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An archaeological survey was undertaken in September 1975. Its purpose was to establish the archaeological potential of the Mississagi Delta area. Specifically, the survey was centered about three islands. These islands are Fox Island, Weber Island, and Island No. 5.

Priority was given to the complete investigation of the entire area. As a result of our survey, I think we can safely predict where new sites may be encountered.

At this time, I would like to thank the many people who contributed so much to the successful outcome of the survey. Without them, the survey would not have been possible. They are: Mr. Rudy Pecteau, field assistant, who gave that extra effort each and every day, making the survey a smoking success. Mr. Ken Buchanan, a late comer, who provided the badly needed help to complete the survey. Chief Dave Morningstar and Chief Camille Chiblow, of the Mississagi Indian Reserve, who provided the author with some background information on the area. Russ Woods, land supervisor, Blind River, who volunteered his time and aided immeasurably to the successful excavation of the Renard Site, conducted by Laurentian University. Cal Osborne, Parks and Recreation Office, Blind River, who not only gave a large amount of his time to the survey, but endured the endless aggravations
that resulted from our own ineptitude. Glen Connell, Parks and Recreation Office, Blind River, who continually surprised us with his amazing powers of seeing that the job got done. Helen Devereux, Professor at Laurentian University, who, as always, inspired and advised me in regard to the basic concepts of archaeology. Thor Conway, Regional Archaeologist, Sault Ste. Marie, who not only arranged for the survey, but had the unfortunate task of accounting for its funds.
ABSTRACT

An archaeological survey of the Mississagi Delta was undertaken in the fall of 1975. This survey, in conjunction with the surveys carried out by Dr. J. Wright (National Museum) in 1961, 1964, 1968 and Professor Helen Devereux, (Laurentian University), in 1962, 1963, will indicate the archaeological potential of this area.

The sites recorded by Wright and Devereux were not re-investigated by this survey. The published information concerning these sites is very limited, but indicated that re-investigation of the delta would be well worth while.

Two of the six prehistoric sites surveyed this fall, Renard Site (CbHs-5) and Swimming Bear Site (CbHs-6), are large enough to suggest a continuous occupation of native people. For Northern Ontario, this is a significant find; however, it is not too surprising considering the large number of ethno-graphic records describing this area as a major occupational area for native people.

The artifacts recovered from The Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9) and the Wood Site (CbHs-8) suggest that these sites were occupied for a short period of time. The Wood Site is characterized by a circular depression which is a unique feature for the occupational history of the Mississagi Delta.
Chiblow Site - 3 (CbHs-4) or Bridge Site, is classified as a contact site. However, severe disturbance to the site by way of bulldozer activity has hampered the interpretive value of the site.

The Kor Rock Structure (CbHs-10) is comprised of a Puckasaw Pit, a cairn and a possible headstone.

In addition to investigation and researching the above sites, a number of sites were reported to the author by the following people: Dave Morningstar, Chief Camille Chiblow, Phil Kor, Helen Devereux, Alexander Ross, Russ Wood and Rudy Fecteau.

As well as prehistoric and contact sites, the delta is rich in historic sites. The three major themes representing the historic era are: missionaries, fur trade, and lumbering activity.

These themes are well documented, however actual sites representing them is lacking. This is in part due to the restricted nature of the survey. Our primary aim was to do a prehistoric inventory of the area, while the actual search for historic material was secondary to our purpose.
One of the surprises of our survey was that the major portion of the sites examined in this survey, were undisturbed by man.

The cultural and temporal affiliations of the sites investigated center around the Late Woodland Peoples. The dates would extend from 800 AD to 1600 AD. The Kor Rock Structure cannot at present be dated. Early manifestations of similar types of structures are recorded for the Archaic Tradition (3000 BC - 200 BC), and Woodland era in the Canadian Shield.
SECTION I: RECOMMENDATIONS

A) Research Requirements

I. The re-investigation of the sites surveyed by Wright and Noble (1961, 1964, 1968) so as to define their content. These sites include: CbHs-I, which is located at the mouth of the Mississagi River and the Falls Site (CbHs-7) located at the first set of rapids. In addition, the Chiblow Site 3 at Bridge Site (CbHs-4) will be completely destroyed if not excavated within the next two years.

2. Additional survey in the Mississagi Delta should be carried out. The survey to follow should concern itself with these aspects:

   i) Archaic manifestations - these manifestations may be in the form of rock structures and the person undertaking such a survey should address himself to the problem of raised beach levels.

   ii) circular depressions - the Woods Site (CbHs-8) and the Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II) are both associated with this phenomena. In addition, Phil Kor reported two other circular depressions on Fox Island. These unfortunately could not be
investigated.

iii) seasonality - a survey should be conducted along the Mississagi River to the head waters.

iv) coastal survey - the areas which should be specifically surveyed are the mouths of the Spanish, Spragge, Thessalon and Blind River.

v) historical - material evidence confirming the documented history of the area is lacking.

vi) the following areas should be surveyed in light of information received by various people; La Salle Island on Lake Huron, Sayer's Pathway and the First Rapids.

3. A partial excavation of the Swimming Bear Site (CbHs-6) should be undertaken. This is proposed since there is a lack of comparative material of Late Woodland Peoples in the Lake Huron area.

4. A complete investigation is recommended of the sites reported by the following individuals, MacIver, Morningstar, Chiblow, Fecteau, Kor, Brizinski and Wood. Specifically, the Kor Rock Structure should be surveyed with a transit. Specific
notice should be taken of its relationship to the gravel beaches on the north side of the base rock outcrop, and the possibility of other rock impressions that may have not been noticed by the author.

5. A compilation of all historical data concerning the three major themes (missionaries, fur traders and lumber activities), in the delta area.

6. A compilation of all linguistic and ethnographic material concerning the Mississagi Indians should be made in order to aid the archaeologist in his model formulation.

7. The compilation of data concerning old beach levels of Lake Huron and channel and delta formation should be undertaken. This is necessary in order to understand the geological and geographical history of the area. It would also be invaluable as a possible dating technique for archaeological sites located along the coastline.

B) Historical Resource Priorities

All sites encountered in the delta survey including historical sites have been given equivalent priority. However, since the author has a limited knowledge of the historical
worth of these sites, their evaluation under the headings of representability, interpretability and protection can only be considered as superficial. As such it is open to change by the regional archaeologist.

Since most of the sites investigated in the I975 survey were undisturbed, they received a higher priority rating than those recorded in earlier surveys. It should be noted that the surveys of I96I, I964, and I968 were very limited in terms of reported evidence. Their archaeological worth is difficult to assess, and the evaluation given here of those sites can be contested.
I) Archaeological Sites
   
   i) **Representability**
   
      a) Renard Site (CbHs-5)
         
         Kor Rock Structure (CbHs-3)
         
         Chiblow Site - 2 (CbHs-3)
         
      b) Chiblow Site - I (CbHs-2)
         
         Swimming Bear Site (CbHS-6)
         
      c) Woods Site (CbHs-8)
         
         Falls Site (CbHs-7)
         
      d) Chiblow Site - 3 (CbHs-4) Bridge Site
         
         Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II)
         
      e) Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9)
         
         Unnamed Site (CbHs-I)

   ii) **Interpretability**
   
      a) Chiblow Sites I, 2, 3 (CbHs-2, 3, 4)
      
      b) Swimming Bear Site (CbHs-6)
      
      c) Falls Site (CbHs-7)
      
      d) Renard Site (CbHs-5)
      
      e) Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II)
      
      f) Wood's Site (CbHs-8)
g) Kor Site (CbHs-I0)

h) Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9)

i) Unnamed Site (CbHs-I)

iii) Protection
   a) *Kor Site (CbHs-I0)
       Renard Site (CbHs-5)
       Swimming Bear Site (CbHs-6)
   b) Chiblow Site I,2 (CbHg-2,3)
       Falls Site (CbHg-7)
   c) Wood's Site (CbHs-8)
   d) Chiblow Site 3 (CbHs-4)
       Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II)
   e) Unnamed Site (CbHs-I)
       Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9)

2) Historical Sites
   i) Representability
      a) Church and cemetery
         Hudson's Bay Post
         Sayer's Property

*absolute protection and preservation is a necessity for these three sites.
b) Lumbering
   Free Trader

   ii) **Interpretability**
       a) Hudson's Bay Post
       b) Sayer's Property
       c) Church and cemetery
       d) Free Trader
       e) Lumbering

   iii) **Protection**
        a) Hudson's Bay Post
        b) Sayer's Property
        c) Church and cemetery
        d) Free Trader
        e) Lumbering

3) **Historical Site**
   There is only one site under this heading of Frontier People.
SECTION II: PLANNING DIRECTIONS

A) Archaeological Sites

i) Unnamed Site (Wright I96I - CbHs-I)

Location - exact location was not given however it is in the general vicinity of the river mouth on the east bank (see Map I)

Access - a gravel road joins the old lumber mill operations and the Government boat launch on the Mississagi River.

Cultural Affiliation - unknown

Significance - unknown

Condition - unknown

Endangerment - unknown

ii) Chiblow Site - I (CbHs-I Devereux I96I, I963, Mississagi Site Wright I96I)

Location - Approximately 100 yards from the CPR tracks, on the south side of a small creek which runs into Mississagi River (see Map I)

Access - a gravel road which runs from the Government boat launch and parallels the Mississagi River.
Cultural Affiliation - a historical site (1700 AD to present)

Significance - a relatively late occupation of native people, comprising of both European and Aboriginal material. Theme - Post Contact Tribes and Bands,
Segment - Mississagi, Rating - B.
Condition - This site is badly disturbed, either by pot holing, top soil and sand pits.

Endangerment - This site is exposed to a commercial tourist area where the constant influx of people undoubtedly add to the pothold nature of the site.


Location - Approximately 300 yards from the CPR tracks on the east bank of the Mississagi River.

Access - a gravel road runs from the Government boat launch and parallels the Mississagi River.

Cultural Affiliation - A historic site post (1700 AD to present.)
Significance - A later settlement of native people compared to Chiblow Site - I. Theme - Post Contact Tribes and Bands, Segment - Mississagi, Rating - B.
Condition - Slightly disturbed due to developments such as tourism and logging operations.
Endangerment - Continual exposure to tourist activity will undoubtedly destroy the site. Note: This site has been salvaged, (1962), little undisturbed or unexcavated areas remain.

iv) Chiblow Site - 3 (CbHs-4 Brizinski 1975 Bridge Site Wright 1961)
Location - on the bank of Mississagi River bordered by the CPR tracks to the north, Chief Chiblow's property to the east and a small creek to the south.
Access - The gravel road which leads to Chief Chiblow's House.
Cultural Affiliations - contact site (1600 AD to present)
Significance - Most of the interpretative value has been lost because of disturbances. Theme - Post Contact
Tribes and Bands, Segment - Mississagi, Rating - B.  
Significance - this site, along with the Renard Site, is a key site if the prehistory of this area is to be understood. Prehistory - Theme - Northern Hunters and Fishers (tentative), Segment - Iroquian Zone - 3 (tentative), Rating - B.  
Condition - water erosion and modern day camping activities are encroaching upon this site.  
Endangerment - continual soil disturbances caused by campers may seriously alter the condition of the site.  

vii) Falls Site (CBHs-7)  
Location - on the east bank of the Mississagi River near the first set of rapids.  
Access - near highway 17 by MacIver's Motel.  
Affiliation - unknown  
Significance - unknown, however thought to be a prehistoric burial ground as well as a historic fur trading area (Morningstar, MacIver, Devereux, 1975 personal communication).
Condition - unknown, however the area is generally disturbed by road construction, commercial development, and water erosion.

Endangerment - anyone of the above mentioned factors may obliterate the entire site.

viii) Wood Site (CbHs-8)

Location - located on an old river channel that at one time ran through Fox Island.

Access - by boat across the Mississagi River.

Affiliation - Late Woodland Site (800 AD - 1600 AD) (tentative).

Significance - the phenomena of a circular depression associated with the site may be a cultural characteristic previously unreported in this area. Theme - Northern Hunters and Fishers, No Segment or Rating.

Condition - undisturbed.

Endangerment - very little (What about rapid natural changes on this delta?)

ix) Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9)
Location - located on the westerly side of Fox Island near the junction of Weber Island and Island No. I.  
Access - by boat down the west channel of the Mississagi River.  
Affiliation - Late Woodland (tentative) 
Significance - unknown 
Condition - unknown, the major portion of the site may have been destroyed.  
Endangerment - very little 

x) Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-I0) 
Location - located on the east bank of Island No. I on a flat sand plain.  
Access - by boat down the west channel of the Mississagi River.  
Affiliation - unknown 
Significance - unknown, however, it may involve the circular depression phenomena described in the Wood Site.  
Condition - unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Endangerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Site</td>
<td>mouth of delta on east</td>
<td>gravel road from lumber mill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-1)</td>
<td>bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiblow Site-I</td>
<td>100 yards south of CPR</td>
<td>gravel road from lumber mill</td>
<td>historic</td>
<td>Theme Post Contact Band Segment Mississagi Rating B</td>
<td>very disturbed</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-2)</td>
<td>bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>(I700 AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiblow Site-2</td>
<td>300 yards south of CPR</td>
<td>gravel road from lumber mill</td>
<td>historic</td>
<td>Theme Post Contact Band Segment Mississagi Rating B</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-3)</td>
<td>bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>(later than CbHs-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiblow Site-3</td>
<td>south side of CPR</td>
<td>gravel road from lumber mill</td>
<td>contact site</td>
<td>Theme Post Contact Tribes and Band</td>
<td>very disturbed</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-4)</td>
<td>bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>(I600 AD to present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renard Site</td>
<td>north-west side of Fox</td>
<td>by boat across the Mississagi River</td>
<td>Late Woodland Site (800 AD to I600 AD)</td>
<td>Theme Northern Hunters and Fishers Segment Iroquoian Zone 3 Rating B (tentative)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>water erosion along the bank will continue to damage the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Cultural Affiliation</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Endangerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Site</td>
<td>Mississagi River near first set of rapids</td>
<td>Hwy I7 by MacIver's Motel</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Site</td>
<td>Fox Island</td>
<td>by boat across the Mississagi River</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>Theme Northern Hunters and Fishers Segment unknown Rating unknown</td>
<td>undisturbed</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Little Tree Site</td>
<td>Fox Island</td>
<td>by boat on secondary channel between Fox Island and Island No. I</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown, the major portion of the site may have been destroyed</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Bear Site</td>
<td>Island No. I</td>
<td>by boat</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CbHs-I0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kor Rock Structure</td>
<td>Fox Island</td>
<td>by boat</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>outside the present theme suggested by the Ministry</td>
<td>undisturbed</td>
<td>high, if public are aware of it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endangerment - unknown

B) Historical Resources
   i) General Information

The historic nature of the Mississagi delta is well documented. However, the compilation of these sources and the impact of the early settlers on this area are outside the present scope of this survey.

There are three themes associated with these early settlers. They are: the introduction of religion by missionaries, the fur trade, and the lumbering industry. These themes will be briefly outlined firstly to provide possible explanations for the historic material found, and secondly to designate areas where further historical research is required.

There were three established missionaries in this area. Fr. Louise André started a mission at the mouth of the Mississagi River in I67I (MacDonald I975: 10). The exact location of the mission house may be on the east shore of the Mississagi River in I67I (MacDonald I975: 10). The exact location of the miss-
ion house may be on the east shore of the Mississagi River. This speculation is based on the direct evidence of vegetation growth. Unfortunately there was no time available to check the original sources. If a survey is to be carried forward to search for this mission house then the following source may be useful in determining its location: Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents LV p. 133, and XVIII p. 231.

Reverend J. D. Cameron preached regularly at the mouth of the Mississagi River (MacDonald 1975-33). There is no reference to a mission house. Services may have been conducted outside, or in the home of one of the early settlers. Again, original sources could give valuable information concerning the day-to-day lives of the individuals living in this area. A list of sources taken from G. MacDonald's report (1975-32, 33, 34) is given in the bibliography of this report.

In 1882, Fr. Joseph Ricard (Sault Daily Star, Feb. 6, 1953) built a church on the Mississagi River. This church is cross-referenced on a map drawn of the delta area in 1882 (Plan of Mississagi Islands Twp. of Cobden, District of Algoma,
Canada Department of Crown Lands, Land Titles and Registry
Offices, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario – see Map I).

From the years 1770 to the beginning of the 1900's, the fur trade dominated the Mississagi River.

The first recorded post (Hudson's Bay Company Archives A. 64/26, fo. I9d) was operated by the North West Company between the years 1770 and 1821. In 1821 the North West Company amalgamated with the Hudson's Bay Company. It was in this year that the Hudson's Bay Company took over the operations of the North West Post on the Mississagi River.

The exact location of the North West Post and the original Hudson's Bay Post (which may be the same) is still unknown. However, in a letter to Factor Edward Hopkins from J. Watts (Hudson's Bay Archives B. I34/c/83, fo. II2-II2 d.) dated 13 July 1861, he states the following, "Sayer's buildings are, of course where they were, on the west side of the river, the Company had old buildings on the West side or I should say the Company's first Post was situated on the West side."

He goes on in the letter to say, "... but the Company's buildings when Sayer entered the service were on the East side of the River which is now an Indian Reserve - there is not a vestige of the Company's buildings to be seen." Henry Sayer entered the service in 1845. The location of Posts changed from the west side of the river to the east side and back to the west side of the river, where Henry Sayer operated the Post from his own house. In the same letter, Watts describes the transition of Sayer's buildings in the following manner, "... that Sayer's buildings were not at all the same then as they are now. He then had a dwelling House, the same he resides in at present, an old store, and a broken down old Bye or Stable, whereas, now he has put up a new men's House... ."

In 1862, Robert Crawford built a new Hudson's Bay Post on the tip of Fox Island. There were five buildings and their locations and measurements are given in the appendix.

In addition to the trading carried out at the Post, there were a number of free traders in the area. For instance, in 1843, Alexander McKay left the Hudson's Bay Service and
started trading on his own (Hudson's Bay Archives I962-2). Similarly Henry Sayer became a free trader in I862 (Ibid - 3).

There must have been sizeable population on the river since in I833 a measles epidemic broke out in which 5 men, 3 women and 4 children died (Ibid - 3). There are no headstones of these people at the Trader's Cemetery (Sayer's Cemetery). However there may be three possibilities: a) they had no headstones but wooden markers. This would account for the several unmarked depressions in the cemetery; b) their headstones were stolen. In Samulski's report (I972-56) she states that the cemetery had been vandalized; c) these individuals were buried elsewhere. This may have been some validity in light of Dave Morningstar's account, (personal communication I975) of human bones being washed out of the bank near the first set of rapids.

Lumbering activity on the Mississagi River is well documented (MacDonald I975, I970, MacDonald I966, Rupp N.D. Thorpe I947). Accordingly, very little need be said in this report, since evidence of its operations are confined to the
rock cribs located in the river.

ii) Nature of Historical Resources

I. Religious Instruction

(a) Name: 1) church built in 1882 by Fr. J. Ricard.  
2) Trader's Cemetery (commonly referred to as Sayer's Cemetery).

(b) Size: approximately 2 acres.

(c) Location: located on the west bank of the Mississagi River, approximately 100 yards south of the CPR bridge (see Map-2).

(d) Access: by boat across the Mississagi River.

(e) Significance: religious instruction, in this case by the Roman Catholic Church, was directed towards the conversion of native peoples.
SPECIFIC FEATURES

I. Church Foundation

i) **Features**: a stone foundation located on Sayer's Property is believed to be the church built by Fr. Joseph Ricard in 1882. In 1963 a survey conducted by Helen Devereux, a stained glass fragment was recovered from the foundation.

ii) **Condition**: vegetation growth has covered almost all that remains of the church. The stoned foundation is shown in plates in the appendix.

iii) **Endangerment**: the foundation will be subject to pot-holing and trendalism by tourists who know of its history.

2. Trader's Cemetery

i) **Features**: there are six remaining headstones at the Cemetery. The following names are recorded on the markers:

- John T. Dyke, aged 12, died Oct. 25, 1881
- George Dyke, aged 9, died Sept. 20, 1881
- Katie E. Dyke, aged 18, died Mar. 30, 1890
Mary E. Dyke, aged 15, died Sept. 14, 1882
Alice M. Dyke, aged 4, died Apr. 10, 1878
Alex Daigle, aged 19, died Oct. 10, 1892
William Cowie, aged 29, died Apr. 29, 1836
Andrew Proulx, aged 33, died Nov. 1, 1879
Ira Tessier, aged 25, died Mar. 27, 1907
Edward Sayer, aged 84, died Feb. 11, 1898
Jane Sayer, ? died Oct. 21, 1872
Mary Sayer, ? died ? 1872
Henry Sayer, aged 85, died Apr. 20, 1869

ii) **Condition:** it has been reported that the site had been vandalized.

iii) **Endangerment:** the headstones and markers may be subject to abuse by tourists.

II, Sayer's Property

i) **Name** - 1) cabin foundations

2) cabin foundations

3) roof pediment

ii) **Size:** approximately 4 acres
iii) **Location**: located on the west bank of the Mississagi River approximately 100 yards south of the CPR tracks.

iv) **Access**: by boat across the River, or by walking south along the west bank from the CPR bridge.

v) **Significance**: the fur trade (from 1770 to 1900) dominated this area. Evidence of Sayer's occupation of this area is confined to three buildings. It is also possible that the first Hudson Bay Post was constructed on his property.

I. Cabin Foundation

i) Glass, cut, and wire nails were found. The foundation is approximately 10 feet by 8 feet. It is located on a rock outcrop.

ii) **Condition**: preservation of foundation is poor, since the structure was built of logs.

iii) **Endangerment**: very little remains of the site, so very little can be done to damage it. It should be mapped however.
2. Cabin Foundation
   i) It is located about 50 yards west of the concrete foundation and 25 yards north of the first mentioned cabin foundation. Again, artifacts recovered were cut and wire nails, and pieces of glass.
   ii) Condition: because the foundation is made of wood, preservation of this structure is poor.

3. Roof Pediment
   i) During the 1963 survey carried out by Helen Devereux, this structure was recorded in the field notes. It was not sighted during the 1975 survey.
   ii) Condition: unknown
   iii) Endangerment: unknown

III. Hudson's Bay Post (1862)
   i) During the 1975 survey, this Post was not investigated, however there are five buildings associated with the Post.
      I) Hay barn and cow stable
2) House
3) Dwelling of Clerk in charge
4) Trading Store
5) Root House

ii) **Size**: ½ acre

iii) **Location**: located on the north-west tip of Fox Island.

iv) **Access**: by boat across the Mississagi River.

v) **Significance**: this Hudson's Bay Post serviced the Mississagi Delta area from 1862 to 1900.

IV. Hudson's Bay Post

i) **Description**: this Post was built in 1862 by R. Crawford and was closed in 1900. The last clerk operating the Post was J. Dyke. Sizes and locations of the buildings are listed in the appendix.

ii) **Condition**: no buildings are remaining. Test trenching to locate structures of the Post was carried out in 1963 by Helen Devereux, with little positive evidence coming to light. This area was not surveyed in 1975.
iii) **Endangerment**: unknown

V. Free Trader

i) **Name**: no historical features were recorded, however from the artifacts recovered it is inferred that an individual trader occupied the site.

ii) **Size**: less than ½ acre.

iii) **Location**: located on the north shore of Island No. 5 near the base rock outcrop.

iv) **Access**: by boat across the Mississagi River.

v) **Significance**: still undetermined. However, artifacts recovered suggest a date of occupation of the site ca. 1800.

VI. Lumbering

i) **Name**: stone and timber cribs.

ii) **Size**: ½ acre area, in which 10 cribs are located.

iii) **Location**: located in the Mississagi River immediately north of the north tip of Fox Island.
iv) **Access:** by boat.

v) **Significance:** indicates a second major theme which dominated the area which is lumbering.

   i) **Name:** stone and timber cribs.

   ii) **Description:** approximately 10 cribs were constructed in the River. They are approximately 30 feet square. Hudson's Bay Records (I962-5) state that they were constructed in 1899.

   iii) **Condition:** excellent

   iv) **Endangerment:** none

C) Individual Historical Features

I. **Kor Rock Structure (CbHs-I0)**

   i) **Size:** less than ¼ acre.

   ii) **Location:** located on an outcrop of rock at the south-easterly tip of Fox Island.

   iii) **Access:** by boat through the channel separating Fox Island and Island No. 5.
iv) **Description:** The stone structure is comprised of a puckasaw pit, a stone cairn and a headstone. The Pit is approximately 7 feet in diameter and 1_1/2_ feet in depth. It is located on the base rock and made of frost fractured rock.

The cairn is comprised of approximately 8 rocks and located 100 feet to the south of the Pit.

The headstone is a glacial erratic. A possible petroglyph may be incised on the rock.

v) **Significance:** The phenomena of Puckasaw Pits extends in time from Archaic (3000 BC – 200 BC) to Late Woodland times (800 AD – 1600 AD) and in space from Ontario to Newfoundland.

vi) **Condition:** excellent

vii) **Endangerment:** the movement of any one rock may seriously alter the nature and the interpretation of the site.

II. **Sayer's Property**

i) **Size:** 1/4 acre
ii) **Location:** located on the west bank of the Mississagi River, approximately 100 yards south of the CPR tracks.

iii) **Access:** by boat across the River.

iv) **Description:** a concrete foundation approximately 30 feet by 30 feet and a well are the two features associated with this site.

v) **Significance:** unknown; however the concrete foundation and the relatively good condition of the basement beams suggest that the building was recently occupied.

vi) **Condition:** good

vii) **Endangerment:** very little
SECTION III: ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH PAPER

A) Working Hypothesis

Travel in Northern Ontario is limited to a large extent by the general relief of the land. The terrain is very rugged in terms of being mountainous and, as such, movement across such features becomes a time-consuming task. One of the most convenient modes of transportation is by water. By following the endless number of lakes and rivers, one can easily cross the continent in any direction.

One of the basic needs in terms of subsistence is water. If a group of people are to occupy an area, then one of the factors in choosing a site will be the availability of water. The closer they settle to the source, whether it be a lake or river, the easier it will be to obtain food resources.

Even in terms of technology, water is needed. This is demonstrated in the manufacture of pottery.

This survey therefore concentrated in searching for prehistoric sites located near the banks of the Mississagi River and along the shore of Lake Huron. This hypothesis was strengthened by ethnographic sources (Kinietz, Henry, etc.) In addition, the entire Delta area is comprised of sand which makes the banks
of the river an excellent area in which to camp.

Initially, our survey produced little evidence to support our hypothesis. There was a virtual absence of cultural material from areas which we considered as ideal camping sites. To account for this negative evidence we discussed several possibilities. The first of these was that our original hypothesis was incorrect. We tested the interior of Island No. 5 with negative results. We felt, however, that our original hypothesis was correct, since we could not offer any other feasible one.

The second possibility (which is every archaeologist’s scape goat) is that this area was not inhabited in prehistoric times. Although this possibility entered my mind, it seemed rather far-fetched in light of the documentary sources which indicated that this area had been inhabited by native peoples.

The third possibility was that this particular area had undergone a particular environmental change from prehistoric times to contact times. Since sand beaches, and especially delta mouths, are constantly changing in form, this possibility seemed to offer the best explanation.
There are five reasons for these changing landforms at the mouth of the Mississagi River. They are:

1) changing water levels of Lake Huron
2) isostatic rebound of the land
3) changing speeds of river flow seasonally
4) vulnerability of sand deposited delta to erosion
5) four major dams on the Mississagi River may have altered the water level of the River.

Because of these factors, it was apparent that areas which today were considered to be excellent camping areas were probably not there or were not excellent camping areas at the time of aboriginal habitation.

We therefore tested the hypothesis that former river channels would exist and the banks of these former river channels would have been occupied. In this manner positive results were obtained in that: a) we were able to explain the considerable extent of the Renard Site and b) a site (called the Wood Site-CbHs-8) was located in the interior of one of the islands on an old river channel.

Unfortunately since at this point our time left for
survey had expired, further evidence could not be obtained.

B) Procedures and Methodology

Our survey was primarily confined to three islands. They are: Fox Island, Weber Island and Island No. 5. The entire perimeters of these three islands were walked and test pitted. As a control to check our hypothesis the interiors of Island No. 5 and Weber Island were walked and test pitted.

Test pits were placed fifteen feet apart and about three feet from the shore. Since two people were involved in the procedure, four rows of test pits were placed parallel to the shore (see Map-3 for areas surveyed).

The test pits were approximately eighteen inches square and each clump of sod from the test pit was reversed on the humus layer and trowelled down. General stratigraphy of the soil was diagrammed. However, the problem of describing the soil arose. First there was a disagreement between the surveyors regarding color. What was a brown color for Rudy was a light sand color for myself. This problem was compounded by the color differences which occurred between the sod and the test
pit. These differences occurred because of differences in lighting and drying.

Second and more important was the problem in trying to define each distinct soil horizon. This was compounded by the differences in color noted through the same horizon, and second by our own inability to distinguish such subtle differences in the soil as a sandy-loam or a loamy-sand.

This problem was resolved by taking soil samples from the different stratigraphic layers and bringing them back to the laboratory to be analysed.

In this particular survey, a considerable amount of time could have been saved if we would have been able to interpret the geographic history of the Delta area. For instance, if a particular area had been a marsh, then the probability of finding a site in the marsh would be low. Over time, this environment would be recorded in the soil by its distinctive soil horizon. In areas which were characterized by high water tables and marsh conditions the soil was a loamy silt. If such a horizon appeared in the profile of our test pit, then it was assumed similar environmental conditions existed. Thus this area could
have been lightly or moderately tested rather than intensively tested.

Once a site had been found, we tried to resolve two basic questions. They were: What is the extent of the site? and, can we define the cultural content of the site?

To find the extent of the site, a grid was oriented to the first fertile test pit. Generally, test pits were placed twenty feet from the fertile test pit, and parallel to the river bank. When the first sterile test pit was encountered, three additional test pits were placed at the same distance apart. If these test pits were sterile, then test pits were placed midway between the previous pits (at ten foot intervals).

Once the limits of the cultural material was found along the river bank, we then proceeded to test the interior of the site. Again, the same procedure was used.

Our overall aim was to define the extent and limits of the site with as few test pits as possible. For example, if test pits A10, A11, A12 were sterile, then no test pits would be dug at the A8 and A6 locations. Similarly, if G5 was fertile then pits would not be dug at the B5, D5, and F5
locations.

FIGURE - I

Since our objective was to limit the amount of disturbance to the site by test pitting, our second objective, (to define the cultural content of the site), was not always
possible to achieve. It was more important at this particular time to leave the site, if it was not endangered, for later excavation, than to assess its contents in detail.

In one instance however, intensive testing of the Renard Site (CbHs-5) was carried out because:

a) material was being lost due to water erosion along the river bank.

b) a salvage excavation was to be carried out along the river bank and it was necessary to determine the areas of most intensive occupation along the bank.

C) Sites Not Investigated

Since our survey work was limited to twenty days of field work, several sites previously reported by others were not re-investigated. The sites previously investigated are:

1. CbHs-1 - This site was recorded by Jim Wright in 1961. It is located near the mouth of the Mississagi River on the east bank. The collection consists of a surface collection of artifacts. (See Map-2 for probable location).

2. Chiblow Site - I(CbHs-2) - or Mississagi Site - I. This
site was recorded by Jim Wright in 1961 and partially excavated in 1962-63 by Helen Devereux. This site is located near a small stream which runs into the Mississagi River. The site is approximately 100 yards south of the CPR tracks. Material recovered from the site is currently under analysis by Professor Helen Devereux of Laurentian University. An analysis of the rim sherds recovered from this site and the Chiblow Site - 2 was done by Mr. Ken Buchanan (1974). Professor Helen Devereux has established this site as an Historic Site (1700 AD to 1900 AD). (see Map-2 for location).

3. Chiblow Site - 2(CbHs-3) - or Mississagi Site - 2. In 1962-63, it was partially excavated by Helen Devereux under the name of the Mississagi South Site. Analysis of the material recovered from this site is currently underway. Helen Devereux has established the site as a Late Historic Site, however, it appears to be later in time than the Chiblow Site - I. It is located on the east bank of the Mississagi River approximately 200 yards south of the CPR tracks (see
Map-2 for location).

4. Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II) This site was briefly tested during the 1962-63 field season directed by Helen Devereux. The site is characterized by circular depressions similar to those encountered at the Wood Site. The chert flakes found at this site by P. Ramsden were of Hudson's Bay Lowland Chert (Bill Fox, personal communication, 1975). The site is located on the westerly channel of the Mississagi River, which separates Fox Island from Island No. I. In addition to the prehistoric artifacts, a hypothesized root cellar and probable historical mound was found. (see Map-2 for location)

5. Falls Site (CbHs-7) This site was recorded by Jim Wright and Bill Noble in 1968. It is located near the first set of rapids and only a surface collection of artifacts were recorded. Interesting is the fact that Dave Morningstar, Chief Camille Chiblow and Professor Helen Devereux (personal communication, 1975) stated that in this same area, a human burial was found. (see Map-2 for location)
The following areas (shown in Map-2) are localities which should be surveyed in the future for possible sites.

I. LaSalle Island - a brief survey was conducted on this island on which several depressions were noted. These depressions occurred on old beach ridges and were comprised of cobbles. Although these features did not resemble any of the Puckasaw Pits found on the Lake Superior shoreline, Phil Kor, geomorphologist, Ministry of Natural Resources, Thunder Bay, stated (personal communication, 1975) that he could not account for such a phenomena through any natural process. In total, 5 depressions were observed and generally noted. They ranged in diameter from eight feet to two feet and in depth from two feet to one foot. (see Map-4 for location)

What is important is the large number of beach ridges on LaSalle Island. Nine distinct ridges were identified; however there may be others which were too obscure to notice. It is these beach ridges which should be investigated since they may be useful as a possible dating
2. Kor Depressions - on a geomorphological study of Fox Island, Phil Kor noticed circular depressions in the beach sand. Similar occurrences of these depressions were noted at the Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II), the Wood Site (CbHs-8) and were noticed by Russ Wood and myself during an interior survey of Fox Island. These depressions are shown on Map-2. The depressions are circular and range in diameter from 1.5 feet to 8 feet and range in depth from .75 feet to 2 feet.

3. Sayer's Pathway - the path which links the Trader's Cemetery to Sayer's Property is an old channel bank of the Mississagi River. This bank is approximately six to seven feet above the present river level and parallels the present channel which separates Fox Island from Sayer's Property. A quartz chip was found approximately 150 feet from the gate that encloses the cemetery. The chip was found near the surface. A one foot square was dug in this same area but no further material was found.
Although quartz is native to this region, this specific type of quartz was not natural to its immediate location. It is hypothesized that this area would be a productive area in which to test, since this particular type of quartz was utilized extensively by the people inhabiting the delta.

4. Mainland - near the Ontario Government boat launch, a large amount of quartzite (a poor type from a cultural point of view) outcrops. This area was briefly surveyed by Rudy Pecteau, and he believes that although frost fractures may account for most of the detritus in this area, a few specimens appear to have been fractured by percussion techniques. This area also deserves further consideration as a possible site, since it is at the same height above the water level of Lake Huron as the Kor Rock Structure. Again lack of time forced us to leave this area for future survey work. Therefore, I would recommend that this area be surveyed for a quarry site and also for rock structures.

5. Historical Features - In the planning section of this report I briefly listed the historical themes, religious instruc-
tions, fur trade, lumber activity which dominated this area. It should be noted that at present the actual evidence which would be derived from these particular settlements is sparse. That is, although these themes are documented, actual proof of their existence is lacking. On Map-2, I have outlined the areas which may be fertile in terms of accurately delineating the previously mentioned themes.

6. Informants - In doing this survey, several people showed an interest in the history of the delta area and not so surprisingly had a great deal of information to offer about it. This particular information would be useful to any individual carrying out further research, whether it be historical or archaeological. These informants are: Alexander Ross, retired carpenter, fisherman, living in Blind River; Dave Morningstar, knows of three possible burial sites, lives on the Mississagi Indian Reservation; Chief Camille Chiblow, knows a great deal of the history of the area, lives on the bank of the Mississagi River, by the CPR tracks; Mrs. MacIver, has a collection of historic
bottles found on their property. She lives at Mac Motel, approximately 4 miles west of Blind River on Hwy. I7; Russ Wood, land supervisor with the Ministry of Natural Resources in Blind River.

D) Sites Investigated

I. Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9)

The Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9) is located on the north-west bank of Fox Island. A channel from the main stream of the Mississagi river separates Fox Island from Island No. I and Weber Island.

The exact location of the site is given by the following readings of latitude and longitude: 46°10'30" and 83°2'40" respectively. In addition, the site is shown on Map-2. Figure - I shows the land features on which compass readings were taken.

The site is characterized by a slight ridge approximately 60 feet from the present river bank. This ridge is approximately 2.3 feet high. If this ridge marks the previous
height of the river, then the water level would have been 7 to 9 feet higher than it was for the September, 1975 river level. The channel bank is 7 feet above the present river level.

When the first fertile test pit was found, a grid was established and test pits were placed along the grid lines to determine the limits of the site. In all, twenty-two test pits were dug and six were fertile. A generalized diagram of the soil stratigraphy from the test pits is shown in Figure - 2.

FIGURE - 2: General Soil Profile of the Poor Little Tree Site.
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From the six test pits, eleven artifacts were recovered. They are:

Ceramics - Three body sherds from the same vessel were recovered in test pit B5. The body sherds are undecorated. The sherds have fine temper. The interiors of the sherds are characterized by laminations and a red color contrasts to the light brown exterior surface.

Lithics - Two small chert flakes and one core fragment were recovered from test pits B4, C5. All chert was of one type. The chert is a light greyish color. Inclusions are numerous and white in color. The following measurements were taken of the core fragment: platform length - 2.1 cm.; platform width - 0.8 cm.; prepared area of platform - 1.0 cm.; maximum length - 1.7 cm.; maximum width - 2.2 cm.; maximum height - 0.8 cm.; no rotation.

Flora and FaunalRemains - Four pieces of bone and two carbonized seeds were recovered. No identification of the bone was undertaken and the carbonized seed may have come
from the humus layer in which forest fire activity had recently taken place.

**Discussion** — The general paucity of artifacts and the small size of the site would suggest that this area had little occupational use. There may be, however, an alternative explanation. Map-3 shows the location of a former channel cutting through Island No. 1. Hypothetically, it may be possible that by the formation of the present channel, the major portion of the site would have to have been eroded away.

Another interesting feature of the site is the height above the present river level. To the south of this area, all heights of land are lower and are approximately two feet above the present river level. This would mean that if there were a rise in the water level, the land to the south of the site would be covered by water.

Bedrock, which outcrops at the first set of rapids, indicates that the high water mark of the river was at one
time at least two feet higher than it is at present.

In Samulski's Report (1972-56), she concludes that at a marsh area, similar to that characterizing Weber Island, may be subject to the forest succession concept. That is, an area begins as a marsh and gradually progresses through successive vegetation phases such as grasses, to shrub brush, to brush, and finally to trees. If we apply this concept to the area surrounding the site, then a raised water level would imply that the area to the south of the site would have been at one time characterized by vegetation similar to that around Weber Island. The vegetation around Weber Island is characteristically associated with cattails and several species of grasses.

Perhaps through further research we may be able to interpret the paleoenvironment of the site and its relationship to man's cultural adaptation.

Conclusion - No definite interpretation of the Poor Little Tree Site can be offered at this time. Before any conclu-
sions can be proposed, a geographic history of this particular area will have to be determined. Particular attention should be focussed on raised water levels and channel formation.

2. Wood Site (CbHs-8)

The Wood Site was located by testing the hypothesis that former river channels existed and that the banks of such river channels would have been occupied.

The Wood Site is located in the interior of Fox Island. The latitude and longitude are: 46°10'50" and 83°2' respectively. (see Map-2 for general location)

From air photographs (73-4608, II8-I2I) of the delta area, Russ Wood and Phil Kor diagrammed former river channels. (see Map-5). The channel on which the Wood Site is located is 330 feet wide. The bank is 5.7 feet above the dry bed of the channel.

An unusual feature of the Site is a circular depression. The following measurements were taken of the depression:
7.8 feet on the N-S axis, 8.0 feet on the E-W axis, and 1.2 feet maximum depth.

Seven test pits were placed in the general area of the circular depression. (see figure - 3 for exact location)

A test pit was placed in the center of the depression and the following profile was observed:

FIGURE - 4: Soil Profile of Wood Depression
Small bits of charcoal were noticed throughout the first three layers. A sample of charcoal was collected from the second and third layers. A radio carbon date of this sample will be sought at a later date. No artifacts were recovered from this test pit, however two soil samples were collected. Tests will be run on these samples to determine any phosphorous or calcium content. In addition, the samples will be "floated" to determine if there is any organic
artifactual material not observed in the field.

From Test Pit I, seven pieces of lithic detritus were recovered. They are described in Table 2.

Discussion - The circular depression which characterizes this site is unusual, and indeed may be a significant feature of the Mississagi Delta. Three additional depressions were noticed by Russ Wood and Morris Brzinski along the same bank of this channel. In addition, Phil Kor (personal communication, 1975) reported two depressions along similar channels. (see Map-2)

The Contemporary Bear Site (CbHs-II) is also characterized by a circular depression. (Devereux, Field Notes, 1963)

Although an interpretation of the site is not possible at this time, there are several factors which may be significant. The first is the location of the depressions along the secondary channels of the Mississagi River. These depressions were not found on the Chiblow Sites I and 2
(Devereux, personal communication, 1975), Chiblow Site 3, Renard Site, or Swimming Bear Site, which are located on the main channel of the Mississagi River.

The second factor is the absence of any ceramic material from the Wood Site or the Contemporary Bear Site. Again, this may in part be due to the limited number of test pits. However, when one compares the amount of ceramic material to lithic material found on the Renard Site (CbHs-5), (which lies across the channel from the Wood Site), one would expect to find a certain amount of ceramic material.

The third factor which is common to both the Contemporary Bear Site and the Wood's Site is that all lithic material is comprised of chert detritus.

Conclusions - Although no conclusive interpretations regarding the native sites are possible at this time, there are two possible hypotheses that may be useful for further investigation. The first is that the Wood and Contemporary Bear Site may represent possible wintering habitation sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Cortex</th>
<th>Fired</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>shatter</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>too small to measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>too small to measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>too small to measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although this is purely conjecture, it is based on:

1. the protection offered by the secondary channels from the elements.

2. the sites are small in comparison to the Renard, Swimming Bear and Chiblow Sites.

3. pottery manufacture would be restricted during the winter. The second hypothesis is that these sites may represent specific activity areas, such as smoking fish, or some other technique for the preservation of food resources.

Recommendations - If another survey is initiated, the archaeologist should address himself to this problem.

3. Kor Rock Structure Site (CbHs-I0)

   During our final day of survey, Phil Kor, a geomorphologist working for the Ontario Government, Blind River District, discovered a Puckasaw Pit.

   Upon inspection of the immediate area, two other entities were discovered which are believed to be a part of this same phenomenon. These are: a stone cairn, and, for lack of a better word, a head stone. Since our time had expired, we were unable to return to the site to complete any
measurements. Photographs were taken and plates to be found in the appendix of this report.

The stone structure is located on the highest point of land at the south-westerly tip of Fox Island. The Puckasaw Pit rests on an outcrop of bedrock. This outcrop is characterized by gravel beach ridges indicating the old water levels of Lake Huron. These gravel beaches occur on the north side of the outcrop. This would indicate that the outcrop of rock, which is now a part of Fox Island, had been at one time an island itself.

The Puckasaw Pit is approximately 7 feet in diameter and 1.5 feet in depth. It is comprised of angular rocks, approximately 10 inches in length by 8 inches in width.

The Stone Cairn is comprised of approximately 8 rocks piled together. These rocks are somewhat smaller than the rocks used in the construction of the Puckasaw Pit, however, they are of the same shapes. Such angular rocks are common to the area.
The Headstone is a glacial erratic. Its dimensions are roughly 4 feet by 3 feet by 3 feet. A possible petroglyph was found on the rock. The possible petroglyph is triangular in shape. The only test available to determine whether or not the incised configuration was natural or cultural, would have been to chip away a part of it. This action was not taken.

The Puckasaw Pit phenomena is one which extends in time from Archaic (5000 - 1000 BC) to Late Woodland (800 - 1600 AD) times. This particular phenomenon occurs in Newfoundland, the interior of Ontario and along the Great Lakes of Lake Superior and Lake Huron.

It is therefore possible that the Kor Rock Structure may have been built during Archaic times when water levels would have isolated the outcrop resulting in an island.

Conclusions - The Kor Rock Structure is a man made feature, however, its nature and date are not known.

Recommendations - I. The absolute protection of the Kor
Rock Structure complex is essential. The displacement of so much as a single rock may seriously alter its nature and hence, interpretive value.

2. The Rock Structure complex must be accurately mapped and otherwise recorded if an interpretation is to be attempted. In addition, there may be other features associated with this site of which we are unaware.

3. If additional survey is done in this area, one phase should be oriented to searching for Archaic Sites. As such, the archaeologist will have to address himself to the problems of raised water levels and changing coastlines.

4. Swimming Bear Site (CbHs-6)

The Swimming Bear Site is located on the north-west side of Island No. 5. This side of the island borders the main channel of the Mississagi River while the south side of the island borders Lake Huron.

The site parallels the river bank which varies in height
from 8 feet above the September water level of the Mississagi River to just 1 foot above the river level.

A large outcrop of bedrock separates the site into two parts, and from the preliminary survey, these parts indicate different cultural occupations.

Initially, random test pitting was employed to determine the actual site location. It soon became apparent that the site was indeed large and complicated in terms of occupational history. A transit was then used and several stations and base lines were set up (see Figure - 6). Test pits were accurately mapped and recorded.

Thirty-one test pits were productive, which raises the question: If the site is so extensive, why were only 15% of the test pits productive? The testing of the site was biassed in that once the general limits of the site were established, efforts were directed to finding the areas in which future archaeological excavation should take place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Cortex</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I6</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I7</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Bag No.</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>L(cm)</td>
<td>W(cm)</td>
<td>H(cm)</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slight wear</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along one edge</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure - 6 shows the number of fertile test pits and the predicted area for future archaeological excavation.

During the actual survey, a number of historic artifacts and possibly prehistoric artifacts were recovered. They are described in the following section.

Lithics - The lithic material was comprised of both chert, quartzite and quartz. Though chert varies in type, it is similar to that type found at the Poor Little Tree Site (CbHs-9). It is a grey to light brown to light blue in color and has several small inclusions. The quartz and quartzite is from a local source. (Phil Kor, personal communication, 1975)

No lithic tools were found: all of the material of chert quartzite and quartz represents detritus. They are analyzed in Table 3a, b.

Copper - One piece of coiled copper (like a spring) was recovered. The coil is 2 mm. wide. The length of the copper
is 84 mm. and the maximum width is 12 mm. One hypothesis is it was used to pull facial hair. (see Figure - 7)

Silver - One piece of silver, the size of a half-dollar, was found in association with prehistoric material. At present, it is unknown whether it is of European origin, or mined by native people, perhaps in the Keewatin Peninsula. This piece of silver may have been used as a gorget. (see Figure - 8)

FIGURE - 7: Shape of Copper Artifact

FIGURE - 8: Silver Artifact from the Swimming Bear Site
Ceramics - All ceramic material was comprised of body sherds. The exterior surface of one sherd was fabric malleated. The rest of the sherds were smoothed evenly, probably by a corded tool. The interior surfaces were either hand smoothed or smoothed by some tool.

The temper ranges from a grass or organic matter to sand, quartzite, quartz, and mica. For the most part, the sherds are not heavily tempered. The temper ranges in size from fine to coarse.

On the interior, the sherds are characterized by laminations. In addition, 30% of the sherds are split. It is hypothesized that the vessels were manufactured by the paddle and daub technique.

Faunal Material - Since the funds are not available for a complete analysis of the faunal material, specific food resources cannot be given at this time. An overview of the material indicates a general food procurement system. The
faunal remains comprise a number of classes: birds, fish, and large and small mammal.

**Historical Material:** The historic material is comprised of a clay pipe bowl, two pieces of corroded metal from a match box, a piece of forged iron, and a glass fragment.

The area in which these fragments were found was heavily test pitted in order to investigate a possible dwelling structure. The paucity of artifacts from such an intensive search would indicate that this area was sparsely used and that if there is a house structure, it exists somewhere else in the vicinity.

**Pipe Bowl Fragment** - The design of the bowl is similar in design to those listed in Figure - 3 of Reid's account of the Ermetinger House (1975- ). Unfortunately, no date of manufacture is given for this particular type of design.

**Glass Fragment** - It is .105 cm. in thickness and has a greenish-tinge. There are a few noticeable air bubbles. The
fragment has been exposed to heat.

**Forged Iron** - This piece of iron is tear-drop-shaped. The pointed end is flat. At Lower Fort Gary, a similar artifact had been used as a rifle screw driver.

**FIGURE - 9: Forged Iron Artifact From the Swimming Bear Site.**

**Match Box** - Two pieces of metal (possibly tin) had the following inscription:
FIGURE - 10A: Inscription On Metal Container

J HYNAM
REGIS...ED ATANT
MATCH BOX

FIGURE - 10B: Inscription On Metal Container

5 SHID
CHEMICAL
AND

These inscriptions may indicate a date of manufacture and therefore give a minimum date of occupation of the site. Discussion - During the actual survey of the entire island, old beach lines were noticed. This phenomenon is not only important in a geographic context, since they mark the
previous extent of the island, but also may be important in an archaeological context. Map-5 shows the former IO beach lines. From the air photographs (73-4608, II8-I2I) of the Mississagi Delta, a smaller island (on Island No. 5) is outlined by the vegetation growth and the last beach line. (see Map-3) If the outline of this smaller island is placed over the extent of the Swimming Bear Site, the congruence of the two is striking. The extent of the site on the river bank is exactly the area that would have constituted the previous island. Evidence to support the hypothesis that the site would be located on the smaller island is indeed scant, and rest upon the slight differences observed in the soil profiles along the river bank, north of the site. Although no interpretation of these soil differences can be offered at present, they probably represent differences in the paleoenvironment.

It is probable, that there have been a number of different
occupations of the Swimming Bear Site. At present, these components cannot be differentiated by stratigraphic methods. The evidence to support the above hypothesis rests on the types of artifacts recovered and the association between the artifacts and their location above the river level.

Before any further discussion can ensue concerning the relationship between historic artifacts and aboriginal artifacts, one basic question will have to be answered: What effect did the influence of European culture have on the traditional technology of the Native People?

The number of historic artifacts recovered is small, some of the artifacts however, are diagnostic of a certain time period. Unfortunately, specific dating of these artifacts will have to be done at a later date. In general, the historic artifacts may be dated ca. 1880. The nature of this site differs from that of the Chiblow Sites. (I, 2,
and 3) The Chiblow Sites are representative of a historic group of people while the historic artifacts associated with the Swimming Bear Site are representative of an historical individual.

Tentatively, the Swimming Bear Site has been classed as a Late Woodland Site (800 - 1600 AD), although diagnostic aboriginal material is lacking.

Area I (see Figure - 6) may represent a later native occupation of the Site than the area north of the rock outcrop. This is based on the paucity of artifacts found in Area I even though an intensive test of this area was carried out. In addition, the occupational area is confined to approximately 1000 square feet. The height above the river varies from 1 to 3 feet.

The area north of the outcrop, in comparison, had a larger number of artifacts per test pit, was located at approximately 8 feet above the river level, and, the extent
of the site is 10,000 square feet.

Specific comparisons of lithic material is unjustified at this particular time because of the small sample size. However, the comparison of quartz to chert may be significant in future studies.

Although no diagnostic ceramic material was found in this survey, an Iroquoian (Lalonde high collar) rim sherd was found on the site. (Ken Buchanan, personal communication, 1975)

This southerly influence is interesting since native copper, which may be from the Lake Superior Region, would indicate a north-westerly influence.

Conclusions - Based on the evidence gathered, the following hypotheses are offered:

1. Swimming Bear Site is a multi-component site.
2. The historical aspect of the site was indirectly associated with the fur trade.
3. The prehistoric occupation of the site was large enough to include several extended families or a small band.

4. Economic ties of the people inhabiting this area ranged from Southern Ontario to North-Western Ontario.

Recommendations -

1. The complete protection of the site.

2. A partial excavation of the site in the area shown in Figure - 6.

5. Renard Site (CbHS-5)

The Renard Site is located in Cobden Township, Blind River District. The exact location of the Site is given by the following degrees of latitude and longtitude respectively: $46^\circ 11', 83^\circ 2'$.

The Renard Site lies on the north-east side of Fox Island. At present, the Site is characterized by a mixed forest growth. Deciduous trees include birch, poplar, maple and oak, while coniferous trees include red pine, white
pine, Norway pine, balsam and spruce. The present forest growth may have been altered by lumbering activities and a forest fire.

Lumbering activity began in this area during the late 1880's and was active until the last decade.

Local informants (Morningstar and others) remembered a forest fire in this area but were not positive about the time or the exact location. Charcoal fragments noticed in the test pits throughout this area, just below the humus layer, would support their claim.

Unlike the mainland which is comprised of sand and glacial till, Fox Island is comprised of sand. There is however, a great deal of variation in the different soil horizons and over a certain distance, there is a variation in amount of deposition of each horizon.

Figure - II shows the basic number of horizons and the
variation that occurs within each horizon.

FIGURE - II: Soil Profile From The Renard Site.

The cultural material was found from just below the humus layer to a depth of approximately 6 inches below the surface. This cultural zone persists through two soil horizons. The first is a dark podzolic soil, while the second
zone is a loamy sand. A study presently carried out at Laurentian University will cope with the problem of soil formation and its relevance to cultural occupations. This information should be available in April of 1976.

The main channel of the Mississagi River parallels the site. This fact is extremely important in light of the fluctuating river levels. The fluctuating river level is a result of two variables, the first of which is seasonality. Informants (Chiblow, Ross, Osborne) have stated that in some years spring runoff has raised the water level as high as six feet above the present river level.

The second variable is the construction of four dams at various points along the Mississagi River. As mentioned previously, the high water mark for the river has been two feet higher than at present. Whether the drop in river level is directly related to the construction of the dams is not
known at present.

Initially, a surface collection of artifacts was gathered along the eroding river bank. By walking along the edge of the site, it became apparent that the site was extensive.

An arbitrary monument was planted and a grid was established. Test pits were then placed along the horizontal base line (parallel to the river) for two hundred feet. At the ends of the base line, two perpendicular rows were placed for a distance of 100 feet. A third row parallel to the two base rows was placed at the monument. Test pits were placed at 10 foot intervals. A total of 57 test pits were dug. Of these, 44 were productive.

Numbers of artifacts along the north base line were fewer than those along the south base line. It was not until a former river channel was reached that the test pits became
sterile. Tests were made along both banks of the defunct river channel and all were sterile.

The west limit of the site extended back from the river bank from 80 feet to 200 feet. The southerly limit of the site was not determined by test pits. The southern edge of the site was unknown until a map diagramming former channels was obtained. At this time, the expansiveness of the site became apparent. The extent of the site and the former river channel are shown in Map-3.

Artifacts Recovered - Forty % of the artifacts recovered were from a surface collection. The surface collection of artifacts were displaced by erosion and would soon have been lost if not collected.

Lithics -

Chert - One type of chert has been identified as Hudson's Bay Lowland chert. (Bill Fox, personal communication, 1975)
The other types of chert are also probably Hudson's Bay Lowland chert, but this has not been verified. The Hudson's Bay Lowland chert varies in color from a brown to grey. Inclusions and striations give a mottled appearance to the chert.

The other types of chert are consistent in color and are either yellow or black in color.

No tools were found. However, a few of the chert fragments had been utilized. The relative abundance of secondary flakes would suggest that tools were manufactured by the people occupying the site. The chert has been analysed in Table 4a of this report.

Quartz and Quartzite - Several pieces of quartz and quartzite were found. This material is available locally. (Phil Kor, personal communication, 1975) It is difficult to determine whether the fragments are the result of nature or
Table - 4A  

Analysis Of Chert Artifacts From Renard Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Cortex</th>
<th>Utilization Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bifacial core</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes, slight wear (L.3 along one edge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.8 slight hinge fractures and scraped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilized flake</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yellow texture</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| flake          | 9       | Hudson Bay   | 1.8   | 1.2   | .4    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | 9       | Hudson Bay   | 1.1   | .9    | .3    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | 9       | Hudson Bay   | 1.0   | .9    | .3    | no     | no                                                     |
| core fragment  | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 1.2   | 1.8   | .6    | no     | no                                                     |
| core fragment  | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 2.2   | 1.0   | .4    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .9    | .5    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .7    | .6    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .6    | .3    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .8    | .4    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 1.0   | .6    | .3    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 1.0   | .9    | .3    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 1.0   | .4    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 1.0   | .5    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | 1.2   | .6    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .9    | .4    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .4    | .4    | .1    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .6    | .4    | .2    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .2    | .2    | .1    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .6    | .4    | .1    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .4    | .3    | .1    | no     | no                                                     |
| flake          | I2      | Hudson Bay   | .4    | .3    | .1    | no     | no                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Cortex</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>black textured</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I6</td>
<td>black textured</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I6</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I6</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>slight wear for I. along edge flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core fragment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhausted bi-polar core</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>flaking has occurred on two rotated platform edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhausted bi-polar core</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>flaking has occurred on two rotated platform edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes - with the flaking edge at 90° to each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The edge of the plate had been seriated by...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Cortex</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>excessive pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>two utilized edges along this flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with scratch marks along the dorsal surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the posterior edge of the platform is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>characterized by slight hinge fractures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>black textured</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>yellow texture</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>black texture</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>black texture</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>black textured</td>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>I.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhausted core</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>two prepared platforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cultural activity.

All fragments were measured, since the quartz and quartzite fragments occurred only where native occupation had taken place. They are analysed in Table 4b.

**Slate** - Several pieces of slate were found. Although this material occurs locally (Ibid) it was found only in areas of native occupation. Slate could have been used as an abrading stone, however evidence of utilization was absent from our sample.

**Copper** - Two pieces of native copper were recovered. Both were rolled and used as beads.

**Bone** - Eight minute bone fragments were recovered. No identification was possible.

**Ceramics** - Six complete rims and 167 body sherds were recovered. The rims are unique in design and in shape, however are comparable in style to Tuntunen ware found on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible core fragment</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core fragment</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bois Blanc Island. (McPherson, 1967) Several tools were used in making the design. These tools were either used in stamping, impressing, pushing or punctuating way on the wet clay.

One rim is straight sided, two have incipient collars; one rim is concave while another flares out. One rim has a small neck.

To attempt to reproduce the designs on the rims, a variety of tools were manipulated in a variety of ways on plasticene. From the impressions left on the rim and the impression left on the plasticene, it is hypothesized that at least two basic tools were used - a cord and a bone. From the six rims, there were a few designs in which it was impossible to determine what tool was used in making the design. For a more detailed description of each individual rim, see Table 4c.

Of the 167 sherds, 38 are decorated. The decoration
### Rimsherds From The Renard Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Design Metrics</th>
<th>General Metrics</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>i</em> - length (mm), <em>ii</em> - width (mm), <em>iii</em> - depth (mm)</td>
<td>(mm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1

- **ii** - 6.0 Lip - 9.2 Designs are the result of dentate stamp, probably a bone tool which was impressed into the clay. The exterior boss is the result of an ovate punctate.
- **i** - 2.0 Max. Width - 11.7
- **ii** - 6.0 Min. Width - 9.9
- **iii** - 6.0 Distance of punctate to
- **a**i - 7.0 lip - 22.0
- **i** - 2.5
- **b**i - 5.0
- **i** - 3.5

**numerals** - designs on exterior of rim from bottom up while

- **A** - lip
- **B,C** - designs on interior of rim top and bottom.

#### 32

- **ii** - 5.9 Lip - 7.8 Designs are stamped onto the wet clay. The tool was probably made of bone.
- **ii** - 5.9 Lip - 7.8
- **ii** - 2.0 Max. Width - 11.2
- **ii** - 3.0 Min. Width - 7.8
- **ii** - 3.9
- **ii** - 3.4
- **ii** - 3.5
- **ii** - 2.7
- **ii** - 2.7
- **a**i - 2.7
- **a**i - 2.7
- **b**i - 12.5
- **b**i - 2.4
- **b**i - 12.2
- **b**i - 2.6
- **c**i - 3.7
- **i** - 3.2

The interior designs are identical to designs numbered 3 and 4. The interior laminations suggest that the lip and the designs on the lip are a necessary feature in the overall construction of the vessel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Bag No.</th>
<th>Design Metrics (mm)</th>
<th>General Metrics</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I8</td>
<td>Ii - 53.0 Lip - broken at lip past break</td>
<td>Max. Width - 10.5 Min. Width - 9.4</td>
<td>Definite breaks and lamination show that the clay was applied in layers. In addition, the vessel was poorly fired. The designs were impressed by a twisted cord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii - 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2i - 43.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(extends past break)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii - 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ii - 5.5 Lip - 7.8</td>
<td>Max. Width - 7.9</td>
<td>The design was impressed with a bone tool. It is the only rim which shows a definite shoulder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii - 2.4 Min. Width - 6.6</td>
<td>2.4 Neck - 23.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3i - 10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii - 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ai - 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii - 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bi - 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii - 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration</td>
<td>Bag No.</td>
<td>Design Metrics</td>
<td>General Metrics</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I8</td>
<td>II - 4.5</td>
<td>Lip</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Designs are slightly obliquely impressed on the wet clay with a probable bone tool. The lip is sloping exteriorly and is unfortunately broken at the design element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 1.9</td>
<td>Max. Width</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2I - 6.0</td>
<td>Min. Width</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 2.3</td>
<td>Incipient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A - un-</td>
<td>Collar</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>II - 25.0</td>
<td>Lip</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>A slightly flared rim. The design elements are smoothed over and therefore it is difficult to determine the kind of tools used in making the designs. One tool used was a twisted cord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 1.8</td>
<td>Max. Width</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2I - 6.5</td>
<td>Min. Width</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3I - 6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ai - 6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bi - 6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ranges from simple designs such as cord impressed to more complicated designs such as fabric or cord wrapped paddle impressed, with smoothing occurring on some of the designs.

Temper varies both in size of material - fine to coarse, and in type of material - quartzite, quartz, mica, organic material. Two sherds from two different vessels were crushed. A great deal of variation in temper was noticed from sherd to sherd. These differences in temper may indicate an individual preference for a particular amount and composition of temper.

General morphology of the vessels cannot be postulated at this time, however, one vessel was partially reconstructed. The cross-section is shown in Figure - I2.

Discussion - The present extent of the Renard Site was finally determined by checking the hypothesis that former river channels did exist, and the banks of these channels would be occupied. By referring to air photographs of the
FIGURE - I2: Renard Site - Vessel Cross-Section

This morphology is consistent with the general morphology of Late Woodland vessels. (see plates XII, XV, McPherron, 1967)

Mississagi Delta, these former channels could be accurately mapped. In the case of the Renard Site, the channel surrounding the Site would make the whole island a site.

In terms of area, the Site would be approximately 130,000 square feet (or 24 acres). As mentioned previously, erosion has destroyed part of the Site, but the actual ex-
tent of damage cannot as yet be determined.

By comparing the bank height of the Wood Site to the Renard Site, a difference of three feet was recorded. If we assume a minimum depth of 2 feet for the past river channel, then the past river level of the Mississagi River would have to be at least 5 feet higher than at present.

The relative absence of lithic tools is not surprising considering the small sample taken from our survey. What is surprising about the chert assemblage in general is not the use of Hudson's Bay Lowland chert, but the absence of Gordon Lake Formation chert. A known quarry site (Flack Lake Site) of Gordon Lake chert is but 30 miles away on the Mississagi River system. Hopefully, future studies will answer the question: Why was the Flack Lake quarry site bypassed?

Tentatively, the ceramic material is associated with the Terminal Woodland Period. This is based on mode of
manufacture, morphology and design types. I must stress the word tentatively because the size of our sample is extremely small and therefore subject to error.

The paddling technique of manufacture as opposed to the coil technique is a characteristic of Terminal Woodland Pottery (Tyyska, 1974). The paddle technique of manufacture accounted for 92% of the sherds while the coil method accounted for 2%. The remaining 6% of the sherds were unknown.

Over time, ceramic vessels also change in form from a cone shape to a globular shape. (Tyyska, personal communication, 1974), (Wright, 1974) Although one vessel may not provide reliable evidence, it does add support to other evidence which indicates a Terminal Woodland occupation.

The decorative techniques present in our collection of rims are again characteristic of a Terminal Woodland Period. These rims may be included in a particular defined type such as Juntunen ware, however the variability that occurs
in the design elements may reflect the potter's freedom in choosing different design elements in which case these decorative motifs may not be particularly useful in grouping these rims into established types. Juntunen Ware ranges in date from I200 AD to I400 AD.

Of the six rims examined, not one design was incised. The incised design style was reported on the Swimming Bear Site and the Chiblow Sites I, 2, and 3. (Buchanan, I974) These incised styles are characteristic of Late Iroquoian Pottery Types, and range in date from I500 AD to I750 AD, in Northern Ontario.

No radio carbon samples were taken from the Site, however a radio carbon sample was taken from the Wood Site. The Wood Site is directly across from the Renard Site on the former river channel and therefore a date from this sample will at least give us a relative date for the Renard Site. A date for the Wood Site will be available in I976.
Conclusions - The following hypotheses regarding the Renard Site are offered, based on the present information:

1. The Mississagi River level was at least 5 feet higher than it is at present.

2. The site was occupied for several centuries.

3. The site is a Late Woodland Site.

4. Of the four major sites (Swimming Bear Site (CbHs-6), Chiblow - I (CbHs-2), Chiblow - 2 (CbHs-3), Renard Site (CbHs-5)) in the Mississagi Delta, the Renard Site is the oldest and the largest.

5. Socio-economic ties revolve around an area that extends from the Mississagi River to Sault Ste. Marie and up to the Michipicoten River, from 1200 AD to 1500 AD.

Recommendations -

1. Complete protection and preservation of the Site.

2. If further excavation is to take place, it should be done where erosion will threaten the site, or by using proper sampling techniques.
Chiblow Site - 3 (CbHs-4)

The Chiblow Site - 3 or Bridge Site was briefly re-visited this fall. It was originally reported by J. V. Wright, 1961. For the most part, the site was partially destroyed by bulldozer activity. A surface collection of artifacts was recovered. It consisted of European and Native material. A bone sample was collected but could not be identified at this time.

Historic Material -

Ceramics - Four ceramic fragments were found. No designs are present.

Buttons - Two 4-holed shell* were recovered. Both are broken.

Pipe - Three clay pipestem fragments were found. No inscriptions or designs are present. The pipe stem hole diameter is 2 mm.

Native Material -

Ceramics - No ceramic sherds were found, however Chief C.

* buttons
Chiblow had in his possession two IroquoianRim Sherds from the site.

Lithics - Both chert and quartz fragments were found. The chert which is identifiable is of Hudson's Bay Lowlands origin. The quartz is from a local source. (Phil Kor, personal communication, 1975) No tools were found. The lithic fragments are analysed in Table 5a and 5b.

Discussion - Disturbance to the site in the way of bulldozer activity has destroyed most of the site. Because of the small sample of artifacts, no interpretation of the site can take place. Tentatively, the site has been designated as a post contact site.

Chief Camille Chiblow has stated that if further development is to take place on his property, he would contact an archaeologist to survey the area that would be destroyed.

Conclusions - No interpretation of the material found can be offered at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>L(cm)</th>
<th>W(cm)</th>
<th>H(cm)</th>
<th>Cortex</th>
<th>Fired</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no, slight edge wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, slight wear length - 2I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>Hudson Bay</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flake</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>platform length - .9 cm rotation - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>platform length - 16 several striking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhausted core</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>L(cm)</td>
<td>W(cm)</td>
<td>H(cm)</td>
<td>Cortex</td>
<td>Fired</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhausted</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, platform length - 18, no rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core flake</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, rotation on 3 axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undetermined</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>L(cm)</td>
<td>W(cm)</td>
<td>H(cm)</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chip</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Stair, 36 X 30, 1½ Storey, Log Clapboarded in good condition.


LAKE HURON DISTRICT - 1st, SEPTEMBER, 1895.

APPENDIX B.

1. Hay Barn and Cow Stable - old, but in fair repair.
2. Store House - very old and shaky.
3. Dwelling of Clerk in charge - comfortable old log house.
4. Root House.

SCALE: 1 IN. = 32 FEET