

REVIEW OF "DERIVATION EASTMAIN-OPINACA-LA GRANDE - PREMIER
RAPPORT D'ENVIRONNEMENT SUR LES PARTIES AVAL DES RIVIERES DETOURNEES",
CULTURAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS

by Harvey A. Feit
for the Technical Support Team IQA/NQIA

August 19, 1974.

This review undertakes to examine the James Bay Energy Corporation's report "Derivation Eastmain-Opinaca-La Grande. Premier rapport d'environnement sur les parties aval des rivières détournées", from the perspective of cultural, social and economic sciences. The review does not undertake an alternative interpretation of the development, nor does it introduce new data. The aim rather is to evaluate the JBEC report from within the perspective of its own aims, and from within the limitations of the data cited by or publicly available to the author(s).

Before undertaking the examination however, it is important to note that I do not agree with the limited aims the author(s) of the JBEC accepted in writing this report. I am in whole-hearted agreement with my colleagues who have already indicated in their reviews of the JBEC report that the omission of consideration of the impacts of the construction period, and the omission of consideration of the effects upstream from the points of diversion, seriously limit the value of the report. I further agree with my colleagues that the major human impacts of the project are those which affect the livelihood and way of life of the native peoples resident in the area.

The JBEC report begins and ends with human factors, so I will address this review to the first chapter and the conclusions of the report. I will leave the review of the main body of the report to colleagues better qualified than I in the relevant disciplines. My comments will be directed to two levels: 1) the methodological and factual aspects of the state of knowledge section on the 'aspect humain', (section 1.1 of the report); and 2) the logical and analytical relationship of human impact statements to environmental description and assessment.

I. The State of Knowledge on the 'Aspect Humain'.

The main body of the first chapter of the JBEC report is devoted to an evaluation of the respective values of traditional subsistence production and cash revenues in the overall economy of the Eastmain Cree people. I will review the various steps in the analysis.

A. Trapping

The report reviews the use of the dozen traplines in the limited geographical area under consideration for the period from 1961-62 to 1972-73, and reaches two basic conclusions about trapping. First, that on most traplines there was a decrease in trapping intensity during the period, and where there was an increase, it was weak (JBEC, 1974: 24). Second, that the most intensively used traplines are those directly on James Bay, in the basin of the Cold Water River, and the basin of the Fishing River (JBEC, 1974: 24 and 135).

- i) With regard to the decline in trapping activity the text reports that the average number of trappers per year was less during the period from 1967-68 to 1972-73 than during the period from 1961-62 to 1966-67, on the traplines registered in the Rupert Preserve and on those registered in the Vieux-Comptoir Preserve. These figures appear on Table 7 (JBEC, 1974: 21).

However, calculations based on the data presented in Table 8 (JBEC, 1974: 22) present a contrary view of trapping intensity. During the first six year period, 1961-62 to 1966-67, the average annual total harvest of beaver on the 13 traplines listed on the table was 426, compared to 519 during the next six year period, 1967-68 to 1972-73, see Table A appended to this review. This represents an increase in the annual beaver harvest of 21.8 percent, comparing the two periods.

Looking at the trends on individual traplines, the average number of trappers, as reported on Table 7, drop during the second six-year period on 8 traplines, and rises on 4. The trends in average catches

of beaver by trapline, calculated from Table 8, increase in the second six-year period on seven traplines and decline on six, see Table A. Some of these specific increases can be seen to be quite substantial.

The actual harvest of animals is the most direct measure available of the intensity of trapping. Unfortunately, the statistics on fur-bearing animals are available by trapline only for beaver; but, as the JBEC report indicates, the beaver represents 66 percent of the catches for the period under consideration and 66 percent of the total value of furs (JBEC, 1974: 24 and 23, Table 9).

The difference in the trends in the average number of hunters using the traplines, and the number of beaver caught on the traplines would require a detailed study for explanation. The data indicates that there has been a shift in the pattern of trapping activity, with fewer trappers going out but with those that do go out capturing more beaver in total, and consequently more per trapper. A working hypothesis to explain this trend might be that the transportation costs have risen sufficiently so that trappers have reduced their numbers and increased their per trapper and total harvests to cover their costs.

The critical point to be noted is that in terms of the intensity of trapping, rather than the decline claimed in the JBEC report, there has been an overall and fairly widespread increase in the intensity of trapping, as measured by the size of the harvest of beaver. The claims of a decline in trapping intensity made in the JBEC report are not confirmed by the relevant data, which are reported but not analysed or interpreted in the report.

- ii) With regard to the location of intensively used traplines - the report lists the location of these traplines as "ceux qui donnent directement sur la baie ou qui s'inscrivent dans le bassin de la rivière à l'Eau Froide, le bassin de la rivière la Pêche et à la confluence des rivières Opinaca et Eastmain" and as "ceux qui donnent directement sur la baie ou qui s'inscrivent dans le bassin de la

rivière à l'Eau Froide et le bassin de la rivière à La Pêche" (JBEC, 1974: 24 and 135 respectively). No actual citations of trapline numbers accompany these claims.

Table B lists the traplines in decreasing order of the average number of trappers using the trapline from 1967-68 to 1972-73, using figures from Table 7, page 21 of the JBEC report. On Table B, I also note those traplines that include a part of at least one shore of diverted rivers, the Eastmain, Opinaca and Little Opinaca Rivers, and those that include a part of the shore of James Bay, a part of the shores of the Cold Water River, or a part of the shores of the Fishing River.

The Table indicates that the three highest ranking traplines (VC33, VC23 and RE3A) all include part of at least one shore of one of the three diverted rivers, down stream of the diversion, and the second ranking trapline VC23 includes the site of the diversion of the Opinaca River. By contrast the traplines that include a part of the shore of James Bay rank 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 8th in the list. Those that include a part of the shores of the Cold Water River rank 3rd and 11th, and those that include a part of the shores of the Fishing River rank 4th, 5th and 8th on the list.

Furthermore, as the JBEC report indicates on page 24, the yields per square mile on the traplines in the Vieux-Comptoir reserve are almost all superior to the yields of the most productive trapline in the Rupert-Eastmain section (see JBEC, 1974: 22, Table 8), and it is the area north of the Eastmain River in the Vieux-Comptoir preserve that is most affected by the diversion plan.

In short, there is no evidence cited in the report in support of the claims made concerning the locations of the most intensively used traplines, and the data provided that appears relevant leads to a conclusion contrary to that cited by the authors, namely that the traplines used by the largest number of trappers are those adjacent to the diverted rivers. This raises serious doubts about some of the conclusions of the JBEC report regarding impacts on trapping, where the evaluation of the relative importance of the

different trapline locations is used in the assessment.

In both of the claims the author(s) of the JBEC report make concerning trapping, they have failed to use the data they themselves cite to reach their conclusions, and their conclusions misrepresent the significance of the data they do provide.

B. Hunting and Fishing

- i) In regard to fishing, the report cites the data of N. Elberg reported in Salisbury, et. al., 1972b, but the figures do not correspond to those in the published edition. This is apparently due to the fact that the figures provided by Elberg cover a period of 15 months. Revision to a 12 month base accounts for the discrepancy, but transformation of publicly available data demands comment and explanation.
- ii) In regard to hunting, the results of a study, apparently made by the Department of Tourism, Fish and Game, are cited for the year 1968-69. The report contains no discussion of how these data were gathered. Such explanation is to be expected if a scientific evaluation of the data is to be made.

This is important because the report does not make any use of the publicly available estimates of the harvests of the Eastmain Cree for 1971-72, namely the study by N. Elberg made for the James Bay Task Force of the IQA-NQIA under the direction of R.F. Salisbury. Indeed, no mention is made of these data on hunting and trapping harvests, although the fishing results are cited in that section. The JBEC report also uses the average live weight and edible weight estimates for the various species that were used in the Elberg study, and other parts of the same report (Salisbury, et. al., 1972b), but the citations for these estimates refer only to "Professeur Salisbury de l'Université McGill" (JBEC, 1974: 23, Table 9, Footnote 3, and 26, Table 10, Footnote 3).

The JBEC report offers no justification for the extraordinary procedure of assuming the 1971-72 hunting results were identical

to those of 1968-69 (JBEC, 1974: 27) despite the obvious discrepancies with the available data for 1971-72, from Elberg. The difference in the total edible pounds of meat between the two sets of figures is significant; the Elberg figures are on the order of 350 percent higher (see Table C appended to this review).

If the author(s) choose not to use the Elberg hunting and trapping harvest data they should have: acknowledged its existence; provided information on how the 1968-69 data was gathered by the Department of Tourism, Fish and Game; offered an evaluation of the respective qualities of the data from each of the studies; and, justified the use of 1968-69 data to estimate 1971-72 catches. In the context of the fishing results, the report comments that the Elberg data should be considered with prudence because they are the result of a partial and short study made closely with the Indians. This warning is well advised. But the question remains whether the data that are cited in the JBEC report should be considered with less or with more prudence.

The report disguises the author(s) decision not to refer to the Elberg data for 1971-72, and it therefore offers no evidence in support of the low figures it cites from 1968-69.

- iii) This questionable procedure for estimating hunting results is also made all the more doubtful by the fact that Table 10, entitled "Chasse totale à Eastmain, 1968-69", and Table 9, entitled "Piégeage Total à Eastmain Pendant 1971-72" completely omit any mention of the snowshoe hare, as well as citing no bear catches. The hare is the fourth most valuable species hunted or trapped, by total pounds of edible meat provided, according to the data given by Elberg (see Table C).
- iv) The considerable discrepancy between the statistics of fur pelts recorded as sold by the Department of Tourism, Fish and Game, and the kills estimated on the basis of reports by trappers interviewed by Elberg is neither noted nor discussed. On Table C both sets of figures are reproduced.

Reasons for such discrepancies were cited by J. and K. Hyman in an earlier section of the Salisbury, et. al. report (1972b).

They list:

- a) sale of pelts locally or through other sources,
- b) use of pelts by trappers themselves,
- c) reporting of young animals and others caught for food where the fur is not worth preparation for sale,
- d) damage to pelts in storing and preservation (Salisbury, et. al. 1972b: 18).

While no analysis of the comparative importance of the factors is made by the Hymans, consideration of such factors when using fur sales statistics as estimates of total trapping harvests is to be expected. Any and all of the factors mentioned above would lead to fur sales statistics being under-estimates of the actual numbers of animals trapped and available for food. The JBEC report gives no consideration to these problems.

In summary, the treatment of native harvesting is not comprehensive and a number of serious omissions are apparent. Readily available public data are not used even when they are immediately relevant, nor is there a considered evaluation of the data that is cited.

C. The Value of the Subsistence Produce

- i) The report gives no consideration to the full range of human and cultural values that are part of the Cree use of the living resources of the James Bay Region. Extensive studies have documented the cultural value of the hunting, fishing and trapping way of life and of the products derived therefrom to the Cree at Mistassini, Waswanipi, Rupert House and Fort George, but the JBEC report fails to consider this aspect of the human environment.
- ii) Consideration of the material value of the subsistence resources fails to evaluate the specific nutritional qualities of the food harvested. The consumption of internal organs of animals freshly killed, provides important quantities of certain vitamins and trace elements critical for a balanced diet and good health. In

some cases the fresh animal organs are the major source of these nutritional elements, and other imported food products are wholly inadequate sources. It should be noted also that increased importation of frozen meats and other products would not readily replace this source. There are then special nutritional values of harvested food resources that the report fails to evaluate.

- iii) The sole value that the authors place on the meat provided by subsistence activities is a cash value. Here the minimum price used is the "prix coûtant du boeuf en 1970-71" or \$0.90/lb., and the maximum price used is the "prix de vente moyen du boeuf à Montréal, en fevrier 1973", or \$1.14/lb. In the summary calculations an average of the two prices, or \$1.02/lb. is used. There is no discussion of the assumptions made in such calculations.

Store purchased beef is not the equivalent of the food the Eastmain people get from their harvesting activities, and any price established on such a basis will be an under estimate of the total value of such food. However, even if the price of purchasable food is used as a starting point for cash evaluation, Montreal prices are meaningless. Transportation and other costs must be added to any product before it is sold locally in northern centers. If a cash evaluation of the locally harvested food resources possibly affected by development is to be made, it must consider the actual local costs at Eastmain of items that for purposes of the calculation are to be treated as starting points for evaluation of the locally harvested foods. As an example of the scale of difference involved, I purchased frozen T-bone steak at the Hudson's Bay Company Store at Eastmain in June, 1974 for \$3.50/lb. I do not propose that this price be used, but that an analysis is needed that takes account of the situation at Eastmain, so that the real extent of damages the people of Eastmain would suffer if their bush food were reduced can be evaluated, and so the possibilities that may realistically be available to them in the future, should there be a reduction in their bush food, can be assessed.

D. The Composition of Revenues

Table 5 in the JBEC report summarizes the author(s) evaluation of the total revenues and the revenue per capita and per family of the Cree people at Eastmain. The figures are taken directly from those presented by Rita Dionne Marsolais during the Superior Court hearings in the case of Chief Robert Kanatewat, et. al. vs. The James Bay Development Corporation, et. al.

- i) The transfer payments figures included in the JBEC report were criticized in the judgement of Mr. Justice Albert Malouf who wrote:

"The reasons given by this witness in support of this method of calculation are not valid. To include in the revenue of an individual the amount which is expended by a municipality or other government agency for the maintenance of streets, sidewalks and so forth is contrary to good sense and logic. Why should such calculation be made to apply to the Cree Indian and Eskimo population when such a calculation has never, to my knowledge, been made with respect to the revenue of any other individual in this country. I do not accept the pretention of this witness in this respect" (Malouf, 1973: 51-52).

The present report uses these same figures without comment or defense. This uncritical use of publicly faulted figures is not acceptable. This is especially the case because of the very substantial size of claimed transfer payments; for example, \$215,458 in 1971-72, 70 percent of the total cash incomes or 66 percent of the total incomes claimed by the JBEC report.

From a reading of the judgement in the Superior Court it appears that Mr. Justice Malouf would remove the transfer payments figure entirely from the calculation of incomes. My view is that that part of government transfer payments which are made in cash or in kind to the individual so as to increase his/her disposable income is legitimately included in the family and personal revenue calculations. For Eastmain this would include: welfare payments, family allowances, old age security benefits, manpower adult retraining

allocations, and social assistance payments. For 1971-72, the respective figures from exhibit I-153 produced by Rita Dionne Marsolais during the Superior Court hearing are - \$63,000.00, \$8,568.00, \$19,800.00, \$36,374.40 plus \$2,337.00, and \$3,567.53 respectively, for a total of \$142,254.93. This represents 66.0 percent of the figure quoted for 1971-72 transfer payments in the JBEC report, and it reduces the cash income total for 1971-72 by 23.8 percent, and the total revenues for 1971-72 by 22.4 percent. These calculations would bring the transfer payment calculations into line with standard research practices.

In any case, the public criticism of the figures cited in the JBEC report demands that detailed explanations and justifications be provided for the continued use of these figures.

It must also be noted that each of the composite figures cited in the transfer payments list in the previous paragraph is somewhat above the values calculated by other researchers (cf. Salisbury, 1972b). The differences may be the result of basing calculations on the population as listed on the Eastmain band list as opposed to basing the calculations on the actual resident population.

Not true

Family allowances, for example, are paid to the residential schools while children are in residence, rather than to the parents, and thus should not be included in Eastmain incomes. A detailed evaluation of these differences would require precise data on how the figures cited in the JBEC report were calculated.

- ii) The figures cited in the JBEC report for salaried income, \$78,319 for 1971-72 (JBEC, 1974: 14, Table 5) is also in need of careful examination, which cannot be undertaken without a detailed account of how this item is arrived at. The item is the same as that listed in the exhibit I-153 presented by Rita Dionne Marsolais in the Superior Court hearings. The \$50,514.07 component of this item attributed to non-governmental employment, is not adequately accounted for, and does not correspond to the information generally available (see Salisbury, et. al. 1972a, and 1972b).

The treatment of the composition of cash revenues in the JBEC report is

characterized by a use of highly suspect figures which were publicly condemned and which the report does not offer justifications for, make critical comments on, or provide detailed explanations of.

E. Minor Comments

The following errors and ambiguities were noted in the text of section 1.1:

- i) Given the definition of the area under consideration in the JBEC report (JBEC, 1974: 16, Figure 6) it is not clear:
 - a) why trapline RE6 is included in Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8?
 - b) why trapline VC36 is included in Table 6 and Table 8?
 - c) why trapline VC35 is not included in Table 6?

In Table 8,

- ii) the sub-total and total of the Vieux-Comptoir traplines for 1971-72 has been incorrectly added and should be 165 and 273, not the figures (185 and 293) that now appear in the table.
- iii) The values of fishing and hunting as percentages of total revenues for 1971-72 are incorrect and appear to have been reversed, in both the text (JBEC, 1974: 27) and the pie diagram (JBEC, 1974: 28).

F. Conclusions

Each error or omission cited in sections A through D above is either in the direction of lowering the estimate, or relative importance, of the dependence of the Cree people of Eastmain on the land and the living resources of the area, or is neutral on this point. This gives the appearance that the author(s) have written the report from the position of defending of some pre-conceived evaluation of the importance of those resources, namely that there is little dependence on subsistence resources. Although the report clearly demonstrates that the Eastmain people do not live solely off the land, the errors and omissions are so serious that the report does not give a satisfactory scientific analysis of the actual extent of present day dependence.

II. The Relationship of Human Impact Statements to Environmental Description and Assessment.

Although entitled "Derivation Eastmain-Opinaca-La Grande. Premier Rapport

d'Environnement....", this report in fact goes beyond a purely environmental description and makes an assessment of environmental changes that will be the result of diversion of the Eastmain and Opinaca Rivers, and further states conclusions on the human impacts of the Eastmain diversion. It does this despite a partial disclaimer with reference to "aspects sociologiques" (JBEC, 1974: 138). This effort to deal with the human impacts is entirely appropriate as environmental descriptions and assessments are made precisely because one or more human interests are involved and affected.

The discussion of the human impacts is however far from adequate. For an environmental impact assessment to be related to human interests and needs, a detailed assessment must be done incorporating cultural, social and economic studies. Without such an assessment it is not possible to know the significance of any change in a given environment for human populations dependent on resources of that environment. Apparently the authors feel that once environmental changes are predicted, the human implications will be apparent. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In the JBEC report there is a confusion between statements of environmental changes and statements of human impacts. For example, section 4.1.2 entitled "Impacts du projet", "Les activités traditionnelles" in fact only discusses the environmental resources themselves, and whether their productivity will be reduced or enhanced or will return to the same level after development. No mention is made here of human use of resources. Later on in sections 4.2 and 4.3 the native people and the resources they actually use are listed in part, but when the actual "Impacts du projet par rapport aux populations de référence" are discussed (section 4.4), the results are summarized in six points on one-half a page. Such a brief treatment is clearly inadequate.

Resources are not used just because they are there. They must be valued and in "short supply", there must be suitable knowledge, manpower and technology available, and their use must be compatible or, at least, integratable with other aspects of the way of life of a people, before a resource is used. The James Bay Energy Corporation has clearly made such assumptions and evaluations in its own arguments for developing the hydroelectric project based on the technology, knowledge, manpower, values, and way of life of southern Québécois.

It is therefore all the more striking that while this report states conclusions on the human implications of changes in the environmental resources used by the native people, the author(s) offer no discussion whatever of the principles, values and factors critical in the resource use of the native people. The use of resources by any people is based on a complex of factors and cannot be treated as if it is a simple function of the resources themselves.

Harvesting living resources usually means that people carefully determine the balance of the costs of and benefits derived from their harvesting activities. The harvesting activities are part of a complex structure of cultural values and social and economic behavior. Many interrelated factors must be evaluated and brought into relation in order to harvest resources. The costs and benefits must be carefully weighed. For example, the costs of manpower in transportation time, harvesting time, preparation time, and the cash costs, relative to the technology available for harvesting, storing and transportation, must be balanced against the benefits in terms of the subsistence needs and demands, specific nutritional values, material required for local production, cash income, and the cultural and personal satisfactions attained.

A pattern of resource use is a complex pattern with many components, and the outcomes are the result of a complex and delicate balance of factors. A change in any factor can significantly alter the pattern of resource use. How this complex of factors and decisions will apply if there are any changes in the conditions is not readily apparent and can only be predicted if careful studies and evaluations of current resource use patterns are made. The JBEC report includes no such evaluations.

This point may be clarified by a couple of straightforward examples that illustrate the kinds of factors and analysis that need to be taken into consideration. The two examples attempt to make clear how apparently minor changes to the living resources of an environment can have many ramifications, and can be critical in determining if a whole seasonal pattern of resource use will remain viable.

The use of a given trapline today is often significantly influenced by the cash cost of transportation to the trapline. Where traplines are sufficiently distant from settlements the transportation costs per family are relatively

high and the return of pelts per hunter is a critical factor that determines when that trapline will be used. Beaver is the single most important pelt caught for cash value and the capture of beaver in a given area is largely determined by the time cost of travelling to and visiting beaver lodges. The result of the interaction of these two factors is that any significant change in the distribution of beaver, especially in relation to the larger waterways that are the summer and winter pathways through the bush, can significantly alter the extent to which beaver can be harvested, and the extent to which a trapline may be profitable to use, and hence the intensity of use of all of the resources of a given trapline. This is independent of any change in the actual productivity of beaver populations.

The second example is the particular integration of subsistence activities during the fall. A delay in the time of whitefish runs could easily cause a conflict with the goose hunting season. Under some conditions the two activities might occur at the same time but at different places, under other conditions the two activities might take place simultaneously in the same area but there might be a shortage of manpower necessary to fully utilize both resources simultaneously. Thus a small change in the timing of the whitefish runs, a possibility mentioned in the review of the JBEC report by J.A. Spence, could significantly alter the useability of the whitefish and geese resources. In both of these cases relatively small changes to the distribution of animals or the timing of animal movements may have significant impacts on a seasonal pattern of resource use practiced by Cree hunters.

Conclusions stated in the JBEC report that the productivity of particular resources will not be affected, or may be augmented, even if they are true, are no basis for saying there will be negligible or positive impact on the native hunting, trapping and fishing. It is simply not possible to discuss environmental changes in isolation from human impacts and to derive the latter as common sense deductions from the environmental changes. Without a cultural, social and economic assessment, any conclusions on the human implications of the project must be treated as untested, and indeed naive hypotheses.

[Signed]

Harvey Feit
Assistant Professor of Anthropology
and Sociology
Carleton University,
Ottawa

HF/rc

References Cited:-

- James Bay Energy Corporation. 1974. Derivation Eastmain-Opinaca-La Grande. Premier rapport d'environnement sur les parties aval des rivières d'étournées. (Montreal): JBEC, Service Environnement.
- Malouf, Albert. 1973. "Judgement. Chief Robert Kanatewat, et. al. vs. The James Bay Development Corporation, et. al." (Montreal): Superior Court. No. 05-04841-72.
- Salisbury, Richard F., Fernand Filion, Farida Rawji and Donald A. Stewart. 1972a. Development and James Bay: Social Implications of the Proposals for the Hydroelectric Scheme. A Report prepared under contract for the James Bay Development Corporation. Montreal: McGill University, Programme in the Anthropology of Development.
- Salisbury, F., J. Hyman, K. Hyman, N. Elberg. 1972b. Not By Bread Alone. The Use of Subsistence Resources Among James Bay Cree of Fort George, Paint Hills and Eastmain. Prepared for the James Bay Task Force of the Indians of Quebec Association and the Northern Quebec Inuit Association and the Northern Quebec Inuit Association (Montreal): IQA, NQIA.

TABLE A:- Average Number of Beaver Trapped by Trapline ¹.

<u>Trapline</u>	<u>1961-62 to 1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68 to 1969-70</u>
	26	87
	43	24
Rupert	40	20
Reserve	19	38
	30	1
Sub-Total	157 (158)²	170 (171)²
	29	37
Vieux	37	41
Comptoir	35	26
Reserve	24	18
	41	50
	25	23
	39	61
	39	94
Sub-Total	269	349 (350)²
Total	426	519

1. Figures calculated from JBEC, 1974: 22, Table 8.

2. Because of rounding off, the numbers do not add up to the sub-totals.

TABLE B:- Rank of Trapline By Average Number of Trappers, and Location of Trapline.

Trapline	Average no. of Trappers 1967-68 to 1972-73 in Decreasing Order ¹	Traplines that Include a Part of at Least One Shore of the Eastmain, Opinaca or Little Opinaca Rivers	Traplines that Include a Part of the Shore of James Bay	Traplines that Include a Part of the Shores of the Cold Water River	Traplines that Include a Part of the Shores of the Fishing River
VC33	4.5	*			
VC23	3.2	*			
RE3A	3.0	*	*	*	
VC31	2.7		*		*
VC30	2.5		*		*
RE1	2.3	*			
VC35	2.2	*			
VC32	1.8	*	*		*
RE2	1.8	*			
VC34	1.5	*			
RE3	1.2			*	
RE6	0.2	*			

1. From JBEC, 1974: Table 7, p. 21.

Table C:- Comparison of Estimates of Hunting and Trapping Catches in Elberg Study and in JBEC Report.

	<u>From Elberg Study¹</u>		<u>From JBEC Report</u>	
	<u>Estimated Number Caught⁴</u>	<u>Estimated Total Edible Meat in Lbs.</u>	<u>Estimated Number Caught</u>	<u>Estimated Total Edible Meat in Lbs.</u>
Canada Geese Bernache	5495	22,089.9	865 ³	3460.0 ³
Beaver Castor	509	6,484.66	420 ²	5350.8 ²
Moose Orignal	16	5,283.2	2 ³	660.4 ³
Snowshoe Hare	1100	1,749	A	A
Wavy Oie	429	1,415.7	144 ³	475.2 ³
Duck Canard	973	1,002.19	206 ³	206 ³
Lynx Lynx	122	829.6	109 ²	741.2 ²
Black Bear Ours	3	567	0 ²	0 ²
Misc. Small Game Perdix Belette Ecureuil	570	427.5	656 ³ 24 ² 1 ²	459.2 ³ A A
Otter Loutre	31	260	11 ²	92.4 ²
Mink Vison	78	65.52	34 ²	28.6 ²
Muskrat Rat Musqué	40	44.8	20 ²	22.4 ²
Fox Renard	14	31.36	14 ²	31.4 ²
Total		<u>40,250.43 lbs.</u>		<u>11,527.6 lbs.</u>

1. Salisbury, et. al. 1972b: 52, Table 6
2. JBEC, 1974: 23, Table 9 "Piegeage totale à Eastmain pendant 1971-72".
3. JBEC, 1974: 26, Table 10 "Chasse, totale l'Eastmain 1968-69".

Table C: - Comparison of Estimates of Hunting and Trapping Catches in Elberg Study and in JBEC Report. (Continued)

4. Note: These figures cover a fifteen month period from June, 1971 to August, 1972. They have not however been converted to a 12 month base, because the period duplicated, June to August, is primarily a fishing period, not a hunting and trapping season (JBEC, 1974: 15).

A - No figure provided.