



# ARCH NOTES

ISSN 0048-1742

October 1976

76-8

---

## C O N T E N T S

O.A.S. Symposium 1976	Page 2
E.S.A.F. Annual Meeting 1976	3
O.A.S. General Meeting, September	4
Late Diggers	6
The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology	7
A New Look at Champlain's First Encounter with the Hurons	12

### ADDRESSES GIVEN BY O.A.S. MEMBERS

Dr. Howard Savage gave an address to the newly formed Collingwood and District Historical Society at Collingwood on September 23, 1976 on "Faunal Bones from Archaeological Sites in Ontario". Faunal findings from the McMurphy Site, Collingwood, the Maurice and Robitaille Sites of the Penetang Peninsula, and the Hind Site, near London, were outlined and compared.

Newsletter of

**The Ontario Archaeological Society (Inc.)**

P.O. Box 241, Postal Station P, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2S8

The Ontario Archaeological Society holds its annual Symposium on Saturday, October 16, 1976. Registration commences at 8:15 a.m. at the Dominion Ballroom of the Four Seasons Sheraton Hotel (The Sheraton Centre), Queen Street West, Toronto.

PROGRAMME

Archaeology of the Great Lakes Region

- 9:00 - 9:30 CLYDE KENNEDY - Champlain Sea and Early Ottawa River Shoreline Studies
- 9:30 - 10:00 PETER STOFCK - Recent Developments in the Search for Early Man in Ontario
- 10:00 - 10:30 ROBERT PEARCE - Archaeological Investigations of the Pickering Phase in the Rice Lake Area, Ontario
- 10:30 - 11:00 ----- Coffee -----
- 11:00 - 11:30 MILT WRIGHT - Excavations at the Glen Meyer Reid Site, Long Point, Lake Erie
- 11:30 - 12:00 IAN KENYON - Neutral Ceramics
- 12:00 - 1:30 ----- Lunch -----
- 1:30 - 2:15 JIM WRIGHT - The Archaeological Survey of Georgian Bay - First Season
- 2:15 - 2:45 JOHN DAWKINS, MICHAEL SPENCE, RONALD WILLIAMSON - The Boyd Site: An Early Woodland Burial Site in Ontario
- 2:45 - 3:15 SHELLEY SAUNDERS - The Analysis of Non-Excavated Human Burials
- 3:15 - 3:45 ----- Break -----
- 3:45 - 4:15 MIMA KAPCHES - The Interment of Infants of the Ontario Iroquois
- 4:15 - 4:45 DEAN KNIGHT - Excavations at the Ball Site.

The Symposium will commence with opening remarks by Drs. Norman Emerson and Howard Savage, and will be concluded by Dr. Wm. Finlayson.

Registration fee, at the door, is \$6 per person, and coffee will be available for early registrants from 8:15 until 9:00 a.m. Mail-in registrations must be received by October 8.

Speakers will be lunched by the Executive of the O.A.S. at the Arcadian Court in Simpson's, Queen Street. At the conclusion of the Symposium a cash bar will be open in the ESSEX ROOM of the Four Seasons Sheraton Hotel from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Publications of the O.A.S. and of The National Museum of Man will be available for purchase or order in the foyer of the Dominion Ballroom during the Symposium. Membership applications for the O.A.S. will also be accepted. Speakers are reminded that their manuscripts, for publication in an upcoming edition of "Ontario Archaeology", must be received by the Editor not later than November 15, 1976.

- - - - -

E.S.A.F. Annual Meeting 1976

18 - 21 November, 1976 - Richmond, Virginia

The 1976 annual meeting of the Eastern States Archaeological Federation will be held November 18-21 at the Hotel John Marshall, Fifth and Franklin Streets, Richmond, Va, 23219. The host society is The Archaeological Society of Virginia. Federation societies or members wishing to reserve display space for artifact or publication exhibits should contact Mr. M.D. Kerby, Local Arrangements Chairman, 13419 Oak Lane, Midlothian, Va. 23113.

A focus of the 1976 program will be prehistoric and historic archaeological research in Virginia and surrounding areas. Papers of general interest to the membership are also encouraged. Persons desiring to present a paper should contact either the chairman of the session or the program chairman. The program chairman is William Engelbrecht, Anthropology Department, State University College, Bufflao, N.Y. 14222.

The preliminary program schedule is as follows:

Thursday, November 18

7:00 - 9:00 Registration

Friday, November 19

9:00 - 9:15 a.m. Opening Address, Ronald Thomas, President, ESAF  
9:15 - 11:30 a.m. State Research Review (Jefferson Chapman, Univ. of Tennessee)  
1:00 - 5:00 p.m. Historic Archaeology  
7:00 p.m. Executive Meeting  
8:30 p.m. General Business Meeting

Saturday, November 20

9:00 - 11:30 a.m. Virginia Archaeology (Howard MacCord, Arch.Soc. of Virginia)  
1:00 - 5:00 p.m. General Session (James Fitting, Commonwealth Associates, Inc.)  
7:30 - 10:00 p.m. Annual Dinner with Speaker. I. Noel Hume of Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Topic: "The West Indies and the American Revolution: An Archaeological Perspective".

Sunday, November 21

9:00 - 12:00 a.m. General Session

\*\*\*\*\*

John Reid will attend on our behalf and present a report of the Society's activities during the year.

In his opening remarks at the first meeting of the Fall session, Dr. Howard Savage mentioned that the Ontario Heritage Foundation had approved in principle our proposal to them and that a meeting would shortly take place between government representatives and members of the O.A.S. with regard to this.

Jim Brennan raised the issue, which has been affecting many of our members this year, of the delayed granting of fieldwork permits by the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. This has certainly created difficulties for some members for no obvious cause or reason.

Our programme convenor, Marti Latta, presented two films: "How Old is Old?" and "Poma Indian Basketry".

### How Old is Old?

Until recently, archaeologists had no way to determine the real dates of their discoveries, especially those from before recorded history. They had to use relative dating, a process which has served them reasonably well for over 100 years. Now, with the advent of nuclear physics, a new world of precision in the measurement of time has been opened. Everything on the crust of the earth is today subject to exact dating by nuclear clocks, even bedrock under the oceans and the ice that covers the north and south poles. Oceanographers, analyzing samples of sediment taken from the ocean floor, have been able to place an age of about 200 million years on the ocean basins. This discovery that the oceans are relatively young - only one-tenth the age of the continents - is one of the greatest in our century.

The death of any organism can be dated within an accuracy of a few hundred years or less, using the Carbon 14 technique which, since 1950, has revolutionized archaeological and geological dating. It is now known that C-14 was not at all times evenly spread throughout the world: variations in the earth's magnetic field and periods of great climatic changes (such as the ice age and, recently, nuclear explosions) cause the amount of C-14 in the air to vary. By taking these fluctuations into account, scientists can use the C-14 method to date objects up to 40,000 years old.

Dendrochronology, or tree-ring dating, was the first - and is still the most accurate - method of placing exact dates on pre-historic objects. Lately, it has become of great importance as a cross-check on the accuracy of C-14 dating. In the 1960s, dendrochronologists found one of their most valuable tools in the White Mountains on the southeastern California-Nevada border: the unimposing pine tree. The oldest living thing on earth, its paper-thin annual growth rings provide a master chronology for some 7500 years of history.

Any ceramic object that has ever been fired can be tested and precisely dated in a process called thermoluminescence. When fragments of clay objects are fired again, the stored energy which they have absorbed from the sun, soil and environment is released as light, so faint it can be detected and measured only by electronic sensors.

The newest nuclear clock is potassium-argon. This method makes use of our knowledge that the radioactive element potassium, one of the commonest on earth, slowly decays into the gas argon. With the aid of

(more)

September Meeting - cont'd

electronic equipment, physicists can now appraise the argon and potassium content of rocks, thus probing through vast reaches of time to date materials as old as the world itself.

Pomo Indian Basketry

In their territory around Clear Lake in California, modern day Pomo Indian women still make their handsome utilitarian and beautiful ceremonial baskets in the traditional way, gathering and preparing local materials.

Shallow plate form baskets are used every day to prepare and serve food; conical and bell-shaped baskets with wide mouths are used in harvesting and for carrying loads. Many baskets are made as traps: the loosely-woven double fish trap for under water, the small woodpecker trap set in a tree, or the long quail trap on land. Cooking baskets are woven so tightly they are used for boiling liquids with hot stones. For routine work, the Pomo Indian women uses a hopper without a bottom to hold acorn meal on a grinding stone, specialized baskets for sifting and storing food, a handled seed beater and burden basket for harvesting wild seeds. The Pomo baby begins life in a sitting cradle made by his mother. The canoe-shaped treasure basket is one rarely made by any other tribe.

Since the Pomo grow no crops, they depend on wild plants for their basket materials, often walking far in the search for choice twigs, roots, bark, vines and rushes. All twelve of the materials they use are to be found near Clear Lake and, though usually gathered in the autumn, they are sometimes gathered as needed during the spring and summer. Bullrush and sedge roots, redbud bark, white willow roots and branches, and dogwood branches are the commonly-used warp and weft elements; split grape vine and tule stems are also incorporated into some special baskets.

Preliminary preparation of the materials may be done near the gathering place, but final preparation still goes on as basket making progresses. For some baskets, like the seed beater or the fish trap, the bark may be left on; usually, however, it is removed with the sharp edge of an obsidian flake. Materials are then properly dried, bundled and coiled, ready to be carried back to the home village. There, they may be used immediately, or stored for future use; in the latter case, soaking them in water restores their flexibility.

The Pomo weaver patiently prepares each element until it is ready for twisting or coiling: smooth, even and pliable. Except for the obsidian flake, a sharply-pointed awl is the only tool used by Pomo basket makers. Ancient awls were made from the leg of the deer by sharpening the ulna bone; modern awls are sharp steel points set in ornate wooden handles. Pomo basket makers have developed ten basket-making techniques, many more than any other tribe. Six of these are twining techniques, of which plain twining is the most used - often for an entire basket. Others include diagonal, lattice and three-strand twining. There are also several coiling techniques. Wicker is employed in one type of basket only: the handled seed beater. Yet another, quite different, technique is used for the Pomo cradle.

(more)

September Meeting - cont'd

The size of a Pomo basket can vary enormously. Very small ones - some less than a quarter of an inch in diameter and others little larger than the head of a pin - have been made in recent times to meet collectors' demands. They serve no practical purpose, but are, nonetheless, remarkable curiosities and evidence of the basket maker's dexterity. Giant modern baskets, some nearly four feet across, further demonstrate unusual skill.

Pomo baskets display a wide range of ornamentation, both elaborate and simple. The designs and patterns, worked into the baskets with red or black colours, are essentially geometric due to the warp and weft of the textiles. Of the seven basic design elements, the triangle is the most often used; others are the straight line, zigzag, rhomboid, rectangle, diamond and quail plume. Patterns may be arranged in bands, diagonally, with opposing diagonals to make a crossing pattern, vertically or individually.

Feathers adorn the Pomo's finest baskets. Varied thrush, mallard duck, meadow lark, valley quail and red-headed woodpecker feathers, crests or plumes are all used by the basket maker. Of all Pomo baskets, the most exquisite is the famous and highly-prized sun basket. This rare ceremonial basket requires the crest feathers of over 100 red-headed woodpeckers and represents the height of artistry and skill achieved by the world's most expert basket makers.

Reminder

Members are reminded that there will be no general meeting in October as this has been replaced by the Symposium on October 16th.

Janet Cooper

- - - - -

Late Diggers

BILL DONALDSON returns to the Hind Site in October. If anyone is interested in working on this site, please contact Bill at (519)542-4317, or 1428 Indian RoadnNorth, Sarnia, Ontario N7V 4C9.

PATSY COOK is still working on her ossuary at Uxbridge, and interested parsons may contact her (in the evening) at (416)466-5484.

- - - - -

O.A.S. November Meeting Change

The General Meeting for November will be held at 8:00 p.m. on THURSDAY, November 18, in the lecture theatre of the McLaughlin Planetarium, Royal Ontario Museum. Please note the change of day for this month only.

- - - - -

Addendum to the O.A.S. Membership List, Ottawa Chapter

Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Watson, 2086 Fairbanks Avenue, Ottawa K1H 5Z1, were inadvertently omitted from the list of members of the Ottawa Chapter. Sorry for this omission.

"Archaeological Survey of Canada's policy remarkably reactionary, wasteful and unimaginative ..."

The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology

By Brian Hayden,  
Simon Fraser University

With the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS) being relieved of the responsibility of excavating the Draper Site, and with Ottawa's representative William Finlayson presenting an alternative approach to the excavation, I think a number of issues of importance merit discussion. Of central concern is the role and goal of salvage (or "rescue") archaeology as currently perceived by many Ottawa archaeologists. Because the Draper Site held unusual potential both in terms of information and financial resources, it is an especially instructive example of the beliefs, goals, and actions behind the archaeological salvage policy in Ottawa.

A number of characteristics of the Ottawa outlook are readily apparent from policy statements from Ottawa. These will be briefly stated as a working base for interpreting events at the Draper Site.

Perhaps the most distinguished characteristic of the Ottawa policy has been an extreme aversion to research. The distinction has often been verbalized and it has been insisted upon in writing that: salvage archaeology is not, and must not be, research archaeology.

Closely related to that attitude is the belief, or implicit assumption, that there is some intrinsic worth in some limited types of information and that other types of information are more or less irrelevant. The information to be gained is relatively static and unchanging and is essentially the same for all sites where it is available. There is an "intrinsic" worth in the data that salvage archaeology seeks. On the other hand, "research" archaeology is presumably oriented toward more theoretical aspects, toward exploration, toward the resolving of issues, etc.; and it is presumably equated with the "newer" archaeologists. In the research orientation, data is only important if it is useful in the context of explanation. One might characterise the opposing salvage position as continuing the Boasian tradition of scouring the earth for bits of information with only the vaguest notion of why or how such information fits into broader theories, or why they were ultimately important. I would like to argue that the ossification of policy on the types of data to be recovered from "salvaged" sites has led to redundant excavations in which the same data has been collected over and over again with no new dimensions added to our understanding of the past. It might be objected that time and funds do not permit alternatives, however the Draper Site proved otherwise.

Perhaps intrinsic to any "salvage" organization is the express goal of saving one's cultural heritage. Unfortunately, whether to impress bureaucrats who know little about archaeology, or for whatever other reason, the emphasis among traditional salvage groups, as well as in Ottawa, has been on how much of the heritage has been saved in terms

(more)

The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology - cont'd

of thousands of artifacts recovered, square yards of dirt moved, and now, pounds of charcoal consumed in feeding crews (!). The heritage which is stressed is that of the antiquarian; new insights into past cultures come only as a poor second where they are present at all. Insights into how culture works are anathema. To impress superiors, each other, and subordinates, many sites are destroyed rather than excavated in order to obtain as many artifacts as possible, while new types of information are lost.

Thus, salvage policy in Ottawa is defined as: 1) in opposition to research (a distinction insisted on only by Ottawa); 2) a limited type of data intrinsically worthy of collection; and 3) antiquarian concern for preserving cultural heritage by acquiring only the most superficial types of data (quantity excavations rather than quality).

To demonstrate what effect these attitudes and goals have in the field, I would like to use the Draper site as an example, since I was the 1973 field director at the site. The Ontario Archaeological Society was under contract from the Archaeological Survey of Canada (ASC) to excavate the site. \*

The site is a Late Ontario Iroquoian site just outside Toronto and is quite special in that about six acres of this unusually large village had never been plowed. No undisturbed Iroquoian sites have been excavated and reported on in the literature, and even Ottawa representatives admit that only about six such sites are known at present in Ontario. Thus, the Draper Site is a rather special non-renewable resource. Because the site was to be destroyed (by the construction of the Pickering Airport), it seems only natural to try to profit from the unique characteristics of the site and to explore new dimensions of data recovery and analysis as well as gathering the more traditional types of data.

With the \$23,000 that the project was given for 1973, I decided to see how much quality, as opposed to quantity, of information was obtainable from excavations in the undisturbed portions of the site. Our mandate from the ASC was simply to investigate settlement patterns. I therefore initiated a series of ecological studies to examine determinants of settlement locations (multi-spectrured remote sensing, pollen analysis, proton-magnetometer, faunal, and seed remains studies) as well as a relatively intensive investigation of intra-structure settlement patterning. It was assumed that the village patterning would be manifest when the entire site had been excavated. Although not all these studies were productive (some were highly productive), if they had been able to yield structure and midden locations, much destructive work could have been averted. These techniques at least had to be tried.

Inasmuch as no one had ever published excavations of an undisturbed Iroquoian site before, I was faced with the question of how much information was potentially available from the undisturbed portion of Draper, and how to recover and analyse it. This too was a very exploratory matter in Ontario archaeology, but given the nature of the site, and given the advances being made in the spatial analysis of artifact distribution, as well as indications of success in determining activity areas and social groupings in contemporary archaeology elsewhere, it seemed foolish to treat the unplowed portion of the site as though it were just another plowed

(more)

The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology - cont'd

site. It seemed that relatively fine provenience controls might produce clearer, more reliable, and newer types of results. We recorded materials in 50 cm. squares and three cm. levels. Although we were unable to carry out an analysis of this material in as detailed a fashion as had originally been hoped (due to lack of money, unavailability of appropriately specialized personnel in programmes, and lack of specialized programmes for our needs), we did carry out detailed settlement pattern analysis within the structure at the 4 m.<sup>2</sup> unit level. I was not completely satisfied with our report, however resources did not permit us to take the matter further and I doubt that as thorough a report has been written on any other Iroquoian excavation in Ontario.

During the course of excavations it became clear from those most influential in Ottawa (although they never deigned to visit the site) that their definition of settlement pattern studies did not include the usual spectrum of data, but were rather narrowly constrained to the finding of postholes and pits. After the season was well under way, the word arrived that Ottawa had little use for detailed excavations, new approaches, theory, or research. What the Ottawa policy mandated was finding houses -- as many as possible, in as short a time as possible. What they did not seem to apprehend was that we did intend to find all the houses -- indeed we intended to excavate the entire site -- but we intended to find them in more detail, and we intended to obtain more insights out of them than was customary, at least for the undisturbed portions of the site. (If the site were to be destroyed, we were going to wait until the last possible moment before using earth moving equipment in the undisturbed zone.)

For that summer, with \$23,000 we were able to hire eight crew members (including a cook), of which only five worked at Draper. All analysis was performed out of those funds. On the basis of the work accomplished by that impoverished crew, I calculated that the entire site could be excavated for \$500,000 over two to three years. This included detailed excavation and recording of the undisturbed area and analysis. It also assumed (although it was never stated) support from volunteer workers recruited nationally and internationally, as well as support from local field schools which could excavate the plowed portions of the site.

When the OAS submitted a proposal to the ASC for completely excavating the Draper Site for a cost of \$500,000, utilizing detailed techniques in the undisturbed portion of the site, the reaction was almost immediate\*. The proposal was soundly rejected on the grounds: 1) that it was a research proposal, and 2) that the cost was unrealistic. Since then the criticism has also been verbally made that the 1973 excavations had simply "not done the job".

One of the more interesting assessor comments came from within the ASC itself. Although dubious of the availability of funds, the assessor stated that: "Ideally, a project of this scope would be generated for all salvage situations". He is no longer employed by Ottawa.

---

\*Because the airport was a federal project, all contract excavating had to go through ASC.

The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology - cont'd

What was the feasibility of funding the Draper Site excavations in a manner suited to "research"? The ASC was not providing funding, rather the federal Department of Transport was. The position that the ASC seemed to adopt a priori was that to ask for \$500,000 was not a salvage request and therefore could not be made. This was obviously by a self-fulfilling prophecy and a good exemplar of archaeological tokenism. On the other hand, sufficient precedent existed elsewhere, as in the United States, for demanding up to 5% of total project costs for archaeological work. In the case of the multi-hundred million dollar Pickering Airport, \$500,000 would hardly have caused a stir. In addition, the Department of Transport, already under heavy public pressure to abandon the airport on environmental grounds, could not have afforded to turn down any request for the adequate retrieval of Ontario heritage, especially with non-renewable resources as unusual as the Draper Site. For the Department of Transport to have refused funds for adequate study of the site could easily have caused the entire programme to collapse. And in fact, public pressure was so strong that plans for work in the near future have been abandoned. Finally, as an ultimate, rather ironic, demonstration of the rhetorical nature of the ASC financial objections to the OAS "research" proposal, the projected cost of their own within-house salvage project is \$750,000 -- 50% more than proposed by the OAS.

Thus, it would appear that the only reason the OAS proposal was rejected was ideological obstinacy - a revulsion for research and theory and displeasure at not finding postholes fast enough. The price of this obstinacy was high, for with only two field seasons available to excavate the site before destruction (in principle), the ASC was unable to find adequate assistance to carry out excavations during the first of those two years, which only left one season in which to excavate the entire site! The result was a not inconsiderable amount of chaos, and the bulldozing of some of the undisturbed portion of the site. Perhaps part of the increase in excavation cost can also be attributed to this state of affairs. It would be nice to think that because of the theoretical problems raised by the 1973 report, and because of the unusually detailed provenience recording, subsequent workers were encouraged to keep moderately good controls on excavations, and that this resulted in some of the high cost of excavation (those in the know at the ASC originally deemed \$75,000 reasonable). It is also flattering to see many of the problem orientations originally formulated in the 1973 report actually presented to the public as important questions that the Draper Site might relate to. Although it would be nice to see the OAS given the credit for those ideas rather than see them presented as in-house products of the ASC. In the final analysis, perhaps because of these factors, not as much destruction has occurred at Draper as might have otherwise taken place. Only the final ASC report on Draper can determine this. Perhaps relatively adequate data retrieval has taken place. There is no doubt however that OAS excavations would have been more detailed and different in emphasis. Certainly a not inconsiderable amount of dirt was moved per capita at Draper by the OAS in 1973, and good provenience is available for all material: the minimal requirement of a good excavation. In addition, substantial advances were made in a number of realms of analysis, including ecological patterning and stylistic intra-structure patterning. The resulting research included types of analysis that were new to Ontario, and in some case probably new to the hemisphere. Such results are

(more)

The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology - cont'd

hardly worthless even though the ASC believes they are not worth publication.

In summary, I hope that I have established peculiarities of federal policy on "salvage" operations, and how this policy can, and has, limited effective and good archaeological work in Canada, with the Draper Site an exemplar. The policy has led to needless destruction and waste of information, and non-renewable resources, and to unnecessary limitations on the scope of archaeological inquiry. The distinction between salvage and research archaeology is false and is being attacked in the literature as such (Schiffer and House, in press, Rex 1976). It is counterproductive, and it is anti-intellectual. "Salvage" groups around the world are asserting more and more that there must be sophisticated research designs behind salvage operations in order to maximize the usefulness of salvage operations and to obtain the maximum return for taxpayers' dollars. Without theory, priorities have no meaning and much that is valuable and useful will be lost. To divorce theory, models, exploration, and research from salvage is to render it impotent, and runs the risk of rendering the museums and institutions that support salvage archaeology no better than antiquarian collectors. In this respect ASC policy has been remarkably reactionary, wasteful, and unimaginative. The attempt should be made to see how much data can be saved from unusual sites such as Draper, and I would urge archaeologists, especially in salvage archaeology, to use the funds provided to probe the limits of archaeology.

Bibliography

Schiffer, Michael, and John House: In press. "Cultural Resource Management and Archaeological Research".  
Current Anthropology

Wilson, Rex: 1976. A status report to the archaeological community.  
Interagency Archaeological Services  
Division, National Park Service,  
U.S. Department of the Interior:  
Government Printer: Washington, D.C.

- - - - -

Editor's Note

Readers wishing to comment on this article, which does not necessarily reflect the views of the Society, may do so through the pages of ARCH NOTES. Please address your replies to: Editor, Arch Notes, 29 Tournament Drive, Willowdale, Ontario M2P 1K1

- - - - -

\* We are given to understand that the O.A.S. was not under contract to the ASC and that this statement is in error.

Editor

A New Look At Champlain's First Encounter with The Hurons

by Clyde C. Kennedy  
Archaeologist  
The Ottawa Valley Historical Society

Archaeologists are often hard-pressed to date Late Woodland Indian sites. Radiocarbon dates usually have "plus or minus" factors too large to permit relative dating of such sites.

For time-markers in relatively recent times, therefore, archaeologists in ever greater numbers are reading the reports of explorers and others, though not always with a critical eye. Few Europeans recorded their experiences in the New World. The reference material that assists the archaeologist is sparse: "...the early European traders were more interested in beavers than in history". (Trigger, 1972: 92) The archaeologist has often been heard saying with resignation: "It's all we have".

To question the sparse records that do exist is simply to suggest that the archaeologist may have even less than he thinks he has. Such questioning, then, may not be received in good spirit.

Nevertheless, it is interesting to look again at an oft-used "time-marker" - the alleged date that the Hurons first made contact with the French and thus began to obtain trade goods directly (and perhaps in greater amounts) rather than through Algonquin middlemen. This marker is said to be supplied by Champlain, who has been described as an explorer, ethnographer, geographer, map-maker, and artist, but rarely as a propagandist. Morris Bishop, however, describes Champlain's Voyages et Descouvertes, published in 1619, as a "propaganda volume". (Bishop, 1963: 246) Bishop is an ardent devotee of Champlain.

In a short article it is not possible to mention all the references to Champlain's meeting with the Hurons in 1609 and related history, so it might be sufficient here to suggest just the following: Champlain, 1613 (in Biggar 2: 65-106); Bishop, 1963: 119-133; Heidenreich, 1973: 232-234; and Trudel, 1966a: 186-199; 1966b: 161-167.

The Jesuits, who came to New France 16 years after the event being examined, made some comments in their Relations that need not detain us in this brief look at a minor skirmish (sometimes called a "war" by modern writers) between Iroquois on the one hand and Champlain with his two French companions and 60 Indian "allies" on the other hand. But if comments in the Jesuit Relations are considered significant relative to the supposed first Huron-French contact, then we must include this from Jerome Lalemant's 1639 report: "It is about forty years since these people (Hurons) for the first time resolved to seek some safe route by which to come themselves and trade with the French, of whom they had some knowledge, particularly through the reports of some of their number, who, going to engage in war against their enemies, had occasionally been at the place where the French were at that time trading with the other barbarians of these countries". (JR 16: 229)

If this Jesuit report is accepted, then Huron-French contact apparently came at least by 1599 rather than at the widely used 1609 date, which may simply be the date of the first meeting between Champlain

(more)

New Look at Champlain - cont'd

and the Hurons rather than the first Huron-French contact.

Champlain arrived on the St. Lawrence, at Tadoussac, for the first time on May 24, 1603, visited the Lachine Rapids about 200 miles upstream the first week of July, made a trip to the Gaspé and returned to Tadoussac, then departed again for the coast on August 16, 1603, and went on to France. He did not report encountering any Hurons making a trading trip, but the Indians could have been at trading spots along the vast St. Lawrence when Champlain was not within sight of them. Champlain notes that rival French traders "trade secretly". (Biggar 2: 242) The Hurons, furthermore, may not have gone down to the St. Lawrence every year.

On his next trip to the St. Lawrence, Champlain arrived at Quebec on July 3, 1608, perhaps after the usual time the Hurons came down for trade, and was kept rather busy handling a mutiny by some of his men and building his habitation, with a defensive moat around it, before winter. (There was a heavy snowfall on November 18.)

Champlain set out from Quebec on June 18, 1609 with a group of Montagnais. Near St. Eloi Island in the St. Lawrence River, he reports in his 1613 volume, he came upon a party of "some two or three hundred" Indians, including "Alcoumequins" (Algonquins) and "Ochatequins" (whom he identifies in his 1632 volume as Hurons). The Indians and Champlain parley, at the Indians' request Champlain has muskets and arquebuses fired, which astonishes some of the Indians (especially those who have not heard the like before), and the Indians are reported to say they want to see the habitation Champlain built at Quebec the previous year.

They all go down the St. Lawrence to Quebec, a distance of about 50 miles, and after "about five or six days" of dancing and feasting, Champlain, accompanied by some French and the Indians, goes back up the St. Lawrence a distance of about 100 miles, ostensibly to fight the Iroquois. They camp for two days at the mouth of the Richelieu River (apparently the major route for raiding the Iroquois by Montagnais, Hurons and Algonquins), where, Champlain reports, there is a dispute among the Indians. Most of the Indians leave for home with their wives and the goods they obtained in trade at Quebec.

Modern writers in recounting the 1609 "war party" strangely fail to note that the Indians Champlain met near St. Eloi Island had their wives with them. Heidenreich, Bishop and Trudel do not mention the fact. It doesn't seem likely that the Ochatequins and Algonquins were originally en route to engage Iroquois in battle as Champlain suggests and modern writers declare with definiteness.

In any case, Champlain is left with only 60 out of the 200 or 300 Indians and two French to go up the Richelieu to Lake Champlain in search of Iroquois. There is an encounter with "nearly 200" Iroquois, Champlain and his Indians are victorious, then they return to the St. Lawrence. Champlain and the Montagnais go downriver to Quebec and Tadoussac and the other Indians head for their homelands.

Champlain had set out from Quebec on June 18 with fewer than 60 Montagnais, with his purpose, he reports, being "to carry out explorations in the country of the Iroquois, to which I was to go with

(more)

New Look at Champlain - cont'd

our allies, the Montagnais". When he met the Ochateguins and Algonquins near St. Eloi Island (apparently by coincidence rather than by any arranged plan to go on a raid against the Iroquois with them), he says: "I began to give them some idea of the object of my expedition...". (Biggar 2: 68)

My general impression from reading Champlain has been that the Algonquins and Ochateguins had set out with their wives to trade on the lower St. Lawrence, not to go on a raid against the Iroquois. If the Indians had planned such a raid, they probably would have left their wives at home and the group would probably have camped at the mouth of the Richelieu and sent a messenger to tell Champlain about their location and intentions, instead of paddling down the St. Lawrence nearly 50 miles past the mouth of the Richelieu to St. Eloi Island at Batiscan.

According to Champlain's report, ships had been putting into Tadoussac since at least 1550 (Biggar 2:117). He also reports that the Ochateguins say they "knew well the country and rivers in the land of the Iroquois". (Biggar 2:70) It seems difficult to imagine the Hurons going down to the St. Lawrence and never trading with the French until, by chance apparently, Champlain visits the Ochateguins for the first time in 1609 near St. Eloi Island.

Champlain's writings reveal clearly enough that when he made his reports he had the "rights" of first discovery ever in mind - rights to profitable trade and favour at court. Rivals were forever fighting against monopolies awarded to the patrons of Champlain, probably because they had been in the fur trade before Champlain arrived on the scene. Large numbers of Indians had to be reported available in various regions to carry on a profitable fur trade; otherwise the merchants would shy away from risky investments.

Champlain does not name the young man he sends to live with the Indians and he does not accord them any "discoveries". (That is, lakes, rivers, lands, peoples and routes that became known to Europeans long after the Indians had discovered them.) Nicolas de Vignau, an exception, is not named for praise.

Champlain does not say directly that the Ochateguins have never before had contact with the French. He reports that in the Indian groups he met in 1609 and 1611 there were some who had not heard the firing of muskets, or arquebuses, or guns mounted on boats, and in 1611 "the greater number of these Indians" had never seen Christians. On the matter of seeing Christians, his 1609 report is vague, for a reading of it indicates that either some or none of the Indians had seen Christians; if it was the latter, Champlain had not only not seen the Ochateguins, he had not seen the Algonquins.

Neither of these Indian experiences prove anything relative to the first Huron-French contact for many trading parties probably would include Indians making their first trip to the St. Lawrence.

Champlain's statements are not always crystal clear. But his report of what he says to Sieur de Monts in France in the fall of 1609 seems clear enough. He says the Ochateguins (the "good Iroquois") understand and do not differ much in language from "the other Iroquois" whom he recently discovered (by going up the Richelieu River) and "who hitherto had been unknown to us" - "us" being Champlain. Heidenreich  
(more)

New Look at Champlain - cont'd

(1973: 233) reads Champlain differently and says "Champlain stated that he had never encountered these people (the Ochateguins) before (Champlain 2: 109)", arguing too that this is part of the proof that Champlain's visits to the Ochateguins near St. Eloi Island in 1609 was "the first direct contact between Hurons and the French". (Champlain had little opportunity to meet the Ochateguins before 1609.)

On his way down the St. Lawrence, on July 10, 1603, Champlain questioned a "young Algonquin" and fellow Indians. "They told us that there is a tribe called the good Iroquois who come to barter for the merchandise which the French ships furnish to the Algonquins..." (Biggar 2: 164) The Algonquins were responding to a question about mines in their homeland and indicating how they had met "the good Iroquois". They probably were not stating that the "good Iroquois" (the Hurons) traded only with Algonquins.

Who were the "Ochateguins" or "good Iroquois"? Who were the "Charioquois", who, rather than the Ochateguins, came down to the St. Lawrence in 1611? Twenty years or so after he apparently first met these Indian groups Champlain recounted, in his 1632 volume, his experiences which he had already recorded in earlier volumes of his writings. But in his last work he substituted "Huron" for "Ochateguin" and for "Charioquois". The names had dropped from view by the time Champlain made his 1613 journey up the Ottawa River. Heidenreich (1973: 24) suggests that "...for want of a better name, Champlain simply called the Huron after the chief who happened to be leading them at a particular time".

But previously I have pointed out that "The cultural development of the Algonquins (Algonkins) referred to by Champlain and by the Europeans who followed him is largely unknown "...Algonquin women apparently copied Iroquoian-type pottery" (Kennedy, 1970: 70), and I placed Iroquoian pottery on the time chart of the Ottawa River Drainage Basin (Kennedy, 1970: 66). Following the extensive Middle (Initial) Woodland occupation of the Ottawa Valley, as shown in archaeological sites, there is more often than not a certain amount of Iroquoian pottery.

Mitchell (1975) records Iroquoian potsherds, representing various time periods, from a considerable number of sites and indicating a total of 47 pots. Similarly our surveys have yielded Iroquoian pottery in meagre amounts throughout a large part of the Ottawa River Drainage Basin, extending inland as far from the Ottawa River as Lac Dumoine in Quebec (Kennedy, 1964). Possibly much of this pottery was left behind by Hurons travelling on trading trips with their wives, going up the several river-lake routes from Georgian Bay to the Ottawa River - routes long known to the Indians. (British engineers seeking canal routes were guided over them by Indians in the early 1800s.) Jesuit descriptions of life in Huron longhouses are a possible indication of why some Hurons, at least, would get out of the villages when they could.

If the Ottawa River Drainage Basin Algonquins copied Iroquoian pottery in later times, the fact that they too took the women on trading trips would account for some of the more extensive spread of Iroquoian pottery (Biggar 2: 298-300).

(more)

But there is a possibility that Hurons resided, at least briefly, in the Ottawa Valley, apart from passing through on trading journeys with stops for the night or the weather. In a paper presented to the Sixth Algonquin Conference (Kennedy, 1974), I pointed out that the configuration of what is apparently the Ottawa River on Champlain's map of late 1612 or early 1613 (Trudel, 1968: map 33) is in certain ways better than the Ottawa River represented on Champlain's later map, dated 1613 (Trudel, 1968: map 34). The Charioquet (Charioquois?) shown on map number 33 could be in or near Westmeath Township. In this general area Nibachis and his people were growing corn (Biggar 2: 275-277), probably close to Muskrat Lake.

It may be that originally the Algonquins lived up tributaries away from the Ottawa River and did not possess pottery. Later, as closer relationships with the Hurons developed, the Algonquins of this region used a certain amount of Huron pottery, obtaining it in Huronia where they wintered with the Hurons, from Huron traders, or from Hurons who resided briefly in the Ottawa Valley.

The possibilities for the spread of Iroquoian pottery on various time levels in the Ottawa Valley are considerable. James F. Pendergast kindly identified for me some Iroquoian sherds, including a few he classified as St. Lawrence Iroquois. Perhaps the Ottawa Valley should be given more consideration as one of the routes by which the St. Lawrence Iroquois dispersed. (See Pendergast, 1975)

Pendergast (1972) reports considerable Huron influence in the Dawson Site on Montreal Island and Trigger (1972) suggests this site dates to about the time of Hochelaga, visited by Cartier in 1535. Perhaps the Hurons were trading into the St. Lawrence via the Ottawa Valley as early as the mid-sixteenth century.

#### References Cited:

- Biggar, H.P.  
1922-1936: The Works of Samuel de Champlain. 6 vols.  
The Champlain Society.
- Bishop, Morris  
1963: Champlain, The Life of Fortitude. The Carleton  
Library No. 4. McClelland and Stewart
- Heidenreich, Conrad  
1973: Huronia. McClelland and Stewart
- Kennedy, Clyde C.  
1964: Survey Report to the National Museum of Canada  
1970: The Upper Ottawa Valley. Renfrew County Council,  
Pembroke  
1974: Champlain's Maps in the Ottawa Valley of the  
Algonkin Farmer-Hunters. Sixth Algonquian Conference,  
Ottawa
- Mitchell, Barry M.  
1975: Late Ceramics in Central Eastern Ontario:  
Iroquois or Algonkin? Ontario Archaeology, No. 25
- Pendergast, James F.  
1972: An Analysis of the Dawson Site Archaeological Material,  
In James F. Pendergast and Bruce G. Trigger, Cartier's  
Hochelaga and the Dawson Site  
1975: An In-Situ Hypothesis to Explain the Origin of the St.  
Lawrence Iroquois. Ontario Archaeology No. 25

New Look at Champlain - cont'd

Pendergast, James F. and Trigger, Bruce G.

1972: Cartier's Hochelaga and the Dawson Site, McGill-Queen's Press

Trigger, Bruce G.

1972: Hochelaga: History and Ethnohistory, In James F. Pendergast and Bruce G. Trigger, Cartier's Hochelaga and the Dawson Site.

Thwaites, R.G.

1896-1901: The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Burrows Brothers Co.

Trudel, Marcel

1966a: Samuel de Champlain, In George W. Brown, ed, Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 1. University of Toronto Press.

1966b: Histoire de la Nouvelle France. vol. 2. Les Editions Fides.

1968: Atlas de la Nouvelle France. Les Presses de l'Universite Laval

Re-printed from ARCHAIC NOTES

- - - - -

Arch Notes - Facts and Figures - October, 1976

Initial mailing this month was to 426 members, as follows:

<u>Metro Toronto</u>	<u>Rest of Ontario</u>	<u>Outside Ontario</u>	<u>Outside Canada</u>	<u>Totals</u>
160	168	18	19	365
9	20	12	20	61
				<u>Institutions</u>
<u>169</u>	<u>188</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>426</u>

This is an increase in membership of 22% over the 350 members last October.

- - - - -

ARCH NOTES is published 7 - 10 times a year by the Ontario Archaeological Society. All enquiries and contributions should be addressed to: Mike Kirby, Chairman, Arch Notes Committee, 29 Tournament Drive, Willowdale, Ontario M2P 1K1.

- - - - -