Historic Kingston
no.3

F
5547
K55H5
no.3
ROBA

HISTORIC KINGSTON

THE BURNHAM SUGAR BOWL
MADE IN THE MALLORYTOWN GLASS HOUSE

KINGSTON HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Kingston, Ontario

No. 3 November 1954

HISTORIC KINGSTON

Being the Transactions of the Kingston Historical Society for 1953 - 54.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The History of the Port of Kingston, by Dr. R. A. Preston, R.M.C.

The History of Kingston Penitentiary, by Mr. J. A. Edmison, Queen's University.

The Story of St. Mark's, by The Reverend Allan J. Anderson, Barriefield.

The Battle of the Windmill, by Dr. G. F. G. Stanley, R.M.C.

Early Canadian Glass, by Mr. G. F. Stevens, Mallorytown.

The History of the Port of Kingston

R. A. Preston, Royal Military College

I. ITS RISE, 1673 - 1845.

Kingston, Ontario, is now distinguished from all other lake and river towns between Montreal and Toronto by virtue of its being a great educational and military centre; but in the past its most important feature, for the greater part of its existence, has been its activity as a great port. The city's fortunes in the nineteenth century were related directly to the rise and fall of its maritime commerce. Other aspects of its history which have attracted much more attention, for instance its importance as a garrison town and as the capital of the united provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, were really dependent upon the city's prosperity as a port. Situated at the junction of the River St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario it had a dominant position as the chief inland port of transhipment on the water route from the Atlantic Ocean to the interior of the continent.

The maritime commerce of Kingston was always subject to many variable influences which were continually operating to further or to impede its growth. Among these the most important were the following: developments in modes of transportation, the opening of rival routes, the settlement of new areas in the interior, British Imperial policy, and the changing relations between the governments of Canada and of the United States. One factor was constant, namely the zeal and vision of Kingston's merchants who planned and worked to maintain the city's maritime primacy. Until the end of the nineteenth century shipping continued to be Kingston's biggest business. Now, fifty years later, when the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway is about to write another chapter in the history of transportation in Canada, and when Kingston's prospects as a port are once again under discussion, it is timely to review the city's maritime history and to analyze the forces which have affected its history as a port.

The site of Kingston, or Cataraqui as it was called, was selected by the French because of its value as a port and not, as is sometimes suggested, because of its strategic position and military strength. The earliest fur-trade route to the Upper Lakes had gone by way of the Ottawa River to keep out of range of Iroquois and English interference; but that route was usable only by canoes. It was clear that the use of the lower lakes would permit larger vessels to be employed for at least part of the way and so decrease the cost of carriage. Hence in 1673 Frontenac and La Salle built a fort at Cataraqui to protect the most suitable harbour for transhipment from river canoe to lake schooner. The fort was secondary to the port.

The French port at Cataraqui was in a little bay inside the magnificent estuary of the Cataraqui river. The little bay faced northeast and thus did not suffer from a disadvantage of the Cataraqui estuary, namely that it is open to the prevailing south-west winds. The old French harbour, now mainly filled in, was located almost in front of the present entrance to Fort Frontenac. There La Salle and his successors built and operated lake schooners which ran regularly to the western end of Lake Ontario and back in less than two weeks carrying trade goods on the outward journey and returning with fur. The schooners also carried supplies and reinforcements for the western forts.

Under the French regime Kingston prospered as a port. Its importance can be seen by the fact that when Col. Bradstreet captured Fort Frontenac in 1758 he found there a warehouse two hundred feet long, six sailing vessels, ten thousand barrels of Indian goods, and provisions, the whole amounting to an estimated value of eight hundred thousand livres (or £35,000 sterling).

But the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence route to the sea had, from the first, been challenged by an alternative route by way of Oswego to the Hudson River. Because the English offered higher prices for fur and the French and Indian traders were inclined to carry their pelts to the south, the French government had to issue orders that canoes (which were also used on Lake Ontario in addition to the schooners) must keep to the north shore. The fall of New France in 1760 was a victory for the Oswego-Hudson route over the St. Lawrence route. The western trade now flowed more freely to the Hudson; and the Ontario - St. Lawrence route and Cataraqui suffered a heavy blow.

With the outbreak of the Revolutionary War the British government found it necessary to re-establish a defended port of transhipment at the junction of the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario. Captain Twiss of the Royal Engineers, sent in 1778 to locate a suitable site, reported favourably on Buck Island, in the channel south of Wolfe Island, in preference to Cataraqui to the north. The southern channel was shorter and more convenient than that to the north of Wolfe Island; and Buck Island, now renamed Carleton Island, was more suitable than Cataraqui as a base for offensive operations against the Americans. A fort named Haldimand was built there, and this new port took over the functions which Cataraqui had performed during the French regime. Canoes and bateaux carried supplies up the St. Lawrence and these were transhipped at Carleton Island into lake schooners for the voyage to the western ports. Cataraqui remained relatively deserted.

Carleton Island had two small sheltered bays, one for naval vessels and the other for merchant ships. But there was little room

for the expansion of mercantile interests. Furthermore its position on an island had obvious disadvantages in time of peace. Therefore in 1783 when Cataraqui, soon to be re-named Kingston, was prospected as a site for a Loyalist settlement, at least two of the shipping firms which had operated through Carleton Island, those of Joseph Forsyth and of Hamilton and Cartwright, moved with the Loyalists and built wharves and warehouses near the old French Fort Frontenac. The new wharves were not actually in the old French harbour. Lieutenant Peachey, one of the officers who went with the Loyalists to Cataraqui in the summer of 1783, has left three drawings which show us that the British merchants built outside of that little bay, on the other side of the old French fort, on the shore of the estaury itself. Why this change was made is not clear Perhaps the old French vessels sunk in the little bay made it unusable. Alternatively it may be that the British intended to use larger vessels than those which had served the French. The old French harbour was probably quite shallow. It was no bigger than the bays at Carleton Island and would be no better than they were for future expansion. Whatever the reason, the change in the location of the port was important. While it made possible the building of a great commercial port at Kingston, it was one that would always be exposed to the wild storms which blow in regularly from the south-west.

For the moment a different problem troubled the merchants in the new port of Kingston. During the war, in order to prevent illicit trade with the enemy, shipping on the lake had been restricted to the naval vessels of the "Provincial Marine." With prospects of rapid expansion of settlement which followed the war, the shipment of colonists, supplies, and produce was obviously about to become a major concern of the shipping industry. But the "Provincial Marine," an organization run under military direction and in military fashion, was unsuitable for this traffic. Under such a system the growth of Kingston as a commercial port would obviously be greatly hampered.

The way for expansion was cleared by the Inland Navigation Act of April 30, 1788 which permitted commercial vessels to operate on the lake and established a registry for lake shipping. The first vessel registered under the new act was the Good Intent of Kingston, a vessel which had been built at Fredericksburg. In Kingston itself Richard Cartwright immediately began to build ships to operate out of the port, the first being the Lady Dorchester. launched in 1789. Five years later, when Governor Simcoe visited Kingston, it had become a flourishing mercantile port. Simcoe wrote: "On my arrival at Kingston I found it improved beyond my expectations; many stores for merchandize and wharfs had been built and new ones were in contemplation. I also found the language of the merchants very much altered. The Fur Trade, as I

had hoped, seem'd no longer the principal object of their attention. They looked forward to the produce of their country as the true source of their Wealth." The foundations of Upper Canada were being laid.

The letter books of Richard Cartwright give a good picture of the forwarding trade of this period in which the barrel of rum was the standard unit for reckoning the cost of carriage. French-Canadian bateauxmen and sailors manned the river and lake craft. Cartwright supplied flour to British garrisons and also to American army posts. He exported pork, middlings, wheat, peas, butter, cheese, lard, potash, and oak staves. The total value of export business carried on by the Kingston merchants, including their forwarding of goods from Detroit and Niagara, was £27,867 (Provincial Currency). In 1800 Kingston became a port of entry for American goods and a customs house was established. Schooners began to run regularly to Sackett's Harbour as well as to other Canadian forts with resulting benefit to the city. Shipbuilding continued to flourish. In 1808 Mr. Cartwright built two more ships, the **Elizabeth** and the **Governor Simcoe** on Mississauga Point where shipbuilding has been carried on ever since. York's isolation up to 1801, when Asa Danforth completed his road along the north shore of the lake, gave Kingston a head start in the race for commercial leadership.

Furthermore, in the period before the war of 1812, developments in transportation did not affect Kingston's strategic position. A bateaux canal to avoid the Cascade rapids was begun as early as 1779. But it was regularly damaged by ice and a second canal had to be dug in 1805. Other St. Lawrence rapids remained as barriers to navigation. Until bigger canals were dug all goods destined for the great lakes had to be brought laboriously from Montreal to Kingston either by being carted past the rapids or hauled up them by ropes. From about 1809 the Durham boat, a rather bigger craft than the bateau, came into use, but it was similar in design, with a heavy oak flat bottom and suitable only for the sheltered waters of canal, river and bay. While some bateaux went on up the Bay of Quinte and even across the Carrying Place over the isthmus of Prince Edward County on to York, it was more usual to tranship into lake schooners at Kingston.

While Kingston was building up its business in commercial transhipment it sought also to become the port of military and naval transhipment and the naval base. Carleton Island had had some disadvantages during the Revolutionary War. It was so close to the American shore that often at night the garrison had been penned up in Fort Haldimand by fear of hostile Indians. Furthermore, after the peace treaty there was good prospect that when the boundary was finally drawn it might be found to be on the American side.

Major Ross, when investigating Cataraqui as a site for Loyalist settlement in 1783, had proposed that a naval base should be built in Haldimand Bay, the next cove east of the Cataraqui River, now called Navy Bay. He had recommended that a breakwater should be built at the entrance to offset the prevailing southwesterlies. In 1785, the merchants built warehouses at Kingston in expectation that government shipment would henceforward be carried on there but in April 1786 the Commander-in-chief ordered that transhipment stores be continued at Carleton Island. In April the Kingston merchants stated that the storehouses on the island were in a bad state of repair and petitioned Lord Dorchester to make their port the naval base for Ontario and the supply depot for the Upper Lakes ports.

However, in 1788 Deputy Surveyor General Collins reported in favour of Carleton Island as against Kingston because "the features of the S.W. end of this island are very singularly formed and seem admirably adapted for all naval purposes, upon a scale perhaps sufficiently extensive for whatever could at any time be requisite upon this Lake." Cataraqui on the other hand, "lies rather open to the Lake, and has not very good anchorage near the entrance, so that they (vessels) are obliged to run a good way up for shelter." Collins was referring here to the entrance to the greater Cataraqui River which was more exposed than Haldimand Cove, the site recommended by Ross, and which also had two shoals in its mouth. He admitted that if the object were transport alone Carleton Island had no advantages but he declared that, as a naval station, the old base was preferable because Kingston was somewhat vulnerable in the rear. He obviously preferred the naval base to be on an island.

Governor Simcoe was also reluctant to move the naval base to Kingston. In his opinion the winter station of the fleet and the re-fitting port should be at York because he considered Kingston open to American attack across the ice. These opinions appear to have delayed the building of a permanent naval base until, in 1794, Lt. Alexander Bryce had made an intensive investigation of all possible bases from Gananoque to the upper part of the Bay of Quinte, twenty-one miles west of Kingston. He reported in favour of Haldimand Cove saying that although Kingston did not command the entrance from the river into the lake, neither did any other place. He saw that it was the obvious place for transhipment from bateau to lake schooner.

Hence the Provincial Marine came to be permanently established in Haldimand Cove, renamed Navy Bay, at Kingston; and the port's significance is made clear by the words of a French-Canadian officer stationed in Kingston during the War of 1812 which describe the city's function concisely and explain its growth. "All

the supplies from the Upper Countries pass through Kingston; it is also the principal depot of military stores, provisions etc. All these stores are usually brought here in bateaux. Large lake vessels, in consequence, seldom go farther down the river, although the largest of them could easily reach Prescott. But the channel is narrow, and the return could only be accomplished with a favourable wind . . ." At the dockyard on Point Frederick were built most of the warships, including the three-masted sloop of war **Royal George** which gave the British a decided advantage over the Americans when the war broke out. As it turned out York was burned by the Americans during the war while Kingston remained perfectly secure. The decision to build the base at Kingston was thus proved to be the correct one.

During the war soldiers, sailors, and craftsmen were brought to the city in large numbers. The story of Kingston as a war time naval base is an important and interesting part of its history as port; but it is too well known to need repeating here. The war, fought in the west, stimulated the carrying trade. Hence in 1815 Commodore Bouchette reported "Wharfes have been constructed, and many spacious warehouses erected, that are usually filled with merchandize. In fact it (Kingston) is now become the main entrepôt between Montreal and the settlements along the lakes to the westward. From the commencement of spring until the latter part of autumn great activity prevails; vessels of eighty to nearly two hundred tons, employed in navigating the lake, are continually receiving and discharging their cargoes; as well as the bateaux used in the river. The harbour is well sheltered and convenient, accessible to ships not requiring more than three fathoms of water, with good anchorage close to the north-eastern extremity of the town."

Yet a map of Kingston's waterfront in 1816 shows that the wharfage was still relatively small. Three piers had been built in the old French harbour and there were a few more at irregular intervals on the west shore of the estuary between the barracks on the site of old Fort Frontenac and Mississauga Point. All these were quite small. Despite Bouchette's enthusiastic account of Kingston's development the great period of expansion was still in the future.

After the war there came depression and falling prices. Freight rates declined as much as 50%. Kingston was affected and many merchants failed. But war had led to a great scarcity of commodities in the country and the reduction of transportation costs actually stimulated the flow of goods and colonists to the west and of western products to the markets of the east and of Europe. Kingston, the port of transhipment from river boat to lake schooner, profitted.

Not all of the expanding trade was legal. To satisfy the demand created by war scarcity, smuggling grew up between U.S. and Canadian ports which the Customs Officers were unable to stamp out. Nor were they any more successful in their attempts to enforce the Navigation Acts. Before the war American vessels on the lakes had traded freely between Canadian ports despite the fact that such trade contravened the Navigation Acts. Immediately after the war a Kingston Customs Officer seized the cargo of an American schooner when it endeavoured to revive the illegal trade. A number of similar seizures occurred; but although Canadian shipping men tried to get the laws enforced, violations were usually winked at. However, all this trade, legal and illegal, benefitted Kingston citizens in one way or another.

To meet the growing demand for the carriage of goods and passengers, ships were needed. Here Kingston's war activity proved a great advantage to the city. The carpenters and shipwrights who had come to the naval dockyard on Point Frederick to build war ships stayed on in the area to build merchant vessels. By their labour they created an industry which was to flourish in the city long after it had decayed in other Canadian and American lake ports. Ships were built on Mississauga Point where Cartwright had had his shipyard. From 1828 to 1832 Robert Drummond owned the yard. When he sold out to MacPherson and Crane he immediately opened a second yard at Portsmouth. The Kingston Marine Railway Company, incorporated in 1836, took over the shipyard at Mississauga Point, built there a large marine railway for hauling ships from the water, and extended the dockyard along the waterfront. One of the promoters of the Marine Railway was Henry Gildersleeve, an American who had worked on the great American warships at Sackett's Harbour during the war and who then became the leading shipping man in the Kingston area. Thus Kingston drew upon enemy resources as well as on those which war had drawn to the port for the defence of Upper Canada.

Gildersleeve had moved to Ernestown (Bath) in 1816 to work on the first steamship to navigate the Great Lakes, the **Frontenac**, which was launched at Finkles Point on Sept. 7, 1816. The construction of this vessel, and of others which soon followed in Kingston itself, was also a direct result of the war. At the instigation of military and naval authorities a committee of the leading citizens of Kingston met together in 1815 to organize a company to build a steamship for the express purpose of forestalling the Americans. One of the provisions of their agreement was that no "alien" could have a share in the ship. It was ironical that the contract for building the **Frontenac** was given to Harry Teabout of Sackett's Harbour, a builder of the American war fleet; but it has been confirmed that the **Frontenac** was in operation before the launching of her American rival, **S S. Ontario**.

The appearance of paddle-steamers obviously posed a serious threat to one of the basic causes of Kingston's primacy as a port. Although the **Frontenac** stuck in the mud on her maiden voyage down the river and had to be ignominiously hauled off by soldiers, the steamers could and did go down river safely as far as Prescott. As they could now ply directly from Prescott to the Head of the Lake the port of transhipment from bateau to lake steamer might well move from Kingston to Prescott. However, for many decades steamers were greatly outnumbered by sailing vessels on the lakes. Furthermore, although they won the passenger trade from the sailing vessels because they were much more convenient and comfortable, for a long time heavy cargo was carried more economically by sailing vessels. Kingston remained the port of transhipment.

The opening of the Rideau canal in 1832 confirmed Kingston's position as the eastern port terminal. Although the canal was built for military purposes, the Ottawa-Rideau route came to rival the St. Lawrence as a means of transporting goods from the oceans of the world to the Great Lakes and the interior of the continent. Steamboats and barges could use the canal. Transhipment to lake schooners was done at Kingston which was therefore the most important shipping centre at the eastern end of Lake Ontario. The steamers in the passenger trade adapted their operations to the fact of Kingston's primacy. Lines fanned out from the port to the Head of the Lake, to American ports, to Prescott, and, via the Rideau, to the Ottawa River.

The opening of the Rideau system in 1832 had brought to the city another advantage which must be mentioned, namely, the opening up of a new hinterland. Much of the lumber and potash derived from clearing the land was exported from the port of Kingston and a regular trade in these commodities developed with Oswego. There was great hope that the country between Kingston and the Ottawa could now be opened up and could produce agricultural products and, perhaps, minerals. Thus, within a generation after the War of 1812, Kingston seemed on the way to becoming an outlet port as well as a port of transhipment.

The naval base at Kingston declined steadily in importance after the war. Even so, for many years it contributed to the city's prosperity. To conform with the letter of the Rush-Bagot agreement, the great **St. Lawrence** and the frigates were laid up "in ordinary"; but £10,000 a year was spent in an attempt to keep them seaworthy. When decay triumphed and the old vessels became waterlogged, ten gun-boats were built on the stocks and the one allowed by the agreement was launched and commissioned. The dockyard was closed down altogether in 1834 and most of its stores were sold off by 1836; but it had to be hurriedly re-opened as a result of the rebellion of 1837. Captain William Sandom, and enough sailors to man a frigate,

were rushed to the city. Gunboats were built and, later, steam-vessels. The first naval steamship on the lakes, a wooden, paddle-driven, schooner-rigged, six-gun sloop of war, **H.M.S. Cherokee,** was built at Kingston in 1842. Thus, although the tremendous activity of wartime was not maintained, the naval base undoubtedly brought business to the city and Kingston remained a great naval port until after the Fenian raids.

However, the chief cause of Kingston's increasing prosperity in these decades after the war was the fact that it was a port of transhipment when the opening of the American west brought a flood of wheat to European markets. In the days before the railways, water transportation was the only means of moving bulk cargoes; and the Great Lakes system provided an invaluable outlet for western grain. Amendments to the British Corn laws ensured Kingston's participation in a good proportion of this trade. In 1825 Canadian wheat was given preference in the British market; and wheat grown in the United States but milled in Canada was classed as "Canadian". Hence a good part of the American harvest flowed through Canada to British ships. The opening of the Erie Canal in 1826 diverted some of this trade from Lake Erie to the Hudson River; but in 1829 some compensation was brought by the construction of a canal at Welland from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario. In 1842 "colonial" wheat was allowed into Britain at a nominal duty of one shilling a bushel and as a result the St. Lawrence trade greatly increased. A grain elevator was built at Buffalo in that year and the Lower Ontario terminals were at Oswego and Kingston. A large part of the grain flowed down the St. Lawrence to the sea and had to be handled in the port of Kingston. So, largely as a result of the opening of the American West, Kingston's rise as a port of transhipment during the generation after 1812 was spectacular. The city seemed destined to become one of the great cities of the North American continent.

The physical expansion of the port in this period is well illustrated by comparing a map of the water-front in 1816 with one dated 1842. Where there had previously been only half a dozen small jetties and wharves, some twenty now filled all the shore between Fort Frontenac and the shipyard at Mississauga Point. Here the great "forwarding companies" which operated on both the Rideau and the St. Lawrence routes had spacious warehouses. Many years later Dr. Barker of the *British Whig* reported that he remembered that in his boyhood in Kingston it was "no unusual sight to see thirty or forty vessels, from a square-rigged three-master down to a small fore-and-aft schooner" waiting to have cargo shipped into barges. The grain was handled in primitive fashion. It was shovelled with scoops by men standing knee-deep in the hold and then moved on stretchers or by horse and tackle. A cargo which today could be moved in seven seconds took seven days to tranship. But of course the large amount of labour involved enriched Kingston's merchants and citizens.

In 1841 Kingston, reacting to the growing stature of its own port, petitioned Lord Sydenham to make Montreal a free port of entry. It realized that any increase in Montreal's trade automatically benefitted Kingston. At the same time Kingston merchants asked that government inspectors for flour, beef, pork, potashes and lumber should be established at Kingston on the same footing as those at Montreal and Quebec, saying that "a large portion of that (export) trade centres at Kingston, being the port of delivery for all the products of the Province and of the surplus of the neighbouring states." So it can be seen that the people of Kingston were well aware of their dependence on their port.

In that same year, 1841, Captain Shepherd took the steamer **St David** from Brockville through all the Cornwall and Coteau rapids to Lachine. He had also succeeded in finding a passage past the St. Ann rapid on the Ottawa which hitherto had been passed only by means of a private lock. Shepherd initiated the practice of towing timber rafts by steamboat to Montreal from Kingston. He also made possible a new circular trade which the "propellers" began in 1841, towing barges down the St. Lawrence and back by the Ottawa and Rideau to Kingston. The deepening of the St. Lawrence canals to 9 feet in 1843 increased the business of towing barges by steamers. In 1845 there were 30 small steamers making the round trip from Kingston. In addition to wheat they carried oats, flour, pork, potashes and staves and brought back for onward transportation to the west coal, salt, general merchandise and immigrants. Kingston's position as the centre of the inland maritime commerce of Canada had thus been firmly established and it was, in effect, in recognition of this fact that Kingston had become the capital of the Canada in 1841. The city seemed destined for a great future.

II—DECLINE, 1845-1953.

The removal of the parliament in 1844 has often been blamed for Kingston's failure to live up to the great promise of its early career. Naturally the departure of the politicians and their clerks and secretaries brought loss to the citizens, especially, as, in anticipation of remaining the seat of the government, they had built the great City Hall and other fine buildings. But the future home of Kingston, like its past, depended much more on its activity as a port and in particular on the flow of grain from the West than on the continuance of parliamentary sessions in the city. The first real blows to Kingston's prosperity were the measures repealing the British Corn Laws in 1846 and the Navigation Acts in 1849. Whereas formerly the "Old Colonial System" had tended to draw American wheat down the St. Lawrence to British ships, the adoption of free trade by Britain, according to Lord Elgin, "drove Canadian wheat down New York channels of communication." The port of New York had certain advantages over Montreal. It was ice-free

all the year round; and it could offer a greater variety of supplementary freights in both directions. The St. Lawrence route, and Kingston, had been dealt a severe blow. Never again was the city to achieve a near-monopoly of the transhipment of grain.

At the same time the improvement of the St. Lawrence canals in the 1840's was steadily working to weaken Kingston's control of the transhipment trade on the St. Lawrence route. After 1843, when the new Lachine and Cornwall canals with a depth of nine feet became available, although most of the grain still went by barge, some lake schooners began to be towed down the canals to avoid the necessity of transhipment. Furthermore, the completion of the St. Lawrence system in 1847 fore-shadowed the end of the Rideau as a commercial waterway and so struck another blow at one of the bases of Kingston's importance as a port.

Other difficulties had also become evident even before the prosperous forties. Kingston's harbour, magnificent as it seemed, had two great advantages. It was wide open to the frequent storms blowing in from the open lake. And shoals in the harbour entrance caused ever more trouble as ships grew in size. A map of Kingston harbour in 1842 was entitled "Part of the Harbour of Kingston showing the Position of the Shoals adjacent to the Town". It shows two shoals in the main stream towards Point Frederick which are covered by only about ten feet of water, and a third (where the Martello Tower was built a few years later) with less than six feet of water. Narrow channels, marked on the chart "deep water", "over 20 feet", had to be negotiated between these shoals. When the wind was high and the water rough, Kingston was not an easy harbour to enter; and sailors on vessels tied up to Kingston's wharves had to give close heed to their shore-lines.

Five or six years before the time when this map was made Kingston newspapers had canvassed the idea of building a pier at Mississauga Point. It had been suggested that the breakwater should run for 400 feet southward and then east toward Point Frederick, making a total length of 1000 feet. It was claimed that 50 vessels would thus be provided with shelter during the mild southerly and south-westerly gales. In 1839 a Kingston merchant, Mr. Markland, had petitioned the Provincial Legislature for the construction of a pier at "Cataraqui Point" near Kingston. It is probable that this was another reference to Mississauga Point near which Markland had property and that it is not a reference to the area near the Little Cataraqui, west of the city. The petition had been reported by a committee but no action had been taken. Kingston's harbour remained dangerous.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding fierce competition from the Erie Canal route now aided by British fiscal policy, notwithstanding the improvement of the St. Lawrence canals, and notwithstanding the difficulties caused by inadequacies of the Kingston Harbour, the

city's mercantile business continued to flourish into the fifties. By 1853 a grain elevator which could handle 3000 bushels an hour and store 80,000 bushels of grain had been erected by the firm of Walker and Berry at the foot of Queen Street. This firm alone shipped annually about 600,000 bushels of grain, mostly to England. Their elevator machinery was driven by a 60 h.p. motor which drove a nail-manufacturing machine as a side-line. A government line of tugs had been established to provide towing service down to Montreal and some of the shippers who had at first taken advantage of the canals to send their schooners down the St. Lawrence began to return to the practice of transhipment into barges at Kingston.

But in the 1850's a recession hit the shipping trade. Over expansion was one basic cause. For instance, Berry of the grain elevator firm, had become too ambitious and had begun to build ocean-going vessels at Portsmouth. When that venture failed, his grist-mill, his warehouse and elevator, and his nail factory were all involved in the crash. A second cause of the slump was the withdrawal of Imperial troops from Kingston for the Crimea in 1853 which cast a blight on the city's business. Soon Canadian lumber interests found that the British transports, which had carried the troops to war, were taking back to England from Black Sea ports at reduced rates, wood which was competing with the Canadian product.

In an essay attempting to explain this depression, C. W. Cooper, the legal editor of the Toronto Globe, wrote that, while the Imperial garrison and the dockyard had furnished employment to a very great number of people directly and indirectly, it was employment in callings which were unproductive and even demoralizing. He instanced the large number of "small inns, taverns, and groggeries". He said that the belief that Kingston's prosperity was based on imperial subsidies was erroneous and that it was actually built on the development of its natural resources. He argued that the temporary check caused by the removal of the seat of government had already been overcome and that the withdrawal of the imperial garrison for the Crimea was not a fatal blow. A "return to the city's many legitimate sources of prosperity and the rapid and certain development of its resources" would, he said, "speedily remove a temporary stagnation".

Cooper's chief thesis was that Kingston's prosperity had been built on its situation and its function as a port of transhipment; and in this he was quite correct. But he seems to have failed to appreciate that there was a new danger to that main prop of the port's prosperity. He mentioned railway building; but he did not understand how it might adversely affect Kingston by creating a rival transportation route which would obviate the necessity for transhipment at the port.

American railroads had reached Lake Ontario in the early forties and, with the support of Kingston merchants, sought to tap the Canadian trade. In 1845, a railway from Toronto to Wolfe Island had been promoted to link up with the American system. The first plan had been to bridge the St. Lawrence at Pittsburgh township, immediately east of Kingston. The Wolfe Island, Kingston and Toronto railway had been incorporated in 1846 and another line from Kingston to Montreal had obtained a charter at the same time. In 1851, the two projected lines running east and west were amalgamated and it was also planned, if the bridging of the St. Lawrence at Kingston proved to be impracticable, to dig a canal across Wolfe Island and operate a car ferry through it to connect with the U.S. railroads. The Kingston City Council arranged for the sale of stock in the canal and itself put up £2,500. Thus Kingston was to become a railway centre connecting Canadian lines with those running to the American Atlantic ports.

Although the incorporation of the Grand Trunk Railway in 1852 destroyed the plans of the earlier Canadian railway companies, the canal and car ferry scheme, in which the Rome and Watertown Railroad owned a half share, went ahead. The car ferry, **John Counter,** was ready to run on December 1, 1853, to bring cars from the Rome, Watertown, and Oswego R.R. at Cape Vincent. They were unloaded at a new stone warehouse in Kingston. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 promised an increase of trade with the United States and gave good hopes of success in this venture. But the G.T.R. was slow to arrive and the car ferry soon found itself profitless. The steamer was sold during the first season of its operation. The plan for linking the Canadian West with American Atlantic ports through Kingston had thus received a serious setback. To the anger of Kingstonians, the G.T.R. station at Kingston, which was opened in 1856, was over a mile from the city, and also from the car ferry stage. Not until 1860 was a branch line thrown to the water-front; and by that time all hope of linking with the U.S. railroads had faded. The termination of reciprocity in 1866 made the plan not worth reviving.

The Wolfe Island canal had not been completed until 1857; it was used until 1890 but only by an ordinary ferry which ran from Cape Vincent to Kingston. Eventually that ceased to operate; and a weedy depression across the island is all that now remains of the schemes in Kingston merchants in the 1850's to make their city a railway centre linking with the United States.

The G.T.R. line along the north shore of Lake Ontario quickly obtained a stranglehold on light freight and fast passenger traffic, and the steamboats, now too numerous for the business, cut their rates in suicidal competition. But the depression lingered on, and the railways were blamed for it. However, early in 1860, the Kingston Board of Trade reported that the competition between the G.T.R. and the steamers had not really hurt the city. "It matters little

whether goods are carried past us by rail or water." The Board felt, perhaps over-optimistically, that the steamers, many of which were still owned in Kingston, could hold their own against the railways in competition for passengers because they were much more comfortable; it went on to declare that the city's most important business was still the transhipment of bulk cargoes from schooners to river boats; it found that the slump was caused by the over-building of sailing vessels in 1854 and 1855 followed by crop failures in 1857 and 1858; and it was confident that the better harvest of 1859 would bring a revival of trade. It is clear that Kingston was still capable of holding a share in the wheat export trade; but because it was now having to share that trade with alternative routes there was not enough trade to go around when business was poor.

Hence it is not surprising that in the second half of the nineteenth century the Board of Trade was active with plans to maintain Kingston's position as a port and to improve its facilities. The crying need was for the opening up of an alternative business to supplement transhipment. One obvious method was to develop the hinterland behind the port. In this work the railway might help. Plans to open up the back country Kingston and Ottawa by various railway developments were discussed in 1854 and again in 1869. In the latter year, to tap mineral resources which were described as "inexhaustible", a railway using cheap wooden rails was proposed. Finally, in 1872 the Kingston and Pembroke R.R. was successfully promoted with a bonus of $400,500 from the government. It was at first believed that the Tête-de-Pont Barracks would be handed over by the government as a site for the station; but the Kingston Board of Trade itself insisted that the line should be carried further west so that it would connect with all wharves and thus support Kingston's function as a port. At the same time an approach was made to the G.T.R. for a "loop-line" through the city.

In 1889 further prospecting having indicated deposits of lead, phosphate of lime, mica, iron ore, and plumbago in the County of Frontenac, the Board urged that the roads leading into the city should be developed. In the same year the completion of the extension of the Napanee, Tamworth and Quinte R.R. to Tweed brought considerable trade to the city; and plans were made for a Kingston, Smiths Falls and Ottawa R.R. In 1895 there were plans for an iron and steel works in the city and as the only site available, on the west bank of the Cataraqui north of the bridge, was inaccessible to vessels of deep draught, the Board of Trade petitioned the Dominion government to dredge the inner harbour. A year later, however, the plan had to be dropped because the supply of iron ore was found inadequate for commercial exploitation. The plain truth is that Kingston did not develop as a big outlet port for the hinterland because the back country produced nothing in adequate quantities for export. The country to the north, at the edge

of the Laurentian shield, was not good agricultural country; and mineral resources were not in adequate quantities for bulk transport through the port.

Nevertheless there were strenuous efforts to make the best of the situation. Some small industries had grown up. In the fifties there was a nail manufacturing plant and a grist mill. In the eighties there were cotton and knitting mills, cigar factories and tanneries, a rope works, milling company, a sawmill and broom factory. By 1890 a car works and an oil cloth factory had appeared. In 1912 there was also a piano manufacturer and a tile and brick works. But all these did not greatly increase the business of Kingston's water front. Calvin's rafting business, which flourished on Garden Island with shipbuilding as a subsidiary, was one of the few large-scale efforts to supplement Kingston's dependence on grain; but, as local timber stands became exhausted, it also became largely a transhipment business and so did not make Kingston an outlet port. In 1901 petitions sought the extension of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway to the Glendower mine and to the iron mines at Carleton Place; and the Board of Trade tried to advertise the iron resources of Frontenac and Lanark counties. In 1907 there was talk of building smelters for zinc and cobalt at Kingston. But all these projects, which might have made Kingston an industrial centre and built up an outlet port, came to nothing. It is significant that Toronto, with a rich agricultural hinterland, and in a convenient location for railway development in several directions, left Kingston far behind both as an industrial centre and also as a port.

Hence, Kingston continued to depend on the trade which had made it what it was, the transhipment of grain. Accordingly, throughout the century, the Board of Trade directed its most strenuous efforts to the retention of that trade. In the first few months after its organization in August, 1851, the Board urged the strengthening of trade bonds with Britain, the best customer for western grain, by the introduction of transatlantic steamers and by a return to differential treatment for British goods. At the same time it proposed various measures to favour goods passing down the St. Lawrence route to the sea rather than through the United States. Although the Board frequently resolved in favor of the improvement of inland waterways it consistently opposed the opening of a canal from Lake Huron to Ontario which might have led to a challenge to Kingston's position as a port of transhipment. It urged the continued subsidizing of the government tug-line operating between Kingston and Montreal. From 1858 it pressed for the remission of all canal dues on the St. Lawrence; but this measure was not finally achieved until 1904 when it was the result of agitation of the Dominion Marine Association, a group of Great Lakes shipowners which was organized in Kingston in that year with a Kingston lawyer, Francis King, as its secretary and moving spirit.

Meanwhile, partly as a result of the Board's efforts, Kingston succeeded in retaining for some time a good share of the growing trade in shipping grain to England. A general depression hit the city in 1875 and 1876 but Kingston merchants felt that they had fared better than those of most other places. Oddly enough the chief cause of Kingston's expanding trade in grain and therefore of the city's continued prosperity was the railway expansion which had at first seemed likely to threaten the city's trade. The opening of the west by the C.P.R. transcontinental line brought a flood of grain to the Great Lakes.

In 1886, the year before the deepening of the Welland to 14 feet was completed, vessels could get through from the Upper Lakes to deliver cargoes of over 50,000 bushels at Kingston. But vessels carrying up to 100,000 bushels were then operating on the Upper Lakes and therefore it was expected that even bigger cargoes would soon be coming through the Canal and that Kingston would need bigger facilities if it was to receive its due share of the trade. In 1871 a new grain elevator had been projected and in 1875 a committee of the Board of Trade had been set up to raise stock for it. In 1882 Richardson's replaced their old elevator, which they had built in 1869, by a new one which could hold 60,000 bushels. In 1890, George Richardson and C. F. Gildersleeve moved a Board of Trade resolution asking for government support for the building of an adequate grain elevator because the task was beyond the capacity of private enterprise. Seven years later, Richardson's elevator having burned down, it was replaced by a new one which could hold 250,000 bushels, and the Board of Trade recommended that the City should subsidize the Montreal Transportation Company (which was rumoured to be planning to leave the city) to build a "second elevator" at the port. So, by the end of the century, Kingston had two new elevators capable of handling the cargoes now being brought from the Upper Lakes in ships which could carry cargoes of over 80,000 bushels.

In response to the challenge imposed by continued growth in the size of ships Kingston also built improved and enlarged repairing facilities. In 1878 in anticipation of the 14 foot Welland Canal the Davis Dry Dock was built in the old French Harbour behind Fort Frontenac. But soon this was not large enough and this fact was emphasized when the "propeller" Myles went aground on a shoal at the entrance to Kingston Harbour and had to go to Port Dalhousie for repairs. Through the agency of John A. Macdonald the government built a new dockyard at the shipyard on Mississauga Point. It was opened in 1890.

But the biggest obstacle to the increase in the size of the grain ships using the Port of Kingston was the condition of the harbour itself. By 1863 many other Ontario ports which were less well

favoured by nature had built breakwaters for the protection of shipping. But Kingston's harbour still lay open to the westerly gales. The wharves were all privately owned and there was no harbour or port authority. Although the city had at one time imposed port dues the practice had been discontinued because it was alleged that vessels were thereby discouraged from coming to Kingston. Hence no fund had been established locally for the improvement of the harbour.

With the growth of the size of ships in the latter part of the century, port development became imperative. In 1872, when the deepening of the Welland Canal to 14 feet was known to be imminent, the Board of Trade requested government aid to deepen Kingston's harbour which was only eleven feet at the wharves in normal times and which, in the low water of that season, had dropped to 9' 6". The removal of the Point Frederick shoal was also requested as was a breakwater, to run from the Murney Tower. The Dominion Board of Trade would not support these requests because they were local matters which it thought ought to be covered by harbour dues. A resolution was therefore introduced at the Kingston Board to prepare for the appointment of Harbour Commissioners to carry out improvements; but for some reason it was withdrawn. Presumably the shipping interests were not prepared to submit to port dues. A year later, in an attempt to get the government to undertake the improvements to Kingston's harbour, some experimental dredging was begun on the shoals. Apparently these tactics were successful for, during the next ten years, the Ministry of Public Works financed a considerable amount of dredging in Kingston Harbour.

However, in 1886, when the **Myles** went aground, the Board pressed for a more vigorous programme of dredging at public expense. Between 1885 and 1896 the water over Point Frederick shoal was considerably deepened at a cost of $66,425. In 1898, in anticipation that the new grain elevators would bring yet bigger ships to Kingston, the Board of Trade again pressed for more dredging to be done at public expense. Effective work was done in 1898 and 1899; but in 1900 B. M. Button, Kingston's M.P., made urgent representations for the building of a breakwater and yet more dredging, saying that the previous work, although considerable, had not been systematic. The channel was still too narrow to allow two of the large grain ships to pass each other. In 1906, 1907, and our 1908 representations for improvements to the harbour were still being made and $50,000 was appropriated for deepening the inner harbour for industrial development but was not spent when the iron mining syndicates concerned abandoned their plans. The root of all the trouble seems to have been that the limestone outcropping under the harbour made dredging a laborious process which could only be justified if profitable commercial expansion could be antici-

pated. As a result, on the eve of the first World War, Kingston Harbour was still too shallow for the safety of big vessels and remained exposed to the prevailing gales.

Meanwhile the prairie harvest continued to grow and bigger ships were being built to carry it on the Upper Lakes. Two years after the building of the second grain elevator at Kingston in 1898 Kingston's merchants petitioned the government to deepen the Welland Canal which had already become a bottle-neck in the lakes grain trade. Silting made the canal actually less than its regulation depth of fourteen feet and many of the big grain boats were unable to pass through into Lake Ontario. The Kingston Board of Trade accompanied its petition for a deepening of the Welland by a resolution against the spending of public money for storage facilities at Port Colborne or Port Dalhousie, saying, "There is no question that the transhipment of grain from lake steamers to river barges should be done at the foot of lake navigation and elevator and storage facilities for this work are already provided at the ports of Kingston and Prescott." However, an increasing proportion of the transhipment from Upper Lakes grain carriers to smaller ships took place at Lake Erie ports and the grain then either went past Kingston down the St. Lawrence or, to make matters worse, through Buffalo down American canals which had been made free of toll in 1885. By 1910 the C.P.R. opened its new grain port and elevators at Port McNicol on Lake Huron and grain which was landed there from the Upper Lakes made the journey to ocean vessels by rail again by-passing Kingston. This trend grew until only about ten per cent of western grain was going down the St. Lawrence. Of that amount Kingston handled only a part.

By 1906 Kingston had become "a city almost without hope". In May of that year, however, the Board of Trade was reorganized to undertake a vigorous programme of economic re-habilitation. This was a period of intense inter-city competition for new industries. Within six years Kingston had successfully re-vitalized its old industries of shipbuilding and locomotive building and had attracted several other industries to the city. But the main plank of the Board's programme, an attempt to restore the city to its position as the chief port of transhipment, had not been successful. In December, 1906, the Board had addressed a query to the manager of the Montreal Transportation Company's Kingston elevator (who happened to be the Chairman of the Board's Marine Committee) to ask whether the elevator was handling its full capacity or whether grain was having to be sent on to Prescott. His answer was not very informative. "They handled there this year all the grain that it was possible for them to do". Whether the elevator was working at full capacity was not made clear, but the real solution of Kingston's problem of re-capturing the trade of transhipment was to bring the bigger grain boats into Lake Ontario. The campaign to achieve this end was given the full support of the re-organized Board of Trade.

Some interests again advocated the building of a new canal from Huron to Ontario to shorten the route and avoid the shallow waters of Lake Erie. Kingston, however, opposed this alternative and put all its efforts behind the deepening of the Welland. By 1910 the city had received some assurances from the government that this would be done and so it turned to the ancillary problem of deepening its own harbour facilities to accommodate the bigger vessels which might now be expected. For a time it was hoped that the development of smelting might bring about the desired dredging of the inner harbour. When that hope faded another obstacle was discovered. It was said that the government was reluctant to undertake the work until something was done about the old Cataraqui Bridge which separated the inner harbour from the outer.

The privately-owned Cataraqui Bridge, built in 1827, was long past its prime. The Annual Report of the Kingston Board of Trade for 1890 had indicated the need for a new bridge, and in 1908 a petition had been sent to the government pointing out that the small swing-span of the bridge prevented large vessels from entering the inner harbour to winter. It had been suggested that the government should build a new bridge at Bell's Island. Nothing had come of this at that time. In 1912 Mr. Francis King of the Board of Trade's Marine Committee expressed the opinion that the government would take no action to improve the harbour until the city had come to a decision about the bridge and that therefore the city could not hope to obtain improvements to the harbour until it controlled the bridge property. He stated that the government preferred to rebuild the bridge at the same place as the old one. A few months later, the private company which owned the bridge having been bought out, Mr. W. F. Nickle, M.P., announced that the plans for a causeway to serve as breakwater and bridge were completed. It was confidently expected that there would be a large appropriation for harbour improvement the next session.

However, things went much more slowly than that. Despite the war which followed two years later, work on the Welland Canal was "well and satisfactorily under way" by 1916; but Kingston had not yet succeeded in getting a start made on its harbour development. In 1919, work on the canal having ceased for a time and then restarted, Kingston had to take up from the beginning the task of persuading the government to build behind its new causeway a great terminal port for the Great Lakes grain trade.

The city appointed a Harbour Development committee in March, 1919, to plan a Deep Water Terminal Port for Kingston. The Inner Harbour was the suggested location but the committee was also instructed to investigate, as possible alternatives, the Montreal Transportation Company's wharves (the present C.S.L. docks) and the Tête-de-Pont Barracks. There was to be ample trackage and wharves for coal and package freight; but the real purpose of

the scheme was to build a deep water terminal for the grain ships which came through the Sault canals. Indeed, the President of the Kingston Board of Trade emphasized this when he wrote in May 1919, "The present work will probably resolve itself into a plant for the transhipment of grain only."

The project of the building of a deep water terminal at Kingston had the support of the Dominion Marine Association in which all the Canadian Great Lakes Shipping lines were represented. In 1919, at the request of the Department of Public Works, the City of Kingston appointed an experienced American elevator engineer, Mr. C. D. Howe, to prepare plans for the terminal. He produced his report on January 20, 1920. He proposed to dredge a 25 foot channel into the inner harbour, to dredge a 25 foot turning basin within the 12 acre area of the inner harbour, to use the material removed from the harbour bottom to connect Bell's Island with the mainland, and to build the terminal on the reclaimed land. There was to be a grain elevator with a capacity of 400,000 bushels and with a storage annex capable of holding 2,800,000 bushels. Mr. Howe stated that borings showed that no rock excavation would be necessary and that the inner harbour, being landlocked and protected by the causeway would require no further protection. Despite the fact that Mr. Howe made it quite clear that a Kingston terminal would compete successfully against rail carriage from the Upper Lakes, the C.P.R., the C.N.R., and the G.T.R., gave full co-operation and advice about laying out the necessary trackage; but the Vice-President of the G.T.R., when his recommendations were not taken, turned rather cool to the scheme, saying, "Inasmuch as . . . the bulk of the grain will be sent forward by water and . . . the amount to be handled by the railroads will be of a much lesser quantity . . . I do not feel that this Company can be of much further help to you." Mr. Howe's estimate for the whole scheme was $2,421,000. A brief, based on his report, was submitted to the federal government and a booklet describing the harbour was prepared. The Kingston Board of Trade was given some kind of promise that as soon as the Welland Canal was completed the improvements at Kingston would be undertaken. It was said that Kingston would thereby not only regain all the shipping it had formerly had but much more and would come to have the same position in Canada as Buffalo had in the United States.

However, the building of the new Welland Canal was a slow process. By 1923 it was learned that the government was still trying to make up its mind whether to build the lower lakes terminal at Kingston or at Prescott. Mr. Francis King, Secretary of the Dominion Marine Association, informed the Deputy Minister of Public Works that his Association, which included all the shipping lines, still preferred Kingston. There is, however, in the files of the Kingston Harbour Improvement Committee a curious letter from which the signature has been cut off and in which one of the steam-

ship lines circularized its masters to say that the Company was in favour of Prescott and that the captains and mates were to send in letters in support of that location. It went on to say, "Any of you captains who can get letters supporting our views from captains who are not in our employ" were to do so. Notwithstanding this break in the ranks, the shipping men as a whole did not want to take the new big ships down the precarious channel to Prescott; in 1923, 1924, and 1927 representations were made to Ottawa; and literature was printed to show that the narrowness of the channel in the St. Lawrence and the frequency of fog made the voyage to Prescott dangerous. It was said that if any of the new long grain carriers went aground they might swing around and block the whole of the navigable channel.

But all Kingston's efforts were of no avail. The government appointed a committee of engineers to report on the proper site for the lower lakes terminal and towards the end of the session it announced that they had decided in favour of Prescott. The engineers' report was never made public, allegedly because of difficulties experienced in getting the United States to agree to dredge its share of the channel in the river; but it is said that the reason given for the abandonment of the Kingston project was the same which Kingston had long urged against Prescott, namely that fog menaced the entrance to the inner harbour. Prescott's advantage, of course, was that it gave sixty miles more of water-carriage without breaking bulk. Accordingly the government built the elevator for the lower lakes terminal down the river at Prescott.

When it had become clear that this would be done the largest Canadian grain-carrying concern, the Canadian Steamship Lines, at once declared it would not send its big ships down the sixty miles of river channel but would build its own facilities at Kingston. In May 1927 Mr. Coverdale of C.S.L. and Mr. James A. Richardson, the grain merchant, endorsed a plan to build an elevator by private enterprise at Kingston, on the site of the Montreal Transportation Company's Dock and Tête-de-Pont. Apparently the inner harbour was not selected because of the great expense which the necessary facilities would cost there and perhaps because of the fear that the causeway would cause continual trouble through the silting of the basin. In any case, as the government had just rejected the plan to build there, it was probably easier to obtain government help for dredging at a different site. A few months later, however, the Mayor and Mr. W. F. Nickle were sent as a deputation to endeavour to persuade Mr. Coverdale to build the terminal above the causeway. They were unsuccessful; and indeed after investigating the dredging necessary to open a channel as far as the proposed site on the Montreal Transportation Company's property, it was decided to move the whole project even further away to Cataraqui Bay at the west end of the city. This decision may have been due to doubts about the feasibility of opening a deep channel in the mouth

of the Greater Cataraqui where rock had always made dredging difficult. But it was possibly also influenced by another factor. The size of grain ships had increased much beyond those of 1919 when the Howe plan was drawn up and the length of ships like the **Lemoyne** made manoeuvring in the narrow channel of the mouth of the Greater Cataraqui extremely difficult. The government agreed to dredge Little Cataraqui Bay and to build moles for the protection of the ships at the elevator wharves. The port of transhipment thus moved from the Greater Cataraqui to the Little Cataraqui. The great elevators which had dominated Kingstons waterfront during the early years of the twentieth century became white elephants. To the new elevators grain boats brought cargoes ten times as big as those previously coming to Kingston. Kingston had not been reinstated to the monopolistic position as a port of transhipment that it had occupied a century earlier, but it had now gained a much greater part of the trade than it had had at the beginning of the present century.

Hardly had the new elevator been built when the great depression came. During the thirties the government elevator at Prescott was little used and most grain ships carried to the Kingston elevator. But Kingston's port declined in all other respects. A great many freighters were tied up for lack of cargoes; and indeed, apart from the trade in transhipment of grain at the new elevator (which employed many fewer men than were employed in transhipment a hundred years earlier), the only function of the Port of Kingston came to be as a port of call for a few daily tourist steamers and as a port of safety for vessels during the winter season. Package freight, which had once been a large subsidiary industry in the port, had disappeared largely as a result of changes in warehouse and wholesale organization in the Province. Due to the improvement of motor transport Kingston had lost its place as a centre of wholesale business for the old Midland District which could now be serviced by road from Toronto or Montreal. During World War II a few small naval vessels revived the memories of the great shipbuilding of earlier days; but the new industries which came into the city, the Aluminum Plant and the C.I.L. Nylon Plant, did not use water transportation to any extent for their raw materials or their finished products. After the war even the remnants of the tourist trade in big ships went with the laying up of the **Kingston** in 1951; and the fleet of launches now making daily trips through the Thousand Islands is but a trivial reminder of what had once been a great system of passenger transportation.

The plans to build the great "Seaway" to connect the Great Lakes with the Ocean have raised once more the question of Kingston's value as a port. Indeed the old Howe plan has been pulled off the shelf (now increased in cost to about $4,000,000) and Kingston has been given assurances that, if the city will surrender its title to the harbour (vested in it by the Act which created the Corporation

of Kingston and which pre-dates the British North America Act by which harbours were made the property of the Dominion Government) federal government money will be spent on the development of the port of Kingston as part of the overall plan for the seaway.

In this connection the foregoing account of Kingston's history as a port has some important lessons to convey. In the first place, the Howe plan of 1919 was primarily to make Kingston a terminal port of transhipment, and indeed to take advantage of the fact that the deep waterway terminated at the eastern end of Lake Ontario and did not carry through to the sea. It is obvious that the creation of the Seaway will not increase Kingston's function as a transhipment port for grain but may possibly decrease the business carried on in Little Cataraqui Bay. Secondly, it is obvious that weight must be given to the arguments which led to the transference of the port for grain transhipment from the inner harbour to the deep water west of the city. However, these arguments may have less force with regard to a Seaway port since it was the phenomenal length of the grain-boats which necessitated the change and it will not be grain-boats but ocean steamers that will be using the new port. Thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, it is clear that the importance of Kingston as a port has, throughout its history, rested on its position at the junction of two different types of waterway and therefore as a port of transhipment from one vessel to another. All efforts to build it up as a great port of outlet for the hinterland have met with failure and indeed what little business it did in that direction has faded away in the twentieth century. No outlet business presently exists for a new port development. On the other hand, it is claimed that the opening of the seaway and the improvement of transportation will bring the possibility of new industrial development to the adjacent country along the whole length of the river and lakes. Obviously such industrial development will occur where the port facilities are available. If Kingston is to obtain a share of that industrial development it is imperative that its port facilities be improved.

The History of Kingston Penitentiary

J. Edmison, Queen's University

The Penitentiary "near the Town of Kingston" was opened on 1st June, 1835, when six convicts were received, five of them from Toronto. The institution was built on land, "combining the advantages of perfect salubrity, ready access to the water, and abundant quantities of fine limestone." The situation was described as "Lot number twenty, in the first concession of the Township of Kingston. . . . The west half of this lot, belonging to the heirs of the late Philip Pember, which contains 100 acres of land, reaching from Hatter's Bay, on Lake Ontario, to the rear of the first concession, was accordingly purchased for the sum of one thousand pounds . . . twenty or twenty-five acres on the front of this lot would, perhaps, furnish all the room that is required for the Penitentiary buildings . . . and the Legislature might therefore direct the residue to be sold. The Commissioners are, however, of opinion that the land is worth the purchase money, and should be retained for public uses. . . ."

The Penitentiary was built upon the plan and lines of the Auburn, N.Y., Prison. The Deputy Keeper of Auburn, William Powers, was hired, at £350 per annum, as building superintendent. The estimated cost was £56,850 sterling. To enclose nine acres of yard walls the sum of £7,500 was estimated. The architect was William Coverdale, the first Warden was the highly controversial Henry Smith Senior, and the first surgeon, Dr. James Sampson, who in 1854 became the first Dean of Medicine at Queen's.

Kingston Penitentiary had only been operating a few years when an agitation was made to have it moved to Marmora in Hastings County. The Honourable Peter McGill of Montreal was willing to sell the Marmora Iron Works for £25,000. Two of the three Commissioners appointed by the Legislature to study the question reported that such a move was feasible and that the Iron Works could be operated by the convicts at an annual profit of £13,037. 18s. 6d. The third Commissioner, Isaac Fraser of Ernestown, however, put in a minority report (dated 20th February 1839), stating . . . "The principal object of transferring the Penitentiary from Kingston to Marmora, would seem to be the employment of convict labour so as not to interfere with the pursuits of the honest mechanics of the Province: but if this object can be equally well attained at the present establishment, it is evident that the loss of the large amount already expended on it will be avoided, and the necessity of a further large outlay would be prevented." Mr. Fraser was eloquently supported in his viewpoint by a communication from Mr. William Powers, Building Superintendent of Kingston Penitentiary. Mr. Powers wrote, in part:

> The wealth and prosperity of a community proceed from the industry of the inhabitants, and is increased in proportion to the produc-

tiveness of the labouring classes; in the benefits of which, all classes participate. Every dollar earned by an individual is so much addition to the commonwealth. No class of society is more interested in an increase of national wealth than the mechanics, or more benefited by it, —as a demand for their labour, and skill in articles of convenience and ornament, will increase with an increase of wealth and refinement. Whatever objections may be made against productive mechanical labour in a Penitentiary, will apply with equal force and reason against water and steam power, and against all inventions and improvements in labour saving machinery; which improvements, by facilitating manufacturing operations, and increasing the product of individual labour, thirty, fifty, or perhaps a hundred fold, notwithstanding its dense population, has made England rich.

I have been informed that a proposition was once made by some person to bring water to the Town of Kingston in pipes or an aqueduct, the Town being mostly supplied from the Lake, drawn by carters; and the proposition was objected to by some, because (they said) it would injure the carters by throwing them out of employ. The objection in the case above, is precisely the same in principle as those made by the mechanics against the Penitentiary, which principle, if universally allowed and carried into effect, would annihilate the arts and sciences, change the plough for the spade or the mattock, and bring mankind to a state of barbarism.

It is said, likewise, that learning the convicts a trade, which they may follow when they are set at liberty, will disgrace the honest mechanic. I cannot see why mechanics should be disgraced by the occupation at mechanical labour, of those who had been convicts, than the farmer would be disgraced, should they follow the plough. If there is any reason at all in this objection, it will apply with equal force against all labour by one who had been guilty of crime, and the divine precept, "let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labour," would be wrong. Of all complaints made or grievances imagined, those of the mechanics against the Penitentiary are, in my opinion, the most preposterous. As well might the physician complain of any measure to preserve the public health, or tavern-keepers, distillers, and gin-shops, of efforts for the promotion of temperance.

Discord and turbulance marked the administration of the Penitentiary in its early years. Warden Smith seemed to quarrel with most of his associates. The Deputy, William Powers, was soon dismissed. The Warden, through his parliamentary son (afterwards Sir Henry Smith) had his own salary increased and those of the Surgeon, Chaplain, and Architect, who had criticised him severely, correspondingly reduced.

Although the Penitentiary did not open until 1st June 1835, five convicts from Toronto had arrived on 27th May and these had to be confined in the County Jail at Kingston until the Big House was

"open for business." On 2nd November, 1835, the Inspectors reported — "It is observed that the sentencing of females to the Penitentiary causes some inconvenience." Other custodial problems are stressed in the first Report, dated 2nd November, 1835.

> In consequence of this sudden concentration within the boundaries of the Prison of so large a number of criminals, many of them daring and desperate, and all unsubdued in temper, and strangers to the restraints of discipline, the Board felt the importance of impressing on their minds the hopelessness of attempting to escape, by adopting every means at their disposal for preventing all conspiracies for mutual aid and co-operation in their insurrectionary schemes. This point was the more urgent, since the yard was surrounded merely by a plank fence, and the prisoners might think it practicable to break through it, if they did not see that they were at all times watched by a sufficient force.
>
> The Warden was accordingly authorized to engage two more Keepers and six more Watchmen.

At this date the penitentiary population was 62. "The cost of a daily ration at first amounted to 7⅛ pence per diem, and is now estimated by the Warden at 5 7/10 pence per convict. As the number of the convicts increase, and the culinary arrangements of the Prison become improved, the cost of sustenance may be expected to diminish."

On October 22nd, 1836, the Inspectors of Kingston Penitentiary had published the Rules and Regulations of the institution. These were pretty strenuous for both staff and inmates alike. The Warden had "to attend constantly at the prison." The guards were to be on duty from five in the morning until 6.30 in the evening, seven days a week, from the 1st of April to 30th September. "During the remainder of the year, the hours for continuing the Prison open, shall embrace all day light." The standard wage for guards was £37, 10s a year. Many of the keepers were illiterate(as we see from the number who signed receipts and depositions by their mark). Their duties were onerous as they had to "preserve unbroken silence" among the inmates, who under the Rules—"must not exchange a word with one another under any pretence whatever." The convicts also "must not exchange looks, wink, laugh, nod or gesticulate to each other." When the bell rang for them to go to the mess hall they were to come out of their cells "in regular order and march with their faces inclined . . . " in one direction. At Chapel the convicts were to be "so seated as to confront the Minister, without looking into each other's faces." The convicts were to yield "perfect obedience and submission to their keepers"—and were, at all times, "to labor diligently." Over them always hung this final threat — "for the wilful violation of any of these duties, corporal punishment will be instantly inflicted." (As we shall see presently, this was by no means an idle threat.) These 1836 extracts will serve to indicate how depressive and soul destroying the

atmosphere must have been. This custodial circus was always open for the citizens of Kingston to visit: "male adults, 1s 3d each, females and children, 7½d each."

The smallest section of all in the 1836 Rules and Regulations had to do with the discharge of the Convicts. It was as follows:

> . . . a discharged convict shall be clad in a decent suit of clothes, selected from the clothing taken from new convicts . . . . He shall then be supplied with money, according to the distance of the District where he was tried and sentenced, but not exceeding the sum specified in the law (one pound). As the time when the convict is about to be discharged is favourable for eliciting truth, with a view to obtain facts which may be useful, the Chaplain will endeavour to obtain from him a short history of his life, his parentage, education, temptations, and the various steps by which he was led into a course of vice and crime, and commit the same to writing, for the information of the Inspectors; after which, the convict shall be discharged with a suitable admonition and advice.

I do not envy the Chaplain giving "suitable admonition and advice" under all the circumstances which we now know existed at Kingston Penitentiary.

Repression almost invariably brings about a blow-off in time and this one finally happened in 1849, fourteen years after the opening of the prison. Headed by the afterwards famous George Brown, a Commission set up headquarters in the British American Hotel in Kingston to ". . . investigate into the Conduct, Discipline and Management of the Provincial Penitentiary at Kingston." This enquiry was directly brought about by the disclosures of the prison physician, Dr. James Sampson. (I am sure, when the Centenary of the Queen's Medical School is celebrated in 1954, that more will be heard about this remarkable man who was the first Dean of Medicine at Queen's. He was also a founder of the Kingston General Hospital and several times Mayor of the city. He was an Irishman, a doctor in the British Army, who took his discharge in Kingston, much to the benefit of this community.) I have one of the very rare copies of the Finding of this Commission. Even after a century its lurid revelations make terrifying reading.

The document contains material and disclosures so incredible and bizarre that the so-called "good old days" quickly lose their reputation for saintliness and humanity. The eighty-four double pages of the Report are crammed with charges of graft, corruption, cruelty and sinister politics. The Commissioners were very severe in their condemnation of the treatment accorded child convicts. They pointed out the case of Convict Peter Charboneau, who was committed on the 4th of May, 1845, for 7 years, when he was ten years of age. They said "The Table shows that Charboneau's offences were of the most trifling description—such as were to be expected from a child of ten or eleven (like staring, winking and

laughing); and that for these he was stripped to the shirt, and publicly lashed fifty-seven times in eight and one half months." Then there was the case of Convict Antoine Beauche, committed on the 7th November, 1845, for three years, aged eight. "The Table"— they said "shows that this eight year old child received the lash within a week of his arrival and that he had no fewer than forty-seven corporal punishments in nine months, and all for offences of the most childish character. Your Commissioners regard this as another case of revolting inhumanity." They cite other cases of the same description and observe—"It is horrifying to think of these little children being lacerated with the lash before five hundred grown men; to say nothing of the cruelty, the effect of such a scene, so often repeated, which must have been to the last degree brutalizing." Even the linguistic angle comes up in these sordid revelations, because it was found that a French-Canadian boy convict named Alec Lafleur, aged eleven years, was on Christmas Eve, 1844, given twelve strokes of the rawhide for talking French. The Commissioners also delved into the practice of flogging women in the Kingston Penitentiary of a century ago. One perhaps shouldn't refer to Sarah O'Connor as a "woman" since she was only fourteen years of age when flogged five times in three months, and the same applies to Elizabeth Breen, who was only twelve years of age when on six occasions she was lashed. We can agree with the Commissioners when they say "We are of the opinion that the practice of flogging women is utterly indefensible."

And so the Report goes on, revealing barbarity after barbarity, and also corruption and inefficiency on a vast scale. Yet all this was, I suppose, unknown to most of the citizens of Kingston who were watching with pride the early beginnings of a little school called Queen's College, and had no concern in what went on behind the grim walls of the other institution at Portsmouth. Perhaps their suspicions, if any, had been lulled by the glowing tribute paid by the eminent Charles Dickens who said, in his *American Notes*, after a visit to Kingston in the eighteen forties. "Here at Kingston is a penitentiary, intelligently and humanely run." I am sure that when the author of *Little Dorrit* visited the prison they did not put on a special flogging of Antoine, aged eight, or of Elizabeth, aged twelve. Yet it should not be thought that these unspeakable happenings were approved by all the penitentiary officers. Some indeed spoke out against them and were afterwards fired on trumped-up charges. Others had their salaries sharply reduced by a parliamentary bill introduced by the warden's son, who very conveniently was also a member of the Legislature for Kingston. (The same warden had another son who was on the prison staff and there was evidence that this favoured young man used to amuse himself by hurling water at the prisoners and by using them for targets in his bow and arrow practices.)

These 1849 Commissioners did a thorough job of removing many of the sadistic, grafting, illiterate prison officials, or having them resign under fire. The harm these monsters did while in office could never of course be undone: for instance, the 720 lashes given James Brown, "an insane prisoner," during his confinement. All honour to Dr. James Sampson, who despite much abuse and name-calling, brought on this belated investigation.

The first Penitentiary Report after the Brown Commission was dated March, 1850. There was a new Warden—Angus Macdonell, and a new Board of Inspectors. Pride is taken in the reduction of punishments, in one year, from 6,000 to 3,825. (Floggings with the cat and confinements in the Sweat Box and in chains had been greatly reduced.) At this time there were 410 inmates, 24 of them being females. Convict labour was a major concern of the Inspectors. The letting out of contracts to outside parties was apparently a big problem—

> In the management of the Industrial Department we have encountered some difficulty. We endeavoured to obtain wholesale orders for various articles to be made by the Convicts, without success; and the same fate attended our efforts to induce parties to hire the labour of the Convicts for the prosecution of branches of trade not yet extensively carried on in the Province. Our last and only resource was to hire out the labour of the convicts for any trade, to any responsible parties who might be willing to contract with us for a term of years. We endeavoured to obtain Contractors by public advertisement and personal solicitation in the Province and elsewhere, but though in treaty with various parties, we did not succeed in closing any contract until the 7th June, 1849. On that day, we concluded an agreement with Mr. E. P. Ross, of Port Byron, in the State of New York, for the labour of fifty Convicts, to be employed in Shoemaking, with liberty to increase the number to one hundred. The Contract was made for five years, at the rate of 1s. 6d. per day for each man, and it was to have commenced on the 15th June. In consequence of the prevalence of Cholera, however, Mr. Ross did not commence operations until the 16th July; he has gone on since then satisfactorily, and will, we understand, shortly call upon us for the additional fifty men to whose services he is entitled.
>
> In June, we opened negotiations with Mr. John Stevenson, of Napanee, C. W., and Mr. William Stevenson, of Auburn, State of New York, for fifty men, to be employed in Cabinet-making. After protracted negotiations, we succeeded in concluding a contract. Twenty-five men were to have been taken on 1st February 1850, and twenty-five on 1st August, 1850; the Contract to be for five years from February, 1850, and the price 1s. 6d. per day. The Contractors are putting up machinery of the best kind, for carrying on the business, and in a very few weeks the whole will be in vigorous operation.

> On the 15th of February, 1850, we concluded a contract with Mr. George Brown, Clothier, of Kingston, and Mr. J. A. McDowall, Furrier, of the same place, for the labour of 50 Tailors; thirty to be taken on 1st April, 1850, ten more on 1st July, 1850, and ten further on 1st October, 1850. The Contract is to run for five years from 1st April, 1850, and the price is 1s. 6d. per day. We have also closed an agreement with the same parties for supplying the Prison Clothing, at rates which will secure a large annual saving to the Institution on the expenditure of past years.
>
> We are now in treaty with several other parties, for the disposal of the remaining available labour of the Convicts, and doubt not, that ere long, we shall succeed in disposing of all of our command.

In this 1856 Report on Kingston Penitentiary, we find about every possible combination of statistics on the 668 convicts then confined in the institution. Their crimes (horse stealing, 42; oxen stealing, 1)—Where they were convicted (Montreal, 115; Toronto, 96)—Their occupations (labourers, 373; law student, 1; medical student, 1; seamstresses, 49). The Chaplains also juggle with figures. We find listed the crimes committed by Methodist convicts, by Presbyterian convicts and those committed by convicts who have been blacksmiths. The zealous Protestant padre asked each convict discharged during the year—"Do you go out a better or a worse man?" He lists their answers as follows:

55—Go out improved morally
7—Go out much better
1—Better in prudence
1—Inclined for the better
1—Not much better
1—Not better
2—Neither better or worse
1—About the same
1—Better in a great many ways
1—Not any worse
3—Cannot say whether improved
1—Is not better
2—Goes out worse
5—No definite answer

All this was evidently pleasing to the Padre because he adds, "These answers make it evident . . . that the discharged convicts, generally, leave the prison morally benefitted." We can question his assurance on this point when we study the Punishment Chart in the same 1856 report. Although the Warden says, "the treatment of convicts I consider to be humane," the Chart shows 1,600 deprivations of bed with concurrent bread and water diet, 735 confinements in the dark cell, 111 convicts punished by water shower, and numerous lashings including that of one convict who was given 84 strokes of the cat in the month of March, 1856.

Ordinarily only those sentenced to two years or over have been incarcerated in Kingston Penitentiary. However, during the time Kingston was a garrison city, military offenders were confined there. It is rather strange to read over the alphabetical convict lists of a

hundred years ago and to see the name of a soldier serving 7 or 14 days for drunkenness and next to his the entry of a man doing 30 years or life for manslaughter or rape.

One crime now appearing strange is that of "returning from banishment." There were quite a number convicted on this account and confined in the Penitentiary. These were mainly those who had been "banished" from Canada due to their support of Messrs. Mackenzie and Papineau in 1837.

One of the best and one of the most humane Wardens of Kingston Penitentiary was John Creighton who held that difficult post from 1870 to 1885. His great-granddaughter, Mrs. Frances Chambers of Kingston, has given me the chance to see a batch of letters received by him from many ex-convicts. During his regime, following the Fenian Raid, he had as his "guests" numerous Americans of Irish extraction. These gentry, many of them, took pen in hand on return to their homes in the United States and in varied ways paid tribute to their late Custodian. One, in 1872, was graduated as a medical doctor from Bellevue Hospital, New York. He is sorry that Mr. Creighton could not attend his graduation, but expects him to be an honoured guest at his wedding. He wrote, "I am bound you shall come to my wedding, even if I have to fix the time therefore with special reference to your convenience." The guests at the St. Patrick's Day Dinner in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1872 must have been very disappointed in one of their 'free ticket' guests. He had been expected to "tell all" in relation to his "horrible experiences in a foreign penitentiary." However, he writes—"I am going to disappoint them very much. If I do say anything about prison treatment, especially since that noble Warden Creighton took his place there, I could not say anything but what was gentlemanly towards him for I love and esteem him the same as if he were my own Father or Brother . . ." Sometimes, also, Warden Creighton would receive letters from grateful relatives. From Manchester, England,— "If I ever go near to Kingston, I shall want to go to see you and thank you in person for your kindness to my brother and your concern for me. May God forever bless you and your's is the sincere prayer of a convict's sister." Warden Creighton not only had the respect and affection of the inmates but of his staff also. This note came out from Keepers Hall on 9th February, 1885:

> We the Officers of the Kingston Penitentiary cannot allow the death of our beloved Warden John Creighton to pass without giving expression to the deep grief we feel at his loss. To us he was ever kind and considerate ever mindful of our smallest wants. To our shortcomings he was forbearing and if at times he had to reprove somewhat sharply it was intended for our good and by him soon forgotten for he remembered that we were but men. By his death society has lost a valuable member. The country has lost a faithful and trusted servant. His bereaved family have our sincere sympathy for it is there his ab-

> sence will be most felt. It was in the family circle the grand qualities of the man had their fullest development. But he is gone fallen a martyr to the great Interest committed to his charge. And those who knew him best loved him most.

Other Wardens have also left their mark in the community and in the institution. Such names as Lavell, Platt, Ponsford, are well known in Kingston. (Queen's graduates will recollect that it was a son of Warden Lavell who was mainly responsible for the famous Gaelic yell of Queen's!) Some have stayed aloof from local affairs. Others like the present incumbent, Richard M. Allan, have become prominent in the community. (Mr. Allan is as well regarded in curling and service club circles as he is in penal ones.) The post of Warden at Kinsgton Penitentiary has never been an easy one. Aside from the obvious problems of custody and internal discipline, the Warden has in the past been hemmed and circumscribed by official red tape. The Archambault Report brought out the ludicrous limitations placed on this important functionary by armchair authority in Ottawa. Now, happily, under the present administration of Commissioner R. B. Gibson, that has changed. The Warden now has the freedom and discretion, especially in his public relations, which his position deserves.

Kingston Penitentiary has through the years been more in the public eye than any other penal institution in Canada. Royal Commissions have on several occasions probed its operations. In 1913 a Commission, of which Dr. Frederick Etherington of Kingston was a member, was set up to investigate and report upon, the conduct and administration of penitentiaries and particularly the conduct of the officers of Kingston Penitentiary. In 1920, W. F. Nickle, K.C., of Kingston, was a member of another Commission which gave special attention to the local institution. The Archambault Commission, before reporting in 1939, spent several weeks in an intensive study of all aspects of Kingston Penitentiary management. In addition, there, of course, has been much additional publicity centred on Kingston Penitentiary through the careers of such notorious alumni as 'Red' Ryan and 'Mickey' McDonald. The underworld in Toronto has a term, "down East," which means "Kingston Penitentiary." In official circles "K.P." is often used. Citizens of Kingston for generations tried to point out that the penitentiary was situated in Portsmouth, and not in Kingston. This technicality availed not and in the popular mind "Kingston" meant "The Big House." Now, however, there is no point to even this distinction because of the merging of the two municipalities.

Fort Henry is the biggest tourist attraction in this area, but I am afraid that "K.P." is not too far behind. The number of cars whose drivers "just want to pass in front of the place" is very considerable indeed.

You may gather from this fragmentary narrative that it has not been too easy to collect data on the long history of Kingston Penitentiary. It is certainly easier to obtain information about the early days of a university than about the pioneer stages of a penal institution. In the latter we do not ordinarily find plaques to founders or memorial windows to first enrollers. "If walls could talk" we would indeed have a story of drama, of tragedy, of cruelty, of every vicissitude of human emotion. We would have a story of people who have been forever 'crushed' in that penal environment and of others who have 'found' themselves in it. We would have a story of staff personnel who have ranged from the illiterate and the sadistic to some whose idealistic, unselfish, ill-paid service is one of our finest Canadian sagas. The penal historian of the future will have much more material to draw on. The public is no longer kept in ignorance of what goes on behind penitentiary walls. The press and the radio are welcomed, and play an important part in the public relations programme. No longer can monstrous abuses exist as they did exist so often and for so long behind the limestone walls of Kingston Penitentiary. And further, the future historian will have the priceless source of the files of the K.P. Tele-Scope. In the old days the inmates could not speak to each other, let alone write an intimate journal which every Canadian can obtain for one dollar per year!

Today, in Kingston Penitentiary — "Prisoners are People." The results of this new and civilized approach are already apparent. I count among my friends many dischargees who are 'making good' and are a credit to their country. There is always tragedy present when the shackled individuals are ushered off the train at Kingston station en route to the Penitentiary. That so many of them can afterwards emerge therefrom with hope for the future is perhaps the most important thing one can now say in dealing with the History of Kingston Penitentiary.

The Story of St. Mark's

The Reverend Allan J. Anderson, Barriefield

If you would look at a map showing the Anglican Dioceses of Canada, you would see that at the present time there are twenty-eight such divisions of the church. But if you could see a similar map dated 1843, you would find only three divisions. These would be marked Diocese of Nova Scotia, Diocese of Quebec, and Diocese of Toronto. This latter included all Upper Canada. The Bishop of Toronto was Bishop John Strachan, and it was to him that a letter went from Barriefield, under the date of April 14th, 1843, asking his sanction for the erection of a church. Behind this letter, and behind the bald inscription on the corner stone of St. Mark's, declaring "*Built by Subscription, A.D. 1843. A Brunell, Inventor*", lies a story of devotion and enthusiasm.

The story begins with the spiritual needs of the families of personnel employed at the Government dry-dock at Navy Bay. The docks were then in full operation, and many of the families connected therewith lived in the vicinity of Barriefield. Bolstering their desire for a church in the community were men such as the Sheriff of Kingston, William Ferguson, and Dr. Edward Barker also of Kingston. The final impetus to build came with the offer of a site by John Bennet Marks, paymaster in the Royal Navy. Following this offer there came an invitation to the people of the community to meet and discuss the building of a church. The notice, a copy of which is still preserved, reads:

Pittsburg, 26th March, 1843.

SIR:—

You are requested to attend a Meeting, to be held at the house of Mr. JAMES MEDLEY, in the Village of Barriefield, on Monday the 3rd of April next, at the hour of 3 o'clock, p.m., for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of

ERECTING A CHURCH

in the

VILLAGE OF BARRIEFIELD

For the use of Members of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND residing therein, and in the adjoining neighborhood, and also for considering other matters connected therewith.

W. FERGUSON
G. BAXTER
W. HUNT

From this meeting went the above mentioned letter to the Bishop of Toronto, and at this meeting the Building Committee to plan the work was elected. Chosen for this important group were: John B. Marks, Esq., Chairman; Edward J. Barker, Secretary; Thomas Gurley, Treasurer; George Baxter, William Ferguson, William Hunt.

By May 31st, this Committee was prepared to settle on the matter of Tenders. The sum of £500, subscribed at their first meeting, was the guide to their spending. The Tender accepted was that of Richard Jones. He contracted "to erect the Stone Work of the Church proposed to be built at Barriefield agreeable to the plans and specification adopted by the Committee for the sum of £249 and the Plastering at £50 Halifax Currency." Of several currencies in use, Halifax Currency was regarded as most reliable. In this month also, Mr. George Cummins was added to the number of the Building Committee.

On Monday, July 10th, 1843, the corner-stone of the new church building was laid by the Bishop of Toronto. The stone-work went ahead, but in January of the following year it was found necessary to supplement the amount subscribed for the building. According to the Vestry Minutes, under the date 22nd of January, 1844, "It was resolved that in order to raise means, Pews be marked out on the floor of the Church, and sold by public auction on Monday, the fifth day of February next, at the hour of 11 o'clock." The sale price of the proposed pews ranged from £3.10.0, with a rental value of 10 shillings per annum, to £10, with a rental of 25 shillings. A few pews were reserved for public use. The pews themselves, when installed, were the old square type, and the original pulpit and lectern were two-decker affairs. These have long since disappeared.

The Vestry Minutes, now preserved in the vaults of the Synod Office, Kingston, prove interesting to the reader. Excerpts from these minutes tell plainly of the progress, and the worries, of the founders. Following is a part of an early entry:—"At the first Vestry Meeting held at St. Mark's Church, Barriefield, this 24th day of June, 1844. Present: the Committee of Management, pewholders, John B. Marks being called to the Chair, and Mr. Robert Breese appointed secretary. It was moved by Thomas Gurley, Esq., and seconded by Mr. Dunn, that George Baxter and Wm. Ferguson be nominated and appointed Churchwardens for the current year.

It was moved by Dr. Barker and seconded by Mr. Wilmot that the Churchwardens be requested to call upon the Venerable Archdeacon Stuart for the purpose of entering into arrangements for performing divine services in the said church."

In response to this petition the church was formally opened on Sunday, July 7th, 1844, by the Ven. Archdeacon John George O'Kill Stuart, assisted by the Rev. John Pope, first Rector of the Parish.

Within ten years of the opening of the church, the Vestry Minutes reveal some of the difficulties which beset the parish. Bearing the date October 18th, 1853, there is record of a letter signed by George Baxter, and addressed to the Bishop. This epistle complained of the need of an active man as Rector (there had been a temporary vacancy), because the parish was so poor, and there were "so many sects, and so many lukewarm and even careless churchmen."

The organization of the Diocese of Toronto was somewhat different from our present administration. The Toronto Synod was known as the Incorporated Church Society. This Society, covering the whole of the diocese, was broken down into various districts, each known as a District Association. Members of the District Association were the Rectors and Churchwardens of the particular district. The Parishes, in turn, were Sub-Associations of the District, and each of these smaller divisions was bound to contribute a stipulated amount annually to the District. The Synod proceedings of Toronto in 1852 record that "St. Mark's Parochial Association, from year to year, since the first organization of this Branch, has shown an increase in its funds; and through its instrumentality, either wholly or in part, the Parish Church has been improved both in appearance and comfort; the amount subscribed for the past year was eighteen pounds, nineteen shillings and eight pence, of which four pounds, eighteen shillings has been received by the Treasurer of the Parent Society." Some benefits accrued from these contributions to the Parent Society. Seven years after the above report, there appeared another statement with respect to Barriefield in the Synod proceedings. "The Parochial Committee report to the following effect:—It is with much pleasure and satisfaction we state that the roof of St. Mark's Church, which was in a very dangerous state, has been thoroughly repaired during the past autumn. For being able to accomplish so expensive an undertaking, your Committee have to return their sincere thanks to the District Branch for their liberal grant of £12 10s, which, with a like sum raised by a voluntary subscription in this Mission, enabled the work to be done in a very satisfactory manner. The services at Birmingham and McLean's school-house have been regularly kept up during the year, and in both places the attendance is very satisfactory."

In the first year of the existence of the Diocese of Ontario as such, a petition was sent from the parish to the new Bishop requesting the Consecration of the Church. On September 25th, 1862, the twenty year old church was Consecrated "the Church of St. Mark" by Bishop Lewis.

A treasure of St. Mark's is a fine old silver Communion set, consisting of Chalice, Paten, and Flagon, and dated 1849. The original Chalice is still in the Church, but a newer one, of the same pattern, given in 1911 as a thank-offering, is the one regularly in use. The

original set came very close to being lost to us in 1863. At the annual Vestry meeting in this year, it was moved by Wm. Ferguson and seconded by F. J. George, "That it is with a feeling of deep regret and sorrow that this meeting places on record the 'sacrilege and church robbery' which took place in this Church during the past week, resulting in the loss of the valuable Communion Service, the Crimson Cloth and Linen of the Communion Table and other property." The congregation at once set about taking up a collection to replace these important items of worship. The purchase of new vessels was not made necessary, however, as the missing ones were eventually found. Notes of the Easter meeting of the Vestry in 1864 enlighten us with respect to their recovery. "It was moved by W. Ferguson, and seconded by George Seal, 'that there be placed on record the recovery of the Church plate and furniture mentioned in our last report, and that we recognize the Hand of Providence in directing us to the successful recovery of the property (hidden miles away in the bush) and the punishment of the Thief."

The perennial problem of Churchwardens is the matter of financing. This problem appears to have become more than a little acute, if we are to judge by the recommendation from the minutes, in 1874. It was moved by R. Millen and seconded by G. Baxter "that the Clergyman be requested to lay before the Congregation at an early day the necessity of placing on the plate a piece of money larger than the usual copper."

In the year 1885 a movement was set afoot which was to change the appearance of the church's interior, namely the replacement of the old square pews and two decker pulpit by newer pews and pulpit. The decision to make this change was by no mean unanimous, but seems to have been carried out with a minimum of difficulty. It is something of a pity that we have been unable to trace what became of the old seats. The present day seating is good, but the old arrangement was, from such account as can be found, more picturesque. In the year following the decision to change the seats, the proposition came forward to abolish pew rents. This was more difficult to achieve than the changing of the seats themselves, for it was not until 1889 that some concession was made to the idea, and pews were made rent free at the evening services.

The commission of the Christian Church has been first of all to teach "all nations." In compliance with this commission, missionary work has always been a very large part of the church's programme. Indeed, a church which is not missionary-minded is a dead church. This is the verdict of history. Consequently, it is scarcely surprising that a young church like St. Mark's, with zealous leadership, should register its desire to take part in this essential work. On November 12th, 1893, there was organized in the Parish the first Women's Auxiliary. Mrs. R. V. Rogers and Miss Muckleston came to Barriefield from Kingston to conduct the organization meet-

ing. What is now the W.A. to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada was then called the W.A. to the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions. The first officers of the W.A. in the Parish were: President, Mrs. C. L. Worrell; Vice-President, Mrs. Henry Milton; Secretary, Miss Constance Hora; Treasurer, Miss Hora. There were 11 members, one of whom, Mrs. Charlotte Vanhorne, is the only survivor, and is still an active and faithful member of this congregation.

The original church structure consisted of what is now the nave, plus the tower. The choir and organ loft were in the balcony at the west end of the church. In 1897 the gift of the present Chancel by Mr. E. J. B. Pense added immensely to the beauty of the building.

Since the inception of the parish, the women had been a tower of strength to the work, but had not been active as an organization, except in the W.A. In the autumn of 1905, a Parish Guild was organized under the leadership of Mrs. John Baxter as President; Mrs. R. J. Moore as Vice-President, and Miss Charlotte Medley (Mrs. C. Vanhorne) as Secretary-treasurer. Since that time, the Guild has been continually active and helpful.

In 1911, Canon A. O. Cooke was appointed Rector, an office which he held until his retirement from active ministry at the end of 1950. During Canon Cooke's rectorship the present, and first, Rectory was purchased. He saw many difficulties, not the least of which came during the depression years in the '30's, and in the succeeding war years, when, in order to make necessary expansion, the Department of National Defence bought up so many farms in the area. Canon Cooke is now living in Kingston, and is a frequent visitor to St. Mark's.

In 1951, by the help of generous friends of the congregation, St. Mark's was completely re-decorated, and its beauty newly emphasized.

So much for the past. What the future may hold for our parish is open to several questions. What will be the development in the area? How far will Army property expand? These are but samples of the questions which face us now. One thing is certain, the continued welfare of the parish is in God's hands. We commend our selves to His disposing, and pledge ourselves to His purpose.

The Battle of The Windmill

George F. G. Stanley, Royal Military College

As you drive eastwards along No. 2 Highway towards Montreal, you will notice, on your right, after you pass through the town of Prescott, a large stone tower which serves as a light house. It is situated close by the river's edge, not far from the Government grain elevator. This structure resembles a martello tower. It is, in fact, an old stone windmill minus the arms. Few people pause even to look towards this tower; fewer know that it was the centre of one of the stiffest battles fought in this province a little over a century ago. It is the story of this battle at the Windmill and its sequel in Kingston that I wish to tell you tonight. The account as I give it is drawn from contemporary sources, including the Kingston *Chronicle and Gazette*, and the proceedings of the trials of the prisoners who were taken at the Windmill.

— I —

The early 1830's had been years of political agitation in Upper Canada. The Reformers, under William Lyon Mackenzie, had struggled to bring about political changes in the province, only to find their efforts constantly thwarted by the Family Compact, among whose leaders was that redoubtable Kingstonian, Christopher Hagerman. Despairing of reform after the victory of the Compact at the polls in 1836, extremists among Mackenzie's supporters began to think in terms of a recourse to arms. Mackenzie himself toyed with the idea of overthrowing the existing regime and of establishing a Republic of Upper Canada. The immediate result was the rising at Toronto in December 1837 which saw the defeat of Mackenzie's ill-armed farmers at the engagement at Montgomery's Tavern. A number of the rebels were taken prisoners and lodged in newly completed Fort Henry. Others, including Mackenzie, managed to escape to the United States.

South of the border Mackenzie succeeded in enlisting a considerable amount of sympathy for his cause. The anti-British feelings of the Americans, the legacy of the American Revolution and the War of 1812, were still close to the surface, and Mackenzie was able to raise men and to obtain arms from the sympathetic citizens of the United States. For a brief period he established himself on Navy Island in the Niagara river. But his plans for using Navy Island as a base for an invasion of Upper Canada very quickly evaporated with the gathering of the militia under Sir Allan McNab; and after the destruction of the **Caroline**, the supply ship upon which Mackenzie depended to bring support from the United States, the army of the Republic of Upper Canada disintegrated. Nevertheless there were a whole series of disjointed raids against Canadian soil carried out during 1838 by renegade Canadians and their American sympathizers. There was fighting at Pelee Island in the spring of

1838, a raid across the Niagara River in June, and finally a landing at Prescott in November. There were piratical activities on the waters of the Lakes and the Upper St. Lawrence, notably the destruction of the Canadian steamer, **Sir Robert Peel,** by one William Johnson, a Canadian who had lived in Kingston prior to the War of 1812 and who had, during that war, been imprisoned for pro-American sympathies.

During the summer of 1838 the republican agitation took on a new form. A number of secret lodges, called Hunters Lodges, after one James Hunter, a refugee from Whitby, were organized. The lodge membership was recruited among the Canadians who had fled or escaped to the United States during the rebellion, and among their American friends. Each member took an oath to work for the establishment of republican institutions in Canada and "never to rest till the tyrants of Britain cease to have any dominion or footing whatever in North America." The new secret organization seems to have enjoyed considerable popularity. It is estimated that the lodges numbered no fewer than 1,174, with 80,000 members. Undoubtedly the prospect of carrying the true gospel of political freedom to the down-trodden Canadians appealed to many woolly-minded youthful enthusiasts in the United States; perhaps however, the promise of 160 acres of land and a cash bounty of twenty dollars and ten dollars a month while on service was an even more powerful stimulant to recruiting on the part of the Hunters.

William Lyon Mackenzie was not himself a member of the secret society. He knew well enough what it was doing and his own activities, his writings and his public addresses in those centre where the lodges were formed, did much to encourage the Hunters. It is rather interesting that the organization was essentially American in composition. Only a few Canadians belonged to the Hunters, and none held any positions of significance in the Lodges. Had Canadians been more prominent in the affairs of this secret society it is possible that the Hunters would not so readily have deluded themselves that they had only to cross the frontier into Canada to be greeted by the shouts of welcome of a people who would look upon them as liberators from the baneful yoke of Great Britain.

— II —

Early in November a number of the Hunters began to assemble in various towns in northern New York State, including Salina (Syracuse), Oswego, Sackett's Harbour, Watertown, French Creek, and Ogdensburg. The principal leader one John Ward Birge. Nils Szoltevky von Schoultz, a young Pole who had come to the United States in 1836, was leader of the Syracuse group; Colonel Martin Woodruff was in charge of the Watertown contingent. Birge visited the several centres, calling for "volunteers for the liberation of

Canada." According to one account two drummers accompanied him. They "beat the long roll" while Birge "flourished his sword" and swore that not only would the people of Canada welcome the liberators, but also large numbers of regular soldiers themselves would desert the British colours once the Hunters had landed on Canadian soil.

There was not much secrecy about these proceedings. They were carried on quite openly. The general public was well aware that a hostile expedition was being planned against Canada; but no steps were taken by the American authorities to prevent several hundred adventurous Hunters from embarking at Sackett's Harbour on the steamer **United States** on the morning of Sunday, November 11, 1838. Proceeding down the St. Lawrence River the **United States** picked up two schooners, **Charlotte of Toronto** and **Charlotte of Oswego** near Carleton Island. Both schooners took aboard men and munitions of war, and were then taken in tow by the steamer. They proceeded as far as Brockville. Then, as the wind was fair, the schooners were released and sailed downstream towards Prescott. After a suitable delay of several hours after the departure of the steamer, the American officer commanding at Sackett's Harbour, Colonel W. J. Worth, undertook to investigate the current reports that a filibustering expedition was in progress against Canada. He went as far as Carleton Island, satisfied himself that nothing was amiss, and reported to Washington that there were no signs of any unusual "Patriot" activity.

The self-styled liberators carried with them a Proclamation, copies of which were to be distributed to the Canadians. It was the work of John Ward Birge and was addressed to the "Brother Patriots of Canada." It ran, in part, as follows:

> We have come to your rescue; we have heard the groans of your distress; and have seen tears of anguish, burning on the cheeks of your exiled companions. They have besought us to aid them and you in the great work of reform, and to establish on your own native soil, EQUAL RIGHTS and EQUAL PRIVILEGES. We come not to invade your country as robbers and plunderers, but we come as brothers from a land of liberty, as free men PLEDGED to your cause. . . Let not your brother patriots, who are men struggling against their oppressors, be disappointed in you. They have raised their standard and will maintain it. They have gained victory after victory and they expect you to AROUSE to the conflict and join in the great work. Your homes, your firesides, and your sacred altars shall not be violated. Come on then, be men, be free men, and your liberties are secured! In behalf of the American and Canadian patriots.
>
> J. WARD BIRGE,
> Brigadier-General Commanding Eastern Division.

Birge was, however, better at flourishing the pen than the sword. His courage diminished the nearer he approached his destination. He not only disagreed with his subordinates, von Schoultz, Dorethus Abbey, Martin Woodruff and others, but, "pale as a ghost" he shut himself up in his cabin on the **United States.** Then he announced his intention of raising more men at Ogdensburg. No sooner did he touch land than he fell ill. The suddeness of his complaint was universally attributed to cowardice. One of his followers later declared that Birge was a "coward, sick with a complaint vulgarly called the belly-ache."

The loss of Birge was no real blow to the Patriots. It might well have been a matter of congratulations, for the leadership fell to the Pole, von Schoultz. Not only did von Schoultz come from a military family in Poland, but he himself had held a major's commission in the Polish Army before migrating to the United States. Von Schoultz's plan was to land his men at the wharf at Prescott and to take Fort Wellington. He, Abbey, and Woodruff, would lead the assault, which would succeed through sheer surprise and audacity. The operation did not work out as planned. The two schooners reached Prescott late Sunday night. They ran in towards the wharf but, missing the pier, they swung around and before they could be got under full sail again, ran aground. To assist them a scow put out from Ogdensburg. Into this craft the heavy cannon and arms were loaded from the schooners. In this way one of the vessels was successfully floated, but the other, commanded by the redoubtable Bill Johnson, the erstwhile Kingstonian turned pirate, remained firm in the mud. The **Charlotte of Toronto** then drew off. Towing the scow with her, she fell down stream towards Windmill Point where she landed her men and arms. Meanwhile efforts were continued to free the other schooner. These efforts were hampered, although not apparently very effectually, by the fire of a small British steamer called **Experiment,** for it was not until the late afternoon of Monday, November 12th, that an American steamer, **Paul Pry** succeeded in freeing the **Charlotte of Oswego.** By this time her captain had abandoned his vessel along with thirty of the Hunters, whose zest for saving the Canadians was by now considerably less than their interest in saving themselves. However, the **Charlotte of Oswego** joined her companion vessel at Windmill Point where she disembarked the remaining men and arms on the Canadian shore.

It was now well on towards evening. Any chance of surprise had long since disappeared. The success of the operation, as von Schoultz had envisaged it, had depended upon the suddeness and unexpectedness of the landing and the attack. Now the filibusters found themselves on Canadian soil with a broad river between them and the safety of the United States. But they were still optimistic. The down-trodden Canadians would be sure to come to their assistance. That at least they professed to believe. For the present their

position did not seem to be completely hopeless. There was, close by, a large stone windmill, and a number of stone houses which offered good protection from attack. The windmill, which had been built in 1822, was a particularly strong work. It was no less than six storeys high and its walls were three and a half feet thick. In consequence, a council of war consisting of von Schoultz, Dorethus Abbey, Daniel Brown, Daniel George, and several others, agreed to hold on to their footing in Canada as long as possible. Accordingly they mounted their three cannon, took possession of the mill and houses, and proceeded to build up and strengthen a nearby stone wall as best they could.

Meanwhile the British and Canadians had mustered their forces. Captain William Sandom, a Royal Naval officer who had been moved from Quebec to Kingston earlier in the year to take command of the Dockyard, rushed to Prescott a small detachment of thirty Marines under Lieut. Parker and forty men of the 83rd Regiment under Lieut. Johnson in the steamers **Queen Victoria** and **Cobourg**. According to some authorities these men reached Prescott late Monday night, but the Kingston *Chronicle and Gazette* states definitely that it was not until Tuesday. This is a minor point; for it was not until Tuesday, November 13th, that the troops, who had been joined by groups of militiamen from Glengarry under Captain George Macdonell, from Dundas under Colonel John Chrysler, and from Grenville, all commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Plomer Young, attacked what the Canadians referred to as "the patriot pirates." Here is the account of the fighting which appeared in the Kingston newspaper:

> While the main body assailed the rascals in front, who had come out of their houses and posted themselves behind a stone wall, a party of militia under Colonel Duncan Fraser, made a detour, with a view to attacking them on their flank. The troops advanced under a galling fire from the wall, and soon succeeded in expelling the enemy from behind it. They then drove them to seek refuge in the houses, from which they kept up a deadly aim on our gallant fellows. Lieutenant Johnson, in a daring attempt, with a few regulars, to storm a house, with nine windows in it filled with men firing at his party, fell within a few feet of the house — a gallant victim for the honour of his insulted country. The Marines strove nobly to succour Mr. Johnson, as their list of wounded will show (no less than one officer and fourteen other ranks were wounded), but were compelled to retreat or die. Being destitute of artillery to batter the houses in which the sympathisers were so strongly posted, our gallant troops were reluctantly obliged to retire from the unequal conflict.

While this battle was going on, the wharves and shore at Ogdensburg were lined with enthusiastic sightseers who cheered repeatedly as the troops and militia retired. And yet these cheers struck a discordant note in the ears of the Patriots at the Wind-

mill. "It embittered our hearts to know," wrote one of them, "that they whose tongues could beguile so successfully had not the moral courage to aid us in our hour of trial."

From this, and other contemporary accounts, it would seem that the Patriots more than held their own. Such gunfire as could be brought to bear upon the Windmill made little impression upon its thick walls, and the guns of the Patriots were able to keep the British vessels at a good distance from the Patriot position. Nevertheless the outlook for the invaders was not very bright. They had lost a number of men in Fraser's flanking movement. More significant was the fact that the American authorities had at length intervened. Colonel Worth, in the steamer **Telegraph,** had taken over the two schooners as well as the **United States,** and with American help Captain Sandom was patrolling the river in order to prevent any reinforcements from reaching the Windmill—and incidentally to prevent the Patriots from getting back to the American shore. Four Patriots attempted to slip back to Ogdensburg to get medicine and surgical supplies for the wounded men in the mill. They managed to launch a dilapidated old yawl, half-filled with sand and water, which they found drawn up on the beach; but before they had pushed out very far into the river they were captured, taken aboard the **Cobourg,** and hurried to Kingston to be imprisoned in Fort Henry.

During Wednesday the 14th there was no fighting. An hour's truce was agreed upon to enable both sides to dispose of their dead; but the Patriots were handicapped by lack of shovels. It is hard to understand why von Schoultz and his men did not make a real effort to get back to the safety of the American shore. Colonel Worth interceded on their behalf and deliberately left the river free for a brief period while Sandom was busy effecting repairs aboard the **Experiment.** The steamer **Paul Pry** crossed to the Windmill; but instead of accepting advice to withdraw while the chance offered itself, the Patriots preferred to believe another report that reinforcements and supplies would soon reach them from Ogdensburg.

The reinforcements which were gathering were not those for the deluded Hunters. Four companies of the 83rd Regiment, under the commanding officer, Lieut. Col. the Hon. Henry Dundas, together with a number of field pieces from Kingston and Brockville, were now en route to Prescott. Dundas took his time. Not until Friday, November 16th, did he put in his assault. Major MacBean's eighteen-pounder field guns were placed so as to batter the mill and stone houses. When these failed to breach the stonework, Captain Sandom, with two gunboats and an armed steamer, took up a position in the river somewhat below the mill. He boomed away with his eighteen pounder cannon; but from all accounts neither MacBean nor Sandom was able to bring about the demolition of the tower. Nevertheless the weight of fire did serve to discourage the

defenders and thus to enable the troops, with the militia on the flanks, to move in close to the Hunters' position. Heavy rifle fire compelled some of the Hunters to abandon one of the houses which they had occupied, and before they could reach the mill and safety they were taken prisoners by the militia. Finally the garrison in the Windmill hoisted the white flag and agreed to Dundas's demand for unconditional surrender. Von Schoultz himself held on until the last. "I kept my position," he wrote, "though the roof crumbled to pieces over our heads.' The Hunters (there were some 130 of them) were then disarmed and marched into Prescott in a long line, single file, each man tied to a rope. After being paraded before the jubilant citizenry they were "crammed into the forecastle of a small steamboat" and brought up river to Kingston.

Inside the thick walls of the mill the soldiers poked about to see what they could find. There was a good supply of powder, two hundred stand of arms and over 10,000 rounds of ball ammunition. Some of the cartridges were rather ingeniously made of powder and bullets, with three buckshot tied neatly down with thread in the cartridge. There were three cannon in front of the door of the mill, one of which, a four pounder, was still loaded with rusty nails and spikes tied into a ball. Such a charge, wrote the reporter in the Chronicle "would do much mischief at a short distance." Among the trophies captured in the mill was a beautiful white silk flag, bearing an eagle surmounted by a star. Beneath the design, fancifully worked by hand, were the words "Onondaga Hunters — Canada Liberated". This flag, it was said, had been given to von Schoultz by the sympathetic ladies of Onondaga County, one of the hotbeds of Hunter activity. A more gruesome find was the bodies of two Patriots who had hidden in a bake oven and who had been burned to death when the building had been consumed by flames.

It is difficult to ascertain accurately just how many Patriots did take part in this battle at the Windmill. There was a certain amount of movement across the river on the Wednesday, and it is known that some of the Hunters succeeded in escaping to the United States both during and after the fighting. According to the Kingston newspaper dated 17th November, 30 Patriots surrendered on Tuesday the 13th and 132 on the 16th. It was also reported that 67 Patriots had been killed in the fighting on the Tuesday and 35 on the Friday or a total of 102 fatal casualties. Subsequent reports gave the Patriot casualties as 56 killed and 16 wounded. Von Schoultz said that his losses were only 16 or 17, a figure which, in view of the strong defences he occupied, may not be very far wrong. One present day estimate, which I regard as reasonably accurate, says that 17 Patriots were killed; three subsequently died of wounds; seventeen were wounded and five escaped. One thing that all accounts are agreed upon is the heavy loss of self-styled "generals". Both Charles Brown and James Phillips, Brigadier-Generals in the Patriot army, were among those killed.

The official returns of the killed and wounded on the Canadian side show one lieutenant of the 83rd, one lieutenant of the 2nd Grenville Militia, and eleven rank and file of the Glengarry Highlanders, 2nd Dundas Militia, 2nd Grenville Militia and Brockville Independent Company of Militia, killed; and one lieutenant-colonel of the 9th Provincial Battalion, one lieutenant of the Royal Marines, one lieutenant of thee 2nd Dundas Militia, one ensign of the Glengarry Highlanders, one sergeant of the Prescott Independent Company of Militia, and 62 rank and file from the Royal Marines, Glengarry Highlanders, 9th Provisional Battalion, 2nd Dundas Militia, 1st Grenville Militia, the Brockville and Prescott Independent Companies and "Gentlemen Volunteers", wounded. [1]

III

Meanwhile great excitement prevailed in Kingston. Men rushed to arms and within several days no fewer than 2000 militia had been embodied to defend Kingston in the absence of the regulars. These included, in addition to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Frontenac Militia, the 1st and 2nd Addington and the 1st and 2nd Lennox and five troops of militia cavalry. On the 14th the *Chronicle and Gazette* reported.

> . . . the 3rd Regiment of Frontenac Militia mustered strong at Barriefield yesterday, notwithstanding the heavy rains which prevailed in the forenoon. They now occupy Barriefield and have taken the Dock Yard guards. As an instance of the activity displayed by the officers and met, we may mention that it was 10 o'clock before Captain Birtle commenced collecting his company from the back concessions of the township of Kingston, and at 3 p.m. he reached his station with about 50 or 60 fine young men. Such exertions are beyond praise.

At 7 p.m. on the same day some 70 to 80 Indians from the Mohawk Village commanded by Captain Portt came in "all anxious for an opportunity to try the accuracy of their aim upon the pretended patriots".

There was great rejoicing on the part of the people of Kingston when news reached town of the successful outcome of the fighting at the Windmill. It was late at night when the miserable, dejected prisoners disembarked at Scobel's wharf on Front Street, but not too late for them to be paraded along the principal thoroughfare, which was, according to the press report, "brilliantly illuminated" for the occasion. Thousands of people turned out to cheer the troops as they passed and to greet the prisoners with "groans of derision". Two by two, they plodded, tied together to a rope passing between them. Von Schoultz, tall and dark, strode at the head.

(1) The British and Canadian casualties included Lieutenant W. S. Johnson of the 83rd and Lieutenant Dulmage of the Grenville Militia killed, and Lieutenant-Colonel Ogle R. Gowan of the 9th Provincial Battalion, Lieutenant Parker of the Royal Marines, Lieutenant Parslow of the 2nd Dundas and Ensign Angus Macdonnell of the Glengarry Highlanders, wounded.

His clothes were in tatters and his shirt hung in ribbons on his back. "In this condition" wrote one of the prisoners "with a line of soldiers on each side, we were marched to Fort Henry, about one mile distant from the landing, the band playing **Yankee Doodle**". There was no pity in the hearts of the onlookers. Said the newspaper reporter "we were much struck at the abominable weapons which the Pirates had carried with them. The bowie knife is certainly a fit instrument in the hands of such a set of cutthroats".

The Roman holiday afforded by the parade of the prisoners was followed several days later by the more dignified and sombre ceremony of the funeral of Lieutenant Johnson of the 83rd, who had fallen while leading an assaulting party on the 13th. Johnson's body had been mutilated by the Patriots, despite the efforts of Von Schoultz to protect it, and public feeling ran high among Canadians in the upper St. Lawrence towns. The funeral was carried out with "unusual solemnity". From the Tête de Pont barracks the long cortege marched slowly to the graveyard. Those who had been so vociferous a few days before, now stood silently along the road side, with their heads bowed. At the head of the cortege marched the firing party, followed by the band of the 83rd, members of the bar, the clergy and gentlemen of the town. Then came the troops of the 83rd in mourning, followed by the Kingston Volunteer Artillery, the dismounted troopers of the 1st and 2nd Frontenac Dragoons, militia officers, and officers of the garrison and the Royal Navy.

IV

The immediate question was, what should be done about the prisoners? After making all allowance for the very natural desire on the part of the prisoners to excuse their actions on the grounds of ignorance of what they were doing, there is no doubt that the Patriots were, for the most part, men who had been deluded into believing in the justice of their cause. The Kingston paper was prepared to concede this point, blaming the whole episode upon William Lyon Mackenzie, that "little vagabond from Toronto", who at this date was spending his time and energy giving speeches in the United States and raising money for the Patriot Cause. And yet the *Chronicle and Gazette* found it hard to understand wh the so-called Patriots should so easily have been deluded when the facts spoke so clearly:

> There are a few plain facts which appear to us, ought to strike the American sympathizers very forcibly. We believe that they are in some measure imposed upon by the discontented renegades from this Province, who make them believe that our people really wish for a republican government. . . . Last winter, at the breaking out of the rebellion at Toronto, when there was not a regular soldier in the Province, why did not the mass of the people join the few wretched rebels who

did assemble to change the form of government — the very reverse was the case — the yeomen of the country flocked in thousands, nay tens of thousands, to Toronto, for the purpose of protecting the government.

Then again as to the party of Sympathizers who a few days since landed below Prescott, they certainly took up a formidable position consisting of a Windmill built of stronger masonry than any ordinary Martello tower, and which with the large stone buildings in the vicinity, offered the greatest shelter for the advance of an attacking party. This disposition the Patriots, as they call themselves, occupied for several days. Did any of our people join them? Were they so inclined they had plenty of time and opportunity to do so, but no, not even a solitary radical. How then can the Sympathizers allow themselves to be so peacefully led astray on this important point — how permit themselves to be gulled by such a cowardly little Jackanape as Mackenzie and his stamp? Do they put themselves in personal danger? No, — they take care of that, but they make dupes enough to do it for them.

Letters written by the prisoners to their friends in the United States make rather pathetic reading in their naivete. One prisoner wrote "We have, for some cause or other, made up our minds that the good people of Canada do not wish a change in their form of government, therefore it is the height of folly to say more." Another prisoner, Charles Smith of Cape Vincent, was captured, bearing in his pocket a letter which urged him to "be like Mr. Mackenzie, do not spare a Tory, and if there is not ropes enough to hang the Tories you can buy more, if you want more men send to me." This belligerent friend did not take part in the fighting. Presumably he was safe in the United States applauding the speeches of William Lyon Mackenzie. But when Smith, behind Fort Henry's forbidding walls, wrote home, his letter indicated no eagerness on his part to indulge in the sport of hanging Tories. Instead he said, "If there should be another attempt made, do you tell them from your best friends, for God's sake, to stay where they are, as I am well convinced that they do not want a new form of Government here; we are deceived by a set of dastardly cowards who threw us into the very jaws of death and left us poor innocent young men, to get out the best way we could, for God's sake expose them and do not let a coward go free". One of the prisoners, Jeremiah Winnegar, said that he "had not expected to fight when he left home, but came for the sole purpose of giving liberty to the people of Canada. He thought when he was coming that he was doing God's service, for he had heard Ministers of Gospel encouraging the people to support the Patriot Hunters".

In the United States the reaction to the events at Prescott and to the capture of the Patriots — almost all of them were Americans — was varied. Some newspapers assumed a threatening attitude; some heaped obloquy upon the Canadian refugees; some appealed for clemency. Colonel Worth, at Sackett's Harbour, wrote to Lieu-

tenant Colonel Dundas asking him to show mercy on "the wretched victims of baseness and duplicity". Dundas replied pointing out that his authority "did not extend in any degree to the remission or infliction of any punishment to which the prisoners taken at Prescott have subjected themselves by the laws of this country", but promised to send Worth's letter to the Lieutenant Governor. Few Canadians were, however, inclined to listen to requests for the release of prisoners. Canadian patience had been pretty well tried by the constant attacks of the patriots along the whole length of the Canadian frontier during 1838. The *Transcript* in Montreal said that the pleas for clemency amounted to, "We tried to murder you and failed, therefore do not hang us". "Will it be mercy to execute . . . some three dozen well selected rascals, and stop the revolt?" asked the *Transcript*; then answering its own question the newspaper continued "We believe the public will unhesitatingly join in our confident affirmative". One Kingstonian, writing to the local newspaper, shared the *Transcript's* view. He expressed great indignation at the sympathy being expressed in the United States for the poor Prescott prisoners, their mothers and their sweethearts, and commented upon the complete absence of any such sympathy for the widows and the orphans which "these misguided innocents made in Canada". Another Kingstonian put forward the suggestion that some arrangement might be made to exchange some of the prisoners for the persons of William Lyon Mackenzie, William Johnson, and John Ward Birge, the men really responsible for the loss of life and damage to property suffered by the Canadians at Prescott.

The Canadian authorities were neither influenced by this suggestion nor moved by appeals on the part of Colonel Worth, Judge Fine of Ogdensburg, or other Americans. On November 20th the Lieutenant Governor directed that a Militia Court Martial be assembled at Fort Henry on November 26th, "for the trial of such persons as may be brought before it, charged with being in arms against Her Majesty, within this Province, contrary to the provisions of an act of the Provincial Parliament of Upper Canada, passed in the 1st Year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled "An Act to protect the Inhabitants of this Province against Lawless aggressions from Subjects of Foreign Countries at Peace with Her Majesty". The president of the Court Martial was John B. Marks of Barriefield, Colonel of the 3rd Battalion Frontenac Militia. The Judge Advocate was the Hon. William Henry Draper, Solicitor-General in the Upper Canadian Government, who also held a commission as Colonel of the 2nd North York Regiment. The other members of the court included Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. John Kirby of the 1st Frontenac Militia; Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Raynes of the 2nd Frontenac Militia; Lieutenant-Colonel John S. Cartwright of the 2nd Lennox; Lieutenant-Colonel John Turnbull of the 1st Hastings; Lieutenant-Colonel William Logie of the 3rd Frontenac; Major Thomas Kirkpatrick of the 1st Lennox; Major James Sampson of

the 3rd Frontenac; Major David John Smith of the 1st Frontenac; Captain Hugh McGregor of the 2nd Frontenac; Captain Elijah Beach of the 2nd Frontenac; Captain John Strange of the 1st Frontenac; Captain James McFarlane of the 1st Frontenac; Captain John Bower of the 3rd Frontenac; and Captain John R. Forsyth of the 1st Frontenac Militia. A quorum for the court was eight officers.

On Monday, November 26th, the Court Martial assembled in one of the low, grey casemates of Fort Henry, and was sworn in. The first case was that of Daniel George, the so-called paymaster of the Patriots. He was no heroic crusader for republican ideas. He had, in fact, deserted his comrades and had been picked up in a small boat while trying to escape to the United States. With the help of his counsel, the young John A. Macdonald, George succeeded in getting an adjournment of his case in order to prepare his defence. The red-coated officers then turned to consider the fate of the Patriot leader, Nils Szoltevky von Schoultz. Somewhat to the surprise of the Court, and against the advice of Macdonald, von Schoultz pleaded guilty. Colonel Draper set forth the terms of the statute. He explained to the prisoner at the bar the severe penalty of the law upon his crime and the impossibility of the court modifying this penalty. But von Schoultz, who bore himself in court with the same stoical, somewhat vain bravery that he had shown on the field, replied that, although he had been deceived as to the situation in Canada, he could not and would not deny his leadership of the expedition. He confirmed his plea of guilty. Despite the plea, the Court went ahead with the trial and heard the necessary evidence. According to Edward Smith, a soldier of the Prescott Independent Militia Company who had taken von Schoultz prisoner on November 16th, the accused had told him that he had taken over command from Birge while en route to Ogdensburg. Another witness, Jean Baptiste Ruza (Rousseau) from Montreal, a Patriot who turned Queen's evidence, identified von Schoultz as one of the Patriot generals; and then to save his own hide he added, "They gave me arms, a musket and cartridges. I threw them away after the first firing on the Tuesday morning". Another witness, a fourteen year old boy from Boucherville, Laurent Mailhotte told a similar story. To clinch the case a statement given by Schoultz to George Baker, the magistrate at Kingston, was admitted as evidence. This statement read as follows:

> Nils Szoltevki von Schoultz, a Pole, aged thirty-one years. In eighteen hundred and thirty-six, came to the United States — is a Chemist; resident in Salina heard of the new Government of Canada for the first time about the beginning of November — was told by a Society in Salina that if he went to Ogdensburg to General Birge of the Patriot Army he should have particulars. Accordingly he embarked at Oswego in the United States Steamer on Sunday the eleventh of November; landed the following morning below Prescott — designed to land at Ogdensburg. The General put the boat in the river and

directed them to land on the Canada side; that he would meet them — was never sworn into the service — never regularly joined the Patriot Army; left Oswego to see the General before joining — his father was a Major in the Regiment of Cracow, and was killed; after which the present von Schoultz got his rank of Major in the Polish army — never received pay in the Patriot Service; saw Bill Johnson when he brought provisions and ammunition; Johnson brought the three pieces of artillery on Monday morning. General Birge was to have the command but never appeared; Birge is from Cazenovia in the State of New York — Johnson left when he landed the artillery; on Monday evening when the General had not appeared the prisoner undertook to lead the party back to the American shore — on Tuesday their adjutant came over and said that schooners were coming to their assistance and to take them off — the adjutant immediately returned — on Tuesday seven or eight were killed and fourteen or fifteen wounded. Mr. Stone, a merchant in Salina first introduced this informant to the Patriots: does not know the name of the Patriot leader in Salina; brought two of his countrymen with him who joined at Oswego; was told that the Upper Canadians would all join with them; about one hundred and eighty landed below Prescott — on Monday night informant sent a man floating on a plank to have the boats sent from the American shore to take them over — the man never returned. When he embarked at Oswego he knew that a great many men were on board with the same intention as himself — paid his passage money (twelve shillings and six pence) —two or three hundred passengers in all — saw some of them pay the passage money — Birge, when he came to the schooner left Ogdensburg in a small steam boat; on the night of Wednesday no relief came to them. Johnson attempted to come over with small boats, but was defeated. On Thursday night a steam boat came over near the shore, but put off again without landing or taking away the wounded does not know her name. Was told to make a landing in Canada and that forces would join them, and that the British regulars would also come over to the Patriots — on Monday night he first took the Command to withdraw the party from below Prescott. Since that time he was sometimes called Captain and sometimes General. No man from the Canada shore joined them after landing; understood that all the men in the schooners and steamboat were Americans; did not know of any British subjects being among them; never was in Canada before; did not know of any assistance being given by the American Government — in the attack the British fired first; procured the flag used by him at Salina; it was given to him by Mr. Stone to be handed to General Birge. Never swore any men into the service.

During the court proceedings von Schoultz remained "as unmoved as a rock". Only the evidence of the mutilation of Lieutenant Johnson's body — and a revolting mutilation it was — disturbed him. When he spoke to the court it was not to save his life

but to save his honour. He denied that he had shown any inhumanity to the dead and wounded. He said:

> When I found we had no medical stores for the wounded I was willing to give them up. On Tuesday evening when Colonel Fraser sent in a flag to remove the dead, I met him and told him that I would give up the British wounded as I had no means of taking care of them and we had already given up all the bedding and every comfort we could for their accommodation. I merely state this to show that there was no inhumanity shown to the wounded.
>
> As regards the maltreatment of Captain Johnson's body — I tried to get the body away but the fire was such that I could not. Two men were wounded in the attempt. I put a sentinel to shoot the hogs that might approach the body and he fired to keep them off. This may show that I had no concern in mutilating his body. I have no witnesses to call.

The court had no choice but to declare von Schoultz guilty. On Friday, November 29th he was condemned to die by hanging. On Saturday Daniel George and Dorethus Abbey were condemned to the same fate. Several days later the warrant for the executions arrived in Kingston. On December 6th von Schoultz, George, and Abbey were removed from Fort Henry to the common jail in Kingston; but on Saturday von Schoultz was taken back to Fort Henry and executed, not on the common gallows in Kingston but on a special gallows erected on the glacis of the Fort. It is said that this was at the request of John A. Macdonald, but the evidence is not conclusive. In any event the other two were hanged on December 12th "at the new drop, back of the goal". According to the *Chronicle and Gazette* "very few persons, besides the military, attended the execution". On December 19th Martin Woodruff, the last of the leaders, was executed. In his last hours von Schoultz wrote to his friend Warren Green at Salina (Syracuse):

> When you get this letter I am no more. I have been informed that my execution will take place tomorrow. May God forgive them who brought me to this untimely death. I have made up my mind, and I forgive them. Today I have been promised a lawyer to draw up my will . . . If the British Government permit it, I wish it (his body) may be delivered to you to be buried on your farm. I have no time to write long to you, because I have great need of communicating with my Creator, and prepare for His presence. The time has been very short that has been allowed. My last wish to the Americans is that they may not think of revenging my death. Let no further blood be shed; and believe me, that from what I have seen, all the stories that were told about the sufferings of the Canadian people were untrue . . . Farewell my dear friend: God bless and protect you.

In the will of which he spoke — it was drawn up by John A. Macdonald — von Schoultz left £400 to the dependents of the militia who had been killed at the Battle of the Windmill. But his body was not delivered to his friend in the United States. It rests today in peace and obscurity in St. Mary's cemetery.

Following the trials of the principals, the work of the court martial became more and more perfunctory. The trial of Martin Woodruff aroused a certain amount of interest: but the rest of the prisoners were poor, terrified, colorless stuff. On December 22, Joel Peeler and Sylvanus Sweet were hanged. On January 4th four more Patriots suffered the same fate, and on February 11 one more. By this time even the most belligerent Kingstonians had had their fill of hangings; and on December 29th the *Chronicle and Gazette* asked whether the execution of *all* the prisoners would "add to the dignity of the Empire". The editor expressed his view that "secondary punishment" would be sufficient, particularly in view of the fact that courts martial had been set up in Western Ontario to deal with the prisoners taken in the raid which the Patriots had tried to carry out against Windsor.

Certainty and speed of punishment were more important than severity. On January 5th the newspaper reported that 140 prisoners had been tried, ten had been executed, four had turned Queen's evidence, two had died in hospital, four still remained in Fort Henry had been tried, ten had been executed, four had turned Queen's evidence, two had died in hospital, four still remained in Fort Henry to be tried and nine were lying in hospital still to undergo trial. Of those who were not executed the more youthful were pardoned and allowed to go back to the United States. The others, about sixty of them, were sentenced to be transported to the Penal Colony of Van Dieman's Land.

The last word on the Patriots who fought the battle at the Windmill comes from the pen of a soldier of the 65th Regiment, who, under the name of "*Milites*" sent the following piece of verse to the Kingston paper:

THE SCHEME THAT MAC BUILT

This is the scheme that Mac built,
These are the people who worked at the scheme that Mac built,
These are the knaves held up by the people who winked at the
scheme that Mac built.

This is the Patriot all tattered and torn
Who prowls like a wolf from night till morn;
He has joined the plundering lawless band,
And bears the name of a "stout brigand";

And he raises the cry of the "Canadas free",
To seize on his neighbours property.
He is one of the knaves held up to the people who winked at the Scheme that Mac built.

These are the widows of those who were slain
For Albion's rights, on the battle plain,
And they slowly chant as they glide along,
To the shade of the dead, the requiem song;
But they change to a cry both shrill and wild,
As the tearless eye of the orphan child
Is fixed on the Patriot all tattered and torn, etc., etc.

These are the bandits! Lo they stand
Bound with manacles hand and hand
And surrounded by an armed band
And they gaze with a wild and vacant eye
On the gallows tree where they're doomed to die.
No trophies of war shall bestrew their bier,
Not their's the sigh, or the friendly tear,
No friendly hand shall adorn their grave;
No! these are reserved for the loyal and the brave.
But their names shall go down the course they run
Unwept — unhonoured — and unsung
As one of the Patriots all tattered and torn, etc.

This is the Peri of Albion's Isle
Ah! where is the wretch that could blight that smile?
Or plant a canker worm of care
In the peerless bosom of one so fair!
She sits aloft, while her lustring eye
Beams with the fire of majesty;
While the millions around her rend the sky
With bursts of — VICTORIA — victory
Over the Patriots all tattered and torn
Who howl like wolves from night till morn;
They have joined the plundering lawless band
And hear the name of "stout brigand"
And they raise the cry of the "Canadas free",
To seize on their neighbour's property!
They are the knaves held up to the people who winked at the scheme that Mac built.

After such an outburst of literary bellicosity what more is there for me to say?

Early Canadian Glass

G. F. Stevens, Mallorytown

The story of glass, its history and authentication, is one having many unwritten chapters. Scholars and students have expended vast efforts in research and, although much is known, there remains even more to discover. Even the country of origin is disputed. Some schools of research claim Syria, and others Egypt, as the home of glass, one of the world's most useful materials.

The principal ingredients used in making glass throughout the ages are the basic materials used to-day. Styles and techniques have changed, but silica, usually in the form of sand, and alkalis, such as potash and carbonate of soda or lime are the main ingredients. Other materials used are oxide of lead or of manganese, saltpeter, etc. These are added according to the kind or colour of glass desired. For example, cuprous oxide gives a ruby colour and silver oxide a yellow colour.

The types of glass most interesting to collectors are free-blown, pressed, and blown-moulded. Free-blown glass has for most students the interest of being hand-made and carries the personal expression of the craftsman blowing it. The basic tools necessary to produce blown glass are a blowpipe, a pontil rod, and a scissors. Another tool of major importance is the pucellas, shaped somewhat like a sugar tongs. Its use is the shaping of the glass while it is being worked.

Basic steps in the art of glass blowing are as follows. The ingredients are first subjected to intense heat (approximately 2500 degrees Fahrenheit) then allowed to cool to the consistency of a very heavy oil. The batch is then at the proper stage for manipulation. The blowpipe, a hollow iron tube from 2 ft. to 6 ft. long, is then inserted into the "metal" (a term for glass), a "gather" of metal is secured, the blowpipe is withdrawn, and a light puff through the blowpipe forms a pocket of air in the metal. This pocket is then enlarged by blowing to whatever size is desired. The gather is then ready for forming. This is done in various ways, using the pucellas and other tools.

The next step is of importance to collectors. The pontil rod, usually a solid iron rod, is dipped into the molten metal to obtain a light coating on the end. The coated end of the pontil rod is then applied to the bottom section of the gather being worked and a fusion takes place. The blowpipe is freed and the shaping of the piece is completed by using the pontil rod as a means of manipulation. The scissors is used to cut a clean edge; or a narrow strip of the edge, or rim, is folded over. Handles and ornamentation of glass are added, and the pontil rod is then severed from the completed piece. This leaves a scar on the bottom of the finished article. This scar is usually round and quite rough and, unless it has been ground out, is a means of determining that a piece of glass has been blown. This

scar is dear to the heart of the collector. The foregoing is only a very rough description of a very great art.

Pressed glass has been made throughout the ages, but it was not until the late 1820's that it began attaining the predominance that it has to-day. Pressed glass is a mechanical process and is made in moulds having a pattern or design chipped or shaped on the inner side. The metal is gathered on a pontil rod and the necessary amount dropped into the mould. The metal is then forced into the designs in the mould by a plunger which is usually operated by a lever. The moulds are of many types and are made in sections, some having two sections, and others having as many as eight or more. The lines made by the joining of the several sections of the moulds distinguish early pressed glass. These mould marks are frequently so noticeable that they are considered to be a distinguishing characteristic. These mould marks are called "fins".

There is also a type of glass blown-moulded. This glass is made by a combination of the two previously mentioned techniques. It is blown into a mould rather than free-blown. Its characteristic marks are the scar left by the pontil rod and the lines or fins left by the moulds.

Glass was ornamented by engraving, cutting, and enamelling, etc., but the ornamentation most interesting to students of glass is that of glass applied to itself. This was the earliest form of decoration, and it includes punts (applied blobs of glass), quilling (ribbons of glass applied in a wavy formation), and superimposed decoration (a separate gather of glass attached to a partially formed piece, pulled up to form an outer layer and worked into the desired form. One of these forms is the so-called lily-pad).

I wish to apologize for the preceding descriptions. It is impossible to condense the techniques of a great art or craft without belittling it.

—II—

History records that by the fourth century A.D. household articles made of glass were, more or less, in common use. The rise of the Roman Empire spread the art of glass making throughout Europe. This art was sadly neglected during the Dark Ages, but Venice was to give it a new impetus, and Bohemia and Silesia were to help develop the artistic side of glass making. France and the Low Countries introduced new styles and techniques. This new knowledge influenced glass making in England, and eventually these techniques and the discovery of a new flux—lead—by English craftsmen resulted in a native English glass, called flint.

The first glass factory in British North America was established at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1608-1610. As time passed and the population in the Colonies increased, a number of small local glass houses

were established. Of greater importance were the eighteenth century glass factories of Caspar Wistar and Henry William Stiegel. The dates of their factories are approximately, Wistar's, 1739-1779, and Stiegel's, 1763-1774. Examples of glass manufactured by Wistar and Stiegel are eagerly sought by glass collectors.

Many people have done a vast amount of research on the glass factories of Europe, Asia, and North America. North America, with the exception of Canada, has had many of its glass houses traced and catalogued. With Canada it is another story. The dates and location of Canada's first glass factory are as yet unknown. In fact, any knowledge of it whatsoever has yet to be learned. The story of early Canadian glass is one which remains to be written. Many people have attempted to obtain facts and definite information on early Canadian glass houses, their founders, and workmen. These efforts, so far, have not proved to be very successful. The leads are few and the data is scanty. A person doing research is obliged to rely to a great extent upon local history and folk-lore which, based frequently upon oral tradition, lacks the definite proof provided by documents. The writer has spent some years on the subject. He has been in touch with various public institutions, including the Public Archives of Canada, and has read many books written on the subject of glass. The books in particular are inadequate concerning Canada.

In only one book has he found a reference to a Canadian glass factory. This book *American Glass* written by Geo. L. and Helen McKearin, mentions a Canadian glass factory. An excerpt from this book, on page 174, was the cause of this writer's first interest in the glass factory at Mallorytown. It is as follows:

> This pitcher and a small bowl . . . are of especial interest because, if the history which came with them is correct, they were not blown in New York State but in a small glass works in the hamlet of Mallorytown in the Province of Quebec, about 30 miles from Watertown. They . . . were purchased . . . right in Mallorytown. Mr. Neff . . . was told by old residents . . . that they were made in a glass works there which was operating at the same time as the Redwood Glass Works near Watertown. On the other hand, we were told by another person, who visited Mallorytown . . . that he was unable to verify the existence of a local glass house and was told that residents of the village had been employed in the glass works at Redwood. We have since discussed the matter with Mr. Neff who . . . revisited Mallorytown, checked the information, and is certain a glass works was located there. Be that as it may, the lily-pad pieces obtain from . . . Mallorytown families are similar in colour and technique to the lily-pad pieces blown at Redwood and Redford.

As this book is one of the most informative books on American glass, and this mention of a Mallorytown glass factory is the only reference to a Canadian glass house, the information available for the student of Canadian glass is most inadequate.

One ray of light is to be found in the *Recorder and Times* of Brockville, Ontario. This newspaper had, on January 11, 1938, an article headed "Site of Old Glass Works now fixed on farm short distance from Mallorytown." Excerpts from the article read as follows.

> The puzzled situation in regard to the location of the glass works which functioned many years ago in the vicinity of Mallorytown is clarified to some extent by the statement of George H. Andress, aged 79, . . . to the effect that the plant was situated not far from the present No. 2 Highway . . ., a short distance west of the village. Mr. Andress says that, as a small boy he was taken to a . . . farm property, . . . (and) the party examined a foundation and a well. He continued north over an outcropping of rock streaked with quartz to what he was told had been the site of the glass works, then also marked by an old foundation. The site, as he recalls it, was only a short distance beyond the rock. . . . Various sites have been mentioned as that upon which the glass works, now little more than a legend in the Mallorytown community, was situated.

This article was most helpful as added evidence that a Mallorytown glass factory had existed but, although helpful in some ways, it added to the confusion in others. The location given proved inaccurate, and a number of persons digging in this location and, finding no evidences of a glass factory, greatly increased the doubts about the existence of this Ontario glass house. This was unfortunate, as we were to find later on that the party mentioned in the newspaper article actually walked over and ignored the true site.

Amongst those who had investigated the site referred to in the Brockville newspaper was the late Miss Harriet Robertson, an antique dealer of Brockville, Ontario. Miss Robertson had, so she told the writer, employed several persons to investigate this site. These persons had, on different occasions, done considerable digging, which had produced negative results. Miss Robertson's opinion coincided with that of Mr. McKearin, namely, that the specimens of glass obtained in the Mallorytown district might have been made at the Redwood or Redford glass factories.

Having moved to the immediate vicinity of Mallorytown, and being interested in Canadiana of all types, I found the local tales of this glass factory a source of great interest. Mrs. Stevens and I decided that, if some day we, or anybody else, ever obtained definite proof that this Canadian glass factory had been in operation, we would try to acquire a specimen of the glass manufactured there.

We made local inquiries and discovered there were few, if any, examples of the glass, said to have been manufactured at the Mallorytown factory, left in the district. We became discouraged and almost gave up the search. One afternoon in August of 1952, we thought that we would try to track down one more lead we had heard of. A visit was made to a farmhouse owned by Mr. Cuthwin Burnham, and there, reposing on a pine sideboard in a Leeds County kitchen, stood a somewhat crude sugar bowl and cover, blown in an aquamarine coloured glass.

The sight of that sugar bowl, and the vehement insistence that it was "made at the Mallorytown glass factory years ago" and that it had been "handed down" as a family heirloom, caused Mrs. Stevens and I to decide to carry on for ourselves a really intensive search to prove or disprove the folk-tale that Canada also had had its share of artisans in the early days. Our first step was to make a list of the people we knew had lived in the Mallorytown-Lansdowne area for sixty years or more. We then questioned them as to their opinion on the past existence of a glass factory in this vicinity and, if their answer was in the affirmative, we attempted to ascertain their ideas as to its location. By questioning we heard of seven different sites. We were a little disconcerted at the thought of attempting to gain permission to excavate on all seven. One thing we noticed, however, and that was that one approximate location was mentioned several times and, as this location was in the field written of in the Brockville paper, although not the same site, we decided to investigate this field for ourselves. We interviewed the owner of the field, Mr. Kenneth Topping, and he graciously granted permission to dig on his property.

We next approached Mr. Fred Guild, the owner of the adjoining property and, knowing he is most interested in anything concerning Leeds County, we asked him if he would wish to join in the search for the site. This he readily agreed to do. We then made a thorough search of the field and found the ruins previously mentioned. While making a study of the field, we noticed that the old road to Kingston had originally curved into the field and passed what appeared to be the ruins of a well. This well was only a circle of stones showing through the sod, and very close to it, almost adjoining, there were mounds that suggested a building. The original road had not crossed over the ledge of rock mentioned in the newspaper article and there were no signs of there ever having been a road across this ledge. Thinking it strange that a factory of any kind would be made so inaccessible as that mentioned in the article we decided that possibly the wells and mounds were of significance and that our first digging should be done at this location.

On August 18, 1953, Mr. Fred Guild, his brother Lawrence, their tractor and two-furrow plow, Mrs. Stevens and I, our shovel and

rake, went to work. It was indeed a pleasure to find vindication of our selection of the site in the first six inches of sod turned by the plow. The plow had been set to cut as deep a furrow as possible and, less than a foot from where the plow had entered the ground, we picked up several small pieces of an aquamarine coloured glass, a broken piece of early Staffordshire, and the remains of a hand-wrought nail. We continued the plowing until an area of about ten by fifty feet had been uncovered. We then commenced digging and raking. It was found that, about twelve inches down, a stratum of sand, stone, and broken quartz was spread over a wide area. This broken quartz was similar to quartz strewn about the mouth of a shaft located on the far side of the ledge of rock previously mentioned. The sand, stone and quartz appeared to be unsuccessful batches of metal. It could be picked up separately, fused, and partly vitrified. This stratum was found where the front of the building had presumably been located. It had probably been put there as fill. Early Canadians must also have had their troubles with spring roads.

Another discovery, which may be considered to be of major importance in its implications, was the finding of a number of pieces of what appear to be pots, coated on the inner side with a thin layer of an aquamarine glaze. From descriptions, and from pieces we had seen elsewhere, we recognized these as parts of early melting pots such as were used to melt the ingredients necessary for the making of glass.

We also unearthed pieces of worked glass with folded rims, rounded corners, and pontil marks. Some of these pieces appeared to be broken bottles. Worked glass and slag was found in sufficient quantities to make it quite certain that an establishment manufacturing glass had been situated on this particular site.

The period spent on excavation on the day of discovery and on the occasion of our second visit was only about six hours, for, on our second visit, the owner of the land requested us to refrain from further digging. Our intentions had been to remove all sod for an area of about fifty by fifty feet, then carefully rake and sift the earth uncovered. Then, when all necessary excavation had been done, we had intended to replace the earth and sod, leaving exposed only the actual foundations of the glass factory. We thought that these foundations might be of interest to other people desiring visible proof. Unfortunately, that plan was not carried out.

As far as we could discover in the short period spent at the diggings, the Mallorytown glass factory was housed in a wooden building, having a stone foundation, and shaped in the form of an L. The tip of the L faced south-east and possibly housed the furnace. The adjoining room, or building, pointed north-east, and a small building or room adjoining this also pointed in the same direction. Ap-

parently these buildings suffered destruction by fire. Charred wood was found close to and all about the foundations. Possibly, after the closing down of the glass factory, the buildings had been used as a residence. This was suggested by the fact that we found the remains of a two-tine fork, and many small pieces of old plates and cups.

The articles most frequently produced in early glass factories were bottles and window glass, and, in Upper Canada during the early part of the 19th century, these items were, we are told, much in demand. The country was sparsely settled, but the need for glass containers was great. Fluids came in bulk, and the shopkeeper, apothecary, and tavern keeper often expected their patrons to supply their own containers. Bottles were used by all, and numbers of these are known to have been owned in Leeds County up to a recent date. Few, if any, exist at the present time. Their colour is said to have been similar to that of pieces excavated at the Mallorytown site; that is, a deep aquamarine. The window glass of many of the oldest of the Leeds County homes has been examined. So far none of a sufficiently early make has been found to indicate that this type of glass had been made in this district.

Strangely enough, it is the whimsey or off-hand glass, made by the individual, that can be traced to particular factories. Often, when all the commercial output has disappeared, the free-blown pieces, being in many cases products of one of the family, are more carefully preserved. A personal search of the Mallorytown area has revealed that a number of pieces of this off-hand glass had been owned by local residents, and examples, such as sugar bowls, pitchers, vases, flasks, ink-wells and cruets can, with some degree of assurance, be said to have been made at the Mallorytown factory. Many of the glass fragments and shards excavated at the Mallorytown site are of the colour mentioned previously, aquamarine. There is much worthwhile investigation necessary before a statement, as to whether or not this is a distinctive colour can be made. If this is so, fragments could be used to verify the authenticity of the worked pieces attributed to the Leeds County factory.

The writer has in his possession several broken pieces of glass said to have been dug up at the site of the glass factory at Redwood, N.Y. These pieces also are of an aquamarine colour, but of a much lighter shade. The confusion existing over the worked examples of glass attributed to the New York State and the Leeds County glass houses could be definitely settled if these Redwood fragments are typical. This is a point of some importance, and, until such time as analysis will be possible from scrapings obtained from authentic examples from the different glass factories, it should be given careful study.

F. St. George Spendlove, Curator, Canadiana Collections, The Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, Toronto, Ontario, visited the site of the Mallorytown glass factory with the writer and has very kindly given permission to quote the following extract from his report of November 16, 1953, to the Archaeological and Historic Sites Board:

> . . . I believe that tests will show that the glass contains lead. The metal is a brilliant and quite heavy glass, of a deep aquamarine tint, used for bottles but also blown into functional shapes such as flasks, and probably drinking glasses and jugs. The glass has so much character that I think a satisfactory attribution of specimens to the factory could be made by the glass-metal itself, accompanied by a technique used at the time.
>
> The factory seems to have used a local sand, plus a local quartz in lump form and (probably) local wood-ash potash. The considerable weight of the metal would suggest a lead content, and the glass seems to be resonant. The addition of quartz was most unusual and may have been called for by a low silica content in the sand. Since specimens of the materials are available, it would be interesting to trace the origin of the deep aquamarine tint in the glass, probably due to the presence of a considerable amount of iron.

Dr. and Mrs. Lorne Pierce of York Mills, Willowdale, Ont., also visited the Mallorytown diggings. Mrs. Pierce was one of Canada's most noted collectors of early glass and was keenly interested in the discovery. Mrs. Pierce was also impressed by the deep aquamarine colour of the glass.

At the time of the writing of this paper, the writer has, in his possession, two pieces of Mallorytown glass of undoubted authenticity, the "Burnham Bowl," the sugar bowl previously mentioned, and the "Shipman Vase," obtained from the descendant of a United Empire Loyalist settler. The writer feels that, as authentic examples of the Mallorytown glass house are so few in number, those pieces having a good "pedigree" should be named after the families from whom they were obtained. Also, in the possession of the writer are three other pieces, a flask, which is very possibly a Mallorytown product, a plate, the origin of which is more dubious, and a blown glass cane, 43" long, having Nailsea-like loopings in the handle. It is so very thin that it is difficult to judge the colour or weight of metal. So far as is known there are only two other fully authenticated worked pieces remaining in the possession of Canadians. First, a vase of cuneiform shape with a circular foot. This piece is in Toronto. Second, a very crude drinking glass owned by a Leeds County family. Mallorytown glass has indeed become a rarity.

An American collector of note has, in his personal collection, several pieces of blown glass having an aquamarine colour, and, also, a superimposed gather in the form of a design known as "Lily-

Pad." These are stated to have been made at the Mallorytown factory; this is possible as they were amongst a number of pieces of glass acquired in that area at some time in the past. However, the "Lily-Pad" design is definitely known to have been used by the Northern New York State factories and further investigation is necessary on this point before this design can be stated to have been used in the Leeds County glass factory. The writer has not had the pleasure of examining these pieces.

It is my hope that a list of all pieces that can be fully authenticated will eventually be compiled and we are working on this. If anyone, at any time, learns anything more concerning the Mallorytown glass factory, the writer will be grateful for information which may be sent through the Kingston Historical Society.

Diggers, untrained to recognize significant shards, can do untold damage. Dr. G. F. G. Stanley, of Kingston, representing the Historic and Archaeological Sites Board of Ontario, paid a visit to the work done at the site of the Mallorytown glass factory to see what steps the Board might take to protect the diggings and to prevent the mutilation of the workings by the owner or his family. But the Board and the Provincial authorities concerned did not see fit to set aside a piece of ground for archeological purposes without the consent of the owner, as would have had to be done.

To return to the specific subject of my talk, namely the Glass House at Mallorytown, here are my general conclusions. I am convinced, from the limited amount of work which I was able to do, and from the samples of glass which I have been able to locate, that the existence of the glass house in Leeds County is beyond doubt. It was located one mile west of Mallorytown on the north side of No. 2 Highway close to the road. Thus far I can go with certainty.

The exact dates when it operated are, unfortunately, less certain. The county records of Leeds have been examined, but they yield nothing. The Township records have, unfortunately, been destroyed by fire. It could not, very well, have been in existence prior to 1800, for the Mallorytown area was just being settled at that time. Oral tradition, backed by family records proving ages of persons supplying the correct location of the site to people who had in turn supplied it to me, show that it was in ruins by 1831 (*History of the Guild Family* by Charles Burleigh). It would be reasonable to assume that the factory operated around 1825. Before we can give any exact dates, and before we can tell anything more about the Glass House, who operated it, what was the extent of its production, a great deal more research will have to be done.

— III —

Another Ontario glass factory, of a later date (circa 1865) is known to have been established at Napanee by the late John Herring. The commercial glass produced by a glass factory holds very little interest for the collector or student. The products which arouse them to an almost fever pitch are the whimseys, usually free-blown, made by the workmen from metal left in the pots at the end of the work period. These must not be confused with the so-called end-of-day glass, usually a commercial glass. These whimseys can be partially listed as: glass walking-canes, paper-weights, hats, cream and milk pitchers, sugar bowls and other small articles of household use, also, invariably, the much controversial witch-balls. Witch-balls are hollow glass spheres and are said by some to have been used by those credulous enough to believe in the charming ladies after whom they were named, and to have been hung in windows to prevent witches hovering about. Other people say they were made for the much more mundane purpose of covering pitchers. Be this as it may, witch-balls were made in quantity at most 19th century glass factories and are very appealing to those happy mortals who have retained a romantic approach to their collecting. A number of whimseys made at the Napanee Glass factory have been acquired by collectors. Possibly the finest collection of these Napanee pieces is owned by Mrs. Lorne Pierce.

Doing research on early Canadian glass factories leads to many strange things. A person will often make a great many calls and write numberless letters, without obtaining any results. Then suddenly a lead is given, a call is made, and unexpected data is forthcoming and flagging spirits are again aroused.

Just recently I have been given a lead which I wish to pass along. The tale told me concerned a gentleman, said to have been a resident of Kingston, who had made several trips to the immediate vicinity of Lansdowne, Ont. This gentleman, it was said, obtained sand-stone from a local quarry and took it to Kingston where he used it in glass making. I had, in attempting to gather further information concerning this gentleman, already annoyed the usually forty to fifty people, without any results, when I was finally instructed to interview Mr. Wm. Armstrong and Miss Sarah-Ann Armstrong of Lansdowne, Ontario. This interview was both pleasant and instructive. They informed me that the gentleman from Kingston had obtained the sand-stone from a quarry originally owned by their grandfather, the late William Armstrong (deceased 1882). The greater part of the quarry had been sold to "a gentleman from Napanee" by their grandfather in "about 1870," and "for a number of years blocks of the sand-stone had been taken to the Napanee Glass Works and used for making glass." "Many flat-cars"

loaded with this stone had been sent to Napanee. This sort of thing is manna to the research worker. The location of this quarry is, Lot 21, 2nd concession, Township of Lansdowne, County of Leeds.

Mr. and Miss Armstrong also informed me that the "gentleman from Kingston had been seen working in the quarry one spring day, about 1900. He wasn't seen again until haying, when his remains were found." He had apparently been overcome by his exertion. "The remains had been taken to Kingston." So far the writer has been unable to discover the name of "the Gentleman from Kingston." Possibly a resident of this city would be willing to attempt to trace and, if possible, verify this somewhat nebulous story of a Kingston glass factory. The visit made to the home of Mr. and Miss Armstrong added much worthwhile data concerning the Napanee glass house. The original information about the "Gentleman from Kingston" was supplied to the writer by Mr. Joseph Turner of Mallorytown, Ont.

The writer feels that students of Canadian Glass should pool their information and so, eventually, obtain sufficient data to warrant the publication of a book written exclusively on the subject of Canadian Glass. There is a crying need for a book of this type. Persons wishing to study Canadian History, or write Canadian historical novels or histories, must at the present time sidestep all mention of glass native to this country. This can be changed if there is a pooling of knowledge. Many people have, or know of, a bit of evidence of information concerning one of tht world's greatest mysteries, Early Canadian Glass. If there could be some focal point established for this pooling of information, it would save years of research and grubbing about in the ground. This being so, the writer will mention several hints as to Canadian glass factories in hopes that these hints will assist anyone wishing to do research on Canadian Glass.

There is another Ontario glass factory waiting for someone to prove its existence. This factory was said to have been located at Picton, Ontario. The writer has, as yet, been unable to learn anything more about this establishment, but hopes that someone living in that vicinity will undertake the search.

Information obtained from Mrs. Lorne Pierce, Dr. Wm. Kaye Lamb, Dominion Archivist, Public Archives of Canada, and other sources, suggest that, at some time in the past, William Godkin Beach (1839-1902) or Thomas Beech (1839-1902) are supposed to have owned three glass works situated in Ottawa, and St. Catharines, Ontario, and in Montreal, Quebec. The writer has so far been unable to gain additional data on these three factories.

The Province of Quebec also has had its share of early glass factories. There is one that we know was situated at Hudson Heights

on the Lake of Two Mountains, P.Q. It was a bottle glass factory, and operated sometime in the latter part of the 19th century. We have been attempting to obtain further information regarding this facory and also to acquire a piece of the glass manufactured there. It is possible that we shall do so.

Another Quebec district that can be said to be rich in possibilities is that of the Eastern Townships and in particular, the country surrounding Lake Massawippi. Many years ago I had the pleasure of examining bulls-eye panes of window glass in several of the older homesteads. I was told that these window panes had been made locally. I tried to verify this statement and to acquire one of these bulls-eye pieces but was unable to do either. The preceding may suggest a line of research to someone. (Bulls-eye window panes were a very early technique and the mark left by the pontil rod was much in evidence).

— IV —

All specific pieces of glass so far mentioned in this paper were made by the technique termed free-blown. As far as we know, there is no outstanding design in pressed glass that may be solely attributed to an early Canadian glass factory. Apparently all moulds used by Canadians were either imported or of minor importance. The subject of pressed glass has been gone into most thoroughly by Ruth Webb Lee in her book *Early American Pressed Glass Patterns*, and it is a valuable source of information. The different patterns are all catalogued under different names so that the reader may distinguish one from the other. There is one named pattern which has caused some confusion, and perhaps I can throw a little light upon one of the obscurities which seem to darken this subject for amateur collectors. Many people seem to think that any glass that is called 'Canadian' should be collected as "Canadiana." There are a good many dangers of which the amateur collector should be aware. A glass having a design or pattern on it of leaves and a scene showing pine trees, a house, and birds in flight, has been named "Canadian" by Miss Lee and other writers. This is pressed glass of the type called 'Pattern'. It dates from around 1870. It was made in all forms for table use. It is not blown glass, and it was made in large quantities by later American glass factories. It has some value and interest to collectors, but it should be appreciated by those who buy it that it is definitely not to be classed solely as Canadian, as has apparently been done many times in the past.

— V —

Any attempt to authenticate the glass of any period of history is most difficult; it is a task which must be approached with some degree of caution and perhaps even of suspicion. In the old days, itinerant craftsmen and glass-blowers travelled from factory to fac-

tory. They took their knowledge to new places and passed on to others their various trade secrets. This has obliged us, in the present day, to use the vague term "attributed to," when we examine a vast amount of the antique glass still in existence. Moreover, and this is very important to the collector — we have no choice. We cannot be sure. Samples of glass prepared by pupils bear all the marks of the master. Modern reproduction methods are such that even the expert and, in many cases, only the expert — hesitates before making a definite statement. There are a multitude of factors to be taken into consideration. The source from which the glass has been acquired; the texture and weight of metal; the colour and form; the type of pontil mark; and, above all, signs and location of wear have all to be studied. This wear must appear to have occurred through natural use, and not be lacking or overdone. There are many pitfalls for the unwary in the collecting of antique glass. I have spent a great deal of time climbing out of these and expect to do more. Only time, help from others, and study of public and private collections can assure a person of at least an elementary knowledge.

KINGSTON HISTORICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS FOR 1953 - 54.

PATRONS

Mr. W. J. Henderson, M.P.
Dr. W. A. Mackintosh
Mr. W. M. Nickle, M.P.P.
Dr. R. C. Wallace
Mayor G. C. Wright

PRESIDENT

Lt.-Col. Courtlandt M. Strange

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Brigadier D. R. Agnew
Prof. C. A. Curtis
Mr. Ronald Way

HONORARY SECRETARY

Dr. R. A. Preston

HONORARY TREASURER

Dr. G. F. G. Stanley

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Mrs. W. Angus
Professor F. W. Gibson
Mr. H. H. Gomery
Mr. H. P. Gundy
Brigadier G. Kitching
Mr. J. H. Ritchie