — by the name krik-wá, which is a Native pronunciation of the French name "Gregoire." He is believed to have been born between 1790 and 1800. At the time of his baptism in 1840, at which time he took the name “Gregoire” he was believed to be around 40 years old (Warner and Munnick 1972:61;) but in 1870 Winans recorded him as being “about 80 years old” (Winans 1870b)

The records do not indicate precisely when Gregoire first became chief. A year prior to his 1840 baptism, the missionary Modeste Demers identified him as "Kessouilluh [k’esawílx] chief of the Lakes" (Demers 1839a). He may also have been the same man identified by Demers in 1838 as "Plitchouegge, chief of the Indians of the Lakes" (Warner and Munnick 1972: 14), as it is possible that “Plitchouegge” may simply be a very poor transcription of k’esawílx (at the time Demers recorded this name in 1838, the sngaytskstx were the first people he had encountered west of the Rockies and he was completely unfamiliar with their language).55 Between the years 1839 and 1875 Gregoire was identified and recognized as head chief of all the sngaytskstx people. He was one of the first chiefs to adopt Christianity and to be baptized. Modeste Demers described him as "one of the best Indians" he knew and remarked on his "remarkable taste for spiritual things" (Demers 1839a). By 1846, according to Father DeSmet, Gregoire had led all his people to Christianity and was "now at the height of his joy" because of it (Chittenden and Richardson 1905: II: 549). Gregoire maintained this sterling reputation

54 Teit transcribed this name as 'Kirwa' (Teit 1930b).
55 The first recorded name of the "Principal Chief" of the Sngaytskstx was "Quilischeenshue," recorded by John Work in 1830 in his report on the Colvile District. The name was not known to our Lakes or Colville consultants, and it is not known whether this person was Gregoire, his mother, or another person. The Fort Colvile Journal of 1830 refers to a man from north of Kettle Falls being recognized as the "little chief of the Lakes," but while this chief was identified as a male, his actual name was not given (Work 1830; Heron and Kittson 1830-1831).
throughout his life. Edgar Dewdney, who met him in 1865, recalled him as “Gregoire, the celebrated Indian chief of that part” (Gosnell 1908). Jason Ovid Allard, who met Gregoire while at Fort Shepherd in the late 1860s, remembered him as "a fine type of Indian who ruled his tribe with an iron hand" (Allard n.d.).

As Gregoire became older, additional men were recognized as sub-chiefs and assistants, but Gregoire always retained the lead role. His death or retirement took place in 1875, by which time the American Indian Agent commented that "Gregware. . . [was] now an old man." (Simms 1875). He was not replaced by a successor from within his own family. Ray (1975:143) stated that "his sons had died before him, or were unwilling to take the office; recollections differ."

Our knowledge of the data on sngaytskstx Chiefs between 1830 and 1906 is summarized in the following Table, taken from our 1985 study of the Lakes people:

Table 5. The Identity of Sngaytskstx Chiefs, 1830-1906 (Bouchard and Kennedy 1985:69-70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>‘‘Little Chief of the Lakes”</td>
<td>Francis Heron (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>‘‘Quilischeenshue’’</td>
<td>John Work (Work 1830).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>‘‘Little Lake chief’’</td>
<td>Heron (Heron and Kittson 1830-1831).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>‘‘Little Chief’s Band’’ at the Kootenay Mouth</td>
<td>James Douglas (Douglas 1835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Kēssōuilih [k’esawRk] ‘‘Chief of the Lakes’’</td>
<td>Modeste Demers (1839a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Gregory, ‘‘their chief’’</td>
<td>Paul DeSmet (Chittenden and Richardson 1905:II:549).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Ask-a-weelish ‘‘a chief of the lakes 60 miles above Colville’’</td>
<td>Paul Kane (Harper 1971:223, 292).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1850</td>
<td>Kirkwa’, KēsawT’lex ‘‘leading Chief of the Lake, at Fort Shepherd’’</td>
<td>James Teit (1930b:270).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Gregora ‘‘1st chief’’; Landre, 2nd chief</td>
<td>A.V. Wilson (Wilson 1855:3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Gugoin ‘‘Chief’’; Miklichore, Qui-qui-las-</td>
<td>W.G. Cox (Cox 1861).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Gregoire</td>
<td>Edgar Dewdney (Dewdney 1865b; Gosnell 1908).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Gregoire</td>
<td>Jason Ovid Allard (Allard n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Gregare ‘‘Chief of the Tribe’’</td>
<td>Walter Moberly (Moberly 1866).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Gregoire Kis-a-wee-likh ‘‘Head Chief’’; Cyprien ‘‘Sub-Chief’’; Baptiste Skil-loom ‘‘Sub-Chief’’; Jacques ‘‘Sub-Chief’’; Edward Choo-wi-likh; Victor; Augustin Squer-a-khin</td>
<td>W.P. Winans (Winans 1870a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Gregory ‘‘Chief’’</td>
<td>R.L.T. Galbraith (Galbraith 1909; Royal Commission on Indian Affairs 1914).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Greg-wah ‘‘Chief of Lake Indians’’</td>
<td>John Simms (Simms 1866-1878).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-1875</td>
<td>Gre-Gore; Edward; Stchu-wi-la-hu; Oraphan; Jack; Joseph</td>
<td>Simms (Simms 1866-1878).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Big Head Edward ‘‘Chief’’</td>
<td>Simms (Simms 1875).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Edward ‘‘newly created chief’’</td>
<td>M. Oppenheimer (Oppenheimer 1875).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Ciprien Chesuils ‘‘Lake Indians Chief’’; Jok ‘‘Lake Sub-Chief’’</td>
<td>Petition 1876.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Melchlor</td>
<td>Simms (Simms 1878).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Joseph Lcotolegu ‘‘Head Chief’’; Edward ‘‘Military Chief’’; Mechior ‘‘Military Chief’’</td>
<td>Joseph Caruana (Caruana 1882).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Edward ‘‘Chief of the Columbia Lake Indians’’</td>
<td>Henry Pierce (Pierce 1883:3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1887</td>
<td>Melture</td>
<td>Edouard Picard (Picard 1926).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Orapahan ‘‘Chief’’</td>
<td>Census Records, Lakes Indians (1886-1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Or-a-pagan</td>
<td>R. Gwydir (Gwydir 1888).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Oripakin ‘‘Chief of Lakes and Colvilles’’</td>
<td>James Gibson (Gibson 1889).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Edward Stelaw</td>
<td>Census Records, Lakes Indians (1886-1908).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Bernard ‘‘the Prayer Chief of Pia’’</td>
<td>St Regis Mission House Diary 1893.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other types of leadership positions also existed within this society. Carstens (1987) noted that the entire Northern Okanagan authority system involved an elaborate division of both labour and power. As Teit (1930b:262) first proposed, the hereditary leadership positions were accompanied by other leadership positions that were task-specific and open to all. We have recorded that the latter category included those leaders known as *xa7tús* (derived from *x7it*, which means 'first; best; most'), who were also commonly identified as "chiefs." This included positions like the Salmon Chief and Hunting Chief, to which individuals were appointed based on skill, knowledge, oratory and often an appropriate guardian spirit power (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:248).

Although the data strongly indicate that Gregoire maintained his authority over his people, even as an elderly man, the data also suggest that the political autonomy of other headmen and leaders began to be undermined, sometimes unwittingly, by the presence of fur traders, priests and government officials. Chance (1973:95-96) has described how fur trade managers at Fort Colville took on roles which had previously been deemed within the authority of chiefs, including providing goods to indigents, receiving the first-caught salmon, and adjudicating disputes. At least by 1848, managers at Fort Colville were being addressed as *ilmíxwm* (the Okanagan-Colville term for 'chief') (Chance 1973:95-96).

### B.4 Demography

Estimating the total *sngaytskstx* population in the 18th and early 19th century is difficult. Before the population was decimated by a significant smallpox epidemic in the 1770s or

---

56 Marilyn James, spokesperson for the Sinixt Tribe, has asserted that the *sngaytskst* pre-contact population was more than 100,000 people; in her 1992 ‘‘General History of the Arrow Lake Band,’’ James stated:

My people in this immediate area were probably 100,000 or better in number. We’re not talking a handful of Indian people. We’re talking about 100,000 people, probably a lot more than that because it’s really hard to estimate even who’s here now unless you travel into this valley at night. And when you see a thousand points of light out there in the darkness and each one of those points of light represents a family, then you understand that there’s a lot more people here than we actually had run across. And Indian people weren’t these real social animals that they HAD to gather, although they did gather. So it was really hard to estimate, but a rough estimation is 100,000 plus (James 1992:1).
1780s, the population appears to have been approximately 500. By the 1820s, the population appears to have been reduced to less than 150, principally as a consequence of disease. Ethnographic and ethnohistoric sources do not indicate that the population was further reduced significantly by disease in the 19th century, or that the permanent migration of most of the *sngaytskstx* people southward to the area around Kettle Falls by the 1870s was prompted principally by reduction in population.

An estimate of the *sngaytskstx* population around 1780 was given by Mooney (1928:15) as 500 and by Ray (1976:17) as 800. The highest estimate made of the early pre-epidemic Lakes population, based on a systematic attempt to calculate the population, was James Teit's (1930b:210-211) figure of 2000 individuals. Teit made this estimate based on his information that twenty villages had existed in *sngaytskstx* territory in what would become British Columbia, each containing an average population of about fifty individuals. This totalled about 1000 people. However Teit also recorded eight villages in present-day Washington State, which were said to have larger populations. Teit remarked that the population of these Washington villages was believed to have been equal to the twenty villages in British Columbia, thus making a combined total population of about 2,000 (Teit 1930b:210-211).

The available documentary evidence strongly suggests that Teit’s estimate of the pre-epidemic population was distorted by some significant errors. First, Teit’s estimate was based on the assumption that all the villages recorded were occupied at the same time, which is very likely incorrect. Moreover, the ethnohistoric evidence suggests clearly that the *sngaytskstx* population in the 18th century, before the great smallpox epidemic, did not inhabit lands very far south of the international border. The *sngaytskstx* occupation and use of these lands came later, after the epidemic. It would therefore be incorrect to make allowances for a larger southern population in pre-epidemic calculations.

Teit’s estimate of *sngaytskstx* population is much higher than the estimates made by other anthropologists working in the early 20th century. As stated above, in 1928 anthropologist James Mooney (1928:15) estimated that the Lakes population around 1780 was about 500. And Verne Ray estimated the population before 1780 to have been 800 (Ray 1952). Teit’s estimate

---

57 The scholarly assessment of the data on the subject of smallpox in the Pacific Northwest concurs that a major epidemic took place in the 1770s or 1780s, although there is some disagreement as to its date. Robert Boyd, the most systematic student of this topic, concludes that a second epidemic revisited the Plateau around 1801 and 1802 (Boyd 1985; 1994; 1998; 1999), but this is not accepted by all scholars (Harris 1994).

58 For example, Teit noted that while the measles epidemic of 1847 was said to have caused many deaths among some groups like the Spokane, the Columbia River groups did not suffer much (Teit 1930b:316). Both Boyd (1985) and Galois (1996) concur that the estimated death rate from this measles epidemic, which can be measured with much more precision than the smallpox death rate because of the presence of recorded pre and post epidemic population statistics, was about 10 per cent. However, while the disease was present at Fort Colville, its known diffusion path was northwest through Kamloops and Fort Alexandria. Whether or not the epidemic spread up the Columbia to the Kootenay country is not really known (Galois 1996:34).
is also much higher than the figures of *sn̓g̓aytskstx* population recorded in the early 19th century (see below). While a significant population decline would be expected to reflect the losses caused by disease, the decline from Teit’s figures is much greater than the decline which might be expected by models of projected smallpox mortality.

The first recorded reference to *sn̓g̓aytskstx* population appears to be contained in a census recorded by Alexander Ross in 1825. Ross was told by a Lakes Chief that the group's population was "about 200" (Ross 1855:II:171). Ross’s figure was based on the Chief's estimate rather than any systematic count, and it is very possible that this number overestimated the *sn̓g̓aytskstx* population at that time. Statistics compiled only a few years later record that the *sn̓g̓aytskstx* population then was considerably smaller. In 1827, John Dease recorded that "34 men" were in the tribe (Dease 1827). Dease's figure for adult males corresponds precisely with the numbers listed in a fuller census taken by John Work in 1829 which recorded a Lakes population of 34 men, 38 women, 25 boys and 41 girls, for a total population of 138 (Work 1830). John Work was very familiar with the country and its inhabitants, so even though it was common Hudson’s Bay Company practice to obtain census figures from aboriginal chiefs, Work's tabulation was likely based to some extent on his own personal knowledge. We thus consider his figure to be a reliable one.

Work's 1830 population figure of 138 was much lower than even the lowest estimate for the total population around 1780 — Mooney's figure of 500. This enormous difference reflects the decimation that took place from the two smallpox epidemics that occurred during the intervening years. A report by Work from March 1829 provides information about the timing and scope of these epidemics. Work stated that a smallpox epidemic had killed immense numbers of people fifty or sixty years previous, a date he had calculated from the ages of those people bearing scars (Work 1829). This dates that epidemic to approximately 1780. Work (1829) also reported that a second epidemic had swept through the area about ten years after the first, i.e. around 1790. These two outbreaks of smallpox are undoubtedly the epidemics referred to by Teit, although he dated them as taking place “about 1800” (Teit 1930b:212).

Estimating how many *sn̓g̓aytskstx* people were killed by these epidemics is difficult. Robert Boyd, who has conducted by far the most detailed research on the effects of disease among Native peoples in the Pacific Northwest, constructed his models of general population decline during the contact period on what he acknowledges to be fragmentary evidence drawn from two sources: comparative epidemiological data on smallpox mortality; and ethnohistoric descriptions of abandoned villages in the post-smallpox period. Boyd (1985:95) cites the work of the historical epidemiologist Alfred Crosby who calculated an average figure of 30 per cent mortality for "virgin soil" smallpox outbreaks in the Americas. Boyd notes that a 30 per cent decline is lower than recorded mortalities for some specific parts of North America, and lower
than the descriptive evidence in some ethnohistoric sources. Consequently, he concludes that

``these two lines of evidence led me to accept the conservative figure of 33 1/3\% as a minimal approximation of the true mortality rate in the Pacific Northwest from the smallpox epidemic of the 1770s'' (Boyd 1985:95). In a more recent study on demographic change in the Plateau, Boyd modified this slightly to assume average mortality in the period between 1774 and 1805 at “a conservative figure of 40 per cent” (Boyd 1998:470).

Boyd’s estimation of the rate of population loss caused by this smallpox epidemic is based on a thorough and systematic review of the literature, and should, in our view, be given considerable weight. As Boyd acknowledges, many ethnohistoric accounts of specific areas indicate higher, sometimes much higher, rates of death. Fur trader David Thompson, who witnessed such an epidemic on the prairies, estimated that a smallpox epidemic killed fully three-fifths of the aboriginal people it encountered (Glover 1962:xvi, 236). Thompson’s ratio, extrapolated to the Arrow Lakes, would correspond with Mooney's estimate of a pre-epidemic population of 500. Approximately 200 people would thus have been remaining after the first epidemic. The mortality rate for the second epidemic would have been lower, since the survivors would have had enhanced resistance. That second epidemic would thus have killed mainly children, the aged and the infirm.

Later recorded census figures of the *sngaytskstx* indicate that the overall population numbers in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century never recovered from this decimation, largely due to the relatively small size of the families. W.P. Winans' census of 1870, which showed a total population of 229, indicated that the Lakes mean family size was between four and five individuals (Winans 1870a). This small family size prevented any possible recovery of the Lakes population to pre-epidemic levels during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century.

**B.5 Religion**

Dreams, visions, and associated guardian spirits were fundamental to the traditional religious beliefs of Plateau peoples, including the Lakes and Kutenai. Essential concepts within this religious tradition include the vision quest, winter spirit dancing, and the sweatlodge (Walker and Schuster 1998:499).

The concept of guardian spirits is based on the belief that individuals can establish contact with supernatural power through a vision experience. Such a vision encounter bestows a song and dance upon its recipient, which are at the same time the visible proof of spirit contact, and the means to mobilize the power of the vision. It would also often be accompanied by a spirit sickness, an illness which indicated that the spirit was present.

While little material has been recorded about specifically *sngaytskstx* religious beliefs, data has
been recorded about the Okanagan-Colville as a whole, which encompasses the *sngaytstkstx*. Spirit powers, guardian spirits and vision quests were also central to the Okanagan-Colville idea of religion. Both boys and girls were sent out on quests, usually between the ages of seven and thirteen (Spier 1938:136). It was believed to be much easier for a child to have a vision before puberty, because after puberty the child “knew everything” (Spier 1938:137).

Although a guardian spirit might come to a child anywhere in the mountains or woods, certain places were thought especially likely to bring success. Parents or other older relatives prepared the child’s quest, warning against sleeping, cowardice, failing to concentrate, and bringing back false reports of success (Spier 1938:137). A father would equip his son with his own power emblem, in the belief that this would make the child more likely to receive the power which it represented (Spier 1938:137-138). The child was expected to keep alert, dive in water, take regular sweatbaths, and fast. Piles of rocks were frequently piled up, not only to prove faithful attendance, but also to keep the mind from wandering (Spier 1938:138, 140).

If a spirit appeared, it would not come in a sleeping dream, but in a vision, when the child was awake or in a trance. The guardian spirit first appeared as a man or a woman, although it might disclose its animal form. Sometimes the spirit was not seen at all, in either human or animal form, and the child only heard its song and its words of advice and command. The spirit would indicate what power it was bestowing, and promise to assist and return later in life (Spier 1938:139). Most men acquired guardian spirits; no more than one man in ten failed in repeated attempts to gain a spirit, and most men had more than one. Fewer women — perhaps 20 to 30 per cent — acquired a spirit (Ray 1932:182).

The most common guardian spirits among the Okanagan-Colville were animals, birds or insects. A creature’s power to be bestowed was generally related to its worldly properties. For instance, the otter gave the power for swimming, the western horned owl gave the power to see clearly at night, and the grizzly bear gave the power to acquire riches (because of the bear’s great strength) as well as the power to kill grizzlies (Spier 1938:133-134; Ray 1932:172). Some powers came from mythological characters, or from inanimate objects. The same spirit might confer a weak or a strong power (Spier 1938:135). The place at which a spirit was seen also had some effect on the strength of the power; high mountains were believed to confer the strongest powers, as the spirits’ natural powers were combined with the powers of the mountains (Ray 1932:172). Unfortunately, by the time ethnographers attempted to compile a detailed list of Okanagan-Colville guardian spirits in 1930, the powers of some beings were no longer known, and different consultants had different recollections of the amount and character of powers that came from a particular spirit (Spier 1938:135).

People did not publicly reveal their power except in certain very specified situations, as this
might offend the spirit and cause it to leave, or might tempt a shaman to steal the power. If a person lied about the strength of his power, other people with the power would know it, but the person was not punished because his own failures would expose and ruin him. If, on the other hand, a person lied about having a spirit when he did not, the spirit itself would kill him (Spier 1938:136).

One way in which a person’s power could be revealed was by being expressed in a pictograph. Two men on confidential terms might talk to each other about their guardian spirits, and watch each other paint symbols of them on a large rock in the hills (Spier 1938:136). The friend would tell other people who had painted the pictures (Spier 1938:143). These paintings were believed to assist the painter to employ his power, especially to cure sickness, but the cure itself did not have to take place near the paintings (Spier 1938:144). Only people with strong power would paint pictures on rock, and never before singing their power song at their first winter dance (Spier 1938:143). These rock paintings or pictographs would themselves frequently become a destination point for later generations of spirit questers, sometimes many years after the paintings had been done (Spier 1938:144). The Arrow Lakes area is noted for having several pictograph sites.

Another proper way to reveal a power was at the winter dance. The return of a power in adulthood was often manifested by an illness which could be diagnosed by a shaman as "spirit-sickness" (Ray 1932:186-187). This ailment could not be cured physically, but only by giving a dance, singing the newly-acquired spirit song, and distributing gifts. This winter dance is known as snixwám, which means ‘take sickness and drop it down’. Its purpose was to cure illness, to express thanks for a successful year, and to ask the guardian spirits for protection and luck in the coming year. Winter dances were held around January and continued until the snow half-disappeared from the mountains. The actual dancing took place from sunset to sunrise. At the dance, a person sang his or her power song, and the audience and other participants would join in the singing, to assist the dancer in controlling the spirit. These dances were sponsored by shamans, who acted as masters of ceremony, assisted by the interpreter, the door-keeper and the host. Traditionally, a winter dance could last as long as two weeks (Spier 1938:146-153). The winter dance continued to be practised in the early 1990s by about a dozen families throughout Okanagan-Colville territory, although the modern dance lasts for a weekend (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:249). Apparently some sngaytskstx people reintroduced the winter dance at Vallican in the Slocan area in December 1998 (Marilyn James 1999, in, Morran 1999:C2).

The focal point of the winter dance room is a partly-peeled fir pole erected in the center of the room, which is said to symbolize the connection being made by the singers and shamans.

---

59 See Lerman (1954) for a first-hand description of a winter dance that anthropologist Norm Lerman
between the human and non-human worlds. Only the singers and shamans touched the pole. Singers carried dance sticks and a symbol of their spirit helper. After the house had been ritually purified by sweeping, a singer would grab hold of the pole, begin to sing his spirit song and to dance, and then others would join in. Other activities occurring at a winter dance included doctoring the sick, power contests between competing shamans, gambling, feasting, and distributing gifts said to be given by the guardian spirit power (Spier 1938:141-157; Ray 1939:103; Lerman 1954).

One ceremony which took place at a winter dance is specifically recorded as having been performed by the sngaytskstx (and the Colville). This is the power seance called sk’tu7stsüt, meaning 'cut oneself in two.' During this ceremony, a man who had lingfish for his guardian spirit power "cut himself in two" by a cord around the waist. This ceremony was used to forecast the outcome of raiding expeditions or other events, to locate lost people and articles, and to cure illness (Spier 1938:152; Miller 1990:130-135; Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:249).

Another type of religious dance which the Okanagan-Colville celebrated was the "prayer dance," directed by one or two chiefs during which the assembled people danced in a circle and offered prayers to the "Chief Above." These dances were held to strengthen the bond between the living and the dead and to hasten the return of the souls of the departed. A distribution of food followed this dance. The touching or marriage dance, by which young people could choose a spouse simply by touching the selected person, was held in conjunction with the prayer dance (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998:250).

The construction and use of the sweatlodge had significant spiritual value for the sngaytskstx. "Sweat House" was considered a deity. All parts of the procedure by which the sweathouse was used were accompanied by ritual and spiritual significance. Prayers would be made to Sweat House when the rocks were being heated, and when one dashed water on the hot rocks. Each person had a sweat lodge song which he along used. Boys apparently did not take sweat baths before the age of twelve or thirteen, when they commenced sweating as part of their training for manhood. The sweat house spirit, along with guardian spirits, the weather and the earth, would be prayed to by hunters when on hunting trips (Teit 1930b:291; Ray 1932:179; Spier 1938:166; Sismey 1970:33-35).
APPENDIX C: CULTURAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION — THE KUTENAI FIRST NATION

This Appendix provides a cultural and ethnographic summary for the Kutenai First Nation with respect to those aspects of aboriginal society that are important for the consideration of aboriginal traditional land and resource use in the Waneta Hydroelectric Expansion Project (WEP) area. This summary (like Appendix B) includes information on the following: subsistence practices (Section C.1); dwellings (Section C.2); social and political organization (Section C.3); demography (Section C.4); and religion (Section C.5).

C.1 Subsistence

Hunting

Ethnographic data indicates that hunting was of importance to both the Upper and Lower Kutenai (Turney-High 1941; Johnson 1969; Curtis 1911; Brunton 1998), although significant differences existed between the practices of the two groups. While the Upper Kutenai, reliant on the horse and strongly influenced by Plains Culture, were quite migratory, the Lower Kutenai, who relied on non-migratory food sources, were comparatively sedentary (Turney-High 1941:199).60

It appears that the Lower Kutenai had a territorial conception of land ownership frequently associated with Plateau groups, although the evidence on this point is not definitive. Some of the principal ethnographies do not discuss the subject, and the information in others is contradictory. William Baillie-Grohman, who was a very authoritative source on hunting matters, observed in the 1880s that:

A singular feature about the tribal relationship of the Flatbows was the fact that the hunting grounds in the mountains about Kootenay lake was laid out in sections, each brave and his family having a huge slice of this American Switzerland, which was called after him; so that when inquiring for the name of any prominent peak you were told the name of the buck in whose preserve it happened to be located. Thus we would find that a district the size of the Engadine, and in many ways not unlike it, would be known as Kankusco’s hunting ground, and nobody else but old Kankusco, or his sons and their families, would invade this vast preserve (Baillie-Grohman 1907:309).

60 Turney-High’s views notwithstanding, the Creston Lower Kutenai should be considered to be comparatively sedentary in contrast to the Upper Kutenai. Although the documentation is very weak, some data strongly suggests that the Creston Kutenai were fairly mobile, even as late as the end of the 19th century. Indian Agent Galbraith noted in April 1897 that the ‘‘Flatbow’’ Kutenai, as well as the Upper Kutenai groups, “move about from place to place” during the spring and summer months (Galbraith 1897).
Indeed, Baillie Grohman remarked elsewhere that he "found that no bribe could tempt the individual to trespass upon another man's ground" (Baillie-Grohmann 1918:49). Olga Johnson later made the same point, stating that each family head was assigned his private territory in the surrounding mountains (Johnson 1969:62).

On the other hand, Paul Baker recorded exactly the opposite information among the Lower Kutenai, stating that the "hunting grounds belonged to the whole tribe and could be used for hunting by any member of the tribe" (Baker 1955:34).

All ethnographic sources emphasize the significance of hunting, and of deer hunting in particular, to the Lower Kutenai.

Turney-High identified deer as one of four animals of traditional economic significance to the Kutenai — buffalo, elk and caribou being the others. He classified all other species as "minor food animals" (Turney-High 1941:40). Turney-High noted that the deer was the primary economic focus of Lower Kutenai culture, and that it was comparatively more important to them than to the Upper Kutenai, for whom it was second in importance behind the buffalo. This greater importance was reflected in the fact that while the Upper Kutenai hunted deer individually, the Lower Kutenai hunted them in organized drives, which constituted one of their chief communal efforts (Turney-High 1941:39). Schaeffer also emphasized the communal nature of the deer drive, in which "emphasis was placed upon the need of group co-operation rather than individual enterprise" (Schaeffer 1940:19). Johnson recorded the same thing, that deer were hunted in concerted communal drives, while other animals were hunted individually (Johnson 1969:62). Deer were also sometimes hunted by individual Lower Kutenai, who would stalk deer and still hunt in canoes along the Kootenay River (Schaeffer 1940:22).

Another indication of the centrality of the deer hunt to the Lower Kutenai was the rigid control of the communal deer hunt by the "Lower Kutenai Deer Chief," the most expert hunter in his band, who "knew where the best deer country was and, through his spirits, knew where they were most likely to be found on the specific occasion" (Turney-High 1941:39). The Lower Kutenai would extend invitations to the Upper Kutenai to join their deer drives, just as the Upper Kutenai would invite the Lower on their communal buffalo hunts. The Deer Chief would deploy a long line of youths and boys as beaters, spaced about twenty yards apart, while the adult males were stationed as archers near the trails. While the beaters raised a ruckus to drive the deer in the opposite direction, the archers would shoot them in quantity (Turney-High 1941:39). 61 The Lower Kutenai reportedly did not use the technique, practised by the Upper

---

61 Schaeffer (1940:18-23) also provided a detailed account of the deer-hunting techniques of the Bonner's Ferry people, which was essentially similar to this information on the Lower Kutenai deer hunt recorded by Turney-High.
Kutenai, of using a “fire surround” to capture deer (as well as bears) (Schaeffer 1940:13). The Lower Kutenai used dogs for hunting deer only in winter, when dogs were used in the upper valleys to assist hunters on snowshoes (Schaeffer 1940:21-22).

Caribou were one of the four animals Turney-High identified as being economically significant for the Kutenai (Turney-High 1941:40). He thought that the caribou played a significant economic role, and moreover, considered it surprising that the Kutenai did not think the animal more economically significant than they did. Turney-High recorded that:

The impression is that the caribou was considered something of a safety valve in the economy. They felt that they could always find caribou when other meat was scarce. They describe these animals as being able to walk on the snow without sinking in (Turney-High 1941:40).

Schaeffer, on the other hand, clearly thought the caribou was a more significant food source to the Upper Kutenai. He noted that they were hunted in April by many who felt the need of animal fat after a winter living on a protein diet (Schaeffer 1940:27). The fat seems to have been prized. In 1861, Magistrate Cox recorded that a Kutenai man he met on Lower Arrow Lake presented him with caribou fat as a gift (Cox 1861).

While the Upper Kutenai hunted moose, the Lower Kutenai do not seem to have done so, at least not in any systematic manner. Schaeffer was told that in the Lower Kutenai country “moose were encountered only seldom, and little or no attempt was made to hunt them” (Schaeffer 1940:28).

Ethnographic evidence suggests that mountain goat hunting was limited among the Lower Kutenai. Although the Lower Kutenai enjoyed eating mountain goat, they were said to consider it of only minor importance because “it is a very wise animal and hard to kill.” It took an expert marksman to kill one, because it was never possible to come close to them. Their hides were used for robes, and as the hair was finest in summer, that is the time they were hunted. They were never hunted in spring, as their hair then was considered poor, in winter, because their habitat was then too dangerous, or in their breeding season, when their musk makes the flesh distasteful (Turney-High 1941:40-41).

Elk was at one time more significant to the Kutenai than to the Lakes (Turney-High 1941:40), although there is some ethnohistoric evidence that the elk population in Kutenai territory had declined by the mid-19th century (Work 1830; Blakiston 1858; Hector, in Spry 1968; O’Reilly 1970). Both Curtis (1911:173) and Ray (1942) indicated that caribou were eaten, although they provided no further details.
Lower Kutenai elders interviewed in the 1930s also indicated that the importance of elk had declined. They said that when elk were hunted in the fall, the people hunted individually, rather than communally, indicating that the hunt was not of fundamental importance. They also indicated that unlike the Flathead, the Kutenai did not practice an elk ceremonial. They said as well that they did not really like elk meat, and that the elk were hunted more for their hides, which made even better robes and tipis than buffalo hide (Turney-High 1941:39).

Little information has been recorded about Lower Kutenai caribou hunting techniques. Schaeffer’s Bonner’s Ferry consultants said that caribou were formerly numerous, but knew of no method of taking them except by stalking (Schaeffer 1940:27).

The Kutenai also hunted bears, but their methods of hunting the bear differed from those of the Lakes people (sngaytskstx). While the Lakes had planned hunts for bear, the Kutenai did not, as they believed that a conscious hunt for bear would automatically alert the bear to the danger. However, if a bear crossed a hunter’s path, or a hibernating bear’s den was randomly encountered, the bear could be killed. Schaeffer recorded that while other bears could be killed in their lairs, the Kutenai had a strong taboo against killing grizzlies in this manner. They could not be killed hibernating, but had to be called out and killed in the open (Schaeffer 1966:10). The Kutenai also practiced bear ceremonialism, particularly with the grizzly (Schaeffer 1966:17).

Fishing
Lower Kutenai fishing practices reflected the fact that fish was the chief staple of the Lower Kutenai, even though they had little direct access to salmon. The Lower Kutenai were able to secure some salmon in the territory of friendly people nearby, but salmon was never a major component of their diet. Schaeffer contrasted the Lower Kutenai’s reliance on fishing as “an economic pursuit of basic importance to the Lower Kutenai” to “one definitely supplementary among the predominantly hunting peoples upriver” (Schaeffer 1940:30). Turney-High noted that the Lower Kutenai were more systematic fishermen than the Upper Kutenai, because fish formed their chief staple. He emphasized that “the really serious Kutenai economic fishing was with traps or weirs.” While Upper Kutenai weirs were individually owned, Lower Kutenai weir
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63 Schaeffer indicates that this was done out of respect for the grizzly, yet there may have been a practical aspect to it as well. Other accounts of aboriginal bear hunting indicate that grizzlies, unlike black bears, were notoriously light sleepers during their hibernation, and the tight confines of the bear’s lair was deemed to be a highly unsafe place for hunters if an active grizzly was encountered. Allan Smith also was told that the Kalispel did not kill a bear in its den if this could be avoided because if blood were spilled inside the den, no bear would ever use it again (A.Smith 1950:114).
and trap building took place under the direction of the Fishing Chief, and this chief also attended to an even distribution of the catch from the weir throughout the camp circle (Turney-High 1941:46-49). Turney-High noted that the Lower Kutenai:

largely subsisted by weir fishing the sloughs of the lower river’s broad valleys. They began by fishing the upper reaches of their range, moving farther and farther downstream as the recession continued. The camps were moved to the high ground... Weirs were set across as many outlets as the slough had, ordinarily from three to five (Turney-High 1941:48).

The making and setting of the weir required several days’ work by the men of the village. Turney-High described in detail the way in which the Lower Kutenai constructed and installed fish weirs:

In contrast with the Upper bands, weir and trap fishing among the Lower Kutenai was group effort under the direction of the Fishing Chief and not the work of private individuals under contract with the chief. The requisite number of green poles was cut so that each had a crotch at the top. The preferred timbers were cedar, tamarack or fir. The screens or mats were square sections constructed of small fir boughs, or somewhat larger ones which had been split. They had to be long enough to reach the bottom of the pond’s outlet, so could not be very wide, as this was quite heavy building material. The mats were made whenever convenient and rolled up to be taken to the stream.

Openings were left in this heavy matting to receive the traps. These were the same conical traps described for the Upper Kutenai. Their position was different among the Lower bands though, as they were set near the bank where the water was shallow instead of out in the middle of the stream. A slough with a wide outlet had two traps near each bank.

The stakes were then driven into the mud, slanting somewhat in the direction of the stream’s flow. Lower Kutenai weirs, being built in sluggish slough outlets, were not set funnel-wise across the stream, as among the Upper Kutenai where faster streams were fished. Long poles were set in the forks to receive the upper lashings of the mats. The mats were then lashed into one piece and taken to the outlet... The bottom of the screen had been made to conform to the shape of the slough’s bottom from bank to bank. The top of course was straight, extending about one or one half feet above the water...

When the whole had been set across the stream, clever divers saw that the apparatus was properly aligned along the bottom. A quantity of good green grass with its roots and attached soil was then fixed to the bottom of the weir on the upstream side by the divers. Were this not done, the fish would be suspicious. This way, they nosed the bottom and thought they had come merely to a grassy bank. Feeling for a way around this, they went into the traps (Turney-High
This type of trap could be expected to last for one season and beyond, but was not robust enough to last through the second year (Turney-High 1941:49).

The great majority of the ethnographic sources indicate that the Creston Kutenai had access to a limited amount of salmon. However, salmon were relatively less important to them than other types of fish. Turney-High indicated that non-anadromous fish, particularly trout, were more important:

the Bonner’s ferry and Creston bands were apparently more dependent on the local fish of the Kootenay River than they were on salmon, and hence were better fishers with the weir and trap, and less adept with the spear than their kinsmen to the north (Turney-High 1941:44).

Turney-High also noted that the Lower Kutenai said that they enjoyed salmon, rather than that they depended upon it (Turney-High 1941:199). Most of their salmon were secured near Windermere, on the uppermost part of the Columbia (Turney-High 1941:51).

Schaeffer also de-emphasized the significance of salmon to the Kutenai, indicating that the three most important fish to them were trout, the Dolly Varden char [now known as ‘bull trout’ (Salvelinus confluentus)] (Hildebrand 1999:pers.comm.), and whitefish (Schaeffer 1940:31). David Chance, on the basis of his review of the early ethnohistoric sources, also noted that the lower Kutenai depended heavily on migrating fish such as trout in the Kootenay River, but not on sea-run salmon. He concluded that:

a few of the lower Kutenai did move seasonally to the salmon fisheries on the lower river between the lake and the Columbia, and also to Kettle Falls, at any rate after the Hudson’s Bay Company established itself there. But to fish and trade for salmon, the lower Kutenai had to be in harmonious relations with the Arrow Lakes and Kettle Falls or Colville Salish, which they not always were (Chance 1981:1).

Only Olga Johnson appears to place a more significant emphasis on the use of salmon by the Lower Kutenai. She stated that:

the Kutenais whose home villages were on the lower reaches of the river, however, depended heavily upon fish all year around. Some of them often went to Arrow Lakes or the upper Columbia for the salmon harvest; the salmon could not ascend the cascades between Kootenay Lake and the river’s outlet into the
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64 While the source is not explicitly identified, this is quite possibly a reference to Teit’s recording of the Kutenai coming to the mouth of the Slocan to fish.
Columbia. At home they used river sturgeon, which sometimes weighed twenty pounds or more, bulltrout, and other kinds of Native fish (Johnson 1969:61).

Johnson’s own fieldwork was done around 1960, and it is possible that this apparent inconsistency between her information and the other sources simply reflects the fact that her information was elicited more recently, and that the Kutenai elders she interviewed had made more frequent use of the salmon fisheries in the Arrow Lakes region in the 20th century than had earlier Kutenai generations. It is also possible, however, that her statement that the Kutenai fished ‘‘often’’ in the Arrow Lakes reflects her interpretation of Turney-High, as she does not explicitly credit her own consultants with providing such information.

Turney High (1941:50) noted that while salmon played an important part in the Kutenai economy, “it is obvious that the members of the trout family were paramount in their thinking.” Both bull trout [Dolly Varden char] and trout in general were also taken by the Kutenai (Turney-High 1941:44-45). Schaeffer emphasized the importance of trout and char to the Kutenai, saying that they were taken principally during the period of the summer freshet (Schaeffer 1940:31). Baillie-Grohman indicated that in 1882, ‘‘Kootenay lake was then full of the finest fish, five different species of the trout family inhabiting it’’ (Baillie-Grohman 1907:308).

Turney-High also recorded that sturgeon (Catostomus catostomus) ‘‘in former times were a reasonably important food fish’’ and were taken by the Lower Kutenai in the Kootenay River during the fish’s spawning season in the fall. Since the fish was large, powerful, and game, Turney-High’s consultants said that they could never take them except in quiet water, and that only very skillful men ever attempted it. They were fished for by still line fishing, and killed by a spear after being slowly pulled to the water’s surface (Turney-High 1941:46). Schaeffer’s consultants told him that sturgeon were found in the Kootenay below Kootenay Falls, but rarely above it (Schaeffer 1940:31).

Two kinds of suckers were recognized by the Kutenai, and consistently taken as economic fish. “T!atsi bkat!” was taken in the summer, at which time it had two red stripes along its side. The other type, "q!ihi," was taken throughout the year, but considered to be at its best in July (Turney-High 1941:45).

Turney-High (1941:45) noted that whitefish were taken in the fall. Schaeffer (1940:31) said

65 Local historian E.L. Affleck, writing in 1978, reported that the Kutenai would travel in their canoes ‘‘down the Kootenay River to Kootenay Lake in search of huckleberries, venison, and the excellent kokanee trout’’ (Affleck 1978:6).
that they were taken mainly in the summer, and identified them as one of the most important fish to the Kutenai.

Schaeffer identified ling as an important fish to the Lower Kutenai during the winter. His information was that these fish moved in schools from the Kootenay River up the different tributaries for about two weeks around the end of January or the early part of February. At this time of year, the fish would not take baited hooks and could only be caught in traps as they ascended the small streams. Unlike the summer fishery, winter ling fishing was informally pursued by individual families (Schaeffer 1940:38).

Two types of fish were taken by the Lower Kutenai solely as emergency food. ‘‘Pea-mouth’’ (*Mylocheilus caurinus*), sometimes called the Columbia River chub, was considered to be a poor fish, only taken when people were hungry. Squaw-fish (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*) was also a hunger food. Their flesh was coarse, their flavour was inferior and they were very bony (Turney-High 1941:44-45).

Father De Smet also described what he termed a ‘‘first fish’’ festival among the Lower Kutenai in 1845, which he indicated was an annual ceremony. He did not explicitly indicate the location, but since the trail he took went in the direction of the present border between Idaho and Montana, the ceremony likely took place around Flathead Lake. This would suggest that he was referring to the Bonner Ferry Kutenai, not the Creston people. De Smet recorded that:

I arrived among the Arcs-a-plats in time to witness the grand fish festival, which is yearly celebrated; the men only have the privilege of assisting there at. Around a fire fifty feet long, partially overlaid with stones of the size of a turkey’s egg, eighty men range themselves; each man is provided with an osier vessel, cemented with gum and filled with water and fish. The hall where this extraordinary feast is celebrated is constructed of rush mats, and has three apertures, one at either extremity for the entrance of guests; the middle one serves for transporting the fish. All preparations being complete, and each man at his post, the chief after a short harangue of encouragement to his people, finishes by a prayer of supplication to the Great Spirit, of whom he demands an abundant draught. He gives the signal to commence, and each one, armed with two sticks flattened at the extremity, makes use of them instead of tongs, to draw the stones from the embers and put them in his kettle. This process is twice renewed, and in the space of five minutes the fish are cooked. Finally, they squat around the fire in the most profound silence to enjoy the repast, each trembling lest a bone be disjointed or broken — an indispensable condition of a plentiful fishery. A single bone broken would be regarded as ominous, and the unlucky culprit banished from the society of his comrades, lest his presence should entail on them some dread evil (De Smet 1906:198).
The fish that was the object of the ceremony is not identified. Many Salish groups practised a similar ceremony to honour the ‘‘First Salmon’’ of the season, but salmon do not run to the Flathead Lake area. De Smet’s account follows this story with the reference to sturgeon noted above, although these sturgeon referred to are identified as coming from Kootenay Lake.

**Gathering**

A limited amount of site-specific information has been recorded about where plants were gathered along the West Arm of Kootenay Lake and Lower Kootenay River. While huckleberries (*Vaccinium membranaceum*), quite possibly the most important plant food used by the *sngaytskt*, were gathered along the north side of the Kootenay River (Teit 1930b:209), none of the early Kutenai ethnographies recorded any site-specific information about where plants were gathered by the local Kutenai.

John Sullivan of the Palliser Expedition noted in 1859 that the numerous swamps and sloughs south of Kootenay Lake not only teemed with ducks, geese and other birds, but that:

> from these swamps also, The Kootanie Indians obtain the Klusquis,\(^{66}\) or thick reed, [*Phragmites communis*] which is the only article that serves them in the construction of their lodges, and the klusquis is an article of barter with them to the other tribes, whose lands do not produce this … (Sullivan, in Spry 1968:483).

Around 1930, Harlan Smith recorded that the ‘‘present area of Kootenay Indians,‘‘ indicating actively used sites, included several places in the region of Kootenay Lake. In addition to the Reserve near Creston, Smith identified use of Kootenay Lake, opposite Kaslo, Cultus Creek, which flows into the west side of Kootenay Lake near its southern end, Procter, where the West Arm meets the lake, and Kootenay Landing, which was formerly on the south shore of the Lake, as places which were then being used by the Kutenai (H.Smith c.1930).

However, in the 1980s, Chris Luke, Chief of the Creston Band, identified some plants which he indicated were traditionally gathered by the Kutenai in the Creston Valley (Chief Luke indicated that a lot of his information came from traditional accounts, particularly from his uncle, who was, in 1986, in his eighties) (Luke, in Wyndel Heritage Society 1986:3).

According to Chief Luke, tiger lily, wild onion, wild carrots, wild potatoes, bracken root, wild clover, flowering raspberries, salmonberry, and hazel nuts were all harvested in the Creston Valley. He also indicated that Saskatoon berries were gathered there and dried for later use, generally during the winter (Luke, in Wyndell Heritage Society 1986:2).

---

\(^{66}\)What Sullivan transcribes as ‘‘Klusquis‘‘ is actually the Chinook Jargon term meaning ‘mat.’
C.2 Dwellings

The Lower Kutenai had two principal types of residences — a tipi used in summer and a mat-covered long house in winter. The tipi, reflecting a Plains influence, was the universal lodging and was the summer shelter for most of the Kutenai people. It had the advantage of being able to be dismantled and packed ready to move at a moment’s notice. The Kutenai tipi had a four pole base (Luke, in Wynndel Heritage Group 1986:3).

The traditional covers of the Lower Kutenai tipis were made from tule stems, sewn together with Indian hemp (Apocynum cannabinum). Turney-High appears to have misinterpreted the information he recorded from his Lower Kutenai consultants. He emphasized that the mat covers *themselves* were made from Indian hemp, provided a detailed account of how the plant was gathered, cured and processed to make mat covers, and indicated that the mats were sewn into three belts which would go around the four-poled tipi frame (Turney-High 1941:62-63). Turney-High was so certain that this particular plant was used to make the Lower Kutenai tipi covers, and explicitly contrasted it with the Upper Kutenai covers which were made from rush and tule (Turney-High 1941:62). It is, however, not possible to make the type of cover described with Indian hemp. Hart, Turner and Morgan (1980:43) questioned Turney-High’s identification of the specific plant, noting that “one wonders if he is actually referring to the sewing of tule stems together to make mats.” This is certainly the case, as other sources record that the Lower Kutenai reportedly used a long, mat-covered lodge similar to those used by adjacent Salish groups (Brunton 1998:232). Chief Luke (in, Wynndel Heritage Group 1986:3) referred to them as “Klo-osques” (which is actually the Chinook Jargon term for ‘mat’). Given the ready access of the Creston Lower Kutenai to rush and tule in nearby marshy areas, this would have been an easily-available construction material.

The Lower Kutenai winter lodges were said to accommodate eight families. Their cover consisted of the same sewn mat covers made for the summer conical tents. When summer came, the individual families in the long house took away their portions of the cover to use on their individual tents. Turney-High noted in 1941 that “Lower Kutenai informants are not speaking from tradition regarding these long houses. The older ones have not only seen them in use but under construction as well” (Turney-High 1941:64).

Evidence as to whether or not the Lower Kutenai built semi-subterranean pit houses is contradictory. Turney-High recorded that “since it is known that some peoples on the Plateau formerly utilized the subterranean, or semi-subterranean lodge, information was sought on this point. The use of the trait was specifically denied by all informants’” (Turney-High 1941:64). Michel Revais, a mixed-blood man, also told Teit that the Kutenai had never used underground lodges (Teit 1930b:331). On the other hand, Chief Chris Luke of Creston, apparently on the basis of information obtained from his elderly uncle, stated that “Some of the members of the
Kootenay Tribe built pit houses circular in shape. These pit homes were 3’ to 6’ in depth with an average diameter of 30’ depending on the size of the tribe or family’’ (Luke, in Wynndel Heritage Group 1986:3). While Turney-High elicited his information from older generations of Kutenai people, his information from the Creston Lower Kutenai sources is thin, and Chief Luke’s information is from a Creston Lower Kutenai source.

C.3 Social And Political Organization

Kutenai social organization revolved around the household. Schaeffer recorded that this basic residential unit was preferably matrilocal. Each household would be led by the oldest, most experienced man, would share a single lodge and fire, and would co-operate economically. It consisted of a man and woman of the grandparental generation, their unmarried children, their married daughters (and their in-marrying husbands and children), and, occasionally, a married son and his family (Schaeffer 1936, cited in Brunton 1998:226).

Several descriptive accounts have been made of Kootenai kinship practices (Chamberlain 1893; Sapir 1918; Boas 1919; Turney-High 1941; Lindburg 1962). However, as Brunton (1998:227) noted, these accounts are so different that it is difficult to know what the traditional system was like. Brunton concluded that Kutenai kinship terminology is bilateral (tracing descent equally through males and females) and thus generating no lineages or clans (Brunton 1998:228).

A significant distinction appears to have existed between the role of chieftainship in traditional Upper and Lower Kutenai culture. Upper Kutenai chieftainship was heavily influenced by Plains cultural practices. The Lower Kutenai culture was more reflective of ‘‘the closer knit social organization of the west’’ (Turney-High 1941:146). Apparently, women were not allowed to become chiefs among any of the Kutenai groups (Chamberlain 1893:556).

Members of the Tobacco Plains band told Turney-High that theirs was the oldest of the Kutenai bands, and that their chief was traditionally the ‘‘High Chief’’ of all the Kutenai bands. No other Kutenai bands recognized this seniority however, and maintained that each band chief was considered to be equal in rank (Turney-High 1941:153). Ultimately, Turney-High’s

8 Turney-High’s discussion of chieftainship is considerably more detailed than the discussions of other writers, and has accordingly been relied on substantially in the present discussion.

9 Chamberlain (1893:556) said that the Tobacco Plains Aboriginal people had two chiefs.

10 Olga Johnson did not herself directly record information on this particular subject. However, she cited the information provided by a correspondent, indicating that:

Present-day Lower Kutenais have told Paul Flinn that there never was an all-tribe chief. ‘‘They say that when a chief visited the grounds of another chief the visiting chief was just another Indian with no special privileges’’ (O. Johnson 1969:153n).
assessment of this discrepancy stated that:

There was some shadowy recognition of a head chief of all the Kutenai, but since this was so long ago its memory is very vague and of doubtful antiquity. Band independence is a mark of the Plateau, and certainly was a Kutenai fact. But there survives at Tobacco Plains a clear impression that their chief was head chief, but in practical matters they do not claim much for such primacy. Yet when there was a movement over the mountains to the Plains, other Kutenai who joined the party were considered under the leadership of the Chief of Tobacco Plains, even though they were chiefs at home (Turney-High 1941:150-151).

The Upper Kutenai considered their War Chief (‘’gwának’na hiq’’) to be their head chief. Nominally, this chief was not formally chosen, for the ideal candidate — the warrior with the strongest military prowess and magic — would be obvious to all and would be proclaimed following the death of the old chief. The type of inherited chieftainship found among the sngaytskstx and other Interior Salish groups was not acknowledged among the Kutenai. However, in practise, Kutenai chieftainship was weakly hereditary, and a dying chief would often appoint one of his sons to succeed him.67 The Upper Kutenai, like the sngaytskstx, also had a council charged with making the appointment of the Chief. Power in the council was reportedly largely wielded by the shamans, who would name the warrior with the strongest powers68 (Turney-High 1941:147).

Other types of leadership positions also existed within Kutenai society. The War Chief’s influence over most matters of everyday life was slight. The role of ‘’band administrator,’’ the Guide Chief or Economic Chief (‘’ya’kaśin’’) was chosen on the basis of intelligence and experience, rather than war honour. And each Upper Kutenai band had a hunting chief (‘’kenemna’’ka’) whose authority was confined to the communal hunt (Turney-High 1941:148). The Plains influence was apparent in the presence of honorary chiefs, who gained their status by ‘’counting coups’’ in battle, and who constituted the ‘’band council’’ (Turney-High 1941:149).

Lower Kutenai chiefs were elected, not hereditary, and the Lower Kutenai did not confer honorary chieftainships. Nevertheless, heredity seems to have played some part.69 Chamberlain

---

67 Curtis (1911:120; 167) also recorded that the Kutenai band chiefs were hereditary.
68 This resembles some parts of the process recorded by Chamberlain (1893:556). He stated that:

One method of selecting the chief appears to have been this: All the men, women and children gathered together around a large fire. The medicine men then conferred with the spirits, and in some mysterious way the chief was named.

69 Ray included the Kutenai among Native people who practised what he termed ‘‘loose heredity’’ in
recorded that the man who was entitled ‘‘by right’’ to the chieftainship of the Lower Kutenai had declined the position, stating that since the wars were over and the buffalo were all dead there was nothing left for a chief to do (Chamberlain 1893:556).70 Apparently, Kutenai chiefs were not identified by distinctive insignia, as was practised by some other Plateau groups (Ray 1939:21-22). Turney-High recorded five separate elective chieftainships being present in each of the lower Kutenai Villages. As was the case in Upper Kutenai society, the War Chief was the most distinguished warrior, but in Lower Kutenai society he was considered to be a subordinate of the Band Chief. The Band Chief had the responsibility of ensuring that everyone in the village was cared for, and in addition, was the village’s religious leader, holding the office of Sun Dance chief. Three separate economic chiefs — the Fish Chief, the Deer Chief and the Duck Chief — also existed, reflecting the need to co-ordinate the communal food gathering activities practised by the Lower Kutenai (Turney-High 1941:152-153).

C.4 Demography

Estimates of the Kutenai population in the late 18th and 19th centuries vary as significantly as the estimates of sngaytsksxt (Lakes) population. The early 19th-century Kutenai population figures, like the sngaytsksxt figures, reflect the great population decline that took place in the late 18th century epidemics. The early ethnohistoric recording of Kutenai population numbers may be less reliable than their sngaytsksxt equivalents. This has nothing to do with the accuracy of the people doing the recording; some of the sources are in fact the same. Rather, the problem reflects the fact that the Kutenai were dispersed into a larger number of separate and scattered bands, making early assessments of their population correspondingly more difficult. Many of the Kutenai population estimates do not differentiate between Upper and Lower Kutenai, although several of the more important, notably Work (1830) and Wilson (1866) do.

David Thompson in his manuscript journals estimated that around 1810, the Kutenai population included ‘‘140 men of families’’ (Thompson 1810, cited in Chance 1981:22). In 1827, John Dease estimated that the tribe included ‘‘150 men,’’ which again, refers to heads of families, and not the entire population (Dease 1827). Both of these figures (if they were intended to refer to both the Upper and Lower Kutenai) are slightly less than the figures recorded by John Work
determining chieftainship, in which heredity was important, but the principle was modified subject to achievement or ability (Ray 1939:19). However, Ray’s Kutenai data appears to be solely Upper Kutenai, and the applicability of his conclusions to the Lower Kutenai is questionable, given the differences between the two groups that others have recorded.

Chamberlain also suggested, however, that the process of electing chiefs may have not originated until the historic period. He stated that:

The selection of the chiefs by direct election has been of late years introduced by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, whose influence is now greater than that of the old chiefs, and whose power is much more feared by the Indians than theirs (Chamberlain 1893:556).
in 1830. As we noted previously, Work is considered to have been an exceptionally keen observer of Natives in this region. Work’s estimates, which were based on information provided by chiefs, indicated a total population for both groups of 630 people. Work, unlike Thompson and Dease, made separate estimates for the Upper and Lower Kutenai. According to Work, the population of the ‘‘Callesouilk’’ [Upper Kutenai] was 91 men, and 349 total. The population of the ‘‘Silaquilaque’’ [Lower Kutenai] was 91 men and 281 total (Work 1830).

Work’s estimation of Kutenai population also appears to be more precise than the estimates made in the approximately thirty years following. The ethnohistoric estimates of Kutenai population in the mid-19th century following Work are generally considered to be quite rough. Hale’s 1841 estimate of the ‘‘Kitunaha, or Coutanies, or Flat-bows’’ was 400 in total (Hale 1846:204-205). Warre and Vavasour’s 1845 estimate for ‘‘Kootoonais, several tribes,’’ was 235 Upper Kutenai and 212 Lower Kutenai, for a total of 447 (Warre and Vavasour 1845). George Gibbs’ 1853 estimate was 400 for the ‘‘Cootenays and Flatbows’’ combined (Gibbs 1853, In, Stevens 1855). Estimates of 1000 were made by the missionary Jean DeSmet (1863:104), and the trader David Linklater (Thibodo 1940:329). In 1866, Captain Charles Wilson provided separate estimates for the Upper and Lower Kutenai, indicating that the population of the Upper Kutenai was about 450, and the Lower Kutenai 200 (Wilson 1866:304). The low end of these estimates is between 400 and 500 people for both Upper and Lower Kutenai combined. The high end is about 1000.

The ethnohistoric references to the total Kutenai population in the early historic period thus vary between 400 and 1000, with a minimum figure of approximately 600 seeming reasonable. Some of the ethnographic recordings are considerably higher however. Curtis recorded that ‘‘the belief of the better-informed among them, based on tradition, is that at the beginning of the historical period they numbered seven hundred lodges, or about five thousand persons’’ (Curtis 1911:120). Turney-High’s reference to population is brief. He stated that ‘‘the Kutenai now number over a thousand, just a little under one fourth their former strength’’ (Turney-High 1941:122).

As a reflection of Kutenai population at the beginning of the historic period, these ethnographic estimates are not consistent with the recorded ethnohistoric estimates. Nor are they consistent with Mooney’s ethnographic estimate of a pre-epidemic 1780 population of 1,200 (Mooney 1928:27). If Thompson’s estimation that three-fifths of the population was killed by the initial epidemic is utilized, Mooney’s pre-contact estimation of 1,200 would result in a post-epidemic population of approximately 480, which is a little low, but still not inconsistent with the recorded ethnohistoric data. If Boyd’s (1985) calculation that one-third of the population was decimated by disease is used, then the post-epidemic population in the 1780s would be

---

71 No source for this statement is indicated. While Turney-High’s figure is not inconsistent with Curtis’,
approximately 800, which is also consistent with the recorded ethnohistoric data.

C.5 Religion

The search for and interaction with guardian spirits was the core of Kutenai religious life (Turney-High 1941:170), just as it was for the Lakes people. The Kutenai also believed that guardian spirits could come from almost any source (Ray 1942:234).

Most boys and some girls would be sent out on a vision quest (Ray 1942:235; Schaeffer 1935, in Brunton 1998:230). Both Turney-High (1941:170) and Brunton (1998:230) recorded that the child would first be sent out at about the age of seven, although occasionally he or she would not be sent out until adolescence. Ray was told that ten was the minimum age for Kutenai questers (Ray 1942:235). Among the Kutenai, adolescence was the last period in one’s life at which one could attract a spirit, as after that time a person lost the ritual quality thought necessary to attract a guardian spirit (Turney-High 1941:170; Brunton 1998:230). The quester was also expected to go naked (Ray 1942:235; Brunton 1998:230). This is because the spirits are ‘‘wild,’’ want things completely natural, and will not come to the quester if anything is worn, even something as small as a ring (Brunton 1998:230).

Questers were sent to a specific named place (Ray 1942:235; Brunton 1998:230). They were given symbols to carry and were very likely given an object to deposit at the site (Ray 1942:235). Designated sites used by the Kutenai included bodies of water, mountain, caves in mountains, un frequented regions and prairie, as well as places generally thought to be the locale of specific spirits (Ray 1942:236). Typically, these quests lasted anywhere between 24 hours and 7 days (Ray 1942:236), with the youth going out on the quest at night (Brunton 1998:230). Sometimes, during the quest, the youth was expected to keep alert, dive in water, take regular sweatbaths, and fast (Ray 1942:237). Other times the youth was expected to simply fast, sit quietly, and await the coming of a spirit (Brunton 1998:230).

If a spirit appeared, it would appear to the individual in a dream or vision. The spirits generally appeared to the Kutenai in their animal form, except for ‘‘Old Man,’’ who was the ‘‘chief of the spirits’’ (Ray 1942:237; Turney-High 1941:170). A parent would very occasionally instruct a child as to what spirit should be sought (Turney-High 1941:170). One way by which an attempt to secure the desired spirit was made was by bringing a token from a relative’s spirit bundle on the quest to attract the spirit (Brunton 1998:231). Ultimately, however, success in getting the spirit would depend on the good will of the spirit, and the people had very little control over which spirit would come to a child, what power was given, or the strength of the power (Turney-High 1941:170; Ray 1942:238; Brunton 1998:230-231). Spirits could each give

Curtis’ work is not listed in Turney-High’s bibliography.
a range of types and amounts of power, although each was known for giving a certain kind of
Revelation of the power was very restricted (although the father or proctor would know if a
power was received without being told). An infraction would cause a loss of the power,
punishment or even death (Ray 1942:238). An individual’s power, would however be made
obvious by his accomplishments (Ray 1942:238).

The Kutenai believe that adults and children have a soul, which is responsible for animating the
body (Ray 1942:232). The soul departs at death. One account has the soul wending its way to
the west, to return from the east at the end of the world (Curtis 1911:127; Schaeffer 1935, in
Brunton 1998:231). Another account has the disembodied soul hovering about the village,
waiting for a baby to be born, so it can inhabit it and begin another life (Brunton 1998:231).
This spirit land of the dead was similar to earth, but was more pleasant (Ray 1942:233).

While the Kutenai did not observe the winter spirit dance celebrated by the Salish peoples (Ray
1942:248; Brunton 1998:231), they did observe other important religious ceremonials. One was
the Blanket Dance, essentially a ceremonial meeting with various spirits in order to seek
assistance from them. It was conducted by two or three ‘‘blanket’’ shamans. Two blankets
skewered together were suspended opposite a doorway facing east. The lodge was darkened,
and a juniper smudge was made, with the smoke intended to fill the lodge. Spirit songs were
then sung to summon spirits, one at a time, behind the blanket. The spirits were offered
tobacco, and were asked questions by the participants. The answers would be interpreted by
one of the shamans (Brunton 1998:231).

The Sun Dance ceremony, which was likely introduced from the plains, was also practised by
the Kutenai. The Kutenai version of this ceremony was a modified form of the rite practised on
the Plains, which did not involve mutilation or self torture (Turney-High 1941:178; Olsen
1998:553). Only one dance was held a year, in the spring. The dance was celebrated by the
Lower Kutenai, as well as by the Upper, and was particularly important because it brought the
Upper and Lower Kutenai together (Schaeffer 1935, in Brunton 1998:231; Turney-High
1941:178). The dance lasted seven days altogether. Three days and nights of actual dancing
with four other days interspersed for rest and praying (Turney-High 1941:183-184).

As well, the Kutenai practised a Grizzly Bear dance, a prayer for plenty that was celebrated in
the spring, with the spirit of the bear present during the ceremony (Turney-High 1941:105, 184-
185). The Bluejay dance, a nighttime ceremony with power demonstrations, predictions of the
future, and spiritual healing, was recorded by Brunton (1998:231) as a traditional Kutenai
ceremony. Turney-High, however, was told that it was a more recent import from the Flathead,
which the Kutenai recognized as being powerful, but which they did not practice themselves
until about 1910 (Turney-High 1941:188). Ray also recorded that the Bluejay complex was not
practised by the Kutenai (Ray 1942:251).

The sweatlodge, and the sweatlodge ceremony, were of considerable religious significance to the Kutenai, who used the Plains type of sweathouse, with a bent willow frame (Ray 1942:180; Turney-High 1941:64). The sweathouse was considered a deity, prayed to and called great-grandfather (Ray 1942:181). One prayed in the lodge, sang his songs and looked forward to having a medicine experience (Turney-High 1941:177). Sweating was always followed by a plunge in cold water. All the sweat houses were communally used (Ray 1942:181).