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This essay focuses on conflicts over wildlife resources in Newfoundland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It pays particular attention to the different attitudes toward wildlife held by individuals engaged in a subsistence lifestyle and by state supported capitalists interested in profits. The paper begins by describing how wildlife resources were used as part of a subsistence lifestyle by settlers. I then discuss how, by the end of the nineteenth century, wildlife resources became important to government and tourist entrepreneurs as part of a fledgling tourist industry. At this time wildlife protection efforts were increased. However, to settlers trying to get by in a harsh environment, wildlife still remained an important resource. Thus I suggest there was a conflict over wildlife resources between the interests of settlers and government supported tourist interests. I analyze these events by looking at game laws, the development of natural resources and the role of the state in the accumulation process. Finally, this paper may contribute to our understanding of contemporary efforts to market Newfoundland’s great outdoors and the conflicts it has generated (see McGrath, 1993a and 1993b).

Wildlife Resources and the Traditional Newfoundland Lifestyle

The majority of Newfoundland’s settlers were fisher folk, and folklorist John Ashton correctly points out that many students think of Newfoundland and Newfoundlander in terms of the sea (1985:5). Ashton also notes that the ocean’s
overriding presence has led many people to overlook the significance of Newfoundland’s forests (1985:5-6). He writes:

Even today, the majority of Newfoundlanders are woodsmen. In rural areas of the province (and this still encompasses much of it) a large number of inhabitants spend much of their working lives and an even greater proportion of their leisure time in the woods. From the early days of settlement until the present time, the forest has provided the people of this island with a readily available source of food, fuel, shelter and employment. The material and spiritual cultural traditions of the region bear witness to the fundamental prominence of the Newfoundlander’s relationship with the forest (1985:6-7).

Ashton says that since the first days of settlement the forest has played a large part in people’s lives. For example, forest products were an important part of the “traditional lifestyle” of early European settlers. Wood was used to build and heat houses, and was also important in the fishing industry, being used to make boats, barrels, wharves, flakes and slipways (Ashton, 1985:9; Story, 1990:22).

Similarly, the natural vegetation of the land, fish and game figured prominently in the diets of the early European settlers (Story, 1990:14;21-2). Nemec (1993:56) draws on Story’s work to argue that “the ecological adaptation of outport populations...to the environment was that of ‘hunter,’ and not ‘harvester’ or producer.” For example, sea-birds and their eggs were a vital part of people’s diets. The great auk was used for food, bait, feather mattresses, and oil (Montevecchi and Tuck, 1987:211).

Similarly, the native caribou, either fresh or salted, was the main source of meat for many of the inhabitants of Newfoundland. One writer at the turn of the nineteenth century theorized that “Newfoundland is probably the only country in the world where venison, salted or fresh, is a staple article of diet for the masses” (McGrath, 1902:63). This same writer discussed how settlers used caribou antlers and hides in their homes. Saunders (1986:237) relates that settlers on the northeast coast of the island took caribou whenever they needed it. Moose was introduced to the island in 1878 and 1904 (Pimlott, 1953:563), and subsequently replaced caribou as the most important big game species (Peters and King, 1959:3-4). One writer states that by the time the first open season on moose was declared in 1936

moose meat had become one of the staples of the outport diet, and in some parts of the country was at least as important as the dole in carrying people successfully through the great depression (Horwood, 1986:39).

The snowshoe hare or rabbit was introduced in the mid-1860s and became an important source of fresh meat in winter to those living along the coast and on offshore islands (Saunders, 1986:160). The importance of rabbits as a food source
was recognized in the Game and Inland Fisheries Board Annual Report of 1911 (Game and Fisheries Board, 1912:714).

Wildlife resources were not only important food items; they were also a source of cash income. For example, McGrath (1911:195) states that in St. John's partridges sold for 50 cents per brace, while rabbits sold for 20 cents a brace. McGrath writes that "the snaring of rabbits has become quite an industry, they being shipped in carloads to that city (St. John's) for sale." Further testimony comes from Butler's account (1980:90-101) of how, in 1914, five men from Placentia caught rabbits in central Newfoundland and shipped them to St. John's, where an agent paid 16 cents each for them. Similarly, another source describes how, in the 1920s, rabbits caught in Gander Bay were shipped in one-pound cans to St. John's for sale (Saunders, 1986:160-63). The Game Board recognized the importance of rabbits as "an article of traffic" in its Annual Report for 1911 (Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 1911:530).

Caribou was also a source of income, as an account from the early 1900s demonstrates:

This south coast deer hunt is a regular industry, like the catching of cod or lobster. The settlers are fitted out for it by their merchants just as they are for the other pursuits named. The outfits consist of advances of requisites for the hunters' families, the deer killed being turned over to the merchant on the close of the hunt to offset advances received...the product of the hunt is then loaded on dog teams and hauled out to the coast, where the outfitters ship the meat to St. John's, there to be sold on the open market for what it will fetch. In January, 1900, the mail steamer... brought 411 and 575 carcasses in two shipments... choice cuts of venison can be bought for five cents a pound (McGrath, 1902:64).

Similarly, Saunders (1986:58) writes that in 1919, caribou killed along the Gander River were sold by a Gander Bay shopkeeper to merchants on Fogo Island and Change Islands for fifteen cents a pound.

By the early twentieth century wildlife resources were important to many of Newfoundland's settlers, both as a source of food and income. To people who were eking out a living from a harsh environment, and in poor economic times, wildlife stocks were clearly a significant part of a subsistence lifestyle.

WILDLIFE LAWS

The first European settlers to the island were initially unrestrained in their hunting efforts. They broke with English traditions, which favoured the exclusive use of wildlife by propertyed sport hunters. Wildlife was viewed as a free-for-the-taking resource (Montevecchi and Tuck, 1987:209; Saunders, 1986:237). However, there were complaints made to the English government concerning unregulated hunting and, by at least 1793, English game laws were being enforced on the island. That
year, several men from Greenspond were flogged for taking eggs from Funk Island in a closed season. The flogging was ordered by the colony's first magistrate, Chief Justice Reeves, under the English Act of Parliament, "An Act Against the Destruction of Wildfowl, 1533," because there were no local laws in existence at that time (Montevecchi and Tuck, 1987:211-12).

Newfoundland did not get its own game laws until April 1845, when "An Act for the Protection of the Breeding of Wildfowl in this Colony" was enacted in St. John's by Governor Sir Henry Harvey, the Legislative Council and the Assembly (Peters and Burleigh, 1951:31; Montevecchi and Tuck, 1987:213). On April 20, 1859, "An Act for the Protection of the Breeding of Wildfowl and Preservation of Game" was passed by the Governor, Legislative Council and the Assembly in St. John's (Acts of the General Assembly of Newfoundland [AGAN], 1859:101-3). This piece of legislation recognized the rights of "poor settlers" to take wildlife resources for consumption purposes (Montevecchi and Tuck, 1987:213; AGAN, 1859:101-3). The special rights of "poor settlers" continued to be recognized in wildlife laws, until they were amended in 1896, after which time "poor settlers" were not mentioned specifically in wildlife legislation (Overton, 1980:44-5). The laws in place by the early 1900s specified when wildlife could be taken, how much might be taken and in what manner. These laws essentially defined wildlife resources as sporting resources. For example, by the early twentieth century, the only legal method for killing caribou was by shooting. The very effective use of snares to catch deer had been outlawed in 1879 (AGAN, 1879:84) and using dogs to hunt deer had been banned in 1899 (AGAN, 1899:223). Thus, by the early twentieth century, wildlife resources had been transformed from a resource that was free-for-the-taking into a recreational/sporting resource governed by laws. Other research on game laws supports this assertion (see Ives, 1988 or Overton, 1980).

Other measures to protect wildlife were undertaken by various Newfoundland governments in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1898, the Winter Administration created a Department of Marine and Fisheries, which took responsibility for hiring wardens (McNeily, 1910:5-6). Prior to this, an organization of sportsmen, the Game Protection Society, had been responsible for the appointment of wardens. In 1906, a Game and Inland Fisheries Board was created on paper (see AGAN, 1906;1910), but no actual Board was appointed until 1909. According to the Vice-President of the Game Board, former MHA and avid sportsfisherman A.J. McNeily, the Board held several conferences with government, leading to the enactment of the "Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1910" by the Morris administration (McNeily, 1910:5). This Game Board remained responsible for game protection and propagation until 1934, when the Commission of Government revised the Game and Inland Fisheries Act and transferred the responsibility for making regulations aimed at protecting and propagating animals and birds to the Commissioner of Natural Resources (Ewbank, 1938:88). In 1934, under the Commission of Government, a Newfoundland Ranger Force was created.
One of their major functions was enforcing the game and forestry laws (Horwood, 1986:12-13). In 1938, the Commissioner for Natural Resources delivered an address to the St. John's Rotary Club on preserving game and fish (Ewbank, 1938).

Another effort to protect wildlife resources occurred in 1902 with the creation of a game preserve in western Newfoundland. This was along the railway line from Goose Brook (which flows into the southern corner of Sandy Lake) to Grand Lake and extended five miles on either side of the railway track (AGAN, 1902:111; see maps 1 and 2). This area is like a narrow funnel between Sandy Lake to the north and Grand Lake to the south. It was an important point on the caribou migration route at which many deer were killed annually (discussed below). Similarly, in 1929 a "National Reserve for Caribou" was created on the Avalon Peninsula (AGAN, 1929:80). Additionally, a closed season on caribou and moose was implemented from 1925 to 1936 (Pimlott, 1953:573). These initiatives to protect wildlife came at a time when various groups were agitating to have wildlife protection strengthened.

By the early 1900s, sportsmen's organizations had become active in Newfoundland. The Game Fish Protection Association was concerned with the propagation of game fish throughout the island and the advancement of angling as a sport (Keegan, 1905:5). This organization was active from at least 1885 (McNeily, 1909:5) and its work was recognized by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in its Annual Report for 1909 (Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, 1910:393). Similarly, the Game Protection Society of Newfoundland, established in 1890, was concerned with game birds, deer and other animals (McNeily, 1910:5). The Game Protection Society was active only for nine years ((Montevecchi and Tuck, 1987:214), but was an important organization since, as mentioned above, it was responsible for appointing game wardens until 1898. In 1927 the Fish and Game Protection Association was established. This private organization was "founded by a group of public spirited citizens who desired that greater attention should be paid to the conservation of the various species of wildlife" (Muir, 1937:218). This group agitated for stricter enforcement of game laws, better regulation of open seasons and the establishment of game sanctuaries (Muir, 1937:218; see for example: Fish and Game Protection Association, 19??).

Other sources also lobbied for increased wildlife protection: for example, the Game and Inland Fisheries Board in its reports for 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1914. Well-known individuals like Wilfred Grenfell also called for better enforcement of the game laws. Newspapers and elected government representatives also called for tighter wildlife protection (see for example: The Evening Chronicle, February 18, 1910; Government of Newfoundland, Legislative Council Proceedings, 1910:686-7). Sportsmen like Millais (1905) and Admiral Sir W.R. Kennedy (1905) both wrote about "the slaughter of caribou" by settlers. A letter to the editor of The Daily News (December 28, 1909) signed "Game Protection," called on government to adopt new wildlife policies and hand game protection over to sportsmen's organ-
izations before "we...find our streams without salmon, the barrens without partridge and the marshes without deer." This individual suggested that government was unable to successfully enforce game laws because they were unpopular with voters (settlers). Clearly, game and fish protection was an issue both for government and for various individuals and groups in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, I would suggest that wildlife conservation was not the sole reason behind the implementation of wildlife laws, their subsequent redrafting and calls for more stringent wildlife protection. The next section of this essay makes clear that wildlife resources had become important commodities to government and certain private interests by the turn of the twentieth century.

WILDLIFE RESOURCES FOR TOURISM

At the same time as concern with protecting wildlife resources was increasing in Newfoundland, efforts were also being made to use these resources to attract hunter/tourists. By the end of the nineteenth century, organized attempts were made to lure tourists to the country by using wildlife resources as bait (Overton, forthcoming; Pocius, 1994; Seymour, 1980; Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1993:6). To a colony looking to diversify its economy beyond the fishery, the seemingly inexhaustible supply of game, fish and wilderness appeared as an attractive development alternative. The Reid Newfoundland Company, formed in 1901, owned the trans-island railroad and a steamship line and played an important part in transforming the caribou into a tourist resource (Pocius, 1994). The rail line opened up the interior, thus allowing access to the migrating caribou herds. A sportsman who visited Newfoundland at the turn of the century wrote that "hundreds of camps are set up near the railway to intercept the deer" (Millais, 1907:3). Another source estimates that from 1911 to 1915, 1,000-1,500 deer were killed annually along the railroad track (Horan, 1981:351). Selous (1907) provides a good indication of what the hunting along the railroad track was like. He relates that upon his arrival at Howley station an important crossing point on the caribou migration route in western Newfoundland between Sandy Lake and Grand Lake; see maps 1 and 2) his guide remarked:

Ah! You've come to the slaughter-house now. What a pity you weren't here yesterday, the deer were crossing the line all day, and everyone got lots of shots; it was just as if a battle was going on (1907:60-61).

The Reid Newfoundland Company was also a big booster of the outdoor tourist industry and produced some of the first tourist promotional literature. This described Newfoundland as a "sportsman's paradise abundant in caribou and other game" (Overton, forthcoming; Pocius, 1994; see for example Reid, 1903 and 1910). If tourists were going to be lured to the colony, then certain facilities, such as accommodations, would be needed. Not coincidentally, the Reid's were involved
in the hotel industry. Pocius (1994:51) states that as early as the 1890s the Reid family planned to build a luxury hotel in St. John’s. He goes on to say that William Reid, son of company founder Robert Reid, planned to build hotels in Notre Dame Bay, the Bay of Islands and St. John’s (1994:61). Pocius also writes that tourist resorts and lodges began opening up along the railway line, particularly on the west coast, with its abundance of excellent salmon rivers (1994:54). McNeily paid tribute to the Reid’s for opening up the interior to tourists, explorers and sportsmen. He stressed that the interests of the company paralleled the interests of the colony (McNeily, 1910:8). The Game Board’s Report for 1911 also discussed the importance of the Reid’s steamships and railway to the growing tourist trade based on sport (Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 1912:715-16).

Other evidence which supports the argument that the Newfoundland government viewed wildlife as an economic commodity is found in the Legislative Council Proceedings on the debate of the Game Board Bill. The member of the Legislative Council who introduced second reading of this Bill, Michael Gibbs, stressed that the colony’s wildlife needed protection, since it was a valuable economic asset that could help increase tourist traffic (Government of Newfoundland, Legislative Council Proceedings, 1910: 686-7). Similarly, the Department of Marine and Fisheries claimed that

[R]ecognition of the importance of the game of Newfoundland has been too lightly regarded by past governments (Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1910:392).

In 1911, the Game and Inland Fisheries Board used the example of the State of Maine, and its profitable “sportsman-tourist” industry, to illustrate the potential value of the game and freshwater fish of Newfoundland (Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 1912:715).

Other sources from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century emphasized the potential benefits of outdoor-based tourism for Newfoundland. For example, Prowse, in his history of Newfoundland, theorized that:

To the sportsman, the tourist, the angler, and the canoeist, the new railway will offer unrivalled attractions. For the hunter of big game there is the noble cariboo, a species of reindeer peculiar to the island; they range over the woods and barrens in countless thousands, the whole interior is one vast deer park...our island offers some of the finest grouse shooting in America...wild geese, ducks, snipe and curlew are abundant (Prowse, 1895:632-3).

Contemporaries of Prowse also suggested that wildlife could be used to attract tourists here (see for example: McGrath, 1902 and 1911; Wood, 1911). A newspaper article from 1910, “Slaughter of Caribou by Newfoundlanders,” further supports the argument that wildlife resources were being used to attract wealthy sportsmen to the island. This report discussed the killing of large numbers of
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caribou on the island's south coast and asserted that this “wanton destruction...will affect considerably the chances of the sportsman” (*The Evening Chronicle*, February 18, 1910). Thus, by the early twentieth century the sportsman and his chances for success had become priorities for government. Wildlife resources had become highly important to Newfoundland's government and other interests as part of a fledging tourist sector. This meant that game stocks received increased attention from policy makers and that settlers' use of wildlife resources would have to be addressed.

**OPPOSITION TO GAME LAWS AND CONFLICTS OVER WILDLIFE**

As suggested in the section on the traditional economy, there is much evidence which demonstrates that the game laws were not closely adhered to. For example, the previously discussed newspaper item from 1910 concerning the "slaughter of caribou" reported that a policeman from St. John's had been sent to the south coast around Fortune Bay, Burgeo and La Poile, to investigate reports of poaching. It was also reported that fines and jail terms had been assigned by magistrates (*The Evening Chronicle*, February 18, 1910). Another example highlighting people's disobedience of the wildlife laws is found in the *Game Board Report* of 1914. This report stated that deer were being killed throughout the year, for both food and for sale in adjoining settlements (Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 1914:8). In its Report for 1910, the Game Board had stated that the "killing of deer by the so-called 'poor settler' is virtually unchecked and unregulated" (Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 1911:527). Similarly, a letter to the editor of the *Daily News* complained about "the poor settler as they call themselves... (and) all the pot hunting many of them do" (*Daily News*, December 28, 1909). McNeily said that sporting organizations were aware of the open violation of the game laws (1910:5), while Grenfell claimed his reindeer herd was heavily poached from 1914 to 1917 (Grenfell, 1967). Sportsmen like Selous (1905:43) and Kennedy (1905:57) wrote of the "reckless slaughter" of deer by settlers, while the Department of Marine and Fisheries stated that the "temptation to procure and sell large caribou heads" was always present and often resulted in numbers of caribou being shot to obtain larger trophy antlers (Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, 1910:392). Morris (1978:4) writes that in the period 1890-91 a man living in Change Islands was brought to trial by the Game Protection Society for illegally purchasing caribou. A Justice of the Peace at Fogo found the man guilty and fined him $200 (1978:4). Morris also discusses the case of two men fined $50 each for hunting birds (partridge?) out of season near St. John's.

Another example of people's defiance of the game laws may be inferred from Horwood's (1986:39) statement that moose meat had become a dietary staple by the time the first open season was declared in 1936. Horwood also points out (1986:39) that the game laws were regarded as laws made to be broken. Similarly, Pilgrim's (1986) work on the accidental death of a Newfoundland Ranger shows that in the winter of 1935-36 much poaching of caribou was occurring on the Great
Northern Peninsula. Another example comes from Saunders’ work (1986:165) which tells how a trapper in the 1930s believed it was right to take a caribou when fresh venison was needed. A significant example of resident opposition to the game laws comes from the early 1940s when the Commission of Government banned the summer shooting of shearwaters or bawks, a coastal bird. This law met with popular resistance, prompting a local songwriter to ridicule the government in a song entitled “The Shooting of the Bawks”:

The ones who made this law can sit, eat chicken, drink port wine,  
But what about the poor old ghost who hauls a fishing line?  
He has to watch bawks flock round, upon a foggy day,  
And watch them rob his trawls of bait, and watch them fly away:  
He’s not allowed to kill one, or someone sure will squawk,  
For there’s a bloody law agin’ the killing of a bawk.

No doubt our wise Commissioners will formulate a plan,  
To furnish fresh meat for everyone who lives in Newfoundland.  
They’ve got a million pounds I hear, from over cross the sea,  
They’ll want it all to feed the men who in the pen will be.

For Mary dear I’ll kill a bird in August, June or May,  
And if they put me in the pen, why there I’ll have to stay,  
For men with children underfed, would rather far be sued,  
Than keep this bloody law that stops a man from getting food.  
(Montevocchi and Tuck, 1987:215)

It seems clear that residents defied the game laws and wildlife resources remained an important part of the subsistence lifestyle, both as food items and as articles of sale.

By the twentieth century, the stage had been set for conflict over wildlife resources. This conflict pitted settlers involved in a subsistence lifestyle against sportsmen and government-supported capitalists involved in the tourist industry. In a colony wishing to attract wealthy foreign sportsmen, wildlife resources had to be treated as economic commodities in need of protection and management. To the government of the day and to those involved in the tourist trade, the disregard of the game laws by the resident population was most certainly a problem that needed to be dealt with. The assertion that the game laws served sporting interests is supported by the reaction of two MHA’s to The Evening Chronicle report of February 18, 1910, on the “slaughter of caribou.” For example, the MHA for Fortune Bay, Charles Henry Emerson, argued that the Chronicle article was biased towards sporting interests, which had “yet to learn that the deer of this country were put here as an article of food for its inhabitants” (Government of Newfoundland, Proceedings of House of Assembly, 1910:311). The representative for Burgeo-La Poile, Robert Moulton, argued in this vein:
The fact is that the sportsmen are jealous of the fishermen...they (fishermen) never kill any more than is allowed by law, and they have as much right to the deer as any outside sportsman who comes here and kills for mere pleasure (Government of Newfoundland, Proceedings of House of Assembly, 1910:311-12).

This comment highlights the conflict between settlers, who used wildlife as a food resource, and sportsmen and capitalists, who viewed wildlife resources as economic commodities. The *Daily News* also took issue with the *Chronicle’s* report and referred to the friction between settlers and sportsmen. The editor of the *Daily News* wrote that the only crime of the settlers was “to use some of the God-given gifts for the benefit of his family, instead of reserving them for the exclusive enjoyment of the itinerant” (*Daily News*, February 19, 1910:3). The above mentioned letter to the *Daily News* (December 28, 1909) called for wildlife law enforcement to be handed over to groups of sportsmen, stating that the changes in wildlife policing called for were not intended to stop

the poor settler as they call themselves from getting their share of the sport... (*Daily News*, December 28, 1909).

Similarly, Selous alludes to the different way in which sportsmen and settlers viewed caribou:

In the year 1900 some six thousand caribou are believed to have been shot in the whole island — some seven hundred by American, British and Newfoundland sportsmen during the fall migration, and the remainder by meat hunters during the winter (1907:64).

The sportsmen were primarily interested in large, impressive caribou racks, as is made clear in any of the accounts left by the sportsmen who hunted here [see Davis, 1895; Millais, 1905 and 1907; Rogers, 1912; or Selous, 1905 and 1907], while the settlers were primarily interested in meat, or the cash its sale would generate.

The different views of wildlife held by the settlers and government-supported tourist/sporting interests are important. Montecucchi and Tuck (1987:210) argue that the second phase of North American wildlife exploitation began in the twentieth century and was characterized by legislation which eliminated “utilitarian endeavors” and emphasized the recreational aspects of wildlife as a sporting resource. Similarly, Ives’ (1988) work on game laws in Maine argues that by 1883 tough new game laws had been enacted which transformed wildlife resources into sporting resources. Some sportsmen and outfitters opposed the intrusive new regulations. However, the brunt of the new laws fell on local hunters who were of the opinion that these laws “favored the rich at the expense of the poor” (Ives, 1988:67-8). Ives writes that the harsh new game laws
Overton (1980) makes a similar argument in his work on wildlife laws in Newfoundland at the end of the nineteenth century.

Shiva's (1991) work on conflicts over natural resources in India also provides a framework with which to analyze the commodification of Newfoundland's wildlife. Shiva writes that the dominant ideology of development is concerned with using natural resources for commodity production and capital accumulation. This view, Shiva argues, ignores the resource processes which have been involved in regenerating natural resources outside the realm of human existence. Also ignored are the requirements of people who rely on the natural environment to maintain their standard of living. Shiva suggests that we must understand natural resources in terms of three economies: the market economy, the ecological economy and the survival economy (Shiva, 1991:28-31). The market and survival economies are most relevant for this discussion.

The market economy occupies the dominant position in capitalist societies, and has contributed to the neglect of the other two economies. In this economy, profits and accumulating capital are the main organizing principles. Thus resources are valued in terms of this economy, resulting in the neglect of the other two.

The satisfaction of basic needs is the organizing principle for natural resources in the survival economy. This is used by human societies to derive a living directly from the natural environment through self-provisioning (e.g., hunting). People's actions in this economy may remain hidden to the market economy. However, the limited resource base of the survival economy is destroyed through the diversion of natural resources from sustaining basic human needs to generating growth in the market economy. Since the market is the guiding principle in capitalist societies, resources and processes not priced in the market are not given priority. This may generate economic development, but it also helps destroy the survival economy (Shiva, 1991: 31-2). Shiva's ideas can be readily applied to the events in Newfoundland outlined above.

Similarly, Marchak's (1987) work on the fish processing industry in British Columbia provides useful insight into the transformation of Newfoundland's wildlife resources. She writes:

This accumulation process is the motive force of a capitalist system, differentiating it from the subsistence system within which groups can sustain communal property. Once accumulation, rather than subsistence, is the reason for catching fish (or cutting
trees or any other activity), there is a need to define and defend property rights; without such definition, individuals and companies would be unable to ensure that they, rather than any others, should benefit from their investments and activities (Marchak, 1987:11).

If we substitute gathering wildlife resources where Marchak has written “any other activity,” it might be reasonable to argue that the state and various capitalists had become interested in wildlife resources as economic commodities at least by the late 1800s in Newfoundland. Poor residents continued to view wildlife as a resource to supplement their diets and incomes. However, state supported interests held an opposing view and game laws were stringently enforced. The use of game as a food item in the traditional economy was not tolerated. Horwood (1986) shows that the Rangers pressed many charges for poaching during the late 1930s. However, to people engaged in a subsistence lifestyle, such actions may have made the Newfoundland state appear illegitimate.

Writers like O’Connor (1973) and Offe (1984) have argued that capitalist states have two contradictory roles: namely, accumulation and legitimation. These ideas may be applied to the events outlined above. The Newfoundland state attempted to set conditions favourable for the private accumulation of capital. According to Offe (1984:120) the state has an “institutional self-interest” in the accumulation process. That is, state survival depends upon the maintenance of the system upon which its power is based. However, in attempting to meet this goal of accumulation, the state must also try to “maintain or create the conditions for social harmony” (O’Connor, 1973:6). A state that is clearly acting in the interest of one class at the expense of another “loses its legitimacy and hence undermines the basis of its loyalty and support” (O’Connor, 1973:6). Drawing on O’Connor and Offe’s work, we might suggest that a crisis of legitimacy faced the Newfoundland state as it involved itself in the accumulation process. This crisis was exemplified in people’s defiance of game laws, and in the comments of the settlers’ supporters, whether in the House of Assembly, newspaper reports, editorials, or the poetic verse of a song.

Notes

1The title is a reference to the settlers’ habit of salting caribou to preserve it. The title also alludes to the contrast between the settlers’ use of caribou as part of their subsistence lifestyle, and the gentleman-hunters’ search for “good heads” (i.e., large sets of antlers from stag caribou).

2Memorial University’s Institute of Social and Economic Research provided financial support for the research upon which an earlier version of this paper was based. See McGrath (1992:ch.3). Dr. Peter Sinclair and Dr. James Overton provided helpful comments on various drafts of this paper.

3In 1908, Dr. Grenfell introduced 300 reindeer from Lapland for his mission on the Great Northern Peninsula. The herd was heavily poached, particularly from 1914 to 1917.
Dr. Grenfell lobbied the Game Board to amend the laws, to protect the animals better. Amendments were made, but poaching continued and in 1917 Grenfell offered the remaining 230 animals to the Canadian government. They were subsequently moved to Anticosti Island in the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Grenfell, 1967:423-424).

4 A number of sportsmen/tourists who went afield at that time published accounts of their trips. See for example, Davis (1895), Millais (1907), Selous (1907) and Rogers (1912).

5 The community of Howley is in western Newfoundland on the Main River. It is nestled between Sandy Lake to the north and Grand Lake to the south. A Flag Station and Railway Crossing were established at Howley in 1894 (Cuff, 1984; Miller Pitt, 1984). The area is an important corridor on the caribou migration route and large numbers of animals were killed as they crossed the railroad tracks.

6 This comment was made on a trip Selous took in 1900. This was two years before the preserve was established in this area.

7 The promotion of Newfoundland’s wildlife as tourist resources continued into the 1940’s. For example, at that time the Tourist Development Board of the Department of Natural Resources hired a professional sportsman, Lee Wulff, to promote the country’s wildlife resources to the North American market (Wulff, 1967:346).
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