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Greetings. We are fast approaching the annual OAS conference, and everyone is working full out to make it a memorable one! Please check out the program online, if you haven't lately, since it has been updated. And don't forget to book your tours... spirits of a libation (and of a haunting?) nature are both on tap for you and family members also attending. Plus, there is everything Niagara Falls and the region have to offer when you aren't involved with fascinating session papers!

And don't forget to attend the annual business meeting Saturday, to hear about and provide input on the direction the OAS is heading.

Life has been focussed for quite awhile on administrative changes and operational needs of the OAS, so I hope we'll be able to finalize some of those measures. Of course, there are always new changes we need to address, notably the looming changes to the Non Profit Corporations Act, which does affect organizations such as ours.

The good news is that the changes we've made in recent years anticipated the change in law, and so we are in good stead and will not have to undergo a massive change during the transition period, following whenever this act comes into effect.

Beyond operations, the OAS continues to hum along. I am told by the OA editor that one of two volumes heading our way this year is about to go into production. Likewise, awards nominations have been coming in, and the day to day of things like submitting yet another version of the PHO grant application have been accomplished.

We will be needing to replace three members of our executive next year (two directors and a treasurer), so please, if you think you would like to help out, let anyone on the board or nomination chair Chris Watts know of your preference.

As well, there seems no end of various advocacy issues to keep the board and members hopping. One such issue that has received a fair amount of media attention and even attention on the floor of Queen's Park has related to the discovery of unmarked burial sites on homeowner properties.

Many of the media accounts were flagged on the OAS Facebook page, coming from places like Lambton and Brant Counties, and entail a similar story of one or some burials being found in someone's backyard, or future backyard, driveway, etc. Under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act (née the Cemeteries Act), the landowner must undertake an investigation of such discoveries to determine the extent and cultural affiliation of the remains, typically completed by a consultant archaeologist hired to complete the task. The cost of these undertakings, ranging from a few thousand to a few tens of thousands of dollars, are the focus of the landowner's hardship – framed in many of these media reports as a punishment for doing the right thing and reporting the discovery.

It IS the case that the Cemeteries Register, under the act, can declare the cost of this investigation a burden to the landowner, and cover the cost of the investigation directly, but the benchmark to prove burden is pretty onerous, requiring people to reveal their finances, and even liquidating assets.

Caught in the middle of these issues is the consultant archaeologist, who is hired to undertake the investigation. Though typically absorbing a fair amount of the costs when private landowners are involved, these investigations do cost significant labour, time, report production, and, often, endless and emotional meetings and conversations between landowner, registrar, First Nations representatives, and others seeking to define extent of the investigation, and disposition over what should happen to the remains. These costs then become framed in media reports, and by the comments of local MPPs, as archaeologists exploiting poor homeowners. In one case the local MPP demanded that archaeology provisions be eliminated from the process.

Clearly such comments reflect an utter lack of understanding of the needs of the act, the difficulties in defining and identifying burials in the field, the information the Registrar needs to make a ruling, the expectations of the representatives for the deceased, and the legitimate costs of doing anything other than destroying the interments.

The more germane comments, however, are the observations in these media reports, and in the endless comments sections attached to online versions of the articles, that the expectations of cost on the individual only encourages people to NOT report these discoveries. This is a concern both to the Registrar AND to law services who know such attitudes mean that forensic discoveries also will not be reported. While such an action would be a violation under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act and the Coroner’s Act, it is certainly hard not to imagine some people being so inclined.

That is a worrisome direction for unmarked burial discoveries to take, particularly because unreported discoveries, anecdotal, are not uncommon already. And state regulation should not be designed to encourage such tendencies. There should be alternative options available in these particular circumstances. It is certainly easy to imagine options such as the Ministry of Consumer Services employing Cemeteries Inspectors who could undertake those investigations on behalf of the Registrar (who remembers back in the day when the province actually maintained several such positions across the province?!); or maintaining
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provincial archaeological staff allocated to doing such investigations. More pragmatically, the Ontario Coroner’s Office contracts local doctors and forensic archaeologists to investigate such discoveries under the Coroner’s Act, whose work is billed back to the provincial office.

Perhaps a similar arrangement should be instituted within the Ministry of Consumer Services? Alternatively, maybe there could be a standard cost sharing arrangement to these expenses, in cases where the landowner is a private citizen and not a developer, and thus has no way of recouping costs, with the province picking up a majority of the cost. I am sure it would even be possible to provide some pro-bono support from the Ontario archaeological community and society for particularly demanding instances, or a funded “volunteer” group of willing archaeologists, akin to volunteer firemen. And I am sure other ideas can come to mind, too.

The point is that surely the solution should not remain that individual landowners need to face bankruptcy before the province assists. There is a legitimate necessary cost involved that a private landowner might not be able to absorb. Meanwhile the state has an interest in absorbing some portion of these costs, since the process mitigates contested values over land and care for the deceased. Moreover, consultants are not charitable organizations and should not be expected to, or guilted into, undervaluing their worth and the important role they play in this process of investigation and mediation.

The OAS Board, some chapters, and several members have expressed these concerns in letters to the editor, letters to MPPs, and to the Cemeteries Registrar. The solution(s) should also involve, obviously, communities and families who represent the interests of the deceased. If the province remains of the view that the deceased must be treated with the respect they deserve when discovered, then steps should be made to ensure such discoveries do not go unreported, and that the living are not punished for doing the right thing. Who knows, maybe these examples that have come to light will help fuel a broader discussion on the topic.

Until next time, see you in Niagara Falls!

Neal Ferris
President

NOTES AND NEWS

LAST CALL FOR SYMPOSIUM 2013 – OCTOBER 25 TO 27

Our 40th Annual Symposium titled ‘Where the Water is Loud’ Archaeology of the Niagara Region and Beyond’ takes place near the end of October in beautiful Niagara Falls. Organizers have been working hard to ensure this is a memorable weekend of tours, talks, and get-togethers.

Along with a book launch of Before Ontario by McGill Queen’s University Press, we will have our usually popular Book Room and Silent Auction so come prepared to buy some Christmas presents!

The ABM will take place on Saturday, Oct. 26, 2013 from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. If you want your say in the OAS, please plan on attending.

Anyone wanting a print copy instead of a digital version of the OAS Annual Report, please contact Lorie Harris in the OAS office and it will be mailed to you. Copies will also be available at the ABM in Niagara Falls.

FROM SASKATCHEWAN

The Saskatchewan Archaeological Society is pleased to announce that it has published Occasional Papers in Archaeology No. 2. The second publication of this series covers a variety of topics on Saskatchewan archaeological sites.

This edition is titled, ‘Contributions to Northern Plains Archaeology’. Articles include:
•The Farr Site - DjNf-8 - S. Biron Ebell
•It Must Be the Company’s Post Because of the Marks of Fire All Over the Chimney – Morton’s Identification of South Branch House (FiNm-1) – Michael Markowski
•Vision Quest Structures in the Ethnographic and Archaeological Record, With Examples from Saskatchewan – Nathan Friesen
•So Why Were People Here? Research and Preliminary Results on Sand Dune Occupations on the Northern Plains – Tim Panas
•Two Middle Precontact Period Burials from Southern Saskatchewan – Ernie Walker and Heather Milsom

Re-Evaluating Climatic Conditions and Human Adaptive Responses to the Hypsithermal on the Northern Plains – Bradley Schiele and Ernie Walker

The second edition is now available for $25. Shipping to Canadian and US addresses will be $13.

Copies of Occasional Papers in Archaeology Number 1 (A Re-Evaluation of the McKeen Series on the Northern Plains by Sean Webster) are still available for the sale price of $25 plus $13 shipping. Please request your copy by visiting their website, where you can order this book and others online (service coming soon) via PayPal.

ERRATUM

An editing error resulted in a missing reference in Bill Fox’s ‘Old Sites’ article in the May / June issue. The full reference is:

Mackintosh, J.
1836 The Discovery Of America, By Christopher Columbus; And The Origin Of The North American Indians. Printed by W.J. Coates, King Street, Toronto.
POINTS AT THE BOTTOM OF THE BAY

by William Fox

I should begin by explaining that the “bottom of the bay” was a term used in the 17th century by the Hudson’s Bay Company to refer to their trading posts situated along the shore of James Bay (Warke 2012: 66). The ‘points’ consist of a handful of bifacially flaked triangular chert points which have been recovered from two such posts – Fort Albany and Charles Fort (Rupert House) (Figure 1).

A single specimen from the latter site was shown to me in 2009 by Jim Chism, when I dropped by the Cree village of Waskaganish during a chert survey with Adrian Burke (Rousseau 2011). That survey was connected with Arkeos Inc. archaeological investigations associated with the Hydro-Quebec Rupert River Diversion project. During a fueling stop on our helicopter-based survey, I took the opportunity to contact a former Parks Canada archaeologist resident in the community – Jim, and he proceeded to enlighten me concerning everything from secondary deposits of chert along local shorelines to his archaeological activities in the Rupert River region over the previous several decades.

One artifact which caught my eye was a finely crafted triangular chert arrowpoint from the late 17th century site of Charles Fort. While it appeared to be manufactured from a local Paleozoic chert, it did not look like anything I had ever seen or read about from northern Canadian Shield or Hudson’s Bay Lowland Native sites. It looked much more like a point which would have been found on an early 17th century Ontario

Figure 1: European Travels and Native Site Distribution (map courtesy of Andrew Stewart, Strata Consulting)
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Iroquoian site – based on the lateral edge serrations, probably a Neutral site (Fox 1982: 3). The point is manufactured of a mottled grey HBL chert, possibly derived from the Kenogami River formation. Both lateral edges display fine edge serrations, ranging from 4 to 5 per centimeter (Figure 2), and measurements in millimeters and grams are presented in Table 1.

Given that its association with Charles Fort could be fortuitous (perhaps associated with an earlier visit to the mouth of the Rupert River), I could only marvel at its southern attributes. However, I remembered a photo plate in Walter Kenyon’s volume on the history of James Bay, displaying three chert points of similar form from Fort Albany (Kenyon 1986: Plate 113, c-e) (Figure 3, Table 1). The largest even displays a tendency to serration (3-4/cm) along the lower portion of both lateral edges, and all are manufactured from HBL chert, which may derive from the Kenogami River Fm.

Two of these points were excavated from outdoor deposits, while the third was recovered from Level 2 of the House 1 floor (Kenyon 1986: 14, Fig. 6), which also produced a window glass fragment (April Hawkins pers. comm. 2009). Of the previous two, one derived from the ‘compound’ excavated within the fort in 1963 (Kenyon 1986: 13,18) and the second was excavated in 1970 from the ‘courtyard’ of the first building (presumably House 3 – Kenyon 1986: 26, Fig. 14) constructed on site (April Hawkins pers. comm. 2009). While all these items could have been incorporated into the fort deposits from unrelated earlier ones, the form and size of points strongly suggest a 17th century date and Walter makes no mention of a pre-fort occupation on site. The fact that a very similar point was found at Charles Fort adds to the circumstantial evidence for contemporaneity with the HBC posts.

**Historical Overview**

Assuming that these projectile points date to the earliest period of these establishments, or the late 17th century, the following is a synopsis of European activities in the region taken from Kenyon and Turnbull (1971):

1668 The Nonsuch sails into Hudson Bay and the crew overwinter at the mouth of the Rupert River, constructing Charles Fort.

1672 Father Albanel reconnoiters Charles Fort.

1673 Priests at Sault St. Marie Mission report that local Native groups, including Odawa, are trading with the HBC.

1674 Fort Albany is constructed by Charles Bayly.

1674 Father Albanel returns to Charles Fort, is arrested and taken to England, and convinces Radisson and Groseilliers to defect to France in 1675.

1679 Louis Jolliet undertakes reconnaissance mission to the Rupert River.

1682 Radisson and Groseilliers promote the establishment of the Compagnie du Nord, and establish Fort Bourbon on the Nelson River. They over-winter with private New England trader Ben Gillam, and HBC governor John Bridgar.

1683 Radisson captures the two competitors, destroys their posts and sails the remaining intact vessel to Quebec, where he receives a poor reception. Based on an equally poor reception in France, Radisson defects to England.

1684 Radisson sails to Fort Bourbon, takes it for the HBC and renames it Port Nelson. He stays there until 1687.

1686 The Compagnie du Nord outfits Chevalier de Troyes with an army, consisting of 30 troupes de la marine and 70 Canadian canoe men and officers, and he takes three HBC posts – Moose Fort, Charles Fort and Fort Albany.

1693 James Knight takes Fort Albany and the French in retreat burn Moose and Rupert (Charles) Forts.

1694 Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur
d’Iberville takes York Fort (replaced former Port Nelson).
1696 English take back York Fort.
1697 Ile-Vert takes back York Fort.
1713 Treaty of Utrecht turns over all posts to the HBC.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE**

The contemporaneity of these chert points with the HBC forts seems plausible, considering the other stone, bone and antler Native artifacts recovered from excavations at Fort Albany (Kenyon 1986: Plates 114-119). Kenyon (Ibid: 46) notes of the “bone lances” that “According to the local Cree who were working with me at the site, these specimens (including those illustrated in Pl. 118) were traditionally fashioned from the cannon bone of a caribou and were in use until fairly recently.”

Interestingly, Walter states that two antler foreshafts “... (Pl. 119) were almost certainly made by the Eskimo.” (Ibid: 46); as the recoveries may reflect the aforementioned violent interaction between these Native groups reported by de Troyes in June of 1686 on James Bay.

From Radisson’s accounts, we know that northern Algonquian groups continued to use bows and arrows into the late 17th century. Archaeological evidence from post-contact Odawa sites in Ontario provide no suggestion that these groups produced chert biface points of the refined nature observed for the James Bay specimens. Tomenchuk and Irving (1974: 41) present a useful description of a Cree triangular chert arrowpoint from the Brant River Site Number 2, comparing its attributes to similar forms from northern Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba. These northern Algonquian points are primarily smaller than the James Bay specimens and invariably are not completely bifacially flaked. That is, retouch is focussed on the edges of the flake blank and does not extend completely across both faces of the point (see also points from Lake Abitibi – Marois and Gauthier 1972: Plates V, 1 and 2 and VII, 1-5).

The authors also compare the Brant River specimen to contemporary Inuit and also to Dorset end blades from Hudson’s Bay sites, but determine that such an affiliation is unlikely (Tomenchuk and Irving 1974: 41).

A comparison of the James Bay points with Arctic tradition end blades indicates that there are similar triangular forms from Dorset sites; however, edge serration has only been documented on Pre-Dorset sites (Daniel Gendron pers. comm. 2013). Based on isostatic rebound data from the Hudson’s Bay basin (Hodgetts 2007: 356-357, Fig. 3), the Fort Albany site would have been under water in Pre-Dorset and almost certainly in Dorset times. Given the elevation of the Charles Fort point findspot (James Chism pers. comm. 2013), it was also inundated during Pre-Dorset times.

To the south in the Great Lakes region, Rock Island excavations in the Green Bay area of Lake Michigan did produce a contemporary chert triangular biface point assemblage of similar form to the James Bay specimens. Mason associates these points with the second Pottawatomi occupation, indicating the at least some central Algonquian groups continued to use chert tipped arrows during the latter half of the 17th and the early 18th century (Mason 1986: 154, Pl. 14.1). The ‘early’ Pottawatomi assemblage (c. 1670) displayed in the lower two rows of Plate 14.1 appears most similar in size and shape; although, the James Bay specimens are thinner (Table 1, Mason Table 14.1, 1). An early 17th century Pottawatomi assemblage from the Dumaw Creek site in western Michigan, illustrated by Quimby (1966: 20-27, Fig. 5-7), is smaller on average and highly variable in workmanship. Individual specimens from later occupations at Rock Island are similar in size and form; however, a “six-point set” (cache) from the 18th century Odawa occupation consists solely of typical northern Algonquian edge retouched flake triangular points (Mason 1986: Plate 14.2, 1).

The serrated lateral edges of the Charles Fort point are not represented in the Rock Island assemblages, but are characteristic of 17th century Ontario Iroquoian, particularly Neutral, forms (Fox 1982: 3). Further to the south, several of the late 17th century bifacial triangular points from the Illinois village of Peoria also appear to be similar in refinement to the James Bay points (Ehrhardt 2004: 294, Figure 6), as do several, albeit smaller specimens recovered from the late 17th century Lasanen cemetery in St. Ignace, Michigan (Murray 1971: 64, Fig. 33 and 36), which has tentatively been identified with a 1790’s Odawa occupation (Cleland 1971: 144). The
contemporary Marquette Mission site in St. Ignace also 
produced a chert point of similar form (Fitting 1976: 169, Fig. 
13, D). That chert tipped arrows were still in use among some 
other 18th century mid-western groups is evidenced by the 
assemblage from the Meskwaki Bell village in Wisconsin 
(Witrity 1963: 27-29, Figs. 18, 19 and Behn 2008: 46, Fig. 22); 
although, the late 17th century Gros Cap cemetery at St. Ignace, 
Michigan included no chert arrow points (Nern and Cleland 
1974).

**Discussion**

Obviously, these were tumultuous times during the European 
struggle for dominance in the Canadian fur trade. The latter half 
of the 17th century was similarly tumultuous from a First 
Nations perspective, due to the Iroquois wars and population 
dislocations. These impacted not only pre-existing Native 
exchange systems in the Great Lakes region, but basic social 
structure involving conceptions and perceptions of ethnicity (ie. 
who was an ‘Odawa’ after 1650?). Similar to the preceding 
French documentation of events, the English record is focused 
understandably on European economic and political (not so 
much religious) self-interest. Observations concerning the First 
Nations’ world view tend to be contingent on their service to 
‘King and Country’.

One may well ask what the record of late 17th century 
European activities has to do with a handful of triangular chert 
arrows points. However, these events could set the context for the 
James Bay arrows, which do not appear to be Cree in form. Yet, 
these anomalous points have been manufactured from local 
HBL chert. If contemporary with the HBC establishments, as I 
suspect; were they left ‘in anger’ or simply lost on site? 
Certainly, there was enough warfare associated with Charles 
Fort (Rupert House) and Fort Albany that they could represent a 
hostile encounter. If conflict related, there are specific European 
documented events: Rupert House (1686), Fort Albany (1686 
and 1693).

A review of de Troyes’ journal provides 17 references to 
Native activities. The first sets a tone and subtext for future 
encounters, when he declines the offer of Christian Mohawks at 
Quebec to join him on the campaign. This refusal of military 
assistance is repeated on June 20th, when he refuses the offer of 
two Cree on the Moose River to assist in attacking the English, 
due to a grudge against the factor Harry Sargeant at Fort 
Albany. He has an initial distrust of Native peoples, which he 
articulates in his journal on May 12 at Mattawa. Nevertheless 
he is prepared to hire locals as guides, and he depended on 
Native groups along the route for the sale of canoes for his 
army. There is no mention of Native fighters at any point during 
his 1686 campaign, although he does mention a Cree war party 
encountered on James Bay on June 29th, returning from an 
attack on the Inuit to the north. His incidental observations are 
enlightening concerning the travels of specific Algonquin bands: four canoes of Temiskaming people arrive at Quebec on 
May 1st, he encounters Nipissings camped on Lake 
Temiskaming on May 21st, a Temiskaming Native offers to 
draw a map of the route to the bay on May 25th, and the arrival 
at Rupert House of Native people from Nemiscou prepared to 
trade with the HBC. The conclusion is that no Native fighters 
were recruited into the 1686 expedition against the HBC.

The mobility of various northern Algonquin groups during 
the late 17th century is presaged by the archaeological evidence 
of extensive exchange systems prior to European contact, based 
on the wide distribution of Iroquoian style ceramics, 
particularly after 1400 A.D. (Fox 1990: 463 and 2008: 8, and 
Guindon 2009). The Nipissing appear to be particularly active 

to the north, as middlemen in a network of exchange between 
Iroquoian (primarily Huron/Wendat) to the south and northern 
Algonquin bands as for north as the Hudson and James Bay 
lowlands. The first Europeans to become actively involved in 
the Native exchange system of the Lake Superior basin were 
Medard Chouart, Sieur Des Groseilliers and Pierre-Esprit 
Radisson, during their 1659/60 travels to the west. As they 
battled their way westward through the Iroquois blockade of the 
Ottawa River with an Odawa brigade of 14 canoes, the fluidity 
of ethnicity was expressed in one canoe carrying Nipissings, 
who planned to visit friends who had lived with the Mascouten, 
but now resided with the people of the Sault (Warkentin 2012: 
248).

Of potential relevance to the topic of this article, is 
Radisson’s statement that he encouraged the Odawa use of 
bows and arrows in close quarter fighting with the Iroquois who 
were using firearms (Ibid.: 251). Indeed, during a 1656 firefight 
with the Iroquois at the Lake of Two Mountains, Radisson 
noted that the Odawa were using bows and arrows and wearing 
traditional body armour, and were “not used to shooting nor 
hear such noise” (Ibid.: 241). The various Native groups 
encountered during their winter in the west included a Christino 
(Cree) camp on the south shore of Lake Superior, west of the 
Keewanan Peninsula, Odawa at Chequamegon Bay, Saulteaux 
groups in western Lake Superior and at Lac Courte Oreilles 
and the Mille Lacs area of Minnesota, and the Santee or Eastern 
Dakota Sioux, whose territory included much of present day 
Minnesota. Hostilities are recorded between the Cree and Sioux 
in the region and between the Huron and Odawa at Rock Island 
in Green Bay. In the Spring of 1660, possibly at Spring Brook 
Hill, in the Mille Lacs area of Minnesota, Radisson and Des 
Groseilliers participated in a Feast of the Dead ceremony at a 
gathering of 18 Nations, including the Sioux (Ibid.: 275).

Thereafter, they travelled west to the prairie edge with the 
Saulteaux to visit a Sioux village. They may also have met the 
Assiniboine.

Following their adventures in the west, Radisson’s voyage 
manuscript describes a trip to James Bay in 1660, possibly via 
the Albany River; however, Warkentin (2012: 286) feels that it 
is unlikely that Radisson participated on the trip, and has simply 
recorded Des Groseilliers’ account. There is a reference to an 
“old house all demolished and battered with boulettes,” which 
Warkentin (Ibid. 286) takes to be Henry Hudson’s former
residence at the mouth of the Rupert River, and observations concerning northern Ontario Ojibway and Cree bands. Following a description of the Swampy Cree peoples, there is a reference to a group, apparently encountered on the return trip to Lake Superior and possibly on the Kenogami drainage – “There is a nation called among themselves Neuter, they speake the Beefe (Sioux) and Christianos (Cree) speech being friends to both. Those poore people could not tell what to give us. They weare overjoyed when we sayd, we should bring them commodities.” Warkentin suggests that they may have been a band of refugee Neutral Iroquoians (Ibid: 289).

**Conclusions**

No matter which upper Great Lakes sites dating to the late 17th century are considered, the authorship of chert triangular points is virtually impossible to determine, given the dynamic state of ethnogenesis resulting from massive population dislocations caused by the Iroquois wars. The Jesuits stationed at Sault Ste. Marie inform us that the Sauteaux (Ojibway) and Odawa were travelling north to the bay to trade with the HBC during the 1670’s; however neither group is known to have manufactured chert projectile points of similar form to the James Bay specimens. They may have been carrying and using central Algonquian arrows, but these would have been tipped with local (Lake Michigan region) chert points manufactured from material such as Norwood chert. They may have been accompanied by an accomplished flintknapper (perhaps, a Pottawatomi individual) who utilized some HBL chert to produce or repair an arrow; yet the Pottawatomis forms are not exactly similar to the relatively large and thin James Bay points.

While it appears to be a ‘stretch’ to argue that Grosseillers encountered a band of refugees from the 1651 dispersal of the Neutral Iroquoian confederacy of southern Ontario during his 1660 return to Lake Superior from James Bay, anything is possible during this period when Iroquois aggression dispersed both Iroquois and Algonquian groups widely to the west. The attributes of the James Bay points are not characteristic of northern Algonquian or Inuit forms, but are of more southerly populations, yet they are manufactured from local HBL chert. It may be more than coincidence that Grosseillers met this apparently destitute group between James Bay and Lake Superior; as a major and logical travel route would include the Albany and Kenogami River drainages, where HBL chert-bearing outcrops have been documented (Wilson 1890: 85), on his way southwest to the eastern shore of Lake Superior.
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19TH-20TH CENTURY SETTLEMENT BY IMMIGRANTS TO NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

by Margaret Schweitzer

Eighteenth and 19th century settlement in northwestern Ontario by non-aboriginal persons is evidenced by historic artifacts discovered in the Thunder Bay area. The remains of a stone barn foundation were explored by the author in 2012, leading to an overview of both government policy of the time and individuals who were affected by it.

The modern city of Thunder Bay began its history as a fur trade post, Fort William, in 1805. Following the decline of the fur trade decades later and the signing of the Robinson-Superior Treaty between the Northern Algonquian people and the Crown in 1850, the area surrounding the Lakehead was surveyed in 1859 by Thomas Herrick. Large tracts of territory then became available through the Free Grants and Homestead Act of 1868.

Northwestern Ontario was viewed as a potential economic driver of Upper Canada, fueled by recent mineral discoveries. The region was also seen as agriculturally important, and the plan of the provincial government was to promote settlement through immigration. Settlers attracted by promises of prosperity in an untested land began to arrive in the area, some from great distances. People primarily from southern Ontario and Great Britain

Interior view of north section of wall, detailing two different construction methods. Photo by M. Schweitzer.
were encouraged to move to the northwest; however, a diverse mix of people from Scandinavia, Eastern Europe, and the United States also made their way into the region by the 1890’s.

Although agricultural settlement was the goal of the provincial government, no assessment of agricultural potential was ever done of the Canadian Shield country prior to efforts being made to attract immigrants. Many who arrived soon learned that much of the land was unsuitable for productive farming due to the climate and soil conditions that awaited them. As a result, they often cut the timber off their land, sold it to the railroad, and left the area soon after. Approximately 70% of the land remained as bush lots, and some 10-15% of the land became farms growing crops. The non-aboriginal population in rural northwestern Ontario never exceeded 40,000 persons between 1871 and 1931.

Northwestern Ontario did thrive and grow as a resource-based economy, primarily from the forest industry, and the twin cities of Port Arthur and Fort William eventually became a busy shipping port on Lake Superior.

The property in the former Oliver Township on which the stone barn foundation is located was originally deeded in 1889 to Peter Pyke. It was surveyed as 160.5 acres in size. Free Grant land had to be cleared of trees, cultivated, and building construction undertaken, for a residency period of six months per year. If these conditions were not met, the land was ceded back to the Crown and became available to another settler.

Pyke, the original landowner, did not have his deed registered until 1909, and it may have taken him that long to meet the conditions of the land grant; the exact reason for the delay is not known.

A search of the Land Titles Registry office in Thunder Bay, plus information garnered from the Thunder Bay Historical Museum and the Oliver-Paipoonge library helped to fill in a record of the subject parcel of land.

Following the grant being made, the property changed hands a number of times before being purchased by Oscar Mutkala, a Finnish immigrant, in 1930. He farmed dairy cattle for over 30 years, selling milk and cream to a dairy in Thunder Bay before retiring and transferring the farm to his son’s ownership. The barn foundation’s rugged assembly appears to have been carried out through manual labour alone, due to the appearance of stone wall construction.

It was not possible to determine exactly when the barn had been built, but it was probably after 1900. By conferring with a descendent of Mutkala, the author was able to learn that his son, Reino, enlarged the barn in the early 1950’s. Examination of the remaining foundation showed that there were apparently two separate construction periods, as the latter used formed concrete.

The only artifact discovered in the foundation itself was a horseshoe, hidden in a space between the two types of forming in the north wall. Visual inspection only suggests that the shoe was forged sometime between 1900 and the 1940’s. A few pieces of farm machinery lie close to the barn foundation, but the author was not able to locate recognizable dates of manufacture on the cast iron of the implements due to weathering and wear.

Elsewhere on the same property, an old garbage dump contained numerous metal food tins, milk cans, glass bottles, and other household discards as might be expected on a farm.

Carrying out a site condition inspection on the stone barn foundation resulted in a more comprehensive history of immigrant settlement in the Thunder Bay area. The story of a single property was repeated hundreds and perhaps thousands of times before WW II, as land was populated by the forefathers of many who still live there today.
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ART HOWEY
(1926 - 2013)

By Gary Warrick

Over the last 40 years, Art Howey earned renown in the archaeological community for his passion and dedication to saving Ontario’s archaeological past. He lived and breathed archaeology, conducting licenced fieldwork and report writing, participating in the Archaeological Conservation Officer program and in the Ontario Archaeological Society at the provincial level and in the Hamilton Chapter, organizing and creating archaeological exhibits, advocating for improvements to archaeological conservation and artifact storage, deterring illegal looting of archaeological sites, and acting as a liaison between avocational and professional archaeologists.

The depth of Art’s love for all things archaeological and his selfless devotion to conserving the archaeological heritage of Ontario was remarkable. On June 19, 2013, Art was the recipient of the OAS Tim Kenyon Memorial Award, which is “awarded to non-professional archaeologists who have made an exceptional contribution to the development of Ontario archaeology and who has earned acclaim for excellence and achievement.” Less than a month after receiving his award, Art Howey died on July 8, 2013 from cancer.

Art was born on May 15, 1926 and grew up in Paris, Ontario. As a boy, in his spare time, Art prowled the fields and forests of the countryside on foot in the summer and by snowshoe in winter. Following World War II, Art earned a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Toronto and was employed by Proctor & Gamble as an engineer, working in Hamilton and Toronto. In 1974, Art conducted his first archaeological investigation in Ancaster, Ontario. The Hamilton Golf and Country Club had decided to expand its golf course with an additional nine holes and began earthmoving in 1973. Living close to the golf course at the time, Art noticed artifacts when walking over the bulldozed and graded areas in the spring of 1974. Consequently, he regularly surface collected the landscaped site areas between April and December 1974, often accompanied by his wife Doreen and sometimes by his son Cameron and continued to record and pick up artifacts from January to November in 1975.

Art applied for one of the first archaeological licences to be awarded under the newly proclaimed Ontario Heritage Act in 1975. Art’s surface collections of the Hamilton Golf and Country Club site (AhGa-20) effectively constituted one of the first salvage archaeology projects in Ontario. The Hamilton Spectator ran a story on Art’s archaeological work on July 4, 1974 and Art mounted an exhibit of recovered points, ranging in age from Paleo-Indian to Late Woodland, in the club house of the Hamilton Golf and Country Club.

The focus of Art’s fieldwork was the archaeology of Ancaster and Brant County. From 1976 to 1978, Art continued his site survey and surface collections of the Hamilton Golf and Country Club site and other sites in the Ancaster region. In his 1977 licence report, Art explained that the goal of his fieldwork was “to stay ahead of the bulldozers” and “to find and report sites before they are destroyed.” In the 1970s and 1980s, planned housing subdivisions were rapidly expanding across the Ancaster landscape and Art began building a site inventory, anticipating the Planning Act that would not be passed until 1983. His survey concentrated on the Meadowlands subdivision in...
Ancaster and the lands owned by Redeemer College. Under the Planning Act, archaeological sites in the Meadowlands that were found, collected, and reported by Art were eventually excavated by Archaeological Services Inc. in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and Redeemer College sites by the firm New Directions in the first decade of the 21st century.

Art’s fulltime job as an engineer occupied his time in the early 1980s and took him away from both the Ancaster area and his archaeological work. In 1987, Art resumed his site survey work in the Regional Municipality (RM) of Hamilton-Wentworth and in Brant County. He held licences in 1988-1990, 1992-1996, and in 1998, documenting 20 significant sites and a number of isolated finds. He deposited his artifact collections, licence reports, and hand-written field notes with the Fieldcote Museum in 2001, where they can be found today.

Public education was an important part of archaeology for Art. As early as 1974, he mounted an exhibit of his recent artifact finds in the clubhouse of the Hamilton Golf and Country Club, educating members about the ancient past of Ancaster. In 2001, Art assisted Lois Corey, Curator of the Fieldcote Museum, with an exhibit of Ancaster’s archaeology and a display of pre-contact archaeological artifacts. In 2002, Art organized a similar exhibit of artifacts for the foyer of Redeemer College, which is still on display today. Art promoted the distribution of OAS posters and brochures, the Passport to the Past program, and visited local schools using the OAS teaching kits. Art was a strong advocate for the use of film in archaeological education.

In addition to his field research, Art was committed to the protection of archaeological heritage in Ontario. He acted as an Archaeological Conservation Officer (ACO) for RM of Hamilton-Wentworth in the 1980s, supported by Bill Fox and Ian Kenyon. In 1983, Art contributed important information to assist Bill Fox with the conviction of the looters of the Freelton site under the Ontario Heritage Act. In fact, Art was zealous in his pursuit of illegal looters and had no qualms about approaching looters in the field, taking licence plate numbers, and reporting them to the authorities. There are few professionals who would go to these lengths to ensure site protection.

While serving on the OAS Board of Directors in the early 1990s, he attempted to revive the Archaeological Conservation Program and ACOs and interviewed about 30 members of the archaeological community to gain support for a new program, writing a report for the OAS about his findings. In addition, he wrote numerous letters to the Province of Ontario pushing for better protection for archaeological sites and long-term curation of artifact collections. Always a true gentleman, Art quietly but firmly pushed government bureaucrats and archaeologists alike to ensure that Ontario’s archaeological past was properly protected.

Art also made significant contributions to the OAS. He served as a Director on the OAS Board in 1991 and 1992. After its creation in 1994, the OAS’ Hamilton Chapter held regular monthly meetings with guest speakers. Art was the backbone of the Hamilton Chapter since its inception, serving as the editor of The Heights, newsletter of the Chapter, from 2005-2009, and was instrumental in inviting guest speakers and organizing monthly meetings. Art encouraged Hamilton Chapter members to get involved in local field archaeology and acted as a mentor to and liaison for both students and avocationals, linking them with professional archaeologists.

Art possessed a love of archaeology and a commitment to preserving Ontario’s archaeological past rarely found even in the most dedicated professionals. Art was an exceptional member of the Ontario archaeological community and will be missed tremendously by all of us.

---

**Honouring Avocational Archaeologist Art Howey**

*by Lindsay Foreman, Director of Member Services*

On June 19, 2013, several generations of Ontario archaeologists met at the Fieldcote Museum in Ancaster to honour avocational archaeologist, Art Howey. Art and his family have been advocating for the protection and preservation of southern Ontario archaeological sites for nearly half a century. They came together on this warm June evening to watch Art accept the Tim Kenyon Memorial Award in the presence of many friends and OAS members.

Art was a member of the Ministry ACOP programme in the 1980s and has documented, researched, and written up numerous archaeological sites during the past five decades. Members of the Hamilton OAS Chapter nominated him for the award, which was presented by Chapter president, Gary Warrick. Gary’s heartfelt speech summarized Art’s many archaeological accomplishments and moved all that were present. Art and his family were proud to receive the award. In fact, Art was rendered speechless at one point during his acceptance – he couldn’t believe that the members of the Ontario archaeological community held him in such high regard.

Following the award ceremony, Art made the rounds and chatted with his archaeological comrades. There was much ‘shop talk’ and the usual ‘show-and-tell’ over refreshments provided by the City of Hamilton. A great time was had by all!

Thank you to Lois at the Fieldcote Museum for setting up the venue for the event, to the City of Hamilton for providing the refreshments, to Rudy Fecteau for photodocumenting the event, and to Gary Warrick for the award presentation.

Congratulations to the Howey family!
ONeTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOciETY
HURONIA CHAPTER:
PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY DAY

By Peter Davis

Saturday and Sunday, 17 and 18 of August 2013, were the ‘Public Archaeology Days’, sponsored and hosted by the Huronia Chapter of the OAS. Nature smiled on us with two gorgeous days of sun and soft breezes (no thunder storms as we endured last year), and the turnout was spectacular, at least 25 people on each day, with ages ranging from youngsters to oldsters, each and every one being avid to get going and make great discoveries.

The dig was held at the Allen tract, in the Simcoe County Forests of the Tay Peninsula, lying between Midland and Penetanguishene. The task ahead of us was to continue sifting the soil of a midden which had been disturbed by pot-hunters, which we had spent two days on last year, to find what they had missed, and to bring the disturbed level down to untouched soil.

The dig is under the licence and aegis of Dr. Alicia Hawkins of Laurentian University (Sudbury campus); also attending both days were Drs. Bonnie Glencross (Waterloo Campus) and Gary Warrick (Brantford Campus) both of Wilfrid Laurier University; we were also graced with the inspired and inspirational presence of several happy youngsters – imagine their utter delight: an open invitation to get dirty.

And our hard work and dedication were rewarded: many beads (both glass and shell), some copper material, several chert sherds, and the ever present burned corn, fish and mammal bones. There were some anomalies: some .22 shell casings (presumably not Ouendat or the books will have to be rewritten) and a broken axe head (whether it is trade period or not will have to be determined by much wiser minds, but it sure raised the blood pressures of several of us).

The beads were distinctive and varied, ranging from round shell or bone beads to a large, indigo coloured ‘football’ bead, to varicoloured striped glass, tiny round red glass, long white and blue glass beads, and even a double round, fused, and striped bead of dark indigo colour, very distinctive and a neat find.

Gary Warrick took a walk in the creekbed, upstream from our dig, and came back with a huge collar of a pot, about the size of the open palm of one’s hand. He reported more such sherds, too, but left them in situ.

Dr. Hawkins has given a preliminary date to this site, from the beads being found there, of Glass Bead Period 2, somewhere around 1600-1625 CE: it is, of course, a contact site, with the presence of French trade material being very evident.

It is the intention of the chapter to continue the investigations next year, and it is fervently hoped that both Laurentian and Wilfrid Laurier Universities will conduct field schools on this site and nearby sites in the years to come.

All are invited to attend next year, and are encouraged to join the Ontario Archaeological Society. See you then.
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