1

49555

0-315-01698-1

National Library
of CanadaBibliothèque nationale
du CanadaCANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHETHÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR JESSIE TURNER WELDON

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE THE SALIENT FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE EARLIEST SETTLEMENT PATTERNS
IN EAST AND WEST HAWKESBURY TOWNSHIPS UPPER CANADA 1788-1846

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ CARLETON UNIVERSITY

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE MASTERS

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1980

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE J. CLARKE

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE 29 April 1980 SIGNED/SIGNÉ

Jessie Weldon

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE 1785 Riverside Drive, #508, Ottawa, K1G 3T7

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

The Salient Factors Contributing
To The Earliest Settlement Patterns In
East and West Hawkesbury Townships
Upper Canada 1788-1846

By
Jessie Turner Weldon

A thesis submitted to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts

Department of Geography
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
1980

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis

"THE SALIENT FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO
THE EARLIEST SETTLEMENT PATTERNS IN
EAST AND WEST HAWKESBURY TOWNSHIPS
UPPER CANADA 1788-1846"

submitted by Jessie Turner Weldon, B.A., in
partial fulfilment of the degree of Master
of Arts.

John Clarke
.....
Thesis Supervisor, Department of
Geography

Kenneth Torrance
.....
Supervisor of Graduate Studies,
Department of Geography

David B. Knight
.....
Chairman, Department of Geography

Carleton University

April 28, 1980

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the original settlement of East and West Hawkesbury Townships, Upper Canada. Particular themes treated are: the impact of the natural environment on settlement patterns; the role of accessibility and the influence of official authority in regulating land acquisition. Attention is also given to elements such as the use and disposal of Crown and Clergy Reserves, the incidence of squatting and mortgaging, and the impact of the fur and timber trades.

It is shown that the Government's land policies were the major deterrent to efficient settlement. The constraints of the physical environment were also identified as being restrictive to contiguous settlement. A lack of roads in this area where the only notable river was lost to navigation by rapids, hampered communication, transportation, settler interaction and discouraged would-be settlers.

Primary source materials used are to be found in the Land Registry Office, L'Orignal, the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa and/or the Provincial Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the members of my thesis committee for their interest and direction in this work. To John Clarke goes my warmest gratitude for his constant enthusiasm and endless patience as my advisor. His criticisms were always well founded and I have benefited greatly from his high level of expertise, his high Irish spirit and his high standards of performance. Thanks are due to David Knight for his critique and for the privilege over the years to be exposed to his unique and enthusiastic approach to Cultural Geography; to Gordon Merrill for his erudite evaluation of this work and for the special skills, the fund of knowledge and the humanism he possesses.

To Professors Ken Torrance, Mike Fox, Dave Bennett and John Tunbridge my warm appreciation for my enrichment under your guidance. Indeed, the Geography Department is staffed by a very special group of people and my involvement with the faculty has been very rewarding.

In addition I would like to take this occasion to acknowledge my appreciation to the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Government of Ontario for waiving the normal tariff fee for searching documents at the Land Registry Office, L'Orignal, Ontario. My thanks also to M. Roger Coté, Deputy Land Registrar, for his goodwill and cooperation and to Mme. Rejean Clairmont, Secretary-Treasurer, Township Office, St. Eugène, for her helpfulness.

To John Carmichael, Kathy Rothwell and Brian Fleming special thanks for your fine efforts in reproducing the maps for me.

I would like to thank the secretarial staff of the Geography Department for their help, cheerfully given, over the years. To Janet Lyons, my sincerest thanks for typing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1 Introduction And Purpose Of The Research	1
1.2 A Legacy Of Upper Canada - The Township	3
1.3 Methodology Of The Thesis	3
CHAPTER TWO - Review Of The Literature	7
2.1 Introduction And Purpose	7
2.2 The Role Of Environmental Perception And Evaluation	7
2.3 The Role Of Accessibility In The Settlement Process	11
2.4 The Impact Of Official Authority On The Landscape	13
2.5 Conclusions	17
CHAPTER THREE - Background To Upper Canada	24
3.1 Introduction	24
3.2 The "Raison D'Etre" Of Upper Canada	24
3.3 The Indians Of Upper Canada	29
3.4 The Survey Of Upper Canada	30
3.5 Commerce In Early Upper Canada	32
3.6 The Impact Of Canal Building On The Inland Transportation Routes And On The Direction Of Agriculture And Trade	33
3.7 Changing Land Policies After 1820	34
3.8 Conclusions	35
CHAPTER FOUR - The Historical Background And Physiography Of The Study Area	43
4.1 Introduction	43

	Page
4.2 Historical Background: Site And Situation	43
4.3 Evidence Of Pre-Settlement Human Occupance On The Landscape	44
4.4 Summary	45
4.5 The Physiography Of East And West Hawkesbury Townships	45
4.6 Climate And Soils	49
4.7 Conclusions	50
CHAPTER FIVE - The Consequences Of The Fur Trade And The Lumbering Industry To The Study Area	53
5.1 Introduction	53
5.2 The Fur Trade	53
5.3 Conclusions	56
5.4 The Timber Trade	56
5.5 Summary	62
5.6 Conclusions	63
CHAPTER SIX - The Social, Political And Environmental Aspects Of East And West Hawkesbury	69
6.1 Introduction And Purpose	69
6.2 Methodology	70
6.3 Data Sources	70
6.4 The Civil Divisions Of The Study Area	72
6.5 The Surveys	75
6.6 The Fledgeling Road Network	84
6.7 The Reserved Lands	87
6.8 Conclusions	93
CHAPTER SEVEN - The Acquisition Of Land In East And West Hawkesbury	98
7.1 Introduction And Purpose	98
7.2 Methodology And Data Sources	98
7.3 The Pioneer Period 1797-1811	99
7.4 The Lag Period 1812-1821	105
7.5 Settlement In Earnest 1822-1846	110
7.6 Conclusions	129
CHAPTER EIGHT - Absentee Ownership, Land Speculation, Squatting And Mortgaging	138
8.1 Introduction	138

	Page
8.2 Methodology And Data Sources	139
8.3 Land Speculators And Absentee Ownership Of Land	139
8.4 The Incidence Of Mortgaging In East And West Hawkesbury	154
8.5 Summary of Mortgaging	156
8.6 Evidence Of Squatting In East And West Hawkesbury	157
8.7 Conclusion	157
CHAPTER NINE - Summary And Conclusions	167
APPENDIX 1	174
BIBLIOGRAPHY	178
Documents	178
Maps	179
Theses	180
Books And Articles	181
TRANSPARENCIES	
Figure 4.2 Physiography Of East And West Hawkesbury	inside
Figure 6.4 East And West Hawkesbury 1798	back cover

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abstract Index To Deeds	A.I.D.
Index To Land Patents	I.L.P.
Journals Of The House Of Assembly Of Upper Canada	J.H.A./U.C.
Land Registry Office, L'Orignal, Ontario	L.R.O./L'O.
Land Record Index	L.R.I.
Public Archives Of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario	P.A.C.
Public Archives Of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario	P.A.O.

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
3.1 Province Of Upper Canada - Original Districts (1788)	27
4.1 Sand Plains Of Prescott-Russell Counties	46
4.2 Physiography Of East And West Hawkesbury	48
6.1 Province Of Upper Canada - Original Counties (1793)	73
6.2 Province Of Upper Canada - Original Districts (1792)	74
6.3 Province Of Upper Canada - Districts In 1816	76
6.4 East And West Hawkesbury, 1798	82
6.5 East And West Hawkesbury, 1973	83
6.6 Roads Approved 1816-1841	86
6.7 Distribution Of Crown And Clergy Reserves	88
6.8 Reserves Turned Over To Canada Company, 1824	90
6.9 Crown and Clergy Reserves Patented from 1824 (Cumulative)	91
7.1 Land Patented/Alienated To 1821	102
7.2 Land Patented/Alienated By Absentee/Large Land Owners To 1821	103
7.3 Assessment Of 1822 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	107
7.4 Assessment Of 1823 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	108
7.5 Assessment Of 1824 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	109
7.6 Population Of East And West Hawkesbury 1824-1846	111
7.7 Total Land Alienated-Cultivated And Uncultivated 1815- 1846	112
7.8 Assessment Of 1832 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	120
7.9 Assessment Of 1834 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	121
7.10 Assessment Of 1836 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	122
7.11 Assessment Of 1840 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	125
7.12 Assessment Of 1843 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	126
7.13 Assessment Of 1846 Lots Occupied By Owners and Non-owners	127

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
7.1 Settlers And Absentee Owners Assessed For Land Over 400 Acres 1797-1846	114
8.1 Typology Of Speculators In East And West Hawkesbury	140
8.2 Incidence Of Mortgaging In East And West Hawkesbury	142
9.1 Population And Land Alienation Statistics In The Ottawa And Eastern Districts 1846	172

Chapter One

"Any landscape develops its character by an ever ongoing complex interplay of many factors".¹

1.1 Introduction And Purpose Of The Research

In the years since Canada celebrated her Centennial in 1967 there appears to have been a growing pride and interest in the realization that we have a countable past: witness the burgeoning genealogical and local historical societies. Since 1973, Heritage Canada, a national charitable organization founded at the federal level, has been diligently and sensitively focusing on the conservation and preservation of Canada's historic buildings and sites. Restoration of property which once signalled urban decay is now widely accepted and "heritage planning" has emerged as an occupation.

As might be expected this increased interest in the nation's heritage is reflected in the work of historical geographers² and has, hopefully, been in part inspired by the work of historical geographers. Since most of these researchers are Ontario based, this province, and Southwestern Ontario in particular has received greatest attention. In particular, Northern and Eastern Ontario have been relatively ignored to the extent that the danger exists of interpreting the history and geography of the South and Southwestern peninsula as the history of the province. One of the aims of this work, and hopefully others will follow, is to help redress this false image by examining the historical geography of a part of Eastern Ontario. In this way it is hoped to contribute to the historiography of Ontario as a whole.

The area selected is the Townships of East and West Hawkesbury on the Ottawa River which were among the earliest of Upper Canada locations to receive settlers. In recent years, in step to the drum-beat of the march of progress, three exceptional landscape features have vanished, by drowning, with the construction a few miles downriver of the new Carillon Dam. Gone are most of the islands on which the original lumber mills were erected in 1808. With the loss of the islands the bleak shanty housing which was a blot on the landscape has also disappeared. Gone too are the Long Sault rapids, running the breadth of both townships, which, while providing a source of power for the mills inhibited the advance of settlement beyond the study area. Finally, gone too, except for vestigial remnants, is the Grenville Canal on the far shore. Completed in 1833 its purpose was to bypass the rapids and thereby facilitate the transportation of goods and people on the river of trade, the Algonquin meaning of the word Ottawa or Outaouais.³

These changes are irreversible but, unlike many parts of Ontario, the townships have retained their rural agricultural orientation. Located north of the Windsor-Quebec Axis, the forces of industrialization and urbanization have been relatively minor and growth has been slow.⁴ Yet East and West Hawkesbury are critically located at the interface of the two principal culture groups in Canada, the English and French speaking peoples. The impact of the latter group has been profound. Now, where once the founding settlers' mother tongue was essentially English, only 32% of the people claim this status while 65% of the remainder are bearers of the French language.⁵ In the town of Hawkesbury the change is even more dramatic for only 13% of the population is English speaking.⁶

Cartwright⁷ has documented the ecclesiastically directed settlement of the low lying clay soils from 1850 to 1910 but the original processes of settlement have not been identified and explained.

The principal purpose of this research is therefore directed at reconstructing the earliest agrarian settlement of East and West Hawkesbury and to place it in perspective with the rest of Upper Canada at that time. Secondly, it is timely to examine this strategic corner of Ontario for its unique heritage value as a tribute to the pioneers whose persistent labours and particular personalities created a distinct

3

landscape despite the myriad constraints of the physical, economic and political environment.

1.2 A Legacy Of Upper Canada - The Township

The township was the basic land unit for administrative purposes in Upper Canada. Within its boxed frame settlement was organized and promoted. Separated by long distances, and with a paucity of roads, each township had an opportunity to develop a unique identity which was recorded on paper and the remains of which can often be seen on the landscape. In one sense the township is a world, albeit a small world.

None-the-less the townships did not develop in isolation one from the other or from the central administration of Upper Canada. While researchers have found the township a useful unit for the purpose of detailed study this feature must also be examined in the perspective of the political and economic forces at work in the whole of Upper Canada.

1.3 Methodology Of The Thesis

The study relies upon a variety of primary sources; notably, the Abstract Index to Deeds, the Index to Land Patents, surviving Assessment Rolls and archival resources of the Crown Land Department. These are used to examine a variety of themes identified in the historical literature of Ontario and which are seen to be relevant to the townships. This literature is reviewed and the themes are identified in Chapter Two. Chapter Three places the township in the context of Upper Canada because, while much has been written about Ontario's disunity, its lack of coherence and many reasons have been advanced to explain it⁸, nothing occurs in a vacuum. While this chapter stresses political, economic and social forces operating in Upper Canada, Chapter Four is complementary in that the historical and physical background to the study area are discussed. Chapter Five provides an insight into two concurrent activities which had an impact on the study area; these are the fur trade and the lumbering industry. Chapter Six deals with the social, political and environmental aspects of the study area, while the actual acquisition of land is elucidated in Chapter Seven. Chapter Eight examines the major issue of absentee ownership in the townships and identifies major speculators

by name, by group typology and gives a brief biographical description of the individuals and includes the maximum acreage held in East and West Hawkesbury. The chapter also discusses the issues of squatting and mortgaging, both of which were consequences of the land policies of the Government of Upper Canada. In conclusion, Chapter Nine summarizes the main issues of the thesis; they are the salient factors responsible for the development of East and West Hawkesbury during the study period.

Endnotes to Chapter One

¹Salter, Christopher L. The Cultural Landscape, Duxbury Press, Belmont, California, 1971, p. 162.

²Examples are;

- (a) Brunger, Alan G. "A Spatial Analysis Of Individual Settlement In Southern London District, Upper Canada, 1800-1836", Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.
- (b) Clarke, John. "Geographical Analysis Of Colonial Settlement In The Western District Of Upper Canada, 1788-1850", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1970.
- (c) Lindsay, Virginia H. "The Perth Military Settlement, Characteristics Of Its Permanent And Transitory Settlers, 1815-1822", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 15, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1972.

³Kennedy, Clyde, "5000 Years Of Indian Occupation In The Upper Ottawa Valley" a paper presented at the Ottawa Valley Conference, Arnprior, Ontario, October 19, 1978, personal notes of researcher.

⁴Assessed population is 9,804 in Hawkesbury, the largest town between Montreal and Ottawa. Corporation of the Town of Hawkesbury, 1979 Assessment, personal communication with Town Clerk, 17 October 1979.

⁵Census of Canada, 1976, Vol. 2. Population Demographic Characteristics: Specified Mother Tongues.

⁶Total employees, payroll of Canadian International Paper Limited as of 24 October 1979, 454.

Total employees, payroll of Amoco Fabric Company as of 18 October 1979, 500.

Personal communication with Personnel Managers of both companies.

- ⁷ Cartwright, Donald, "French Canadian Colonization in Eastern Ontario to 1910", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.
 - (b) Mackay, D.S.C. "The Influence Of Government Policy And Technological Change On Mill Development In The St. Lawrence Counties Of Upper Canada, 1783-1846", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 25, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1974.
 - (c) Widdis, R.W. "A Perspective On Land Tenure In Upper Canada: A Study Of Elizabethtown Township, 1790-1840", unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1977.
 - (d) Wood, C.J.B. "Human Settlement In The Long Point Region, 1790-1825", unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1966.
-
- ⁸ Warkentin, John, "Southern Ontario: A View From The West", Canadian Geographer, Vol. 10, No. 3, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1966, passim.

Chapter Two

Review Of The Literature

2.1 Introduction and Purpose

Researchers who have specialized in nineteenth century Upper Canadian settlement processes have identified three basic themes as being particularly significant: firstly, the perception and evaluation of the physical environment; secondly, the role of accessibility or distance of settlers to major transportation routes, in the form of roads or waterways, mills, markets, next-of-kin, friends or familiar institutions; thirdly, the impact of official authority in directing settlement. No one factor has been found to be singularly responsible for any particular landscape pattern. Rather, it would appear that all three factors were interrelated and to varying degrees shaped the unique characteristics of each settlement or township.

The intent of this literature review is to expand on these three themes and to indicate the manner in which they will be used to help identify the salient factors at work in the earliest settlement of East and West Hawkesbury.

2.2 The Role of Environmental Perception and Evaluation

In the literature there is no consensus on the individual settler's abilities to evaluate the environment of a site; indeed there is conflicting opinion. Gentilcore¹ asserts that occupance or choice of site was indiscriminant of physical conditions to the point that even

when environmental advantages were perceivable, these factors were subsumed by the strategy of authority. He concludes that it was only when settlements matured with time and experience that personal choice and initiative led to location based on the physical conditions of the land.

Kelly², on the other hand, reasons that a practical knowledge of environmental conditions was, from earliest times, available to prospective settlers at the collecting and organizing centres. (In Québec these would be at Sorel and Trois Rivières; in Upper Canada at Cataraqui and Newark). Kelly therefore places emphasis not on direction but on individual choice.

The practical information alluded to was in the form of surveyors' field notes and diaries along with travellers' and settlers' guides. Surveyors' reports generally contained detailed information on the type of forest cover, swampy or marshy land, the presence or absence of running water and any noteworthy topographical feature.³ These reports, while objective in scope, depended upon the reliability, diligence and skill of each surveyor. The surveyor, it must be remembered, did not go regularly into the interior of the lots therefore his inspection would be principally of the area adjacent to the survey lines. Mrs. Simcoe, wife of the first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, had a somewhat jaundiced opinion of surveyors at large. She noted in her diary, "The surveyors draw slowly and I am told when they want to suit their map to the paper do not scruple cutting off a few miles of a river or add to it."⁴

Even if the settlers could not avail themselves of the opportunity to read these notes or guides their contents would be spread by word of mouth among the waiting settlers. Furthermore, some surveyors lived locally such as Mahlon Burwell at Burwell's Corners⁵, Elgin County and William Fortune in East Hawkesbury. These men would be available for consultation by incoming settlers.

Kelly's summary conclusions of the role of vegetation in the perception of land quality is based upon a variety of settlers guides and is interesting.⁶ The dense forest cover of Upper Canada was seen as an obstacle to progress, to be rid of as quickly as possible. However, tree cover was the essential indicator of the underlying soil type

and the basis of the "rules of thumb" developed in northeastern United States and Quebec in preceeding years. They were based on the acceptance that soil and drainage conditions determined the pattern and character of vegetation and were at times erroneous and contradictory.⁷

Firstly, no allowance was given to the effects on the environment by the activities of pre-European settlement by the native Indian peoples nor of plant succession following burnings. Neither were there warnings that species patterns and composition were not static, nor that the dominant species did not reappear first after fires or clearing. This was learned by personal observation and often after trial and error.⁸

In respect to tree types, pure stands of pine were regarded to be growing upon the poorest soils: they were claimed to be both infertile and sandy. A hardwood cover with pine or beeches with hemlock was classed as mediocre. While some guide books classified hemlock with wet heavy lands, others credited the soil with only a high sand content. Oak-chestnut or beech-maple associations indicated light sandy soils which would only sustain cultivation while the covering mulch layer remained to supply nutrients. These light upland soils were easy to bring into cultivation and as such were the areas of choice by settlers with little capital; many abandoned these sites once they had harvested a few years' wheat and were somewhat more solvent financially.

Soils underlying swamp vegetation such as cedar, fir, spruce and tamarack were considered to be highly fertile but costly to develop with the primitive implements of the day. They were generally by-passed as sites for farms.

The mixed, dense hardwood forest was considered the best cover for "endless" wheat productive soils.⁹ A problem here was that some areas had clayey subsoils which after clearing showed wet spots following spring run-off and which remained so until very late spring thus delaying both seeding and harvesting. An early frost would be disastrous.

The low lying wet lands were everywhere avoided until the mid-1830's when under-drainage techniques were introduced. Acceptance was not universal as many settlers were unwilling to engage in unproven methods which might take many years to show positive results. The general farmer sought a high, if short-term, profit for a limited investment in his farming operation.¹⁰

Although Kelly maintains that attitudes to "plains land" for wheat production were usually negative J.D. Wood¹¹ has shown that the "oak openings", at least in Dumfries Township were, from the first, utilized by settlers. Furthermore Wood contends that using tree types as gauges of the conditions of the soil was a method too localized to be of value to settlers moving onto 100 or 200 acre sites which would contain a variety of soils.¹²

In C.J.B. Wood's thesis¹³ on the Long Point settlement, he noted that many settlers looked for landscape features which reminded them of "home".¹⁴ Such an evaluation could be effective for those coming from the American colonies where physiographic conditions were similar and the climate reasonably alike.

Gentilcore does not agree with Kelly on the usefulness of surveyors' guides in his study on settlement in the first fifty years of the nineteenth century.¹⁵ Brunger¹⁶ stated that settlers were unable to discriminate between indicators of "good" and "bad" land quality. However he does note that the writer Guiller suggests that, "...the vast majority (of settlers) had some control over location of their new homes and if they had not already decided to settle near relatives or friends there was an important problem to be solved."¹⁷

This debate on perception appears at least to be one of scale. While one might agree with Gentilcore that the principal direction of settlement was directed by government, Kelly appears to provide enough evidence that at a local level there was adequate information available to help the settler choose a favourable location. In the study area for example, the surveyor assigned settlers to the lots on the original first two concessions. He did not assign anyone to the three lots which he knew to be water logged well into summer. This will be dealt with later in the thesis.

In conclusion it must not be assumed that all incoming settlers were literate, indeed the opposite may well have been the case. Many would require and rely on verbal descriptions at the dispersing centres or would receive information via folk wisdom passed on by fellow travellers. Neither can it be assumed that all immigrants had similar attitudes towards the dense expanses of unbroken forest that is said to have stretched back from every shore.

The forest could be friend or foe depending upon the ethnic background of the settler and the cultural baggage he brought with him. Europeans, whose woodlands had long since vanished to supply grazing grounds, family lands, building material and fuel might well find "each tree an obstacle".¹⁸ Loyalists and Americans from the backwoods may not have been as intolerant and fearful of the tree barrier. They may well have been more perceptive in evaluating Upper Canada's physical environment as well.

Clearly the early nineteenth century settler arrived with a unique mental map drawn by preconceived myths as to what the nature of the landscape would be. The specific reason for migration - be it political, religious, fear of authority, loyalty, opportunity or induced by poverty - the hardships of the voyage, plus basic intelligence, cultural traits, experience and quality of the information passed on to him all coloured each person's individual capacity to discern or evaluate a location. Later on when the settler had identified the properties of the soil of his holding and had some personal experience in developing it for agriculture, a re-evaluation of the landscape might well take place prompting new attitudes and behavior patterns.

2.3 The Role of Accessibility in the Settlement Process

The second factor that researchers have found to be significant in the settlement mechanism is that of ease of access to roads or navigable water. Transportation meant transport of goods but also association with relatives, friends and co-religionists. The church apparently played a vital role in immigrants' locational decisions from the start. This concern showed up in the allotment of land in the original nine "Royal" townships when settlers requested that they be located separately as to "race" and religion.¹⁹

Mackay's interesting thesis on the impact of mills in settler location in the St. Lawrence counties substantiated the importance of ease of access to mills in earliest settlement days.²⁰ Lieutenant Governor Simcoe had of course led the way in promoting mill sites to direct settlement. The farmer considered mill locations a major factor for he could ill afford the time to make long journeys away from his farm.

Brunger, Clarke, Widdis and Wood tested the accessibility factor using quantitative analysis techniques, the results of which were interesting.²¹ Wood's analyses concludes that location trends in the Long Point region were strongly influenced by Lake Ontario, then Indian trails and river valleys. Of almost equal importance was access to the so-called "Oak Openings" which were perceived to be easier for cultivation; accessibility for cultural reasons followed place utility as a consideration.²² Brunger, using cluster analysis, maintains that despite Colonel Talbot's authority some locational choice manifested itself. Later arrivals tended to locate so as to minimize distances to relatives but not to compatriots to any degree. Little importance was attached to road and waterways except nearness to grist mills for indeed this was the Talbot Road "planned" settlement.²³

Clarke's dissertation using trend surface analysis to complement the traditional cross-section, indicated a strong attachment to roads and waterways even when they traversed poor soil. Settlement was shown to proceed more rapidly over these routeways as well as on areas of reasonably well drained soils.²⁴ Widdis, whose thesis is mainly concerned with land tenure, allows that while accessibility to Brockville, an unusually early urban centre, was a factor in locational decisions, accessibility was not important beyond the initial settlement period.²⁵

Both MacLeod²⁶ and Lindsay²⁷ were able to demonstrate the strong pull of large groups which began with well established family or military links in Glengarry Township and the Perth Military settlement respectively. MacLeod suggests that there may have been emotional considerations, especially religious, in which accessibility to the local "kirk" was important. MacLeod also notes a close linkage between family name and religious affiliation as well as a desire to preserve an identity as a people through the institution of the Highland Games.²⁸ Accessibility to family and relatives was obviously critical to the unity of the Scottish clans.

In East and West Hawkesbury it will be demonstrated that accessibility was thwarted by the high incidence of absentee ownership. This had dire consequences on development. Roads were not built, nor the few existing maintained, due to non-performance of settlement duties and nonpayment of taxes to the townships by these non participants in the progress of the study area.

2.4 The Impact of Official Authority on the Landscape

The third major theme perceivable in the literature is that of the role of official authority in the settlement processes. In short, this theme is directed at the effects of the government's everchanging land policies. These policies produced a number of social problems; among them were land speculation, illegal squatting and the emotional debate on the continued existence of the Crown and Clergy Reserves.

The enormous land grants awarded military personnel, government officials and other "deserving" persons, along with the ease in buying available crown land was an invitation to speculation. The theme of speculation interested such writers on early Upper Canada as Clarke, Gates, Johnson and Widdis.²⁹ A land speculator was a person who amassed certain quantities of land and held it to be sold at a future point in time with the expectation of profit due to a hoped for higher market value.

Widdis critically divided speculators as being of three basic types. These were: firstly, classical speculators who held land for a period before resale; secondly, land bankers who were actively buying and selling land; thirdly, the investing farmer who bought extra land when the price was low in hopes of selling it when the price rose. The profits would then be used to improve his prime holding. Widdis also considered the Canada Company a fourth type of corporate speculator when the Crown turned over their Reserves to the company to manage after 1824.³⁰ Gates maintains that from their inception the Reserves made the government the largest speculator of all.³¹ This critic notes that 4,500,000 acres of land were in the possession of speculators by 1838.³²

In an essay on the Home District, Johnson makes the point that if land was used as a capital resource the investment was only a potential. Land was the government's basic resource and easy to acquire.³³ therefore, it could not always be disposed of at will for other assets. Only when land was scarce in the Home District would it be of great value due to proximity to the provincial capital, York. The "land-rush" by speculators had a strong impact on the social structure of the townships involved. The poor immigrant could not compete for land close to York and was forced to travel long distances over roads neglected by absentee land owners to market his produce or to secure supplies. Johnson

is unwilling to place the full blame for dispersed settlement patterns and lack of progress on the speculators. Rather, he suggests a contributing factor may well have been the continuing availability of free land, (except for location and patent fees), and the lack of an adequate supply of immigrants with resources to compete for land closer to York.³⁴

Clarke's work on the role of political position and family and economic linkages is enlightening in outlining the scope and possibilities in land speculation. This work challenges Saunder's statement that the charge of land speculation leveled at the Family Compact was hard to prove or disprove.³⁵ Both Johnson and Widdis note prominent personalities in their work on speculation. There is much room for rewarding research in this area.

Speculation was not limited to the Upper Canadian scene. Parallels can be found in the United States, especially in the case of the mid-west which was developing at approximately the same time as Upper Canada.³⁶ Former Europeans in America as well as in Canada desired land to assure wealth and social positions; indeed, it was a motivating force.³⁷ The difference was of course one of scale and the enormous quantities of land involved were staggering which makes the Upper Canadian scene look small indeed.³⁸ As in Upper Canada speculation was credited with retarding settlement and local improvements.

Squatting on lands of absentee owners, Crown, Clergy, and Indian Reserves was another consequence of Upper Canadian land policies. Although there is very little research on this factor in the literature it is alluded to not infrequently.³⁹ Gates insists that it was squatting which actually settled Upper Canada⁴⁰ while Guillet laments that these people were not given the credit they deserved.⁴¹ They performed a valuable service for the administration by improving wild land and building roads thereby integrating an otherwise dispersed settlement.

The Canada Company, which must be classified as a corporate speculator considering the vast quantity of land it received, had a definite problem with squatters on the Crown Reserves. This land company had received all Crown Reserves not sold, leased or occupied which had been surveyed prior to 1824.⁴² In addition, they were awarded 1,100,000 acres, known as the Huron Tract in lieu of the Clergy Reserves which were withdrawn from the initial arrangement.⁴³ Squatters were

everywhere and finally pre-emption rights were permitted in 1841. It had been proposed that squatters with ten years "standing" should not be dispossessed while those with less could and were. The Canada Company was not disposed to leniency although compensation was awarded for improvements to the lands.⁴⁴

In the United States squatting was a more prevalent and a more complicated practice. With special pre-emption laws squatters were permitted, in certain cases, to purchase the lands. However in 1837 payment in gold currency became the medium of exchange over silver and bank notes, due to a depression. Many squatters lost their land at this point.⁴⁵ A solution was eventually found in tenancy.⁴⁶

Another land policy which has been appraised in the literature is the Crown and Clergy Reserves plan. The Reserves have been much maligned by writers⁴⁷ as well as the settlers of the time for several reasons: they were considered detrimental to a compact settlement by holding empty, large areas of townships. In such circumstances clearing and road building was sporadic and settlement duties were not fulfilled. A second reason previously noted was their attraction to squatters and speculative activity. Thirdly, in many cases they were not leased or rents were not collected and therefore did not serve their intended purpose, to provide revenue for the Crown and Clergy.⁴⁸

Wilson,⁴⁹ who has made a detailed study of the Reserves, reminds us that all through recorded time there has been conflict and challenge associated with the ownership of land where agriculture is the chief source of livelihood.⁵⁰ Other charges of corruption and inefficient administration were, to Wilson, not serious enough to have been an economic threat to the new province. He also notes that their sale and/or lease depended on such factors as available capital, rate of immigration, policies of the Crown and the influence of American conditions of settlement. These factors must be weighed along with the alienation of public lands for Reserves in damning them as inhibitors of an effective settlement process.⁵¹

Clarke's study concludes that in the Western District, the Reserves were no worse than other unoccupied land, in fact he maintains that they were eagerly taken up when need for additional land arose.⁵² On the other hand Widdis' figures show that 43.5 percent of the Reserves in

Elizabethtown Township were turned over to the Canada Company for disposal in 1824.⁵³ Widdis offers no explanation as to why their utilization was seemingly low. There is no consensus on this issue in the literature reviewed. The areas are spatially removed one from another and presumably different arguments are possible.

One aspect of land tenure which is only now receiving consideration by the historian Gagan,⁵⁴ principally, is the security of land; the ability to buy land and hold onto it through mortgaging practices. Rural indebtedness cannot have been a rare occurrence considering the abject poverty of many early settlers who came to Canada. Great Britain was the scene of much social and economic ills during the first half of the nineteenth century, a situation which prompted migration to the colonies.⁵⁵ Although land was available to the new immigrant there were innumerable difficulties and expenses incurred in homesteading. Few had much foreknowledge of farming in Canada nor often the necessary skills to develop land under unfamiliar soil and climatic conditions.

Gagan⁵⁶ developed the theme of mortgaging for Toronto Gore Township between 1835 and 1895. This location represented the most favourable agricultural land in Peel County. It was in an advanced state of development and furthermore the county was linked to major markets over a good road network. Moreover, the land was almost all cultivated, the little remaining uncleared was untaxed. In other words Toronto Gore was in an ideal situation.⁵⁷ Gagan investigated both initial mortgaging to improve the holding, the periods of amortization, foreclosures, terms of borrowing as well as costs and finally the types of people who were the mortgagees.⁵⁸

The principal lenders were discovered to be banks and private persons. Interestingly, the impress of authority was felt here when, after 1861, banks ceased to lend any more money in this field due to overextension in the previous decade. This situation was effected by statute.⁵⁸

Gagan determined that while mortgaging was a regular phenomenon in the area, the township was not beset by chronic debtors. They were in the minority. Those families which failed often moved to minimize their losses and started afresh elsewhere. Gagan felt that mortgaging could not be considered a source of agrarian discontent. The writer has also

shown that mortgaging of land was a factor of the post-pioneer period in Toronto Gore rather than the early settlement period. Whether or not less favourably endowed townships presented a similar pattern is worth investigating.

2.5 Conclusions

This chapter has identified and discussed the major themes that writers on Upper Canada have isolated as being major issues in the settlement process. They are: the ability of settlers to ascertain the potential of their physical environment; the role of roads or waterways in settler accessibility to markets, mills or for social interaction; and, finally, the influence of the government in the settlement processes, especially the inefficacious land policies. The value of the literature is that it provides a basis for approaching an examination of the study area and facilitates comparisons and contrasts. The extent to which any or each of these issues is relevant to the study area will be appraised in later chapters of the thesis while a search for other pertinent factors will be sought as well.

Endnotes to Chapter Two

- ¹Gentilcore, L. "Lines On The Land", Ontario History, Vol. 61, No. 2, 1969, pp. 57-73.
- ²Kelly, Kenneth, "Practical Knowledge of Physical Geography In Southern Ontario During the Nineteenth Century", in A. Falconer, B.C. Tahey, and R.D. Thompson, editors, Physical Geography: The Canadian Context, McGraw Hill, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, pp. 10-17.
- ³Gentilcore, L., and Donkin, Kate, "Land Surveys of Southern Ontario", Cartographica, B.V. Gatsell, editor, Department of Geography, York University, Toronto, Ontario, 1973, Monograph No. 8, pp. 13-26.
- ⁴Innis, Mary Quayle, editor, Mrs. Simcoe's Diary, MacMillan of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, 1965, p. 54.
- ⁵Ermatinger, C.O., The Talbot Regime, Municipal World Limited, St. Thomas, Ontario, 1904, p. 38. Ermatinger notes that Burwell lived on the line dividing the townships of Southwold and Dumwich in Elgin County.
- ⁶Kelly, Kenneth, 1974, op. cit., pp. 11-12.
 "The Evaluation of Land for Wheat Cultivation in Early Nineteenth Century Ontario", Ontario Geography, Vol. 8, 1974b, pp. 57-64.
 "The Artificial Drainage of Land in Nineteenth Century Southern Ontario", Canadian Geographer, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1975, pp. 279-298.
- ⁷Ibid., 1974, p. 11.
- ⁸Ibid., p. 11.
- ⁹Ibid., pp. 11-12, 17.
- ¹⁰Ibid., 1975, p. 279.
- ¹¹Wood, J. David, "The Stage is Set: Dumfries Township, 1816", Waterloo Historical Society, Ontario, Vol. 48, 1960, p. 46.

- ¹² Ibid., p. 45.
- ¹³ Wood, C.J.B., "Human Settlement In The Long Point Region 1790-1825", unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1966.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 19-26.
- ¹⁵ Gentilcore, L., "Change In Settlement In Ontario (Canada) 1800-1850: a correlation analysis of historical source materials", International Geography, Vol. 1, 1972, p. 418.
- ¹⁶ Brunger, A.G., "Analysis of site factors in nineteenth century Ontario settlement", International Geography, Vol. 1, 1972, pp. 400-402.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., p. 401.
- ¹⁸ Greening, W.E., The Ottawa, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1961, p. 69.
- ¹⁹ Craig, Gerald M., Upper Canada The Formative Years 1784-1841, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1963, p. 6.
- ²⁰ Mackay, D.S.C., "The Influence of Government Policy and Technological Change on Mill Development in the St. Lawrence Counties of Upper Canada, 1783-1846", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 25, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1974.
- ²¹ Brunger, A.G., "A Spatial Analysis of Individual Settlement in Southern London District, Upper Canada, 1800-1836", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.
- Clarke, John. "A Geographical Analysis of Colonial Settlement in the Western District of Upper Canada, 1788-1850", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1970.

Widdis, R.W., "A Perspective On Land Tenure In Upper Canada: A Study of Elizabethtown Township, 1790-1849" unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1977.

Wood, C.J.B., op. cit.

²²Wood, C.J.B., op. cit., pp. 68-69.

²³Brunger, A.G., "Settler Location in the Talbot Settlement, Upper Canada", paper presented to the Canadian Association of Geographers, Annual Meeting, 1973, Thunder Bay, Ontario, 1973, p. 5.

²⁴Clarke, John, op. cit., p. 76.

²⁵Widdis, R.W., op. cit., p. 160.

²⁶MacLeod, P.K., "Gualainn Ri Gualainn: A Study of Concentrations of Scottish Settlements in Nineteenth Century Ontario", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 18, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1972.

²⁷Lindsay, Virginia H., "The Perth Military Settlement Characteristics of Its Permanent and Transitory Settlers 1815-1822", unpublished M.A. thesis. No. 15, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1972.

²⁸MacLeod, P.K., op. cit., p. 208.

²⁹Gates, Lillian, Land Policies of Upper Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968.

also

Clarke, John, op. cit.

and

Johnson, L.A., "Land Policy, Population Growth and Social Structure in the Home District, 1793-1851", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, pp. 32-57.

Widdis, R.W., op. cit.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 166.

³¹ Gates, Lillian, op. cit., p. 304.

³² Ibid., p. 304.

³³ Johnson, L.A., op. cit., p. 33.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 33.

³⁵ Saunders, Robt. E., "What Was The Family Compact?", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 135.

³⁶ Gates, Paul W., "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western Development", in V.R. Carstensen, editor, The Public Lands, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1962.

Mitchell, Robt. D., Commercialism and Frontier Perspectives on the Early Shenandoah Valley, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., 1977.

Swierenga, R.P., Pioneers and Profits: Land Speculators on the Iowa Frontier, Ames Publishing Co., Iowa, 1968.

³⁷ Gates, Paul W., op. cit., p. 350.

³⁸ Gates, Paul W., Landlords and Tenants on the Prairie Frontier, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1973, pp. 13-14.

³⁹ Gates, Lillian, op. cit.

Guillet, E.C., The Pioneer Farmer and Backwoodsman, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, Vol. 1, 1973.

Wood, J. David, op. cit.

⁴⁰Gates, Lillian, op. cit., p. 305.

⁴¹Guillet, E.C., op. cit., p. 303.

⁴²Craig, Gerald M., op. cit., p. 135.

⁴³Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁴Gates, Lillian, op. cit., pp. 288-89.

⁴⁵Gates, Paul W., op. cit., pp. 355-57.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 358.

⁴⁷Examples: Gates Lillian, op. cit., pp. 223-224, 303-304.

Gourlay, Robert, Statistical Account of Upper Canada, abridged by S.R. Mealing, The Carleton Library, No. 75, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, pp. 109-111.

⁴⁸Clarke, John, op. cit., 1971, p. 79.

⁴⁹Wilson, Alan, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 3.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 219-220.

⁵²Clarke, John, op. cit., 1970, p. 198.

⁵³Widdis, R.W., op. cit., p. 31.

- ⁵⁴ Gagan, D.P., "The Security of Land: Mortgaging in Toronto Gore Township 1835-95", in F.H. Armstrong, H.A. Stevenson and J.D. Wilson, editors, Aspects of Nineteenth Century Ontario, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, pp. 135-153.
- ⁵⁵ MacDonald, Norman, Canada 1763-1841 Immigration and Settlement, Longman, Green Co., Toronto, Ontario, 1939, p. 28.
- ⁵⁶ Gagan, D.P., op. cit., pp. 135-153.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 136-137.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 144.

Chapter Three

Background To Upper Canada

3.1 Introduction

The agrarian settlement of Upper Canada in the years following the American War of Independence and on into the nineteenth century can be described as the first non-exploitive use of British North America.¹ In the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Québec, agricultural activities were secondary to the prime orientation to the fishing, fur and timber industries. Only when the latter resources were "spent" did permanent agricultural settlement become important.²

The agrarian purpose of the new province was therefore novel in that the agricultural potential of land was the sole criterion in settlement. This chapter seeks to review the political ideologies and economic forces at work within early Upper Canada.

3.2 The "Raison D'Etre" of Upper Canada

Beginning in 1763 Imperial British political authority had a profound impact on the evolution of the cultural landscape of the area which was to become Upper Canada. Britain had been awarded most of France's North American possessions following the Seven Years' War in the Peace of Paris. The decision to settle the area to the west of the inhabited parts of Quebec Province was a direct outcome of the American Revolution. There was then an urgent need to find land for loyal British subjects, disbanded military personnel and their families, as well as

the Six Nation Indians. The latter had been dispossessed of their territory in the Mohawk Valley of Upper New York State. There were also Americans, among the refugees, who were opportunists in that they were eager to avail themselves of free land and new opportunities to succeed. The strength of the allegiance of some of the Loyalists may well have been flavoured by the same token, of course.

Governor Frederick Haldimand, in Québec City, had initially planned to settle all but the Indians in the maritime area of Canada. However, the favourable survey reports of 1783 on the agricultural potential of the unsettled region west of Lake St. Francis caused him to alter his plans.³ The military garrisons along the Great Lakes needed food supplies which settlers could provide. In consequence, this area was surveyed and laid out as nine "Royal" townships. To the west of Fort Cataraqui (formerly Fort Frontenac) were five more townships known collectively as "Cataraqui". Here Haldimand planned to locate disbanded military personnel.⁴ The boundary between Canada and the United States was planned to run nearby at the 45°N. parallel, which was a point midway across the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes.⁵ Actually, the first settlement was at Newark (Niagara) where Butler's Rangers wintered from 1778 to 1783.⁶ Their presence attracted refugees seeking security.⁷ Simultaneous to settlement at Cataraqui was that on the east side of the Detroit River in what is now Essex County and which was also the western boundary of the original Province of Québec under the French.⁸

From the start in 1784 incoming settlers were discontented. They wanted the same conditions of British tenure as fellow Loyalists in the Maritimes received.⁹ It was the administration's intent, however, to incorporate the new townships into the existing Seigniorial System.¹⁰ The new settlers were unfamiliar with French law and custom which had been accorded Quebecers in the Quebec Act of 1774. In addition, the officer corps deliberately sought to keep the rank and file ignorant of their rights.¹¹

In 1785, Sir John Johnson, who had commanded the two battalions of the King's Royal regiment of New York and was now superintendent-general of Indian Affairs in British North America,¹² along with a group of officers, petitioned the King for redress on the settlers' behalf.¹³ Their plea was for the more familiar and liberal British laws, land

tenure and government. The manoeuvre was successful and led to the Constitutional Act of 1791 whereby Upper Canada was organized as a separate political territory.¹⁴ Land was granted in free and common soccage to Upper Canadians while provision was made to retire the existing Seigniorial grants.¹⁵

The new territory of Upper Canada extended west from Lake St. Francis to include an area enclosed by Lakes Ontario, Erie and Huron. The Ottawa River divided Upper and Lower (Quebec) Canada on the northeast (Figure 3.1).

John Graves Simcoe, a soldier who had distinguished himself in the American Revolution, became the first Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada in 1792. His prime intent was to build a viable, defensible British province for the Crown. Mealing suggests that Simcoe actually came to Canada merely to found the new province not to govern it.¹⁶ To accomplish his tasks he intended using the British Constitution and the Roman military colony as archetypes.¹⁷ The ambitious Simcoe envisioned a series of military roads linking bridgeheads which would, in the future, become urban centres. He chose a site at the forks of the Thames River in the Western District for his future capital, to be called New London. York, near the former French Fort Rouillé, was occupied and named in 1793 and was destined to be the capital as well as a place of naval and military strength. All these "coloniae" would "...ensure the security and allegiance and ... mould the character of a frontier".¹⁸

The ports on the St. Lawrence, some of which had been former military posts and organizing centres for settlers, became important for commerce and communications. Two of Simcoe's best known roads, Dundas and Yonge, running west and north from York respectively, were successful in diverting settlement away from the United States borders. The roads also helped direct settlement away from its hitherto strong attachment to the St. Lawrence - Great Lakes waterways.¹⁹

The ideology by which Simcoe planned to govern could best be described as a legacy of eighteenth century British Imperialism; the authority of a sovereign state over a dependency. His administration was therefore autocratic in its efforts to duplicate and maintain the British Conservative political system in Canada. Simcoe hoped that the Legislative Council might one day parallel the House of Lords.²⁰

Figure 3.1

Many of those chosen to sit on the Executive and Legislative Councils or elected to the House of Assembly shared Simcoe's views. These views included a graded aristocracy which was the "cement" of society. The small group of upper class people in Upper Canada considered themselves the natural leaders of their society.²¹ By and large they supported Simcoe's uncompromising attitude towards the supremacy of the Church of England in Upper Canada. Their ideology was that man was born into a social class and it followed that authority should come from king, history and religion, not from common man. Republicanism and equalitarianism as advanced in the politics of the new country to the south were renounced as being "... contrary to the universal order of nature from the Divinity down...".²²

These strong conservative ideals of both Simcoe and many Loyalists were born of feelings aroused by both the French and American Revolutions. Wise suggests they had a powerful impact on Upper Canadian Toryism.²³ These insurrections were a real threat to the old order of men like the small group who led Upper Canada in an authoritarian and paternalistic manner.²⁴

This oligarchy is known to history as the Family Compact.²⁵ It was not a political party, in the modern sense, as the Lieutenant-Governor had the final say in all legislation. Nor were many of the members related: rather, it was a group of men whose union was based on social standing, often military background, education and usually, but not always, wealth. By holding all the highest public offices as magistrates, lawyers, judges and highest offices of the Anglican Church they influenced the Executive Council, thereby wielding all the powers of government.²⁶ According to Armstrong the magistrates were the building blocks of the local élite appointed by the central government. These men were usually recommissioned when their tenure of office expired. Frequently their selection was from the merchant class, the military and such governmental departments as Indian Affairs. Family connections and interconnections played such a strong role that it was almost qualification by heredity.²⁹

Successive Lieutenant-Governors submitted to the influence of the Family Compact but by and large they shared similar ideologies. The Compact disposed of petty positions through patronage around the province which created a local élite, or Family Compacts, throughout the province.²⁸

In time as Simcoe desired, the oligarchy accumulated much land throughout Upper Canada,²⁹ a veritable territorial aristocracy.³⁰ He had taken the view that members of the Executive and Legislative Councils, as well as other leading citizens, deserved grants at least equal to those of military officers.³¹ Later, Lord Durham was to be highly critical of the group in that they shared, almost exclusively, all the offices of trust and profit.³² Durham did realize that the situation was not unique to British North America. He was of the same opinion as Sir Francis Bond Head who, perhaps more realistically and charitably, suggested that this elite group were no more than, "... that social fabric which characterizes every civilized community in the world".³³ None-the-less, they have been credited with the mismanagement of Upper Canada in its fifty year life span, especially through the land granting system.³⁴

3.3 The Indians of Upper Canada

The first step in the "peopling" of the new province by white men was the Crown's alienation of Indian claims.³⁵ As early as 1783 land was purchased, from the Mississauga Indians, which extended between the Cataraqui and Trent Rivers.³⁶ In May of the following year the land for the Six Nation Indians was acquired west of Niagara.³⁷ It was British policy to deal with the Indians via formal treaties in the purchase of land as it was required for expanding settlement. Unlike America, Upper Canada had a fairly smooth relationship with the Indians who apparently did not regard the Loyalists as invaders.³⁸ The attitude of the Indians to the Colonial Authorities was not that they were subjects, but rather, allies of King George.³⁹

The Proclamation of 1763 had awarded the Indians the right to the lands which they then possessed and it also forbade purchase of them by any British subject.⁴⁰

The Chief of the Six Nations, Joseph Brant, had chosen the Grand River area west of Niagara for his Iroquoian people. Besides having much in common with the landscape of the Mohawk Valley from whence they had been removed, Brant felt that it was located favourably to forge a link with the "Western Nations", the Confederacies of the Upper Great Lakes.⁴¹ The tribal territory was immense and the shrewd Brant was quick to realize that he and his fellow five hundred tribespeople could not settle the

vast three million acres allotted them. He attempted to sell parcels of land privately to the incoming settlers which was in flagrant disregard of Colonial policy.⁴² Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe and Brant clashed heatedly on this issue but a weaker successor to Simcoe, Administrator Peter Russell, allowed confirmation of deeds of sale for six blocks of land. This involved 352,000 acres, some of which fell into the hands of the Government's ruling clique, the Family Compact.⁴³

The Government at times sold land to settlers on the Indians' behalf and monies realized were distributed to each member of the tribe. Further, private land might be ceded to the Crown to be used for the Indians' benefit.⁴⁴ This was to occur in Hawkesbury East when Ann Claus, wife of the late Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Daniel Claus, ceded 4000 acres of her holdings for the benefit of the Six Nation Indians in 1831.

By 1830 the attitude of the British Colonial Office towards the Indians altered. The need for courting the Indians to preserve their loyalty was questioned after many years of peace. There was, moreover, a need to reclaim the Indian from a state of "barbarism" and to introduce amongst them habits for "an industrious, civilized life".⁴⁵ From the years of the French Regime missionaries had attempted to Christianize these native peoples with varying degrees of success. They remained essentially migrants or at best semi-migrants, while drunkenness and moral corruption were common.⁴⁶

Changes were instituted aimed at settling Indians in villages to become self-supporting through cultivation of part of the land. Religious and educational instruction, as well as farming techniques, were to be provided. To assist the Indians in building homes and farm buildings and provisioning them with tools and seeds, the annual gifts were to be used as a vehicle of exchange.⁴⁷ The result of the changes was the new Indian Reserve Policy and the programme also required personnel changes in the Indian Department. Much effectiveness was damned by bureaucracy but it was a start in the Indians becoming "settled" Canadians.⁴⁸

3.4 The Survey of Upper Canada

Critical to the implementation of settlement policies in the new province was the land survey. The survey was to be a requisite to any land grant. Major Samuel Holland was appointed Surveyor-General of

Québec in 1764 with John Collins his deputy.⁴⁹ Holland had previously carried out large scale surveys in British North America, especially in New England.⁵⁰

In response to Haldimand's instructions of 1783, Collins and his assistants began the first surveys of five townships along the St. Lawrence near Cataraqui. The first group of Loyalists arrived in January of 1784.⁵¹ The first four districts were established in 1788 out of the Province of Québec. In 1792 at the first session of Parliament in Newark these districts were changed to Eastern, Midland, Home and Western. Land Boards were set up in each district and deputy-surveyors dealt with the disposition of Crown Land.⁵² Two years later by Order-in-Council the Land Boards were abolished and all those desiring land were required to apply to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.⁵³ From that time on as well, all surveys proceeded under the direction of the Surveyor-General. He was also responsible for appointing deputy-surveyors. This system continued under the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor until 1849.⁵⁴

The legal status and authority of the survey was reflected in the ordinances and requirements related to the task. The first ordinance bearing on survey activities outside of French Canada was passed in 1785. There was a provision therein that any survey carried out prior to 1780 was not to be disturbed.⁵⁵ All surveyors were obliged to take the oath of allegiance to the Crown and all were required to keep field notes which, upon the death of a surveyor, were to be filed in court in order to be made available to the public. In 1798 the markers or monuments placed by surveyors were protected by statute: "...if any person or persons shall knowingly and wilfully pull down, alter, deface or remove any such monument as aforesaid ... adjudged guilty of felony and shall suffer death without benefit of clergy".⁵⁶ Thomson notes that few places in the world have ever had such a severe penalty as Upper Canada for the transgression of altering boundary monuments in relation to private property or ownership of land. In 1849 the penalty was reduced to imprisonment.⁵⁷

There was a variety of survey systems used in Upper Canada during the early years.⁵⁸ The Single Front System (1783-1815), created long and narrow lots of approximately 200' acres; the Double Front System, (1815-1829) produced wider lots which permitted their division into half-

lots of 100 acres which were the size of Crown grants at this time; the Front and Rear System (1787-1813) which was a variation of the Single Front, but which produced 100 acre lots, was initiated in the Niagara area but abandoned due to a greater cost for the survey. In 1829 a 2400 acre Sectional System was introduced creating twelve 200 acre lots. The Canada Company used a modified 1,000 acre Sectional System producing ten 100 acre lots beginning in 1835. This latter system was adopted as the official survey system for opening up government lands between Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario in 1850.⁶⁰ There were some multiple survey systems in a single township. Sandwich Township in Essex County, for example, had four different arrangements of lots; the long lots alluding to the early French settlement and its Seigniorial tenure, the special survey of the Talbot road, a Single Front survey and a wedge-shaped gore to fit the space between the other systems.⁶¹

3.5 Commerce In Early Upper Canada

The commerce of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterway began long before the Loyalists fled to British soil. From the time of the Conquest the so-called "Laurentian" group of merchants, based in Montreal, was a strong force in a network of activities concerning the receiving and forwarding of supplies for the fur trade and in the lucrative enterprise of provisioning the British military garisons.⁶² Eventually a powerful, well organized and integrated "Shopkeeper Aristocracy" grew to have links in commerce between Halifax-Québec City-Montreal-Kingston-York-Niagara and Detroit.

Wilson has documented the influence of this merchant class using Robert Hamilton of Niagara as an example.⁶³ The names of his colleagues are well known to students of Upper Canada: they were the wealthy land-owners of the day with powerful links to one another through business associates, political friends and extensive kinship ties.⁶⁴ Such contacts facilitated growth not only in the receiving, forwarding and provisioning trade but also in milling, processing and retailing enterprises.⁶⁵ Their influence was felt in social positions in local areas in patronage across the province, in the judiciary and in the political arena.⁶⁶ This merchant oligarchy was a co-operation of near equals, not being hierarchical; economic interest always was the dynamic force over and above family ties.⁶⁷

One of John Graves Simcoe's "enthusiasms" was for trade into the interior of the continent along the same route used by the well established trading group.⁶⁸ Simcoe and his administration clashed with and challenged the influence of the major merchants. The Lieutenant-Governor stressed the military and centralization. It was his belief that commerce was subservient to higher Imperial aims.⁶⁹ Merchants such as Robert Hamilton did not share such idealistic motives. Their economic sense included toleration of Americans, therefore they preferred to make use of past ties with Britain and America rather than to dwell on the differences. Moreover, the heavy influx of Americans, after the Loyalists, necessitated such tolerance.⁷⁰ Simcoe came to depend on the Niagara merchants for supplies and information and eventually accepted the fact that the only effective source of power within the Niagara Peninsula was commerce. Hamilton was appointed County Lieutenant further institutionalizing the political influence of the merchant group's major member.⁷¹

3.6 The Impact Of Canal Building On The Inland Transportation Routes and on the Direction of Agriculture and Trade

The Upper Canadian Government's commitment to the building of the Welland Canal, in the way of almost 300,000 pounds Sterling in grants and subscription of public funds, effectively sealed for the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterways the inland route to the upper lakes.⁷² William Hamilton Merrit had first petitioned in 1818 for a charter to build a canal, to pass through his property on Twelve Mile Creek, linking Lakes Erie and Ontario and avoiding the major obstruction of the falls at Niagara.⁷³ It was not until 1825 that a Charter of Incorporation was drawn up, the same year that the Erie Canal was completed.⁷⁴ (This latter canal linked Lake Erie at Buffalo, New York, with the Hudson River at Albany, creating a link for America to the Atlantic port of New York City).

The major directors of the Welland Canal were also members of the ruling Family Compact! The greater number of the private investors, although holding only 1½ percent of the total capital stock, was a small group of American business men from Albany and New York City.⁷⁵ Their interest was thought to have been largely to compete with the Erie Canal but their minor investment denied them a voice in management. Only eight residents of Upper Canada had the twenty shares or more which qualified them for seats on

the Board of Directors and they were, principally, members of the Family Compact.⁷⁶

The Rideau Canal linking Lake Ontario to the Ottawa River at Bytown was completed in 1832 and, along with improvements to the canal system at Lachine, completed in 1816, further promoted navigation away from the Ottawa River route. Dunham notes that the essential indifference of Lower Canada to attend to the task of improving navigation on the St. Lawrence River was a serious handicap to the whole of Upper Canada.⁷⁷ The impact of these two canals, completed before the Grenville Canal in the study area, was profound. The Ottawa River route was never to capture any significant trade to the Ottawa region which was growing rapidly with the burgeoning lumber trade. It was too late. The consequences for areas such as Hawkesbury were marked. They became stagnant in development and lacked prestige; investors ignored them and the government did not appear to be interested in their lack of progress.

3.7 Changing Land Policies In Upper Canada In The 1820's

During his unpopular tenure as Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada between 1818-1829, Sir Peregrine Maitland made a concerted effort to attend to some of the inadequacies of the land policies of the province.⁷⁸ The Land Regulations of 1818 had also attempted to halt the indiscriminate granting of land to non-residents by restrictive measures and by the insistence upon the performance of settlement duties. Maitland pressured for a law to include the assessment of idle lands. He proposed that such unoccupied lands be sold to meet tax arrears after eight years if owners did not co-operate. A law was passed but confined itself to one eight-year period. The Lieutenant-Governor then pressed for permanency and, while the Legislative Assembly was in favour, the many absentee landlords with large holdings who held seats in the Legislative Council were strongly opposed, and criticized Maitland's role in having the bill passed. The latter was censured by the Colonial Office for unorthodox behavior but the bill was not repealed.⁷⁹ It was noted at the time that many Legislative Councillors were also on the Executive Council therefore it was not always independent legislators who cast an influence on other matters; thus Maitland was not so conspicuous in his action as the legislators insinuated.⁸⁰ District Sheriff's sales of properties with tax arrears

of over eight years duration became commonplace after 1828⁸¹ and in some measure were effective in reducing this fault in land policies in spite of the Bill's unpopularity amongst absentee landowners and large scale speculators. This measure will be shown to have had a significant effect in reversing the situation of scattered settlement and ill-kept roads in the study townships.

3.8 Conclusion

Upper Canada was created to provide land for refugees loyal to the Crown who had fled the American Colonies due to the War of Independence. The initial occupation of Upper Canada began along the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes corridor, a route well traversed by fur traders and by suppliers of goods to garrisons along the route. While the fur trade was soon to use another route, the commercial enterprises flourished and the focus of Upper Canada's development remained in the Home and Niagara Districts at the Western end of Lake Ontario. York became the province's capital in 1794 and the Home District with its vast hinterland soon led all others in growth, demand and prestige. This economic lead never faltered, in fact dynamism was described as its characteristic feature by the 1820's. By comparison eastern Ontario was off centre to this development.

This densely forested land was first governed by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe as Britain's first province without a sea port. Simcoe, the soldier, fully intended to build a province whose order was based on the British Constitution and Laws. From the outset Upper Canada's greatest resource, abundant land, was carelessly and liberally disposed of to Loyalists, disbanded military personnel, Indian allies, and other "deserving persons" who would become Simcoe's desired aristocratic landowning class. The land policies of successive administrators served to create discontent, dissatisfaction and disunity and was one of the major problems, (along with political, economical and social reasons), that led to the Upper Canada Rebellion of 1837, the ensuing Durham Report, and the expiration of Upper Canada in 1841. It is apparent that the major thrust towards economic growth and development was focused in the Home and Western Districts. Scant attention was given to the Eastern

and Johnstown Districts beyond the initial settlement arrangements.

The implications of this lack of concern will be shown in the progress in the study townships.

Endnotes To Chapter Three

¹Clark, S.D. "The Backwoods Society of Upper Canada", The Developing Canadian Community, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968, p. 63.

²Ibid., p. 63.

³Craig, Gerald M., Upper Canada The Formative Years 1784-1841, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1963, p. 4.

⁴Ibid., p. 6.

⁵Mackay, D.S.C. "The Influence of Government Policy and Technological Change on Mill Development in the St. Lawrence Counties of Upper Canada, 1783-1846", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 25, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1974, p. 15.

⁶Landon, Fred, Western Ontario and the American Frontier, The Carleton Library, No. 34, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1967, p. 11.

⁷Ibid., p. 12.

⁸Ibid., p. 12.

⁹Craig, G.M., op. cit., p. 9.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 6.

¹¹Ibid., p. 11.

¹²Wallace, W. Stewart, The MacMillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 3rd Edition, MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, Toronto, Ontario, p. 350.

- ¹³Craig, G.M., op. cit., p. 11.
- ¹⁴Ibid., p. 17.
- ¹⁵Ibid., p. 19.
- ¹⁶Mealing, S.R., "The Enthusiasms of John Graves Simcoe", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 309.
- ¹⁷Ibid., p. 309.
- ¹⁸Ibid., p. 309.
- ¹⁹Gentilcore, Louis R. and Wood, David, "A Military Colony in a Wilderness: The Upper Canada Frontier", in J.D. Wood, editor, Perspectives On Landscape and Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario, The Carleton Library No. 91, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 36.
- ²⁰Craig, G.R., op. cit., p. 39.
- ²¹Wise, S.F., "Upper Canada and the Conservative Tradition", Profiles Of A Province, Ontario Historical Society, Toronto, Ontario, 1967, p. 24.
- ²²Craig, G.R., op. cit., p. 111.
- ²³Wise, S.F., op. cit., p. 20.
- ²⁴Ibid., p. 21.
- ²⁵Craig, G.R., op. cit., p. 102.
- ²⁶Gagan, David, "Property and 'Interest': Some Preliminary Evidence of Land Speculation by the 'Family Compact' in Upper Canada, 1820-1840", The Ontario Historical Society, p. 63.

- ²⁷Armstrong, Frederick H., "The Oligarchy of the Western District of Upper Canada 1788-1841", Canadian Historical Association Papers, Toronto, Ontario, 1977, p. 97.

see also

Clarke, John, "The Role of Political Position and Family and Economic Linkage in Land Speculation in The Western District of Upper Canada, 1788-1815", The Canadian Geographer, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1975, p. 18.

and

Wilson, Bruce, "The Enterprises of Robert Hamilton: A Study Of Wealth And Influence In Early Upper Canada: 1776-1812", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, 1978, passim.

- ²⁸Wise, S.F., op. cit., p. 27.

- ²⁹Johnson, Leo A., "Land Policy, Population Growth and Social Structure in the Home District, 1793-1851", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays On Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, passim.

- ³⁰Craig, G.R., op. cit., p. 33.

- ³¹Ibid., p. 33.

- ³²Saunders, Robert E., "What Was The Family Compact", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 125.

- ³³Ibid., p. 127.

- ³⁴Gates, Lillian E., Land Policies of Upper Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968, p. 303.

- ³⁵Gentilcore, L.R. and Donkin Kate. "Land Surveys of Southern Ontario". B.V. Gutsell, Cartographica, Department of Geography, York University, Toronto, Ontario. Monograph No. 8, 1973, p. 1.

³⁶Craig, G.R., op. cit., p. 5

³⁷Ibid., p. 5.

³⁸Ibid., p. 5.

³⁹Ibid., p. 5.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 5.

⁴¹Johnston, Charles M., "An Outline of Early Settlement in the Grande River Valley", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays On Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 5.

⁴²Ibid., p. 7.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁴⁴Surtees, R.J., "The Development of an Indian Reserve Policy in Canada", Ontario Historical Society, 1969, pp. 87-96.

⁴⁵Surtees, R.J., op. cit., p. 90.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 91-93.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 92.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 97.

⁴⁹Weaver, W.F., "Crown Surveys in Ontario", Department of Lands and Forests. Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario, n.d., p. 2.

⁵⁰Thomson, Don W., Men and Meridians. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, Ontario, 1966, Vol. 1, p. 218.

⁵¹Weaver, W.F., op. cit., p. 5.

⁵²Ibid., p. 5.

⁵³Ibid., p. 5.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 5.

⁵⁵Thomson, D.W., op. cit., p. 223.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 232.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 232.

⁵⁸Gentilcore, L. and Donkin, K., op. cit., pp. 4-10 and
Weaver, W.F., op. cit., pp. 6-12.

⁵⁹Gentilcore, L. and Donkin, K., op. cit., p. 8.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 11.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 11.

⁶²Wilson, Bruce G., op. cit., pp. 3-4.

⁶³Ibid., *passim*

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 110-121. Included here are some of Hamilton's colleagues in business: Richard Cartwright, Richard Todd, John McGill, John Forsyth, John Richardson, John Askin, Thomas Claus, Samuel Street, Alex McKee, Wm. Robertson, Alex Grant, Alex and Edward Ellice.

⁶⁵Ibid., *passim*.

⁶⁶Ibid., *passim*.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 275.

⁶⁸Mealing, S.R., op. cit., pp. 305-06.

⁶⁹Wilson, B.R., op. cit., pp. 210-11.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 207.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 248.

⁷²Aitken, Hugh G., "The Family Compact and the Welland Canal Company", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays On Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, pp. 164, 167.

⁷³Ibid., p. 156.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 156-157.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 157.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 158.

⁷⁷Dunham, Aileen, Political Unrest In Upper Canada, 1815-1836, The Carleton Library, No. 10, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1963, p. 26.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 103

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 105.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 105.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 105.

⁸²Achison, T.W., "The Nature and Structure of York Commerce in the 1820's", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays On Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 171.

Chapter Four

The Historical Background and Physiography of the Study Area

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is twofold; firstly, to locate the study area geographically and to describe the historical background. This will allow the reader to understand better the subsequent chapters on the settlement processes. Therefore, the chapter will look at prior usage of the area by native Indians, French fur traders, missionaries, explorers and soldiers. Secondly, the essential elements of the physiography of the area will be explained in order to understand more readily the resultant quality of the physical environment. The soils and topographical features are the most important elements. A facet of the physical environment not treated here, as would be expected, is the natural vegetation. The writer found that it was not separable from the surveyors' accounts without being repetitious and therefore the description of the vegetation will be found further on in the thesis.

4.2 Historical Background To The Study Area: Site and Situation

The East and West Divisions of Hawkesbury Township are tucked into the most north-eastern corner of Ontario in Prescott County. The Ottawa River serves as a boundary with Quebec on the north while the interprovincial boundary on the east is formed with Vaudreuil County. To the south the township of Lochiel of Glengarry County is inserted like a carot mark into the study area. Longueuil and Caledonia Townships are the western neighbours of Hawkesbury.

The townships were so named as a significant and prestigious tribute to Charles Jenkinson¹ and his son Robert Banks. The elder Jenkinson had served Britain as Lord of the Admiralty and was created Lord Hawkesbury in recognition of this service. He himself chose the name for his native district near Coventry, England. Later Jenkinson was made first Earl of Liverpool, that city being Britain's great port of trade with the western hemisphere. Robert not only inherited both titles but continued on the same course as his statesman father. He was organizer of Government patronage under King George III, was a close colleague of William Pitt the younger, and held a variety of public offices continuously during the war with France.² He succeeded in becoming Minister of War before serving as Prime Minister of England from 1812 until his death in 1827.

Hawkesbury's townships face the Ottawa River where the current is swift as the river tumbles over the rocky obstacles known as the Long Sault Rapids. Actually there are three sets of rapids over a twelve mile stretch of the river which proved to be a major barrier to navigation in the days before canals. As there was only an Indian foot-path on either side of the river, the rapids were also an effective restraint to settlement up the Ottawa during the French Regime. There was no attempt by French Canadians to penetrate the Valley beyond the foot of the rapids for settlement when there was ample land available in the rest of Québec.

4.3 Evidence Of Pre-Settlement Human Occupance On The Landscape

(1) The Indians

The rapids may have arrested the westward movement of the Habitant but the study area was not a "terra incognita". The Ottawa River had been well travelled for centuries by Huron and Algonkian Indians who used this route on their raiding and trading expeditions.³ A footpath was stamped out by these portaging canoeists along the river's edge from the site of the present town of Hawkesbury east to Point Fortune where the rapids end. A favourite fishing spot of the Indians was a site five miles before the rapids petered out at present day Chute à Blondeau. Evidence of Indian occupance in the form of artifacts and burial mounds has been discovered here.⁴ Thomas, Higginson and Deputy-Surveyor William Fortune report on islands off Hawkesbury as belonging to the Indians and being rented to White settlers.⁵

(ii) The French Regime

The narrow path parallelling the river was also a passageway for Roman Catholic missionaries and French explorers. Of the former, the Jesuit, Brébeuf is perhaps the best known. It was he who sought to Christianize the Algonquin "sauvages" living in Huronia around Georgian Bay.⁶ Of the explorers, Dollard des Ormeaux is perhaps the prime example. It was just east of the town of Hawkesbury that the heroic "stand to the death" by Dollard and his sixteen companions against the warring Iroquois took place in 1660.⁷ The site is marked today by a commemorative plaque but otherwise there is no imprint of this tragedy on the landscape.

From the inception of the trade with the Indians for peltries, the intrepid Coureurs-de-Bois preferred the Ottawa-Mattawa-Lake Nipissing-French River route to Georgian Bay over that of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes journey to gather furs from the area north of the Great Lakes. Although there were eighteen portages⁸ to contend with, La Grand Rivière du Nord, as the Voyageurs called the Ottawa, was a far shorter route and less exposed to the treacherous winds and waves that were wont to sweep across the Great Lakes.⁹ Heavier supplies were forced to take the southern route; it was slower but less expensive for bulk goods.¹⁰

4.4 Summary

Although there is some evidence of presettlement usage of East and West Hawkesbury it was confined to the water's edge and therefore minimal. The only lasting alteration of the landscape was a trail parallelling the Ottawa River to bypass the troublesome Long Sault rapids. Indians, missionaries, explorers and Voyageurs provided a well worn path for settlers to utilize when Upper Canada was opened for settlement.

4.5 The Physiography Of East And West Hawkesbury Townships

Basically the area is a sedimentary limestone, dolomite and shale plain of Ordovician age lying on the edge of the Laurentian Shield in the lower Ottawa Valley (Figure 1). Due to isostatic depression the area was left lying below sea level following ice retreat after the final Wisconsin stage of Pleistocene glaciation. Subsequently, the land was covered by a temporary influx of the Atlantic Ocean, via the Gulf of St. Lawrence, known as the Champlain Sea. Marine sedimentation occurred

Source: The Physiography of Southern Ontario, Chapman, L.J. and Putnam, D.F., University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1966. Second Edition, pp. 358-359.

Figure 4.1

during that period laying a clay floor on the plain. Sediments were carried into the Sea from melt waters originating both locally and on the Shield.¹¹

Following isostatic rebound, areas of Prescott-Russell County, in which the study townships are located, became channels of the then mighty Ottawa River. When the ice lobe retreated around Mattawa, about one hundred and seventy miles upstream from Hawkesbury, the debris related to this damming was released and formed a massive sand delta below Ottawa. Various channels were cut into the delta by the river and its northern tributaries before the Ottawa retreated to its present course and intensive run-off diminished to its present annual flow.¹² The result was a sand plain on top of the clay plain running in an almost continuous belt from Ottawa east to beyond the eastern boundary of the study area. There are sandy remnants dispersed over the remainder of the clay plain. Hawkesbury's townships received mainly coarse sand (Figure 4.1).

The third surficial feature of the study area is the glacial till deposits. Figure 4.2 describes their location: the largest till plain is located in West Hawkesbury as is the largest sand plain. This smaller western township has also the highest elevation and the least amount of lacustrine clay. Outcroppings of the limestone bedrock can be seen on the till plains, one in each township at the same degree of latitude. A fault line probably lies across the area, most of which is buried under clay and till.¹³ The till is thought to be morainic in origin, transported from local sites.¹⁴ The limestone debris has calcareous material in it while the shale detritus contains clay forming minerals (Figure 4.2, Transparency inside back cover).

The plains are relatively flat yielding a gently undulating surface: the relief is from 150 feet to 350 feet above sea level, and gradual. It is mainly the till areas which display any topographical interest. The till plain in West Hawkesbury rises in a single instance to 375 feet and here the town of Vankleek Hill is located. It is a significantly stoney till and today one can see stone fences between fields where early farmers made use of this impediment to agriculture.

The drainage system is described as being immature¹⁵ for with the absence of much relief and heavy clay soils the few rivers and creeks flow very gently. A final surficial distinction which testifies further to the inefficiency of the drainage arrangement is the presence of muck and organic soils (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2

4.6 Climate and Soils

The climate of the area may be termed sub-humid, receiving about thirty-six inches of precipitation annually. The annual mean temperature is six degrees Celcius with extremes in summer and winter. The July mean is a pleasant twenty and one-half degrees Celsius while the January average is minus ten or eleven degree Celsius. Such a climate is one of the more favourable in Ontario: however, the low lying areas are subject to late spring and early fall frosts.¹⁶

A complex group of soils has formed on the three principal surfaces from the physical, chemical and biological weathering of the parent materials which were transported there as a result of glaciation and deglaciation. Soil formation in this climatic region in which precipitation exceeds evapo-transpiration is known as podzolization; a process in which there is severe leaching of highly soluble salts, especially calcium carbonates, yielding an acid soils.

The lacustrian clays of the Champlain Sea in the study area are of the chlorite type which have a low cation exchange capacity.¹⁷ This is a measurement of the clay's ability to hold on to soil nutrients necessary to promote vigorous plant growth. When the excess water problem of the area is added to the situation, the potential of the clays is even further reduced.

Two main soil orders have developed on well drained sites, Brunisolic and Podzolic. The former known as Brown-Forest soils are locally represented by Matilda and Grenville loams. For the most part they are to be found on the till plains in both townships. Stoniness has always been a problem reducing immeasurably the potential of the soils. The Grenville loams are superior to the Matilda loams and are also better drained, thus are to be found in greater amounts in West Hawkesbury. Both loams can suffer from excess moisture and often spring planting may be delayed.¹⁸

The Podzols have developed in areas in both townships where there have been coarse or fine sand and silt as parent materials. Problems may arise when these porous soils are shallow and overlay a clay floor which results in a perched water-table. In wet summers this may be a problem, also water may lie on the land well into summer.¹⁹

The low lying heavy clay soils are much more extensive in East Hawkesbury (Figure 4.2). Some are also burdened with stones while others profit from sand spots which provide somewhat better drainage conditions. They all require heavy liming and artificial drainage.

4.7 Conclusions

In essence the study area is a rather "monotonous" limestone plain. This area was covered with lacustrine clays, glacial till and sand deposits following Pleistocene deglaciation, due to the invasion of the Champlain Sea and copious glacial runoff. The drainage system has proved inadequate through time due to the subtle relief and heavy clay soils in the low lying areas. The soils which have formed are acid due to heavy leaching and are not naturally fertile today. Doubtless they were somewhat more fertile during initial usage when the humus and litter of the old forest floor were still present to supply nutrients to the soil beneath. The better loams are to be found on the till plains of West Hawkesbury and to a lesser degree in East Hawkesbury. The most extensive occurrence of clay soils is in East Hawkesbury, which is by far the larger of the two townships. Both townships share sandy areas.

According to current evaluation none of the soils in the study area is particularly fertile and all require good management in the form of artificial drainage, liming and applications of other fertilizers to sustain adequate production.²⁰ No doubt in the first years of farming these soils had a higher fertility when the debris of the forest floor was mixed into them.

Kelly notes that while some hand furrowing may have taken place, the artificial drainage of soils was not common before mid-nineteenth century.²¹ While many farmers did realize the usual high fertility of wet lands, underground drainage was costly and swampy lands were generally avoided until land became scarce.²²

Endnotes To Chapter Four

- ¹Higginson, Miss M.A., and Brock, Mrs. J.T., The Village Of Hawkesbury 1808-1888, The Ladies Guild, Holy Trinity Church, Hawkesbury, Ontario, 1961, no pagination.
- ²Churchill, Sir W.S., History of the English Speaking Peoples: The Great Democracies, (Vol. 4), Cassell and Company Limited, London, England, 1958, p. 4.
- ³Trigger, Bruce C., The Children of Aataentsic, Vol. 1 and 2, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, Quebec, 1976, *passim*.
- ⁴Thomas, Cyrus, The History of the Counties of Argenteuil Quebec and Prescott, Ontario, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, Quebec, 1896, p. 289.
- ⁵Ibid, p. 289
Higginson, Miss M.A. and Broch, Mrs. J.T., op. cit., no pagination.
P.A.O., R.G.I., A-II-I, letter of William Fortune of Point Fortune to Surveyor-General D.W. Smith, 28 March 1797.
- ⁶McInnis, Edgar, Canada A Political And Social History, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Toronto, Ontario, Revised Edition, 1966, p. 77.
- ⁷Ibid, p. 40.
- ⁸MacLennan, Hugh, Seven Rivers of Canada, MacMillan Company of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, 1927, p. 10.
- ⁹Ross, A.H., Ottawa, Past And Present, Mission Book Company, Toronto, Ontario, 1927, p. 10.
- ¹⁰Wilson, Bruce G., "The Enterprises of Robert Hamilton: A Study of Wealth and Influence In Early Upper Canada: 1776-1812", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, 1978, p. 136.

- ¹¹Chapman, L.J. and Putnam, D.F., The Physiography of Southern Ontario, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, Second Edition, 1966, pp. 47-50.

also

Wicklund, R.E. and Richards, N.R., Soil Survey of Russell and Prescott Counties, Research Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College, Report No. 33 of the Ontario Soil Survey, Guelph, Ontario, 1962, pp. 2-3.

- ¹²Chapman, A.J. and Putnam, D.F., op. cit., p. 360.

- ¹³Ibid., p. 9.

- ¹⁴Wicklund, R.E. and Richards, N.R., op. cit., p. 3.

- ¹⁵Ibid., p. 4.

- ¹⁶Department of the Environment, Soil Capability for Agriculture, Canada Land Inventory, Ottawa, Ontario, general description and legend of the Ottawa Map Sheet, 31G.

- ¹⁷Torrance, Professor J.K., notes taken in lectures in Geography of Soils, Carleton University, 1975-76.

see also

Brady, N.C., The Nature and Properties of Soils, MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 8th Edition, Chapter 12, 1974.

- ¹⁸Wicklund, R.E., and Richards, N.R., op. cit., pp. 28-35.

- ¹⁹Ibid., pp. 20-27.

- ²⁰Department of the Environment. op. cit.

- ²¹Kelly, Kenneth, "The Artificial Drainage of Land In Nineteenth Century Southern Ontario", Canadian Geographer, Vol. 19. No. 4, 1975, pp. 279-296.

Chapter Five

The Consequences Of The Fur Trade And The Lumbering Industry To The Study Area

5.1 Introduction

Despite the auspicious location of the study area on the second major river of Upper Canada and on the border between the two provinces of Canada, the townships were, from the start, isolated from the mainstream of purposive settlement in Upper Canada. Certainly Simcoe, the first Lieutenant-Governor, did not perceive it as playing any role in his scheme of events. This was in spite of the fact that the area was a safe distance away from an immediate threat of American invasion, a thought uppermost in Simcoe's mind. The geographic location was, however, on the mainstream of both the fur and timber trades. A consideration of their presence, however minimal their influence was on the study area, is requisite to a complete picture of the development of the townships. This chapter, then, focuses not on these industries per se but rather on their impact upon the economy of the settlement area and upon the settlement process.

5.2 The Fur Trade

Following the Conquest there was a brisk competition between rival French and English trading companies for the peltries of the uninhabited areas north and west of the Great Lakes. Sir William Johnson was placed in charge of the fur trade and issued 25 permits enabling

traders to go into the interior to carry supplies as far as the Saskatchewan River.¹ In 1764, by proclamation, there was freedom of trade for fur trading at the posts on the St. Lawrence as far west as Les Cedres and on the Ottawa River at Carillon at the foot of the Long Sault Rapids. Beyond these posts licences were required. In the following year, 1765, there was an added stipulation for greater control of the lucrative fur trade, by which, licence holders were required to provide financial security.²

New France had been economically neglected by France. After the Peace of Paris, in 1763, prosperous merchants from New York along with English merchants in Québec gave added vigour to the St. Lawrence fur trade.³ In short order they became a political power because they represented a commercial system of enormous potentialities, which dictated political demands.⁴ At first the merchants were in no hurry to become landed proprietors although by 1788 some thirty seigneuries were in their possession.⁵ By the turn of the century they had become promoters, money lenders, carriers of the new agricultural society in Upper Canada and land speculators.⁶

Indisputably the French Canadians were more effective in dealing with the Indians. However, their financial resources could not compete with the large forwarding companies growing up in Montréal which backed the new fur trading companies. The North West Company which had merged with less successful companies, notably the XY Company in 1804, emerged the winner over Gregory McLeod and Company for the St. Lawrence-Ottawa Fur Trade. Forsyth and McTavish and Company, leaders in the forwarding trade, owned half of the North West Company's twenty shares.⁷ The Canadian fur trade was both transcontinental and transatlantic in scope, and managed, significantly, by first generation British-Canadian merchants.⁸ The French connection was felt socially to some measure. Partners such as Simon McTavish, Joseph Frobisher and James McGill and John Macdonell married with French Canadian or Indian women.⁹

The northeasternmost corner of the study area, near Point Fortune became not only a stopping-off centre on the canoe route of the North West Company employees but also the site for large land holdings by some of the partners who lived in Montreal. Vast fortunes had been accumulated by these partners, some of whom sat in the legislatures of not only Upper and Lower Canada but also, as Wallace implies, the Parliament of Great

Britain.¹⁰ Wallace also notes that it was claimed that the political strength of the partners was such that they dominated the Government of Canada.¹¹

The ruins of the once fine home of one of the wealthy partners, John Macdonell, lies in Point Fortune. This massive (26 feet by 80 feet), two-storied stone mansion is perhaps the only tangible reminder of the fur trade in Hawkesbury. One lot to the west of Hawkesbury West, in Longueuil, a second well tended manor home can be found. This too was built from the profits of the fur trade. The outbuildings are an important feature on the cultural landscape in that they are built in the Red River style. This was the home of John Grant (Daldreggan) who owned considerable acreage in the study townships as well.

Unfortunately, the North West Company did not bring prosperity to Hawkesbury Townships despite its unparalleled success which as a Canadian commercial enterprise has never been duplicated. Eventually a struggle developed with the British Hudson Bay Company in which the North West Company was the loser. Lord Selkirk's Red River settlement, founded in 1811, has been identified as being instrumental in the initiation of problems. Its location served to sever the lines of communication to the far west for the North West Company. Agriculture beyond a necessary minimum threatened the company's fur operation. Lord Selkirk held a controlling interest in the Hudson's Bay Company and he fought a long and successful battle for his side with the result that the North West Company was united with the Hudson Bay Company in 1821.¹²

The Ottawa River route was gradually abandoned in favour of the Hudson Bay route as the habitat of the furbearing creatures receded ever further to the west and to the north due to the heavy trapping practices of the two rival companies.

The struggle was very costly for the North West Company and drained its financial resources beyond repair for there were no reserve funds. Many of the partners were deeply in debt to the Company for their shares. Montreal not only lost its prestigious position as the commercial headquarters of the fur trade, the Montreal firm of McTavish, McGillivrays and Company, agents for the North West Company, declared bankruptcy in 1825. Litigation by creditors continued to 1851.¹³ Not only the study area but Upper and Lower Canada lost out financially as the fur trade

passed entirely into the hands of the British company. The timing of the acquisition and disposal of the lands held in Hawkesbury by fur traders and their merchant associates will be presented in Chapter Six.

5.3 Conclusions

Even though it was at one time regarded as the basis of the country's prosperity,¹⁴ the lucrative fur trade, which was carried on at the doorstep of the study area, yielded no lasting financial benefit to Hawkesbury. The large scale speculation in land here by the wealthy partners in this monopolistic enterprise was perhaps the sole noteworthy effect.

5.4 The Timber Trade

Concurrent with the earliest days of settlement in Hawkesbury East and West was the birth of the extensive timber trade of the Ottawa Valley. Ray¹⁵ and Cartwright¹⁶ argue that the lumber industry predates settlement: however, if one notes that land was being patented in Hawkesbury by 1797, while the first lumberman, Philemon Wright, did not settle in Wrightsville, now Hull, until 1800 to start an agrarian life-style it must be conceded that the beginnings were almost simultaneous, at least in the lower Valley.

The impetus for the timber trade was due to Britain's situation in Europe during the English-French wars lasting some twenty-two years between 1793 and 1815. As Lower¹⁷ aptly describes the need for timber as being due to "the wooden world of war", it is easy to understand how important the vast stands of pine in the Ottawa Valley became when the intrigues of Napoleon succeeded in cutting off Britain's usual source in the Baltic.

Fortunes were to be made in a short time from the pineries of the Ottawa Valley. Hawkesbury, with the current of the Long Sault rapids at hand, became an excellent site for a sawmill. In 1804 Thomas Mears, originally from Vermont, arrived in Hawkesbury with that intent.¹⁸ He had previously built the first paper mill in Canada a few miles downstream at St. Andrews, Quebec.¹⁹ In partnership with another former American and non-practicing physician, David Pattee, Mears purchased two islands off Hawkesbury at the head of the Long Sault rapids plus a tract

of land in bordering Longueuil Township. A wooden dam with flumes was built between the islands to harness the river's current while a saw mill was erected on one of the islands.²⁰

Mears appears not to have been an able businessman for in 1808 he sold the enterprise to William Hamilton of Quebec City.²¹ Along with his brother Robert and George, William Hamilton had been looking for such a business in order to establish a lumber exporting trade out of Quebec City.²² The new owners were able to run the business from start to finish without middlemen to draw off profits. George ran the mills in Hawkesbury and sent the lumber to Quebec City by raft to Robert who managed the on-loading of the timber for Britain. In Liverpool, William handled the distribution tasks and most of the financing as well. From the outset the business flourished and expanded so that in 1818 eighty men were employed in the mills. By 1820 with forty saws in operation the Hawkesbury Mills were one of the largest in the world.²³

The islands on which the enterprise thrived were separated from the mainland by a channel of the Ottawa River known as the Chenal Ecarté (lost or, literally, discarded channel). Through time the site's name was corrupted to become the "Sry Carté", then, simply, the "Sry".²⁴ On these islands George Hamilton had houses built for employees who did not live in Hawkesbury Township, cleared land for pasture and to grow food and fodder for the workers and horses respectively. There were 25 teams of horses at the outset.²⁵ Hamilton had purchased cutting limits on the South Nation River about twenty-five miles to the west and on the Rouge River less than a mile away above the rapids on the north side of the Ottawa River. Other rights were purchased on the Petite Nation River in Papineau's seigneurie.²⁶

In the early 1820's George Hamilton suffered a series of personal tragedies which would have felled a lesser man. Without a pause, a flood caused the loss of a year's supply of logs, his house burned to the ground, both William and Robert died and on his way to Québec City to settle the firm's ensuing financial problems his two children were drowned.²⁷

Hamilton was made of strong matter and rebounded with vigour to continue successfully. In 1836 300,000 deals,²⁸ worth 30,000; were washed in the mills to clean and brighten them before the trip down

the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers to Quebec City. By 1844, 400,000 deals were processed per season by a working force of nearly 300 employees and the mills were the largest supplier of this type of lumber in Canada.²⁹

An early visitor to the study area, a Dr. J.J. Bigsby, reported not only on the severe outbreak of typhoid fever but on the physical landscape of Hawkesbury in August, 1819.³⁰

"Hamilton Mills is a large establishment for sawing up the timber which lumbermen raft down from the higher part of the Ottawa, the adjacent rapids furnishing the motor power. I was afterwards astonished at the quantity of logs I saw floating in the back water, at the easy manner in which each log was presented and held to saw, and the number and vast force of the saws. The immediate vicinity of the mills was all but in a state of nature. The mill, ..., was merely a large, oblong wooden shed: - the proprietor's house (barely comfortable) was surrounded by offices, forges, workmen's dwellings and stables. A kitchen garden there certainly was, with little patches of wheat here and there; but the eye saw little else than the charred stumps of trees, clumps of young Beech and Alder on a rugged surface, covered with rocks, stones and sand, and hemmed in by the virgin forest. Around the mills for a half a mile was the accumulation of foreign loose rocks ... left here by an ancient still water at the point of obstruction, created by a sudden narrowing of the river ...

I felt not a little awkward, in presenting myself to Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton of the Mills at whose house, as the principal person in the settlement, it was arranged that I should reside ... I passed a pleasant and busy month at their hospitable dwelling ... Mr. Hamilton furnished me with a horse, and was so good as to accompany me to my scattered patients ... otherwise I most certainly should not have found my way along primitive by-paths, over crazy bridges, through morasses and woods whose pines were of a size and height I never saw equalled elsewhere.

The Hawkesbury settlement now called Hawkesbury West, is an oblong block of heavily-timbered land, of variable fertility. There are many swamps and sand hills; but in places I noted many excellent crops of wheat growing among the tree-stumps. It now contains about 2000 inhabitants. My duties lay among a young colony of Irish planted apart in the woods"

Bigsby also noted the bad roads and the fact that the Ottawa River was the only easy access to market, that being Montreal.³¹

No longer able to run the business from forest to market following the death of his brothers, George Hamilton was forced to take a partner in the firm. Charles A. Low became the first partner in 1830 and actually managed affairs for four years after George Hamilton's death in 1839.³² Three of Hamilton's five sons, born after the earlier tragedy, ran the firm in partnership with a John Thomson and his two sons from 1843 to 1851. Upon the dissolution of this partnership the firm stayed within the Hamilton family until the death of the Honourable John Hamilton in 1888.³³

The Mills provided evergrowing employment opportunities for local settlers many of whom earned the price of land in salaries at the mills before settling down to farming. Thomas³⁴ reports on settlers who began as mill labourers as young lads of sixteen years of age who later successfully combined a mill job and farming. There were others who sought employment on the river as raftsmen, a dangerous job that required great skill and courage.

The sparse population of the study area experienced some distress owing to the careless and ruthless behavior of the lumbermen working in the pineries in the early years of the timber trade. Settlers were not only incensed by the damage inflicted on their own lands by those with contracts to remove timber from Crown lands but were also critical of this practice as well; they felt it constituted a loss of timber to future settlers.

Licences to cut masts for the British Navy were awarded in 1808 to a Henry Runions and a David Wright in the Eastern District. Some 2748 pine for masts were secured; unfortunately the data does not identify how many were cut in Hawkesbury.³⁵

The timbermen were not discerning and cut down the forest in areas of poor soil as well as good, with damaging results due to erosion.³⁶ The damage to the physical landscape by lumbering or land clearance for farming is difficult to estimate today. An examination of Figures 6.4 and 6.5 indicate some changes in the drainage pattern especially in East Hawkesbury. Thomas records that Lot 22 on Concession IV had for many years a fine saw mill but Burwash Creek running through the property

dried up due to the removal of the forests and the mill became useless.³⁷

As Creighton points out, the situation was ironic, "to the Loyalist the destruction of the forest was the first condition of their success."³⁸ In actual fact it took many years before farmers, let alone lumbermen, became aware of the value of woodlots to prevent erosion along streambanks, to prevent flooding or drying up of streams, and the benefits of shelter or wind breaks between fields and around buildings.³⁹

As late as 1841, when lumbering had moved well up the Valley beyond Ottawa (Bytown), there was still concern due to the plundering of Clergy Reserves in the study area by lumbermen and squatters acting illegally. Neil Stewart, a Justice of the Peace and County Treasurer,⁴⁰ wrote to the Land Board requesting a list of unsold Reserves in order to issue licences for the cutting of timber and also to notify collectors of trespassing on Reserves.

The lumbermen were obviously neither far-sighted nor overly scrupulous in their attitudes to the pineries. The forest was considered a temporary source of wealth to be left to the settlers when the valuable timber had been removed under an outlook that suggested, "get what you can before somebody else does".⁴⁰ William Spragge of the Crown Lands Department was to propose that a person buying Crown Land be given four months to settle the land and that a large percentage of the purchase price be paid in advance, "to guard against the land being plundered of its timber, and then abandoned".⁴¹

Yet the study area appears to have been most fortunate in not suffering from the social conflicts that were to plague Ottawa and other settlements up the Valley. These conflicts were due to the disruption of everyday life when the society of unattached males, the lumbermen, swarmed into the settlements during their few off-weeks, disturbing the citizens with their immoderate drinking and constant brawling.⁴²

The study site was also fortunate in that the lumbering concerns stimulated agricultural production by providing an ever increasing market for food supplies. In fact all life rotated about the supply of excess produce for the lumber camps.⁴³ A small shanty or camp might have between 20-25 men. larger camps held 40-50 men. When the industry peaked in the mid 1840's a large timber concern might operate 25-30 camps.⁴⁴

There was a difference, it would appear, between supplying the lumber camps and the military. During the War of 1812-14, which was unpopular to many people who had no desire to fight one-time countrymen, the settlers were also reluctant to supply the military post of Prescott. The Commanding Officer, Major-General Francis De Rottenburg, was forced to proclaim Martial Law on the twenty-second of November 1813 on both the Eastern and Johnstown Districts for the provision of food supplies.⁴⁵ Thomas Mears, by then a magistrate, received the edict for Hawkesbury and in 1814 reported that Hawkesbury Township farmers and those of Longueuil to the west had supplied 510 bushels of wheat, 368 bushels of corn, 350 bushels of oats and 28 bushels of peas to the Prescott post.⁴⁶

Jones notes that in connection with the lumber camps it was possible for farmers in the study area to profit in two ways. Firstly, a man could use his horses and freight his and his neighbours' supplies to camps in the fall; secondly, he could then remain and work in camp over the winter when chores were at a minimum on the farm. The horses would be kept in good condition for spring plowing when the farmer returned home at sowing time.⁴⁷

When the timber industry receded up the Valley as supplies of pine and oak were depleted, the time spent away from home by farmers became a social and an economic issue. Long absences disrupted family life when men left for camp before harvest was completed and returned late for spring planting. This situation placed a strain on both the marriage and on farm production.

Because of the insatiable demand for food and fodder for the lumber camps, the farmers in the lower Valley did not switch to wheat monoculture when enough land was cleared for its growth. Hawkesbury did not grow enough wheat for local needs.⁴⁸ It is doubtful if the soil was capable of supporting vigorous wheat growth. Hay, oats and legumes were in great demand; the bulk of fodder made it a difficult commodity to import and therefore local farmers had a virtual monopoly in this respect. Flour and pork were imported from the western districts and as far away as Ohio. Transportation was via Montreal and the Ottawa River in early times then through the Rideau Canal to Ottawa after the latter's completion in 1832.⁴⁹

Although it was possible to take excess produce to Montreal for marketing this did not occur. Apparently no produce left the Valley for Montreal after 1832.⁵⁰ Prices at Bytown (Ottawa), and in the shanties, as well as at canal building sites were generally double those offered at Montreal.⁵¹ Far sighted farmers stayed away from lumbering and increased food production in Hawkesbury in contrast to those from Glengarry County, to the south, who neglected their farms to cut timber along the Castor and South Nation Rivers west of the study area.⁵²

The market for cash crops demanded a more diversified type of agriculture than the wheat growing areas. The farmers in Hawkesbury did not keep up with the new techniques or implements particular to wheat growing and lagged behind as a result. This was balanced by a lack of dependency on a single crop in order to satisfy the large consuming population of the lumber shanties. Although prices fluctuated with the fortunes of the timber trade, this economy did not suffer the distress of the wheat farmers when, in the mid-1830's, increases in duties on wheat exports into Britain soared from six pence to five shillings per bushel and eventually, for a time, Canada was excluded from British markets.⁵³ While the rest of Upper Canada suffered depressed times due to the oversupply of wheat, the study area and others who shared the market demand continued to supply the lumber camps with staples. It was not until the close of the study period that the timber industry suffered a major depression that was a crushing blow to the shanty trade and it collapsed.⁵⁴

5.5 Summary

Hawkesbury's townships were not adversely affected by the lumbering industry. The timber trade actually opened doors for agricultural and employment opportunities. The mills at Hawkesbury provided a means whereby farmers could earn a salary with which to develop their farms. There is no evidence in the literature concerning farm neglect or the abandonment of farmsteads due to lumbering interference as in neighbouring townships.

Hawkesbury Mills also became the "raison d'être" for the development of an urban centre for supplies and services both to the mills and to local farmers. Hawkesbury Village was incorporated in 1849.

while the only other centre of the period, Vankleek Hill, was not incorporated until 1898. Despite its more favourable surroundings for agriculture, the absence of a road until 1816, no doubt was a major setback for the latter, while Hawkesbury Village on the Ottawa River profited by this means of communication and transportation as well.

5.6 Conclusions

Although the study area was long used as a land portage by the fur traders very little evidence of their presence was left on the physical landscape. The main impact was that, while the Ottawa River was used as a route to transport furs, the location of Hawkesbury was felt to be important economically. Partners in the North West Company and associated merchants secured large acreages but it appears only John Macdonell used the land for a home in Hawkesbury. There may have been a negative impact in that absentee owners retarded the settlement process in neglect of their lands in the study area.

On the other hand the overall impact of the lumber industry may be regarded as positive in that employment opportunities and a market for produce were immediately created. Only minimal damage was caused by the lumbermen to private land as they removed the trees on Crown lands.

Lumbering is still an important factor in the economy of East and West Hawkesbury. The mills are now relocated and are owned by Canadian International Paper Limited. They are the second largest employer in the town of Hawkesbury.⁵⁶

Endnotes to Chapter Five

¹Innis, Harold, The Fur Trade in Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1970, pp. 106-07.

²Ibid., p. 171.

³Creighton, Donald, Empire of the St. Lawrence, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1958, p. 14.
Innis, Harold., op. cit., pp. 22, 24.

⁴Creighton, Donald, op. cit., p. 28.

⁵Ibid., p. 114.

⁶Ibid., p. 114.

⁷Ibid., p. 114.

⁸Ibid., p. 29.

⁹Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁰Wallace, Wm. Stewart, Documents Relating to the North West Company, Facsimile edition by Greenwood Press, New York, N.Y., 1968, p. 1.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 27-34.

¹²Ibid., pp. 27-34.

¹³Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁴Landon, Fred, Western Ontario and the American Frontier, The Carleton Library, No. 34, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1967, p. 5.

- ¹⁵ Ray, D.M., "Settlement and Rural Outmigration in Easternmost Ontario 1783-1956", unpublished M.A. thesis, Institute of Geography, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1961, p. 18.
- ¹⁶ Cartwright, Donald, "French Canadian Colonization in Eastern Ontario to 1910: A Study in Process and Pattern", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.
- ¹⁷ Lower, A.R.F., Great Britain's Woodyard, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, Quebec, 1973, p. 45.
- ¹⁸ Thomas, Cyrus, History of the Counties of Argenteuil, Quebec and Prescott, Ontario, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, Quebec, 1896, p. 534.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., p. 534.
- ²⁰ Higginson, Maria A. and Brock, Mrs. J.T., The Village of Hawkesbury 1808-1888, Holy Trinity Church, Hawkesbury, Ontario, 1961, no pagination.
- ²¹ Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 534.
- ²² Higginson, M. and Mrs. J.T. Brock, op. cit., no pagination.
- ²³ Lower, A.R.M., The North American Assault On The Canadian Forest, The Ryerson Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1938, p. 178.
- ²⁴ Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 537.
- ²⁵ Higginson, Maria and Brock, Mrs. J.T., op. cit., no pagination.
- ²⁶ Gilles, Sandra J., The Timber Trade in the Ottawa Valley 1806-1854, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Parks Canada, Hull, Quebec, Manuscript Report Series No. 153, 1975, p. 68.
- ²⁷ Higginson, Maria and Brock, Mrs. J.T., op. cit., no pagination.

- ²⁸Lower, A.R.M., 1938, op. cit., p. 178.
- ²⁹A deal is a collective term for pine or oak planks cut to a specific dimension, usually 3 inches thick, 7 to 11 inches wide and either 6 or 12 feet in length. Only the finest timber is used and deals were an early specialization in the lumber industry. Deals are expressed in "great hundreds" of 120 single deals.
- ³⁰Bigsby, John J., The Shoe and Canoe, Palodin Press, New York, N.Y., 1969, Vol. 1, pp. 68-70.
- ³¹Ibid., p. 71.
- ³²Lower, A.R.M., 1973, op. cit., p. 178.
- ³³Higginson, M. and Brock, Mrs. J.T., op. cit., no pagination.
- ³⁴Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 538.
- ³⁵P.A.C., R.G. 5, A1, Upper Canada Sundries, Mic. Vol. 7, pp. 2990-91.
- ³⁶Lower, A.R.M., 1938, op. cit., p. XXI.
- ³⁷Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., pp. 615-16.
- ³⁸Creighton, Donald, op. cit., p. 162.
- ³⁹Kelly, Kenneth, "Practical Knowledge of Physical Geography in Southern Ontario During the Nineteenth Century", in Falconer, A., Fahey, B.D., and Thompson, R.D. (Editors), Physical Geography: The Canadian Context, McGraw-Hill, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, p. 16.
- ⁴⁰Lower, A.R.M., 1938, op. cit., pp. 146-47.
- ⁴¹Cross, Michael S., "The Lumber Community of Upper Canada, 1815-1867", Ontario History, Vol. 52, No. 4, 1960, p. 225.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 228-31.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 232.

⁴⁴ Cartwright, Donald, op. cit., p. 146.

⁴⁵ P.A.C., R.G. 5, A1, Upper Canada Sundries, Mic. Vol. 7, pp. 25377-78.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 25383.

⁴⁷ Jones, R.L., History of Agriculture in Ontario 1613-1880, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1946, p. 116.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 117.

⁴⁹ Legget, Robert, Ottawa Waterway, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 138.

⁵⁰ Jones, R.L., op. cit., p. 118.

⁵¹ Pringle, J.F., Lunenburg on the Old Eastern District, Standard Printing House, Cornwall, Ontario, 1890, p. 130.

⁵² Picken, Andrew, The Canadas, Emigrants, Colonists and Capitalists, Effingham Wilson, London, England, 1832, pp. 130-31.

⁵³ Jones, R.L., op. cit., p. 122.

also see

McCalla, Douglas, "The Wheat Staple and Upper Canadian Development", Historical Papers, 1978, Canadian Historical Association, London, Ontario, 1978, 10 pages, no pagination.

⁵⁴ Jones, R.L., op. cit., p. 121.

⁵⁵ Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 631.

⁵⁶ Personal communication with Mme. J. Quesnel, Personnel Department, Canadian International Paper Limited, Hawkesbury, Ontario and Mme. C.

Turpin, Personnel Department, Amoco Fabric Company, Hawkesbury,
Ontario.

Total employees on payroll of Canadian International Paper Limited as
of 24 October 1979 was 454.

Total employees on payroll of Amoco Fabric Company as of 18 October
1979 was 500.

Chapter Six

The Social, Political And Environmental Aspects Of East And West Hawkesbury

6.1 Introduction and Purpose

The survey of each township was a necessary precondition to orderly land grants in the early settlement of Upper Canada. Each surveyor was required to keep diaries and field notes on the progress of the survey. These were to include; the physical appearance of the land, the types of terrain, vegetation and soil he was traversing. In addition his instructions required the surveyor to record the presence of timber suitable for the British navy, to provide allowance for future roads and to reserve two-sevenths of each township for the future use of the Crown and the Clergy. Through time there was reorganization of the original four districts to facilitate the management of local affairs. Until 1841 the management of these affairs was accorded to the District Courts of General Quarter Sessions.¹ Some of their wide ranging responsibilities included the supervision of the building of roads, court houses, jails and asylums. The courts also appointed district constables, road and highway surveyors. Financial duties required the courts to assess and pay wages of the members of the House of Assembly, jailors, town clerks and pound keepers. They also granted certificates for licences to ministers or clergymen of "dissenting" congregations enabling them to carry out the sacraments of marriage.² These courts, then, were very important to the daily life of the people in each district.

The purpose of this chapter is fourfold. It seeks to clarify the various civil divisions into which the Townships of Hawkesbury East and West were periodically re-organized. Secondly, the chapter examines the various surveys made of the area in order to establish the quality of the physical environment at the time of each survey. Thirdly, it seeks to establish the extent of the road network throughout the study period. This will enable the writer to judge the impact of the road system on the settlement process. Finally the spatial arrangement of the Crown and Clergy Reserves are reconstructed and their history in the years down to 1846 is described.

6.2 Methodology

The issue of changes in the civil administration is treated first. Following this attention is focussed upon the question of surveying. The chapter uses a number of transparent overlays in conjunction with physiographic and edaphic surveys to determine the role of the physical environment in the disposal of Crown land as well as the Crown and Clergy Reserves. A number of maps are developed to aid in the interpretation of this material, viz., a map of the road network of the townships, an overlay transparency of the physiography of the study area and a map of the locations of the Crown and Clergy Reserves. A graph is also produced which describes the patenting of these Reserves over time.

6.3 Data Sources

Primary source materials were found in four locations; the Land Registry Office, L'Orignal, Ontario, (hereafter, L.R.O./L'O), the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, (P.A.C.), the Public Archives of Ontario (P.A.O.) and the Department of Natural Resources, Toronto, Ontario. Although most of the documents used are common to students of Ontario history and historiography, the information available in them for Hawkesbury was either incomplete or had shortcomings which deserve elucidation at this point.

(a) The Abstract Index To Deeds (A.I.D.)

These large volumes were used in the Registry Office in L'Orignal although they were also available at the P.A.O. In only one

case was the date of patent recorded in the A.I.D. which necessitated a complete cross-referencing with the Index to Land Patents (I.L.P.). Financial details were never recorded and in most cases the acreage involved was ignored. This was a noteworthy departure from the idealised model called for by the legislation of 1865.³ Another peculiarity of these records is that land transfers by Bargain and Sale or Indenture, the most frequent methods of conveyance of title, were not indicated in the prescribed column which was simply left blank. The Deputy-Registrar, M. Roger Coté, reassured this researcher that the assumption that these transfers were indeed Bargains and Sales or Indentures was valid. It was therefore not necessary to search each memorial for proof. All other land dealings were identified by name; such as, Will, Trust, Quit Claim, Power of Attorney, Lease, Deed of Gift, Release, or Partition, Sheriff's Deed or Mortgage. Not uncommon to old records, many of the entries were illegible.

(b) Index to Land Patents (I.L.P.)

Located in L'Original and the P.A.O. this index has recently been typewritten from the original. Consequently spelling errors are frequent, probably due to the typist's inability to read the original document or perhaps an unfamiliarity in "deciphering" English script. The index's main shortcoming is that in numerous cases the acreage of the lot was not recorded or was replaced by the word "all".

(c) Ontario Archives Computerized Land Records Index (L.R.I.)

This index is a research aid only now available to the public. The index consists of two alphabetical listings: (a) by grantee and (b) by township or town. The information therein has been derived from three groups of records: (a) the Crown Lands Papers (P.A.O., R.G. 1), (b) the Canada Company Papers; and (c) the Peter Robinson Papers (P.A.O., M.S. 12). The L.R.I. indicates the original alienation of land resulting in a deed or patent although the I.L.P. is not incorporated into it and must be used separately. The time period covered is from the 1780's to the start of World War One. The purpose of this new index is

"to give researchers a fast and efficient means to search land records in the P.A.O. (archival reference numbers are provided); to trace initial land grants and to exploit fully a valuable source of data reflecting the patterns of Ontario settlement".⁴

Information given in the index includes the name of the grantee, his geographical location, the type of grant, the type of transaction, the type of lease or sale, the dates of sales or grants and archival reference.

There are several problems associated with the use of this index. In fairness, the L.R.I. was conceived only as an initial referencing document. The copy used was issued prior to the final release to the public and changes may have been made. Several grantees were simply listed by name without locations. Frequently, the designation, East, West or Gore was omitted which created extra work for the researcher in identifying a settler on a particular lot. There were no deed numbers recorded for Hawkesbury and the archivist in attendance felt that this was unusual. The lands patented by the Canada Company were not identified until they were actually sold; however the Archival reference was to the Canada Company Papers. Hence, land patented in 1846 and sold in 1880 would show the latter date although the lot may have been occupied for some time previously as indicated in the Assessment Rolls. Taxes were being paid on some.

Although the code "CR" is identified as being a Crown Reserve that was not always the case. In many instances when checked against the Schedules of the Crown and Clergy Reserves⁵ these lists according to the I.L.P. and the A.I.D. were simply Crown land. This fact led the researcher to the conclusion that one cannot assume automatically, that all information is completely accurate according to the codes on the L.R.I.

A final discrepancy, in Hawkesbury, was that two lots which were taken up and patented in 1802 and 1804 according to the I.L.P. show on the L.R.I. as being alienated only in 1858 and 1860 respectively. This index must be used with caution and with other references.

6.4. The Civil Divisions of the Study Area

East and West Hawkesbury were originally designated as Townships No. 1 and No. 2, South Side of the Ottawa River in Glengarry County⁶ (Figure 6.1). The district name, Lunenburg, Figure 3.1, was changed to Eastern in 1792 at the first session of Upper Canada's first parliament⁷ (Figure 6.2). In 1800 the northern part of Glengarry County was reorganized and Hawkesbury East and West, became part of Prescott County.⁸

Figure 6.1

Figure 6.2

This latter county was named in honour of Sir Robert Prescott, Governor of Canada succeeding Lord Dorchester⁹. Finally, in 1816, the Eastern District was divided into two separate districts; the northern half became the Ottawa District which consisted of Prescott and Russell Counties¹⁰ (Figure 6.3). In 1822 these two counties were united for parliamentary and judicial affairs, with the county town being L'Orignal, in Longueuil Township immediately to the west of Hawkesbury.¹¹ The use of districts as a civil division of territory remained until 1849 when they were abolished completely.¹² East and West Hawkesbury became independent townships in 1843 rather than East and West Divisions of Hawkesbury Township.¹³

6.5 The Surveys

The first non-official survey of the townships on the Ottawa River was carried out on the request of Colonel Jessup, Commander of Jessup's Rangers, in 1783. A Lieutenant Gersham French of the Rangers led a party to explore, "the lands on the Ottawa River from Carillon to the Rideau River..."¹⁴ He found the timber to be "neither too heavy nor too light and in general very Tall and Straight without any Underbrush".¹⁵ He judged the land, not specifically Hawkesbury, to be fairly good for cultivation and suggested that an acre could be cleared and be fit for seeding in eight days.¹⁶

The first official survey, a Single Front System, appears to have been carried out by Patrick McNiff in 1795: the map alone survives and is of the first two concessions only.¹⁷ Written on the map are the names of the settlers to whom the lots were originally awarded: the Commons in each township and Lots 17-19 in No. 2 Township are left blank. There was no provision on these two concessions for Crown and Clergy Reserves although after 1792 it was requisite to reserve lands for this purpose.

In January 1797, William Fortune resurveyed the above mentioned two concessions on orders of Acting Surveyor-General D.W. Smith, "in Compliance To A Petition From The Inhabitants Of The Grand River To His Excellency John Graves Simcoe, Esquire".¹⁸ A map¹⁹ and the survey diary²⁰ survive but there is no vegetation report included in the survey which took from January to July to complete. Fortunately, a letter to the

Figure 6.3

Surveyor-General's Office survives²¹ in which William Fortune describes the character, whereabouts, and performance on the land of grantees in Hawkesbury. Of thirty-one petitioners only eight lived in the township; one was deceased; seventeen lots showed improvements carried out, six lots having hired men doing the work.

A complete survey of the East and West Divisions of Hawkesbury was carried out in the fall of 1797 and winter of 1798. A map,²² the diaries and field notes survive this survey which was started by William Fortune and completed by his son, Joseph. The map is torn where the date was inserted, therefore it can only be assumed to be the map of this survey. (Since William Fortune did no further surveys in Hawkesbury it is assumed to be the map of this survey time.) The notes are not adequate enough to reproduce the vegetation, lot by lot, in map form. In a further letter to the Surveyor-General's Office Fortune, Senior, reports on the quality of the land in the first three concessions.²³ He begins his letter by noting that the survey began at Point Fortune, the name given to that point in the extreme northeast of Hawkesbury (now in Quebec) by Mr. John Collins, Deputy Surveyor-General, "as a mark of Mr. Collins' good wishes and in some measure to recompense the Proprietor of injuries done to me by persons who unjustly endeavoured to dispossess him whom it is named after".²⁴

The elder Fortune reported that the land in these front concessions was "chiefly good" abounding with maple, beech and birch in parts then ash, cedar, red spruce and some pine timber. He also noted that the north-western corner of the western division, "was not arable for twenty chains, being swampy and abounding in spruce". There was overflow from the Grand (Ottawa) River which stayed on the land part of the summer season.²⁵ This was the area covered by Lots 17 to 19 which McNiff had not assigned to anyone on his map of 1795. Joseph Fortune continued the survey past the third concession and noted very swampy lands in East Hawkesbury on the third and seventh concessions as well as along the southern boundary line with Lochiel Township of Glengarry.²⁶

The field notes of Joseph Fortune's 1816 survey of the Gore in East Hawkesbury are an excellent source of information on the quality of land and tree associations.²⁷ The climate of the summer of 1816 when the survey was carried out is remarkable in Canadian History. This

was the infamous "Summerless Year"²⁸ or the "cold summer",²⁹ when "... the ultimate in human misery was experienced in the Ottawa District and in fact throughout Upper Canada".³⁰ There has never again been a repeat of these conditions in Canadian weather records.

Joseph Fortune reported snow falling and covering the ground to a depth of one foot on June 3rd. He also noted in his diary that the ice was twelve inches thick on Concession IX.³¹ Fortune's ever present complaint was a lack of drinking water for his workers. This had been a problem in the 1798 survey as well.

There is no indication that any land was taken up in the Gore at this time. Fortune judged the land between Concessions I and II to be "good soil ... for wheat and corn". The land was described as high and sandy, with maple and basswood growth. The rear line of Concession III was low and swampy in part, the soil a white clay with white pine, elm, basswood, hemlock, ash, poplar and spruce growing. Free water lay on the soil on Concession IV with three lots bared of vegetation due to a previous burn. By Concession IV the land had become white sand or yellow with moss growing on it. Then swampy land took over and Fortune noted a "rappid" in a stream located here. Towards the rear of the Gore the soil became very stoney. Birch, maple, hemlock were noted while on higher ridges the soil supported "mixed hardwoods". The rear or IXth Concession was identified as, "rich low land with elm, cedar and pine". Fortune noted many rills and predicted that the land would "be good for grass or hemp".

A final survey of the study period was carried out on the Concession lines between VI and VII, and VII and VIII by Duncan McDonell in 1833. The field notes and map have survived.³²

Earlier in the chapter it was noted that the earliest survey reports of the vegetation were not adequate to reconstruct the vegetation spatially in map form. McDonell's notes are adequate for a small, not necessarily representative, area. None-the-less they provide some interesting insights to the original vegetational patterns and are reproduced in part at this point.

Beginning on the Eastern Boundary of the VIth Concession of East Hawkesbury. McDonell records in his field notes -³³

		A Small Knoll Timbered with Pine, Hemlock and Spruce
2 Chains 56 Links		Low land pine, Spruce, Tamarack
5 "		pine, hemlock and spruce
16 "		Tamarack Swamp
18 "		Hemlock and spruce
25 "		Spruce and pine
35 "		Swamp pine Tamarack and Spruce
45 "		Ridge mixed timber
53 "		Brook running easterly
60 "		Swamp pine Spruce and Tamarack
63 "		South branch of River La Grasse (Rigaud)
65 "		Maple hemlock basswood Spruce
70 "		Low land pine and balsam
100 "	76 "	Planted a post marked 6 _____

Later, on the VIIth Concession line he records

Lot 4		pine balsam spruce tamarack and small hemlock
19 Chains 29½ Links		planted a marker 4/5
5		pine, balsam, spruce tamarack and hemlock
19 Chains 29½ Links		planted a post marked 5/6 _____
Lot 6		as 4 and 5
7		pine Tamarack and Spruce
10 Chains		pine hemlock mixed with hardwoods
8		pine balsam hemlock
9 3 "		Rill running northerly
12 "		Rill running northerly
10 3 "		Rill running northerly
4 "		River La Grasse
9 "		Crossed River
16 "		Balsam and mixture of hardwood
-		
21		Balsam Cedar and pine
15 "		Hemlock, beech, maple, basswood
22 15 "		Hemlock, beech, maple, basswood
23		as above

Line between VIIth and VIth Concessions

Lot 1		Hemlock ash balsam and pine
2		as above also ash
3		as above
4		Pine balsam and mixture of hardwood
5		as above
-		
7		Beech maple hemlock and basswood
8		Maple beech and hemlock
9		as above
10		as above
5 Chains		ash, balsam, cedar and water elm

Lot 12 cedar balsam spruce and pine
 7 Chains Hemlock beech maple elm
 -
 15 as above
 15 Creek running northerly

 16 Maple beech basswood and hemlock
 10 Balsam ash and hemlock
 15 Cedar hemlock balsam and ____
 17 Cleared land
 -
 19 Cedar hemlock spruce and pine
 -
 24 maple elm beech hemlock and basswood
 25 as above
 26 as above

In Hawkesbury West McDonell again reports well on the physical environment.

Lots 9 and 10 / 2nd Concession easterly
 Lot 8 good land mixed timber
 7 low land some dry
 6 swamp then dry
 5 creek, good land mixed timber
 4 swamp with dry land southerly, good land
 Line between 2nd and 3rd Concessions
 Lots 8-5 good land mixed timber
 4 swamp ash cedar pine tamarack
 9 good land mixed timber

 Lot 11 low land maple bass hemlock
 12 cedar swamp cedar ash elm tamarack
 creek
 13-15 pine and tamarack, creek

3rd and 4th Concessions
 Lot 4 good land mixed timber
 5-9 ditto
 10 low land rich deep soil
 11 cedar and ash
 12-18 good mixed timber

Nothing until Concession 7

Lot 8 elm, bass beech birch
 9 ditto
 10-15 good mixed timber

Nothing further until Concession VIII

Lot 7	swamp cedar ash
8	cedar swamp
9	low elm birch
10	low
11	dry mixed timber
12	good land
13-14	ditto
15-16	low
17-18	maple, beech elm

A base map was prepared from William Fortune's survey map assumed to be 1797-98, Figure 6.4. A similar base map was adapted from a 1973 Department of Transport map of Prescott-Russell Counties, Figure 6.5. A comparison of these two maps suggests that drainage patterns may have changed (see Chapter Five) and a significant change in the river level has occurred in East Hawkesbury along the Ottawa River.

Using Figure 4.2, notes on the physical environment, the transparent overlay of Figure 6.4 (see pocket in back cover), and the available vegetational notes from the surveys the following assumptions and pattern of land uptake is suggested.

Maple and beech associations with basswood, birch and elm were found to be growing on the higher till plains. As soon as sandy soils were reached pine predominated with ash, hemlock and spruce although maple and basswood occurred in selected areas. The low lying or clay soils were notably covered with a heavy growth of cedar, tamarack, poplar, elm and birch. Maple and hemlock were also noted on some clay soils. Surveyor McDonnell identified the soil between Concessions III and IV in West Hawkesbury as being good with mixed timber at Lot 4 (no report for Lots 1-3). It would appear that the edge of the till and clay plains may have been fairly well drained and sloping at the higher elevations, relatively, in West Hawkesbury compared to that of East Hawkesbury. Mixed timber and hardwoods also grew on the margins of till and sand plains. West Hawkesbury, although much smaller in size, had a superior growth of hardwoods or mixed timber, while East Hawkesbury had more extensive areas of swampland and cedar, ash, elm and tamarack. There was a far greater number of creeks, rills and other water courses in the Eastern Township although the western sand plains of the second township also appeared to be well watered.

Figure 6.4

Figure 6.5

It is apparent that Hawkesbury West would be the most attractive township for settlement in early times. This statement is based on Kelly's argument in Chapter Two, that light, sandy upland soils or maple, beech associations were preferred sites if there was a choice. There do not appear to have been any dense areas of hardwoods which Kelly claims were avoided due to the fact that they had clay subsoils which remained wet in spring, and were costly to develop and bring into production.

The front two concessions did not show any unusable land except for the already noted northwest corner of West Hawkesbury and so would therefore be good sites for settlement. The surveyor, William Fortune, rated the front two concessions favourably. East Hawkesbury, where vegetation notes have survived, showed excessive areas of low, clayey land, and these sites would not have been the first choice of settlers. Since the sand plains diminished in depth eastwardly, perched water tables may have been present in shallow sandy soils. Settlers may have noted these if seen in spring when water may have remained on the surface until late spring similarly to the heavy clay soils. These sites would not have attracted settlers if inspected in the spring season.

In conclusion, reports of the physical environment suggest that the higher loam and sandy soils of West Hawkesbury would have been more attractive to settlers initially. Only when land was scarce would the interior of East Hawkesbury be taken up, or, given the limited technology concerning drainage of clay soils at the time, they may have been avoided altogether or abandoned due to failure.

6.6 The Fledgeling Road Network

One of the essential weaknesses of the study area was the absence of an adequate transportation system on land and on water until well into the 1830's. There are no surviving documents as to the actual road situation. However, all visitors to the area were quick to report on the inadequacies of the roads. Robert Gourlay for instance visited the study area in 1818, "on horseback, at great hazard" and summed up what to him was the reason for the lack of roads: "Much of the landed property being held by merchants in Montreal ... the farmers in Hawkesbury were so kept at arm's length by untaxed lots that they could do little in union for public good or their own relief".³⁴ Gourlay also recommended

a canal be built to bypass the rapids which would make the Ottawa River navigable for two hundred miles. He predicted a vast commerce as a result from the development of naturally fertile regions on the banks of the Ottawa and its tributaries.³⁵ Gourlay claimed that the Ottawa District had hitherto attracted little attention but "is rising in importance due to the planning of a new route of inland navigation between Montreal and Kingston via canals".³⁶

The Grenville Canal was completed in 1833. However, by then the Rideau Canal had a six year advantage in the transportation of goods from Montreal to Ottawa by way of Kingston which it never relinquished. The fur trade had long since abandoned the Ottawa River route and the hoped for commerce on the Ottawa River was never to be a reality.

Doctor Bigsby, on a visit to Hawkesbury about 1820 lamented on the primitive paths he had to follow to visit the sick.³⁷ The Surveyor, Duncan McDonnell, reporting in Hawkesbury in 1827, also decried the absence of roads and blamed absentee ownership for this state of affairs.³⁸ The only road besides the "tolerable good" road along the waterfront in East Hawkesbury was one along the La Grasse River in the southeast corner which led to Lower Canada.³⁹ McDonnell also commented on the need of a canal to bypass the Long Sault Rapids.⁴⁰

No fewer than thirty requests for roads to be constructed were heard at the Court of General Quarter Sessions between 1816 and 1841.⁴¹ These have been identified on Figure 6.6. The road running east from Concession V in West Hawkesbury along the boundary line with Locheil Township, formerly Lancaster, is suggestive since the exact route it took to reach the La Grasse River is not known. Another questionable route is that along the La Grasse River itself. There is no indication in the literature as to which side of the river the road followed. The exact course of the Ottawa River road is also not known and is drawn in as the most probable.

One can readily conclude that the road network in Hawkesbury Townships was grossly inadequate through the entire study period. Whether or not it had an impact on the settlement pattern will be examined in Chapter 7. Certainly, the earliest locations were those along the Ottawa River according to the earliest surviving map by Patrick McNiff.⁴² Inspection of Figure 6.6 leads to the suggestion that settlement started

2

Sources: F.A.C., R.G.22, Series 7, Vol. 158.
F.A.C., R.G.5, A1, Vol. 9.

FIGURE 6.6

much earlier in West Hawkesbury than the township to the east due to the lack of indication of any roads before the 1830's. It is also noteworthy to point out the importance of the north-south road running down the centre of West Hawkesbury in that all the roads in East Hawkesbury link to it. There may have been the attraction of the small village of Vankleek Hill which began on Lots 9 and 10 on Concession V in the early days of settlement. The north-south road is then linked to the Village of Hawkesbury on the Ottawa River.

6.7 The Reserved Lands

One of the principal controversies of Upper Canada's Government Land Policies involved the existence, usage and disposal of the Crown and Clergy Reserves. Designed to provide an ongoing income for the Crown and Clergy through leasing them, a sales policy was later introduced. Leasing was unsatisfactory as the authorities were unable to enforce the payment of rents. In addition some persons authorized to be collectors proved incompetent.⁴³ Perhaps the best known example of ineptness was the performance of Sheriff Hands of the Western District who, during the eight years between 1803 and 1811, failed to make a single collection.⁴⁴

Many Reserves lay idle and were consequently condemned as contributing to a more dispersed settlement and to discontinuous road building and maintenance. Settlement duties were not being carried out on empty lots and if Reserves were clumped together such a dispersion in settlement would be inevitable. These factors will be applied to the situation in Hawkesbury to determine whether or not the Reserves lay idle and hence delayed effective settlement.

Figure 6.7 indicates the distributional pattern of the Crown and Clergy Reserves; there were no Indian lands set apart in the study townships. The pattern is irregular in that the front two concessions are free of these lands except Lot 3, Concession II in West Hawkesbury. None-the-less the distribution can be described as a modified "chequered" plan. There were a total of 105 Reserves, 50 Crown and 55 Clergy in the two townships and gore. The Crown was not shortchanged but rather Lots 31 to 33 on Concession VI in East Hawkesbury were taken over by Lochiel Township during a boundary change;⁴⁵ this was probably in 1800 when Prescott County was set apart from Glengarry County. West Hawkesbury

Source: N.A.C., E.C., Vol. 25, mic. Reel 10

held 24 Crown lots and 13 for the Clergy while in East Hawkesbury 23 lots were reserved for the Crown and 39 for the Clergy. The Gore held 3 of each purpose.

Beginning in 1808 two lots were leased in West Hawkesbury for the usual three, seven year periods. In 1810, one lot, number 37 on Concession VI in the eastern township was leased for the same time period. All three lots were relatively close to one another and located on Matilda loam soils. One lot, number 10 on Concession V later became part of the Village of Vankleek Hill. These were excellent locations for farming purposes.

When in 1824 the Canada Company took over the selling of the Reserves when the Government policy was changed to a sales policy⁴⁶ only five 200 acre lots and four 100 acre lots in West Hawkesbury were turned over to the Company. All others were sold or leased.⁴⁷ In East Hawkesbury, 36 full lots and four half lots were turned over to the Canada Company (Figure 6.8). This means that 82 percent of the Reserves in the western township were leased or sold while 39 percent of the eastern part of the study area had been utilized by the Crown or the Church of England. Only one lot in the Gore was leased. Invariably all the lots which were leased or sold were either on loam soils and upland sandy soils or on the edges of loam-clay or sand-clay sites.

Figure 6.9 shows graphically the disposal of the Reserves in the study area as far as patenting of the lots was concerned. Hawkesbury West, which was smaller and therefore had fewer Reserved lots, was a little more than 71 percent completely "relieved" of these contentious lots by the end of the study period. East Hawkesbury with its heavy clay soils had only 43.7 percent of its lots patented. In the Gore, 3 lots were disposed of in 1846 but it took until 1913 for the remaining three to be patented.

It is interesting to note in West Hawkesbury that no lots were patented between 1828 and 1838 and in East Hawkesbury between 1829 and 1838. These were periods of depression and political unrest and conceivably settlers were unable to afford the cost of patenting their lands.

Using the Assessment and/or Census Rolls⁴⁸ of the study area it is possible to demonstrate the rate of occupancy of the Reserves held by the Canada Company over the study period and is perhaps more meaningful to the settlement process. Compare Figure 6.8 with Figures 7.8 to 7.13.

Source: F.A.O., R.G. 1, A-1V, Vol. 32, Mic. Reel 11

Assessment and Census data on the study area have survived only since 1822. Those pertaining to Hawkesbury record names of assessed persons, location, amount of land cultivated and uncultivated, type of house and an inventory of cattle, mills, waggons, carriages and distilleries. They are incomplete; persons "absent" or "away" or "gone" are not assessed and there are many discrepancies when crossed referenced with the A.I.D. and I.L.P.

In 1822, in West Hawkesbury, 57 percent of the Reserves were occupied, none in either East Hawkesbury or the Gore. By 1824, 65 percent of the Reserved lands in the western area had settlers on them but no assessments were recorded in the other two areas. In 1832, 86 percent of Reserves were occupied in West Hawkesbury, 55 percent in East Hawkesbury and 1 lot (17 percent) in the Gore. By 1836, although the western township was unchanged the eastern side had a 60 percent occupancy rate and the Gore 50 percent. The occupancy rate did not alter by the 1843 Assessment of West Hawkesbury; the Gore lost one tenant but East Hawkesbury had only a 45 percent occupancy rate. It is difficult to account for the drop since by the last year of the study the rate was up to 58 percent. Perhaps error in the Assessment and failure may both be responsible. West Hawkesbury showed an 89 percent occupancy on the last Assessment while the Gore had one third of its six lots occupied. The Crown and Clergy Reserves in the study area were not a detriment to the settlement process. It would appear however that environmental conditions played a strong role in the selection process. Until the latter part of the study period the occupied Reserves were located on the loams or lighter sandy soils and only when choice was limited were a few taken up on the clay soils. This may well account for the drop in occupancy in East Hawkesbury in 1843. The western township had a much higher occupancy rate on its more favorable soil sites.

There were only a few areas in the study townships where the Reserves were contiguous (Figure 6.7), and those in East Hawkesbury were not well taken up due to unfavourable locations. Nor can the lack of road building be attributed to the Reserve policy; that situation has already been examined and the absence of roads was found to be a chronic weakness of the study townships from the outset of settlement.

6.8 Summary

This diverse chapter has reviewed the changing civil divisions and boundaries of the study area over time and has identified the duties and usefulness of the District Court of Quarter Sessions to the administration of the townships. Following this there was an examination of the five known surveys of East and West Hawkesbury, or parts of the townships. These surveys provided an adequate base of information on which to identify the original vegetation and drainage patterns in order to suggest where the most favourable sites for agricultural settlement might be. The physiography of the study area was reviewed and a map and transparency overlay was produced, to be used in conjunction with a base map of the area. These maps facilitated a more detailed examination as to the location of the three main soil groups of East and West Hawkesbury.

The incipient road network was examined and the problems of its inadequacies were identified. A map is included describing the locations and time scale of roads approved for construction by the Court of General Quarter Sessions which met in nearby L'Orignal. Finally the distribution and disposal over time of the Reserved Lands was discussed in relation to the study area and their original purpose.

Endnotes To Chapter Six

¹ Spragge, George W., "The Districts of Upper Canada 1788-1849", Profiles On A Province, Ontario Historical Society, Vol. 39, 1967, p. 36.

² Ibid., pp. 36-37.

³ Clarke, John, "Land and Law in Essex County, Malden Township and the Abstract Index to Deeds", Histoire Sociale - Social History, Vol. 11, 1978, pp. 475-77.

⁴ P.A.O., Explanatory notes on the use of the L.R.I., courtesy of Mr. John Mezaks, Archivist, P.A.O., Toronto, Ontario.

⁵ P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-IV, Vol. 25, mic. Schedules of the Crown and Clergy Reserves under the Assessment Act of 1820, Reel No. 10.

⁶ P.A.O., Map Division, Map of No. 1 and No. 2 Townships, South Side of the Ottawa River, Patrick McNiff, C-18, No. 9, 1795.

⁷ Spragge, George W., op. cit., p. 38.

⁸ Armstrong, F.H., Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology and Terretorial Legislation, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1967, p. 139.

⁹ Weaver, Emily P., The Story Of The Counties of Ontario, Bell and Cockburn, Toronto, Ontario, 1913, p. 5.

also

Armstrong, F.H., op. cit., p. 116.

¹⁰ Spragge, G.W., op. cit., p. 40.

¹¹ Weaver, S.P., op. cit., p. 120.

¹² Spragge, G.W., op. cit., p. 42.

- ¹³ Armstrong, F.H., op. cit., p. 183.
- ¹⁴ Stuart, E. Rae, "Jessup's Rangers As A Factor In Loyalist Settlement", in Three History Theses, The Ontario Department of Public Records and Archives, Toronto, Ontario, 1961, pp. 68-69.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 68-69.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 68-69.
- ¹⁷ P.A.O., McNiff, P., op. cit., map C-18, No. 9.
- ¹⁸ Ministry of Natural Resources, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario, Map of East and West Divisions of Hawkesbury Township, William Fortune, Deputy Provincial-Surveyor, 1797.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ P.A.O., Survey Diary, William Fortune, Book No. 349, 1797.
- ²¹ P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-I, William Fortune to Acting-Surveyor-General D.W. Smith, 23 February 1797, Reports of the Surveyor-Generals Office, 1795-99, Vol. 1, pp. 461-468.
- ²² Ministry of Natural Resources, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario, Map of East and West Hawkesbury Townships, William Fortune, Deputy Provincial Surveyor, Undated, assumed 1798.
- ²³ Ibid., pp. 99-101.
- ²⁴ Ibid., pp. 99-101.
- ²⁵ Ibid., A-II-I, Vol. 1, pp. 99-101.
- ²⁶ P.A.O., Survey Reports of William and Joseph Fortune, 18 Mar. - 29 Oct., 1798, R.G. 1, Series CB-1, Box 14, Appendix E.

27 Ibid.

28 Walker, Harry and Olive, Carleton Saga, The Runge Press Limited, Ottawa, Ontario, 1968, p. 36.

29 Thomas, Cyrus, History of Argenteuil, Quebec and Prescott, Ontario, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, Quebec, 1896, p. 76.

30 Walker, H., op. cit., p. 36.

31 P.A.O., Survey of Hawkesbury Gore, Joseph Fortune, 1816, mic.

32 P.A.O., Survey of Duncan McDonell, parts of East and West Hawkesbury, 1833, mic. The map was unavailable, being enroute between the P.A.O. and the Ministry of Natural Resources.

33 Ministry of Natural Resources, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario, Field notebook of East and West Hawkesbury, Duncan McDonell, No. 494, 1833.

34 Gourlay, Robert, Statistical Account of Upper Canada, abridged edition by S.R. Mealing, The Carleton Library, No. 75, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, p. 282.

35 Ibid., p. 283.

36 Ibid., p. 120.

37 Bigsby, John J., op. cit., p. 74.

38 McDonell, Duncan, "Ottawa District Report", in Andrew Picken, The Canadas: Emigrants, Colonists and Capitalists, Effingham Wilson, London, England, 1832, p. 132.

39 Ibid., p. 131.

40 Ibid., p. 131.

⁴¹P.A.O., R.G. 22, Series 7, Vol. 158, 1816-1841. Road Reports of Court of General Quarter Session.

⁴²P.A.O., McNiff, P., op. cit.

⁴³Clarke, John, "Documentary and Map Sources for Reconstructing The History of the Reserved Lands in the Western District of Upper Canada", The Canadian Cartographer, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1971, p. 78.

⁴⁴Wilson, G. Alan, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada, A Canadian Mortmain, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968, p. 41.

⁴⁵L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., Hawkesbury East.

⁴⁶Clarke, John, op. cit., p. 76.

⁴⁷P.A.O., R.G. 1, Series A-IV, Vols. 26, 32, 35, 42, 47, 54, Mic. Reels 10, 11, 12.

⁴⁸P.A.O., R.G. 21, M.S. 116, mic. Assessment Rolls for 1822-24, 1832, 1834, 1836, 1840, 1843, 1846.

Chapter Seven

The Acquisition Of Land In East And West Hawkesbury

7.1 Introduction and Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the acquisition of land over time in ~~the~~ two townships, to demonstrate the pattern of settlement and to analyze the roles of accessibility and of the physical environment in these processes. The issue of absentee ownership of land will also be identified and interpreted in terms of the economic and social obstructions that it caused. As noted in Chapter Six, the A.I.D. in Hawkesbury was subject to a number of shortcomings and this has limited the scope of explanation of settlement. None-the-less enough material has survived to present a meaningful reconstruction of the settlement pattern of this area in the first half of the nineteenth century.

7.2 Methodology and Data Sources

There will be a cross-sectional examination of the study area in three selected time periods in the analysis. They are: the period from the arrival of the first settlers until 1811, a period lasting from 1812 to 1821 and a third period of twenty-five years duration ending in 1846.

The chapter relies on a number of primary resource materials as mentioned in previous chapters, especially the A.I.D., I.L.P., L.R.I., Upper Canada Sundries, records of the Crown Lands Department, and

Assessment Rolls. In addition the returns of the population published in the Appendices to the Journals of the House of Assembly of Upper Canada (J.H.A./U.C.)² are also used along with two notable local histories³ and other personal files which were relevant to this area. The data are used separately and in conjunction with one another.

A series of eleven maps has been produced. The first two maps reflect the patenting and/or alienation of land up to 1821 while the remaining nine reflect the settlement pattern from 1822 to 1846 as suggested by the use of nine Assessment Rolls. No Assessment Rolls for the Hawkesbury townships have survived prior to 1822 and a void also occurs from 1825 to 1831 inclusively. The selection of these nine Assessment Rolls is therefore as balanced as is possible given the available data.

A chi square analysis, a statistical test of association, will be carried out to determine whether there was any significant differences in accessibility between owner occupied and non-owner occupied lots.

Finally two graphs are presented which represent the population of the Townships between 1824 and 1846 (earliest available) and the total land that was alienated, either cultivated and uncultivated in periods beginning in 1815 to 1846.

7.3 The Pioneer Period 1797-1811

On a tombstone in Greenwood Cemetery, Vankleek Hill is the following inscription:

"Sacred to the memory of Simeon Vancleeck who died Nov. 15th, 1827, aged 82 years. He was a United English Loyalist and was first founder of Vankleek Hill, 1786".⁴

This myth has persisted until recent months when a researcher of Vankleek Hill uncovered the deception.⁵ Local historians such as Brault⁶ and Thomas⁷ have faithfully honoured this "mistruth" innocently begun by Vankleek's grandson, Barnabas, presumably by remembered tales of the American Revolution.⁸ The truth of the matter is that Vankleek, (the spelling has changed over time as well), was actually a late Loyalist to Upper Canada.⁹ He had settled first in Nova Scotia in 1783, then moved on two years later to Missisquoi Bay, at the head of Lake Champlain in Quebec. It was here, in 1796, that he began to petition for land

for both himself and his son, also named Simeon. His claim was for losses of his New York real estate when he elected to side with the Crown, for his work as a surveyor and as a Loyalist. He petitioned for 1200 acres for himself and a further 1200 acres for his son. The choice of location was to be Chatham, in Argenteuil County.¹⁰ He claimed also to have resided in the lower province ten years. Although it was recommended that the petitioners receive 1000 acres each in Chatham they did not do so.¹¹ A second petition for land near Pike River, Mississquoi County, was also unsuccessful. The Vankleeks, the son was now married, with a family, moved to Hawkesbury around 1800 and settled on Lot 9, Concession VI. Petitioning for a third time on 19 June 1801,¹² Vankleek strayed from the truth and claimed residence in Upper Canada prior to 1798 in order to qualify for a free grant.¹³ The petition was signed by both William and Joseph Fortune. Although the petition took seven years to process, the Vankleeks were each awarded 200 acres. Simeon Junior's was on Lot 7, Concession VI;¹⁴ however, the elder Vankleek was found to be on someone else's land and his lot was number 7, Concession IV.¹⁵ One might therefore classify Vankleek as a squatter. In 1808 he purchased his desired lot from owner Alex Chisholm of Montreal for sixty pounds.¹⁶ MacKinnon suggests that Vankleek's grandson, Barnabas, inadvertently came to believe that his grandfather had actually settled in Hawkesbury in 1786. Barnabas was at least 27 when the tribute was engraved on the tombstone in 1827, his own father having moved to Point Fortune in 1822.¹⁷

Brault and Thomas also refer to a second settler, a Colonel Solomon Cole of Vermont, who supposedly arrived in 1790 and who remained on either Lot 2 or 11 on Concession I of East Hawkesbury until 1805.¹⁸ No sources are provided for the reader and none of the usual records show any such person on either lot. This is equally strange since a ranking officer would have claimed a large grant. A "Solmon" Cole (the spelling used in A.I.D.) did purchase a 100 acre lot, number 12, Concession I in 1847. Whether or not this family had squatted in the area in the intervening years or whether the earlier dates were an error remains unexplained.

However it was probably William Fortune, the surveyor, who was the initial settler.¹⁹ He was awarded 1000 acres on the Ottawa River on the twenty-third of July 1788 by Lord Dorchester.²⁰ The place name,

Point Fortune, appears on Fortune's survey map of 1797-98, at the foot of the Long Sault Rapids where the Fortune family lived. The surveyor attributes this toponymic tribute to Deputy-Surveyor General John Collins' desire to express "good wishes" for services rendered.²¹

Others who received grants in these new townships in 1788 were: the Honourable William Dummer Powell; the widow of Daniel Claus; the heirs of Sir Guy Johnson; and Captain Thomas D'Arcy.²² It is unfortunate that a map drawn by McNiff in 1786²³ is unavailable to the researcher. Such a map is listed at the Archives in Toronto but could not be located in the map department nor at the nearby Ministry of Natural Resources.

The exact date of arrival of the first group of settlers is uncertain but was certainly before the 23rd of February 1797, on which date William Fortune submitted a report on the progress of settlement.²⁴ The locations of these settlers are clearly written on Patrick McNiff's survey map of 1795.²⁵ Of the 52 individuals assigned to lots thereon, 15 did not take out patents.²⁶ Of the 30 assignees Fortune reported on, he noted 22 did not reside in either township. Most of the absentee grantees lived in Montreal according to Fortune. One, a James Duncanson, was reported to be a ship's carpenter residing in Halifax.²⁷ His widow sold this holding in 1808.²⁸

Figure 7.1 summarizes the pattern of land alienation to 1821. The Crown and Clergy Reserves are indicated along with the Claus Family's 6200 acres in East Hawkesbury. William Claus did not patent his land until 1826 and his mother's holdings were never patented by a Claus; they were all assigned before 1811. Evidence is found in a letter of Captain Thomas D'Arcy to the Surveyor-General's Office requesting locations for the remainder of his grants in the rear of those already assigned in East Hawkesbury. These had already been awarded to the Claus family and D'Arcy was referred to vacancies in Gloucester Township. The letter was dated 13 June 1811.²⁹

A visual inspection of Figure 7.1 indicates that very little land remained to be alienated in 1811 due, mainly, to absenteeism. One must keep in mind that the Gore was not surveyed until 1816. Figure 7.2 describes the pattern of lots held by large landowners with acreage, exceeding 500 acres plus the many assumed absentee owners with holdings less than 500 acres by 1821. It is again apparent that when the Reserves

Sources: A.I.D., I.L.P., P.A.C., McNiff Map No. C-18

FIGURE 1.1

Source: I.L.P.

FIGURE 7.1

are added, consisting of 105 lots, very little vacant land remained for general settlement.

An absentee owner was subjectively identified by using a combination of independent source materials, notably, the A.I.D., the I.L.P., and the Assessment Rolls. Any grantee whose holding; (a) showed no activity through the study period, (b) had been forfeited for tax evasion after 1828 and subsequently sold, or (c) the grantee could be identified as a Loyalist, or a daughter or son of a Loyalist with known holdings in the St. Lawrence Townships, was deemed an absentee owner. The source for the Loyalists' St. Lawrence holdings was Pringle's work on the Old Eastern District.³⁰ The L.R.I., and the Upper Canada Land Books³¹ were the sources for the identification of many Loyalists and their dependents. Another clue to absentee ownership was the high frequency of Quit Claims on suspect lots by heirs after the study period. A Quit Claim is a legal instrument whereby one party gives up all claims to the land.³² There were 19 two hundred acre holdings, 3800 acres, on which a decision was required. The author examined 47 memorials and deeds on these lots as indicated in the A.I.D., to further prove absenteeism. While errors might have occurred in any one instance for a particular unknown reason, it was reassuring that none of those identified as absentee owners found their way onto the Assessment Rolls used during the study period.

Although Figures 7.1 and 7.2 indicate a fairly evenly spread pattern of land acquisition, it is assumed, due to the high rate of absenteeism and the absence of other roads, only the front two concessions and the centre strip of West Hawkesbury actually held genuine settlers. Yet, 36.5 percent of East Hawkesbury had been alienated and/or patented while 51 percent of West Hawkesbury was patented. Therefore, at this point in time, there was no direct relationship between the amount of land alienated and actual settlement.

Transfer of land titles began almost at once especially among the large landowners. The Honourable William Dummer Powell sold his lands (1,000 acres) to John Forsyth and John Richardson in 1804. Richardson sold out to Forsyth in 1829 and this well known merchant held the lands until after the study period.³³ According to the A.I.D., William and Joseph Fortune and five others sold all or parts of their lands by 1811. Transfers did occur between families but this did not necessarily mean

movement off the land, rather, it might be explained by subdivision.

Petitions to the Heirs and Devisees Commission account for a fair amount of change in this period. Eighteen lots involving eight original grantees were delivered to six new petitioners.³⁴ Actually of 66 whole (200 acre) lots and 5 half (100 acre) lots patented on the first two concessions only 27 full lots and 4 half lots remained in original hands by 1846. Of these only four farming families can be identified. The remainder of the lots belonged to speculators such as John Forsyth, John Grant (Lachine), the Wraggs, the Platts and a small absentee owner.

In West Hawkesbury, the turnover in land titles in this period was astonishing. On the first concession only 3 Broken Fronts of lots were retained by the original patentee, John Grant (Daldreggan) of Longueuil. On the second concession the same 14 full lots were patented as on the first plus 2 partly claimed lots. Only John Grant's half lot was held through the study period.

Although permanent settlers such as Thomas Mears, David Pattee and the Hamiltons were involved in Hawkesbury Mills by 1811, they were not original landowners. It is apparent that the major contribution to permanent settlement in the study area did not come from the initial patentees.

7.4 The Lag Period 1812-1821

The War of 1812-14 in North America had a significantly negative impact on settlement in Upper Canada. Immigration from the United States ceased. An economic depression followed. There was some immigration from the British Isles but growth was slow in Upper Canada as a whole.

Further inspection of Figure 7.1 shows that the Gore of East Hawkesbury was being patented at this point, but in fact by only three people. These were William Hamilton of the Mills, John Macdonell who became an important figure in the townships and C.A. Hagerman, land speculator and one of the so called "pillars of the Family Compact".³⁵ In the rest of the townships only a few scattered lots were patented, mainly by persons already involved in Hawkesbury. One significant block was alienated in West Hawkesbury; that being 1000 acres on Concession III by

the heirs of Major John Lake of New York. This grant had actually been recommended in 1788³⁶ and Sir John Johnson had the power of attorney for the family.³⁷

Some of the Crown Reserves were acquired in 1816 by passengers crossing the Atlantic on two emigrant ships, the "Baltic Merchant" and the "Elize".³⁸ Besides the 13 emigrants from the ships, three disbanded military personnel were all assigned 100 acre lots.³⁹ Of the three directed to lots in Hawkesbury East only one patented his lot 24 years later.⁴⁰ Twelve of the thirteen ships' passengers remained in West Hawkesbury and all patented their lots eight years later.⁴¹ Two changed their locations from Concession III to Reserves on Concession VII. No doubt this was to be near the ten others located on Concession VII and VIII. Only one stayed on Concession III. His lot, number 8 was within one lot of the new north-south road built in the same year. This may well have been a factor in his decision to stay on the assigned lot. The thirteenth passenger cannot be traced.

Three families who became well known and well respected in the history of the townships settled in Hawkesbury in 1819. These were four Higginson brothers from Ireland,⁴² Charles Hersey from Massachusetts,⁴³ and Hugh Lough also from Ireland.⁴⁴ The latter two gentlemen were to become land bankers and mortgagers in the townships and will be discussed further along in this chapter.

Although settlement was minimal in this period, the Hamiltons, Mears, Pattee and a John Shuter were busy buying and selling lots on the front concession of West Hawkesbury, between lots 8 to 10 especially. These lots were destined to be the Village of Hawkesbury.⁴⁵

The oldest standing house in the townships was built in 1817 by John Macdonell in Point Fortune.⁴⁶ This massive stone mansion was built with profits of the fur trade, its owner being one of the partners in the North West Company. Declared a heritage home by the Government of Ontario it was saved from demolition in the 1960's when the new Carillon Dam was constructed a few hundred feet away.⁴⁷ The land on which the house stands was originally owned by William Fortune, the surveyor, and purchased by Macdonell in 1813.⁴⁸

While the population remained small, it was the initial period of permanent settlement. Highlights of the 1815 Assessment have been

Source: P.A.O., R.G.21, m.s.116, m.c.

FIGURE 7.2

Source: P.A.C., R.G.21, m.s.116, mic.

FIGURE 1.4

Source: P.A.O., R.G.21, m.s.116, m1c.

FIGURE 7.5

recorded by Pringle.⁴⁹ Only 54 settlers were assessed, (no names or locations given), on 10,199 acres of land of which 885 acres were cleared. Therefore, the average holding was 205 acres of which 16.3 acres was in use. However, there were only 19 houses, 7 of squared timber while 12 were 2 storied frame buildings. One must assume the remaining settlers were housed in the small wooden shanties common to earliest settlers. These, apparently, were not classified as houses; therefore they were not assessed for tax purposes. This bare report reflects the immaturity of settlement at this period although settlers had been in the townships since 1796. Only 3.7 percent of the total lots were patented in this decade in West Hawkesbury and 3 percent in East Hawkesbury, bringing the total lands patented to 54.9 percent in the western township and 39.6 percent on the eastern side of Hawkesbury and its gore.

7.5 Settlement in Earnest 1822-1846

Adequate data have survived between 1822 and 1846 from which a realistic interpretation of the settlement process can be reconstructed. A comparison of Figures 7.3 to 7.5 and Figure 6.6 indicates very clearly that, in the 1820's, settlement was tied strictly to the two existing roads in the townships: the east-west road parallelling the Ottawa River and the north-south road running between lots 9 and 10 in West Hawkesbury. This latter road also linked the St. Lawrence townships of Glengarry County with the county seat of the new Ottawa District, L'Orignal, situated immediately west of Hawkesbury in Longueuil Township. It would be needed in case of further hostilities with the United States.

Chi square analysis (Appendix 1) was used to test for significant differences in accessibility between owner occupied and non-owner occupied lots. Ownership and non-ownership was determined by examination of both the A.I.D., and the Assessment Roll for 1824. It should be noted that in the case of East Hawkesbury those lots in the Gore and in Eastern Division on Concessions II and III assessed as owner occupied belong to John Macdonell, the Cass and the Barron Families and are in addition to their holdings on Concession I. This actually gives a false impression for it is doubtful that any use was made of these lots at this early date.

The calculated value of chi square was 0.161; 6.635 is required for significance at the 0.01 level with one choice of freedom.⁵⁰ The

Townships of East and West Hawkesbury

111

Population 1824-1846

Figure 7.6

Townships Of East and West Hawkesbury
Total Land Alienated-Cultivated-Uncultivated

112

Sources

P.A.C., Appendices of the journals of the Legislative Assembly 1824-1846
P.A.O., R.G. 21, M.S. 116, Assessment Rolls, East and West Hawkesbury 1822-24
Pringle, J.F. Lunenburg or the Old Eastern District, for 1815.

Figure 7.7

null hypothesis was accepted; the statistical results suggesting that in East Hawkesbury in 1824 there was no relationship between tenure and accessibility as might have been expected. A second analysis of West Hawkesbury led to the same conclusion since the calculated chi square value was 3.554.

The lots were then examined for location on till and sand plains or on the clay soils. In East Hawkesbury 87.5 percent of the lots were located on the lighter soils of the till and sand plains. In the Gore the results show an even usage while, in West Hawkesbury only 10 percent of occupied lots were located on the heavy clay soils.

Settlement was not only related to accessibility and the physical environment, which in themselves were interrelated, but obviously was affected by population changes in the townships. Figure 7.6 indicates that there was an increase in population of 34 percent between 1824 and 1830. In absolute terms it represents only an increase in 480 persons. The graph presented in Figure 7.7 indicates a corresponding increase in land alienation although the area being cultivated rose very slowly.

Under the land policies of the Upper Canadian Government of Lieutenant-Governor Maitland, uncleared land became taxable and subject to forfeiture after eight years of arrears in payment. In 1828 a Commissioner of Crown Lands was appointed in the province to replace the Land Board. His duty was to select lands to be offered yearly for public auction and to provide details on price, place and date of sales.⁵¹ How selections were made is not clear and a study of Table 7.1 demonstrates that many of the large absentee owners such as John Forsyth, John Grant (Daldreggan), John Platt, John Wragg and some of the ubiquitous Macdonell family were not inconvenienced in this manner.

The Appendix to the J.H.A./UC for the years 1831-32 shows that 9,113 acres of land in the study township were forfeited for tax arrears in 1828.⁵² These lands involved 55 lots or parts thereof. Most of these were lots of absentee owners. Other non-resident owners such as Charlotte De Lotbinière and a few Macdonells divested themselves of some of their holdings as well as forfeiting others.

The demise of the NorthWest Company at this point in time may have been another factor in speculators selling off their lands. Table 7.1 indicates that Daniel Sutherland, William and Phillip Byrne and

Table 7.1

Townships of East and West Hawkesbury
Assessed Settlers and Absentee Owners >400 acres

1797-1800

<u>Assessed Settler or Absentee Owner</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Catherine Claus	4200
Captain Thomas D'Arcy	800
Joseph and William Fortune	1000
Sir John Johnson	400
Captain David McFall	800
Honourable William D. Powell	1000

1801-1805

Phillip and William Byrne	3500
Amanda Cass et al.	800
Catherine Claus	4200
Alexander Chisholm	2000
Captain Thomas D'Arcy	700
John Forsyth and John Richardson	1000
Thomas Forsyth	800
Joseph and William Fortune	3200
John Grant	1350
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Charlotte (Munro) de Lotbinière	1200
Alexander Macdonell	1050
Angus Macdonell	1000
Ann Macdonell	1850
Archibald Macdonell	1930
Marjery Macdonell et al.	1310
Elizabeth Phillips	900
John Platt (land entailed)	400
John Wragg	800

1806-1810

Cyrus Anderson	600
Joseph and Rachel Barron	800
Phillip and William Byrne	3500
Amanda Cass et al.	800
Alexander Chisholm	1200
Catherine Claus	4000
Honourable William Claus	2200
John Forsyth and John Richardson	1000
Thomas Forsyth	800
John Grant	1350
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Charlotte de Lotbinière	1200
Alexander Macdonell	1050

1806-1810 (continued)Acreage

Angus Macdonell	1000
Ann Macdonell	1850
Archibald Macdonell	1930
Marjery Macdonell et al.	1310
Elizabeth Phillips	700
John Platt	400
John Wragg	800

1811-1815

Cyrus Anderson	
Joseph and Rachel Barron	800
Phillip and William Byrne	3500
Alexander Chisholm	800
Amanda Cass et al.	700
Catherine Claus	4000
Honourable William Claus	2200
John Forsyth and John Richardson	1000
Thomas Forsyth	800
John Grant	1350
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Charlotte de Lotbinière	1200
Thomas Mears and David Pattee	1000
Alexander Macdonell	1250
Angus Macdonell	1000
Ann Macdonell	1850
Archibald Macdonell	1930
John Macdonell	800
Marjery Macdonell et al.	1510
John Platt	400
Daniel Sutherland	425
John Wragg et al.	800

1816-1820

Joseph and Rachel Barron	800
Phillip and William Byrne	3500
Amanda Cass et al.	700
Alexander Chisholm	800
Catherine Claus	4000
Honourable William Claus	2200
John Forsyth and John Richardson	2200
John Grant	1350
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Honourable Christopher A. Hagerman	864
William Hamilton	
Alexander Macdonell	650
Angus Macdonell	1000

1816-1820 (continued)Acreage

Ann Macdonell	1850
Archibald Macdonell	1930
John Macdonell	1412
Marjery Macdonell et al.	1310
Thomas Markland	600
Thomas Mears and David Pattee	1000
Charlotte de Lotbinière	1200
Elizabeth Phillips	954
John Platt and George Platt	800
Daniel Sutherland	425
John Wragg et al.	800

1821-1825

Joseph and Rachel Barron	950*
Peter Beers	600*
Elijah Brown	500*
William and Phillip Byrne	3500
Amanda Cass et al.	700*
Catherine Claus	4000
Honourable William Claus	2200
John Duff	1000*
John Forsyth and John Richardson	2200
John Grant	1350
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
C.A. Hagerman	664
Wm. Hamilton	
Charlotte de Lotbinière	800
Alexander Macdonell	650
Angus Macdonell	1000
Ann Macdonell	1850
Archibald Macdonell	1930
John Macdonell	1412*
Marjery Macdonell et al.	1310
Thomas Markland	600
Thomas Mears	1500*
David Pattee	1000*
Elizabeth Phillips	954
John Platt et al.	800
Robert Thistlewaite	550*
Daniel Sutherland	800
Benjamin Whitney	664
John Wragg et al.	800

1826-1830

Joseph and Rachel Barron	600
Amanda Cass et al.	500
Catherine Claus	4000

1826-1830 (continued)

	<u>Acreage</u>
Honourable William Claus	2100
John Forsyth	2200
Josaiah Gibb	3200
John Grant	1350
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Alexander Macdonell	650
Angus Macdonell	1000
Archibald Macdonell	1930
Ann Macdonell	1850
John Macdonell	1412
Marjery Macdonell et al.	1310
Thomas Markland	600
Hamnet Mears	1400
David Pattee	1000
John Platt et al.	800
John Shuter	854
Benjamin Whitney	664
John Wragg et al.	800

1831-35

Alonzo Bangs	580*
Joseph and Rachel Barron	550*
Catherine Claus	4000
Honourable William Claus	1900
John Forsyth	2200
Josaiah Gibb	3000
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Robert Hamilton and Charles Low	870*
Anthony Lyon	1206*
Thomas Markland	600
Hamnet Mears	1200*
David Pattee	650*
John Platt et al.	800
William Teasdale	600*
Benjamin Whitney	664
John Wragg et al.	800

1836-1840

Alonzo Bangs	580*
Joseph and Rachel Barron	490*
Baby, Dunn and Markland	4000
Honourable William Claus	1800-- less 2 small parcels
John Forsyth	2200
Josaiah Gibb	2900
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Hamilton and Low	1200*
Anthony Lyon	1000*

1836-1840 (continued)Acreage

Angus Macdonell	600
John Macdonell	1040*
Marjery Macdonell et al.	800
Thomas Markland	600
William McAlpine	1200*
Honourable Peter McGill	1100*
Rev. Frank Metcalf	600*
David Pattee	655*
John Platt et al.	800
William Smallbones	1100*
William Teasdale	600*
John Wragg et al.	800
B. Whitney	664

1841-46

Joseph and Rachel Barron	450*
Baby, Dunn and Markland	4000
Honourable William Claus	1740-- less 2 small parcels
John Forsyth	2200
Josaiiah Gibb	2900
John Grant (Daldreggan)	1200
Hamilton and Low	1421*
Charles Hersey	674*
George S. Jarvis	491
Hugh Lough	500*
John Macdonell	800*
Marjery Macdonell et al.	800
Thomas Markland	600
Honourable Peter McGill	1005*
David Pattee	665*
John Platt et al.	800
John Scott	600*
John Waddell	860*
John Wragg et al.	800
Benjamin Whitney	664

Sources: A.I.D., *Assessment Rolls P.A.O., R.G. 21, MS 116

Elizabeth Phillips' lands changed hands. The first named was a partner in the North West Company while the Byrnes and Phillips were merchants. The withdrawal of these people presumably indicated that they no longer considered the area as financially rewarding. (See Chapter 8 on speculators).

Duncan McDonell, a deputy-surveyor, reported on conditions in the townships in 1827.⁵³ The lack of roads was a severe constraint on all prospective settlers trying to locate Crown lands in the interior of the townships. Furthermore, many of the concession markers or monuments had been either removed by the lumberers or had decayed over the 20 years since the survey. (McDonell was to re-survey parts of the study area in 1833.) It was noted that the Crown Reserves were being taken up by emigrants from Scotland. McDonell claimed that the lots which were rejected were mainly swampy and belonged to the Canada Company. These the French Canadians were accepting finding "...certain kinds of swamp best for tillage".⁵⁴ Land could be purchased on the installment plan: prices ranged from 15 to 20 shillings per acre to 22 to 25 shillings per acre depending on the location. "Souls in distress" were being forced to sell for as low as 5 to 7 shillings per acre, that is for what they could obtain rather than the true value of the land.⁵⁵ McDonell reports that money was not as plentiful in the late 1820's as it had been post-war.⁵⁶

The decade 1830 to 1839 is represented by the Assessment of 1834 (Figure 7.9). Again comparison of the road network (Figure 6.6) with this map testifies to the importance of transportation routes, although perhaps not as strongly as in 1824. Another observable change is the increasing number of owner occupied lots to non-owner occupied lots in West Hawkesbury. The actual observations are 71 to 45. The reverse situation occurs in East Hawkesbury whose interior was receiving its first settlers in 1832. There, non-owner assessed lots numbered 73 while 42 were owner occupied. Patent lag⁵⁷ may also be responsible for the higher rate of non-owners in East Hawkesbury, as well as the occurrence of non-owner assessed lots in the western township.

An interesting situation is demonstrated on the first two concessions of East Hawkesbury. Here, four people were assessed for lands owned by absentee owners⁵⁸ and yet there is no indication of any transfer of title nor leasing on the A.I.D. These are all for large acreages.

Source: P.A.C., R.G.21, m.s.116, mic.

Figure 7.8

Source: P.A.O., R.G.21, m.s.116, mic.

Figure 7.9

Source: P.A.C., R.G. 21, m.s.116, mic.

Figure 7.10

For example; Anthony Lyon on Platt land, William Teasdale on Josiah Gibb's land, William Smallbones on Wragg and Platt land, and the Reverend F. Metcalf on John Forsyth's property.⁵⁹ Table 7.3 indicates that these were only a temporary event over two time periods. There is no obvious solution to this puzzle however sharecropping is a possibility. It did not require an official lease and was known in the Western District.

Only one occurrence of this situation was identified in West Hawkesbury which was also recorded in the A.I.D. A William McAlpine secured Thomas Mears' lands before they passed to Peter McGill.⁶⁰ The problem in this case is that McAlpine was assessed for all Mears' 1200 acres while the A.I.D., records only a few acres.⁶¹

Chi square analysis was again carried out for the Assessment of 1834 (Figure 7.9 and Appendix 1) under the same conditions as that of 1824. Again the calculated result was much lower than the expected result: owner occupied lots and those assessed to non-owners showed no significant difference in their locations to distance from the nearest road. In a township in which so much land was ill drained and good roads so few in number, presumably both owner and non-owner alike were guided by similar notions.

Analysis of location on or off the better quality till and sandy soils indicated a strong tendency for location on the higher lying soils. In East Hawkesbury 80 percent of locations were on the till and sand plains and its Gore had a 66 percent occurrence on the easier worked soils. Only 3 percent of West Hawkesbury had locations on the heavy clay areas. One must keep in mind the disproportionate relationship of clay land here than in East Hawkesbury.

There was some movement off lots located on clayey areas in the eastern township when the Assessments of 1832, 1834 and 1836 are compared.⁶² (Figures 7.8-7.10) Some 14 lots appeared to have been abandoned here on clay soils compared to four on the till-sand types. One may assume settlers had difficulties in bringing these heavy soils into production. This situation reflects Kelly's discussion on the perception of heavy wet lands in Chapter 2.

Although not as common, abandonment also took place in West Hawkesbury. Of the 7 changes between 1832 and 1837,⁶³ two belonged to the Crown and here, perhaps leases expired and were not renewed. Two

further lots belonging to absentee owners were also vacated. Thomas Mears gave up a lot for an unknown reason and it was assigned to Peter McGill by Sheriff Treadwell in 1838.⁶⁴

Although many thousands of acres were still being held by non-residents, settlement was progressing well in spite of economic depression in Upper Canada. Increasing political unrest culminated in the Upper Canada Rebellion in 1837. Two major canals, the Welland and Rideau were both completed and in use before the Grenville canal was opened in 1833.⁶⁵ The route up the Ottawa was used mainly locally. There was no further talk of canalizing the Ottawa River further upstream. The Hawkesbury Townships do not appear to have been favourably affected by the canal although transportation to the little village of Hawkesbury, or Headport⁶⁶ as it was also called, was undoubtedly improved.

Population rose by 83.5 percent in East Hawkesbury between 1832 and 1839⁶⁷ but slightly less than 16 percent in the western division.⁶⁸ (Figure 7.6) Land alienation increased accordingly in East Hawkesbury and by 1835 had surpassed West Hawkesbury (Figure 7.7). Cultivated land also increased but as might be expected West Hawkesbury was still ahead.

Emigrants from Ireland outnumbered all others by more than 4 to 1.⁶⁹ A few came from Scotland, England and Wales as well as Quebec. This was not a time of economic prosperity and mortgaging became increasingly common especially in East Hawkesbury and the Gore from this point on (see Chapter 8).

The final five years of the study period took place after the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1841. Figures 7.11 to 7.13 indicate quite clearly that most of West Hawkesbury was settled and that the lots were also nearly all owner occupied according to the Assessment of 1846.⁷⁰ Although there was some infilling of East Hawkesbury the clay soils continued to be avoided. The massive grant belonging to the Claus family accounts for many of the vacant lots on Concessions III-VI, (Figure 7.1). It will also be noted that these were almost all on clay land except lots 24-26 on Concession IV, half of which William Claus had sold off.

The data of the Assessment of 1846 was also subjected to chi square analysis (Figure 7.13 and Appendix 1). In West Hawkesbury it is observable that the non-owner occupied lots were on the perimeter of the

Source: P.A.O., R.G.21, m.s.116, mic.

Figure 7.11

Source: P.A.C., R.G.21, m.s.116, mic.

Figure 7.12

Source: P.A.C., R.G.21, m.s.116, m.c.

Figure 7.13

township for the most part. The road situation was such to again accept the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between ownership and non-ownership of occupied lots and distance to the nearest road. Although West Hawkesbury was well settled, Figure 7.11 indicates that settlement in East Hawkesbury and the Gore was still tied strongly to the road system.

The increasing movement onto clay soils is indicated by the fact that now only 68 percent of occupied lots were on the till-and-silt soils, a drop of 12 percent from 1834. But then till, sand and silt soils had a finite limit and therefore this is to be expected. The Gore was equally divided as in 1824. As expected some 91 percent of the locations in West Hawkesbury were on the higher better drained soils. The clay soils are the locations of most of the unoccupied lots; the two most conspicuous areas being the northwest corner of Concession I and the eastern half of Concession IX. Eighty-eight percent of the township had been patented which meant that only 18 lots, including Commons lots remained unpatented. However, most of these lots had settlers on them and it was the heavy clay areas, patented by non-resident owners, which were actually empty. Lots 15 and 16 on Concession IV were also patented by an absentee owner. All lots in West Hawkesbury were patented by 1875.⁷¹

In East Hawkesbury and its Gore there was much empty, unpatented land remaining in 1846 (Figure 7.13). There were 70 full lots unclaimed which later were patented by 128 persons. The holdings were much smaller after the study era than before; no doubt higher land value and economic recession were responsible. Only 67 percent of the township and Gore were patented by 1846. By and large empty lots were on clay soils or belonged to non-residents. Cartwright⁷² has shown how planned, ecclesiastically-oriented settlement from this period on in time actually settled East Hawkesbury.

According to Figure 7.6 the population of West Hawkesbury was again climbing after a reversal in 1838, which was a period of economic and political distress. Figure 7.7 indicates a levelling in land alienation although advances were being observed in acreage being cultivated.

During the last years of the study period further lands, which had been forfeited for tax arrears, were offered for sale.⁷³ Actually

the first recorded sale was in June 1839 for arrears from 1828 to 1836. Of 1137 acres offered only 2 "parts" of a 200 acre lot are recorded in the A.I.D., at this time.⁷⁴ A further 355 acres and part of another offered lot were purchased in 1842. Of the 17 lots subjected to seizures sales occurred on only 9 in East Hawkesbury and the Gore. In West Hawkesbury 7 lots containing 672 acres were listed for tax arrears. Only 4 of these holdings can be reconciled with the A.I.D., for a total of 383 acres.

In 1844, wildland seizures for tax arrears totalled 2914 acres on 20 lots.⁷⁵ Of these 11 owners paid the taxes or the claims were withdrawn (no reason given) while 3 listings cannot be reconciled. There were 6 actual sales for 850 acres.

The following year Sheriff Treadwell remarked that these wild lands were not selling well due to increasing taxes in the Ottawa District.⁷⁶ Ready money appears not to have been available at this time. There were 10 seizures in West Hawkesbury, 4 of which were paid by the owners while 890 acres were sold to new owners. In the eastern township and gore there were an initial 11 seizures; 6 were redeemed by their owners, 4 cannot be traced so that only one lot of 150 acres actually changed hands.⁷⁷

The 1846 sale was brief, for 5 lots in East Hawkesbury for 940 acres. There were no bids on 2 lots, 1 transaction does not appear on the A.I.D. Only 2 lots totalling 340 acres can be verified as having changed hands.⁷⁸

These foregoing Sheriff sales were common in Upper Canada after 1828⁷⁹ and are indicative that the Government of Upper Canada was attempting to do something concrete about the situation of undeveloped lands. The Hawkesbury records show that some people would pay their taxes before giving up their land. Finally these sales indicate that there was an element of failure which requires further study.

7.6 Conclusions

Environmental conditions played a strong role in the acquisition and settlement patterns of East and West Hawkesbury. From 1822 on it is quite evident that the heavy clay soils, principally in East Hawkesbury, were avoided. The lack of roads played an equally important role and it

has been shown that occupancy on the land was directly related to the road network. However, throughout the study period there was no significant statistical difference between owner and non-owners in their desire for accessibility. This was in turn a measure of settler perception of the quality of the environment and the lack of roads.

Permanency on the landscape did not begin with the original grantees but rather from immigration from the British Isles after the War of 1812. The population was a melange of Loyalists, Americans, Scotsmen, Englishmen, French Canadians; however; by far the greatest number of emigrants were Irishmen and their families.

Growth was relatively steady, but slow, so that by 1846 West Hawkesbury was well settled on its higher and dryer soils. East Hawkesbury and the Gore lagged behind due to continuing absentee ownership and large areas of heavy soils which were difficult to bring into production due to lack of skill.

It was perhaps the high incidence of absentee ownership which caused the greatest distress in the two townships and kept settlement, widely dispersed and progress slow in developing in terms of roads, bridges and their maintenance. There was no sense of unity in the early periods. Only when government policy led to forfeiture of lands for arrears of taxes on undeveloped lands was there any amelioration in East and West Hawkesbury.

Endnotes To Chapter 7

- ¹Brault, Lucien, Histoire des Comtés Unis de Prescott et de Russell.
Conseil des Comtés Unis, L'Orignal, Ontario, 1965.
Thomas, Cyrus, History of Argenteuil, Quebec and Prescott, Ontario,
John Lovell and Son, Montreal, Quebec, 1896.
- ²P.A.C., Appendices to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1824-
1841.
- ³Examples of Personal Files.
P.A.C., M.G. 23, H14, Vols. 4-5, Papers of the Honourable William Dummer
Powell
P.A.C., M.G. 19, F1, Vol. 20, Papers of the Honourable William Claus
P.A.C., M.G. 24, D7, the George Hamilton papers
P.A.C., M.G. 24, I50, C.P. Treadwell diaries 1829-39, letter of 1837
- ⁴Centennial Committee of St. Gregory's Parish, St-Grégoire, St. Gregory,
Vankleek Hill 1878-1978, St. Gregory's Parish, Vankleek Hill, Ontario,
1978, p. 8.
- ⁵MacKinnon, Alan D., The Study of Vankleek Hill and its Environs, Vol. 1,
Mika Publishing Co., Belleville, Ontario, 1979, p. 22.
- ⁶Brault, Lucien, op. cit., p. 269
- ⁷Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 564.
- ⁸MacKinnon, A.D., op. cit., pp. 21-22.
- ⁹Ibid., p. 27.
- ¹⁰Ibid., p. 24.
- ¹¹Ibid., p. 25.

¹²Ibid., p. 28.

¹³Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁵L.R.O/L'O, I.L.P., Hawkesbury West, Concession 4, Lot 9, 200 acres, 2 May 1808.

¹⁶L.R.O/L'O, Memorial No. 131, Deed of Bargain and Sale, Alex Chisholm to Simeon Vankleeck, Senior, 2 July 1808, 60 pounds Sterling.

¹⁷MacKinnon, A.D., op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁸Brault, Lucin, op. cit., p. 210

and

Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 499.

¹⁹Middleton, J.E., and Landon, F., The Province of Ontario, A History 1615-1927, Vol. 11, Dominion Publishing Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, 1927, p. 924.

²⁰Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 478.

²¹P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-I-1, Vol. 55, pp. 99-101.

²²P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-I-1, Vol. 2.

²³P.A.O., Map of the Townships on the Ottawa River, A-13, 1786, Patrick McNiff, Surveyor.

²⁴P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-1, Vol. 1, Reports of the Surveyor-General's Office 1795-99, pp. 461-468.

²⁵P.A.O., Map of the Townships on the Ottawa River, C-18, 1795, Patrick McNiff, Surveyor.

- 26 L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., Hawkesbury East and West cross-checked with McNiff Map of Grantees, P.A.O., Map C-18, 1795, Townships 1 and 2, South Side of the Ottawa River.
 - 27 P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-1, Vol. 1, Reports of the Surveyor-General's Office, 1795-99, p. 468.
 - 28 L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., Hawkesbury East, Book 1, Lot 34, Concession I and Broken Front.
 - 29 P.A.C., R.G. 5, A1, Upper Canada Sundries, Captain Thomas D'Arcy to Surveyor-General, Vol. 12, pp. 5473-5476.
 - 30 Pringle, J.F., Lunenburg or The Old Eastern District, Standard Printing House, Cornwall, Ontario, 1890, Appendix D, pp. 403-411.
 - 31 P.A.C., R.G. 1, Upper Canada Land Book C, mic., C-101, Petitions of United Empire Loyalists.
 - 32 Clarke, J., "Land and Law in Essex County. Malden Township and the Abstract Index to Deeds", Histoire Sociale - Social History, Vol. 11 1978, p. 480. Other usages of Quit Claims may be to clarify an earlier property description, to reduce conflict between neighbours, or to settle accounts where a mortgager has been unable to meet his obligations and foreclosure is imminent.
- and
- Widdis, Randy, "Tracing Property Ownership In Nineteenth Century Ontario: A Guide to the Archival Sources", Canadian Papers in Rural History, Langdale Press, Ganonoque, Ontario, Vol. 2, 1980, p. 83.
- 33 L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots W₁ 12, 13, 14 Concessions I and II.
 - 34 P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-5, Vol. 1. Petitions to Heirs and Devisées Commission.

- ³⁵Wallace, W. Stewart, The MacMillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 3rd Edition, MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1963, pp. 289-90.
- ³⁶P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-I-1, Vol. 2.
- ³⁷L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots 9, 11-14, Concession III.
- ³⁸P.A.O., R.G. 1, Series C-I-4, Vol. 41.
- ³⁹Ibid.
- ⁴⁰L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., East and West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lot N $\frac{1}{2}$ 31, Concession III East Hawkesbury.
- ⁴¹Ibid., West Hawkesbury Lot N $\frac{1}{2}$ 8, Concession III, Lot N $\frac{1}{2}$ 11, Concession IV, N $\frac{1}{2}$ Lots 8, 9, 17, Concession VII, N $\frac{1}{2}$ Lots 12, 14, 16, 18 Concession VIII, S $\frac{1}{2}$ Lots 15, Concession VII and 18, Concession VII.
- ⁴²Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 540.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 540.
- ⁴⁴Ibid., p. 599.
- ⁴⁵L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Lots 8-10*Concession I.
- ⁴⁶Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 478-79.
- ⁴⁷Personal communication with Mr. William Byers, President Prescott County Historical Society, 401 Stevens Drive, Hawkesbury, Ontario.
- ⁴⁸L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lot 1 Concession I.
- ⁴⁹Pringle, J.F., op. cit., p. 208.
- ⁵⁰Fisher, R.A., and Yates, F., Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research, Oliver and Boyd Limited, Edinburg and London, 1948, Table IV.

- ⁵¹ MacDonald, Norman, Canada 1763-1841, Immigration and Settlement, Longman, Green and Company, Toronto, Ontario, 1939, p. 318.
- ⁵² P.A.C., Appendices to the J.H.A./U.C., 1832-33.
- ⁵³ Macdonell, Duncan in The Canadas: Emigrants, Colonists and Capitalists, Pickin, Andrew, (author), Effingham Wilson, London, England, 1832, p. 132.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 133.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 130.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 130.
- ⁵⁷ Patent lag is a term used to describe the time delay between occupancy of the land by a settler and the acquisition of the full legal title, the issue of a patent deed to Crown land.
- ⁵⁸ P.A.O., R.G. 21, mic., MS116 Assessment Rolls of East and West Hawkesbury 1832, '35, '36, '38, '39.
- ⁵⁹ P.A.O., R.G. 21, mic., MS116 Assessment Rolls of East and West Hawkesbury 1835, 1838.
- East Hawkesbury 1835
- Anthony Lyons Lots 9, 10, E $\frac{1}{2}$ 11, 8 Concession I 1000 acres
9, 10, E $\frac{1}{2}$ 11 Concession II
- William Teasdale Lots $\frac{1}{2}$ of 2, 3 Concession IV
2; west part of 4, N.E. Corner 3 600 acres
Concession V
- East Hawkesbury 1838
- Rev. F. Metcalf Lots W $\frac{1}{2}$ 3 Concession I, II 600 acres
4 Concession I, II
- William Smallbones Lots 9, 10, E $\frac{1}{2}$ 11 Concession I, II 1100 acres
W $\frac{1}{2}$ 5 Concession I

West Hawkesbury 1836

William McAlpine Lots Front of 8-12, E $\frac{1}{2}$ 13 Concession I

Rear $\frac{1}{4}$ 6 Concession VI

W $\frac{1}{2}$ 15 and part of 11 and 12 Concession II

= 1200 acres

- ⁶⁰L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Lot 11 with Broken front, Concession I.
- ⁶¹See Wm. McAlpine, Endnotes No. 59 and No. 60 above.
- ⁶²P.A.O., R.G. 21, mic., MS116 Assessment Rolls, Hawkesbury East 1832, 1834, 1836.
- ⁶³Ibid., Hawkesbury West 1832, 1834, 1836.
- ⁶⁴L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., Hawkesbury West, Book 1, Lot 15 Concession II.
- ⁶⁵Legget, Robert, Ottawa Waterway, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 138.
- ⁶⁶Smith, Wm. H., Smith's Canadian Gazetteer, H.W. Rowsell, Toronto, 1846, facsimile by Coles, Toronto, Ontario, 1970.
- ⁶⁷P.A.C., Appendices to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1832-34.
- ⁶⁸Ibid.
- ⁶⁹Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., pp. 558-570.
- ⁷⁰P.A.O., R.G. 21, mic., MS116 Assessment, 1846.
- ⁷¹L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Book 1.
- ⁷²Cartwright, Donald, "French Canadian Colonization in Eastern Ontario to 1910", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.

⁷³P.A.C., R.G. 4, B15, Reports of the Commissioner of the Crown Lands Department, Vol. 17, 1846.

⁷⁴L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lot Front 111 Concession III.

⁷⁵P.A.C., R.G. 4, B15, op. cit., Sale of 1844.

⁷⁶P.A.C., R.G. 4, B15, Vol. 17, op. cit., Sale of 1845.

⁷⁷Ibid., and A.I.D.

⁷⁸Ibid., Sale of 1846.

⁷⁹MacDonald Norman, op. cit., p. 318

Chapter Eight

Absentee Ownership, Land Speculation, Squatting And Mortgaging

8.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter the problems of absentee ownership in East and West Hawkesbury were identified as being those of economics and an obstruction to continuous settlement and compact growth. This area was not unique because throughout Upper Canada absentee ownership was a problem. Robert Gourlay, the social protester ultimately banned from the Colony, identified it, Lord Durham wrote of it, and the subject has been treated by a wide variety of writers including Gates,¹ Wilson,² Clarke,³ and Widdis.⁴ In the United States the condition was equally rife and a question identified by writers such as Mitchell⁵ and Swierenga⁶ is that of typology. In short, what sorts of persons functioned as land speculators?

In this chapter such a typology is advanced for Hawkesbury's townships. It appears to work here, whether it does elsewhere is for later researchers to decide. The typology is simply a classification scheme and there are several instances of individuals belonging to several categories. Because of the multitude of interrelationships and linkages, biographical information is also presented to aid in understanding the issue.

In addition to speculation the chapter treats the issues of squatting and the occurrence of mortgaging. These are obviously inter-related themes and can be treated together.

8.2 Methodology and Data Sources

Six categories of land speculators will be identified and discussed. Those individuals recognized as speculators in the study area will be categorized and presented in tabular form (Table 8.1). This will be followed by biographical sketches of the individuals involved. Data sources for this information are, principally, biographical reference texts such as Wallace,⁷ Armstrong,⁸ Chadwick⁹ and Borthwick.¹⁰ Other morsels of biographical data are located in the general literature of the study time and will be referenced when used.

The extent to which squatting occurred on the lots of absentee owners or Crown and Clergy land in East and West Hawkesbury will then be investigated. Here the data sources were the correspondence of surveyors with the surveyor-general's office and reports on the Crown and Clergy Reserves.

The issue of mortgaging as a common phenomenon in early Upper Canada will be outlined. The frequencies of mortgaging in the study area will be calculated in tabular form (Table 8.2). The A.I.D. provided the data here. However, as noted in an earlier chapter, there is a lack of detailed information in this otherwise useful resource in Hawkesbury. The absence of acreage mortgaged and the monetary value involved hampered the examination of this theme. Enough data are provided to present an insight into the situation of mortgaging here, however.

8.3 Land Speculators and Absentee Ownership of Land

The factor of absentee ownership encouraging land speculation¹¹ was shown to have been a major obstacle to a contiguous and well integrated settlement in the study area. There were at least 55 owners of land in excess of 400 acres, 38 of these owners were also non-residents; another 19 absentee owners held smaller parcels of land. A typology was developed in order to classify the various owners and to evaluate their role in society. The six categories are: (1) the elite group which was composed of elected or appointed persons involved at all levels of government, local and provincial; (2) the wealthy merchant class and entrepreneurs. These persons were invariably connected with the North West Company or the commerce of the St. Lawrence. From these connections it is possible to link this group in Hawkesbury with Clarke's elite

SPECULATORS BY GROUP TYPOLOGY

Elite Group	Non-Resident Merchants Entrepreneurs	Military and Loyalist Grantees	Corporate Speculators & Institutions	Investing Farmers - Local	Resident Clergy, Merchants and Businessmen
Honourable William D. Powell 1000 acres	Thomas Forsyth 800 acres	Alexander Macdonell 1050 acres	Canada Company 7195 acres	Barron Family 800 acres	Charles Hersey 674 acres
William and Joseph Fortune 3200 acres	John Richardson and John Forsyth 1000 acres	Angus Macdonell 1000 acres	Kings College Toronto 2100 acres	Cass Family 800 acres	Hugh Lough 500 acres
Sir John Johnson 400 acres	John Grant 1350 acres	Ann Macdonell 1850 acres		Alonzo Bangs 580 acres	(David Pattee) (Thomas Mears)
The Heirs of Guy Johnson 1000 acres	John Grant (Daldreggan) 1200 acres	Archibald Macdonell 1930 acres		Robert Thistlewaite 550 acres	(Hamiltons Robert and William)
Mrs. Catherine Claus 4200 acres	Captain William and Phillip Byrne 3500 acres	Marjery Macdonell et al. 1310 acres		William Smallbones 1100 acres	John Shuter 854 acres
Honourable William Claus 2000 acres	Elizabeth Phillips 954 acres	(John Macdonell) Captain William D'Arcy 800 acres		William McAlpine 1200 acres	Anthony Lyons 1000 acres
William Hamilton 950 acres	Josiah Gibb. 3000 acres	(Captain William Byrne) Captain David McFall 800 acres		William Teasdale 600 acres	Reverend Frank Metcalf { 600 acres
Robert Hamilton & Charles Low 1200 acres	Peter McGill 1100 acres	Major John Lake 1000 acres		John Scott 600 acres	
	Benjamin Whitney 664 acres	Alexander Chisholm 2000 acres			

Table 8.1

Elite Group	Non-Resident Merchants Entrepreneurs	Military and Loyalist Grantees	Corporate Speculators & Institutions	Investing Farmers - Local	Resident Clergy, Merchants and Businessmen
Thomas Mears 1400 acres	(John Platt)	(William Claus)			
David Pattee 1000 acres	Richard Wragg 800 acres	(Heirs of Guy Johnson)			
C.A. Hagerman 664 acres	(John Macdonell)	(Sir John Johnson)			
Thomas Markland 600 acres		& 19 others with small grants as assumed absentee owners 3800 acres			
George S. Jarvis 491 acres		(Charlotte de Lotbinière)			
Charlotte de Lotbinière 1200 acres		Dr. Charles Blake 800 acres			
John Platt 800 acres					

Table 8.1 cont'd.

Mortgaging in East and West Hawkesbury
to 1865

Date	Hawkesbury West Total Lots = 155	Hawkesbury East Total Lots = 284	Gore Total Lots = 30
1797 to 1810	7 of 99.75 lots patented, mortgaged by 3 persons = 7%	12 of 133.25 lots patented, mortgaged by 3 persons = 9%	0
1811 to 1820	4 of 101 lots patented, mortgaged by same 3 persons = 3.9%	no new mortgages 144.25 lots patented	0
1821 to 1830	13 of 128 lots patented, mortgaged by 9 persons = 10%	6 of 165.5 lots patented, mortgaged by 4 persons = 3.6%	0
1831 to 1840	23 of 130 lots patented, mortgaged by 15 persons = 17.6%	24 of 189 lots patented, mortgaged by 12 persons = 12.6%	0
1841 to 1846	11 of 142.25 lots patented, mortgaged by 8 persons = 7.7%	24 of 221.75 lots patented, mortgaged by 22 persons = 10.8%	0
1846 to 1865	93 of 154 lots patented, mortgaged = 60%	156 of 262.5 lots patented, mortgaged = 59.4%	23 of 27.5 lots patented, mortgaged = 83.6%

Source: L.R.O/L'O, A.I.D., East and West Hawkesbury.

Table 8.2

merchant group and Wilson's entrepreneurs as well. Upper Canada did not have a great number of wealthy men, rather a few men had great wealth; (3) Loyalists and military grantees and their dependents who were entitled to free land on arrival in the Province, at marriage or at maturity; (4) corporate speculators and institutions which in Hawkesbury were the Canada Company and Kings College; (5) local investing farmers who had sufficient capital to buy up a few extra lots and who also sold them off periodically; (6) resident clergy, merchants and businessmen who became land bankers for investment purposes and who also bought and sold at best market prices when possible. Table 8.1 indicates the frequencies of speculators in each group. The groups with highest frequencies are undoubtedly the largest land holders as well as being absentee owners.

There does not appear to have been any particular pattern shown by the speculators. Figure 7.2 demonstrates that the holdings were rather evenly spread over both townships. It is doubtful that many of the absentee owners ever set foot in the study area. There is a concentration of large grants on the first two concessions of East Hawkesbury but this may be explained by recalling that, at first, only the front two concessions were surveyed. One might expect that the speculators would seek accessible land since, in fact, their future customers would want to be favourably located. It would seem this was not so in the Hawkesbury area except in relation to the Ottawa River. As has been pointed out in Chapter 6 there were no roads in the area until 1816 beyond the track parallelling the Ottawa River. As will be seen later in this chapter the majority of large grants were acquired much earlier.

Nor can the physical environment have been an important concern for the large speculator. The largest grant, that of 6200 acres in East Hawkesbury (Figure 7.1) belonging to the Claus family, was located almost entirely on low clay soils.

The attraction of Hawkesbury to land speculators in earliest times was probably due to the influence of the North West Company and its use of the Ottawa River to travel into the interior of the continent. Of the 55 individuals who held more than 400 acres of land, only 11 cannot be linked to either the North West Company, the Indian Department, the government of either Upper or Lower Canada, or to the financial community of Montreal. There are many multiple relationships and linkages

which can best be explained through presentations of biographical information.

Catherine and the Honourable William Claus. The Claus family were directly related to Sir John Johnson, Bart. Sir John's daughter Catherine Ann was married to Daniel Claus, Loyalist and Superintendent of Indian Affairs. Their son, William, was appointed Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs in 1799. He was a member of the Legislative Council of Upper Canada between 1812 and 1825 and as well served on the Executive Council from 1818 to 1824.¹²

The Honourable William Claus patented 2200 acres of land in 1826¹⁴ shortly before his death. His heirs disposed of 300 acres and two small parcels of unknown acreage between 1829 and 1843; the remaining holdings (about 1800 acres) lay idle through the study period.

Catherine Ann Claus, widow of Daniel, was granted 4000 acres in Hawkesbury in 1797.¹⁵ These lots were never patented by Mrs. Claus. Other known holdings included 10,000 acres of Block 3 along the Grand River originally belonging to the Six Nation Indians and 15,300 acres in Maldimand which were a gift.¹⁶ The Hawkesbury lands lay idle but in 1831, 1200 acres were transferred, through a Bargain and Sale "In Trust" to James Baby, Henry Dunn and George H. Marland. These lands were, "...for sale, use and benefit and on behalf of the Indians... Six Nations settled ... upon the Grand River ... and their posterity forever".¹⁷

In 1845 by a Deed of Surrender to the Queen, the remaining 2800 acres of Ann Claus' land were placed in the hands of attorneys Henry Dunn and George Markland. (James Baby was by then deceased).¹⁸ Finally in 1853 by Bargain and Sale for 5000 pounds sterling all rights to the said 4000 acres were surrendered to the Queen. The lawyers at this time were William Stewart, William Dickson and Joseph A. Woodruff.¹⁹

The remainder of William Claus' lands, 1600 acres in all, were subject to litigation by his heirs-at-law, Catherine Lyons (a daughter and widow of John Lyons and Benjamin Geale respectively), and sons Warren and John in 1854 and were sold.²⁰

Sir John Johnson, Bart., a Loyalist and son of Sir William Johnson, Bart. of New York, was Superintendent of Indian Affairs before the American Revolution. Sir John organized and commanded two battalions of the King's Royal Regiment of New York. He was regarded as an outstanding

Loyalist and he continued in his father's footsteps when, in 1783, he became Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs in British North America. Sir John served on the Legislative Assembly for Quebec in 1787 and that of Lower Canada from 1796 until his death in 1830.²¹ In 1814, he purchased the seigneurie of Argenteuil where he spent the rest of his life.²² His holdings in Hawkesbury were only two lots which he patented in 1798 and sold to John Platt in 1820. They were left idle until 1844 when parts were sold off but were involved in litigation after the study period.

Heirs of Guy Johnson. Julia Johnson and Mary Campbell (widow of Lieutenant-General Campbell) were awarded 1000 acres in Hawkesbury East in 1824.²³ These lands lay idle and were sold piecemeal by Sheriff Maedorell for unpaid taxes in 1833.²⁴ Guy Johnson was a nephew of Sir William Johnson and married the latter's daughter, Mary, a first cousin.²⁵ He later succeeded his uncle as Superintendent of Indian Affairs but was relieved of his duties due to financial irregularities. These charges were never resolved and Guy Johnson returned to England to live after the Revolution.²⁶

John G. Lake. This former major in the King's Royal Yorkers under Sir John Johnson patented 1000 acres in West Hawkesbury in 1824.²⁷ Sir John acted on his behalf with Power of Attorney. Four lots were sold off at once, the fifth after the end of the study period.²⁸

The Honourable William Dummer Powell. Powell was a Loyalist who moved to Montreal after the Revolution where he practised law before moving to Upper Canada. He was appointed as judge in 1794 then Chief Justice of Upper Canada in 1816. In 1788²⁹ Powell petitioned for a grant of land "... to repair for my children the loss they will sustain by their father's loyalty".³⁰ Of his total grants of 12,800 acres only 1000 acres were patented in the study area³¹ in 1797. These lots were sold to John Richardson and John Forsyth in 1804.³²

John Richardson and John Forsyth. These purchasers of the Powell lands were wealthy Montreal merchants owners of the firm of the same name which backed the XY Fur Trading Company. In 1804 this fur trading company acquired an interest in, then united with, the North West Company in 1804. John Richardson sat in the Legislative Assembly of Lower Canada between 1792-1796, 1804-1808; in 1804 he was appointed to

the Executive Council. In 1817 Richardson was one of the founders of the Bank of Montreal.³³ His interests in the Hawkesbury lands amounting to 2200 acres were transferred to John Forsyth in 1828.³⁴

John Forsyth was appointed to the Legislative Council of Lower Canada in 1827³⁵ where he served until his death in 1837 in London, England. Forsyth married Margaret, a daughter of Charles Grant of the North West Company. Their elder son William married a cousin Jane Forsyth and they assumed the name Forsyth Grant thereafter.³⁶

Although these lands remained in the Forsyth ownership they were developed, in part, as noted in the foregoing section of this chapter. Beginning in 1843 the lands were disposed of by heirs of the owner.

Thomas Forsyth. A brother to John, above, Thomas patented 800 acres in East Hawkesbury in 1801.³⁷ He was also a partner in the firm of Forsyth, Richardson and Company but lived in England after 1804. His land in the study area was transferred to Forsyth and Richardson in 1817.³⁸

John Grant (Lachine). This wealthy merchant patented 1150 acres in East Hawkesbury in 1802 to 1804 and held a further 200 acres unpatented. The lands were originally awarded to a Captain Andrew Naughton and John Telfer but were reassigned by petition to the Heirs and Devisees Commission.³⁹ He employed a John Goudie to manage the lands, built a substantial house and lived there at least part-time.⁴⁰ He was an agent for the North West Company in the forwarding trade with a post in Lachine where he lived most of the time. He was connected by marriage to Charles Grant's family (Western District), thence to the Forsyth Grants. A daughter married Thomas Blackwood; a son James became prominent in the Bar of Lower Canada. Both children inherited lands from a Peter Grant, a relative and trading partner of John Grant's in the North West Company.⁴¹

John Grant, Laird of Daldreggan. This Scotsman was married to Jane Macdonall, a daughter of Allen of Matilda Township and a Loyalist. He was father to the Honourable Alexander Grant, member of the Legislative Council in 1831 under Sir John Colborne.⁴² John Grant patented 1300 acres in East and West Hawkesbury in 1802.⁴³ Originally a partner in the North West Company, he broke away to trade alone with the Indians at the head of the Long Sault rapids in Longueuil Township. His lands

lay idle throughout the study period. Those in the northwest corner of West Hawkesbury have already been singled out as being swampy clay lands. Another Grant of this family, Catherine also patented 200 acres in 1802. All Grant lands passed to Duncan before the Honourable Alexander and were disposed of after the end of the study period. John Grant's mansion, Daldreggan Hall, is still maintained in fine condition and is owned by Dr. Drummond Smith, of the Smith Clinic Hawkesbury, who resides there today.⁴⁴

Daniel Sutherland. This gentleman was another partner in the North West Company who patented only 400 acres⁴⁵ but was an absentee owner of wealth. Sutherland was also linked with Peter McGill and John Richardson as a founder-promoter of the Bank of Montreal in 1817. In 1812 he became postmaster of Montreal and five years later appointed Deputy Postmaster-General of British North America.⁴⁶ Sutherland was disposing of his lots piecemeal fashion in 1804 although he did not receive the patents until 1811.⁴⁷ All lots were sold by 1829.

The Macdonell Family. For the sake of uniformity Wallace's⁴⁸ spelling of this surname is used although variations occur in the A.I.D., I.L.P., and the L.R.I. Armstrong⁴⁹ notes that the

"...spelling of proper names has presented a problem" and charitably adds, "... Upper Canadians were little concerned with spelling, and members of the same family tended to spell their names differently... and the Macdonell clan sometimes used McDonell".

John (1768-1850). A Loyalist, soldier, judge and partner in the North West Company he began patenting and acquiring lands in East Hawkesbury in 1813 to the extent of 1412 acres. He was a well known and respected man, married to an Indian woman whom he held in high esteem.⁵⁰ As already noted his great stone mansion, badly vandalized, is still standing 162 years later. Macdonell became a colonel in the Prescott Militia and an Ottawa District judge. He and his brother Miles and the family of John appear to have been the only permanent Macdonell residents of the townships of all those who patented land in the earliest years. Judge John's lands were divided amongst his wife Magdeline and children and eventually sold off, beginning in the 1840's.⁵¹

Alexander (Greenfield) Sr. and Jr. It is very difficult to distinguish between the two as to the ownership of the 1250 acres

patented between 1808-1818. The older Alexander was husband to a daughter of Alexander of Aberchalder, his father being brother to John Macdonell's father John, Scotus. Alexander Junior was second cousin to Judge John and also a partner in the North West Company. He commanded the Glengarry Militia and was also active in politics being elected as a member of the Legislative Assembly for Glengarry, Prescott-Russell in 1834.⁵² His lands were left idle until disposed of in 1831.

Another Alexander who may have been one of the Alexanders patenting land was known as Alexander of Collachie. They were all related through marriage. From 1800-1812 and 1820-23 he sat in the Legislative Assembly as member for Glengarry. He was Speaker of the Assembly in 1804.⁵³ He was also a brother to Allan of the North West Company and Angus who drowned.

Angus. There are two individuals with this given name; records do not identify which, or if both, were the rightful patentees to 1000 acres in 1802. One Angus was a lawyer and member of Parliament for Glengarry and Prescott 1801-04. A son of Allan (see John Grant, Daldgreggan) he was drowned in 1804.⁵⁴ These lands lay idle and were sold for tax arrears in 1832 and 1835.

The second Angus was a son of Alexander (Greenfield) who also met death at an early age. He was murdered while with the North West Company.⁵⁵ A possible link here is noted with sales of land in 1832 and 1835 by a John Macdonell. This particular Angus had a brother John.⁵⁶ Both gentlemen named Angus were therefore related, connected with the North West Company and died unmarried.

Ann. This woman who patented 1850 acres in East Hawkesbury in 1802 may have been a widow of Lieutenant James Macdonell who was awarded lands in 1788⁵⁷ but did not patent them. Alexander (Greenfield) might also have been her father as he actually picked up the lots assigned to James. Ann's were patented at the same time. There were no transactions recorded on these widely spread holdings until 1832. A James Macdonell apparently controls some, however, in most cases, transactions are between an Alexander Wilkinson to a Peter Friel. The relationship between Ann Macdonell and Alexander Wilkinson is unknown.

Archibald is another of the ubiquitous Macdonells who is difficult to identify positively. He patented 1930 acres in West

Hawkesbury in 1802 as well. He may well have been the Archibald of Cornwall who served in the King's Royal Regiment of New York and who later became a Colonel in the Stormont Militia.⁵⁸ One deed investigated was the Will of H. Walker of Augusta, dated 1831. Walker indicated the lot was granted to him by James Macdonell of Cornwall;⁵⁹ probably he was a son of Archibald's.

Marjery, Elizabeth, Catherine and Jane. This mother and her three daughters were heirs of Donald (Greenfield). Marjery was a daughter of a Ronald Macdonell.⁶⁰ Their lands, totalling 1310 acres, were patented in 1804 in East Hawkesbury and lay idle until partitioned in 1830. From then on they were sold off slowly, Marjery's after the end of 1846.

In all, the Macdonell family held 8752 acres in East and West Hawkesbury and only John Macdonell can be positively identified as a genuine settler. These lands were all undeveloped except for John's and a deterrent to the settlement process on a large scale. Not until 1828 were the first of these lands sold and many were later to be forfeited for non-payment of taxes.

Helena Wilkinson was another absentee owner who held patents on 600 acres in 1802 in West Hawkesbury. She was probably the wife of Richard, Captain in the Royal Canadian Volunteers 1796-1802, then of the Glengarry Militia in 1803. Other lands were held in Charlottenburg.⁶¹ Richard was elected to the Legislative Assembly for Glengarry in 1797-1800.⁶² Heir-in-law of Richard, Alexander disposed of Helena's idle lands; 200 acres in 1830, 400 acres in 1857. It is probable that this person was connected with Ann Macdonell.

The Honourable C.A. Hagerman, a lawyer and son of Loyalist parents, Hagerman was called to the War of Upper Canada in 1815 and was appointed a judge in 1840. He patented 864 acres of land in Hawkesbury Gore in 1818 and in 1822 these lands were transferred to Benjamin Whitney, another non-resident and perhaps a creditor. Christopher Hagerman has been touted as one of the pillars of the "Family Compact";⁶³ his career included an appointment to the Executive Council in 1816 and he was elected to the Legislative Assembly for Cornwall from 1836-1840. A further honour was his appointment as Solicitor-General of Upper Canada in 1829.⁶⁴ Hagerman's daughter, Mary Jane, married John Beverley Robinson Jr.

and their son John Beverley succeeded to the grandfather's baronetcy.⁶⁵ Hagerman's lands, except for 200 acres, reverted to John Beverley Jr. by heirs of Benjamin Whitney in 1851. The holdings were all sold off by 1860.⁶⁶ George William Allen, a colleague of Robinson's who had also married a daughter of Sir John Beverley Robinson, another guiding spirit of the "Family Compact",⁶⁷ was involved as well.

George Stephen Jarvis. A son of Loyalists, Jarvis moved to Upper Canada from New Brunswick as a teenager. He studied law and was called to the bar in 1823 after serving as a lieutenant in the War of 1812-14. Jarvis was elected to the Legislative Assembly for Cornwall in 1836-40 and then was appointed county judge in 1842 for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry.⁶⁸ His daughter married George Hamilton of the Hamilton Lumber Mills.⁶⁹ Beginning in 1843 Jarvis patented 491 acres in Hawkesbury, mainly Commons land.

William Hamilton. He was one of three Hamilton brothers who bought out Mears' and Pattee's Lumber Mill. In 1818 William Hamilton patented 1300 acres, in Hawkesbury Gore, which were turned over in part to George Moffatt, merchant and partner in the North West Company, member of the Legislative Council and Executive Council of Lower Canada. William Hamilton was a member of the Assembly for Prescott in 1820 but declared unseated in 1821 and replaced by David Pattee.⁷⁰ William supposedly dealt with the Quebec City end of the business and lived there where he died in 1822. The third brother, Robert, handled the Liverpool end of the family concern.

There are many puzzling facts concerning this family which make it impossible to determine which member held title to the land. George, who was resident in Hawkesbury, asked for extra time to complete settlement duties⁷¹ due to the family tragedy alluded to in an earlier chapter. None-the-less some of brother William's lands in the Gore were confiscated for tax arrears and awarded to others.⁷²

Thomas⁷³ describes in detail the Hamilton disasters and the drowning of three young sons of Robert on the way to Quebec City, following the deaths of William and Robert in 1822. Yet Charles Moffatt received security from Robert and a John Hamilton for a loan in 1828. A William Hamilton was appointed Lieutenant Colonel in 1837 and a Robert as Lieutenant in the 1st Regiment of the Prescott Militia in 1841.⁷⁴

These offices in the Militia would not have gone to children born after 1822! One wonders if the Hamilton boys actually drowned or if sons of the deceased William and Robert came to live with their uncle. A study of the Hamilton family might uncover accurate facts.

Thomas Mears and David Pattee. Originally Americans, these two gentlemen started the first industry in the study area. They owned 1900 acres jointly in the area of the Mills and more, separately; Mears' lands which passed to son Hamlet then to a William McAlpine, totalling 1400 in 1830 while David Pattee appears to have held 1000 acres on his own at that point.⁷⁵ A John Shuter figures prominently in Mears-Pattee-Hamilton conveyances but he cannot be identified in any local histories. Peter McGill of Montreal eventually became the owner of Mears' property.

David Pattee, a physician who did not practice medicine in Canada, became a prominent figure in Hawkesbury. He replaced William Hamilton as a member of the Legislative Assembly for Prescott when irregularities in the vote count were settled. Surveyor Joseph Fortune, then a Surrogate Court Registrar, was dismissed from office for the offence.⁷⁶

Peter McGill. A Montreal merchant, and the head of Peter McGill and Company. This wealthy Scotsman bought out Thomas Mears and patented additional land. He was born a McCutcheon but changed his surname in order to qualify as heir to John McGill.⁷⁷ The latter was a creditor of the Askin Family in the Western District. Peter McGill became president of the Bank of Montreal from 1834-1860 and was Chairman of the first railroad in Canada, the St. Lawrence and Champlain, in 1834. Appointed to the Legislative Council of Canada in 1841, he became Speaker from 1847-48 with a seat on the Executive Council as well. McGill hired Zaccharian Hersey, brother of Charles, to manage the estate in Hawkesbury which he ultimately purchased. McGill Street in Hawkesbury was named in his honour.⁷⁸

Charles Hersey. An American, who came to Hawkesbury in 1819, Hersey began by opening a tannery shop near the Mills. He was successful in business and patented 730 acres principally by buying up lands forfeited for tax arrears in the 1830's and 1840's. Many of these lots were sold by the holding of mortgages in the latter part of the study period. Both Charles and Zacchariah built fine stone homes which are still in use on McGill Street.⁷⁹

William Fortune. • Born in Ireland William Fortune first moved to South Carolina then came to Upper Canada as a Loyalist. He was a surveyor of the Eastern District and his son Joseph succeeded him. The lands of father and son are difficult to distinguish clearly; however, in all, they patented or purchased 3200 acres in both East and West Hawkesbury. The property did not stay long in the family, probably due to debts. Josaiah Gibb, and Richard Barnum appear to have been their creditors⁸⁰ and, as noted earlier, John Macdonell purchased those properties in the neighbourhood of Point Fortune.

William Fortune reached the rank of Colonel in the Prescott Militia and his son, ever to follow the father's lead, also became a Colonel. The son, however, was involved over irregularities in a tie vote in 1821 when serving as Registrar in Surrogate Court. He was subpoenaed by the Government of Upper Canada but had removed himself and family to Argenteuil and refused to appear. He was summarily dismissed from office.⁸¹

Charles Blake. Very little is known of this Loyalist who was also a Montreal physician with 800 acres granted to him in East Hawkesbury in 1803. In 1809 he sold the land to a John Harris retaining a mortgage on it which was not settled until 1851. Blake's spinster daughter sold the land after the study period.⁸²

Captain David McFall. A Loyalist and soldier, Captain McFall probably sold the 800 acres which he had received by patent in 1797 to a John McKay of Niagara in 1807. McKay immediately sold the land to William Hamilton et al. The Deed of sale does not indicate how McKay received the McFall grant.⁸³

The Cass Family, Amanda et al. The Cass family were Loyalists who came to the area with the encouragement of N.H. Treadwell who had purchased the Longueuil Seigneurie in 1796.⁸⁴ The Cass family inter-married with the Pomeroy, Pattees and Marstons who came to neighbouring Longueuil at the same time. As serious farmers they patented 1200 acres in 1803 but soon sold parcels beginning in 1807. Part of the Cass holding was obtained in a swap with a Captain Pomeroy for Cass land in Longueuil; Pomeroy was married to Cass' daughter.⁸⁵ Pomeroy's grant is shown on McNiff's map of 1795.⁸⁶

John Platt. He was a Montreal merchant, an American by birth and, as noted earlier in this chapter, a relative of Judge Platt of

Plattsburg, New York and N.H. Treadwell. The lands, consisting of 800 acres, were patented in 1802 and entailed, which caused a great deal of distress to those trying to develop the land.

Richard Wragg, John and Thomas. This family was related through marriage to the Platt family and their 800 acres patented in 1802-1804 were left idle as far as legal title is concerned until after 1846. However, as noted earlier, settlers did develop some of the lands and after the study period eventually purchased them. Richard was also involved in the litigation of the Platt lands.⁸⁷

Elizabeth Phillips was a Montrealer and Loyalist daughter of Warrant Officer Henry Sweetland. The father's original 550 acre grant⁸⁸ was listed under her name and 200 acres of Elizabeth's holdings were not patented and were sold to the Barrons along with the 900 acres before 1811. Another 954 acres were patented by this woman in 1816. Her son Robert inherited the land and began to sell to the Hamiltons and John Shuter in 1827⁸⁹ in the area that was developing into Hawkesbury Village.

Captain Thomas D'Arcy. Here was another Loyalist and military claimant who received a patent for 800 acres in 1797. He also ran a ferry service across the Ottawa River above the rapids and was a farmer for a few years as well.⁹⁰ An Ann Hass disposed of his land between 1804 and 1819; the relationship is unknown. It will be recalled that D'Arcy had attempted to secure more land due him in the rear of his original lots but the Claus family had taken them first.

Charlotte (Munro) de Lotbinière. This woman, the wife of the owner of the seigneuries of Vaudreuil, Rigaud and Lotbinière (near Quebec City), patented lands in both her maiden and married surnames. A total of 1200 acres was patented between 1797 and 1803. The owner of the two seigneuries east of the study site had a prestigious background which included the title of Marquis which he did not use. He was the last of his particular line, having only three daughters from two marriages. M. de Lotbinière was a member of the Legislative Assembly from 1792-96 for York (Argenteuil) Lower Canada, was Speaker in 1793 and appointed to the Executive Council in 1796. He fought on the side of the British in the War of Independence.⁹¹ Most of the Hawkesbury lands were sold between 1825-1827, others were acquired by Charles Hersey for tax arrears in 1832. The land was unoccupied until sold.

Alexander Chisholm. This large landowner lived in Montreal while holding title to 2000 acres in Hawkesbury as of 1802.⁹² His lands were sold between 1806 and 1820, the lot of note being the one sold to Simeon Van Kleeck in 1808 as recorded earlier in the chapter. A further 200 acres belonging to a Nancy Chisholm were sold by Alexander's widow, Ann Marsh. The relationship is unknown; Nancy was probably a sister of Chisholm's who patented her land in 1801 and left it idle until it was sold in 1830.

James and Rachel Barron. One of the few original patentee families who farmed in Hawkesbury, the Barrons patented 800 acres in East Hawkesbury including 200 acquired from Elizabeth Phillips. Over time the Barrons sold off parcels of their property yet still retained 450 acres in 1846 (Figure 7.3).

It is apparent from these biographical sketches that the study area's lands were of great interest to partners of the North West Company, Montreal merchants and financiers as well as prominent government officials in both Upper and Lower Canada. Linkages by marriage have also been shown to have been a factor in the relationships. Until permanent settlement began after the War of 1812-14 very few local individuals had large holdings and even later these were modest in comparison to original grants.

8.4 The Incidence of Mortgaging in East and West Hawkesbury

The factor of mortgaging or the facility to acquire security for land has received scant attention in the historiography of Upper Canada. Gagan's work (Chapter Two) is notable on this theme which was enough to stimulate the author's interest in examining the situation in the study area. Due to the nature of the data offered in the A.I.D., which is often lacking both in the amounts of acreage involved in any conveyance and in the monetary considerations, only an overview was possible at this time.

Table 8.2 indicates the number of new mortgages being taken out on lots at ten year intervals (except the last two) in both townships and the gore. Between 1800 and 1830 there was relatively little mortgaging of property. It is also apparent that mortgaging was actually done by only a few persons, Thomas Mears and the Fortunes being two prominent mortgagees.

Mortgaged properties did not exceed 10 percent of the patented lots until the 1830's. The lower incidence of mortgaging in the eastern township up to 1830 was probably due to the sparse settlement: speculators had taken out all mortgages to this fourth decade of the Nineteenth Century. Somewhat the same situation occurred in West Hawkesbury; however, one of the mortgagees, Thomas Mears, was a resident and apparently not a particularly efficient businessman. It will be remembered he had sold his mills to the Hamiltons. Most of the mortgaged lots were near the mills and those close by, which became the Village of Hawkesbury. The original grantees sold their holdings in the first period of settlement, mainly to men involved in the lumber business. Presumably the importance of the mills was reflected in the price of land which may have been responsible for mortgaging due to an inability to pay.

One can conclude that up to 1830 the small land owner was not involved in mortgaging his land. Changes in land policies in which free grants were to cease, and taxes collected on undeveloped lands may have been reasons for increasing mortgages. Furthermore, the emigrants arriving in the townships were mainly from Ireland which knew severe economic distress at this time. Penury would no doubt have prevented many settlers from purchasing land outright. In addition, economic depression in Upper Canada may have resulted in greater mortgaging. This condition was particularly severe in 1819 and especially 1837.

Not all mortgages appear to have been actual transfers of land away from the family. Common to the Hawkesbury townships is the frequency of mortgages between family members. Usually the conveyances of land are between father and son(s). This type of mortgaging in which the son received land on condition that he support not only the parents but often brothers, sisters and other next-of-kin, Gagan refers to as "the English-Canadian system of inheritance."⁹³

Many mortgages do not show their discharge dates on the A.I.D., which prevents an accurate estimation of duration of mortgages. The length of some of those with completion dates indicate poverty may have been a factor. The longest mortgage in West Hawkesbury covered twenty-eight years/while in East Hawkesbury up to 1865 the longest surviving mortgage had run twenty-one years. Two mortgages were discharged after

twenty years, one after eight years while eleven were held for both six and two years. Since at this point the focus of mortgaging is on the average settler, mortgages taken out by speculators and non-residents are not included. In the Gore after the study period a number of lots showed repeating mortgages of two years' duration. Whether or not the same monetary involvement existed cannot be determined without examining each deed.

The mortgages in West Hawkesbury tended to be discharged in two years and many of those settlers taking out mortgages have their descendants in the township today: such surnames include the Beyers, Mooneys, McCanns, Higginsons, Steeles and Modes. Their counterparts in East Hawkesbury had more difficult soils to bring into production which may have accounted for some of the lengthier mortgages. As noted earlier Charles Hersey and Hugh Lough, two residents of the townships, became mortgagers in the latter part of the study period. Hersey especially held mortgages on lands he purchased at Sheriff sales and resold.

Although, in 1865, West Hawkesbury had a slight edge in mortgages it must be noted that only one lot was unpatented while there were still 21.5 unpatented lots in the eastern division. Sixty-one percent of all lands patented in 1865 were mortgaged, a measure of marked change from the years that this study covers.

8.5 Summary of Mortgaging

In conclusion, indebtedness by the genuine settler was not a factor until the 1840's; however, as noted above, by 1865 sixty-one percent of all patented land had a mortgage on it. It would appear that those settlers wishing to settle permanently on the land by the 1840's were likely to require financial help through mortgaging until the farm was productive. Repetitive mortgaging was common in Hawkesbury Gore and to a lesser degree in East Hawkesbury. Those farmers mortgaging their holdings in West Hawkesbury did so for a shorter period and usually only one mortgage was held. Environmental factors are suggested by the writer as being the contributing factor here. Mortgaging is an area that would benefit from detailed study if true comparisons are to be made with other townships such as Toronto Gore.

8.6 Evidence of Squatting in East and West Hawkesbury

Another area of investigation that has received but brief comment is that of squatting on the land. Gates, is perhaps the strongest voice on this issue having declared that it was squatting on the Reserve lands that actually settled Upper Canada.⁹⁴

William Fortune was the first to complain about squatters already on the land when he surveyed the front two concessions of the study area in 1797.⁹⁵ There is no record available as to the reply from the Surveyor-General's office on how to proceed in dealing with these illegal occupiers of land.

These may be the same squatters referred to in Thomas' local history. He referred to squatters on Lot 16 Concession I in 1804. They were being troublesome to the purchaser of Captain Thomas D'Arcy's neighbouring lot, an early farmer in that area, Daniel Wyman. Thomas writes that the squatters, "... had rendered themselves so obnoxious to the other settlers from their thievish propensities, that a party from Chatham ... crossed over (the river) one night, (and) quickly demolished their cabin, and compelled them to seek 'fresh fields and pastures new'."⁹⁶

Squatters were identified on Reserves in 1828 on a visit by a Crown Lands inspector. Seven families had located in West Hawkesbury and one in East Hawkesbury. The inspector listed the settlers by name and added that a good road was needed to provide access to the lot in East Hawkesbury!⁹⁷ That particular squatter had cleared two of the 117 acres the lot contained. This lot was not patented until 1855 and 1895 by others.⁹⁸

Only one squatter of the eight sought legal title to the land which he was usurping. A John McInnis patented 100 acres in 1847.⁹⁹ One other squatter purchased a corner of "his" lot in 1859, the lot itself was patented in 1846 by someone else.¹⁰⁰ There is no record of any penalty being imposed on these uninvited guests nor do records indicate how long they remained on the land. The only eviction from the land appears to have been carried out by other settlers taking matters into their own hands as described by Thomas.

8.7 Conclusions

Squatting, it would seem, was either not sufficiently common nor

such a pressing social evil as to be the subject of much concern in East and West Hawkesbury. Mortgaging, on the other hand, was an ongoing occurrence. Rural indebtedness increased markedly from 1840 on.

- ⁹ Chadwick, Edward Marion, Ontarian Families, Rolph, Smith and Company, Toronto, Ontario, 1895 (Vol. 1) and 1898 (Vol. 11).
- ¹⁰ Borthwick, Reverend J. Douglas, History and Biographical Gazetteer of Montreal to the Year 1892, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, Quebec, 1892.
- ¹¹ The choice of 400 acres was subjectively selected as the minimum acreage for speculators.
- ¹² Wallace, W. Stewart, 1963, op. cit., p. 142.
- ¹³ L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., East Hawkesbury. Land patented by the Honourable William Claus, lots 14, 17, 19, 24-26, Concession IV; lots 20-23 Concession V, lot 21 Concession VI.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1. Land sold by the Honourable William Claus; 100 acres of lot 23 Concession IV in 1829; 100 acres of lot 24 Concession IV in 1834; 100 acres of lot 22 Concession V in 1835; parts of lots 14 and 26 Concession IV, 100 acres of lot 20 Concession V in 1838; 60 acres of lot 23 Concession V in 1843. Total sold, 360 acres and 2 small parcels of unknown acreage.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., I.L.P., land belonging (not patented) to Catherine Ann, Claus; lots 13-16, 18, 20 Concession III; lots 12, 15, 18 Concession IV; lots 13-16, 18, 25 Concession V; lots 14, 15, 17-19 Concession VI.
- ¹⁶ Patterson, George C., "Land Settlement in Upper Canada 1783-1840", 16th Report of the Department of Archives, Province of Ontario, Clarkson W. James, Toronto, Ontario, 1921, p. 228.
- ¹⁷ L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Instrument No. 1259.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., Instrument No. 3969.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., Instrument No. 6323.

²⁰See endnote number 13.

²¹Wallace, W. Stewart, 1963, op. cit., p. 350.

²²Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 66.

²³L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots 10-12 Concession VI,
Lots 11, 13 Concession VII.

²⁴Ibid., A.I.D.

²⁵Wallace, W. Stewart, 1963, op. cit., p. 350.

²⁶Allen, Robert S., "The British Indian Department and the Frontier in North America, 1755-1830", Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History, No. 14. Research Division, National Historic Parks and Sites, Indian and Northern Affairs, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, p. 103.

²⁷P.A.O., L.R.I. I12, p. 6415.

²⁸L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots 9, 11-14 Concession III.

²⁹P.A.C., M.G. 23, H14, Vol. 4, 5. Papers of the Honourable William Dummer Powell.

³⁰Patterson, George C., op. cit., p. 63.

³¹L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots W¹12, 13, 14 Concessions I and II.

³²Ibid., A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1.

³³Wallace, W. Stewart, 1968, op. cit., pp. 493-494.

³⁴L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots W¹12, 13, 14 Concessions I and II, West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lot 4 Concession III.

³⁵Wallace, W.S., 1968, op. cit., p. 442.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 442-443.

³⁷L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., East Hawkesbury, Lots 3, 4 Concessions I and II.

³⁸Ibid., A.I.D. East Hawkesbury, Book 1.

³⁹P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-5, Vol. 1, Lots 19, 20, S 3/4 22, 26 Concession I. Lots 19, 20 Concession II.

⁴⁰Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 597.

⁴¹Wallace, W.S., 1968, op. cit., pp. 450-451.

⁴²Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 512.

⁴³L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., West Hawkesbury Broken Front Lots 17-19 Concession I, W $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 6 Concession II; East Hawkesbury Lots 20-23 Concession VII.

⁴⁴Personal communication with William Byers, President, Prescott County Historical Society. Hawkesbury, Ontario.

⁴⁵L.R.O./L'O, I.L.P., and A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots W $\frac{1}{2}$ 11, E $\frac{1}{2}$ 12 Concession I, Lot W $\frac{1}{2}$ 11 Concession II, Lot W $\frac{1}{2}$ 11 Concession III.

⁴⁶Wallace, W.S., 1968, op. cit., p. 501.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 501

⁴⁸Ibid., passim.

⁴⁹Armstrong, F.H., op. cit., pp. X-XI

⁵⁰Gates, Charles M., editor, "The Diary of John Macdonell", in Five Fur Traders of the North West, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1965, pp. 64-69.

and

Thomas, Cyrus, History of Argenteuil, Quebec and Prescott, Ontario, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, Quebec, 1896, pp. 478-494.

⁵¹L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Gore Lot 1&BF, Concession I, Gore Lots 1 and 2 Concession II, Gore NE $\frac{1}{2}$ Lots 1 and 2 Concession III, Lots 1 and 2, Concession I, Lots 1 and 2 Concession II, Lots 1, 2, and part of 3 Concession III.

⁵²Wallace, W.S., 1963, op. cit., p. 444.✓

⁵³Ibid., p. 443.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 444.

⁵⁵Chadwick, E.M., op. cit., p. 9.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷P.A.O., L.R.I., K.13, p. 6432.

⁵⁸Pringle, J.F., op. cit., p. 414.

⁵⁹L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Instrument No. 1154.

⁶⁰Chadwick, E.M., op. cit., p. 9.

⁶¹Pringle, J.F., op. cit., p. 414.

⁶²Armstrong, F.H., op. cit., p. 46.

⁶³Wallace, W.S., 1963, op. cit., p. 289.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 289.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 675.

⁶⁶L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury Gore, Book 1. Lots 5 part 3 and 4 Concession VII, Lot 1 Concession VIII, Lots 1-4 Concession IX.

⁶⁷Wallace, W.S., 1963, op. cit., p. 639.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 345.

⁶⁹Chadwick, E.M., op. cit., p. 138.

⁷⁰Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., pp. 463, 552.

see also

Armstrong, F.H., op. cit., p. 184.

⁷¹P.A.C., R.G. 5, A1, Upper Canada Sundries, pp. 38780-38783.

⁷²L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury Gore, Book 1, N $\frac{1}{2}$ Lots 1, 2 Concession III, Lots 1, 3 Concession IV, Lots 2, 3 Concession V, Lots 1, 3, 4 Concession VI, N $\frac{1}{2}$ 3 and 4 Concession VII.

⁷³Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., pp. 534-537.

⁷⁴P.A.C., M.G. 24, D7, George Hamilton Papers, 1803-06, Estate 1840-1906.

⁷⁵Author's compilation from A.I.D.

⁷⁶See Endnote no. 70.

⁷⁷Wallace, W.S., 1963, op. cit., pp. 538-453.

⁷⁸Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., pp. 538-539.

⁷⁹Personal communication with William Byers, op. cit.

⁸⁰Borthwick, Rev. J.D., op. cit., p. 517.

⁸¹See Endnote No. 70.

- ⁸² L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Lots 15, 16 Concessions I and II.
- ⁸³ Ibid., A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Instrument No. 74.
- ⁸⁴ Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., pp. 502-507, 530-531.
- ⁸⁵ Personal communication with William Byers, op. cit.
- ⁸⁶ P.A.O., P. McNiff map, C-18, 1795. Lot 5.
- ⁸⁷ L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury Book 1, Lots 8-11 Concessions I, II, Lots 9, 10 Concession III.
- ⁸⁸ P.A.O. P. McNiff Map, C-18, 1795, Lot 23.
- ⁸⁹ L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East and West Hawkesbury, Book 1, East Hawkesbury, Lots 31, 35 Concessions I and II, Lot 24 Concession III; West Hawkesbury, Lots 6, 9, 10 Concession I, E $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 6, part 9, 10, E $\frac{1}{2}$ 15 Concession II.
- ⁹⁰ P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-1, Vol. 1, Reports of the Surveyor-General's Office 1795-1799, Report of William Fortune, 23 February 1797, pp. 461-468.
- ⁹¹ Wallace, W.S., 1963, op. cit., p. 422.
- see also
- Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 39.
- and
- Borthwick, Rev. J.D., op. cit., p. 265.
- ⁹² L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lots 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 Concession VI.
- ⁹³ Gagan, D.P., "The Security of Land: Mortgaging in Toronto Gore Township, 1835-95", F.W. Armstrong, H.A. Stevenson, J.D. Wilson (editors), Aspects of Nineteenth Century Ontario, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, p. 139.

- ⁹⁴Gates, Lillian, Land Policies Of Upper Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968, p. 290.
- ⁹⁵P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-II-1, Vol. 1, Wm. Fortune to D.W. Smith, Surveyor-General, 12 June 1799.
- ⁹⁶Thomas, Cyrus, op. cit., p. 589.
- ⁹⁷P.A.O., R.G. 1, A-VI-19, Vol. 1, Reports of inspections of Clergy Reserves, 1828.
- ⁹⁸L.R.O./L'O, A.I.D., East Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lot 16 Concession 8.
- ⁹⁹Ibid., A.I.D., West Hawkesbury, Book 1, Lot 14 Concession VI.
- ¹⁰⁰Ibid., Lot 17 Concession III.

Chapter Nine

Summary And Conclusions

The townships of East and West Hawkesbury have been exposed as victims of government land policies in which this great resource, land, was disposed of through lavish grants. In the study townships the result was a high incidence of absentee ownership and subsequent lack of development and consequent non-performance of settlement duties. The outcome was a dispersed and incapacitated settlement due to a lack of roads and insufficient money to upgrade and maintain the few in existence. Six different types of speculators were identified, the majority of whom were members of the elite, non-resident entrepreneurs or merchants, military and Loyalist grantees. The Canada Company held a substantial amount of land in the study townships, as did Kings College of Toronto. The number of local businessmen and investing farmers with large holdings was minimal.

Other major factors were those born of the physical environment. The Long Sault rapids running the width of the townships made accessibility to the western township a difficult procedure by portage on a road barely more than an Indian path in earliest times. However, it was the heavy clay soils of East Hawkesbury that were the greater deterrent to successful settlement. Farmers of early nineteenth century Upper Canada had neither the technical knowhow, skills or tools to drain and develop the low lying clay soils. The essentially flat topography

combined to act with the low lying clay soils in creating extensive drainage problems in a watershed whose streams and rivers were inefficient and immature.

Settlers came to the study area in the last few years of the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century only to discover that much of the land was alienated by non-resident owners. This situation was further aggravated by the fact that only one line of communication existed, the east-west road parallelling the Ottawa River. Unfortunately, due to scarcity of records until 1822 it was impossible to reconstruct any location patterns of the few early settlers. One assumes they were aligned along the front two concessions close to the solitary road.

The Assessment Rolls of 1822-23-24 were examined and a representative map of the 1822 Assessment was developed showing the earliest settlement pattern available. The map also indicated the lots occupied by non-owners or owners. A second road had been cut through the forest by 1822 which ran north-south through the centre of West Hawkesbury on the higher lying till soils.

In order to determine the relationship between the two types of land occupiers and the distance to the nearest road a chi square analysis was carried out. The common variable was distance greater or less than a mile to the nearest road. The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference in type of occupier and distance to the nearest road. The results of chi square calculated to chi square expected at the 0.01 level of significance was lower and therefore the null hypothesis was accepted. Therefore there was only one chance in a hundred that location could have occurred by chance. Patent lag and leasing of Reserve lands are suggested reasons for the incidence of non-owner occupancy.

Maps developed from the Assessments of 1834 and 1846 were also subjected to chi square analysis under the same terms of reference and in both years no significant difference was noted between lots occupied by owners and those by non owners. The slow expansion of the road network also indicated settlement was motivated by accessibility to transportation routes.

The foregoing results also gave strong support to the assumptions made by the writer as to which owners were absentees. Indeed

it was reassuring that no one identified as a non-resident appeared on the assessment rolls examined during the study period. A further conclusion was made that a high proportion of original grantees did not become permanent settlers on the land. Not more than six settlers who were identified as serious farmers and who received their grants before 1811 remained in the study area in 1846.

An overlay map of the physiography of East and West Hawkesbury was prepared and used to determine locations of assessed residents in 1822-23-24, 1832-34-36, and 1840-42-46. The impact of environmental conditions was readily apparent. The till soils of both townships were highly preferred to the low lying clay soils especially noticeable in East Hawkesbury. The sand and silt soils were joined to the till soils in this examination. The strong preference for the higher and drier soils continued throughout the study period. However, as West Hawkesbury became well settled there was an increase in locations on the clay soils. At the same time an examination of working maps prepared for this analysis indicated some movement off the clay soils between 1832 to 1836 and 1840-46 although new locations were taken up at the same time. Failure due to lack of ability to cope with the heavy soils and consequent financial embarrassment is the suggested reason.

Changes in land policies by the government whereby undeveloped land was subject to taxation and to forfeiture after eight years in arrears of said taxes helped to clear the study area of some absentee ownership. Further, the completion of the Welland and Rideau Canals plus the continued westward progress of settlement by the early 1830's took away any site advantages for the study site for any success in commercial enterprises. The Grenville Canal system, also referred to as the Ottawa River canals, had very little impact beyond local needs. There was no further talk concerning canalizing the upper reaches of the Ottawa beyond the city that bears that name. The fur traders had abandoned the route which left the ill-regarded lumber industry as the prime users of the river. Hawkesbury was never to develop any significant port functions beyond local provisioning and transportation.

The Crown and Clergy Reserves showed a particular pattern in the study townships wherein the first two concessions were free of Reserves except for one lot in West Hawkesbury. The explanation for this

deviation from the general chequered pattern is thought to have been to facilitate awarding of land as quickly as possible and as close to the river as possible. If the first survey did take place in 1786 as suggested in the references in the P.A.O. to a map by Patrick McNiff, this would help explain the pattern of the Crown and Clergy Reserves. Only after the Constitutional Act of 1791 were surveyors required to set aside 2/7 of each township for the future use of Crown and Clergy.

The Reserves in Hawkesbury's townships were not found to have had a significantly negative influence on the settlement process. They were well leased and purchased at a rate comparable to other Crown lands on the preferred till soils of West Hawkesbury. In the eastern township the high incidence of availability may well have been their location on the low lying clay soils rather than their being Reserves per se.

The fur trade which was carried on along the Ottawa River route was shown to have a negligible influence on the study area. None-the-less numerous partners in the North West Company did have sizeable holdings on the front concessions of East Hawkesbury which were sold off after the Ottawa route was abandoned. One of the partners in the North West Company, John Macdonell, became a leading citizen in the townships and his home serves as a relic of the fur trade and the wealth it accorded the partners.

As far as the lumber industry was concerned, a positive relationship resulted. The Hawkesbury Lumber Mills provided a source for employment opportunities while the lumber camps were an insatiable market for produce and fodder for horses in this machineless society. A diversified agricultural base was shown to have helped prevent the depression that the wheat monoculturists suffered during the collapse of the wheat market in the 1830's. The swift movement of the lumberers up the Ottawa Valley to keep pace with the source of pineries meant that Hawkesbury did not suffer the social distress of communities above Ottawa when lumbermen came to town in their leisure moments. Fortunately, except for the fact that Reserves were often denuded of their valuable lumber before sale, very little damage is recorded as a result of lumbering activities in the townships.

Mortgaging of property was shown to have been a tactic employed essentially by speculators up to 1830. From that point onwards indebtedness of small farmers appeared to indicate increasing financial distress

over time. Three reasons are immediately apparent: firstly, the emigration to Upper Canada of a large group of farmers, principally from Ireland, who attempted to develop the heavier clay soils of East Hawkesbury; secondly, the changing governmental land policies which required payment of taxes on undeveloped lands; thirdly, the cessation of the free land grant system required downpayments and regular installment payments despite productivity. The severe economic depression in Upper Canada at this time may also bear some responsibility.

Squatting was an observable but occasional occurrence on the landscape of the study site according to available records. Illegal occupation of the land did not appear to have any noteworthy impact on settlement.

By 1846 West Hawkesbury with an advantage of superior till soils had resolved most problems of absentee ownership although the inadequate road network persisted. This perhaps was due to economic reasons which fact is supported by the rapidly increasing incidence of mortgaging after the study period. All land was patented by 1865 except for a final lot which was taken up by patenting in 1875.

East Hawkesbury at this point in time was still tied down by the inaction of eleven non-resident owners who controlled 28.2 percent of the township. A further 1296 acres, or 6.4 percent, were still available as Crown land and many lots owned by the Canada Company and Kings College were still lying vacant (Figure 7.11). Mortgaging was to soar in the post study period in East Hawkesbury and the Gore.

Table 9.1 compares the progress in the two townships and gore in relationship to the rest of the Ottawa District and the Eastern District from which it was separated in 1816. Only Elizabethtown and Ernesttown Townships were ahead of Hawkesbury and the average for the rest of Upper Canada in terms of land cultivated to that alienated in each township. Never-the-less West Hawkesbury ranked only 10th in population size at the same time. The western township ranked 11th in relation to rateable property. This obviously reflected a hardworking although not wealthy populace.

East Hawkesbury, as is to be expected, ranked well behind. With respect to the three variables; the percentage of land cleared to that taken up, population size and rateable property, East Hawkesbury ranked 12th in a total of 24 observed townships.

Population and Land Alienation Statistics
in the Ottawa and Eastern Districts

District-County Township	Acres Cultivated	Acres Uncultivated	% Cultivated of Alienated	Rateable Property	1846 Population
<u>Ottawa-Prescott</u>					
Alfred	682	6,320	9.7	3,069	220
Caledonia	1,594	8,111	19.6	7,087	714
Hawkesbury East	4,746	24,037	16.4	18,946	1,751
Hawkesbury West	7,201	23,459	23.4	27,138	1,976 (1842)
Longueuil	4,546	16,949	21.1	17,922	1,122 (1842)
Plantagenet	2,356	18,075	11.5	10,589	934 (1842)
<u>Russell</u>					
Cambridge	161	2,878	5.2	963	108
Clarence	734	4,682	2.9	2,524	200 (1842)
Cumberland	1,616	10,654	13.1	5,895	713 (1842)
Russell	504	4,936	9.2	504	196
<u>Eastern-Glengarry</u>					
Charlottenburg	17,415	73,784	19.0	63,795	4,975 (1842)
Kenyon	3,837	43,166	8.1	20,812	2,536 (1842)
Lancaster	10,094	49,273	17.0	38,627	3,171 (1842)
Lochiel	8,366	53,886	13.4	32,445	2,047 (1842)
<u>Stormont</u>					
Cornwall	13,624	53,583	20.2	65,632	3,907
Finch	2,305	15,410	13.0	9,504	756 (1842)
Osnobruck	12,116	45,163	21.1	45,235	3,623 (1842)
Roxborough	2,411	20,118	10.7	9,992	1,107 (1842)
<u>Dundas</u>					
Matilda	6,518	37,765	14.7	29,064	2,535 (1842)
Mountain	6,269	25,362	19.8	18,275	1,316 (1842)
Williamsburg	8,301	45,340	15.4	38,935	2,941
<u>Johnstown</u>					
Edwardsburg	7,748	31,557	19.7	31,174	2,837
Elizabethtown	21,834	48,187	31.1	97,297	6,437
<u>Midland</u>					
Ernesttown	22,507	59,447	27.4	64,631	4,317
<u>Upper Canada</u>	2,064,903	6,060,332	25.4	-	-

Source: Compiled from data in Smith, Wm. H., Smith's Canadian Gazetteer, H. and W. Rowse, Toronto, Ontario, 1846, facsimile by Coles, Toronto, Ontario, 1970.

In comparison to the whole of Upper Canada's progress in clearing alienated land, both townships were below average. The provincial average was 25.4 percent; West Hawkesbury had achieved a 23.4 percent rate and East Hawkesbury fell well behind with only 16.4 percent of its alienated land cleared.

The salient factors contributory to the earliest settlement of the townships of Hawkesbury East and West have been determined to be essentially due to the impress of political authority on the landscape. The constraints of the physical environment played a secondary, although major, role in the settlement process. The achievements of the early settlers are impressive when one considers that there was no discernable support or encouragement from outside sources. It is a history that is worth recording and a heritage of which the descendants of those early settlers may well be proud.

Appendix 1

Chi Square Analysis

Chi square analysis is a simple quantitative analysis of data which is used to determine whether or not there is any significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in distribution. It is calculated using the following formula:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left(\frac{(O-E)^2}{E} \right) \quad \text{where } O \text{ is, the observed frequency and } E \text{ is the expected frequency}$$

The chi square value reflects the sum of the squares of the deviations of observed conditions from the expected conditions. The problem requires the formulation of a null hypothesis.

H_0 = there is no significant difference in the locations of owner-occupied lots and those occupied by non-owners and distance to the nearest road.

The alternate hypothesis is therefore

H_1 = there is a significant difference between owner occupied lots and those occupied by non-owners and distance to the nearest road.

A. Hawkesbury East and Gore 1824 Assessment

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	13	8	21
> 1 mile	6	5	11
Totals	19	13	32

$$1. \quad \frac{13 \times 19}{32} + \frac{8 \times 13}{32} +$$

$$2. \quad \frac{6 \times 19}{32} + \frac{5 \times 13}{32}$$

$$\chi^2 = 0.161 \text{ calculated}$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ expected with 1 degree of freedom at 0.01 level of significance} = 6.635$$

$\therefore H_0$ must be accepted since χ^2 calculated does not exceed χ^2 expected.

B. Hawkesbury West 1824 Assessment

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	30	16	46
> 1 mile	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>26</u>
Totals	41	31	72

$$\therefore \frac{30}{72} \times \frac{46}{72} + \frac{16}{72} \times \frac{31}{72} +$$

$$\frac{11}{72} \times \frac{26}{72} + \frac{15}{72} \times \frac{31}{72}$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ calculated} = 3.554$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ expected} = 6.635$$

$\therefore$ accept H_0

C. Hawkesbury East and Gore 1834 Assessment

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	35	63	98
> 1 mile	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>22</u>
Totals	48	72	120

$$\therefore \frac{35}{120} \times \frac{98}{120} + \frac{63}{120} \times \frac{72}{120} +$$

$$\frac{13}{120} \times \frac{22}{120} + \frac{9}{120} \times \frac{48}{120}$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ calculated} = 1.336$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ expected} = 6.635$$

$\therefore$ accept H_0

D. Hawkesbury West 1834 Assessment

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	61	33	94
> 1 mile	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>20</u>
Totals	69	45	114

$$\therefore \frac{61/69 \times 94}{114} + \frac{33/45 \times 94}{114} +$$

$$\frac{8/69 \times 20}{114} + \frac{12/45 \times 20}{114}$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ calculated} = 4.320$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ expected} = 6.635$$

$\therefore$ accept H_0

E. Hawkesbury East and Gore 1846 Assessment

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	56	53	109
> 1 mile	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>35</u>
Totals	75	69	144

$$\therefore \frac{56/75 \times 109}{144} + \frac{53/69 \times 109}{144} +$$

$$\frac{19/75 \times 35}{144} + \frac{16/69 \times 35}{144}$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ calculated} = 0.089$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ expected} = 6.635$$

$\therefore$ accept H_0

F. Hawkesbury West 1846 Assessment

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	84	18	102
> 1 mile	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>23</u>
Totals	99	26	125

$$\therefore \frac{84/99 \times 102}{125} + \frac{18/26 \times 102}{125} +$$

$$\frac{15/99 \times 23}{125} + \frac{8/26 \times 23}{125}$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ calculated} = 4.384$$

$$\chi^2 \text{ expected} = 6.635$$

$\therefore$ accept H_0

The chi square test for each period separately is not statistically significant. The absolute frequencies are, however, very low. Indeed, in some cases the expected frequencies fall below 5, a value identified by Maxwell* as representing a minimum threshold. Aggregating all frequencies across the three time periods also yields an insignificant chi square.

	Owner	Non-owner	
Distance	Occupied	Occupied	Totals
< 1 mile	279	191	470
> 1 mile	<u>72</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>137</u>
Totals	351	256	607

$$\therefore \frac{279/351 \times 470}{607} + \frac{191/256 \times 470}{607} +$$

$$\frac{72/351 \times 137}{607} + \frac{65/256 \times 137}{607}$$

$$\chi^2_{\text{calculated}} = 4.0237$$

$$\chi^2_{\text{expected}} = 6.635$$

$\therefore$ accept H_0

In this study the researcher decided to follow the results of the separate tests, despite the low expected values, because the focus of Chapter Seven was on the evolution of the settlement pattern at specific time periods.

*Maxwell, Albert Ernest, Analysing Qualitative Data, Methuen, London, 1961.

Bibliography

A. Primary Documents

1. Land Registry Office, L'Orignal, Ontario

Abstract Index to Deeds

Index to Land Patents

2. Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario

Appendices to the Journals of the House of Assembly of Upper Canada
1824-1841

M.G. 19, F1, Vol. 20

Papers of the Honourable William Claus

M.G. 23, H14, Vols. 4, 5

Papers of the Honourable William D. Powell

M.G. 24, D7

The George Hamilton Papers

M.G. 24, I50

The C.P. Treadwell Diary 1829-39, Letter,
1837

R.G. 1, L2

Upper Canada Land Books B, C, mic., C100,
101, United Empire Loyalist Petitions
and Grants

R.G. 1, L6E, Vol. 5

Correspondence, Commissioner of Crown
Lands 1841-62

R.G. 4, B15

Land Records Vol. 17. Reports of the
Commissioner of Crown Lands, 1846

R.G. 5, A1

Upper Canada Sundries

3. Public Archives of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario

Ontario Archives Land Record Index, Township Listing 031

R.G. 1, A-I-1, Vols. 2, 55 Correspondence with Surveyor-Generals

A-II-1, Vols. 1-4, Office

6, 20, 22, 23

R.G. 1, A-II-5, Vol. 1

Petitions to Heirs and Devisées Commission

R.G. 1, A-IV, Vols. 26, 32

Schedules of the Crown and Clergy Reserves

35, 42, 47, 54, 58

R.G. 1, A-VI, Vol. 19

Schedules of the Crown and Clergy Reserves

- R.G. 1, B-II, Vols. 2, 10' Crown and Clergy Reserve Leases 1802-43
B-III, Vol. 7
- R.G. 1, B-III, Vols. 10, Sales of Clergy Reserves and Canada
13, 26 Company Sales
- R.G. 1, CB-1, Box 14, Survey Reports of William Fortune 1797
Appendix E William and Joseph Fortune 1798
Joseph Fortune 1816
Duncan McDonell 1833
- R.G. 1, C-I-4, Vols. 18, 41 Return of Locations of the Land Board
- R.G. 1, D-23, Vol. 2 Collections on Sales of Crown and Clergy
Reserves
- R.G. 21, M.S.116, mic. Assessment Rolls of East and West
Hawkesbury, 1822-24, 1832-46
- R.G. 22, Series 7, Vols. Minutes, Road Reports, Courts of General
155, 158 Quarter Sessions
- Survey Diaries and Notebooks
- No. 348 William Fortune 1797
- No. 349 William and Joseph Fortune 1797-98
- No. 350-51 Joseph Fortune 1816
4. Ministry of Natural Resources, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario
- Field notebook, No. 494 Duncan McDonell 1833
- B. Maps
- P.A.O., C-18, No. 9, 1795 Patrick McNiff, map of No. 1 and No. 2
Townships South Side of the Ottawa River
- Map of East and West Hawkesbury, Concessions I and II, 1797, William
Fortune
- Map of East and West Hawkesbury, no date but assumed 1798, William
Fortune
- Canada Department of Agriculture Soil Survey Map, Russell and Prescott
Counties, No. 33, 1962 Scale 1:250,000
- Canada Department of the Environment, Ottawa, Ontario, Soil Capabi-
lity for Agriculture map, Ottawa - 31G, 1967 Scale 1:63,360
- Government of Ontario, Department of Transport, Toronto, Ontario,
Counties of Prescott-Russell, 1973. Scale 1:63,360
- The Physiography of Southern Ontario, Map 3227, East Portion, Southern
Ontario, Chapman, L.J., and Putnam, D.F., University of Toronto
Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1966.

C. Theses

- Brunger, A.G., "A Spatial Analysis of Individual Settlement in Southern London District, Upper Canada, 1800-1856", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.
- Cartwright, Donald G., "French Canadian Colonization in Eastern Ontario to 1910", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1973.
- Clarke, John, "A Geographical Analysis of Colonial Settlement in the Western District of Upper Canada, 1788-1850", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1970.
- Lindsay, Virginia H., "The Perth Military Settlement, Characteristics of Its Permanent and Transitory Settlers, 1815-22", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 15, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1972.
- Mackay, D.S.C., "The Influence of Government Policy and Technological Change on Mill Development in The St. Lawrence Counties of Upper Canada, 1783-1846", unpublished M.A. theses, No. 27, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1974.
- MacLeod, Peter Kenneth, "Gualainn Ri Gualainn, A Study of Concentrations of Scottish Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario", unpublished M.A. thesis, No. 18, Department of Geography, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1972.
- Ray, D.M., "Settlement and Rural Outmigration in Easternmost Ontario 1783-1956", unpublished M.A. thesis, Institute of Geography, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, 1961.
- Shefman, Alan, "The Loyalists of Eastern Upper Canada, A Study of An Emerging Political Culture", unpublished M.A. thesis, Institute of Canadian Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1979.
- Widdis, Randy W., "A Perspective On Land Tenure in Upper Canada: A Study of Elizabethtown Township, 1790-1840", unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1977.
- Wilson, Bruce, "The Enterprises of Robert Hamilton: A Study of Wealth and Influence in Early Upper Canada: 1776-1812", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of History, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, 1978.

Wood, C.J.B., "Human Settlement in the Long Point Region 1790-1825", unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Geography, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1966.

D. Books and Articles

Acheson, T.W., "The Nature and Structure of York Commerce in the 1820's", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, 1975.

Aitken, Hugh G.J., "The Family Compact and the Welland Canal Company" in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, pp. 153-170.

Allen, Robert S., "The British Indian Department and the Frontier in North America 1755-1830", Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History, No. 14, Research Division, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Indian and Northern Affairs, Ottawa, 1975.

Armstrong, F.H., "The Oligarchy of the Western District of Upper Canada 1788-1841", Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers, 1977.

Armstrong, Frederick H., Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology and Territorial Legislation, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 1967.

Bigsby, John J., The Shoe and Canoe, Vol. 1, Paladin Press, New York, 1969 (Reprint of edition of 1850, London).

Borthwick, Reverend J. Douglas, History and Biographical Gazetteer of Montreal to the Year 1892, John Lovell and Son, Montreal, 1892.

Brady, N.C., The Nature and Properties of Soils, MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 8th Edition, Chapter 12, 1974.

Braut, Lucien, Histoire des Comtés Unis de Prescott et de Russell, Conseil des Comtés Unis, L'Orignal, Ontario, 1965.

Brunger, Alan G., "Analysis of site factors in Nineteenth Century Ontario Settlement", International Geography, Vol. 1, 1972, pp. 400-402.

- Brunger, A.G., "Early Settlement in Contrasting Areas of Peterborough County, Ontario", in J.D. Wood editor, Perspectives on Landscape and Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario, The Carleton Library, No. 91, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975.
- Canniff, Wm., The Settlement of Upper Canada, facsimile edition, Mika Silk Screening Ltd., Belleville, Ontario, 1971 (Originally 1869 Dudley and Burns, Toronto).
- Carstensen, Vernon R., The Public Lands, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1962.
- Chadwick, Edward Marion, Ontarian Families, Ralph, Smith and Co., Toronto, Vol. 1, 1895, Vol. 11, 1898.
- Chapman, L.J. and Putnam, D.F., The Physiography of Southern Ontario, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1966.
- Clarke, John, "Aspects of Land Acquisition in Essex County, Ontario, 1790-1900", Histoire Sociale - Social History, Vol. 11, No. 21, May 1978, pp. 98-119.
- _____, "Land and Law in Essex County. Malden Township and the Abstract Index to Deeds", Histoire Sociale - Social History, Vol. 11, 1978, pp. 475-493.
- _____, "Documentary and Map Sources for Reconstructing the History of The Reserved Lands in the Western District of Upper Canada", The Canadian Cartographer, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1971, pp. 75-83.
- _____, "Spatial Variations in Population Density in South-western Ontario in 1851", International Geography, Vol. 1, 1972, pp. 408-410.
- _____, "The Role of Political Position and Family and Economic Linkage in Land Speculation in The Western District of Upper Canada, 1788-1815", The Canadian Geographer, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1975.
- Clark, S.A., "The Backwoods Society of Upper Canada" being Chapter IV in The Developing Canadian Community, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1968, pp. 63-80.
- Craig, Gerald M., Upper Canada: The Formative Years 1784-1841, McClelland and Stewart Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, 1963.
- Creighton, Donald, Empire of the St. Lawrence, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1958.

Cross, Michael S., "The Lumber Community of Upper Canada 1815-1867",
Ontario History, Vol. 52, No. 4, 1960.

Dunham, Aileen, Political Unrest in Upper Canada 1815-1836, The
Carleton Library, No. 10, McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1963,
Toronto, Ontario.

Ford, Larry R., "Saving the Cities: Urban Preservation in America",
Focus, American Geographical Society, New York, Vol. 30, No. 1,
Sept.-Oct. 1979, pp. 1-2.

Gagan, D.P., "The Security of Land: Mortgaging in Toronto Gore Township
1835-95", F.H. Armstrong, H.A. Stevenson, J.D. Wilson, editor,
Aspects of Nineteenth Century Ontario, University of Toronto
Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, pp. 3-17.

_____, "Property and 'Interest': Some Preliminary Evidence of
Land Speculation by the 'Family Compact' in Upper Canada, 1820-1840",
Ontario Historical Society, Vol. 70, No. 1, 1978, pp. 63-69.

Gates, Charles M., editor, "The Diary of John Macdonell", in Five
Fur Traders of the North West, Minnesota Historical Society, St.
Paul, Minnesota, 1965.

Gates, Lillian, Land Policies of Upper Canada, University of Toronto
Press, 1968, Toronto, Ontario.

Gates, Paul W., Landlords and Tenants on the Prairie Frontier, Cornell
University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1973.

_____, "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western Development"
in V.R. Carstensen, editor, The Public Lands, University of Wisconsin
Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1962.

Gentilcore, Louis, "Change in Settlement in Ontario 1800-1850: A
correlation analysis of historical source materials", International
Geography, Vol. 1, 1972, pp. 418-19.

_____, "Lines on the Land", Ontario History, Vol. 61,
No. 2, 1969, pp. 57-73.

_____, "Settlement" being Chapter 2 of Gentilcore, L., editor,
Studies in Canadian Geography, University of Toronto Press, Toronto,
Ontario, 1972.

Gentilcore, Louis and Donkin, Kate, "Land Surveys of Southern Ontario",
Cartographica, B.V. Gutsell, editor, Department of Geography, York
University, Toronto, 1973. Monograph No. 8.

Gentilcore, Louis and Wood, David, "A Military Colony in a Wilderness: The Upper Canada Frontier", in J.D. Wood, editor ; Perspectives on Landscape and Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1974.

Gilles, Sandra J., The Timber Trade in the Ottawa Valley 1806-1854, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Parks Canada, Terrasse de la Chaudière, Hull, Quebec, Manuscript Report Series No. 153, 1975.

Glazebrook, G.P. de T., History of Transportation in Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 11, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1964.

_____, Canadian External Relations, Oxford University Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1942.

_____, A History of Canadian External Relations, Oxford University Press, Toronto, 1950.

Gourlay, J.L., History of the Ottawa Valley, no publisher, Ottawa, 1896. A Collection of Facts, Events and Reminiscences for Over Half a Century.

Gourlay, Robert, Statistical Account of Upper Canada, abridged by S.R. Mealing, The Carleton Library, No. 75, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1974.

Greening, W.E., "The Lumber Industry in the Ottawa Valley and the American Market in the Nineteenth Century", Ontario History, Vol. 62, No. 2, June 1970, pp. 134-136.

_____, The Ottawa, McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1961, Toronto, Canada.

Guillet, Edwin C., Early Life in Upper Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1933.

_____, Pioneer Settlements in Upper Canada, University of Toronto Press, 1969.

_____, The Pioneer Farmer and Backwoodsman, University of Toronto Press, Vol. II, 1963, Toronto, Ontario.

Harris, R. Cole and Warkentin, J., Canada Before Confederation, Oxford University Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1974.

Head, Grant, "An Introduction to Forest Exploitation in Nineteenth Century Ontario", in J.D. Wood (editor), Perspectives on Landscape and Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario, The Carleton Library, No. 91, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, pp. 78-112.

Higginson, Miss Maria A. and Brock, Mrs. James T., The Village of Hawkesbury 1808-1888, The Ladies Guild, Holy Trinity Church, Hawkesbury, Ontario, 1961.

Innis, Harold A., The Fur Trade in Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1970.

Johnson, Leo A., History of the County of Ontario 1615-1875, Corporation of the County of Ontario, Whitby, Ontario, 1973.

_____, "Land Policy, Population Growth and Social Structure in the Home District, 1793-1851", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975.

Johnston, C.M., "An Outline of Early Settlement in the Grand River Valley", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975.

Jones, R.L., History of Agriculture in Ontario 1613-1880, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1946.

Karr, Clarence, "The Canada Land Company: The Early Years. An Experiment in Colonization 1823-1843", Ontario Historical Society, Research Publication No. 3, 1974.

Kelly, Kenneth, "Practical Knowledge of Physical Geography in Southern Ontario During the Nineteenth Century", in A. Falconer, B.C. Fahey, and R.D. Thompson, editors, Physical Geography: The Canadian Context, McGraw-Hill, Toronto, Ontario, 1974, pp. 10-17.

_____, "The Evaluation of Land for Wheat Cultivation in Early Nineteenth Century Ontario", Ontario Geography, Vol. 8, 1974, pp. 57-64.

_____, "The Impact of Nineteenth Century Agricultural Settlement on the Land", in J.D. Wood, editor, Perspectives on Landscape and Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, 1975, pp. 64-77.

- Lambert, R.S., and Pross, Paul, "Renewing Nature's Wealth", Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, Toronto, Ontario, 1967.
- Landon, Fred, Western Ontario and the American Frontier, The Carleton Library, No. 34, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1967.
- Langton, W.A., editor, Early Days in Upper Canada, (The Letters of John Langton), MacMillan Co. of Canada, Toronto, 1926.
- Legget, Robert, Ottawa Waterway, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1975.
- Lower, A.R.M., Great Britain's Woodyard, British America and the Timber Trade 1763-1867, McGill-Queen's University Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1973.
- _____, The North American Assault on the Canadian Forest, The Ryerson Press, Toronto, Ontario, 1938.
- MacDonald, Norman, Canada 1763-1841 Immigration and Settlement, Longman, Green Co. Toronto, Ontario, 1939.
- MacKinnon, Alan Douglas, The Story of Vankleek Hill and Its Environs, Vol. 1, Mika Publishing Co. Belleville, Ontario, 1979.
- McCalla, Douglas, "The Wheat Staple and Upper Canadian Development", Historical Papers, 1978, Canadian Historical Association, London, Ontario, 1978.
- Mealing, S.R., "The Enthusiasms of John Graves Simcoe" in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975, pp. 302-316.
- Middleton, J.E. and Landon, F., The Province of Ontario, A History 1615-1927, Vols. I and II, Dominion Publishing Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, 1927.
- Mitchell, Robt. D., Commercialism and Frontier Perspectives on the Early Shenandoah Valley, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1977.
- Morice, A.G., "A Canadian Pioneer: Spanish John", The Canadian Historical Review, Toronto, Ontario, Vol. 10, No. 3, September 1929, pp. 212-235.
- _____, "Sidelights on the Careers of Miles Macdonell and His Brothers", The Canadian Historical Review, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 308-332, Dec. 1929.

- Patterson, George C., "Land Settlement in Upper Canada 1783-1840", Province of Ontario, 16th Report of Government Department of Archives, Clarkson W. James, Toronto, 1921.
- Picken, Andrew, The Canadas: Emigrants, Colonists and Capitalists, Effingham Wilson, London, England, 1832.
- Pringle, J.F., Lunenburg or the Old Eastern District, Standard Printing House, Cornwall, 1890.
- Riegel, Cristina Arnaud, "Poplar Villa - The Forgotten Language", Student Essay ESL 201/3 Section CC, Professor Barbara Barclay, March 1978 (SGWU), Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec.
- Ross, A.H., Ottawa, Past and Present, Mission Book Company, Toronto, Ontario, 1927.
- Saunders, R.E., "What Was the Family Compact?", in J.K. Johnson, editor, Historical Essays on Upper Canada, The Carleton Library, No. 82, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1975.
- Smith, Wm. H., Canadian Gazetteer, (H&W Rowsell, Toronto, 1846), facsimile by Coles, Toronto, 1970.
- Spragge, George W., "The Districts of Upper Canada 1788-1849", Profiles of a Province, Ontario Historical Society, Vol. 39, 1967, pp. 35-42.
- Stuart, E.R., Three History Theses, Ontario Department of Public Records and Archives, Toronto, 1961, "Jessup's Rangers as a factor in Loyalist Settlement".
- Surtees, R.J., "The Development of an Indian Reserve Policy in Canada", Ontario Historical Society, 1969.
- Swierenga, R.P., Pioneers and Profits: Land Speculators on the Iowa Frontier, Ames Publishing Co. Iowa, 1968.
- Thomas, Cyrus, History of Argenteuil, Quebec and Prescott, Ontario, John Lovell and Son, 1896, Montreal.
- Thomson, Don, Men and Meridians, Vol. 1, Queens Printer, Ottawa, 1966.
- Traill, Catherine Parr, The Canadian Settler's Guide, New Canadian Library, No. 64, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto, Ontario, 1969.
- Trigger, Bruce C., The Children of Aataentsic, Vols. 1 and 2, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, Quebec, 1976.
- Trudel, Marcel, The Canadian Historical Association, Booklet No. 6, Ottawa, 1963.

Wallace, W. Stewart, The MacMillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 3rd Edition, MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1963, Toronto, Ontario.

_____, Documents Relating to the North West Company, facsimile edition by Greenwood Press, New York, 1968 (Originally published as Champlain Society Publication XXII).

Weaver, Emily P., The Story of the Counties of Ontario, Bell and Cockburn, Toronto, 1913.

_____, "Crown Surveys in Ontario", Department of Lands and Forests, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario (no date).

Wicklund, R.E. and Richards, N.R., Soil Survey of Russell and Prescott Counties, Report No. 33, Ontario Soil Survey, Guelph, Ontario, 1962.

Widdis, Randy, "Motivation and Scale: A Method of Identifying Land Speculators in Upper Canada", Canadian Geographer, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1979, pp. 337-351.

_____, "Tracing Property Ownership in Nineteenth Century Ontario: A Guide to the Archival Sources", Canadian Papers in Rural History, Langdale Press, Ganononque, Ontario, Vol. 2, 1980, pp. 83-102.

Wilson, Alan, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada A Canadian Mortmain, University of Toronto Press, 1968, Toronto, Canadian Studies in History and Government #8.

_____, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada, Canadian Historical Association, Booklet No. 23, Ottawa, 1969, P. Archives.

Wise, S.F., "Upper Canada and the Conservative Tradition", in Profiles of a Province, Ontario Historical Society, Vol. 39, 1967, pp. 20-33.

_____, "Colonial Attitudes from the Era of the War of 1812 to the Rebellions of 1837", in Wise, S.F., and Brown, R.C., editors, Canada Views the United States, University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington, 1967.

Wood, J. David, "The Stage is Set: Dumfries Township, 1816", pp. 40-50, Waterloo Historical Society, Ontario, Vol. 48, 1960.

_____, "The Wood-Oak Transition Zone in the Settlement of Western Upper Canada", Canadian Geographer, 1961, pp. 43-47.

END

301 128 11

FIN