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Prologue

The Western World is still struggling to *come to terms* with indigenous minorities. There is no longer even a generally acceptable label for such people. Once commonly referred to as primitives . . . and before that, around the beginning of this century, as savages and barbarians, indigenous peoples are now more likely to be called *tribals*, natives, or more possessively, "our native peoples." None of these *terms* are happy choices, being if not insulting at least either misleading or condescending.

... only slowly and reluctantly do we learn simply to call others by the names they call themselves . . .
Abstract

This report presents the histories of the Sheshatht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Ucluelet, groups whose traditional territories today are encompassed in part by one of the three units of Pacific Rim National Park. These groups are the modern day survivors of a two hundred year period of intense socio-political change in the region.

A minimum of twenty-two independent groups once operated in the region. The reduction is attributed to the dramatic changes that resulted from contact with the first European and American explorers and traders. Disease and warfare were the prime reasons for the decline in population by as much as ninety percent and the number of independent political units by over sixty percent.
The histories of the Sheshaht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht have been reconstructed from three main sources: historic documents, interviews of native people and the physical evidence on the landscape of use and/or occupation.

In this report each of these data sets is presented and analyzed separately. It is only after this that integration occurs. The ethnohistoric data set documents chronologically observations of native people in the region of study by individuals (generally whites) who are external to the culture. It spans the period from 1787 to around 1920. The ethnographic data set consists of historical traditions from the region of study that were obtained by interview of knowledgeable members of a native community. It spans a time period of approximately two hundred years. The archaeological data set consists of physical evidence of use and/or occupation that has been identified primarily by archaeologists. The time span of this record is not known for the region, but is hypothesized to span several thousands of years. After these analyses the information from each of the data sets that relates specifically to the area of the Park is extracted and integrated by park unit.
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Introduction

Terms of Reference and Project Overview

The objectives of the Pacific Rim Ethnographic History Project as stated in the Terms of Reference were:

1. To identify and retrieve from archives written and/or taped native texts pertinent to understanding location, function and ownership of territories and sites within the three units of Pacific Rim National Park (Fig. 1).

2. To retrieve other native texts, including interviews of present day elders, to further understand the native history of the park units.

3. To translate and to transcribe where necessary any of the above materials.

4. To produce a final report that synthesizes and integrates the ethnographic, ethnohistoric and archaeological data.

The identification and retrieval of ethnographic texts from archives was highly successful. The primary sources retrieved were the Edward Sapir notebooks from his 1910 and 1913-14 field work in Alberni, the Alex Thomas manuscripts collected between 1914 and 1923 in the Barkley Sound area, the Mary Haas and Morris Swadesh field notebooks from their 1931 field work in Port Renfrew and the Morris Swadesh notebooks from his 1949 field work in Port Alberni.1
Additional ethnographic information was collected for the project in interviews with three Ucluelet elders, one Sheshaht elder, two Ohiaht elders, one Opetchesaht elder, one Toquaht elder and two Ditidaht elders. Denis St. Claire conducted all but the Ditidaht interviews. During various phases of this work, translations were provided by Alice Paul, Lawrence Paul and John Thomas. Transcriptions were provided by Randy Bouchard and John Thomas.

This new interview and archival information along with the earlier published works of G.M. Sproat, F. Boas, A. Carmichael, E. Sapir and M. Swadesh and the recently completed manuscript by E. Arima from field work in the 1960s, forms one of the major bodies of ethnographic material on the Northwest Coast.

To accomplish the fourth objective, the synthesis of this wealth of ethnographic data and integration with other data sets, this report has been divided into five main sections. The first outlines the research design employed and the theory and methodology that provided the framework for the analysis and synthesis of the data. The second section, the ethnohistoric data set, documents chronologically the observations of native people by individuals external to the society in the historic period. It includes the descriptions of people, settlements, and activities recorded by early explorers, fur traders, government agents and missionaries. The third section, the ethnographic data set, consists of historical traditions that have been obtained by interview of knowledgeable members of a native community. The history of research is presented, followed by overviews which focus on the identification Of
people, settlements and activities with the three park units. This section is augmented by geographies for the Sheshaht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht which are included as Appendices A to F.

The fourth section, the archaeological data set, summarizes the results from the Historical Resources Site Survey and Assessment Project. It consists of the physical evidence on the landscape that has resulted from occupation or utilization by a person or persons sometime in the past.

The fifth section integrates the data from the ethnohistoric, ethnographic and archaeological data sets.

As Nuu-chah-nulth history spans at least 4,300 years from a scientific point of view, or since the time the world was created from the native point of view, each of the above sources has valuable information to contribute from its own unique perspective. It is the integration of these different perspectives of history that can provide the most balanced view of past events and ways of life. But before integration each data set must be critically analysed to allow for independent appraisal.

The report is not an attempt to write a comprehensive ethnography of the native peoples whose traditional territories are encompassed within the boundaries of Pacific Rim National Park. Certainly much of the data necessary for such an undertaking has been collected, but it would be a massive task well beyond the financial and human resources available at this time. Two ethnographies that relate to the study area in a general way, however, have been published: The Northern and Central Nootkan Tribes by Philip Drucker and The West Coast People by Eugene Arima.
Fig. 2. Drawing of a village in Nootka Sound by Webber, 1778 (Photo: BCPN PN 4645).
Pacific Rim National Park is located within the southern half of Nuu-chah-nulth territory which extends from Cape Cook in the northwest to Sheringham Point in the southeast (Fig. 3). This area has been the homeland of the Nuu-chah-nulth people for millennia. In the late 1880s nineteen separate groups were recognized by the Indian Reserve Commission as resident in the area. There were many other groups however, which had not survived as separate political entities. They had fallen victim to the ravages of disease and warfare in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The only record of their existence now is in the oral traditions. In 1986 there remain fifteen politically separate "bands", six of whom have portions of their traditional territories encompassed by one of the park units: the Clayoquot and Ucluelet in the Long Beach unit, the Sheshaht in the Broken Group Islands unit and the Chiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht in the West Coast Trail unit (Fig.4).

Prior to Euro-American contact the three park units had numerous villages and a population in the thousands. Life was oriented towards the sea. Bill Holm recently characterized this lifestyle in graphic terms for another Northwest Coast people. It is equally applicable to the Nuu-chah-nulth. He wrote:

> The salt water was the front doorstep and the road of the village. It was also the larder. Every kind of living thing within reach of the canoe-borne hunter or fisherman; the weir or trap, the digging stick or quick fingers of seaweed gatherers, and was sweet or good tasting, or nutritious, was harvested. Special tools were developed, like the sharp canoes and paddles and the sea hunters' three-fathom long harpoons, with their double foreshafts and ingenious detachable points that
Map of late nineteenth century boundaries for Nuu-chah-nulth groups on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

Fig. 3.
Fig. 4. Map of the territories of the six bands with traditional territories encompassed by Pacific Rim National Park.
anchored the long braided line in the hide of a seal or sea lion and let it be played like a giant salmon.6

The sea furnished ... other important materials, such as the skins of sea otters, seals and sea lions, and the bones, sinews, stomachs, and intestines of various sea creatures, which became the materials of technology. Skins were turned into clothing and armor, the bones became tools and weapons, the sinew was used for cordage, and the intestines, stomachs, and bladders became containers and buoys for harpoons and halibut-fishing lines.

... Fish were cleaned and filleted with the curved, sharpened edges of giant mussel shells...

(Materials came from the forests as well) ...inner bark of the yellow cedar for robes, kilts and capes; of the red cedar for baby bedding, towels, baskets, mats... The wood, bark, roots and branches of almost every tree and shrub... were used... each according to its strength, suppleness, or ease of splitting or working into some implement or necessity of life.7

Food came from the land, too. Salal berries, salmonberries, huckleberries, strawberries, and many others were gathered and some preserved by drying or stored in (fish or seal) oil. The shoots of salmonberries and thimbleberries were peeled and eaten as a special treat in the spring. Roots and rhizomes were important staples, and the cambium of hemlock trees was scraped, steamed, and dried into cakes for future use. Dye for cedar bark mats and ceremonial dress came from the inner bark of trees, hemlock for black and alder for red. Meat, furs, and hides came from the animals of the land: deer, black bears and grizzlies, mink, marten, otter, and others.8

The two hundred and eighty-nine native archaeological sites, forty-six in the Long Beach unit, one hundred and sixty-three in the Broken Group Islands unit and eighty in the West Coast Trail unit reflect the physical expression of this lifestyle. With contact came dramatic changes particularly to settlement and subsistence patterns. As population declined villages were abandoned and the survivors moved to
partake in the new economic order. Today the sixteen reserves, four in the Long Beach unit, three in the Broken Group Islands unit and nine in the West Coast Trail unit and the two hundred and eighty-nine archaeological sites remain as reminders of the once thriving communities. Only one, Esowista (Clayoquot IR 3) is still occupied on a year round basis. The Ucluelet today are centred at Ittatsoo (IR 1) in Ucluelet Inlet, the Sheshaht in Port Alberni at Tsahahleh (IR 1), the Ohiht at Anacla (IR 12) near Bamfield, the Ditidaht at Malachan (IR 12) at the head of Nitinat Lake and the Pacheenaht at Gordon River (IR 2) near Port Renfrew. Utilization of traditional territories and reserves is generally on an individual basis. There are still structures at Whyac (Mtidaht IR 3), Iktuksasuk (Ditidaht IR 7) and at Cleho (Sheshaht IR 5).

The native history presented in this report will focus on these sites and the identity and activities of the people who inhabited and utilized them. Before proceeding it is important to understand two concepts, the so-called "ethnographic period" and the "Nootkan local group", as they provide the theoretical and methodological framework around which the data has been analysed, synthesized and integrated;
The "Ethnographic Period"

Much of the writing about native history is based on the belief that there is an "ethnographic period", a span of approximately one hundred years after contact when native cultures operated largely along traditional lines. In this period the Euro-Canadian presence was sporadic and restricted. Native communities generally were isolated and therefore protected from disruptive influences. It was not until the first decades of the twentieth century that traditional native life changed dramatically, and native people assimilated to the new order.

Anthropologists are largely responsible for this belief. Douglas Cole wrote in his excellent and highly readable study of the frenzied museum collecting on the Northwest Coast between 1875 and the Great Depression:

Anthropological collecting had special impetus behind it: the realization that time was essential, that civilization was everywhere pushing the primitive to the wall, destroying the material culture and even extinguishing the native stock itself. Once the culture of these people was gone, wrote Adolf Bastian, . . . it could not be recalled to fill the gaps required by an inductive ethnological science. "What can be done must be done now. If it is not, the possibility of ethnology is forever annulled". This sense of urgency, this notion of a scientific mission, was a constant theme of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century anthropology. "In a few years it will be impossible" wrote John Wesley Powell, "to study our North American Indians in their primitive history".1
Pioneer ethnographers like Franz Boas and Edward Sapir believed that they were documenting the end of an era, the last knowledge of traditional customs and patterns of life. Boas wrote on his perceptions of the Northwest Coast during the late nineteenth century in a report published in 1889:

I wish to close with a few words about the anticipated future of these Indians. We find here very gifted people fighting against the penetration by the Europeans... Their ethnographic characteristics will in a very short time fall victim to the influence of the Europeans... 2

This belief that traditional native culture was intact in the late nineteenth century and then destroyed by advancing civilization early in the twentieth century is maintained in the anthropological literature of today. For example, Michael Ames in a recent review of 'Smoky-Tup', The Art and Times of Willie Seaweed describes the life of an elder in this duality:

Willie Seaweed was born in a cedar plank house on the shores of an inlet that knew only canoe travel... He has lived through a century of rapid and disruptive change during which the very foundations of his society were being questioned, his people dislocated, divided and proselytized, their traditional economic pursuits eliminated and their ceremonies suppressed.3

While it may be true that the last century has seen perhaps the greatest political, social, economic and technological change ever to native cultures, it should not diminish the impact of earlier contact.

The authors have argued elsewhere that contact with Euro-Americans at the end of the eighteenth century resulted in immediate and profound changes to economic patterns and to socio-political and settlement patterns for groups at the trading centres.4 In areas peripheral to
this intensive contact changes were likely less radical and the traditional patterns persisted longer. Changes still occurred, however, but as a result of changing relationships with their neighbours.

The historic period was a time of constant disruption to the traditional way of life. Survival was dependent upon re-defining group composition and settlement pattern. In order to comprehend the magnitude of change to traditional patterns it is important to look at the historic period not in terms of a temporal duality, traditional versus acculturated, but in terms of a series of time frames which reflect the ongoing changes brought about by such factors as population decline, warfare and changing economic pursuits.

The Nootkan Local Group

Fundamental to understanding Nuu-chah-nulth culture is the concept of the local group, the basic socio-economic unit of society. Drucker first described the local group as:

centering in a family of chiefs who owned territorial rights, houses and various other privileges. Such a group bore a name, usually that of their "place" (a site at their fishing ground where they belonged) ... and had a tradition, firmly believed, of descent from a common ancestor.5

Kenyon elaborated:

... the Nootkan local group was conceived of as an idealized family, expanded over time, which owned a distinct territory and shared common ceremonial and ritual property. Members of this family were ranked on the basis of primogeniture and it was the highest ranking member who was regarded as the owner of most of the group’s property.6
Commoners established their presence in the local group on the basis of kinship ties. Explaining the role of commoners Drucker quoted an informant:

"The people who lived in the houses used to move in and out all the time. After a man had stayed with one chief awhile, fishing and working for him, he would decide he had helped that chief enough, and would move to the house of another chief to whom he was related..." 7

Ownership of the local group's heritage was vested in the highest ranking chief, and was passed on to his eldest son, often long before his death. The magnitude of ownership and accompanying privileges in the economic realm are illustrated in the following passages from Drucker:

Not only were houses themselves owned, but the entire village sites as well were the property of the chief of the local group or tribe residing there. If others built houses at the place, it was with the owner's express permission... In fact, all the territory, except for remote inland areas, was regarded as the property of certain chiefs.8

Salmon streams constituted the most important economic properties of the Nootkan chiefs. Though they gave rights to set salmon traps in certain places to kin and henchman, the chiefs exercised their right to claim the entire first catch of the traps made in their individual rivers.9

The conditions under which a group member was permitted to exploit a chief's territory expressed public acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the ownership. They were as follows: No one might fish on any important fishing ground until the owner formally opened the season either by ordering some man to go out to procure the first catch or the first two catches for him, or by calling on all to accompany him on the first expedition of the season. After this, men could go when they pleased. Sometime during the season, or afterward when the product had been dried, the chief sent men to collect "tribute" (o'umas) for him. This was nothing more or less than a tax exacted in kind for the use of his domain. No definite amount was
specified; it "as left to each man to give what he would. Informants say, "the fishermen gave all they could spare. They didn't mind giving, for they knew the chief would give a feast with his tribute." The foodstuff collected in this fashion was always used to give a great feast, at which the giver announced it had been obtained as tribute, and explained his hereditary right to demand tribute from that place. He invariably concluded by requesting the people to remember that the place belonged to him, "to take care of it for him," though they might use it when they wished after the formal seasonal opening. The right to exact this tax demonstrated very neatly the relationship between chiefly status and property ownership. Each chief collected this tribute from whatever fishing grounds he owned, river, inlet, or fishing banks. 10

A chief owned also the important root and berry patches along his river. When the berries, or roots ripened, he sent some women from his house to gather the first crop for him. With this harvest he gave a feast to his people. The crew of berry pickers or root diggers were "paid" in kind.11

The ownership of a territory included rights not only to foodstuffs procured from it by human labor, but also to salvage. Whatever was found derelict in a chief's ocean territory stranded on his beach, or lost on his land, was salvage (honi) and belonged to the chief owning the place. The finder of such property was obliged to bring it to the chief, or at least notify him, and was in return given payment. This right of salvage applied to anything from a whale, a canoe, a good log, or a runaway slave to a dentalia shell or a canoe bailer.12

From these examples it is clear that the local group, headed by a chief, owned a well-defined territory and controlled access to every aspect of the economy within that area. Therefore, in order to understand the social context of the archaeological record, the physical evidence of habitation and resource exploitation, it is essential to identify the local group that was responsible for that record.
This is not an easy task, however, as the social units that operated on the landscape underwent numerous redefinitions during the historic period as a result of population decline, warfare, amalgamations and changing economic patterns. It is necessary, therefore, to document these changes before one can identify the social units responsible for the archaeological record.
Ethnohistoric Research

Introduction

In this report ethnohistory is defined as the study of primary historic documents in order to gain knowledge of a particular native culture as it existed in the past and how it has changed since contact. This study relies on analytical skills derived from both history and anthropology. The methodology is historiography with the context of anthropology needed to evaluate and critically analyze the data. One aim of ethnohistory is to penetrate through the events of the historic period to reconstruct a precontact baseline of native culture to which the vast majority of archaeological sites relate.

The historic period on the west coast of Vancouver Island commenced in 1774 when the Spaniards aboard the Santiago traded with Nuu-chah-nulth people in several canoes near the entrance to Nootka Sound. For the purposes of this report, the 212 year interval between this first contact and the present, is divided into two periods: Period I, 1774 to 1839, and Period II, 1840 to the present. Period I is characterized by a maritime focus to European and American approaches to the new land. Contact with native groups was generally sporadic and of short duration as the primary interest of the foreigners was in the trade of the fur of the sea otter. This was a time of internal change for the native cultures. The impact of Euro-American contact was dependent on the degree of access to the foreigners. The social, economic and political adjustments occurred using
traditional mechanisms. They were not imposed. This does not mean, however, that there was little cultural disruption. Disruption was profound and the changes immense.

Period II is characterized by a land focus to an ever increasing foreign presence, brought about by the ascendancy of the Hudson's Bay Company in the fur trade. This was a time of decreased autonomy for native people; First there was the imposition of colonial rule and gunboat enforcement of the new order. This was followed by full government administration of many aspects of native life through the Indian Act and what was to become the Department of Indian Affairs. The result for the native people was restricted access to the land through the reserve system and to the resources through newly imposed laws, settlements and commercial developments.

The Nature of the Documentary Sources

Primary historical documents are accounts which include observations of people and events written by eyewitnesses to those events. These accounts must be critically evaluated. Facts of history never come in a pure form. They are always refracted through the mind of the recorder. As recorder bias is always in the writings, the objective is to separate that which is bias (the judgemental statements) from that which is fact (the observations). To accomplish this the first concern is to evaluate the recorder. Who was the writer—the actual observer or a ghost writer? When was the document written—at the time? Shortly afterwards? Years
afterwards? What was the purpose of writing—posterity? Political ambition? Duty?

Equally important is to identify about which people the recorder was writing. For example, the impact of early contact was not uniform along the coast. Groups whose traditional territories encompassed the trading centres of Friendly Cove (Nootka Sound) and Clayoquot Sound had far greater access to and contact with the Euro-American traders. It is not surprising to find that most observations of Nuu-chah-nulth culture have come from these areas. But to what extent do these descriptions apply to Nuu-chah-nulth peoples as a whole? It is clear from first contact that groups with access to the foreigners made significant changes to traditional patterns to capitalize fully on the wealth of the trade.\(^1\) What was happening in these locations was in many ways unique and cannot be applied to other groups except in a generalized context. Consequently for this report it is only the documents that contain descriptions of people and/or places in the areas of Pacific Rim National Park that have direct relevance.

In Period I the historic documents include the journals, logs, letters, drawings and charts of explorers and fur traders. Those consulted are listed below in chronological order by ship, captain and area visited.

1787 Imperial Eagle, captain Charles Barkley, Broken Group Islands and entrance to Juan de Fuca Strait

1788 Felice Adventurer, captain John Meares, Broken Group Islands; longboat from the Felice, under Robert Duffin, north shore of Juan de Fuca Strait
Washington, captain Robert Gray, off the Broken Group Islands

17 a9 Washington, captain Robert Gray, Barkley Sound area, Juan de Fuca Strait, Port San Juan

1790 **Princesa Real**, commander Manuel Quimper, survey of Juan de Fuca Strait including Port San Juan

**Argonaut**, captain James Colnett, Barkley Sound area

1791 **Santa Saturnina**, commander Jose Maria Narvaez, survey of Clayoquot and Barkley Sounds

**San Carlos**, commander Don Francisco Eliza, survey of Clayoquot Sound, Juan de Fuca Strait

**Columbia**, captain Robert Gray, Juan de Fuca Strait

**La Solide**, commander Etienne Marchand, off Ucluelet region

**Mercury** (Gustavus III). captain Thomas Barnett, Barkley Sound region

1792 **Adventure**, captain Robert Haswell, Barkley Sound region

1793-94 **Jefferson**, captain Josiah Roberts, Broken Group Islands and Barkley Sound region

1795 **Ruby**, captain Charles Bishop, Ucluelet region

1817 **Le Bordelais**, captain M. Camille de Roquefeuil, east shore of Barkley Sound

In Period II documents include reports and maps of colonial and government agents, exploration parties identifying the mineral resources of Vancouver Island, and Indian Reserve commissioners. Also included are the diaries and reminiscences of traders, store keepers, travellers,
missionaries and settlers. Those consulted are listed below in chronological order by author, occupation and area visited.

1847 Royal Navy hydrographer, Port San Juan

1858-62 William E. Banfield, trader and government agent, West Coast Trail, Barkley and Clayoquot Sound regions

1860 Bishop Hills, Barkley Sound region

1861 Captain Richards, Royal Navy hydrographer, Clayoquot and Barkley Sound regions

1860-64 Gilbert M. Sproat, businessman and government agent, Alberni and Barkley Sound regions

1861-65 Reverend C. Knipe, missionary, Alberni

1864 Captain Brown, Vancouver Island Exploration Expedition, Nitinat Lake and coast to Port San Juan

1868-71 Reverend Xavier Willemar and Mr. Guillod missionaries, Alberni and Barkley Sound region

1874 Reverend Charles J. Seghers and Reverend A.J. Brabant, Catholic priests, Port San Juan and Barkley Sound regions

1874 George Blenkinsop, Indian Reserve Commission, Barkley Sound region

1878-80 Reverend Peter Joseph Nicolaye, Catholic priest, eastern Barkley Sound

1881-1903 Harry Guillod, Indian Agent, West Coast Agency

1882 Peter O'Reilly, Indian Reserve Commission, Pachenaht, Ohiaht, Sheshat and Ucluelet reserves.

1883 Ashdown Green, Indian Reserve surveyor, some of the 1882 allocations
1889  Peter O'Reilly, Indian Reserve Commission, Pachenaht and Ucluelet reserve additions. Clayoquot reserves

1890  Peter O'Reilly, Indian Reserve Commission, Ditidaht reserves

1893  E. M. Skinner Indian Reserve surveyor, 1882, 1889 and 1890 allocations

1894-1904  Reverend Swartout, Presbyterian missionary, Barkley Sound region

1903-11  A.W. Neill, Indian Agent. West Coast Agency

1913-16  McKenna - McBride Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, 1914 west coast of Vancouver Island

The McKenna-McBride Royal Commission on Indian Affairs has been chosen as the cut-off date for documents used in this report. This Commission marks the official end for native people to freedom of movement on and utilization of the landscape.

In the following section observations from the documents listed above that are relevant to the location of settlements and identification of people and activities within the region of the three park units will be detailed. Quotation from original source documents will be used extensively to provide the reader with a feeling for the time.

Overview

The first Euro-American to enter Clayoquot and Barkley Sounds was Captain Charles Barkley. The official log from this voyage has been lost
but his wife, Frances, kept a journal which has survived. She wrote in July 1787:

A day or two after sailing from King George's (Nootka) Sound we visited a large sound, which Captain Barkley named Wickaninnish's sound, the name given it being that of a chief who seemed to be quite as powerful a potentate as Maquillia at King George's Sound. Wickaninnish has great authority and this part of the coast proved a rich harvest of furs for us. Likewise, close to southward of this sound, we came to another very large sound, to which Captain Barkley gave his own name, calling it Barkley Sound. Several coves and bays and also islands in this sound we named. There was Frances Island, after myself; Hornby peak, also after myself; Cape Beale after our purser; Williams point and a variety of other names, all of which were familiar to us. We anchored in a snug harbour in the sound, of which my husband made a plan as far as his knowledge of it would permit. The anchorage was near a large village, and therefore we named the island Village Island. From here my husband sent the boats out to trade under the charge of Mr. Miller, second mate, and Mr. Mackey, and they were again very successful. 2

The anchorage which Barkley mapped (Fig. 5) was in the bay on the northwest side of Effingham (Village) Island (Fig. 6).

Barkley was also the first trader to identify Juan de Fuca Strait.

His wife recorded this discovery:

“a large opening extended to the eastward, the entrance of which appeared to be about four leagues wide, and remained about that width as far as the eye could see . . . which my husband immediately recognized as the long lost Strait of Juan de Fuca, and to which we gave the name of the original discoverer.”3

No mention was made of entering the Strait.

Captain John Meares aboard the Felice Adventurer entered the same anchorage one year later on July 11 likely using the plan and log confiscated from Captain Barkley. Meares wrote:
Fig. 5. A plan of Barkley Sound published by Meares in 1790 but attributed to Captain Charles Barkley (from Meares, Voyages to the Northwest Coast, opposite p. 172).
On the 11th, in the morning, we “are off the mouth of this sound, which appeared extensive, but of no great depth. Several islands were placed nearly in the middle of it, which were rather high, and well wooded. The long-boat was sent to find the anchoring-ground; and, above eleven o’clock, she returned to pilot us into a fine spacious port, formed by a number of islands, where we anchored in eight fathoms water; over a muddy bottom, and securely sheltered from wind and sea. A large number of natives immediately came off in their canoes, and brought abundance of fish, among which were salmon, trout, cray and other shell-fish, with plenty of wild berries and onions. These people belonged to a very large village, situated on the summit of a very high hill. This port we named Port Effingham in honour of the noble Lord of that title.1

**Meares** continued:

On the mainland there are large and populous villages, well watered by rivulets, where great numbers of salmon are taken.3

Unfortunately, the location of these villages cannot be determined from the journal entry. While at anchor in this station **Meares** traded for numerous furs along with salmon, large quantities of shellfish, wild onions and berries.

On the 13th of July Robert Duffin with thirteen men and the ship’s longboat, was sent to explore Juan de Fuca Strait, thus becoming the first European to enter the Strait. He wrote:

14th... came to in a sandy bay opposite to the village of Attah. Came alongside a number of canoes; but no appearance of any furs: Bought from them some hurst-skins and a few fish, for beads . . .

Steered... along the coast, at the distance of a quarter of a mile. This coast, in general, to a village called Nittee Natt, affords a very pleasant prospect: is mostly a sandy beach . . . There are also a number of water-falls, and the surf breaks very high all along the coast.
15th... ran into a small sandy bay, seeing two or three houses there, and came to; upon which all the natives quitted the place. They being only fishermen, taking their fish with them. Seeing no probability of getting any furs here, I weighed and ran out again, and came to off the village of Nitte Natt... attempted to enter a rivulet there, but found too great a surf on the bar to approach... came along-side the chief, named Kissan.

16th... weighed, having purchased several skins, ran into a sandy bay, or rather cove, where there was a village, two canoes in company decoying us in. When, immediately on our approaching the shore, the natives assembled on the beach with spears, bludgeons, bows and arrows making at the same time a dismal howling... Weighed and ran out... At day-light found ourselves abreast a small village: several canoes came off, but no appearance of any furs... Coasted along shore... This coast is entirely a bed of rocks... saw the entrance of a deep bay...

17th... came to in a small cove... close to the rocks... came along-side the boat several canoes... One of the canoes put off a little from the boat; when one of the savages in her took up a spear pointed with muscle-shell, and fixed it to a staff with a cord made fast to it... Upon inspecting... their canoes, I found them all armed with spears, bludgeons and bows and arrows; I also perceived a number of armed people amongst the trees on shore... I saw the spear just coming out of his hand... I ordered (my men) to fire... We instantly had a shower of arrows poured on us from shore... We... weighed anchor... A great quantity of arrow and stones came into the boat, but fortunately none were wounded mortally.

Duffin named the bay Hostility Bay. The long boat returned on the 20th of July and Meares sailed northwards on the 21st after a stay of ten days in Barkley Sound.

Later in the same year the Washington under Captain Gray, was becalmed off Barkley Sound which Haswell described as "a very deep bay in the entrance of which lay a great manery Islands to this was given the
name of Company Bay. Haswell wrote on the afternoon of the 28th of August:

... we were visited by 3 Canoes containing 46 people from among the islands in Company Bay, as soon as they came within Muskit shot of us they paddled with exceeding great haste singing an agreeable air and keeping stroke in time to the tune with there Paddles and at the end of every cadence all together they would point there paddles first aft and then forward first hooping shrill and then horse; they went three times round the vessel performing this manual exercise, and then came alongside without further seremoney, the principle Chief in the Canoes came onboard on the first invitation, they had no sea otter skins and but few of any other sort its beyond a doubt some English Ship must have visited here this season for they plainly articulated several English names, they were very extravagant in there demands for every thing we wished to purchase in consequence of which but little commercial intercorse took place, it was late in the afternoon when they Departed but they first sang a song the air of which was very agreeable ... 8

The Washington did not enter Barkley Sound.

After wintering In Nootka Sound with her consort the Columbia under the command of John Kendrick, the Washington sailed south on the 16th of March in pursuit of trade. Again passing "Company Bay" (Barkley Sound) the Washington entered Juan de Fuca Strait, passed the village of "Mitenat" and anchored in Port San Juan. Haswell wrote on the 29th of March:

... a good maney of the natives in two or three Canoes came off with Salmon for sale and they remained with us all day.

These people have seen vessels before as they are acquainted with the effect of Fier arms but they all say they never saw a vessel like ours and I believe we are the first Vessel that ever was in this port ... This place by the natives is called Patchenat and by us Poverty Cove.9
The reference to another vessel and the effect of firearms likely relates to the conflict with Robert Duffin. Only one “deserted hut” and the “smoke of the Natives habitation” at the head of the bay were seen. No furs were traded and the Washington quit the area on the 21st of March.

On the 12th of April the Washington entered "Companys Bay" and stayed until the 17th. It is impossible to identify from the journals where the ship anchored. Two villages, "Cechasht" and another unnamed, were mentioned. Trade was poor as "Wickanish had been down there and purchased all they had". On the 21st of April the Washington was again off the "Nittinat" village from where the chief came out to trade. Captain Gray exchanged commands with Kendrick at the end of July and left the coast for China and Boston.

In 1790 the Spanish began their explorations south of Nootka Sound. On June 11 Don Manuel Quimper, commander of the _Princesa_ Real, entered Puerto de San Juan (Port San Juan). Upon anchoring in the "middle of the port... a large canoe came out... with two chiefs, between whom I divided a large copper sheet...". Quimper's diary entry for June 12 contained other observations of the native people:

> During the morning some canoes of Indians came out from two small settlements which can be seen on the two streams which empty into this port... They stayed until 2 in the afternoon, having been presented with some beads and pieces of copper... Their color is a clear brownish and their stature and features good. The chief was named Xanape. He told me that some ships had been in this port... saying that they had given them the copper bracelets, ear rings and beads with which all were adorned.

The longboat with the pilot and the canoe with a second pilot spent two days charting this port (Figs. 7,8).
On the 13th Quimper wrote:

... the pilot told me that the two rivers of the port are of delicious water, that the Indians had their settlement in a very pretty small meadow and that they apparently numbered about two hundred altogether.\(^{14}\)

After the pilots had finished taking soundings of the port the Princesa Real continued southeastwards on the 15th of June reaching the area of Victoria on the 30th. Their plan of Juan de Fuca Strait (Fig. 9) is the first on record.

The only trader along the southern coast in 1790 was James Colnett, captain of the Argonaut. The ship's long boat under the command of Mr. Robert Gibson traded along the coast from northern California to the appointed rendezvous, Barkley Sound. The Argonaut, however, was forced by weather to anchor in "Port Wickinnish" or Cleaquot" where she would spend the winter. Gibson arrived in Barkley Sound on the 17th of October and traded there until the 22nd, "when the Indians growing refractory" forced him to quit the area. "An Indian fishing" informed him of the anchorage of the Argonaut.\(^{15}\)

Spanish explorations continued in 1791. The San Carlos, under the command of Don Francisco Eliza with Don Juan Pantoja as pilot, and the Santa Saturnina, under the command of Jose Maria Narvez with Juan Carrasco as pilot, entered "Puerto de Clayocuat" (Clayoquot Sound) on the 7th of May. Over the next two weeks the Spanish surveyed the region. Eliza wrote:

The Puerto de Clayocuat is formed by various islands ... Five large settlements were observed in all this archipelago, each one of which, in view of the multitude of Indians to be seen, might contain upwards of 1500 of both sexes. The largest of all
Fig. 9. Spanish plan of Juan de Fuca Strait, 1790 (from Wagner, *Spanish Explorations*, opposite p. 82).
is that of Guicanich (Wicannanish), in which the number of both sexes may pass 2500, as simply in a dance of young men which Guicanich gave me in his house, more than 600 took part. Their language and customs are similar to those of Nuca.16

The plan of Clayoquot Sound (Fig. 10) shows four villages: one on Echachis Island, one on Stubbs Island and one on either side of the entrance to Sydney Inlet.

On the 21st of May the Santa Saturnina was sent to survey "Puerto de Carrasco" (Barkley Sound). Pantoja reported the findings of the expedition:

... the entrance or inlet of the Boca de Carrasco was a great archipelago of small islands extending 6 leagues from east to west and 4 from north to south. Inside there were two arms of the sea half a league wide, which extend inland from some distance, one in the direction of the first quarter and the other in that of the fourth. These he could not explore for more than 3 leagues on account of the heavy storms with much rain which lasted for 12 days. Finding his food exhausted he had found it necessary to leave without concluding his task. During that time the Indians had attacked him three times. He repulsed them with the artillery, firing various shots in the air, in order to drive them away from the schooner. This he succeeded in doing in a very short time. If he had allowed them to persist in their actions he could visualize the great destruction that would be made among them with the grape-shot from the cannon, because the Indians were very numerous and close together in many canoes, showing themselves to be very warlike and daring. In what he had traveled over he had seen four large settlements. They all dress in the same way as those at Nuca but there is some difference in the language.17

The plan of Barkley Sound (Fig. 11) shows five villages, not four as recorded in the journal. The first is located on the northwestern shore, the second on the northeastern shore in the vicinity of the Alma Russell Islands, the third in the Broken Group Islands, the fourth on the western
Fig. 11. Spanish plan of Barkley Sound, May 1791 (ABC, Maps Collection).
shore of the entrance to Alberni Canal and the fifth on the western shore of Tzartus Island.

The expedition commander Don Francisco de Eliza, aboard the San Carlos, entered Juan de Fuca Strait. On the morning of the 26th of May he wrote:

On passing the Punta de Bonilla (Bonilla Point) twenty canoes came alongside from the large settlement at this point to exchange skins, mats and some fish... After this brief exchange Eliza continued into the Strait.

The Columbia returned to the Northwest Coast in the spring of 1791. On the 28th of June while off the village of "Nittenat", they met a "canoe with ten men... bound a whaling; the natives requested us to go to their village". Hoskins wrote further:

... when the village was between two and three miles distance; several canoes came off, in one of which was Cassacan the Chief and his Lady... the natives tarrying with us until evening... during which time several very valuable skins were purchased for copper and clothing; also a few fine hallihuts for trifles...

The village Nittenat... has no harbour or any other shelter before it; and is only rendered remarkable by a large cataract or water fall a few miles to the northward of it.

Cassacan we found troubled with the venereal to a great degree... on questioning Cassacan, he says sometime since a vessel came to this place; to the Captain of which he sold a female prisoner or slave girl for several sheets of copper; On the vessels going away, the girl was sent ashore; he afterwards cohabited with the girl, who shortly after died; caught the fatal disease and communicated it to his wife, who, he says, has it equally as bad as himself; thus this most baneful disorder will e'er long prove fatal to this pair, and possibly spread throughout the village; making the most dreadful
deslrucl ion: we dressed Cassacan and gave him several medicines; ... Cassacan has also had the small pox; of which his face bears evident marks.20

Boit, aboard the same vessel commented further on disease:

Twas evident that these Natives had been visited by that scourge of mankind the Smallpox.21

Two other vessels traded in the area in 1791, the Mercury or **Gustavus III** under Captain Thomas Barnett and **La Solide** under captain **Etienne Marchand**. The **Gustavus III** reached the Northwest Coast on the 5th of March and ran into “Bartlett’s Sound ... coming to anchor with great difficulty ...”.22 The next day the anchorage was changed to “the lee of a small island where the canoes came off to us to trade with fish and furs”.23 This anchorage proved unsatisfactory and not being able to find another in the sound the **Gustavus** followed the **coastline** north for several days finally reaching Clayoquot Sound where she traded until the 26th.

**La Solide** lay off “Berkley Sound” in the fog from the 6th to the 8th of September. When the weather cleared a three masted vessel was seen coming out of the sound. Marchand, judging the trade to have been ruined, decided to quit the coast for China. Despite being anchored two and one half to three leagues west of the northern point of **Barkley Sound** **La Solide** did come into contact with people from the area. Fleurieu recorded valuable descriptions of the people, **canoës** and whaling gear. He wrote on the 7th of September:

... at six o'clock in the morning, were perceived five canoes, which had come from the part of the coast that bore north-north-east, steering for the ship which then successively approached. Each of these canoes carried six men, all of a certain, age; in that which first came near the ship, was a man
somewhat more advanced in years, who stood up, on approaching the side, and sang for several minutes. In these five canoes, no other furs were seen than some tolerably large pieces of bear-skin.

... After having stopped near the ship for half an hour, they directed their route towards the offing, where, no doubt, they were going to wait for whales; and they drew up in a well-formed line, leaving an equal interval between each canoe.

... their whole clothing consisted of rugs, some of which were woven of the filaments of bark, and others, of wool, appeared, from the pattern, to be of Spanish manufacture; they also wore necklaces of glass-beads, ear-pendants, and bracelets of plaited brass wire, from which hung some bobs of the same metal ... Some had, round their head, a piece of blue cloth, twisted ... Their hats of rush, plaited ... in shape, which is that of a flowerpot turned upside-down, with strait rims, and terminated like a bell in its upper part. Our voyagers did not see them long enough to be able to examine their persons minutely; they appeared strongly made and robust, but very ugly and rather thin; their hair is black and straight; five or six only among them had their face smeared with a sort of ochre.

Their canoes are constructed with still greater intelligence and art than any of those which had been seen on the coast ... they are likewise larger. They are from thirty to thirty-five feet in length, and their greatest breadth is three feet; they are hollowed out of a single trunk of a tree, and the stem is raised by pieces joined firmly, and in a workmanlike manner, to the body of the canoe: the after part is terminated in a round and perpendicular stern: they have throughout their whole length a slight sheer; and the rising of their floor forward and aft is fashioned in a manner so advantageous for going through the water...The Americans move them with paddles which appear intended to serve both for an oar and an offensive weapon; for the blade, or the part which is dipped into the water, is terminated in a point; and, on the whole, this paddle bears a resemblance to a lance.

No other weapon was seen in their canoes, nor any other European commodities than those which have
Fig. 12. Frederic Remington drawing of a Nuu-chah-nulth canoe, published in Harper's New Monthly Magazine, December 1891, opposite p. 186 (Photo: BCPM PW 7774).
been mentioned. But their implements for fishing particularly attracted the attention of the French seamen. A strong lance, twelve or thirteen feet long, cut to a point at one of the ends, and strengthened, at certain distances by broad wooldings of cord which afford to the hand points of rest... and prevent it from slipping; two or three lances, more slender and without being strengthened, but of the same length; two or three pieces of rope of two inches or two inches and a half in circumference; an equal number of leathern bottles, three feet long by fifteen inches, diameter, filled with air; lastly, a chest containing harpoons, lines, fish-hooks, and other fishing gear, composed the equipment of each of the canoes.

On the request of the French, the natives were eager to explain to them, in the best way they could, the use which they make of all this furniture... in their great whale-fishing. The strong lance... is intended for striking the whale, when he presents himself on the surface of the water;... the slighter lances are employed for darting the harpoons, to each of which is fastened one of the long pieces of rope: the other end of the line is fixed to one of those large bladders filled with air: this sort of baloona, floating on the water, cease not to indicate the place where to find the whale, dead or wounded, that has carried with him a harpoon: and the fishermen, directed by this signal, follow him up, and celebrate, by songs of joy, their victory and conquest. But the most difficult is not, undoubtedly, to deprive the monster of life; it remains for them to get possession of him: and it would never be believed, if we were not assured of the fact, that with skiffs so slight and ticklish, as canoes hollowed out of the trunk of a tree, a few men should succeed in dragging the space of four or five leagues an enormous mass, and contrive to run it on shore on a beach where they can cut it up: it, cannot be believed that it was given, to men, who are not sons of gods, to execute, with the sole help of their hands, these real labours of Hercules.²⁴

In 1792 only one vessel traded along the southern coast. On the 2nd of April, Haswell in command of the sloop Adventure, which had been built
on Meares Island during the winter of 1791-92 by Captain Gray and the crew
of the Columbia, entered "Cehaht Cove" in Company's Bay. Haswell wrote:

Several natives alongside who traded with me on a
very friendly footing . . . a Highua Chief of Hichaht
was alongside 'all the morning.25

On the 7th of April the Adventure sailed northwards.

The most important voyage from the point of view of observations of
villages, people and trading practices was that of the Jefferson under
Captain Josiah Roberts. The Jefferson first entered Barkley Sound on the
29th of May, 1793 staying until the 10th of June, then returning on the
7th of September to winter over before leaving on the 12th of April,
1794. Bernard Magee, the first officer, kept a journal of the voyage
which remains unpublished.

On the 31st of May, 1793, Magee accompanied by the doctor and six
hands all well armed left in the jolly boat on a trading expedition around
the sound. His journal reads:

31st . . . I first visited the village on the west
side of the entrance of the middle bay where I
yesterday passed by . . . it was large and populous
. . . a great number of canoes kept around us in one
of which was the Chief of the village. I presented
him with a copper cap, a jacket and trowsers in hope
it would cause some trade to commence . . . but I soon
found it to have no effect tho he had a few skins in
his canoe . . . he soon left us and hauled his canoe
up on the beach without presenting us with anything
in return for what he received excepting an old red
jacket and trowsers . . . they frequently would tell
us that Wickinenish collected all their skins . . .
having no prospects of any trade at this village my
stay were but short . . . I then proceeded across the
sound (where) directed by some canoes to a village
on the east side on the mainland . . . were likewise
large and very populous . . . I anchored close in with
it . . . a great number of canoes put off to us full
of inhabitants but no skins . . . my stay was about
one hour as the evening was advancing and time to look out a place to anchor for the night... I then put off to the lee of an Island in a small creek where we took a small repose to wait the morning when we again revisited the above village where a great number of canoes put off too us as before... purchased one prime skin for 10 towees (chisels) and two small skins for other articles... I made but a short stay as I was determined to have no part of the sound unexamined... this sound which goes under the name of Barkly's sound is very extensive... it forms in the entrance 3 large bays that is from one extreme to the other... and the bays (are) separated from each other by numbers of islands with sufficient passages for ships of any berthing to navigate through from one bay to the other... I went up near the head of the middle bay where I was directed by some Indians in a canoe that accompanied us... got up to it in the evening... the entrance to the village were but very small when I got in along side the village which was the largest of any we had visited... a great number of canoes came around us... brought no skins... for which reason I suppose (they are) obliged to bring all (their) skins as Wickenenish the head Chief who resides at Port Cox... and whose territories this sound is apart... I put off from the village to an island a little to the north of it and anchored for the night... in the morning I went to a village on the west side of the bay which was still larger than any we had before visited... I anchored in close to the village... a great number of the natives came along side us but no trade took place...

June 2nd this was the 4th village we visited during our cruise and collected but one prime skin and two inferior ones... I then gave over any further researches... I proceeded to the ship on the west side of the sound.26

The rest of the time was spent graving the ship and taking on water. On the 6th of June "Too too tiche egettel the next brother to Wicananish" visited the ship. The Jefferson sailed north on the 10th of June for "Port Cox" (Clayoquot Sound).

On the 7th of September the Jefferson returned from trading in the north to the anchorage where the trading schooner Resolution was up on the
The next day they moved up the sound to their winter quarters at the head of Toquart Bay. The crews then busied themselves preparing the ships for the winter lay up and cutting wood for the kiln.

Magee's entry for the period September 13th to 22nd reads:

Every day around the ship full of the natives . . . all hands industriously employed . . . the carpenters sheathed the schooner, smith's making iron swords for the trade to the south . . . sawyers sawing boards and a number of hands cutting wood for coal . . . Collected a quantity of muscle shells which we burnt to lima for the purpose of dressing some of our largest size seal skins to leather, in hopes, to answer for some trade with the northern Indians . . . The course of the week purchased 23 Clammons (tanned hides) generally at the rats of a yard and half square of cloth with some towees in addition . . . we were fortunately supplied with fresh grub since our arrival as we every day killed a quantity of geese and deer.27

Magee continued:

... the 28th (of September) was visited by Tatoochetcticus with his sute from Cleoquot . . . (they) remained on board during the night . . . the next morning (they) went on shore to the village . . . (I) wrote to Wicananish at the instance of that Chief in respect to selling him the schooner with her apperterance for 50 prime skins . . . in the evening arrived a canoe of Capt. Hannah a Chief a little to the north of Clioquot who tarried on board the night together with Tatootchetcticus . . .

... 3 (clammons) purchased from Tattiau the Chief of the Clahasset who came alongside the evening of the 2nd (October) in a large canoe . . . the next morning visited us again when we purchased from him 6 good sea otter skins for 2 iron swords . . .28

In the entries for October Magee recorded a unique event:

... Tatoocheteticus with his people left us giving us to understand that he was going but a short distance and would soon return and requested the lend of our jolly boat which was complied with . . . he promised to return the same evening but 5 days was already lapsed.28
Tatootcheticus returned with the jolly boat on the 11th of October *along* with Wicanninish's answer to the letter "agreeing to the price proposed for the schooner". 30

The appearance of a congenial relationship between the Americana and the native people was shattered on the 8th of October. Magee wrote:

... we observed that no natives appeared as (usual) and a number of guns heard from the village and 2 men stationed... at the mouth of the river as upon the look out... all these circumstances seemed to denote that something or other was planning not much for our benefit... heard a call from the island astern of us... immediately followed by a large canoe from behind the island with 18 men and Huquiss, the Chief standing in her bow clad in his war jacket as were some of the rest and having (their) spears with them.31

Nothing developed. Magee's entry for the 9th explains:

... were visited by a Chief of a village a little to the east who informed us that 2 or 3 nights past (they) had been surprized and set upon by Tattaio the Chief of Clahasset who plundered him of everything (they) could carry off besides 2 girls of 6 or 7 years age. 32

On the 15th of October one of the seamen who ventured alone from the ship was murdered. Magee wrote:

... from the 15th to the 19th few natives were to be seen when on the 19th... a canoe approached... and signified that those of Huquis were good and innocent of the murder committed... that the other tribes were bad.33

Trade continued. On the 20th traders from Clahasset and on the 21st "Huquis, Chief of Toquot" visited the ship. On the 25th a canoe from "Nittenat" came to trade and "Wickanenish" and his 3 brothers in 2 canoes arrived to view the schooner. Magee wrote:
... in mentioning to them the murder of one of our people by the natives here Wickanenish himself mentioned strongly to us to kill 2 of them in retaliation ... that he was under the necessity himself to kill 40 of them no long since on account of (their) abstenable and troublesome disposition ... that (they) paid him but little tribute.34

Little trade occurred in November and December although two chiefs, "Hyuquis" and "Heocheenook" were seized on the 7th of December and held until restitution was made for various thefts from the ship.

On the 24th of January, 1794, "Wickanenish" in one canoe arrived to trade. In the exchange he received two brass field pieces for ten prime sea otter skins. He stayed on the ship overnight and borrowed the jolly boat the next day to transport his guns to Clayoquot. Two other chiefs arrived to trade on the 25th, Hannah from Ahouset and "Tatooseh the Chief of an island in the mouth of the straight of that name --- he lately had married a daughter of Capt. Hannah." 35 A new item in the trade was "hiqua" (dentalia) for which the Americans gave five pounds of powder for a fathom in length, an iron sword for two fathoms and a musket for six fathoms. Clamons were traded at the rate of a musket for one, leading Magee to comment that "muskets has got to be of little value on every part of the coast." 36 Towees (iron chisels) were however in demand much to the surprise of the traders "as almost any quantity of them when we first arrived on the coast would not purchase a skin".37 The rate now was forty for a prime skin or clamon.

On the 25th of February "Chief Tattaio of Clahasset" with four large canoes visited the ship to trade. The chief and three others spent the night on board, the others camped on the island astern. Magee wrote:
... the next day a brisk trade took place ... purchased of him 4 sea otter skins and 26 clamons ... *among other articles* sold him the cabin carpet for 5 clamons and 4 sheets of copper for 2 clamons each. 38

*Depradations* continued throughout the winter. To punish the *thieves* a raid was planned on the identified culprits at the village of "Seshart*. Magee wrote on the 31st of March:

... At day light ... got abreast of the village being about 6 miles distance from the ship ... the natives were considerable in number and *spearred* to be much alarmed at our *arrival* there ... upon demanding the stolen articles which at first (they) denied ... but on threat of firing on them if not immediately produced (they) then went and brought down our canoe with the part of the cable ... at (their) going off from the beach we discharged a number of swivels and blunderbusses at them ... set them in great confusion ... I then landed in the *pinnace* with a number of hands and forced my way into the village ... we then *rumaged* (their) houses took everything of any consequence ... a great quantity of dried fish, some *towees*, bits of copper, one musket ... tore down a number of (their) houses ... stove some of (their) large canoes and took off 6 of the best canoes. 39

The results of the *raid* were reported over the next few days. Magee wrote:

5th April ... were visited by a canoe from Nittinsh ... (they) informed us that there was 3 men killed in the skirmish at Seshart ... besides some wounded. 8th April ... was visited by a canoe from *Hachart* ... (they) informed us that 2 men were killed at *Seshart* in the attack in that place, one wounded in the hand and another in the ankle. 9th April ... was visited by *Hahiw way the Chief of Hachart* ... he says that none were killed only 2 were wounded at *Seshart*. 40

On the 12th of April the *Jefferson* got underway but it was not until noon of the 13th that they reached the entrance of the sound. Magee wrote:
Could not weather the rocks that form the eastern passage... was obliged to bear away within them but in this sound there (is) nothing to fear but what the eye can perceive... we soon got out clare of all many canoes at the rocks afishing but at our approach (they) put if for the shore to avoid us as much as possible.

It was over a year before the next vessel, the Ruby under captain Charles Bishop, traded in the region. Bishop wrote on the 28th of September, 1795:

Last night we anchored at the Entrance of this Place thinking it to be Port Cox. Nor where we undeceived 'till this Morning when the Chief came out to us, in a Large canoe attended by many Smaller ones. He said his Name was Ryhucus, & was Subject to Wicannanish at Cloaquit about 3 Leagues to Westward of this Place, but that if we would go into his Port, he had 50 skins and would sell them to us, and would also send a Canoe to Cloaquit to inform Wicannanish of our situation, who he said would come to his Place with Skins... the wind being unfavourable to go to the residence of that Chief, we weighed our anchor and run into this snug Haven, formed by many small Woody Islands and the West shore of Berkleys Sound and anchored in 15 fathoms, muddy Ground...  

The Ruby had entered present day Ucluelet Inlet where she lay anchored until the 14th of October.

"Wicannanish with his two brothers" arrived to trade on the 2nd of October. Bishop wrote:

The trade being done Wicannanish with his two Brothers Partook of some refreshments with us, when we where Surprized by his demanding to know if we would sell the Ship, and for which he offered to Procure a Cargo (sic) of Furs.

The deal for the schooner of the Jefferson had fallen through for unknown reasons but "Wicannanish" remained determined to purchase a sailing vessel.
The trade with “Hyhocus” netted only two of the fifty skins promised as the chief “frankly acknowledged that he had before disposed of them to his Sovereign, Wiccananish.”

Bishop described “Hyhocus” and his activities:

Hyhocus is an agreeable looking young man, but his mind forms a striking contrast to his Person. That he is a liar we have experienced as well as some Petty Thefts, committed by him and his People. He went out to day in a War Canoe, and fell in with a Small Fishing canoe belonging to some of the Poor People, under the command of a Chief to the Northward named Clahooomas and which Wiccananish is at War with. They took these Poor Fellows and after rifling the Canoe, cut off their heads, and then Sunk her with the boddies, coming alongside of us rejoicing at this victory, that is 2 to 1.

Wiccananish on the other hand was described as:

...one of the most easy People to deal with I ever knew: He Prides himself in having but one Word in a Barter: he Throws the Skin before you, these are the Furs, I want such an Article: if you object, they are taken back into the Canoe and not offered again.

On the 8th of October, “two Chiefs from the East shore, their Names were Yaphasuet and Annathat” came to trade. Bishop wrote: “I believe these People are independant of Wiccananish, but speak the same language and are of the Same ‘Manners’ and Persons.” After three attempts to leave the anchorage the fourth, on the 14th of October, was successful and the Ruby headed south for her winter anchorage.

It was not until 1817 that there is evidence of another trading vessel in Barkley Sound. By 1795 the sea otter had been hunted to near extinction on this part of the coast, and the trade had moved to the north. M. Camille de Roquefeuil, captain of Le Bordelais, was at end of
the season’s trade when he entered the eastern channel of Barkley Sound.

He wrote:

This port, into which the natives told us no vessel had ever before entered, is situated two leagues from the passage, on the east side of the bay. The only mark is a steep hilllock, destitute of trees but covered with a beautiful verdure, which is on the sea side, some cables’ length to the south, and which has the appearance of a ruined fortification.

As far as I could understand, the natives call by the names of Anachtchitl and Ohcia the district which surrounds the bay. They give the name Tchaka or rather Tchacktaa, to Port Desire, and the district which surrounds it.

Roquefeuil continued:

The Indians on the Nitinat shore are generally better made and more cleanly than those at Nootka. We saw several men and a greater number of women, whose complexion differed from white only by a tinge of pale yellow. The greater number of the Indians have black hair, the remainder a light red, all wear the hair long, and the women comb it carefully and divide it over the middle or the forehead. Both sexes dress the same as in Nootka, with this difference, that the women wear under their other garments a kind of apron of bark.

We observed here the same hierarchy and the same subordination as at Nootka. Nanat appeared to be the grand chief (Cia a lesser chief).

During the sea otter fur trade period (1785 to 1825), there were approximately three hundred voyages to the northwest coast. The relative paucity of ships on this part of the coast (fifteen) was the result of two main factors. First, captains wishing a safe port to repair ships, replenish supplies or to rendezvous chose Nootka Sound, the “friendly” harbour since the time of Captain Cook. Second, except in the very first years, few furs were available in direct trade from Barkley Sound. This
area became known to the traders as the "dominion" of Wicanninish who had monopolized all trade to himself. Consequently, Clayoquot Sound (also known as Port Cox and Wicanninish Harbour) became the trading centre for this part of the coast.

When traders did enter the Barkley Sound region it was often after they had visited either one or both of the two trading centres, Nootka Sound and Clayoquot Sound. It was at these centres where the ships laid over, often for considerable periods of time, that the "manners and customs" of Nuu-chah-nulth people were described in detail. The peoples of the Barkley Sound generally were compared to those of the two regions, and inevitably were described as like those in Nootka or Clayoquot Sound though they spoke a slightly different language.

The nature of the trading voyages that entered Barkley Sound also affected the quality of observations. It was the combined scientific and trade voyages of the earliest years of the trade that described the "manners and customs of the native people". The purely commercial voyages, that are more typical of those that entered Barkley Sound, recorded the nature of the trade itself, such things as who conducted the trade and from where they came, rates and products of exchange and everyday events, that affected the crew. It is not until the mid-nineteenth century that there are detailed descriptions of the native people in the region of study.

In Period I, the focus had been trade in sea otter and other fur pelts. Visitations generally were of short duration, lasting only as long as there was potential for trade. In Period II the nature of
Euro-American contact on the west coast of Vancouver Island changed. The impetus was now toward identifying the resources of the area, commercially developing them and establishing settlements.

Maritime trading, however, continued into the early decades of Period II. The initial traders were Americans, operating small schooners out of Port Townsend, Neah Bay or San Francisco. In 1852, W.C. Grant noted that the Americans had bought one hundred and twenty barrels of salmon from the native people in Barkley Sound for trade in Honolulu. In 1854 William Eddy Banfield in partnership with Peter Francis and Thomas Laughton of Port San Juan became the first of a new breed of trader on the coast. They operated a small trading schooner as well as stores in Port San Juan, Clayoquot Sound and Kyuquot Sound.

Competition in the trade continued to be provided by American schooners. The primary commodity of trade at this time was dogfish oil.

As part of his duty as a loyal British subject, Banfield communicated on a regular basis with Governor James Douglas in Victoria. One of his first letters written in 1855 with Francis reported on the native populations along the west coast of Vancouver Island:

Nettinets total population 800 including men women and children (250 warriors). Oh-I-aha . . . 500 in total and about 180 able bodied men above 20 years of age. She-shata . . . from the group of Islands in Nettinet Sound . . . about 200 . . . their warriors might amount . . . to about 50. You clue1 yet . . . the total population is about 350 . . . about 100 warriors. Clayuquot . . . they number about 550 and about 175 men fit for fighting.

In the summer of 1858 Banfield explored the coastline from Victoria to Clayoquot and wrote a series of eight articles for The Victoria Gazette.
entitled "Vancouver Island: Its Topography, Characteristics, etc.". His primary purpose appears to have been to draw attention to the resources of the land and sea for future development. Also included were descriptions, some lengthy, of the native people and their activities in this area.

Banfield wrote of the Pacheenaht in Article Number II on August 14:

About twenty Indians, a branch of the Nitinett tribe are located on the eastern inlet (of Port San Juan). They were formerly much more numerous, but war with the Songish Indians has reduced them to this number in connection with the small pox which ravaged them eight years since. They were at that time nearly annihilated . . .

The bay, inlet and river, abounds in salmon and various rock-fish; the water is also perfectly alive at this season of the year with dog-fish . . . and for the four antecedent years from five to six thousand gallons of oil have been produced from these fish each year (and) bartered by white traders resident in the bay. (Thomas Laughton) . . .

The tribe have also another important fishing ground ... Carlante (Cullite I.R. 3). It is . . . where they migrate in the early part of March, and remain until June for the purpose of fishing halibut. These fish are caught by thousands . . . The fishing banks are distant from the shores, varying from fifteen to twentyfive miles. The fishermen start about midnight, so as to arrive early on the ground, and remain about seven hours in hundreds of canoes, the sea for miles being dotted with them. The Macaws, as well as the whole Nitinett tribe, fish on these banks. From two to three men are in each canoe, and invariably, if the weather and sea are at all moderate, they load their tiny crafts down to the gunwales; and should the seas or wind make up quick, so as to at all seem to endanger their return, they lash large inflated skins to either side of their canoes, which render them buoyant and safe with their experienced and expert management. They never think of throwing a fish overboard for the purpose of lightening their canoes; yet but few cases of drowning occur. The skins referred to are seal skins with the hair side in, inflated so as to form a perfectly compact and ornamental life buoy;
various devices, emblematical of some event in their history, being painted on them. Seals are abundant in this neighborhood. The flesh the savages eat, and deem it quite a luxury. The Indians frequently dive in six fathoms water and bring up young pup seals two and three at a time. knowing from long habit the precise resorts of these animals.

The hooks by which the halibut are taken, are of native manufacture, being made from a stringy tough part of the red pine, which is cleaned and trimmed up nicely to a proper size, and then it is steamed for some time, until it becomes perfectly flexible, when the Indians form it to their taste and let it remain for twenty-four hours. It then is fit for use. They prefer it to the steel hook for halibut, but for salmon and dog-fish they invariably use the steel hook. They also use small thongs of sea weed, bent on neatly together for lines. Hemp lines are rarely met with. Near the hook, about a fathom of neatly twisted fibres or sinews from the deer are bent on. These are very strong, and not easy to bite through.

The halibut fishery forms a great article of traffic with neighboring tribes, with whom the fish are exchanged for potatoes, blankets, Cummasse (camas) and other articles of food, clothing, or ornament.

Nearly every tribe has a different mode of burial. The Pachenetts place their dead above the ground, enclosed in a box, and covered over with loose pieces of cedar plank, and to denote rank in, or particular affection for the deceased, large pieces of white or red calico are extended in front of the pile of boards. These Indians bewail their dead long and loud, the female part of the community manifesting much feeling; but the men show no outward signs of grief.

Article III published on August 19 was subtitled "Whale Killing by the Netinett Indian":

Netinett proper extends from Pachenett on the east to Ohiat head (Cape Beale) on the west . . . The tribe that inhabits this coast number about five hundred and during the spring and summer months they divide themselves into different encampments, or kinds of clanship, each having a recognised chief or head of
Fig. 13. Unloading a catch of halibut from the canoe at Neah Bay, around 1900 (Photo: WSHS).
a house; but withal acknowledging one as supreme. They are different in this respect, from any other tribe I have met with. The principal chief’s name is Maacoola, a man about forty years old. The Netinetts fish halibut and salmon in great quantities.

A large number of whales frequent the waters on this coast, and the Netinetts, as well as the Macaws, kill a great many in a season. They manufacture their own harpoons and gear, and it is a sight well worth seeing, their mode of attack and killing a whale. The season is looked forward to with intense interest, and preparations are making for months prior to the time. It is considered a sacred season.

Very few attain the honor of using the harpoon—probably some twenty men. This is an hereditary prerogative, descending or bequeathed from father to son. However there are instances of its being attained by merit, but they are invariably most dexterous with the weapon, and its use likewise gives them a seat in the council board of their tribe. They have the choice of their own crews, and go with eight—sometimes nine—in a canoe. These canoes are magnificent models, and are handled admirably. For two moons previous to commencing operations, they have to conform to stringent regulations—a sort of savage Lent. Sexual intercourse is strictly prohibited and they are restricted to a certain description of food, compelled to make frequent ablutions, morning, noon and midnight, also to rub their flesh with a rough stone, as well as to undergo other ceremonies too tedious to enumerate.

When the whales near the coast, the canoes are out all day, blow high or blow low. They do not go in a body, but each have different cruising grounds, some little distance apart. The gear consists of harpoons, lines, inflated seal-skins and wooden or bone spears. The harpoons are very delicately made. A piece of the head iron hoop of a stout bound porter cask is what the most of them use. It is cut with a cold chisel into the shape of a harpoon blade—and affixed by the means of gum on to this iron are two barbs made from the tips of the antlers of deer. Attached to this is a stout piece of line, made of sinews, and served round with the
Fig. 14. A Nuu-chah-nulth whaler, Neah Bay around 1910 (Photo: BCPM PN 5393).
same tough material. This then is spliced on to a long line, about three inch stuff, made from cedar twigs by the hand. They "se no (winch), but put a good lay in the rope; it is also moderately strong. Within about two fathoms of the harpoon, a number of large sized inflated skins are seized on. The harpoon is then stopped on slightly to a long wooden handle made from the yew tree, about ten feet in length.

When they get near enough to a whale to strike, the harpooner who is in the bows of the canoe, throws his weapon and in most cases with effect. Sometimes the iron will double up; instantly the barb enters, the stop breaks and the wooden handle becomes detached from the line. The whale directly he feels the harpoon, starts down at a great rate with the seal skins attached to him, which tend to impede and cramp his movements much. The fishermen always are well supplied with length of line. Presently the whale will again appear on the surface in the vicinity of another canoe, the fishermen in which are ready to attack him in the same manner, until he gets from forty to fifty large buoys attached to him, which prevent his disappearing below the surface of the water. He now beats and plunges in a fearful manner, overturning and breaking canoes, till at length he becomes fatigued, so much so that they surround him in their canoes and good him with their short spears until he becomes exhausted and dies; but it sometimes happens he carries all before him, snaps ropes, harpoons, seal-skins and all go with him, the savages seldom give up the combat with one failure. Pursuit is made by all hands, at times successfully; but should the whale escape and afterwards die from wounds, and be washed on shore on the territories of another tribe, or picked up at sea, the harpoons, rope, buoys, etc., are returned to their original proprietors with a present of a large piece of the fish.

The noise attendant on killing a whale is fearful, the whole crowd of savages yelling horribly from the first attack until the death. When they succeed in killing him, all hands clap on, and with a song that would paralyze a strange white man, move off with him cheerfully, keeping time with their paddles.53
It is interesting to note that after over seventy years of contact with Euro-Americans and Western material culture the only change in the technology of the whale hunt was the replacement of the mussel shell blade of the harpoon with an iron blade.

'In the fourth article, published on August 28, Banfield described the distribution of the whale:

The piece which is considered the most desirable, is cut off for the chief, and generally weighs about one hundred pounds. The next in priority is the individual who first harpooned the whale. Then division is made among the subordinate chiefs in quantities according to their rank, and thus the whale is divided and subdivided until the huge carcass is exhausted. Next, the feast takes place. The chief of the tribe invariably sets the example in the beginning. Two or more heralds, attired in red and blue blankets, arranged very tastefully, so as to have the appearance of a scarlet tunic, and blue kilt, or vice versa, proceed to each lodge, and in a loud voice issue their invitations, commanding all men of the tribe to attend at the chief's lodge, as an entertainment is about to be given. The plebeian order generally hasten to attend early and take their seats near the door or aperture through which they enter. The whole lodge is cleared of any incumbrance; the divisional planks which separate the different families are removed, and a clear area is left varying from eighty to one hundred and sixty feet square.

The cooking takes place in one corner of the lodge. A large pile of stones are heated, and large wooden boxes, containing a small portion of water, are placed near them, the stones are put into the boxes by means of a wooden tongs until the water boils. The blubber is cut into slices about an inch in thickness, and put into the boiling water, which is kept boiling by means of a supply of hot stones till the fish is considered ready for serving.

The Ohiat District was featured in Article V, August 28:

The Ohiat Indians are a large tribe, about four hundred and fifty or five hundred strong. They inhabit the eastern side of Nitinat (Barkley) Sound
Fig. 15. Cutting up of a harpooned whale, Neah Bay around 1910 (Photo: BCPM PN 6408).
... The Indian villages are numerous from the very point. They are traceable for twelve or fourteen miles up the Sound, but in winter they assemble in one encampment, showing a full mile frontage. One chief controls the whole; his name is Cleshin.

Herrings come on this coast in February and March in immense quantities . . . They are caught with a small bag net. These Indians also catch a number of whales, and make a quantity of oil from dog-fish and seals. They are likewise great hunters of bears, land-otters, martins, beavers, mink, raccoons, and sea-otters. They exchange these commodities with white traders and the Indians in the interior for blankets, tobacco, powder, shot, calico, etc.

In Article VI, entitled "Ohiat and Nitinat Sounds", Banfield discussed briefly the Sheshah, Toquaht and Ucluelet people of Barkley Sound:

The largest group of islands (in Barkley Sound) is inhabited during the summer months by a tribe of Indians named Sheshats, numbering about two hundred. Like the other tribes, they subsist by fishing and hunting; in the winter months they migrate to an inland water near the mouth of the Alberni canal. This is the great mart of inflated prepared seal-skins, most other tribes on either side coming here to purchase. The Sheshats also have some considerable traffic with the Macaws in cedar planks for building lodges... They excel too in a sort of historical painting, on these prepared planks, which frequently may be seen on the front boards of an Indian lodge. All such decorations have a design, and boards of this description bring a high price. The Macaws transport these planks across the open sea in their canoes - voyages frequently attended with much risk, the distance from Cape Classet to this Sound being about thirty five miles. About eight miles from Sheshat, on a deep indentation of the bay, is a small tribe of Indians, about twenty in number, called Tsquats, once a much larger tribe, but some ten years since they were engaged in an intertribal war with the Nitnats, and in consequence were reduced to their present small number. The quantity of salmon and herring caught here is actually incredible.
On the western extremity of the Sound, is a large tribe of Indians, numbering about four hundred and fifty, called Youcloulyets. 56

Article VII, entitled “Clayoquot Sound . . . The Tonquin Massacre” and Article VIII entitled “A Chief’s Death-Bed and Burial” related to the Clayoquot among whom Banfield was living. He wrote in Article VII:

The Clayoquets number about five hundred, and are the most warlike Indians on the west coast of Vancouver Island, and the most feared by other tribes. They are governed by a good old chief named Tackwizep . . . Whales, dogfish and sharks are caught in large quantities here, for their oil; also, halibut, salmon and codfish. This is the great canoe mart of the west coast. The Indians make canoes varying from ten to sixty feet in length, of the most accurate workmanship and perfect design . . .

Immense quantities of potatoes are purchased every year by this tribe from white traders and the Macaws. They make large feasts. I have seen seventy bushels of potatoes cooked at once, in two piles on hot stones. They eat whale oil in quantities with potatoes. 57

On the 29th of April, 1859 Banfield was appointed government agent by Governor Douglas. He chose the Ohiaht area as his centre of operations, buying the island known as Osmetitcey in Bamfield Inlet. A title deed was signed by “Cleeshin”, the Chief of Ohiaht, and Howeessen, the next in rank, on the 6th of July 1859. 58 During the nearly three years before his death Banfield wrote twenty reports to Douglas. 59 Again his emphasis was to describe the resources and the “capabilities for settlement” of the Barkley Sound region. There are no descriptions of native life in these reports, other than the observation that they were “quiet” or “peaceable”.

To encourage and facilitate development on the coast the British navy initiated hydrographic surveys of the coastline; Port San Juan was
mapped in 1847, and Barkley and Clayoquot Sounds in 1861. The British Admiralty also published *The Vancouver Island Pilot* in 1864 which contained sailing directions for the coast. There were numerous editions of the maps, which contained both major and minor corrections to information. The original survey date, however, remained in bold print in the title while the edition date was almost illegible on the bottom. For example, the Barkley Sound chart (592) was first published in 1865. The following native settlements were plotted: two on the east shore of Ucluelet Arm, one on the western shore of Barkley Sound, Seshart on what is now Equis IR 5, one of the northwest shore of Robbers Island, one at Numukaaiks and several on the south shore of the Sarita River, the Ohiaht village at what is now Keeshan IR 9 and one on the north shore of Kirby Point on Diana Island. No white settlements were noted. Major corrections were made to this map in April 1866 and August 1897.

The native settlements plotted on the 1898 edition include one on the east shore of Ucluelet Arm, one on Village [Effingham] Island in the Broken Group Islands and one each on Diana and Haines Islands in the Deer Group. The Ohiaht village of the 1865 edition was noted as "ruins": Stores were plotted at Ecolle, at the west entrance to Ucluelet Arm and on the east shore of Ucluelet Arm. Anderson's wharf and mine were located on the north shore of Seshart Channel.

Commercial development, however, occurred slowly. In the spring of 1860 *Banfield* reported the arrival of a Captain Stuart in Ucluelet to establish the first trading store in the Barkley Sound region. Later in the same year *Banfield* entered the employ of Captain Stamp and acted as
his agent in making arrangements with the Chiefs of the Sheshat for land for a sawmill and townsit at the head of Alberni Canal. Banfield’s quarters in Bamfield Inlet were taken over by Captain Stamp in the fall of 1861 for a temporary trading post. Banfield remained in the employ of Stamp until July 1862 when he resigned “because I could not serve correctly two masters. Therefore . . . I judged it better to have and devote my whole time to the government service.”62...

Banfield’s 1862 reports remarked on the increasing commercial activity in Barkley Sound. Included were details on the shipping traffic to the mill in Alberni and the prospecting and mining activities on Tzartus (Copper) and Santa Maria Islands in eastern Barkley Sound. Banfield had reported on the potential for a cod fishery in several of his early reports, and in June 1862 he noted:

> A small schooner has been purchased here by Messrs. Stamp & Company for the purpose of fishing codfish, halibut, etc., on the banks outside Barclay Sound but no attempt has been made as yet to fish . . . 61

The first mention of the operation is in an 1866 newspaper account of a voyage by HMS Scout. The party visited a fishing establishment of Messrs. Sproat and Co. that was set up on Village island Where “they salted down vast quantities of excellent cod”.64

The sawmill operation in Alberni, first known as Stamp and Co. and later as Anderson and Co., was the focus of a small white settlement during its four years of operation. One of the people associated with the operation was G.M. Sproat. During his stay in Alberni he collected information on the native people which he published in 1868 under the title Scenes and Studies of Savage Life. He wrote in the preface:
My private and official business on the west coast of Vancouver Island gave me an advantageous position for studying the natives, themselves, and also the effect upon them of intercourse with civilized intruders. I lived among the people and had a long acquaintanceship with them. The information which I give concerning their language, manners, customs, and ways of life, is not from memory, but from memoranda, written with a pencil on the spot—in the hut, in the canoe, or in the deep forest; and afterwards verified or amended by my own further researches, or from the observations of my friends.

The account is a generalized description of the life of the Aht (Nuu-chah-nulth) people in the 1860s. Topics discussed include physical traits, material culture, economic activities, social life, religious practices and ceremonies.

One of the major exploration parties of this period was the Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition under Captain Robert Brown which assessed the country from Cowichan Lake to the entrance of Nitinat Lake in the summer of 1864. Travelling down the Nitinat River the expedition passed numerous salmon weirs in the river and a total of eleven uninhabited Indian lodges along the banks. Continuing down the lake the party passed several abandoned villages on the right side, one of which was stockaded in front. On the 29th of June they reached the mouth of the inlet, called "Etlo", and the village of 'Wye-yack' (Fig. 16.17). Brown wrote:

... we camped in the middle of the village square, and until late at night our camp was a queer scene of trading for tobacco, begging, talking, smoking and watching them. As the Nitinats bear a very bad name I thought it only prudent... to use the necessary precaution against theft or treachery.

He continued on the 30th:
Fig. 16. Drawing of Whyac village as viewed in 1864, published in The London Illustrated News, 24 November 1866 (Photo: BCPM PN 15522).

Fig. 17. A similar view of Whyac village in 1983 (Photo: BCPM 1983:116).
The village is almost unpregnable and stockaded facing the sea... The Nitinahts were at one time a very powerful tribe, the terror of the coast but they have shared in the universal decay, and do not number more than 400 fighting men - They are still great bullies... They have not been at war now for four years when they took 22 heads and many prisoners from the Elwhas (a sub tribe of the Scallama or Scallan Say Indians). They have been often at war with the Clay-o-quot's and Kar-o-quot's... They are noted whale fishers and were at present in the stir of the halibut season.

Brown hired a 'large war canoe and three good pilots' from the village to take him to Port San Juan. He wrote:

... About 2 miles down we passed Kloos (Clooose) a large village of the Nitinats situate(d) in a sandy bay and further on Quamadooa (Carmanah) ... Then came Echwates a small village ... Further on is another village called Karlalt (one house) ... Further on we passed Wawa-hades - about a dozen lodges. This is the eastern boundary of the Nitinat territory.

Brown described the San Juan or Pachena Indians as:

... once a principal tribe but ... with war and disease (last winter many died of dysentry) they are now so thinned that they have amalgamated with the Nitinats. The Thongees from Victoria decimated them a few years ago - Their head Chief is Quastoch ... Their borders, are the Jordan River on the east and Karlalt on the west.

Brown mentioned two villages, one on the right as they rounded the point into San Juan and one on the left bank of Coopers Islet (eastern arm of San Juan giver).

Missionary activity on the west coast of Vancouver Island was initiated in 1860 when Bishop Wills visited Barkley Sound aboard H.M.S. Grappler. He spent from the 20th of October to the 28th in the Alberni area. On the 29th, Hills visited "Cleeshin", Chief of the Ohiahts who was living at the head of Bamfield Inlet. gills wrote:
The principal village of the O-hy-ats is higher up the Sound... Here (Bamfield Inlet), however, lived the Chief Cleeshin and a few families a part of the year.

The interior of his lodge was the same as the universal type. Salmon hanging up to dry. Fires burning in the midst. Women engaged in diligent mat making...

In 1861 Rev. C. Knipe, on the recommendation of Bishop Hills, established the first mission in Alberni to serve the Sheshalht, Ecoolaht and Opetchesalht. He stayed until early 1865 when the white settlement and mill were abandoned. He authored an account of the Tahk-aht language.

The Alberni Mission was re-established in 1868 under Rev. Xavier Willemar. Harry Guillod was the native catechist. Willemar wrote of the first year of missionary work at Alberni:

The wandering habits of the Indians are a very great obstacle to Mission work: the Barclay Sound Indians are always dispersed during the year except for three or four months in the winter time. In the spring they are to be found in every creek and inlet, busy catching dogfish for the sake of the oil which they make out of them, and herrings for food. In summer, they again shift their quarters for the sea-coast-whence they carry on a lucrative trade in seal skins.

During the absence of the Indians, Mr. Guillo and I employed ourselves in cultivating the Mission garden, hoping that, by teaching the natives to obtain their livelihood from agricultural pursuits, we might cure them of their migratory habits; and when once settled at Alberni, we could probably obtain a permanent hold upon them.

In November, 1868 Guillo reported an outbreak of smallpox among the "The Ohy-aht Indians". He wrote:

40 Ohy-ahts had died of the disease which was fast spreading... those who were affected by it were so terrified that they were neglecting to lay in their winter's store of salmon, so that starvation would probably ensue upon the disease.
The result of this epidemic, in the words of Guillod, was that:

they were all very **ill-disposed** towards us on account of the fatality caused by the small-pox among the Ohy-ahts, and which the Indians think was communicated to them purposely by the white men.77

Trade was an important adjunct to missionary activity. The inventory for the mission included rice, tobacco, blankets, soap, biscuits, molasses, shot, gun powder, gun flints, **shirting** cotton, printed cotton, shirts, thread, needles, butcher knives, axes and pipes. **Guillod** wrote:

> The trade here which we have carried on to get acquainted with the Indians and learn the language is very little. The profits to the mission during 2 1/2 years is after all expenses are paid perhaps £ 20.

It takes up a good deal of time and we are continually abused and told that we steal the skins and make lots of money by them.78

**Willemar** and **Guillod** continued their work at Alberni and in Barkley Sound until 1871 when the mission was abandoned and moved to **Comox** on the east coast of Vancouver Island. **Guillod** wrote in his year end report for 1870:

> Another, year has passed and I am sorry to say I have very little progress to report with regard to our work at Alberni. The Indians have been more migratory in their habits this year than before, if they kept more together it might be advisable to travel with them, but the Seshalts alone have the following distinct stations, Alberni. Somass River, Ecoolh, Homoah and Equis, and it is seldom that the whole of them are at any of these places together. Part of the tribe are constantly moving about, so that it is very difficult to make any good impression collectively.79

The Roman Catholic missionaries Right Rev. Charles J. Seghers and Rev. A.J. Brabant were the next to visit the west coast of Vancouver Island. They left Victoria on the trading schooner **Surprise** on the 12th of April 1874 and returned on the 15th of May. Brabant kept a daily diary of the trip. A selection of his observations of the native people follows:
April 14 . . . Enter San Juan harbour . . . The schooner Favorite, Captain McKay, and the schooner Alert, Captain J. Christianson . . . were making preparations to go out sealing . . . with a crew of Nitinat and Pacheena Indians. (The Chief of this area was Kwistog).80

April 16 . . . Entered Dodger Cove . . . The Chief was living alone on Mission Island (Diana). Two canoes full of Indians came over from Keehan . . . .

April 17 . . . Said Mass in the house of Mr. Andrew Lang, the storekeeper . . . The Indians arrived from Kaehan and other camping places and assembled in the house of an Indian called “Jenkins” . . . We left . . . and went to our anchor at Clarkonikose, Village Island, Barclay sound.81

April 18 . . . arrived at Ucluelet . . . young 'Wishkoutl', the Chief . . .

April 19 . . . Mass . . . in the storekeeper's house and then . . . off to the ranch. The Clayoquot Indians came over to join the Ueluelets . . . .82

In September 1874 a second trip was undertaken by Right Rev. Seghers and Reverend Brabant to determine the site for a mission. On the 7th of September they arrived in Dodger Cove aboard the Surprise only to find that the “Ohiat Indians had moved up the Sound”.83 From here they headed north in a sealing canoe, returning to the Ueluelet area at the beginning of October. Again Brabant noted: “the Indians were all away to their salmon rivers.”84 They next visited Ecoole and Numukamis before returning to Victoria via Alberni Canal and then overland.

The first Catholic mission was established in 1875 at Hesquiat under Father Brabant. A second mission was built under the supervision of Brabant at Numukamis and named St. Leo's, being blessed on Christmas Day, 1877. Father Nicolaye was given charge of the mission and the six tribes of Barkley Sound, and the Nitinaht and Pacheenaht. He was replaced by
Father Eussen in 1880 who was in turn replaced by Father Verbeke. In 1891 a new church, residence and school house were built at the summer village of the Ohiahts on Diana Island. This mission was abandoned around 1896.

In 1894 two other religious denominations initiated missionary work in the region. Reverend Stone, a Methodist, established at Clo-oose to administer to the Ditidaht, and Reverend Swartout, a Presbyterian, settled at Alberni. Swartout moved to Ucluelet (Ittatsq) in 1895 and travelled extensively to the native communities in Barkley Sound. The Presbyterians had three missions with schools by 1899: Miss Armstrong at Ucluelet, Mr. Taylor at Alberni and Mr. McKee at Dodger’s Cove. They were under the superintendence of Reverend Swartout.

Swartout wrote a manuscript under the pseudonym C. Haicks based on his missionary work and observations of native life in the Barkley Sound region. Of particular value are lengthy descriptions of a high ranking wedding ("Klootch-Ha") ritual preparations for hunting ("Oos-im-itch"), spiritual beliefs ("Min-nock-eck"), the potlatch, the wolf ritual ("Klo-quan-na"), Indian doctors, death and commercial sealing. Also included are descriptions of the native settlements at Ittatsq, Omoah and Dodger Cove. The manuscript entitled "On the West Coast of Vancouver Island" remains unpublished.

When British Columbia entered Confederation in 1871 jurisdiction over Indian affairs fell to the Dominion Government. (Clause 13 of the Terms of Union). In 1872 Dr. I.W. Powell was appointed first Indian Commissioner for the new province. He identified the land question as a major priority and in May 1874 he instructed George Blenkinsop to reside
Fig. 18. Group of Barkley Sound Indians aboard HMS Boxer during tour by Dr. I.W. Powell, Indian Commissioner, in 1873 (Photo: BCPM PN 4708).
among the Indians of Barkley Sound "for the purpose of acquiring an intimate knowledge of their wishes in regard to lands to be hereafter reserved for them . . .". 86

Blenkinsop wrote an extremely valuable report of his observations from the three months he spent travelling amongst the tribes of Barkley sound. 8 Appendixed to his report were a statement of their Resources and Occupation during the year; an account of their Villages and Fishing Stations; a census of the different tribes of the Sound; and a map locating the boundaries of the tribal territories and the villages (Fig. 19). The ultimate intent of his visit was noted by Blenkinsop in several passages in his report:

It would no doubt have a good effect . . . if these Indians were supplied with tools for clearing land at an early opportunity. It would show them that the Indian Department is in earnest in endeavouring to improve their condition and take that interest in their welfare . . . 88

They are prepared to submit to be ruled by the Department under your authority and have shown a ready willingness to relinquish all claims to the country, with exception of their winter and summer villages and some of their principal fisheries . . .

. . . (and) giving them permission to fish as usual at their different stations until the country becomes of more importance to settlers and others . . . when other arrangements would have to be made regarding their exclusive right to fish in these waters. 89

I believe I am warranted in saying that they are a race of people easily controlled . . . it requires but firm and judicious management to bring them under the sway of civilization as far as is practicable with any of their race. 90

As regards the people Blenkinsop wrote:

The numerous old village sites, some of them several hundred yards in length, now overgrown in some
Fig. 19. Redrawing of "Map of Barclay Sound showing the boundaries of each Indian Tribe", made by Blenkinsop in 1874.
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instances with gigantic maples... prove incontestably that the population of Barclay Sound must have been at some very remote period ten times its present number.

War in former years, and disease... in latter years have wrought this change.91

Scrofula and diseases of the lungs seem most prevalent.92

Blenkinop's census listed nine hundred and forty-nine people for the seven tribes of Barkley Sound. He wrote of his methodology:

Each fire place was visited in succession and the different families counted as they either reclined on their beds, or sat at their hearths, which ensured the greatest degree of accuracy... one or two who were overlooked for the time came some distance to my camp to have their names inserted on the list.93

In regards to social organization Blenkinsop wrote:

Rank... is hereditary. The sister of a chief taking precedence of a younger brother in case of the Chief's death without issue.

The nearest relative at all time succeeds to power...

Whenever the son of the head chief arrives at the age of maturity he invariably assumes the reins of power and the father retires in his favor.94

Although the minor chiefs have each their respective fishing streams yet they are all under the control of the head chief of the tribe, to whom the former invariably contribute a portion of their take whenever the salmon season is over; and this rule applies to food of all kinds.

Even the trees of which they make their canoes and the wood used in constructing their dwellings have to be paid for; and whenever a bear is killed the skin has to be surrendered to the chief...

Property cast on shore, whales included, and all animals killed swimming in the water are given up to the chief, who selects that portion which, according to usage, he is entitled to.95
I experienced great difficulty in arriving at the names of those holding minor rank in the different tribes of the Sound owing to the great jealousy entertained of each other. No one individual of this class being willing to acknowledge another of equal importance with himself, and the lower class too indifferent on the subject to give the desired information.

One and all claim to have but one chief.96

The first Indian agent for the newly formed West Coast Agency was Harry Guillod, who arrived in Alberni on the 27th of June, 1881. Guillod found Alberni too isolated from the coast and moved the agency office from Alberni to Ucluelet in 1884. It was moved back to Alberni in 1890. A.W. Neill replaced Guillod as Indian agent in 1903.

The annual reports of the Indian agents were a major source of information on events on the coast. The reports ranged from one page overviews to a structured format divided into categories: principal reserves, population, health and sanitary conditions, resources and occupation, education, religion, buildings, stock and farming implements. Of particular interest was information on population, economy and settlement.

One of Guillod's first tasks was to undertake a census on the west coast of Vancouver Island. In 1882 he visited the main villages of the nineteen Nuu-chah-nulth tribes recording names, sex and age of individuals by household unit. The total population was 3,610. These population figures were updated each year, and reasons for changes noted. Throughout this period population declined (Table 1). Diseases such as measles, whooping cough, and consumption (tuberculosis of the lungs) were the main
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clayoquot</th>
<th>Uclalalw</th>
<th>Shehalit</th>
<th>Dietl</th>
<th>Ditiddal</th>
<th>Pacheenal</th>
<th>Area of Pacific Rim National Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>3590</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>3750</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>18200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>3740</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>18200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>17200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Population Estimates and Census Returns (1855-1914) for Tribes with Territory within Pacific Rim National Park.
factors for the steady decline. Children, in particular, were the most severely affected which had serious implications for future population.

A selection of observations of economic activities and settlement from the annual reports follows:

1882 - The Tseshahts had left their winter quarters and were making fish oil in the canal in December last year, but all assemble at the sealing stations in February. In the month of June, or as soon as sealing is over, they begin to travel, some to potlatches, others to Victoria. New Westminster or the American side for goods or work; others again are scattered along the coast fishing till it is time to get their winter supply of dry salmon up the rivers; this secured, they settle at their villages in November.97

1885 - The prices of fur seal still being low, the catch small, and fish oil having declined twenty percent in value . . . so most of them are away, to the American side for the hop picking and other work; there being little work and low wages at the canneries in British Columbia.98

1889 - Nitenahahts and Ucluelahts bought schooners for sealing purposes. 99

1890 - In several of the villages a great improvement has taken place in the class of houses lately and now being built.100

1891 - Of late years many of (the) Indians have got into the way of visiting distant places in search of employment at the canneries and hop-fields . . . The catch of fur seal has . . . been large and of considerable value.101

1893 - Ohiaht Tribe are turning their attention to canoe-making . . . the Indian catch (of fur seals) on the coast by canoe was good.103

1896 - The Alberni Indians . . . move down to the islands in Barclay Sound early in the spring, where the men seal on fine days and fish, the women gathering a plentiful harvest of shellfish; herrings and herring spawn . . . The dogfish-oil industry used to be of importance but owing to the low price and limited market very little is made; there are four sealing schooners owned by Nitinaht Indians.103
Fig. 20. Jackson Jack, Ohiaht, hunting fur seal around '1930s' (Photo: AVM 1854).

Fig. 21. Recently killed humpback whale in Dodger Cove around 1900 (Photo: BCPM PN 16345).
1897 - Ohiahts brought in two small whales which they harpooned outside, off Cape Beale; these are much prized for food and are a source of profit to them, the oil and blubber being readily saleable to other bands.104

1901 - Seal-hunting is the principal and most renumerative occupation: ... Indians from the west coast fish and sell salmon and clams in Victoria and Seattle: ... several whales have been harpooned and brought in by the Ohiahts and Clayoquot.105

1904 - The Indians of this agency are all practically wage-earners in some way or other and their prosperity from year to year is to a great extent governed by causes over which they have no control. A poor run of fish on the Fraser, a surplus of labour in the hop-fields, or a small catch of seals in the Behring Sea, will all operate to produce distress ... 106

1906 - The Indians have almost entirely ceased building the huge old-fashioned Indian houses which can still be seen on all the reserves, with beams consisting of whole trees ...

Those Indians who do not go sealing will leave about the end of June or early in July for canneries on the Fraser or at Rivers Inlet, where the men catch salmon ... and the women work inside ... cleaning fish. When the season is over, the Indians will either return home or ... proceed to the hop-fields in the state of Washington ... Sometimes, a portion of a band will remain in Washington State for the winter ... (employed) digging clams.

With the recent erection of new saw-mills in the agency, a small number of Indians have obtained ... work in the logging camps.107

1908 - A number of the Kyuquot Band ... and of the Tseshahit Band ... obtained ... employment at the whaling stations ... it afforded them the opportunity of getting an abundance of whale meat, a diet of which they are fond.

The number of new buildings erected ... has been small ... As a rule the Indian postpones building operations until he has a chance to collect some lumber from the sea, thrown or washed overboard from some vessel in distress or perhaps part of the cargo of a total wrack.108
Negotiations on the 'Indian land issue' on the west coast of Vancouver Island began in 1882. On the 26th of May, Peter O'Reilly, the Indian Reserve Commissioner, arrived at the Ohiaht village of Dodger Cove in Barkley Sound to begin the government allocation of reserves. O'Reilly wrote:

The chief (Keeshan) expressed his satisfaction and that of his tribe at my visit and the prospect of having their fishing stations secured to them, and after a good deal of conversation to the same effect, I proceeded to mark . . . plots of land, 13 in all, as reserves for their use.109

Three are within and two are adjacent to the boundaries of the West Coast Trail unit of the Park. O'Reilly wrote:

No. 9 Keeshan is the principal summer residence of the Ohiet tribe. I have here reserved 375 acres, which includes several old potato gardens, and gives a frontage of Bamfield Creek, a small but secure harbour at the entrance of Barclay Sound. About 100 acres of this land when cleared may be brought under cultivation. Cedar of large size is abundant, and is especially valued by the Indians for making canoes, an industry successfully carried on by them at this place.

No. 10 Rich-ha, one and a-half mile east of Cape Besale, is a fishing station used during the summer when the Indians are engaged in the halibut fishery. It contains 12 acres, the greater part of which when cleared may be utilized . . .

No. 11 Clutus is a rocky point at the western entrance of Pachena Bay, and is used by the Indians when halibut fishing. It contains about 80 acres, of which five acres is fairly good land; the greater part, however, is rocky and comparatively worthless.

No. 12 A reserve of about 200 acres on the Ana-cla River at the head of Pachena Bay. Although densely covered with timber and underbrush, the land is for the most part level and rich, is well watered, and will be valuable when the Indians, turn their attention to agricultural pursuits.
Here the Indians during the autumn obtain a large supply of salmon, it being one of their old established fishing stations.

No. 13 Ma-sit, situated four and a-half miles south east of Cape Beale, contains about 80 acres of rough, broken land. Though worthless and difficult of access, except in calm weather, it is prized by the Indians as a halibut fishery.

The next tribe visited was the Sheshalts. O'Reilly wrote:

In the course of a long conversation with the Chief Hi-you-pa-nool, and some of the leading men, in which I fully explained the object of my mission, the chief laid claim to fishing stations, extending at intervals from the entrance to Barclay Sound to the first rapids on the Somas River, at the head of Alberni Canal, a distance of 40 miles...

... he accompanied me and pointed out the various places he was desirous of acquiring nearly all of which were reserved for the use of his tribe.

Nine reserves were allocated, three are within the Broken Group Islands unit of the park. O'Reilly described them:

No. 6 Cle-ho, a reserve of 12 acres, for fishing purposes, situated on Nettle Island. It is covered with fine timber, but otherwise is valueless.

No. 7 Keith Island contains about 25 acres; on it stands the fishing station of Ka-ka-muck-a-nil. The timber on this island is unusually fine, and is much prized by the Indians.

No. 9 O-mo-ah, a reserve situated on Village Island, contains 30 acres, and is a favorite seal fishing station. As regards soil it is worthless, being all rocky, there is, however, an abundance of timber for all purposes...

On the 5th of June O'Reilly visited the Ucluelet tribe at their principal village (ittatso) in Ucluelet Arm. As the Chief had died the previous year and had not been replaced a spokesman was chosen "to represent the tribe, and to point out the several fishing stations used by
them... After a careful examination of each, I assigned to the Indians
... five reserves". 113 None are within Pacific Rim National Park.

After leaving Barclay Sound en route to Victoria O'Reilly stopped at
San Juan Harbour on the 6th of June. He wrote:

After a lengthened conversation with the chief
(Christopher) in the presence of his people, in
which he explained his wants, I made (two) reserves:

No: 1 Pacheena village stands on this reserve,
which contains 230 acres; it is situated at the
mouth of the South Branch of the San Juan River ...

No. 2 A reserve of 220 acres, situated at the mouth
of the North Branch of the San Juan River ...

Two small gardens on the left bank of the river have been cultivated...

The salmon fisheries on both the North and South
Branches of the San Juan River are very valuable, as
supplying the entire wants of the tribe with this
staple article of consumption; the right to fish has
been reserved to them on both branches from the head
of tidal water to the Forks, a distance of about two
and a-half miles.114

A number of the 1882 reserve allocations were surveyed the next year
by Ashdown Green.

O'Reilly returned to the west coast of Vancouver Island on the 14th
of June, 1889 stopping first at Port San Juan, Harry Guillo the local
agent met O'Reilly there and accompanied him through the district. A
third reserve (Cullite) was allocated to the Pacheenaht:

No. 3 Cullite, a fishing station about five miles
west of the entrance to Port San Juan contains 90
acres ...

As a halibut and dogfish station this is much valued
by the Indians; it is the only place within many
miles where a canoe can land with safety.115
A visit to the Ditidaht was again aborted because of rough weather. O'Reilly then proceeded to Ucluelet where he defined four additional reserves, two of which are in the Long Beach unit of the Park. He wrote:

No. 8 Oo-oolth, a well sheltered fishery to which the Indians resort for halibut is situated at the northwestern extremity of Wreck Bay. Four houses have been built here...

No. 9 Qui-si-tis, this reserve is situated about one mile northwest of Wreck Bay and contains 14 acres, mostly rock and sand.116

On the 19th of June, O'Reilly met the Chief of the Clayoquot "and such of his people as were not absent engaged in sealing or working at the canneries."117 He wrote:

... after a long conversation I ascertained from them where the several fisheries were situated that they wished to have reserved; all these I undertook to visit, and invited them to accompany me in the steamer, or if they preferred it, to have them towed in their canoes, an offer which they gladly accepted.

With the assistance in every case of some members of the tribe, I defined ... 29 reserves, all of which are fishing stations.118

The Clayoquot at this time were considered one tribe with four branches, the Clayoquot, Ahousat, Kelsemart and Manhouset. Two of the 29 reserves are within the Long Beach park unit. O'Reilly wrote:

No. 3 Esowista, situated in Long Bay....contains 19 acres. There are three houses upon it. Except as an Indian camping ground it is valueless.

No. 4 Koo-to-wis contains thirty six acres, and is situated at the head of a slough southeast of Indian Island, Tofino Inlet. A limited quantity of salmon of inferior quality are taken here. The land is low, and covered with Cedar, spruce and hemlock of good size.119
O'Reilly finally managed to meet with the Ditidaht on the 31st of July, 1890. He wrote:

... On my arrival I was waited upon by Sewish the Chief, and a large number of the tribe, and I then explained to them the object of my coming at which they were much pleased; they stated that they had been expecting me for a long time, and complained that several white people had taken up lands belonging to them.

I promised to visit the various places referred to and this I afterwards did in company with the Chief and those interested.

Having ascended the Nitinat river for about ten miles I found that the Indians (in addition to their ancient fishing stations) had staked out large tracts of land, and in many instances had built houses thereon of a very temporary character. This was done very recently, and in anticipation of my visit; with a view to establishing their claim to those lands.

I explained that it would not be advantageous to them should they be allowed to occupy the lands they wished for, as when this part of the country became more populated they would find themselves constantly in difficulties with their neighbors...

The reserves I subsequently defined include a sufficient quantity of land for all purposes, they embrace the sites of all their fisheries and villages, and the places occupied by them when canoe making; an industry of much profit to them...

The Nitinat Indians number 220; their principal occupation is that of fishermen, they are eagerly sought after as seal hunters and find ready employment at the sawmills, canneries and hopfields...

Sixteen reserves were allocated to the Ditidaht. Eight are within or adjacent to the West Coast Trail unit of the park. O'Reilly described the reserves:
No. 1 Ah-"k, situated in the eastern shore of Ah-uk lake contains 105 acres. The Indians find profitable employment at this place in the construction of canoes.

No. 2 Tsu qua na, about one mile west of the outlet of Nitinat Lake. This was once the site of a large village of which but five houses remain. It is a good fishing station being convenient to the halibut banks off Cape Flattery, and to the course followed by the fur seals when migrating northward.

No. 3 Wyah, the principal village of the Nitinat tribes there are many old potato patches which would repay cultivation. Halibut, and dogfish are plentiful in the neighbourhood.

No. 4 Clo-oose... is situated at the mouth of the Sarque river. On it stands the winter village comprising seven houses. Its principal value to the Indians is a fishing station, for in addition to the deep sea and seal fisheries, the sockeye salmon frequent the Sarque river in great numbers.

No. 5 Sarque, a salmon fishery situated on the right bank of the Sarque river, about two miles from its mouth.

No. 6 Car mah na... is situated 1 1/2 miles west of Bonilla Point. It is a favorite camping place for the Indians when travelling, and is one of the few spots on the exposed coast where a canoe can land with safety. Five houses have been built here, and are occupied during the halibut and dogfish season.

No. 7 Ik tuk sa suck, situated on the northern shore of Nitinat lake about 3/4 mile north of Reserve No. 3... This was formerly the site of a large village at present there are but 7 houses upon it.

No. 8 Homitan, on the northern shore of Nitinat Lake... is situated at the mouth of the outlet of a large lake, much frequented by the sockeye salmon. It is the most prized of any of the salmon fisheries of the tribe.
Fig. 22. Meeting of members of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs with Pacheenaht at IR 1, May 1914 (Photo: BCPM PN 12473).
The reserves defined in 1889 and 1890 and the remaining 1882 allocations were surveyed by E.M. Skinner in 1893 and all reserves were confirmed by the McKenna-McBride Indian Reserve Commission of 1913-1916.

The native people were no longer able to move freely on the landscape. Their settlements were restricted to lands that had been reserved for them by the government authorities. Subsistence activities were restricted by government fish and game laws and International treaties such as the fur sealing treaty of 1911. All other aspects of their lives were controlled by the Indian Affairs Department through the Indian Act and administered by the Indian Agent.

Summary

Since first contact with European explorers and traders, native peoples have experienced dramatic and profound changes to all aspects of their lives. The three most important areas of change will be summarized in this report: population and group composition, subsistence and settlement.

The early estimates of the numbers of people on the coast reveal a thriving population. In 1788 Meares wrote:

... to the Southward of Port Cox to Port Effingham, and in that Port, two thousand; and in the other villages which are situated as far as the mouth of the Straits of John de Fuca, on the Northern side there might be about seven thousand people.122

This means that the areas of Barkley Sound and the north shore of Juan de Fuca Strait, the area of this study, had a population of approximately nine thousand people in the late eighteenth century. Eliza, reporting on
Narvaez's survey of Barkley Sound, estimated the population to be larger than both Nootka and Clayoquot Sounds.\(^{123}\) Blenkinsop writing less than one hundred years later, felt that the population of Barkley Sound in the past had been ten times that of the nine hundred and forty-nine counted in his 1874 census.\(^{124}\) This would give a figure of between nine and ten thousand people, which does not include the Ditidaht and Pacheenaht of Meares' estimate. Ten thousand people appears at first to be a high estimate but there is enough indirect evidence from the historic records to warrant confidence in this figure.

What happened to reduce the population by up to ninety per cent? New diseases carried by the European and American crews of the exploration and trading vessels and increased warfare had perhaps the greatest impact. The diseases came in two forms: epidemics of infectious diseases producing spectacular mortality in short periods of time and chronic diseases which produced a continuous long term impact.

Epidemic disease, in particular smallpox, was known on the coast of British Columbia in the late eighteenth century and the officers of the Columbia recorded it among the Ditidaht in 1791.\(^{125}\) The first description of the ravages of epidemics, however, are not found until the 1850s when whites became year round residents on the west coast of Vancouver Island. Samuel Hancock wrote of an outbreak of smallpox in Neah Bay in 1853:

It was truly shocking to witness the ravages of this disease... In a few weeks from the introduction of the disease, hundreds of natives became victims to it, the beach for a distance of eight miles was literally strewn with the dead bodies of these people.\(^{126}\)
The impact was felt far beyond the confines of the area of the outbreak. Fear and panic, combined with a lack of knowledge of quarantine, saw people try to escape the disease by fleeing from their community. Hancock wrote of the exodus from Neah Bay:

... those who had escaped became almost frantic with grief and fear, and conceived the idea of crossing the Strait and going to the Nitinat tribe living on Vancouver's Island. They crossed over to this place, carrying the infection with them, and soon nearly all those who fled from Neah Bay, besides a great many of the native tribe, became victims of the epidemic.127

The loss of life must have been devastating, but without census information an absolute appraisal is impossible. The impact was noted in general terms by people like Banfield in the 1850s when, for example, he described the Pacheenaht as being "nearly annihilated."128

Measles was another epidemic disease which affected children in particular. Brabant wrote in 1887:

... sickness (was) amongst the thousands of Indians who were in the hopfields [in Puget Sound].

Later on some of the people began to come home, their children had died of measles. Others brought their little ones home, but they had the sickness with them... Before long I counted over forty children of Hesquiat alone who had become victims of disease and had died.129

The 1831 census had listed about seventy children in Hesquiat.

Chronic diseases, such as scrofula (tuberculosis of the lymph glands), lung diseases and dysentery, had a less immediate and dramatic impact. Table 1 presented census figures for the area of study from the last half of the nineteenth century to the first decades of the twentieth
century. The continuous decline in population that is attributable largely to chronic diseases is clear.

It is more difficult to assess the impact that warfare had on the population. As with disease the references in Period I documents are not based on direct observations but on second hand reports or impressions. A number of conflicts were mentioned as occurring in the Barkley Sound region, the most severe being the report by Wicanninish in 1793 that he had recently killed forty people. Another imminent conflict, between the Clayoquot and a Barkley Sound group called the "Hichahats", was reported by Hoskins in 1792:

... having heard several guns fired the last evening I asked the Chiefs the cause of it when Tootoocheticus informed me he had been learning his people to fire having placed up a board on which he drew a figure the size of a man. As they were shortly a going to fight the Hichahats he wanted his people to know how to fire in the night. 131

... they were making spears barbed arrows etca others preparing guns and making shot etc. I demanded the cause of all this preparation they said shortly they were going to destroy a tribe not far distant called Hichahats who had not of late in every respect paid them that homage which they thought due to so great a nation. I returned to old Wickaninanish and enquired concerning this war and when it was to commence. He said in two months.132

The end of the war may have been recorded by John Jewitt, survivor of the capture of the Boston and slave to Chief Maquinna, at Yuquot in Nootka Sound. On the 1st of November 1803, he wrote in his diary:

... arrived a canoe from the Wikeniqish. Our chief was informed that they had been at war with another tribe called Ah-char-arts, and killed men and women to the amount of one hundred and fifty. They brought to our chief nine slaves as a present ... 133
Perhaps an observation of the aftermath of another war was Roquefeuil's description in 1817 of "a steep hillock, \ which has the appearance of a ruined fortification" on the east shore of Barkley Sound.

In Period II, warfare was restricted to the early decades. The last documented conflicts on the coast were the raid by the Clayoquot and their allies on the Kyuquot in 1855, and by the Ditidaht on the Clallam on the American side of Juan de Fuca Strait around 1860.

What impact these and other conflicts had was not recorded until the last half of the nineteenth century when warfare was attributed together with disease as the primary cause of the dramatic decline in population.

A description of the Toqualht by Blenkinsop in 1874 is representative:

Continual wars with their more powerful neighbours and disease have reduced them to their present weak state. On one occasion dysentery swept off more than half the tribe, and smallpox and measles decimated them frequently.

They are now the smallest tribe of the Sound numbering only forty-seven men, women and children.

The ultimate result for some groups was amalgamation and consequent loss of autonomy and identity. Blenkinsop wrote:

About sixty years since (the Ekoolthahts) being hard pressed by the other Indians, and having through sickness and war become unable to cope with their enemies, they of their own accord joined the Se.shah.ahts, as they say for protection.

Banfield considered the amalgamated community to be the general pattern in the late 1850s. The Ditidaht were the one group he considered different as they maintained four traditional villages each with its own chief.
One of the frustrations of the ethnohistoric documents is the paucity of references to names of people or groups and to their villages or territory. This is due in large part to the nature of the trade, where the chiefs came to the ships rather than the Euro-American traders going into the villages. Consequently names recorded were most often those of the visiting chiefs, and only occasionally was there a group affiliation. Names of chiefs recorded for Barkley Sound in Period I were: **Hyuquis**, Chief of Toquaht (1793), **Heocheenok** (1793), **Hahiw.way**, Chief of Hashart (1793), **Hyhocus** from the area of Ucluelet Arm, (1795), Yapasuet and **Annathat** from the east shore (1795), and **Nanat** and **Cia** from the area of Bamfield Inlet (1817).

It is interesting to note that chiefs from other parts of the coast were referred to more often in the records then those from Barkley Sound. In particular, Chiefs **"Wicanninish"** and **"Tatoocheticus"** from Clayoquot, **Chief "Hannah"** from Ahouset, Chief **"Tattaic"** from Clahasset and Chief **"Tatooseh"** from Tatoosh Island were mentioned.

The changes to the subsistence pattern of the people living in the region of study were likely less dramatic in Period I than they were in Period II. As noted earlier, this part of the coast was at the periphery of the sea otter trade of Period I, and consequently there do not appear to be the adjustments to traditional economic activities that have been documented for the same time period in Nootka Sound for example. The vessels that did visit Barkley Sound were not guarded by a particular group nor did the native people constantly supply them with fresh foodstuffs as in Nootka Sound. In fact, the crews of the ships did much
of the procuring of fresh food themselves. What descriptions there are of observed subsistence activities are traditional and are very similar to those observed early in Period II. For example, there is little difference in the description of whaling in terms of the gear and the method of the hunt by Fleurieu in 1791 and that of Banfield in 1858, or Blenkinsop in 1874. As well, there are no descriptions in Period I of people moving their settlements on a seasonal basis, as for Nootka and Clayoquot Sounds at this time, suggesting either that this pattern was not observed or had not developed here.

In Period II, however, there is a definite seasonal pattern with people moving from station to station procuring food. For all groups in the study area this pattern had an inside/outside focus. The Pacheenaht spent the winter at the head of San Juan Harbour, and the spring and early summer at their halibut camp at Cullite. For the Midaht the pattern was less defined as they basically lived year round at their outside villages with only a brief excursion inside in the fall to procure salmon. For the Ohiaht, the movement was from Numukamis, their winter village, to Keeshan, their summer village, from where they dispersed to smaller camps at Malsit, Clutos and Kicha for example. This pattern changed towards the end of the nineteenth century when Dodger Cove became the main settlement and the people scattered in the fall to numerous inside salmon stations. The Sheshalht spent the winter at the head of Alberni Canal and the spring and summer at their various stations from Alberni Canal to the Broken Group Islands. The Ucluelet lived in Ucluelet Arm during the winter and scattered to their various fishing stations on the outside of Uculth Peninsula in the summer and to their inside salmon stations in the fall.
Further modification to this pattern were brought about by the increasing presence of whites. The trading stores established in Port San Juan around 1854, Ucluelet Arm in 1861, Dodger Cove around 1868 and Ecoole around 1870 created markets for new products. The first was the trade in dogfish oil which was produced in great quantities by all groups.

Banfield reported the trade by the Pacheenaht in Port San Juan at five to six thousand gallons a year in the 1850s. Blenkinsop reported the production of dogfish oil in Barkley Sound at twenty to twenty-five thousand gallons per year in 1874 which sold for twenty-five cents per gallon. O'Reilly in 1882 reported the production at Numukamis by the Ohiaht at fifteen thousand gallons annually. The liver from ten dogfish was said to produce one gallon of oil. In Barkley Sound the dogfish were most abundant in March, August and December. Along the coast of the West Coast Trail and in Port San Juan the oil fishery took place in August.

Pelagic fur sealing took on increased importance as a wage earner in the 1870s as schooners from Victoria came to the coastal villages to pick up crews of hunters with their canoes (Fig. 22). Blenkinsop reported that from fifteen hundred to two thousand skins annually were taken by the Barkley Sound tribes in April, May and June. The Ditidaht and Pacheenaht also were renowned sealers.

New employment opportunities arose in the 1880s in the Fraser River canneries and the hop fields of Puget Sound. The more people participated in these wage earning activities, the more they had to give up traditional subsistence pursuits. All the major wage earning opportunities occurred in the spring and summer, thereby restricting subsistence activities to
the fall. Salmon became the major food resource, supplemented by flour, sugar, tea, biscuit, molasses and potatoes—from the traders. The cash economy had replaced many traditional pursuits.

Changes in settlement occurred in response to both population decline and change in economic patterns. Again there is little information from Period I. Villages that were observed were described as large and populous. No other information was recorded and the only settlement that was entered was "Sesart" in Barkley Sound during the retaliatory action of 1794. In Period II there are descriptions of abandoned villages overgrown with vegetation, evidence of population decline and the amalgamation of remnant groups into new village structures.

Focus for settlement in Period II became the trading centres. The first stores were established in or near existing communities and as the wage economy took on increased importance people began to gravitate to these centres. The best example is Dodger Cove where Spring and Co. established a store around 1868. Only one Ohiaht house was in the area at the time but by the end of the century Dodger Cove was the main Ohiaht village.

The allocation of reserves in the 1880s reflected the subsistence and economy of the time. Outside of the village sites the reserves were either salmon stations, where the fall supply of food was obtained, or they were outside fishing camps from which people participated in the wage economy. The land was considered valueless by the reserve commissioners unless it had potential for cultivation.

The intent of both government agents and missionaries was to end the migratory habits of the native people and bring them under the guidance of
"white civilization". To this end missions were established at Alberni, Ucluelet, Numukamis which was later moved to Dodger Cove, and Clo-oose. The government funded the religious schools at Alberni, Ucluelet and Clo-oose. The economic foundation of this sedentary life was to be farming. Correspondence from the Indian Agents to the Indian Affairs Department in Ottawa on behalf of the Ohiaht exemplifies the pressures to change. Indian Agent H. Guillod wrote in 1902:

Their principal village at present with the best houses is at Dodger Cove their sealing station, here there is not suitable land for cultivation and Mr. Swartout has persuaded them to try and build a proper village at Numukamis. I visited the proposed town site on my last visit to the tribe and found some clearing had been done; roads were marked out and it was agreed to have lots about 50 by 75 feet so that each would have its own garden, some lots were already marked out.

Indian Agent A.W. Neill wrote Ottawa in 1904 forwarding an Ohiaht resolution requesting that band funds be spent on lumber for housing at Numukamis. In the 1911 annual report, both villages were listed as the principal residences of the Ohiaht, Numukamis in the winter and Dodger Cove in the spring.

Native cultures by the early decades of the twentieth century had experienced over one hundred years of dramatic changes as a direct result of contact with Euro-Americans. In this section these changes have been presented as seen through the ayes of the foreigners. Another way to look at native history is presented in the next section.
Ethnographic and Oral History Research

Introduction

An equally important way of looking at native history is through the eyes of the people themselves. This is not a written history but an oral history. It is a living knowledge that is passed down from generation to generation in daily life and at ceremonial gatherings. In part it is legend and myth, Sapir wrote of its importance:

Legend and myth permeate the whole of Indian life... The Nootka Indians... distinguish very strictly between myths proper and legends. Both are believed to be true, but the myths go back to a misty past in which the world wore a very different aspect from its familiar appearance of today. They go back to a time when animals were human beings, to be later transformed into the creatures we know, and the tribes of men had not yet settled in their historic places nor started upon their appointed tasks. The legends, on the other hand, deal with supposedly historical characters of human kind, are definitely localized, and connect directly with the tribes of today and what is of ceremonial or social importance to them. A myth--is no one's special property. It may be told by anyone and is generally known to a large number. A legend, however, is family property. Only those may tell it who have an inherited right to it.1

In part it is also life history. Phillips wrote:

... the life history is still the most cognitively rich and humanly understandable way of getting at an inner view of culture. [No other type of study] can equal the life history in demonstrating what the native [him/herself] considers to be Important in his [her] own experience and how he [she] thinks and feels about that experience.2
Life histories can be avenues to understanding subsistence activities, beliefs, marriage, rank, rights and ceremonies for example. As Margaret Blackman wrote: “the basic fabric of ethnology is woven from the scraps of individuals’ lives, from the experiences and knowledge of individual informants”.  

This is the data set that anthropologists use to write native history. It is collected by interview of knowledgeable community members, generally the elders. Edward Sapir wrote to Alex Thomas, his assistant, on the importance of the methodology of collection:

... of course we know that old Indians often do better when they tell things of their own accord than when they are bothered by precise questions which they do not always understand.

Ethnographic recording results in two types of native history. The first is the publication of the verbatim recording of traditions as ethnographic texts. The second is the writing of history based on interpretation of these traditions and publication as an ethnography which is structured according to categories of anthropological study.

A major problem encountered when using native historical traditions is time frame. When working with Swadesh and Haas-in 1931 Pacheenaht Chief Peter talked of four time periods for traditions: “story of old people, of ancestors”, “story of one’s own life time”, “story of a little while ago” and “a dream.”

Time is also referred to in terms of generations. It is, however, a relative concept not an absolute one. When events are said to occur at the time when the respondent’s father’s father was a young man, how long ago was that? Does it depend on the age of each individual or can an
average number of years per generation be used? If events are said to have happened when the first sailing vessel arrived, does this refer to the first European vessel on the coast, e.g.: Perez in 1774 or Cook in 1778? Or is this a reference to the first sailing vessel to enter that specific place, perhaps seventy-five years later?

Is it possible to date the memory span of respondents? Is it accurate for one hundred years? Two hundred years? Longer? These and others are crucial types of questions that must be answered before oral historical traditions can be used effectively to reconstruct native history.

History of Ethnographic Research in the Barkley Sound Region

The first anthropologist to undertake field work in the Barkley Sound region was Franz Boas, who spent two weeks in Alberni in August 1889. This field work was part of the project to document the "Northwestern tribes of the Dominion of Canada" by the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Boas' paper on the Nootka appeared in the 1890 report.

Boas wrote of the focus of his article:

Our knowledge of the Nootka is not so deficient as that of most other tribes of British Columbia, as their customs have been described very fully by C.M. Sprout in his book ... I confine myself ... to recording the new facts that I have observed or learnt by inquiries among the older Indians.7

The only respondent named was "Tlutisim, a man of about thirty years old belonging to the Nctcmu'asath sept."8 Interviews were conducted in the
Chinook Jargon. Topics discussed by Boas include political organization, the potlatch, games, customs relating to birth, puberty, marriage and death, religion and shamanism and the wolf ritual. Twenty-three legends collected at the same time were published separately in 1895. 9

The next anthropologist to work in the region was Edward Sapir, who had done his doctoral dissertation with Boas at Columbia University between 1904 and 1906. Sapir had taken a position as Chief Anthropologist at the National Museum of Canada in June, 1910. From the 20th of September to the 6th of December he undertook field work among the Nootka at Alberni. His reasons for choosing this region for study, however, are as yet unknown. During these two months he collected six notebooks of ethnographic information, made recordings of sixty-seven songs, witnessed six ceremonies and collected ninety-one artifacts for the National Museum. His respondents were: Sayaach'apis (Sheshaht), Big Fred (Sheshaht), William (Sheshaht), Douglas Thomas (Sheshaht), Tyee Bob (Opetchesaht), Cultus Bob (Sheshaht), Frank Williams (Sheshaht), Dan Watts (Opetchesaht) and Mr. Bill (Sheshaht). 10

Sapir returned to the Alberni area in October, 1913. Over the next five months he collected eighteen notebooks of ethnographic information from Sheshaht and Opetchesaht respondents and another eighty-three artifacts for the National Museum. He also witnessed four ceremonies. His respondents were: Big Fred, William, Sayaach'apis, Frank Williams, Douglas Thomas, Mr. Bill, Captain Bill (Sheshaht) and Hamilton George (Opetchesaht). 11

During his second field season Sapir trained two native assistants, Alex Thomas and Frank Williams, in procedures for collecting and recording
Fig. 26. Alex Thomas in 1968 (Photo: NMC J.21201).
ethnographic information. They were paid fifty cents a page plus paper and postage. Thomas in particular became a valuable recorder of ethnographic information for Sapir. Between 1914 and 1923 he collected thirty-eight ethnographic manuscripts containing seventy-two texts, a number of these from groups in Barkley Sound other than the Sheshaht and Opetchesaht. Among those Thomas worked with were Tom Sayaachapis (Sheshaht), Kwishanishim (Ucluelet), Dick Thlaamahuue (Ohiaht), Klootasee (Sheshaht) and Douglas Thomas (Sheshaht).  

Sapir's strategy was to publish the myths and legendary texts first, which would then serve as a solid basis for the systematic discussion of various aspects of "Nootka" culture. It appears from his files that he intended also to write an ethnography of the "Nootka". Typewritten "notes" taken from his twenty-four field notebooks were organized into thirty-one topic areas which range from technology to ceremonials and potlatches.  

The analysis of the Nootka material and publication plans were disrupted in 1925 when Sapir left the National Museum of Canada for a teaching position at the University of Chicago. One of his students, Morris Swadesh, began to work with Sapir in 1930 as a research assistant. In 1931 Sapir left Chicago for Yale University. Swadesh accompanied him to collaborate in preparing the "Nootka" data for publication. In the summer of 1934 Alex Thomas was brought to Yale to assist in the project. The American Council of Learned Studies funded this trip and provided Swadesh with a fellowship. This work, Nootka Texts, Tales and Ethnological Narratives with Grammatical Notes and Lexical Materials, was
published in 1939, shortly after Sapir's death. The purpose of the volume was outlined in the introduction:

The 44 texts of this volume consist partly of folk tales, partly of ethnographic narratives intended to give some idea of the life of the natives.14

In 1914 Edward Curtis worked in the Clayoquot region gathering ethnographic information on the "Nootka" for his study on the North American Indian. George Hunt appears to have been his assistant at this time and likely recorded the historical traditions and ethnographic notes. The names of the Clayoquot respondents, however, were not recorded in the 1916 publication.15

The work of two individuals in the 1920s added new ethnographic information of importance to this report. In August 1922 Alfred Carmichael, an early resident of the area, was on holidays in the Bamfield area. During this time he developed a relationship with an Ohiaht Sa-sa-watin (Mr. Sport) and his wife Yim-a-uk (Lucy). He wrote:

On several occasions we were visited by two old Indians ... Gradually we gained the confidence of the two, (after buying model canoes and baskets) and from them or through them I was able to hear many tales, of long ago.16

Carmichael had previous experience collecting stories when he was working in the Alberni area in the 1890s. He talked with Mr. Bill, a Sheshahht. Again he was interested in writing down the stories told him but times, had changed. He wrote:

News that I was interested in Indian folk lore had already reached the village (Dodger Cove), but I found that since my early visits (i.e. 1890s), stories had become of commercial value. Had not Dr. Sapir from Ottawa paid $2.00 per hour for every hour it took to tell a story, and would I not pay the same? ... After much talking I made a bargain to
pay $2.00 per story... several stories took more than one day to tell... For hours they talked and I questioned, as the Chinook jargon is limited in vocabulary and much patience is required on the part of both narrator and hearer if a true impression of the story is to be gathered.17

Carmichael published one volume of stories in 1922 and a second volume remains in manuscript form.18

Reverend Vincent A. Koppert spent two summers, 1923 and 1929, at Opitsat studying Clayoquot ethnography. He wrote:

I was only a casual observer on my first trip to Opitsat; my second, was undertaken with the view of conducting a systematic field study. My investigation was chiefly confined to material culture... My chief informants were, Chief Joseph Weekinnanich, aged sixty-nine, David James, aged seventy-five and Yeskan Jack (age 68?)... There was also old Peter, aged eighty-one, and his wife... Whenever possible the indirect question was used.19

Reverend Charles Moser served as Koppert's primary interpreter., Assistance was provided by Hyacinth David and George Dan. The material was written up by Koppert for his Doctorate from The Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. Koppert's earlier Masters Degree on Clayoquot mythology20, was based on texts recorded by Reverend Moser.

In 1923 and 1926 while working at Neah Bay Frances Denmore recorded a number of songs from two Clayoquot women who were married to Makah. Annie Long Tom was the granddaughter of a warrior, Sarah Guy was the daughter of a hereditary chief. The songs were published in 1939. In 1926 Denmore recorded songs from people who had come to work in the hop fields near Chilliwack. Frank Knightun and Wilson Williams from Carmanah and Annie Tom from the Nitinat village contributed a number of songs including war, medicine and dance songs which were published in 1943.21
During the 1930s there were two field projects in the region of study. In 1931 Morris Swadesh and Mary Haas collected ethnographic material from Chief Peter at Port Renfrew. The material ranges from vocabulary, to place names and includes a large number of texts. The fourteen notebooks of information remain unpublished.

In the period 1935-36 Philip Drucker received a pre-Doctoral Research Fellowship from the Social Science Research Council to study Nootkan social organization. He collected enough data, however, for a general ethnography which was published in 1951. Drucker's primary field work was with the Nuu-chah-nulth people who lived from Nootka Sound north, but he did collect some data from the central Nuu-chah-nulth people including historical details on the Clayoquot. His principal respondents were Jimmy Jim and yaksu'Is. Drucker also made a short visit to Alberni where he made:

Brief checks with element lists...of the Alberni Canal people to determine their cultural position with respect to their kinsmen of the outer coasts. I obtained no information from the Barkley Sound tribes nor from the Nitinaht.23

His field notes, however, show that he did collect some texts on the doctoring ritual and Tlokwana and about twenty place names in Barkley Sound. Hamilton George, Opetchesaht and Jackson Dan, Sheshaht were his respondents. Alex Thomas was the interpreter.24

Swadesh was the only active researcher in the area in the 1940s. From 1946 to 1948 he received a fellowship from the Guggenheim Foundation to continue preparations of the Sapir-Thomas texts for publication. In 1949 he received a field research grant from the Social Science Research Council to "round out the picture of Nootka culture." He went to Port
Alberni where he worked for several weeks in August with thirteen respondents: Seymour Gallic (Sheshaht), Billy Yuukum (Sheshaht - Opetchesaht), Tom Toochie (Ucluelet), Chief Nuukmis and Aida Nuukmis (Ohiaht), Willie Joe (Ohiaht), Sarah Bill (Sheshaht), Eva Thomas (Sheshaht), Katie Jackson (Sheshaht), Chief Jacob Sheewish (Sheshaht), Jimmy Santos (Sheshaht-Ecoolthaht), Eva Watts (Sheshaht) and Emma David. Swadesh recorded five notebooks of ethnographic information which remain unpublished.  

In 1955 the Nootka songs collected by Sapir in 1910 and 1913 were published by Helen Roberts and Morris Swadesh. Native Accounts of Nootka Ethnography was published in the same year. The thirty-five texts of this volume were offered to “give a more complete account of the culture”. A third volume, Nootka Legends and Stories, which was to include an ethnographic index, was planned but was never completed. 

Wilson Duff, anthropologist at the British Columbia Provincial Museum, undertook a number of studies relating to the Nuu-chah-nulth beginning in 1951 when he filmed the George Clutesi dance group performing “Nootka dances” during the 24th of May celebrations in Port Alberni. In the summer of 1954 he worked briefly with Mrs. Joshua Edgar and in 1961 with George Clutesi. In the mid 1960s Duff interviewed a number of canoe makers including Jimmy Jones of Port Renfrew for his research on the Nootka canoe and whaling. His study on canoes was published in 1965. 

In 1963, Duff introduced Eugene Atima to Pacheenaht Chief Charlie Jones and his wife Ida in Port Renfrew. This grew into a long lasting relationship which has resulted in a number of manuscripts and
Fig. 27. Morris Swadesh working with Roy Taylor, Jacob Shewish and Alex Thomas, Port Alberni 1949 (Photo: AVM 3624).
publications by Arima. In the same year Arima accompanied Don Abbott of the British Columbia Provincial Museum, during a survey for the proposed National Park. It was at this time that he interviewed Chief Louie of the Ohiaht. These accounts were transcribed and translated by Alex Thomas in the late 1960s and written up by Arima in 1984. Arima also worked with Alex Thomas in Ottawa in 1968 to produce a practical orthography for the Nootka language which was published in 1970.

In the 1970s there was increased ethnographic activity in the Barkley Sound area. In 1973 Denis St. Claire began what has become a long term interest in collecting information on place name, site usage and territorial boundaries of the native groups of the region. His primary respondent during this period was Mabel Taylor of the Sheshahht. Other Sheshahht respondents were Jacob Gallie and Adam and Margaret Sowish. From 1973 to 1977 Barbara Moon collected information from unnamed Ohiaht and Pacheenaht elders on the changing role of animals in the Nuu-chah-nulth world which included both utilization of animals and the spiritual relationship with them. The results of this study have been published only in summary form. In August 1978 Kathleen Mooney interviewed Pacheenaht Chief Charlie Jones. This material, is unpublished.

John Thomas (Ditidaht), Bernice Touchie (Ditidaht) and Mabel Denis (Ohiaht) were among a number of individuals who received diplomas from the Native Indian Language Programme, Department of Linguistics, University of Victoria in the 1970s. Mabel Denis worked with Ohiaht elder, Robert Sport in 1974. In 1977, Touchie worked with several Ditidaht elders for a report on Whyac for Parks Canada. John Thomas has concentrated on
linguistic studies and has translated material for Arima and for the Pacific Rim Project.

In 1980 Nancy Turner, John Thomas and others recorded traditional information on the names and uses of plants among the Ditidaht. This major study, *Ethnobotany of the Nitinaht Indians of Vancouver Island*, was published in 1982. 36

In 1981, James Haggarty and Richard Inglis of the British Columbia Provincial Museum initiated a major project to research the native history of Pacific Rim National Park. Interviewing of contemporary elders was undertaken for the project primarily by Denis St. Claire and John Thomas. During this period St. Claire worked with Mabel Taylor (Sheshaht), Robert Sport (Ohiaht), Jim McKay (Toquaht and Ucluelet), Sarah Tutube (Ucluelet), Rose Cootes (Ucluelet), Leonard Mack (Ucluelet), Ella Jackson (Uchucklesaht-Ohiaht) and Ernie Lauder (Opetchesaht). 37 John Thomas interviewed Ida Jones (Ditidaht) and Charles Jones (Pacheenaht). As well, Inglis worked with John Thomas (Ditidaht) and with Haggarty interviewed Joshua Edgar (Ditidaht). 38 These interviews were aimed primarily at recording place name, site usage and historical information for each of the six groups whose traditional territories are encompassed by Pacific Rim National Park. St. Claire also attempted with some of his respondents to identify place names gleaned from earlier studies. Nearly seven hundred place names have been compiled from both the contemporary and archival sources by Cairn Crockford and are included as appendices A to F to this report.

In 1984 and 1985 St. Claire worked with the Ohiaht Ethnoarchaeology Project collecting similar information. Respondents interviewed were Mary
The data collected by the ethnographic research outlined above are immense. Most of it has not been analysed and very little has been published even as ethnographic texts. Unquestionably there is the information to write a comprehensive ethnography of the peoples of the Barkley Sound region. It is not, however, within the mandate of this report to consider such an undertaking. Instead only information that will assist in understanding the historical context of the archaeological data base will be extracted. This includes information on group composition, changes in group territory and population shifts brought about by warfare and migration, resource exploitation and settlements.

Sheshaht History

Introduction

The modern Sheshaht are an historic period amalgamation of at least six independent groups of people from the central region of Barkley sound. Sapir described them as:

... a cluster of various smaller tribal "units, of which the Ts'ish'aa'tch, that gave their name to the whole, were the leading group. The other subdivisions were originally independent tribes that had lost their isolated distinctiveness through conquest, weakening in numbers or friendly removal and union. Each of the tribal subdivisions or "septs" had its own stock of
Fig. 28. Aerial view of amalgamated Shebaht territory including the Broken Group Islands (foreground) and the Vancouver Island shoreline (Photo: BCPM 1982B:642).
legends, its distinctive privileges, its own houses in
the village, its own village sites and distinctive
fishing and hunting waters that were still remembered
in detail by its members. While the septs now lived
together as a single tribe, the basis of the sept
division was really a traditional local one. 39

Sheshahaht territory at the end of the nineteenth century included all
of the Broken Group Islands, much of the north shore of Barkley Sound, the
west shore of the Deer Croup Islands and much of the Alberni Canal and
lower Somass River (Figs. 29, 30). Today the Sheshahaht are centred in Port
Alberni at Tsah.ah.eh, IR 1.

Our knowledge of Sheshahaht history is extensive. There are probably
more texts recorded for this group than there are for all of the others in
Barkley Sound together. George Blenkinsop, in 1874, was the first to
collect Sheshahaht historical traditions. He recorded information on their
amalgamated territory, village and fishing station locations and economic
activities in interviews with Chief Iya.pamoolth. In 1889 Boas worked
for two weeks with an unknown number of Sheshahaht elders in Alberni. The
only one he named was Tlutlisim. Sapir undertook field work in Alberni in
1910 and in 1913-14. He recorded particularly valuable information on
Sheshahaht local group origins and composition from Sayaach'apis, and on
local group composition and territories from William. Unfortunately the
map that accompanied William’s territory information has not been located
to date. Additional pertinent ethnographic notes were collected from
Sheshahaht respondents Mr. Bill and Frank Williams. Alex Thomas continued
the recording of historical traditions for Sapir from 1914 to 1923. Of
particular note are two texts, recorded from Tom Sayaach'apis entitled 'The
Fig. 29. Map of the western area of amalgamated Sheshahlt territory with known places numbered (for key see Appendix A).
Fig. 30. Detail of Wouwer and Howell Islands from Fig. 29.
Yearly Round and the 'Tsisha Defeat, Ahousets'. Both have been published. From 1976 to 1983 St. Claire worked extensively with Mabel Taylor recording information on place names, site usage and seasonal round. The work of Drucker in 1935-36 and Swadesh in 1949 contain little information pertinent to the specialized interests of this report.

The place name data compiled from these sources by Cairn Crockford are presented in Appendix A, Sheshahl Geography. They are included to provide a geographical framework in which to locate the events of the historical traditions.

Component Groups of the Sheshahl

Before proceeding with an analysis of the historical traditions it is necessary to identify the participant groups and their relationships. There are two sources for this information: lists of group names with accompanying notes that were elicited by explicit questioning and historical traditions from which names can be gleaned.

Boas was the first to collect information on the component groups of the Sheshahl. He listed nine septs according to rank:

1. Ts'ēcā'ath
2. NEc'asath
3. NEcimū'sasath
4. WaninEa'ath
5. Mā'ktl'aiath
6. Tla'sEnuesath
7. Ha'méyisath
Fig. 32. Mabel Taylor, Sheshah (Photo: BCPM 1983B:262).
8. Ku'tseEmhaath
9. Kuai'ath

The Eku'lath (bushes on hill people) and the Hatcâ'ath were listed as separate tribes. 42

In 1910 Frank Williams listed ten "bands of Tslicya'ath" although he was "not certain about the order of the septs." 43

1. Tslicya'ath
2. Nac'as'ath
3. Hatc'a'ath
4. Mak'aiya'ath
5. Hiku'l'ath
6. Natcim'os'ath
7. Mok'wa'ath
8. Wanine'ath
9. L'asiml'isc'ath
10. Nc'm'iyis'ath

These bands were "originally separate tribes that joined together to make bigger tribe". 44

Mr. Bill listed eight "septs of the Tslicya'ath:

1. Tslicya'ath or Tslicya'ath_taqemi
2. Nac'as'ath
3. Natcimwos'ath
4. Mak'L'ai'ath
5. L'asimis'ath
6. Wanina'ath


7.  \(\text{Hik'út'ath}^a\)
   a.  \(\text{Hatclá'ath}^a\)

The last two "were really another tribe."\(^45\)

Ethnographic texts collected by Sapir from two other Shesháht respondents, Sayaachapis and William, add significantly to our understanding of the relationship between these groups and the process of amalgamation to form the modern Shesháht. The first, recorded in 1910 from Sayaachapis, listed eight "bands" of the Ts'ic'ya'ath^a:

1.  \(\text{Ts'ic'ya'ath}^a\)\(\text{taqemít}\), main village was \(\text{Ts'ic'ya'}\) in winter and summer. (Shesháht #41)
2.  \(\text{Nac'as'ath}^a\) or \(\text{Oq'wátis'ath}^a\), main village was \(\text{Oq'wátis}\) (Shesháht #18)
3.  \(\text{MakL'ái'ath}^a\), "higher than others", main village was \(\text{MakL'ái}\) (Shesháht #52)
4.  \(\text{Hémaiyis'ath}^a\), main village was \(\text{Hémaiyis}\) (Shesháht #43)
5.  \(\text{Muk'wa'ath}^a\), on island \(\text{Muk'wa'c'á}\) (Shesháht #36)
6.  \(\text{Wáníña'ath}^a\), main village was \(\text{Hík'wis}\) (Shesháht #22) old village was \(\text{Wánín}\) (Shesháht #19)
7.  \(\text{Nac'imi'as'ath}^a\), "people (who have) whale fins all around (their) island"
   a.  \(\text{L'asimí's'ath}^a\), main village \(\text{Hík'wis}\), formerly occupied \(\text{L'asimíl'is}\) (Shesháht #21)

According to Sayaachapis "one band is not higher than another; chief of one band is as high as another. These bands became one because united in war against other tribes."\(^47\)
The T'slicya'cath'a, were centred at Benson Island. Sayaachapis described them as one tribe with four bands:

1. ta'ác'cath'a (located at Sheshaht #40)
2. T'slicya'cath'a (located at Sheshaht #41)
3. T'okwaq'li'cath'a (located at Sheshaht #42)
4. Hémiyis'cath'a (located at Sheshaht #43)

The main chief was from the T'slicya'cath'a. He owned the island. The other three bands "came from them by moving to other beaches because crowded". The Hémiyis'cath'a, were described by Sayaachapis as slaves living in separate houses because T'slicyá proper was too crowded. The first to come to Hemayis was Qwáyatslik'úr, who drifted there from an unknown place. He was not a slave and became chief of the village.

Sayaachapis named a fifth group of the T'slicya'cath'a, the Nanatsukwíitaqemiít. Nanatsukwíít was another person from an unknown region who drifted into T'slicya after the flood. He married the eldest daughter of the T'slyáyae'cath'a chief and established his house at the village.

William listed five "tribes" in order of rank within the T'slicya'cath'a:

1. T'slicya'cath'a, including Mukwa'cath'a
2. Wanin'cath'a
3. 'oqwátísath'a
4. L'asimía'cath'a
5. Hemayis'cath'a

William described the territory of these groups as the western side of the Broken Group Islands including Benson, Clarke, Turret, Dodd, Willis,
Keith, Jarvis, Brabant and Hand Islands, the Pinkerton Islands and the Vancouver Island shoreline (Fig. 33:11). The Wani'cathà, the 'oqwatisatHà and the L'asimis'cathà "had their own secondary chiefs and places to live, but owned no country, were mástim of the Ts'icya'cathà and always moved, where Ts'icya'cathà moved." Their land belonged to Ts'icya'cathà.53

In his version of the “Legendary History of the Ts'icya'cathà,” William described the formation of the Muk'wa'cathà. The eldest son of the head chief of Ts'icya died. The chief burned his house and abandoned the village moving to Muk'wa'a on Turret Island (Sheshahit #36). Here he founded a new village, and was joined by his brothers. Because they had moved away from Ts'icya they ceased to be chiefs of that village,56 but they were still considered part of the Ts'icya'cathà.

Sayaachapis related:

Ts'icya'cathà kept apart from Muk'wa'cathà when wealth was distributed; Ts'icya'cathà would come before Muk'wa'cathà; these two always invited together, because always considered one tribe.57

The Nác'as'cathà or 'oqwatis'cathà were considered by Sayaachapis originally to have been a separate group. The name Nác'as'cathà refers to the flood legend, the name 'oqwatis'cathà refers to the mountain behind the village where they tied onto during the flood and also to the beach in front. He listed four “families” for the Nác'as'cathà58:

1. Téc'mapis'atHà, “people of little point” (Sheshahit #17)
2. k'I'na?a'athà, "people of k'I'na?a creek “ (Sheshahit #16)
3. L'asimiyis'atHà, “people of L'asimiyis creek (Sheshahit #21)
4. 'oqwatis'atHà, “people of fine on the beach” (Sheshahit #18)
Reconstruction of Sapir's map of tribal territories in Barkley Sound based on interview of William in 1914.

I* Hikul'atH
II Ts'icya'atH
III MakL'ai'atH
IV Hutc'a'atH
V ?a'uts'atH
VI Tlo'mak'Lai'atH
VII Houtc'uq'Lis'atH
VIII Na'mint'atH
IX Ts'omas'atH
X TsiomS'atH
XI P'op'om'a'atH
XII Ho'ai'atH
XIII Ki'x'in'atH
XIV Tc'mat'aqso'atH
XV ?an.aq'la'atH
XVI T'ok'wa'atH
XVII Nitinat

* The Roman numerals correspond to Sapir's coding.
Each family had its own chief and village. The main chief lived in e'oq'watis.

According to Sayaachapis a fifth group, the Wanin'ath8, joined the Nác'as'ath8:

Wanin'ath8 were really MakL'ai'atH8 but chief of the 'oq'watisath8 gave salmon creek on mainland named Wanin (Sheshah 19) in exchange for copper, whence their name; this family built village on mainland and became separate 'uctaqemif tho they kept up relations with Storm Island (i.e. Maklai).59

Where this group came from in MakL'ai'atH8 territory was not recorded.

The copper may relate to sheet copper, a popular trade item in the early historic period...

According to Sayaachapis the Ts'icya'atH8 conquered the Nác'as'ath8 and took their country as his'ök't "Only their Nác'as'ath8 relatives were preserved". This was when the Ts'icya'atH8 moved to Híkwis.60

The MakL'ai'atH8 were originally a separate people with distinct territory centred on Wouwer Island. Sayaachapis described them as "one tribe with four bands":61

1. MakL'atH8 (located at Sheshah #52)
2. 'ost'is'ath8 (located at Sheshah #54)
3. T'imik'aq'is'ath8 (located at Sheshah #55)
4. Te'ap'is'ath8 or Narc'imwas'ath8 (located at Sheshah #53)

Each of these bands owned not only its village but also a number of islands which were considered family property.62 The main chief was from the MakL'atH8. Sayaachapis later listed two family groupings for this band:63
1. K!walo'astaqemI?

2. Mayuqwi'acteqemI?

William mentioned another subgroup of the MakÍtlaí'atHa³:

Used to be village at hóts!atwi santé (Sheshahit #62) inhabited by hóts!atwi santé, on top of hill, sept of MakÍtlaí'atHa³. Used to be village at hóts!atwi santé (Sheshahit #62) inhabited by hóts!atwi santé, on top of hill, sept of MakÍtlaí'atHa³. Used to be village at hóts!atwi santé (Sheshahit #62) inhabited by hóts!atwi santé, on top of hill, sept of MakÍtlaí'atHa³. Used to be village at hóts!atwi santé (Sheshahit #62) inhabited by hóts!atwi santé, on top of hill, sept of MakÍtlaí'atHa³.

"When William "as young (the MakÍtlaí'atHa³) had already joined Ts!icya'atHa³, also during his father's days; thinks they joined before white people came --- Joined because reduced in numbers by fighting with Hatcí'atHa³. MakÍtlaí'atHa³ territory was described by William as including Wouwer, Howell, Dicebox, Effingham and Wiebe Islands (Fig. 33:III). According to William when they joined the Ts!icya'atHa³ and "even no" drift rights in MakÍtlaí'atHa³ country went to MakÍtlaí'atHa³ chief, not Ts!icya'atHa³." Another independent group, the T!o'makÍtlaí'atHa³, "as discussed by William but not included in any of the lists of Sheshahit bands. According to William they "never joined the Ts!icya'atHa³ but disappeared even before white people came. Village "as at northeast side of Gibraltar Island in little bay within three small rocks" (Sheshahit #28). William described their country as small (Fig. 33:IV). It was lost to the Hatcí'atHa³ "long before his father "as young." What happened to the people "as not recorded.

The Hatcí'atHa³ were another independent group whose territory in the Broken Group Islands included Prideaux, Reeks and Jaques Islands (Fig. 33:IV). There is only one reference to a named group in this area, Sayaachapis while relating names he had rights to, named the
Hop'kisaq'atH, "a band of Hatc!a'atH formerly living on island of Hop'kisaq'atH (Jaques Island, Sheshat 81).

The Hiku'atH were another independent tribe who became part of the amalgamated Sheshat. William listed three subgroups of this tribe and their territories:

1. Tite'iminActa qemif, west side of Tzartus Island, Chain Group Islands
2. 'yaq'elimif'atHtaqemif, north shore of Imperial Eagle Channel from Seddall Island to Vernon Bay,
3. Tcute'up'taqemif, Chup Point area

Their main village was at hiku'.

Based on analysis and interpretation of this information a minimum of six independent local groups have been identified. They are listed below with their known component groups.

1. Ts!icya'atH
   a. L'a'ac'atH
   b. Ts!icya'atH
   c. Tiokwaq'!la'atH
   d. Hemiys'atH
   e. Nanatsukwitqaqemif
   f. Muk'wa'atH

2. Nac'es'atH
   a. Tc!omapis'atH
   b. K!Ina'a'atH
   c. L'asimiyis'atH
Two of the septs listed by Boas, the Ku'tssEmhaath and the Kuai'ath are anomalies and have not been included.

Historical Traditions

Much of the information on Sheshaht history occurs as ethnographic notes rather than as narrative. There are, however, a number of historical traditions which provide insight into the changing political
structure within what became amalgamated Sheshsht territory. The traditions selected for discussion include:

"How the Hikuł'atḷa Explored the Head of Alberni Canal", told by William;

"The Ucluelets Seize Effingham Inlet", told by Kwishanishim;

"Tsishaa Defeat Ahousets", told by Sayaachspis;

"The Long War in Barkley Sound: told by Kwishanishim;


Notes gleaned from other respondents that have information that relates to these traditions also will be included for analysis and discussion.

"How the Hikuł'atḷa Explored the Head of Alberni Canal" was told to Sapir by William in 1913-14. It has not been published. According to this tradition the Hikuł'atḷa were the first to explore the head of Alberni Canal. "This land was unknown; not one of all the tribes new of it." It was a young chief from hikuł who discovered a village inhabited only by women at the head of the Canal. "The one who found this place was my former grandfather, a long time ago." Later a marriage was arranged with the daughter of the Tsl̓ómaʔas'atḷa chief. The Hikuł'atḷa received half their land as dowry.

The Hatcł̓á'atḷa also expanded their territory to include the Somass River at the head of Alberni Canal. According to Tyee Bob:

The Hatcł̓á'atḷa were first to come up here and occupied country from flats up to forks of river. Hikuł'atḷa came after Hatcł̓á'atḷa and took in country... on west aide of river; they and Hatcł̓á'atḷa used to fight about fishing places.
It was Hiküf'Ith'a Indians who first pushed up Alberni Canal. Coast Indians were jealous of those about Sproat Lake because of their good hunting and river fishing country. These Nanaimo-like people were displaced by Hiküf'Ith'a who held West side of Somass River and Natc'ł'a'ath'a who held east side. Ts'íc'a'ath'a were the last to come up Alberni Canal. 77

Johnny Yocum told Sapir that it was the Ts'ómás'as'ath'a, a distinct tribe, who owned the Somass River. They fought with the "Natc'ł'a'ath'a and Hiküf'Ith'a for lands about head of Alberni Canal, before Ts'íc'a'ath'a came in from coast." 78 Sayaachapis related a slightly different sequence of events:

Hiküf'Ith'a and Natc'ł'a'ath'a banded together against Ts'ómasaht and got their land (as his'ök't). This was before white people came. Ts'ícya'ath'a came to help Hiküf'Ith'a and Natc'ł'a'ath'a later. 79

The Haachaht were involved in a number of other territorial expansions. According to William territory added as his'ök't included that of the 'á'uts'ath'a, centred in Effingham Inlet, and that of the T'o'mák'La'ath'a on Gibraltar Island in the Broken Group Islands. 80

According to Sayaachapis they also fought with the MakLa'ath'a, Natc'imwas'ath'a and Wanín'atth'a who were "reduced to 15 men... All this happened before Ts'ícya'ath'a moved to Hikwsa;" hence (the three tribes) formed one with Ts'ícya'ath'a on island of Ts'ícá. (Nác'as'ath'a not yet incorporated). 81 The village of Omoah (Sheshaht #67) likely became Natc'ł'a'ath'a at this time.

Haachaht territorial expansion also figured prominently in "The Ucluelets Seize Effingham Inlet," a war story told by Kwishanishim, a Ucluelet, to Alex Thomas in 1914. 82 The conflict began as a dispute.
between the Haachaht and Toquaht over land at kaena?a (Sheshaht 626) located near Equis (Sheshaht 822). This occurred "before the Tsishaa had come into possession of the land of Hiikwis." A jumping competition was arranged to settle the matter in which the Toquaht competitor was killed. Both sides claimed victory, and war broke out. In one night raid the Haachaht killed "a group of Ucluelet, mistaking them for Toquahts. The Ucluelets sought revenge and together with the Clayoquot, who brought with them the first guns, attacked and defeated the Baachaht at the fortified village of Tayaanita (Sheshaht #3 on Alma Russell Island). According to Peter Kishkish one-third of the Haachaht people were killed and the survivors scattered.  

In another version of the jumping competition it was the Sheshaht and the Toquaht who competed. Again the Toquaht competitor was killed and both sides claimed victory. Blenkinsop wrote in 1874:  

Years of dispute and contention have even now left undecided the right to Pt. Lyall, Ah. to shep (Sheshaht #28), between the To.kwah.ahts and the Seshahahts. .... each party up to the time of my arrival claims it as their exclusive right and actually felt like the old feud in my presence.  

William also mentioned fighting between the Toquaht and Sheshaht over the boundary in this region.  

The third tradition "Tsishaa Defeat Ahousets", is another war tradition. At the time the Sheshaht were living at "Hursatsswithl" (Dicebox Island, Sheshaht 662). A passing party of Ahousahts killed a fisherman from the village. In revenge the Sheshaht ambushed the Ahousaht canoes on their return up coast. In the battle, fought with bows, arrows and shields of whale shoulderblades, the Ahousaht were defeated.
The Sheshaht also were involved in territorial expansion obtaining the Sarita River on the eastern shore of Barkley Sound. There are two accounts, one by Sayaachapis and one by William, of this event. Both agree that the Sheshaht used to own the Sarita River. Sayaachapis claimed that "the Ts' icya'ath'la killed off "the tribe who lived there (the ?enlq'cil'atl'la) and got the Sarita River as his'ok't before the Alberni country." 88 William, on the other hand, said that the Ho'ai'ath killed off the ?enlq'cil'atl'la, and that the Sarita River was given to the Sheshaht by them as tutcha, to help them against an enemy. This happened at the time of William's grandfather, long after the Alberni country. 89

"The Long War in Barkley Sound" is another tradition told by Kwishanishim. 90 The primary combatants were the Ucluelet and Ohiaht. The Sheshaht participated as one of the tribes allied against the Ucluelet. At the start of the war the "Ucluelet houses filled the space from end to end at Hiiikwis" 91; they "always lived at Hiiikwis all winter." 92 Himayis (Sheshaht #43 on Benson Island), McMc?aq is (Sheshaht #37 on Owen Island) and Cleho (Sheshaht 685 on Nettle Island) were used as camping places. During the hostilities the Sheshaht took part in raids on the Ucluelet at the Nahmint River, at Yasaayis (Sheshaht #14) and at Waayi (Ucluelet #30). The Sheshaht were not attacked by the Ucluelet in the Kwishanishim tradition although Blenkinsop, writing in 1874, inferred that they did not escape the hostilities. He wrote:

This tribe not many years since were obliged to seek the protection of the Oheh.ahts in order to escape total destruction at the hands of the Utloo.11th.l.ahts...
Increasing after a time in numbers and their enemies becoming less warlike, the Se.shah.ahts again returned to the homes of their forefathers at E.kwis. . . 93

Sayaachapis talked of the time when the war was over in “The Yearly Round”:

I saw Hiiikwis at the time the Tsishaa Tribe ceased to be at war with the Ucluelert. I was still a small boy. 94

We always moved away (from Hiiikwis) when the herring finished spawning. We would go to Huumuwa (Sheshahht #67), the whole Tsishaa Tribe staying together because the war had ended only recently. We did not want to get separated. 95

Sayaachapis was born in 1843. It was not until he was “a young man” that peace seemed a reality. He related:

War was (no longer) in season. So the Tsishaa moved apart. The Maktlii tribe to Maktlii (Storm/Wouwer Island). The Tsishaa Band was with the Nachinwas at Tsishaa. The Himayis people went to Himayis. The Wanin people went to Wanin. The Nashas people went to Dutch Harbour. The Tlasinmyis people went to Tlasinmyis. The Hachaa people lived on Village Island, for that was their land. The Hikuuthl people went to Shaahuwis. I used to live at Mokwa’a. 96

In 1874 Blenkinsop described the Sheshahht as an expansionistic people, having acquired first the territory of the “Haht.chah.aht” and the territory of the “E.koolth.aht”. He wrote:

About sixty years since being hard pressed by the other Indians, and having through sickness and war become unable to cope with their enemies, they (the E.koolth.aht) of their own accord joined the Se.shah.ahts, as they say for protection only and did not at the time surrender the right to control their own lands. 97

In fact, they had lost control of their territory, Blenkinsop described Chief Hyllthiche.nuk and a number of his people as living “a wandering life ... having no village they can call their own.” 98
In 1874, Equis (Sheshaht #22) was the Sheshaht winter village, the principal fisheries were at Omoah (Sheshaht #67 on Village/Effingham Island), Se.shah (Sheshaht #41 on Green/Benson Island) and on one or two other islands of the Broken Group. On the map accompanying his report, however, six fishing stations were plotted: one each on Wouwer, Turret, Dodd and Chalk (?) Islands, and two on Nettle Island. The principal salmon fishery was on the Somass River.

Summary

The events leading to the formation of the modern Sheshaht were violent. The primary cause of amalgamation in all cases appears to be related directly or indirectly to warfare. A discussion of these events and a reconstruction of the sequence of the amalgamation process follows.

Prior to the changes brought about by territorial expansions and conflicts, outlined above a minimum of five independent local groups existed in the region of the Broken Group Islands: The Ta' icya'ath at Tsicya (Sheshaht #41 on Benson Island), hemayis (Sheshaht #43 on Benson Island) and Muk'wa'a (Sheshaht #36 on Turret Island); the Mak'L'ai'ath at MakLai (Sheshaht #52 on Wouwer Island) and hot'slatswil (Sheshaht #62 on Dicebox Island); the Tlo'mak'Lai'ath at TomakLai (Sheshaht #28 on Gibraltar Island); the Haachaht at Haacha (Sheshaht #3 on Alma Russell Island) and Hop'kisaq'o'a (Sheshaht #81 on Jaques Island); and the Nac'as'ath at 'eqwatis, k'I'na'a', Tel'onapis and L'asimiyis (Sheshaht #18, 17, 16 and 21 on the Vancouver Island shoreline). A sixth local group, the HikuL'ath was centred at HikuL at the head of Imperial Eagle Channel.
The first territorial expansion was made by the Hikwilatn and the Haachath to the head of Alberni Canal. About the same time the Haachath also took the territory of the Tlo'mak'laLa'atn by his'ôk't. Shortly afterwards they went to war against the Mak'L'ai'atn reducing them to "15 men" and capturing the village of Omoah (Sheshaht 967). The Mak'L'ai'atn joined the Ts'icys'atn at this time as a result of the reduction in their numbers. What happened to the Tlo'mak'laLa'atn survivors was not recorded. The next conflict the Haachath initiated was against the Toquaht. What is interesting about this territorial dispute was its location near Hikwis, a region that belonged to the Nac'as'atn. There are two possible explanations. The first has the Haachath taking the Nac'as'atn territory as his'ôk't in an undocumentated war and then coming into conflict with the Toquaht; the second has the Sheshaht conquering the Nac'as'atn and coming into conflict with the Toquaht. Whatever the scenario this region is documented as part of Ucluelet territory at the start of the Long War. The Ucluelet could have obtained it either as his'ôk't from the Haachath in the documented conflict that occurred early in the historic period or from the Sheshaht in an unrecorded conflict inferred by Blenkinsop.

Another conflict involving the Sheshaht was against the Ahousaht. This conflict had to occur after the Mak'L'ai'atn had amalgamated with the Ts'icys'atn, as the Sheshaht were living at Hotlatswot (Sheshaht 962) a Mak'L'ai'atn site. Only traditional weaponry was used in the conflict leading to the conclusion that it took place before guns were readily available.
The "Long War in Barkley Sound" was the last war in which the Sheshaht were involved. The fighting had ended by the time Sayaachapis was a small boy, estimated to be around 1850. There are few details, however, regarding the Sehshaht participation in this war. At the beginning of the tradition the Ucluelet controlled several areas within Sheshaht territory including Benson Island, Owen Island, Nettle Island and the area of Equis. It is unclear where the Sheshaht were living, but it does not appear to be in the Broken Group Islands. As the Sheshaht were allied with the Ohiahts it may be at this time that they gained the Sarita River, or it may be at this time that they moved to the Somass River. At the end of the war, estimated to be around 1840, the Sheshaht re-established in Barkley Sound.

Initially the Sheshaht continued to live as an amalgamated group moving on a seasonal basis to various stations in the Broken Group Islands and along the Alberni Canal. The initial seasonal movement was from Equis, the winter village, to Omoah, the spring and summer village, to salmon fishing stations on the Alberni Canal and Somass River in the late summer and fall and then back to Equis. A number of variations to this pattern developed as the Sheshaht moved apart. The major change was the increased use of the Broken Group Islands as groups returned to their traditional sites where they set up seasonal resource camps. Equis and Omoah continued as amalgamation sites. This was the pattern observed by Blenkinsop in 1874.

By the early decades of the 1900s the Sheshaht were centred in Port Alberni at Tsahaheh (IR 1), and moved to the coast in the spring
Fig. 34. Tsahsheh, Sheshahlt Reserve #1 on Somass River, near Alberni (Photo: NMC 26541)
Fig. 35. Sheshaut village of Clebo (IR 6) on Nettle Island, Broken Group Islands, around 1930s (Photo: private collection).
Fig. 36. Sheshat:t village of Cleho (IR 6) on Nettle Island, Broken Group Islands, around 1930s (Photo: private collection).
Fig. 37. Sheshahlt village of Omoahl (189) on Effingham Island, Broken Group Islands, around 1925 (Photo: private collection).
through the summer to villages at Cleho (Sheshahit #85), Keith Island (Sheshahit 175) and Omoah (Sheshahit 667).

Ucluelet History

Introduction

The modern Ucluelet are an historic period amalgamation of at least six independent groups of people who lived in the region of Ucluth Peninsula. Today they are centred in Ucluelet Arm at Ittatsoo IR 1. Ucluelet territory at the end of the nineteenth century extended from the area of Green Point (ća.wi?ls, Ucluelet #33), where it bordered with the Clayoquot, to the eastern entrance of Ucluelet Arm (tu'maq̓i, Ucluelet #1) where it bordered with the Toquaht (Fig. 38). It also included the Nahmint River on the Alberni Canal and Effingham Inlet at the head of Barkley Sound.

Our knowledge of Ucluelet history comes from several sources. In 1874, George Blenkinsop interviewed Chief Kla?wii?to?h, for the Indian Reserve Commissioner. He recorded information on contemporary territory, village and fishing station locations and economic activities. In 1910 and in 1913-14 Edward Sapir collected outline information on Ucluelet social organization from three Sheshahit respondents: Tom Sayaach’apí, William and Frank Williams. In November, 1914, Alex Thomas collected a number of texts from Kwishanishim, a Ucluelet elder who was born towards the end of the Long War in Barkley Sound (ca. 1840). His mother was Toquaht and his father was Angryface, a chief of the Ucluelet local group.
Fig. 38. Map of amalgamated Ucluelet territory with known places numbered (for key see Appendix B).
Fig. 39. Aerial view of coastline between Oo-coith and Quisitis in Ucluelet territory (Photo: BCPM 1984B:237).
Fig. 40. Mr. Roberts, Ucluelet (Photo: PAC c89143).
In 1981, Denis St. Claire collected information on Ucluelet place names, site usage and social organization during interviews with Sarah Tutube, Rose Cootes, Jim McKay and Jessie Mack. The place name data from the above sources have been compiled by Cairn Crockford in Appendix B, Ucluelet Geography.

Component Groups, of the Ucluelet

To understand the events of Ucluelet history it is first necessary to identify the various groups that formed the modern Ucluelet. Two types of ethnographic information have been used to identify groups and their relationships: listings and historical traditions.

In 1914 Alex Thomas collected a text entitled "Ucluelet Bands and Scatings" from Kwishanishim. In it were listed the names of seventeen bands who comprised 'the Ucluelet at that time.

1. L'aa'wihtactaqim\[
2. Hayupiyactaqim\[
3. wa?o'atH
4. ts'ax'winoptaqim\[
5. kli\ns\'a'saatH
6. L'akmaqis'atH
7. tce'is'atH
8. WāLwā\nya\ntaqim\[
9. hitatalo'atH
10. ho'o\f'atH
11. t'okwI'is'atH
12. L'axwaqti\ns'atH, died out
Kwishanishim then discussed the relationships between groups. Bands 12 and 13 were part of the hitats'lo'ath, but had no survivors in 1914. Bands 15 and 17 were part of band #5, the k'linaxom'as'ath. six bands, 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 14 and 16 made up the yuYu'lt'athla proper. The L'a'wihtactaqimf was the highest ranking of these bands. The head chief of the Ucluelet came from this group. In 1914 Tyee Jack, Lliwito'a, was the chief. His eldest daughter, Nina, held the highest seat and would hold this seat as long as she remains unmarried, and when she marries, her younger sister (Viola) would then take her place. and like her older sister she would occupy the seat as long as she also is unmarried." The hitats'lo'ath were not represented in the seating as "those who belong to that band have gone to the other bands where they have a higher standing than they have from the hitats'lo'ath". A restructuring of the list taking into account the relationships follows:

hitats'lo'ath

L'axwaqtis'ath

ts'akwistis'ath

k'linaxom'as'ath

totkwisistaqimf

?â?asqictaqimf

13. ts'akwistis'ath, died out
14. ts'alt!as'ath, died out
15. totkwisistaqimf
16. yuYu'lt'athla
17. ?â?asqictaqimf, bald-headed people

\[101\]
yułu'iț'atH

L'a'wihtactaqimł
Hayupi?yactaqimł
wa?o'atH
ts'âx'winoptaqimł
Wälwayactaqimł
t'okwi'is'atH
ts'aht'las'atH
yułu'iț'athsa

L'akmaqis'atH
tce'is'atH
ho'ol'atH

Tom Sayaach'apis listed three tribes with fifteen component groups (septs or bands) for the Ucluelet:

Ucluelet septs:

1. Yulu'iț'atH

2. Hāyupi'Actaqemł, "lo-on-forehead family"

3. Wälwayictaqtæemł, "coiled-lanyard family"

4. Ts'âxwinuptaqemł, "spearing-at-neck family"

Hitats'lo'atH³ septs:

1. 'I'was'atH³

2. Ts'akwistis'atH³

3. Ll'axios'tas'atH³, "house-in-hollow-of-wedge family"

4. Ll'itas'atl'as'atH³, "small-neck (creek)-running-down-muddy family"

5. Ts'aht'las'atH³, "creek-coming-out-of-the-woods family"
6. masoctaqemif, "house-under-thevlater family"
7. klûwûyûmtûl'sath^a

KlinixumAs'sath^a tribe had bands:
1. Wîwîta'aliktaqemif, "always-potlatching family"
2. Tot'kwísistqemif, "always-thundering-as-they-arise-from-beach family"
3. Kwíspisistaqemif, "always-going-on-the-otherside family"
4. Numímates'yaq'taqemif, "whose-house-is-decked-with-ckkwasis family"

"These people now amalgamated with Ucluelet". 107

William listed six bands for the Ucluelet area in 1914:

Tcîlu'mat'ath^a, originally separate tribe, main village at Stewart Bay

Hitâtslo'ath^a
Tcô'is'ath^a
Yułu'î'ath^a
'Wûyû'ath^a
Ho'ul'ath^a

The KlinaxumAs'sath^a were listed as a separate group. They "used to talk like Clayoquots". 108

Frank Williams listed seven "septs" for the Ucluelet in 1910:
1. tcô'is'ath^a = (klûwûyûmtûl'sath^a), "people living on beach near where are rocks (islands) sticking out of sand"
2. Yułu'î'ath^a
3. Hitâtslo'ath^a, "people living in bay"
4. **Hin'ap'c'isath**, "people living on other side, across"

5. **bó'uí'ath**

6. **K'inexumAS'ath**

7. **'wayi 'ath**, "people living on high hill"

Based on analysis and interpretation of this information a minimum of six local groups have been identified. They are presented below with component groups and geographic location. How many of the component groups may have been independent at an earlier time is unknown.

The **Klnaxum?as?ath** were the northerwost of the Ucluelet outside local groups. They were centered at **Quisitis** (Ucluelet #32), present day IR 9, at the south end of Long Beach. Five component groups have been identified:

1. **Wi'ita'ai̱k'taqemíłł, always potlatching family**

2. **Tót'kwispisistaqemíłł, always-thundering-as-they-arise-from-beach family**

3. **Kwispisistaqemíłł, always-going-on-the-other-side family**

4. **Numiáta's'yak'taqemíłł, whose-house-is-decorated-with-tcahwasis family**

5. **?á?atsqictaqímilł, bald-headed family**

The **hu?u?ath**, "flock-place-people" were the next local group south. They were centered at the village of **hu?u? (Ucluelet #31)**, present day **Oo-oohlth IR 8**, at the north end of Wreck Bay. No component groups have been identified.

The **yu.iu?il?ath** local group held the outside of the **Ucluth Peninsula**. They were centered at the village of **yu.iu?il** (Ucluelet..."
1129), within present day IR 6. Seven component groups have been identified:

1. L'a'wiHTactaqemilk, "band of pointed stick"
2. Yułu'1råth
3. Hayupi?yactaqemilk, "lo-on-head-family"
4. wa?o'ath
5. wâlmwàyictaqemilk, "coiled lanyard family"
6. tsa'axwinoptaqemilk, "spearing-at-neck family"
7. t'okwi'is'ath

The Hitatslo'atH, "people-living-in-bay" were centred in Ucluelet Inlet. Seven component groups have been identified:

1. '1'was'ath
2. Ts1akwistis'ath
3. L'axaqctas'ath, "house-in-hollow-of-wedge family"
4. L'itsat'as'ath, "small-creek-running-down-muddy family"
5. Ts1alHtl'as'ath, "creek-coming-out-of-the-woods family"
6. másoctaqemilk, "house-under-the-water family"
7. k'wâyimit'atH or te'éis'atH, "people-living-on-beach-near-where-are-rocks-sticking-out-of-sand"

Two other groups also held territory within Ucluelet Inlet. The cu.ma?as'ath main village was at öuma.تا (Ucluelet #41) in Stewart Bay near the eastern entrance. The lakmaqisath were from lakmaqis (Ucluelet 811) at the head of the Inlet. No component groups have been identified for either group.

Two groups, the wa.yi.?ath (from Ucluelet #30) and the hinapi?is?ath (from Ucluelet 824) were within yu.Iu?ii?ath territory. It is unclear
whether they are independent peoples or component groups of the yu.\textsl{j}u?il'ath.

The status of another group is also unclear. The tc\textsl{c}u'tcath were named by yaksuis, one of Drucker's Clayoquot respondents, and described as a "small family from Ucluelet place, tc\textsl{c}u'tca, moved in here (Opitsat)."\textsuperscript{110} Ču\textsl{c}u?a (Ucluelet #19) is the name for the George Fraser Islands.

Historical Traditions

Much of the information on Ucluelet history came from five traditions told by Kwishanishim to Alex Thomas in 1914. Four of these were war stories which were published in 1955:

74. Ucluelets Seize Namint
75. Ucluelets Seize Effingham Inlet
76. Ucluelets Fight Uchucklesits
77. The Long War in Barkley Sound\textsuperscript{111}

Kwishanishim related these traditions because of the recent interest in war as a result of the outbreak of World War I. The sixth tradition, "Origin of the ho'ož'atlh", is unpublished.\textsuperscript{112}

Historical events documented in these narratives will be augmented by relevant notes collected from other respondents in the following analysis and discussion of Ucluelet history.

The "Origin of the ho'ož'atlh" documents the migration of a Clayoquot group to the area of Wreck Bay.\textsuperscript{113} A Clayoquot whaler named 'a'at?op hunted whales in the area of Florencia Bay. He used the island called
qámintc'a (Florence Island, Ucluelet 840) as a lookout. 'a'at?op felt that whaling in this area created too many hardships so he proposed, along with the head chief t'o'waqlmik, to move to no'oť, “place for singing” (Ucluelet #31). Their relatives agreed. The ts'ah?as?atH, a subgroup of the Clayoquot who were related to them, followed. The chief, t'o'waqlmik, built his house at the new village on the hill. It was called sayáctlaq'as. 'a'at?op built his house in the middle of the village. It was called 'ap'win'as'i. Another house built was t'istcimk'wa?a, “stones piled on rocks”. The house at the far end of the village was called cu'o'wath, “place for shitting”. The village site was at first called no'oť. This was changed to ho'oť because the tribe was noisy and always squabbling. They became known as the ho'oťatH, the noisy, always talking band like the small sea birds.

To cement their claim to the area the eldest daughter of chief t'o'waqlmik was given by ħutcHa to the son of the chief of the L'a'wihtactaqmık band of the Ucluelet local group, their neighbours to the south. The second daughter was given by ħutcHa to the KlínaxumAs'atH, their neighbours to the north.

The first of the war traditions, “Ucluelets Seize Namint” begins with the Ucluelet Arm people, the hitacu'ath, looking for a productive salmon river. Only the ḫakmaqisath with ḫakmaqis creek and Pathluus, a chief of the yu'lu'if'ath, with Yasaayis creek (Sheshah 314) had rivers. Travelling around Barkley Sound, the hitacu'ath visited and were feasted by the Toquaht, the A'uts (Effingham Inlet people), the Uchucklesaht, the Ohiaht at Numukamis and the Namint. From these visits
they determined that the **Namint** had the best salmon. In a series of raids
the **hitacu?ath**, assisted later by several other groups, defeated the
Namint. The territory as divided among the Ucluelet victors, the
hitacu?ath, the hu?u?l'ath who were given this right by a Toquaht warrior,
and three Ucluelet component groups, the **wa.iwa.yastaqim?x**, the
ca.x'Win?upstaqim?x and the **tuk?i?si?ath**.

The second war story, entitled 'Ucluelets Seize Effingham Inlet', resulted in further territorial gain by the Ucluelets. The conflict originally as between the Toquaht and the **Hacha?aht** and **A'uts?aht**. In one of their night raids the **Hacha?aht** mistook a Ucluelet camp for that of the Toquaht and killed all. The Ucluelets then raided the **Hacha?aht** and **A'uts?aht** in retaliation. Soon after the Clayoquot joined in, bringing with them the first guns. The **Hacha?aht** were wiped out in one raid and the survivors scattered. Later the Ucluelets alone attacked the **A'uts?aht** in their villages in Effingham Inlet. Among the Ucluelet raiders were the **hu?u?l'ath**, the **hitacu?ath**, and two Ucluelet component groups, the
**wa.iwa.yastaqim?x** and the **maawicinstaqim?x**. **Maawitsin** "as chief of the
Spearing Neck Band, the **ca.x'Win?upstaqim?x**. The **A'uts'aht** were
defeated and their territory as absorbed by the Ucluelet.

The third conflict, 'The Ucluelets Fight **Uchucklesits**' occurred after the previous war as the Ucluelet owned Effingham Inlet. The war as precipitated by the Uchucklesahts killing Dog-Dancer, a Ucluelet whaler who as living among them. The Ucluelets raided in revenge, killing many Uchucklesahts. The nephew of Dog-Dancer, Two-hundred-up, as not soothed by this action, and continued to kill Uchucklesahts secretly.
Another conflict related as part of this tradition was with the Neah Bay people. The conflict began with Two-hundred-up stealing a whale from the Makah and taking it to Himayis (Sheshahlt 843) to butcher. The Neah Bay raided the Ucluelet at Himayis in revenge, wounding Two-hundred-up. The Ucluelet then moved to Yasaayis (Sheshahlt #14) where Two-hundred-up died. His death brought an end to the conflicts with the Uchucklesaht and the Makah.

The Ucluelet local group was following a seasonal round economic pattern at the time of this tradition in order to exploit the resources in the new territories gained in the two previous wars. The shifts in settlement were from hinapiatis (Ucluelet #24), the winter village, to wayi (Ucluelet #30), the spring village, and in the summer to the salmon rivers at Namint and Effingham Inlet. Himayis (Sheshahlt 843) and kacna?a (Sheshahlt #26) were other seasonal camps.

The “Long War in Barkley Sound”118 happened in the time of Kwishanishim’s father, Angryface. The conflict was characterized by numerous raids and changing alliances that lasted several years. The Ucluelet at this time lived at Equis (Sheshahlt #22) during the winter, moving to Ucluelet Arm in the springtime (herring spawn season) and to Namint in the summer (drying fish season). Hostilities began with the Ucluelet “roughing up” the Toquaht. Kwishanishim related:

They (the Ucluelets) did not break the houses down. They would rough up any Tukwaa who tried to show fight. They would let him go when he was nearly dead. They only roughed him up pretty well. They did not break up their buckets, nor split the boards all to pieces nor take everything away from them.119
The Toquaht wanted revenge. They gave girls in marriage to the Ohiaht, Sheshaht, Uchucklesaht and Opetchesaht as payment to make war against the Ucluelet. "They were willing because the Ucluelets bullied every tribe." A combined raid was carried out, intended to annihilate the Ucluelets while they were stopped at their camps on their way to the Namint. Many were spared, however, because of kinship ties with their attackers. The survivors regrouped at Yasaayis (Sheshaht #14) near Equis, "it being . . . suitable if they were at war with the tribes, since the beach was slippery and of a war party fighting there many would fall down on the beach". Here the Ucluelet built "a shooting platform of saplings, and set up a wall in front of the houses the whole length of Yasaayis". A series of raids and counter-raids followed, the primary adversaries being the Ucluelet and Ohiaht. The raids were generally against small parties out procuring resources or against villages when the men were away. One such attack by the Ohiaht and other tribes occurred at Yasaayis while the Ucluelet men were off raiding Shaahuvwis (Ohiaht #188). Many Ucluelet women and children were captured, the village was set on fire and the canoes broken up. When the Ucluelet raiding party returned many were wounded and killed. Yasaayis was abandoned. Some of the survivors went to live with their Clayoquot and Ahousaht relatives. Others went to live at Tsiithluukwis (Ucluelet #16) at the head of Ucluelet Arm. Times were hard. Kwishanishim related the impact the war had on Ucluelet seasonal movements:

It was difficult for the Ucluelets to move to Namint passing between the Tsishaa and Huu'ii'a . . . They would tie the canoes together. That was so they would not get scattered in a fight. They would paddle off
in that formation. As soon as they left the land, they would take their guns. They would fire. . . . It was as tho the land were bursting from much shooting, since they had many guns. . . . The same way, when they moved down to the coast, they would by tied together and shooting as they went. I%

The Ucluelet then moved to *wa.yi* (Ucluelet # 30) where they could fish for halibut. While the men were out on the halibut banks the Ohiaht and other tribes attacked again, setting the village on fire. The fires were seen by the Ucluelets from *kwisitis* (Ucluelet #32) and *hu?uX* (Ucluelet #31) and the Clayoquot from Esowista. All rushed to the fight but by the time they arrived the raiders had left. Among those killed were three chiefs of the Ucluelets. The Ucluelet moved from *Waayi* into Ucluelet Arm. "They no longer lived at *Waayi*. 125 After several other raids the fighting was brought to an end by the exchange of women. 126

Contemporary respondents provided details on the fortunes of some of the other Ucluelet groups. According to Rose Cootes the *hitacu?ath* were once a "big tribe" who were "cleaned off" on the way to or at the *Nahmint* River by the Ohiahts. The *hitacu?ath* turned to the *kinaxuma?as?ath* for assistance, offering them fishing rights at the *Namint* and a village site in Ucluelet Inlet. 127

The *kinaxuma?as?ath* were also decimated by war. According to Sarah Tutube they were attacked by a combined Opitsat and ‘Ahousaht force and nearly wiped out. 128

Blenkinsop described the Ucluelet as once holding the “position of notorious pre-eminence” in Barkley Sound and of being the “terror of their neighbours”. 129 In 1874 the population was 280 men, women and children. 130 They were living in “two villages, distant from each other
about four hundred yards... named Kw'i.yim.tah (Ucluelet #7) and Ik.tate.so (Ucluelet #5), the latter being the largest and nearest to the sea. They had four fishing stations for halibut on the seacoast:

U.tlou.11thl (Ucluelet #29), Wy.ee (Ucluelet #30), Kwis.it.is (Ucluelet 832) and Oo.oohlth (Ucluelet 831). They had "no summer village in which they all congregate for the season similar to the other tribes (in Barkley Sound), but scatter over the Sound and its different arms securing food and (dogfish) oil until the arrival of severe weather compels them to go into winter quarters". The Namint River was still the principal salmon fishing station of the Ucluelet. By the end of the century, however, the Namint was no longer used as "all would go sealing and be absent for long periods of time".

Summary

The four war traditions are a yu.Łu?il?ath local group version of Ucluelet history. This should not be surprising as Kwishanishım was of the L'a'wihtactaqimə, the highest ranking of the yu.Łu?il?ath component groups. He was a younger brother of the chief's (Tyee Jack) father. From these traditions, the yu.Łu?il?ath are pictured as an aggressive, expansionistic people who were involved for much of the early historic period in a series of conflicts with a number of other groups in Barkley Sound, the Toquaht, the Haachaht, the A'uts'ath, the Sheshaht, the Uchucklesaht, the Opechessait and the Ohiaht as well as the Makah. These wars either directly or indirectly were responsible for the formation of the Ucluelet as we know them today. A discussion of these events and a reconstruction of the sequence of the amalgamation follows.
Fig. 41. Ucluelet village of Nuu-chah-nulth (IN 5) around 1905 (Photo: BCPM PN 1176).

Fig. 42. Ucluelet village of Nuu-chah-nulth (IN 5), 1904 (Photo: BCPM PN 4934A).
Prior to the changes outlined above a minimum of six independent local
groups lived within the region defined as modern Ucluelet territory: the
Kinaxum?as?ath at kwisitis (Ucluelet 132) on Long Beach, the hu?ul?ath
at hu?ul (Ucluelet #31) on Florencia Bay, the yu.?u?if?ath at yu.?u?if
(Ucluelet 829) on the outside coast of the Uculth Peninsula, the
hita?cu?ath at hitadu (Ucluelet #5) on the eastern shore of Ucluelet Inlet,
the cu.?u?asi?ath at ?cum?ta (Ucluelet #41) at the eastern entrance to
Ucluelet Inlet, and the ?akmaqisath at Rakmaqis (Ucluelet #14) at the head
of Ucluelet Inlet.

The first territorial expansions occurred at about the same time. the
Raachoht war and the taking of the Nahmint River. The Raachoht conflict
is hypothesized to have taken place slightly earlier as Yasaayis (Sheshalt
#14) was owned by the Ucluelet at the time of the Nahmint war. This site
was in the region of the jumping competition which precipitated the
initial outbreak of war between the Toquaht and Raachoht. The first use
of guns in this war dates the conflict to around 1790.

The capture of the Nahmint River and Effingham Inlet involved the same
Ucluelet groups, the yu.?u?if?ath, the hita?cu?ath and the hu?ul?ath. To
utilize these newly acquired territories the three local groups developed
a seasonal round moving from their traditional territories to the salmon
rivers in the late summer.

An unrecorded conflict with the Sheshalt is hypothesized to have
occurred before the next conflict with the Uchucklesaht as several sites
in the Broken Group Islands were being utilized by the yu.?u?if?ath in the
tradition.
The "Long War in Barkley Sound" brought an end to Ucluelet dominance in the region and major changes to group composition and settlement. As a result of raids over a number of years by the Ohiaht and their allies the Yułuʔat and the Hitatchuʔat were reduced greatly in numbers. The Huułuʔat, because of their close Clayoquot connections, were not attacked. By the end of the war the Yułuʔat had moved to Hitatchu (Ucluelet #5). The Kinaxumdat had also moved in at the invitation of the Hitatchuʔat. The Ucluelet local group name became the name of the amalgamated entity and from their senior component group came the head chief. When the Huułuʔat joined the amalgamation is unknown.

In 1874 the Ucluelet were living in two villages in the eastern shore of Ucluelet Inlet, k̓waʔyimta (Ucluelet #7) and Hitatchu (Ucluelet #5). The four outside village sites k̓wisitis (Ucluelet #32), Huułuʔ (Ucluelet #31), waʔyi (Ucluelet #30) and Yułuʔat (Ucluelet #29) had become halibut fishing camps. The Nałmintgiver was their major salmon river.

Clayoquot History

Introduction

The modern Clayoquot are an amalgamation of a number of independent peoples from the Clayoquot Sound and Kennedy Lake region (Fig. 43). Today the Clayoquot people are centred in two settlements, Opitsat (IR 1) on Meares Island and Esowista (IR 3) at the north end of Long Beach.

The Clayoquot were one of the prominent groups in the historic period literature and their chief, Wicanninish, was perhaps the most powerful
Fig. 43. Map of amalgamated Clayoquot territory with known places numbered (for key see Appendix C).
chief on the west coast of Vancouver Island during the years of the sea otter trade. The Clayoquot were renowned warriors and had a reputation of only needing to raid once to annihilate an enemy.

Our knowledge of Clayoquot group composition and historical traditions comes from several sources. Although the Clayoquot were not one of the groups of research focus by Sapir, he did collect some relevant ethnographic data from Sayaachapis and William. Sayaachapis had connections with the Hisawist'athà. He relateh a text on “The Origin of the Hisawist'athà”, and listed the order in which Clayoquot groups attacked in war. William included a number of the Clayoquot groups in his list of tribes north of Barkley Sound. The Clayoquot were also prominent in several traditions from the Barkley Sound area, particularly "Ucluelet's Seize Efingham Inlet" and “The Long War in Barkley Sound”. collected by Alex Thomas from Kwishanishim. Curtis worked in the Clayoquot region in 1914 gathering information and photographing for his study on ‘The North American Indian’. George Hunt likely recorded the Clayoquot traditions and ethnographic notes for Curtis at this time. Who George Hunt interviewed was not recorded in Curtis’ publication on the Nootka. Rev. Vincent A. Koppert was the next person to record Clayoquot ethnography. His study emphasized material culture. His respondents at Opitsat in 1929 were Chief Joseph Weekmanish, David James, Yeskan Jack and Old Peter and his wife. In 1935-36 Philip Drucker collected information from Jimmy Jim and yaksu' is. Of particular interest are the several lists of Clayoquot groups, houses, and chiefs and the historical tradition of the Clayoquot Wars.
Fig. 45. Chief Joseph, Clayoquot, around 1940 (Photo: PAC PA 140976).
Component Groups of the Clayoquot

There are a number of different lists of component groups of the modern Clayoquot. These lists will be presented, analyzed and integrated in the following discussion.

Sayaachapis, while working with Sapir in 1913-14, listed eleven groups of the Clayoquot:

1. 'ap'wini'as'ath⁸, "in the middle of the village"
2. Yutch⁸uk'taq⁸mit, "obtaining by Yutcha people"
3. Kwąq'laas'ath⁸
4. Kátcké'is'ath⁸
5. 'laqlwitis'ath⁸
6. Lā'okwi'ath⁸, Clayoquot proper
7. tc'utc'a'ath⁸
   a. Playá'ath⁸
8. Hayuqwilactaq⁸mit
9. Qo(),'na:ath⁸taq⁸mit
10. kitsis'ath⁸taq⁸mit

This was the order in which they entered war. "This is all I know". ¹³⁴

William, when listing tribes north of Barkley Sound, named three "tribes" in Clayoquot territory:

Hisāwistath⁸ (Clayoquot got land as his'ök't)
Hop'its'ath⁸ (Clayoquot band)
La'ó'kwí'ath (real Clayoquot, main band)¹ 3 5

Curtis listed sixteen "septs" for the Clayoquot:

1. Hluchháuqhtákũmũhl, named from wedding ceremony
2. Máashtákũmũhl, house growing higher
3. Haiyúquishtákũmũhl, "ten feathers on the head"
4. Kachkíísutʰɑ'tákũmũhl, hair in a knot on the top of the head
5. Païyáshtánkũmũhl, to distribute presents
6. Nutumúkstíshtákũmũhl, twin child or congenital cripple
7. Síchůnyaʰɑ'míshtákũmũhl, a whale in the position of diving
8. Shiwusautʰɑ'tákũmũhl, from an island, Shiwa, near Clayoquot
9. Kítsísutʰɑ'tákũmũhl, log on the beach
10. Tíchúuʰɑ'tákũmũhl, a whale near the entrance to the sound
11. Mahltsoosútʰɑ, house by a hill
12. Úpwinúsúthʰɑ'tákũmũhl, house in the middle
13. Akowítísúthʰɑ'tákũmũhl, from a place, Akowitis, on Vargas Island
14. Qátsiwiúʰɑ'tákũmũhl, from Qatsiwi, a place in Mosquito Harbour
15. Qáktlisúthʰɑ'tákũmũhl, from Qaktlis, a place on Kennedy Lake
16. Issawistaunthʰɑ'tákũmũhl, from Issawista, a place at Long Beach¹³⁶

The source(s) for this list is (are) not known at present.

Drucker collected a number of lists of Clayoquot groups in 1935-36.

One list, obtained from yaksu'is, named twelve families at Opitsat
(Clayoquot #5):

1. ḳutchaaktakaml, "first chiefs bunch"
2. qatcqlísath, from here (hair tied on top of head)
3. païyactakimiakt, from here (giving out potlatch gifts)
4. kwəklasath, used to be kwəlisath, small tribe from Kennedy Lake
5. aqowitisath, lived at place aqowitis (whalers)
6. tsab'tasath, from here
7. ap'winasath, from here
8. kitsistikam', from here
9. maltsasath, from here
10. ciw'ath, from ciw, up the inlet
11. tc'utca, small family from Ucluelet place tc'utca (Ucluelet #19?)
12. mas'ath, from here, not related, given seat because helped the chief much 137

In a second list Jimmy Jim named seven "tribes", when describing houses at Opitsat:

1. tutchaoktakiml
2. haiyuhwsctakiml (used to be hisauistath)
3. masactakuml
4. aqowo'tisath
5. kitsistikumtl
6. paiyactakuml
7. katchIsath

Tribes 2 through 6 used to own their own places but when ya'allstohsmałni (Wicanninish) became head chief he took their places away from them.

"This was five generations ago." 138

Jimmy Jim also mentioned four other groups:

8. timika:sath
9. ti'nama
10. hopitcath (or ciwath)
11. kwəkwəlasath

Groups 9 and 10 moved to Opitsat after war with the histaiusath. 139

Drucker integrated the information from yaksu'is and Jimmy Jim in a list of seventeen Clayoquot groups:

1. ḥuteHaökraumʔ, from Kennedy Lake, outside place at itcactict
2. aqowitisath, “washed down from actis (Kyuquot)“
3. hopitcath, ciwath, "different names for same bunch"
4. kwəkwəlasath, small group from Kennedy Lake
5. apəwinasath
6. qateqI'isatH
7. kistsistikumʔ
8. katsistikatH
9. tcūtcatH, small group from Ucluelet
10. mascal (also masactakum1)
11. palyactakum1f
12. tsaiitasath (house on site of mythical tsahtas house)
13. malsasatH (house at end of village)
14. hisauistath, exterminated by #1 under ya'aistoHsnaʔni
   (Wicanninish)
15. La'ō'kwath
16. timikasath, exterminated, sub-division of hisauistath
17. tsiiqtkisath, exterminated

For a number of reasons it is difficult to identify the original local groups who held territories in the Clayoquot Sound region from these
lists. First, territories and groups changed significantly as a result of
wars which will be discussed later. Second, a number of the groups were
newly created by the head chiefs for family members from the spoils of the
wars and were not independent. And third, the lists generally reflect the
social organization after this period of turmoil when the Clayoquot were
living at Opitsat, the amalgamation site.

As a result only three pre-amalgamation groups have been identified
with certainty: the hisawistath at esowista (Clayoquot #2) and Indian
Island (Clayoquot #7), the hopitcath at hopite (Clayoquot #3) and echachis
(Clayoquot #6) and the Clayoquot at L'a'o'kwa (Clayoquot #1) and yalapis
(location unknown, but likely on Esowista Peninsula around Tofino).

Historical Traditions

There are a number of recorded historical traditions and ethnographic
notes that elucidate the origin of the independent local groups and the
formation of the modern Clayoquot.

In the "Origin of the Hisawistath" told by Sayaachapis the sky
chief created the first person "Sunbeams-on-the-beach" and named the land
hisawist'la'. He then created first woman and named all the things that
came to be foods. The hisauistath came to be the dominant group in
the region, and fought with both the hopitcath and the Clayoquot. The
hopitcath appear to have been forced from their homeland by these
conflicts. The Clayoquot were nearly "cleaned out" in another.

The last war between the hisauistath and the Clayoquot began as a
dispute over salvage rights to a killer whale that had drifted ashore on
the inside of Tofino Peninsula. The hisauistath saw the whale first and salvaged it although it was on Clayoquot territory. Some Clayoquot youths who witnessed the salvage went into the hisauistath houses on Indian Island (Clayoquot #7) and took back the whale meat. They were caught and the chief’s son was killed. The Clayoquot raided in revenge, killing a few people. The hisauistath thought the matter was settled but the next summer, while most of the men were out fishing, the Clayoquot attacked the village of esowista. After killing the men who had stayed in the village the Clayoquot warriors then went after and killed the fishermen. Only a few hisauistath survived and they were taken as slaves. The Clayoquot got the hisauistath territory as his'ök't including their sockeye rivers, bong Beach and the islands for sea lions on the east end. There are references to a number of other conflicts involving the Clayoquot about this time, in which they consolidated their position of dominance in the region.

The Clayoquot also exerted their influence beyond Clayoquot Sound being involved in several conflicts in Barkley Sound. In the first, they attacked and defeated the Haachaht at Tayanita (Sheshahit #3). This war featured the first use of guns. In the second the Clayoquot came to the assistance of the Ucluelet in the Long War in Barkley Sound.

The last war in which the Clayoquot were involved was the attack on the Kyuquot at Aktis around 1855.

Summary

At the earliest time represented in the recorded traditions a minimum of three independent groups have been identified: the hisauistath
located on the outside in the region of Long Beach and Schooner Cove with their village at esowista (Clayoquot #2) and on the inside in Grice Bay with their village on Indian Island (Clayoquot #7); the hopitecath in the region of the Radar Beaches and the offshore islands with villages at hopite (Clayoquot #3) and echachis (Clayoquot #6); and the Clayoquot whose original territory is unknown, but who had villages at yalapis (location unknown, but hypothesized to be on the north end of Esowista Peninsula) and on Kennedy Lake at La'okwa (Clayoquot #1), their ancestral site.

The hisauistath were the group that initially dominated the region in a number of conflicts with the hopitecath and Clayoquot and probably other groups as well. These groups may have joined together at tsaahtas, the original name for Opitsit (Clayoquot #5). The hisauistath eventually were wiped out by the Clayoquot who absorbed their territory and became the new dominant force in the region. Once Wicanninnish and the Clayoquot had established their supremacy, other smaller groups joined.

The next recorded conflicts in which the Clayoquot were involved were in Barkley Sound. In revenge either for the killing of a Clayoquot in Barkley Sound or an attack on one of their villages, the Clayoquot attacked the Haachaht at Tayanita, their defensive site. In the attack the Clayoquot used the first guns and wiped out the Haachaht. In the other conflict the Clayoquot assisted their Ucluelet relatives in fighting against the Toquaht during the Long War. The Clayoquot had a reputation as warriors who needed to attack only once to defeat an enemy. Their last attack was on Aktis, the Kyuquot village, around 1855.
Fig. 46. Opitsat, the main village of the Clayoquot, around 1910 (Photo: private collection).

Fig. 47. The Clayoquot village of Echachtsj around 1900 (Photo: Mount Angel Archives).
In the late nineteenth century the Clayoquot had two main settlements: thirty-one houses at Opitsat (Clayoquot #5) and twenty-two houses at Echachis (Clayoquot #6). Esowista (Clayoquot #2) was used as a fishing station.

**Obiaht History**

**Introduction**

The modern Obiaht are an amalgamation of at least six independent peoples whose traditional territory encompassed the area from Tsusiat Falls or Pachena Point to Cape Beale and the eastern shore of Barkley Sound and the Alberni Canal to Coleman Creek, including many of the islands in the Deer Group (Fig. 48). Their neighbours to the southeast were the Mtidah, and in Barkley Sound the Hiku't'athd, the Uckucklesahlt and the Sheshaht. Today the Obiaht are centred at Anacla IR 13, located at the head of Pachena Bay.

Our knowledge of ONaht history stems from a number of sources. In 1874 George Bleakinsop interviewed Chief Naht'sik for the Indian Reserve Commissioner. He recorded information on contemporary villages, fishing stations and territory. During the 1913-14 field season Sapir collected information from William and Sayaachapis on Obiaht group composition and territory. In'1922 Alex Thomas interviewed Obiaht elder Dick Thlamaahuus obtaining information on the subdivisions and seating of the ONaht. Also in 1922 Alfred Carmichael recorded several ONaht traditions with explanatory notes from Sa-sat-win. In 1949 Morris Swadesh worked with
Fig. 48. Map of amalgamated Ohiaht territory with known places numbered (for key see Appendix D).
Fig. 49. Aerial view of Cape Beale headland with Outer Deer Group Islands in background, Chiaht territory (Photo: BCPM 1984E:131).
Chief Nuukmis gathering data on village pattern and house composition. Eugene Arima worked with Chief Louie in 1964, recording a number of Ohiaht historical traditions which were translated by Alex Thomas around 1968 and written up by Arima in 1984.

In 1974 Barry Carlson and Mabel Dennis and in 1981 Bernice Touchie worked with Robert Sport collecting information on ONaht place names. Between 1982 and 1985 Denis St. Claire worked with a number of Ohiaht elders for both the Pacific Rim Project and the ONaht Ethnoarchaeology Project. Respondents included Robert Sport, Ella Jackson, Bill Happynook, William Sport, Mary Moses and Alex Williams. St. Claire’s particular research interests were place names, site usage and social organization.

The place name information from the above sources have been compiled by Cairn Crockford in Appendix D, Ohiaht Geography.

Component Groups of the ONaht

As with the other groups discussed in this report, the composition of the Ohiaht has changed dramatically over the years. “These changes are reflected in the lists of component groups of the ONaht which have been collected.

In 1913 William named and defined the territories of seven independent groups which are now included within present day Ohiaht territory (see Fig. 33):

1. Yact'q̓o't̓ath': start on Alberni Canal at K̓aço'a (ONaht #7) up to Ts'ł̓əmənasat̓h̓ country (east shore of Alberni Canal).
Fig. 50. Robert Sport, Ohiaht in 1975 (Photo: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council).
2. P'op'uma?á'ath³: Region of San Mateo Bay. When they died out, Uchucklesaht got their country, then (before whites came) Ho'lai'ath³ got it by his'ék't.


4. Hó'aí'ath³: Includes all ?eniq'cil'ath³ country, which was taken by his'ék't, and Banfield Creek. Boundaries start from Tsaxslá'a point (Ohiaht #68) out to sea; other determined by Hiku'atH³. Main Ho'aí'ath³ village called ?a?lsowis on Diana Island (Ohiaht #140), the other one called Tcáp'is (Haines Island, Ohiaht #139).

5. Kíx'inI'atH³: Territory begins at Tsaxslá'a'and goes along coast to point called LatsLaksi'asa'a' (Ohiaht #100). Kíx'in (Ohiaht #92) was their village.

6. Tc'imataq'so'ath³: Rounds Tc'imataq'suí (Cape Beale, Ohiaht #105) and goes down to point called kwisáyis?i kíxa (Ohiaht #182). On this beach was camping village of Kíxá. Main village was Tc'imataq'suí, located on top of rocky hill back of deeper inlet of two together.

7. ?aqa'I'la'ath³: Country ran down to point near Pachena Point called Tslá'itslaxwätc'a'a'qath³ “place on rocks for spearing ma'ak' whales” (Ohiaht #203). After this to south came Nitinat country.

Groups 4, 5, 6 and 7 “all joined because (they were) reduced in numbers. They formed Ho'aí'ath³ bands; joined long before white people came.”¹⁴⁹
In 1913 Sayaach'apis listed eight bands for the Hó:lai'at'Ha. He did not know the order of rank.

1. **Kłx'in'at'Ha**, originally separate tribe, now head of tribe. Head band named **L'lól'áswi'Actaqemíl**, "putting-hands-thru-holes-in-rocks-family".

2. **Kwí'iq'to'asat'Ha**, named from place to Tlok'wa, "rocky-on-the-face-of-a-hill". Hó:lai'at'Ha chief went to Tlok'wa to tutchá and got girl belonging to this house, hence name of descendants.

3. **Tuxu'il:'at'Ha'Actaqemíl**, "falls-people family". Name refers to falls on Sarita River; they used to have a village for trapping fish at this falls.

4. **Tcatkahatsí:yas'at'Ha'Actaqemíl**. Named from creek of that name.

5. **tc'lú'mat'at'Ha**. Named after mountain called tc'lómat'á near Tlok'wa. Name is of one of Tlok'wa bands; name came to Hó:lai'at'Ha by tutchá.

6. **máltálas'at'Ha**, "houses-right-against-a-hill-people". No place so called; got name from custom of having their house at this spot. Numu'q.Emí present main village, but not formerly. There used to be another tribe there, perhaps named from ?éníq'cil, present name of Sarita River. Tsícyaacht'Ha killed them off.

7. **Tlok'wa'at'Ha'Actaqemíl**, so called because one of ancestors tutchá to Tlok'wa.

8. **Lôt'as'at'Ha** younger line of L'lól'ótl, to whom they were wAstcim. 150
According to Sayacaachapis two of these bands (#2 and #8) moved to whaling camps in summer "being better lookout places than (their) regular villages." They would take on the name of their whaling camp at this time. Thus band 2 became the 'maalsit'athd, after 'maalsit (Ohiacht #123) and band 8 became the Kixa'athd after Kixa (Ohiacht #113). In a description of boIai'ath names he had rights to, Sayacaachapis equated the Llo'ofswi'Actaqemik to the tsAxtsa'aas'athd, "Bamfield Creek people" where they got their dog salmon.

In 1922 Alex Thomas recorded the subdivisions of the boIi'ath and their seating from Dick Thlamaahuus. Fifteen bands were listed:

1. 'ap'win?as'ath, "band of middle of village"
2. tcatca.htsi.'as'ath, "band of tcatca.htsi'as"
3. toxol'ath', "band of Falls"
4. teu'ina.'ath. "band of teu'ina. ta"
5. tokwa.'ath'taqimt, "band of tokwa. 'ath"
6. ma.ltsa.s'ath, "band of House against Hill"
7. toxwi.tstaqimt, "band of toxwi.t"
8. xa'ya'ath, "band of xa'ya"
9. ?anaqtla'ath, "band of ?anaqtla"
10. 'ma.Isit'ath, "band of Cold Water"
11. lu. tas'ath, "band of lu.tas"
12. kixa.'ath, "band of kixa"
13. tsaxtsa.'ath, "band of Banfield Creek"
14. tlisnatcis'ath, "band of tlisnatcis"
15. tlihska.po'is'ath, "band of red-mouth-vessel-on-head"
Chief Louie mentioned four groups of people within the texts of Ohiaht historical traditions recorded in 1964:

1. Ch'imatagsu?ath, people of Ch'imitagsul (Cape Beale)
2. ki:x'in?ath, village at Ki:x'in (Ohiaht 892)
3. Tuht'a:?atH or ?Anaqtl'a (?ath), Pachena Bay tribe, village was Tuht'a' (Ohiaht #119?)
4. Hu:i:?ath, village at husmatqa'tus (Ohiaht #148)\(^\text{154}\)

In 1984 Ella Jackson listed 13 "families" of the Ohiaht tribe:

1. xaya7ath ...
2. maalhsit?ath
3. lhuut'as7ath
4. anaklt'a7ath
5. kiixin7ath
6. kiixa7ath
7. huu7ii7ath
8. timk7ath
9. 7uts'uu7a7ath
10. tsaxts'aa7a7ath
11. chachaahs17as7ath
12. tliisnoch'is7ath
13. ch'imataksu7ath

While discussing places Ella Jackson listed three other groups:

14. aa7ikis7ath
15. tuup'alhsit (7ath)
16. mukwchi7ath
Groups 14 and 15 were part of the \textit{kiixin7ath} (§5), group 16 was part of the \textit{chimataksu7ath} (§13). She also responded to the names of three groups from Dick Thlaamahuus’ list:

17. \textit{tuxwuulh7ath}
18. \textit{ch'umaat'aa7ath}
19. \textit{tukwuwa7ashtakmlh}

Ella Jackson also listed five house groups at Numukamis:

20. \textit{maalhts'aas7ath}, “house against the bluff” people
21. \textit{ts'atakwa7ath}, “people by the creek”
22. \textit{hitakktlas7ath}, “people at the back”
23. \textit{ap'win7as7ath}, “middle of village people”
24. \textit{hiilstu7as7ath}, “people on other side of creek”

Two other places, sayaach’a and \textit{amihata}, were given as locations of houses.

Mary Moses listed eleven house groups at Numukamis in order from the north end:

1. \textit{maalhts'a7asath}, to Dodger Cove in summer
2. \textit{ts'a7akwath}
3. \textit{ch'uumaata7ath} or \textit{sayaach'a7ath}
4. \textit{t'ak'ak'ts'as7ath}
5. \textit{ustu7asath}
6. \textit{apswin7asath}
7. \textit{chu'uuhuulh7ath}
8. \textit{ch'ich'ahch'i7as7ath}
9. \textit{apswas7ath}
10. \textit{kwisp'a7as7ath}
11. *hilstu7as7ath* to *ku.tas* in summer

Four other house groups were mentioned in discussion of where various families went in summer. Three were part of the *apewin7asath*:

1. *kiixin7ath*, went to *Kiixin* (Ohiaht 892)
2. *kiixa7ath*, went to *Kiixa* (Ohiaht 8113)
3. *7aanaktl'a7ath*, went to *7aanaktl'a* (Ohiaht 8121)

The *kwisp'a7as7ath* (*#10*) went to *lhutaas* (Ohiaht #119) in the summer and became the *lhuut'as7ath*. 156

There are significant variations in the groups on these lists. The process of defining the original local groups is not simply a matter of integrating the lists and coming up with a maximum number of groups. These lists in fact are not directly comparable as they reflect the composition of the Ohiaht at different times in the past. Only two lists, from Frank Williams and Chief *Louie*, relate to a pre-amalgamation social organization.

The lists of Sayaachapis, Dick *Thlamaahuus*, Ella Jackson and Mary Moses represent a *new socio-political* reality brought about by a prolonged period of warfare in what is now Ohiaht territory. The new pattern sees people taking their names from the houses they lived in at the winter amalgamation village of Numukamis, and then when they move to various seasonal camps they change their name to that of their camp. The number of names a particular group of people had depended directly on the number of places where they set up during the year. Those who stayed year round at Numukamis would have only one name; those who moved only to a summer or fall fishing station would have two names and those who moved to both a summer and fall fishing station could have three names. Another factor
further complicating the picture is that groups did not necessarily maintain the same composition during this seasonal movement. How they divided and re-combined has not been reconstructed for this report.

At this time, it is only possible to identify seven independent local groups as the original occupants of the area that is today Ohiaht traditional territory. They are:

1. Hōlaḵ’at̓ a, outer Deer Croup Islands
2. Kix’inat̓ a, eastern shore of Barkley Sound
3. Tc̓ limatáq̓ so’, Cape Beale area
4. ?anəq’il’a, Pachena Bay area
5. ?en̓ iq’cil’a, Sarita River area
6. P̓ opl̓ um’a, San Mateo Bay
7. Yacti’q̓ o’a, eastern shore of Alberni Canal

Historical Traditions

As with the other independent groups in Barkley Sound the events of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, especially the wars, determined the fate of the groups and the eventual composition of the present day Ohiaht.

There are three war texts extant as well as brief mention of a number of other conflicts in which the above groups were involved. One of the recorded war texts, "Uchucklesets Exterminate Kiihin", featured the Ki:x̱?in’at̓ a although the conflict likely involved other groups as well. The other two war texts, “The War with the Clallams and Barkley Sound Natives” and the “Long War in Barkley Sound” featured the amalgamated Ohiaht.
There are no traditions of the conflict between the Ho'ai'atl and the ʔeniq'cil'atl. In Ns description of tribal territories William remarked: "old tribe of ʔeniq'cil'atl were killed off by Ho'ai'atl, and their territory absorbed."

Another conflict, "Uchucklesits Exterminate Kiihin", was told by Sayaachapis in 1913. It is a Uchucklesht historical tradition. The narrative began with the marriage of the daughter of the chief of Kiihin to the son of the Uchucklesht chief. The Uchuckleshts were living at Kelp-in-Bay (Ohiaht #148, Kirby Point) at this time which is Ho'ai'atl local group territory. The Uchuckleshts received the drift-whale rights of the Kiihin as dowry, causing "miserable conditions" among the Kiihin commoners. They planned to kill the princess and her two sons but the plot was never carried out. In retaliation the Uchucklesht raided the Kiihin. In subsequent raids, the Kiihin were killed off with the exception of the immediate relatives of the princess and the Uchuckleshts took over the country down to Tsusayi'at (Ohiaht #193). According to Chief Louie it was the Uchucklesht chief of Kildonan who raided as far as Tsusayi?:at and killed off the Tl'a:ni:wa:a and Ts'axq'u:?:is bands.

William implies that others besides the Ki:x?in'ath fought with the Uchucklesht as "long ago the (Uchucklesht) claimed all of the land from Tsusayi'at' creek on open sea around to Uchucklesht country. The Hō'ai'atl, KIxinI'atl, Telimataqso'atl and ?anaq'L'a'atl were subject bands."

An indirect reference to further Ohiaht/Uchucklesht hostilities was made by William when he noted that the Ohiaht got the area of San Mateo
Bay from the Uchucklesaht by his'ók't. This happened "before whites came." 161

According to Chief Louie, both the Ch'imataqsuʔath and the Ḵuht'aʔath were wiped out by the aftermath of an earthquake. The Ch'imataqsuʔath had gone into a cave where they were trapped by a landslide;162 the Ḵuht'aʔath were drowned by a tidal wave.163 The only survivors of the Ḵuht'aʔath were the people from the House-Up-Against Hill (Ma:its'a:s) at M'ís:ísit164 and the eldest daughter of the chief who had married a Klíx'í'nath.165

The war with the Clallam was related by Chief Louie in 1964.166 The events took place four generations ago. Tlí:šhína was the head chief. The Ohiahts at this time were a "nation" whose territory "reached the waterfall (Tsusiat) on one side and on the other went as far as Coleman Creek" (on Alberni Canal).167 They numbered 2000 men. The narrative began with the murder of the young second chief of the Ohiahts who was half Clallam. His mother returned to Clallam Bay and a war party was organized to gain revenge. The Clallams raided the Ohiahts at Klíx'í'n (Ohiaht #92), Tlí'inhapis (Ohiaht #90), Brady's Beach (Ohiaht #86), Uts'uʔa (Ohiaht #84) and Tlaʔaktaqapiʔí (location unknown). The survivors escaped to the Sarita River where they established villages at the Tlí'ihskapúʔís (Ohiaht #40), Wihtaʔa (Ohiaht #43) and Klí:kí:xí)n'uk (Ohiaht #44). The survivors of the Ohiaht who lived at Husmatqts'ús (Ohiaht #148) on Diana Island hid at Hu:ʔí (Ohiaht #146). "They held onto this land ... The Clallams were here for a long time, going about searching for people to kill here and there".168 The Ohiaht stayed in hiding up the Sarita. As years passed they grew to be "big again" and came down the river to reclaim their old territories.
Soon after a Ucluelet war party killed the young Ohiaht chief leading a war that eventually embroiled all of Barkley Sound. The fighting lasted ten years. According to Kwishanishim the Toquaht "gave girls to the Hu'u'ii as pay to make war against the Ucluelets" (lurcHa). The Ohiaht became the main combatants and raided the Ucluelet many times. They were attacked in return by Ucluelet war parties at Shaahuwis (Ohiaht #188), Flow-Point (Ohiaht #36), Chachahtsu'as (Ohiaht #23), Shred Place at Poet's Nook (Ohiaht #48), Tlissnachis (Sarita area), Bamfield Creek and Tabu Beach (Ohiaht 825). The warring tribes eventually made peace by the exchange of women.

In 1874 Chief Hat'sik defined Ohiaht territory as extending from Coleman Creek on Alberni Canal (Ohiaht #1) to Tsusiat River (Ohiaht #193). Within this territory the Ohiaht had two villages, Noo.muk.em.e.is (Ohiaht #25) their winter village and Keh.ahk.in (Ohiaht #92) their summer village. Numerous camps dotted the islands and the Vancouver Island shore. Blenkinsop's census listed ten houses at Keh.ahk.in and one at Dodger Cove with a total population of 262.

Summary

By the time the last of the wars ended the Ohiaht had experienced a period of intense fighting, long term dislocation and subjugation that likely spanned half a century. When they returned to their territories in peace it was not as the socio-political entities that had existed prior to this continuous series of events but as a new socio-political entity, the amalgamated Ohiaht.
Prior to the changes brought about by the various wars, a minimum of seven independent groups inhabited the area from Pachena Point to Coleman Creek: the anaqtl'a'ath or Yuhta'aht at Fuht'a (Ohiaht #119 at the entrance to Pachena Bay), the chimataqsu'ath at chimataqsu'ath (Ohiaht #105 at Cape Beale), the Kixiinath at Kixin (Ohiaht #92 on the eastern shore of Mills Peninsula), the Ohiaht at ?a?lsowis (Ohiaht #140 on Diana Island), the ?eniqcil'ath in the region of the Sarita River, the Ploplum'a'ath in the San Mateo Bay region, and the Yacti'qo'ath on the eastern shore of Alberni Canal.

The first territorial expansion was made by the Ohiaht when they took the Sarita River from the ?eniqcil'ath. This group subsequently disappeared from the record. The next conflict was the-subjugation of the Popuma?a'ath, Ohiaht, Kixiinath, Chimataqsu'ath and Anaqtl'a'ath by the Uchucklesaht. The Uchucklesaht expansion appears to have occurred sequentially along the eastern shoreline of Barkley Sound. The Ohiaht, for example, had already been defeated before fighting broke out with the Kixiinath as the Uchucklesaht were living at Kelp-In-Bay (Ohiaht #148, Kirby Point), an Ohiaht site, at the start of the conflict. The Uchucklesaht also continued their territorial expansion at the expense of several Ditidaht groups until they reached Tsusiat Falls (Ohiaht #193). The anaqtl'a'ath and chimataqsu'ath probably ceased to function as independent groups about this time. There are two possible explanations for their demise from the traditions: the war with the Uchucklesaht or natural disaster as a result of an earthquake.
How long the Uchucklesaht held this territory and how the various Ohiaht groups regained their autonomy was not recorded. The Ohiaht taking the region of San Mateo Bay by his'ók't from the Uchucklesaht argues for continued hostilities. By the time the Uchucklesaht had been forced out of the region the number of independent groups operating along the eastern shore of Barkley Sound had been reduced from six to two, the Kixixinath and the Ohiaht. The territory of the chimataqsuʔ'ath and anaqtla'ath had been absorbed by the Kixixinath and that of the ?eniqgił'ath and Ploplumʔa'ath by the Ohiaht.

The Clallam War was the next conflict recorded for the region. The Clallam attacked both the Kixixinath and the Ohiaht forcing their retreat to the Sarita River. Here the survivors established a number of villages where they stayed for an unknown period of time. Soon after they returned to reclaim their territory, the Barkley Sound Wars broke out. The Ohiaht were one of the principals. There are two accounts that explain their involvement: the first as a result of a raid by the Ucluelet in which their young chief was killed; the second as a result of kucha by the Toqualhts which possibly explains the Ohiaht group names that were derived from the Toquaht. During the war the Ohiahts were attacked by the Ucluelets at a number of villages from Bamfield Creek to the Sarita River. This was the last war in which the Ohiaht were involved.

In 1874 Blenkinsop described the Ohiaht as having two villages, Noo.muk.em.e.is (Ohiaht #25) where they resided from September to the end of January, and Keh.ahk.in (Ohiaht 1192) which was their "headquarters" between April and September. During February and March they were at
Fig 51. The Chiaht winter village of Namukami, around the late 1880s (Photo: WSHS, Morse Collection 381).
Fig. 52. Ruins of the Khiate village of Kiixin, around 1900 (Photo: BCPM PN 495).
various camps "on the Islands". Blenkinsop also noted numerous old village sites within the boundaries of this tribe. The population numbered 262 men, women and children. *It is this* period that many of the component group lists apply.

**Ditidaht History**

Introduction

The modern Ditidaht are an amalgamation of at least ten previously independent groups. Their traditional *territories extended* along the coast from ḣuʔdaqsuws (Pachen Point, Ditidaht 832) in the northwest where it bordered with the Ohiaht, to ba.łqaw.aʔ (Bonilla Point, Ditidaht #1) in the southeast where it bordered with the Pacheenaht, and inland to near Cowichan Lake (Fig. 53). Today the main Ditidaht settlement is at Malachan IR 11 (Ditidaht 165) at the head of Nitinat Lake.

Most of our knowledge of Ditidaht history *comes* from unpublished sources and recent interviews. In 1913-14 Sapir collected outline information on the composition of the Ditidaht from William and an origin tradition for one of the groups from Sayaach'apis. In 1931 Swadesh worked with Chief Peter and collected a number of Ditidaht traditions. These were translated for this project by John Thomas. **Arima** worked with Pacheenaht chief Charlie Jones and his *Ditidaht wife* Ida in the 1960s and 1970s collecting a wide range of ethnographic information for the region. In 1976 **Bernice Touchie** worked with a number of Ditidaht and Pacheenaht elders gathering data for her report on Whyac village. In 1981 Inglis
Fig. 53. Map of amalgamated Ditidaht territory with known places numbered (for key see Appendix E).
Fig. 54. Aerial view of Bonilla Point, the boundary between the Ditidaht and Pacheenaht (Photo: SCPM 1984:43).
interviewed Ditidaht elder John Thomas and in 1983, with Haggarty,
interviewed elder Joshua Edgar. John Thomas provided further information
on Ditidaht places and history, including data he collected from Ida and
Charles Jones, when working for the Pacific Rim Project in the fall of

The place name information from the above sources has been compiled by
Cairn Crockford and Bianca Message, and is included as Appendix E.
Ditidaht Geography,

Component Groups of the Ditidaht

There are a number of references to component groups of the Ditidaht
in the above sources. In 1914 William listed eight tribes in what is now
amalgamated Ditidaht territory. They are in order, starting from the
north:

1. Tsaq qó'is'athl, now form band of “Nitinat”
2. Li:ní'wa'athl
3. Tsuxkwána'athl
4. Na'ó'wa'athl, used to be big tribe, now mixed with “Nitinat”,
one house still kept up in their country, but not occupied.
5. 'wayi'athl, main band of “Nitinat”
6. Ló'owis'athl
7. Wawáxwi'sathl
8. Qwáma'no'atl172

Arima adapted this list when he discussed the composition of the Ditidaht
in his 1983 publication. 173
Fig. 55. Joshua Edgar Ditidah (Photo: BCPM 1983c:21)
Sayaachapis listed three subgroups of the Na'śwa'ath:

'animiyistaqemíł
laphái'tap'taqemíł
'táps.wipi'actaqemíł, “standing-in-middle-of-passage family”

He could not remember the name of the fourth subgroup.174

The names of a number of groups have been extracted from the texts related by Chief Peter. In the “Nitinat defeat the Saanitch and the Cowichan” four groups from the Nitinat River and Lake region were mentioned:

1. 'iłuwwaatx
2. xubitadaatx
3. 'qi.qo.wsaatx
4. hi.daadlaatx, “up the river people”175

In “Old Time Nitinat Counting” two groups were mentioned in a note to the text:

1. hi.id'a.asaatx, “back of the bay people”
2. da'ow'a.atx, old time name of people inhabiting Nitinat176

In 1981 John Thomas listed nine villages and tribes of the Ditidaht, starting on the coast from the north:

1. caqqawis (Ditidaht #29), main village of the caqqawisa?tx
2. ḡa.di.wa (Ditidaht #28), main village of the ḡa.di.wa.a?tx
3. cuwxk'w'a.da? (Ditidaht #23), main village of the cuwxk'w'a.d?a?tx
4. wa.ya?aq (Ditidaht #33), main village of the wa.ya?aq?tx; this was the founding village of the Ditidaht; it is synonymous with Nitinat
5. ḥu.ʔu.ws (Ditidaht #15), main village of the ḥu.ʔu.wsatx
6. ʔa.xʷi.yt (Ditidaht #14), main village of the ʔa.xʷi.ytatx.
7. qaqbaqis (Ditidaht #11), main village of the qaqpasisatx; it "as known as "slave village"
8. wawa.xʔadiʔs (Ditidaht #6), main village of the wawa.xʔadiʔsatx
9. qwa.ba.duwaʔ (Ditidaht #4), main village of the qwa.ba.duwaʔatx

Each of the main villages had its own chief and sub-chiefs and territory. 177

In 1986 John Thomas confirmed the above listing and also named three villages at the south end of Nitinat Lake at the entrance to the Narrows and their group affiliation:

1. wiiqpalu.ws (Ditidaht #43), winter village of the Caqqawisaʔatx
2. hititaʔs (Ditidaht #46), winter village of the Cuxʷkʷa.daʔatx
3. hitacʔaʔsaq (Ditidaht #47), main village of the daʔu.wʔaʔatx; their origin site was at the head of the lake at daʔuwaʔqe (Ditidaht #79)178

From these lists, a minimum of ten independent groups have been identified in the region of what is now Ditidaht territory:

1. caqqawisaʔatx
2. ḥa.di.ʔaʔatx
3. cuʔxʷkʷa.daʔatx
4. wa.yaʔaʔaʔatx
5. ḥuʔu.wsatx
6. ʔa.xʷi.ytatx
7. qaqpasisatx
The status of the groups named by Chief Peter is unclear at this time. According to John Thomas the villages at ?1ñu.w (Ditidaht #64), ɐbiqta (Ditidaht #62), Ɂi.qu.ws (Ditidaht #63) were fall fishing stations of a number of the coastal groups. Apparently they changed names at this time. Whether this represents a traditional or a more recent pattern was not determined. If the Nitinat Lake region was the traditional territory of the da?u.w?a.tx then the original inhabitants of these sites would have been component groups. Following this scenario it would appear that the coastal groups' use of these sites was a recent occurrence.

Historical Traditions

There are two accounts, each with differing versions, of the origin of the Ditidaht. In the tradition "How the Nitinats came to Nitinat", related by Chief Peter in 1931 and translated by John Thomas in 1986, the Ditidaht settlement of the region was brought about by conflict with their enemies. According to this tradition the people from Tatoosh Island, off Cape Flattery in Washington, got into a fight with the Ozette and were forced to abandon their home. They moved to Jordan River (Pacheenaht 87) and became the Ditidaht. Here they lived for a long time. Again they got
into a number of conflicts, this time with the Clallam, Sooke and Saanich. These groups banded together and attacked the Ditidaht forcing them to move again. They settled at qala.yit (Pacheenaht #114), q'a.ba duwa? (Ditidaht #4), k'u.u.ws (Ditidaht #15) and wa.ya.qaq (Mtidahnt #33). 179

In Joshua Edgar’s version of the settlement of the region, the Ditidaht village at Jordan River became overcrowded. They began to look for a new village and travelled along the coast until they reached the entrance to Nitinat Lake. Here they met another people called the Da?u.wa.ta whom they joined. “There were so many Ditidaht here at the time that they changed the name to Ditidaht... but before that it was Da?u.wa.ta.”180

The other origin account of the Mtidahnt relates to the Flood. There are three differing versions of the events. 181 According to Sayaachapis, a Sheshat, the Na’o’wa’ath³ were the first people to settle in the region. Their origin goes back to the time of the Flood when the chief, ?a’mi.niyis “Going above on the beach”, loaded his children and his younger brothers into a large canoe and went to ka.kapiy (Mt. Rosander, Ditidaht #74). When the waters subsided they came down from the mountain and built their houses at wa.ya.qaq (Ditidaht #33). 182

Liya.nu-am, a Mtidahnt, told Alfred Carmichael a different version of this tradition in 1922. With approaching flood waters Cha-ats-sem, the chief of Whyac, his wife, four boys and four girls, got into a canoe. The salt water rose over the land and covered everything. Cha-ats-sem sought
refuge on the top of ka.ka.piya (Ditidaht #74) where they stayed until the waters subsided. Then Cha-ats-sem went to Tatoosh near Neah Bay and Niteena at Jordan River where other survivors from his village had landed. They returned with their chief and again built houses at Whyac. 183

A third version of the Flood was told to Bernice Touchie by Bobby Joseph, her father, and Ida Jones, her grandmother. According to this tradition the people were living at Ditidaht (Pacheenaht 67, Jordan River). When the flood waters began to rise there was panic in the village as people tried to save themselves. One canoe with eleven people, a man and woman, eight sons and one girl, drifted until they landed on a dry shelf on ka.ka.piya. Here they lived until the waters subsided, when they began to explore the new country. They finally settled at Whyac, the place where one of the sons had obtained whaling power. 184

Common to all the traditions is the founding of Whyac as the first village. The formation of most of the other groups appears to be a budding off from this settlement, or from one of the bud-off groups. The original bud-offs are hypothesized to be the caqqawisa?tx, the ka.di.wa.a?tx, the cuw'k'a.da?a?tx and the qua.ba.duwa?a?tx. Little information, however, has been collected on the history of these groups. John Thomas provided some historical details on the caqqawisa?tx and the cuw'k'a.da?a?tx. He knew little about the ka.di.wa.a?tx as they had died out. 186 The caqqawisa?tx were an outside people who wintered at uliqpalu.ws (Ditidaht #43). They were related to a number of other groups through marriage of the chief's three daughters. The eldest married the qua.ba.duwa?a?tx chief, 187 the middle one married the
ca.x̱i.yta?tx chief and the youngest married the wawa.x̱?adi?sa?tx chief.

The cuw.wa.da?a?tx "are another outside people who were renowned whalers and raiders. They also had an inside winter village at hitiita? (Ditidaht #46). They had close connections with the people at Whyac through marriage.

John Thomas related information on the founding of two other groups. The tu.?u.wsa?tx and ca.x̱i.yta?tx.188 The founder of Clo-oose (Di tidaht #15) "as dawa. sab. He had three sons, ca.x̱i.yitxx, M.šal and tawinaqis (ta.ši?). The eldest son had no hier and the chieftainship passed on to ši.sal. Ta.ši? also had no sons and only one daughter. She married Chief Queesto of Pachida?, thereby giving up rights at Clo-oose.189 ši.sal "as John Thomas' grandfather. The ca.x̱i.yta?tx "are formed by a budding off from Clo-oose.

The qaqaqisa?tx were slaves of previously high status who belonged to either Whyac or Clo-oose. For reasons unknown they were allowed to set up a village at qaqaqis (Ditidaht #11). They had a reputation as good hunters and as artists. According to John Thomas, they "era the first to hire out on sealing schooners, thereby accumulating wealth which they used to gain respect. They then joined with the groups at Whyac and Clo-oose.190

According to John Thomas the wawa.x̱?adi?sa?tx came from the American side of Juan de Fuca Strait. They settled initially at qala.yit (Pacheenaht 8114) before they moved to wawa.x̱?adi?s (Ditidaht #6). They had a reputation as "brainy" people. Chief Peter was related to this group.191
There are a number of war traditions which impacted on the independence of these groups. According to Chief Louie, an Ohiaht, the caqawisa?tx and the ƛa.di.wa.a?tx were killed off by the Uchucklesaht chief N'asli:smi who raided as far as cus1.yiyt (Ditidaht #27). 192

In 1985 Charlie Jones related to John Thomas a tradition of a war between the Makah and the Ditidaht. The Makah were without salmon rivers and made war against the Ditidaht to obtain them. The Ditidaht were driven from the region of Nitinat Lake, the survivors scattering to camps along the shoreline to the southeast and to their Pachida? relatives. The Makah occupied Nitinat for a long time. When the Ditidaht became strong again they raided, together with the Pachida?, the Makah while they were fishing offshore. The Makah were defeated and the Ditidaht reclaimed their lands. 193 Many of the place names in the region are Makah and likely relate to the time of their occupation. Why these names were retained is not known.

Chief Peter also related two war traditions of the Ditidaht. In “The Nitinats Fight the Saanitch” 194 a war party of four canoe.9 of warriors attacked the Saanich at cili.dad, killing many men. This tradition appears to date to the time the Ditidaht lived at Ditidaht (Pacheenaht #7). In the second tradition “The Nitinats Defeat the Saanich and the Cowichans” 195 the Cowichans and the Saanich people raided the Ditidaht while they were up the Nitinat River drying salmon. The survivors of the raid sought the aid of the Ditidahts camped at ?iľu.ʷ (Ditidaht #64), ქubitad (Mtidaht #62) and /XML/ (Ditidaht 863). Many Cowichan and Saanich were killed in the revenge raid.
There are brief references to continued hostilities with the Makah and the Clallam into the mid-nineteenth century. At this time there were still four villages occupied, wa.ya.aq, ñu.u.ws, qwa.ba.du.wa? and cuwx.kw.a.da?, each with its own chief (Figs. 56 to 59).

Summary

Ditida:da (Pacheenaht #7), at Jordan River, was the original village of the Ditidaht which “as abandoned as a result of either attacks by enemies, overcrowding or the Flood. In the Flood traditions wa.ya.aq (Diridaht #33) became the first new village while settlement occurred at a number of villages in the other migration traditions.

There is conflicting evidence whether the Ditidaht were the first to settle in the region of Nitinat Lake or whether the Da?u.w?a.tx were already there. Whatever the scenario the Ditidaht came to dominate the region. The settlements at caqqawis, ña.di.wa, cuwxkw.a.da?, wawa.x?ad1?s and qwa.ba.duwa? are interpreted either as a budding-off of groups from the original settlement at wa.ya.aq or as initial settlements themselves. The settlement, at ñu.u.ws is viewed as a bud-off from wa.ya.aq while ca.x?y1.yt is viewed as a bud-off from ñu.u.ws.

Qaqbaqis, the village of slaves, also is interpreted as a bud-off from either wa.ya.aq or ñu.u.ws.

Unfortunately there are few details in the historical traditions to date events (i.e. wars) or to identify with certainty the participants. The conflict between the Uchucklesaht and the caqqawisa?tx and the ña.di.wa.a?tx resulted in their territories being absorbed by the
Fig. 56. The Ditidaht village of Whyac, around 1900 (Photo: private collection).
Fig. 57. The Ditidaht village of Tsuquada, around 1890
(Photograph: BCPM PN 897).

Fig. 58. The Ditidaht village of Carmanah, around 1900
(Photograph: BCPM PN 896).
Fig. 59. The Ditidaht village of Clo-oose, around 1900 (Photo: private collection).
Uchucklesaht. The survivors appear to have moved in to the Nitinat Narrows region. In the various conflicts with the Salish-speaking peoples and the Makah, it appears that most, if not all, of the Ditidaht groups were involved. Only the Makah conflict resulted in the temporary loss of territory.

At the end of the nineteenth century four of the villages, wa.ya.aq, Ḵu.ʔu.ʔs, qwa.ba.duwaʔ and cuxʷkʷa.daʔ, still existed as separate entities with their own chiefs. The Caqqawisaʔtx and Ḵu.ʔu.ʔs̱aʔtx had disappeared as separate political entities, possibly as a result of the attack by the Uchucklesaht. The Daʔu.ʔs̱a.ʔtx appear to have merged with the people at wa.ya.aq and the wawa.xʔadiʔsaʔtx with the Ḵu.ʔu.ʔs̱aʔtx.

In 1882 the population “as two hundred and seventy-one, one hundred and seven at wa.ya.aq, forty-six at Ḵu.ʔu.ʔs, seventy-one at qwa.ba.duwaʔ and forty-seven at cuxʷkʷa.daʔ.

Pacheenaht History

Introduction

Today the Pacheenaht are centred in Port Renfrew at Gordon River, IR 2. In the past they were a numerous people whose territory extended along the coast from Sheringham Point (Pacheenaht #1) to Bonilla Point (Pacheenaht #112) and inland up the San Juan River valley (Fig. 60).

Their neighbours to the southeast were the Salish speaking Sooke, to the northwest their kin the Ditidaht, and inland the Cowichan.

Our knowledge of Pacheenaht history comes from two main sources: Chief Peter and Chief Jones. In 1931 Mary Haas and Morris Swadesh worked
Fig. 60. Map of Pacheenaht territory with known places numbered (for key see Appendix F).
Fig. 61. Four "Ditidaht" chiefs, around 1910. Chief Peter is on the left, second from right is Chief Charles Queesto (Photo: United Church Archives).
with Chief Peter, who was the second chief of the Pacheenaht, and his son Jasper. Their emphasis was linguistic study and the collection of mythological and historical texts. Mary Haas also collected a valuable geography of Port San Juan. Eugene Arima worked extensively with Chief Charlie Jones, the hereditary chief, between 1963 and 1975. From these interviews Arima has produced manuscripts on the making of a west coast canoe, notes on Southern West Coast (Nootka) Natives and Native Peoples of Pacific Rim National Park which includes some of the information from his 1976 manuscript. In 1985 and 1986 John Thomas verified place name and historical information with Chief Jones for this project. Edward Sapir also collected a number of brief references to groups and events within Pacheenaht territory from William and Sayaachapis in the 1913-14 field season.

The place name information from both Chief Peter and Chief Jones has been compiled by Cairn Crockford and Bianca Message in Appendix F, Pacheenaht Geography.

Component Groups of the Pacheenaht

There are few listings or discussions of component groups for the Pacheenaht. In 1914, William, in his list of tribes, named three groups in what is now Pacheenaht territory:

1. Qanayit'athà, “bad” people who were killed off by the Ts'lícya'athà
2. P'låtcína'athà
3. Niti'na'athal97

Sayaachapis described the Qanayit'athà as a:
Nitinat tribe between Kloos and San Juan, who were giants, to whose hips common people would reach; burned all Ts'icya'atHa villages when men were out whaling.

On the map of place names in Port San Juan collected from Chief Peter, Haas divided the bay in half. On the west side are named the San Juan Indians and on the east side are named the Pachena Bay Indians. As well two villages were plotted at the head of San Juan Harbour, t'luquxoct'aatx (Pacheenaht #63) and qawqa.d'aatx (Pacheenaht #86). The suffix 'aatx, however, refers to people. If removed the place names are rendered correctly. It is inferred that these places represent the main villages of the two peoples.

Arima listed and briefly discussed the villages of the Pacheenaht from information he obtained from Chief Jones. Five villages are described as permanent:

1. Kw'itibe?t (Pacheenaht #43), Harris Cove, a village of 20 houses with a high knoll behind.

2. ?A?aqwaxtas (Pacheenaht #71), located on the north shore of Fairy Lake in San Juan River valley.

3. K'u?uba? (Pacheenaht #40), Robertson Cove, a village of 12 to 15 houses.

4. ?U:yats' (Pacheenaht #96), Thrasher Cove, a village of eight houses.

5. Qa'ta:yit (Pacheenaht #114), at Clyde Beach, a village of 18 to 20 houses.

Three are described as winter villages:

1. Bu:lapi7s (Pacheenaht #41), at Port Renfrew, a village of 12 houses.
2. ?Apasawa (Pacheenaht #31), south entrance to San Juan Harbour, a village of eight houses.

3. Ti:xwapa (Pacheenaht #27), Botanical Beach, a village of six small houses at top of the bluff.

Another three villages are listed but not described:

1. Tl'ix:sit (Pacheenaht #53), a former large village on the south channel of the San Juan River.

2. Tl'ehib (Pacheenaht #12), a village at Boulder Beach.

3. Ditida:a? (Pacheenaht #7), a village at Jordan River.

P'a:chi:da? (Pacheenaht #52) at the head of San Juan Harbour became the main village in recent times. There was no discussion by Arima of the groups associated with any of these villages.200

In summary, a minimum of three independent groups have been identified in what is now Pacheenaht territory:

1. qala:yita?tx

2. p'achida.?tx
   - t'luquxoct 'aatx
   - qawqa.d'saatx

3. ditida:a?atx

Historical Traditions

Chief Jones related the origin of the pa:ci.d?a.?tx to John Thomas in 1985. He stated that there were no pa:ci.d?a.?tx for a long time, they were only a branch of the Ditidaht. One morning sea foam filled the village at the head of Port San Juan. The chief sent out an old slave
woman to see if it was safe, which it was. They took the name pa.ci.d? which meant "sea foam" after this event, and became a separate people.201

Chief Peter related a tradition "Pachena once spoke Salish" to Swadesh in 1931. According to this tradition the ?a?a?uspay, meaning Salish-speaking people were the pa.ci.d?atx. They spoke like the Sooke people. A man from this group married a Ditidaht woman, another married a woman from ?a.di.wa?. This is how they learned to speak Ditidaht. This happened a long time ago when there were no white men.202

The pa.ci.d?atx were involved in a number of conflicts with Salish-speaking peoples, and in particular the Clallam. Unfortunately no recorded traditions of these conflicts were found.

summary

The pa.ci.d?atx were originally a component group of the Ditidaht who became independent at an unknown time in the past. They became a numerous people in part through the addition of other peoples such as the ?a?a?uspay. The pa.ci.d?atx occupied at least eleven villages along the southwestern coast of Vancouver Island. Seven of these were located in the region of Port San Juan: four of the five permanent villages, two of the three winter villages and one of the three other villages listed by Arima. Of the remaining four villages, one, the fifth permanent village, was located on the outer coastline north of Port San Juan and the other three on the outer coastline south of Port San Juan. The identity of the social units that occupied these villages, however, is not known. The
relationship of the villages to each other, whether they were occupied contemporaneously or sequentially, also is not known.

The pa.c.i.d?a.?tx appear to have suffered a number of setbacks in the historic period which forced their amalgamation at the head of Port San Juan. By the end of the nineteenth century they were a small band with a population of less than one hundred.

**Summary**

The ethnographic history section had two main objectives: first, to identify and locate the groups of people who lived in the regions of study before the massive changes of the historic period; and second, to document the events that resulted in changes to the composition of these groups and/or their territories. Two sources of ethnographic data were analysed: the published and unpublished information recorded by early ethnographers (e.g. Sapir, Thomas, Curtis, Swadesh), and interviews of contemporary elders collected primarily by St. Claire.

The overview histories generated from the ethnographic data document an estimated two hundred year period of profound socio-political change on this part of the coast. The six tribes that today claim the region of study within their traditional territories are the survivors of the events of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The other groups that have been identified were the casualties.

The socio-political changes that have been documented did not occur in a random fashion. There were cultural mechanisms that allowed for
flexibility: Restructuring of the social unit by fission (budding off) or fusion (amalgamation) was built into the cultural system of the Nuu-chah-nulth. The local group, which generally took its name from the main village, was the basic social unit. It consisted of a number of ranked component groups that were represented as house units at the local group village. The local group chief came from the highest ranked house. The component groups were named after ancestral events, a chief, house location or reputation.

In pre-contact times restructuring of this unit is hypothesized to have occurred most often as a result of population expansion. When the main village became over-crowded a satellite village could be created by a budding-off process. Amalgamations were brought about as a result of warfare or natural disaster. In the historic period warfare, which resulted in group decimation and capture of territory, increased in intensity. It was the major factor leading to group and territory re-alignment s. Re-structuring took on two forms. When the conquering group claimed the territory (his'ök't) then the other group lost all rights and ceased to exist as an independent entity. When the conflict did not result in territorial loss, or only partial loss, the survivors retained their rights. If, however, the group was left so weakened by the hostilities that they joined another their territory generally was absorbed by that new group, although they often retained some of their traditional rights in the area.

Whether new territories were acquired by conquest or amalgamation, local groups were forced to develop new subsistence patterns to
effectively exploit them. The pattern utilized was dependent on the size of the territory and the resource diversity, but all involved a shift in settlement on a seasonal basis.

Each amalgamation also necessitated an internal re-structuring of the local group. The ranking of an incoming group did not necessarily reflect the internal ranking of that group when it was independent, but depended on the relationships of the component groups with those to whom they were amalgamating. For example, a lesser ranked component group who had marriage ties with the new group would be ranked higher in the new structure.

A by-product of amalgamation was the creation of new group names. While some groups maintained their names derived from their traditional sites (e.g. Sheshaht) others took on new names which reflected their location in the amalgamated village (e.g. Ohiaht). Other name changes occurred in response to shifts in settlement, groups taking on names from their seasonal camps during the time they were at that location.

The net results of the amalgamations were a dramatic reduction in the number of independent groups and a corresponding increase in the size of the territories of the remaining groups. It is at this time that a seasonal round pattern was developed to fully utilize the larger territories.

This section has provided an outline of the events from the traditional histories that led to the formation of the Sheshaht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht, groups whose traditional territories are encompassed in part by one of the three units of Pacific
Rim National Park. The information that relates specifically to the park units will be extracted in a succeeding section and integrated and discussed with the archaeological data which will be presented next.
Fig. 62. Remains of a traditional style longhouse being reclaimed by the forest, Kixlin (Ohiaht #92) (Photo: BCPN 1983B:219)
The Archaeological Record

Introduction

The archaeological record is the observable physical evidence on the landscape of modification resulting from human occupation and/or use. This evidence can be obtained only by direct observation and is recorded as sites based on the format outlined in the "Guide to the British Columbia Archaeological Site Inventory Form". Site records are of varying quality depending on the reporting procedure and the standards at the time of recording. They range from general descriptions of sites that were reported by interested individuals to scientific descriptions that were obtained by systematic surveys by archaeologists.

Individuals who directed projects which recorded native archaeological sites in the region of study are listed below in chronological order by investigator(s) and areas visited.

1963  Don Abbott and John Sendey, Cape Beale to Bamfield, Long Beach

1971-73  Dave Coombes and Barry Campbell, Esowista Peninsula

1972  Beth and Ray Hill, rock art survey, West Coast Trail and Long Beach

1973  Brian White, Broken Group Islands, Long Beach (?) and West Coast Trail (?)

1973  Alan Carl, Deer Group Islands

1975  Denis St. Claire, Barkley Sound region with emphasis on the Broken Group Islands
1979  Lynne Melcomb and L. Mason, Long Beach
1980  Richard Brolly, Meares Island
1982  James Haggarty and Richard Inglis, Broken Group Islands, Meares Island
1982  Al Hackie, Meares Island
1983  James Haggarty and Richard Inglis, Long Beach and West Coast Trail
1983  James Haggarty and Richard Inglis, Santa Maria Island
1984  Al Hackie and Laurie Williamson, Banfield Inlet, Mills Peninsula and the Outer Deer Group Islands
1985-86  Arcan Ltd., tree resource area survey, Meares Island

As well, there have been two excavations in the region. Catherine Capes tested the site at Green Point on Long Beach in 1962 and Judy Buxton excavated the defensive site at Aguilar Point near Banfield In 1968. Only the Buxton material has been analyzed.

There has been a major change in the methodology of archaeological survey since the early 1980s. Rather than focusing on locations extracted from ethnographic data or of known potential, surveys in 1982, 1983 and 1984, for example, were based on a rigorous examination of all the modern shoreline that was accessible. The results were impressive. In the Broken Group Islands, for example, the increased rigour resulted in a four hundred and sixteen percent increase in the number of recorded sites.

There will be a twofold discussion of the archaeological data in this section. First, a general overview of the archaeological record will be organized by modern tribal territory for the six groups who have territory within Pacific Rim National Park. And second, a detailed discussion will
focus on the archaeological record within the three park units. Before proceeding the archaeological site classification system employed in this report will be summarized to assist the reader in understanding the range and complexity of the archaeological record.

Archaeological Site Classification System

Six major site categories have been defined based primarily on the type of modification observed and secondly on the basis of function inferred both from existing ethnographic and historic documentation and from their environmental setting. These six categories are: 1) General Activity; 2) Fish Trap; 3) Burial; 4) Rock Art; 5) Tree Resource Area; and 6) Isolated Find. Within each of the six categories a number of specific site types and sub-types have been defined. The range of potential site types within each major category along with a general discussion of the limitations inherent in classifying these data is presented below.

General Activity Sites

Archaeological sites in this category are characterized by the presence of molluscan remains throughout much of the deposit and commonly are referred to as shell middens. They range in length from a few metres to over three hundred metres, and in depth from a few centimetres to over four metres. A wide range of cultural activities obviously are represented by such a broad range in size. Sites have been classified based on physical characteristics and function which has been inferred from environmental setting and ethnographic analogy.
Shell middens which generally exceed one hundred metres in length and have well-defined house platforms, house depressions and back midden ridge, have been classified as villages. These sites occur in a variety of environments, from the exposed outer coast to protected bays. A major feature of their locations was protection from severe weather thereby assuring year round access for canoe*. Favoured locations were on the lee side of headlands, or areas protected by offshore reefs, islets or Islands.

Based on ethnographic documentation these structured middens represent the main settlements of independent local groups or their component groups. They were occupied either year round or on a seasonal basis. It is at these sites that the large, permanent post and beam or shed roof houses, typical of Nuu-chah-nulth culture, would have been erected (Fig. 63).

Shell middens which are generally less than one hundred metres in length have been classified as camps. These sites, based on ethnographic evidence, are the locations to which people from the main settlements moved to harvest various seasonal resources. They are located in a diverse number of environmental settings from exposed outer coast to protected island bays and lake margins. Two general functions have been inferred: 1) long term, multi-resource use, and 2) short term single resource use. Long term camps are generally larger than forty metres in length while short term camps are smaller. Assignment to specific function can be inferred from the physical setting of the camp and the resources available from the immediate environs (e.g. shellfish flats, salmon stream, halibut bank offshore, etc.). As well, function can be inferred from ethnographic information. Confirmation of inferred
Fig. 63. A late nineteenth century village site (Photo: BCPM PN 4650).

Fig. 64. A historic period camp site (Photo: BCPM PN 2095).
Fig. 65. A defensive site (far right) located adjacent to the main village (Photo: BCPM PN 1980).

Fig. 66. Lookout site on Cree Island, Broken Group Islands (Photo: BCPM 1982B:467).
function, however, can be achieved only by the excavation and systematic collection and analysis of subsurface samples.

Structures, which often resembled small versions of village houses, were constructed at the long term, multi-resource camps (Fig. 64). No structures were built at the short term, single resource camps if procurement activities were scheduled on a daily basis. If the activity stretched over a number of days, a temporary lean-to or mat hut was built.

Two specialized functions have been inferred for a few sites in the general activity category. Sites which are located in areas difficult of access such as on high, steep-walled and flat-topped promontories are classified as defensive locations (Fig. 65). These sites have a number of physical characteristics in common with settlement sites including house platforms and house depressions. Because of restricted space, the sites and the features tend to be smaller. Defensive sites are interpreted as a specialized type of village which were used as retreats during periods of hostility. Their relationship to the settlement sites, however, is unclear.

Sites which also are situated in elevated locations and with a commanding view, but without a flat area for houses, are classified as lookout camps for observing resources and the movement of neighbouring groups (Fig. 66). Structures at these sites were likely temporary and inconspicuous.

Fish Trap Sites

The classification of sites within this category is based on three criteria: the material used in the trap construction, trap morphology and
Fig. 67. Weir structure on Kitsuksis Creek, Port Alberni (Photo: BPM PN 4646).

Fig. 68. Intertidal wicker trap, Nootka Sound (Photo: BPM PN 530).
microenvironmental setting. Initially, all sites are sub-divided on the basis of the material used in their construction: stone or wood. The vast majority of fish traps recorded in this study are constructed of stone.

Wood traps are divided into two sub-types: 1) single stake; 2) multiple stakes. The stakes are the remnants of weir structures. These sites are generally associated with streams or rivets that support runs of anadromous fish of which there are few within the study region (Fig. 67).

Stone wall traps have been sub-divided into three sub-types based on morphology: 1) isolated, 2) aligned and 3) enclosed. The isolated sub-type includes all intertidal rock features which are hypothesized to relate to the use of wicker-trap or weir structures, known to have been used in the intertidal area in historic times (Fig. 68). The aligned sub-type includes both single and multiple features aligned parallel to a generally linear or curvilinear intertidal area (Fig. 69). Enclosed traps are distinguished by the fact that the outer-most wall of the trap is constructed so that all or portions of small embayments are closed off or are built so that the walls connect isolated bedrock outcroppings to create pen-like enclosures in the intertidal area (Fig. 70). At present, we have only limited knowledge regarding the use of these traps. Drucker briefly mentioned the use of stone weirs in a discussion of fish traps:

For shiners and similar small fish low stone weirs were built on shallows that dried at ebb tide. The fish remained trapped behind the rows of stones.

This is the only ethnographic reference located that relates to the use of intertidal stone wall traps.
Fig. 69. Aligned stone wall fishtrap, Broken Group Islands (Photo: BCPM 1982B:431).

Fig. 70. Enclosed stone wall fishtrap, Broken Group Islands (Photo: BCPM 1982B:151).
Burial Sites

Blenkinsop described the burial grounds of the Barkley Sound tribes in 1874:

They usually select for this purpose the most rugged spots they can find, not unfrequently caves which abound in numerous places on the Islands and along the steep rocky shores of the Sound... The Se.shah.ahts name their burial places Che.ah.ihth from the word Che.ah, to put in a hole.

The bodies of their chiefs are placed in boxes on trees of some height and these are readily known by the numerous strips of blankets suspended on the branches around the box containing the body.7

The archaeologically recorded sites in this category are classified first on the basis of burial placement and second on the basis of location. There are two basic forms of burial placement, surface and interred. All burials located within the study region were surface placements. In terms of location the majority of burials were found in relic sea caves. The few remaining burials were located at the base of large trees on or near general activity sites. No tree burials were observed despite efforts to locate them.

Although only one form of burial practice was found and recorded interred burials will occur, based on evidence from past archaeological work on the Northwest Coast, particularly in the midden ridges located at the rear of major village sites. Again, no evidence of this form of burial practice was observed. All burials recorded appear to relate to the historic period.
Rock Art Sites

Rock art sites are classified into two distinct subtypes: 1) petroglyphs (rock carvings) and 2) pictographs (rock paintings). They are differentiated further based on imagery of the glyphs: zoomorphic (animal form), anthropomorphic (human form), geometric, historic, or combination. All rock art sites recorded in the study area are petroglyphs and all occur on the exposed, outer coast shoreline.

Tree Resource Areas

This site category includes all areas with trees that show some form of cultural modification. Utilization of trees within a single tree resource area varies from a single example of modification to numerous examples within a reasonably well-defined area such as a developing deltaic environment.

Tree resource areas are differentiated on the basis of 1) bark utilization, 2) wood utilization and 3) bark/wood utilization. Bark utilization is differentiated further on the basis of scar morphology: 1) notch, b) strip, c) slab, and d) combination. Wood utilization is also differentiated on the basis of scar morphology: a) notch, b) slab, c) plank, d) stump, and e) combination of any or all of the preceding. Bark/wood utilization is a combined site type.

Isolated Finds

This category includes all sites that are a single artifact or feature which stand apart from any other identifiable human activity. These sites are classified into three site types: artifacts such as canoes or canoe
preforms; features such as isolated canoe runs or intertidal trench features; and structures.

The site classification system outlined above is designed specifically to interpret archaeological data recorded during systematic survey. The quality of other site records generally is not of sufficient detail to allow for inclusion in this system. Consequently the classification will not be fully utilized until the discussion of the archaeological record by park unit. The archaeological overviews by tribal territory will be brief and deal only with major site categories. Distribution maps will be provided only for general activity sites.

Sheshahat Territory

The traditional territory of the modern Sheshahat includes the Broken Group Islands, the north shore of Vancouver Island from Lyall Point to Chup Point at the entrance to Alberni Canal, and the western aides of Tzartus Island, and the northern Deer Group Islands. White, St. Claire and Haggarty and Inglis have recorded archaeological sites in this region. The only area that has been systematically surveyed is the Broken Group Islands by Haggarty and Inglis in 1982.

One hundred and eight-three site records exist for this region. Ninety of these are classified as general activity sites (Figs. 71 and 74) and forty-four as fish traps. The remaining forty-nine sites include twenty-six burial sites, eighteen tree resource areas and five isolated finds.
Fig. 71. Map of distribution of general activity sites recorded within Sheshahit territory.
Ucluelet Territory

The traditional territory of the modern Ucluelet includes the outer coast from Green Point south to Amphitrite Point and Ucluelet Inlet. There has been little archaeological work in this region. The only area that has been systematically surveyed is the south-end of Long Beach to Wya Point, including Florencia Island, by Raggarty and Inglis in 1983.

Twenty-seven site records are on file for Ucluelet territory. Nineteen of these are classified as general activity sites (Fig. 72). The remaining eight include one fish trap, one rock art site, four tree resource areas and two burial sites.

Clayoquot Territory

The traditional territory of the modern Clayoquot includes the Esowista Peninsula, a large part of Meares Island and the region surrounding Tofino Inlet and Kennedy Lake. Portions of this territory have been surveyed by Abbott and Sende, Coombes and Campbell, Melcomb and Mason, Brolly, Mackie, Haggarty and Inglis and Arcas Ltd. The only systematic surveys were those of Mackie, Haggarty and Inglis and Arcas Ltd. covering Meares Island and the northern portion of the Long Beach unit of Pacific Rim National Park.

Two hundred and twenty-two sites have been recorded in this region. Ninety-eight of these have been recorded as general activity sites (Fig. 73), twenty-eight as fish traps and seventy-two as tree resource areas. The remaining twenty-four sites include fifteen isolated finds, one ceremonial site and eight burial sites.
Fig. 72. Map of distribution of general activity sites recorded within Ucluelet territory.
Fig. 73. Map of distribution of general activity sites recorded within Clayoquot territory.
Fig. 74. Map of distribution of general activity sites recorded within Ohiaht territory.
Fig. 75. Map of distribution of general activity sites recorded within Ditidaht territory.
Fig. 76. Map of distribution of general activity sites recorded within Pacheenaht territory.
Pacheenaht Territory

Pacheenaht territory extends from Bonilla Point southeastwards to Sheringham Point and includes Port San Juan and the San Juan River valley. There has been almost no archaeological work in this region which is reflected in the site totals. The only systematic survey was by Haggarty and Inglis and this was restricted to the northern portion of the territory that was encompassed by the West Coast Trail unit.

Fourteen sites have been recorded in this extensive territory. Eleven are general activity sites (Fig. 76). The remaining three consist of one rock art site, one burial site and one isolated find.

Six hundred and thirty-two sites have been recorded to date within the traditional territories of the Sheshaht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht. Of these sites two hundred and eighty-nine (46 percent) are within the boundaries of Pacific Rim National Park. All have been recorded to modern standards and are documented in the Pacific Rim Heritage Assessment Project report. These sites will be the focus of the following discussion of the history of native occupation and use of the park region.

Broken Group Islands Unit

The archaeological survey of the Broken Group Islands was conducted during the summer and fall of 1982. One hundred and sixty-three native historical sites were recorded. This represents fifty-six percent of the
total number of sites recorded for Pacific Rim National Park and
eighty-nine percent of sites in Sheshahit territory.

Eighty sites (49 percent of the park unit total) are classified as
general activity or shell midden sites. Of these, eighteen (22.5 percent)
are classified as villages and sixty-two (77.5 percent) as camps. Fifteen
of the village sites are hypothesized to represent the main settlements of
local or component groups that had territories within the boundaries of
the Broken Group Islands Unit. The remaining three settlements are
defensive villages. Sixty of the sixty-two camps identified represent
single or multi-resource use either on a daily or long term basis. Two
camps are classified as lookouts. The distributions of the fifteen
settlement sites and three defensive sites are presented in Fig. 77, and
the sixty resource camps and two lookout sites are presented in Fig. 78.

The forty fish trap sites (24.5 percent of the park unit total)
recorded are all constructed of stone. One is an isolated sub-type, seven
are of the aligned sub-type and thirty-two are of the enclosed sub-type.
All traps were built in sheltered locations behind islets or reefs and in
bays (Fig. 79). These sites appear to have been used on a daily basis as
only six small camps were found in association.

The twenty-one burial sites (12.9 percent of the park unit total) all
consist of surface placements. Eighteen of the sites are located in
cave/rock shelter settings, while the remaining three are located at the
bases of large trees. A minimum of sixty-one individuals have been placed
in these 21 locations. All appear to relate to the historic period. Due
to the sensitive nature and high incidence of vandalism associated with
Fig. 77. Map of distribution of settlement and defensive sites in the Broken Group Islands unit.
Fig. 78. Map of distribution of resource camp and lookout sites in the Broken Group Islands unit.
Fig. 79. Map of distribution of fish trap sites in the Broken Group Islands unit.
this type of site, no distribution map for this site category is included in this report.

No rock art sites were found in the Broken Group Islands unit.

Eighteen tree resource areas (11 percent of the park unit total) were recorded. Two of these are associated exclusively with bark stripping, eleven with different forms of wood utilization and five with a combination of bark and wood utilization. The four isolated find sites (2.5 percent of the park unit total) consist of three isolated canoe runs and one trench feature.¹⁰

Of the one hundred and sixty-three sites recorded for the Broken Group Islands, one hundred and thirty-eight (84.7 percent) are associated with some form of resource procurement activity. The remaining twenty-five sites (15.3 percent), twenty-one burial and four isolated find sites lack direct association with resource related activities. Of the one hundred and thirty-eight resource related sites, eighty-seven (63 percent) are hypothesized to represent a specific resource activity. Included in this total are the forty fish trap sites, eighteen tree resource areas and twenty-nine of the sixty-two camps which are associated directly with fish trap locations or extensive clam flats. The remaining fifty-one sites, (37 percent) are hypothesized to represent multi-resource activities. Included are the fifteen settlement sites, the three defensive sites, the remaining thirty-one camps and the two lookout sites.
Long Beach Unit

During the spring of 1983, forty-six native historical sites were recorded in the Long Beach unit. These sites represent sixteen percent of the total number of sites recorded for Pacific Rim National Park. Fifteen sites are in Ucluelet territory (56 percent of the total number of Ucluelet sites) and thirty-one sites are in Clayoquot territory (14 percent of the total number of Clayoquot sites).

Thirty-four sites (73.9 percent of the park unit total) are classified as general activity or shell midden sites. Of these, nine (26.5 percent) are classified as villages and twenty-five (73.5 percent) as camps. Seven of the nine village sites are hypothesized to represent the main settlements of local or component groups that had territories within the boundaries of the Long Beach unit. The remaining two are defensive sites. Eight of the nine village sites are located on the exposed outer coast shoreline. The twenty-five camps identified represent both single and multi-resource use. Five are classified as lookout sites. The distributions of the seven settlement and two defensive sites are presented in Fig. 80 and the twenty resource camps and five lookout sites are presented in Fig. 81.

Two fish trap sites (4.4 percent of the park unit total) were recorded. The trap of stone construction is located on the exposed outer coast, and the one of wood construction is located at the mouth of a stream in the Grice Bay area. Both sites are associated with general activity sites. The outer coast trap is located directly in front of a settlement site while the trap in the Grice Bay area is associated with a resource camp located at the mouth of the same stream.
Fig. 80. Map of distribution of settlement and defensive sites in the Long Beach unit.
Fig. 81. Map of distribution of resource camp, lookout and fish trap sites in the Long Beach unit.
No burial sites were found in the Long Beach unit. The one rock art site (2.2 percent of the park unit total) occurs on the exposed outer coast shoreline. It consists of a vertical panel containing at least six zoomorphic images. Seven tree resource areas (15.2 percent of the park unit total) were recorded. Five of these areas are associated exclusively with bark stripping, one with plank removal and one with a combination of bark stripping and plank removal. The two isolated find sites (4.4 percent of the park unit total) consist of one canoe fragment and one isolated canoe run. 11

Of the forty-six sites recorded for the Long Beach unit, forty-three (93.5 percent) are associated with some form of resource procurement activity. Only the single rock art and two isolated find sites lack direct association with resource related activities. Of the forty-three resource related sites, seventeen (39.5 percent) are hypothesized to represent a specific resource activity. This total includes the two fish trap sites, the seven tree resource areas and eight of the resource camps, which are associated directly with fish trap or clam flat locations. The remaining twenty-six sites (60.5 percent) appear to be multi-resource sites. Included in this total are the nine village sites, the remaining twelve resource camps and the five lookout sites.

The West Coast Trail Unit

Eighty native historical sites were recorded during the archaeological survey of the West Coast Trail unit in the summer of 1983. These sites represent twenty-eight percent of the total number of sites recorded for
Pacific Rim National Park. Seventeen are in Ohiaht territory (14 percent of the total number of Ohiaht sites), forty-nine are in Ditidaht territory (95 percent of the total number of Ditidaht sites) and four are in Pacheenaht territory (29 percent of the total number of Pacheenaht sites).

Forty of these sites (50 percent of the park unit total) are classified as general activity or shell midden sites. Of these, fourteen (35 percent) are classified as villages and twenty-six (65 percent) as camps. Thirteen of the fourteen village sites are hypothesized to represent the major settlements of local or component groups that had territories within the boundaries of the West Coast Trail unit. Ten of these thirteen sites are located along the exposed outer coast shoreline. The remaining sites are located close to the outer coast shoreline near the entrance to Nitinat Lake. Only one defensive site was located. The twenty-six camps are classified as multi-resource sites. The distribution of the thirteen settlement sites and one defensive site are presented in Figs. 82a,b and the twenty-six camps are presented in Figs. 83a,b.

The two fish trap sites (2.5 percent of the park unit total) are of wood construction. Both are located in the Cheewhat giver (Fig. 83b) which has a substantial run of small sockeye salmon. The three burial sites (3.7 percent of the park unit total) all consist of surface placements in a cave/rock shelter setting. A minimum of six individuals have been placed at these locations, four at one site. Again, due to the sensitive nature of the burial issue and the high incidence of vandalism at these sites, no distribution map for this site category is included in this report.

The six rock art sites recorded (7.5 percent of the park unit total) are petroglyph sites and all are located on the exposed outer coast.
Fig. 82a. Map of distribution of settlement and defensive sites in the West Coast Trail unit (western section).

Fig. 82b. Map of distribution of settlement and defensive sites in the West Coast Trail unit (eastern section).
Fig. 83a. Map of distribution of resource camp sites in the West Coast Trail unit (western section).

Fig. 83b. Map of distribution of resource camp and fish trap sites in the West Coast Trail unit (eastern section).
shoreline. Four of these sites are located on exposed rock platforms above mean high tide while the remaining two sites occur on the walls of two sea caves. Most of these sites contain a combination of geomorphic, zoomorphic and anthropomorphic images. One site also contains images that relate to the historic period. A minimum of one hundred and eighteen images are represented at the six sites. The twenty-seven tree resource areas (33.7 percent of the park unit total) are the second largest site category in the West Coast Trail unit. Twenty of these sites are associated exclusively with bark stripping, two with various forms of wood utilization and five with a combination of bark and wood utilization, primarily bark stripping and plank removal. Four of the five bark/wood utilization sites contain examples of plank removal from standing cedar trees. The two isolated find sites (2.5 percent of the park unit total) are classified as features. One is a collapsed structure and the other is an intertidal trench. 12

Of the eighty sites recorded for the West Coast Trail unit, sixty-nine (86.2 percent) are associated with some form of resource procurement or subsistence activity. Only the six rock art, three burial and two isolated find sites lack direct association with resource related activities. Of the sixty-nine resource related sites, twenty-nine (42 percent) are associated with a single resource activity. Included in this total are the two fish trap sites and the twenty-seven tree resource areas. The remaining forty sites (58 percent) all appear to be multi-resource sites. Included in these totals are the fourteen village sites and twenty-six resource camps.
Summary

There are two hundred and eighty-nine recorded sites that relate to the native history within Pacific Rim National Park. One hundred and forty-four (53.3 percent) are general activity or shell midden sites. Of these, forty-one (14.2 percent) are classified as villages and one hundred and thirteen (39.1 percent) as camps. Thirty-five of the village sites are hypothesized to be the main settlements of local or component groups whose territories are entirely or in part within the boundaries of Pacific Rim National Park. The remaining six village sites are classified as defensive sites. Of the one hundred and thirteen camp sites identified, one hundred and six are classified as resource camps. The remaining seven are classified as lookout sites.

Forty-four sites (15.2 percent) are fish traps. Forty-one of these (93.3 percent) are of stone construction and are located in sheltered intertidal areas. They are likely associated with trapping small, inshore schooling fish. The three fish traps of wood construction are located in small streams and likely are the remains of weirs for trapping salmon.

All twenty-four burial sites (8.3 percent) consist of surface placements representing a minimum of sixty-seven individual burials. Twenty-one of the twenty-four sites occur in a cave/rock shelter setting. All appear to date to the historic period.

The seven rock art sites (2.4 percent) are all petroglyph sites. All are located on the exposed, outer coast shoreline, five on bedrock panels and two in caves. Most of these sites contain a combination of geomorphic, zoomorphic and anthropomorphic images. A minimum of one hundred and twenty-four images are represented at these seven sites.
The fifty-two tree resource areas (18 percent) are the second largest site category in the park. Twenty-seven of the tree resource areas are associated with bark stripping, fourteen with some form of wood utilization and eleven with a combination of both bark and wood utilization. This major site category is likely under-represented for the park as most sites were identified during the shoreline survey. Inland areas, other than lake margins in the West Coast Trail unit, were not investigated systematically.

Eight isolated find sites (2.7 percent) were recorded. Six are classified as features, one as a structure and one as an artifact. All the features (isolated canoe runs and trench features) are located in the intertidal zone. The structure site consists of a collapsed house located on a small island in a lake. The single artifact site consists of the remains of a dugout canoe.

The two hundred and eighty-nine native historical sites represent the documented physical evidence of native use of the land and resources within Pacific Rim National Park. Each of these sites is unique in terms of its size and composition. Each site contains information that is specific to it; information that relates exclusively to an activity or set of activities responsible for its existence. These activities once formed part of complex interactions between people and the cultural and natural environments in which they lived. Archaeological information on these interactions, however, is only available through systematic excavation.

The archaeological data set has contributed physical evidence of occupation and resource utilization to our knowledge and understanding of
the native history of the Pacific Rim National Park region. The contribution of the archaeological data set to a greater understanding of the native history of Pacific Rim National Park becomes apparent when it is integrated with pertinent ethnographic and ethnohistoric data in the following section.
Integration of the Ethnographic, Ethnohistoric and the Archaeological Data Sets

Introduction

In the previous sections three sources of data on native history were presented and analysed. Each was studied as a discrete data set to allow for internal evaluation of the information. The aim of this section is to integrate these separate data sets to provide the most complete possible reconstruction of the native history within the three units of Pacific Rim National Park. Before proceeding a brief summary of each data set will be presented.

The ethnohistoric data set, the observations and descriptions of native peoples in the region of study by explorers, traders, government agents, missionaries, etc., related to the period from 1787, the year of first native-white contact in this region, to the second decade of the twentieth century. The first chroniclers in the late eighteenth century described a country inhabited by a people who lived in numerous, large and populous villages. These people, misnamed 'Nootka', were great seafarers, whalers and astute traders. They were also warriors. The foreigners brought with them new items such as metals, guns and blankets. Contact also introduced new diseases, such as smallpox to the native population.

Seventy-five years later, when whites first became resident in the area, contact took on a different character. The native people were still 'Nootka' although tribal names were more commonly used. The country was more carefully explored, mapped and named as exploration parties recorded
the resource wealth. Some of the names were derived from native terms, but more often than not names were given in recognition of early explorers and pioneers. Observations of native people took on a different quality now that white people were resident on the coast year round. Whereas earlier only the scars from smallpox were seen, now the full carnage was described. Rather than numerous populated villages, observers described numerous abandoned village sites. Although a few traditional subsistence activities, such as whaling, lasted into the twentieth century many other aspects of the native economy changed. Wages became the economic mainstay, first the production of dogfish oil for sale to the first trading stores, then the hunting of fur seals from white schooners, offshore and in the Bering Sea. Canneries on the Fraser River and hopfields in the Fraser Valley and around Puget Sound provided further employment opportunities before commercial developments began on the west coast.

By the late 1800s many aspects of native life were controlled by government. Settlements were restricted to reserves and economic activities were limited by Canadian and international laws. Potlatching was forbidden by law and children had to go to white schools. Missionaries fought against traditional religious and medical practices. Eventually groups like the Sheshaht and Ditidaht moved away from the coastal areas of their traditional territories; others like the Clayoquot, Ucluelet, Ohiacht and Pacheenaht maintained settlements on the coast.

In summary, the importance of the ethnohistoric data set lies in the absolute time frame it provides for observed events and activities of native people since first contact in 1787.
The ethnographic data set parallels the ethnohistoric data set in time. Just as events from the former are presented from the observers'/writers' points of view, so are those in the latter. The major difference is that the participants in the latter are not outsiders but insiders who have a vested interest in knowing who they are and their relationships with others. They know their history, where they are from and who they are related to in the past and at present, because without that knowledge they have no identity.

The ethnographic data set presents history from the participants' point of view and in their terms. People are called what they called themselves and would like to be called today. Misunderstandings which have led to such terms as 'Nootka' and 'Nitinat' now become Nuu-chah-nulth and Ditidaht. The landscape is also seen in their terms. For example, Cape Beale at the southeastern entrance to Barkley Sound becomes Ch'imaatsut and Benson Island in the Broken Groups Islands becomes Ts'icna. The geographies, included as Appendices A to F, present over seven hundred native place names for the region of study.

In the ethnographic history section the events leading up to the formation of the modern Sheshahht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiaht, Mtdidaht and Pacheenaht are summarized. This history is one of constant restructuring of the local and component groups brought about primarily as a result of intergroup warfare. A number of groups cease to exist as socio-political units on the landscape, others become so depleted in numbers that they are forced to join with stronger groups. As a consequence of these amalgamations not only do the number of independent
groups become fewer but the territories of surviving groups become larger and settlement and subsistence patterns change accordingly. It is at this time that the generalized seasonal round pattern described by Drucker and adopted by others applies. The essence of this pattern is that groups wintered in protected locations, shifted to "outside" sites in the spring and summer then to "inside" salmon fishing stations in the fall before returning to the winter villages.

In summary, the ethnographic data set has established a minimum of twenty-two local groups and twenty-two component groups who operated within the boundaries of the three units of Pacific Rim National Park.

The archaeological data set represents the physical evidence of occupation and utilization of the landscape. The site types that have been defined represent the remains of the activities of the people who lived there or utilized the region. Who they are by name, however, cannot be established from this data set. Through excavation of some site types, it is possible to characterize their culture by the artifacts, detritus and features uncovered. In particular archaeologists can talk about subsistence and technology. Archaeology can also provide time frame, but rather than the approximately two centuries represented by the ethnographic and ethnographic data sets, time goes back millennia to the first occupation or utilization of a particular place.

In summary, from the archaeological data set two hundred and eighty-nine sites representing the native history within the boundaries of Pacific Rim National Park have been identified. These break down into one hundred and fifty-four general activity sites of which thirty-five
represent structured settlements, forty-four fish trap sites, twenty-four burial sites, fifty-two tree resource areas, seven rock art sites, and eight isolated feature sites.

The following integration of these data sets will take place by present political group within park unit: the Sheshaht within the Broken Group Islands unit, the Ucluelet and Clayoquot within the Long Beach unit and the Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht within the West Coast Trail unit.

**Broken Group Islands Unit**

**Sheshaht**

The modern Sheshaht are an amalgamation of at least six independent local groups from the central Barkley Sound region. Two of these, the Naa'satll! and the Hikul'atll! did not have territory within the Broken Group Islands and therefore will not be discussed further. The territories of the remaining four, the Ts'icya'atll!, the Mak'la'atll!, the Tlo'mak'la'atll! and the Hatcla'atll! are presented in Fig. 84. This socio-political reality is estimated to date to around 1775.

The four local groups with their known component groups and village locations are listed in columns 1 and 2 of Table 2. The village locations are plotted on Fig. 84.
Fig. 84. Map of territories and villages of local groups within the Broken Group Islands unit (around 1775).
Table 2. Integration of Ethnographic and Archaeological Data on Village Sites within the Broken Group Islands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Social Units</th>
<th>Ethnographic Village Locations</th>
<th>Archaeological Village Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ts'icya'atHa</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #40)</td>
<td>DfSi 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l's c ac atHa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'icya'atHa t aqemik</td>
<td>Ts'icya (Sheshaht #41)</td>
<td>DfSi 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ok'waq'L'a'atHa</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #42)</td>
<td>DfSi 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemiyis'atHa</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #43)</td>
<td>DfSi 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanatsukwi'atqemik</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #41)</td>
<td>DfSi 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muk'w a'atHa</td>
<td>Muk'w a' (Sheshaht #36)</td>
<td>DfSi 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MakL'ca'atHa</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #52)</td>
<td>DfSi 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MakL'ca'atHa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'walo'astqemik</td>
<td></td>
<td>DfSi 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayuwi'actqemik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'ostcis'atHa</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #54)</td>
<td>DfSi 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timik'aq'is'atHa</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #55)</td>
<td>DfSi 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tc'apcis'atHa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nac' imwas'atHa)</td>
<td>Tc'apcis (Sheshaht #53)</td>
<td>(DfSi 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hots'atwistHa</td>
<td>hots'atwist (Sheshaht #62)</td>
<td>DfSh 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanin'atHa or</td>
<td>(Sheshaht #67)</td>
<td>DfSh 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an unknown subgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td>DfSh 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DfSi 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlo'mak'La'i'atHa</td>
<td></td>
<td>DfSh 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sheshaht #83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hac'lo'atHa</td>
<td></td>
<td>DfSh 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hop'kisag'o'atHa</td>
<td>Hop'kisag'o'á (Sheshaht #81)</td>
<td>DfSh 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This became their name after they joined the Nac as ath. There is no record of their name or where they lived when they were part of the MakL ai ath.

2 DfSi 17, DfSi 29 and DfSh 43 are classified as archaeological camps, not villages.
The fifteen archaeological sites that are classified as settlements are plotted on Fig. 84 and listed in column 3 of Table 2. It is hypothesized that these sites, which are major midden deposits with distinct house platforms and features and back midden ridges, represent the main villages of independent local groups or component groups. Only three of the fifteen sites, DfSi 16 and 19 and DfSh 47, however, can be confirmed as local group villages from the ethnographic data. The main village of the fourth known local group, the Hata'la'atHa, was located on the Alma Russell Islands outside of the Broken Group Islands.

DfSi 16 on Benson Island was Ts'icya (Sheshaht #41), the main village of the Ts'icya'atHa local group (Figs. 85 and 86). According to tradition this was where they were created. As Ts'icya became crowded three of the component groups moved to adjacent beaches. Only hima.yis (Sheshaht #43), however, is distinguishable as a separate archaeological site (DfSi 17) (Fig. 85). The other two places (Sheshaht #40 and #42) form part of the deposit of DfSi 16. These were the original component groups of the Ts'icya'atHa. A fifth component group, the

Nanatsukwi'tlaqemi'a formed later by marriage of an outside chief to the daughter of the Ts'icya'atHa chief. They lived at Ts'icya. The sixth group, the Muk'wa atHa, budded off from Ts'icya five generations before 1910, estimated to be around the mid-eightheenth century. They established a village at Muk'wa'a (Sheshaht #36) on Turret Island. There is a large structured midden, DfSi 7, at this location (Fig. 87).

DfSi 19 on Wouwer Island was MakL'ai, the main village of the MakL'ai

atHa (Fig. 88). Similar to Ts'icya four of the component groups had
Fig. 85. Aerial view of Benson Island, arrows mark Tsicya and hims.yi (Photo: BCPM 1982B:644).

Fig. 86. Aerial view of Tsicya (She’hahu #41) (Photo: BCPM 1984B:112).
Fig. 87. Aerial view of Muk'wa'al (Sheshahit #36) on Turret Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:659).

Fig. 88. Aerial view of Makl'ail (Sheshahit #52) on Wouwer Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:488).
separate named places where they lived (Sheshaht #52, #53, #54, #55). Tc'ap£is (Sheshaht #53) is distinguished as a separate archaeological site, DfSi 29. The fifth MakL'ai£atH component group, the Hots!atswH'atH, lived at Hots!atswH' (Sheshaht #62). There are two archaeological sites on Dicebox Island. DfSh 31 is a large structured midden located between two headlands. DfSh 43 is a large defensive site, with a minimum of 21 house platforms evident on the surface, located atop one of the headlands (Fig. 89).

One archaeological site, DfSh 4 on Effingham Island (Fig. 90), is known from the ethnographic data to have been a MakL'ai£atH village before it was taken by the HatcL'a'atH as his'ëlkt. Whether a sixth MakL'ai£atH component group or one of the other five lived at this site is unknown. It may have belonged to the Wanin£atH, a former MakL'ai£ atH group of whom little is known.

DfSh 47 on Gibraltar Island (Fig. 91) was the main village of the T'lo'mak'Lai'atH. No other villages were recorded for this group. The only HatcL'a'atH village identified from the ethnographic texts as being located in the Broken Group Islands was Hop'kisaq'at (Sheshaht #81) on the southern end of Jaques Island (Fig. 92). This was the home of the Hop'kisaq'atH component group. The archaeological site DfSh 43, located here is a small, unstructured midden.

Four component group sites, DfSh 47, DfSh 4, DfSi 30 and DfSi 7 are large structured middens which are similar to the three known local group villages. The component groups that lived at these sites may have been separate and distinct local groups at one time, or the archaeological expressions may be that of groups of whom there is no longer any knowledge.
Fig. 89. View of the defensive site at hots!atswil (Sheshahit #62) on Dicebox Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:175).

Fig. 90. Aerial view of Omoah (Sheshahat 667) on Effingham Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:667).
Fig. 91. Aerial view of Tomaklal'atíí village (Sheshalht #83) on Gibraltar Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:459).

Fig. 92. Aerial view of hop'kisaq'áa' (Sheshahlt #81) on Jaques Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:601).
There are another nine large, structured deposits which again are similar to the three known local group villages. There is, however, no ethnographic information that relates to these sites. Six of these sites, DfSh 17, 19, 20, 22, 27 and 111, are within Ts'icya'athd local group territory. One site, DfSh 5 (Fig. 93), is within Haci'a'athd local group territory and two, DfSh 29 and Dfsi 30, are within MakL ai athd territory. These nine sites may have functioned as the main settlements of component groups of the local group in whose territory they were located or of another local group that occupied the area at an earlier time and for which no history has survived.

There are few references in the early ethnohistoric record to villages that can be positively identified to the Broken Group Islands. Most of the references came from the traders who were using the northwest bay of Effingham Island as an anchorage. In 1787 Barkley mentioned passing a large village when approaching the anchorage which is interpreted to be Omoah (Sheshaht #67). This village also appears to be one of the five villages plotted on the 1792 Spanish map of Barkley Sound, and one of the four visited by Magee in 1793. A second village mentioned by Meares in 1788 fits the description of Dicebox Island (Sheshaht #62). The location of a third village, Cechasht, mentioned by the Americans in 1789, cannot be determined accurately from the journal entries. It may be the same village as that called Seshart, which was attacked by the crew of the Jefferson in 1794. The inferred area of this attack and the similarity of these names to the Ts'icya'athd lead to the conclusion that this village was located in their territory.
Fig. 93. Aerial view of Cleho (Sheshacht #83) on Nettle Island (Photo: BCPM 1982B:678).
In both the ethnographic and ethnographic data sets the last decades of the eighteenth century are portrayed as a time of intense conflict. The catalyst for these events is hypothesized to be the presence of the European and American traders, and the attempts of groups to control the sea otter trade. In 1787 and 1788 both Barkley and Meares were successful in obtaining furs in Barkley Sound. In 1792, 1793 and 1794, however, traders obtained few furs as the trade had been monopolized by Wicanninish, the Chief of Clayoquot. Barkley Sound was referred to as “the dominion of Wicanninish”. In fact, while the Jefferson was anchored at the head of Toquart Bay, in the winter of 1793-94 the Clayoquot chiefs were frequent visitors, as were chiefs from other areas outside of Barkley Sound, including Ahousaht, Ditidaht and Clahasset (Neah Bay).

Magee, the first officer of the Jefferson, recorded two conflicts between the non-resident groups and those of the area. The first was reported by Wicanninish after one of the crew of the Jefferson had been killed while on shore. The chief recommended killing two of the culprits in revenge just as he had been necessitated to kill forty recently. The crew of the Jefferson took their revenge on the village of Seshart, leading to the assumption that this was the same group that Wicanninish had attacked. This interpretation is supported by the fact that of the groups in the area of the anchorage only Toquaht and Hät'a'at'ath chiefs, and no Ts' icya'at'ath chiefs were recorded as visitors to the Jefferson. The conclusion reached is that the Ts' icya'at'ath were the example used by Wicanninish to exert his dominion over Barkley Sound.

A number of territorial changes also took place at this time. The Hät'a'at'ath were the most active. They went to war against the
T'lo'mak'Lai'atH and absorbed their territory, and then against the MakLai'atH taking over Omoah. The T'lo'mak'Lai'atH ceased to exist after their defeat while the MakL'atH became part of the Ts'icya'atH.

The Hbtc'a'atH expansion at this time is hypothesized to relate to the presence of the Euro-American traders in Effingham Bay in the late 1780s and attempts to control access to the wealth they represented.

The next conflict in which the Hbtc'a'atH were involved was with the Toquaht in the area of Equis. Again the reasons for this conflict are hypothesized to relate to their attempts to control the foreign trade. The Effingham anchorage did not develop into a fur trade port. In the winter of 1793 and 1794 the anchorage used by the Jefferson was in the region of Toquart Bay within Toquaht territory. The Hbtc'a'atH chief was a frequent visitor to the ship which likely increased friction and precipitated the conflict. The Toquaht were defeated by the Hbtc'a'atH but in the hostilities the Ucluelet inadvertently became involved. The Hbtc'a'atH in turn were wiped out by the Ucluelet and their allies the Clayoquot who used the first guns. The Hbtc'a'atH ceased to exist as an independent political entity operating in the Broken Group Islands. The survivors scattered to other groups in the region. Their territory was eventually absorbed by the amalgamated Sheshaht. This conflict has been dated to somewhere between 1792 and 1803 based on the observations of the officers of the Columbia in 1792 and of Jewitt in 1803.

The Ts'icya'atH also were involved in a number of conflicts around this time. They probably lost forty at the hands of Wicanninish, and their villages were burned in a raid by the Qanayit'atH, a Mtidaht.
group from the region of Bonilla Point. After the hostilities between the Hātc’a’atla and Ucluelet, the Ts’icya’atla appear to have come into conflict with the Ucluelet. There are no details of these conflicts but the Ucluelet came into possession of Himayis (Sheshaht #85) on Benson Island. Whether the Ts’icya’atla were defeated or simply had abandoned Ts’icya and moved to the defensive site, hots’atswil (Sheshaht #62), on Dicebox Island for greater protection is unknown. While living at hots’atswil they were involved in a conflict with the Ahousaht in which they defeated a large war party. There is archaeological evidence from the defensive site DfSh 43 on Dicebox Island to support an argument for increased activity at this site. The presence of eleven new house features to the north of the main site area is interpreted as a late expansion of occupation at this site.

How long the Ts’icya’atla lived at Dicebox is unknown. They appear to abandon the Broken Group Islands early in the nineteenth century. The sequence of the following events in unclear. They lived for a while at the mouth of the Sarita River and by around 1810-20 they were at the head of Alberni Canal. Whether these are sequential occupations or a division of the Sheshaht is unknown. During the Long War in Barkley Sound, estimated to be in the period 1830-40, there is no evidence of them returning to the Broken Group Islands. The Ucluelet had established a village in the Mikwis area and used Himayis (Sheshaht #43) and lictic’aqlis (Sheshaht #37) as resource camps and Cleho (Sheshaht #85) as a camping area on the way to the Namint giver. It was while the Ucluelet were at the Namint that the Sheshaht attacked them at the start of the Long War.
By the mid 1840s the amalgamated Sheshaht returned to the area of the Broken Group Islands. Hikwis (Sheshaht 822) on the mainland coast of Vancouver Island (Figs. 94 and 95) became their new village site in the winter part of a new seasonal round cycle. After the herring spawn season they moved "as a tribe" to Omoah and from August to December moved from fishing station to fishing station up the Alberni Canal to the Somass River. At the end of December they moved back to Hikwis.

This seasonal round pattern of subsistence or variations upon it lasted well into the twentieth century. Around the 1860s the Sheshaht moved apart into their component groups in the spring. The traditional village sites became resource camps for the component groups: the Ts' icya' atll at Tsicya, the MakLca' atll at MakLca, etc. In 1874 Hikwis still was described as their winter village but by 1882 it was deserted. This abandonment likely occurred as a result of the increased importance of their spring camps. The restriction of settlements to reserves in the 1880s forced a re-amalgamation at one of the three reserves in the Broken Group Islands. On the 1893 survey maps of the reserves Omoah (IR 9) had nine houses, Cleho (IR 6) had seven houses while Keith Island (IR 7) had only one old house. In 1914 the houses at Omoah had burned to the ground, Cleho had three houses and Keith Island had six houses. In 1922 most of the people were staying at Cleho. In the 1930s both Cleho and Omoah were the major Sheshaht villages in Barkley Sound. By the 1940s Tsahaheh IR 1 on the Somass River was the major Sheshaht settlement. Utilization of the Broken Group Islands then became an individual pattern as it is today.
Fig. 94. Aerial view of Sheshart Channel and Toquart Bay (Photo: BCPM 1982B:630).

Fig. 95. Aerial view of Equis (Sheshart #22) on the Vancouver Island shoreline (Photo: BCPM 1982B:511).
From an archaeological point of view the period from 1840 to 1940 represents the last period of occupation in the Broken Group Islands. The evidence for this occupation is on the surface in the form of features and/or artifacts or simply as vegetational changes. Sites which were abandoned early and never reoccupied would have mature forest growth. The vegetational cover on sites or portions of sites that continued to be occupied would, be reflected accordingly. This is exactly the pattern that was observed.

In summary, based on the archaeological data set, there are a potential fifteen local groups or component groups represented by the fifteen structured settlement sites. From the ethnographic data three of these were confirmed as local group villages and three were confirmed as component group villages. Nine of the archaeological sites were unknown ethnographically. In the period between 1785 and 1805 three of the four local groups known from the ethnographic data set to have held territory and occupied villages in the Broken Group Islands were wiped out by warfare. The survivors either amalgamated with the Ts'icya'atih local group at Ts'icya or scattered to other areas of Barkley Sound. The Ts'icya'atih local group in turn abandoned the Broken Group Islands for several decades in the early 1800s. When they returned to the Broken Group Islands in the 1840s the region was the territory of an amalgamated socio-political unit, the Sheshaht.

If as hypothesized the fifteen structured archaeological sites represent the main settlements of up to fifteen independent local groups or their component groups then the earliest historic records and the
ethnographic data set document only the end of the amalgamation process in the Broken Group Islands.

**Long Beach Unit**

The Long Beach unit of Pacific Rim National Park encompasses the traditional territories of at least four independent groups whose territory became included in that of the modern Ucluelet and Clayoquot. The history of each of these modern groups will be discussed separately.

**Ucluelet**

The Ucluelet, as we know them today, are a mid-historic period amalgamation of at least four independent local groups from the general area of Ucluth Peninsula. The territories of two of these groups, the Hitats'ox'atH from Ucluelet Arm and the Yu. Xu? XatH from the outer coast of Ucluth Peninsula, are outside of the boundaries of the Long Beach unit, and therefore will not be discussed further. The territories of the remaining two, the KlínaxumAs'atH and the 'ho'ol'athH are encompassed within the park unit boundaries and are presented in Fig. 96. The boundary between the two was not recorded.

The two local groups with their known component groups and village locations are listed in columns 1 and 2 of Table 3. The village locations are plotted on Fig. 96.
Fig. 96. Map of territories and village locations of Ucluelet local groups with the Long Beach unit.
Table 3. Integration of Ethnographic and Archaeological Data on Village Sites within Ucluelet Territory of the Long Beach Unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Social units</th>
<th>Ethnographic Village Locations</th>
<th>Archaeological Village sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K'inxumAs'atHà</td>
<td>Quisitis (Ucluelet #32)</td>
<td>DgSk 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiwit'aik taqemil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot kwisistqemil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwispisistaqemil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numimats'yak taqemil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?a?atsictaqiml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ho'oI'atHà</td>
<td>Hu?ul (Ucluelet #31)</td>
<td>DfSj 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the seven archaeological sites from the Long Beach unit that are classified as structured settlements are within amalgamated Ucluelet territory. They are listed in column 3 of Table 3 and plotted on Fig. 96. It is interesting to note that only one structured village site was found within the territory of each of the local groups identified from the ethnographic data set. Both are large villages with a number of house platforms (Figs. 97 and 98). Each of the platform areas likely reflects the houses of one of the component groups. Although there are no component groups listed for the 'ho'oI'atHà four houses were named and located at the village.

There are no early ethnohistoric descriptions of people or villages on this part of the coast. The linear shoreline and lack of safe anchorage discouraged ships from entering these waters. If either the K'inxumAs'atHà or the 'ho'oI'atHà were in contact with the traders it would have had to occur out at sea or at one of the trading centres, most likely in Clayoquot Sound. The only reference to a trading vessel in Ucluelet territory was in 1795 when the Ruby anchored in Ucluelet Inlet.
Fig. 98. Aerial view of hut (UCN VI 233), site of the main village of the
hut site (Photo: BCPM 1984.234).
Little ethnographic information has been recorded for the KlínaxumAs'athä. They were a large tribe who spoke the Clayoquot dialect of central Nootka. They were involved in a number of disputes with the Clayoquot over the sea lion rocks at the northern end of their territory. In one conflict against the Clayoquot from Opitsat and the Ahousaht, the KlínaxumAs'ath were nearly wiped out. Whether it was at this time that they moved into Ucluelet Inlet or at another by invitation of the Hitatso'ath is not clear.

The 'ho'oJ:'atHä, on the other hand, are quite prominent in the historical traditions. Originally a group from the Clayoquot area they moved to Hu'uʃ, possibly at the time of the Clayoquot wars (mid to late eighteenth century). They had close ties through marriage to the Yu'ju'il'atHä to the south, and to a lesser extent with the KlínaxumAs'athä to the north. It seems that they functioned as a sub-group of the Yu'ju'il'atHä in the historical traditions, being involved in three major wars with them: the war against the Htc'a'atHä and ?a'uts'ntHä, the taking of the Namint, and the Long War in Barkley Sound. Whereas the Yu'ju'il'atHä component groups were repeatedly attacked in the Long War by the Ohiaht, Sheshaht, etc. alliance, the 'ho'oJ:'atHä were not, apparently for fear of involving their Clayoquot relatives. Heavy losses in the Long War forced the amalgamation of the Yu'ju'il'atHä and the Hitatso'athä. It appears that the 'ho'oJ:'atHä followed their Yu'ju'il'atHä relatives.

In 1874 Hu.uʃ and Quisitis were used only as fishing stations, for halibut. Both were allocated as reserves in 1890. On the 1893 survey map
Huul' (Oo-oohlth IR 8) had 3 houses and 1 shack, Quisitis IR 9 had two small houses.

Cayoquot

The Clayoquot are a late precontact period amalgamation of an unknown number of independent local groups from the Kennedy Lake and Clayoquot Sound region. Two identified groups, the Histau'istath and the Hophitcath had territory or portions of their territories within the boundaries of the Long Beach unit (Fig. 99). The majority of amalgamated Clayoquot territory, however, is outside the park unit and therefore will not form part of the following discussion.

The two local groups and known village sites are listed in columns 1 and 2 of Table 4. The village locations are plotted on Fig. 99. The five archaeological sites in Clayoquot territory that are classified as structured settlements are listed in column 3 of Table 4, and plotted on Fig. 99.

Table 4. Integration of Ethnographic and Archaeological Data on Village Sites within Clayoquot territory of the Long Beach Unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Social Units</th>
<th>Ethnographic Village Locations</th>
<th>Archaeological Village Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histau'istath</td>
<td>Histau'is (Clayoquot #2)</td>
<td>DgSk 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Is. (Clayoquot #7)</td>
<td>DgSk 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DgSk 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hophitcath</td>
<td>Hophitc (Clayoquot #3)</td>
<td>DgSi 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DgSk 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 99. Map of territories and villages of Clayoquot local groups within the Long Beach Unit.
Fig. 100. Aerial view of Hista'ilis (Clayoquot #2), north end of Long Beach (Photo: BCPM 1984B:246).

Fig. 101. Aerial view of village site on Indian Island (Clayoquot #7) (Photo: BCPM 1984B:242).
All three of the ethnographically known villages are confirmed by major archaeological deposits: Histau'is is DgSk 6 (Fig. 100), Indian Island is DgSk 7 (Fig. 101) and Hophitc is DgSl 17. There is no ethnographic information on two of the archaeological sites DgSk 2 and DgSk 38. DgSk 2 is located at Green Point near the boundary between the Clayoquot and Ucluelet. Whether this village was occupied when this was the boundary or at an earlier time is not known. DgSk 38, in Hopitcath territory, may represent the village of an unknown component group, or it may represent a shift in location of Hophitec, the Hopitcath main village.

As with the two Ucluelet local groups at the south end of the Long Beach unit, there are no early ethnohistoric references to the people of this area. The ethnographic references are sketchy.

The Histau'istath were created at Histau'is (Clayoquot #2). Hophitec (Clayoquot #3) was the traditional home of the Hophitecath. I'tcatcict (Clayoquot #6) on Echachis Island was their summer village. The Histau'istath were an aggressive group who eventually controlled much of the area. They were defeated by an alliance of other local groups who were centred at Opitsat (Clayoquot #5) sometime in the last half of the eighteenth century (estimated to be around 1780). Their land was absorbed by the Clayoquot.

In 1890 Histau'is was allocated as a Clayoquot reserve (Esowista IR 3). In 1893 there were eight houses mapped on the reserve. Indian Island was not allocated as a reserve until 1914. The reserve was mapped in 1926. At that time there were three shacks with fish drying houses on the site. The two sites in Hophitcath territory and Green Point were not allocated as reserves.
Fig. 102. Map of territories and villages of Ohiaht local groups within the West Coast Trail Unit.
The *Tc'mataqso'ath* had two villages, the main village was at *Ch'imataqso'ul* (Ohiaht #105) which was located on top of a rocky hill at Cape Beale, the second was *Kixa* (Ohiaht #113) which was called a camping village. *Kixa* is confirmed by the archaeological deposit at DeSh 6. DeSh 13, the major archaeological deposit at Cape Beale (Fig. 103), however, does not fit the description of *Ch'imataqso'ul*, as it is located at see level.

The people who occupied the area around Pachena Bay generally were called the *?anaq'L?a'atl* and had their main village at *Luht'a* (Ohiaht #119). They appear also to take their name from this village, hence the *Luht'a?ath*. The village site at *Luht'a* is confirmed by the major archaeological deposit DeSg 6 (Fig. 104).

Ethnohistoric references for the Ohiaht from the period of first contact are few. Cape Beale, named by Barkley in 1787, was a key landmark for the early traders identifying the entrance to Juan de Fuca Strait and the southeastern limit of Barkley Sound. The region, however, was largely bypassed. Robert Duffin in 1788 appears to be the first to contact the Ohiaht. On the first night of his voyage southeast of Barkley Sound he anchored in a bay interpreted to be Pachena Bay. There was a large village, At *rah*, from which a number of people came to trade. Magee was the next to visit Ohiaht country. In 1793 he visited a "large and very populous" village on the mainland of the east shore of Barkley Sound. Which village he visited cannot be determined from this description. No Ohiaht villages were plotted on the 1792 Spanish map of Barkley Sound. In 1795 Bishop named two chiefs, *Yapasuet* and *Annathat* "from the east shore" who came to trade at Ucluelet. These names have not been found in later
Fig. 103. Aerial view of the area of the Tcimataqso'ath main village (Photo: BCPM 1984B:132).
Fig. 104. Aerial view of ṭuht'a (Ohiapt #119), site of the main village of the ṭanaq' L'a'at.²
(Photograph: BCPM 1984B:125).
lists of chiefs from the Barkley Sound series so it is not possible at this
time to identify any more accurately where they were from.

In 1817, Roquefeuil sailed up Trevor Channel and anchored in Port
Desire. Unfortunately he did not make any observations of people or
villages in the area of focus in this study. By the time we have the next
descriptions of the Ohisht in the late 1850s they are described as a
single tribe under one chief, with numerous villages along the shoreline
from Cape Beale to Numakamis where they gather in the winter.

From the ethnographic data set there are a number of traditions that
relate to the Tc'limataqso'atHa and the ?anaq'L?a'atHa. Both are
described as independent peoples who became subject bands of the
Uchucklesaht for an unknown period of time estimated to be in the mid to
late eighteenth century. In one tradition the Tc'limataqso'atHa were
nearly wiped out by the Uchucklesht, the survivors fleeing to Ditidaht
territory. In another tradition both groups were wiped out by the effects
of an earthquake. The survivors moved in with their Kix'in'ath relatives and their territory was absorbed.

Wars with the Clallam and Ucluelet forced the amalgamation of the
remaining two independent groups, the Kix'in'ath and the Ohisht, in the
early 1800s. In the late 1850s they are described as a single tribe under
one chief. Numukamis (Ohiaht #25) was the main winter village of the
amalgamated Ohiaht. In the spring they scattered to their resource camps
among the islands and gathered together again for the summer at Kix'in.

Blenkinsop in the map that accompanied his 1874 report plotted resource
camps at Malsit, Clutus, Kixa, Haines Island, two on Diana Island, two on
Fig. 105. Aerial view of Kixd (Ohlendt #113) (Photo: BCPM 1984B:159).

Fig. 106. Remains of house feature at Kixa village (Photo: BCPM 1984B:141).
Helby Island and two in Bamfield Inlet. In the late 1880s Kix' in was abandoned. New villages were established on Haines Island (Ohiaht #139) and on Diana Island (Ohiaht #140), in an area called Dodger Cove.

Kixa (Onaht #113) in traditional Tc!imataqso'ath territory and Clutus (Ohiaht #119) and Malsit (Onaht #123) in ?anaq'La'at H traditional territory became summer resource villages of the amalgamated Ohiaht. The people took on the name of these summer villages when they lived there, hence Kixa'ath, Clutus'ath and Malsit'ath. In 1882 these three summer villages were allotted as Onaht reserves. Kixa (JR 10) had four houses, Clutus (IR 11) had four houses and Malsit (IR 13) had two old houses on the 1883 survey maps.

Ditidaht

The modern Ditidaht are an historic period amalgamation of ten local groups whose traditional territories included over half of the outer coastline of the West Coast Trail unit as well as the Nitinat Lake region. The territories of the ten independent groups identified from the ethnographic data set are within the park unit. They are presented in Figs. 107a and 107b.

The ten local groups with their known component groups and village sites are listed in columns 1 and 2 of Table 6. The villages are plotted on Figs. 107a and 107b.

The nine archaeological sites within Ditidaht territory that are classified as structured settlements are listed in column 3 of Table 6 and are plotted on Figs. 107a and 107b.
Fig. 107a. Map of territories and villages of Ditidaht local groups within the West Coast Trail Unit (western section).
Fig. 107b. Map of territories and villages of Ditidaht local groups within the West Coast Trail Unit (eastern section).
Table 6. Integration of Ethnographic and Archaeological Data on Village Sites within Ditidaht territory of the West Coast Trail Unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Social units</th>
<th>Ethnographic Village Locations</th>
<th>Archaeological Village Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>caqqawitsa?tx (A)</td>
<td>caqqawis (Ditidaht #29)</td>
<td>DeSf 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wi.qpalu.ws (Ditidaht #43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.di.wa?a?tx (B)</td>
<td>a.di.wa? (Ditidaht #28)</td>
<td>DeSf 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuXwkw'wa.da?a?tx (C)</td>
<td>cuXwkw'wa. da? (Ditidaht #23)</td>
<td>DeSf 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. a.baqu.ws (Ditidaht #45)</td>
<td>DeSf 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da.o.wa?a?tx (D)</td>
<td>'an.imlyistaqemil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lap/Haltap tageqemil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'aps.wipi?actaqemil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa.ya.?apa?tx (E)</td>
<td>wa.ya.?aq (Ditidaht #33)</td>
<td>DeSf 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.?u.wsa?tx (F)</td>
<td>u.?u.wsa (Ditidaht #15)</td>
<td>DdSe 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wawa.x?adi?sa?tx (G)</td>
<td>wawa.x?adi?sa (Ditidaht #6)</td>
<td>DdSe 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwa.ba.duwa?a?tx (H)</td>
<td>qwa.ba.duwa? (Ditidaht #4)</td>
<td>DdSe 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaqbaqis?sa?tx</td>
<td>qaqbaqis (Ditidaht #11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.xwi.yta?tx</td>
<td>ca.xwi.yta (Ditidaht #14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the ten local group villages identified from the ethnographic data, seven are confirmed by major structured archaeological deposits.

DeSf 11 (Fig. 108) corresponds to the main village of the ta.di.wa?a?tx,
DeSf 2 (Fig. 109) corresponds to the main village of the
cuXwkw'wa.da?a?tx, DeSf 10 (Fig. 110) corresponds to the main village of
the da.o.wa?a?tx, DdSe 4 (Fig. 111) corresponds to the main village of the
tu.?u.wsa?tx, DdSe 7 corresponds to the main village of the
wawa.x?adi?sa?tx, and DdSe 17 (Fig. 112) corresponds to the main village
Fig. 108. Aerial view of the village site of #a.di.wa?, the arrow marks the archaeological site DeSF II (Photo: BCPM 1984B:104).

Fig. 109. Aerial view of the village site of cux'k'a.da? (Photo: BCPM 1984B:97).
Fig. 110. Aerial view of the main village site of the da-o-wa'ta?tw (Photo: BCPM 1984B:377).

Fig. 111. Aerial view of the village site of ū-lu-wé (Photo: BCPM 1984B:403).
of the qua.ba.duwa?tx. DeSf 4 (Fig. 113) at the entrance to Nitinat Narrows is the wa.ya?aga?tx main village. A second major archaeological deposit, DeSf 5, in the same area is likely part of the same village complex.

No archaeological sites were recorded for three groups, the caqqawisa?tx, the qaqqbaqisa?tx and the ca.wi.yra?tx. The last two groups were both established in more recent times and their villages were likely occupied for a limited time which would explain the absence of archaeological deposit. The lack of archaeological evidence for the caqqawisa?tx village, however, remains a problem.

Two groups, the caqqawisa?tx and the cuxkwa.da?a?tx, also had an inside winter village on the north shore of the entrance to Nitinat Lake at wi.qpalu.ws and ta.ta.baku.ws respectively. These winter villages are confirmed by the archaeological sits DeSf 9.

According to the recorded historical traditions the Ditidaht migrated to the Nitinat Lake region from d1:ti:da? (Facheenaht #7) at Jordan River. There are a number of possible explanations for this move: warfare with their neighbours, overcrowding and the Flood. Whether the Ditidaht were the first to settle the region or whether the Da.o.wa?a?tx were already there is unclear. According to some traditions Whyac was the first settlement, while in other traditions a number of the villages were occupied around the same time.

There are few early ethnohistoric references to this part of the coast. In 1788 Robert Duffin sailed along the shoreline of this part of the coast. He saw four villages, none of which he named. From his
Fig. 112. Aerial view of the village site of qwa.ba.duwaʔ (Photo: BCPM 1984B:57).

Fig. 113. Aerial view of the entrance to Nitinat Narrows and the village site of wa.yaʔ (Photo: BCPM 1984B:90).
descriptions of the landforms one of the villages has been identified as Whyac. In 1789 and again in 1791 Gray traded offshore from the village of "Nittenat" (Whyac). Two of his officers who kept journals recorded the scars from smallpox among the people who came to the ship to trade. This is the first reference to this disease among the Nuu-chah-nulth. There is, however, no account of the severity of its impact.

There are a number of war traditions which relate events leading to the amalgamation of some groups to form the Ditidaht. According to a non-Ditidaht the two local groups living closest to Barkley Sound, the qaqqawisa?tx and the ta.di.wa?a?tx, were wiped out in warfare by the Uchucklesaht, who were occupying at the time what is now Ohiaht territory. This war is estimated to have occurred in the last half of the eighteenth century. The Ditidaht also were driven from the Nitinat Lake region by the Makah, who occupied this area for some time. The date of the conflict was not determined but the survival of a number of Makah place names in the region suggests a not too distant time in the past. The Ditidaht regained their lands from the Makah through warfare.

In 1858 the Ditidaht were described as a single tribe that divided itself in the spring and summer into encampments, each having its own chief. The principal chief lived at Whyac. Brown, writing in June 1864, noted four inhabited Ditidaht settlements southeast of the entrance to Nitinat Lake: villages at Whyac, which was fortified on the seaward side, Clo-oose and Carmanah, and a camp at Echwates (Ditidaht #2).

In 1890, sixteen reserves were allocated to the Ditidaht. Included among these were the four villages of cux(tk)wa.da? (IR 2), wa.ya.?aq
(IR 3), tu.ʔu.ws (IR 4), and qwa.ba.duwa? (IR 6). The combined population of these villages in the 1882 census "as two hundred and seventy-one. The village sites at caqqawis, a.dl.wa? and wawa.x?ad1?s did not become reserves leading to the conclusion that they were no longer being used. In the 1893 reserve maps cuxʷkʷa.da? had nine houses, wa.ya.?aq had fifteen houses which included one much larger than the others, uʔu.ws had five, ca.xʷl.yt had one and qwa.ba.duwa? had four. There were ten houses on the Iktuksasuck Reserve (IR 7) on the north shore of the entrance to Nitinat Lake.

The archaeological sites at cuxʷkʷa.da? (DeSf 2), the defensive portion of wa.ya.?aq (DeSf 3) and qwa.ba.duwa? (DdSe 17) still have the standing remains of traditional style longhouses. A sketch of Whyac village, drawn in 1864, (Fig. 114) shows the layout of the longhouses at this village. A photograph taken around 1940 provides roughly the same view (Fig. 115). Instead of the traditional style houses, however, are found Canadian frame style houses but arranged in much the same pattern. The supposition is that the internal social structure of the village stayed much the same despite the change in housing style.

Whyac and Clo-oose gained importance in the early decades of the 1900s with the increased presence of white settlers in the area of the Cheewaht and commercial developments in the area of Nitinat Lake. cuxʷkʷa.da? and qwa.ba.duwa? were abandoned gradually. In 1964 a new reserve "as built for the Ditidaht by the Department of Indian Affairs at Malachan IR 11 at the head of Nitinat Lake. Today this is the main settlement of the Ditidaht.
Fig. 114: Village of wa.ya.?aq (Whyac) as viewed in 1864 by the Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition (drawing published in 1866) (Photo: BCFM PN 15522).

Fig. 115: Village of wa.ya.?aq around 1940 (Photo: AVM PN 3589).
The Pacheenaht, who today live at Gordon River IR 2 near Port Renfrew, are the vestiges of an once populous tribe that had at least eleven villages along the shoreline from Sheringham Point to Bonilla Point including Port San Juan and the San Juan River valley. Their territory that is included within the boundaries of the West Coast Trail Unit is presented in Fig. 116.

There are no component groups listed for the Pacheenaht in the ethnographic texts. It is inferred from a map in Haas' notes that Port San Juan was divided between two groups, the qawqa.d'aatx and the t'luquxoct'aatx. Only the latter are of concern in this study as part of their territory falls within the park unit boundaries. Two Sheshahl respondents in 1913-14 named another group within what is now Pacheenaht territory. The Qanayit'ath'a, who lived at Qala.yit (Pacheenaht #114), were a Ditidaht tribe of giants who were wiped out in a raid by the Sheshahl, estimated to be around 1800. These two groups are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Integration of Ethnographic and Archaeological Data on Village Sites within Pacheenaht territory of the West Coast Trail Unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Social Units</th>
<th>Ethnographic Village Locations</th>
<th>Archaeological Village Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t'luquxoct'aatx</td>
<td>(outside of park)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qanayit'ath'a</td>
<td>Qala.yit (Pacheenaht #114)</td>
<td>DdSe 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 116. Map of territories and villages of possible Pacheenaht local groups within the West Coast Trail Unit.
The one archaeological site, DfSe 8 (Fig. 117), in Pacheenaht traditional territory that is classified as a structured settlement is plotted on Fig. 116 and listed in Table 7. It corresponds to Qala.yit, the village of the Qala.yit.atl. The main village of the t'luquxoct'aatx is outside of the park unit boundaries.

There are a number of early historic references to the Pacheenaht. The Port San Juan region, in particular, was a centre of activity for vessels exploring the entrance to Juan de Fuca Strait as it was the only harbour along an otherwise linear shoreline. Robert Duffin, in a longboat from the *Felice*, was the first to enter Juan de Fuca Strait in July 1788. The longboat was attacked in Port San Juan by about 80 men in two canoes. In 1789 the *Columbia* entered Poverty Cove (Port San Juan). A "deserted hut" was seen on the northwest shore (likely Pacheenaht #96) as well as the smoke from the village at the head of the bay. The Spanish mapped the area in 1790. Two villages were plotted on the map, one at the mouth of the Cordon River, the other at the mouth of the San Joan River. The only other settlement in the region was noted by the Spanish in 1791 when they traded with twenty canoes from a large settlement at *Bonilla* Point which is hypothesized to be Qala.yit (Pacheenaht #114).

The next description of the Pacheenaht is not until 1858 when Banfield described them as a once numerous tribe who had been nearly annihilated by warfare and smallpox in 1850. In 1864 Brown noted three villages of the Pacheenaht. Only one, Karliet (Pacheenaht #114) which had one house, is within the park unit. In 1889 Cullite was allotted as a reserve (IR3). One house was recorded on the 1893 map.
Fig. 116. Mr. and Mrs. Jim McKay, Ucluelet (Photo: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council).
Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

The major objective of this project was to write an integrated history of the native peoples who traditionally occupied the areas of Pacific Rim National Park. Three major sets of information were defined: ethnohistoric, ethnographic and archaeological. Primary source materials relating to the first two data sets were collected, analyzed and summarized for this report. The archaeological data set was summarized from the report of the Pacific Rim Historical Resources Site Survey and Assessment Project. The focus of the data summaries was on information that would identify places, settlements, people, activities and events within the areas of the three park units. This information provided the basis for the integrated histories of the Sheshah in the Broken Group Islands unit, the Ucluelet and Clayoquot in the Long Beach unit and the Ohiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht in the West Coast Trail unit.

Summary

The Broken Group Islands unit was the traditional homeland occupied on a year round basis for an identified four local groups, comprising thirteen component groups. Six of the fifteen archaeological sites classified as major structured settlements were confirmed as local or
component group villages. The remaining nine sites likely represent the villages of social units of whom no knowledge has survived.

In the last decades of the eighteenth century a series of wars resulted in the T'omokl'ai'ath³ the MakL'ai'ath³ and the Hatc'a'ath³ ceasing to exist as separate socio-political entities on the landscape. The survivors either scattered or joined the Ts'icya'ath³, the only local group that remained. The Ts'icya'ath³ in turn were forced to abandon the Broken Group Islands for several decades in the early nineteenth century. They set up at the head of Alberni Canal during this period.

In the 1840s the prolonged wars in Barkley Sound had come to an end and the Ts'icya'ath³ returned to the coast. Instead of operating from a year round village, however, a new seasonal round settlement and subsistence pattern was adopted: Hikwis, on the mainland shore of Vancouver Island, became the winter village of the amalgamated groups who now formed the Ts'icya'ath³. Omoah became their summer village, and in the fall they moved to their fishing stations along the Alberni Canal and Sumass River, before returning to Hikwis. By the 1870s Hikwis was abandoned in favour of the old village sites in the Broken Group Islands where families, likely remnants of the original local groups, set up resource camps for fishing and sea mammal hunting in the spring. The rest of the cycle stayed the same.

As whites began to alienate land, settlement became restricted to the three reserves allocated in the Broken Group Islands in 1882, Omoah, Keith Island and Cleho. Omoah and Cleho were major villages up until the late
1930s. Today the Sheshaht are centered year round at Tsahacheh LR 1 near Port Alberni and use the Broken Group Islands on an individual basis for procuring seafoods.

The Long Beach unit was the traditional year round homeland for a minimum of four independent local groups. Of the seven archaeological sites classified as major settlements within the unit, five correspond to the main village of local groups. There is no information recorded on the people who occupied the other two sites. As a result of a series of wars in the late eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth century these groups ceased to exist as separate entities. The territories of the Histau'istath and the Hophitcath were incorporated by the Clayoquot around 1770. The K'inuxumAs'athä joined the amalgamated Ucluelet centered in Ucluelet Inlet at the time of the Long War around 1830-40. The 'ho'ol'athä either joined at this time or sometime later.

During the last decades of the 1800s the villages of Hu'uif and Quisitis were used in the spring by a few Ucluelet families, likely descendants of the original local group owners, as halibut fishing stations. How long this use continued into the twentieth century is unknown. Both areas were allotted as reserves in 1890.

A similar pattern is evident for the Clayoquot. Both Histau'is and Hophitc were used as summer fishing camps in the late eighteenth century. Only Histau'is, however, was allocated as a reserve in 1914. Today, Histau'is is one of the two Clayoquot settlements.

The West Coast Trail unit encompasses the traditional territories of thirteen known independent local groups and part of the territory of two
others. Thirteen archaeological sites have been classified as major settlements in this unit. Ten of these sites correspond to the main villages of ten of the local groups. Three local groups had two villages. The village of one local group was not documented archaeologically and two local groups that formed in recent times also lacked archaeological deposits. The main villages of the two groups with partial territories within the park unit were located outside of the park.

As a result of natural disaster or warfare the two Ohiaht groups ceased to exist. The territories of the Tc!ima?so'a?th and the ?anaq'L?a'ath were absorbed by the Kix'ina'ath after they were wiped out by the effects of an earthquake or warfare with the Uchucklesaht estimated to have occurred in the late eighteenth century. Two of their villages, Luht'a and Kixa, were used by the amalgamted Ohiaht as whaling camps in the mid to late nineteenth century. Both were allocated as reserves in 1882 and continued to be used into the early decades of the twentieth century.

The Caqqawisa'tx and a.di.wa?a'tx, two Ditidaht groups, were wiped out by the Uchucklesaht in the mid to late eighteenth century. No archaeological deposit was found for the Caqqawisatx village of Caqqawa ta.dia.wa? was occupied up until the early 1900s but was not allocated as a reserve.

Four of the other Ditidaht groups maintained their traditional village sites, each with its own chief, into the twentieth century. The Cux'wa.da?a'tx and Qwa.ba.duwa?a'tx moved into Whyac and Clo-oose in the early 1900s. The remaining groups, the u.?u.wsa'tx and the wa.ya?aqa'tx were still living at their villages until the 1960s. Today
the Ditidaht are centered at the head of Mitinat Lake. The reserves of Whyac (IR 3) and Iktuksasuk (IR 7) are used on a seasonal basis by a few families.

Two local groups had territory in Pacheenaht territory. The Qanayit'atH who lived at Qala yit were wiped out in a raid by the Ts' icya'atH in the late eighteenth century. They were considered one of the Ditidaht tribes. The village was used by the Pacheenaht as a halibut fishery camp by 1850 and likely earlier. It was made a reserve in 1889. The main village of the t'luquxoct'aatx is located outside of the park. The only structured archaeological site in Pacheenaht territory, DdSe 8, corresponds with the village at Qala yit.

Conclusion

The information contained in the ethnohistoric and ethnographic data sets ranges widely in content and quality. The ethnohistoric data set is a compilation of observations of native people and events that has been recorded since first contact in 1787. This data set, however, does not provide a continuous record through the historic period. It is limited by when and where the observations were recorded. There are many years for which there are no records and there are many areas for which there are no recorded observations. The ethnohistoric data set is limited further by the observational and descriptive abilities of the recorder. What was the importance to them at the time (i.e. trading practices) not surprisingly may not be of prime interest to anthropologists today (i.e. names of chiefs, villages, etc.).
The ethnographic data set is a compilation of historical traditions told by native people. This information is gathered by the interview process, generally of knowledgeable community elders. Two major biases are inherent: first, the information collected represents the research focus of the collector; second, the information represents only the views of the people interviewed. Interviews of other individuals and different lines of questioning undoubtedly would produce additional data. Often the information required for this project was not the focus of that collected by past researchers. As a result information on people, settlements and territories occurred often as brief footnotes or tantalizing asides to the main texts, rather than in discussions of socio-political organization and settlement patterns. For example many of the references to local and component groups were found scattered through ethnographic notes on ranking or rights of particular individuals.

The archaeological data set on the other hand is an inventory of physical modifications to the landscape resulting from native occupation and use. In the Pacific Rim National Park two hundred and eighty-nine native archaeological sites have been recorded. In one sense this represents an absolute data set. It is a physical reality, irrefutable evidence of use that needs explanation. The major limiting factor of this data set is time frame. Without control of time it is impossible to talk relationships between sites: were they occupied contemporaneously or is there a sequence to the occupations? These types of questions, however, can be answered by systematic excavation and chronometric dating.

This history from the ethnographic and ethnohistoric data sets reflects what was recorded. The gaps in information are many and frustrating. The
material that does exist however, provides valuable insight into the participants, events and lifestyle in the region of the Pacific Rim National Park over the past two hundred years. The archaeological data set represents the only data set that can document native history beyond the approximately two centuries of the ethnohistoric and ethnographic record. The integration of the three ultimately provides the most complete understanding of native history.

Most of what is known about the number, composition and territories of local groups has been extracted from the ethnographic data set. A minimum of twenty-three independent local groups who had traditional territory within Pacific Rim National Park have been identified. Of the twenty-three, twenty-one had main villages which are now within one of the three park units.

From the same area thirty-five major structured archeological sites have been identified. Of these thirty-five, twenty-three were confirmed from the ethnographic data set as local or component group village sites. The remaining twelve sites are similar to the known local group sites. The question is whether these sites functioned in the past as villages of local or component groups of whom there is no record in the ethnohistoric or ethnographic data sets or whether they represent alternate villages of known local groups or their components.

Today, the twenty-three local groups are survived by six “tribal groups”, the Sheshat, the Ucluelet, the Clayoquot, the Ohiaht, the Ditidaht and the Pacheenaht. This is a loss of nearly seventy-five percent of the independent socio-political units that operated on the
landscape in the areas encompassed by the Park. The dramatic decline was brought about by a number of different factors occurring at different times. Warfare was the major causal factor for wholesale changes to the socio-political map. Twelve amalgamations or extinctions were brought about by intergroup wars documented for the late eighteenth century and first four decades of the nineteenth century. Of the twelve known local groups, four were wiped out by warfare and eight were forced to amalgamate either with the victors or with other extant local groups because of severe decline in numbers. The future of a group in the amalgamation depended on how amalgamation occurred. Conquest generally resulted in total absorption and loss of group identity. Amalgamation of survivors in groups where they had kin ties often resulted in their becoming a ranked component group. The majority (nine of twelve) of these events took place before 1800. The major catalyst for the conflicts appears to have been the presence of the first Euro-American traders and the attempts of groups to control the immense wealth and therefore prestige and power which they represented.

Natural disaster accounted for the extinction of two of the twenty-three local groups. Of the remaining nine, a general decline in population and changing economic patterns of the twentieth century forced five to amalgamate.

Of the remaining four, two formed the basis of one of the modern amalgamations. What happened to the last two is unknown. It is likely that their numbers declined as a result of disease to the point where they ceased to exist as distinct political entities, the survivors joining one of the extant groups.
The ethnographic and ethnohistoric records also document two hundred years of profound and dramatic change in settlement and subsistence patterns. The traditional pattern was for local groups to live year round at a village from which they exploited the range of resources within their territories. The local groups who lived along the outer coast of the Broken Group Islands, Long Beach and West Coast Trail units were renowned as whalers and sea mammal hunters. During the socio-political re-alignments of the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries local group territories expanded either by conquest or by amalgamation. These expanded territories were exploited generally by adopting a seasonal round pattern of settlement and subsistence. There were a number of variations in this pattern depending on the nature of the territorial gains. For groups that annexed territory adjacent to their holdings shifts would occur only if the new territories offered better features, such as beach access, a lookout place or resource availability, than the regular village. The seasonal round pattern became most pronounced when “outside” local groups acquired salmon rivers on the “inside”, and moved from their outside villages in the late summer to set up camps at the salmon fishing stations.

The timing and specifics of this new pattern varied from group to group. For some groups the pattern developed in the late 1700s, for others not until the mid-1800s. The nature of the pattern also varied from local group to local group. The shift for some was from a Winter village to a summer village, for others it was from a winter village to a summer village to fall salmon stations.
Numerous other variations developed in the last half of the nineteenth century as people participated in new economic opportunities provided by increased white settlement. Dogfish oil and dried halibut and salmon production and offshore pelagic sealing were the first activities. Numerous abandoned villages were re-occupied as camps to procure and produce these products. Many of the reserves allocated in the late nineteenth century reflect the participation in this cash economy. As the demand for these products diminished so did the use of the reserves. New employment opportunities for wages were offered away from the coast in canneries and hop fields. When commercial developments opened on the west coast, new 'company towns' were built to which native people from different areas of the coast moved to work during the season of operation.

Today the modern communities of the Sheshaht, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Ohiiaht, Ditidaht and Pacheenaht are situated in or near white communities where employment is offered in the forest and fishing industries.

**Recommendations**

The native history is a vital part of the story of Pacific Rim National Park. The landscape has been modified and utilized by native peoples for thousands of years. The two hundred and eighty-nine native archaeological sites are the physical record of this history reflecting a range of activities from village life, to whaling, to stripping of the bark of cedar trees. To visit the Park is not only a "wilderness experience", it is also an experience in the past relationships of people to that environment.
Seven recommendations are put forward that would make the native history better known and an integral part of the Park activities.

1. Develop interpretive programmes on native history for the Wicanninish Centre, the Interpretation Centre and the Green Point Theatre in the Long Beach unit.

2. Produce brochures that summarize the native history for each of the park units.

3. Produce brochures that summarize aspects of native culture that are common to the three park units such as whaling, use of cedar, traditional house styles, etc.

4. Adopt more native terms for physical features on the landscape and the sea. Known terms are compiled in the geographies which are included as Appendices to this report.

5. Employ native people in the Park as rangers and interpreters.

6. Develop signage for the park units pointing out areas of native historical significance.

7. Develop programmes with the six bands who have reserves within the park. These bands could organize native food nights, Nuu-chah-nulth singing and dancing and traditional story-telling for example.
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J. Haggarty and R. Inglis, *Historical Resources Site Survey and Assessment, Pacific Rim National Park* (Calgary: Parks Canada, 1986) (hereafter cited as *Historical Resources Report*).

For distribution maps of the tree resource areas and isolated find sites in the Broken Group Islands unit see Haggarty and Inglis, "Historical Resources Report" (1986).

For distribution maps of the tree resource areas, rock art and isolated find sites in the Long Beach unit see Haggarty and Inglis, "Historical Resources Report" (1986).

For distribution maps of the tree resource areas, rock art and isolated find sites in the West Coast Trail unit see Haggarty and Inglis, "Historical Resources Report" (1986).

Integration of the Ethnographic, Ethnohistoric and Archaeological Data Sets


2. The presence of the Clayoquot in Barkley Sound and their participation in the Hacht'a'ath war at the end of the eighteenth century likely relates to their assertion of control over the fur trade.

3. Attah is hypothesized to be the ?anaq'L'a'ath Village of ?uht'a (Ohiaht #119).

Summary and Conclusions

1. J. Haggarty and R. Inglis, "Historical Resources Report" (1986).
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