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1. INTRODUCTION

PRAXIS Research Associates is pleased to submit a comparative review of historical research reports pertaining to "historic métis in Ontario", as well as a map which provides a cartographic presentation of key findings. This chapter presents the background and review objectives of the project. Methods of analysis are also provided in this introductory chapter, including sociological and anthropological criteria by which historic métis populations are evaluated, as well as a formula for calculating estimates of fur trade post populations.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Between 1999-2001, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) commissioned historical research addressing the presence of historic métis populations in the following geographic areas:

- Area 1: Northwest (Fort Frances, Dryden, Kenora)
- Area 2: Wawa
- Area 3: Timmins, Cochrane and the Abitibi region
- Area 4: Georgian Bay region (Penetanguishene, Owen Sound, Parry Sound)
- Area 5: Sudbury / Espanola
- Area 6: North Bay / Sturgeon Falls
- Area 7: Mattawa
- Area 8: Burleigh Falls (omitted from this present review)

Identical terms of reference framed the historical investigation into each of Areas 1 - 8, resulting in a review of findings that are relatively comparable. However, prior to this body of research, studies had also been conducted on historic métis at the following locations:

- Thunder Bay (Gale 1998, prepared for Indian and Northern Affairs Canada)
Although these earlier studies do not address all, or the same types, of issues as the OMNR studies for Areas 1-7, a review of findings on Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay are included here in order to provide a full review of extant research on historic métis in Ontario.

Reports on areas 1-4 above were completed by PRAXIS Research Associates (1999a; 1999b; 2000; 2001). A preliminary review of each was conducted in preparation for discussions with OMNR officials in September 2001 in Peterborough. Subsequently, PRAXIS reviewed the reports authored by other researchers on Areas 5, 6, and 7, and a second round of discussions were held in December 2001 in Toronto. These discussions resulted in the identification of three main tasks necessary to standardize all research materials on historic métis including Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay, as follows:

3. Conduct a review and summary of reports and supporting materials pertaining to historic métis, for Area 5 (Sudbury/Espanola), Area 6 (North Bay/Sturgeon Falls), Area 7 (Mattawa), Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay.

4. Conduct a comparative overview of all OMNR reports addressing historic métis populations in Ontario (Areas 1-7, Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay).

5. Produce a cartographic representation of key information pertaining to historic métis populations in Ontario during the fur trade era (Areas 1-7, Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay).

These three tasks provide the framework of this present project. Specific review questions and requirements are itemized in Section 1.2 below.

1.2 REVIEW OBJECTIVES

The discussions in Peterborough and Toronto (September and December 2001, respectively) crystallized several critical questions and issues about which Ontario requires answers for all study areas. Of particular importance is the degree to which evidence demonstrates distinct métis “ethnic identity” among historic populations that developed out of the fur trade in Ontario. Hence, a preliminary objective involves the preparation of a concise list of social scientific criteria by which historic ethnic groups can be evaluated. These criteria are presented below in Section 1.3.

Chapter 2 addresses specific review objectives with respect to reports prepared for the Sudbury/Espanola, Mattawa, North Bay/Sturgeon Falls locations (Areas 5, 6, and 7). Several gaps in data and analysis identified by PRAXIS during initial reviews of these reports are now addressed in the present review. In particular, PRAXIS has examined and analysed the 1901 Census returns in order to determine a more accurate assessment of the métis population in each study area at the turn of the century.
Because the terms of reference for the Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay studies did not include many of the same questions addressed in later studies, a comparative review required that additional secondary sources be consulted. As well, 1901 Census returns were examined and a summary analysis is presented within the discussion of each study area. These two locations are summarized separately in Chapter 3.

For all study areas, an attempt is made to review the evidence with respect to the following questions:

- What evidence is there of a historic ethnic métis community in the location in question?
- If evidence indicates that a historic ethnic métis community developed, when did this occur?
- At what time did the following events occur in the location in question:
  - the establishment of a permanent European presence;
  - the assertion of effective European control as manifested by the obtaining of a cession of Indian title, the advent of significant European settlement or the establishment of a significant governmental or administrative presence (i.e. surveying of lands, opening of land registry, establishment of a military or naval presence).
- If a métis ethnic community developed, what were its harvesting practices, if any?
- If a métis ethnic community developed, has it persisted to the present day?
- Identification of gaps in the reports and supporting documentation that preclude arriving at reasonably well founded answers to the foregoing questions.

Chapter 4 of this review provides summary pages for each of the present-day locations in all study areas (Areas 1 - 7, Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay). These summary pages are organized to correspond with the fur trade districts shown on the map appended to this report.

A wall-size map titled, *OMNR Studies of “Historic Métis in Ontario”: Fur Trade Post Populations*, is appended to this report (produced with the technical assistance of GeoWare Consulting, Ottawa). The map illustrates the following key information:

- Location of historic fur trade posts (see Appendix A);
- General characterization of such posts, including date of establishment, functions and permanency.
- Important lines of communication (trade routes) in the historic fur trade era;
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• Connections between posts which belonged to the same district and among which métis traders/employees travelled, worked, and lived with their families.

• Location of significant European settlements in proximity to fur trade posts, with the date of their settlement.

For reference purposes, the map is also appended to this report in 8½ x 11" format (Appendix B).

1.3 METHODOLOGY: CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY

Criteria for evaluating the relative strength or weakness of evidence supporting the view that métis communities developed in various locations are provided in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 below.

The basic analytical issue of this comparative review concerns the degree to which historical evidence demonstrates that "ethnic community" developed among historic métis populations in the study areas. Social scientific criteria by which the character and development of historic ethnic communities are measured in this report, are gleaned from two main sources as follows:

• *Sociological and Anthropological Perspectives on Community: An Overview* (OMNR report prepared by Praxis Research Associates, 17 July 1997);

• "Issues and Indicators of Métis Identity", Section 2.3 of *Historic Métis in Ontario: Wawa and Environs* (OMNR research report prepared by Praxis Research Associates, 12 August 1999).

It is important to note that the criteria presented here are an attempt to provide an operational definition of community that is both consistent with social science and appropriate to the types of documentary evidence available on historic métis populations. The tables below allow for a consistent measure of the evidence of such populations in various locations across Ontario.

The comparisons drawn from the application of these criteria are based solely on the varying amount and type of historical records available to researchers about métis in each of the study areas. That is, findings are based on the state of evidence and the degree to which evidence indicates ethnic community. The actual existence of historic métis ethnic community is difficult or impossible to determine in many cases, due to methodological limitations such as sparse historical records. These issues are discussed for each study area examined in this review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of Ethnic Community</th>
<th>Application to Historic Métis Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Descent (necessary but not sufficient)</td>
<td>1. Fur trade endogamy leading to métis endogamy; generations of métis families traced in fur trade records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common experience at individual level</td>
<td>2. Bi-cultural parentage, culture brokers between Europeans and Indians, socialization solely within context of the fur trade and post settlements, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective recognition:</td>
<td>3. Other-ascription (eg., “halfbreeds”) by European and/or Indian observers indicating a distinctive identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) group identification by outsiders</td>
<td>3.b. Self-ascription as evidenced in letters or petitions (“we the halfbreeds...”) and perhaps the 1901 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(other-ascription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) group identification by insiders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(self-ascription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social structure (eg., kinship, institutional)</td>
<td>4. Fur trade (eg., HBC) economic and social organization; distinct métis segment within that hierarchy (eg., servant class of voyageurs, occupational niche as interpreters, post provisioners, etc.); collective and permanent presence of “women of the fort”; post settlements as microcosms of overall social structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political / Ideological element (shared goals, political or legal aspirations, common worldview)</td>
<td>5. Petitions and/or negotiation for treaty status, reserves, scrip, etc.; correspondence or speeches asserting métis rights, expressions of historical basis for such rights; leadership/organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geographic element (residential proximity, eg., “neighbourhood”)</td>
<td>6. In fur trade period, métis &amp; other HBC employees characterized by high mobility; but, indication of post settlements with significant or majority métis segment; generations of métis families within a fur trade district; post-fur trade (ca. 1900) clusters of métis on reserves or urban neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural distinctiveness (material culture, lifestyle, language/dialect, music, art, symbolic celebrations, etc.)</td>
<td>7. Eg., red capote, sash, log houses, fiddle music, “Michif” dialect, or other language use, religion, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Stages of Community Development</td>
<td>Application to Métis Ethnogenesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Commonality of experience at discrete individual level</td>
<td>1. Bi-cultural parentage; exclusive fur trade socialization; other-classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structural conditions permitting discrete individuals to share experiences and perceptions, to acknowledge common characteristics (i.e. community without communication is impossible)</td>
<td>2. Social, cultural, economic, and geographic structure of fur trade results in distinct post populations with mixed descent segment that increases in proportion with succeeding generations; métis families share occupational and class characteristics within fur trade structure (voyageurs, culture brokers / intermediaries / interpreters, post provisioners); Aboriginal or métis women as members of the post community and children socialized within post culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective organization: members cluster geographically or create central institutions; this necessarily implies a group of individuals or families with common values and/or goals</td>
<td>3. Institutional recognition by EuroCanadians of social (later legal) status distinct from ‘Indians’; petitions for treaties, scrip, etc. and settlement on reserves or convergence in neighbourhoods (late 19th - early 20th century); creation of formal political organizations and legal recognition (mid-late 20th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Historical foundation / common heritage: set of common values passed down through generations; development of 'culture'</td>
<td>4. Heritage traced to the fur trade; eg., Red River / Louis Riel as symbolic of identity / political aspirations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 POST POPULATION FORMULA

Criteria of ethnic community based on social phenomena such as descent, cohesion, structure and geographic proximity are inherently group related. The implication is that numbers of people with some degree of commonality are required in order for community to develop. Accordingly, a situation in which métis individuals or families were temporary residents and in which the number of residents was very small in any given season or year, is less conducive to the development of community than a situation in which larger concentrations of métis formed a relatively stable population-base over several generations of time.

An attempt is made here to quantify post populations during the historic fur trade period. The aim of this exercise is to provide a stronger sense about whether the populations of métis at various locations are more or less indicative of a potential for development of an ethnic community. While the number of employees at a post or in a district during any given year are generally available from HBCA Post Journals, District Reports and Servants’ Accounts, the number of dependents (wives, children, extended family members) living at the post are only rarely recorded. Two such rare records have been located in the course of research on historic métis in Ontario. Both are census records compiled at the district level by HBC officers, providing accounts of total populations for several posts and outposts within a single district.

The first is an account of men and their families in the Lac la Pluie District for the Outfit 1818-1819 compiled by Chief Trader Robert Logan (HBCA B.105/a/6 [PRAXIS 1999b:Doc.8]). The second is provided in a series of censuses compiled by Chief Trader George Keith at Michipicoten from 1828 to 1833 (HBCA B.129/e/5,6,7,9,10 [PRAXIS 1999a:Docs.10,11,13,15,16]). From these efforts to compute “the number of women and families connected with the Officers and Servants” in their districts, it is possible to develop a formula that may be used to estimate overall post populations elsewhere, based on the number of post employees. Generally, it can be estimated that the post population may be at least double that of the number of employees.

Applying these District calculations to individual posts is problematic in that populations varied both according to assignment of men and depending on season and year. For example, an outpost might be managed by one or two single men during a winter, while in another winter one man with his aboriginal wife and their children might be assigned to that same outpost. Populations at permanent trading posts decreased significantly during the summer when only a skeleton staff was left to manage the post. The majority of men were employed from late June/early July in the transport of fur bundles to major depots (eg., York Factory or Moose Factory), returning in late August/early September with cargo for the district’s next Outfit. The formula used for the purposes of this present review is based on winter complements of fur trade post employees.

The census records of Logan and Keith together with the resulting formula are presented in Table 1.3 below. This formula is applied to all study areas reviewed in this report where records allow for a count of post employees (Table 1.4). It is important to note that the formula used here is tentative and the resulting post population figures are, at best, comparative estimates.
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### Table 1.3
#### Post Population Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HBC Census of Men &amp; Families</th>
<th>1818 Lac la Pluie District (HBCA B.105/s/6 [PRAXIS 1999a: Doc.8])</th>
<th>1828 Lake Superior District (HBCA B.129/e/5,6 [PRAXIS 1999a: Docs.10,11])</th>
<th>1830 Lake Superior District (HBCA B.129/e/7 [PRAXIS 1999a: Doc.13])</th>
<th>1833 Lake Superior District (HBCA B.129/e/9,10 [PRAXIS 1999a: Docs.15,16])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks / Postmasters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants/Labourers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices/Recruits</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Permanent Employees</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total District Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Employees multiplied by X</td>
<td>$X^1 = 1.677$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 2.167$</td>
<td>$X^3 = 2.188$</td>
<td>$X^4 = 2.608$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Average of above $[(X^1 + X^2 + X^3 + X^4) / 4] = 2.16$

**Working Formula:** $\# \text{ Employees} \times 2.2 = \text{District} / \text{Post population}$

---
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### Table 1.4

**Post Population Size (Winter)***

*Posts are numbered to correspond with the “Key to Fur Trade Locations” on the map; Year indicates the date(s) for which post populations are measured.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST (Year)</th>
<th># EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>x 2.2 = POST POP.</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Moose Factory (1890)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Long 1985:141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Abitibi (1790)² (1809)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>HBCA SF-Fred.H., p.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Praxis 2001, Doc.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Matagami (1822)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HBCA SF-Matawag., p.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Flying Post (1822)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HBCA SF-Matawag., p.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Frederick House (1787-1812)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HBCA PH - Frederick H. HBCA SF-Matawag., p.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Matachewan (ca.1870)²</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>HBCA SF-Matachewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New Post (1891)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HBCA SF-New Post, p.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Temagami</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fort Coulone / Lac des Allumettes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mattawa (ca.1840s)</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>Jones 1999, Doc.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent traders: Lake Huron District (1828)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Doc.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. La Cloche (1828)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Docs.1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Missisagi (1828)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Doc.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Biscotasing (ca.1880s)</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Doc.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Whitefish Lake (1828)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Doc.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. French River (1828)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Doc.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The winter “complement” of men represents the more permanent population in any given district or post.

2 Number represents men at several posts at this location, including HBC, NWC and/or independent posts.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST (Year)</th>
<th># EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>X 2.2 = POST POP.</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. LaRonde/Nipissing (1828)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Calverly, Doc.B-1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Shawanaga (1828)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jones 2001, Doc.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Penetanguishene (1828)</td>
<td>35 métis voyageurs</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Osborne 1901; Patterson, in Praxis 2000:97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dukis Post (1820s)</td>
<td>2-3 (?)</td>
<td>4-7 (?)</td>
<td>Calverly, n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sault Ste Marie (1826)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HBCA B.194/e/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total population, ca.1845)</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Holmes, Doc.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Michilimackinac</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Fort St. Joseph</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Batchewana (1828)</td>
<td>2-3 (?)</td>
<td>4-7 (?)</td>
<td>Praxis 1999a:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Michipicoten (1828)</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>Praxis 1999a:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Pic (1828)</td>
<td>4-5 (?)</td>
<td>9-11 (?)</td>
<td>Praxis 1999a:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1828) (+ Freemen, 1817)</td>
<td>5-7 (+ 73)</td>
<td>11-15 (+ 160)</td>
<td>Campbell '80; Arthur '81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Fort Frances (1828)</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>33-44</td>
<td>Fleming 1940:209-10;259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1861) 18 + 4 freemen</td>
<td>18 + 4 freemen</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Praxis 2002: App.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Dinorwic / Wabigoon</td>
<td>2 (?)</td>
<td>4 (?)</td>
<td>Praxis 1999b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. North West Angle</td>
<td>2 (?)</td>
<td>4 (?)</td>
<td>Praxis 1999b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Hungry Hall</td>
<td>2-3 (?)</td>
<td>4-7 (?)</td>
<td>Praxis 1999b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Fort Garry (1829)</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>44-66</td>
<td>Fleming 1940:239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. REVIEWS OF REPORTS: SUDBURY, NORTH BAY AND MATTAWA

This chapter summarizes data specific to the development of métis populations in the Sudbury/Espanola, Mattawa, and North Bay/Sturgeon Falls locations (OMNR Areas 5, 6, and 7), as presented in reports and supporting documentation prepared by Gwyneth C.D. Jones and David Calverly, Ph.D. These three locations are connected both geographically and historically. Lake Nipissing and Mattawa were closely tied as posts along the "Nipissing Passageway" fur trade route and during the mid-19th century both were administered under the HBC Timiskaming District. Nipissing, however, was originally part of the HBC Lake Huron District for which La Cloche — near present-day Sudbury and Espanola — was the headquarters for about a century. A brief description of the connections between these posts and other study areas is provided in the introductory section.

Fur trade records from La Cloche demonstrate direct contact between traders from Drummond Island (and later Penetanguishene), Sault Ste. Marie, and Lake Huron district posts including Shawanaga, French River, and Nipissing. These traders travelled the fur trade route which followed waterways from the Ottawa River at Mattawa, along the Nipissing passageway into Georgian Bay and west through the North Channel of Lake Huron to Sault Ste. Marie or Michilimackinac (and then into Lake Superior). The significance of these routes is that métis individuals living in sparsely populated areas such as the Nipissing district are certain to have had some connection with foci of positively identified métis ethnic communities such as at Penetanguishene and Sault Ste. Marie.

La Cloche journals document visitors and traders travelling back and forth from Drummond Island, Sault Ste. Marie and east to Whitefish Lake and northeast up the French River to Nipissing (Jones 2001: Doc. 2). The Chief Factor at La Cloche made business trips to Sault Ste. Marie, and in 1833 he requested that more boats be built to carry good from there to his district posts (Jones 2001: Doc. 13). In 1863, maple sugar was traded between Sault Ste Marie and La Cloche (Jones 2001: Docs. 50, 51). Once Drummond Island was turned over to the United States, traders who relocated to Penetanguishene continued to be active in the region, particularly in the Lake Nipissing area (Jones 2001: Doc. 31). In 1831, the Chief Factor at La Cloche indicated that Andrew Mitchell of Penetanguishene was one of two principal rivals (Jones 2001: Doc. 12). Alfred Thompson of Penetanguishene was also active in the region, outfitting Dukis on Lake Nipissing and further north in the Kenogamissi and Timiskaming regions.\footnote{Mitchell, Elaine A. (1977). \emph{Fort Timiskaming and the Fur Trade}. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, p.215.}

It is also known that Mattawa was a supply depot for inland HBC posts as far north as Abitibi. While there is no direct evidence, it is possible that the Shawanaga post (near Parry Sound) was a stopover along the Georgian Bay route from Penetanguishene to the French River. Apparently Etienne de la Morandiere had also been at
Drummond Island, but relocated to Killarney around 1820 in order to be nearer his Ottawa wife's family, a fact which may explain why some Drummond Island voyageurs moved there after the 1828 relocation (Jones 2001: Docs. 403, 407).

As information about La Cloche and records from that post also inform fur trade period developments at North Bay and Mattawa, the Sudbury report is summarized first. Within the discussion of each study area, supporting documentation is cited using the document numbers assigned by the author of the report under review.

2.1 SUDBURY / ESPANOLA REGION


For most of the 19th century fur trade period, the region in which Sudbury and Espanola are now located was served mainly by the Hudson's Bay Company's (HBC) Lake Huron district headquarters at La Cloche. The HBC Archives report and post history for La Cloche locate the post on the north shore of Lake Huron “10 miles east of the mouth of Spanish River”, about halfway between Sault Ste. Marie and the mouth of the French River (Docs. 394, 409). Several smaller posts in the region were under the management of La Cloche from at least the 1820s, including Whitefish Lake, Shawanaga, Mississagi, Green Lake, French River and Nipissing. During this same period (1820s), an independent fur trade store was established at Killarney by Etienne de la Morandiere. In the 1880s, the HBC opened a variety of small posts and outposts inland along railway lines (eg., Biscotasing, Pogomasing, Wahnapitaesing, Onaping, and Vermillion/Larchwood), and in 1889 the District headquarters was transferred from La Cloche to the HBC store in Sudbury (established 1888).

2.1.1 Evidence of historic ethnic métis community

Descent: Jones traces several lineages of métis family names in the district from the 1820s through to the 1880s and a few into the 20th century, including Boyer, Rastoule, Flammand, Faille, Bisaillon, Cantin, Solomon and Lamorandier (eg., Docs. 1, 2, 6, 11, 16, 26, 34, 43,128, 183, 278, 283, 290). Jones indicates that many of these family names are later found on area band lists, for example Dokis First Nation, Henny Inlet, Wikwemikong, Thessalon and the Point Grondine band. Other names are later found at Sault Ste. Marie and Killarney. However, these names are not listed on 1901 Census enumerations for the Sudbury region.

Common experience at individual level: Métis men who shared bi-cultural heritage are identified as servants of the La Cloche post and other Lake Huron district posts. There is also evidence of several métis – eg., Joseph Cadotte – travelling through the La Cloche area on their way to or from Sault Ste Marie and Drummond Island. Lists of Servants from 1824 and 1830 identify individuals' parish as "Hudson's Bay", including McKay, McLeod, Cantin, Chevalier, etc. (Doc.1,
11). Of 31 winterers in the district in 1830, 12 were from Hudson Bay, 17 were from Canada and 2 were from Britain (Doc.11). That several families are traced in the area for several decades indicate the probability that métis children shared the experience of growing up in a fur trade culture and in post communities, albeit small. By 1875, métis servants with “family connections” were in charge of small outposts in the Lake Huron district (Doc.90). With respect to the métis experience as culture brokers, the Lamorandier family in Killarney acted as ‘middlemen’ between Aboriginal people and the Indian Department by collecting Treaty annuity payments to save Natives the trip to collect said payments; they also acted as paymasters for the Indian Department and wrote letters on behalf of Aboriginal people (Doc 53-70, 73, 77, 80, 83, 84, 136).

**Collective recognition: other-ascription, and; self-ascription:** There is evidence of both other ascription and self-ascription of métis in the area. The term “halfbreed” was used to label individuals of mixed ancestry in the area. For example, in 1828 Chief Factor McBean identified two “halfbreeds”, Joseph McLeod and Michel Frechette (Doc.2, see also Docs. 128, 185, 186, 204). A cleric’s letter in 1838 applies the term “halfbreed” to denote a group of people resident on the north shore of Lake Huron (Doc. 18). In 1850, Robinson estimated that the north shore Lake Huron “halfbreed” population numbered about 200 (Doc. 28). Indian Affairs records from 1857-1916 demonstrate various attempts to include or exclude individuals and families identified as halfbreeds from band memberships and treaty paylists (Docs. 253, 256, 257, 259, 263, 267, 269, 272, 339). In the 1870s - 1880s, the Solomon and Lamorandier families were viewed by both Natives and non-Natives as “not Indian”; although bands did not object to having them on paylists and may have considered them members, they were reluctant to cede reserve land to them (Docs. 92, 105, 109, 110).

**Analysis by PRAXIS of the 1901 Census shows a total of 142 persons enumerated as métis in the Sudbury region, particularly in areas immediate to La Cloche and Killarney:** Enumeration listed under “Collins Inlet” — located approximately 10 kilometres northeast of Killarney — show that 53% (88 of 165) of the population was métis. While many of the métis households are listed in Schedule 2 (Buildings and Lands) to be situated on Reserve lands, it is uncertain whether any or all were band members. A discrepancy exists when compared to margin notes on the enumeration sheets (Schedule 1 - Population) which indicate the same métis (and non-métis) households as situated in Carlyle and Humboldt townships. Only one margin note refers to the Indian Reserve proper, listing four or five métis households at “Indian Reserve & Humboldt.” However, none of the métis surnames identified by Jones (see above) match those found in the Collins Inlet enumeration. No métis were enumerated in the town of Sudbury itself, but another 33 persons were enumerated as métis at Biscotasing. Jones notes that surnames such as Solomon are listed as ‘French’ in the 1901 Census for Nipissing District, ‘Chippewa’ for Salter Twp., and ‘Indian’ for Whitefish River. In the 1920s - 1940s, letters and reports regarding establishment and practices at the school in Whitefish Falls identify métis children

---

4 Originally identified as a gap in Jones’ report, **PRAXIS** examined the 1901 Census enumeration sheets for a count of total métis populations in the Sudbury area, including also the records for Collins Inlet (NAC 1901 Census, Ontario — Nipissing District (92): Collins Inlet (q); Killarney (g); May, Salter & Twp. 116 (p); Spanish (a); Whitefish River, Mouth (f) [Reel T-6483 & T-6484]).
in attendance (eg., Docs. 360-363, 369-372).

**Social structure / organization:** Although La Cloche was a district headquarters, the post population was moderately small. In 1824 it employed 7 men including the post Factor; the 1828 report lists 6 servants (Docs. 1, 6). The smaller posts employed on average 2-4 employees, and were operated at times on a seasonal basis only. In the late 1820s to mid-1830s, the HBC Lake Huron District as a whole employed an average of 30-35 men and it is not known to what extent country-born families lived with them at the posts (Docs. 6, 7, 10, 12). However, McBean did report that although the HBC population was relatively small, the independent / rival traders in the area numbered 101 (Doc. 7). Unfortunately, no records exist to indicate the extent of families or nature of social structure among opposition post populations which in 1828 numbered “no less than ten” (Doc. 15). Evidence of a permanent post settlement at La Cloche includes, for example, journal entries which indicate that Chief Factor John McBean had a family and that other men had wives and/or children (eg., Doc. 2). There is also direct evidence that a permanent group of “women of the post” lived and worked at La Cloche (Docs. 2, 16). Together these data suggest the existence of a post community social structure consisting of families with mixed ancestry offspring socialized within the local fur trade post culture and economic system. A more extensive examination of Servants Accounts (Moose Factory) may provide additional data on the occupation and origin of HBC Lake Huron district employees over a longer period of time (see section 2.1.5 below).

**Political identity:** There is no direct evidence of political group identity among La Cloche area métis per se. However, the letter in 1838 by a Roman Catholic priest (probably Bishop Gaulin) may indicate that some degree of political consciousness was held by métis living on the north shore and islands of Lake Huron (exact locations unidentified). This letter to the Lieutenant Governor’s secretary addresses the issue of métis benefits under the 1836 Bond Head treaty and reports the “repeated and earnest solicitations from the Half Breeds... to obtain for them and their families the same privileges and advantages, as the pure Indians have acquired,” including settlement on Manitoulin, permission to fish, and sanction for a Catholic clergyman (Doc. 18).

**Geographic proximity:** From at least the 1820s, there appears to have been a trade settlement at Killarney (Shebaonaning), with a post operated by the métis trader Lamorandiere (Doc. 407). Killarney later appears to have grown to a larger métis settlement whose economy was centred on fishing. However, by 1901, most of these individuals were enumerated as French not métis, although the “core” métis family names (Solomon, Lamorandiere, Rocque, etc.) remain, demonstrating stable residency patterns spanning several generations. The 1901 census for Sudbury and surrounding townships show no concentration of residents enumerated as métis. However, in the district of “May, Salter & Township 116” south of Espanola where La Cloche was historically located, 41 métis were enumerated. According to Jones, these families were connected to families living on the adjacent Spanish River Indian Reserve (p.28). Other métis populations near the Sudbury region were enumerated north at Biscotasing (33 métis) and south near Killarney, at Collins Inlet (88 métis) (see footnote #4, above).
Cultural distinctiveness: There is no significant data regarding material culture, etc. One document dated 1836 records a steamship trip to Shebaonaning (Killarney) where the captain visited the “house of the trader, Mr. Lamarandunt, and danced away to the merry sound of the fiddle, with the gay and lively half-breeds” (Doc. 407).

Date of occurrence: The evidence summarized above suggests that a métis population had begun to develop on the north shore of Lake Huron by the 1820s. By the late 1830s there is some evidence that this population perceived itself as a separate group identity. 1901 census records and school records from the 1920s - 1940s indicate that métis families continued to live in the area, but that identity was fluid, as some joined bands, others identified as French, and some continued to identify or be identified as neither Indian nor White.

2.1.2 Evidence of harvesting practices of métis ethnic community

Fur trade records for the period 1827-1863 indicate fishing as the most important post subsistence harvesting activity, followed by hunting (primarily rabbits). In 1863 post employees killed 16 deer by the end of March (Doc. 52). Jones’ report does not systematically record the extent to which métis servants were post provisioners. “Women of the fort” and post families harvested maple sugar (Docs. 2, 16). The cultivation of corn, potatoes, and carrots also occurred at La Cloche (eg., Docs. 4, 7, 9, 10, 12).

By the 1860s, fishing was an important industry at Killarney and a number of the “French halfbreed” population there were involved in fishing, two of whom were the largest-scale fishermen in the village (Doc. 81). In the 1870s, mixed ancestry people also farmed potatoes, kept some domestic animals, produced maple sugar, and occupied themselves with a significant amount of fishing (Doc. 81). During the fishing controversy in the 1890s, Jones indicates that the “old mixed ancestry families” of Killarney seem to have acted together against the newer Anglo-Saxon residents (p.24).

With respect to Aboriginal peoples in the Lake Huron region, the 1871 Census lists Manitoulin Island Indians (including members of Whitefish River Indian Band) as ‘farmers’ (Docs. 46, 81). Indian Affairs annual reports from the late 1870s indicate that the agricultural bands on Manitoulin Island were doing well, while those peoples on north shore who relied on hunting are suffering (eg., Doc. 91).

2.1.3 Permanent European presence and assertion of effective control

Permanent European presence is estimated at circa 1790 when the North West Company established a trade post at La Cloche. By 1824, the HBC was a strong presence in the area, having established a series of posts along the north shore of Lake Huron and northeast to Mattawa. By the 1840s, mineral exploration was occurring along the north shore of Lake Huron.

European contact prior to this time consisted of explorers and traders, beginning in 1615
when Samuel de Champlain travelled to mouth of the French River, and possibly to the area of present day Killarney (Docs. 407, 408). Between 1640 and 1670 French Jesuits attempted (unsuccessfully) to establish permanent missions at Manitoulin and Sault Ste. Marie (Docs. 393, 405, 408, 417). By 1657 there had been a sufficient number of Jesuits and other travellers that a relatively accurate map of area immediately north of Manitoulin Island was produced (Doc. 417). By the 1680's, Native people were well-supplied with European trade goods (Doc. 417). In 1761-1764 Alexander Henry travelled through La Cloche.

Effective European control in the area was asserted in 1850 with the signing of the Robinson-Huron Treaty. However, there is evidence that the 1836 Bond Head treaty exerted some European influence on the Aboriginal people living on the mainland. At the time of the 1850 Treaty, fur trade posts and the settlement at Shebaonaning (later Killarney) were the only ‘non-aboriginal’ centres in the region.

Although Killarney is characterized as a “non-fur trade” settlement, it was originally the location of a store established in 1820 by a former American Fur Trade Company clerk and trader, Etienne de la Morandiere (Docs. 397, 403, 407). By 1836 the settlement had grown large enough to request the permanent presence of a priest (Docs. 278, 403). In 1848 a post office was officially located in Killarney (then still known as Shebaonaning, Docs. 403, 407). In the 1870s government and churches established schools at Spanish River (1876), Sagamok (1878), and Whitefish Lake (1879-80) serving all populations through to the 1940’s (Docs. 91, 99, 100, 113).

Economic development in the Sudbury area followed construction of the railway in the 1880s. By 1881 sawmills and timber operations employed local native populations (Doc. 114). By 1883 the railway reached Sudbury. By 1886, five open pit mines were in operation in the Sudbury area.

2.1.4 Persistence of métis ethic community to the present day

There appears to be almost no data for the latter half of the 20th century. Currently Sudbury has both MNO and OMAA branches, of which the OMAA appears more active. Also, names such as Lamorandiere, Solomon and Rocques are apparently still present in Killarney.

2.1.5 Gaps in the report and limitations of evidence

Evidentiary Limitations:

- There is no continuous or long-term record of everyday life at La Cloche during the fur trade period. HBCA journals and reports for La Cloche are available only from circa 1827 - 1836. There are a few HBC district reports for 1875-1888 and scant correspondence records for various years. It is known that many other traders were active in the area during the 19th century, but no records from NWC or independent fur companies are available. While the available material solidly establishes métis in
the area, earlier presence can only be inferred from rare mention in scholarly texts, and statements about the character of métis as a community are based on rare and brief descriptions.

- Fur trade records for associated posts at Whitefish Lake, Shawanaga, Mississagi, etc. are almost non-existent and provide no supporting data to métis life at La Cloche.
- Robinson Treaty Annuity Paylists (Henvey Inlet, Whitefish Lake and Whitefish River) are not available for the years 1851 - 1856, nor for most of 1860s - 1870’s;
- There is no specific mention of Espanola in this body of documents.

Gaps in the report:

- HBCA post journals are not systematically examined for the connection between known métis names and harvesting practices (it would be necessary to search the microfilmed journals to address this gap).
- HBCA Moose Factory Abstracts of Servants Accounts respecting the Lake Huron district are examined for only one year, 1829-1830. An examination of these records for following decades might be useful in tracing métis servants’ residence and occupation in the Lake Huron district, possibly for several generations.

2.2 NORTH BAY / STURGEON FALLS AREA
The Existence of an Historical Métis Community in the North Bay / Sturgeon Falls Area
(Report prepared by David Calverly, Ph.D., no date)

The estimated date of a trading post established on Lake Nipissing is around 1800 when the NWC built “Fort La Ronde” on the south shore (Doc. O-1-1). In 1821 the HBC took over La Ronde and trade was centralized at the Nipissing post on an island south of the mouth of Sturgeon River (Doc. M-1-1). At this time, the Nipissing post was in the Lake Huron District under the management of La Cloche, which also established a post on the French River in the 1820s (apparently at the mouth of the French River on the west bank, Doc. M-1-1). These were small, seasonal (winter) posts employing 2-5 men, possibly some with families. Like Mattawa, the Nipissing and French River posts functioned primarily as strategic frontier stations to protect and/or to intercept trade and to act as supply depots along “the Nipissing Passageway” (from Ottawa River to Georgian Bay). In 1832 the HBC transferred the Nipissing post to the Timiskaming District. Independent fur trade posts operating on Lake Nipissing included the “Dukis Post” (1845) outfitted by Alfred Thompson of

Penetanguishene (located on the north shore at Dokis Point near the mouth of the Sturgeon River). In 1848, in an effort to better compete against independent traders, the HBC post (also known as "Sturgeon Hall") was relocated to the north shore of the lake on the North Bay. In 1860 it was reassigned to the Lake Huron District where it remained until it closed sometime in the early 1900s when its business was transferred to the Saleshop Division and new headquarters established in North Bay.6

2.2.1 Evidence of historic ethnic métis community and date of occurrence

Descent: A métis lineage that is reliably traced in the Nipissing area is one branch of the Laronde family (see summary of Jones 1999, Section 2.3.1 below). Additional data from secondary sources indicates that a fairly large extended family of "free traders" named La Ronde were solidly established in the area "before and after the absorption of the North West Company" (p.16). Apparently some La Ronde descendants relocated to Penetanguishene after the HBC/NWC merger, but remained active in the fur trade (pp.16-18). As noted below (Section 2.3.1), members of the Laronde family are documented in the Nipissing area into the 20th century (in 1901 at Beaucage IR and Widdifield, some identified as métis and others as Chippewa). Several members of the McLeod and Goulais [Goulet] families also identified as métis on Beaucage IR. Members of the Rastoule, GrandLouis and Beaucage families were enumerated in 1901 at Beaucage IR, but identified as either Algonquin or Chippewa (cf. pp.99-102).7

Common experience at individual level: There is no direct evidence of métis servants at the HBC Nipissing or French River posts. However, estimates that 35% of Lake Huron district servants between 1830-1850 were métis, and that by 1875 small outposts in the district were being managed by métis would suggest that métis were also at Lake Nipissing (see Section 2.1.1 above). Michel Rastoule Sr. (Canada) was the HBC post manager at French River in the late 1820s - early 1830s, and his country-born son Michel Jr. (Hudson's Bay) was in the service by the time he was age 18 (Appendix #1, Table 2). In this instance, at least, a child of mixed parentage is known to have been socialized within the area fur trade. That several other country-born families seem to have been in the region (eg., Grant, La Ronde) indicates the probability that Michel Rastoule Jr. shared this experience with others of his generation. Certainly some of the independent traders in the area were of mixed ancestry, Dokis and La Ronde, for example, the latter having a large extended family on Lake Nipissing. Michel Dokis was of mixed ancestry, but identified as Indian and was the chief representing the French River band in the Robinson-Huron treaty.

Collective recognition: other-ascription, and; self-ascription: There is almost no evidence of either other-ascription or self-ascription applied to métis in the Nipissing area during the fur trade. This is due primarily to the complete lack of post journals in which references to persons as "halfbreeds" most commonly occur. Available district reports and correspondence related to Nipissing do not apply the term "halfbreed" to servants. Robinson's 1850 census identified

7  NAC 1901 Census, Ontario – Nipissing (92): Widdifield Twp. (g7); Beaucage IR (i7) [Reel T-6484].
halfbreeds at Sault Ste. Marie, St. Joseph’s Island and Killarney, but no mention is made of métis in the Lake Nipissing area. After the Robinson-Huron treaty, Indian Affairs correspondence about disputes over annuity payments to individuals of métis descent applies the term “halfbreed” in several instances (see Section 2.2.1, above). In the 1890s, some members of the Nipissing band are identified as halfbreed, some with ties to fur trade (eg., La Ronde, pp.87-89).

Analysis by PRAXIS of 1901 Census records show a total of 99 métis individuals (self- and/or other-ascribed) in the North Bay/Sturgeon Falls area. The majority of these métis lived on the Beaucage Indian Reserve: 24 métis were enumerated off-reserve in Widdifield township, and; 75 métis were enumerated on the Beaucage Indian Reserve. In addition, 20 métis – all members of the D’Aigle family – were enumerated in 1901 at the “Indian Reserve south of Lake Nipissing in Tps. London & Falconer”.

Social structure / organization: In terms of employees, the Lake Nipissing post was second in size only to La Cloche in the Lake Huron district. In 1828, a Clerk (unnamed) and 4 Labourers lived at the post (Doc. B-1-2). In 1830, Nipissing was managed by Francis Grant, assisted by 4 men; French River was managed by Michel Rastoule (Sr.), assisted by one man (Doc. B-1-3). After Nipissing was transferred to Timiskaming in 1832, information about the population of the Nipissing post disappears. Independent establishments will have added significantly to the overall trader population on Lake Nipissing in the 1820s, as the opposition seemed “always stronger manned” than the HBC (Doc. B-3-3). In 1828 the La Cloche Chief Factor noted that at French River and Lake Nipissing there were “no less than four houses” carrying on trade at each place (Doc. B-3-4). Francis Grant (Canada) apparently had a country wife and family who in 1829 were asked to “take care of the Buildings and Garden” over the summer while all the men were gone from the Nipissing post (Doc. B-3-6). The 1833-34 report states that one of the French River men – probably Rastoule Sr. had a county wife and four children (Doc. B-1-6; cf. Appendix #1, Table 2). Although the population size of the Nipissing post makes some structure of post community a possibility (if most men had wives and families), the fact that it was operated seasonally (winter) likely precluded such a development. The seasonal and transient nature of both the French River and Nipissing posts – and likely the independent posts as well – probably also meant that many métis offspring stayed with their Aboriginal mothers and band family when the posts were closed for the summer.

Political identity: There is no evidence of political consciousness among a métis group in the Nipissing area during the 19th century. Robinson-Huron treaty negotiations contain no record of chiefs from French River (Dokis) or Nipissing bands requesting special consideration for métis (Docs I-1-1, N-1-1).

Geographic proximity: There is evidence of a small off-reserve concentration of métis in Widdifield township by 1901. This township is immediately east of the Nipissing [Beaucage] Indian Reserve, and appears to include the location of the HBC post after it was relocated to the North Bay
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8 NAC 1901 Census, Ontario – Nipissing (92): Widdifield Twp. (g2); Beaucage IR (i2); IR south of Lake Nipissing (n2). [Reel T-6484]
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area in 1848 (see above).

Cultural distinctiveness: There is no data regarding material culture, language, etc.

Date of occurrence: It appears that the transient and seasonal character of the fur trade on lake Nipissing during the first half of the 19th century did not provide the necessary elements for métis ethnic community to develop, despite evidence of métis individuals and families in the area during this time. Evidence of a sizeable métis group living in the Widdifield township by 1901 may indicate that a community developed sometime after the Robinson-Huron treaty, possibly related to members of the Nipissing reserve and to fur traders in that immediate area when posts were established or relocated on the North Bay shoreline in the late 1840s. As was the case in Mattawa, it appears that some métis were compelled to live off the reserve due to disputed annuity rights, and this may have resulted in the development of a métis community nearby.

2.2.2 Evidence of harvesting practices of métis ethnic community

The issue of harvesting by métis is not addressed. The lack of daily fur trade journals precludes such an analysis.

2.2.3 Permanent European presence and assertion of effective control

Permanent European presence in the area seems to have occurred around the turn of the 19th century with the establishment of La Ronde post by the NWC circa 1800. The Lake Nipissing area was primarily a trade route throughout the 1700s, and Fort Temiscamingue (est.1679) was the nearest large post followed by La Cloche in 1790 (NWC). Lake Nipissing and French River posts were established by the HBC around 1820, and independent traders were also present in the area by that time. Evidence suggests that the “Nipissing Passageway” was dotted with multiple “frontier” stations used to intercept trade and to protect furs from theft. These posts were generally small, seasonal, sometimes temporary, and subject to change in location for strategic reasons.

Prior to the fur trade era, Champlain travelled Lake Nipissing in 1615. Nicollet lived among the Nipissings from 1620-1629. Missionaries were in the area for a short time in 1621-22, returning in 1640 to establish a small mission. The Beaver Wars in the mid-1600s dispersed both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal inhabitants in the Nipissing region, although missionaries renewed attempts when the Iroquois were defeated and Ojibwa and Algonquin people returned. From the 1670s onward, there was an intermittent mission presence in the area.

Effective European control was asserted in 1850 with the signing of the Robinson-Huron Treaty by representatives of both the French River and Nipissing bands (Doc. N-1-1). The Dokis Indian Reserve (French River, #9) and the Nipissing Indian Reserve (Beaucage, #10) were both surveyed in 1853 (PRAXIS, data on file).
2.2.4 Persistence of métis ethic community to the present day

The report does not address the question of métis in the North Bay / Sturgeon Falls area during the 20th century, nor does it provide information about the economic development or growth of non-Aboriginal / immigrant population in the region.

2.2.5 Gaps in the report and limitations of evidence

Evidentiary limitations:

- There are almost no primary fur trade records for the Lake Nipissing posts (a few HBCA “Miscellaneous” items dated 1831-1835 only). No records for the French River post have survived, and after 1834 references to this post disappear. La Cloche district reports potentially provide the next best primary source for the period 1821-1832, but these contain little specific information about either the Nipissing or French River posts. There are no district reports for the period 1832-1860 when Nipissing was in the Timiskaming District.

Gaps in the report:

- Mitchell 1977 (Fort Timiskaming and the Fur Trade) was not consulted. This publication includes a fair amount of detailed information about the Lake Nipissing posts and their role in fur trade.

- HBC Abstracts of Servants Accounts (Moose Factory) for the Lake Huron District are examined for only two years, 1830 and 1850. A more systematic examination of these records for the 19th century may provide evidence of continuity of métis family names in the area as well as additional positive identification of native-born servants.

- 20th century information regarding area economic development, immigrant settlement, and Métis organizations is absent.

2.3 MATTAWA AND ENVIRONS


The fur trade history of Mattawa spans over a century, beginning in 1784 when the NWC established a post at the fork of the Ottawa and Mattawa Rivers as a branch of Fort Timiskaming (Doc. 198). The post was strategically located at the entrance to the “Nipissing Passageway” leading to Georgian Bay, as well as along the Montreal-Timiskaming trade route. In 1821 the Mattawa post was taken over by the HBC and assigned to the Ottawa River District (Fort Coulange, headquarters, Doc. 192). At this time, the post was small, and seems to have operated only on a seasonal basis, its
primary function being to acquire furs from Indians travelling the Nipissing passageway. Through most of the 1820s and 1830s, Mattawa post’s most important function was a frontier station to intercept independent traders. In 1837 the HBC staffed the post as a permanent supply depot along the Montreal-Timiskaming route, and posts as far north as Abitibi were supplied via Mattawa (Docs. 192, 195). Mattawa was transferred to the Timiskaming District in 1840 by which time the post was operated on a year-round basis to compete against independent posts in the area (eg., McConnell brothers from Hull). By 1843, 80% of the business at Mattawa was with lumbermen and in 1848 the post was re-annexed to Fort Coulange (Doc. 192, p.9). In 1883 Mattawa became the headquarters of the Timiskaming district (Doc. 192, p.14). In 1893 the Mattawa post was transferred to the HBC’s Saleshop Division and in 1908 the post was closed and its business moved to North Bay.

2.3.1 Evidence of historic ethnic métis community

Descent: Jones’ report focusses largely on tracing the lineages of “four founding families” (most frequently occurring family names) of the métis community at Mattawa, with some links to the fur trade and to Robinson-Huron treaty paylists. Much of Jones’ data is derived from Indian Affairs documentation of family members seeking reinstatement on Treaty paylists during the late 1800s. Jones family tables indicate a few instances of intermarriage among these families, for example between members of the Antoine, Bastien and Grandlouis (Commanda) families (possibly indicative of métis endogamy). Members of each of these three families were enumerated as métis residing in the same Polling Division (1) of Mattawa in 1901:

The Antoine family is documented from circa 1820-1940 mainly in the Mattawa area. The 1901 Census enumerated members of this family as Algonquin FB. It does not appear that this family was connected to the fur trade as traders or post employees; rather, census records indicate occupation as hunters and later as merchants. Their successful application in 1910 to be reinstated on the Treaty paylist indicates a strong identification with their Algonquin ancestry (through the male line). However, the Antoine extended family in Mattawa chose not to return to the Reserve, but rather lived in the neighbourhood where the HBC post once stood.

The Bastien family is documented from circa 1820 - 1910 in the Mattawa area. By 1901, members of this family are enumerated as Algonquin FB. Family history is similar and also related to the Antoine family, and there is no direct evidence of their connection to the fur trade. The Bastien family application to be reinstated to the treaty paylist was denied because their Indian ancestry was traced through the female line.

The Grandlouis (Commanda) family is documented from circa 1850 to 1910 in Mattawa, Kippewa and at the Beaucage Indian Reserve (Lake Nipissing). Some family members were enumerated as Chippewa and/or Algonquin FB in the 1901 census. Like the Bastiens, their application for reinstatement on the treaty paylist was denied on the grounds that Indian ancestry was traced through the female line. Connection to the fur trade, if any, is not documented.
The Laronde family appears to have a weak connection to Mattawa (of a total of 94 entries on Jones’ “Laronde Family Table”, only 10 refer to Mattawa), and this family is likely better discussed within the context of métis community in the Lake Nipissing/North Bay area (60 entries refer to Widdifield and Beaucage Indian Reserve). The Laronde name has a strong link to the fur trade in that area, documented for almost a century from at least 1814 to 1911. Before the HBC took over the NWC post on Lake Nipissing, it was named the “La Ronde Post.” Jones indicates that some Laronde descendants lived on the Beaucage Indian Reserve (late 1880s - early 1900s) which would indicate intermarriage with the Nipissing band. However, by the time of the 1901 Census, the Laronde name does not appear on the enumeration sheets for Beaucage IR (Doc. 141). Jones also provides evidence of Laronde intermarriage with Algonquins of Lake of Two Mountains and Allumette Island. Other branches of the Laronde family apparently lived off-reserve at Sturgeon Falls, Widdifield Township (North Bay), Mattawa, Pembroke Township and Allumette Island, and according to Jones, most were identified as métis (Chippewa MF [Métis French] and OB [Other Breed] in the 1901 census (see Section 2.1 above, cf. Doc.141 [illegible and/or incomplete]).

Common experience at individual level: The common experience at the individual level for descendants of the “four founding families” appears substantially different than for other fur trade areas. The family histories indicate a strong connection to their Algonquin or Ojibwa ancestry and in each case there is evidence of members struggling to be reinstated as status Indians receiving treaty benefits. In light of the fur trade history in this area characterized by small, seasonal posts, it is possible that no significant post settlement developed and the historical data indicate that métis offspring were likely absorbed into local band communities (this is supported by comments by David Joanisse, p.49). It was only during treaty disputes that this group was singled out as métis. In the face of being told they were “not Indian”, individuals and families fought to prove their Aboriginality and accompanying rights and benefits. In being refused status and in some cases being forced to relocate off reserves, concentrations of métis developed in towns such as Mattawa and some intermarriage between off-reserve métis occurred. The evidence that a métis neighbourhood grew near the HBC post location may indicate at least some self-identification with their fur trade heritage (see below). Several métis surnames associated with the district fur trade were enumerated there in 1901, for example, the Walter Ferris (Faries) family. Ferris was the interpreter for the Treaty 9 commission at Matachewan and had strong family ties to métis in the Abitibi fur trade region (see Jones’ “Mattawa... Unsorted Table” 1999:13-14; cf. Timmins, Cochrane & Abitibi report, PRAXIS 2001:103).

Collective recognition: other-ascription, and; self-ascription: Due to an almost complete absence of fur trade records for Mattawa, no instances of other-ascription for that period are available. The earliest instances of self- and other-ascription are found in the Indian Affairs documentation of halfbreed ancestries of individuals applying for treaty benefits during the 1880s and 1890s (see above). The basis for Jones’ claim that by the turn of the century 20% of the Mattawa population had some association with métis families is unclear (p.41). Examination of 1901 census records by PRAXIS reveals that métis enumerated in Mattawa comprised about 10.5% of the total
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town population (150 of 1,400).\textsuperscript{10} Jones is correct in stating that Mattawa métis lived in the HBC post neighbourhood. 1901 Census enumerations show that a majority (125 of 148, or 85%) of Mattawa métis lived in Polling Division 1 where the HBC post was still located. Of a total population of 433 in Polling Division 1, at least 125 (29%) are “Breeds” (cf. Doc. 141). Furthermore, several surnames are the same as men employed at HBC and independent posts at or near Mattawa during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century: McKenzie, Turner, and Ferris, for example (cf. Doc. 192).

School records from 1906 to 1940 list métis children (36 in 1907; “a great number” in 1923) whose “halfbreed families reside in the town of Mattawa are assessed and pay [school] taxes” (Docs. 145, 169, 171, 182). Because the Indian Department did not recognize these halfbreed children for school grants, such payments to the Mattawa school were discontinued in 1940 (Doc. 183). Although earlier evidence indicates a desire among métis families in Mattawa to identify with their Aboriginal ancestry (for treaty purposes), later evidence indicates that métis identification emerged, possibly due to external pressures.

Social structure / organization: As described above, the Mattawa post was small and likely did not support a permanent post population until the 1840s at the earliest. In the absence of post journals, little can be said about the social organization at Mattawa during the fur trade period. While there is evidence of the presence of mixed ancestry individuals at the post at various times, there is no evidence of daily life or social relationships. HBC records for the period 1828 - 1834 indicate that the Mattawa “outpost” was managed during the winter months by 2 men, and a rival post was operated by 2-3 winterers (Doc. 192, p.1). In the winter of 1834-35 an interpreter “Charles Lapage” was sent by the HBC from Fort Coulange to oppose the rival traders at Mattawa, possibly remaining there until his death in 1841. In 1837-38 the HBC chose a site on which to build a permanent store, and while the post was now operated year-round, it appears that its population remained small. During the 1840s the Mattawa post employed 3-5 men including the post manager and an interpreter, J.S. Hunter (Doc. 192, pp.5-6). Frequent turnover of managers and servants at Mattawa (eg., 7 different post managers between 1843 and 1848) likely precluded any permanent sense of post community during that time. The sense of a transient fur trade population is echoed in comments by the ‘anonymous genealogical researcher’ cited in Jones report, that the métis community at Mattawa “originate in families along the fur trade route from Lake Timiskaming to Penetanguishene” (p.49). Others may have come to Mattawa from Quebec during the lumber period (1840s, \textit{ibid.}). In the 1850s and 1860s, Mattawa post management was more stable – Collin Rankin managed the post from 1848-1853, succeeded by George Hunter (perhaps the son of the interpreter?) who remained at Mattawa in various capacities until 1866. It should also be noted that a rival post (house and store) was built in 1847 by Roderick McKenzie, McKenzie’s son (unnamed), his son-in-law John McLeod, Alexander McDonell and John England, all former HBC employees from Lake Nipissing (Doc. 192, p.8). McLeod is identified as métis in the Sudbury report; the origin of McDonell, England and McKenzie is not known, but McKenzie’s son and son-in-law likely indicate country-born families. HBCA Inspection reports from the late 1880 - 1890s (cited in Doc. 192) may provide insight into the physical size and spatial organization of the HBC’s Mattawa post including the existence of

\textsuperscript{10} NAC 1901 Census, Ontario – Nipissing (92): Mattawa, Town (o'), Polling Divisions 1,2,3 [Reel T-6484].
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family quarters (not examined in Jones’ report). By 1888, the population at Mattawa was close to 1,000 consisting of “mostly French, and entirely dependent on the lumbering on Lake Temiscaming. The Indians of the area were rapidly decreasing and there were only two or three hunters” (Doc. 192, p.15).

Political identity: There is no evidence that persons or groups of mixed ancestry in the Mattawa vicinity asserted any degree of political consciousness. On the contrary, historical evidence of a political nature focuses exclusively on métis individuals and families seeking rights and privileges as Indians under the Robinson-Huron treaty.

Geographic proximity: As indicated above, most of the mixed ancestry individuals and families enumerated at Mattawa in 1901 lived in Polling Division 1, the old HBC post neighbourhood on the north side of the river (“Squaw Valley”). The Algonquin and Ojibwa ancestries of this métis group are rooted in a fairly wide geographic area surrounding Mattawa, including Lake Timiskaming, Kippewa (141 métis enumerated in 1901 [PRAXIS, on file]) and Lake Temagami (112 métis enumerated in 1901 [PRAXIS, on file]), land north of Lake Nipissing., and as well as Quebec communities such as Lake of Two Mountains (Oka) and River Desert (Maniwaki).

Cultural distinctiveness: The only evidence of cultural distinctiveness is that of musical traditions attributed to métis in Mattawa as documented by Anne Chretien in her 1996 thesis (pp.51-52, Doc. 209).

Date of occurrence: Métis ethnic community at Mattawa may have begun to develop in the 1840s after the HBC post was made permanent and other independent traders established more permanent posts. The simultaneous development of the lumber industry in the area may also have brought in métis families looking for work. By 1901, about 150 métis were resident in the town of Mattawa.

2.3.2 Evidence of harvesting practices of métis ethnic community

The issue of métis harvesting practices is not addressed in Jones’ report, largely due to the fact that no records of daily life – fur trade post journals, for example – are available. However, census records and oral accounts indicate that subsistence hunting was part of the métis lifestyle in the late 19th and into the early 20th centuries. For example, in the 1881 Census, many métis are listed as hunters. By the time the 1901 Census was taken, a shift to wage economy had occurred (logging, etc.).

2.3.3 Permanent European presence and assertion of effective control

The first permanent European site at Mattawa was the NWC “Fort Mattawa” post established in 1784. Prior to this date, Champlain travelled through the area in 1615, and in 1626 Jesuits passed through on way to Huronia. Fort Temisicamingue was established in 1679. Effective European control dates to 1850, the Robinson-Huron Treaty. In 1853 the Mattawan-Nipissing Road was
surveyed by the provincial government and in 1854-56 farm lots in Mattawa/Nipissing were surveyed. The first permanent logging camp was built in 1855 on the north bank of the Mattawa River. In 1861-62 Mattawan township lots surveyed and the first European full-time permanent resident was a hotelier. In 1872 the first court session was convened in Mattawa (judicial district of Nipissing). The railway connected to Mattawa in 1881 bringing with it increased immigrant settlement.

2.3.4 Persistence of métis ethic community to the present day

Ann Chretien’s 1996 thesis provides oral evidence of a continuous métis community in Mattawa with a self-perceived cultural distinctiveness manifested in music, language, etc. There is contradictory historical evidence with regard to such continuity. For example, in the late 1850s, an “Antoine Belanger” was in charge of the transport sleighs that passed through Mattawa (Doc. 192, pp.13-14). According to Chretien, a métis family with the name of Belanger continues to live in Mattawa, one of whom was a principal informant for her thesis (p.50). Two Belanger families were enumerated in Mattawa in 1901, but neither appears to be identified as “Breed” (faded copies), and neither is enumerated in Polling Division 1 where the HBC post was located. The name Belanger is also not listed on Jones’ “Mattawa... Unsorted Table”. Apparently both the MNO and OMAA are active in Mattawa (p.50).

2.3.5 Gaps in the report and limitations of evidence

Evidentiary limitations:

- Fur trade records are scant for the Mattawa post. There are no post journals, and very few other records (eg., correspondence, accounts, district reports scattered over the years, 1868-1906. Posts for the districts to which Mattawa belonged also contain few records: Temagami has a few post journals only (1932-1941); Fort Coulouge & Lac des Allumettes have no post journals and few other records (1822-1853); Fort Timiskaming has post journals for one year (1840-41), and a few other scattered records for the years 1822-1905.

Gaps in the report:

- Although fur trade records are scant, most that are available are not listed in the sources consulted (Temagami, Timiskaming, Fort Coulouge, Lac des Allumettes). As well, the HBC post history for Mattawa (Doc. 192) lists several sources that may be useful, but were not examined. For example, inspection reports from the late 1880 - 1890s cited in that document may provide some additional data.

- HBCA Moose Factory Abstracts of Servants Accounts may allow for a more systematic examination of individuals in the district (cross-referenced with names mentioned in the HBCA Mattawa Post History) during the fur trade period.
3. REVIEWS OF REPORTS: SAULT STE. MARIE AND THUNDER BAY

In preparation for R. v. Powley and Powley (1998), two reports were completed for OMNR focussing on historic métis at Sault Ste. Marie (Holmes 1996; Jones 1998). Also in 1998, a report was prepared for Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) on Robinson Treaty métis, specifically the historic métis population at Thunder Bay (Gale 1998). The summaries below are based primarily on these three reports. However, in each report, the thrust of data collection and analysis is on the period around and after the Robinson Huron and Superior Treaties of 1850, and there is little information about the genesis of a métis population as a result of the fur trade during the 18th and 19th centuries. In order to fill this gap, several key secondary sources are used in the summaries below in order to provide a more complete picture of the fur trade history at both Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay.

3.1 SAULT STE. MARIE


The fur trade history at Sault Ste Marie spans about two centuries beginning in the late 1660s until the early 1880s. The Sault passage (Bow-e-ting) was the gateway from Lake Huron to Lake Superior, and a natural hub connecting the upper and lower Great Lakes both before and during the fur trade. A French fort at St. Ignace had been in operation since 1627 and around 1670 a trade post for coureurs de bois, explorers and Indian nations was established on what later became the American side of the St. Mary’s River (Holmes, p.5). These French traders established an east-west pattern of trade that involved annual convoys to and from Montreal. In 1762 the settlement was captured by English troops. By the 1760s the convergence of Lakes Michigan, Huron and Superior supported three major fur trade centres: Fort Michilimackinac (French, 1712), Fort St. Joseph (NWC, 1765), and; Sault Ste. Marie (Independent/HBC, 1768). The Sault settlement included a small fort and houses occupied by both English and French traders, remaining on the south side St. Mary’s River until 1794 when, in accordance with the Jay Treaty, all of the “British Sault” holdings were relocated to the north shore (Holmes, pp.6-7). At this time, the North West Company was already operating a post on the north side at Garden River, where a band of Ojibwa settled after the Jay
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Treaty and where a métis village subsequently emerged (Holmes, p.7). Sault Ste. Marie ceased to be a principal location on the east-west fur trade artery after the NWC/HBC merger in 1821, when trade was re-oriented to follow a south-north route to Hudson Bay (Holmes, p.9). In 1843 the HBC closed its post at the Sault (Holmes, p.15). However, some “old Sault” traders continued to manage independent fur businesses until the 1880s when the fur trade was no longer a viable economic activity in the region (Jones, p.18).

3.1.1 Evidence of historic ethnic métis community

Descent: The earliest recorded birth of a half-breed is that of Charles Langlade, born in 1724 to Mackinac trader Augustin Langlade and his Ottawa wife Domitilda (Holmes, p.5). Charles became a prominent trader and military leader in the region, and descendants apparently can be traced to the present in Green Bay, Wisconsin and Penetanguishene. Charles’ first wife was an Indian woman; the children of this marriage were raised in the French trade post culture at the Mackinac fort, educated in Montreal and the Langlade sons became traders and military officers. Mixed marriages in the Parish of Mackinac between 1744-1800 include surnames later attributed to métis in the region including Reaumes, Amiot, Cadot, and Solomon. By 1800, the highest level of intermarriage occurred at the Sault (Holmes, p.8). There is evidence of métis endogamy (eg., between the Langlade and Cadotte families), and a pattern whereby sons of these marriages also entered the local fur trade and/or military. Following the British takeover, Scotsmen joined the trader ranks in the colonies, giving rise to métis surnames such as McKay, McCoy, Grant and Gordon.14 Peterson documents that the highest level of intermarriage for the early “corporate towns” occurred at the Sault where by 1800 a growing number of Canadien, métis, Scottish and Irish traders had fanned out along both sides of the rapids with their native wives and children (eg., Nolin, Piquet, Barthe, Comparé).15 Chute documents kinship ties that linked the métis and Ojibwa communities together at the British Sault, Garden River and Batchewana.16 Petitions in 1850 list métis family names that had been in the area for several generations, including McKay, Boyer, Perrault, Biron, Cadotte, Ermantinger, Grant, Corbiere and Nolen (Holmes, Docs 39 & 40). Of those métis households enumerated in 1901 in the town of Sault Ste. Marie, the surnames Biron, Corbiere and Nolan are listed, indicating some continuity in the off-reserve métis population.17

Common experience at individual level: Many individuals of mixed Indian and White ancestry lived in the Great Lakes region from the mid to late 1600s, including Sault Ste. Marie. These individuals shared a lifestyle shaped by the fur trade, and generations of traders’ métis children
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14 Harrington, op. cit., p.77.
were socialized in fur trade culture and society. By the time of the fur boom in the 1770s when the upper country was opened to trade by the British, Harrington suggests that most, if not all *coureurs de bois* were half-breed. Métis men native to the Sault region were involved in the organization of numerous independent traders to form the North West Company (eg., Cadotte). Subsequently, labour pools of boatmen, provisioners, guides, interpreters and builders resulted in the growth of "villages" of fur trade men and their country-born families around the Sault, as well as at Michipicoten and Pic. Holmes documents that for 25 years after the Jay Treaty (1794), most "British" subjects were the métis employees of the NWC and their families (Holmes, pp.7-8). During the time of the Robinson Treaty in 1850, métis individuals and families were singled out from both Indian and white populations at the Sault, experiencing threats to land rights and property ownership that they had formerly taken for granted.

**Collective recognition: other-ascription, and; self-ascription:** By 1835 the Sault métis were viewed by Lieutenant-Governor Colborne and by local authorities (eg, Magistrate McMurray) as a distinct class to be reckoned with, as métis were viewed to interfere in both trade and in Indian matters. It appears also that Shingwaukonse recognized “the métis at Sault Ste. Marie” as a distinct group, and in 1837 agreed to represent them, not only because many had married into his band but also because he viewed métis skills and education as a benefit to his plans for a progressive Aboriginal community at the Sault (Jones, p.27). At the time of Treaty, the Sault chiefs requested that provision also be extended to métis in the form of land grants (Holmes, Doc.46). In 1849 Vidal and Anderson acknowledged that “Half Breeds” were a separate group with whom to contend when the treaty was negotiated (Holmes, Doc.26). Robinson’s censuses of Lakes Huron and Superior counted “Half-breeds” separately from Indians (Holmes, p.25). Treaty annuity paylists show a steady increase of métis on band lists, which specifically identified “Half Breeds” up to at least the 1890s, at which time métis represented 67% of the population at Batchewana and 47% at Garden River (Holmes, Docs. 44, 45, 59, 72, 78, 79). Finally, the introduction in 1899 by Indian Affairs of non-transmissible title to métis in the Robinson Treaty area accentuated their self-awareness of different status (Holmes, p.63). According to Macrae’s report on this issue, “the line of demarcation between the Indians... at Garden River... and the half-breeds was and is still perfectly clear to the Indians’ minds”; apparently 250 persons were not recognized as Indians by the Garden River Chiefs (Holmes, Doc.110).

With respect to self-ascription, métis in the area appear to have been conscious of a separate identity from Indians prior to the time of the 1850 Treaty. John Swantson’s letter in 1850 indicates that this self-identity had a political dimension, arguing that halfbreeds should also share in annuity payments and land grants (Holmes, Doc.36). Sault Ste. Marie métis sent several petitions regarding their land rights in the wake of the 1850 Robinson Treaty (Holmes, Docs. 39 & 40). A statement by Sault Ste. Marie métis Joshua Biron in 1892 clearly indicates that at the time of Treaty, some métis were conscious of their separate status from Indians, electing not to join in political alliance with
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neighbouring bands, nor to live under band authority. His explanation for only four métis families agreeing to join Shingwaukonse’s band prior to treaty was that “all the other Half-breeds said they were already Indians enough without binding themselves to be under an Indian Chief” (Holmes, Doc.92). The 1901 Census enumerated almost 700 persons who were identified (self-identified?) as métis, of whom 30% lived in the town of Sault Ste. Marie and 70% on nearby reserves at Batchewana (8%) and Garden River (62%) (cf. Jones, p.13, Doc.79). Total métis populations at each location in the Sault area in 1901 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algoma (44) / Sub-District</th>
<th># Métis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Batchewana</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Garden</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Sault Ste. Marie, Town</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>677</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social structure / organization:** Jones’ analysis of pre-1850 documentation agrees with the argument provided by Chute that throughout the first decades of the 1800s, the native community on the British side of the Sault was split between Ojibwa and métis residents. Although related through kinship, the Ojibwa and métis maintained occupational, religious, linguistic and political differences (Jones, p.25). Métis as the Sault were predominantly Roman Catholic, and most permanent residents had built their habitation on narrow but deep river lots (Holmes, pp.12-14, cf. Doc.5). By 1835 approximately forty Roman Catholic French and métis families lived in close proximity to the Anglican mission at the Sault. Peterson states that the métis community at Sault Ste. Marie exhibited occupational homogeneity characterized solely by the northwest fur traffic during the 1760s to the early 1800s. After the closure of the HBC post in 1843, métis and Indian employees remained in a section called “Frentchtown” (Holmes, pp.15). By the mid 1840s, the métis and Indian population at “Frentchtown” (near the closed HBC post) was approximately 250 living in 50 houses (Holmes, Doc.9). That a group of métis approached Shingwaukonse in 1837 to be their representative, suggests group organization in a context in which métis at the Sault were refused recognition by authorities as a bona fide political group. Borron reported a six-fold increase in the Robinson Treaty métis population between 1850 and 1890 (Holmes, Doc.86, cf. p.49, footnote 24).
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19 Source: Census of Canada, 1901: Table XI - Origins of the People, Algoma District, pp.312-315 [PRAXIS, on file]. Note that there remains uncertainty about whether the “origin” codes assigned in the 1901 Census are a reflection of self-identification, or enumerator-designation.

20 Chute 1997, op. cit., pp.48-49. Harrington argues that the métis population of the village and environs of Sault Ste. Marie during the French and British fur trade periods was spread throughout the social community, both in terms of occupation and class. Harrington argues that divisions and distinctions of métis from Indians and Whites were effected by the 1850 Robinson Treaty (which separated half-breeds from Indians by definition) and by subsequent immigration of large numbers of European labourers and white Canadian settlers (Harrington, op. cit., p.89). This interpretation does not accord with the evidence and interpretations offered by Holmes or Jones.


According to Jones’ analysis of Canada Census records for 1861, 1871, and 1891, the métis population increase at Sault Ste Marie was due entirely to newcomers to the area, while the population of original métis families stayed constant (Jones, p.12). Overall, the métis population at Sault Ste. Marie appears to have possessed the permanence, the size and the common social and cultural elements necessary to form a community, one founded and structured on fur trade traditions, values and lifestyle.

**Political identity**: According to Chute, from the mid-1830s to time of Treaty in 1850, the métis and Ojibwa communities at Sault Ste. Marie assisted each other toward political goals. Métis were educated enough to draft petitions on behalf of the Ojibwa, and Ojibwa chiefs who had gained “the ear of local officials” spoke in defence of métis.24 However, with the serious decline of the fur trade in the late 1840s and emerging government policies in Canada, it became expedient for métis and Indians to merge into an economically and politically viable “Ojibwa” community. Apparently the métis sons of Xavier Biron were especially politically active.25 John Swanton’s letter in August 1850 demonstrates a political dimension to métis self-identity prior to Treaty (Holmes, Doc.36). Immediately after the 1850 Robinson Treaty, 55 Sault Ste. Marie métis families petitioned for land rights either by possession or by right at half-breeds (Holmes, p.30). Of these 55 families, 21 are not traceable on later treaty paylists; Holmes suggests that some of these non-treaty métis may have “formed a core of Métis separate and distinct from those associated with bands” (Holmes, p.32). Documentation from the 1860s (re: fishing rights at the rapids, cf. Doc.74) and 1870s (re: municipality motions indicating a significant urban métis population, cf. p.47) may support this hypothesis (see below). Petitions in subsequent months list 70 métis families: half lived in town and requested recognition of rights to their village lots; the other half lived in surrounding rural areas and petitioned for a 100 acre grant for each family (Holmes, Docs. 39 & 40).

**Geographic proximity**: Peterson argues that a high degree of “intra regional mobility” characterized métis individuals and families in the Great Lakes fur trade, and that in the early decades of the 18th century, personal and group identity was less space specific than regionally and occupationally defined. This mobility made group solidarity and combined action difficult to sustain, and métis identity a “fragile construction.”26 However, by 1800 trader villages were present at the Sault on both sides of the St. Mary’s River. Around the North West Company post on the north shore grew a small village of log houses belonging to independent traders, including Charles Ernanteinger (Holmes, p.6-7). Shingwaukonse’s band re-located downstream at Garden River. A larger village remained on the south shore, its population predominantly half-breed or the families of mixed marriages between French/Scottish men and Indian/métis women.27 After the closure of the HBC post in 1843, métis and Indian employees remained in a section nearby the old post called “Frentown” (Holmes, pp.15). When Sault Ste Marie became a municipality in 1871, records indicate that “a great portion of the inhabitants... [own] property here-in and pay taxes... are of

---

26 Peterson, *op. cit.*, pp.63-64.
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French descent and... intermarri[ed] with Indian women” (Holmes, p.47). Jones argues that métis “clustering” is evident already in 1861, when census records also indicate some separation between “old Sault” and newcomer métis families, both in town and on reserves (Jones, p.29). According to Jones, subsequent censuses indicate a tendency for métis families and their descendants to settle near one another, suggesting “some sense of commonality or at least extended kin ties” (Jones, p.30). However, analysis by PRAXIS of the 1901 Census enumeration sheets for the town of Sault Ste. Marie indicates that by the turn of the century, such “clustering” is not clearly defined. The majority of off-reserve métis are spread across Polling Division 1 (46%) and Polling Division 2 (34%), plus a few métis households on the “Indian Reserve” enumerated in Polling Division 3 (18%). Jones accurately states that, generally, extended families appear to have maintained residential proximity; other than “Biron”, all other métis surnames are listed in either Polling Division 1 or 2, but not in both.

Cultural distinctiveness: Generally, it appears that throughout the fur trade period, métis distinctiveness was based more on lifestyle than on ancestry alone: there were those who lived more as French or English at permanent locations such as the Sault in log houses, others who lived a more mobile existence as coureurs de bois, and some who chose to live as Indians in Indian communities. Métis in the Sault area lived in distinctive bark-roofed pole huts and log cabins along both shores of the rapids. More prosperous métis independent traders – Ermantinger, Biron and Nolin, for example – had built larger structures on the American side when the fur trade was at its peak, but these were abandoned after the Jay Treaty, 1794. In contrast to the local Ojibwa, the métis home language was either English or French. Métis men frequently were asked by Ojibwa leaders to act as political brokers in cultural exchanges. Métis at the Sault also possessed both education and occupational skills which the Ojibwa lacked. Almost all métis in the Sault area were Roman Catholic, distinct from the Garden River Ojibwa who had adopted Anglicanism by 1835, at the urging of Chief Shingwaukonse. Into the 1890s, voting patterns in band council elections at Garden River demonstrate that divisions remained between the Anglican Ojibwa versus Roman-Catholic métis population (Jones, p.31). The situation at Batchewana was somewhat less divisive on the religion question, as Ojibwa there were also mainly Roman Catholic. This is attributed to their Chief Nebenagoching, a métis whose European name was Joseph Sayer and whose mother was a Perrault, one of the “old-Sault” métis families.

Date of occurrence: There was steady growth of a métis population at Sault Ste Marie (American side) from the mid-1700s onward. A historical map from 1788 shows established residences of métis traders Nolin and Cadotte. After the 1794 Jay Treaty, the métis population on the north side of St Mary’s river (present site of Sault Ste. Marie in Ontario) increased steadily and came to form the majority of the population, particularly in connection with the NWC post near Garden River. However, it is uncertain if these métis represented an “ethnic community” during this

28 NAC 1901 Census, Ontario – Algoma (44); Sault Ste. Marie, Town (y), Poll. Div. 1,2,3. [Reel T-6457-6458]
29 Harrington, op. cit., p.35.
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period, or whether they were merely a concentration of racially alike individuals linked by occupation. However, by the 1830s there is evidence that a sense of group cohesion had developed, as métis requested Chief Shingwaukonse to represent their political requests to local authorities (1837). By the time of the Robinson Treaty negotiations in 1850, métis at Sault Ste. Marie were a well-established group, petitioning on their own behalf for property rights and land grants.

3.1.2 Evidence of harvesting practices of métis ethnic community

In the 1830s, the métis were described as “very poor and live almost entirely on fish,” obtaining “the necessary articles for their families by selling their fish” (Holmes, Docs.5 & 9, cf. p.15). Holmes documents the Ermantinger family engaged in fishing east of Sault Ste. Marie and on both sides of the border (Holmes, Doc.7). Chute qualifies that although métis fished at the Sault rapids, it was the local Ojibwa who showed a more detailed knowledge of the local environment. Apparently the HBC operated a commercial fishery at the Sault, and hence métis servants will almost certainly have participated in that fishery as employees. In the 1840s, métis at the Sault also hunted and cultivated small gardens (Holmes, Doc.9). After the 1850 Treaty, Sault area bands acquired fishing leases, and while no specific provision was made for métis, all band members, including métis, could fish under the lease. In 1859, Fishery Overseer Gibbard reported that “half-breeds” in the Sault area were employed as fishermen, particularly for American operations (Holmes, Docs.64 & 65). In 1875 métis band members at Batchewana signed a petition for exclusive rights to the fishery at the rapids, but this demand was made on behalf of the entire band and there is no specific reference to “half-breed” members or to métis-specific fishing rights (Holmes, Doc.73). However, a letter from Indian Lands Agent Van Abbott dated 1876 identifies both treaty and non-treaty métis with a history of using the fishery at Sault Ste. Marie, for domestic and commercial purposes (Holmes, Docs. 74 & 75). In Van Abbott’s opinion, non-treaty métis held an historic right to fishing rights at the rapids. E.B. Borron’s report in 1891 argued that Sault Ste. Marie métis did not live an Ojibwa lifestyle, but that métis did regularly hunt, fish, and harvest maple sugar if and when not employed by the Hudson Bay Company or other trading outfits (Doc.85). By the time of the 1901 Census, only a few métis residing at Batchewana and Goulais Bay were identified occupationally as hunters, although Jones cautions that other occupational identifications—“general labourer” for example—likely did not take into account domestic resource harvesting as a secondary economic activity (Jones, p.27).

3.1.3 Permanent European presence and assertion of effective control

According to Harrington, permanent European contact in the Sault Ste. Marie region began in the French period at around 1665. French priests/missionaries and coureur de bois lived with and were dependent on the Indians while in Indian-country, but remained connected to their home colony on the St. Lawrence via the annual convoys. Following the British takeover of the “upper country” (north of the Great Lakes) in 1760, an influx of traders from both Quebec and Scotland populated the area. The HBC established its post at the Sault in 1768. The “General Society” of traders
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organized in 1783, later forming the North West Company which established a post near Garden River. British holdings on American territory were relocated to the north side of St. Mary’s River at the present site of Sault Ste. Marie in 1794 in accordance with the Jay Treaty.\textsuperscript{33} Full assertion of effective control came in 1850 with the Robinson-Huron Treaty. Sault Ste. Marie officially became a municipality in 1871 (Holmes, pp.46-47).

3.1.4 Persistence of métis ethic community to the present day

As in the studies of historic métis for other Ontario locations, Holmes found little information about Sault Ste. Marie métis in the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century (Holmes, pp.67-71). Nevertheless, evidence from the 1980s onward indicate that a métis community persisted. In 1985 the Ontario Métis and Aboriginal Association (OMAA) located its head office in Sault Ste. Marie. Holmes cites subsequent publications by OMAA to demonstrate the range of political, social, cultural and economic activities engaged in by self-identifying métis living in the Sault Ste Marie area. Recent métis population statistics or estimates for the Sault Ste Marie area are not provided in Holmes’ report.

3.1.5 Gaps in the report and limitations of evidence

Evidentiary Limitations:

- Hudson Bay Company archival records are available for Sault Ste. Marie for the years 1818-1864, but post journals and districts reports which provide the best qualitative data are available only for about one decade, 1824 - 1835. However, correspondence books from the 1820s and through to a few years beyond the time of the Robinson Treaty 1850 are available. For Batchewana, only one account book dated 1868-69 has survived.

- As in other locations, data about métis in the Sault Ste. Marie area during the 20\textsuperscript{th} century is almost absent.

Gaps in the report:

- The Holmes report is basically an historical account of political developments and issues regarding métis rights leading up to the Robinson-Huron Treaty, 1850 and beyond. The report is not focused on sociological or anthropological factors regarding métis ethnicity, and such information must be gleaned from discussions of issues related to métis population growth, assertion of rights, and relationships to area Indian bands.

- The Jones report begins with the period of negotiation of the Robinson-Huron Treaty, and does not present any analysis of métis community development prior to this

\textsuperscript{33} Harrington, op. cit., pp.37, 77-85.
period. However, Jones’ analysis of census materials from 1861-1901 provides important population data not covered in Holmes’ report.

- There is no systematic examination of fur trade records for Sault Ste. Marie. While Holmes provides a brief description of the fur trade history in this area, this is based on secondary sources.

3.2 THUNDER BAY

Robinson Treaty Métis Historical Report (Prepared by Alison E. Gale for Claims Research and Assessment Directorate, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, March 31, 1998)

NOTE: Document numbers (Doc. #) cited throughout this section refer to Gale’s document set (“Index to Primary Documents”) appended to the above report.

In 1679 French traders established the first post near the mouth of the Kaministiquia River, entrance to an important route of the same name allowing access to fur resources in the western interior. Although closed temporarily between 1696 and 1715 – but during which time unlicensed coureurs de bois continued to trade – by 1717 the Kaministiquia post became a springboard for fur trade establishments in the west. In the 1760s the post was moved to Grand Portage which offered easier access to the interior. After the British takeover in 1763, English and other traders also entered the Lake Superior fur trade. For example, Ezekiel Solomon (who also had business interests at Drummond Island and whose métis descendants are documented at Penetanguishene) controlled trade in a wide territory around Lake Nipigon, operating 17 posts in the region during the 1770s - 1780s. Negotiations which led to the formation of the North West Company in 1784 were held at Grand Portage, where each spring the NWC partners held their annual meetings. Grand Portage was also the major depot where master canoes delivered supplies from Montreal and picked up furs procured from inland posts. Each summer there was a great rendezvous when men who worked on the Lake Superior canoes and schooners met the inland voyageurs, and by the 1790s over 1,000 men congregated at Grand Portage. In 1800 the XY Company built a post at Grand Portage, establishing competing inland posts near both NWC and HBC trading posts. When the international boundary agreement placed Grand Portage on the American side (1783), and after the Jay Treaty of 1794, the NWC finally relocated its post to the old French site at the mouth of the Kaministiquia in 1803. The XY merged with the NWC in 1804, and in 1807 the post was renamed Fort William. From 1816-1817 the Fort was seized by the HBC in the aftermath of severe competition and the Seven Oakes massacre for which the NWC was partly blamed.⁴

The 1821 amalgamation of the NWC with the HBC saw the immediate reduction of Fort William to a minor district headquarters, as trade was now routed north to Fort Albany, and not east to Montreal. According to Arthur, this downgrade in the Thunder Bay region economy and shift in

---

jurisdictional authority resulted in "confusion on the part of the Indians and half-breeds who formed the only permanent population."⁵⁵ In 1830 Fort William was further reduced to a minor centre of local trade and along with the Nipigon post remained in the Lake Superior district under the authority of the chief trader at Michipicoten until the 1860s. In 1863 both posts were transferred to the Montreal department; Fort William was closed in 1883.

3.2.1 Evidence of historic ethnic métis community

Descent: Gale documents several métis families who lived in the Fort William area for several generations, including the surnames Boucher, Collin, Deschamps, and Vizina (eg., Doc.22). Joseph Boucher was employed at the HBC post as a canoe-maker for at least several years before and after the Robinson-Superior Treaty (Doc.9). By the end of the 19th century, the Bouchards, Larondes and Deschamps were members of the Red Rock band (Doc.96, see below). A letter in 1889 regarding "Half Breeds" possibly indicates that métis not connected to these original families – that is, children of White men married to Indian women – were later living among the Fort William band (Docs.63, 64). A schedule in 1898 listing Fort William band members with doubtful treaty eligibility does not include the surnames listed above, but does include surnames McKay, St. Germain, Pero, Singleton, Parent, Scott, Shabb, Millet, Banan, McVicar, Dick and O’Connor (Doc.96, cf, Doc.132 [1907]). Most of these surnames are listed as métis households in the 1901 Census for the Fort William band.⁵⁶ However, a memorandum several months after the 1898 schedule indicates that most of the individuals on the Fort William list had roots in the United States (Doc.97).

At Nipigon, métis surnames Lagarde and Bouchard appear on several paylists (eg., Docs.29, 33). Members of the De la Ronde family lived at Lake Nipigon for at least 20 years, and in 1874 a census indicates that both the De la Ronde and Deschamps families were permanent residents in that district (Docs.29, 45). Nipigon paylists from 1879 to 1889 continuously list families of La Ronde, Deschamps, and Bouchard and Morriseau (Docs.54, 59 - 62, 68). In 1890 the De la Ronde family members had moved to Red Rock (Doc.68). The 1898 schedule lists several métis families at Red Rock and Nipigon: Bouchard (10), Laronde (3) and Deschamps (2) were at Red Rock; 1 Bouchard and 1 Morriseau family are each listed at Nipigon (Doc.96, cf. Doc.132 [1907]). This is consistent with 1901 Census enumerations for the Red Rock, Nipigon and Pic bands.⁵⁷ A memorandum outlining the origins of these families demonstrates their fur trade roots in the Thunder Bay region, as well as patterns of intermarriage. For example, of seven children of Louis Bouchard Sr., four married the sons or daughters of fellow fur trade métis families (Laronde, Moore, Maville, Soulier) during the period 1860-1883 (pp.91-93; Doc.97). However, the next generation of Bouchard descendants tended to marry the sons and daughters of local Indian bands, although some métis
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marriages continued to occur (e.g., Bouchard/Morriseau, pp.93-94, 96). There is also at least one instance of intermarriage between the Deschamps and Laronde families (p.96). The account of the Laronde family indicates that some family members lived off-reserve at Red Rock (pp.96-97).

**Common experience at individual level:** There are several instances of métis men at Fort William and surrounding posts who shared a common life experience raised in the fur trade culture. A published excerpt from the HBC post journal for 1826-27 records the presence of Collin, Bouchard, and Deschamps, as well as "the women of the Fort." Antoine Collin was a canoe-maker at Grand Portage and Fort William, and his son Michel and other descendants remained in the area. \(^{38}\) Shortly after the HBC/NWC amalgamation in 1821, many métis sons of Nor'wester's who sought employment or promotion in the new company were refused, despite the fact that some were well educated. For example, Roderick McKenzie, the clerk at Fort William from 1824-25, was considered a "promising young man" by former NWC officers, but Governor Simpson evaluated him as "tolerably steady for a half breed... manages a small post but has no right to look higher." \(^{39}\) Arthur provides an account of a "fantastic scheme" undertaken by several of these dispossessed métis men in the mid-1830s to form an "Indian liberating army"; in view of the potential danger presented by these men Simpson agreed to offer positions in the Company service. Henry de La Ronde was stationed at Fort William in 1829, was transferred among posts in the Department over the next two decades, and in 1851 he assumed command of the post on Lake Nipigon where he remained until retirement in 1888 (cf. Doc.29). \(^{40}\) The HBC post manager at Fort William in 1850-1852 was F. Ermatinger, possibly a relative of the Sault Ste. Marie métis family. \(^{41}\)

Many of the employees of the various companies at Fort William throughout its fur trade history had married local Ojibwa women and had families with close connections to the Ojibwa community. As indicated above, many métis are later found on band lists, and according to Swan & Jerome, many of the HBC freemen who had married Ojibwa women and their descendants took treaty in 1850 when the opportunity arose, in part because other forms of secure income and land were absent at the time (e.g., scrip was not offered until 20 years later at Red River). These authors also suggest that métis who stayed in the Thunder Bay area became "Indians" while those, such as Jean-Baptiste Collin a younger son of Antoine, who moved west to the Red River valley became "Métis." Based on a close examination of the Collins family, Swan & Jerome argue that while métissage (cultural mixing) occurred, there were probably no "Métis" (distinct ethnic group) at the fur trade communities around Grand Portage and Fort William; rather, descendants of the freemen

---

38 Swan, Ruth and Edward A. Jerome (1998), The Collin Family at Thunder Bay: A Case Study of Métissage. \*Papers of the Twenty-Ninth Algonquian Conference*, David H. Pentland, Ed. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, pp.311-327. [Note: Grand Portage and Fort William were important canoe-making centres; large birch trees grew in abundance and local families – both métis freemen and Ojibwa – developed expertise in canoe workmanship. In 1827 Collins was commissioned to build a canoe for Governor Simpson (pp.319, 323).]


41 Examination of HBC Abstracts of Servants Accounts is necessary to confirm Ermatinger's origin.
with French names (some anglicized) became Ojibwa or French Canadian.42

Collective recognition: other-ascription, and; self-ascription: HBC clerks at Fort William rarely used the label “halfbreed” to describe employees or other persons at the post; the earliest instance of other ascription in the Fort William journals is in 1831 when a hunter named Solomon is referred to as a “Half Breed.”43 Métis as distinct from Indians were apparently recognized by Vidal and Anderson during their investigations at Fort William in 1849 (Doc.2). In 1850 Robinson was confident about his census of Lake Superior, which included “eighty-four half-breeds” but numbers of métis at Fort William or any other mission or post is not provided. However, paylists from that period contain separate lists of “Half Breeds” and show between 14 - 16 métis families (56 - 77 persons) at Fort William (Docs.20, 22). Apparently only two métis families (11-12 persons) were listed separately as “Half Breeds” on the paylists at Nipigon (Doc.29, 33). By 1876 the paysheets for Fort William and Nipigon First Nations do not provide separate listings for the number of métis paid, and known métis names are simply included in a single list of band members (Docs.48, 49).44 However, in 1892 métis band members were again singled out in an effort to determine eligibility. Based apparently on returns from HBC agents who “know all these Indians”, E.B. Borron reported 147 métis (42%) in the Fort William band, 11 - 12 métis families (~10 - 15%) at Lake Nipigon, and 72 métis (35%) in the Red Rock band (Doc.78).

If taken as a reflection of self-identification, the 1901 Census provides evidence of métis self-ascription in the Thunder Bay/Nipigon region, where over 400 persons were identified as métis. Of these, 60% lived near Fort William and 40% near Nipigon. The great majority (88%) of métis in the area were living on reserves belonging to the Fort William, Nipigon, Red Rock, and Pic bands. Total métis populations at each location in the Thunder Bay area in 1901 are as follows45:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algoma (44) / Sub-District</th>
<th># Métis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r^1 Fort William, Town (off-reserve)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-S^1(78) Fort William Band (on-reserve)</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k^2 Port Arthur, Town</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g^2 Nipigon Tp. (off-reserve)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-H^2(74) Nipigon Band (on-reserve)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Rock Band (on-reserve)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pic Band (on-reserve)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

43 Swan & Jerome, op. cit., p.316. It is possible that this person was a descendant of Ezekiel Solomon who was in the Nipigon area during the 1770s-80s (see above).
44 Separate listings of métis were also discontinued at Michipicoten, but not until 1889 (Doc.67).
45 NAC 1901 Census, Ontario – Algoma (44): Fort William, Town (r^1); Port Arthur, Town (k^2); Nipigon (g^2) [Reel T-6458]; Indian Reserves: Ojibwa Indians - Lake Superior [Reel T-6554].
Social structure / organization: The post population at Grand Portage and Fort William fluctuated over the years, and depending on the season. Other than the annual summer convergence of voyageurs (rendezvous), the post population at the NWC Grand Portage post was relatively small: a 1799 list of employees shows only 7 permanent men (one of whom was Antoine Collins). By 1805, the merged NWC/XY labour force at Fort William was 35 men. A later estimate (ca. 1815) numbers 25 men at the NWC post during the winter: “most of them had married native or métis women, so these - plus any children - might also be seen around the premises.” As well, Canadien freemen lived across the river with their native families, in all making for “a modest little settlement at Fort William.” In 1828, five families lived at HBC’s Fort William, plus 2 elderly people dependent on the post. Métis are described in contrast to Upper and Lower Canadian society at the time; Henry de Laronde, for example, is said to have “shared the society and concerns of the Indians to a remarkable extent, cutting himself off from his youth in Lower Canada.” Socially and economically, métis fur traders such as Laronde lived within the “rigid organization of the Hudson’s Bay Company.” Antoine Collins and his sons are described as belonging to a separate class of freemen in the fur trade hierarchy, treated neither as bourgeois nor as Indian. Documents dated in the 1850s indicate that the Catholic HBC men “attended Mass” at the mission established at Fort William, and where an Indian settlement had developed. According to Borron’s 1894 account of “How the Half-Breeds Lived”, métis at Fort William (as well as Garden River, Batchewana and Michipicoten) were of French-Canadian ancestry and Roman Catholic faith (p.77, Doc.88). Borron suggested that their Catholicism was an influential element in the lifestyle and social organization of métis who in comparison to Indians tended to be more sedentary (although “fond of change”), more involved in the trades (associated with HBC fur trade post occupations), and less engaged in hunting and fishing as a primary economic activity. Descriptions by the Indian Agent in 1898 of individual métis at Fort William, Red Rock and Nipigon contain numerous references to métis not living “the Indian mode of life”, “not attached to any Indian Society or community” or as “adhered to white society” (pp.91-98, Doc.95).

Political identity: Possibly the first indication of political consciousness among métis in the Fort William area occurred in 1836 when several men joined the “Indian liberating army” in response to their grievance against the HBC policy toward half-breed sons of Nor’westerners. Incidents of “piracy on the lakes” received press from Buffalo to Montreal, and although the “army” apparently disbanded almost as quickly as it was formed, it nevertheless brought attention to the issue of métis identity and discriminatory policies. A letter from Jesuit missionary N. Fremiot in 1849 states that métis were present at the meeting held by Vidal and Anderson at Fort William, but that they were “passed by in silence” (Doc.2). However the Commissioners did take notice of the métis, and in their
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report addressed the issue of "halfbreeds... having a claim to share in the remuneration awarded to the Indians" (Doc.3). In 1879 the Indian Agent at Prince Arthur's landing wrote that several "halfbreeds" who "consider themselves Indians, and live and associate with them" were claiming rights under the Robinson Treaty and demanding annuity payments (Doc.51). A similar letter regarding the "Half Breeds" in the Fort William band was submitted by the Indian Agent in 1889 (Doc.63).

**Geographic proximity:** Arthur describes three types of transient populations at Thunder Bay prior to 1855: 1) travellers en route to the west; 2) Company employees and missionaries whose work kept them in the district for a number of years, and; 3) Ojibwa and traders, including métis, who had married Ojibwa women and who chose to remain associated with the region, appearing periodically at various posts in the district. Many of the workmen employed by the HBC fit into the latter group, and Arthur's analysis of lists of servants reveals a certain continuity of service among several workmen, particularly those with country-born families: "It is among the Bouchard, Laronde, Collin and Deschamps families that one finds the longest established residents of a particular location" in the Thunder Bay district. A travel account of Thunder Bay from around 1875 describes "log and clap-board houses" at McVicar's Creek and personnel at the HBC post are described as "white men, Indians and half-breeds." By 1901, most (90%) of métis were concentrated among the Fort William Band (see above). Analysis by PRAXIS of the 1901 enumeration records for Fort William reveals no clustering of the few métis households located off-reserve.

**Cultural distinctiveness:** Except for indirect evidence of log houses possibly associated with métis at McVicar's Creek, there is no information on material culture provided in Gale's report or in other secondary sources examined for this review.

**Date of occurrence:** Métis ethnic community at Thunder Bay may have begun to develop in the 1820s-30s after the amalgamation of the HBC and NWC, when métis men experienced discriminatory policies and recognized shared social and economic characteristics and goals. By 1850, however, it appears that métis still in the area chose to identify with local Ojibwa bands to whom they were related, in order to benefit from Treaty annuities. In the 1890s, many métis at Fort William were observed as having a distinct lifestyle from that of local Ojibwa.

### 3.2.2 Evidence of harvesting practices of métis ethnic community

In 1837, Ojibwa from the Grand Portage reported that a "great number of Freemen with their families" were fishing on Isle Royale for the American Fur Company. At this time, métis such as
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54 NAC 1901 Census, Ontario – Algoma (44): Fort William, Town (r'), Polling Divisions 1,2,3,4. [Reel T-6458]
55 Swan & Jerome, op. cit., p.315; also, Lytwyn (op. cit., p.31) indicates that freemen established "active commercial fisheries... that supplied the American market" at several locations in and around Thunder Bay.
Antoine Collin and his son Michel were both “freemen” living and working in the Fort William area, and it is possible, if not likely, that some of the other fishermen were also métis. Swan & Jerome provide an overview of the seasonal round of métis freemen of Thunder Bay and subsequently argue that these freemen spent much of their time in subsistence activities supporting their families from country produce. From HBC journals, these authors demonstrate the extent to which Antoine Collin (a former NWC employee who remained as a freeman in the area after the HBC merger in 1821) was engaged to operate a fall fishery for the HBC during the 1820s, who apparently hunted and trapped inland from the post during the winter, and harvested maple sugar in the spring. In summer Collin was hired to build canoes as well as other odd jobs around the fort. In the fall of 1823, Antoine’s fishery produced 31 casks of salted fish, and his son Michael’s fishery produced 20 casks. Lytwyn states that some of the freemen were paid by the HBC on a monthly basis, while others sold their produce directly to the Company as did their Ojibwa neighbours. Arthur also documents commercial fishing activity by former HBC men. In 1837 M. Wallace and A. McKay proposed a joint stock company with Americans to carry on Lake Superior fisheries within Canadian limits, promoting themselves as “possessing all the rights and privileges of British subjects, and having been engaged for several years in the fur Trade and fisheries... in the services of the Hudson’s Bay Company.”

3.2.3 Permanent European presence and assertion of effective control

French traders established the first post near the mouth of the Kaministiquia River in 1679. According to Peterson, French couriers de bois congregated about the cordon of wilderness posts garrisoned after 1714, including “at Kaministiquia on the northwest shore of Lake Superior” in 1717. In the 1760s the French trading establishment was moved to Grand Portage. The North West Company established its major western frontier post at Grand Portage in 1784, moving its operation to British territory at Fort William in 1803. The HBC officially took over the post in 1821 and Fort William’s importance declined as trade was re-organized to flow north to the Bay, rather than east to Montreal. The first missionaries moved into the Thunder Bay area during the 1830s, and in the late 1840s the Mission of the Immaculate Conception was built at Fort William. Effective control was asserted by the Province of Canada in 1850 through the Robinson-Superior Treaty.

3.2.4 Persistence of métis ethnic community to the present day

No information is provided in Gale’s report nor in other publications reviewed with respect to the present-day status of métis in Thunder Bay. Arthur documents the period of European  

56 Swan & Jerome, op. cit., p.312, footnote 4.  
58 Lytwyn, op. cit., p.29.  
60 Peterson, op. cit., p.45.  
settlement at Thunder Bay which began with the discovery of silver at Silver Islet in 1868. The labour force available to the mining companies was "largely Canadian", although Norwegian, Cornish and other European miners were also brought in. By the time silver prices collapsed at the end of the 1880s, the lumbering industry was already being developed in the area. Road and railway construction was also underway (e.g., Dawson’s road to Red River). The judicial district of Thunder Bay was created in 1884. Although European settlement grew slowly, local "Indian and halfbreeds" were nevertheless affected, particularly by new diseases. By 1901 the combined urban population of Fort William and Port Arthur was over 7,000.  

According to the final report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, in 1965 the Lake Nipigon Metis Association was formed in response to the plight of métis fishermen in northwestern Ontario. That apparently led to the creation of successive organizations, including the Ontario Metis and non-Status Indian Association (now the Ontario Metis Aboriginal Association), and, most recently, the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples and the Metis Nation of Ontario.  

Information gathered at a meeting between *Praxis* and representatives of the Red Sky Métis Independent Nation in 1999 indicates that some continuity exists between the historic fur trade métis in the region, and those still resident in the city of Thunder Bay. For example, Roy Delaronde – the chief of Red Sky at the time – traces his ancestry to fur trader De la Ronde who worked at Fort William and Lake Nipigon. The Red Sky métis explicitly define themselves as a people with a distinct cultural heritage in the fur trade, and trace their genealogy to the "eighty-four half-breeds" referred to in the census taken prior to the 1850 Robinson-Superior Treaty. Red Sky is apparently in the process of enumerating the present day descendants of these 84 families (*Praxis*, personal communication, April 26, 1999).  

### 3.2.5 Gaps in the report and limitations of evidence  

**Evidentiary Limitations:**  

- The summary presented here relies heavily on secondary sources, particularly with regard to the early development of a métis population during the fur trade period at Fort William. However, these sources indicate that substantial historical records are available for the American, North West and Hudson’s Bay Companies (e.g., HBCA Fort William post journals are available for 1817-1851; Nipigon House post journals date from 1792-1941).  

---  

63 Census of Canada, 1901. Table VII. Areas, Houses, Families, Population, etc., p.54.  
• There exists almost no data on métis in Thunder Bay during the 20th century.

Gaps in the report:

• Gale makes only passing reference to the fur trade origins of métis at Thunder Bay, stating that they are the descendants of NWC and HBC employees working at Fort William and surrounding posts. Her report begins with data on pre-treaty investigations by Vidal and Anderson in 1849.
4. SUMMARIES OF HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO AND MAP OF FUR TRADE POST POPULATIONS

This chapter provides single-page summaries for each location and area addressed in the various reports on historic métis in Ontario. The summary pages are organized according to fur trade districts portrayed on the map appended to this review (see Appendix B; wall-size map attached). The purpose of organizing the summaries in this order is to provide descriptions of historic métis that correspond with individual locations shown on the map. In turn, the map portrays how these present-day locations are linked historically within the geographic context of the fur trade in Ontario, providing a visual understanding of the connections between post populations which may have given rise to historic métis communities.

Summary pages are ordered by district moving generally from a northeasterly to northwesterly direction, as follows:

1. HBC Moose District [Inland Posts] (Trade Posts # 1 - 8)
   1.1 Timmins, Cochrane and Abitibi Region

2. HBC Timiskaming / Ottawa River Districts (Trade Posts # 9-12)
   2.1 Mattawa

3. HBC Lake Huron District (Trade Posts #13 - 16)
   3.1 Sudbury / Espanola
   3.2 North Bay / Sturgeon Falls
   3.3 Parry Sound

4. Independent Traders (Trade Posts # 20 - 21)
   4.1 Penetanguishene [= Owen Sound]

5. Early French/British Fur Trade [pre-1821] (Trade Posts # 22-24)
   5.1 Sault Ste. Marie

6. HBC Lake Superior District (Trade Posts #25 - 30)
   6.1 Wawa
   6.2 Thunder Bay

7. HBC Lac la Pluie District (Trade Posts # 31 - 36)
   7.1 Fort Frances / Rainy River
   7.2 Kenora
   7.3 Dryden / Wabigoon

PRAXIS Research Associates, 2002: Review and Map pertaining to Historic Métis in Ontario
1. HBC Moose District [Inland Posts]  
(Trade Posts # 1 - 8)

HBC District Headquarters:  
Moose Factory  
(HBC Southern Department Depot)

Report Summary Page:

1.1 TIMMINS, COCHRANE AND ABITIBI REGION
| HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO | 1.1 TIMMINS, COCHRANE & ABITIBI REGION  
[Trade posts: Abitibi, Frederick House, Kenogamissi, Flying Post, Matagami, New Post, Matachewan] |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY** | 1. Descent: fur trade/métis endogamy at regional level, connected to Moose Factory families; lineages traced from late 18th - early 20th centuries  
2. Common experience at individual level: métis servants and families identified at all inland posts; several families remained in the Abitibi region, some descendants working at posts into the early 20th century; occupational niche as interpreters and post provisioners  
3. Collective recognition: other-ascription - HBCA records provide positive identification of métis at inland posts from 1804 onward ("native-born" servants, "factory lads"); self-ascription - 1901 Census enumerated 450-500 métis, many with ties to the fur trade  
4. Social structure/organization: métis HBC servants were influenced by the social structure at Moose Factory from where most originated; eg., marriages were performed at Moose; "women of the establishment" at larger inland posts indicate family life and children raised in fur trade culture  
5. Political identity: insufficient data; no evidence of petitions from métis at inland posts before or after Treaty 9, or advocacy on behalf of métis by bands entering into treaty  
6. Geographic proximity: - 1901 Census enumerated métis mainly at two locations south of Timmins: 1) Flying Post and; 2) Matagami  
7. Cultural distinctiveness: insufficient data |

| **POST POPULATION** | - regionally the inland posts employed 45-50 men, and the district population is estimated at 100 people including women and children  
- during the HBC period, Kenogamissi and Abitibi were the largest posts with estimated populations of 20 and 35 respectively; other inland posts had small post populations with an estimated range of 8-15 people each |

| **HARVESTING PRACTICES** | - inland region was a resource poor environment, necessitating all post servants to hunt and fish; however, evidence suggests that métis men and their families were the primary post provisioners (eg., William Polson at Abitibi); numerous references in fur trade records of métis servants and families operating hunting, fishing and sugar camps |

| **DATE MANIFESTED** | - 1840s: socially and culturally, a regional population with a significant métis segment  
- 1870s: majority of the regional post population is métis men and their families |

| **CONTINUITY TO PRESENT** | - "silent period" regarding métis in the region for most of the 1900s  
- in the late 1980s - 1990s, establishment of locals of OMAA (Cochrane, Timmins, Matachewan), MNO (Timmins, Cochrane, Timiskaming) and CMC (Cochrane) |

| **PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL** | - ca. 1775: presence of French and British "Pedlars" throughout the region  
- 1779: permanent Canadian post established at Abitibi  
- 1784: HBC post established at Frederick House  
- 1905/06: Treaty 9 |

| **DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT** | - first decade of 1900: mining activity and railway construction from Temiscaming northward  
- 1909: influx of immigrants to Timmins to work in mines resulting in significant European settlement in the region |

| **EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS** | Quality of available evidence: body of historical fur trade data is limited in that it is scattered among records for various time periods from 7 posts comprising the "inland trade"; evidence of extensive communication between these posts by servants and families indicates that the métis population must be viewed in regional perspective (vs. single post settlement), and perhaps as an extension of the Moose Factory community (who submitted the 1905 "halfbreed petition")  
Quantity of available evidence: inland fur trade post records span an almost continuous period from 1785-1921; there is a gap in all records from ca. 1850-1880, but Moose Factory "Servants Accounts" provide a glimpse of the extent of the métis population during these three decades  
- 1901 Census records are also scattered ("Unorganized Territories") and sometimes ambiguous but nevertheless document métis in the Abitibi region with ties to the fur trade |
2. HBC Timiskaming / Ottawa River Districts
(Trade Posts # 9-12)

NWC / HBC Timiskaming District Headquarters:
Fort Timiskaming

HBC Ottawa River District Headquarters:
Fort Couflage / Lac des Allumettes

Report Summary Page:

2.1 Mattawa
| **HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO** | **2.1 MATTAWA**  
**[Trade post: Mattawa]** |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| **CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY** | 1. Descent: at least 3 “founding families” traced with links to fur trade & R-Huron treaty paylists; instances of intermarriage (métis endogamy);  
2. **Common experience at individual level:** scant direct evidence of métis individuals involved in the fur trade  
3. **Collective recognition:** other-ascription -  
   ; self-ascription - 1901 Census enumerated 160 métis in Mattawa town and 112 at Montreal River / Temagami  
4. **Social structure/organization:** insufficient data  
5. **Political identity:** insufficient data; no record of requests made by or on behalf of métis during 1850 Treaty negotiations  
6. **Geographic proximity:** evidence of métis residence patterns which indicate close ties with Reserve but many lived off-reserve in town of Mattawa (concentration near HBC site); oral evidence of old métis neighbourhood replaced by housing development  
7. **Cultural distinctiveness:** insufficient data |
| **POST POPULATION** | - the HBC Mattawa post was small, employing 3-5 men in the 1840s  
- estimated post population with women and children is 7-11  
- a few independent traders (some perhaps with families) also operated in the Mattawa area |
| **HARVESTING PRACTICES** | - insufficient evidence; subsistence hunting indicated as part of the métis lifestyle in the late 19th and into the early 20th centuries (eg., census & oral accounts)  
- 1881 Census = many métis listed as hunters  
- 1901 Census = shift to wage economy (logging, etc.) |
| **DATE MANIFESTED** | - possibly late-1840s when HBC Mattawa post began to operate on a full-time and permanent basis |
| **CONTINUITY TO PRESENT** | - oral accounts indicate that métis originate from families along the Temisc.-Penetang. fur trade route, and from Temisc.-Montreal route, including migrations of Algonquin/Nipissing from Lake of 2 Mountains, Maniwhi, etc.  
- school records 1907 onward list métis children whose parents lived in Mattawa “and paid taxes”  
- oral history evidence of continuous métis community with self-perceived cultural distinctiveness manifested in music, language, etc.  
- apparently both MNO and OMAA are active in Mattawa (not listed on MNO/OMAA websites) |
| **PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL** | 1784: first permanent European site at Mattawa = NWC “fort Mattawa” post  
1850: Robinson-Huron Treaty |
| **DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT** | 1853: Mattawan-Nipissing Road surveyed by provincial government  
1854-62: farm lots and township lots in Mattawa/Nipissing surveyed; first permanent logging camp on north bank of Mattawa River  
1872: first court session in Mattawa (judicial district of Nipissing)  
1881: Railway & consequent increased immigrant settlement |
| **EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS** | **Quality of available evidence:** Indian Affairs correspondence regarding treaty annuities to local métis, treaty paylists and school records provide direct evidence of a métis population at Mattawa for the years ca. 1850-1940; Census records from 1871 to 1901 provide data on métis families and residence patterns  
**Quantity of available evidence:** fur trade records are scant; Mattawa = no post journals; few other records (1868-1906); other district posts also have scant records (Temagami, Fort Coulange / Lac des Allumettes, Timiskaming); 3 decades of Census records, 1871-1901; variety of Indian Affairs records available for 1850-1940 |
3. HBC Lake Huron District
(Trade Posts #13 - 16)

HBC District Headquarters:
La Cloche

Report Summary Pages:

3.1 SUDBURY / ESPANOOLA

3.2 NORTH BAY / STURGEON FALLS

3.3 PARRY SOUND
### 3.1 Sudbury / Espanola

**[Trade posts: La Cloche, Independent Traders]**

#### Criteria of Ethnic Community

1. **Descent**: several métis lineage traces from the 1820s to the 1880s, and a few into the 20th century; many métis family names are later found on area band paylists; evidence of others at Sault Ste. Marie and Killarney
2. **Common experience at individual level**: direct evidence of métis servants and families at La Cloche and district posts, as well as at Killarney; in 1830, one-third of HBC servants in the Lake Huron district were métis
3. **Collective recognition**: other-ascription - direct evidence of term “halfbreed” applied to area métis at least by 1828; in 1838 métis in the area are collectively referred to as “halfbreeds” living on the north shore of Lake Huron; after 1850 Indian Affairs records indicate that both officials and Indians considered some “halfbreeds” as “not Indian”; self-ascription - 1901 Census identifies 142 Sudbury area métis; early 20th century Indian Affairs records demonstrate a fluid identity whereby mixed ancestry individuals identified as Indian, French or métis
4. **Social structure/organization**: collective and permanent presence of women at La Cloche and children socialized in HBC post culture; social organization among independent traders not known
5. **Political identity**: indirect evidence dated 1838 of political identity among “200 Lake Huron halfbreeds”, possibly referring to métis on the mainland north of Manitoulin Island who solicited for benefits under Bond Head treaty
6. **Geographic proximity**: trade settlement at Killarney with métis segment since 1820s; 1901 Census indicates concentrations of métis south of Espanola (near La Cloche, 41 métis) and at Collins Inlet (Reserve lands near Killarney, 88 métis); no métis enumerated in the town of Sudbury
7. **Cultural distinctiveness**: insufficient data; fiddle music and dancing associated with “half-breeds” at Killarney in 1836

#### Post Population

- in 1828 La Cloche employed 7 men; estimated post population is 15
- about 100 independent traders reported in the Lake Huron district some of whom were likely métis; estimated trader population in the area is 220 (consistent with 1838 halfbreed population)

#### Harvesting Practices

- fur trade records from 1827-1863 indicate that fishing was most important post subsistence activity; evidence of deer hunting by post employees in 1860s; sugar harvest by women of the post
- evidence of métis commercial fishermen at Killarney from 1860s-1890s

#### Date Manifested

- evidence suggests that a post community with significant métis segment had begun to develop on the north shore of Lake Huron by the 1820s; evidence that by mid-1830s these métis may have perceived themselves as separate identity

#### Continuity to Present

- evidence from 1900-40s indicate métis presence at Whitefish Falls, Killarney and near old La Cloche; except for evidence of métis family names currently in Killarney, no documentary evidence exists regarding métis community in the area for the latter half of the 20th century
- MNO and OMAA locals established in Sudbury; MNO at Thessalon

#### Permanent European Presence / Assertion of Effective Control

- 1615-1760s: explorers, missionaries, traders travelling through the area
- 1790, NWC post at La Cloche; 1824, HBC posts in the area; 1820s, trading hamlet at Killarney
- 1840s: mining activity on north shore of Lake Huron
- 1850 Robinson-Huron Treaty (preceded by 1836 Bond Head Treaty, Manitoulin Island)

#### Date of Significant European Settlement

1880s: railway construction, lumber industry, and 5 mining operations attracted European immigrants to Sudbury

#### Evidentiary Limitations

**Quality of available evidence**: findings re: métis community are inferred from rare and brief descriptions; fur trade data is sparse but consistent with patterns documented in other regions, suggesting that if additional records were available, these would support the contention that métis ethnic community developed in the fur trade period; proximity of La Cloche to Sault Ste. Marie and evidence of frequent contact between the two locations (as well as with Drummond Island and Penetanguishene) further supports this contention;

**Quantity of available evidence**: few fur trade records from HBC posts in the Lake Huron district have survived; no records from independent posts are available. Indian Affairs records available for late 1800s - early 1900s; annuity paylists absent for years 1851-56 and most of 1860s-70s
### HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO

**3.2 NORTH BAY / STURGEON FALLS**

*Trade posts: Nipissing, French River, Dukis, North Bay*

#### CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY

1. **Descent**: At least one métis lineage (La Ronde) is traced from ca. 1800-1900 in the Lake Nipissing area; known ties to fur trade (NWC & Penetanguishene merchants); one branch of the Laronde family identified with the Nipissing band
2. **Common experience at individual level**: indirect evidence of métis servants and men with Aboriginal wives and country-born families are at independent and HBC/NWC posts; indirect evidence of métis sons pursuing a career in the fur trade
3. **Collective recognition**: other-ascription - insufficient data; self-ascription - 1901 Census enumerated about 100 métis in the North Bay/Sturgeon Falls area
4. **Social structure/organization**: insufficient data
5. **Political identity**: insufficient data; no record of requests made by or on behalf of métis during 1850 Treaty negotiations
6. **Geographic proximity**: in 1901, 75% of métis lived on Beaucage Indian Reserve and 25% lived off-reserve in Widdifield Twp.
7. **Cultural distinctiveness**: insufficient data

* Insufficient evidence to determine extent, if any, of historic métis ethnic community

#### POST POPULATION

- HBC Nipissing, North Bay and independent posts (eg, Dukis) were small, seasonal, and frequently relocated; in the late 1840s Nipissing became a permanent post, but remained small; generally, conditions were not conducive to the development of ethnically defined community during the fur trade period
- 5 men were posted at Nipissing ca. 1828, plus perhaps 2-3 men at the Dukis post; estimated post populations at Lake Nipissing is 15-20

#### HARVESTING PRACTICES

- Insufficient evidence

#### DATE MANIFESTED

- Insufficient evidence

#### CONTINUITY TO PRESENT

- Post-1850 Indian Affairs records indicate that some métis were accepted as Nipissing band members; others lived off reserve either because they were denied treaty privileges or by choice
- MNO at North Bay; OMMA at North Bay / Sturgeon Falls

#### PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL

- 1620-1629: Nicollet lives among Nipissings
- 1650s-1670s: Recollet missionaries establish small mission 1650s-60s; intermittent mission presence, 1670s ff.
- 1700s: Nipissing area = primarily a trade route (Fort Temiscamingue est.1679)
- 1800-1820s: Lake Nipissing & French River posts established by NWC, HBC & Independents
- 1850 Robinson-Huron Treaty
- Doks IR #9 (French River band) & Nipissing IR #10, both surveyed in 1853

#### DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT

- Not addressed in OMNR report

#### EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS

**Quality of available evidence**: much of the evidence cited in the OMNR report is indirect with respect to a métis population in the North Bay/Sturgeon Falls area

**Quantity of available evidence**: very few fur trade records available; none that provide insight into daily life (eg, journals); other sources of primary data are scattered over the 19th century

*Note: evidence about historic métis in this area may benefit both in terms of quality and quantity following a systematic examination of records identified as “gaps” in the OMNR report (see Section 2.2.1 of this review)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO</th>
<th>3.3 PARRY SOUND [Trade posts: Shawanaga; Independent Traders]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>1. Descent: data suggest that Penetanguishene métis moved there to work in lumber industry during the mid-1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Common experience at individual level: insufficient data; may have been métis employees at HBC Shawanaga post; métis men worked on survey crews in the region during the 1850s-1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Collective recognition: other-ascription - insufficient data; paylists for Parry Sound Agency do not include separate list “half-breeds”; self-ascription - 1901 Census shows 2 foci of métis pop: 1) MacTier (120 Iroquois FB, possible ties to Gibson); 2) Wallbridge Twp (100 FB with ties to Penetanguishene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Social structure/organization: possibly an extension of Penetanguishene métis community, e.g., independent traders operated in Muskoka region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Political identity: treaty docs. from 1785, 1836, 1850 &amp; 1923 contain no evidence of Georgian Bay métis negotiating separate benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Geographic proximity: most métis were associated with bands at Shawanaga and Henvy Inlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Cultural distinctiveness: insufficient data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* insufficient evidence to determine extent, if any, of historic métis ethnic community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST POPULATION</strong></td>
<td>- 4 men posted at Shawanaga in 1828; estimated post population is 9 persons, including women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARVESTING PRACTICES</strong></td>
<td>- no evidence of métis harvesting in Parry Sound area, although métis were involved in lumbering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reports from 1830s on excellent fishing in the Parry Sound area do not mention métis fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE MANIFESTED</strong></td>
<td>- 1860s-1870s: movement of Penetanguishene métis to work in lumber industry; date of development of Iroquois métis population at MacTier is undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINUITY TO PRESENT</strong></td>
<td>- local histories provide no data re: métis in 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- OMNSIA at Britt and Nobel; MNO at MacTier; CMC at Britt and Parry Sound/Nobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>- Shawanaga post established by HBC in 1820s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1850 Robinson-Huron Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1923 Williams Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT</strong></td>
<td>- 1860: village at Parry Sound consists of few houses and small sawmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1868: Homesteaders Act passed resulting in rapid settlement; Guelph Lumber Co. establishes large mill in 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Quality of available evidence: findings regarding métis in the Parry Sound region are qualified by the number and scope of gaps in the data base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity of available evidence: almost no primary records available; no fur trade records; few Ontario survey records; few Indian Affairs records related to questionable band membership at Henvy Inlet during 1890s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Independent Traders
(Trade Posts # 20 - 21)

Report Summary Page:

4.1 PENETANGUISHENE [& OWEN SOUND]
### 4.1 PENETANGUISHENE & OWEN SOUND  
**[Trade posts: Independent traders]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of Ethnic Community</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Descent: direct evidence of métis endogamy; descendants traced in Georgian Bay area into late 19th - early 20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common experience at individual level: positive identification of métis voyageurs who migrated from Drummond Island; many had supported British in war of 1812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective recognition: other-ascription - migrants who settled at Gordon’s Point are identified as “métis”; 1855 document identifies “halfbreed” population at Penetanguishene; self-ascription - no direct evidence of métis self-identity prior to 1901; voyageurs refer to themselves as “Canadian inhabitants”; 326 métis (mostly FB) enumerated in Tiny &amp; Tay twps in 1901 Census</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social structure/organization: mainly French Roman Catholic with established social organization prior to migration from Drummond Island; formed an “occupational class”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political identity: 1832 petition from “Canadian Inhabitants” for land grants may have political implication (indirect evidence); treaty records from 1785 - 1836 contain no evidence of Penetanguishene métis negotiating separate benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geographic proximity: métis described as living in “French Settlement” after 1828; 1901 Census lists 124 métis in Tay and 180 métis in Tiny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural distinctiveness: occupational niche as guides, trappers, boat-men, fur traders; majority were French speaking; no data re: material culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Post Population | - 75 voyageur families reportedly migrated from Drummond Island to Penetanguishene in 1828, of which it is estimated that 40% were métis; métis population is estimated to be between 65-80 |

| Harvesting Practices | - métis fishermen at Penetanguishene Bay; 1830s-1870s many voyageurs were occupied as fishermen, both commercial and for local consumption (evidence that most local fishing was by métis); evidence of métis families harvesting maple sugar; métis acted as guides, etc. for sport fishing and hunting (area considered a “sportsman’s paradise”) |

| Date Manifested | - 1828: socially distinct métis settlement at Penetanguishene; evidence of families still resident in the area in the 20th century |

| Continuity to Present | - except for Honey Harbour, 20th century local histories do not acknowledge métis origin |
| - OMNSIA at Port McNicol & Honey Harbour | |
| - MNO at Midland | |
| - CMC at Penetanguishene & Port McNicol | |
| - Owen Sound: no locals listed on métis organization websites (MNO at Port Elgin) | |

| Permanent European Presence / Assertion of Effective Control | - 1790s: small independent fur traders who branched operations to the Muskokas and further north to Lake Nipissing (Dukis post) and into the Abitibi region |
| - 1798: Surrender of tract of land on Penetanguishene Harbour | |
| - 1815-1818: Lake Simcoe/Nottawasaga Purchases include entire Penetanguishene peninsula and Owen Sound; British naval station established/operated on permanent basis at Penetanguishene | |
| - 1836: Bond Head Treaty includes territory south of Bruce Peninsula | |

| Date of Significant European Settlement | - 1828: migration of voyageurs along with military from Drummond Island marks permanent settlement of civilian population at Penetanguishene |
| - ca. 1845-55: Penetanguishene - proper roads constructed; area surveyed for settlement | |
| - mid-1800s - 1870s: Midland - lumber mills and port facilities/grain elevators draw settlement | |
| - 1840-41: Owen Sound - surveyed and 300 newcomers settle within first year | |

| Evidentiary Limitations | **Quality of available evidence:** almost complete reliance on published and secondary materials, eg., diaries, local histories, archaeological studies, etc.; however, because the migration from Drummond Island to Penetanguishene was a major military event, several excellent accounts are available (eg., Osborne 1901 publication Migration of the Voyageurs... is seminal work re: study of métis in the area); 1901 Census is best primary source |
| - except for Penetanguishene proper, conclusions on métis in the Georgian Bay region are qualified by the number and scope of gaps in the data base | |
| **Quantity of available evidence:** absence of fur trade records, as no major companies (HBC, NWC) established posts in the area; other primary data is sparse, eg., treaty paylists | |
| - for Owen Sound, there exists almost no data re: métis population (or lack thereof) | |

---
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5. Early French/British Fur Trade [pre-1821]
   (Trade Posts # 22 - 24)

Report Summary Page:

5.1 SAULT STE. MARIE
### HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO

#### 5.1 SAULT STE. MARIE

[Trade posts: Sault Ste. Marie, Michilimackinac, St. Joseph]

#### CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY

1. **Descent**: several métis families are traced in the area from both French and British regimes; 3 métis family surnames from the French fur trade are listed in 1901 Census
2. **Common experience at individual level**: many individuals of mixed ancestry documented at fur trade settlements in Sault Ste. Marie region; evidence suggests most *couriers de bois* were métis; after 1794 Jay Treaty, most British subjects were NWC métis employees & families
3. **Collective recognition: other-ascrption** - métis considered distinct class in 1835 by government officials and Indian chiefs; land grants for métis requested during 1850 treaty negotiations; Robinson's census had separate list of "Half-breeds"; paylists contained separate halfbreed lists to 1890s; **self-ascrption** - petitions, etc. are direct evidence of distinct métis self-identity, ca.1850; 1901 Census identified 700 métis in the area (30% in town; 70% on reserves)
4. **Social structure/organization**: generations of métis children raised in fur trade culture; by 1770s, métis formed significant segment of fur trade occupational pool; permanent population of mainly French speaking Catholics; evidence of métis population increase between 1860s - 1890s
5. **Political identity**: 1837 request that Shingwaukonse represent métis political interests to local authorities; some métis joined Ojibwa forces to pursue common political goals prior to 1850 Treaty, other preferred to remain separate; 1850 Swanton letter solicits specific rights for area métis; 55 métis petitioned for land rights immediately after Treaty; indirect evidence of an urban métis population who lobbied for land and fishing rights, 1860s-70s
6. **Geographic proximity**: after closure of HBC post in 1843, métis continued to live in "Frenchtown" (202 enumerated in town in 1901); over 400 métis at Garden River and over 50 at Batchewana in 1901
7. **Cultural distinctiveness**: log house houses built on long narrow river lots; métis home language was French or English (vs. Ojibwa)

#### POST POPULATION

- trading villages in the Sault area established in late 1600s; population not determined
- after HBC/NWC merger in 1821, the Sault Ste. Marie post lost its importance; only 4 employees reported in 1826; estimated post population is 9
- however, it appears that numerous freemen remained to pursue other economic opportunities (eg., fishing); population at the British Sault in 1845 is estimated at 250

#### HARVESTING PRACTICES

- direct evidence that métis families fished at the Sault as well as small-scale hunting (subsistence)
- HBC operated a commercial fishery; métis servants presumed to have participated
- 1859 report that Sault area "halfbreeds" were fishing for American firms
- 1876 official’s opinion that non-treaty métis had right to fish at Sault for domestic use
- 1891 Borron report: métis hunt and fish as secondary economic (subsistence) activity

#### DATE MANIFESTED

- 1780s: established métis population on American side of Sault
- post-1794 Jay Treaty: métis population growth at British Sault
- 1830s métis group cohesion evident by request for Shingwaukonse to represent their interests to local authorities

#### CONTINUITY TO PRESENT

- little data about métis during 20th century
- OMAA head office at Sault Ste. Marie since 1985; MNO local also established here

#### PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL

- 1665: permanent European contact; traders, explorers missionaries
- 1768: HBC established post at Sault Ste. Marie; 1783 NWC established post at Garden River
- 1850: Robinson-Huron Treaty

#### DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT

- 1871: Sault Ste. Marie became official municipality
- by 1901, town population was over 7,000

#### EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS

**Quality of available evidence**: description of métis during the fur trade is taken from secondary sources as the reports reviewed here (Holmes; Jones) only briefly refer to that period

**Quantity of available evidence**: secondary sources indicate a wide range of primary data available for French and British fur trade; HBCA fur trade records are relatively sparse (1818-1864); abundant Indian Affairs records available leading up to and following 1850 Treaty
6. HBC Lake Superior District
   (Trade Posts #25 - 30)

French / NWC District Headquarters:
   Grand Portage / Fort William (1679 - 1827)

HBC District Headquarters:
   Michipicoten (1827 - 1887)

Report Summary Pages:

   6.1 Wawa

   6.2 Thunder Bay
### HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO

#### 6.1 WAWA & ENVIRONS

[Trade post: HBC Michipicoten]

| CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY | 1. Descent: Direct evidence of mixed marriages and métis offspring during fur trade; several métis (‘French Breed’ [FB]) families with ties to fur trade enumerated in 1901 Census

2. Common experience at individual level: métis servants and families form a significant segment of the post population at Michipicoten; métis children raised in post culture

3. Collective recognition: other-ascription - separate list of half-breeds on 1850 paylist;

self-ascription - 1850 letter by métis post master at Michipicoten indicates self-ascription and identity distinct from Indians; 1901 Census lists 48 individuals possibly self-identified as métis

4. Social structure/organization: métis lifestyle characterized largely by fur trade; HBC hierarchy and socio-economic norms structured life of many métis who chose to be fur traders

5. Political identity: direct evidence of distinct métis group: separate list of halfbreeds for treaty purposes, and pre-treaty letter by métis post master at Michipicotan, John Swanton (ca. 1850)

6. Geographic proximity: by 1901, most fur trade métis families had left the Wawa area; of the 48 métis enumerated in the area, half lived at Michipicoten Harbour and half in “Wawa City”

7. Cultural distinctiveness: no direct or specific data re: material culture; Vidal/Anderson reported that métis lived a lifestyle distinct from Indian semi-nomadic hunters

| POST POPULATION | - throughout the 19th century Michipicoten was staffed by less than a dozen employees; the post population is estimated at 25-30 persons, including women and children

| HARVESTING PRACTICES | - 1830s-40s: Michipicoten operated fairly large fisheries for both post provisioning and commerce; post journals illustrate that some métis servants and their families operated seasonal fisheries; ca. 1833, references to fishing outnumbmered hunting for game or furs (decline in large game)

- 1840: small schooner employed for commercial fishing; evidence of métis servants participating

- 1858: survey of one entire journal demonstrates that métis servants were primary post provisioners, both fishing and hunting (game increase by this time)

| DATE MANIFESTED | - 1820s-30s: socially distinct post community in which métis are a segment, but not necessarily distinct from other post personnel except perhaps for more extensive post provisioning

- 1849: politically distinct métis population; Vidal/Anderson report & other treaty-related documents indicate that métis share political and social values with Indians, but distinguish themselves from the Indian population per se; Swanton letter 1850 asserts métis-specific rights

| CONTINUITY TO PRESENT | - “silent period” for most of the 1900s with regard to métis populations in the Wawa area

- OMAA local in Wawa; interview with Wawa métis indicates that ancestry is traced to 20th century mining period (marriages between European miners and Aboriginal women)

| PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE/ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL | - 1714: Michipicoten post established by French; this marks the beginning of a permanent European presence in the Wawa area; 1760: NWC takes over French post at Michipicoten; 1797: HBC establishes post at Michipicoten

- 1850: Robinson-Superior Treaty

| DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT | - 1898-1920: “Wawa Gold Rush” and iron mining brings in a variety of European miners

- 1901 Census: only a few métis enumerated; trade post closed ca. 1890 and most métis likely relocated to other posts; no métis enumerated within the mining settlements

- 1915: railway connection from Sault Ste. Marie to Michipicoten

- 1930s: permanent establishment of gold and iron mines, with significant European settlement

| EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS | Quality of available evidence: substance of historical data is directly relevant to Wawa; body of data spans a prolonged time-period, and consists of various types of documentation (fur trade, Indian Affairs, and Census records); eg.: HBCA post records for Michipicoten span years 1797-1899, showing continuous métis presence; 1833 census (HBC) lists 26 resident families of which several heads are positively identified as métis; 1850 Robinson Treaty paylists includes Michipicoten “halfbreeds” also listed on HBC 1833 census; 1901 census records document métis (French-breed) families with ties to the fur trade

Quantity of available evidence: abundant historical records of fur trade and treaty periods available; sparse data available regarding métis in Wawa area during 20th century
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY</th>
<th>6.2 THUNDER BAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Descent: several generations of métis families documented in Fort William area and at Nipigon; limited evidence of métis endogamy; data suggests that by the end of the 19th century most métis had joined area Indian bands; paylists include known métis family names from ca. 1870s onward.</td>
<td>[Trade posts: Fort William, Grand Portage, Nipigon House]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common experience at individual level: positive identification of métis servants and families at Fort William and surrounding posts; métis sons of NorWesters protested discrimination from HBC after merger in 1821; by mid-1800s, métis were post managers at Fort William and Nipigon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective recognition: other-ascription - earliest instance of term “halfbreed” is 1831; Vidal-Anderson recognized métis as distinct from Indians at Fort William in 1849; Treaty paylists show 14-16 métis families at Fort William and 2 at Nipigon; in the 1890s, Borron reported 147 métis in Fort William band; self-ascription - 1901 Census identifies over 400 métis in Thunder Bay area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social structure/organization: métis lifestyle structured according to the fur trade; after 1821, HBC hierarchy defined classes of men, including métis freemen who remained near the Fort and were hired for specific tasks (eg., canoe building); French Catholics attended mass at Indian mission; in 1898 Indian Agent reported that many métis did not live Indian mode of life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political identity: 1836 several métis men joined an “Indian Liberating Army” in reaction to HBCs refusal to hire them; direct evidence that métis attended meeting in 1849 with Vidal &amp; Anderson who subsequently addressed issue of “claims of halfbreeds”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geographic proximity: in 1901, 88% of métis at Fort William lived on reserve; 88% of métis at Lake Nipigon lived on reserves, mainly at Red Rock; 1901 Census does not indicate any off reserve métis neighbourhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural distinctiveness: log and clap-board houses at McVicar Creek; insufficient evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST POPULATION</th>
<th>HARVESTING PRACTICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- prior to amalgamation, Grand Portage/Fort William post populations averaged 25-35 men; estimated permanent population prior to 1821 is 55-80, including women and children; 1,000 men reported during summer rendezvous (convergence of voyageurs from east &amp; west) - after 1821, Fort William reduced to 5-7 employees, with estimated population of 10-15; however, up to 70 freemen documented in the immediate vicinity, estimated at 160 people.</td>
<td>- evidence that métis freemen and their families hunted, trapped, fished and harvested sugar for subsistence in 19th century - 1837: a great number of freemen reportedly fished at Grand Portage for American Fur Co.; also independent commercial fishery efforts by métis men documented in 1830s - direct evidence that HBC Fort William hired métis freemen to operate fall fisheries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE MANIFESTED</th>
<th>CONTINUITY TO PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1820s-1830s: merger of HBC/NWC may have triggered first manifestations of métis ethnic community in face of discriminatory policies - by 1850s métis appear to have identified with local Ojibwa bands, presumably for economic purposes (treaty annuity) although métis were later observed to lifestyle distinct from Ojibwa.</td>
<td>- “Red Sky Independent Métis Nation” claim direct ties to fur trade at Fort William and to “84 halfbreeds” enumerated by Robinson, 1850 - Lake Nipigon Metis Association formed in 1965; MNO local at Thunder Bay; OMAA locals at Thunder Bay and Nipigon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL</th>
<th>DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1679 - mid-1700s: French post at mouth of Kaministiquia River; coureurs de bois active there - 1765-1803: French post moved to Grand Portage; taken over by NWC in 1784 - 1803-1821: NWC post relocated to Fort William; taken over by HBC after merger - 1830s-1840s: Catholic mission established at Fort William - 1850 Robinson-Superior Treaty</td>
<td>- 1860s-70s: silver discoveries bring European miners; Red River road; townships surveyed - 1880s-90s: lumber industry development, railway construction bring more settlers - 1901 population = 7,282 (Fort William: 3,997; Port Arthur 3,285)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of available evidence: Gale report begins with data on treaty period; hence summary of early development of métis population during fur trade period relies heavily on secondary sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of available evidence: sources indicate that substantial historical records are available for the American, North West and Hudson’s Bay Companies (eg., HBCA Fort William post journals are available for 1817-1851; Nipigon House post journals date from 1792-1941).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. HBC Lac la Pluie District
   (Trade Posts # 31 - 36)

   HBC District Headquarters:
   Lac la Pluie / Fort Frances

   York Factory (#38): HBC Northern Department Depot
   [via Lower / Upper Fort Garry & Red River Colony (#37)]

   Report Summary Pages:

   7.1 FORT FRANCES / RAINY RIVER

   7.2 KENORA

   7.3 DRYDEN / WABIGOON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO</th>
<th>7.1 FORT FRANCES / RAINY RIVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>[Trade posts: Lac la Pluie / Fort Frances, Hungry Hall, Whitefish Bay]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Descent: métis families resident at Fort Frances by the late 18th century; several métis surnames listed in the 1901 Census can be linked to the area fur trade, both on and off-reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common experience at individual level:</strong> métis employees and offspring are positively identified at both the NWC and HBC posts; métis children were raised in post culture and there is evidence that some also pursued careers in the fur trade, forming an 'occupational class'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective recognition:</strong> other-ascription - there are explicit references to &quot;halfbreeds&quot; in the Lac la Pluie post journals beginning in 1817; recognized in 1870s by area Indians as having a separate identity; Morris acknowledged métis as a separate group in his Treaty 3 report; self-ascription - in 1873 métis self-identify as &quot;halfbreeds of Fort Frances&quot;; 1901 Census enumerated 225 métis in the Fort Frances area and 73 métis in the Rainy river area (possible self-identity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social structure/organization:</strong> métis lifestyle characterized largely by the fur trade; HBC hierarchy and socio-economic structure; direct evidence of &quot;women at the fort&quot; indicating a community of families with children raised in cross-cultural post environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political identity:</strong> by the 1870s, métis assert separate rights to treat and to their own reserve; métis had own leader, N. Chatelain, and in 1875 negotiated a &quot;Half-Breed Adhesion&quot; to Treaty 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic proximity:</strong> métis beneficiaries to the Half-Breed Adhesion to Treaty 3 maintained separate residence patterns on Couchiching reserve; in 1901 off-reserve métis were concentrated at McIrvine (a village later annexed to Fort Frances), perhaps near the old HBC site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural distinctiveness:</strong> evidence of fiddle dances and social gatherings between post personnel; métis were generally bi-lingual in parents' languages (English/French &amp; Aboriginal) and often filled occupational niche of interpreter (eg., Chatelain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- between 1828 and 1861, HBC post employees ranged in number from 15-22; the estimated post population including women and children is 35-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- however, the area post population was likely larger as other companies operated simultaneously to the HBC post at Fort Frances; eg., American Fur Co. post on other side of the river</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARVESTING PRACTICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- throughout the 19th century, métis interpreters and other métis servants at LLP engaged regularly in operating HBC fisheries, goose/duck hunting, and other post provisioning (domestic) activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- during the 1890s several off-reserve métis men acquired commercial fishing licenses, some for independent operations, others under the umbrella of larger commercial firms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in 1909 a petition re: fishing rights was submitted by the &quot;Half-breeds of Couchiching&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE MANIFESTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1790s - 1820s: Lac la Pluie was a major fur trade crossroads and all major companies had posts there at one time or another; NWC and HBC operated posts simultaneously for 20 - 30 years and socially distinct post populations with métis segment developed around each; after amalgamation in 1821, the post populations also merged and some freemen remained with country-born families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1871: politically distinct métis community fully evident; &quot;Halfbreeds of Fort Francis&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1875: Half-Breed Adhesion to Treaty 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINUITY TO PRESENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- insufficient evidence re: 20th century métis population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1994: MNO office established at Fort Frances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1732: Fort St Charles established by French on western shore of Lake of the Woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1780 - 1809: NWC posts established in Rainy River &amp; Kenora districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1790 - 1836: HBC posts at Rainy Lake, Eagle Lake, Rat Portage, Dinorwic, Shoal Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1873/1875: Treaty 3 and Half-Breed Adhesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1870s: Dawson Route &amp; Steamboat transportation, Rainy Lake to Lake of the Woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1902: CN Railway brings immigrant settlers to Fort Frances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of available evidence:</strong> substantial historical database directly relevant to Fort Frances; body of data includes various sources, eg., HBC records 1794-1890, Treaty paylists 1871-77 containing separate &quot;Halfbreed&quot; lists; personnel file on métis leader N. Chatelaine; Indian Affairs annual reports 1885-1912, métis petition 1909, and 1901 Census</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of available evidence:</strong> abundant data available covering almost a 200 year span of fur trade records and about 40 years post-treaty data including Indian Affairs and Census records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **HISTORIC MÎTIS IN ONTARIO** | **7.2 KENORA**  
*Trade posts: Dalles / Rat Portage, North West Angle, Shoal Lake* |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY** | 1. Descent: direct evidence of mixed marriages and mîtis off-spring; several fur trade mîtis names listed in 1901 Census enumerations can be traced to the regional fur trade; in some fur trade families, 2 or more generations can be traced in Kenora area  
2. Common experience at individual level: Rat Portage post was managed continuously by mîtis men (with families) from the 1830s - 1870s (eg., George McPherson)  
3. Collective recognition: other-ascration - McPherson explicitly referred to as ‘half-breed’; self-ascration - in 1901, 165 people identified as mîtis in Rat Portage and surrounding area  
4. Social structure/organization: HBC socio-economic structure and fur trade lifestyle; evidence of children raised in cross-cultural post environment  
5. Political identity: no evidence that mîtis were politically distinct; a few Rat Portage mîtis participated in Treaty 3 negotiations, but did not petition for separate benefits  
6. Geographic proximity: in 1901 mîtis were spread across 4 of 5 polling divisions; the largest concentration of mîtis lived in the ‘Rideout’ neighbourhood also the site of the old HBC post; present-day Kenora mîtis claim that “Rideout” is known historically as a mîtis neighbourhood  
7. Cultural distinctiveness: no data |
| **POST POPULATION** | - in the 1850s-60s, Rat Portage employed about 7 men; the estimated post population was around 15 persons, including women and children |
| **HARVESTING PRACTICES** | - direct evidence that HBC employees at Rat Portage operated fisheries for post provisions  
- 1892, mîtis men (eg., McPherson, MacKay) submitted applications for gill net fishing licenses  
- several other mîtis are identified in records from the 1890s to have participated in or operated commercial fisheries  
- 1901 Census lists 8 mîtis families at Beaudro Fishery (commercial) on Lake of the Woods |
| **DATE MANIFESTED** | - when post was established in 1836 only 2 mîtis families were at the post at the time; in the mid-1800s the mîtis population had increased only slightly but remained quite constant (eg., McPhersons)  
- census data indicates that by the 1880s Rat Portage was attracting mîtis from elsewhere (eg., Manitoba) and in 1901 about 150 mîtis were enumerated at Rat Portage |
| **CONTINUITY TO PRESENT** | - “silent period” re: 20th century mîtis population  
- 1994: MNO offices established at Kenora; conversations with mîtis representatives at Kenora (MNO) in 1999 indicate that they trace their historic mîtis roots to the fur trade self-identity essential, and claim a shared lifestyle with an emphasis on resource harvesting and or high rate of participation in natural resource occupations (eg., guiding, etc.) |
| **PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL** | - 1780 - 1809: NWC posts established in Rainy River & Kenora districts  
- 1790 - 1836: HBC posts at Rainy Lake, Eagle Lake, Rat Portage, Dinorvic, Shoal Lake  
- 1873: Treaty 3 |
| **DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT** | - 1870s: Dawson Route & Steamboat transportation, Rainy Lake to Lake of the Woods  
- 1884: CP Railway brings immigrant settlers to Kenora |
| **EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS** | Quality of available evidence: fur trade data is scant with large time gaps between records; some extrapolation from the Lac la Pluie experience is possible, as Rat Portage belonged to the LLP district, and posts in the Dryden area, etc. were administered by Rat Portage; Federal Marine & Fisheries records from the 1890s provide a data on Kenora fishermen (some mîtis) active on Lake of the Woods; 1901 Census records provide fairly detailed data about the mîtis population in Kenora at the turn of the century  
Quantity of available evidence: few fur trade records have survived from Rat Portage; only rare reference to Rat Portage mîtis in treaty records |

*Praxis Research Associates, 2002: Review and Map pertaining to Historic KA0095722_67-000154*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HISTORIC MÉTIS IN ONTARIO</strong></th>
<th><strong>7.3 DRYDEN &amp; WABIGOON</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>[Trade posts: Eagle Lake, Dinorwic, Wabigoon]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Descent:</strong> one reference is made in 1907 to a guide named “McGraw”, a well-known métis name (Maggrah) in Dryden today; local history published in 1988 documents several families in Wabigoon who trace their ancestry to fur trade mixed marriages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Common experience at individual level:</strong> there is one direct reference to métis at Dinorvic post; as outposts of Rat Portage it is possible that métis men and/or country-born families were assigned to these posts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Collective recognition:</strong> other-ascription – insufficient historical data; self-ascription – the 1901 Census identifies 15 métis at Dryden and 18 métis at Wabigoon, a few with names connected to the Lac la Pluie district fur trade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Social structure/organization:</strong> insufficient data; these outposts were small, operated seasonally or intermittently and occasionally re-located, and it is unlikely that post communities developed; these small outpost populations might be viewed as extensions of Rat Portage and the greater Lac la Pluie district fur trade community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Political identity:</strong> no evidence of politically distinct métis group during the 19th century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Geographic proximity:</strong> insufficient evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Cultural distinctiveness:</strong> insufficient evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST POPULATION</strong></td>
<td>- no record of the number of post employees assigned to Eagle Lake, Dinorwic or Wabigoon has been found; as outposts these will have been operated by a minimum of men, likely 2 or at the most 3, possibly with families at some points in time; estimated post population is 4 to 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARVESTING PRACTICES</strong></td>
<td>- one entry in the 1938-40 Dinorwic post journal refers to several trappers with French surnames; while it is possible that these men were métis, there is no direct evidence of identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE MANIFESTED</strong></td>
<td>- it is unlikely that ethnic community developed during the 19th century fur trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINUITY TO PRESENT</strong></td>
<td>- strong OMAA presence in Wabigoon since 1970s; interview indicates that métis in Wabigoon acknowledge but do not emphasize the fur trade as the root of métis identity, but also later mixed marriages between immigrant miners and local Ojibwa women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MNO local established in Dryden in the 1990s; interview with métis in Dryden indicate they trace their roots to the local fur trade and to Red River, and to later immigrant mixed marriages;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMANENT EUROPEAN PRESENCE / ASSERTION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>- HBC fur trade posts established at Eagle Lake in 1809, Dinorwic in the 1830s and Wabigoon in the 1880s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1873: Treaty 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE OF SIGNIFICANT EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT</strong></td>
<td>- 1880s-1890s: the railway and gold mining brought European immigrants to the area but the settler population dwindled when gold was discovered further north; both Dryden and Wabigoon later established themselves as forestry centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Quality of available evidence: insufficient historical data to evaluate quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quantity of available evidence: there exist almost no fur trade records for Eagle Lake or Dinorwic/Wabigoon; likewise there is almost no data regarding the recent history of métis in the Dryden/Wabigoon area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# APPENDIX A
KEY TO FUR TRADE LOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>★ FORT / DISTRICT HQ</th>
<th>♦ TRADE POST</th>
<th>□ OUTPOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- permanent (long-term operation)</td>
<td>- year-round (long / short-term)</td>
<td>- seasonal / temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multi-functional / regional centre</td>
<td>- trade &amp;/or supply / frontier post</td>
<td>- winterers / frontier station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Moose Factory (1673/1730) - HBC Southern Department Depot
2. Abitibi (1686/1779)
3. Kenogami (1794)
4. Manigami (1794)
5. Flying Post (1800)
6. Frederick House (1784)
7. Langue de Terre (1785) / Maniwaki (1865)
8. New Post (1802)
9. Timiskaming (1679/1720)
10. Temagami (1820)
11. Fort Coulon (1680) / Lac des Allumettes (1823)
12. Mattawa (1784/1840s)
13. La Cloche (1799) / Sudbury (1883)
14. Missisagi (1804)
15. Desgagnés (ca. 1880-90) [also offer post locations along CPR 1880-1890s]
16. Whitefish Lake (1824)
17. French River (ca. 1821)
18. LaRonde (ca. 1800) / Nipissing (1824/1825) / North Bay (1895)
19. Showangan (1820s)
20. Penetanguishene (1790s / 1828) - 4 major independent traders [various Penetang. trade operations north & inland, 1850-1860s]
21. Dukis (1845)
22. Sainte-Marie (1670/1688)
23. Michilimackinac (1781)
24. Fort St. Joseph (1816)
25. Batchewana (1814)
26. Michipicoten (1714/1827)
27. Pic (1779)
28. Kaminiusqua / Fort William (1679 / 1804)
29. Fort Canaustiquy / Red Rock / Nipigon (1678)
30. Grand Portage (1765)
31. Fort St. Pierre (1731) / Lac du Plutre / Fort Frances (1793)
32. Portage du Plutre (1783) / Rat Portage (1835)
33. Portage des Mille Iles / Stony Point (1804)
34. Fort Chippewa (1787) / North Bay (1895)
35. Lower / Upper Fort Garry (1803/07) / Red River Colony (1812)
36. York Factory (1682) - HBC Northern Department Depot

Source: Ray 1988

1. Alternate shaded / unshaded rows indicate posts belonging to the same fur trade district.
2. Where two dates are listed (eg., 1670/1678), the first represents the date of initial establishment (temporary and/or intermittent/seasonal) and the second represents the date of permanent full-time operation.
3. Locations in [square] parentheses were not investigated in the OMNR studies or reviews of reports regarding historic métis communities in Ontario. These are included to illustrate connections between fur trade districts.
APPENDIX B

OMNR Studies of "Historic Métis in Ontario":
Fur Trade Post Populations

LEGEND
- Present-day Ontario townships
  (date of European settlement)
- • • • Fur trade posts (see Key at bottom left)
- Fur trade routes
- --- HBC Northern / Southern Department Boundary

Posts: Fur trade districts
1-8 HBC Moose District (Inland Posts)
9-12 HBC Thimaming District
13-19 HBC Lake Rooke District
20-21 Independent, 1761
22-24 Early French Posts, 1671-1701
25-30 HBC Lake Superior District
31-36 HBC Lake of the Platte District
37-38 Manitoba Depots/Forts

QUEBEC
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