

The Indians and the Crown: Aboriginal Memories of Royal Promises in Pacific Canada



KEITH THOR CARLSON

The tenacity of Indian memory is a well-known fact. These three chiefs will remember every detail of their visit to His Majesty as long as they live and will transmit even the minutest details to their children and the account of the visit may be handed down until it becomes traditional. From the earliest times in the dealing between the British and the Indians it has been considered a matter of policy to explicitly carry out promises made to the Aborigines and no small share of the success of the British and Canadian Governments in dealing with their wards may be attributed to this policy being carefully carried out.¹

NO SESSION
ebrary

NO SESSION
ebrary

— Canadian Governor General Earl Grey
to British Colonial Office, November 13, 1906

The Dominion Governor General Earl Grey was certainly correct when he informed the Colonial Office that the Salish delegates from British Columbia would remember every detail of their August 1906 visit to King Edward VII and that accounts of that encounter would become traditions of the delegates' descendants. Today, memories of that visit, transmitted across several generations, remain prominent in the indigenous versions of the history of Native-newcomer relations in Canada's Pacific province. Lord Grey was also perceptive in anticipating how important honouring official promises would be to building and

NO SESSION
ebrary

maintaining positive future cross-cultural relations. Yet whereas Grey and the Colonial Office assumed that their governments' obligations had been fulfilled when they provided each of the Salish chiefs with the promised signed portraits of King Edward, the chiefs regarded these tokens merely as symbols of the King's much more substantive promises concerning their land and rights. The only question in their minds, and in those of subsequent generations who pondered the matter, appears to have been whether the King himself was complicit in the deception or whether he too was being deceived and dishonoured by nefarious elected officials.

Needless to say, Aboriginal people continue to show great interest in the 1906 delegation, and they maintain alternative versions of what transpired on that hot August day when the monarch of the British Empire met the chiefs who represented the entire indigenous population of British Columbia. According to the official government accounts, in turn reflected in the academic interpretations, the Aboriginal delegates received no political promises from the King for the simple reason that they laid no grievances before him. Rather, they were informed by the High Commissioner's office prior to their audience (on orders from both London and Ottawa) that they were forbidden to discuss politics with the King. But according to accounts circulating within Native communities today, as well as in the accounts of the chiefs as reported in some contemporary newspapers immediately following the royal visit, the King did listen to their political grievances, and what is more, he provided them with assurances that they would be rectified.

Much of the tension within the subsequent history of Native-newcomer relations in Western Canada is a product of these divergent historical accounts. Understanding how and why these divergences developed, and why they persist, requires more than simply comparing and assessing the various historical accounts against some sort of objective measure of truth. It requires accepting that, despite outward appearances of similarity, Native people perceive the world differently than post-Enlightenment-era Europeans and, what is more, that each side engaged in activity and discussions which led the other to perceive them not as they saw themselves, but as the other thought they should, or must, be.

On May 27, 1915, nine years after returning from the historic meeting with King Edward, Cowichan Chief Charlie Isipaymilt



Figure 3.1 Cowichan man holding a portrait of Edward VII, 1915.

addressed the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in British Columbia. Isipaymilt spoke with a conviction that impressed his audience, Native and newcomer alike. In addition to his hereditary prerogatives, Isipaymilt's authority derived in part from his intimate association with Britain's king — the man ostensibly chosen by God to rule the world's largest empire, and the man in whose name both the Indian reserves and the provincial Crown lands of Canada were held. Physical proof of this relationship was manifest in the framed and signed portrait of the King cradled in the arms of the man in full traditional ceremonial regalia standing next to the Cowichan Chief. Raising his arm in the air, with clarity and alacrity Isipaymilt informed the commissioners that what he and the Cowichan people required and expected was the fulfillment of certain promises made to him by the British monarch nine years earlier:

... I went to the King a few years ago to try to get some settlement from the King, and when I got there, the King gave me this photograph. His Majesty promised to do something for us, and said he would send somebody out to look into the matter. The King told me that I need not feel very sorry about these things, as if there was anything he could do[,] anything for me, he would do it. His Majesty promised to give each male Indian on the reserve, 160 acres of land, as this land belongs to us Indians. I hope you will take what I say into consideration and do what you can for us.²

Accompanying Isipaymilt to London were the flamboyant and gregarious Squamish Chief of North Vancouver, Joe Capilano, and the quiet and reserved Shushwap Chief from the Bonaparte Reserve in the B.C. interior, Basil David. Simon Pierre, a young residential school graduate from the Katzie tribe on the lower Fraser River, joined the three Aboriginal elders as translator. Upon returning to Canada, Chief Capilano embarked on a tour of Aboriginal British Columbia. From the northern Nisga'a settlements on the Nass River to the Salish reserves of southern Vancouver Island, Capilano assured indigenous audiences throughout the province that the King supported them in their dispute

with the non-Native usurpers of Aboriginal land and resources.³ According to the western press, who hovered on the fringes of these gatherings seeking to make sense of the newly emerging feeling of province-wide indigenous collective identity and political confidence, Capilano was “believed to have convinced his braves that the King of England is standing on his back, and that, if necessity arises, Ottawa’s authority can be overridden.”⁴

One of the three signed portraits of King Edward featured prominently in the funeral procession on the occasion of Capilano’s death in 1910.⁵ Equally telling is the carving on the marble slab within the stately granite mausoleum where Capilano’s body was laid to rest. Visitors to the site today can still see, in bas-relief, the hands of Capilano and the King of the United Kingdom clasped in a firm handshake. Giant identical totem poles erected on the Squamish reserve and in England, Germany, and the United States, tell the same story in cedar: two hands stretched across the Atlantic beneath a depiction of a spirit singer “petitioning that ... land, fish and hunting” will forever be preserved for Native people.⁶

Accounts of royal promises feature prominently in the oral traditions of indigenous people living in Canada’s Pacific province. Among the most commonly cited are those describing royal assurances of compensation for alienated lands. Certainly, along with concerns over government hunting and fishing regulations and a desire to see the ban on the potlatch lifted, this was the key issue raised in the formal written petition Capilano, Isipaymilt, and David carried with them to London in 1906. Likewise, apparently associated oral traditions currently circulate among families within the two dozen contemporary lower Fraser River Coast Salish Stó:lō communities. Stó:lō First Nations explain that at a great mid-nineteenth-century gathering to celebrate Queen Victoria’s birthday in New Westminster, the colonial governor agreed to a compensation formula that would see one-third of all revenues raised through the alienation of land outside of Indian reserves returned to the Stó:lō, the other two-thirds to be divided equally between the federal and provincial governments.⁷ What these memories collectively reveal is an indigenous understanding of a very special relationship between themselves and the monarchy — a relationship that non-Native Canadians have never appreciated.

The delegates who travelled to London in 1906 seeking promises from King Edward VII were not asking for new protections. Rather, they wanted confirmation that existing royal promises would be honoured. They believed, for example, that during the colonial period of the mid-nineteenth century Governor James Douglas had both verbally and in writing entered a “covenant that all land taken from the Indians should be paid for.”⁸ Nine years later, in his presentation to the Royal Commission, Chief Joe Capilano’s son, Mathias Capilano, made explicit that Douglas had led Natives to believe that the governor spoke with the full authority of the Queen. According to Capilano, Douglas had given the chiefs “the understanding that ... anything that I do, it is the same as if the Queen were doing it herself. Also any thing I say it is the Queen herself that is talking ... And when he put the [survey] posts down, he said, [‘]Now, no one shall take that out, for it is the work of Her Majesty the Queen and not my Self.”⁹

Considered in light of such historical understanding, the 1906 delegation was a desperate effort by British Columbia’s indigenous people to secure confirmation of earlier promises and means to their fulfillment. Two years earlier Chiefs Chilihitza and Louie, from the Douglas Lake and Kamloops bands respectively, had travelled to Europe in the company of a sympathetic French Oblate missionary to attend a conference on Aboriginal languages and literacy.¹⁰ While overseas the chiefs and their Oblate companion secured an impromptu interview with Pope Pius X in Rome before returning to Canada.¹¹

News of Chilihitza and Louie’s success in meeting the pontiff spread quickly through Aboriginal British Columbia. According to the western media, within days of their return, “Hundreds of Indians [were] flocking to the Kamloops reserve to partake in the distribution of 2,000 medals, blessed by His Holiness [the] Pope,” and to examine the 120 stereopticon images of the chiefs’ travels taken with Fr. Le Jeune’s stereo camera.¹² Many other indigenous people throughout the province learned about the sojourn by reading Le Jeune’s travel log, published in the Aramaic-like Duployan shorthand of the Oblate’s Chinook Jargon newspaper, the *Kamloops Wawa*.¹³

Chiefs Chilihitza and Louie’s meeting with Pope Pius proved to be an inspirational event in B.C. Aboriginal history. For strategically minded

Aboriginal leaders it demonstrated that it was possible to bypass local provincial and federal officials and speak directly with powerful European authorities — authorities who ostensibly commanded the respect and even the obedience of those prominent Canadian officials who consistently failed to listen to indigenous concerns and grievances. Anticipating the potential that a successful audience with the British monarchy would have for advancing Native claims and redressing past wrongs, following the 1904 sojourners' return a series of large gatherings was organized in Nanaimo, Quamichan, Vancouver, Kamloops, and other locales throughout British Columbia to discuss strategy. By the early spring of 1906 Joe Capilano had emerged as the leading figure in a wholly Aboriginal-organized and -directed movement to petition King Edward VII. At a large gathering in Cowichan,¹⁴ veteran travellers Chief Chilihitza and Chief Louie were identified to be members of the return expedition, but failing health ultimately prevented both from participating.¹⁵ Instead, Chief Basil David of Bonaparte joined the two coastal chiefs and their young translator to become the delegation's fourth member.¹⁶

Joe Capilano and his companions were determined that their mission would succeed. If the 1904 emissaries, who officially represented only their own relatively impoverished and isolated reserves, had gained the ear of the Pope, then surely delegates speaking on behalf of the entire Native population of British Columbia could gain access to Buckingham Palace. Capilano's designs were overtly political and extremely well conceived. There was nothing naïve about the 1906 delegates' decision to bypass the British Columbia and Canadian governments in their effort to secure fulfillment of earlier promises and to ensure the repeal of restrictive hunting laws and the anti-potlatch provisions of the Indian Act. As the petition they ultimately carried to London explained, "the Dominion government is made up of men elected by white people who are living on our lands, and, of course, we can get no redress from that quarter. We have no vote. If we had it might be different, but as it is we are at the mercy of those who have the vote, and alas! They have no mercy."¹⁷ As such, it is easy to appreciate how Capilano and his associates would come to represent, for non-Native society, a new generation of westernized, practical Native leadership. Yet such rational behaviour did nothing to diminish the fact that in

indigenous eyes Capilano remained a symbol of continuity with the spiritually potent world of their ancestors. As his son Mathias recounted years later in 1939, Chief Capilano was “fiercely proud of his lineage and of his tribal codes and customs.”¹⁸

Among the delegates, Capilano in particular demonstrated deftness in his dealings with not only the Canadian and British press but also a host of political figures. It seems clear that a central aim of the chiefs was to draw attention to the injustice of Canadian Indian policy in British Columbia, and in so doing to embarrass the Dominion into applying the rule of law with consistency in all of its provinces. That the delegates might succeed greatly concerned many non-Native British Columbians who had profited by the alienation of Native lands and the restriction of Aboriginal economic activities. As his comments to the British press immediately before meeting King Edward reveal, Capilano was cognizant of this: “They told me, the white men told me, not to come to the great King ... because he did not like his dusky children. We would never go back to our people alive, they said.”¹⁹ Such opposition had convinced Capilano to play his cards close to his chest.

To build political momentum prior to embarking for London, Capilano teased the Canadian third and fourth estates. In British Columbia, after delivering speeches to sympathetic and enthusiastic indigenous audiences, Capilano routinely told the newspaper reporters that he was as yet unwilling to provide non-Native society with a translation that would reveal the details of his forthcoming mission. The media responded predictably, dogging the Squamish Chief as he travelled from gathering to gathering, pestering him for information. To their chagrin, Capilano remained steadfastly evasive, if ever cheerful.

Indicative of Capilano’s and the press’s mutually enriching relationship is the Native leader’s response to questions posed by the media only days before his anticipated departure. A correspondent for the *Victoria Daily Colonist*, reporting on the final big intertribal gathering in Kamloops before the complete team of delegates boarded a train for the East Coast, observed, “even the most persistent interviewer would fail to gain any inkling of the object of the mission. The Chiefs will talk miles of eloquent Chinook, but when up against the main question it is, ‘Nothing now. By-an-by, when we come back.’”²⁰

If Capilano had intended by his silence to draw attention to his mission he certainly succeeded. Curious members of the non-Native populace lined the streets of Vancouver on the day of the departure to watch as the Aboriginal delegates arrived by canoe from the Squamish reserve on the north shore of Burrard Inlet and then marched through the city streets behind a Native brass band. At the CPR station Capilano delivered a circumspect speech professing B.C.'s Aboriginal peoples' loyalty to the Crown, but still revealing nothing of his objectives beyond his intention to tell the King personally "what his Indian subjects want" and promising to convey the monarch's reply upon his return. It was only when the delegates boarded the train that the media was finally provided the full text of the petition the chiefs were carrying to the King. A complete transcript appeared in B.C. newspapers the following week.²¹

The petition is a remarkable document written in a slightly stilted and awkward prose that reflects the Aboriginal delegates' desire to retain control over all aspects of their mission; that is to say, no sympathetic priest or lawyer penned the text. The pragmatic nature of the address no doubt contributed to the perception among non-Natives that the chiefs were practical, rational individuals not unlike themselves. The petition's authors began by noting that they were aware of and recognized the inequity of Native policy within the Dominion: "In other parts of Canada Indian title has been extinguished, reserving sufficient land for the use of the Indians, but in British Columbia the Indian title has never been extinguished, nor has sufficient land been allotted to our people." The relatively recent discovery of this geographic/jurisdictional inequity, however, was not the precipitator of their grievance, though undoubtedly the chiefs hoped to appeal to the British sense of equity and fair play. Nor was the petition an effort to place before a new king a list of freshly identified grievances. Rather, it was explicitly an attempt to alert the monarch to breaches of the promises made in his mother, Queen Victoria's, name many years earlier. As such, it was both an appeal to the Crown's honour and an effort to reaffirm the intimate familial relationship they had come to believe existed between themselves (as disenfranchised residents of the Canadian Dominion) and the royal family. If, however, this proved inadequate to move the King to action, other rationales were also provided.

The petition raised the issue of political accountability. Without the franchise Native people had no practical way to influence Canadian politicians or to keep them accountable for promises made. The petition also outlined their frustration, as wards of the state, at being excluded from the process of selecting the agents who acted as liaisons between themselves and the representatives of non-Native government. They pointed out the hypocrisy of a system that denied them political influence on the basis of their being “uncivilized” when they could, in fact, meet the criteria that the missionaries and government officials had established. Moreover, the petition appealed to the western liberal notion of self-reliance, explaining that under the current state of affairs in British Columbia, Native people were becoming unable to support themselves.

Ultimately, and significantly, the chiefs recognized that independent evidence would need to be garnered to confirm their oral histories and accusations before the King could or would act: “We are sure that a good man, or some good men, will be sent to our country who will see, and hear, and bring back a report to your majesty.” What they sought, in other words, was a promise from the King that the earlier royal promises, which had established a mechanism for standardizing Native-newcomer relations, would be fulfilled. Put another way, what the delegation ultimately sought was an assurance that corroborating evidence, clearly so important to the validating of Native oral history and grievances in non-Native eyes, would be gathered and presented to the King. Beyond this, they seemed content to rely on the honour of the Crown and the impartiality and integrity of British/Canadian justice — about which they had heard so much — to ensure that amends were made and harmonious interracial relations restored.

Though news of the Aboriginal mission and its objectives were now readily available to anyone reading British Columbia newspapers, politicians and senior bureaucrats in Ottawa claimed to be taken off guard by the delegation’s arrival in the Canadian capital. With the Prime Minister out of town, senior bureaucrats and the minister of Indian Affairs struggled to determine Capilano’s true intentions. In the end, after much probing discussion, the chiefs left Ottawa with little more to show for their efforts than a letter of introduction to High Commissioner Lord Strathcona.²² Coded telegrams, meanwhile, conveyed

Ottawa's guarded request to London that attempts be made to expedite the chiefs' desire to meet the King. As the Salish delegation steamed across the Atlantic, British telegrams darted back across the same expanse asking for clarification from Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier as to whether it was "expedient" to facilitate the meeting, noting that in addition to worries over the chiefs' political intentions, the summer months were particularly busy ones for the King. It was also via telegram that the Colonial Office informed Ottawa that regardless of any directions received from the Canadian prime minister, it was simply "not permissible" for the chiefs to lay grievances before the King.²³

Two days later, on August 4, Laurier's consent had been received and a time set for the chiefs to meet the King. The audience was scheduled for August 14, the day after Edward VII was to return from the royal yachting regatta at Cowes. The High Commissioner's office, however, chose not to inform Capilano, Isipaymilt, and David of these arrangements until August 13, the very eve of the royal audience and just two days prior to the chiefs' scheduled departure on the SS *Manitoba*.

The deception manifest in the High Commissioner's selective communications with the chiefs was part of a broader scheme to politically neutralize the delegation. The Colonial Office and the High Commissioner's office together were concerned over the attention Capilano and his colleagues had attracted since departing Vancouver. Indeed, no sooner had they stepped off the steamer in Liverpool than the chiefs became the object of intense media interest, made all the more potent by the relatively recent introduction of technology allowing newspapers to print photographs. The *Daily Graphic*, one of the most popular of the new image-centred British newspapers, ran a large portrait on August 3 showing all four of the B.C. Natives standing at Euston Station, Capilano and Isipaymilt dressed in their traditional regalia. Beneath, in bold capital letters ran the caption "TO PETITION THE GREAT WHITE KING." Elaborating on the title, a short article noted that among the delegates' concerns was a fear that if their petition was not granted their game preserves would dwindle to such an extent that their "tribes [were] in danger of starving."²⁴ A very similar photo in the same day's edition of the *Daily News* drew attention to the chiefs' assertion that

their sojourn was a desperate last effort to seek reparations from an authority higher than the local provincial and federal officials, from whom “they could obtain no redress.”²⁵

The attention bestowed by the British press, however, was a knife that cut two ways. While the journalists remained interested in the fate of the political mission, the delegation became, over the course of the two weeks, increasingly an entertainment item rather than news. A *Daily News* representative who toured London with Capilano and his team on their first full day in the city devoted slightly more than half of his roughly seven-hundred-word article to a quixotic discussion of how the “four cinnamon-coloured individuals” were awestruck by the greatness of the British metropolis. “Everything in London struck the chief of the Redskins as either too big or too small, too good or too bad,” the reporter noted. The engineering wonders of subways and overhead railway lines were matters Capilano was quoted as finding “too wonderful!” and he wondered whether his wife, children, and friends back on the Squamish reserve would believe his description of such marvels.²⁶

The *Daily News* reporter assumed that, as “Red Indians,” the delegates would be particularly interested in the “wilderness” areas of the capital city. Capilano, ever alert to an opportunity to use humour to play upon stereotypes, did not fail to please the British reading public when upon reaching the centre of the park, halfway between the Marble Arch and Piccadilly, he “drew a deep breath and waving his hands about ... exclaimed ‘What a fine hunting ground!’” The article concluded not with an analysis of Aboriginal policy in Canada, but by a comment that could only serve to diminish the delegates in the public eye: “Chief Joe and his friends are looking forward to a visit to the Hippodrome to see and criticize Dr. Rougumont’s style of turtle riding.”²⁷

Thus, while nervous about the newspapers’ ability to highlight Aboriginal discontent in Canada, Strathcona was also keenly alert to the power of the press to transform political delegates into political caricatures. Certainly the High Commissioner and others in London concerned with the political and economic development of the various British dominions and colonies were familiar with the phenomenon of indigenous people bypassing local authorities and bringing their grievances directly to the British government and public. Certain

indigenous people from other parts of the Empire had earlier made successful trips to London to petition the monarch and Parliament.²⁸ Considered in this context, a key component of Strathcona's strategy for dealing with the B.C. Aboriginal delegates was to use his office's control of the gate to Buckingham Palace to leverage Capilano and the other delegates into modifying their immediate aims of presenting a formal petition — and to let the Fleet Street tabloids take care of the rest.

Strathcona worked with some success to create an impression in the delegates' minds that the High Commissioner's office was their strongest ally in London.²⁹ In addition to facilitating the chiefs' room and board at the Chelsea soldiers' barracks at Buckingham Gate, Strathcona's office also assumed charge of scheduling the chiefs' private time, and in so doing guided and shaped the delegates' views of London — and in turn London's views of the delegates. H.H. Aflingham, a Canadian expatriate and former Vancouver resident who apparently knew Capilano, was engaged by the High Commissioner's office to escort the Aboriginal leaders around London while they waited to hear the result of Strathcona's fictitious negotiations to secure their access to King Edward.³⁰

It is from the accounts of the chiefs' supposed non-political (that is, private) activities that we are provided with glimpses into their world view, and we come to appreciate the extent to which their epistemology differed in significant ways from those of most non-Native Canadians. It was during this time, for example, that Sir Arthur Pearson, the publisher of the *Daily Express* and Strathcona's friend, invited Pauline Johnson, the famous mixed-blood Mohawk-Canadian poet then touring London, to come to Canada House and interview the chiefs.³¹ The Mohawk poet and the Squamish Chief immediately struck up a confidence that later developed into a close friendship when Johnson took up residence in Vancouver after her return to Canada. Johnson presented herself to the chiefs just as she did to the readers of her commissioned articles in the *Daily Express*: as an Aboriginal person who walked comfortably in the non-Native world — as “a pagan in St. Paul's Cathedral” who sought similarities rather than differences between Christianity and indigenous spirituality.³² During their meetings, Capilano shared with Johnson a number of Squamish accounts of creation and ancient transformations. In addition, he also related a tribal tradition

concerning a previously unknown, but immensely significant, aspect of European history. In hushed tones Capilano explained to Johnson that the rise and fall of the famous Napoleon Bonaparte was a result of the Corsican's connection to the Squamish people. Napoleon had acquired the magical "joint of a sea serpent's vertebra," which had previously belonged to a renowned Squamish warrior. According to Capilano, this powerful talisman had found its way to Napoleon after the Squamish had given it to French prisoners of the Russian American Fur Company who were secretly visiting the inland waters of Georgia Strait. The Frenchmen used the amulet to escape their Slavic captors and to return to Europe, where they transferred the object to the ambitious French Emperor. With the serpent's power Napoleon went from victory to victory until, as Chief Capilano recounted in a whisper, with "his face almost rigid with intentness," the "Great French Fighter ... lost his Squamish charm — lost it just before one great fight with the English people."³³

Similarly revealing are the insights into the chiefs' epistemology found in newspaper discussions of such matters as their trip to the London Zoo, their reaction to the city's motor cars, and, in particular, their visit to Westminster Abbey. Each in turn provides clues that potentially offer new ways of appreciating their later assertions of promises from the King.

Clearly the London Zoo was one of the highlights of the chiefs' London field trips. Like the exotic animals in the cages, the delegates were considered objects of fascination worthy of study, if only because, like the rare species gathered from around the world and held behind the bars, they too were perceived as representatives of an exotic, vanishing race. It was at the zoo, a reporter with *The Express* noted, "that a gentleman went up to the interpreter and told him to ask each of the chiefs for a little of tuft of hair. He said he collected the hair of all the different nations but had none of Indian Chiefs." This, however, was more than the B.C. chiefs would tolerate. To this day many Salish people continue to conceive of hair not as inert dead tissue or "flattened fusiform fibers ... [containing] pigment granules or air," as an Edwardian reader of Henry Gray's *Anatomy* might suppose.³⁴ Rather, hair is regarded as an extension of the human form, carrying with it residual spirit power of the person from whom it grew. Shamans with

evil intentions are believed to use carelessly discarded (or surreptitiously acquired) hair to “do bad work” upon people. Outside of the context of predominantly non-Native urban barbershops or hair salons, hair that falls out or is cut off is carefully disposed of to ensure it does not fall into the hands of those who may use it for nefarious purposes. Whether these matters were on the minds of the chiefs in the London Zoo in the summer of 1906 is impossible to know. It is also a possibility that the chiefs understood that the request reduced them from being perceived as human beings to, in effect, curious laboratory specimens. They “looked at the petitioner sternly and refused. ‘He make too free and ask too much.’”³⁵

Beyond the zoo incident, perhaps the greatest insight into the chiefs’ cosmology might be derived from a cultural contextualization of the media’s description of their experiences at Westminster Abbey. Attired in their regalia, Capilano and Isipaymilt drew the attention of the resident clerics who, after the services, led the chiefs and their interpreter through the imposing edifice and adjoining cloister and Chapel House. It was what the reporter for *The Observer* characterized as “the chief objects of interest,” more than either the Episcopalian homily or the renaissance architecture, that impressed the chiefs most. As baptized Catholics they were familiar with churches as places of worship. What appears to have caught the delegates unaware was Westminster Abbey’s role as a nexus of British history and power, for within its walls they encountered the burial places of Britain’s greatest chiefs, and the “transformer stone” that made them so.

According to the reporter, “the Coronation Chair was an object of especial veneration; so also were the tombs of the Royal dead and the shrine of Edward the Confessor,” which the chiefs beheld in “reverent silence.” Attempting to appreciate how the chiefs may have understood these objects involves a certain amount of conjecture. Metaphors, the main tools used to communicate foreign concepts, prove most useful.

Insights into what metaphors the chiefs may have applied to try to understand the Stone of Scone and Edward the Confessor’s shrine might be acquired by reversing the process of cross-cultural communication used by certain contemporary Salish people when they explain their own transformer stones and ancestral spirits to contemporary

non-Native outsiders. The staff cultural adviser at the Stó:lō Nation, Sonny McHalsie, currently spends many days each year speaking with non-Native students, teachers, scholars, and other guests about his Salish cultural heritage. Often McHalsie takes people on bus or boat tours throughout the Fraser Valley and Canyon to visit transformer stones and other sacred sites. In explaining these objects to outsiders he typically employs a series of carefully chosen metaphors. Transformer stones are boulders, but they are also special rocks that hold within them a certain type of spiritual power, namely the spirits or souls of Salish ancestors who were transformed at or near the beginning of time. “They are sort of like the sacred relics and shrines of old Europe,” McHalsie often explains. While McHalsie is not himself Catholic or Christian, he is familiar with much of the imagery used in the Christian discourse and ceremony. “Like the miraculous stories Catholics carry about people long ago being turned into pillars of salt, or of the voice of God appearing from a bush, our ancient stories tell of the spiritual potency of a past age, and of great transformations.” On other occasions, during longer, more intimate discussions, McHalsie has spoken of the analogy between his understanding of Salish residual spirit power and the spiritually potent sites of Lourdes or Fatima — places where spiritual messages and power are communicated.³⁶

Salish people believe that transformer stones were created in a moment of profound metaphysical alteration and that as a consequence they contain within them latent transformative power. That is to say, they can, and do, provide contemporary Salish people with spiritual power, assistance, and energy, which, once acquired, literally transform the human recipient by causing the spiritual essence to be altered. As a result, “winter dancers” who have acquired their spirit helpers and associated songs are considered to be newly born; their age is henceforth counted from the date of their transformation rather than physical birth. Individually, they are regarded as “new people” (indeed, new initiates in the winter dance are referred to in English as “babies”).

The Salish chiefs likely regarded the Stone of Scone within the context of Salish transformer stones. It was upon this stone, the “Stone of Destiny” as they were told, that every British monarch since Edward I had been seated when transformed from a mere mortal into

the king or queen. The facts that the Stone of Destiny was held within a sacred church, not a museum or palace, and that it was described to them by clerics of the Church of England, not tour guides or government officials, could only have reinforced the view of its spiritual significance. The association of the Stone of Scone with Edward I, that is, the *first* Edward, would almost certainly have been understood by the chiefs within the context of their own “first people”—prominent heroes (often referred to in the academic literature as “immortal ancestors”³⁷) who were transformed into stone and whose spirits still influence the living human carriers of those hereditary names within contemporary society.

It is within these cultural contexts that we must consider whether King Edward made a promise or series of promises in 1906. Certainly the evidence is mixed, which makes ethnohistorical contextualization all the more crucial to understanding this event (or non-event). The government records in the Public Record Offices in London, the Royal Archives at Windsor Palace, and the National Archives in Ottawa make no reference to promises having been made by King Edward VII other than a commitment to provide his visitors with signed portraits of himself. What the official records do describe, as has been shown above, are government agents who were at pains to prevent the chiefs from discussing or presenting their grievances to the King. Prior to the Buckingham Palace visit, Simon Pierre and Chiefs Capilano, Isipaymilt, and David were required to meet with Lord Strathcona for two hours, during which time they were told that their audience would be short (the King’s day calendar for August 14 shows that he had scheduled fifteen minutes to meet with “Indian Chiefs from Canada”³⁸), that no petitions could be laid before the King, and that “if they have grievances His Majesty has no control over British Columbia Lands.”³⁹ To ensure compliance with London and Ottawa’s directives, Sir Montagu Ommanney, Permanent Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, was assigned to chaperone the delegates throughout the duration of their royal audience.⁴⁰ Much of the non-official documentary evidence suggests Capilano reluctantly accepted the government’s conditions. In response to the direct question “Has the King granted your petition?”, posed by a correspondent from the London *Daily News* only minutes after returning from Buckingham Palace, Capilano allegedly “shook his head gravely”

and replied, “No the Great White Father has granted no petition because no petition was presented to him.”⁴¹ Historical geographer Robert Galois concluded from this evidence that the chiefs ultimately failed to present their grievances, and were instead compelled to “present their petition through the appropriate channels in Canada.”⁴²

But of course, Capilano’s corroborating statement was made in Strathcona’s presence while sitting in the High Commissioner’s office at Canada House. Other newspaper reports suggest that a written petition was indeed presented, followed by a sympathetic and supportive discussion with the King concerning grievances (perhaps just outside Ommanney’s earshot). Later in the evening of August 14, for example, when back in their private rooms and away from the government officials, the chiefs provided a reporter from the *Daily Express* with a detailed account of their audience. In his report the *Express* correspondent recorded, “The petition was then presented to the King who talked for over a quarter of an hour with the Chiefs. Chief Joseph would not, of course, divulge this part of the interview, but we understood that His Majesty gave his visitors advice as to the best way in which they could get their grievances redressed.”⁴³

The *Daily Mail*, likewise, reported:

His Majesty gave the Chiefs some valuable advice relating to their grievances, which they deeply appreciated. Joe said last night that he would be busy for six months after he got home speaking to great gatherings of the tribes, telling them wonderful stories about the great, good and kind King and Queen, who told them how deeply pleased he was to see representatives of his far Western children. “Yes,” said Joe, smiling and nodding his head, “he called us his children and we are.”⁴⁴

Isipaymilt, the Cowichan delegate, was also satisfied with the audience. The *Canadian Gazette* reported:

... every muscle in [Isipaymilt’s] thickly lined face quivered as he strove to conceal his emotion. “I have prayed to be allowed to live long enough to see the Great White King,” he

said earnestly, “and tell him the wishes of my people. Now I have seen him and my heart beats with joy. Once let me bear the glad news back to the wigwams of my tribes, and I care not how soon death claims me.”⁴⁵

Four years after the epic journey to London, Capilano spoke at length with a reporter from *The Province* outlining his frustration at non-Native denunciations of his accounts of his communications with the King.

They say here that I never saw the Great White Chief in London. They say I make too much of that affair and that I am full of untruth. The men who say such things are little men, the men who have no honour and think all others have no honour also. The big men, the men who deal with real men, know that I speak the truth about all these things. They know that when one chief meets another great chief he not go about telling all the world what they speak ... Great men are silent and honourable.... the Crown is above all and when I go [to] London I speak with the Crown, with the Great White Chief ... We talk with the King and at the end he shake my right hand hard and with his left hand pat my left shoulder three times ... and say “Chief we see this matter righted but it may take a long time, five years perhaps.”⁴⁶

If this array of seemingly contradictory accounts are difficult to reconcile, perhaps alternative explanations for the Aboriginal delegates’ view that the King made them promises may ultimately provide more satisfying explanations for both indigenous and non-Native audiences. Presented here is a speculative hypothesis that involves recognizing that communications and promises need not assume the same form in Salish society as they did in Edwardian Britain to be considered legitimate and valid — that practical and rational understandings are culturally and temporally dependent. As Chief Capilano insightfully articulated to *The Province* correspondent in 1910 when discussing missionary biases toward Aboriginal customs and spirituality, just because Europeans are able to observe Aboriginal behaviour does not

mean they understand it: “They tell you things they have heard, but they do not understand them. If they have seen them they do not understand them, for white men go about with a veil over their eyes and do not think as we think.”⁴⁷

Taking Capilano seriously and at his word, memories of royal promises in London in 1906 may be references to communications with Edward the Confessor (1042–1066) or Edward I (“Longshanks,” 1272–1307) rather than the reigning Edward VII. To the chiefs, who regularly communicated with ancestral spirits of their own, either Edward the Confessor or Edward I (who was, after all, the Confessor’s namesake) would have been as real and sentient as the living king. Indeed, to the extent that Salish people appear to consider ancestor spirits to be incapable or unwilling to deceive, communications of this sort are typically regarded as more reliable than those between two living people. This is not to say that Salish people do not distinguish between communication between two living humans and communication between a living person and the spirit of a deceased person. Rather, they do not consider one of these expressions of communication to be more real or legitimate than another. Certainly, the sacred context in which they encountered both Edward the Confessor’s entombed body and the coronation chair of Edward I while visiting Westminster Abbey, coupled with their earlier experiences with Catholic priests in Canada whom they witnessed regularly supplicating ancestor spirits (saints), could only have reinforced the notion that western society operated in a similar way to their own; distinguishing for English audiences whether they had received a promise from a living or a dead monarch would not have been considered necessary.

In Salish epistemology there would be no meaningful distinction between Edward the Confessor, Edward I, and the current monarch, Edward VII. Both of the earlier Edwards were great men and kings, and although they were not genealogically related they did carry the same name (one having been named by his father, Henry III, in honour of the other). King Henry’s decision to bridge the Saxon-Norman divide by naming his son after the Confessor would have metaphysically linked the two Edwards in the Salish mind. Indeed, today Salish nobles carrying high status hereditary names are not always direct blood relatives of

their namesakes. What matters is peoples' understanding that the person given the name was considered worthy of that honour, and such worthiness is typically justified by saying that the ancestors saw that they are related or connected, even though the living know of no blood ties. As such, communication between the Salish delegates and any of the Edwards would be possible, and indeed communication with the original Edward(s) would have been preferred. More to the point, communication with either of the ancient royal Edwards would have also been considered legitimate and real communication with the contemporary reigning king.

Contemporary oral histories still circulating in Aboriginal communities describing both the 1904 and 1906 European visits make clear that they were understood within the contexts of both politics and metaphysics — both history and legend. Among certain Douglas Lake elders, for example, accounts of the 1904 papal audience describe Pope Pius X performing a particularly miraculous feat. Johnny Chilihitzza, the Nicola delegate who met the Pope, is remembered as a shrewd politician and leader who “got his ‘smarts’ from the Oblates.”⁴⁸ Interestingly, important aspects of Chilihitzza's leadership abilities continue to be assessed in terms of his spiritual qualities. Indeed, a crucial strength of his successor, Felix Gregoire, was the fact that Gregoire's mother had been a prophet who had received messages from the dead describing the future.⁴⁹ When asked specifically about the visit to the Vatican, elders have recently explained that the part of the story that they remember being told was not what the Pope said, but rather his mysterious actions. According to Lottie Lindley, whose aunt subsequently acted as Chilihitzza's translator during discussions with non-Native officials, Chilihitzza and the others were waiting in a special room when the Pope appeared down a flight of stairs. He entered the room, spoke with Chilihitzza and Chief Louie, and then “just vanished.”⁵⁰ Some of the younger people in the Douglas Lake community today think that perhaps this story refers to the Pope sneaking out a hidden doorway. For the elders who remember Chilihitzza, however, “that was the big story of Johnny Chilihitzza.” The story of the vanishing Pope refers to a real act that demonstrates the Pontiff's spiritual power and, by extension, his worthiness.

In a similar manner, among some of the descendants and relatives of Simon Pierre, a story continues to circulate of a wondrous encounter between the chiefs and certain prominent members of the London elite. According to the oral history, representatives of the British government sought to impress the Aboriginal delegates by discussing the power and greatness of Britain during the course of a formal dinner. In response, to demonstrate that the Native delegates were not without their own power, young Simon conjured a small bird that flew in circles four times around his head before disappearing out of a window.⁵¹ Along similar lines, two decades ago Okanagan Elder Harry Robinson related for the anthropologist Wendy Wickwire a marvellous account of a journey made by Coyote (the Interior Salish trickster figure who at the time was half-man, half-animal) to London to negotiate with the King over Native land rights and policy. According to Robinson, the King eventually consented to Coyote's demands that an agreement be written and signed that would forever define the relationship between Natives and newcomers. This "law," as Robinson explained, specifically articulated the King's commitment to protect Aboriginal lands. However, as the years passed and it became apparent that neither the King nor his son after he ascended to the throne ever truly intended to fulfill the promise, a small artificial bird was released in Buckingham Palace that flew around in circles until it landed on the head of the King's granddaughter. As a result, she became queen and eventually fulfilled the royal promise despite Canadian officials' subsequent attempts to thwart her.⁵²

Spirit power, however, was not the only thing remarkable about the relationship between monarch and chiefs. In 1950, Simon Pierre shared memories of his London trip with anthropologist Wayne Suttles, explaining that King Edward had expressed sincere regret over the fact that the delegates had not arrived a few years earlier while his mother, Queen Victoria, was still alive. The Queen would have been most anxious to greet the chiefs herself, Edward allegedly explained, if for no other reason than the fact that she "had a drop of Indian blood in her." How the Queen came to claim Aboriginal ancestry is as mysterious to cultural outsiders as the role of the Squamish serpent's vertebra in Napoleon's conquest of Europe. Equally puzzling, as Suttles points out, is how Edward apparently failed to inherit his mother's bloodline.⁵³ To Pierre, and presumably his travelling

companions, however, Victoria's Native pedigree appears to have made all the more meaningful the oft repeated rhetorical kin ties between the Great White Mother and her Native children. The chiefs did not need to rely on British justice alone to see their grievances addressed, for among Edward's own ancestors they had discovered indigenous people who had shared in their experiences of exploitation and marginalization. Theoretically, such links would have made communication with royal ancestral spirits all the more possible and desirable.

Clearly, a degree of uncertainty shrouds the 1904 and 1906 delegations, but to the extent that deception may have been involved the evidence indicates that the insincerity was on the part of the Canadian and British officials, not the delegates. The different significance both sides assigned to the signed portrait of King Edward reveals much about the way they regarded one another.

History needs to be understood within particular contexts. Historical messages and narratives are conveyed in multiple manners. Both the Aboriginal people and the newcomers had practical, rational goals and expectations concerning the ability to profit and prosper from the exploitation of the land and resources of British Columbia. But the way each side sought to advance its claims and secure its objectives differed, and it is these differences that reveal the extent to which divergent epistemologies and world views account for the confused accounts of the discussion between chiefs and kings in 1906. Indeed, epistemology, as much as economics or politics, begins to explain the variance between western and indigenous understandings of the past — of history. It reveals (and in turn is revealed through) the separate though interpenetrating historiographies that account for the past through culturally prescribed lenses. Native people have been struggling for some time to try to appreciate the western historiography and historical understandings that emerge from both the political and academic western discourses. Historians should not wait for Aboriginal people to explain these matters, for in the past they have tried and they have not been heard. In the spirit of developing an intellectual forum where divergent historical consciousnesses can co-exist and therefore better inform one another, the onus is now on non-Natives to try better to understand the basis of Native historical interpretation.

NOTES

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to the scholarly and intellectual generosity of Albert “Sonny” McHalsie, Clarence Pennier, J.R. Miller, John Lutz, Colin Coates, M.T. Carlson, Barbara Messamore, Wendy Wickwire, and Judith Binney for their helpful and insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper. I also deeply appreciate the assistance and guidance of the many Salish Elders and cultural experts who have assisted me in learning about their cultural history, especially, in terms of the specific content of this paper, Gwendolyn Point, Steven Point, Rena Bolten, Patricia Charlie, Wesley Sam, Ken Malloway, Jimmie Charlie, Danny Charlie, Josie Saddleman, Louis Lindley, Virginia Lindley, Sharon Lindley, Issac Lindley, Lottie Lindley, and Brenda Lynn Jorgesen. Research on this paper was made possible in part through funding from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

- 1 Public Record Office [hereafter PRO], Colonial Office, C.O. 42/907, Original Correspondence for 1906 Governor General Earl Grey to Colonial Office, 13 November 1906.
- 2 Charlie Isipaymilt, “Testimony before the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in the Province of British Columbia, 27 May 1913”, BC, Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia, *Evidence*, (Victoria: Acme Press 1916), hearings at Cowichan, May 27, 1913.
- 3 On May 15, 1908, the provincial Attorney General’s office filed a report outlining concerns over Joe Capilano’s continuing political activities in light of his trip to London, and B.C. Indian Superintendent A.V. Vowell considered having the Squamish Chief arrested after “unrest” among the Nisga was traced to Capilano’s oratory and assurances of the King’s support for Native rights. BC Archives, Attorney General, GR-0429, Box 16, File 1, Folio 4169/08, “Joe Capilano Agitation at Hazelton”; also *Ibid.*, Folio 4381/08, “Indians at Hazelton”.
- 4 “Cowichan Indians in Restless Mood: Alleged That Tribal Discontent is Aroused Through Oratory of Joe Capilano”, *Victoria Daily Colonist* (8 May 1907), 3.
- 5 James W. Morton, *Capilano: The Story of a River* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1970), 31.
- 6 Edward Green, “The Squamish Totems”, *The Beaver: A Magazine of the North*, Outfit 270, No. 1 (June 1939): 37. Green quotes Joe Capilano’s son, Chief Mathias Capilano, explaining the pole’s symbols.

- 7 Promises of compensation attributed to both Governor James Douglas and his successor, Frederick Seymour, are cited by numerous Stó:lō Chiefs testifying before the Royal Commission between 1913 and 1915. The promises are also referred to in the 1908 and 1911 petition to Ottawa signed by Stó:lō Chiefs, among others. These accounts still circulate in the Stó:lō communities today. Among certain Stó:lō families, however, the promise is remembered as being for one-quarter rather than one-third of the funds raised. “Outside promises” are the subject of much debate in other Canadian jurisdictions. In 1880, Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba Alexander Morris investigated Aboriginal assertions that promises beyond those contained in the final treaty documents had been made to Canadian prairie Natives during the negotiations of Treaty One and Treaty Two. The Privy Council ultimately decided to acknowledge and accept the oral history after it was corroborated in a memorandum written by the government’s negotiators themselves. See Hon. Alexander Morris, P.C., *The Treaties of Canada and the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories Including Negotiations on Which They Were Based, and Other Information Relating Thereto*, (Toronto: Belfords, Clark & Co., 1880), 126–7. I am grateful to my colleague J.R. Miller for drawing my attention to this source.
- 8 A reporter for the *Vancouver Province* relating a conversation with the 1906 delegates under the title “Indians Ask [for] More Compensation” *Vancouver Province* (14 July 1906). As they explained in broken English to the *Canadian Gazette* reporter in Ottawa, “Victoria long time Queen. Indians give land to her.” “Stray Points”, *Canadian Gazette* (2 August 1906): 411. See also, National Archives of Canada [hereafter NA], Indian Affairs, RG10, Vol. 11021, File 520C, “Statement of the Scowlitz Band to the Honourable Members of the Royal Commission,” 1915.
- 9 NA, Indian Affairs, RG 10, Vol. 11020, File 5208, Chief Mathias Joe and other Squamish men, to the Royal Commissioners, 8 March 1915.
- 10 Personal communication with Brenda Lynn Jorgesen, Research Coordinator, Upper Nicola Band, 27 June 2003.
- 11 *Victoria Daily Colonist* (15 November 1904). The *Colonist* reports that Chilihitza and Louie actually met Edward VII, but this is incorrect as Chief Morrison, who later accompanied Chilihitza and Louie to Ottawa on another delegation in 1908, explained in a letter to the *Ottawa Free Press* that was picked up by the *Daily News-Advertiser* in Vancouver: “They went to the Old Country; but did not see His Majesty, so they went over to Rome to Pope Leo XIII, and they succeeded in an interviewer with His Holiness.

But not with His Majesty.” Moreover, the daily travel log of the 1904 journey published by Fr. Le Jeune in the *Kamloops Wawa*, as well as the extant oral histories I was able to acquire from descendants of the two chiefs in the summer of 2003, make no reference to a royal audience. There is still some degree of confusion concerning the details, however, for the newspaper account mentions Pope Leo XIII, who died in 1903.

- 12 Thus far I have been unable to track down these images.
- 13 See *Kamloops Wawa*, XIII, 2 (September 1904); *Ibid.*, XIII, 3 (December 1904). I am grateful to David Robertson, a graduate student in linguistics at the University of Victoria for transliterating and transcribing excerpts of these editions of the *Wawa* from Duployan shorthand into English.
- 14 George Shankel, “The Development of Indian Policy in British Columbia”, (Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1945), 193.
- 15 *Victoria Daily Colonist* (6 and 13 July 1906).
- 16 “Indian Chiefs Speak Good Words”, *The World* (14 July 1906), 7.
- 17 *Vancouver Daily World* (4 July 1906).
- 18 Green, “The Squamish Totems,” 36.
- 19 “Redskins To See The King — Chiefs Go to Buckingham Palace Today”, *Daily Express* (13 August 1906).
- 20 *Victoria Daily Colonist* (13 July 1906).
- 21 See *Ibid.*, (6 July 1906). All quotes from the petition in the following paragraphs are taken from this source.
- 22 “Indian Chiefs Speak Good Words”, *The World* (14 July 1906).
- 23 PRO, C.O. 42/908, Earl of Elgin to Governor General Earl Grey, 2 August 1906.
- 24 “TO PETITION THE GREAT WHITE KING: THE INDIANS WHO HAVE ARRIVED IN LONDON FROM CANADA TO ASK KING EDWARD TO PROTECT THEIR GAME RESERVES”, *Daily Graphic* (3 August 1906).
- 25 “North American Indians to See The King”, *Daily News* (3 August 1906).
- 26 *Ibid.*
- 27 *Ibid.*
- 28 Neil Parsons, *King Khama Emperor Joe and the Great White Queen: Victorian Britain through African Eyes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
- 29 The *Vancouver Province* reported that Capilano had explained to representatives of the British Press that he and his travelling companions were pleased to discover that they had much in common with Lord High Commissioner Strathcona: he was a “mighty chief and hunter himself,” and they “were sure of his sympathy.” (14 August 1906).
- 30 “Redskins See the King”, *Daily Express* (14 August 1906).

- 31 Charlotte Gray, *Flint and Feather: The Life and Times of E. Pauline Johnson, Tekahionwake* (Toronto: Harper Flamingo Canada, 2002), 322–7.
- 32 Quoted in *Ibid.*, 326.
- 33 E. Pauline Johnson, *Legends of Vancouver* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986 [1911]), 141–9.
- 34 Henry Gray, *Anatomy of the Human Body* (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1966), originally published in London in 1858 under the title *Anatomy, Descriptive and Surgical*.
- 35 “Redskins see the King”, *Daily Express* (14 August 1906).
- 36 McHalsie and I were colleagues at the Stó:lō Nation office from 1992 through 2001. I was privileged to witness and sometimes assist in his cross-cultural explanations.
- 37 See Jay Miller, *Lushootseed Culture and the Shamanic Odyssey: An Anchored Radiance* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).
- 38 Edward did not keep a personal diary, and there appears to be no official minutes or notes taken of his conversations with the Salish leaders. Personal communication with the chief archivist of Windsor Palace Archives, February 2001.
- 39 PRO, C.O. 42/907, Coded telegram from Governor General Earl Grey to High Commissioner Lord Strathcona. Also, “Great White King” *Daily Chronicle* (14 August 1906).
- 40 PRO, C.O. 42/907, Governor General Earl Grey to High Commissioner Lord Strathcona, 4 August 1906.
- 41 “Great White Father – Red Indians at Buckingham Palace – ‘Chief Joe’ Exultant” *The Daily News* (14 August 1906), 7. The *Daily Chronicle* also reports that the chiefs were not allowed to speak of the real reason for the visit. “Great White King” (14 August 1906). See also descriptions of the Royal Audience in “The King and the Indian Chiefs”, *The Morning Post* (14 August 1906); “Kind Indian Chiefs”, *Victoria Daily Colonist* (31 August 1906); “A Present for the Queen”, *Daily Gazette* (15 August 1906).
- 42 Robert Galois, “The Indians Rights Association, Native Protest Activity and the ‘land question’ in British Columbia, 1903–1926” *Native Studies Review* 8, 2 (1992): 7.
- 43 “Ceremonial Dress”, *Daily Express* (14 August 1906). The Royal Archives at Windsor Castle contains no reference to a petition being presented to the King, but neither does it have any evidence that a petition was not given. The only record of the chiefs’ visit is a notation of a fifteen-minute audience in King Edward VII’s day calendar. Other sources also

describe Capilano as giving the Queen three small cedar baskets woven by his twelve-year-old daughter, Emma, along with a note from Emma and a photograph of the Chief and his daughter. Windsor Castle archivists report that they cannot find the baskets, note, or photographs. They offer as an explanation that the royal family has received so many gifts that numerous ones have simply vanished without record. They also point out that during air raids in the Second World War some records and artifacts were destroyed or lost during efforts to relocate them to safer locations. Personal communication, February 2001.

44 “Good, Kind King”, *Daily Mail* (14 August 1906).

45 “The King and the Indian Chiefs”, *Canadian Gazette* (16 August 1906).

46 *The Province, Magazine Section* (26 March 1910), quoted in Morton, *Capilano: The Story of a River*, 32, 34. In similar detail, four years earlier at the time of the visit to London, *Lloyd’s Weekly News* quoted Capilano stating that the monarch had promised to look into the issue of fishing and hunting rights, although he cautioned that it might take as long as five years to sort out. Gray, *Flint and Feather*, 326. *Lloyds* also reported that the delegates received gold medallions from the King and Queen on which were the monarch’s images. These medallions, worn like medals, are visible on Capilano’s and Isipaymilt’s chests in the photo taken of them in Vancouver on their return from London.

47 Quoted in Morton, *Capilano: Story of a River*, 36.

48 Conversation with Lottie Lindley, 3 July 2003, Upper Nicola Band Research Office.

49 Conversation with Isaac Lindley, 3 July 2003, Upper Nicola band Research Office.

50 Conversation with Lottie Lindley, 3 July 2003, Upper Nicola Band Research Office.

51 Conversation with Steven Point, 14 February 2001.

52 I am indebted to Wendy Wickwire for making available to me this story from among her vast collection of unpublished recordings of Robinson, and to the late Harry Robinson himself for agreeing to share his knowledge with outsiders.

53 Personal communication with Wayne Suttles, 19 June 2003.