Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Land Selection and Jurisdictions: A Pilot Study of Stó:lō Family and Tribal Relations and Systems of Caretaking Land and Resources throughout *S'ólh Téméxw*

prepared and submitted

on behalf of the

Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association

A Treaty Related Measures Project

funded by

Canada

December 9, 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report presents the results of the Treaty Related Measure project entitled '*Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Land Selection and Jurisdictions: A Pilot Study of Stó:lō Family and Tribal Relations and systems of caretaking land and resources throughout S'ólh Téméxw'* (the Project) carried out on behalf of the Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association (SXTA). The Project was launched in January of 2011 as a means of fostering progress in the development of a 'Lands' chapter framework leading to an Agreement in Principle for the SXTA. This pilot project examines issues faced by the SXTA in identifying Stó:lō-based land interests affecting land selection. The fundamental importance of relations between Stó:lō families, Stó:lō tribes and lands within *S'ólh Téméxw* ('our World') is currently recognized but not fully understood.

Working to better understand these relations increases the SXTA's ability to effectively address them in developing land selection and governance principles and frameworks. This project entails: (1) developing an understanding of Stó:lō perspectives of family organization; (2) exploring the nature of land-based relations at family and tribal levels; (3) outlining and defining family structures and relations to land within SXTA communities; and (4) identifying inter-family connections and inter-tribal land interests that extend beyond the SXTA membership. In addition to assisting the SXTA's lands negotiations, this study is intended to aid in addressing land use planning, constitutional development, eligibility and enrolment, and intra-Stó:lō overlap relations.

The intent of this project is to clarify Stó:lō protocols and practices associated with the care of natural and cultural resources (herein referred to as "resources") that exist within *S'ólh Téméxw* – commonly referred to as Stó:lō Territory - and beyond. Given the established importance of the Stó:lō cultural principle '*Xólhmet te mekw'stám ít kwelát*' (We have to look after everything that belongs to us) -- a primary goal of the research is to understand and articulate how this principle can be integrated into effective and sustainable policy and practice. Central questions include: Who is currently involved in ensuring that Stó:lō lands and all resources are cared for properly, and who should be consulted in the future? How do pre-existing Stó:lō systems of resource management at hereditary, village, tribal and Nation levels work and what is the relationship between these systems and reserve, band and treaty jurisdiction? In order to gain an understanding of this relationship, it requires defining caretaking authority for resources (including locuses of place) and their associated practices. How are access, use, ownership and control defined culturally for the diverse resources which exist with *S'ólh Téméxw*? Fundamentally, we are seeking to better understand the application of Stó:lō cultural principles defining the nature of relations to land, resources and management practices influenced by the past, practiced the contemporary world, and a useful in shaping a future affected by a framework of treaty-based relations. Outlined below as a set of bullet points are core findings, conclusions, gaps and potential next steps resulting from this project.

Findings: Themes

- Access and use of resources shared by the greater Stó:lō community and with neighbouring First Nations is defined primarily through inter-marriage, or when permission is asked. Hozameen Mountain is given as an example[1] of a gathering place for multiple tribes on the coast/mainland where resources were accessed, used and shared.

- Emphasizing the inter-connectedness of physical and cultural resources is essential to understanding caretaking responsibilities and ensuring that effective policy and practice are developed. Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) gives the example of a berry patch which was maintained by means of controlled burn by hunters using the grounds for hunting purposes.[2] Certain geographic areas contain multiple resources and are therefore cared for by many.

- A distinction between caretaking for a place and resources associated with it must be made. For example, harvesting and using medicinal plants for treatment is an example where caretaking means maintaining and using the knowledge associated linked to a physical resource, not being the steward of a physical place where the resource exists. Burial mounds are another example where caretaking for this resource is linked to the individual trained in maintaining and using the knowledge associated with its use, not the physical place isolated from this.

- Geo-cultural borders between Stó:lō and neighbouring First Nations were discussed. One example is the boundary between Nlaka'pamux and Stó:lō Territory in the Fraser Canyon for dry rack fishing. There exists some debate among Stó:lō people about the border's location. Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*), who has family ties to Stó:lō and Nlaka'pamux states "A lot of people talk about Sawmill Creek as an area in the canyon that was like a border. I talked with my late grandfather and older people up in the Nlaka'pamux and a lot of people understood it to be "Spuzzum Creek." Sonny McHalsie provides insight into the different sets of rights geo-politically situated between Sailor Bar Rock, north of Sawmill Creek and Spuzzum Creek. The prior marking the outer edge of Stó:lō title; the latter marking the outer edge of a set of access and use rights (e.g., hunting). Another example provided of a Territorial border was Larson's Hill on the Coquihalla for hunting and berry harvesting. [3]

- Ancestral names are central to defining caretaking responsibilities.

[1] Dalton Silver Interview Pages 14-15
[2] Frank Malloway Interview Page 4
[3] Dalton Silver Interview Page 12-13

- A distinction between caretaking and ownership exists. However, enacting Stó:lō models of caretaking does not mean giving up control, access and use of resources in *S'ólh Téméxw*.

- The sustained impact of colonization (anti-potlatch laws, residential schools, band electoral system, social welfare system, fisheries and wildlife regulation) has disrupted, but not destroyed systems of caretaking which define "authority" within the greater Stó:lō community. Goal is for continued renewal of existing systems of resource management, and enacting such systems in treaty is a start.

Conclusions

- *Treaty must reflect existing systems of resource management.* Stó:lō individuals, families, villages and tribes are to be considered primary authorities to care for resources with less reliance on band and reserve levels of authority to determine access, use and regulation. Caretaking responsibilities of various resources lie with those who access, use and or manage the resource. Examples of this include care for gravesites, berry patches, hunting, fishing and spiritual bathing/fasting sites.

- *Self-Determination*. "The Government should out and out recognize the protocols that we have amongst ourselves as tribes and not interfere with what we have and have had."[4]

- *Innovative Traditionalism*. Enacting Stó:lō caretaking practices and protocols for all resources within *S'ólh Téméxw* is integral to the maintenance and continuity of all aspects of Stó:lō life past, present and future. They have been consistently maintained while innovative in form. Examples include contemporary hunters getting letters of permission to access and use another Band's Territory to hunt, when before they were "given the nod."[5]

- *Maintenance of Cultural Identity*. Reciprocation and forms of exchange for use/access/ of resources has always been and remains essential. Examples given for hunting, fishing, berry picking, plant gathering.

- *Integration of caretaking principles and practices into existing governance models*. Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*) describes the program undertaken by a Stó:lō Governmental organization to hire a Stó:lō caretaker for plants and medicines. This is

[4] Dalton Silver Interview Page 10
[5] Dalton Silver Interview Page 7

but one example of integrating cultural caretaking practices into service delivery programs.

- *Cultural Revival*. The revival of ancestral names for youth which are associated with certain physical resources in *S'ólh Téméxw* so as to ensure the continued care, use and maintenance of such places is one example of how cultural principles are expressed in new ways. Ancestral names of this type are thereby used as a strategy for cultural survival.

- *Education.* Teaching of Stó:lō youth about caretaking responsibilities at a Nation, village, family and individual level essential to the maintenance of Stó:lō culture. It was stated[6] that Stó:lō youth are uniquely situated historically as they have an opportunity for a cultural and institutional education. This needs to happen to begin to mitigate the effects of having cultural systems of caretaking disrupted. Solution to question: Given the dislocation/disruption of Stó:lō life due to colonialism, what do we do as these systems are being rehabilitated, revived and renewed?

- *Unity of all Stó:lō People*. While partisan politics may exist within the greater Stó:lō community about how band and reserve levels of authority designate caretaking responsibilities, such knowledge and practice requires the unity of Stó:lō people. As Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*) describes: "Certain things that we have to protect we will have to stand side by side on things. With these Governments today they kind of make it hard for communities to work together on some things. [7]

- *Enacting Caretaking practices based on a concept of moral ownership.* Stó:lō caretaking practices are distinct from non-Stó:lō practices in that there is a moral and spiritual right and obligation to care for the resources which exist within *S'ólh Téméxw*. The process of engaging with resources over generations and the reciprocal relationship this creates is the focus. Therefore resources are not treated exclusively as objects and products.

Gaps

- More fully explore the tension between externally imposed practices and protocols associated with the care, access, use and regulation of resources. Examples include: Band and council issuing letters of permission to hunt or the impact of Yale Treaty on Stó:lō canyon fisherman who, under currently contested wording in the Yale Final Agreement, would be required to gain permission to fish hereditary fishing grounds. This is a site of conflict and we need additional examples of resolution strategies.

[6] Sid Douglas, Herb Joe Interviews
[7] Sid Douglas Interview Page 6

- Gain knowledge of existing *Halq'eméylem* terms for community, nation, family, village, tribe, reserve, band, individual.
- Further explore contemporary relationships between ancestral names and caretaking for resources.
- Create an inventory of names and associated *Sqwélqwel*.
- Build on the existing place names information found in *A Coast Salish Historical Atlas.*
- Inquire about whether there are other examples of a resource "co-ordinator" or caretaking authority similar to the *Sia:teleq*.
- Gain additional examples of protocols for use/access of resources, including permission and restrictions.
- Further explore implications of breaking cultural protocols for access/use of specific resources.
- Explore existing relevant conflict resolution strategies which can be enacted as part of Treaty and related resource management strategies.

Potential Next Steps

This research has successfully produced a dialogue with Stó:lō community members and record of participants views of caretaking. Our initial questions have helped to inform additional questions and, as such, there are a number of term goals established from this initial research.

Short term goals include continued interviews with community members not yet interviewed about caretaking practices and protocols. In addition to this, the creation of an inventory of ancestral names and the sqwélqwel associated with those names is considered extremely valuable. An additional goal is to gather more in depth genealogies of families which will help "map" family connections to resources.

From this point, the goal of the next stage of research is to focus on how these protocols and practices can be incorporated into a workable governance framework which can be enacted in a sustainable and culturally sensitive manner through Treaty and beyond. To accomplish this, it will involve further exploring the existing historically and culturally based practices of conflict resolution practiced throughout Stó:lō history related to resource management.

Gathering additional narratives about restricted Stó:lō access to resources both historically and currently is extremely valuable in clarifying methods of conflict resolution. What can we learn from these existing systems of resource management and conflict resolution that can help

mediate the current circumstance and acknowledge Stó:lō cultural history as it has been shaped by ongoing colonial policy and practice?

With continued dialogue, it is hopeful that a balance can be struck to create workable relationships between Stó:lō peoples collectively and the various stakeholders who seek to assert control over the access, use and management of Stó:lō resources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Yálh yexw kwás hó:y to all those who participated in, informed and otherwise contributed to this project...in an effort to advance understanding of Stó:lō principles, teachings and relationships with and within *S'ólh Téméxw*.

‘We have to learn to live together in a good way.’

– *T'xwelátse* (Time Immemorial)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CREDITS

Project Steering Committee

.....	Grand Chief Joe Hall, Political Advisor
.....	Jean Teillet, Legal Advisor / Chief Negotiator
.....	David Schaepe, Ph.D., Advisor / Analyst
.....	Albert 'Sonny' McHalsie, Cultural Advisor

Project Direction / Research / Authorship

Research Director / Co-Author	David Schaepe, Ph.D., Analyst / Advisor
Primary Researcher / Co-Author	Meagan Gough, PhD. Candidate, Researcher
Research Assistance.....	Tia Halstad, Librarian / Archivist
.....	Ashley vanDijk, Assistant Librarian

SXTA Lands Working Group

.....	Angie Bailey, Chief, Aitchelitz FN
.....	Mike Kelly, Councilor, Leq'a:mel FN
.....	Frank Malloway, Chief, Yakweakwioose FN
.....	Harry Murphy, Councilor, Popkum FN
.....	Jeff Point, Councilor, Skowkale FN
.....	Lawrence Roberts, Tzeachten FN
.....	Deborah Schneider, Councilor, Skawahlook FN

Administration / Clerical Support

.....	Tracey Joe, Managing Supervisor
.....	Rachel Anderson, Administrative Clerk
.....	Sharlene Charlton, Financial Services
.....	Darren Stollings, Financial Services

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the Treaty Related Measure project entitled '*Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Land Selection and Jurisdictions: A Pilot Study of Stó:lō Family and Tribal Relations and systems of caretaking land and resources throughout S'ólh Téméxw'* (the Project) carried out on behalf of the Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association (SXTA). The Project was launched in January of 2011 as a means of fostering progress in the development of a 'Lands' chapter framework leading to an Agreement in Principle for the SXTA. This pilot project examines issues faced by the SXTA in identifying Stó:lō-based land interests affecting land selection. The fundamental importance of relations between Stó:lō families, Stó:lō tribes and lands within *S'ólh Téméxw* ('our World') is currently recognized but not fully understood.

Working to better understand these relations increases the SXTA's ability to effectively address them in developing land selection and governance principles and frameworks. This project entails: (1) developing an understanding of Stó:lō perspectives of family organization; (2) exploring the nature of land-based relations at family and tribal levels; (3) outlining and defining family structures and relations to land within SXTA communities; and (4) identifying inter-family connections and inter-tribal land interests that extend beyond the SXTA membership. In addition to assisting the SXTA's lands negotiations, this study is intended to aid in addressing land use planning, constitutional development, eligibility and enrolment, and intra-Stó:lō overlap relations.

The intent of this project is to clarify Stó:lō protocols and practices associated with the care of natural and cultural resources (herein referred to as "resources") that exist within *S'ólh Téméxw* – commonly referred to as Stó:lō Territory - and beyond. Given the established importance of the Stó:lō cultural principle '*Xólhmet te mekw'stám ít kwelát*' (We have to look after everything that belongs to us) -- a primary goal of the research is to understand and articulate how this principle can be integrated into effective and sustainable policy and practice. Central questions include: Who is currently involved in ensuring that Stó:lō lands and all resources are cared for properly, and who should be consulted in the future? How do pre-existing Stó:lō systems of resource management at hereditary, village, tribal and Nation levels work and what is the relationship between these systems and reserve, band and treaty jurisdiction? In order to gain an understanding of this relationship, it requires defining caretaking authority for resources (including locuses of place) and their associated practices. How are access, use, ownership and control defined culturally for the diverse resources which exist with *S'ólh Téméxw*? Fundamentally, we are seeking to better understand the application of Stó:lō cultural principles defining the nature of relations to land, resources and management practices influenced by the past, practiced the contemporary world, and a useful in shaping a future affected by a framework of treaty-based relations.

The Current Need for Additional Information: Gaps in Research and Data

Currently, there is very little written which articulates Stó:lō cultural perspectives of access, use, ownership and regulation of resources in *S'ólh Téméxw* and within the available

literature[8] (see *Addendum – Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography*) there are established research gaps. Geographer Karen Albers' exceptional work Resource Sites in S'ólh Téméxw: Traditional Concepts of Ownership (2000), is one of the few secondary sources available on the topic. In it, she draws upon her extensive oral history interviews with Stó:lō individuals about concepts of ownership, and demonstrates "the existence of family owned resource sites in Stó:lō society."[9] However, Albers observes areas for future research include exploring the division of labour in Stó:lō society and how this impacts caretaking for resources as well as the hereditary caretaking rights and responsibilities of Stó:lō women. [10] Similarly, the *Stó:lō Heritage Policy* (2003), which provides an exceptional foundation for the development of policy and practice related to resource management, can be built upon by speaking further with members of the current generation of Stó:lō cultural, political and family leaders to explore how principles of caretaking can best be enacted.

OBJECTIVES

As outlined in the Project proposal submitted by the SXTA (September 18, 2010), the specific objectives of this TRM are to:

- inform SXTA land selection and regulation frameworks and processes;
- better understand family structures and relations to lands, including addressing the question of how many families exist within each SXTA FN;
- better understand Stó:lō relations with land and resources;
- better understand family-based inter-relations among the Stó:lō,
- begin to develop an understanding of relations and relationship maintenance mechanisms between SXTA and other Stó:lō communities regarding land;
- begin developing strategies to facilitate positive intra-Stó:lō relations involving land (commonly referred to as intra-Stó:lō 'overlaps').

Two proposed activities resulted in being out of scope for this TRM - with greater value attributed to data collection – at this initial pilot phase of work:

- **Genealogical database review** – (a) use the Stó:lō genealogical database and relevant archival data to define Stó:lō family organization focusing on SXTA communities and tribes, and (b) define family structures through discussions with community representatives;
- **SXTA Community workshops** – facilitate discussions with and gain feedback from SXTA Community-members about land selection and jurisdictional issues.

[8] Secondary sources on the topic of caretaking responsibilities and the levels of authority associated with the use and care of resources in *S'ólh Téméxw* are limited. However, two documents provide the foundation on which to build a Stó:lô perspective of caretaking and resource management. The first is Resource Sites in S'ólh Téméxw : Traditional Concepts of Ownership (Final Report for the Family Owned Sites Project) Research Report by Karen Albers Geography student Albert-Ludwigs-University of Freiburg, Germany June 2000, which is based on extensive oral history interviews with Stó:lō people on the topic of family owned sites or resources. The Stó:lô Heritage Policy (2003) articulates strategies of resource management in accordance with Stó:lō cultural principles, protocols and values.

[9] Albers 2000: 24

[10] Albers 2000: 25

These activities are considered to maintain value as an aspect of ongoing research subsequent to the outcomes of this pilot phase of the Project.

METHODS

Of the research activities identified in the proposal for the Project, we have our research strategy and methods to focus on the following activities:

- **Literature / archival / traditional use and heritage site database review** -- identifying documented places in the landscape of *S'ólh Téméxw* with family- and tribally-based jurisdictions (see *Addendum – Literature Review & Annotated Bibliography* in this report).
- **Stó:lō community-member Interviews** – gaining information on family organization and land connections from a selection of knowledgeable Stó:lō community-members, including members broadly situated throughout the Stó:lō area and not only SXTA First Nations;
- **SXTA Working Group Workshops** – dialogue with the SXTA Lands Working Group, to discuss findings and formulate a lands selection strategy addressing family / tribal jurisdictional interests.

While this research combines written and oral sources to better clarify the process, protocols and practices associated with the care of resources within *S'ólh Téméxw*, as mentioned above, a gap exists in the available literature on the topic. In order to best explore and understand Stó:lō perspectives of this topic, oral history interviews with Stó:lō Elders, political leaders, cultural practitioners, heads of families and caretakers of resources were determined to be the best research method to articulate a Stó:lō perspective on the topic. It is not assumed that a Stó:lō perspective on the management (access, use, regulation, ownership) of resources is homogenous, and the oral history interviews will ideally reflect the diverse perspectives which exist within the greater community so that this complexity can be incorporated into effective policy and management strategies. Oral history interviews with Stó:lō individuals considered knowledgeable about the caretaking or management of specific cultural and natural resources were nominated by the SXTA Lands Working Group and core members of the SXTA research team: David Schaepe, Sonny McHalsie, Tia Halstad and Meagan Gough (see *Appendix A: Lands TRM List of Potential Interviewees April 2011*).

Scope of Research Topic

We initially discussed the possibility of conducting interviews with knowledgeable Stó:lō people focusing on two distinct research topics. The first topic of interest involved an historical perspective researching how caretaking authority and hereditary systems of governance have been impacted by the creation of the reserve system. This was deemed necessary to understand current inter-Stó:lō relations and dynamics, as affected by governmental legislation and design. How do externally imposed definitions of "community", which take the form of reserves and bands, impact already existing systems of caretaking and shape the local histories of particular communities? The pervasive and extensive family ties between the three communities of Yakweakwioose, Skowkale and Tzeachten serve as one

possible case study about the existing system of caretaking responsibilities and the sustained impact of the reserve and band system – these bands effectively 'disintegrated' from more cohesive village and tribal units. A second possible case study involves the community of Leq'á:mel, as a somewhat more cohesive set of village and tribal (though not entirely) units 'encapsulated' within a band framework.

However, it was determined prior to commencing interviews that this research topic is beyond the scope of time available for interviews and will be pursued separately. Through initial meetings we agreed that the focus in interviews should be on exploring caretaking responsibilities for the numerous resources that exist in *S'ólh Téméxw*. We presented a comprehensive list of resources to potentially discuss with Stó:lō individuals that was compiled from the limited secondary sources and experience working in the community (see *Appendix B: Complete List of Cultural and Natural Resources in S'ólh Téméxw).*

We further determined during our research team planning meetings that to discuss all of these resources during interviews would be beyond the scope of time available for each interview and the research project. As a result, we prioritized specific resources to focus interview questions upon (see *Appendix C: Revised list of Cultural and Natural Resources in S'ólh Téméxw for Interviews).*

Interview Questions

Once we narrowed the scope of the research, we developed a refined list of interview questions which were then used in the first round of interviews (See "*Appendix D: General Interview Questions Land TRM").* While I used our questions as a starting point, I also developed specific questions for each individual catered to the specific knowledge and background of the interviewee.

Where known to the individual, interviewee's *Xwexwilmexw* or ancestral names are cited throughout this report. Ancestral names, and the responsibilities and rights attached to each name, are central to Stó:lō life and the fulfillment of caretaking responsibilities. When conducting interviews for this project, I first asked individuals to introduce themselves by their ancestral name. The purpose of this was two-fold: first, it is my belief as the interviewer that this acknowledges, if not validates, the cultural identity and experience of each individual as a Stó:lō person; second, articulating one's ancestral name often involves describing *Sqwélqwel* (family history or "true news") and related caretaking responsibilities as this is what an ancestral name indicates. It is an individual name which reflects one's role, place and history in the greater community. Throughout the course of this research, it became evident how invaluable an inventory of ancestral names would be to the development of meaningful resource management policy and practice. This initial inventory of names is the first step of important work in this area.

While during interviews I focused on a single resource, many Stó:lō interviewees considered knowledgeable about a specific resource spoke with equal authority and experience about multiple resources. This was an unintended benefit of the interviews, although not surprising given the level and nature of experience of interviewees.

Research Process

Within the scope of this project scope, we completed 16 formal interviews with 14 interviewees. Each interviewee discussed aspects of 'caretaking' associated with multiple resources. In addition to the formal interviews, the interviewer engaged in a number of "informal" interviews with Stó:lō community members about the topic of caretaking. As is often the case when doing applied, community based research of this nature, often the role as "researcher" shifts to encompass a role as liaison, which includes sharing information about the project and gaining information about community perception of the topic. Another result of such "informal" conversations, which usually take place while attending Stó:lō family and cultural events, was that additional interviewees were nominated by the community as knowledgeable people to speak on the topic. As a result, the research "snowballed" through the process of engaging with Stó:lō community members on the topic and resulted in more interviewees being recommended. Appendix A (*Completed List of Interviewees*) includes interviewees recommended by the research team but also by the interviewees and community members with whom we spoke.

The initial round of interviews conducted in April/May 2011 built momentum, and a second round was determined to be required to speak with at least a portion of additional interviewees deemed by the Working Group, researchers and interviewees to be very knowledgeable on a number of topics. A unique opportunity arose as a result of both formal and informal discussion with Stó:lō community members during the research trip. There was interest in a group interview to explore Stó:lō forms of conflict and dispute resolution related to issues arising from Land Claims[11].

In July, 2011, a third round of interviews was carried out. This round produced four additional formal interviews and we were also able to co-ordinate a group interview which included the participation of sixteen Stó:lō community members who are involved in the dry rack fishery (*Appendix G-List of Interviewee's Lands TRM Group Interview, July 19, 2011).*

[11] On May 1, 2011 at the Seabird Island community, Ivan McIntyre (*Qwosqwesten*), held a burning, which is a spiritual ceremony, to honour the ancestors up at Yale and ask for guidance in the resolution of the Yale and Stó:lō Treaties. Participants in the ceremony included the major canyon fishing families who are currently members of the Seabird Island Band. This ceremony followed typical traditional form for such a ceremony adhering to spiritual protocols and processes, but in addition, asked the ancestors for help to resolve the potential conflict arising from the contemporary Yale Treaty, specifically Stó:lō exclusion from access, use and management of their hereditary fishing sites located in the Fraser Canyon if the Yale treaty is ratified as it is currently written. This community spiritual gathering highlights the inextricable link between fishing and wind drying in the canyon and the social, cultural, political, spiritual lives of Stó:lō fisherman who have used this resource in culturally regulated ways since time immemorial. That this event was held for the first time ever illustrates the gravity of the impact of the Yale Treaty and serves in itself as a case study for understanding contemporary resource management in accordance with Stó:lō laws. Ivan McIntyre suggested that a group interview with the heads of canyon fishing families during the 2011 wind drying season in July would serve to illustrate how the Stó:lō fisherman involved are engaged in a dialogue with one another and are seeking to develop resolution strategies in addition to those discussed in a formal treaty setting.

FINDINGS

This following summary of findings, gaps, trends and themes in the LANDS TRM oral history research is intended to highlight the results of this research and establish goals and scope for continued research in the near future.

The goal of this research was to build on the cultural principle articulated in the statement *S'ólh Téméxw ít kwelát Xólhmet te mekw'stám ít kwelát*: "This is our land, we have to take care of everything that belongs to us" by clarifying how, and by whom this can best take place in a contemporary setting. Culturally defined caretaking responsibilities involve determining the control, access, use and regulation of specific resources and associated protocols of reciprocation (spiritual, social, financial, legal) essential for their use.

Given that there are extensive cultural and natural resources within *S'ólh Téméxw* that have interconnected yet distinct caretaking responsibilities, we narrowed the scope to focus on gravesites/burial mounds, dry rack fishing spots, hunting and trapping, medicinal plants and places associated with spiritual bathing and fasting.

There are multiple levels of caretaking authority which exist within the greater Stó:lō community which are simultaneously and inextricably linked. To reflect this, the interviews were framed to begin by generally inquiring what are the caretaking responsibilities of all Stó:lō people (greater Stó:lō community)?

From this starting point, we moved our discussion to explore more specific levels of Stó:lō cultural authority: villages, families, and individuals. We emphasized these Stó:lō expressions of collective identity in favour of an emphasis on externally imposed band and reserve concepts of community. The interplay and tension between these systems of caretaking authority are of central importance to this research and the development of effective policy and practice related to resource management.

Expressions of Stó:lō Collective Identity: Defining Community, Village, Tribe, and Family within a Stó:lō worldview

There is no singular, or even homogenous expression of Stó:lō identity, and therefore a key facet of understanding Stó:lō caretaking rights and responsibilities and the multiple levels of authority involved in enacting this role involves clarifying what constitutes Stó:lō collective identity. What is apparent in this research and the work of other scholars is that Stó:lō collective identity has multiple, inextricably linked expressions. How are individual, hereditary, tribal, village and Nation/community levels of collective authority understood and enacted? In particular, the very notion of what constitutes "family" must be explored as consequently this informs how existing hereditary systems of management are understood. These internal, culturally based perspectives of what constitutes the Stó:lō community are essential not only to record but integrate into policy and practice, particularly in light of how they interface with externally-imposed notions of community such as band and reserve in the management of Stó:lō resources.

While Canadian government allocations of band status include one or more numbered reserves scattered throughout *S'ólh Téméxw*, before the imposition of the reserve system, movement of Stó:lō people between villages or communities was very common. Prior to the designation of reserves, it was villages, defined as places "associated with fishing sites and spirit-power sites or associated with a tribal town" [12] which were the foundations of Stó:lō communities. It is notable that archeological evidence suggests that "the sub-dialects of *Halq'eméylem* almost perfectly correspond with the *Xwélmexw* (Human Beings who speak the same language) sub-watershed 'tribal groups.' Villages within these groups sometimes co-operated for common defense and economic reasons…"[13]

The term community denotes the broadest grouping of a Stó:lō collective; it can be understood to include all Stó:lō people and their relations past, present and future. It reflects the entire population of Stó:lō people whether living on or off reserve. As it relates to rights and responsibilities to care for resources within *S'ólh Téméxw*, the whole Stó:lō community acts as a family who designates, then shares, uses, and maintains these resources. "Nation" is a term used informally by some to refer to the entire Stó:lō community, however, more formally it refers to an expression of community based on a governance model as Stó:lō Nation is a First Nation governmental and service delivery organization which provides services to, and represents, band level Stó:lō communities in treaty negotiations. Stó:lō band level communities are further identified in terms of whether or not they are "member" or "non-member" bands, which refers to their status in relation to their participation in treaty negotiations as part of Stó:lō Xwexwilmexw Treaty Association, which is made up of seven Stó:lō Bands/First Nations: Aitchelitz (*Áthelets),* Leq'á:mél *(Leq'á:mél),* Popkum (*Pópkw'em),* Skowkale *(Sq'ewqéyl),* Skawahlook (*Sq'ewá:lxw),* Tzeachten (*Ch'iyáqtel) and* Yakweakwioose (*Yeqwyeqwí:ws)*, or Stó:lō Tribal Council which represents the bands of Seabird Island *(Sq'éwqel)*, Skowlitz *(Sq'éwlets)*, Soowahlie *(Th'ewá:li)*, Kwaw Kwaw Apilt *(Qweqwe'ópelhp),* Kwantlen (*Qw'ó:ntl'an)*, Shxw'ow'hamel *(Shxw'ōwhámel)*, Chawathil *(Chowéthel)* and Cheam *(Chiyó:m).* These emergent definitions of community are discussed in literature regarding contemporary Stó:lō identity, where it is stressed that: The Stó:lō "rely on multiple expressions of their identity suitable to fit into the contemporary B.C. political and economic environment."[14] Albers found in her interviews with Stó:lō people that they used the term community interchangeably to mean "the whole Stó:lō community, the band or the longhouse extended family." She notes that "In general, it is though birth, and later, formally, through a naming ceremony, that people became members of the community.[15]

The next level of collective identity expressed within the Stó:lō community is one that is based on the "tribal" groupings which characterized the area prior to reserve creation. These three main Stó:lō tribal groupings or areas are the Pilalt, the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* [16] and the Teit. Some Stó:lō individuals favour an emphasis on these tribal areas in defining their identity as a Stó:lō person. During our interview, Elder Jeff Point (*A:yai:seleq*) described known tribal groupings and their geographic boundaries:

---

[12] Carlson 2001: 24

[13] These cooperative relations are further illuminated through archaeological evidence of rock wall fortifications, as is noted in Carlson: 2001.

[14] McIlwraith: 1996: 42

[15] Albers: 2000: 8

[16] " *Ts'elxwéyeqw*" is the term which describes the Stó:lō tribe who's Territory extends into what is now called the city of Chilliwack.

[T]here's the Teit tribe that's up there now where Yale is and it comes as far down as Rosedale….Then there's Pilalt and it's around Cheam and it comes all the way to Chilliwack down to where it meets Semá:th there, it comes this way a little bit (towards Chilliwack) it comes almost to the freeway, not quite as close but almost. Then there's the Semá:th Tribe, then there's a Chowat Tribe and then there's the Matsqui Tribe.[17]

Further to self-identification by some Stó:lō people as members of these tribal groupings, there is a movement among some to re-unify along tribal lines as a collective to negotiate for Right and Title. For example, Elder Jeff Point *(A:yai:seleq)* who resides and is a Band Councillor at Skowkale, one of seven bands included in the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* tribe, describes how Tribal boundaries and identities which existed since time immemorial were altered:

[w]hen Governor Douglas came in he drew circles around them, eh? Wherever there was a village and said 'now you stay there' and they became bands! So he erased the Tribe…But we're trying to bring that back, Chilliwack tribes is way ahead of everybody because the other ones don't even use it, we're the only ones.[18]

One example of a caretaking initiative currently undertaken by the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* Tribe is to control access and use of lumber in the Chilliwack Valley and in doing so, fulfill caretaking responsibilities for this resource. "The Chilliwack tribes…are trying to enforce our responsibility because it is our responsibility to look after it and slow the process of logging it out".[19]

Villages constitute another level of jurisdiction and collective identity which informs caretaking responsibilities. According to Sonny McHalsie (*Naxaxalhts*'i), villages can be defined as "a place where remnants of a longhouse and pit house exist".[20] Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) adds to this definition that a village is a place where more than one family traditionally lived.[21] People I interviewed as part of this research often spoke of the responsibilities of villages to care for resources.

The next level of caretaking authority is family or hereditary systems, which form the core of Stó:lō caretaking. A family can be defined as a unit of immediate and extended relations united either by blood, and/or marriage and/or adoption. In the broadest sense, the entire Stó:lō community constitutes a family united by some combination of these factors. However, this also extends through marriage to include neighbouring First Nations which then play a role in the control, access, use, maintenance and regulation of resources.

Another key expression of a Stó:lō family is the smokehouse or longhouse family: a family unit defined not necessarily by blood, adoption or marriage but by shared spiritual practice. This spiritual "family" is made up of the winter dancing practitioners and initiates and extends throughout multiple smoke "houses" located in *S'ólh Téméxw* and beyond to neighbouring First Nations.

---

[17] Jeff Point Interview Page 7.
[18] Jeff Point interview Page 7
[19] Jeff Point Interview Page 4.
[20] Sonny McHalsie Interview Page 12
[21] Frank Malloway Interview Page 6

The long house or winter dance family in this way is an additional form of Stó:lō collective to be considered when discussing caretaking. Therefore, if we understand Stó:lō winter dancers to be a form of extended family, then are caretaking responsibilities of individuals engaged in spiritual activities related to winter dancing regulated under similar hereditary systems of management evident in resources such as the dry rack fishery?

So given the existence of multiple levels of culturally ascribed levels of jurisdiction prior to and since the imposition of reserve and bands within *S'ólh Téméxw*, what rights and responsibilities fall under these levels of jurisdiction and how are they enacted?

The interviews were structured to first ask: what is the responsibility of all Stó:lō people? What people shared is it is the responsibility of "the community" as a group of individuals, to care for a number of things. First is for the River.[22] This is represented through the Halq'eméylem language in the term Stó:lō. Stó:lō means People of the River, but is also the term for the River itself.

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) describes the teachings his father passed on to him regarding the responsibility to care for not only the resources river produces, but to protect and honour the watershed itself, as living entity:

Things that he would tell me for instance is: "You have to understand that that river is alive. We think of that river as alive. That river is an old lady and if you don't respect that old lady, she'll take you. And the more disrespect you show that old lady, the longer she'll keep you."[23]

The consequences of not following the cultural laws which inform these caretaking responsibilities as Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) concludes are dire: *"Because if the salmon die, we die. If the animals of the world that live out there, if they die, we die. If we kill the land that we're living on, then we die."*[24]

In addition to being responsible for caring for the Fraser River, Sonny McHalsie (*Naxaxalhts'i*) states, "it is the responsibility of all Stó:lō people to care for ourselves. This includes an identity as *Xwexwilmexw* people." He further explains that "*T'éméxw* is the word in our language that has to do with our land. If you look at the last part of the word Téméxw and you look at the last part of the word *Xwexwilmexw* they both have the same ending and then there's that attachment we have as *Xwexwilmexw* people that's the attachment to the land." The next responsibility of all Stó:lō people is to care for and maintain the Halq'eméylem language. It is equally essential for each Stó:lō individual to assume caretaking responsibility for the *Sxwōxwiyám* (oral history) and their own family *Sqwléqwel* ("true news" or family history).

Sonny also explains the unbreakable connection between *Sxwōxwiyám*, (which include origin stories which describe the work of *Xexá:ls*), and caretaking responsibilities:

[22] See also: Frank Malloway and Herb Joe, Ivan McIntyre, Jeff Point, Sid Douglas who also stress importance of caretaking of water and the watershed by all Stó:lô.
[23] Herb Joe Interview Page 17
[24] Herb Joe Interview Page 17

We have an ancestor that was transformed into this rock, or we have an ancestor transformed into this mountain or this important resource that is only available in our area. Our ancestor was transformed into that, so that's why it's so important that everyone take care of their Sxwōxwiyám because when we look at those resources, it's not only viewed as a resource, but it's viewed as part of our extended family, it's one of our ancestors that was transformed into that. [25]

Sxwōxwiyám functions to create both an accurate history and a sense of identity within the Stó:lō worldview. Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) describes how it was the responsibility of each individual to care for their part by learning and transmitting it accurately**:**

So that Universal responsibility is something that is coming back into vogue again, the young people of today are getting a little better understanding. The generation that I come from, it was a part of the world we were living in, so the Elders that were alive at that time, they followed their natural teachings and passed them on to their children and grandchildren. So my dad for instance, every time we went to the river, he told me about our relationship with the river. Every time. Every time we went. Say if we went to the river five of the seven days of the week, well five times out of the week I got taught that same lesson about the river and our relationship to the river. Every time.[26]

There is not one, but rather multiple stories of *Sxwōxwiyám* that exist throughout Stó:lō Territory, figuratively but also literally grounding Stó:lō people's identity past, present and future to *S'ólh Téméxw*. Each Stó:lō individual therefore bears the responsibility to learn and transmit accurately the narratives of their village that make up part of the tapestry of the collective origins of all Stó:lō and link that village to specific resources. Salish Scholar Wayne Suttles elaborates on the contemporary relationship between Stó:lō people and mythical figures which forms the basis of ties between Stó:lō people and the natural resources in their Territory:

Traditional local groups usually told how the group's founder dropped from the sky, where the transformer gave him technical or ritual knowledge, and where he established special relationships with local resources. Marriage with non-humans established an affinal relationship with obligations of reciprocity.[27]

Sonny explains the relationship between maintaining this knowledge and Stó:lō right and title:

Sxwōxwiyám is so important because just about every village has their own stories, like it almost seems like wherever there is a village they have a Sxwōxwiyám that attaches them to that place, either a unique resource area or it could be a mountain or rock and that becomes part of them, that's their Sxwōxwiyám, that becomes part of their identity, part of their attachment of the land… What really makes it unique though and what is at the core of our relationship to the land and the core of our Aboriginal Right and Title is the word "Shxwelí.[28]

[25] Sonny McHalsie Interview Page 5
[26] Herb Joe Interview Page 16
[27] Suttles In Sturtevant: 1990: 466
[28] Sonny McHalsie Interview Page 5

Central to understanding caretaking for resources is the concept of *shxwelí*, which describes the "spirit or life force" that connects Stó:lō to all resources; resources alive with the spirit of ancestors articulated in *Sxwōxwiyám*.[29] The late Stó:lō Elder Rosaleen George shared teachings about the meaning, value and nature of s*hxwelí* to Sonny McHalsie (*Naxaxalhts'i*), who described these teachings and the importance of understanding how shxwelí defines caretaking responsibilities in our interview:

I went to see the late Rosaleen George and that's what she said, I asked her "what is shxwelí?" and she puts her hand on her chest and says "shxwelí is inside here, your parents, your grandparents, your great, great grandparents, your great, great, great grandparents it's in the rocks, it's in the trees, it's in the grass, it's in the ground." So you look at that word and shxwelí is in everything, including ourselves and including our ancestors. So that is what connects us to everything that is around us. So they say the shxwelí of those ancestors is still inside those resources, the black bear, the beaver, the mountain goat or whatever. It's still inside that stone or mountain, then we have a close attachment to it, its part of us. So that creates relationship that we have. So it's not just a rock out in the forest, it's got the shxwelí of our ancestors in there, and we have a shxwelí so we're connected and it's important for us to take care of that. So that's a responsibility that lies with all Stó:lō people because all Stó:lō people have a shxwelí and all those resources, the stones and mountains they have a shxwelí, every Stó:lō person is connected through the shxwelí to those things."[30]

The concept of *shxwelí* described by Sonny McHalsie similarly articulated in Herb Joe's father's teachings of the Fraser River as animate reflect a cultural and spiritual dimension integral to a Stó:lō perspective of resource management. The relationship between Stó:lō and the natural world is one which centres on notions of animacy articulated in the concept of shxwelí and related teachings, and as such, reciprocation is at the centre of the process by which access, use, control and ownership is defined.

The second type of Stó:lō oral history is *Sqwélqwel* ("family history, true news"). Much more than genealogy in Euro-Canadian terms, it reflects not only family history, but relationships to resources, which are viewed as extended family members and it is the responsibility of all Stó:lō to care for this knowledge. As access to resources was historically determined through marriage, knowing one's family history impacted social, political, cultural, spiritual and economic dimensions of community life. Sonny McHalsie (*Naxaxalhts'i*) explains the relationship between *Sqwélqwel* and individual caretaking responsibilities:

The whole concept or principle or teaching of Sqwélqwel is that it is the responsibility of everyone; everyone has to follow that rule or law to look after the places that their ancestors used; to use them and maintain them. Not just to use them, but to maintain them as well. [31]

Stó:lō oral history (both *Sqwélqwel* and *Sxwōxwiyám*) which has existed since time immemorial forms the "laws" and "constitution" of the land and informs all aspects of Stó:lō life, identity and resource management. The accuracy of this record is protected and

[29] Sonny McHalsie Interview Page 6
[30] Sonny McHalsie interview Page 6
[31] Sonny McHalsie Interview Page 2

maintained through an oral tradition[32] which includes a number of practices and protocols such as calling witnesses, covering individuals with ancestral names and the teaching methods by which oral histories were transmitted.

As Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) states "how did you remember an event? Well, it was passed on from generation in the smokehouse and that became *Sxwōxwiyám* over the thousands of years. So it became engrained in the way you were brought up."[33]

While caretaking responsibilities allocated to the entire community (language, river, *Sqwélqwel*, *Sxwōxwiyám*) may fall under the programs and policies of Stó:lō Nation or Stó:lō Tribal Council, they reflect a form of moral caretaking to be assumed by all Stó:lō people, whether living on or off *S'ólh Téméxw*. Elder Jeff Point (*A:yai:seleq*) further asserts why to know one's history is essential because *"...to recognize where you've come from and where you're going is the biggest responsibility of all Stó:lō people. Because if you don't know that you're lost within your own being, within your own self."* [34]

It is up to villages to collectively bear responsibilities for a number of resources. These include: the aforementioned *Sxwōxwiyám* of their particular village, the watershed which exists within the village,[35] harvesting and maintenance of berry brush done by method of controlled burn[36], hunting grounds[37] and fasting/bathing grounds[38]. It is the responsibility of villages to care for Stó:lō burial mounds[39] that exist within their village boundaries.

It is the responsibility of families to care for a number of resources. It was asserted by many that it is at this level of "jurisdiction" where cultural authority primarily lays. The salmon fishing spots and dry racks in the Five Mile fishery in the Fraser Canyon are a primary example of the enacted system of hereditary based caretaking responsibilities. Under the stewardship of a *Sia:teleq*, a fishing grounds co-ordinator, use and access of the dry racks and their accompanying fishing spots are managed. Management of this resource includes knowledge of the "spot" itself, fishing techniques, wind drying techniques, but also extensive knowledge of family history or *Sqwélqwel* to ensure that all immediate and extended family have time and space allocated to them to fish and wind dry. These responsibilities are passed down through generations to a chosen member of a particular family.

Further to this, families, particularly women, are also the "owners" of ancestral names and the keepers of the knowledge and practices associated with an ancestral name. However, it is the responsibility of the individual covered with an ancestral name to live up to the

---

[32] Scholar Donald Fixico (Shawnee, Sac and Fox, Muscogee, Creek, and Seminole)distinguishes between oral history and oral tradition: oral history is the "event told orally", while oral tradition is the process or vehicle for transmitting this same reality of past to present. Further, oral history contains the oral tradition of native groups in the forms of "oratory, myths, legends, songs, parables and prophecy." (Fixico: 2003: 32)

[33] Herb Joe Interview Page 14

[34] Jeff Point Interview Page 2

[35] See Sonny McHalsie interview, Herb Joe Interview.

[36] See Sonny McHalsie, Frank Malloway Interview.

[37] See Dalton Silver, Sonny McHalsie Interview.

[38] See Sonny McHalsie, Frank Malloway Interviews.

[39]Burial mounds and cemeteries were described as distinct. While they bear similarity as places where Stó:lō ancestors are laid to rest, the amount of time elapsed since the burial impacts caretaking responsibilities. This distinction, and protocols associated with their care, will be discussed in more detail later on in this report.

responsibilities associated with it. It was also stated that families bear the caretaking responsibilities associated with gravesites of their family members.

As far as individual caretaking responsibilities, it is the responsibility of individuals to find out about their ancestral name and the caretaking responsibilities associated with it. Knowledge of one's ancestral name and its responsibilities comprise a single piece of a "puzzle" which connects the shared responsibilities between individuals, families, villages and the entire community. It is also the responsibility of individuals who have received teachings to harvest medicinal plants and then share this natural resource and its associated knowledge with those in need in the greater community.

It is similarly the responsibility of individuals who are engaged in spiritual activities, particularly the use of fasting and bathing sites, to care for and maintain these sites as part of their use.

The Distinction between Concepts of Ownership and Caretaking

In exploring Stó:lō concepts of ownership and caretaking, we examined issues regarding -- What does caretaking "authority" mean among Stó:lō? Does it also involve ownership? How close is this to a non-Stó:lō idea of property ownership? Given the centrality of this concept to our research, we asked the question "What is the difference between ownership and caretaking?" It is an essential starting point, as stressed by a number of interviewees, to understand that Stó:lō concepts of ownership differ from western law and tradition. Such recognition does not suggest a difference in weight of ownership, even if the nature of relations to land and resources is expressed differently, as filtered through a Stó:lō cultural framework of land title and tenure. It is imperative not to confuse or underplay Stó:lō concepts of caretaking responsibilities and/or collective ownership as carrying less weight or authority than notions of ownership in western society. Stó:lō land tenure systems, as it was stressed throughout this study, carry weight of ownership among the Stó:lō collective equivalent to that of western expressions of ownership.

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) provided clear insight into this concept: "We don't own the world, we are a part of the world; we are a part of the world we live in."[40] This understanding reflects a concept of ownership much closer to stewardship. While caretaking involves notions of use, control whereby access is determined and restricted, it also embodies a moral and spiritual ownership which necessitates care, maintenance and protection of the all resources in an extensive system of reciprocity.

Building on this, we asked interviewees what the difference between ownership and caretaking was and found that according to the Stó:lō people we spoke with, ownership resembled something much closer to the concept of stewardship for it emphasizes taking care more so than principles of private land tenure and possessive individualism that characterizes non-Stó:lō property law.

[40] Herb Joe Interview Page 5

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) explains why the term "ownership" does not reflect a complete understanding of Stó:lō caretaking for *S'ólh Téméxw*:

[It] "goes back to a concept of land tenure, which was a completely foreign concept to us – how could we own something that's living? You know, it's like I don't own my sister or my brother, they are special human beings. So, it's the same thing with all of the land and everything that's around us. We were taught to see the world around us in that manner. So the ownership of the land and the resources that were around, no human being owned it. But that's not to say there weren't caretakers for those resources and there were specific families for instance that had that responsibility." [41]

While cultural principles and understandings which forms the basis of a Stó:lō relationship with the land have endured, it is without having these relationships have not been stretched and taxed over the course of past century. Quite the opposite in fact – Stó:lō people are struggling, literally for their lives, to carry forward teachings which were subverted and disrupted via the residential school experience, the anti-potlatch laws[42], assimilationist policies and the impact of modern technologies and a Western influences of individualism and materialism. Examples of this disruption and its sustained impact on caretaking practices were plentiful in our interviews. Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) describes how band and reserve community identities often clash with enacting caretaking responsibilities:

And I think that is something that isn't stressed enough in the contemporary world we live in today, its more individualistic in terms of our responsibilities growing into adulthood and then further on through our lives, we all think more about individual tasks…And I would think if we were to extend those responsibilities to, for instance, the natural resources that are around us, then for instance, on my coat here, it has "Ch'iyáqtel First Nation". Well, the word Ch'iyáqtel is the name of the First Nation that I belong to now, but historically it was a place name. It was "Tzeach" in our ancient language which was a descriptive word used to describe a fish trap or fish weir. And "Ch'iyáqtel" is the place where you go to trap fish, so it was a name place. Of course, the Chilliwack River flowed right through the middle of our reserve and when the salmon were spawning what they did was build a fence right across the river and had a weir so that the fish would go into it and be caught there and then the people would go in and harvest what they needed and then take what they needed and go then one family would move in or other families would move in and take what they needed. So it was a place where you went to fish and trap fish. Our responsibility as each of the families was to take what we needed and only what we needed, but look after the fish weirs because it was for the benefit of all of our community, all of our families, not just one family…today they might say "this part of the fish weir is on our side of the river and we look after it, but I don't want to look after the one on your side of the River." Well, historically that wasn't part of the way they thought, they would

[41] Herb Joe Interview Pages 6-7

[42] The impact of this policy is described in *A Coast Salish Historical Atlas*: The 1884 'anti-potlatch' amendment to the Indian Act designated the large property-transfer gatherings a crime. This policy was significant for Stó:lô peoples in that the " banning of the potlatch made it illegal to publically transfer hereditary names and their associated property-ownership rights between generations. Small scale informal transfers continued, but the absence of public ceremonies where such decisions could be effectively communicated to people throughout the territory caused competing claims of ownership to pit individuals and families against one another without formal mechanisms for resolution."[42] (Carlson: 2001: 59)

have thought "ok, well, we're here and we all look after the whole thing because it is going to benefit us all. And if the fish weir goes down then none of us get anything.

Elder Joe Aleck (*Siyamalaxw*) stresses that the key difference between the concepts of ownership and caretaking involves principles of sharing: "That's a good question, because in our culture, our language, the word "ownership" doesn't really come in, it's more a sharing, in everything, everything you do. And caring, to take care of something, or somebody, like we mentioned the trees, the wild strawberries, you got to take care of it. Don't waste it… "You only take what you need, and that's it. If you're helping your family or people who need it, do it well." That's a teaching eh?" [43]

Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) reiterates this point about ownership, noting: "I never hear those words, even though I wasn't born that long ago." For as he describes: while access to resources was provided to all, it was accompanied by a responsibility as well. He describes the use of a canoe as an example "my father in law -he had a canoe up the river and somebody would come along and say "I've got to set a net, I need to use your canoe" "yeah" he'd say. People use things when they need it and it was always returned. You can't do that today. You go to your neighbours and take something they would charge you with stealing even if you asked."[44]

Many interviewees spoke of the impact the band and reserve system had on caretaking, which led people to focus on their own small piece of land, not the connections between resources and principles of sharing central to Stó:lō life. Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) explains:

Really, the imposition of European culture, especially ideas of land ownership, the whole thing's really upset the natural responsibilities of the people who lived on and used the resources of the land. The geographic boundaries that were part of the Federal Government's establishment of Indian reserves was very, very confining and restrictive in that it didn't allow people to actually move about the Territories to gather the resources that they needed to survive. And to do that you had to be mobile enough to move to where the resources were actually. And if you were on one of the reservations that restricted you, for example the reserve I grew up on was Tzeachten, or Ch'iyáqtel, it was a very small geographic area that had nothing going for it other than the salmon going through to spawn in the fall; summer and fall. So what were the resources that you had available to you the rest of the year? Very little.[45]

Perhaps not surprisingly, there were concerns raised by multiple interviewees about having Stó:lō concepts of caretaking misconstrued as not carrying the same weight or authority as western notions of ownership. Jeff Point (*A:yai:seleq*) describes misconceptions about ownership and caretaking:

We are the caretakers of this land and that's what we believe. Because we only pass through. I'm only here now until I wait out the rest of my life if I live to eighty five! But you know, they don't see it that way. They see it that you should own it before you can put out, say treaty rights. But they don't see it through our eyes. They see it "if you don't own that piece of land

[43] Joe Aleck Interview Page 13
[44] Frank Malloway Interview Page 14
[45] Herb Joe Interview Page 9

than that don't belong to you" but we see it as, I see it as a two process thing: I own it, I'm the caretaker of it because I do own it. Until I leave. So it's my right to look after it, I mean I have to take care of it because I do own it right now. But I'll never take it with me because I'm going to die soon so it goes to my son or grandson or whoever is left here to care. We got to teach them to take care of it because they're going to be the next owners of it until they're gone…Because if you say you "own it" then you are dishonouring the spirits of the past that taught us to that you can't own it because it don't belong to you and that's right. You can never own anything and that's something that's been told to us time after time. You can't even own this (gestures) and that's something that's been proven. [46]

Caretaking of resources in a Stó:lō worldview does not involve only notions of responsibility or obligation but also a sense of privilege or honour, as Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*) describes:

...when you talk about resources and things, there's hunting, there's gathering, but there are different things, too – cultural resources and things like that. Families, extended families, look after some sacred items that we don't really talk about. Certain families look after these things. I guess it belongs to those families, that you carry the privilege, the right, to carry those things. [47]

However, the importance of treating resources as relations and therefore honouring notions of sustainability does not exclude Stó:lō from participating in resource extraction and participation in a wage economy which draws upon these resources. Fishing and logging, as well as harvesting berries and medicines are all currently done commercially and while there is debate within the community about the best way to balance this economy with principles of caretaking, there is no doubt that harvesting resources for exchange (sale and trade) has always been a part of Stó:lō life. Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*) uses the example of fishing to describe this moral dimension to Stó:lō resource management and sales, stating: "We've always felt it was our right to sell fish to use it to help sustain the families. But if you sell fish and use the funds to create illegal activities than that's a different story."[48]

The moral dimension of caretaking extends in a contemporary setting to restrict access and use of resources to people who choose to profit in an individualistic or unhealthy manner from access, use or control of resources.

As Darwin Douglas (*Eyteleq*) explains, caretaking involves building a relationship with the resources in *S'ólh Téméxw*:

It's important to use it, to interact with it and build that relationship with it and understand it. Then you understand "how do we take care of this?" and basically you're not so much taking care of the land, the Earth takes care of itself, it's your taking care of your relationship to that spot that is providing something for you, whether its food or resources or whatever, spiritual well-being, its providing you with something. And you have to keep that relationship – the use and that relationship alive. This is a big part of the problem with the fishery is that you're only

[46] Jeff Point Interview Page 22
[47] Dalton Silver Interview Page 5
[48] Sid Douglas Interview Page 10

out there for eight hours and you're fishing like a mad man and you lose the relationship that you have – like it's nice to go and sit out and "hey we have four days" and I mean we used to have twenty four seven for as long as the fish are there and now it just gets cut back and cut back and cut back and now it's just like you've got six hours and "boom!" you've got to go home.[49]

While non-Stó:lō resource management strategies tend to view resources located in the natural world as objects and products to be handled and managed, caretaking for these resources in accordance with Stó:lō cultural laws is centred on a relationship between man and resource which involves a moral and spiritual dimension.

What can be concluded from our discussions on this topic is that a Stó:lō concept of ownership is different from non-western ideas of ownership in three distinct ways: (1) a Stó:lō view of time and relations with the natural world as existing and/or promoting sustainably in balance or harmony with future and past generations (implicit within the term *tómiyeqw*[50]); and (2) ideas of animacy expressed through the concept of *shxwelí* link Stó:lō people to all non-human resources in familial relationships; and (3) Stó:lō caretaking practices are unique and distinct from western notions of ownership, being centered upon a unique relationship with the land, including moral, ancestral and spiritual dimensions and which hinges on reciprocity (i.e., must give in order to take) -- supporting an equivalency of weight between Stó:lō and western concepts of ownership as a foundation upon which care-taking responsibilities are played out.

The Connection between Ancestral Names and Caretaking

Ancestral names are an integral aspect of Stó:lō identity, history and culture and constitute the core of caretaking responsibilities. Ancestral names are names carried by members of previous generations and given to individuals when they are deemed to be ready to carry the rights and responsibilities attached to that particular name. Potential ancestral names suitable for an individual are chosen by Elders, (typically grandmas), who carry the knowledge of the character traits and life skills and knowledge associated with the particular ancestor. The name is then presented to the individual in a ceremony witnessed by members of the immediate family and greater community, (referred to as "being covered with a name"). Elder Joe Aleck (*Siyamalaxw*) describes the relationship between an ancestral names and responsibility to the greater community:

I talk to our people in the longhouse about getting an ancestral name, what you must do is research that name and you are borrowing a name of our leader so you must look after it. So you're standing here getting your name, so don't dirty it. You respect your culture, your

[49] Darwin Douglas Interview Page 15

[50] In *Stó:lō* culture a special link exists between the past, present and future. We express this connection in many ways. In *Halq'emeylem*, for instance, we have the word *tómiyeqw* which translates into English as both great-great-great-great-grandparent and great-great-great-great-grandchild. The relationship expressed in this word connects people seven generations past with those seven generations in the future. The connection between the past and future rests with those of use living today." (*Stó:lō Heritage Policy Manual*, 2003, page 5)

ancestry and whoever held that name. You have to respect it, not only that individual, but the family and community.[51]

Elder Jeff Point (*A:yai:seleq*)describes the connection between ancestral names and caretaking, and the importance of maintaining and protecting this knowledge:

People who carried the history of our people…they were selected out of all of the people right from birth…to learn the history of our people so they were taught real young and this is what my mom told me and my uncle… they were selected from when they were small and they were taught from right before they could walk, they were fed all the history. Told everything; how our people began and everything. So, there's different things that involved the health of our people. A lot of the health of our people involves the history of where you come from and where your people started from eh? And most of that is gone. And that's the beginnings of the health of our people. I know when my mom used to tell us, she was from Semá:th, eh? And her Elders sat her down and told her, her and her brother – and this ties in with the question about the names and our culture – and she was told starting off with one name and told the history of that name and where it came from and who it came to in the beginning of time and where it's supposed to go from one person to another and how it's supposed to travel in the family. [52]

There are examples of ancestral names being linked to caretaking of a particular geographic feature. Jeff Point (*A:yai:seleq*) provides one example of this cultural method of ascribing caretaking: "Well…we were territorial. And to mark out the Stó:lō Territory there was boundaries…My uncle, one of my uncles from Lummi came over and asked my mom for Indian name for his son and she said 'Mount Baker is the boundary for Coast Salish people and it has been since our people have been living so I carry the responsibility for looking after that name so I'll give it to you to give your son'…and that's what they called him and it went over to Lummi and they put up a gathering and stood him up…"[53]

Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*)notes that recently Elders are reviving ancestral names for youth which are associated with certain physical resources in *S'ólh Téméxw* so as to ensure the continued care, use and maintenance of such places. Cultural revival of this practice determined is by some community members to be a useful method of getting youth engaged culturally and therefore protecting *S'ólh Téméxw*. Could it be that ancestral names of this type are a strategy for cultural survival?

Case Studies, Caretaking Protocols and Practices Enacted

Once we discussed the multiple levels of caretaking authority which exist, starting from the broadest (all Stó:lō) to tribes, villages, families, then individuals, and concepts of caretaking and ownership, we discussed how these responsibilities are enacted. While caretaking protocols required for access/use/management of resources are unique to a particular type of resource, they are spiritual, political, social and physical and now legal in nature and must be understood as having existed since time immemorial while flexing in form.

[51] Joe Aleck Interview Page 8
[52] Jeff Point Interview Pages 2-3
[53] Jeff Point Interview Page 3

As part of this research, a number of case studies have emerged which highlight the diverse strategies utilized to ensure the proper control care, use, management of the resources.

While there are distinct caretaking protocols associated with the access, use and control of the resources within *S'ólh Téméxw* which are presented below, Joe Aleck's (*Siyamalaxw*) statement during our interview about general principles of caretaking serves as a guideline for management:

The Stó:lō people, we have stories about animals too: bears and deer and elk and everything you can think of really, have some reason to be here and have teachings associated with them. That's why we're taught not to go out and kill everything you know? That animal has a life, has a spirit. Even that plant over there. Why does it grow? There's something in it that makes it grow, it has a spirit. Even that rock over there, we have to take care of it, it's looking after you. Take care of everything.[54]

Case Study #1: Transformation Places

There are multiple transformation objects which exist throughout *S'ólh Téméxw* as natural features of the land which have accompanying origin stories and teachings, or *Sxwōxwiyám*. These physical features literally "map" the Stó:lō world and provide a deep sense of place and identity with the natural world.

As Sonny McHalsie (*Naxaxalhts'i*) explains, it is the responsibility of all Stó:lō to care for *Sxwōxwiyám*, but as each village has a different *Sxwōxwiyám* which links them to different resources and animals, a responsibility lies with the village group to carry and maintain this *Sxwōxwiyám* and teachings associated with it. Sonny provides an example:

If you look at an ancestor that comes from a particular village, so like at O'hamel and Chawathil, that man and that woman that were transformed into the sturgeon, they're the ancestors of the people from that village, somewhere, I don't know, hundreds, or thousands of years ago when that man and woman were transformed into the sturgeon, that creates the responsibility of those communities then, because both those communities carry the same stories, Chawathil and O'hamel. So then it does create this village responsibility, a connection to the village and no other village can connect to that story because it came from that village, it creates that responsibility. But then it's the sturgeon, and the sturgeon is all over right? And then of course, Leq'á:mél, they have their own version, a different version of their ancestor being transformed into a sturgeon as well. But then when you get to things like T'xwelatse, well, T'xwelatse was an ancestor that was transformed to stone and of course that responsibility was passed down to the women in the family and then the person who has the ancestral name, like Herb Joe and one of the Roberts[55] *...there's a responsibility that they have as far as the Sqwélqwel to understand who carried that name before them because after T'xwelatse was transformed into stone, later one, his descendants still carried on his name and the importance of his name was always there. His memory taps into that story so then that*

[54] Joe Aleck Interview Page 14
[55] Full name Simon Roberts

creates that responsibility to the individual who carries that name but then it's also spread out, it's the responsibility of the woman to actually look after the stone. So if you look at Sxwōxwiyám and it's a large responsibility of everyone to care take all of the stories, all of the animals, all of the resources, all of the mountains, all of the rocks. It's a big responsibility that we have to respect everyone's stories. And then there's the community, our own individual – like if it's a resource, like the example of the sturgeon that I gave at O'hamel, down Matsqui it's the beaver, in Popkum it's the mountain goat and so on. So all those different villages have that attached to them. [56]

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) further explains how caretaking responsibilities for stone *T'xwelátse* are carried by the entire family, even though he has been given the ancestral name *T'xwelátse*:

Well, these tasks, responsibilities are more in tune with the whole family, they are family responsibilities. And I, as a member of that family, or a member of that "team" of caregivers have to play my part and that is more about how the Stó:lō, and I am sure many other tribes, I'm sure all the other tribes think about their responsibilities of looking after the world around us, that we are a minute part of that world. But we have to be responsible for that minute part of the world. If the whole world is to flow naturally and healthy and safely then our part has to be taken care of. Our responsibility has to be looked after. And I think that's more the way that I was taught about responsibility and for being a caregiver for the world that we live in.

Caretaking responsibilities for transformation objects therefore rest with an individual who has been chosen through their name to become knowledgeable of and share that particular *Sxwōxwiyám* on behalf of the family, or collective of families, which make up a village group. This structure of responsibility repeats itself multiple times throughout the families of *S'ólh Téméxw*. Currently, as all numbered reserves do not exist on historical village sites, a caretaker for a particular transformation object may reside in a different band or reserve than the object itself but still have been given the responsibility to care for it by their family or families linked to the resource.

Case Study #2: Hereditary caretaking system for fishing and wind drying in the Five Mile Fishery of the Fraser Canyon.

The Fraser Canyon is a unique geographic place; and Stó:lō *Sxwōxwiyám* demonstrate that since time immemorial Stó:lō families have continually occupied the Fraser Canyon region during the summer months to make use of the relatively warm climate and strong breezes which provide the ideal conditions for sockeye fishing and the preservation of this salmon by the wind drying technique. Stó:lō peoples have accessed and utilized the Fraser Canyon for fishing and related sustenance activities (harvesting of materials such as nettle or yew wood for

[56] Sonny McHalsie Interview Page 10

fishing poles), social activities (socializing and working alongside families to maintain camp), economic activities (trading and then selling fish to First Nations and *Xwelítem* for various goods) and ceremonial activities (gathering resources for ceremonial purposes) since time immemorial. There are multiple methods Stó:lō people use to cure salmon including smoking, canning and wind drying which prior to the arrival of *Xwelítem*, was the preferred practice to preserve the fish as no modern refrigeration existed. However, wind drying in the region is limited to the month of July and early August, as conditions at this time are ideal for wind drying – warm breezes blow through the narrow canyon and flies and bees which eat the hanging fish are yet to appear.

There are a number of Stó:lō fishing families who have dry rack and fishing spots in the canyon. Access to dry rack locations and their accompanying fishing spots is determined through marriage and family connection to the place.

While Department of Fisheries ("DFO") regulates the catch of fish allowed by dry racker's, there has never been a time in Stó:lō history where dry racker's have had to ask permission of a Band or Nation to access, use and maintain the canyon dryracks as will be the case if the Yale Treaty is ratified as it is currently written. Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*), whose family has a fish camp in the canyon, describes how access to dry rack's was granted:

We never really ask permission, it was an unwritten law that you could use somebody else's place and if they showed up you would pull out, that's the way we grew up. Other people fished our site and we fished their sites when they weren't there.[57]

Darwin Douglas (*Eyteleq*) describes the cultural dislocation produced by restricted access to canyon fishing and dry racking resulting from DFO:

I mean the traditional knowledge that our Elders gained…was passed down, but it's from being there and interacting and learning and "oh the waters doin g this right now. Look at the fish. What are the fish doing? Where are they travelling? What are they doing?" all of this is so important.[58]

Many Stó:lō families who use canyon dryracks are also members of the Seabird Island Band – a reflection of the complex interplay between varied expression of Stó:lō collective identity. This is in part why our opportunity to engage with multiple dryracker's in our group interview provided such a unique opportunity. The following is a Summary of main points:

- Access to canyon fishery was never given up, never sold.
- Family history or *sqwélqwel* determines Stó:lō rights to canyon fishery. As one interviewee stated "We must stand together" as dry rack fishermen, and "look at who we are originally, not as separate bands, but as Stó:lō".
- Five Mile Fishery was intended for all Stó:lō, not just Yale. Six ancient cemeteries and statement on destroyed *I:yem* memorial illustrate this.

[57] Sid Douglas Interview Page 3
[58] Darwin Douglas Interview Page 14

- Access to canyon fishery being restricted as a result of Yale Treaty a major concern: it was argued Stó:lō do not need permission to access, use and maintain this resource: "Our rights come from who we are."

- Yale people are Stó:lō, connections described here and elsewhere in interviews.

- In addition to providing fish to families, there is a lot more to dry racking than the curing of fish – as one individual stated, that use includes "the time spent, teachings, medicines and how we bring up our children, and are all irreplaceable". Interaction with the canyon and fellow Stó:lō in this setting central to the maintenance of Stó:lō cultural life and forms an inseparable aspect of Stó:lō identity and history.

- Other interviewees reiterated the value of a collective of families to represent the unique concerns of dryrackers. Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough)* states: *"I guess individual families should be aware of what's going on. It's probably a collective that's going to make it survive. You know like one individual family is not going to be able to keep it going on their own. It has to be a number of families that do it and learn how to work together."* [59]

What remained consistent through our meeting was that there needs to be increased dialogue and relationship building between dryrackers and other parties interested in regulating this resource (e.g., Yale First Nation, DFO, Federal and Provincial Governments).

Case Study #3 Caretaking Responsibilities of Gravesites and Burial Mounds

These resources, while similar, require different treatment. Burial mounds are described to be spiritually more potent than gravesites and therefore require different protocols for their care. As too much time may have passed to know the identity of the ancestors in a burial mound, the caretaking responsibility for this resource lays with the village where it is located and can involve the handling of trained spiritual people from other Stó:lō villages if necessary. More contemporary gravesites, where the burial of known Stó:lō family members has occurred, are to be cared for by immediate family members.

As Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) stated, caretaking responsibilities for the physical cemeteries lies with the immediate and extended family of those deceased relatives, although sometimes funding is available at a band level for upkeep and maintenance.[60] However, treatment of ancestors in terms of funeral services as well as spiritual ceremonies (for example a burning) calls upon trained spiritual practitioners. Ivan McIntyre (*Qwosqwesten*) carries this caretaking responsibility along with a small group of other trained spiritual people in his community of Seabird Island. When asked about the distinction between grave mounds and cemeteries and the protocols associated in their treatment, he stated:

Gravemounds are more delicate and dangerous because of the gifts that the people had when they were alive. And they're powerful. I'm not saying, even the cemetery now, we've got to

[59] Sid Douglas Interview Page 3
[60] Frank Malloway Interview Page 14-15

respect that too, but it's a little bit different with the gravemounds. It's not really cared for like the way we do in the cemetery. You can't go in there. The cemetery anyone can go in there. [61]

He describes one case where he inadvertently broke spiritual protocol in the treatment of a gravemound and its consequences:

There are so many gravemounds on Seabird that – I don't know if I mentioned it before when we talked, but they were going to clear the land where the gravemounds were and when we were younger we got told to "stay out of there." Everybody got told that by the Elders not to go in there and I just happened to be looking for Maple, Maple Trees, certain Maple trees and I went in there and I looked around. I went up to a tree and looked up at it and I wasn't looking at where I was walking and this Maple Tree was growing right beside this mound. And all of a sudden I felt my legs go numb, from my knees down and I looked down and I seen what I was standing on and it was a gravemound and I don't know how I recognized it, but I seen it as a gravemound. But there's one mound in there that is about one hundred feet long and sixty feet wide. And I don't know how many people are in that – that was from when that smallpox epidemic went through and they're all over in there. That's right beside our cemetery.[62]

Disturbance of gravemounds can lead to serious consequences, and Ivan warns the access, use and maintenance of lands where gravemounds exist must follow proper protocols

…or they'll do what they done to me to get my attention. I had to get a spiritual healer from the States, Doby Tom, to take that off. Because my legs from my knees down stayed numb and to this day it bothers me but it's just a reminder I guess. I am still walking yet, so I'm not really worried about it. If I worry about it, I'll get sick.[63]

There are protocols and practices which are put in place to mitigate the spread of spiritual sickness such as the numbness in his legs Ivan described. Ivan hosts burnings, a means of honouring the ancestors and keeping the community spiritually safe "That's why we look after it by having an annual burning, to feed them, eh? And ask for their help."[64]

Ivan Macintyre (*Qwosqwesten*) shares knowledge about how to care for the cemetery along with a group of community members at his band of Seabird Island including Caz Peters, Junior Pettis, Rudy Leon. They advise and are currently working with some young men passing on "…the teachings. How to dig the grave and when to do it, how to handle the loved one when they come from the funeral home and stuff like that. All those little things we have to go by and we can get hurt spiritually if we don't do it properly." In terms of how someone is chosen to become a caretaker of a cemetery, Ivan states: "We ask a lot of young fellows to come and if they're interested they come. We don't really try to force anybody."[65]

Ivan Macintyre (*Qwosqwesten*) further describes that in terms of gender, only men participate in caring for the cemeteries, although women look after the cooking[66] and although

[61] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 4-5
[62] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 3
[63] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 5
[64] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 5
[65] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 7
[66] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 5

there are differing views of this among Stó:lō. However, Ivan remains resilient in his belief in this protocol, stating it must be this way because "we just don't want to see anyone get hurt spiritually."

In terms of who bears caretaking responsibility for funeral services and care of grave mounds, Ivan states that he and the group at Seabird Island not only advise their community but will travel to neighbouring communities: "We go, if we're asked to go and help at a funeral or whatever on an Indian reserve, we go. If we're asked. But a lot of times we go there and they haven't got any help. Then we have to step in, but we try not to force ourselves."[67]

From what certain Stó:lō interviewee's stated, cemeteries require different care than burial mounds. Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) says that it is the responsibility of family members of the deceased to assume caretaking responsibility:

My dad used to teach me if you have somebody buried in the cemetery you look after it. You kept it clean. Today the people they think the Chief and the Councillors are responsible for that. They're not responsible for keeping the cemetery clean; it's the people whose own relatives are there, they're the ones responsible to clean it. Things like that, you know, you got to remind them "it's your responsibility, not ours" people always try to rely on the Chief.[68]

Case Study #4 Hunting Grounds

Access to hunting grounds is provided to hunters through family connection, marriage or invitation. No one particular tribal, village or family group "owned" access to hunting grounds, as Chief Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*), who hunts extensively states:

I think it's just cared for – I don't know that you out and out "own" a certain area, especially as far as hunting goes. I mean there may be certain places where certain people in a tribal group will know … then there'd be other people who hunted that area as well. I think there used to be...people used to hunt in groups more or less. But I know my uncle used to hunt with Clarence Ned and though they were in two different familie; they hunted the same area together or with other siblings.

Caretaking for hunting grounds involved protocols of reciprocation associated with their use, which Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*) describes:

If you looked after the resources in a good way then that pretty much was all that was expected. But out of respect for the caregivers, you might give them a gift. For instance, if you came from a part of our Territory that had particularly good hunting, you might bring a deer or a moose or something of that nature and share that with that family, the caregiver of the cranberry field. So those are the kinds of reciprocal relationships that I was told about.[69]

[67] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 8
[68] Frank Malloway Pages 14-15
[69] Herb Joe Interview Page 17

Access to hunting grounds was restricted historically if proper protocols were not followed:

There's stories about hunters going and running into people in other Territories where they didn't share the same language and there would have been a communication breakdown and sometimes violence would occur, right? Some people got protective. Because I've heard some stories about the Ts'elxwéyeqw people were pretty protective of their hunting territories unless you had connection. If there was a total intruder into the hunting territory then you had to watch out for that, an uninvited person coming in and taking from your resources wasn't taken too kindly, right? [70]

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) describes hunting protocols taught to him by his uncle:

Uncle Joe [Louis] used to teach me, he said: "You know, if you're gonna be a hunter, you're going to have to learn to start from the ground up. The first thing we're gonna do is we're gonna go for a bath." I would say "aren't we going hunting?" and he'd say "we're not going hunting until the weekend!" We had to prepare for it. He didn't say we had to fast, but we had to "eat right" as he said it, what he told me. Then he would take me down to the river and go for a bath. And then finally he told me why. He said "we're eating like this we're bathing every day like this to prepare for the hunt" he said "do you know why?" and I said "no" and he said "you don't want to go out there to hunt and smell like a human being." Well "oh, o.k. that makes sense!" he said "that's the respect that you show those animals out there and the world that they live in. It's different than the world we live in." So he said "we have to respect that.

Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*) describes changing protocols for access to hunting grounds:

I think it's changed somewhat. See in some areas where I've gone and hunted it's just like one of my relatives who's a hunter in the area has just invited me to hunt. Or some people might say "I talked to the chief" or whatever. But I think in the past it wasn't necessary to talk to the chief, it was your relatives that invited you. But I know in some areas I talk to the Chief, like in the Okanagan, I talk to the Grand Chief of the Okanagan council and he says "he's a good friend and as far as he's concerned he can come and hunt. [71]

He describes how Provincial legislation has changed and how access to traditional hunting grounds is provided:

They gave me a letter, like an open invite to come and hunt in their territory. And that's something that in the past it would be, they would just give you the nod or whatever to come, So what's happening is some are passing letters around. I know some who say "you don't need a letter, just come out." A letter from the Chief or council office saying you have permission and a lot of guys do that now. But the letter I got was after the fact, when the Provincial authorities had been harassing us a bit. [72]

[70] Dalton Silver Interview Page 3
[71] Dalton Silver Interview Page 6
[72] Dalton Silver Interview Page 6

However, certain protocols associated with use of hunting grounds remain consistent as Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*) describes:
I've talked to some leaders from up in the interior and there are a couple of different places – like the Kooteney where I don't have relatives but have been invited to hunt there and they have a representative of wildlife and hunting there and all he asks of me is that we used every part of the animal. [73]

Joe Aleck (*Siyamalaxw*) reiterates that there are consequences not following spiritual protocols while hunting:

When we were younger we were sort of taught that we had to leave something. If you take something you have to leave something. Even when we go hunting. A lot of times we get taught that and if we don't– we go out and shoot a deer, we dress the deer, get it ready and everything, get it ready to take home – and low and behold we forget our knife and it's so far up the hill!! And that's something that I don't know whether it's an accident or whatever, but it's something that we treasure and when you're a hunter you need to treasure your knife.[74]

Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*)posits an approach to contemporary regulation of traditional hunting grounds as well as other natural resources: *"What I think is the Government should out and out recognize the protocols that we have amongst ourselves as tribes and not interfere with what we have and have had."* [75]

Case Study #5 Harvesting Of Medicinal Plants, Cedar

Both men and women harvest medicinal plants[76], and Ivan McIntyre (*Qwosqwesten*), who has been taught to harvest medicines in a good way, discussed the teachings he received from his Aunt Birdie. In terms of protocols associated with harvesting, the caretaking responsibility lies with the individual harvesting the medicine to care for and share the knowledge appropriately, while responsibility for the care of the site lies with the community where the resource is located. While it is currently the case in some situations with hunting in another Stó:lō or First Nation's community to get a letter of invite by chief and council to access and use the Territory for hunting, in the case of harvesting medicines, this is not required, although as Ivan states "if we go on another reserve, it's only polite to ask permission to go in there so you know you're not abusing anything eh?"[77]

He explains how he used to harvest cedar with his mother, Jeannie McIntyre, when he was young, along with wild cherry bark near Hicks Lake. However, he harvests medicines now for his own use and the use of other people, but clarifies that this knowledge (of

[73] Dalton Silver Interview Page 4
[74] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 10
[75] Dalton Silver Interview Page 9
[76] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 9
[77] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 9

harvesting sites, techniques) is to remain private, stating: "I don't usually mention what I pick…[b]ecause sometimes when we bring it out [knowledge]we lose it."[78]

When asked "Are there other protocols when harvesting medicines to do it the right way?" Ivan responded that one protocol is to leave tobacco, but more generally that: **"**Well, you got to leave something in order to take something" and stated that this principle of reciprocity involved in caretaking of all resources. [79]

Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) explains overlapping caretaking of resources:

You had other people looking after the streams or the berry field. Like they didn't cultivate berries, but they looked after anything overgrown. Not my dad, but other people like Stan Mussel, he was from Soowahli and Robbie Sepass from Skowkale; when they went hunting up Elk Mountain the berry season was over because it was fall time so they'd burn part of the berry canes, you know? The dead ones, they'd burn them and that way it was like pruning. A controlled burn; and he said they never ran out of berries because all would grow back in spring. They'd grow back their sprouts and the old sprouts would be...if the cane quit producing it was easy to burn and the ones that survived the fire they would produce extra. They looked after berry fields that way, because it was blueberry territory up there on Elk Mountain. That was the only area where I understood that they went up the summer time to dry berries up there. The other place was Leamchen Meadows, that's where the Soowahlie people used to go.[80]

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) describes protocols for access to harvested resources:

So they would be the people that, out of respect, if you wanted to use that resource, say it was a cranberry field, the marshlands – well, one family or the group of families that lived there would be the caretakers and they would be the people who occupied the land there around it. So they would be responsible for looking after it and if you wanted to access that, then out of respect for them, you had to go through them to get access to it…and ask permission. And very often of course, if they were very valuable resources then there were arranged marriages for instance. So that the resources could be shared.[81]

In terms of contemporary maintenance of medicinal plants, Sid Douglas describes an initiative undertaken by the STC Governmental organization to employ a worker to plant and maintain medicinal plants for use by the community.[82] As he notes in his interview, one of the challenges faced by caretakers of all resources is lack of time and funding to participate in such activities on a full time basis in addition to maintaining full time employment. Stó:lō governmental programs could use funding to assist by providing resource management positions such as this to individuals.

[78] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 8
[79] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 10
[80] Frank Malloway Interview Page 4
[81] Herb Joe Interview Page 7
[82] Sid Douglas Interview Page 7

Case Study #5 Caretaking of Spiritual Places: Bathing/Fasting Sites

Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*), who is the caretaker of the Richard Malloway Memorial longhouse at Yakweakwioose where he is Chief, states that the responsibility to care for these places rests with "the people who use them. They don't put that responsibility on anyone else. You want a good place to bathe, you look after it. There was nobody designated to look after it. If you wanted a good private place to swim, you kept it that way."[83] He further states that the integrity of the private nature of the spiritual activities performed at the site can be maintained while still being shared with others who are using it for the same purpose. Protocol states: "You share it with all the people who need to have a swim; you don't hog it for yourself. So a lot of people used to go into different areas and if they wanted privacy they'd go way out to make a spot for themselves and never tell anybody."[84] Frank also clarifies that other neighbouring First Nations groups are provided access to certain spots in *S'ólh Téméxw* for their use in bathing and fasting: When they [people from Saanich and Lummi] came over here they really loved swimming in the Vedder River, Chilliwack River… 'take us swimming uncle' they'd say so I'd take them up there."[85] Although members of a larger smokehouse family, each individual winter dancer bears responsibility to care for and maintain the spot they use.

Cultural Protocols Associated With Caretaking Responsibilities

There are essential and distinct cultural protocols associated with the access, use, maintenance and control of various resources throughout *S'ólh Téméxw*. These protocols enact the principles of reciprocity central to Stó:lō ideas of caretaking. Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*) observes:

We have our First Salmon Ceremony – you know the reason we do that is to recognize our brothers for supplying us with the food. Thanking them for coming back every year and ask them that they would come back and provide for our future generations. You know, the same is when you go out hunting – you pray when you go out. Talk to the Creator. [86]

Elder Joe Aleck (*Siyamalaxw)* describes the process of honouring resources, including salmon:

Our people used to always give something back to the trees; nature, the river when we'd fish. We do a lot of offerings. Like when we have the First Salmon Ceremony at Stó:lō Nation over here, don't…you take care of it…don't throw your entrails or bones or anything back in the bush, you take it back down to the river and thank the mother of all salmon for sending all the salmon up. Respect the river and the water. You send the bones back to the mother of all salmon, and in our language, the mother of all salmon is called "Sthoqwom". [87]

[83] Frank Malloway Interview page 8
[84] Frank Malloway Interview Page 8
[85] Frank Malloway Interview Pages 10-11
[86] Sid Douglas Interview Page 8
[87] Joe Aleck Interview Pages page 12-13

Joe Aleck (*Siyamalaxw*) also describes protocols for using and harvesting cedar:

And they're healers. People talking about hugging a tree and our Elders would say 'go sit down by the tree' or 'go be by the tree' and offer something, tobacco or something and say a prayer and sit there. A lot of things like that. You can dry it and grind it down for your smudge, or use sweet grass, whatever we could get to use in a smudge…you can just say a prayer or make any type of offering that you want...[T]hat's the main thing, where it comes from. Our people used to always give something back to the trees; nature, the river when we'd fish. [88]

Herb Joe (*T'xwelátse*) recalls hunting protocols taught to him by his Uncle Joe [Louis]:

As a hunter I need to share. Share the kill and look after the people. That's why it was done and of course, they didn't tell me that but they made me do it – they made me go around the village and share. Share the kill and tell them: "this is your first kill" and share it with the people. And that was the same thing we did when we were fishing.[89]

As Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*) reiterates, protocols for hunting involve not only by having access and use if hunting grounds defined though kinship or an invitation, but also the proper treatment of the animal in accordance with spiritual protocols.

Our people had a way of looking at things and I guess people talk about "sustainability" now. Where we would use things from the forest, from the rivers, from the lakes, from the mountains and it was...there was a principle among us "you only took what you could use" you never took too much. And there were certain protocols we had as well about paying respects to everything that you took. There were certain little ceremonies in a spiritual sense where we give thanks for everything we take from the earth, from mother earth. It was just a given that that was the way things were done. I know some of my brothers and I still practice that when we hunt. We say prayers and give offerings and things. Not everyone does that I know, but I think more and more amongst our young people I think there's a resurgence of those teachings coming with our young people.[90]

For those hunters who do not adhere to these protocols he states: *"the people who do that, there's a belief amongst our people that it will come back on them. So things take care of themselves that way."*[91]

Lands Working Group Workshop Outcomes: Questions of Family, Band, and Tribal Relations

The SXTA Lands Working Group met on three occasions and conducted Workshops / dialogues regarding family, band/First Nation, and tribal relations and caretaking responsibilities / authorities. The information presented below is extracted from meeting notes. These findings are preliminary and without prejudice to ongoing research and/or treaty negotiations.

[88] Joe Aleck Interview Page 12
[89] Herb Joe Interview Page 18
[90] Dalton Silver Interview Page 5
[91] Dalton Silver Interview Page 11

(1) Questions of Family organization and relations:

- *Halq'eméylem* words for 'family' / 'family' relations = (to be determined / future work)

- Identification of contemporary family groups by SXTA First Nation/Band:
    - Yakweakwioose = Malloway (note: linked also to Tzeachten & Aitchelitz)
        - 1 Family group.
    - Aitchelitz = George (note: linked to the origin of Aitchelitz as a village/Band; connected to Skowkale; possible link to post-smallpox repopulation)
        - One Family group.
    - Skawahlook = Chapman
        - 1 Family group.
    - Skowkale = Point, Hall, Archie, Sepass
        - 3 Family groups
    - Tzeachten = Hall, Malloway, Roberts, Kelly, Campbell, Joe
        - 6 Family groups (linked to Yakweakwioose & Skowkale FNs)
    - Leq'á:mel = Kelly, Phillips, Jasper, Johnson, Louis
        - 5 Family groups (links to Semá:th FN)
    - Popkum = Murphy
        - 1 Family group

Note: Consider future case studies looking at: (1) the history of Tzeachten FN (originally a woodlot allocated to Skowkale, Yakweakwioose) as an aspect of Reserve-Band establishment and relations of authority among the SXTA membership; (2) relations between families and the impact of Indian Agents / Missionary (Skowkale = Methodist / Yakweakwioose = Roman Catholic) as influencing current inter-Band relations; (3) investigate ancestral / inherited names (e.g., Siyemches, Welaleq), using historic documents, etc.

(2) Questions of Family-based governance of properties:

Cultural Property / *Caretaking Authority*

a. Names = family-based authority / inherited
b. Fishing Sites = family-based authority / attached to names / inherited
c. Longhouse (contemporary) = family / individual (builder / funder)

i. Syúwél family
ii. Family / house crest (spiritual aid)

d. *Sxwó:xwey* = family / inherited birth-right
e. Regalia = family / elder
f. *Stl'áleqem* = ?
g. Bathing sites = ? =
h. Fasting grounds = ? = family-based (intergenerational use) per village

(3) <u>Questions of Band/Village- based interests in and governance of 'Reserve' Lands:</u>

- What Bands are associated with the SXTA?
  - Yakweakwioose
  - Aitchelitz
  - Skawahlook
  - Skowkale
  - Tzeachten
  - Leq'á:mel
  - Popkum

- What is the relationship between SXTA Bands and Reserve Lands?
  - see Table 1

- Refine list of 'commonage' reserves associated with SXTA Bands:
  - Chilliwack Mtn
  - Fraser Canyon
  - Others?

Table 1. SXTA-ASSOCIATED RESERVES WITHIN S'ÓLH TÉMÉXW – preliminary findings

RESERVE	BAND ASSOCIATION	NOTES
AITCHELITCH 9 GRASS 15	Aitchelitz Aitchelitz, Kwaw-kwaw-Apilt, Shxwhá:y Village, Skwah, Squiala, Skowkale, Soowahlie, Tzeachten, Yakweakwioose	 Held in common (9 Bands)

Table 1. SXTA-ASSOCIATED RESERVES WITHIN S'ÓLH TÉMÉXW – preliminary findings		
RESERVE	**BAND ASSOCIATION**	**NOTES**
SKUMALASPH 16	Aitchelitz, Kwaw-kwaw-Apilt, Shxwhá:y Village Skwah, Squiala	Held in common (5 Bands)
PEKW'XE:YLES INDIAN RESERVE	21 Bands – including all 7 SXTA members	Held in common (21 Bands)
YAALSTRICK 1	Leq'á:mel	
LAKWAY CEMETERY 3	Leq'á:mel	
PAPEKWATCHIN 4	Leq'á:mel	
AYLECHOOTLOOK 5	Leq'á:mel	
ZAITSCULLACHAN 9	Leq'á:mel	
LAKAHAHMEN 11	Leq'á:mel	
HOLACHTEN 8	Leq'á:mel	
SUMAS CEMETERY 12	Leq'á:mel	
SKWEAHM 10	Leq'á:mel	
LACKAWAY 2	Leq'á:mel	
RUBY CREEK 2	Skawahlook	
SKAWAHLOOK 1	Skawahlook	
SKOWKALE 10	Skowkale	
SKOWKALE 11	Skowkale	
TZEACHTEN 13	Tzeachten	
YAKWEAKWIOOSE 12	Yakweakwioose	
'LOWER FRASER CANYON / 5-MILE RESERVES'	--	Held in common – Stó:lō Collective

(4) <u>Questions of BAND/TRIBAL relations and governance:</u>

- What the Band-Tribal relations associated with the SXTA First Nations?

<u>Band / Tribe Relations</u>:

- Yakweakwioose Band / Ts'elxweyeqw Tribe
- Aitchelitz Band / Ts'elxweyeqw Tribe
- Skowkale Band / Ts'elxweyeqw Tribe
- Tzeachten Band / Ts'elxweyeqw Tribe
- Leq'á:mel Band / Leq'á:mel & Semá:th Tribes (Upper / Lower Semá:th)
- Skawahlook Band / Tít Tribe
- Popkum Band / Tít Tribe

<u>(5) Questions of STÓ:LŌ / NATIONAL-based governance</u>:

- Open waterways throughout the territory – connected to the Salish Sea
- Factors and places of transformations / *Sxwóxwiyám*
- explore further = future work

CONCLUSIONS, GAPS AND NEXT STEPS

Anthropologist Valda Blundell uses the term "innovative traditionalism" to describe the process by which Aboriginal cultural knowledge is maintained and given new meaning over time through the integration of traditional cultural forms in a contemporary setting.[92] In framing this research about Stó:lō caretaking responsibilities for resources, it is evident that Stó:lō tradition has been and can be maintained in flexible and adaptive ways that can be of benefit to the greater Stó:lō community and build successful relationships with external stakeholders (Federal and Provincial Governments, other First Nations) currently involved in the process of determining Aboriginal Right and Title. While the content of Stó:lō cultural knowledge associated with caretaking practices remains the same, the form flexes to ensure the continuity of this knowledge in a contemporary setting.

In this vein, the findings of this pilot project provide new information and insight aiding in the process to:

- develop an understanding of relations and relationship maintenance mechanisms between SXTA and other Stó:lō communities regarding land and authorities over properties and resources within Family, Band, Tribe, and National realms of relations;
- lay a foundation for facilitating positive intra-Stó:lō relations involving the sharing of land and rights of access, use and management.

Outlined below are sets of conclusions, gaps and suggestions for next steps in following up and expanding this project.

Principles of Caretaking

Throughout the course of our interviews, many descriptions of caretaking practices and protocols associated with the control, access and use of resources can be distilled into cultural principles or "laws" associated with their use. The following were described in our interviews and presented briefly here:

- "You have to leave something in order to take something" [93]
- "Only take what you need"[94], similarly expressed as "Only take what you can use"[95]
- "We all must learn to live in a good way"[96]
- *Xólhmet et mekx' stam s'i:wes te selsila:lh chet* (Take care of everything our great grandparents taught [showed] us) / *Haqles chexw xwelmi:ay staxwelh* (Remember the future generations)[97]
- Don't waste, don't ruin[98]

---

[92] Valda Blundell and Tony Bennett Introduction: First Peoples in C*ultural Studies*, 9 (1), 1995, p 5.
[93] Ivan McIntyre Interview Page 10
[94] Herb Joe Interview Page17
[95] Dalton Silver Interview Page
[96] Herb Joe Interview Page 20
[97] As stated in *Halq'eméylem* in the Stó:lô Heritage Policy 2003, which expands on this principle.

Themes

- Access and use of resources shared by the greater Stó:lō community and with neighbouring First Nations is defined primarily through inter-marriage, or when permission is asked. Hozameen Mountain is given as an example[99] of a gathering place for multiple tribes on the coast/mainland where resources were accessed, used and shared.

- Emphasizing the inter-connectedness of physical and cultural resources is essential to understanding caretaking responsibilities and ensuring that effective policy and practice are developed. Frank Malloway (*Siyemches*) gives the example of a berry patch which was maintained by means of controlled burn by hunters using the grounds for hunting purposes.[100] Certain geographic areas contain multiple resources and are therefore cared for by many.

- A distinction between caretaking for a place and resources associated with it must be made. For example, harvesting and using medicinal plants for treatment is an example where caretaking means maintaining and using the knowledge associated linked to a physical resource, not being the steward of a physical place where the resource exists. Burial mounds are another example where caretaking for this resource is linked to the individual trained in maintaining and using the knowledge associated with its use, not the physical place isolated from this.

- Geo-cultural borders between Stó:lō and neighbouring First Nations were discussed. One example is the boundary between Nlaka'pamux and Stó:lō Territory in the Fraser Canyon for dry rack fishing. There exists some debate among Stó:lō people about the border's location. Dalton Silver (*Lemxyaltexw*), who has family ties to Stó:lō and Nlaka'pamux states "A lot of people talk about Sawmill Creek as an area in the canyon that was like a border. I talked with my late grandfather and older people up in the Nlaka'pamux and a lot of people understood it to be "Spuzzum Creek." Sonny McHalsie provides insight into the different sets of rights geo-politically situated between Sailor Bar Rock, north of Sawmill Creek and Spuzzum Creek. The prior marking the outer edge of Stó:lō title; the latter marking the outer edge of a set of access and use rights (e.g., hunting). Another example provided of a Territorial border was Larson's Hill on the Coquihalla for hunting and berry harvesting. [101]

- Ancestral names are central to defining caretaking responsibilities.

---

[98] This was mentioned by Joe Aleck, Darwin Douglas, Dalton Silver, Herb Joe, Frank Malloway, Ivan McIntyre and is similarly stated in the Stó:lô Nation Heritage Policy as "*Ewe chexw qelqelit te mekw' stam loy qw' esli hokwex yexw lamexw ku:t* (Don't ruin, waste, destroy everything; just take what you need).
[99] Dalton Silver Interview Pages 14-15
[100] Frank Malloway Interview Page 4
[101] Dalton Silver Interview Page 12-13

- A distinction between caretaking and ownership exists. However, enacting Stó:lō models of caretaking does not mean giving up control, access and use of resources in *S'ólh Téméxw*.

- The sustained impact of colonization (anti-potlatch laws, residential schools, band electoral system, social welfare system, fisheries and wildlife regulation)has disrupted, but not destroyed systems of caretaking which define "authority" within the greater Stó:lō community. Goal is for continued renewal of existing systems of resource management, and enacting such systems in treaty is a start.

- *Treaty must reflect existing systems of resource management.* Stó:lō individuals, families, villages and tribes are to be considered primary authorities to care for resources with less reliance on band and reserve levels of authority to determine access, use and regulation. Caretaking responsibilities of various resources lie with those who access, use and or manage the resource. Examples of this include care for gravesites, berry patches, hunting, fishing and spiritual bathing/fasting sites.
- *Self-Determination*. "The Government should out and out recognize the protocols that we have amongst ourselves as tribes and not interfere with what we have and have had."[102]

- *Innovative Traditionalism*. Enacting Stó:lō caretaking practices and protocols for all resources within *S'ólh Téméxw* is integral to the maintenance and continuity of all aspects of Stó:lō life past, present and future. They have been consistently maintained while innovative in form. Examples include contemporary hunters getting letters of permission to access and use another Band's Territory to hunt, when before they were "given the nod."[103]

- *Maintenance of Cultural Identity*. Reciprocation and forms of exchange for use/access/ of resources has always been and remains essential. Examples given for hunting, fishing, berry picking, plant gathering.

- *Integration of caretaking principles and practices into existing governance models*. Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*) describes the program undertaken by a Stó:lō Governmental organization to hire a Stó:lō caretaker for plants and medicines. This is but one example of integrating cultural caretaking practices into service delivery programs.

- *Cultural Revival*. The revival of ancestral names for youth which are associated with certain physical resources in *S'ólh Téméxw* so as to ensure the continued care, use and maintenance of such places is one example of how cultural principles are expressed in new ways. Ancestral names of this type are thereby used as a strategy for cultural survival.

[102] Dalton Silver Interview Page 10
[103] Dalton Silver Interview Page 7

- *Education.* Teaching of Stó:lō youth about caretaking responsibilities at a Nation, village, family and individual level essential to the maintenance of Stó:lō culture. It was stated[104] that Stó:lō youth are uniquely situated historically as they have an opportunity for a cultural and institutional education. This needs to happen to begin to mitigate the effects of having cultural systems of caretaking disrupted. Solution to question: Given the dislocation/disruption of Stolo life due to colonialism, what do we do as these systems are being rehabilitated, revived and renewed?

- *Unity of all Stó:lō People*. While partisan politics may exist within the greater Stó:lō community about how band and reserve levels of authority designate caretaking responsibilities, such knowledge and practice requires the unity of Stó:lō people. As Sid Douglas (*Sru-Ets-Lan-Ough*) describes: "Certain things that we have to protect we will have to stand side by side on things. With these Governments today they kind of make it hard for communities to work together on some things."[105]

- *Enacting Caretaking practices based on a concept of moral ownership.* Stó:lō caretaking practices are distinct from non-Stó:lō practices in that there is a moral and spiritual right and obligation to care for the resources which exist within *S'ólh Téméxw*. The process of engaging with resources over generations and the reciprocal relationship this creates is the focus. Therefore resources are not treated exclusively as objects and products.

Gaps

- More fully explore the tension between externally imposed practices and protocols associated with the care, access, use and regulation of resources. Examples include: Band and council issuing letters of permission to hunt or the impact of Yale Treaty on Stó:lō canyon fisherman who, under currently contested wording in the Yale Final Agreement, would be required to gain permission to fish hereditary fishing grounds. This is a site of conflict and we need additional examples of resolution strategies.
- Gain knowledge of existing *Halq'eméylem* terms for community, nation, family, village, tribe, reserve, band, individual.
- Further explore contemporary relationships between ancestral names and caretaking for resources.
- Create an inventory of names and associated *Sqwélqwel*.
- Build on the existing place names information found in *A Coast Salish Historical Atlas.*
- Inquire about whether there are other examples of a resource "co-ordinator" or caretaking authority similar to the *Sia:teleq*.
- Gain additional examples of protocols for use/access of resources, including permission and restrictions.
- Further explore implications of breaking cultural protocols for access/use of specific resources.
- Explore existing relevant conflict resolution strategies which can be enacted as part of

[104] Sid Douglas, Herb Joe Interviews
[105] Sid Douglas Interview Page 6

- Treaty and related resource management strategies.

Next Steps

This research has successfully produced a dialogue with Stó:lō community members and record of participants views of caretaking. Our initial questions have helped to inform additional questions and, as such, there are a number of term goals established from this initial research.

Short term goals include continued interviews with community members not yet interviewed about caretaking practices and protocols. In addition to this, the creation of an inventory of ancestral names and the *Sqwélqwel* associated with those names is considered extremely valuable. An additional goal is to gather more in depth genealogies of families which will help "map" family connections to resources.

From this point, the goal of the next stage of research is to focus on how these protocols and practices can be incorporated into a workable governance framework which can be enacted in a sustainable and culturally sensitive manner through treaty and beyond. To accomplish this, it will involve further exploring the existing historically and culturally based practices of conflict resolution practiced throughout Stó:lō history related to resource management.

Gathering additional narratives about restricted Stó:lō access to resources both historically and currently is extremely valuable in clarifying methods of conflict resolution. What can we learn from these existing systems of resource management and conflict resolution that can help mediate the current circumstance and acknowledge Stó:lō cultural history as it has been shaped by ongoing colonial policy and practice?

With continued dialogue, it is hopeful that a balance can be struck to create workable relationships between Stó:lō peoples collectively and the various stakeholders who seek to assert control over the access, use and management of Stó:lō resources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Oral History Interviews

Herb Joe Interview. May 6, 2011. SRRMC, B.C.

Joe Aleck Interview. July 14, 2011. Cheam, B.C.

Sidney Douglas Interview. July 13, 2011. Cheam, B.C.

Tina Jack Interview. May 9, 2011. Chilliwack, B.C.

Sonny McHalsie Interview. May 2, 2011. SRRMC, Chilliwack, B.C.

Frank Malloway Interview. May 3, 2011. SRRMC, Chilliwack, B.C.

Darwin Douglas Interview. July 19, 2011. SRRMC, Chilliwack, B.C.

Ivan McIntyre Interview. May 5, 2011. SRRMC, Chilliwack, B.C.

Dalton Silver Interview. May 4, 2011. SRRMC, Chilliwack, B.C.

Jeff Point Interview. July 18, 2011. SRRMC, Chilliwack, B.C.

Dry rack Fisherman Group Interview. July 19, 2011. Seabird Island Band, B.C.

Secondary Sources

Albers, Karen. Resource Sites in S'ólh Téméxw: Traditional Concepts of Ownership. (Final Report for Family Owned Sites Project). Unpublished Research Report, on file at the Stó:lō Archives, Sardis, B.C. 2000

Blundell, Valda and Tony Bennett Introduction: First Peoples in C*ultural Studies*, 9 (1), 1995, p 5.

Carlson, Keith Thor. You are asked to Witness: The Stó:lō in Canada's Pacific Coast History. Stó:lō Heritage Trust, Chilliwack, 1996.

Carlson, Keith Thor, David Schaepe, David Smith, Albert McHalsie, and Leeanna Rhodes, eds. A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas. Stó:lō Heritage Trust / Douglas & McIntyre, Vancouver, 2001.

Fixico, Donald. The American Indian Mind in a Linear World. Routledge Press, 2003.

McIlwraith, Thomas. "The Problem of Imported Culture: The Construction of Contemporary Stó:lō Identity." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, Vol, 20, no.4, pp.41-70, 1996.

Wayne Suttles in Sturtevant, William. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 7. Washington, D.C, Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990.

Stó:lō Heritage Policy. Prepared by the Stó:lō Nation, on file at the Stó:lō Archives, Sardis, B.C. 2003.

Appendix A: List of Potential Interviewees

April 2011

1. Sid Douglas
2. Herb Joe
3. Frank Malloway
4. Ivan McIntyre
5. Elizabeth Phillips
6. Sonny McHalsie
7. Dalton Silver
8. Tina Jack
9. Darwin Douglas
10. Joe Aleck
11. Darren Charlie
12. Willie Charlie
13. Pat Charlie
14. Parry ("Caz") Peters
15. Percy Roberts
16. Ginnie Silver
17. Helen Joe
18. Gwen Point
19. Steven Point
20. Mark Point
21. Melvin Malloway
22. Mike Joe
23. Wendy Ritchie
24. Stan Greene
25. Ida John
26. Yvette John
27. Caroline Credico
28. Ray Silver

Appendix B: List of Cultural and Natural Resources in S'ólh Téméxw – Potential Subjects

April 2011

Type of Resource (not in order of importance)

1.Fishing
2.(Salmon/Sturgeon)
3.Windrying
4.Transformation/Iyoqthet
5.Regalia
6.Bathing
7.Hunting
8. Spirit Poles
9. Trap lines
10. Berry Patches
11. Mushroom/Hazelnut
12. Medicinal Plants
13. Cedar
14. Shellfish
15. Wild Onion
16. Wild Potato
17. Salt Patches
18. Cranberry Bog
19. Gravesites
20. Water Babies
21. (S'ó:lmexw)
22. Sxwó:yxwey
23. Petroglyphs
24. Spring Water spots
25. Stl'áleqem
26. Eulachon

Appendix C: Revised list of Cultural and Natural Resources to discuss in Lands TRM Interviews

April 30, 2011

Type of Resource

1. Fishing (salmon/sturgeon)
   -sites
   -locations

2. Transformation/Iyoqthet
   -landscape/places

3. Bathing
   -specific places

4. Hunting

5. Medicinal Plants

Appendix D: General Interview Questions

Generally, what responsibilities are allocated to:

1. All Stó:lō/Tribe/Village/Family/Individuals? Move then to how/what specific...
2. What does "Authority" mean with regards to access, use, ownership and regulation?
3. What does ownership mean?

Specifically,

1. Who has caretaking responsibilities for _____ site/place or practice?
2. If you, how did you then acquire these responsibilities?
3. Does anyone own the "resource" (site or practice associated with a site)?
4. Who? By what means?
5. By whom were you taught to care for _____ resource?
6. As far as you know, do both men and women care for this type of resource?
7. What protocols are required to access/use this resource?
8. Who decides this and how?
9. What kind of communication needs to take place? (writing/asking permission. Exchange of resources or payment or spiritual offering)
10. Are there circumstances where people can lose access to community owned/collective territories?
11. If so, what is an example of how this worked?

Appendix E: Oral History Consent Form

We _____ and _____, give our consent to the Stó:lō Research and Management
interviewee interviewer
Centre to record this interview and to use all or any part of our interview and supplementary materials in any format for legal scholarly, educational, or community awareness purposes. We share copyright with the Stó:lō Research and Resource Management Centre and we may use the recorded interview or the information contained in any supplementary materials as we wish.

We understand that copies of the recording and transcript will be deposited in the Stó:lō Archives to be available for public listening, reading and viewing, and that portions of our interview may be used in publications, documents, and/or on the Internet.

We release SRRMC from all claims arising out of, or in connection with the use of our observations, memories, and experiences. We understand that the SRRMC cannot be held liable for the use of information by third parties who may extract portions of our words for their own creative work.

The purpose of the interview is to document the interviewee's experiences and knowledge how authority over land and resources is defined. This is a Treaty funded project done by SRRMC with outcomes that we hope will inform how land and Governance will be dealt with in Treaty. We hope that there will be more immediate outcomes in forming land resource management that is of potential use to all Stó:lō people. Our participation is entirely voluntary.

I wish to receive a copy of the recorded interview and the transcript (if a transcript is prepared).

Yes ___

No ___

I/We wish to place the following restrictions on this interview.

- ☐ None
- ☐ I would like to reserve the right to correct or add material to the interview within two months of receiving the copied recording.
- ☐ Other _____

_____

Interview date(s) _____

Please sign and date this form on the reverse. Please provide contact information so that you may be contacted if there are further questions and so that you can receive copies of the interview(s) as requested.

Appendix F List of Completed Individual Interviews and Resources Discussed

June 2011

1. Sid Douglas: Hunting, Trapping, Cascara Tree Harvesting,
2. Herb Joe: Caretaking responsibilities, *Sxwōxwiyám* of *T'xwelátse*, hunting, fishing, streams.
3. Frank Malloway: Hunting, streams, trapping, fishing, bathing sites, gravesites
4. Ivan McIntyre: Gravesites, burial mounds, fishing, medicinal plants.
5. Elizabeth Phillips: Waiting for response in writing of Halq'eméylem terms.
6. Sonny McHalsie: gravesites, pithouses, fishing, hunting, bathing sites, berry picking, medicinal plants
7. Dalton Silver: hunting, trapping, fishing, geo-cultural border of Stó:lō Territory for hunting. Hozameen mountain gathering place for many Nations.
8. Tina Jack; Transformation stories associated with Dog Mountain in Chawathil, hunting, trapping, medicinal plants, Cascara bark harvesting
9. Darwin Douglas: Hunting, fishing, systems of governance, bathing and fasting
10. Jeff Point: Hunting, fishing, ancestral names, longhouse traditions, systems of governance, ancestral names.
11. Joe Aleck: Berry picking, cedar harvesting, protocols, ancestral names, place names.

Appendix H-Lands TRM Group Interview Questions

*Indicates Questions asked in July 19, 2011 group interview

To be asked of each individual:

1. Can you introduce yourself and your family's connection/history to the dry rack fishery in the canyon including the location of your fishing spots?*
2. Who is the authority in your family to speak about the spot(s)? How did they come to be recognized as the authority? (Can the acting family authority ever restrict access completely?)*
3. When do you use your site? Besides fishing, what else do you do there?

Appendix I-Lands TRM Research Inventory of Interviewee's Ancestral Names

Interviewee Name	*Ancestral Name*
Herb Joe	*T'xwelátse*
Sid Douglas	*Sru-Ets-Le-Nough*
Dalton Silver	*Lemxyaltexw*
Elizabeth Phillips	*Siyamiyateliyot*
Tina Jack	*Unknown*
Ivan McIntyre	*Qwosqwesten*
Frank Malloway	*Siyemches*
Sonny McHalsie	*Naxaxalhets'i*
Joe Aleck	*Siyamalaxw*
Darwin Douglas	*Eyteleq*
Jeff Point	*A:yai:seleq*

Appendix J-Lands TRM Recommended Interviewee's Not Yet Interviewed

- potential follow-up Lands TRM Research-

12. Darren Charlie
13. Willie Charlie
14. Pat Charlie
15. Parry ("Caz") Peters
16. Birdie Garner
17. Percy Roberts
18. Ginnie Silver
19. Helen Joe
20. Gwen Point
21. Steven Point
22. Mark Point
23. Melvin Malloway
24. Mike Joe
25. Wendy Ritchie
26. Stan Greene
27. Ida John
28. Yvette John
29. Caroline Credico
30. Ray Silver
31. Joe Hall
32. Helen Joe
33. Mel Bailey
34. Art Andrew
35. Clem Seymore
36. Gary Paul
37. Sean Gabriel
38. Mike Kelly

ADDENDUM – PRELIMINARY LITERATURE REVIEW AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The object of this element of the TRM project is to conduct a literature review of existing ethnographic and ethnohistorical sources to clarify the impact of treaty-making on specific places within Stó:lō Territory by exploring the meaning and origins of Stó:lō "caretaking" responsibilities for sites of cultural significance. The management of places of cultural significance including, but not limited to: *Iyoqthet* (transformer) sites, fishing sites, *Sxwó:yxwey* sites, *Stl'áleqem* sites, bathing/winter dance sites and gravesites require different types of caretaking responsibilities held individually and/or collectively by Stó:lō people. These caretaking responsibilities vary and draw upon individual, Stó:lō family (hereditary), tribal and Nation level identities in order to fulfill these responsibilities. By contextualizing these multiple identities, we may better understand how access, use, protection and control of places in *S'ólh Téméxw* can be defined in a meaningful way for the purposes of clarifying Aboriginal Right and Title to Stó:lō Territory. Further, the literature review will establish current gaps in research on this topic and flag sources which contain additional relevant information.

Amoss, Pamela

1978 Coast Salish Spirit Dancing: The Survival of an Ancestral Religion. Seattle, University of Washington Press.

- Describes pervasiveness of Spirit dancing among Salish despite opposition of various forms (governmental, religious, social).
- Explores the psychological impacts of ceremonialism in the contemporary Stó:lō world and chronicles the revival (or increased visibility) of these cultural practices.
- Amoss has written multiple texts on the topic of ceremonialism, for more titles, see bibliography in *Handbook of North American Indians* ed Sturtevant: 1990.

Archibald, Jo-anne (Q'um Q'um Xiiem)

2008 *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit*. UBC Press, Vancouver.

- Archibald's work establishes seven key principles in Stó:lō thought: respect, responsibility, reciprocity, reverence, holism, interrelatedness, and synergy in order to establish ways of more deeply understanding oral histories. Her goal is to clarify this so as to create understanding of oral stories and their multiple meanings to educate and to heal.

- Although not directly addressing "caretaking" responsibilities of natural resources in *S'ólh Téméxw*, Archibald's work provides an invaluable contribution to an understanding of *Sxwōxwiyám* and the guiding principles of Stó:lō thought which translate effectively into the development of sustainable and meaningful cultural resources management strategies.

Barnett, Homer

1955 *The Coast Salish of British Columbia*. Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers.

- Barnett's work contains valuable ethnographic material gained from Salish informants; however, according to Kew (1990: 480), he did not witness spirit dancing or Shaker Church rituals first hand.

- Barnett's work, typical in methods and approach of other ethnographic research during the first part of the century, discusses various aspects of Stó:lō life. It is particularly informative in terms of its discussion of winter dancing and the protocols and practices associated with the initiation of new dancers.

- Describes social and political structures, Barnett's description of Coast Salish chiefs is instructive.

1957 *Indian Shakers: A Messianic Cult of the Pacific Northwest,* (Carbondale Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press)

- Explores the origins and practices of the Shaker Religion on the Northwest coast, beginning with the story of founder John Slocum. Early work about "hybrid" forms of spiritual practice in the region – illuminates innovative nature of religious belief and practice and is an early examination of "hybrid" religion.

Bennett, Marilyn.G.

1973 "Indian Fishing and It's cultural importance to the Fraser River System." Prepared for *Fisheries Service, Pacific Region, Department of the Environment and Union of B.C. Indian Chief*."

- Study of Fraser River fishing which found that 86% of those surveyed believed that more people fished when their grandparents' were young – around 1900. The most popular reasons given for greater fishing involvement in the past were: lack of employment or social services, a greater abundance of fish, and a lack of regulations or restrictions. (Bennett: 1973: 14 in MacDonald, Katya: 2008: 45).

Beirwert, Crisca

1986 *Tracery in the Mistlines: Semiotic Readings of Stó:lō Culture*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of British Columbia.

- Explores the continuity of various aspects of Stó:lō ceremonialism, particularly *sxwó:yxwey* and winter dancing, despite adjustments of ceremonies for public and private audiences, and in the face of colonial policies which restricted participation.

1999 *Brushed By Cedar, Living by the River.* University of Arizona, Tucson.

- Postmodern text which explores knowledge and power in Salish. Extensive ethnographic information and oral histories on *sxwó:yxwey* origins, *Xexá:ls* narratives, transformer sites, place names and protocols for winter dancing.

- Beirwert establishes that the work of *Xexá:ls* was linked to Stó:lō perspectives of orality and literacy. She contextualizes Stó:lō cosmogony, for example how place names associated with the work of *Xexá:ls* cannot be renamed by elders living today. (see also : McHalsie; 2001, Carlson 2006)

- This work also presents a critical analysis and argument for, the use of cultural methods of conflict resolution related to fishing disputes.

Boas, Franz

1894 *The Indian Tribes of the Lower Fraser River.* In report of the Sixty-fourth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science for 1980, pp.454-463. London.

- Contains transformer narratives and stories associated with how Stó:lō people gain spirit power from non- human ancestors.

- Transformer narratives, stories of *Xexá:ls*.

- Story of hunter receiving hunting power from a bear who took off his skins to reveal he is human. (p.460)

1895 *Indian Legends from the North Pacific Coast of America*. Berlin: Ascher and Co.

- Early ethnographic accounts of transformer narratives.

Boas, Franz (Bouchard, Randy and Dorothy Kennedy, eds)

2002 *Indian Myths and Legends from the North Pacific Coast of America*. Vancouver: Talon books.

- Contains narratives of transformers movements and associated spiritual places, recorded by Franz Boas in *Indianische Sagen von der nordpacifischen Kuste Americas, (1985)* recently translated into English.

Boxberger, Daniel

1989 *To Fish in Common: The Ethnohistory of Lummi Indian Salmon Fishing*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Butler, Caroline. F.

1998. "Regulating Tradition: Stó:lō Wind Drying and Aboriginal Rights" Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, UBC.

- A invaluable source of the history of Stó:lō access, use and management wind drying sites in the Fraser canyon and the impacts of *Xwelítem*-Stó:lō relations (Creation of reserves, industry, gold rush, development) and Government intervention on the fisheries (fisheries act, DFO).

- Drawing extensively on oral history interview, Butler presents how management of canyon fishery is defined by Stó:lō peoples in accordance with Stó:lō cultural laws. Butler's work is integrated and more fully analyzed in the report authored by Schaepe et al. "Sumas Energy 2, INC Traditional Use Study –Phase Two: Stó:lō Cultural Relations to Air and Water." (unpublished Report on File at Stó:lō Nation Archives).

Carlson, Keith (ed)

1996 *You are asked to Witness: The Stó:lō in Canada's Pacific Coast History.* Stó:lō Heritage Trust, Chilliwack.

- One of a small number of seminal Stó:lō community publications which greatly shapes and informs the development of effective policy, establishes Right and Title in *S'ólh Téméxw* and favours the use of Stó:lō oral history. Includes articles about all aspect of Stó:lō culture, history, identity and heritage management.

Carlson, Keith

2001a) Expressions of Collective Identity. In *A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, eds. Carlson, Keith et al. Pp. 24-29. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver.

2001b) The Numbers Game: Interpreting Historical Stó:lō Demographics. In *A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, eds Carlson, Keith et al. pp. 76-77. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver.

2001c) History Wars: Considering Contemporary Fishing Disputes. In *A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, eds Carlson, Keith et al. pp. 58-59. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver

1996 Stó:lō Exchange Dynamics. *Native Studies Review* 11 (1): 5-48.

2003 "The Power of Place, The Problem of Time: A Study of Aboriginal History and Identity. PhD Dissertation, Department of History, UBC, Vancouver.

2005 *Events, Migrations, and History in Coast Salish Collective Identity Formation.* Unpublished Paper.

- Explores the numerous Stó:lō oral histories which describe events that caused people to migrate and move on the physical landscape. He seeks to fill a historiographic gap which overlooks these movements in favour of an academic perspective which favours "stability"

- Contains excellent analysis of the stories of *Xexá:ls*, arguing that "Perhaps most importantly of all, the narratives provide the basis for shared collective identities over vast geographical distances." (4)

- Critically analyzes and builds upon Stó:lō oral sources, including Stó:lō Elder Amy Cooper's interviews with Oliver Wells.

- Explores origins of place names throughout *S'ólh Téméxw*.

2007 "Innovation, Tradition, Colonialism and Aboriginal Fishing Conflicts in the Lower Fraser Canyon." In *New Histories for Old* (eds) Ted Binnema and S. Neyland. UBC Press.

- Presents the history and historiography of fishing disputes on the Fraser River, particularly in the Fraser canyon. Drawing upon Stó:lō oral histories, ethnographic and historical materials, Carlson explores the creation of the Five Mile fishery and how Stó:lō fisherman have sought to be innovative with their cultural practices over the past hundred years.

2007 "Toward and Indigenous Historiography: Events, Migrations and the Formation of "post contact" Coast Salish Collective Identities. In *Be of Good Mind: Essays on the Coast Salish,* ed. Bruce G. Miller, pp.138-181. University of British Columbia Press.

Carlson, Keith and Sarah Eustace

1999 "The "True Spirit of Original Intent" of Fraser Canyon Fishing Reserves." Unpublished Paper provided to Stó:lō Nation, Chilliwack.

- Explores who are, and who were the Yale Band and how government intervention in the Five Mile fishery has impacted contemporary access, use and management by Stó:lō and the *Xwoxela:lhp* people of the fishery.

- Description of term "*Sia:teleq*" – described to Sonny McHalsie in a conversation with Rosaleen George in April 1995. The *Sia:teleq's* task was to regulate access to the fishery and to ensure that all family members had sufficient access for adequate supplies for the winter. A family's *Sia:teleq* was someone intimately familiar with the fishing grounds, as well as the family's history." (13)

- Cultural strategies for managing and regulating hereditary fishcamps is presented in an appendix of Stó:lō elders unsolicited descriptions of "Fish camp co-coordinators duties" and "fish camp rules" provided by Elders participating in the Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq'eméylem language revival program. "From the list emerges six broad categories of "duties." These duties correspond extremely well with accepted ethnographic descriptions of the respected attributes and abilities of a *Siya:m* or *Sia:teleq*: 1) General monitoring of people's behavior, noting who contributes and who does not; 2) Co-ordination and organization of people's labour; 3) Determining distribution of salmon caught based upon individual's distinct status and needs; 4) Ensuring standards of cleanliness and hygiene are maintained by all present; 5) Dispute resolution; 6) Being a conduit of information between the local camp and the broader community" ("Nation") (35)

- The twenty something "Fishcamp Rules" described by the elders first establish the camps as a drug and alcohol free zone and also include: "make sure people respect the elders", "make sure they either cut or fish" and "make sure before anyone is brought to camp that their duties are told to them" (36)

- Carlson and Eustace provide an ethnohistorical analysis of how sustained government intervention shaped current fishing disputes the Fraser Canyon fishery: "[d]espite Sproat's intentions, the collective Aboriginal fishery has been threatened, when the canyon reserves were eventually registered by the Department of Indian Affairs (DIA), they were inaccurately assigned to the Yale Band – the official name of the Stó:lō village of *Xwoxela:lhp*. The government's registration process never intended to recognize the *Xwoxela:lhp* people as having any different or preferred access rights beyond those enjoyed by Stó:lō from other communities." (2)

Carlson, Keith, Kristina Fagan, Natalia Shostak (eds)

2006 "Orality about Literacy: The "Black and White" of Salish History." In *Intersections of Orality and Literacy: Talking about Writing, and Writing about Talking.* Unpublished Paper.

- Excellent postmodern critical analysis of orality and literacy in the Coast Salish world: as Carlson notes he turns his gaze not to the common discussion of Aboriginal orality in literature or the extent of literature in orality, but rather Stó:lō orality about literacy as a means of better understanding the origins and impacts of native newcomer relations.

Carlson focuses his analysis on Transformer narratives and the work of *Xéxáls* as well as the *Book of the Stalo Prophet*.

- Carlson goes on to observe: ``During the course of interviews, Stó:lõ Elders explained to me that the verb "to write" in their language was "xélá:ls." This is significant for two reasons. First, it reveals that the Stó:lõ did not choose to borrow the English word for literacy as they did with certain other words for which they had no prior knowledge.`` (Carlson: 2006:193)

- Excellent source for critical analysis of the relationship between *Xéxáls* and Stó:lō collective identity.

Carlson, Keith, David M. Schaepe, Albert McHalsie, David Smith, Leanna Rhodes, and Colin Duffield (editors)

2001 *A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas*. Douglas and McIntyre & Stó:lō Heritage Trust, Vancouver.

Cole, Douglas

1985 *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for the Northwest Coast Artifacts.* Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.

Cole, Douglas and Ira Chaikin.

1990 *An Iron Hand Upon the People: The Law against the Potlatch on the Northwest Coast.* Douglas and McIntyre, Seattle.

Duff, Wilson

1950 *Unpublished Fieldnotes, Notebook 1*. British Columbia Archives, Victoria.

1952 The Upper Stalo Indians of the Fraser Valley of British Columbia. *Anthropology in British Columbia*, memoir no.1, Victoria, B.C.

- Origin stories of *sxwó:yxwey* as told by Stó:lō informant Amy Cooper, follow up to interviews conducted by Wilson Duff (1952) with Amy Coopers parents, Mr and Mrs Bob about *sxwó:yxwey* story and spiritual places associated with it's origins. (More on this topic, see also *Stó:lō Nation Heritage Policy*: 2003, pp.38-39, Sonny McHalsie 2007:116).

- Duff here argues that "the Stalo as a whole possessed was not a result of social or political organization, but of common language, culture and habit" (Duff: 1952:11). This is a much disputed interpretation, and recent ethnographic and ethnohistorical research refutes Duff's assertion (See: Jay Miller, "Commentary: back to Basic: Chiefdoms of Puget Sound," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 44, No 2. Spring 1997, 375-387).

- Here Duff initiates use of the term ``Stalo` as a reflection of Indigenous word for River what people themselves use (pp.11-13)

Elmendorf, William

1971 Coast Salish Ranking and Intergroup Ties. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 27(4): 353-380.

- Explores the complex hierarchical systems in Stó:lō kinship ties and the pervasive inter-tribal ties between communities. Extends Suttles discussion in "Affinal Ties, Subsistence, and Prestige among the Coast Salish." *American Anthropologist*, no. 62 (1960): 296–305.

Fehr, Amanda

2008a) "The Relationships of Place: A Study of Change and Continuity in Stó:lō Understandings of I:yem" (Unpublished MA Thesis defended 2008).

2008b) "Relationships: A Study of Memory, Change and Identity at a Place Called I:yem. *UFV Research Review* 2(2): 9-35.

- Explores the complex ways in which Stó:lō and Nlaka'pamux histories and cultural identities are linked to, and shaped by shared access and use of the Fraser canyon fishery. Research combines oral history interviews with Stó:lō community members as well as secondary sources.
- Fehr's paper, particularly her oral history interviews with Stó:lō community members further clarifies how access, use and control of canyon fishing grounds in the five miles fishery are defined.

Galloway, Brent

1980 *The Structure of Upriver Halq'eméylem: A Grammatical Sketch. Wisdom of the Elders. Edna Bob et al.* Sardis, B.C. Coqueleetza Education Training Centre

1993 *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*. University of California, Berkley

2004 *Dictionary of Upriver Halkomelem: Halq'eméylem to English and English to Halq'eméylem.* Unpublished manuscript on file at Stó:lō Nation Archives.

- This is just a small sample of the extensive work linguist Brent Galloway has contributed. Place names were a key area of interest to Galloway, and as Sonny McHalsie reflects of his contribution: "his place name records remain among the richest in terms of Aboriginally contextualized information."(McHalsie 2001: 134)

Haggarty, Liam

2008 "I'm Going to Call it Spirit Money: A History of Social Welfare Among the Stó:lō." The *UFV Research Review* volume 2: issue 2,

- This work builds on the recent work *Makuk* (2008) by John Lutz, by critically examining the history of social welfare in the greater Stó:lō community.

Harry B. Hawthorn, C.S. Belshaw and S.M. Jamieson

1958 *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment.* University of Toronto Press.

Hill-Tout, Charles. (see Ralph Maud Salish People 1978, vol. 1, 2.3 for Hill Tout's collected essays)

1902. Ethnological Studies of the Mainland Halkomelem, a Division of the Salish of British Columbia. Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 72:355-449.

1904. Ethnological Report on the Stseelis and Skaulits Tribes of the Halkomelem Division of the Salish of British Columbia. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 34(July-December):311-336.

1907. Report on the Ethnology of the South-Eastern Tribes of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 37(July-December):306-374.

Jenness, Diamond

1955 The Faith of A Coast Salish Indian. *Anthropology in British Columbia*, memoir no.3, Victoria, B.C, 1955.

- Seminal ethno-historical work which explores various elements of Stó:lō ceremonialism, particularly origin stories association with *Xexá:ls*, place names, winter dancing and the prophet dance. His work was focused in the community of Katzie, one of his key informants is Old Pierre.

- Jenness gathered oral histories in the Katzie community which document Katzie origin stories and the work of *Xexá:ls*.

Jilek, Wolfgang

1982 *Salish Indian Mental Health and Culture Change* (North Vancouver, BC: Hancock House**).**

- Jilek's work explores the phychotherpeudic consequences of spirit dancing and other ceremonies.

- Work similarly explores the contemporary role of shaman in Salish culture.

Kew, Michael

"Central and Southern Coast Salish Ceremonies Since 1900" In *Handbook of North American Indians,* Volume 7, pp. 476-480

- Describes the nature, function and survival ceremonialism, particularly spirit dancing and the *Sxwó:yxwey* among Salish.

- Describes functions of *Sxwó:yxwey*, particularly the importance of the features of conferring names, honouring deceased, passing on regalia.

- Describes central importance of "access to wilderness" to winter dancers so that they may use places for ritual bathing and depositories for items at the end of initiations. Places associated with winter dancing are spiritually significant.

- Article describes 1978 Indian and Religious Freedom Act in which U.S. agencies were directed to protect these areas, including the area near Mount Baker.

Laforet, Andrea

1974 *Folk History in a Small Canadian Community.* Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Department of Anthropology, UBC, Vancouver.

Laforet, Andrea and Annie York

1998 *Spuzzum: Fraser Canyon Histories 1808-1939.* UBC Press, in association with the Canadian Museum of Civilization, Vancouver.

- Discussion of Stó:lō and Nlaka'pamux access and use of canyon fishing sites: (224)
- Establishes the centrality of intermarriage and exchange to Nlaka'pamux: "The family was at the heart of the dynamic between the cluster of villages that constituted a local area and the larger regions of Nlaka'pamux country." (135) Further: "A marriage between two families from different river valleys could give both families access to the resources of both valleys over several generations." (137)

- "Before the goldrush, the Nlaka'pamux relationship with the Halkomelem-speaking peoples of the Fraser River was the primary interregional relationship. Upcountry marriages existed but were rare. The prevailing trend was for women to marry downriver, taking things such as Nlaka'pamux language, basketry skills, techniques for food preparation, and their own kinship connections with them. Newly married people customarily lived with the husband's family but spent time with the wife's people; this

arrangement brought Halkomelem speaking men into Nlaka'pamux territory and into Spuzzum and, as sons in law, gave them access to fishing stations whose use was proprietorial and regulated by kinship. Because both societies had a bilateral system of decent, a married couple could, in principle, make a claim on resources belonging to parents and grandparents of both spouses." (137)

Linkous Brown, Kimberly

2005 "To Fish for Themselves: A Study of Accommodation and Resistance in the Stó:lō Fishery" PhD Dissertation, University of British Columbia.

- Excellent analysis of how Stó:lō fisherman have sought to maintain their Aboriginal Right and Title to the fishery, including the Fraser Canyon.

Lutz, John

2001 Seasonal Rounds in an Industrial World." In *A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas,* edited by Keith Carlson David Schaepe, Albert McHalsie, David Smith, Leeanna Rhodes, and Colin Duffield, 64–67. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

2008 *Makúk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

- A precedent setting cultural and economic analysis of Aboriginal social welfare in Canada. Lutz employs unique and new sources – oral histories, biographies and ethnographic material to develop a nuanced historical analysis of Aboriginal economies and colonialism.

- Lutz presents the central concept of "moditional economies": hybrid economic systems that historically emerged and combined modern capitalist practices and traditional subsistence-prestige activities. Lutz's work further illustrates how Aboriginal people both accommodated and resisted aspects of European culture, including the social welfare system – by combining welfare with other economic activities such as emerging wage labour and subsistence work.

MacDonald, Katya

2008 "Crossing Paths: Knowing and Navigating Routes of Access to Stó:lō Fishing Sites." *UFV Research Review* Volume 2: issue 2, pp. 36-53.

- Examines how access to fishing spots in the Fraser canyon is determined in accordance with Stó:lō Laws. Author interprets how strategies for access and management co-mingle with government regulation of fishery resources in the region.

Maud, Ralph (ed)

1978 *The Salish People: The Local Contributions of Charles Hill-Tout,* vol. **3** Vancouver, BC: Talonbooks

- Contains extensive ethnographic information pertaining to Stó:lō ceremonialism. Of particular focus in this work is the *sxwó:yxwey* ceremony. Contains photos and descriptions of the ceremony as well as a story of the origins of the masks and places associated with *sxwó:yxwey*.

- Includes documentation of places names.

- Contains transformer narratives recorded and translated by Charles Hill Tout.

McIlwraith, Ian

1996 "The Problem of Imported Culture: The Construction of Contemporary Stó:lō Identity." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, Vol, 20, no.4, pp.41-70.

- Examines Stó:lō collective identity and the flexible and fluid ways that cultural tradition, particularly ceremonialism, is carried forward. Article focuses the integration of 'pan-Indian" ceremonialism such as the powwow, argues that the private nature of Stó:lō ceremonialism, such as *sxwó:yxwey* and winter dancing deems it less able to be visible to non-natives, though no less meaningful. Argues that the Stó:lō have a history of welcoming and accepting foreign ideas and people into their area.

McHalsie, Albert, "Sonny."

2001 "Halq'eméylem Place Names in Stó:lō Territory." In *A Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, eds. Keith Carlson et al., pp.134-153.

- Provides the most comprehensive Stó:lō inventory of place names to date – some 727 places names extending from mouth of Yale to the mouth of the Fraser River. (134)

- Sonny's work also establishes some 75 place names of different types within what is currently being claimed as Yale Territory. (140)

- McHalsie establish that "the naming of places in *S'ólh Téméxw* "began thousands of years ago" (134) and that Stó:lō place names fall into three broad categories, which he explicates in detail. These categories not only establish a connection for Stó:lō people to the physical landscape, but also moral, spiritual, social and political dimensions of life. In reflexive prose, Sonny explains that the first category "deals with historical understandings, which are understood in *Halq'eméylem* as *Sqwélqwel*. Names from this category infuse "the landscape with human agency and speak of the actions of past

generations" (134). The second category of names is more geographic in nature, used for navigating and for locating oneself within the landscape. The third type of names are those "associated with the miraculous events from *sxwōxwiyám*, the distant past when the world was transformed into its present recognizable form. (134)

2007 "We Have To Take Care of Everything that Belongs To Us. In *Be of Good Mind: Essays on the Coast Salish,* ed. Bruce G. Miller, pp.82-130. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.

- Article presents McHalsie's personal process whereby he learns, explores and further understands his connection to the Stó:lō cultural and physical landscape. He describes his collaborative work with academics to research various aspects of Stó:lō heritage over the past nineteen years and what he deems to be the most important things associated with the concept of "this is our land and we have to take care of everything that belongs to us". In a reflexive style, he draws upon his own personal narrative and work as a cultural advisor for Stó:lō Nation to establish more complete recognition of Stó:lō Aboriginal rights and title.

- Describes his journey to undertake extensive work recording *Halq'eméylem* place names which built on the initial work of Brent Galloway in the 1970's and inventory sites of significance to Stó:lō people throughout *S'ólh' Téméxw*. Provides an illuminating example of the importance of culturally relevant research and acts as a model for the ideal form and uses of community-based research (CBR).

- Excellent discussion of how access, use and control of hereditary fishcamps is ascribed, (97-101), particularly a critical analysis of the concept of "ownership".

- Describes spiritual "burnings" and protocols associated with ceremony (118-120)

- Water Babies stories and origins and *mimestiyexw*, little people. (122-123)

- Spirit Power – Sonny analyzes the private nature of certain knowledge and experiences "you couldn't tell people your spirit power was or you'd lose it. If something special happens to us, we're not allowed to tell it. Just like an encounter with a Sasquatch…" (124)

- Winter dancing – as an expression of spirit power (125)

- *Stl'áleqem* – (126-129) translated by linguist Brent Galloway in English as "supernatural creature", which Sonny learns from Elders Elizabeth Herrling and Rosaleen George "robbed it of it's meaning." (126) – *Stl'áleqem* "protect family owned sites" and come in many forms, which Sonny describes learned though Stó:lō oral histories with Lawrence Hope, Bobby Peters and as told by Bob Joe to Oliver Wells. Sonny shows how *Stl'áleqem* can be present even after a site has been developed,

citing examples of the Marina in Cultus lake is right where a particular Stl'áleqem, *Hiqw Apel* used to be (129) and Elisabeth Herrling's story of the serpent with the tale used to cross the road at Seabird Island right by where the ball field now lays. (129)

McHalsie, Albert, David Schaepe and Keith Carlson

2001 "Making the Word Right Through Transformations," in Keith Thor Carlson et al, eds., *A Stó:lõ-Coast Salish Historical Atlas* (Vancouver, Seattle, Chilliwack: Douglas and McIntyre Press, University of Washington Press

- This article provides substantive oral historical information about the workings of *Xéxá:ls*, and associates sites illustrates the inextricable link between *Xéxá:ls* and corresponding Transformer sites and Stó:lō *Sxwōxwiyám*.

Miller, Bruce. G.

1996/1997 "The Really 'Real' Border and the Divided Salish Community", in: *B.C. Studies*, no. 112, Winter 1996/97, pp. 62-77.

- Miller's article explores the impact of the International border dividing Canada and US on Salish peoples and is primarily concerned with the ways in which political borders create parallel conceptual and practice boundaries for First Nations in the region and how they respond to this" (64)

- Miller argues that access to resources, both cultural and natural, must be understood within the complex social, political and kinship based systems which characterize Salish life. He argues that "the Coast Salish kinship system emphasized bilaterality and marriage was preferentially exogamous; consequently, individuals had kin in many different villages. (65)

1998. *The Problem of Justice: Tradition and Law in the Coast Salish World.* Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

(1998). Culture as Cultural Defense: An American Indian Sacred Site in Court. *American Indian Quarterly, 22,* 83-97.

- Argues that the "discourse of the sacred is problematic in court" (84) and explores various efforts to define and utilize Indigenous perspectives of sacredness and what constitutes a sacred site in court.

- Uses example of strategies of sacred site classification proposed by Gordon Mohs (1994), and also fundamentally argues the complex system of inter-connectedness between natural resources and the significance of Coast Salish (and other Indigenous groups) cultural cosmogony.

2007 *Be of Good Mind: Essays on the Coast Salish,* ed. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.

- Miller's *Introduction* to the collection of essays provides a comprehensive historiography of Coast Salish ethnographic and ethnohistorical writing. This multi-disciplinary volume is a follow up to Wayne Suttles seminal *Coast Salish Essays* (1987) and fills a historiographic gap. While Suttles was trained under the Boasian model of anthropology, this anthropology establishes that it is equally important to consider the viewpoints of aboriginal peoples themselves (5).

Miller, Bruce. G. And Daniel Boxberger.

1994 *Creating Chiefdoms: The Puget Sound Case*. Ethnohistory 41 (2): 267-293.

- The Lushootseed are the primary focus of article, which explores Coast Salish social political and kinship organization and the concept of "chiefdoms" among Coast Salish. Thesis is that colonial processes may have forced Salish into creating more formal alliances.

- This work is part of a lively debate in ethnographic and ethnohistorical studies in the 1990's about the political organization of Salish peoples. This work is considered a response to Tollefson's research (1987, 1989) and is continued by Miller in his 2001 work. Jay Miller also adds dimension to this debate with his 1999 work *Lushootseed Texts.*

- Miller and Boxberger present the agreed upon cultural principles upon which access and control of natural resources is defined "Many fishing sites were considered the property of one or more individuals. Nonetheless, ethnographers agree that despite this property being owned, everyone in the village had rights of access. "Stewardship" is a better term than "ownership": an individual held the site on behalf of an extended kin group and all those with either consanguinal or Affinal ties had the right to use the site. Clearly, the organizing principle is the extended bilateral kin group, or kindred" (Miller and Boxberger: 1994: 282)

Miller, Jay.

(1999). *Lushootseed Culture and the Shamanic Odyssey: An Anchored Radiance.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press (Great book – in Schaepe report though)

- Seeks to respond/build upon the work of B. Miller and Boxberger (1994), which discusses political organization in Lushootseed, Stó:lō and other Salish groups. Miller draws upon semiotics and a literary approach.

- Contains excellent analysis of hierarchical social classes.

- Miller argues for a renewed understanding and more fully explicated local and cultural context regarding how access to geographic "places" and their associated "teachings/advice" is defined: "calling any and all winter settlements "villages" hides the complex pattern of interranked communities along a waterway and region, communities ranging spatially from towns as regional centres through villages and hamlets to temporary seasonal camps and resorts used every year over centuries." (Miller: 1999: 10)

Mohs, Gordon.

1976 Spiritual Sites, Ethnic Significance and Native Spirituality: The Heritage and Heritage Sites of the Stó:lō Indians of British Columbia. Unpublished MA Thesis, Department of Archaeology, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver.

- Explores the development of varied cultural heritage management policies and practices in British Columbia.

- Provides classification system to assist with the management of Stó:lō heritage sites based on eight categories: 1) transformer sites, 2) spirit residences, 3) ceremonial areas, 4) traditional landmarks, 5) questing/power sites, 6) legendary/myth sites, 7) burial sites as well an additional category for "other" sites associated with astronomy, medicine pools, springs. (For further analysis of Mohs, See Miller: 1998: 93)

- Excellent ethnographic and archeological information pertaining to Stó:lō cultural principles regarding places associated with winter dancing and *sxwó:yxwey*.

1994 "Stó:lō Sacred Ground". In *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*, edited by David L. Carmichael, and Hubert, Brian Reeves and Audhild Schanche pp. 184-208. Routledge, New York.

- Mohs contributes an article to this excellent collection of comparative essays about the ontological and epistemological foundations of local definitions of what constitutes "sacred" land.
- Mohs work focuses on descriptions and generating critical awareness of local Stó:lō understandings of places – particularly sites associated with *Xéxá:ls*.
- Mohs notes that to date (1994) some 200 sacred sites have been identified in Stó:lō territory, along with a tribal registry (192)
- Mohs establishes a means of categorizing Stó:lō sacred sites which is built upon in his dissertation (see Mohs : 1994)

Mooney, Kathleen

1976 Social Distance and Exchange: A Coast Salish Case. *Ethnology* 15 (4): 323-46.

- Mooney's seminal work explores the means by which Salish families gain members and resources through a cultural system of reciprocity wherein they depend on each other and particularly, their leaders, to offer them resources.

1979 Ethnicity Economics, the Family Cycle, and Household Consumption. Canadian *Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 16: 387-403.

Newell, Dianne

1993 *Tangled Webs of History: Indians and the Law in Canada's Pacific Coast Fisheries*. Toronto.

Ray, Arthur. J.

1996 *I Have Lived Here Since the World Began: An Illustrated History of Canada's Native People.* Lester Publishing, Toronto, 1996.

- Comprehensive survey work about the Native history across Canada. Small section deals with Salish, Fraser`s interaction with Stó:lō (308).

Rivera, Trinita

1949 "Diet of a Food-Gathering People…" In *Indians of the Urban Northwest* 1949:25 Indians of the Urban Northwest (Columbia Contributions to Anthropology Volume 36).

David Schaepe

2007 "Stó:lō Identity and the cultural landscape of S'ólh Téméxw" in Miller, B. *Be of Good Mind: Essays on the Coast Salish* (Vancouver: UBC Press) pp.234-259.

- Explores the current paradigm shift which allows the possibility for anthropological practice (archeology, ethnography) to be located within Aboriginal practice and perspectives. Drawing upon his extensive work with the Stó:lō community, Schaepe uses his experience to provide a case study illustrating how the Stó:lō have "undertaken anthropological research with the intent of occupying the field of heritage resource management within their territory." (237).

- Provides a concise historiography and critical analysis of Coast Salish anthropological, ethnohistorical and ethnographic writing.

2008 "Stó:lō Perspectives and Relationships with Land and resources: A Foundation for Understanding Impacts to S'ólh Téméxw and Stó:lō Cultural Integrity. Unpublished Paper on File at Stó:lō Nation Archives, Chilliwack.

2009 "Pre-Colonial Stó:lō –Coast Salish Community Organization: An Archaeological Study." Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, UBC, Vancouver.

David Schaepe, Marianne Berkey, John Stamp and Tia Halstad

2004 "Sumas Energy 2, INC Traditional Use Study –Phase Two: Stó:lō Cultural Relations to Air and Water." (unpublished Report on File at Stó:lō Nation Archives)

- A Stó:lō community policy paper which contains extensive oral history interviews with eighteen Stó:lō community members to record their oral histories related to the a number of topics including: dry rack fishery, *Sxwó:yxwey*, winter dance, fishing, hunting and gathering, *shxwelí*, *sxwōxwiyám*, *stl'áleqem* and water babies.

- This is one of the most extensive and complete community sources for understanding and further developing protocols for the management of these and other types of cultural heritages resources.

- This paper helps to clarify Stó:lō understandings of natural (air, water, the environment) and cultural resources (*shxwelí*, *sxwōxwiyám*, *stl'áleqem* and water babies) throughout *S'ólh Téméxw* by illustrating clearly how they are inextricably linked.

Schaepe, David, Michael Blake, Susan Formosa and Dana Lepofsky.

2006 Mapping and Testing Pre-contact Stó:lō Settlements in the Fraser Canyon and Fraser Valley (2004-2005). Unpublished report on the file at the Stó:lō Nation Archives, Chilliwack)

- Based upon recent archaeological research in the Yale Canyon area at the *Xelhálh* site.

David M. Schaepe, Dana Lepofsky, Anthony P. Graesch, Michael Lenert, Patricia Ormerod, Keith Thor Carlson, Jeanne E. Arnold, Michael Blake, Patrick Moore, and John J. Clague. 2009. "Exploring Stó:Lō-Coast Salish interaction and Identity in Ancient Houses and Settlements in the Fraser Valley, British Columbia" *(American Antiquity*, Vol. 74, No. 4, October 2009).

Schaepe, David, Albert McHalsie and Herb Joe (Stó:lō Research and Resource Management Centre)

2006 *T'xwelátse is Finally Home*. Bear Images Productions, DVD on file in the Stó:lō Archives.

- Documentary which chronicles the journey of *T'xwelátse* and David Schaepe at Stó:lō Nation, along with museum personnel in Canada and US, to repatriate Stone *T'xwelátse,* an object of sacred significance which embodies the work of *Xéxáls*.

- The documentary provides a historical and cultural context for one of many *Xéxáls* narratives associated with physical features within the Stó:lō world and protocols associated with ensuring it's appropriate care.

Smith, Marian. W

1945 Unpublished Fieldnotes: (MS 268:1, p.15, MS 268: 3:2, No.10). British Columbia Archives, Victoria.

- Extensive ethnographic information with Stó:lō community gathered during Smith's 1945 Columbia University ethnographic field school at Seabird Island reserve.
- Interviews with many Stó:lō community members including Bob Joe of Tzeachten, Patrick Charlie of Yale and Mary Charles of Seabird Island address how leadership and thus, caretaking roles related to natural resources are defined. Until 2004, Smith's field

notes were housed in the archival division of the Royal Anthropological Institute in London.

Smith, Marian W., Editor. Trinita Rivera, Erna Gunther, Paul S. Wingert, George Herzog, Arden R. King, June M. Collins, Morris S

1949 (ed) *Indians of the Urban Northwest* Indians of the Urban Northwest (Columbia Contributions to Anthropology Volume 36).

Stó:lō Sitel Curriculum Coqueleetza Education Training Centre 1983. Unpublished report at the Stó:lō Nation Archives.

1983 *Upper Stó:lō Interaction*

- Handbook for educational purposes of Stó:lō Elders teachings and oral histories including prayers for hunting fishing, and heritage management.

Stó:lō Tribal Council.

1988 "Fisheries Co-Management Proposal for the Lower Fraser River Watershed" (unpublished document).

- Proposal for fishery co-management between the Stó:lō and governments which notes the importance of having a process in place to resolve internal disputes.

Stó:lō Nation, David Schaepe, Albert McHalsie.

2003 *Stó:lō Heritage Policy Manual*. Unpublished Document on file at Stó:lō Nation Archives, Chilliwack, B.C.

- A groundbreaking and invaluable resource to assist with establishing Aboriginal Right and Title to *S'ólh Téméxw*. The Manual clarifies guiding Stó:lō cultural principles and corresponding methods and practices by which this principles may be effectively enacted by Stó:lō and non-Stó:lō.

Sturtevant, William.C.

1990. *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 7.* Washington, D.C, Smithsonian Institution Press.

- A comprehensive volume with the goal of providing an encyclopedic summary of what is known about the history, prehistory and cultures of the Northwest Coast. Chapters with a particular focus on Salish peoples, include: *Central Coast Salish* by Wayne Suttles pp.453-475 and Michael Kew Central and *Southern Coast Salish Ceremonies since 1900* pp 476-480), and *Southern Coast Salish* by Wayne Suttles and Barbara Lane (pp.485-502).

Suttles, Wayne

1955 Katzie Ethnographic Notes *Anthropology in British Columbia*. Memoir no. 2, Victoria, BC, 1955.

- Suttles' short 29 page work here is based on his ethnographic fieldwork in the Katsie community, with informant Simon Pierre (son of Old Pierre who had worked extensively with Diamond Jenness), resulting the publication of *The Faith of the Coast Salish Indian* (1955).

- Suttles argues that terms such as guardian spirit, power or shamanism previously used by Boas, Barnett and Hill Tout must be nuanced.

1958 "Private Knowledge, Morality, and Social Classes among the Coast Salish." *American Anthropologist*, no. 60 (1958): 497–507.

- Seminal article of Suttles where he first defines and describes the Stó:lō cultural practice of giving "advice", which is said to consist of genealogy and family history, gossip about other families and riles of proper behavior.

1960 "Affinal Ties, Subsistence, and Prestige among the Coast Salish." *American Anthropologist*, no. 62 (1960): 296–305.

- Explores and "demonstrates the connection between subsistence and prestige economic activities (including potlatching) and the kinship system as well as how coast salish people in one region are connected to those elsewhere." (Miller: 2007: 2)

1963 "The Persistence of Inter-Village Ties Among the Coast Salish." *Ethnology* 2(4): 512-525.

1968a) "Variation in Habitat and Culture on the Northwest Coast." In *Man in Adaptation: the Cultural Present,* ed Yehudi A Cohen, pp.93-106, Adline Press, Chicago

1968b) "Coping With Abundance: Subsistence on the Northwest Coast." In *Man the Hunter Present,* ed Richard B Lee pp.56-68 Adline Press, New York.

1987 *Coast Salish Essays*. University of Washington Press, Vancouver. Cross reference with journal publications below)

- Based on his work in the 1940's and 1950's, this collection of essays is considered to be the most seminal ethnographic work on the Coast Salish peoples. Contains a number of often cited articles which establishes key cultural concepts in the Stó:lō world .

1987 "The Plateau Prophet Dance Among the Coast Salish," *Coast Salish Essays* (Vancouver: Talon books 1987), 152-198.

1990 "Central Coast Salish," *Handbook of the North American Indians, Vol. 7, The Northwest Coast,* p 466.

- Suttles article makes a significant contribution, addressing Central Coast Salish history in a comprehensive manner – sections explore: Environment, External Relations, Subsistence, Hunting, Gathering, Technology, Social Organization and more.

- He reviews concepts and stories associated with Winter dancing, including how dancers are initiated, "get their song" ext… (See: Kew: 1990 for further descriptions) as well as *sxwó:yxwey* (468) and the work of *Xéxá:ls* (466) .

Teit, James

1882 A *Dream Book of a Stalo Prophet*. Unpublished manuscript, CMC, MS (VII-G-19M), c.1882.

- Included as part of Teit's ethnographic writings is a notebook of a Salish prophet that contains pencil drawing and repetitive symbols that only the prophet himself was said to be able to read. The book, which is a ledger book, is now part of the Canadian Museum of Civilization. (See Carlson: 2006 for further analysis)

Teit, James.

1900 *Traditions of the Thompson River Indians* of BC Boston and New York: Memoirs, American Folk-Lore Society 6. 1900.

- Keith Carlson (2006) links Teit's *Traditions of the Thompson River Indians* to corroborating oral history gained from personal communication with Sonny McHalsie which describes the transformers actions in the Fraser Canyon region and Thompson Territory.

- Describes the impact of the canyon wars.

Turner, Nancy .J.

1979 *Plants in British Columbia Indian Technology*. British Columbia Provincial Museum Victoria, Canada.

1995 *Food Plants* of *Coastal First Peoples* (Royal British Columbia Museum Handbook). Vancouver: UBC Press, 1995, (Second edition of *Food Plants* of *British Columbia Indians. Part* 1. *Coastal Peoples.* 1975).

Ware, Rueben

1983 *Five Issues, Five Battlegrounds: An Introduction to the History of Fishing In British Columbia 1850-1930*. (Chilliwack, Coqueleetza Education training Centre).

- Provides historical context related to early regulation of the Stó:lō fishing, but also ethnographic information which legitimizes sustained Stó:lō access, use, and occupation of dry rack fishing sites in Fraser Canyon.

Wells, Oliver

1962 Bob Joe, "Bob Joe at Tzeachten February 8, 1962" in *Oliver Wells Interview Collection (1961–1968),* transcript, Stó:lō Nation Archives

- In an interview, Bob Joe describes how access, use and control of canyon fishing grounds were defined by Stó:lō and Nlaka'pamux (103) See : Fehr: 2008 a) and b) for further analysis.

1987. *The Chilliwack and their Neighbors*. Vancouver: Talon Books.

- Research undertaken within the "salvage" paradigm, Wells is considered an "amateur" ethnographer.

- Documents place name and *Halq'eméylem* terms and orthography which illustrate Stó:lō use and occupation of *S'ólh Téméxw*.

- Contains over fifty interviews with Elders, including Dan Milo, Amy Cooper who discusses origin stories of *sxwó:yxwey* and spiritual sites associated with winter dancing and *sxwó:yxwey* regalia, "little people" and "water babies." (See McHalsie : 2007 for further contextualization of these interviews).

- Bob Joe speaks about location of pithouses, gravesites and transformer sites.

- See http://www.acadweb.wwu.edu/cpnws/wells/wellsdescription.htm (accessed Oct 30, 2010) for summary of contents of Well's taped interviews included in this work, as well as supplementary unpublished tapes.

Woods, Jody

2001 "The Salmon Canneries: Making Room for Families." In *A Stó:lō Coast Salish Historical Atlas,* edited by Keith Carlson David Schaepe, Albert McHalsie, David Smith, Leeanna Rhodes, and Colin Duffield, 72–73. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

- Illustrates how canneries functioned on same seasonal rounds as fishing on the Fraser River did, thus becoming part of this seasonal activity and a shared social space for

Stó:lō. Salmon fishing, and all associated forms of preservation (or modern factory processing) are integral to Stó:lō identity and culture.

Analysis: Summary of Main Points

- The scope of this brief analysis is limited to a review of existing ethnographic and ethnohistorical sources, both published and non-published materials. It is beyond the scope of this literature review to fully review Governmental and archival sources extensively, although some mention of seminal reports is made where they pertain to the topic. Similarly, an invaluable source of knowledge regarding Stó:lō cultural protocols for heritage management (including the form and genesis of individual, hereditary, band and nation level caretaking responsibilities) exists in the extensive oral history materials which Stó:lō community members have collaborated with scholars over the past hundred years to record. The majority of these oral history sources are currently archived at Stó:lō Nation archives, and while many interviews have corresponding transcripts, many do not. Review and analysis of these oral materials can further substantiate existing records which articulate a Stó:lō perspective of this and other topics. Although this would be an extensive and timely undertaking, it would undoubtedly be extremely beneficial.

- As is clearly demonstrated in the literature, how Stó:lō caretaking responsibilities for cultural/natural resources are defined is characterized by the understanding that "the Coast Salish kinship system emphasized bilaterality and marriage was preferentially exogamous; consequently, individuals had kin in many different villages. Kin ties then created a network of relations that extended far beyond one's own river drainage, and that, potentially, provided access to the labour and resources of a larger population as we as to a rich environment." (Miller:1996/1997: 65) There is a need for additional research to review literature and oral sources (if available), of neighboring First Nations communities to further clarify caretaking as well as historical and contemporary understandings of inter-community modes conflict resolution. Of particular relevance would be critical analysis of Nlaka'pamux secondary sources and oral history interviews with members of the Yale band to help clarify perspectives of access, use and control of Five Mile Fishery. As is evident in both historical and contemporary literature, Stó:lō social organization is based upon a bilateral system of decent by which resources are allocated through marriage within the community as well as with surrounding tribal groups. Numerous Salish scholars discuss the fluid movement of families from lower Fraser communities (one excellent example is Seabird Island) to the Fraser Canyon over time. Therefore, interviews and secondary sources with individuals who share Nlaka'pamux/Stó:lō cultural affiliation such as the Hope family, the Charlie family, the Andrew family and the Pettis family in to name a few, would be

of great use in clarifying Stó:lō rights and title to the Fraser Canyon. Also, families from Seabird Island in particular maintain a strong/direct connection to the canyon (for example the late Archie Charles carries both Thompson/Stó:lō names and kinship ties) and their narratives are of great use to the clarification of right and title to canyon resources.

- Gap in literature review: further analysis of Stó:lō oral sources, particularly the vast quantity recorded in past fifteen years. Particularly since the inception of the UBC field school and its evolution into the USASK/UVIC school, extensive oral history interviews have been recorded and can help substantiate Stó:lō perspectives of caretaking responsibilities. Further contextualizing the perspectives inter-generational, gender specific and those who have been covered with names associated with certain caretaking responsibilities will be of great use. Review of Coqueleetza Elders Training Centre materials would be a great asset in further clarifying Stó:lō perspectives special consideration for cultural/natural resources.

- While there is extensive discussion of *Xexá:ls* and places associated with their work in literature, there appears to be a gap in sources (oral and/or secondary) about individual/personal caretaking responsibilities associated with particular physical features connected to stories of *Xéxá:ls.* It would be useful to continue to build on the work of the *Stó:lō Heritage Policy Manual* (2003), the inventory of place names included in the *Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, the work of Gordon Mohs (1994) and the narrative of Herb Joe presented in *T'xwelátse* (2006) and elsewhere.

- Community publications including the productions *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas* (2001), the *Stó:lō Heritage Policy Manual*, *You are Asked to Witness* (1996) and the *Sumas Energy 2 Report* (2004), along with the collection of essays in *Be of Good Mind* (2007) provide keen insight into Stó:lō perspectives of heritage management of all forms discussed in this review. These publications are an invaluable resource to continue to develop sustainable and culturally sensitive policies related to heritage management and ensure that natural/cultural resources (which are inextricably linked) that require special consideration may receive such care.