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ABSTRACT

This study, part of a project for the establishment of a historical interpretation centre at Cartier-Brébeuf Park in Quebec City, was first presented as four separate reports; these appear here as four sections. The first section deals with Jacques Cartier's life and exploits. The second is a detailed examination of his second voyage, with emphasis on the first known wintering of Europeans on Canadian soil. The third section discusses French-Indian relations during Cartier's three voyages and certain related questions. The final section shows Cartier's influence in the second half of the 16th century, that is, until Champlain's expedition.

Presented for publication 1969 by Réal Boissonault, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch.
INTRODUCTION

Exploration in the last decade of the 15th century and throughout the 16th century was directed by three motives: the wish to find a sea route to Asia, permitting access to luxury goods such as spices, silks, and precious stones, while bypassing Muslim middlemen; the need to discover gold to equalize the trade balance with East Africa; and the Renaissance urge to satisfy scientific curiosity. Economic imperatives took precedence, and Christopher Columbus’s discovery in 1492 of a new continent (which he believed to be part of Asia) raised the hopes and nourished the expectations of many a European country.

England, Portugal, Spain, and France all backed expeditions to the new lands. Cabot, Corte Real, Fagundes, Verrazano, Gomez, and Rut ploughed the seas in hopes of finding the route to Asia and riches. Although they never reached their goals, their voyages were not entirely in vain. By 1534, just before the French expeditions, the east and south coasts of Labrador to Brest, the northern, eastern, and southern shorelines of Newfoundland, and Chateau Bay in the Strait of Belle Isle had been explored. Cape Breton Island, eastern Nova Scotia, and a part of the New England coast were no longer unknown.

Although the Europeans failed to find a passage to Asia and discovered no precious metals along the Gulf of St. Lawrence, France decided to continue the explorations begun by Verrazano in the area. The task was entrusted to a navigator from St. Malo, Jacques Cartier, an explorer of the new world like Cabot, Corte Real, and others. If it were not for his discovery of a great river, during his second voyage from 1535-36, he would deserve no greater fame than his predecessors. But as the first official explorer to enter the St. Lawrence, the passage inland, Jacques Cartier deserves a place of honour in the history of Canada.
JACQUES CARTIER: HIS LIFE AND EXPLOITS

Birth to First Voyage to Canada (1491-1534)

Early biographies of Jacques Cartier gave his birth date as December 31, 1494, based on a baptismal record - but one that does not show the child's first name. In 1888, however, Frédéric Joiion des Longrais brought out a set of previously unpublished documents from the St. Malo civil register. Three of these documents point to 1491 as Jacques Cartier's birth date. According to them, he was 56 years old on January 2, 1547, 60 on December 23, 1551, and 64 on June 6, 1556. Joiion des Longrais concludes that Cartier was born in 1491, between June 7 and December 23 - a perfectly acceptable conclusion, and one that later historians have taken as fact.

Jacques Cartier was the grandson of Jean Cartier and Guillemette Beaudoin and the son of Jamet Cartier and Geseline Jansart; he had a sister, Jeanne. He was married in April or May of 1520 to Catherine Des Granches, the daughter of the St. Malo high constable and thus from a family of some social standing. The marriage act reads as follows:


From August 21, 1510 until his marriage, Jacques Cartier's name is mentioned nine times as godfather or witness in baptismal acts. It is in one of these baptismal acts, dated March 3, 1518, that the earliest sample of his signature is found. It is also found at the bottom of several other acts. (Joiion des Longrais has pointed out the lack of individuality among signatures of this period.6) These facts are all that we know from document on Cartier's life from his birth to his marriage.

The period between his marriage and March 18, 1534, when the Court of France ordered its treasurer to grant Cartier the subsidies necessary to equip ships for a voyage to the New World, is equally obscure, if not more so. All that we can learn from the sources is that he appeared as witness or godfather in baptisms 21 times.
We know nothing of his seafaring career up to 1534, except that he was named "maistre pilote" in his marriage act. He must certainly have had some experience in the art of navigation in order to have acquired this title. We may suggest, with caution, that he had already been to Spain, Brazil, and Newfoundland before his voyage in 1534. The accounts of his voyages and some other documents give clues that support this suggestion.

First of all, the account of his first voyage says, referring to the natives of Chaleur Bay, that "leur terre est en chaleur plus tempérée que la terre d'Espaigne." We may assume from this that Cartier had been to Spain. Also in the records, there are four comparisons with Brazil: "y croist de groz mil, comme poix, ainsi que au Brésil;" "blé qui est comme mil de Brésil;" "peuple qui vyt quasi en communauté de biens assez de la sorte des Brézillans;" "de ce mesme bled en croist assez au Brésil." It is clear that Cartier had acquired some notions of Brazil and it would be surprising if he had never been there. Furthermore his wife stood as godmother to an Indian girl named Catherine de Brésil, in July 1528. This indicates that the voyage or voyages to Brazil took place before 1528.

That Cartier had been to Newfoundland before 1534 is even more plausible. According to Marcel Trudel, Cartier indicates during his first voyage that he is not in unknown parts. An order from the Court of St. Malo shows that Cartier knew that he was to "allez aux Terres Neufes, passez la destroict de la baye des Chasteaulz." And during this voyage, he made a beeline to Funk Island, and from there to Castle Bay, as if this were his customary itinerary.

Nothing more is known of Cartier's career in navigation before 1534. One thing is, however, certain: his maritime experience in Brazil and Newfoundland was sufficient to earn him the support of Bishop Jean Le Veneur, the Admiral of France, and of Francis I.10

Francis I had made a pilgrimage to Mont St. Michel in 1532 and Bishop Le Veneur, Count of Lisieux, Abbot of Mont St. Michel, and Chaplain of France, had presented to him a St. Malo navigator by the name of Jacques Cartier, who was related to the bursar of the abbey, saying that this Cartier, "en considération de ses voyages en Brésil et en Terre-Neuve," was capable "de conduire des navires à la découverte des terres nouvelles dans le nouveau monde." Le Veneur even promised to provide chaplains and to share in the cost of the expedition if the mission were entrusted to Cartier.11

In this way Jacques Cartier came to the attention of Francis I and was later chosen to undertake a voyage to the New World, to retrace the route taken by Verrezano several years earlier.
The study of Cartier's voyages is possible because of the records kept. However, the original accounts have been lost; we must rely on copies and even so, the account of the third voyage is incomplete. For the first voyage, in 1534, the most reliable reproduction, and the one referred to most frequently in recent publications, is the Moreau manuscript, discovered in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris by Henri Michelant, and catalogued as follows: MS., Collection Moreau, vol. 841, folios 52-68. For the second voyage, a manuscript (called manuscript B), first published in France in 1545, seems to be the one most faithful to the original. It is kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, under number 5589. For the third voyage, we have only an English version of the account, done by Hakluyt around 1600, based on an incomplete document discovered in Paris around 1583 and later lost. These three records are reproduced in The Voyages of Jacques Cartier by Henry P. Biggar (1924) and they are the texts we used in this study. Since the originals are lost, it is practically impossible to establish the authorship of the accounts.12

The First Voyage: April 20 to September 15, 1534

We do not have Cartier's commission for this first expedition. However, a document dated March 18, 1534 shows that payment (6,000 livres) was made of the subsidies necessary to organize a voyage under Jacques Cartier "es Terres Neufves pour découvrir certaines yslés et pays où l'on dit qu'il se doibt trouver grant quantité d'or et autres riches choses."13 This was the primary purpose of the expedition, but the search for a passage to Asia was also important, as is evident in Cartier's perseverance in extending his explorations.14

All that is known about the preparations for the first voyage is that Cartier had some difficulty in finding good sailors, as they were being hidden by shipowners. An order of the Court of St. Malo was issued, summoning shipowners to give priority to Cartier and to do nothing to impede his preparations.15

These two documents are the only ones we have seen that describe the conditions immediately preceding the first voyage. Nor are there any additional details in the 1534 account. The names of the two ships (each of about 60 tons burden) are unknown, as are the embarkation rolls listing Cartier's 61 men.16 All that is known is that he was the leader of the expedition.
The expedition left the port of St. Malo on April 20, 1534. The crossing took 20 days, a very short time. There is no need to dwell on the itinerary; Cartier's route has been traced on modern maps by several historians, and an indication given of the places known before 1534 and their names. We refer the reader to one of these works, Biggar (1924). The expedition returned to St. Malo on September 5, after a voyage of four and a half months.

In terms of the objectives set beforehand, the first voyage was a failure. Still, Cartier was the first to give an official report of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, thus helping to open up new territory to the fur trade and fisheries. Furthermore, it was during this expedition, on July 7, 1534 at Saint Martin's cove, that the first duly witnessed barter ceremony between Europeans and the Indians of the Gulf took place. On July 24, 1534, Cartier took possession of a vast territory by erecting a cross engraved with the name of the king of France at Gaspé Bay (Honguedo). Cartier also took back with him to France two sons of Chief Donnacona of Stadacona, Domagaya and Taignoagny. During the second voyage, they would show Cartier the route to Canada and to the kingdom of Saguenay.

The Second Voyage: May 19, 1535 to July 16, 1536

On October 30 (only two months after returning from the first voyage), Cartier received a commission from Admiral Chabot enjoining him to undertake the necessary preparations for a continuation of his explorations in the New World. He was to equip three ships for a 15-month expedition. The commission was presented to Cartier in St. Malo on February 8, 1535.

On March 3, before an assembly of burghers, of which he was a member, and before the authorities of St. Malo, Cartier requested and was granted first choice of vessels and sailors for his expedition:

A esté par ledict Cronier pour lesdicts bourgeois remonstré que ledict Cartier a fait arrestez les navires de cestedicte ville demandant qu'il ayct à choisir à esgard de gens des navires tel qu'il luy plaïra pour ce que la saison vient pour allez en Terre Neuffve.

On March 30 he received 3,000 L to prepare for his voyage, whose general objective was "aller descouvrir certaines terres loingtaines." The following day a provisions embarkation roll was issued, listing the names of 74 persons of various occupations, including that of sailor, apothecary, barber, carpenter, and trumpeter. However, some names were doubtless struck from the roll and new ones added, so we cannot view it as a definitive document: "& a
This is the extent of documentary information on Cartier's activities between the return from his first voyage and the departure for his second. One point has been gained: we know that Cartier was listed among the burghers of St. Malo.

On May 16, 1535 the members of the crew took confession and communion and received the episcopal blessing. Three days later, they left - 110 men, plus Donnacoma's two sons brought from Gaspé Bay the previous year. They sailed on three ships: the Grande Hermine, the Petite Hermine, and the Emerillon, of a burden of 120, 60, and 40 tons respectively. The crossing took 50 days; on arrival Cartier was anxious to take up his explorations where he had left off the year before. The second voyage lasted 14 months; its itinerary is shown in Biggar (1924). The expedition returned to St. Malo on July 16, 1536.

The route to Asia was not discovered, and Cartier was able to take back to France only some pelts and a few pieces of gold, supposedly from the land of Saguenay ('and the said Jacques [Cartier] brought to the King a sample of gold, ten or twelve stones shaped like small goose quills, and he says it is fine gold and comes from the said city of Sagana.' However, according to documents, Cartier was the first European to ascend the St. Lawrence; he even went beyond the settlement of Hochelaga, whose inhabitants he describes. His influence on 16th century cartography was considerable.

During this 14-month voyage, the French were exposed for the first time to the Canadian winter, which they spent at the junction of the Saint-Charles and Lairet Rivers. It was a fatal wintering for many: 20 of the 110 men died of scurvy. Thanks to the anneda, the remainder of the crew was saved.

Cartier was in constant contact with the Laurentian Huron-Iroquois; he described their customs and religion, and wrote down a vocabulary. Through these contacts, at times difficult, Cartier gained some notions of the fabled kingdom of Saguenay, which nourished his hopes that he might someday be able to go there. On his return to France, he took with him several Indians, including Chief Donnacoma, who encouraged the same project in an audience with Francis I.

The Third Voyage: May 23, 1541 to the Beginning of September, 1542

When Cartier returned from Canada in 1536, France was once again at war with Charles V, so further expeditions were, for the moment, out of the question. Let us look at the documentary information on Cartier from his return from his second voyage until his commission on October 17, 1540.
Cartier stood as godfather on December 1, 1536. On May 10, 1537, he received the Grande Hermine from the king as compensation for the expenses incurred during the second voyage. On September 14, 1537, he received another 3,499 L, due to him for expenses incurred during both expeditions. On September 22, Francis I granted him 50 écus for his "sallaires et vaccations," and for the maintenance of the Indians that had been brought back from Canada.

From the few extant pages of the record of the third voyage, we learn that Cartier reported on his second expedition to the king, both orally and in writing. We do not know the date the meeting took place, nor the substance of the report; it is clear, however, that Cartier kept a ship's log, which included maps. Two letters from Jacques Noël, Cartier's great-nephew, confirm this.

Cartier stood again as godfather on March 25, 1539, at the baptism of three Indians brought back from Canada in 1536. He was godfather again on May 18; on May 22, he received the Irish rebel Fitzgerald at St. Malo and showed him the city.

In June 1538 the Treaty of Nice ended the war, and Francis I could begin to think about another expedition. Early in 1539, in conversations with the Portuguese spy Lagarto, the king still seemed dazzled by tales of the riches in the kingdom of Saguenay that Donnacona had described under questioning by the king and by Cartier before a notary. However, despite his interest, the king did nothing until the latter half of 1540.

In the middle of 1540, he granted his subjects the freedom to go to any of the new lands. Portugal and Spain became worried and demanded that the Alexandrian line be respected. Assiduous correspondence was exchanged between the ambassadors and spies in the service of John III of Portugal and Charles V of Spain, wherein Cartier's name was mentioned several times, especially after October 17, when Cartier's commission for a third voyage to Canada was delivered. In one of these missives, written in November 1540, the Spanish ambassador to France tells Charles V that Jacques Cartier had plundered Spanish and Portuguese merchant vessels in the past (between 1537 and 1540). The accusation is probably justified, but cannot be proven.

This is all that can be learned from the documents on Cartier's activities from the return from his second voyage to the commission for his third.

By October 17, 1540, the king had made up his mind, and Cartier received a commission to go to Canada. He was named "capitaine général et maistre pilote de tous les navires et aultres vaisseaux de mer" that were to take part in the expedition. His objective was to go to the countries "de Canada et Ochelaga et jusques en la terre de Saguenay, s'il peult y aborder." The number of vessels and persons in the
expedition is not known. However, the Emerillon was one of the vessels, and Cartier was able to take 50 prisoners from French prisons. A new purpose for the expedition was adopted: to lead the people of Canada to the knowledge of God. It is difficult, however, to judge the sincerity of this mission. Basically, the purpose of the expedition was to repeat and extend the explorations of the second voyage.40

In any case, Cartier set to work immediately upon receiving his commission. Through Cardinal Farnese, the papal nuncio, he requested certain spiritual favours from Rome.41 He next received patent letters from the Duke of Brittany, granting him authority to select fifty prisoners. And, as he was still having difficulties in recruiting good sailors — it was said that they "ont esté par aucuins de nos subjects, tant de la ville de Saint-Malo que aultres villes...pernitieusement et malicieusement divertyz et dissuadez" — the king ordered a discreet enquiry into this state of affairs.42

Then, with no warning, the entire undertaking was upset when Jean-François de la Rocque de Roberval was appointed head of the expedition in a commission dated January 15, 1541, which did not even mention Cartier's name. Cartier was to be navigator, under Roberval's orders; and in addition to exploration, an attempt at colonization was to be made. This new commission superseded Cartier's commission of October 1540.43

In the midst of his preparations for departure,44 Cartier attended a baptism on April 11 and on May 19 drew up his will, recorded on November 12, in which he left all his worldly goods to his wife and to his sister Jeanne. It seems evident that Cartier had no children; for if he had, he would surely not have favoured his sister in this way.46

The will provides some definite information on Cartier. In it, he has the title of "capitaine et maistre pillote de Roy es Terres Neuffves," sire of Limoilou, and burgher of St. Malo. He owned a house at Limoilou, in the parish of Paramé and Saint-Ydeux, and another little house with a garden in back,

sitez et estant en cestedicte ville de Saintct Malo jouxte les murailles d'icelle aux environs de Buhen, joignante par une part la rue dudict Buhen, par aultre endroict et bout à aultre jardin apartenant à Jehanne Eberard et d’un côté le manoir de Buhen.

On May 20, 1541, Cartier put a stop to a quarrel and had to testify before the St. Malo court.47 Three days later, he departed with five vessels; as Roberval was not yet ready to leave, Cartier enjoyed the same prerogatives as his superior during his absence.48 The roll of the crew and the number of persons going overseas are not known; the
Spanish spy Santiago, however, suggests about 1,500 persons. The accuracy of this figure cannot be determined. In any case, the fleet passed Sainte-Croix on August 23, 1541, but Cartier decided to set up quarters farther on, at Cape Rouge, and had a fort built there. The settlement was called Charlesbourg-Royal. Once settled, Cartier continued on to Hochelaga, arriving September 7, in order to continue exploration of this area and pursue the route to Saguenay. The attempt did not succeed and the French returned to their home port near Stadacona, hoping to go back the following spring. Unfortunately, the relation of the third voyage ends at this point. The little we know of the continuation of the expedition is provided mostly by the records of Roberval's voyage.

Here is a summary of the important points: Cartier was Roberval's subordinate; he did not set up quarters at Sainte-Croix as on the second voyage; he was still seeking the route to Saguenay; upon his return, he met Roberval's expedition at St. John's, Newfoundland, and Roberval ordered Cartier to return with him to Canada. Cartier, under the illusion that what he had in his hold was gold and diamonds, slipped away during the night, abandoning Roberval, and returned to France.

He arrived in St. Malo at the beginning of September 1542, after an absence of less than 17 months. The exact date of his return to France is not known. However, we know that the expedition had returned by September 7, because that is the date of the announcement of the death, during the third voyage, of one of Cartier's sailors.

Cartier also stood as godfather on October 21, 1542. This was the last official expedition that Cartier took part in, although for a time it was believed that he made another trip to bring Roberval and his men back to France. This belief was based on the statement of Cartier's account, dated June 21, 1544, where we read:

pour le tiers navire metrez pour 17 mois qu'il a esté au voyage dudit Cartier, et pour huit mois qu'il a esté à retourner querir ledict Roberval audict Canada.

However, the Grande Hermine was not yet at France-Roy (Cape Rouge) on June 19, 1543, and Roberval's settlers returned to France at the beginning of September. Therefore Cartier, who was in St. Malo on July 3, could not have been on this trip.

Retirement (1543-57)

Jacques Cartier had finished his navigations for the king. It seems that in the last phase of his life, he led a
simple, peaceful existence, including a few public activities. He lived in one of his two houses (one was on Buhen Street in St. Malo and the other at Limoilou). His name still appeared in the registers - as juror, witness, defendant (Literal translation of the French. References elsewhere in this text indicate that Cartier's role in the courts was more likely that of "defenseur" - an advocate - Tr.) in trials, and as godfather in several baptisms. He and his wife founded an "obit" at the St. Malo cathedral, "moyennant une somme de 4L forte monnaie de rente sur l'hypothèque de leur maison et jardin situés jouxté l'hôpital saint-Thomas." He also looked after such everyday matters as making "an estât...pour le prix du poids du pain," establishing ratios between the price of bread and the price of wheat, giving his opinion on the tides of St. Malo harbour, recommending a guardian in a tutelage case, and acting as interpreter of Portuguese during a trial.

Cartier is listed among the merchants of St. Malo, and is also identified as official appraiser at a partition of noblemen's effects. Although he is called "sieur de Limoilou," "honneste gens," and "noble homme," nothing allows us to state categorically that he was granted a title. In any case, these appellations do not refer exclusively to the nobility.

Cartier died without issue on September 1, 1557, in his sixty-sixth year. We do not have the burial record as such (there are none for this period at St. Malo; see note 2 of this chapter), but Jouon des Longrais found the following note in the margin of a transcript dated September 1: "Ce dict mercredi au matin environ cinq heurs deceda Jacques Cartier." Jouon des Longrais points out that this kind of note is unusual in court records. Mention of Cartier's name is perhaps due as much to his qualities as advocate as to his skill in navigation.

We do not know what illness caused Cartier's death. However, administrative records show that the plague had raged in St. Malo since the beginning of that summer; we may suppose that Cartier succumbed to it.

We can make only vague conjectures as to the place of Cartier's death and his burial. It is probable that he died at his manor in Limoilou, since the plague had spread throughout the city. However, we have no way of verifying this hypothesis. It has been claimed that his remains were deposited in the St. Malo cathedral; but here again there is no proof.

If Jacques Cartier were to be described in a few words, we would say that he was a hardy and experienced navigator, well viewed by Francis I. Jehan Mallard, in his rhymed navigational atlas addressed to the king, includes Cartier among the best navigators of his time:
Si l'entreprise excède le savoir
Je me confie à votre grand avoir
Qui subviendra à la même indigence
Faisant revoyer cet oeuvre en diligence
Par bons pilotz qui sçavent les hauteurs,
Comme ceux-ci, très bon navigateurs, Jacques
Cartier, Grignon.66

Cartier was also counted among the respected merchants, advocates, and burghers of St. Malo. Two things are known of his personality: he was a merry soul67 and deeply religious.68

In summary, we have few proven details of the life of Jacques Cartier. However, we do have sufficient information for further investigation of his activities during his second voyage.
THE WINTER OF 1535-36 IN CANADA

In the first section we presented a brief biography of Cartier and in so doing touched briefly on his voyages to the New World. Here we will examine more thoroughly the account of Cartier's second voyage, with special attention to the first officially recognized wintering by Europeans on Canadian soil.

Choice of a Wintering Site: Cartier's Fort

Cartier left St. Malo on May 16, 1535, and had arrived at the area of Lobster Bay and Cape Sainte-Anne by August 17 of that year. After searching in vain for a passage to the north (this explains his reluctance to sail directly up the St. Lawrence), Cartier finally entered the great river, under the guidance of the two Indians he had taken to France the previous year, who told him that Saguenay began there and assured him that it was "le chemyn et commencement du grand fleuve de Hochelaga et chemyn de Canada, lequel allait toujours en estroisissant jusques à Canada." He sailed along the banks, alternating from one to another - as if he wanted to make sure he was missing nothing - and occasionally exploring the mouths of rivers, but no further. On September 7, he cast anchor between the Ile d'Orléans and the North Shore.

The next day, Donnacona, the lord of Canada, came to meet Cartier at his ships and harangued him, after which there was feasting. After this initial contact with the people of Stadacona, the Frenchmen looked for a spot upriver to lay up the ships. They chose a site at the confluence of the Sainte-Croix (Saint-Charles) River and the Lairet River (sometimes called Jacques Cartier River), which they named Sainte-Croix harbour, in honour of the Elevation of the Holy Cross. The following two excerpts from the account of the second voyage give a good description of the site and environs, as well as the reasons for which it was selected.

Et fumes oultre ledict fleuve enuyron dix lieues, cotoyant ladite ysle, et au bout d'icelle trouvasmes ung affourcq d'euses, fort beau et plaisant, auquel lieue y a une petite ripvière et hable de basre, marinant de deulx à
troys brasses, que trouvassmes lieu à nous propice pour mectre nosdictz navires à sauveté. Nous nommasmes ledict lieu saincte Croix pource qu ledict jour y arrivasmes.\textsuperscript{5}

Le meilleur [passage past the Ile d'Orléans] et le plus seur est du coustê devers le su. Et au bout d'icelle ysle, vers l'ouaist, y a ung affourq d'eauses [the Saint-Charles river branches off] beau et delectable, pour mectre navires ouquel il y a ung destroict dudit fleuve, fort courant et parfond;... Le travers deuqel, y a une terre double, de bonne haulteur, tout labourée, aussi bonne terre qu'il soit possible de veoyr; et là est la ville et demourance du seigneur Donnacona, et de noz deulx hommes que avyons prins le premier voiage, laquelle demourance se nomme Stadaconé...Puys, ledict lieu de Stadaconé soubz laquelle haulte terre, vers le nort, est la ripviére et hable de saincte Croix, ouquel lieu avons esté despuis le quinzièmes jour de septembre, jusques au VI\textsuperscript{me} jour de may, VVXXXVI, ouquel lieu les navires demeurent assec, comme cy davant est dict.\textsuperscript{6}

On September 15, Cartier had buoys and landmarks set out "pour plus seurement mectre les navires à sauveté."\textsuperscript{7} On the following day, the largest two ships, the Grande Hermine and the Petite Hermine, were anchored in the harbour. The Emerillon was left in the roads so it could be used for the planned trip to Hochelaga.\textsuperscript{8}

Despite the refusal of Donnacona's two sons to act as guides for the trip and the demonstration of witchcraft intended to prevent the French from making the trip,\textsuperscript{9} on September 19, 1535 Cartier left Sainte-Croix on the Emerillon, with 50 sailors and two longboats, and set off for Hochelaga. This was his first expedition from the wintering site.\textsuperscript{10}

On October 11, the crew returned to Sainte-Croix, and Cartier saw the fort that the Frenchmen, remaining behind, had built in front of the two anchored ships, "tout cloz, de grosses pièces de boys, plantées debout, joignant les unes aux aultres, et tout alentour garny d'artillerie, et bien en ordre pour se deffendre contre tout le pays."\textsuperscript{12} This is the first European building known to have been constructed in the St. Lawrence Valley. We know little about it, but it was reinforced shortly after its construction, since Cartier feared treachery from the Stadacona Indians. He had also been warned by a lord of Hagouchonda (from the province of Achelacy, corresponding roughly to the region of Portneuf) and by other inhabitants of Canada:

Voyant la malice d'eulx [the natives of Stadacona] doubtant qu'ilz ne songassent aucune
trahison et venyr, avecques ung amast de gens, [run] sus nous, le cappitaine fait renforcer le fort, tout alentour, de groz fossez, larges et parfondz, avecq porte à pont-levys, et renfort de pantz de boys, au contraire des premiers.

On this occasion, Cartier also issued the first official order on Canadian soil:

> Et fut ordonné pour le guet de la nuit, pour le temps advenir, cinquante hommes, à quatre quars, et à chacun changement desdictz cars, les trompettes sonnentes; ce qui fut fait selon ladite ordonnance.

In any case, French-Indian relations during the second voyage were very unstable. Friendliness and mistrust followed one another in cycles, up until the departure of the French in the spring of 1536.

### Wintering Conditions

The first winter at Sainte-Croix was a dreadful one for Cartier's crew. From mid-November to April 15, they were imprisoned by ice more than two fathoms thick. The snow piled up over four feet high, higher than the decks of the ships. Beverages froze, and both the inside and the outside of the ships were covered with a layer of ice four fingers thick.

Then appeared a disease, worse than the rigours of winter: scurvy. The word scurvy, of Norwegian origin, was first applied to an illness suffered by fishing crews whose diet was composed almost exclusively of sour milk. Later, two types of scurvy were distinguished: land scurvy and sea scurvy. The first occurred in northern countries where fruits and green vegetables were unavailable for a large part of the year. The second occurred on ships, for the same dietary reasons. In the 17th century, it was learned that scurvy could be prevented by adding lemons, oranges, herbs, wine and other foods rich in vitamin C to the diet. But in 1535 no means of preventing or curing scurvy was known.

The illness first appeared among the Indians in December 1535, and, although they were forbidden to approach the fort, it rapidly spread among the French. By mid-February 1536, fewer than ten of the 110-man expedition were untouched. Eight had already succumbed, and more than 50 were on the point of death. The first symptoms were a general feeling of weakness and swelling of the legs; then the illness spread to the mouth, which became "si infecte et pourrye par les gensisvez que toute la chair en tomboyt,"
At his wits' end, Cartier first resorted to prayer. He placed an image of the Holy Virgin against a tree outside the fort, "distant de nostre fort d'un traict d'arc." The following Sunday, all who were able took part in a procession to the tree, and mass was said. Cartier promised to make a pilgrimage to Roc-Amadour if God would allow him to return to France. The same day an autopsy was performed on the body of Philippe Rougemont, in the hopes of finding out the cause of this strange illness. But it continued to spread, until there were only a few healthy men left, including Cartier.

It was essential to keep the Indians from learning of the disastrous situation, for fear that they would take advantage of the situation to kill all members of the French expedition. To this end, Cartier went outside the fort with two men, and pretended to beat them for their laziness and pushed them onto the ship. This was intended to show the Indians that work inside the ship was continuing apace. To make the sham more noticeable, he had his sick men make a great deal of noise with sticks and stones.

By April 25, 1536, scurvy had claimed 25 members of the crew. Then, by chance, the French learned of "un remède contre toutes maladies le plus excellent qui fut jamays veu, ny trouvé sus la terre."19

While strolling outside the fort, Cartier met Domagaya, whom he had seen ill with scurvy 12 days earlier but who was now completely cured. Seeing the transformation in Domagaya's state after such a short time prompted Cartier to ask him how he had been cured, under the pretext that one of his servants had contracted the disease from the Indians. Domagaya brought two women along with him to show how the cure was made. First they got branches from a tree called annedda. The tree came to be known as the tree of life; according to Jacques Rousseau, it is Thuya occidentalis, or the eastern white cedar.20 The bark and leaves of the tree were pounded and then boiled in water. After the brew was drunk, the dregs were placed on affected parts. Cartier had some made up, and after some hesitation, a few of the sick men resolved to try it. Results were not long in coming; and one man was even cured of a raging case of syphilis that had been plaguing him for five or six years. Seeing the results, the others threw themselves on the miraculous infusion and "si tous les médecins de Louvain et de Montpellier y eussent esté, avecques toutes les drogues d'Alexandrie, ilz n'en eussent pas tant faict en vng an que ledict arbre a faict en huit jours."21

Weakened by their bout with scurvy, the French were still worried by the strange actions of the Stadacona natives, whose number had increased suddenly: "par tout trouva les maisons si plaines de gens que on ne s'i pouvoit
tournier, lesquels on n'avoyt accoustumé de veoir."

When Cartier learned of the situation, he decided to seize Chief Donnacona, his two sons, Taingnoagny and Domagaya, and some other headmen of the tribe and take them back with him to France, thus giving free rein to Agona's government. He also wanted Donnacona himself to tell Francis I what he claimed to know about the kingdom of Saguenay. On May 3, 1536, as solemn celebration of the festival of the Holy Cross, Cartier had a cross erected inside the fort. This is the description in the record of his second voyage:

```
de la haulteur d'envyron trente cinqu pieds de longueur, soubz le croizillon de laquelle y avoit vng escusson, en bosse, des armes de France, et sus icelluy estoit escript en lettre attique: FRANCISCVS PRIMVS, DEI GRATIA FRANCORVM, REX, REGNAT.
```

Around two o'clock on the same day he seized by force Donnacona, Taingnoagny, and Domagaya, and "deulx aultres des principaulx" of Stadacona.

On May 6, Cartier decided to leave Sainte-Croix. Since the number of sailors had been reduced by scurvy, he had to leave the Petite Hermine behind. He left its carcass and nails to the Indians of Sitadin, a small settlement near Stadacona. The French stayed at Sainte-Croix from the middle of September 1535 to the beginning of May 1536, a total of about seven and a half months.

These, in our opinion, are the important topics dealt with in this section about the first wintering of Europeans in Canada: the choice of a wintering site, the construction and reinforcement of the fort and what is implied thereby about French-Indian relations, and Cartier's final actions before returning to France.
In this section we will describe, in as much detail as possible, French-Indian relations during the 16th century in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and especially in the St. Lawrence Valley. In the first part, entitled "Relations between French and Indians," we will present all the material related to Cartier's contact with the natives of New France, based entirely on the accounts of his voyages. This part is divided into three sections, one for each of his voyages. Several questions will be raised in the first part which we will attempt to answer in the second part, entitled "Questions Concerning the Laurentian Indians and Cartier's Relations with Them." Referring to the work of several historians who have dealt in particular with this specific aspect of our history, we will discuss four questions: first, the identity of the Laurentian Indians in Cartier's time; second, the reason behind the Stadaconians' negative attitude toward Cartier's desire to go to Hochelaga; third, the consequences of the arrival of Europeans in New France; and last, the reasons for the disappearance of the Laurentian Huron-Iroquois between the time of Roberval's voyage (1543) and the arrival of Champlain (1603).

Relations between French and Indians

First Voyage

On June 12, 1534, near the harbour now bearing his name, Cartier met a group of Indians, whom he described as follows:

Il y a des gens à ladite terre, qui sont assez de belle corpulence, mais ilz sont gens effarables et sauvaiges. Ilz ont leurs cheveulx liez sur leurs testes, en faczon d'vne pougnye de fain teurczë, et vng clou passé par my, our aultre chosse; et y lient aulcunes plumes de ouaiseaulx. Ils se voistent de certaines couleurs tannées.
Ils ont des barques en quoy ilz vont par la mer, qui sont faictes d'escorche de bouays de boue, o quoy ilz peschent force loups marins.

Cartier does not seem to have established definite relations with these Indians (who, in Hawley's opinion, were Beothuks). After his first meeting with them, he learned that they did not live there but in warmer regions, which they left periodically in order to hunt seal.1

On June 30, 1534, Cartier recorded that he had seen some Indians in their canoes on a river he named Canoe River, near Cape Kildare or Cascumpiquè: "Et n'eûmes aultre congnoissance d'eulx, pour ce que le vent vint de la mer, qui chargeoict alla coste, et nous convint retires o nosdites barcques à nos navires." The next day, an Indian was seen running after the French longboats along the shoreline, and signalling to them several times to return to shore. They turned their boats in his direction, but he ran away. Finally, they left him a knife and a woollen belt on a branch, then returned to their ships.2

Following this, their occurred the incident which we have previously described as the first duly noted bartering between French and Indians.3 Before that, on July 6, Cartier had had to shoot off two passevollans (small cannon) and two fire-lances over the heads of the Micmac, as they had insisted on following the French. Because of the Indians' superior numbers, Cartier did not wish to approach them. On the following day, the Indians returned with nine canoes, at St. Martin's Cove, and Cartier must have resolved to deal with them. Three days later, on July 10, these same Indians returned again, this time with food to barter. At one time, according to the records, they numbered 300 men, women, and children.4

In the same entry, Cartier allowed himself to slip into conjecture, concerning the Indians he had just met:

Nous congneumes que se sont gens qui seroient fassilles à convertir, qui vont de lieu en aulstre, vivant, et prenant du poysson, au temps de pescherie, pour vivre. Leur terre est en chaleur plus tempérée que la terre d'Espaigne, et la plus belle qu'i soict possible de voir, et aussi eunye que vng estanc....Nous nommâmes ladite baye, la baye de Chaleur.5

From July 16 to 25, Cartier had to remain at Gaspé Bay because of unfavourable winds. A great number of Indians came to visit the ships: more than 200 persons - men, women, and children - in 40 canoes. According to Cartier, they were the poorest people in the world: "Ilz sont tous nudz, reservé vne petite peau, de quoy ilz couvrent leur nature, et aulcunes vieilles peaulx de bestes qu'ils gectent sur eulx en escharpes." He also stated that their race and language were different from those he had met earlier and
that, as far as he understood them, they came to the sea only during the fishing season.

The day before his departure from Gaspé Bay (July 24), Cartier had a cross erected. Shortly thereafter, the chief of these Indians came to Cartier's ship, accompanied by his brother and three of his sons. There he presented a harangue that seemed to mean that he would not allow the cross to be erected on his territory without his consent. Cartier had an axe held up to him, pretending to barter it for the fur the Indian was wearing. The Indian approached the ship and one of the Frenchmen caught hold of his canoe and made the Indians board the ship. There they were feasted, and signs were made to them indicating that the cross had been erected only to serve as a landmark and buoy at the entrance to the harbour, and that the French would return soon with many iron articles and other objects. The chief was also informed that Cartier wished to take two of his sons to France, with the promise that they would be returned. Small presents were given to the other three Indians, who returned to land to tell the news to their people. They came back around noon the same day with six canoes, to say goodbye to those who were to go to Europe. The following day, July 25, the ships left Gaspé Bay, and a few days later set sail for France.7

On the way back, on August 5, Cartier noticed smoke near Cape Thiennott; twelve Indians came toward the ships. They gave Cartier to understand that they came from the Great Bay (the Gulf of St. Lawrence) and belonged to Captain Thiennott, who would soon return home (to Europe) with his ships loaded with fish. This was the last encounter the French had with Indians during Cartier's first voyage (this last group is believed to have been Montagnais).8

During his few months in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, Cartier established contact with the Indians. He gives descriptions of two groups: the Beothuk at Jacques Cartier Harbour on June 12, 1534, and the Huron-Iroquois at Gaspé Bay at the end of July 1534. However, we cannot say that he established genuine relationships with them, because of language difficulties and the short time he spent among them. Of the four tribes he met, two did not live in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Nonetheless, some observations can be made about Cartier's contact with the Indians.

First, it is clear that some Indian groups had already been initiated in trade with Europeans, and eagerly sought it. An example is the Micmac's persistent attempts to barter with the French at Chaleur Bay. In the following section, we will see that fishermen came regularly to the Newfoundland coast, where they traded with the natives. When Cartier arrived in the gulf, there were European fishing boats at Cape Thiennott.9

Secondly, the seizure of the two sons of Chief Donnacona to take them to France, with the promise that they
would be returned, is an important fact and one that would have repercussions on French-Indian relations during the second voyage: "L'habile et rusé Cartier enlève au chef Donnacona deux de ses fils tout en sauvegardant l'amitié franco-iroquoise." 10

Second Voyage

French-Indian relations during the second voyage merit greater attention, since it was during this voyage that Europeans spent their first winter in Canada. Thus there were greater possibilities of sustained relations between the two groups.

We know nothing about the time spent in France by the two Indians that Cartier brought back from Gaspé Bay. Only at the beginning of the second account are they mentioned again. They were part of the crew; they acted as guides for Cartier, showing him where the kingdom of Saguenay was and pointing out the route to take to enter the St. Lawrence River. 11 Their presence must have softened the reception the Indians gave Cartier's expedition as he went up the St. Lawrence and settled in Canada.

At the beginning of September 1535, the French were at the mouth of the Saguenay River, when two canoes from Canada appeared in front of the ships. The occupants advanced fearfully until one of the two Indians taken by Cartier identified himself and had them come alongside. Then, they continued up the St. Lawrence. 12

On September 7, for the first time on their home territory, Cartier met the Indians from Canada that he had seen the previous year at Gaspé Bay. The French cast anchor between the North Shore and the Île d'Orléans, and went ashore to return the two Indians, Taignoagny and Domagaya. Several Indians were on shore and wanted to flee, but were greatly reassured by the sight of their brothers. Next, the headmen of the country came to the ships, bearing fish, corn, and melons. Throughout the day, several Indians came to see Cartier and greeted him with friendship. In exchange, he gave them small presents of little value, "desquelz se contentèrent fort." During this first meeting, the Laurentian Indians gave the French a warm greeting—certainly in part due to the return of the chief's two sons. Cartier had kept his promise.

The next day (September 8), the lord (Agouhanna) of Canada, named Donnacona, came to the ships with many Indians and twelve canoes. He sent back ten of the canoes and boarded the ship with 16 of his men. He spoke with his sons, who told him of the good intentions of the king of France (Henry IV), the good treatment they had received there, and what they had seen. Everyone was greatly pleased, Donnacona welcomed Cartier, and then there was feasting. 13
To this point, the French and Indians were on excellent terms. However, between September 13 and 16, events occurred to disturb somewhat this atmosphere of friendship (perhaps feigned). The trouble arose from Cartier's desire to sail up the St. Lawrence to Hochelaga. On September 14, when Cartier arrived at Sainte-Croix, Donnacona, Taignoagny, and Domagaya came happily to the ships with 25 canoes.

However, the two sons would approach only after repeated entreaties. Cartier was not mistrustful and asked them if they were still willing to keep their promise and go with him to Hochelaga. They replied that they were, and French and Indians took leave of each other.

That same day, leaving Sainte-Croix, Cartier met one of the chiefs of Stadacona, who, accompanied by several of his subjects, spoke critically. Cartier bade them approach, and gave them knives and beads, with which they were greatly pleased.

The next day, when buoys and landmarks were being set up, a large number of Stadaconians approached, but Donnacona, Taignoagny, and Domagaya remained apart. Cartier went to meet these three, and Taignoagny, on behalf of the group, told him that Donnacona was displeased that the French carried so many weapons while the Indians carried none. Cartier replied that this was the custom in France, as Taignoagny well knew. Despite this slight conflict—which nonetheless marked the beginning of hostilities—Cartier and Donnacona welcomed one another and promised mutual friendship, though Cartier could see that this was just a trick devised by the chief's two sons.

On September 16, the Indians came again to the ships. Donnacona and his sons, 10 or 12 headmen of the tribe, and more than 500 others paid their respects to Cartier, who feasted them as usual. Taignoagny told him that his father did not want the Frenchmen to go to Hochelaga with him as their guide, because the river was "worthless." Cartier replied that he would go anyway, but if Taignoagny changed his mind, he would give him a present. Taignoagny refused, and the Indians returned to their village.

The next day, they made another attempt to dissuade the Frenchmen. Donnacona came to see Cartier, and presented him with a little girl, somewhere between 10 and 12 years old, and two little boys. Taignoagny said that his father was offering the children so that Cartier would not go to Hochelaga. To this Cartier replied that he intended to go and that if the children were offered with the intent of preventing him from going, then they must be taken back. Domagaya said that the present had been offered out of friendship and that he himself was interested in going along to Hochelaga with them. There followed a heated discussion between Taignoagny and Domagaya, whereupon the Frenchmen realized that Taignoagny was trying to betray them.

Cartier then had the three children brought on board and offered presents to Donnacona, who asked him to have a
piece of artillery discharged. The Frenchmen complied, causing great panic among the Indians. Taignoagny took advantage of their distress to spread the rumour that Cartier's men had killed two Indians with their cannon.15

The next day, September 18, the Indians' obsession with preventing the Frenchmen from going to Hochelaga reached its culmination. The Indians dressed three of their men as devils, and they performed a ceremony of witchcraft. When Cartier asked Taignoagny and Domagaya what had happened, they replied that the three devils had been sent by their god Cudouagny to warn them "qu'il y aurait tant de glaces et neiges, qu'ilz [the French] mourroient tous." The French laughed at this prediction, and Cartier told the Indians that his priests had assured him that the weather would be fine. Taignoagny and Domagaya thanked him and returned to their people, who, feigning great joy, began to dance and shriek in front of the ships, as was their wont.

Before leaving, the two Indians had taken care to inform Cartier that Donnacona did not want them to go to Hochelaga unless French hostages were given to him. Cartier replied that, in that case, he would go alone.16 The following day, September 19, he left for Hochelaga on the Emerillon.

On the way he saw the huts of many Indians, who gained their sustenance by fishing. They approached the boat with equanimity and confidence, as if the French were natives of the country. They brought fish and whatever else they possessed to trade for European goods.

The French put in at Achelacy (now Portneuf, about 32 miles from Quebec City), some 25 leagues from Stadacona. There, several canoes came alongside the Emerillon, and the chief of the settlement made a speech and presented two of his children to Cartier. Cartier accepted the girl, eight or nine years old, but refused the little boy, who was only two or three, as being too young. He feasted the chief and offered him a small present, for which he was thanked. When Cartier returned to Sainte-Croix, the same chief came there to see his daughter: "Et depuis sont venuz seigneur et sa femme, veoir leur fille jusques à Canada, et apporter aucun petit present au capptaine [Cartier]."

On September 28, 1535, the French saw five Indians hunting on an island in Lake St. Pierre. They came up to the longboats as if they were used to seeing Europeans every day of their lives. On the land, one of them took Cartier in his arms and carried him like a six-year-old child. They traded muskrats for knives and beads. To Cartier's inquiries, they replied that this was indeed the way to Hochelaga, and that it would take three days to reach it.17 Here again, it is evident that the Indians were used to dealing with Europeans.
Continuing on their way, the French met other Indians and traded with them. When they were near Hochelaga, a group of more than a thousand came to meet Cartier and be touched by him. Seeing their friendliness, Cartier had the women sit in a row and gave them various tin articles; to some of the men he gave knives. Then the Frenchmen returned to their longboats.

The next day, October 3, on the path to Hochelaga, Cartier met a chief of the settlement and several of his subjects. The chief made a speech, Cartier presented him with a couple of axes and a couple of knives, and a cross, which he put around his neck. Cartier gives the following brief description of this people:

Tout cedict peuple ne s'adonne que à labouraige et pêcherie, pour vivre; car des biens de ce monde ne font compte, pource qu'ilz n'en ont congnoscence et [also] qu'ilz ne bougent de leur pays, et ne sont embulataires, comme ceulx de Canada, et du Saguenay; non obstant que lesdictz Canadians leurs soient subjectz, avec vਮैौ७ ix aultres peuples qui sont sur ledict fleuve.

To this point, the Frenchmen's reception at Hochelaga had been excellent. The feelings of friendship and confidence grew. Many Indians came to meet Cartier, who allowed himself to be touched by the women of the settlement and their children. Then the women withdrew, and the great chief was brought forward, very ill, so that Cartier could touch him. The chief placed his crown on Cartier's head. Cartier, impressed with the good nature of these people, read them the In principio of the Gospel of St. John. Then presents were distributed and trumpets sounded. In return, the Indians graciously offered foodstuffs, which the French refused, indicating that it was not needed.

After leaving the settlement, Cartier went to Mount Royal to see the three rapids, but was unable to tell how far apart they were. The Hochelagans indicated to him that once the rapids were passed, one could navigate for more than three moons, and arrive at a country where there was gold and where the people were always at war. However, they added, the gold came from the land of Saguenay.

During this trip to Hochelaga, Cartier became acquainted with the esnoguy, the Indians' most precious possession, which they used instead of gold and silver. The esnoguy was a little snow-white shell, with which the Indians made "manières de patenostres." According to Marcel Trudel, Cartier (who was perhaps the first European to do so) came across the famous strings of wampum that crop up so frequently in the history of French-Indian relations.

By October 11, 1535, Cartier had returned to Sainte-Croix. There he saw the fort that his subordinates had built in view of their now unsettled relationship with
the Stadaconians. The relationship had probably been affected by the trip to Hochelaga. In any case, on October 12 Taignoagny and Domagaya and several of their people came to see Cartier and feted him, pretending to be very pleased. They were well received, and Donnacona invited Cartier to visit him the next day at the Stadacona settlement. Cartier did so, along with gentlemen and 50 sailors, and, according to the custom, offered his hosts knives and other trifling wares.24

During this visit, Donnacona showed Cartier the scalps of five men, stretched on wooden frames like parchment, and told him they were Toudouman from the south (Micmac and Malecite), who continually waged war against them. After seeing this, Cartier and his men returned to their ships, on the other side of the Saint-Charles River.25

Toward the end of autumn, the good relationship gradually deteriorated, as the relation of the second voyage indicates fairly clearly. After the French had returned from Hochelaga, the Stadaconians came day after day to trade fish for knives, awls, beads, and so forth, with which they were quite content. Still, the Europeans realized that Donnacona's two sons had told their people that the goods offered by the French were worthless "et qu'ilz auroyent assi tost des hachotz comme des cousteaulz, pour ce qu'ilz nous balyoyent, non obstant que le capptaine leur eust fait beaucoup de presens, et si ne cessoyent, à toutes heures, de demander audict capptaine."26

Cartier had also been warned by the Achelacy chief (Hagouchonda), who had given him a little girl, to beware of Donnacona and his two sons, for they were traitors. Other Indians had said the same thing. The French had further occasion to remark on the Stadaconians' malice when they tried to take back the three children that Donnacona had offered, and convinced the older girl to run away from the ship. Then, on the advice of Taignoagny and Domagaya, for four or five days no Indians came to visit the French, except a few, who approached fearfully.27

In view of the Stadaconians' attitude, which hardly inspired confidence, Cartier had the primitive fort strengthened and gave orders that continuous watch was to be kept. When Donnacona and his sons learned of these measures, they sent their men over on several occasions to introduce themselves as strangers in order to find out if the French intended to do them harm. No notice was paid to these envoys.

During this period, Donnacona and his sons came often to parley with Cartier and asked him if he was angry and why he never came to visit them on the other side of the Saint-Charles River. Cartier answered that several people had told him they were traitors, and he had had occasion to observe the same for himself. He mentioned several of their bad turns (their refusal to go to Hochelaga with him, the
escape of the little girl who had been given to him, and so on) and told them he was willing to forgive all and receive them on board his ships as before, if they were willing to reform. They thanked him and promised to return the runaway child within three days. On November 4, 1535, Domagaya and six of his people came to tell Cartier that Donnacona was trying to find the girl, who would be brought back the next day, and that Taignoagny was ill and needed bread and salt, a request which Cartier granted.

The following day, Donnacona, Taignoagny, Domagaya, and several others came to see Cartier, but he refused to take back the Indian girl. The Indians insisted, and brought her themselves to the ships. Cartier feasted them, and then they left. "Et depuis sont alles et venus a nos navires, et nous a leur demourance, en aussi grand amour que pardavant."29

As far as we know, relations between the two groups remained fairly good throughout the winter, taking into account the scurvy episode and the ostensible hunting trip of several Stadaconians. Cartier also states:

Despuys estre arrivez de Hochelaga avecq le gallion et les barques, avons conversé, allé et venu avecques les peuples les plus prochains de noz navires en doulceur et amytié, fors que, par foys, avons eu aulcuns différendz avecques aulcuns mauvais garçons, dont les auttres estoient fort marriz et couroucez.30

When the French saw their ranks decimated by scurvy, they definitely did not want the Indians to find out and take advantage of their sorry situation. So they remained mistrustful of the Stadaconians, even though the Indians gave them the means of a cure - the annedda.31

A noteworthy incident occurred in the middle of the winter. While sickness and death fell to the Frenchmen's lot, Donnacona, Taignoagny, and some other Indians left Stadacona, saying they were going to hunt deer and other wild game. Domagaya and others told the French the hunting party would be gone only two weeks, but the excursion lasted two months. Cartier and his men suspected that they had gone to seek alliance with a greater number of Indians so that they could attack the French. During the absence of their chief, the Stadaconians continued their usual visits to the French; however, they sold their meat at a fairly steep price, preferring to keep it for themselves during the long winter if the French refused to pay.32

Then, on April 21, 1536, Domagaya boarded the ship with several handsome, powerful Indians whom the French had not seen before, and told Cartier that Donnacona would return the next day, with a quantity of provisions. Donnacona did come on April 22, with a large number of newcomers, whose reasons for being at Stadacona the French did not know. When Domagaya came to tell Cartier of his father's visit at
Sainte-Croix and yet refused to cross the Saint-Charles, Cartier had strong suspicions of treachery.

To investigate further, at the end of April Cartier sent his servant, Charles Guyot, and Jehan Poullet (those Frenchmen the Stadaconians liked best) to visit the Indian settlement, supposedly to offer a present to Donnacona. When Donnacona learned of their visit, he said he was ill; instead, the two Frenchmen went to see Taignoagny. Everywhere they saw huts full of Indians they did not recognize. Taignoagny refused to let them enter the other huts. He accompanied them halfway to their ships and asked, on behalf of Donnacona, if Cartier would be willing to take chief Agona back to France with him. The answer was to be given the following day.

Seeing such a large number of Indians gathered in Stadacona, Cartier resolved to outsmart them and take Donnacona, Taignoagny, Domagaya, and several other headmen back to France with him. On April 29, he sent Charles Guyot back to Stadacona to invite Taignoagny to come see him and receive the answer to his request. Taignoagny told Guyot he would come the next day, with Donnacona and Agona. However, no one showed up in the next two days; apparently the Indians suspected the French of wishing to do them harm. Once again, Cartier became convinced of their wickedness.

When, on May 2, the Stadaconians learned that Cartier had left the carcass of the Petite Hermine to the Indians of Sitadin, they came to see him. However, Donnacona refused to cross the river, and his sons consented to do so only after much hesitation. Cartier reassured them by telling them that the king had forbidden him to bring any Indians back to France with him, except two or three little boys, so that they might learn French. Cartier hoped that this statement would encourage Donnacona to come over. Taignoagny said that he would come back the next day with his father and all the people of Stadacona.33

On May 3, after the cross had been erected at Sainte-Croix harbour, the Stadaconians came nervously to the fort. On Cartier's orders, the French seized Donnacona, Taignoagny, Domagaya, and several headmen of the tribe. Throughout the night, the Indians howled outside the ships. The next day, Cartier had Donnacona brought into the sight of all. The chief told his people that he would return the following year, after telling the king of France, who would give him a magnificent present, all he had seen in Saguenay and elsewhere. Headmen of the tribe came to the ship, bearing presents for Cartier, who gave them gifts in return.

On May 5, four Indian women came with food for their chief; each of them presented Cartier with a string of wampum. To reassure them, Cartier had Donnacona tell them he would return the following year. The next day, they set off for France.34
The last contact the French had with Indians during this second voyage took place at Ile aux Coudres. Here some of Donnacona's subjects, coming from the Saguenay River, met Cartier's ships. When Domagaya told them how they had been captured and that their chief was to be taken to France, they were astonished. This, however, did not prevent them from coming to speak to Donnacona and bartering with the French. This was the final episode in the unstable relations between French and Indians during Cartier's second voyage. 35

What stands out in French-Indian relations during this first wintering? First, approaching the Laurentian Indians, was on the one hand, made easier by the presence of the two Indians Cartier had taken to France: they acted as interpreters and guides, but on the other hand, they often instigated conflict between the two groups. It seems that most of the difficulties arose from the Europeans' desire to go to Hochelaga. Taïgoagny and Domagaya refused to keep their promise to guide Cartier to Hochelaga, and the Stadaconians did all they could to dissuade the French from going, but to no avail.

During the trip to Hochelaga, the Stadaconians were very hostile to the crew members who had stayed behind. The Frenchmen built a fort, which Cartier had reinforced when he returned, in view of the Indians' threatening attitude. Throughout the winter, both sides remained mistrustful; then there was Donnacona's supposed hunting trip and Cartier's ensuing actions. Saying he was going hunting, Donnacona assembled a large number of allies. Was his intent to attack the French, weakened by scurvy? Possibly. But it may well have been that he wanted to settle the political rivalry for chieftaincy between himself and Agona. Cartier seized by force Donnacona, his two sons, and other headmen of the tribe. As we will see later, this act had repercussions on French-Indian relations in the following years.

From another perspective, more numerous and more continuous contact with the Indians (in particular, the Stadaconians and their nearest neighbours) confirmed the impressions gained from the study of the first records. The behaviour of the Laurentian Indians in the presence of the French shows that they were used to Europeans, whom they treated with fearful respect. It is also clear that their primary purpose, whether relations were friendly or not, was to obtain gifts and to barter.

During the winter, relations between the French and Indians passed from friendliness to mistrust, and back to friendliness. One fact is interesting: as the Indians became more used to frequenting the French, they demanded more and more articles, and of better quality.
Third Voyage

Little is known about the activities of the Indians Cartier took back to France, between the return from the second voyage and the departure for the third in 1541. Here is a chronological presentation of the documented facts. On September 22, 1538, Francis I ordered that 50 crowns be paid to Cartier for food and maintenance of the Indians for two years. An excerpt from a letter dated January 22, 1539, from the spy Lagarto to King John III of Portugal, describes the king of France relating what Donnacona had told him. The Indian chief had been questioned in the presence of a notary more than once, by both the king and Cartier, on matters concerning Canada and Saguenay. Thus we see that Donnacona had to fulfill the role Cartier had in mind for him when he carried him away from Sainte-Croix at the end of the second voyage.

There is a baptismal act dated March 25, 1539 for three unidentified Indians from Canada. The Indians brought back from Canada are also mentioned in Cartier's commission for his third voyage, dated October 17, 1540:

\[ \text{desquelz [Laurentian Indians] il \ Cartier nous} \]
\[ \text{a semblent amené aucun nombre que nous avons} \]
\[ \text{par long temps fait vivre et instruire en} \]
\[ \text{nostredicte saincte foy avecques nosdictz} \]
\[ \text{subiectz.} \]

We thus have some notion of the Indians' activities, to which can be added the meagre information contained in the incomplete relation of the third voyage. The very beginning of the records states that the Indians gave Francis I information about Canada. Cartier had informed the king that ten Indians had died between the time of their arrival in France (1536) and the departure for the third voyage (1541). There remained only one little girl about ten years old (probably the eight- or nine-year old girl given to Cartier by the chief of Achelacy in the fall of 1535). This is all that our sources reveal about the Indians' stay in France.

At the end of August 1541, Cartier arrived at Sainte-Croix, the site of his wintering in 1535-36. The Stadaconians came to meet the ship, with displays of great joy. Agona, acting as chief during Donnacona's absence, came forward with six or seven canoes and asked Cartier where his people and chief were. Cartier answered that Donnacona had died in France and that the other Indians had married, were living like great lords, and had refused to return to Canada. This, of course, was false; Cartier had stated earlier that they had all died, except the little girl. Agona showed no signs of displeasure; understandable perhaps, for Donnacona's death meant that he would be the permanent chief of the tribe.

The usual exchange of compliments and honours was made between Agona and Cartier. The Indians seemed totally
insincere. Cartier feasted Agona, and gave him presents, as was his custom, leading him to understand there were many more to come. After this apparently friendly meeting, the Indians returned to shore, while Cartier set off to explore the mouth of the river at Cape Rouge, hoping to settle there. The change in the wintering site seems significant: perhaps Cartier thought he would be safer away from Sainte-Croix if the Indians should decide to attack.

Next Cartier went to Hochelaga to have a better look at the three rapids, in view of his plans for a trip to Saguenay the following spring. During this trip he paid a visit to the chief of Achelacy who had given him the little girl and told him of Taignoagny's and Domagaya's treachery. According to Marcel Trudel, Cartier left two young Frenchmen there to learn the Indians' language. Up to that date, the practice had been to take Indians to France; this, then, was an innovation. Cartier also gave his host a coat and some other presents, with which he was quite pleased.

Continuing to the three falls, Cartier met other small groups of Indians, who were very friendly to him. On the way back, he stopped again at Hochelay (Achelacy), but found no one there but one of the chief's subjects, who told him that the chief had left for Maisouna (unknown) two days before. This was untrue; in reality the chief had gone to talk to Agona, to see what action they could take against the French. When Cartier's group returned to Charlesbourg-Royal, the Cape Rouge settlement, those who had remained behind reported that the Indians no longer came to the fort to bring fish and that they seemed fearful and mistrustful of the Europeans. When Cartier learned from his men that the chief of Achelacy had gone to Stadacona and that the Indians were gathering in large numbers, he had the fort strengthened for defence.

Unfortunately, the account of the third voyage ends there. We do not know what happened after the return from Hochelaga. We may assume that hostilities intensified; because when Cartier met Roberval at St. John's in the spring of 1542, one of the reasons he gave for fleeing to France was that, with his small company of men, he could no longer hold off the Indians who came to bother them every day. Roberval himself took steps to increase his defences. Thus hostilities seem to have opened officially during the third voyage. According to some French fishermen in Newfoundland, Laurentian Indians had killed some carpenters in Canada and behaved in a savage manner. There is also a report that Indians who had come to Grand Bay (the Gulf of St. Lawrence) and boarded a Spanish ship had boasted that they had killed more than 35 of Cartier's men. These two reports (although Trudel disputes the second) are further confirmation of the break between the French and the Indians in the St. Lawrence valley.
In summary, the incomplete account of the third voyage (Roberval's relation is also incomplete) contains little new information on French-Indian relations, beyond giving rise to suppositions that hostility increased greatly and there were numerous and substantial attacks during the winter. The Indians pretended they were happy to see the French; they were eager to barter and obtain European goods. However, they continued to harass the French, even going so far as to kill some of them. In the words of Marcel Trudel: "Si l'on veut fixer le début du long conflit franco-iroquois, c'est à cet hivernement de 1541-42 qu'il faut s'arrêter." 47

Questions Concerning the Laurentian Indians and Cartier's Relations with Them

The preceding pages give a summary of those parts of the records that deal with French-Indian relations. This account, of little originality, is not complete in itself. It raises certain questions that we shall attempt to answer, relying on the work of historians who have studied this aspect of our history. The following questions will be discussed: What group did the Stadaconian and the Hochelagan Indians belong to? What was the reason behind the Stadaconians' negative attitude toward Cartier's trip to Hochelaga in 1535 and what are the implications? What was the impact of Cartier's arrival in America? What were the causes of the disappearance of the Laurentian Huron-Iroquois between the time of Roberval's voyage (1543) and Champlain's (1603)?

The Identity of the Laurentian Indians

The question of the identity of the Laurentian Indians has intrigued historians, linguists, ethnologists, and archaeologists for some time. Many theories, hypotheses, and tentative advances—of varying degrees of validity—have been put forward at different times. Even today, the question has still not been answered definitively, as certain essential data are lacking and there are often conflicts in the data we have.

One researcher who has studied the question recently is Bruce G. Trigger; one of his articles gives an excellent summary of the various aspects of the problem. 48 Unaccustomed as we are to this type of study, we think it best to give a step-by-step account of the hypotheses suggested by Trigger and the conclusions he draws.

It is clear from the records that Cartier makes distinctions between the Indians he met at Stadacona (and
surrounding areas) and at Hochelaga. The amount of information given on the two groups is disproportionate: the Hochelagans are described in much greater detail than the Stadaconians, even though Cartier stayed in Hochelaga only a few hours and with the Stadaconians nearly a year and a half. Of the information available today, there are more linguistic data on the Stadaconians and more ethnological and archaeological data on the Hochelagans.

Despite this discrepancy, it has been established that both groups belonged to the Huron-Iroquois family. It seems likely that the Stadaconians' language had points in common with several other Huron-Iroquois dialects recorded in the 17th century, but was identical to none of them. It is doubtful that the Hochelagans' language was the same as the Stadaconians', of which we have some idea from the vocabularies annexed to the accounts of Cartier's first two voyages.

In recent years, new discoveries and comparisons have been made that allow researchers to confirm unequivocally that the Hochelagans' material culture had traits in common with that of the Onondaga and the Oneida. There are not enough points of comparison to establish the relationship between the Hochelagans' and Stadaconians' material cultures.

However, Trigger (1968) hypothesizes, on the basis of pottery comparisons, that the Pickering culture, which developed north of Lake Ontario between 1100 and 1300, could have spread to the lower St. Lawrence Valley. Furthermore, most recent studies of the vocabularies annexed to the records indicate that the Laurentian dialect was closer to Huron than to the dialect of the Five Nations Iroquois. We know indirectly that the peoples associated with the Pickering culture and probably the Glen Meyer culture spoke an ancient dialect (or dialects) related to Huron and possibly to Neutral.

How can this last hypothesis be reconciled with the Onondaga-Oneida cultural characteristics established in the Hochelagans' material culture? According to Trigger, if it could be established that the Hochelagans and Stadaconians both spoke the Laurentian language recorded in Cartier's vocabularies, then it would be plausible that there was a period of continuous development in the St. Lawrence Valley, during which the local population, of the Pickering culture and probably in an Ontario Huron-Iroquois language group, adopted several cultural traits from the south.

It is also quite probable that the Hochelagans acquired Onondaga-Oneida cultural traits through a process of diffusion or transmission from the central New York State Indians and those in the upper St. Lawrence Valley, rather than through migration, as several researchers have proposed. Still, according to Trigger, it is possible that a group of Onondaga may have invaded the St. Lawrence Valley
at a given moment, displacing the people of the Pickering culture who spoke the Laurentian language everywhere but in the Stadacona area, where some remained at the time of Cartier's voyages.

Thus there are several hypotheses, which are valid up to a point, but cannot be confirmed or disproven without new evidence. All that can be stated with certainty about the Indians Cartier met was that they belonged to the Huron-Iroquois family. In the domain of possibilities, we can hypothesize that the Stadaconians spoke a language that shared features of several Huron-Iroquois dialects recorded in the 17th century, but was identical to none of them. There is no definitive evidence that the Hochelagans spoke the Laurentian language. We may suppose that the Indians Cartier met were associated with the Pickering culture, except those in the region of Hochelaga, who shared cultural traits with the Onondaga and Oneida.49

The Stadaconians' Attitude Toward Cartier's Desire to go to Hochelaga

The second important question is the reason behind the Stadaconians' attitude toward Cartier's desire to go to Hochelaga during his second voyage. We saw in the first section that they did everything in their power to prevent the French from going there.50 Why? During the 16th century, Coast traders and European fishermen apparently carried on considerable trade with the Indians, so the first Europeans to penetrate the continent saw evidence of extensive trade networks between tribes along well-established routes. With the later avalanche of European goods, these networks spread throughout the country. Furthermore, it became clear that these supposedly primitive Indians were quite ingenious in trade techniques, and understood perfectly the necessity of keeping their rivals out of profitable trade relationships.51 This is the basic reason for the Stadaconians' negative reaction to Cartier's wish to go to Hochelaga, especially since the Hochelagans reigned supreme among the inhabitants of the St. Lawrence Valley. Stadacona and eight or nine other settlements on the St. Lawrence were dependent on Hochelaga.52

Doubtless having learned from his sons' experience in Europe, Donnacona wanted to keep the advantages of trade with the French for his own settlement. He expected to act as middleman between the Europeans and the other tribes, hoping perhaps to escape Hochelagan domination in this way. He wanted to prevent Hochelaga from trading with the French.53 The desire to exclude trade rivals is also connected to the Indians' desire to obtain as many European goods as possible, a sign of progress and power for them.
The same attitude continued long after the incidents of Cartier's second voyage. Champlain, in his trip into the Great Lakes region, noted that every tribe along the Ottawa River tried to dissuade him from going to the other tribes. The Allumettes (Algonkins) warned him against the Nipissing; the Ottawa (Cheveux Relevés) tried to keep him from the Neutrals, saying they were cruel and hostile to the French. In summary, it was a repetition of what had happened 80 years earlier, each tribe intriguing to retain the role of intermediary between the French and the other tribes.54

The idea of exclusivity in trade, of which one of the first occurrences was during Cartier's second voyage, had a great effect on the course of events in the Great Lakes area for more than two centuries, and perhaps on the history of the entire continent.55

The fact that Cartier did eventually go to Hochelaga is one of the prime reasons for the mistrust and hostility between Indians and French. When we add to that the takeover of territory occupied by the Indians and the seizure of their tribesmen, we can better appreciate the reasons for French-Indian hostility during Cartier's second and third voyages. This hostility degenerated into open warfare during the third voyage. We have no further information on the exact causes of hostility, as more detailed documents do not exist.57

We do not believe Cartier set up practical rules for his men to follow in their dealings with the Indians, but documents proving this are unavailable. However, it seems that Cartier, perhaps more than Champlain, was the originator of the enmity between the French and the Huron-Iroquois, through his trip to Hochelaga and his seizure of Laurentian Indians during the first and second voyage. Alfred G. Bailey speculates that the hostility engendered in Cartier's time may have contributed to the formation of the Iroquois League in Champlain's time.58

There were repercussions on French colonization in the meantime. After Roberval left in failure in 1543, the French turned their colonization efforts toward Brazil and Florida; the establishment of a settlement at Port-Royal instead of Quebec City was probably partly due to the hostility of the Huron-Iroquois. We do not know why La Roche's expedition in 1577 was cancelled; perhaps the reason was conflict with the Laurentian Indians. These suggestions are merely hypotheses; as mentioned earlier, there are very few documents on French-Indian relations during the 16th century.59

Repercussions of the Europeans' Arrival

The year 1534 is an important date in French-Indian relations. Although the Indians seem to have become
accustomed to seeing Europeans before this date, there was no real possibility of culture shock. With Cartier's arrival, the period of occasional contact by fishermen and traders was replaced by an era of steady infiltration of European cultural traits throughout the territory of the Atlantic provinces. The French and Indians did have a common ground: the French wanted to learn about the New World and the Indians were eager to acquire European goods.

The geographical orientation of the Laurentian Huron-Iroquois is surprising. They were corn growers, and faced the gulf. By the beginning of the 17th century, the seaward tendency had disappeared. After the arrival of Europeans, all the tribes of the St. Lawrence Valley and the Gulf of St. Lawrence were affected by a strong inland-moving trend, toward the fur-bearing animals.

Thus it is clear that the arrival of Europeans, and in particular Cartier's voyages, had a marked effect on Indian civilization and structures, and is even one of the causes of the disappearance of the Laurentian Indians between the time of Roberval's voyage and Champlain's.

The Disappearance of the Laurentian Huron-Iroquois

A final question remains: how can the disappearance of the Laurentian Indians in the second half of the 17th century be explained? The St. Lawrence Valley was their domain in the time of Cartier and Roberval; they seemed to control the river all the way to the gulf. However, they did have enemies: The Toudouman (Micmac and Malecite) and the Agojuda, apparently Algonkins living upstream on the Ottawa River. The Huron-Iroquois felt sufficient strength nonetheless to carry on a political struggle with Cartier, leading to the exile of Donnacona and the supremacy of Agona, and later actual warfare, which forced Cartier to return to France. This was also the main reason for the failure of Roberval's mission. The Iroquois wars had already begun.

When the French returned to the St. Lawrence Valley at the beginning of the 17th century, they met only nomads. There was no sedentary population at Stadacona; Hochelaga had disappeared, as had Tutonaguju; the cultures and villages described by Cartier were gone and had not been replaced. When Champlain speaks of Iroquois, they are Indians far to the southwest, near Lake Ontario and Lake Champlain.

It is not known exactly when the disruption occurred. Jacques Noël, who had come to the St. Lawrence (see the copy of his letter in Appendix B) and gone to Hochelaga, has nothing to say on the subject. Can we deduce from this that the transformation was already underway or perhaps completed by 1685? The time of the changes must be fairly soon after
the voyages of Cartier and Roberval, if one gives credence to Champlain's statement that the "anciens du pais" had never seen anything at Hochelaga and to Marc Lescarbot's report, in 1618, that the French living along the St. Lawrence could not understand the Indian vocabulary left by Cartier. There were only 60 years between Cartier and Lescarbot. The question remains unanswered.

There are three noteworthy hypotheses on the cause of the changes. First, they may have been caused by warfare. Champlain believed so, as did Lescarbot, the author of the 1644 Jesuit relation, and Lachesnaye, who in an account dated 1697, stated that, according to Algonkin tradition, the Algonkin had driven the Iroquois from the St. Lawrence Valley. This hypothesis is plausible; already during Cartier's time, the Laurentians were fighting the Toudouman, who had killed almost 200 of their tribe, and were constantly at war with the Agojuda.

The second theory is that the transformation was due simply to migration rather than to extermination. It was the custom of the Iroquois, a sedentary people, to move at regular intervals, when the soil was exhausted and the settlement uninhabitable. In the 1541 relation, Cartier does not mention Hochelaga, where he had been welcomed six years earlier, but talks instead of Tutonaguy, located upstream. "Pressés par des impératifs économiques et, peut-être en même temps, par un plus grand besoin de sécurité, les Laurentiens ont pu préférer se retirer à l'intérieur des terres pour rejoindre un peuple de même langue et de même culture."62

The third hypothesis is that the Laurentian Huron-Iroquois disappeared following the formation of the league. The league, consolidated well before 1603, made up of Algonkins from the Ottawa River, Montagnais from the Saguenay, and Malecite from the South Shore. Following Cartier's voyages, the St. Lawrence River region turned into an enormous fur-trading market for the French, who were supplied by nomadic peoples such as the Algonkin, Malecite, and Montagnais. The sedentary Iroquois were blocking passage to the waterway, and Hochelaga, Achelacy, and Stadacona were the strong points of the blockade. Hunters from other tribes had to go around them to avoid interference. Also, European goods rapidly penetrated by barter to the allied tribes, often through Algonkin middlemen to the Huron. Among the goods supplied by the Europeans was iron, which the League used in defensive and offensive warfare. Iron had been available to the peoples of the league from the 16th century:

Et c'est ainsi que la ligue, couvrant tout l'arrière-pays du Saint-Laurent et devenu de plus en plus puissante par le matériel européen, serait venue à bout, par la destruction ou la migration forcée, des Iroquois de Stadaconé et d'Hochelaga.63
French-Indian relations during the 16th century are a fruitful subject for hypothesizing since, as we have seen, documents are so rare as to preclude certainty. Still we have a fairly good idea of the relations, and their passage from friendship to mistrust to open hostility. Cartier is the first to provide some notion of his contact with the Laurentian Indians. From his account we can imagine the general living conditions of these isolated tribes and the Frenchmen who came to live among them. While perhaps Cartier did not establish the tenor of future relations between Europeans and the Laurentian Indians, his voyages to New France still represent an important step in French colonization in North America and had a definite influence on the second half of the 16th century.
CARTIER'S INFLUENCE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 16TH CENTURY

No study of Jacques Cartier would be complete without an attempt to evaluate his influence on the latter half of the 16th century - that is, up until Champlain's arrival in North America. We will not examine this 60-year period in detail here, but rather seek to establish the spheres in which Cartier's voyages may have had repercussions. We will summarize developments in the areas of exploration in the St. Lawrence region, fisheries, the fur trade, and, in particular, cartography.

No Official Expeditions to New France in the Second Half of the 16th Century

Most of the sources we consulted agree that the second half of the 16th century was not a period of prolific exploration in the St. Lawrence Valley. No official expedition brought glory to France in this part of North America. There was some exploration in Brazil and Florida, but it cannot be said to have stemmed from Roberval's and Cartier's exploits. The interest in exploration in the Gulf of St. Lawrence did not revive until La Roche's voyage in 1587.1 And even then, no settlements were founded before Champlain's on the North Shore of the St. Lawrence in 1608.

It might be thought, then, that Cartier's efforts were in vain; this is not the case. Far from it; his exploits had some influence during the second half of the 16th century.

Cartier's Influence on Fishing and the Fur Trade

Although there were no official expeditions, Canada was not completely abandoned after 1543. Private expeditions kept up the contact with New France. Indeed, there was extensive activity: in 1544-45, after Cartier's and Roberval's definitive return, two ships left nearly every day in January and February from Dieppe, Le Havre, and
Honfleur for the New World. The ships crossed the ocean to fish for cod and hunt whales, and to trade European goods for furs. However, this is not the most interesting fact, for we know that fishing and fur-trading expeditions had been going to Newfoundland since the beginning of the century, well before Cartier's voyages. The relevant point for us is that Cartier's voyages had an influence on fishing and fur trading in the second half of the 16th century.

According to Bernard G. Hoffman's study of harbour records, in 1534 the fisheries extended along the Atlantic coast from southeastern Labrador to southern Nova Scotia. After Cartier's voyages, the industry expanded throughout the Gulf of St. Lawrence and even up the river. Thus Cartier's influence on the fishing industry is definite, but difficult to evaluate.

Since the fishing industry and the fur trade had been very closely connected from the beginning of the century (no ship left the harbour of St. Malo exclusively for fur trading until 1581), Cartier's voyages had a similar influence on the fur trade. At first it was concentrated in the area around the Strait of Belle Isle, but underwent expansion after Cartier's discoveries. In the second half of the century, Tadoussac became the preferred spot for trade with the Indians.

Cartier's explorations opened the door, stimulating the fishing industry and the fur trade by expanding their territorial limits. But Sainte-Croix is not mentioned in the records of fur traders and fishermen during this period. We know from his letters to Jean Groote in 1587 that Cartier's great-nephew, Jacques Noël, went to the same places his uncle had been to 60 years earlier. But even he does not mention the first wintering site of Cartier's expedition in 1535-36 and it seems doubtful that he explored further than Cartier.

Cartier's Influence on Cartography

The fishing industry and the fur trade were not the only areas where the influence of Cartier's explorations was felt. Cartography in the middle and end of the 16th century could not fail to advance following his discoveries. Here we will review the principal maps of the period, and discuss the evidence of Cartier's influence, as pointed out by experts such as Hoffman, Ganong, Winsor, and Harrisse.

The first question that must be clarified concerns Cartier's own maps. Did Cartier leave any maps behind? An examination of the records leaves no doubt that he sketched maps of his explorations. In the first place, one of the
The duties of a master-pilot in the service of the king was to make maps not only for his own use but also to illustrate reports to his superiors. Furthermore, a 1539 document (reproduced by Biggar) mentions that the king of France possessed two well-painted and illuminated charts; the context indicates beyond any doubt that these were Cartier's maps. Also, the two letters from Cartier's great-nephew in 1587 attest to their existence. Lastly, there are several maps of the world (which we will present) that, because of their concordance with the records, could only have been drawn following Cartier's directions.

Cartier's maps have not survived to the present day. However, experts in 16th-century cartography believe that certain maps contain information identifiable as coming from Cartier. It is these maps that we will examine here.

The results of Cartier's explorations did not appear immediately on maps of the period. An examination of the works of Chavez (1536), Gutierez (1550), Vopellio (1540), and Ulpius (1542) shows that European cartographers had little or no notion of his discoveries at those dates. The first references to Cartier's voyages appear in 1541 and 1542 on the maps of Nicolas Desliens and Jean Rotz.

The first mapping of Cartier's initial voyage (but not the second) appears on a map by Jean Rotz (Fig. 13), a French cartographer in England's hire. This reproduction is of great interest as the first known mapping of Cartier's discoveries. It was made for Henry VIII of England in 1542, and the parts depicting the Gulf of St. Lawrence were probably based on prototypes dating from before 1534 or 1535. The map is a planisphere and appears in a hydrography book. William F. Ganong associates it with the harleian map (circa 1536): "The map lacks all nomenclature, but that is supplied on a rarely exact copy of it that is embodied in the Harleian map; and we may therefore consider them together."

There is also a map, dated 1541, made by Nicolas Desliens of Dieppe (Fig. 14), which belongs to the Portuguese-Cartier mapmaking tradition. In the opinion of Ganong and Harrisse, this is the first dated map to take into account Cartier's discoveries on his first two voyages. It has no drawings and is rather summary. However, it does show the Saint-Charles (or Sainte-Croix) River, without naming it.

There are other maps from this period that show Cartier's discoveries. Following Hoffman's divisions, we can set up the following list:

**Cartier Tradition**
1. Harleian Mappemonde, circa 1536 (Fig. 15)
2. Map attributed to Desceliers, 1546 (Fig. 16)

**Portuguese-Cartier Tradition**
1. Desliens map, 1541 (Fig. 14)
2. Sebastian Cabot map, 1544 (Fig. 17)
We will not deal with each of these maps separately, as that is beyond the scope of this work. We will try to point out those that best represent Cartier's discoveries—the Rotz (1542), Desliens (1541), Harleian (circa 1536), Cabot (1544), Desceliers (1546 and 1550), and Vallard (1547), maps—and discuss them.

We will say no more about the Rotz and Desliens maps, which we discussed above. According to Ganong, the general style of the Harleian map, drawn about 1536-37, indicates that it may be the work of Pierre Desceliers of Dieppe. As was the custom at the time, it is illuminated with drawings; the scene south of the St. Lawrence probably represents Cartier and his men, and may be a realistic portrait. 'Se Croix' is included among the place names, referring probably to the river near the 1535-36 wintering site.

The 1546 map, attributed to Desceliers and also called the Henry II or Dauphin map, also belongs to the Cartier tradition, and has a high degree of concordance with the records, and with the Harleian (except in a few details). This reproduction is also illuminated and shows Roberval's group. The marking 'S^a+' can also be seen near "Franciroy" (France-Roy).

There is another parallel series of maps, based on an old Portuguese map, which in turn was based on Cartier's originals. The place names and topography for the second voyage are in general different; all, however, have the name Tutonaguy in the Montreal area for the third voyage. It seems, then, that they are not based on the maps we examined earlier, but rather form a separate, parallel series, known as the Portuguese-Cartier tradition.

In this group, after the Desliens map already mentioned, there is Sebastian Cabot's 1544 map (Fig. 17). It was drawn by an apprentice; the nomenclature is atrocious and often misplaced. Still, the map has some value for us, because of its link with the Portuguese-Cartier tradition and its date. It also shows the Saint-Charles River, although it is not named.

The Nicolas Vallard map, dated 1547, is a handsome piece, decorated with drawings. It has the most extensive nomenclature of all the maps recording Cartier's explorations. The Saint-Charles River is drawn in, but not named. The main figure in the foreground of the
drawings above the St. lawrence (marked with an X on Fig. 18) may be Cartier.25

Because of its geographical features and place names, the 1550 map by Desceliers (Fig. 19) belongs to the Portuguese-Cartier tradition, although they underwent some modification after the Harleian map, in the Cartier tradition, became known.26 The Desceliers map also has drawings, including one that may show Cartier discussing with the Indians after their demonstration of witchcraft at Sainte-Croix in 1535.27

These mid-17th century maps showing Cartier's explorations do not, however, provide any further details on Sainte-Croix harbour. Often, place names are missing and only the topography around the Saint-Charles River is shown. Sometimes, the Lairet River is not drawn in. But, since we do not possess Cartier's own maps, these are of great interest and value. The scenes drawn on some of them are very interesting, for they may be based on sketches drawn by Cartier himself.28

There are many later maps showing this area, but it would take too long to present them all here,29 and they do not, in general, add to our information about the site of Cartier's first winter in Canada. After a careful examination of maps of the St. Lawrence in the second half of the 16th century, F. De Costa concludes:

from the period of the Dauphin map [Desceliers 1546?] down to the first voyage of Champlain to Canada, in 1603, no substantial improvement was made by the cartographers of any nation in the geographical delineation of the region opened to France by the enterprise of Cartier and those who followed him.... The connection with New France was maintained, vast profits being derived from the fisheries and from trade; but scientific explorations appear to have been neglected, while the maps in many cases became hopelessly confused. It was the work of Champlain to bring order out of confusion; and by his well-directed explorations, to restore the knowledge which to the world at large had been lost, carrying out at the same time upon a larger scale the arduous enterprises projected by Jacques Cartier.30

As a short summary of this section, we can say that Jacques Cartier's exploits, while not as brilliant as might have been initially hoped, did have some influence on the second half of the 16th century. There were repercussions on the fishing industry, the fur trade, and cartography, although the extent of this influence is difficult to measure.
CONCLUSION

In the first section, we briefly sketched Cartier's biography. Since documentary sources on his life are rather rare, we often had to rely on unprovable data and hypotheses, as have others who have written about Cartier. Fortunately, the relations of his voyages contain more abundant information on his navigation and exploration, especially his second voyage to Canada.

The second section deals specifically with this second voyage. Emphasis was placed on the choice of a wintering site, the construction and reinforcement of a fort at Sainte-Croix, the hardships of the first winter in Canada, including problems with the Indians and the scurvy epidemic and its cure. Before leaving, Cartier erected a cross and carried off by force Donnacona, his two sons, and other headmen of the Stadacona tribe.

This seizure and that of 1534 affected French-Indian relations, which are the subject of section 3. Here we describe French-Indian relations during Cartier's voyage and try to answer some questions that arise from the account. Certain facts stand out. It is clear that some groups of Indians had already become accustomed to trading with Europeans and were eager to do so. The two Indians Cartier had taken to France during his first voyage acted as his guides and interpreters, making it easier for him to go among the Indians in 1535-36. However, they were often the instigators of conflict between French and Indians. The trip to Hochelaga seems to have been the cause of most of the difficulties between the French and the Stadaconians. The latter were extremely hostile to the Frenchmen who stayed behind, and a fort had to be built. When Cartier returned, he had the fort reinforced and guarded night and day. When a large number of unfamiliar Indians came to Stadacona, Cartier was forced to return to France, but he carried off several Indians with him. During the third voyage, there was open warfare between the French and the Indians of the St. Lawrence Valley. According to Trudel, this break marks the beginning of the French-Iroquois conflict.

In summary, French-Indian relations went from friendship to mistrust to open hostility in the time Cartier was in the New World. He was the first to provide information about the Laurentian Indians and their general living conditions, as well as the conditions his men lived under.
At the end of section 3, we attempted to clarify certain questions arising from the study of French-Indian relations during this period. The only definitive answer we could give as to the identity of the Laurentian Indians is that they were Huron-Iroquois. As to their negative attitude toward Cartier's trip to Hochelaga, it seems the cause was a desire for trade exclusivity. The Stadaconians were anxious to retain the role of middlemen between the other tribes and the Europeans. The arrival of Europeans resulted in a change in geographical orientation: the Indians, who were initially oriented toward the gulf, turned inland afterwards, seeking fur-bearing animals.

Three hypotheses were given concerning the disappearance of the Laurentian Indians during the latter half of the 16th century. War might have pushed them far to the southwest; there may have been a migration, as was the custom among some of these Indians when their soil was exhausted; or the Iroquois League, with its easy access to ironware and other European goods, may have defeated the Laurentian Indians and forced them to emigrate.

In the fourth and final section, we discussed Cartier's influence in the second half of the 16th century. This influence is difficult to evaluate, but it was felt in the fishing industry and the fur trade, where Cartier's explorations considerably enlarged the field of action. His exploits also influenced 16th-century cartography. It is certain that Cartier drew maps of his voyages, but they have not survived to the present day. However, some reproductions of maps from the second half of the 16th century show the routes he followed. The first mention is made on a 1542 map, in the Cartier tradition, by Jean Rotz. A map in the Portuguese-Cartier tradition, drawn by Nicolas Desliens in 1541, shows the first and second voyages. The reproduction closest to Cartier's own maps is probably the Duro map, drawn around 1585.

Those are the main ideas developed in this study. Certain points have remained obscure, largely because of the lack of documentary sources. Still, we have a fairly accurate overview of Cartier's life and exploits, especially his second voyage, which was the main object of our research.

Cartier's voyages are a landmark in the history of French colonization in New France, even though no official permanent settlement was made in the St. Lawrence Valley until Champlain's expedition in 1603. Still, Cartier's influence was felt in private commercial enterprises in the second half of the 16th century, although, until Champlain, no explorers extended his explorations. He was the discoverer of the great passage inland, the St. Lawrence, and as such, deserves a place of importance in our history.
Here we will deal briefly with portraits presumed to be of Cartier. According to Gustave Lanctôt, eight portraits have claims to authenticity. Of this number, it seems that the reproductions by Léopold Massart in 1836 and by François Riss and Théophile Hamel (Figs. 22 and 23) are probably authentic. The portrait shown in Figure 143 of Costumes français depuis Clovis jusqu'à nos jours by François de Clugny is probably an enlarged tracing from the Harleian map (post 1536), attributed to Desceliers. It is signed Léopold Massart; in Lanctôt's opinion, it should represent Cartier.

In 1839, however, François Riss did a portrait for the city of St. Malo. Taken up by Théophile Hamel several years later and based on a pen drawing in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, this portrait also deserves consideration. There is no way to decide definitely on this question; however, it seems to us that Hamel's (or Riss's) portrait is more realistic, and it is the one we submit as a possible portrait of the great navigator (Fig. 23).
APPENDIX B. LETTERS FROM JACQUES NOËL TO JEAN GROOTE, 1587.

Letter to Mr. Jean Groote, a student in Paris, from Jacques Noël of St. Malo, the great-nephew of Jacques Cartier, concerning the discovery of rapids in Canada.

Monsieur Groote,

Votre beau-frère M. Gilles Watier m'a montré ce matin une carte publiée à Paris, dédiée à un nommé M. Hakluyt, gentilhomme anglois, dans laquelle toutes Isles occidentales, la région du nouveau Mexique & les pays de Canada, Hochelaga & Saguenay se trouvent compris.

Je maintiens que la Rivière de Canada qui est décrite dans cette carte n'y est pas placée comme elle se trouve dans mon livre, lequel est conforme à celui de Jacques Cartier, & que lad. carte ne place pas le Grand Lac qui est au dessus des Saults en la façon que les Sauvages qui demeurent aux dits Saults nous en ont donné connaissance. Dans la susdite carte que vous m'avez envoyée, le Grand Lac s'y trouve placé trop au Nord, les Saults & chûtes d'eau sont par le 44e degré de latitude & il n'est pas aussi difficile de passer qu'on se l'imagine. Les eaux ne tombent pas d'aucunes hauteurs bien considérables; ce n'est qu'un lieu de la rivière où il y a mauvais fond; il seroit possible de construire des barques au dessus des saults et il est facile de marcher par terre jusques à la fin des 3 saults: il n'y a pas plus de cinq lieues de marche.

J'ai été sur le haut d'une montagne qui est au pied desd. saults, d'où j'ai pu voir lad. Rivière au delà desd. saults; laquelle se monstre plus large qu'elle n'est en l'endroit où nous l'avons passée. Par le peuple du pais nous a été dit qu'il y avait dix journées de marche depuis les Saults jusqu'au Grand Lac; mais nous ne savons pas combien de lieues ils comptent pour une journée.

Je ne puis pour le moment vous en écrire plus long, car le courrier ne peut demeurer plus longtemps. Je terminerai donc pour le présent en vous présentant mes meilleurs saluts, priant Dieu de vous accorder l'accomplissement de tous vos désirs.

Votre ami affectionné,

JACQUES NOËL.

De Saint-Malo, avex hâte, ce 19e de juin 1587.
Mon cousin, je vous prie de me faire le plaisir de m'envoyer le livre qui traite de la découverte du Nouveau Mexique & l'une de ces nouvelles cartes des Indes occidentales que vous avez envoyée à votre beau-frère Gilles Watier & qui est dédiée à M. Hakluyt, M. Anglois. Je ne manqueray pas de me informer par moi-mesme s'il y a moyen de trouver ces relations que le capitaine Jacques Cartier a écrites après ses deux derniers voyages en Canada.

A second letter to Mr. Jean Groote from Jacques Noël:

Monsieur Groote,

Je ne puis vous écrire rien davantage de tout ce que j'ai pu trouver des écrits de feu mon oncle le capitaine Jacques Cartier (quoique j'aie fait des recherches partout où il m'a été possible de le faire dans cette ville), à l'exception d'un certain livre fait en manière d'une carte marine, laquelle a été redigée de la propre main de mon oncle susdit, & qui se trouve maintenant en la possession du sieur de Cremeur. Cette carte est passablement bien tracée & dessinée en ce qui regarde toute la rivière de Canada; ce dont je suis bien certain, par ce que d'icelle j'ai moi-même connaissance, aussi loin que s'étendent les saults où j'ai été moi-même. La hauteur desd. Saults est par est par les 44° degrés, j'ai trouvé dans ladite Carte, audessous de l'endroit où la Rivière se partage en deux, au milieu des deux branches de la dite Rivière & quelque peu plus proche de la branche qui court vers le Nord-Ouest, les mots qui suivent écrites de la main de Jacques Cartier:

"Par le peuple du Canada et Hochelaga, il est dit: que c'est ici ou la terre de Saguenay; quelle est riche et abonde en pierres précieuses."

Et à environ 100 lieues au-dessous de cet endroit, j'ai trouvé les deux lignes suivantes écrites sur la dite carte dans la direction du Sud-Ouest:

"Ici, dans ce paus se trouvent la canelle et le girofle que dans leur langue ils appellent canodilla."

Pour ce qui est de mon livre dont je vous ai parlé, il est fait en la forme d'une carte marine & je l'ai remis à mes deux fils Michel et Jean qui présentement sont en Canada. Si à leur retour, qui sera avec la volonté de Dieu vers la Sainte-Magdaleine prochaine, ils ont appris quelque chose qui vaille la peine d'être rapporté, je ne manquera pas vous le faire savoir.
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Appendix B

Several Canadian historians and certain French ones have investigated the life and exploits of Jacques Cartier. Secondary documents are therefore abundant, especially from the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, when there was a rebirth of interest in Cartier. Primary sources, on the other hand, are relatively few. Therefore, some of the secondary sources are partly speculative. We are required to be selective, retaining in as much as possible only those that seem the most definitive on the subject at hand. This is the spirit in which we offer this bibliography, which is, of course, not intended to be exhaustive.
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Figure 1. Itinerary of Cartier's first voyage. Solid lines show the coastlines discovered during this voyage; dotted lines show previously known coastlines; unmarked coastlines are those still undiscovered at that date. (Mapping based on Henry P. Biggar in Bernard G. Hoffman, Cabot to Cartier: Sources for a Historical Ethnography of Northeastern North America, 1497-1550 [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961], p. 133; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 2. Facsimile of Cartier's signature. a. Tracing of Cartier's signature as it appears on the provisional roll for the second voyage. (Public Archives of Canada.) b. Tracing of another of Cartier's signatures (Frédéric Jouon des Longrais, Jacques Cartier; documents nouveaux, recueillis par F. Jouon des Longrais.... (Paris: A. Picard, 1888), p. 121.) The two signatures are nearly identical. The first reads "Jacq Cartier" and the second "Jac Cartier." Both signatures end with flourishes.
Figure 3. Facsimile of a page of the record of Cartier's first voyage (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate IV. This is a photograph of the page in the Moreau Collection, Vol. 841, fol. 56, Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 4. Facsimile of a page in the account of Cartier's second voyage. (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa, The King's Printer, 1924], Plate VI; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 5. Itinerary of Cartier's first and second voyages, (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate XVI; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 6. Provisional roll of the crew for Cartier's second voyage (Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 6 (2).
Figure 6 (3).

(1) Ce nom omis dans l’original a été supprimé par M. Cunat dans la liste qu’il a publiée à St. Malo, le 4 Décembre 1548.
Figure 6 (4).

(1) La relation du 2e voyage de J. Cartier mentionne de plus Philippe Rougemont, âgé d'environ 20 ans, qui mourut du scorbut en 1536.

(2) Jean Carter.
Figure 7. Bird's-eye view of Cartier's manor (Jacques Cartier, Relation originale du voyage de Jacques Cartier au Canada en 1534; Documents inédits sur Jacques Cartier et le Canada [Paris: Henri Michelant et Alfred Ramé, 1867], Vol. 2; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)

Figure 8. Interior view of Cartier's manor (Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 9. Exterior view of Cartier's manor (Public Archives of Canada.)

Figure 10. Photograph of Cartier's manor, called "Les Portes Cartier," taken at the beginning of the 20th century (Joseph Dumais, Héros d'autrefois; Jacques Cartier et Champlain [Quebec City: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale ltée, 1913], facing p. 16; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 11. Cartier's arrival at Stadacona (Quebec City), from a painting in St. Malo (Public Archives of Canada.)

Figure 12. Meeting between Cartier and the Stadaconians, May 6, 1536 (Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 13. Section of Jean Rotz's map, 1542 (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate V; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)

Figure 14. Tracing of a section of Nicolas Desliens's map, 1541 (William F. Ganong, "Crucial Maps in the Early Cartography and Place-Nomenclature of the Atlantic Coast of Canada, VI. The Voyages of Jacques Cartier," Royal Society of Canada Proceedings and Transactions, Vol. 28, Series 3, Section 2 (May 1934), p. 244; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 15. Section of the Harleian map circa 1536-37 (perhaps 1542?) (Henry P. Biggar, *The Voyages of Jacques Cartier* [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate VIII; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 16. Section of a map attributed to Pierre Desceliers, 1546 (also called the Dauphin or Henry II map) (Marcel Trudel, Atlas de Nouvelle-France [Quebec City: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1968], p. 19; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 17. Section of a map by Sebastian Cabot, 1544. (Henry Harrisse, Découverte et évolution cartographique de Terre-Neuve et des pays circonvoisins, 1497-1501-1769 [Paris: H. Welter, 1900], Plate 14; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 18. Section of the Nicolas Vallard map, 1547. The figure marked with an X may represent Cartier (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate X; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 19. Section of a map by Pierre Desceliers, 1550, (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate XIV; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)

Figure 21. Map of Hochelaga by Ramusio, 1532. (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Plate IX; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 22. Portrait of Jacques Cartier, from a painting by Léopold Massart. (Henry P. Biggar, The Voyages of Jacques Cartier [Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1924], Frontispiece; copy in the Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 23. Portrait of Jacques Cartier from a painting by Théophile Hamel (Public Archives of Canada.)
Figure 24. Approximate locations of Cartier's settlements in the Quebec City region, in 1535-36 and 1541-42, (from Marcel Trudel, Histoire de la Nouvelle-France [Montreal: Fides, 1963], Vol. 1, P. 93, 145.)
Excavations at Cartier-Brébeuf Park, Quebec City, 1959

Kenneth E. Kidd
ABSTRACT

Three weeks' excavation was carried out in August 1959 at Cartier-Brébeuf Park in Quebec City to determine, if possible, the location of Jacques Cartier's wintering place of 1535-36. No evidence of this was found due to radical changes in the site since the 16th century. Remains were located of masonry work which indicates a mid-17th-century origin and appear to be attributable to Jesuit activity at the site.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The excavations at the part of the Cartier-Brébeuf Park site then known as the Townend property were carried out by the writer under a contract with the National Historic Sites Division (now the National Historic Parks and Sites Branch) in the summer of 1959. The author wishes to thank J.D. Herbert, then chief of the organization and Jervis D. Swannack and John H. Rick of the Branch for their help and advice while on the site and in preparing the report. He has also received much valuable help from other interested persons and agencies. A.J.H. Richardson, of the National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, has given assistance of primary importance and Reverend Adrien Pouliot, S.J., has made invaluable comments and suggestions regarding source materials. Rev. Paul Desjardins, S.J., archivist of the Saint-Marie College in Montreal, has been exceptionally kind in providing transcripts of early records bearing on the history of this site.

J.A.S. Townend, the owner of the property, provided numerous and important services and conveniences such as a work shack, a telephone and a workman to clear away weeds. Robert D'Amours, of the Quebec Office of Parks Canada, generously supplied the services of surveyors and recommended workmen, and in addition contributed help in the way of tools and materials. The Canadian army loaned two tarpaulins. Local citizens kindly offered their knowledge of local conditions at the site as they recalled them in years gone by and some provided maps of interest. Others contributed their labour on a voluntary basis.

Thanks are also due to the Canada Council for assistance in revising the manuscript and in final typing.

To all of these individuals and agencies, the writer is happy to take this opportunity of expressing his thanks.
INTRODUCTION

At the time of the excavations the land under investigation, known as the Townend property, was privately owned and it did not become part of the park for several years; nevertheless, it is referred to as Cartier-Brébeuf Park throughout this report.

On 10 August 1959 the preparations for the excavation were virtually complete and the crew was on location. The crew consisted of the field director, his wife as photographer and artist, Helen Devereux and George MacDonald as supervisors, and the surveyors. The owner of the property to be investigated, John A.S. Townend, president of Bergerville Enterprises, had already placed two shacks on the site, one to be used as an office and a second for the storage of tools. He also had a telephone installed in the work shack and provided a man to cut the weeds on the site with a scythe.

The first three days were occupied in surveying the site and in laying out a grid. Surveyor George Trottier then prepared a map to show the layout, working from an original map prepared for Bergerville Enterprises. A baseline was laid down to run approximately at right angles to Julien Street and from that street to the north bank of the Saint-Charles River (Figs. 1, 4, 5). Using this line, the site was divided into 100-ft squares, that is, each of these large units contained 100 by 100 ft$^2$ of area, and each was given a designation, A, B, C, D, etc. Provision was made to subdivide each of these 100-ft sections, as they were called, into squares measuring 5 ft each way and thus having an area of 25 ft$^2$. These lesser squares were denominated by numbers in one direction, beginning near Julien Street and running towards the Saint-Charles, and by letters of the alphabet in the other, beginning with "a" at the baseline and advancing through the alphabet as one progresses towards Francois 1er Street (Fig. 4). Small letters were ordinarily used here except where there was risk of some confusion, thus, "L" had to be used in order to avoid confusion with the numeral "1." Typical square numbers would be J4g, L1f or F10m. To locate the position of any given 5-ft square, it is only necessary to analyse its designator as follows: the first letter, such as "A", signifies the section; the number indicates the position between Julien Street and the Saint-Charles, and the following lower-case letter is the position east or west of
the baseline. The tidal flats were not covered in the survey nor was the extreme western portion of the site south of Bibeau Street, although it would be a simple matter to extend the lines to cover these.

Although there is rather ample documentation on the history of the site, it was felt desirable to disregard it for the time being in order not to form opinions about what to look for and where, and to rely solely upon the evidence which the site itself could furnish through archaeology. Further, in accordance with one of the basic principles of archaeology, excavation was begun at the limits of the site and not near the centre. The primary objective was, of course, the location of the spot where Jacques Cartier is thought to have wintered in 1535-36, namely, close to the confluence of the Saint-Charles and Lairet rivers. With this in mind, excavation was started along the baseline and in the square nearest to Julien Street, Hla. For a distance of 50 ft, every third square was dug, but since no evidence of occupation was forthcoming, squares were dug at more irregular intervals until K18a was reached. At this point and because a ditch, whose nature was of some interest, crossed the baseline a short distance ahead, every other square was dug through to Fl4a. Exploratory trenches were laid out at right angles to the baseline from H5a, J4a, K19a and L10a.

All squares excavated during the three weeks' field session are indicated on the plan in solid black (Figs. 1, 5). They amount to 92 or a total of 2,300 ft². The total area of the site, exclusive of those parts which are inundated by the tide at any time, is estimated to be 189,370 square feet. This being so, 1.1 per cent of the site was excavated. It was taken as a principle to excavate as far as any disturbance was evident and since this varied from a depth of a foot or so to as much as 5 ft, there was a wide variation in the depths to which excavation was carried. No estimate of the volume of soil removed has been made, but it must be at least 2,300 yd³ and possibly more.

A surface inspection indicated that the site was quite level except, of course, along the riverbanks where the drop to the water's edge was often rather steep, and along the western edge near rue François 1er and Bibeau Street (Fig. 2). Fifty feet east on rue François 1er the level of the ground was several feet higher than on the rest of the site and this situation prevailed the length of the street frontage. Furthermore, the high ground was decidedly uneven, making walking hazardous, and there were many stones. This is not surprising, however, for it is known that sheds had recently been removed from this area. South of Bibeau Street the level was lower than to the east. The rest of the site, except where mentioned, was monotonously level. No contour map was prepared, but elevations were
recorded at all principal stakes. No object of any great age was to be seen on the surface. On the contrary, many modern rubbish heaps existed, particularly on the high ground along François 1er Street and in the P, L and R sections. In these areas also remains of brick paving, assumed to be part of an old road, were to be seen and there appeared to be a path or road in parts of sections P and Q. The cinder foundation of an old tennis court or baseball diamond occupied parts of sections D, H and J. A short, curved depression was visible in sections E and K; as already mentioned, it appeared to be part of an old ditch. However, no object which could possibly be attributed to a date earlier than about the beginning of the present century was seen on the surface.

It was anticipated that the excavation of the site might yield evidence of 16th-, 17th-, and 18th-century occupation in the way of soil disturbance, structures, specimens or all three. To this end, a close watch was kept on all digging, particularly of the floors of squares for evidence of post-moulds (for palisading) and of walls or profiles for evidence of soil disturbance. Graphs of floors designed to record any unusual features and profile drawings of the walls of squares were made as required and these were supplemented by photographs both in colour and in black and white. In many cases, the squares revealed so little of interest that there was virtually nothing to record by drawing or photograph, and notes alone sufficed. There are thus the following kinds of records: (i) notes on square description forms; (ii) graphs of square floors; (iii) profiles of the walls of squares; (iv) photographs similar to (ii) and (iii), and photographs of specimens. In addition to these records, there is the plan already mentioned.

Examination of Figures 1 and 5 will indicate that digging was dispersed as widely over the site as time permitted. Only on the baseline was a continuous line explored more or less minutely throughout and the purpose of this was to provide a control over the conditions prevailing on the terrain. Exploration of the baseline area revealed (i) that there was almost no topsoil over a large part of the site; (ii) in certain other parts there had been filling, and (iii) that there was recent industrial activity at the southern end. These findings were corroborated by the evidence derived from squares dug elsewhere on the site. These will be detailed in the analysis which follows.
THE EXCAVATION

Excavation indicated four major areas of interest on the site. These four areas may be labelled for descriptive purposes as: (1) Area 1, the trench along the baseline through sections H, J, K and L; (2) Area 2, the east-west trench nearest to and parallel with the bank of the Saint-Charles River; (3) Area 3, in sections D, H, J, K and P, and (4), comprising parts of sections P and Y.

Area 1

The control trench was dug immediately west of the baseline and traversed sections H, J, K and L. In other words, it cut a section from Julien Street to the north bank of the Saint-Charles River. As already remarked, not all squares were investigated, but those which were, were judiciously selected so as to give an overall picture of soil profiles throughout this trench and to provide a control over any disturbances which might be present. It is true, of course, that this method of investigation, since it did not provide a complete picture, may possibly have missed some important features, but the alternative was to investigate a smaller area more thoroughly. Of the two choices, it seemed much more desirable to sample a larger area and thus to increase the chances of finding the evidence for Cartier's sojourn, if it existed.

Most of the conditions of soil structure and soil disturbance found on the site were exemplified in one place or another of this baseline trench. Thus, the first square to be opened, H1a, revealed that in some areas the original surface had been removed down to subsoil; in this case, the subsoil had been covered at a later date by coarse material resembling road fill, probably washed in from Julien Street. A similar condition was found in H4a, H7a and H13a; the latter contained fill which showed some lensing. In square J5a the topsoil had been similarly cut off only to be replaced by four or five layers of slightly different types of soil: (i) gritty grey soil; (ii) sandy yellow earth; (iii) grey clay; (iv) yellow clay; (v) grey clay, and (vi) yellow clay. These were so obviously stratified as to give the impression they were natural (Fig. 6). About the same
conditions prevailed in J7a, J8a and J14a. The removal of
the original surface down to subsoil was visible also,
though not so conspicuous and lacking the multiple
stratification, in J20a, K3a, K6a, K9a and K18a. Indeed, in
the last-mentioned square, the lowest disturbance seemed to
be at about 9 in. from the present surface, a condition
which continued in L2a, L4a and L6a.

There is thus strong evidence that over much of the
area along this line, between H1a and L6a, the original
surface had been cut down for some purpose and that
subsequently greater or lesser depths of fill, mostly of a
clayey nature, had been deposited on it in such a way as to
leave a fairly level surface. However, in at least one
place there was no cutting away, but, on the contrary,
direct filling had taken place. This situation prevailed in
J2a where modern fill containing wood and other refuse was
encountered to a depth of 25 in. At 26 in., water rapidly
began to seep in. Undoubtedly, this had originally been a
low spot, possibly the course of a spring, which had been
filled in and levelled up to the surrounding area.

The depth of the recent layer varied, but was usually
from 6 to 9 in. Artifactual material in it was so patently
modern that it was deemed unnecessary to preserve any of it: it consisted of such things as fragments of ceramics, iron
nails and small pieces of red brick. The latter was by far
the most abundant foreign material, so much so that it could
almost be used as a diagnostic marker of disturbance.
Foreign matter such as coal and cinders likewise betrayed
modernity.

In section K a shallow ditch was visible on the
surface, but it proved to be of no historic significance
(Fig. 7).

Square L8a was especially interesting because it was
carried to a depth of 6 ft 3 in., thus providing a vertical
control in this area into the subsoil till. Beneath the
usual deposit of humus a layer of red brick was found at a
depth of 6 in. and beneath this the clay was stained red to
a depth of 13 in. This staining beneath the brick was
characteristic wherever concentrations of that material were
found and was doubtless due to the leaching of the iron
oxides it contained. Below this again grey clay appeared
and continued for 31 in., followed by bands of red, blue and
brown clay. An occasional line of sand appeared and the
base was achieved at a depth of about 75 in. This profile
indicates clearly the basic structure of the site, viz.,
clay overlying sand, and may be compared with profiles
kindly supplied by A.W. Burditt, of the Anglo-Canadian Pulp
and Paper Mills, of walls drilled nearby by them in 1954.
Although the Cartier-Brébeuf profile shows more detail, the
two are in substantial agreement (Figs. 8, 9). Fossil woods
were found at a depth of about 55 in. but human disturbance
did not exceed some 6 or 7 in.
The brick fragments, first noted in quantity in K18a, became more conspicuous in L6a and then changed to a solid layer in L8a. In L10a the solid layer continued and on through L12a, L14a and L17a where this trench ended at the edge of the decline to the tidal flats. Some slight interruptions to this pattern were observed.

It was obvious that the concentration of brick and brick fragments was due to the presence of a sort of flooring which was of considerable extent. Although the material was often fragmentary and in a state of disintegration, many squares revealed the presence of a pavement of bricks, most of which were in a fairly sound state. It appeared that for the most part the flooring had been laid one course deep upon a deposit of crushed bricks and brick dust, and that this deposit was, on the average, about 8 in. deep, extending to some 13 in. (L10a). Since the top of the floor was 3 in. below the surface of the field, the total depth to which brick and brick-like materials extended was about 12 to 15 in. (Fig. 10a).

Area 2

The trench which was laid out parallel to the bank of the Saint-Charles River was, in effect, a double trench, consisting of two contiguous rows in which squares were often opened alternately. However, the length of this trench was much less than that of the baseline trench (220 ft as against 390 ft in the latter) and the number of squares opened was proportionately less (16 as against 28, the overlapping square, L10a, being counted with the latter). This trench lies in sections F, L and R.

The theme in this area seemed to be "brick;" it was met with in every square and in considerable quantity, to the exclusion of almost everything else. While the sequence of opening squares was to begin at the baseline and spread out, we may for the sake of convenience begin with the most westerly square in this trench, Rlln, and work eastward. In it, a floor or pavement of brick was encountered below about 2-1/2 to 4 in. of topsoil; the bricks had been laid in the simplest possible pattern on top of a tan-coloured clay, stained red from the brick above. The bricks themselves were of modern size and shape, as elsewhere in Areas 1 and 2, and were unglazed; they were, in fact, ordinary cheap red brick such as one might purchase today in almost any brickyard. The same conditions prevailed in Rllf except that the topsoil was a bit deeper, and the same held for Rlla. The profile of Llllp suggests strongly that at least in certain places the topsoil had been cut away before the bricks had been laid and the staining of the subsoil was
conspicuous. In L1lk a dark area near the bottom of the profile suggests an old sod line, probably indicating some filling at this spot. No old humus line appeared in L1lf and no disturbance of the soil was visible below the brick. However, a dark round spot visible near the centre of the square was probably the remains of an old post from the brick sheds. A different situation prevailed in L9c for here the brick and brick deposit overlie a dark soil whose surface is quite level and distinct. The same holds for F10s and in both of these the deposit of brick is thicker than hitherto, that is, about 1.0 ft. A lens of pure sand was enclosed in the brick at one spot. Much the same conditions held for F11r, F10p, F11n (where iron nails were encountered at a depth of 29 in.), F11m, F11L (Fig. 10), F10L and F10m.

From this evidence it is clear that a brick floor or pavement covered most and probably all of the area between the east end of this trench where it abutted the bank of the Lairet westward for at least 220 ft and perhaps more. This floor was laid on top of a surface prepared in some places by removing the topsoil and, at least near the Lairet (as will be seen below), by filling it in. In a few places, the soil below the brick was very black which would suggest either that the original humus had not been removed or that the black colour was caused by the heat from the kilns above, and probably the latter. The bricks themselves were laid carefully on the prepared bed and were presumably used as flooring for kilns and yards. The brick rubble was doubtless waste material which was put to use as a foundation, making it possible to get by without more than a single course of bricks.

The easternmost squares in this trench were interesting also on another count. It was found that the fill of brick rubble was not placed on soil or subsoil here as elsewhere, but on fill of another sort. At a depth of 20 in. or thereabouts the fill changed to one in which brick became scarcer and bits of wood, mortar and coal were mixed with clay. The amount of foreign material in the clay varied greatly, but was usually only a fraction of the bulk. Then, at a depth of 3 ft 10 in. in the southeast corner of F10m, a small pile of stones was discovered. They were flat stones and had evidently not been placed in position but dumped in so that they lay against one another on edge. Also, a rotted wooden stake about 4 in. in diameter and 2 ft long was found to protrude at an angle of about 80° upward near the stones. It was standing in a small cavity which was presumably the result of the shrinking of the wood itself upon decay. In the square to the east, F10L, somewhat similar conditions prevailed and fill containing rubble, mortar, charcoal and wood were found below the brick rubble, and rocks were found intruding into the blue clay at a depth of 3 ft 10 in. (Figs. 11, 12). In F11L, the same situation
was found: boulders as much as 21 in. by 14 in. lay on the clay and above them was a fill containing mortar, bits of coal cinders, wood and other foreign material.

It was also apparent that these two terminal squares mark the original bank of the Lairet for the slope of the original clay was very obvious. No humus had been able to accumulate here because of tidal wash; hence, when the fill was dumped it lodged directly on the original clay. In some way the stones had fallen first and were therefore on the bottom and on top of them had fallen the old fill. More recently, the brick rubble had been used to level the land and extend the terrain still further towards the tidal flats. No cultural material of any great age was encountered in this. If we grant that the use of coal was introduced into Quebec not more than 100 years ago, the entire fill must postdate that occurrence since small pieces of coal were found at the very bottom, almost in contact with the clay bank. We can thus indicate where the banks of the Lairet once stood, but there was no evidence anywhere along this trench of any disturbance to which could be attributed an age of more than a century.

Area 3

Area 3 includes the remainder of the site except section Y and a part of section P; that is, it includes all squares dug in sections D, E, H, J, K and P not already mentioned, but omitting those to be mentioned later in connection with Area 4.

Time permitted the digging of only two test squares in sections D and E. In D4i, there was some disturbance on the surface, chiefly from the tennis court, but beyond the depth of 18 in. the soil was undisturbed and water-washed sand was apparent at 33 in. In Eli, to the south of the above, there seemed to be no disturbance whatever nor was there any material to be found. The ancient bank of the Lairet is definitely to the east of a line joining these two squares, but begins to swing slightly westward to the south of Eli.

In section H, five squares were opened along the western limits, but not all were recorded. In H1lt, brick of recent type was found to a depth of 23 in., indicating that a depression had been filled in with some modern refuse. In H13t little disturbance was visible, perhaps none below the first level. Similarly, H20t was undisturbed below the depth of 6 in. and even here there was no evidence of any ancient use.

In section J seven squares were investigated, four of them contiguous in the 4-line. A postmould appeared in J4g but since it did not intrude beyond the 15-in. level at
which modern iron and pottery fragments lay, it must be coeval with them or later. Square J4i, dug to a depth of 1 ft 10 in., showed nothing of significance, but the next three squares were of some interest in proving that there had been a depression there in which modern rubbish had been deposited. At a depth of about 20 in. in J4j was a conspicuous layer of mortar and stone rubble. The adjacent square J4k was even more convincing for here the mortar and stone rubble were concentrated, mostly at a depth of from 2 to 2-3/4 ft below the surface, and it seemed to lie on old sod (Fig. 13). Among the more significant specimens to come from this dump was a piece of glazed pottery, an iron nail and a kaolin pipe bowl, the latter found at a depth of 26 in. (Fig. 14). Square J4L showed a similar fill. The last square opened in this line was J4s; here there was no rubble, but it had certainly been disturbed to a depth of 12 in. because iron objects and brick fragments were found at this depth. The belief is that this had been a low spot filled in recent times. One final square in this section was explored, viz., J17t; no disturbance was observed below the first level.

The evidence in this section points strongly to its having been a natural depression which was levelled by filling some time during the last century.

The trench explored in section J was followed westward into section P and (with the exception of squares P1t, P4t, P5s and P6t which more properly belong with the masonry structure in section Y) may be described here. In P4d the conspicuous feature was a well-preserved board set vertically on edge and running north and south across the middle of the square beginning at a depth of 9 in. from the surface (Fig. 15). The square was certainly disturbed to a depth of about 15 in., but apparently not beyond that. In P4i there seemed to be little or no humus, suggesting that the surface had been cut off. A 2-in. iron pipe crossed diagonally at post P4j at a depth of 3 in. and a wooden timber was found at a depth of 8 in. There was also some glass and pottery indicative of modern disturbance. Water, however, seeped in quickly at 18 in. and the same conditions were met in P4m. In P4r fresh timber was found at a depth of 8 in. and broken bits of brick at 18 in.; here, again, the top had evidently been taken off and replaced by modern fill.

The last section to be considered under Area 3 is section K where four or five squares were opened in a scattered pattern. In some of the squares there had been disturbance to a considerable depth, while others were either undisturbed or had simply the humus removed in a levelling process.

The evidence for Area 3 is to the effect that a general levelling had taken place sometime during the last century, with the deep depression or depressions in section J being
filled in, first with rubble and later with clay; the other presumably high spots being cut down and left with only what humus has accumulated in recent times. A few squares quickly filled with water and since they were generally in line, it is suggested that a spring existed, from which there was a seepage eastward toward the Lairet.

Area 4

Briefly, Area 4 covers the elevated portion of the site immediately east of rue François 1er Street; more specifically, that portion of it which falls in the northern parts of sections P and Y. The elevation above the general level is only a matter of 4 or 5 ft at most, but the top of the area is, aside from rubbish heaps and loose stones, fairly level. When the writer first saw the site in the spring of 1959 there was a shed standing on the high ground and the locations of two were marked on the plan (Figs. 1, 5). Both were removed before excavation began and it was then difficult to determine exactly what their locations had been. All that could be seen from the surface was a short, low line of brick wall and some irregular areas of flat stones.

The fact that the ground in this section was higher than ordinary suggested that it would have been the most desirable part of the site for a building and accordingly digging was begun here along the baseline of the P and Y sections, that is, in Pit. It was only a short time until masonry was encountered. In the end, several masonry structures were located, not necessarily all from one period or related to each other. Further, due to the fact that remaining time in the field was already short, it was not possible to complete the work on any one of them and the fact that data were accumulating faster than they could easily be recorded made this phase of the work somewhat unsatisfactory. For descriptive purposes, it will be sufficient to deal first with the excavated area as a whole and secondly with each unit individually. A brief résumé will clarify the relationships.

The principal structures, and the first to be discovered, lay in the northeast corner of this section and extended approximately 2 ft eastward into section P. It is referred to below as structure 1 and is understood to include the brick pavement or flooring adjacent to it on the south side. Structure 2, also of masonry, was situated a little to the west of structure 1; the distance between them being in the order of 2-1/2 ft. The exact dimensions and location of structure 3 cannot be so clearly defined for its excavation is only in the initial stages; however, it
appears to approach to within 6 in. or so of the southern
end of structure 2 and to run southward and nearly parallel
to the long axis of structure 1, from which it is distant
about 2-1/2 ft.

Structure 1 was a large rectangle of masonry 17 ft 1
in. from north to south in the P section and 16 ft 4 in. in
the Y section. Its width along the P1-Y1 line is 7 ft 2
in. and 7 ft 3-1/2 in. in the P4-Y4 line. The thickness of
the walls was somewhat variable, but lay between 17-1/2 and
23 in. The existing height of the walls from the top of the
sill to the surface was 1-1/2 ft as measured along the
northeast corner and the north face - the only fully exposed
parts (Fig. 17). The structure, like all others in this
area, was covered with an accumulation of about 3 to 6 in.
of modern refuse and it was not always easy to know when a
stone was not part of it. It was very obvious that an
excavation for the masonry had been dug into the clay
subsoil; it had been cut extremely well so that the walls
were quite vertical and there had been no wasted effort for
the distance between clay and masonry was not more than 3
in.

The floor of the excavation had been carefully levelled
and heavy 3-in. by 8-in. planks, presumably of cedar, had
been laid on it. Upon these the masonry had been set. The
planks were in a fair state of preservation although the
intercellular structure had been destroyed leaving only the
heavy fibres (Fig. 16). The stone used in the masonry was a
kind of shale which broke into sections of even thickness
and flat surfaces. The thickness of the blocks varies,
usually between 2-1/2 and 5-1/2 in., and the surface size
from 1.0 ft or less in diameter to about 15 in. They are
generally straight along the outer edges, that is, they have
been dressed there, but are irregular along other edges.
For the most part they tend to be rectangular although many
are triangular. There was but a rough attempt at coursing.
The mortar, which was rather generously employed, was of a
creamy colour and contained a good deal of sand. Despite
the fact that it had been subjected to many years of
dampness and frost, much of the mortar was still hard. The
interior of the structure was not explored.

At the northwest corner of the structure and at a depth
of 1.0 ft a wooden log or sill was visible, running at right
angles to the masonry, that is, north to south. It had a
rather fresh appearance and was in a good state of
preservation. Other pieces of wood, probably logs also,
seemed to be arranged in steps here, but the structure was
not fully enough explored to determine this point for lack
of time. Specimens of significance were an iron nail of
modern type found in close proximity to the east face of the
masonry at a depth of about 6 in.; and 8 in. below the
surface a kaolin pipe bowl was discovered. Great quantities
of recent cultural materials were found at near-surface
levels, but all were very modern, such as glass bottles and stoneware sherds.

The south end of structure 1 was abutted by a small paved area of bricks, about 7 ft 3 in. by 5 ft (Fig. 17). The bricks were dark red, 7-3/4 in. long, 3-3/4 in. wide, and between 1-1/4 and 2-3/4 in. thick, and somewhat irregular and devoid of any marks. They were imperfectly made for the most part and were often warped and cracked. They gave the appearance of being quite different in origin from those found on the lower parts of the site (that is, in Areas 1, 2 and 3) in colour, texture, firing and shape. The pavement itself had heaved and been so severely damaged that its southern limits could not be determined. To the east, in the angle between the masonry and the brick, wood appeared which was suggestive of some sort of flooring; one piece was 23 in. long, 8-1/2 in. wide and was oriented north and south. Fragments of wood, possibly also the remains of flooring, lay in an east-west direction at the southwest corner of the masonry.

During the last day or two of the excavation, work had been extended westward in order to examine more fully the nature of structure 1. In doing so, other masonry remains were encountered which we have already denominated structure 2 and structure 3 (Fig. 17). The principal of these is a square affair, seemingly the base for a chimney or for a forge (structure 2). It covers approximately the area of a square. The stones of which it is built are very similar to those in structure 1 and may have in fact been taken from it, but the mortar in which they are set is much harder, suggesting that the two are not contemporary. Four iron stakes had been built into it vertically for some unknown purpose. North of this structure, a rough wooden flooring appeared with boards running in two directions, parallel to and at right angles to the masonry. In the square to the east, some interesting specimens came to light. Chief of these was an iron axe head of a type common in French colonial times (Fig. 19), found at a depth of 4 in. It lay among modern cinders and a three-pronged fork and a companion knife were found immediately below it. A nail, probably hand made, was also found beneath the axe.

Structure 3 hardly deserves the name because instead of being a homogeneous complex it is rather an aggregation of stones, some of which may be set in mortar and others loose. They have not been cleared nor examined in detail. The belief is, however, that they are the remains of a modern building recently removed.

During the last day a deep exploratory excavation was made between structures 2 and 3, and slightly to the west in square Y2c. Certain formations were found whose significance there was no time to follow up. It can be said, however, that there were several flat stone slabs at a depth of 19 in., possibly the remains of wooden planking or
flooring below this, and at a depth of 20 in. a rusted iron water pipe ran diagonally across the square. This pipe ran at a different angle from the one found in P4i, was not of the same size and neither seems to have run beneath structure 1.
The evidence of antiquity furnished by the specimens discovered on the site is not more abundant than that of soil disturbance nor of the masonry. In other words, it must, unfortunately, be regarded as largely negative. Nevertheless, some examination of it is necessary.

The material recovered as work progressed was so obviously recent that it was deemed unnecessary - and in view of the problems of storage - inadvisable to collect any but the most representative examples. Hence a sampling only was saved from all areas excavated, but not necessarily from every square. It is felt that this collection is adequate and fully representative of pre-20th-century conditions at this site. Mention was made of most large or significant deposits in the previous section so that all that is needed here is to describe and identify some of the more important specimens.

A sample of brick from the flooring south of the masonry structure 1 may be seen in Figure 20. They are almost certainly not of 20th-century manufacture and it is extremely doubtful if they are of 17th-century origin either. On the basis of colour and general characteristics, they would appear to be of early 19th-century make although there is a possibility they could derive from the 18th century. We know that brick was made in Quebec between 1688 and about 1700 by Landron and Larcheveque, and that the brickyard they used was located on the left bank of the Laiter (Roy 1916: 162-63). The location is marked on Villeneuve's "Plan of Quebec" of 1690, at No. 16, "ou est la briqueterie," evidently the property of M. Charon; it would appear to have been within a few hundred yards of the site under consideration. Roy believes it disappeared around 1700 and no mention of later brickyards has come to notice although it is to be expected that they proliferated in the latter part of the 18th and early 19th centuries. Only one other relevant reference for the 17th century has been noted; it occurs in Les annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu, where it is mentioned that in erecting their building in 1644, the Hospitaliers themselves "montâmes toute la brique des chimiénes" (Juchereau and Duplessis et Ste. Hélène 1929: 50). There is no comment as to whether these bricks were local or imported. It may be said with some assurance that those under discussion here differed from those found at Ste. Marie in being (i) red as against buff, (ii) thicker,
(iii) generally shorter, (iv) more regular in shape and (v) softer and less well fired (Kidd 1949: 163-64). It is thought that the Ste. Marie bricks were imported from France. Those at Cartier-Brébeuf Park were doubtless locally made and at a later date. However, a good deal of study could well be done on this and the materials are probably available in old vaults and other datable structures in Quebec City.

Great quantities of iron nails were found on the site and, in at least one instance, in close proximity to the wall of masonry structure 1. Most of them were in an advanced state of decay from rusting and nothing could be determined from them as to shape or method of manufacture. However, the very fact that they were so rusty would seem to argue that they were made of steel and not of iron, and if so it can be assumed that they were not more than a century old. In one or two cases it was difficult to say whether a specimen was square in section, but some certainly were. This would surely seem to indicate that these nails were made before, say, 1850 and they could easily have been derived from the debris of old buildings dumped on the site at a more recent date.

An iron tool resembling a small broadaxe was encountered in the first square to be opened (Hla). It is 6 in. long, with a triangulate blade, a round "waist" and a hammer-type head. It is deeply corroded. Such tools have long been in use and this one seems to date from the 19th century. The iron axe head of 17th-century French type has already been mentioned. Directly beneath it lay the three-pronged fork shown (Fig. 19). This specimen was bone-handled and is attributable to the mid- or late 19th century. The axe therefore cannot have been in its present situation longer than, say, a century at the most. Despite the fact that it is an old type of tool, it was introduced to the site long after Cartier's visit and the Jesuit occupation; perhaps it too was thrown out along with the material from an old building.

The refuse mantle covering structures 1, 2 and 3 contained innumerable scraps of iron, old cogwheels, pegs, bars of iron and castings of various sorts such as might be found around an old tool or machine shop, but none of them appeared ancient. Other material found in it included earthenware sherds, glass fragments, old shoes, bottles and bottle caps.

Sherds of delftware, porcelain and other ceramics were found in various sections of the site and derived from dinner plates for the most part, but also from saucers, cups and other dishes (Fig. 21). Although such pieces, being common table ware, are hard to date precisely, it seems safe to say they are all 19th-century manufacture. A sherd from a bottle impressed with the name LACKING BOTTLES dates from the last century.
Stoneware is of considerable antiquity in western Europe and the famous works of Grenzhausen are well known and widely distributed. Such goods were made in Germany, and the Low Countries, France and England from the 16th century onwards with little change. The stoneware from Cartier-Brébeuf Park might derive from heirlooms which had been broken and discarded or they may have been of early 19th-century make. In any case, the context limits their importance as time-indicators.

While much glass was found in the form of sherds, whole pieces were not uncommon in the refuse mantle on the masonry structures. Good examples of these may be seen in Figure 23. Most are straight-sided, with slightly concave bottoms, short, constricted necks and flaring rims; the metal is either white or brown. There is little doubt that most of them were medicine bottles and all are 19th century. An interesting example is one impressed with the words:

SIROP des ENFANTS
du DE CODERRE

It is 5 in. high and of white glass (Fig. 18). Sherds of a brown bottle glass such as was common in whiskey bottles was fairly abundant; one or two examples of them were saved from the bottom of the specimen. Again, these date from the 19th century.

A badly damaged glass crucifix was found in the same refuse mantle over the masonry (Fig. 24). Only the body and parts of the lower limbs of the figure remain. While the writer has not seen a specimen of this kind before, he feels that the context suggests that it is also of 19th-century origin and the quality of the glass would bear this out.

Two kaolin pipe bowls were found in different parts of the site, always in conjunction with other material (Fig. 18). There were also several fragments of stem from such pipes. From square Plt came a bowl with the initials G B in raised letters on the part facing the smoker and enclosed in a circle thus

Otherwise, the bowl is white, smooth and polished. From a depth of 2 ft 2 in. in square J4k and lying amongst rubble came a fragmentary white and polished pipe bowl decorated with a band of raised lines of two different widths below the rim and a wheat (?) motif on the lower parts near the stem. Elsewhere two fragments of stems, one of them 2-3/4 in. long, were found on masonry structure 1. It cannot be claimed that any of these is of 17th-century date; the bowls are too large and the decoration is out of the question. They are most likely of Montreal manufacture of the first half of the 19th century.

A copper coin, about the size of a large Canadian one-cent piece, was found in square Fl0L in the fill at a
depth of 4 ft 2 in. It is so worn that no inscription or design can be discerned upon it. The fact that it is not milled may indicate that it was not actually a coin or that it antedates the use of milling. This practice was introduced in the late 17th century, but it is highly unlikely that this object, found as it was in indisputably 19th-century fill, is of that antiquity.

It should be mentioned that Raymond Richard, of Quebec, showed the field director an iron axe head which he said had been picked up on the banks of the Saint-Charles not far from where the workmen were excavating at the time. It was a specimen of the so-called French trade axe about 7 in. long and was the only one apart from the one already described attributed to the site. Under the circumstances, no accurate information concerning its finding was available.

Except for these two French trade axes, not a single specimen was found on the site, either on the surface or during the course of the excavations, which could be positively assigned to the 16th or the 17th centuries.
REVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

With the evidence from the excavation before us, it is desirable to see how it fits the facts of history. But first, is the site actually the one where Jacques Cartier and his sailors spent the grim winter of 1535-36 and is it likewise the spot where stood the buildings first erected by the Jesuits in the early years of the 17th century and added to and used by them in subsequent years?

Cartier, in his record of this trip, tells how he found

ung affourcq d'eaues, fort beau et plaisant, auquel lieu y a une petite ripvière et hable de basre, marinant de deulx à troys brasses, que trouvasmes lieu à nous propice pour mettre nosdictz navires à sauveté. Nous nommasmes ledict lieu saincte Croix pource que ledict jour y arrivasmes (Cartier 1946, l: 132-33).

Again, on September 13, "partismes avecq nosdictz navires, pour les mener au dict lieu de saincte Croix, et y arrivâmes le landemain XIII dudict moys...." (Cartier 1946, l: 134). And on the 16th day,

nous mismes noz deulx plus grandz navires dedans ladict hable et ripvière, où il y a de plaine mer trois brasses, et de bas d'eaue, demye brasse; et fut laissé le gallion dedans la radde, pour mener à Ho(u)chelaga (Cartier 1946, l: 136).

When Cartier returned from Hochelaga, on October 11, he recorded the event thus:

Le lundi, unziesme jour d'octobre, nous arrivâmes au hable de saincte Croix, où estoient noz navires; et trouvasmes que les maistres et mariniers, qui estoient demouréz, avaient faict ung fort davant lesdictz navires, tout cloz, de grosses piéces de boys, plantées debout, joignant les unes aux autres, et tout alentour garny d'artillerie, et bien en ordre pour se deffendre contre tout le pays (Cartier 1946, l: 154).

The captain felt, as the days passed, that he had reason to fear danger from the Indians; consequently, he strengthened the fort, "tout alentour, de gros fosséz larges et profondz, avecq porte à pont-levys, et renffort de pantz de boys, au contraire des premiers" (Cartier 1946, l: 161).
Cartier's apprehensions increased, particularly after scurvy had broken out in his camp and many of his men were ill and dying. No more defences were erected, but the captain tried to keep up a great show of activity to impress the natives with their strength. Sailors continued to die during the winter and one of them, Philippes Rougemont, was dissected in an attempt to determine the nature of the malady. He was buried, Cartier said, "au moings mal que l'on peult" (1946, 1: 169). Nothing is said as to the disposal of the other 25 men who died that winter, but that they could not very well have been buried immediately is likely for we are told there was a four-finger depth of ice over the ships, two fathoms of ice in the river and four feet of snow on the ground (Cartier 1946, 1: 170). If the men had been in good health, it is quite possible they would have buried the dead because it frequently happened that ground covered by deep snow is not itself frozen, but in their weakened condition it is hardly to be thought that the sick men would spend their energies thus. More likely, the dead were buried after the snow melted in the spring.

Cartier's narrative informs us of some important details, such as the manner of building the "fort" and how it was later strengthened, that there was a wide and deep ditch around it and so forth, but it omits a description of where the fort stood in relation to the two streams, how big it was, how close to the banks and how the dead were buried. It does not even give precise information as to where on the banks of the Saint-Charles all this took place. (He refers to the river as the Saint Croix.)

The identity of the river is crucial to the argument. Champlain was aware of this also, for in his day another river was known as the Saint Croix. He says:

Il [Cartier] fut contraint d'hyverner en la rivière Sainte-Croix en un endroit où maintenant les Pères Jésuites ont leur demeure, sur le bord d'une petite rivière qui se décharge dans cell's de Saincte Croix, appelée la rivière Jacques Cartier,

and further,

Je tiens que dans cette rivière [Sainte-Charles] ... ce fut le lieu où Jacques Quartier yverna, d'autant qu'il ya a encore à une lieue dans la rivière des vestiges comme d'une cheminée dont on a trouvé le fondement, & apparence d'y avoir eu des fossez autour de leur logement, qui était petit. Nous trouvasons aussi de grandes pièces de bois escarrée, vermoulues, et quelques 3 or 4 balles de canon....Toutes ces choses,

he thinks,

monstrent éuidement que c'a esté une habituation, laquelle a esté fondée par des...
This, coming from a highly capable observer who made exploration his life's work and who was close in time to the events referred to, is evidence which cannot lightly be dismissed. We must, I think, accept Champlain's opinion that the Saint Croix of Cartier's time corresponds to the Saint-Charles of Champlain's and our own, and that the place occupied by the Jesuit Fathers in his day was the same as that where Cartier's "fort" had once stood. The identity of the "rivière Jacques Cartier" mentioned by Champlain as the Laiaret is not specific, but it is apparent from the evidence of some of the maps which will be discussed below.

Another contemporary and important piece of evidence comes from the writings of the Recollet brother, Gabriel Sagard-Théodat. Sagard-Théodat recorded that en l'an 1627, ils [les Recollets] leur [les Jesuites] en prêteront encore une autre [charpente] que nos Religieux avaient derechef fait dresser pour agrandir notre couvent lesquelles ils ont employées à leur bâtiment commencé au delà de la petite rivière sept ou 800 pas de nous, en un lieu que l'on appelé communément le fort du Jacques-Cartier (Sagard-Théodat 1866: 788).

The volume of documentary material relating to the Jesuit holdings on the Saint-Charles is too extensive to be examined in detail here. Briefly, it can be said that the Jesuits were granted a seigniory in 1626, on the north bank of the Saint-Charles, which was to extend from the creek called Saint-Michel for a league eastward to the Sainte-Marie or Beauport River on the east (Malouin 1955: 11), and back from the Saint-Charles for 4 leagues. There can be no doubt that the land on both sides of the Laiaret was once part of the Jesuit fief. Malouin says the first Jesuits chose as a place to build their residence the point of land

opposé à cet endroit que le frère Sagard et
Champlain indiquent dans leurs écrits sous le
nom de Port Jacques-Cartier, la ou l'immortel
découvreur du canada avait érigé en 1535, un
petit fort pour se mettre à l'abri des attaques
des sauvages (Malouin 1955: 11; Malouin quotes
from Dionne 1913).

A house or cabin was ready for occupancy in April 1626 (Malouin 1955: 12); Le Jeune says it was 200 paces from the riverbank and had four low rooms, but he does not indicate the manner of construction. That it was of wood is most
likely, for he says "Il y a même grandeur vis-à-vis, mais ils ont été brûlé par les Anglais" (Malouin 1955: 13). It was rebuilt, apparently, and was used as a residence until 1637; in that year it became a seminary for the instruction of Indians. The seminary, it is said, endured for five years (Malouin 1955: 13).

The seigniory of Notre-Dame des Anges was, after the 1640s, devoted largely to agriculture and cleared. In 1666 there were 112 residents, including 33 small farmers, 2 tailors, a mason, 5 carpenters, a woodworker, a hatter, a pastry cook, a weaver, a miller and others (Malouin 1955: 14). By 1690 the seigniory was well cultivated; the Jesuits ran it themselves with the help of hired farmers whom they housed and provided with tools, but it was quite some time since the Fathers had actually lived there (Malouin 1955: 21).

There now seems to occur a long lacuna when very little was recorded concerning the site. Malouin does, however, say that several ship-building yards occupied the land between the Saint-Michel and the Laireset, but these had all disappeared by 1885-90 just as had all other forms of industry in the area (Malouin 1955: 25-26). Previous to this date, also, a mill, known as Bickell's, stood on the Laireset and a brickyard belonging to a sieur Lauzon was located in St. Roch parish. Landron and Larcheveau's brickyard of 1680 was reputed to have been found in the same parish and reactivated by a M. Richard.

For further information, it is possible to consult maps of various vintages. The first of these which I have had an opportunity of examining is known as "La Ville de Quebec en 1660" and is attributed by the Inventaire des Oeuvres d'Art of the Province of Quebec to the Archives of Quebec Seminary. (Rev. Adrien Pouliot, S.J., says that this map is not in the Archives of Quebec Seminary and that it should bear the date 1663.) It is little more than a picture drawn from memory and would seem to show a building, or probably two, between the Laireset and Saint-Michel. If this is so, the Jesuit seigniory is located wrongly. In any event, it offers no firm information. The next map, dated 1685-86, drawn "very exactly" and "measured on the spot," was made by the sieur de Villeneuve; it clearly shows the "rivière de Larray." Less distinctly, on the west bank of the Laireset, a group of buildings is indicated with a small cultivated area around them. There appear to be four buildings, but the copy which I consulted is indistinct and there may be more. The distance from the nearest corner of a building to the Saint-Charles appears to be somewhat greater than the width of that stream and the most distant corner would be 3-1/2 times that distance. This I believe would place at least some of the buildings north of Julien Street and west of François 1er Street, provided the scale is at all accurate. If the dark line below the buildings represents
the higher land to the north, then the buildings were situated about half-way between the bank of the Saint-Charles and the higher land. However, it comes very close to suggesting that at least part of the buildings may have stood on or near the spot where the masonry was found.

What appears to be a later edition of this map, issued in 1690, shows at least one building, square in shape, in the northwest corner of one of two fields on the west bank of the Lairet. If we assume that the width of the Saint-Charles River has remained constant and is shown here at low tide, the distance between the Saint-Charles and the nearest corner of the building is greater than the width of that stream and at least 2-1/2 times the width of the Lairet west of it. This could conceivably place the building just east of François Ier Street but probably north of Julien Street. The creek is identified here as the "de la ray."

With the next map, that of de Couange, dated 1701 (Malouin 1955: 20), we enter the 18th century. It shows nothing of interest except the extent of the Jesuit estate. The McKellar map (1759) brings us down to a more modern period when better surveying techniques were available and it has the appearance of considerable accuracy. It shows four buildings in a field, apparently not cultivated as farmland; the field is rectangular with the long side to the Saint-Charles and this is only a little more than half as wide as that river. Two buildings are shown as being very close to the banks of the Saint-Charles and one as being near the junction of the two streams - and well within the area now excavated. The fourth is also probably in it. But there is no further information as to what the buildings were nor of what construction; since no vestige of these appears to have survived, they were probably wooden structures without foundations. The scale indicates clearly that all of the area was included in the site now excavated.

B.M. King's map, published the following year, is indistinct, but it does show two and probably three buildings on our site; their location differs sufficiently from those shown on McKellar's map to put one or both in doubt. Only the most northerly structure appears in more or less the same location on both. King shows the open field as more nearly square than does McKellar.

A 1776 plan of Quebec, often referred to as Eaden's map, shows Notre-Dame des Anges as east of the Lairet. Perhaps more significantly, it indicates an open field, irregular in outline and so probably not fenced, five rectangular areas which we take to be gardens, and four rectangular buildings, all about the same size. The width of the site from north to south is shown as somewhat less than one-half the width of the Saint-Charles to the south of it, while its dimension from east to west is only slightly less. In any case, the site is smaller than the present
Cartier-Brébeuf Park. As for the buildings, all of which must of necessity have been on the area just explored, two are close to and parallel to the Saint-Charles, while the remaining ones are oriented at right angles to that stream and lie between the other two; but farther back from the Saint-Charles.

With the remaining maps we move into the 19th century and become even more remotely separated from the object of our interest. A look at them may be profitable, however, as showing modern changes, although it must be borne in mind that the record is far from complete. Wallace's plan of 1861 calls the Lairet the Saint-Michel and leaves the Saint-Michel unidentified. Between the two, if we can rely on such a carelessly made record, are A. St. John's shipyards, W. Cotnam's shipyards and T. St. John's shipyards, while on the east side of the Lairet is G.H. Parke's shipyard. It would be difficult, in view of the inaccuracy of the delineation of the courses of the Lairet and Saint-Charles, to say whether the first of these was located on our site, but it probably was not.

Sitwell's "Fortification Survey of 1864-67" is well done and shows the location of buildings and other features in great detail. On it, Richard's sawmills are shown on the west bank of the Lairet, which at the time had been straightened at this point. An old bridge crossed a few yards to the north of it and the road from it, which appears from the map to have been projected rather than actually existing, would have crossed the site. Judging from the scale attached, the smithy shown near the sawmills would just barely intrude upon the present Cartier-Brébeuf Park assuming that the river banks have not altered position in the meantime. The small rectangular building near the Saint-Charles was not found nor was any trace of the sawmills; however, the latter structure was located over the tidal flats which were not explored. It is worthy of note that the banks have changed considerably in the last 90 years and particularly the Lairet has shifted eastward and a landsplit has built up east of the site where it once debouched. The built-up land referred to in the section dealing with the excavation, in squares Fl0L, Fl0m, etc., was probably the result of activity centred around the sawmills.

Finally, an 1867 map, probably also by Sitwell, shows most of the same features as the last. It is interesting to us chiefly for its comment that "Jacques Cartier Wintered Here A.D. 1535," placed at a cove at the mouth of the Saint-Michel where a small creek entered it.

So far as we know, there are no contemporary maps of the site either from Champlain's time or from the first three or four decades of the Jesuit occupancy. The earliest, Villeneuve's, does show the location of a clearing and some buildings on the west side of the Lairet which are
identified as Notre-Dame des Anges; while that of de Couange - the next one available - suggest that the west side of the Lairet was part of the Comté d'Crainville though still within the bounds of the Seignieury Notre-Dame des Anges. The post-1760 maps are more detailed and evidently more exact; the first of these - McKellar's of 1759 - shows one group of four buildings on the west side of the Lairet and other buildings on the east side. King's map of 1760 is of limited use; it marks a couple of buildings on the west and none on the east. Seventeen years later, according to the Eaden map, there were several fields and four buildings west of the junction of the Lairet with the Saint-Charles and what we take to be a church, since it is labelled Notre-Dame des Anges, across the stream on the east bank.

The maps of the 19th century cannot be expected to afford much evidence of conditions in the 1600s nor do they, but they do indicate what disturbance and change may have occurred on the site over the years. Thus, Wallace's map of 1861 tells us there was a shipyard nearby; Sitwell's of 1864-67 pinpoints the location of Richard's sawmill and a smithy.

In assessing the value of these maps for archaeological purposes, we should remember that none of them shows contours; hence, we have no means of knowing how the present heights of the land compare with those of a century ago. Also, the farther back in time one goes, the less accurate in detail maps in general are likely to become. Indeed, not until the advent of aerial surveying have maps become wholly reliable. The best available prior to that event, and in whose preparation skilled engineers using fine precision instruments were used, were often found to be incomplete or actually erroneous. Hence we must not rely too implicitly upon any of the old maps; we can take them only as indicative. To this extent, I think it acceptable to say that there were buildings on the Parc Cartier-Brébeuf site or very close to it around the mid-18th century. Probably also in Villeneuve's time there were one or two buildings there and perhaps as early as 1685 the Lairet was known by its present name. The 1690 version of Villeneuve's map shows four and possibly five buildings close to, if not actually upon, the present site. For the most part, the map evidence suggests that the Jesuit buildings were west of the Lairet, but the Eaden map introduces a doubt by showing Notre-Dame des Anges on the east bank.

Needless to say, no map bears any evidence as to the location of Cartier's camp; that on Sitwell's plan must be regarded as apocryphal.

A very considerable body of documents is extant bearing on the Jesuit occupation of the site in question, but it is hardly within the scope of an archaeological investigation to discuss it in detail. In sum, it seems quite obvious, in view of Champlain's remarks on the subject, that the Jesuits
occupied the spot where Cartier camped (and this should be taken to mean not literally the exact location, but approximately) and that from that time until the end of the 17th century, the Jesuit occupation was continuous. The Fathers did not necessarily live there throughout the period though they did in the beginning, but operated the seignieury by means of hired and other help, to the number at times of 129 people, who undoubtedly did live on it.

What happened in the following centuries is far from clear. Buildings came and went and evidently left no trace for the most part. Why should this be so? Because for one thing, these buildings were probably of an impermanent type, that is, they were wooden structures merely sitting on the ground. I believe this would have been the case with barns and sheds and probably also with cheap houses. Not so, however, with at least some of the buildings of the Jesuit period. A mason was retained by them and it is entirely likely that he and his helpers prepared stone foundations for at least some of the buildings and furnished them with fireplaces as well. Why then are the remains of them not found more abundantly? The answer to this question seems to lie in the activities of the last 75 years and that same activity may readily account likewise for the absence of any evidence of Cartier's sojourn.

Archaeological evidence indicated that in many places on the site the topsoil had been removed. It was also apparent that a brickyard had been operated on it in the not-too-distant past and certainly within the present century. It would seem logical in view of the nature of the soil to expect that the topsoil had been removed in order to reach the clay and that the clay had then been used to make bricks. Local tradition amply bears this out. Various residents of the nearby streets reported that within their memory, even as late as the 1920s, a M. Paradis had had a brickyard here and more recently A.J.H. Richardson has informed me that Quebec directories record the existence of a brickyard on the site in 1893-94. Narcisse Leroux, of 95 Papineau Street, gave me a rough map on which he tried to show the depth of soil which had been removed from various places in the neighbourhood for brick making and it often reached as much as 7 ft. While we have no means of knowing now how much was taken from our site, it is beyond question that the height of the terrain was reduced, more perhaps in some places than in others, but certainly reduced. As the soil was removed, so also were any ancient objects, evidence of palisading and building structures. Only on the high spots, left untouched by these activities, did anything escape. And it was precisely on these spots that some slight traces of ancient occupation were found.

Structure 1 bears striking similarities to masonry found at Ste. Marie I, also built in the early 17th century under Jesuit auspices. Not only is the technique directly
comparable, for in both flat stones were built up almost regardless of coursing and a dependence laid upon the width of the wall and a hearting of small stones for bonding, but more importantly, timbers were employed as a sort of sill upon which to construct the masonry superstructure. At the Ste. Marie I site timbers were used under the bastion walls just as they were under structure 1; the only difference being that in the latter the timber was usually smaller as befitted a smaller structure (Kidd 1949). I know of no other occurrence of this structural feature although it may still be used in places. My inclination is to equate it with 17th-century French-Canadian architecture until and unless it is proven to have a wider physical and temporal distribution. If we accept this position, we can accept structure 1 as being of 17th-century origin. Its delapidated condition at present may safely be attributed to the ravages of time, particularly in the fairly recent period when it was pillaged to obtain stone to build the modern masonry near it. The remark that the other adjacent structures are modern eliminates any need for further consideration of them. Further, the fact that so much building activity has occurred where structure 1 stands will account for the presence of the large stones lying round about. (Leroux told me that he placed some of these stones himself as foundations for a shed.) The same theory will account for the fact that structure 1 has been exposed and later covered with modern debris. How the modern nail got down into the face of the wall casts some doubt on its antiquity, it is true.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In sum, I suggest that structure 1 may date from the 17th century and that the complete absence of any other remains in situ, either of palisading, buildings or specimens, is due to the devastating activities which have occurred on the site in modern times and which have obliterated them along with the very soil in which they lay. Any further investigations would seem to be foredoomed to disappointment. In the event, it would seem best to accept structure 1 as probable evidence of 17th-century occupation and to accept the fact that the remains of Cartier's "fort," if it were here, is not now likely to exist.
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Figure 1. Cartier-Brébeuf Park (Townend Property) 1959. The dotted line shows the river at low tide. Projecting from the bank in Section S is the ruins of an old wharf. (Map prepared by S. Epps, adapted from G. Trottier.)
Figure 2. View of Cartier-Brébeuf Park (Townend property) looking north from the south bank of the Saint-Charles River at high tide.

Figure 3. View across the site looking west from the junction of the Lairret and Saint-Charles rivers.
Figure 4. System of identification of excavation units. Black square is excavated unit J17P. (Plan by S. Epps, adapted from G. Trothier.)
Figure 5. Detail of the excavation, according to the plan of Cartier-Brébeuf Park (Townend Property) 1959. (Map prepared by S. Epps, adapted from G. Trottier.)
Figure 6. Profile J5b-J5a showing coarse material on top of natural stratification beneath. The sudden and uniform transition suggests the removal of upper levels of the natural deposits.

Figure 7. Profile through ditch (L4a-L5a) looking east.
Figure 8. Profile through L8a-L9a, upper levels.

Figure 9. Profile through L8a-L9a, lower levels.
Figure 10. View of portion of brick flooring in Area 2.

Figure 11. View of squares F10L and F10m showing profiles of levels 1 to 21 in the F11L-F11m-F11n line.
Figure 12. South profile of squares F10L and F10m.
(Drawing by S. Epps, from field drawing.)
Figure 13. Evidence of fill above a layer of mortar, stone rubble and refuse in profile J5k–J4k, looking west.

Figure 14. Refuse material including bone, mortar, glass, pottery and iron nails from square J4j.
Figure 15. View of square P4d looking west and showing wooden plank set on edge.

Figure 16. Detail of masonry wall in square Yla, looking south.
Figure 17. Overall view looking north over masonry structure 1.

Figure 18. Specimens found in association with masonry structure 1.
Figure 19. Iron axe of 17th-century French style, three-pronged fork, and iron nails from squares Hla and Ylb.

Figure 20. Brick from flooring near structure 1.
Figure 21. Sherds of pottery and chinaware from square H10a.

Figure 22. Sherds from Grenzhausen type ware, an iron nail and other sherds from square P4i.
Figure 23. Two small glass bottles, one of white glass, the other of brown glass.

Figure 24. Fragments of a glass crucifix from square H5t.
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Kenneth E. Kidd's 1959 excavations at Cartier-Brébeuf Park in Quebec City failed to locate traces of Jacques Cartier's wintering quarters of 1535-36. As Kidd had excavated on the west bank of the Lairet River, test excavations were carried out on the east bank in 1962. All topsoil, and perhaps an unknown quantity of the subsoil, had been removed and subsequently replaced with modern fill. This may be attributable to earlier brick making in the area. If Cartier's camp had indeed been in this area, no trace of it is now likely to be found.

Submitted for publication 1963, by John H. Rick, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Ottawa.
INTRODUCTION

From 27 September to 4 October 1962, a field party of the National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, under the direction of the author, undertook archaeological investigations at the junction of the Saint-Charles and Lairet rivers in Quebec City. The purpose of this work was to locate, if possible, the remains of a fort built by Jacques Cartier during the winter of 1535-36 and supposedly located in this area.

Prior to this, in 1959, the Branch had employed Kenneth E. Kidd to search for the fort. Kidd's excavations were carried out on a strip of vacant land, known as the Townend property (and subsequently included in the national historic site) located on the north bank of the Saint-Charles immediately west of the Lairet (Fig. 1). No trace of Cartier's fort was found. Kidd concluded that further work on the site would prove fruitless (Kidd 1976).

Since nothing had been found on the west bank of the Lairet, it was decided to undertake exploratory excavation on the east bank. The 1962 work took place on a small area of vacant land consisting of Cartier-Brébeuf Park and an adjoining lot the the west (Fig. 1).
THE EXCAVATIONS

Six men were hired locally, the excavation area was fenced in and digging began in a 10-ft by 10-ft square (operation 1A) in the higher ground (that is, the vacant lot) to the west of the park. Concurrently, a row of eight 10-ft by 6-ft pits (operation 2A) was laid out roughly in line with the east sidewalk of avenue Cadillac (Fig. 2).

Every pit in operation 2A was excavated in order to provide a north-south soil profile cutting across the park. The uppermost stratum in each pit is a light brown sandy clay, 1.0 ft to 1.3 ft in thickness. Artifacts were abundant in this layer, but most are obviously 20th century and none appear to predate the 19th century.

Below stratum I is a layer of brown sand, so light in colour that the uppermost stratum appears dark by contrast. This sand seems to be a water-deposited layer undisturbed by human activity and, with the single exception discussed below, devoid of artifacts. No postmoulds were visible on the surface of this second stratum.

A third stratum is a very light brown sandy clay and, like the sand, is apparently water-deposited and undisturbed. A few twigs were found in this level, but these are unworked and their presence is not inconsistent with a belief in the water-deposition of the clay layer.

The centremost of the eight pits was excavated to a depth of 6.2 ft Below Surface (B.S.), while the others were dug to at least 3 ft B.S. (Fig. 3). No new strata were encountered down to this depth.

Two new pits were then laid out, continuing the operation 2A line 20 ft to the south. Only the southernmost of these was excavated and it showed no change in the stratigraphic sequence encountered in the eight northern pits (Fig. 3).

On 29 September Rev. Adrien Pouliot, S.J., visited the site and told us that all of the higher ground to the west of the park had been formed within the last decade by filling in part of the wide mouth of the Lairet. The rise in ground level from the park to the vacant lot marks the spot where the park had once dropped sharply into the Lairet. As a result of this information, we decided against further excavation to the west of the park. The operation 1A square had, by this time, been excavated to a depth of 1.0 ft B.S. through obviously disturbed soil filled with modern artifacts.
Deciding to test near the east end of the park, we put in a row of nine 10-ft by 6-ft pits (operation 1B) roughly in line with the west sidewalk of Aiguebelle Street. Beginning with the northernmost, every other pit was dug, making a total of five pits excavated (Fig. 2). The uppermost stratum in operation 1B is similar to that found in operation 2A, but runs somewhat deeper, averaging 1.6 ft in thickness. Underneath is the same water-deposited sand and below that the sandy clay. The three northernmost pits were excavated to below 3 ft B.S. without encountering any change in stratigraphy (Fig. 4).

By this time, it seemed fairly obvious that there was no hope of finding 16th-century material in the park. However, to make absolutely certain, two more lines of pits were dug. The first of these (operation 1C) consisted of seven excavated 10-ft by 6-ft pits in a row beginning near the north end of operation 2A and running across part of the park. The second (operation 1D) comprised nine excavated 10-ft by 6-ft pits in a line extending from near the south end of operation 2A eastwards to within 21 ft of the southernmost pit of operation 1B. In these two new operations, each excavated pit was separated from the next by 10 ft of undug ground (Fig. 2).

In addition to the above, four new 10-ft by 10-ft squares were excavated (operation 1A). Two of these were between operation 1B and the eastern boundary of the park; one lay between the northernmost operation 1B pit and the southernmost pit in operation 1C, and the fourth was within the area enclosed by operations 1C, 1D, 2A and the stone monument (Fig. 2).

The new excavations demonstrated that the same strata occur throughout the park. In each pit was found the same uppermost stratum (viz., disturbed light brown soil containing modern artifacts) underlain by a stratum of apparently undisturbed sand, very light brown in colour. The top of this sand layer was examined for postmoulds; none were found. With this, excavation at the park ended.

The pit outlines were surveyed in relation to the stone monument in the western third of the park. The top of the northeastern foot bolt in the base of the iron commemorative cross was chosen as a bench mark and arbitrarily assigned an elevation of 50 ft. With this as vertical datum, soil profiles were drawn for the operation 2A and 1B pits (Figs. 3 and 4). It was considered unnecessary to draw profiles of the other excavations because of the common stratigraphy across the park.

Excavations were backfilled and the fencing removed. It should be noted that all excavation was done with shovels, there being no occasion to use more delicate tools.
Artifacts were intended to be segregated into lots by pit and stratum. However, since only the uppermost layer (with one exception) produced artifacts, the lot numbers merely reflect a horizontal division by excavation unit. In view of the obviously disturbed nature of the soil, it is not thought that the horizontal disturbance of artifacts has any archaeological significance.

Most of the artifacts are objects easily assigned to the 20th century: beer-bottle caps, pop bottles, wire nails, etc. These have been noted and discarded. A few potsherds could, perhaps, date from the 19th century, but there is little point in attempting to determine this. Verification would involve much work and would merely show that old material had been mixed with new and that the whole had been deposited fairly recently. This latter point is already obvious.

For the same reasons, it was not considered worthwhile to identify the various animal bones recovered.

The presence of lot numbers in Figure 2 thus shows whether or not artifacts were found in the uppermost stratum of a given pit. The exceptions to this are operation 1A, lot 1, which is the uppermost foot of a mound of fill supposedly many feet deep, and operation 2A, where lots 8 and 9 together represent the topsoil layer in one pit.

In the southernmost of the first eight operation 2A pits, a small fragment of glass was found in the sand layer, 2.8 ft B.S. (operation 2A, lot 10). This is the only artifact recovered from below the uppermost stratum. This piece is probably a fragment from a modern cosmetic jar, but no date has been definitely established. There are a number of ways of accounting for the presence of the fragment, but in view of the overall results of the excavation, the point hardly seems important. Even if the glass could be dated to the 16th century, this would not alter the conclusions reached.
CONCLUSIONS

The fact that no trace of Cartier's fort was found is hardly surprising; even if one accepts as fact the belief that he wintered near the junction of the Saint-Charles and the Lairet, there is absolutely no proof that he built his fort in the particular area where we dug. And had he done so, there would have been only a slight chance that traces would have survived in an area that has been the centre of so much human activity for so many years. What is astonishing is that we uncovered no evidence of the shipbuilding, brick making and other industries known to have been carried out on this spot in more recent times. All traces of pre-20th-century activity on the park site have been obliterated.

The available evidence suggests that at some time in the past all topsoil was stripped from the park and with it all older cultural material plus, perhaps, part of the light brown sand layer beneath. The park was then resurfaced, with much of the fill presumably coming from city trash-heaps. That all this took place fairly recently is attested to by the modernity and good condition of many of the artifacts, for example, a key case of unrotted leather, with unrusted zipper and keys. On the other hand, a number of the metal objects are badly rusted, which suggests that all artifacts are not of the same age, albeit of the same date of deposition. This supports the belief that the fill came from a garbage dump.

If the above conjecture is true, one should be able to determine, from the records of the City Parks Department, the date when the work was done and the reason for doing it. For the purposes of this report it is sufficient to note that, if Cartier's fort was ever on the site of the park, no trace of it has survived.
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Figure 4. Composite section through OP.1B pits.
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ABSTRACT

During the summer of 1969, the National Historic Parks and Sites Branch conducted a dig at Cartier-Brébeuf Park. It was an archaeological salvage project carried out on the exact site of the planned water main to divert the Lairet River, in case the excavation required for the water main revealed any archaeological remains, especially from Cartier's fort constructed in the winter of 1535-36.

However, no trace of the settlement was found.

Presented for publication 1969 by Marcel Moussette, Parks Canada, Quebec Region.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank all of the staff at Artillery Park in Quebec City, in particular the superintendent, Mr. René Fournier, whose availability and efficiency greatly facilitated the organization and accomplishment of our work.

The workers who participated in the dig were Michel Lebrun, Gilles Leblanc, Richard Grenier, André Godbout, Raymond Côté, Richard Chabot, and Norbert Marceau.
INTRODUCTION

The salvage excavation took place from July 24 to August 8, 1969 at Cartier-Brébeuf Park, located at the junction of the Lairet and Saint-Charles Rivers within Quebec City. It followed previous digs at the same site by Kenneth E. Kidd (Kidd 1959) and John H. Rick (Rick 1962), undertaken to uncover the site of the fort built by Cartier in the winter of 1535-36. These digs were fruitless: no evidence whatsoever of mid-16th century occupation was found.

Cartier-Brébeuf Park was to undergo major development beginning in August 1969, including, on the former Townend property, the digging of a canal for a galvanized corrugated steel pipe 15 ft 6 in. in diameter intended to divert the Lairet River (Fig. 1). The purpose of our dig, then, was to definitely establish by means of lengthwise and crosswise cuts the presence or absence of archaeological remains (especially those of Jacques Cartier's fort) on the proposed location of the canal.

As shown in Figure 1, a large portion of this area had already been explored by Kidd in 1959, with no results. Nonetheless, to preclude any eventual criticism, we decided to partially redig his excavations, sometimes with deeper cuts, and to extend the excavation at the two ends of the proposed canal. Our reconnaissance work was limited by two main obstructions: at the north, a layer of fill at least 5 in. thick, and in the centre, a softball field, still "in use," where we thought excavation would be inadvisable.

Our work consisted in digging trenches 2 to 3 ft wide by 4, 10, or 25 ft in length, depending on the location. Trench depths varied from 2 to 5 ft. Some of the more important trenches are marked on Figure 1, to show their position in relation to the general topography of the site and the work done by Kidd.

The median marking the middle of the canal was chosen as the arbitrary north; this axis is 39° west of the magnetic north. When we speak of north in this report, we are referring to this arbitrary north.

Figure 2 is a scale plan of all the trenches we dug as part of Operation 2G3. The exact location of the trenches can always be determined by reference to geodesic point ST12 on the Vandry and Bergeron map. The size, direction, and arrangement of the trenches were chosen so as to cover as much ground as possible, affording reasonable certainty that
no archaeological remains had been missed. Since these were merely reconnaissance trenches, we did not think it necessary to divide them into parcels. Therefore, with two exceptions, the trenches have only a single identification number.
Judging by the selection of profiles shown in Figure 2, human occupation of the site was the cause of many upheavals. However, it seems that the general stratigraphy comprises four layers: 1. a surface layer of peat; 2. a layer of brown alluvial soil; 3. a layer of relatively sandy grey clay with rusty patches; 4. layers of sand sills in the lower part of the grey clay layer.

In most cases, no artifacts were found below 1 ft from the top of the brown alluvial soil layer. When artifacts were found below this level, such as the wooden drain uncovered approximately 3 ft below the surface (Fig. 2), signs of disturbance were evident. Relatively modern pieces of brick were found at the surface and others had been used to fill holes and trenches that had been dug; they served as a good means of dating structures.
FINDINGS

Among the most interesting artifacts is the green glaze pottery from the 18th century, uncovered in trench 2G3A1 in a layer of black organic soil, along with some handmade nails, possibly dating from the same period. Unfortunately, this layer corresponds to the same level at which fragments of brick were found, indicating, in our opinion, recent digging.

In trench 2G3D1, three pieces of timber were found side by side 4 ft below the surface (Fig. 3). These large pieces also appear to have been buried in the not-too-distant past, since they were covered by bricks and brick fragments found directly below the surface layers. Near the timber pieces we found a metal fragment covered with aluminum paint, indicating that digging had taken place quite recently.

Similarly, the rectangular wooden drain (1.4 ft by 0.7 ft, found in trench 2G3J1 [Fig. 2]), leading to the nearby Saint-Charles River, was covered by brick fragments and brown silt located directly below the surface, evidence that the drain had been built fairly recently.

In several trenches, we found a section of brick pavement covering a layer of brick dust, which in turn covered a layer of very fine, very black material (Fig. 2). This stratigraphy was described and interpreted previously by Kidd (Kidd 1959: 11-14). In our opinion, this section of brick pavement was used, as some of the older informants suggested, for drying fresh brick. It may have been part of the Rochette brickyard, which was still in operation about forty years ago, according to the same informants.

Similarly, the thick layer of bricks found in trench 2G3K1 near the Saint-Charles River (Fig. 2) may in fact be the Rochette brickyard dump. A thick layer of recent artifacts was uncovered in the same trench; their good condition indicates that they were deposited recently at the site. Furthermore, the stratigraphy of the area indicates that this refuse dump is later than the Rochette brickyard dump.
CONCLUSION

The stratigraphy of Cartier-Brébeuf Park indicates a great deal of previous disturbance. For the most part, the artifacts uncovered were recent and, based on the stratigraphy of the area, probably date back to a period contemporary with, or subsequent to, that of the Rochette brickyard, which was still in operation approximately 40 years ago. We found older artifacts dating back to the middle of the 18th century, but evidence showed that their context was unreliable. Our excavation work did not reveal any trace of French occupation during the middle of the 16th century. According to local informants, it would indeed have been remarkable to find remains of Jacques Cartier's fort. They told us that some 3 ft of soil had been removed from most of the area surrounding the site and was used for making bricks.
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ILLUSTRATIONS
Figure 1. General view of the site, showing the location of the proposed galvanized steel water main to divert the Laireset River into the Saint-Charles River (from Vandry and Bergeron map). We have also indicated some of the trenches we dug (solid rectangles marked with National Historic Parks and Sites Branch identification numbers) and the main grid of Kidd's excavation.
Figure 2. Operation 2G3: Plane drawing of trenches, with selected profiles, Cartier-Brébeuf Park, July-August 1969.
Figure 2. (cont'd)
Figure 3. Pieces of timber found in trench 2G3D1, shown in situ. The camera is pointed down and to the west; the trowel is pointing north.
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