

1884 Pigeon Lake Road, Geographic Township of Emily

Heritage Designation Evaluation

Emily Township
CON 11 PT LOT 19
2024



Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

The subject property has been researched and evaluated in order to determine its cultural heritage significance under Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O. 1990. A property is eligible for designation if it has physical, historical, associative or contextual value and meets any two of the nine criteria set out under Regulation 9/06 of the Act. Staff have determined that 1884 Pigeon Lake Road has cultural heritage value or interest and merits designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

1. The property has design value or physical value because it:

i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method:

The property is representative of a historic agricultural landscape in Emily Township. The property was first developed by non-indigenous settlers in the mid-1820s and the property has evolved from that period and is representative of the evolution of these landscapes from early settlement to the present day. The property includes both an early twentieth century concrete block farmhouse and barn, alongside limited fields, replanted forest lands and shoreline.

ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit:

The property displays a typical degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit for a property of this type.

iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement:

There are no specific technical or scientific achievements associated with this property.

2. The property has historical or associative value because it:

i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to the community:

The property has historic associations with the Peter Robinson settlement through its first owner, John Collins and his family. Collins arrived as part of the settlement scheme in 1825 with his family of ten and settled on this property which later passed through the hands of two of his children. Additionally, it has associations with the wider Irish Catholic community in Emily Township through its successive owners throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture:

The property yields information regarding the patterns of Irish Catholic settlement in Emily Township from the early nineteenth to early twentieth century through its succession of owners. Through these owners, it speaks to the impact of Irish Catholic settlers on the cultural

heritage landscape of the northern part of the township, highlighting the successive waves of settlement in the nineteenth century and the familial connections within the township.

iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to the community:

The designer or builder of the structures on the property are not known.

3. The property has contextual value because it:

i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area:

The property is important in maintaining the historic rural character of the majority of Emily Township. The township remains primarily rural and agricultural and is comprised of a mix of cultivated and forested lands on large historic land grants and including a mix of historic structures, such as barns and farmhouses.

ii. is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings:

The property is historically linked to its surroundings as part of the historic agricultural development of rural Emily Township dating from the early nineteenth century.

iii. is a landmark.

The property is not a specific landmark.

Design and Physical Value

1884 Pigeon Lake Road has design and physical value as a representative example of a nineteenth century rural farm in Emily Township and as evolved cultural heritage landscape. First settled by non-Indigenous settlers in 1825, the property typifies the 100 acre parcels granted to settlers in the township throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, retaining its lot layout from the time of its land grant. Although it was extensively reforested in the late twentieth century, the property retains key features of a historic farmstead, including cleared property, an early twentieth century farmhouse, and historic barn. The house is an important example of a concrete block Edwardian Classical house in Emily Township, while the barn demonstrates the evolution of agricultural structures by the turn of the twentieth century.

1884 Pigeon Lake Road is located on the east half of lot 19 in concession 11 of Emily Township and is approximately 100 acres in size, typical of surveyed agricultural lots from the early nineteenth century. The property was first surveyed in 1818 as part of the broader survey of Emily Township at this time that divided the township into 200 acre lots. The lots were granted to non-Indigenous settlers in half lots of 100 acres throughout the township to clear and develop into farms. The subject property has remained in its original size and orientation since its survey except for the southeast corner of the property; this section was originally a small wetland, but the area of wetland has expanded with the rise in water levels of Pigeon Lake in the late nineteenth century due to the development of the Trent Severn Waterway and the development of critical infrastructure, including mills and their associated dams. This had made the land area of the property slightly smaller than when originally surveyed and created a different landscape on the south side of the property than initially, both before and after it was surveyed.

The property was cleared for agricultural use beginning in 1825 when it was first granted to non-Indigenous settlers. From this time period, it followed a typical pattern of farmstead evolution in Ontario. This included the creation of cleared areas for crop cultivation and grazing, retained wooded and wetland areas that were either retained to denote areas within the property or because they were not suitable for agriculture, and built heritage features, notably the farmhouse and the barn. The farm, as a landscape, evolved slowly over time, as vegetated areas were gradually cleared as the settlers were able to do so and new buildings were constructed and then replaced as families became more settled and grew in prosperity.

The layout of the farm fifty years after it was initially settled can be seen on the 1877 map of Victoria County. The farmhouse, which was likely not the original structure, was located on the north side of the property, where the current house is located and surrounding by orchards. The location of the barn is not indicated on this map but it was likely in close proximity to the house

and orchards. The extent of clearing is not indicated on the map but the 1877 assessment roll indicated 40 of 100 acres were cleared at this time. These were likely arranged in defined fields on the north half of the property, closest to the built features and furthest from the wetland on the south side of the property.

The property continued to operate as a farm well into the twentieth century. The farmhouse and barn were replaced around 1920 with the current extant structures. This is very typical of agricultural buildings on nineteenth century farms which underwent periods of evolution. The earliest buildings – both residential and agricultural – were rudimentary and log, serving a purely utilitarian purpose as settlers established themselves on the land. They were replaced as the farm family became more established with frame buildings and larger barns and, often, those residential buildings were then again replaced with masonry structures. The fields also evolved as more land was cleared although, generally, by the late nineteenth century, the layout of spaces for grazing and cultivation had been established. The field layout and orientation can be seen in the 1954 and 1965 aerial photos which shows the buildings in their current location and several distinct fields along the north half of the property. The fields are distinguished with wooded areas, with the wetland portion of the property clear in its southern area. When viewed in relation to the farms in the surrounding area, this is the typical pattern of development, with farm parcels including fields, built structures, wooded areas and, in some cases, water features included wetlands and streams.

This layout is typical of a nineteenth century 100-acre farm, with closely clustered built features, and fields defined by vegetated areas. The wetland area is distinct to this property but is resultant from factors other than human design. The property, however, has had some substantial changes since it was originally cleared, notably that most of the rear fields have been replanted as part of a broader rewilding approach to the property, leaving on the area at the north end of property around and immediately adjacent to the house and barn without tree cover. However, the outlines of the fields are still visible though differentiation in the tree species between the newly planted areas and the historic field edges, particularly when viewed in contemporary aerial photos. In its historic and continued patterns of settlement, clearance and usage, the property is demonstrative of the nineteenth century farmstead, and forms an evolved cultural heritage landscape. The property has evolved from a natural space prior to settlement, to a nineteenth century farmstead with its associated build heritage and landscape features, to a contemporary rural property that includes both features of the nineteenth century farmstead as well as modifications overtime, including its more recent rewilding.

In addition to the broader significance of the property as a cultural heritage landscape, the property contains an early twentieth century farmhouse and

barn of around the same time period. These two structures each, on their own, have cultural heritage value as representative examples of their respective structural types. The house, constructed around 1920, is a representative example of a concrete block Edwardian Classical farmhouse while the barn, constructed around the same time, is representative of turn of the century barn design when older, smaller agricultural structures were supplanted by larger buildings with gambrel roofs to accommodate increasing agricultural yields.

Concrete developed as a construction material throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Although concrete had been used as far back as the Roman Empire where it was used extensively for infrastructure, it was not a widespread or traditional building material in Europe or North America. It was not until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that European architects and builders began to investigate the potential for a modern form of cement that could be used in both architecture and infrastructure with modest successes in the late eighteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In 1824, English mason Joseph Aspdin patented Portland cement, the first reliable artificial cement to be used in concrete construction. While this development occurred in the early decades of the nineteenth century, concrete was still not widespread as a building material as the formula and production methods were developed and refined throughout the nineteenth century. By the 1870s, Great Britain was the largest producer and exporter of cement and concrete products, although it was surpassed by the United States by the end of the century, a time in which cement and concrete production increased exponentially across both Europe and North America.

Until around 1900, concrete was primarily used for industrial construction, particularly when combined with structural steel to create reinforced concrete, which could support the large structures required in growing industrializing cities. It was, however, occasionally used in residential construction at least as early as the 1870s but was generally not seen as a preferred material for residential buildings, particularly detached and semi-detached housing. Concrete did, however, have several benefits, namely that it was relatively inexpensive, particularly when compared with stone, and it was fire resistant. It was not, however, easy to use as it generally had to be cast in place, or was integrated into other masonry buildings as architectural elements as opposed to being used for an entire structure.

This changed around the turn of the century with the development of technology to cast concrete blocks. Although there had been experimentation with this type of technology for several decades, a patent was filed in 1900 by Harmon S. Palmer in the United States for a cast iron machine to allow the mass manufacture of hollow concrete blocks and, with that, the technology

took off. Within the next ten years, companies had sprung up across North America manufacturing these construction components and they were quickly integrated into new buildings including residential structures. These blocks were extremely easy to make and the machines that made them were small enough to be used outside of a factory context; by 1905, mail order companies such as Sears were actually selling concrete block making machines for home use, allowing construction amateurs and individuals to manufacture concrete blocks for their own homes.

Around this time, concrete also began to become accepted as a material for residential construction, specifically because it was durable and because it was viewed as a cheaper alternative to stone. Designs for concrete block houses began to appear in patterns books in the early twentieth century and by 1910 were being offered as part of kit homes by Sears, a major provider of mail order home kits during this period that shipped house kits across North America. In order to create a less industrial look to these homes, the blocks were manufactured using pigments or with ornamental, rusticated faces in an attempt to mimic stone. Machines that people bought to make concrete blocks from places like Sears generally included moulds to make rusticated faces which would be oriented to the outside of the house. Large block manufacturer also produced rusticated blocks and regularly marketed them as “cast stone” or “rockface” blocks. As a result, concrete became substantially more popular as a building material during this period as, although still more expensive than wood, it was cheaper than stone in general, but it could also be cheaper than brick to lay because the blocks were larger, allowing people to construct masonry homes at a lower expense. It also allowed for the creation of ornate decorative elements, as concrete could be cast in a variety of mould to imitate decorative stone and terracotta work popular in Edwardian Classical architecture – the preferred domestic architectural style at the time – at a lower cost.

The use of rusticated concrete blocks for residential construction persisted from about 1900 to 1930, although there are certainly examples from after this period. It was often viewed as a construction material of the middle and lower middle classes; throughout this period, there was a significant amount of snobbery in architectural circles over the use of concrete blocks as a form of imitation stone but this did not lessen its popularity for modest and mid-sized homes across both Canada and the United States where it was used with regularity in both urban and rural settings.

The house on the property at 1884 Pigeon Lake Road is an excellent example of this construction type in rural Emily Township where there are few examples of rockface concrete block construction; other examples do exist in Kawartha Lakes and were constructed around the same time period. The house was constructed around 1920, at the height of the popularity of this

construction method and uses concrete blocks in a number of ways; the 1921 census shows that it was in place on the lot with 6 rooms occupied by the Twomey family who lived there. Standard plain face blocks have been used for the foundation, a common practice, while the bulk of the house was constructed with rockface blocks with a tooled edge and quoins accentuated by the use of panel faced blocks. All three of these block types were very common in the 1910s and 1920s and could be both purchased from manufacturers and manufactured by the builder using a home-use machine and its associated design inserts; all three of these design inserts were sold for use by amateur manufacturers. Concrete elements have also been used for lugsills and lintels, as well as the concrete piers for the porch on the front of the house and the chimney, while wooden elements are used for columns, railings, windows, soffits and fascia, as well as the dormers. The interior of the house is much as any other house from the early decades of the twentieth century with wooden trim and flooring and plaster walls; there is no evidence from the interior of the building of the house's primary construction material.

Stylistically, the house is built in the Edwardian Classical style which, as noted above, was the preferred domestic architectural style of the early decades of the twentieth century. By the late nineteenth century, European and North American architects were turning away from the flamboyant and medieval-inspired architecture of the Victorian period, in favour of a more subdued and restrained Classical aesthetic. Throughout the long Edwardian period, architecturally from about 1890 to 1930, Classical styles prevailed in domestic, commercial and institutional architecture. In institutional and public building design, in particular, this shift manifested with the reintroduction of exaggerated Classical features, such as columns, pediments, and porticos, and heavy decorative elements. In domestic design, however, the style was expressed more simply through selective application of Classical design elements to buildings with solid and regular massing.

Two primary domestic types emerged: the Edwardian gable front house and the Edwardian foursquare. The Edwardian gable front, defined by their large front gable and entrance porch, were more typically found in urban centres as their tall and narrow massing was suitable for narrow lots in cities and towns. Edwardian foursquares, of which the house on the subject property is a representative example, were more commonly found in both urban and rural locations, with massing that could suit either a city lot or a farm, as can be seen in the subject property.

Edwardian foursquares were typically constructed on a square plan with a wide-eaves hipped roof and symmetrical massing and included two full storeys plus a half storey in the attic illuminated by dormer windows. These houses typically had a verandah across the full width of the front of the house where the primary entrance was located although occasionally, as is the case in the

subject property, the verandah was inset into the corner of the front elevation; the house at 1884 Pigeon Lake Road also includes an upper storey balcony which is uncommon but not atypical of this house type. Generally, these houses have a limited amount of decoration with a few Classical elements to associate them with the wider Classical stylistic type. These features typically include porches with columns and entablatures and heavy lintels and lug sills, as can be seen on the subject property. Edwardian foursquare houses are extremely common across Ontario, particularly in urban areas where houses of this style were constructed with regularity, particularly throughout the 1910s and 1920s.

The house is representative of this stylistic form and a good example of the use of the Edwardian Classical style in rural Emily Township, although aspects, such as the inset porch and balcony, are unusual for in a foursquare house. The use of concrete in an Edwardian foursquare, however, is not uncommon. While most examples of this house type in Ontario are built of brick, they were also built with concrete blocks on a relatively frequent basis. The rise of the Edwardian Classical style corresponded directly with the development of concrete blocks as a viable material for residential construction. When looking at both extant examples of the construction material as well as designs in pattern books for concrete block homes, most of these were designed in the Edwardian Classical style because they rose to popularity at the same time in the early twentieth century.

In addition to the house, the property also contains a turn of the century barn. The barn is believed to have been constructed around 1920, at about the same time as the house, and is a representative example of a gambrel roof barn constructed around this period. The barn, as with many other barns constructed around this time, includes a lower masonry storey stable and an upper loft, constructed using post and beam and with a gambrel roof. It shows how barns were constructed on Ontario farms in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and the evolution of agricultural buildings during this period.

The earliest barns, and likely what was constructed originally on this property when it was settled in 1825, were rudimentary structures. Generally one to one-and-a-half storeys in height, they were built quickly and, to today's viewers, would not be recognizable as a barn, but more closely resemble a medium sized shed. Roughly constructed, they were intended to house the limited number of livestock and feed that early settlers had. They were recognized as temporary buildings and usually constructed on a rectangular in log with either shed or gable roofs, with the understanding that they would be replaced by larger and more permanent structures as farms grew and prospered.

By the mid-nineteenth century, these rudimentary barns were being replaced with larger structures, generally of frame or post and beam construction with a

stable on the lower level and hay loft above. The stable was constructed from rubble stone and around seven feet in height, while the hay loft was erected above with wood construction. Sizes and shapes of these barns varied but, even in the mid-nineteenth century, were still usually fairly small, reflecting the still limited amount of livestock and more localized nature of farming at this time; farming was still primarily subsistence employment at this time in central Ontario and farms did not produce as much or have as much livestock as they would by the end of the century. It was around this time that the first bank barns in Ontario emerged, with the stable portion of the building integrated into the slope of a hill, where the landscape allowed it, to take advantage of the terrain to allow for at grade entrance into the barn from both levels. Most of these barns were still fairly simple structures with a gable roof and a rectangular plan and, with exceptions, were not overly large, but were still larger than their early log predecessors and more functional as part of a working mid-nineteenth century farm.

By the later decades of the nineteenth century, however, changing economic conditions charged farmers with the need for new barns and agricultural structures. By this period, farming, in most areas of southern and central Ontario, had evolved beyond a subsistence activity and into a business. Farms were producing more and selling their products further afield, leading to greater prosperity and the ability to expand their operations. Most farms at this time had more horses than previously as they worked more land than fifty years before and, as a result, need to house them and their feed, alongside that for cattle, pigs and other livestock. Mid-century barns were no longer adequate for their need and, from about 1880 to 1920, there was a significant uptick in the construction of new barns across the region to support increasingly large and prosperous farms. Some farmers simply added a wing onto their existing barn, but many built new.

The barn of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was, in many ways, similar to its immediate mid-nineteenth century predecessor, but larger and consistently constructed using post and beam construction to accommodate for their size. The stable was housed on the lower level, in both bank and conventional arrangements, with the hay loft above; in some cases, as with the barn on the subject property, earthworks were undertaken to create a bank for at grade access to the hay loft. While they were most often constructed on a rectangular plan, both T- and L-shaped plans were also used, particularly on larger farms where additional space was required. These barns generally either had a gable roof, like their predecessors, or a gambrel roof, a relatively new design feature in barn design that emerged in the late nineteenth century.

Gambrel roofs had first appeared on residential, commercial and institutional architecture in North America in the seventeenth century. Examples exist in the eastern United States from the mid-1600s and in Atlantic Canada from the

early 1700s; the oldest documented house in Nova Scotia, the de Gannes-Cosby house in Annapolis Royal, is constructed using this roof form. This roof line was prized because it maximized useable attic space and often features dormer windows to let light into the attic of the house. It had fallen out of favour in residential construction by the early nineteenth century but, by the end of that century, had found favour in barn construction for the same reason it was favoured in residential architecture: the addition of space within the roofline. With a gambrel roof, the hayloft was given additional volume without increasing the height of the sidewalls, allowing more hay to be stored within the barn on a similar footprint and height. Although gambrel roofs were more difficult to construct, their advantages from a storage perspective made them extremely attractive for farmers. They were also seen as being more windproof because of their roofline and could also be balloon framed, although many farmers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century continued to use traditional post and beam construction to erect barns of this style.

The extant barn on the property is highly typical of this type of gambrel roof barn from the turn of the twentieth century. This example is not particularly large but exemplifies the larger agricultural structures constructed in the late Victorian, Edwardian and interwar periods. It is built using post and beam construction with rough hewn, squared timbers throughout; the rafters and some of the smaller beams are rounded timbers while sawn lumber has been used for the knee braces and interior partitions. The stable walls are constructed from concrete, typical of this period when, as is evidenced by the house, concrete construction was increasing in popularity and accessibility across North America. It is built on a rectangular plan, as were most barns from this period. It is not known what this barn replaced, but there were certainly agricultural buildings on the property prior to the construction of the current barn. It is likely that it is the third generation of agricultural buildings on the property, replacing structures from the early and mid-nineteenth century, as the farm grew and developed.

Overall, the property has layers of design and physical value, both as a whole and through its individual built elements. As a whole, the property is representative of a nineteenth century 100-acre farm in Emily Township, despite changes to the landscape through the water level changes to Pigeon Lake and the more recent late twentieth century rewilding of large portions of the property. It is demonstrative of this type of evolved cultural heritage landscape through its build heritage elements, including the house and barn, the lot size and orientation, and its field layout, both former and current. Its two primary built elements, the house and barn, also exhibit cultural heritage value of their own as representative example of early twentieth century residential and agricultural building design trends.

Historical and Associative Value

1884 Pigeon Land Road has historic and associative value through its pattern of settlement throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century. First settled by non-Indigenous settlers in 1825, it was originally occupied by John Collins, who arrived in Emily Township as part of the Peter Robinson settlement and subsequently by other Irish Catholic settlers and families who arrived in Emily Township throughout the nineteenth century and occupied the property into the twentieth century. Through this pattern of settlement, the property yields information regarding Irish Catholic settlement in northern Emily Township throughout the nineteenth century, its impact on the landscape and the demographics of the community.

The area on in which the subject property is located did was not settled by non-indigenous people until the early nineteenth century. The land, located on the western side of Pigeon Lake, is the traditional territories of the Michi Saagiig Anishinaabe who occupied the land prior to the arrival of non-Indigenous settlers. There is not a specific narrative of occupation for the subject property itself but both oral histories and archaeological sites in the surrounding area speak to their long-standing occupation and traditional uses of the area. It is important to note that the landscape changes to this and surrounding properties as a result of the rising water level of Pigeon Lake have changed the pre-settlement landscape and may have obscured records of Indigenous occupation. With the arrival of non-Indigenous people in the area and the influx of settlement into Ontario, the government of Upper Canada sought to make treaties with the Michi Saagiig to coopt their lands for settlement. The property, as with the surrounding area, was included as part of the land negotiated as part of the Rice Lake Treaty, signed in 1818 by colonial government representatives and Michi Saagiig chiefs, with the ultimate colonial goal of removing the Michi Saagiig claim to the land and instead support the transition of the environment into an agricultural landscape settled by non-Indigenous Europeans.

Emily Township was first surveyed for non-Indigenous settlement between October and December 1818 by government surveyor Samuel Wilmot as part of a broader survey effort in the Newcastle District to layout lots for settlement in Emily, Manvers, Cavan, Monaghan and Smith Townships. It is notable that this surveying, alongside that in adjacent townships, was initiated prior to the signing of the Rice Lake Treaty. When the lots were surveyed, as elsewhere, the half lots to be granted to settlers were around 100 acres, but these lots varied in size throughout Emily, in large part due to broken frontages along waterbodies, as well as large swampy areas that cut into arable land; this was the case for Lot 19 in Concession 11 – the subject property, where the southeast corner of the lot was primarily wetland.

The first lots in Emily were granted in 1819, but these were primarily located in the first six concessions in the south of the township and the earliest settlers arrived around this time. Over the next several years, more settlers gradually arrived in the southern portion of the township and around what is now Omemee, where a mill was established in 1825 by William Cottingham. The majority of these early settlers were Protestant and Irish, primarily from Armagh, Fermanagh and Cavan in the north of Ireland and had been directed by British land agents to Cavan and Emily Township in the Newcastle District.

The landscape of settlement changed substantially in 1825 and 1826 with the arrival of the Robinson settlers, a large group of Irish Catholic settlers, primarily from Cork, Kerry, Limerick and Tipperary, who came to Upper Canada as part of a planned settlement scheme pioneered by businessman and politician Peter Robinson. The early nineteenth century had brought significant economic challenges and societal upheaval to rural Ireland which was faced with massive over population, a decreasing market for Irish goods, and a potato crop failure in 1821; as a result, the idea came forward for a scheme of assisted emigration for rural Irish Catholic families to Upper Canada. Not only was a scheme of this type seen to help alleviate the challenges faced by large numbers of destitute tenant farmers in Ireland, it also provided an opportunity to populate the sparsely populated back townships away from Lake Ontario. Once in Upper Canada, Families would receive land, supplies and equipment and would be required to clear and cultivate the land. Once 20 acres of the land was cleared and under cultivation and they had lived there for five years, they would be granted the patent for their property. In response to the introduction of the scheme in Ireland, Robinson received thousands of applicants from families willing to emigrate and in 1823, the first group of just under 600 settlers departed on two ships from Cork for the Bathurst District (Lanark). The second group of settlers, comprised of just over 2,000 people on nine ships, left Cork in May 1825 bound for the Newcastle District where they were primarily settled across seven townships: Emily, Gore of Emily, Otonabee, Douro, Asphodel, Smith and Ops, although some settled elsewhere or stopped in settlements including Montreal and Cobourg. Of these, the over half of the families settled in Emily Township and Gore of Emily, later renamed Ennismore Township. These settlers were Catholic and primarily came in large family groupings with parents and children ranging from infants to young adults and sometimes including extended family members including grandparents, aunts, uncles or cousins. The majority had been farmers in Ireland, although Robinson allowed for a certain numbers of tradesmen as well.

The settlers arrived in Montreal then proceeded to Cobourg and then Peterborough, then known as Scott's Plains and later renamed in honour of Robinson, in the early fall of 1825. The group, now around 1,900 people, erected shanties nearby the small settlement and waited to receive their land throughout October and November of 1825; Robinson was criticized for

settling the families on their lands so late in the year when they would be unable to do much on their lands with the coming winter. Each head of family – generally the husband and father – was assigned 100 acres of land, as were most boys aged 18 and over. Just over 400 land grants were given out, with the majority of land – 13,800 acres – in Emily Township, by far the largest portion in any of the townships where land grants were made. In addition to their land grant, families were given set rations for the next eighteen months on a per person basis, including 1 pound of salt pork and 1 pound of flour per adult per day, with smaller rations for children. Families also received seed potatoes, seed corn, a cow, a handsaw, a kettle, an iron pot, an auger, axes, nails, gimlets, and hoes.

The subject property was granted to John Collins and his family in November 1825 who travelled from Peterborough to Emily Township and settled on the east half of Lot 19 in Concession 11; they had left Cork on May 11, 1825, travelling on the *Albion*, one of the smaller ships commissioned by Robinson to bring the settlers to Canada. John Collins is recorded in the ship's surgeon's list as being "rather dirty & of an unhappy temper." Collins' family, like many families who were part of the Robinson scheme, was large, consisting of Collins, who was around 40 years old, his wife Johanna and their eight children ranging in age from 1 to 20: Michael, Timothy, John, Catherine, Edmund, James, Bridget, and Maurice. Their son Timothy also received a grant of land, the west half of Lot 6 in Concession 11, but he is recorded as travelling and living with his parents and siblings in these early days.

Collins received the Crown Patent for the land around 1831, indicating that he had, by this time, cleared twenty acres of the property and it was under cultivation. A home of some variety was certainly erected on the property by this time, and likely outbuildings for tools and livestock. The property likely resembled most other Robinson homesteads in the area as the family gradually worked together to clear the land and begin to farm. Farm specific statistics are not available for this early period of settlement but broader comparisons of the output of Irish Catholic farms across the Trent Valley show a high reliance on potatoes, turnips and corn in the years immediately following the Robinson settlement, with wheat production increasing dramatically by the middle of the nineteenth century as more land was cleared and become the primary crop in the area by the 1851 census. With regard to livestock, hogs were and remained throughout the nineteenth century as the most common non-poultry farm animal, but this was the case across Ontario where there was a high reliance on pork as a significant part of the majority of people's diets for most of the nineteenth century.

John Collins died prior to the 1851 census but it not known when or in what circumstances. By 1851, Johanna Collins was a widow and living with her daughter Bridget. Bridget had married Denis Houlihan, likely around 1840, who

had also come to Emily Township as a child as part of the Robinson emigration scheme and with whom she had four children – Margaret, James, Timothy, and Denis. However, Denis had also died by the 1851 census and Bridget herself was a widow with four young children. Unlike many nineteenth century widows, Bridget took over her husband's family's farm on Lot 8 in Concession 10 and her occupation is listed as farmer in the 1851 census and as the head of household in the agricultural census. This was far from common practice. At this time, most widows were taken in by one of their sons and his family or another male relative and legally considered dependants. It was very rare for a woman to inherit a farm in this way and continue to operate it on her own but the census indicates that this is the path that Bridget took.

The original Collins farm itself appears to have been in a period of flux at this time. The farm passed from John Collins to his youngest son, Maurice in 1847, possibly around the time of the elder Collins' death. However, Maurice appears in the Ennismore census in 1851 and was likely farming there by the 1840s. As a result, in 1850, the farm passed to Bridget Houlihan in 1850, by then widow and already farming 100 acres elsewhere in the township. By this time, both Michael and John Collins, the younger, were married with their own farms and families in the township; John had taken over the land grant given to his brother Timothy, receiving the patent in 1854, nearly 30 years after it was granted. Timothy is believed to have died in Peterborough around 1842, while the whereabouts of Catherine, Edmund and James are not known. This dispersion of the children of the Robinson settlement families is very common. With large families, some stayed in the townships they settled in, while others moved to townships nearby and others dispersed to communities throughout Ontario and into the United States.

The impact of the Robinson settlers on Emily Township, however, was extremely significant. About 150 land grants were given out in the township to families who came as part of the settlement and they had a profound impact on local demographics. Whereas Emily's earliest settlers were mostly Protestant, the Robinson settlers brought large numbers of Catholics to the township which began a rapid change in demographics. In the earliest part of the century, Anglicans were the largest denomination and they settled primarily in the southern part of the township and were heavily concentrated around Omemee. However, by the mid-nineteenth century, Catholics – most of whom were Irish – and Anglicans each had around 1,000 adherents in Emily and Catholics quickly surpassed their Protestant counterparts and, by the end of the nineteenth century, were concentrated largely in the northern part of the township, concentrated around the predominantly Catholic settlement of Downeyville and St. Luke's Catholic Church, where the original Robinson settlers had received their land grants. This Catholic population was made up of both the Robinson settlers, their descendants and more recently arrived Catholic settlers, many of whom came to Emily Township in the 1840s at a

time of mass emigration from Ireland and settled in an area where there was already an established Catholic population. This concentration of Catholic settlers together in northern Emily Township is typical of denominational settlement patterns across Ontario, including in Emily and the surrounding townships, where Catholics and Protestants had a tendency to settle separately, reinforcing denominational and cultural differences between groups of settlers.

In 1857, Bridget sold the property to Thomas Brennan. Brennan was born in County Sligo, Ireland around 1826 to Thomas Brennan and Honora McCarrick and was the owner of the farm, along with his wife Ellen Guiry, for about 10 years. Information regarding Brennan's arrival in Canada is not known. Another Brennan family, Alexander and Catherine Brennan, along with a son, also named Thomas born in 1827, arrived in Ontario from Ireland around 1831. Five more children – Alexander, Margaret, John, Catherine and Ellen – were eventually born to the family between 1831 and 1844. It is not known where they originally settled but, in 1845, Alexander Brennan purchased the north half of lot 21 in concession 13; the Brennans also eventually purchased the adjacent north half of lot 20. They arrived at a time of gradual, but steady population increase in Emily Township in the late 1820s and early 1830s as more settlers, primarily Irish Catholics, arrived and took up land. It is likely that Thomas Brennan, the owner of the subject property, was a cousin.

Thomas Brennan's marriage to Ellen Guiry is recorded in the St. Luke's parish register on May 11, 1854, with Alexander Brennan as one of the witness, indicating a familial connection; the first church at Downeyville was built in 1835 as a log structure which served the Catholic population until the new church, the core of the current building, was erected between 1857 and 1858. Ellen Guiry, then aged 19, was also born in Ireland in 1835 and came to Emily Township at an unknown date with her parents, Michael Guiry and Mary Breslane and sister Margaret. They appear to have first settled in Ops in the early 1840s, where two boys, Michael and John were born in the early 1840s. The wider Guiry family owned several farms in Emily Township, although the relationship between Ellen Guiry and the broader family tree is not fully known. Ellen, at the time of her marriage, was an orphan; both her parents died in November 1847 and are buried at St. Luke's. She is listed by herself, age 16, on the 1851 census in the home of James Collins, a tavern keeper, and was probably a servant in the home. Her sister Margaret, then 11, is listed as a servant in another home and her brother Michael later appears as a hired boy elsewhere.

The couple's first home after their marriage is not known but by, 1857, had purchased the farm from Bridget Houlihan, taking out a mortgage from her for £82 pounds against the £112 pound purchase price. By 1861, they had four children – Michael, Thomas, Mary and Hannah – and had the farm well in hand,

with sixty acres under cultivation, and the farm and its products valued at \$2000, a high value for the time. The 1861 census shows the yields of the farm for the previous year, which were of a similar size to surrounding farms, including 150 bushels of fall wheat, 300 bushels of spring wheat, 100 bushels of peas, 180 bushels of oats, 200 bushels of potatoes and 150 bushels of turnips.

Additional mortgages were taken out on the property in 1860 and 1866, likely to build a new house for their growing family and replace the older house on the property which was constructed from log and still extant in 1861. However, by the end of the latter year, Ellen Guiry had died. The cause and exact date of her death is unknown, but Thomas is listed as a widower on the abstract book for the register in that year and soon sold the property. It is likely that with a hefty mortgage and a young family, Brennan was not able to cope with the familial and financial burdens of the farm; his mortgage was not discharged until 1871, five years after the property was sold. It is not known where Brennan moved to, although his son Thomas later appears in the Emily Township census with his mother's sister, so it is likely that the family stayed within the general area of the township.

The property was sold to Timothy Crowley in late 1866. Crowley was related to the Brennans through marriage; his wife, who he married in 1857 at St. Luke's Church in Downeyville, was Margaret Mary Brennan, the oldest daughter of Alexander and Catherine Brennan and cousin to Thomas Brennan. Before purchasing the property from Thomas Brennan, the young couple first lived with Thomas Brennan, Timothy's father, with whom they appear in the 1861 census, before moving to farm on the Brennan property where Catherine Brennan, now a widow, lived in the mid-1860s. It is possible that, when Thomas Brennan needed to sell the property, it was offered to his cousin and her husband, with a growing family and in need of their own establishment.

Crowley, as with the former owners of the property, was Irish and Catholic. Born in County Clare in 1829, he was the second of five children of Thomas Crowley and Jane Moore. In 1847, the family came to Canada, including both parents and all five children, then between the ages 23 and 9. They appear to have settled immediately in Emily Township; Mary, the oldest daughter was married at St. Luke's in 1850, to Thomas O'Dwyer of Emily Township.

The Crowleys arrived in Emily as part of a wave of Irish immigration to Canada in the wake of the Great Famine. The Great Famine, also known as the Irish potato famine, was a period of starvation and social upheaval in Ireland lasting from approximately 1845 to 1852 that profoundly impacted both Ireland and English-speaking locations across the globe. The central cause of the famine was a potato blight which severely impacted potato crops across Ireland; the potato, at the time, was the primary food source of the majority of people in the country, particularly in rural areas where tenant farmers subsisted on them.

As a result, widespread starvation swept across Ireland with the poorest and more rural areas the most impacted. However, as had been the case when the Robinson settlers set sail just over two decades before, the economic situation of Ireland was poor and the British government doing little to alleviate the challenges faced by tenant farmers, massively exacerbating a significant crop failure. During this period, around 1 million people died and 1 million more left the country, primarily to Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, and the population of Ireland dropped around 25%.

County Clare, where the Crowleys originated, was one of the worst impacted counties on the island, with one of its highest death rates and the most evictions of any county in Ireland in 1851. Although there was less emigration from the county when compared to others, specifically because most of its occupants were too poor to pay for the cost of transport elsewhere, the county still saw a 30-40% reduction in population in its rural areas. The Crowleys were part of the emigration from the county, during this period, leaving Ireland for Canada in 1847, the worst year of the famine, along with around 100,000 other people from Ireland who arrived in Canada in 1847 alone.

Unlike in the United States, where most Irish immigrants who came during the Famine period settled in urban areas, the majority of Irish immigrants who came to Canada during this period settled in rural areas. This was certainly the case in Ontario where many cities, such as Toronto, had significant Protestant populations and large numbers of members of the Orange Order, making anti-Catholic bias rife within these centres. For immigrants such as the Crowleys, it was beneficial to seek out areas where Catholics were also settled and established, such as in north Emily Township which was almost an exclusively Catholic area. As it had been throughout the 1830s and early 1840s, the desire to settle near ethnically and religiously similar people continued and newly arrived Irish Catholics continued to arrive in Emily Township and take up farms there.

Timothy Crowley was 18 years old when he arrived with his parents in Emily Township and lived there until his death in 1911 at the age of 81. The majority of his life was spent on the farm at lot 19 in concession 11 after its purchase in 1866. Timothy and Margaret Crowley had five children raised on the property: Jane, Catherine, Thomas, Margaret and Elizabeth Ann. The farm grew and prospered. By 1871, the farm had sixty acres cleared, as it had under Thomas and Ellen Brennan, as well as four cows, four sheep, two hogs and two horses, a good number of livestock for a farm at this time. The farm continued to operate around these levels until and after Timothy's death when the farm passed to his son Thomas in 1911. Unfortunately, Thomas died soon after in 1917 at the age of 50 and without a family of his own and the farm passed on again, this time to his sister Jane.

Jane sold the property in 1918 to young farmer Angus Twomey. Twomey was 21 years old and unmarried, and the property was purchased by Twomey alongside his parents, Thomas Twomey and Margaret Ann Sullivan. Despite the sale, however, the property still remained within the family: Angus Twomey's maternal grandmother Catherine Brennan was the younger sister of Margaret Brennan, the wife of Timothy Crowley and his mother Margaret was Thomas and Jane Crowley's first cousin. His father's family had originally immigrated to Ennismore, but Thomas Twomey had moved to Emily when he married Margaret Sullivan, representative of the relatively fluid Irish Catholic population between the two areas; Angus Twomey himself an Irish Catholic would marry a woman from Ennismore, Bernice Scollard, in 1927, also a Catholic of Irish descent.

The progress of ownership of the property in the 100 years from 1825 to the mid-1920s demonstrates a number of key themes in the settlement patterns of northern Emily Township. First and foremost, it reinforces the heavily Irish Catholic demographic of this area of Kawartha Lakes. Every owner of the property in its first 100 years of non-indigenous occupation was both Catholic and either born in Ireland or of Irish descent, reflecting the broader demographic of northern Emily where the vast majority of settlers were of this ethnic and denominational group, moving between farms within the Catholic area and marrying within their own community. This is in stark contrast to southern Emily where most settlers were Protestants, although many were also Irish, but primarily from the heavily-Protestant north of Ireland. Consistently throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century, these communities settled apart and this separation is starkly evident in both Emily Township as a whole and as a microcosm within the subject property. The Catholic population in northern Emily was significant and large, comprising over half of the township's population by the turn of the twentieth century and centred around parish life with St. Luke's Church, in both its earlier and current form.

The property also yields information regarding the waves of Irish settlement in Emily Township throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. Although the Irish Catholic population of the northern part of the township was an ethnically and religiously homogenous population, there was no one consistent settlement story across the township, as is evidenced by the successive owners of the property, and their families, and their routes to the township throughout the second quarter of the century. There were three primary narratives of immigration evidenced through this property. The first was through the organized settlement scheme of the Robinson settlement, which formed the initial influx of Irish settlement in northern Emily, as evidenced by the original non-indigenous settlers on the property, the Collins family who arrived are part of this planned settlement scheme and were initially settled on this property. The second is through the unorganized emigration from Ireland

that occurred beginning in the mid-eighteenth century; emigration from Ireland beginning around the Napoleonic Wars in response to local economic and social conditions; in the years between the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 and the beginning of the Great Famine in 1845, it is estimated that 1.5 million people left Ireland for the New World. Not all of these emigrants during this period were Catholics, but many of them were and those like the Brennans and Guirys gradually came to North America on their own and settled in areas like Emily where there was an existing and established Irish Catholic population. The final narrative of settlement was through the mass relocation of Irish families as a direct result the Great Famine. Although Irish immigration had been occurring throughout the century, this last wave was the largest, and most well-known and brought huge numbers of Irish immigrants to Canada over a very short period of time. Families like the Crowleys represent a snapshot of this mass immigration event, demonstrating the patterns of settlement as a result of the Famine where new Irish families arrived to and settled in areas of ethnic and denominational similarity. It also demonstrates the success of many famine immigrants after arrival in North America; broader studies of Irish immigration to Canada from this period have shown the success of famine-era arrivals once they were able to arrive in communities and settle on farms and the long tenure and prosperity of the Crowleys on the property speaks to this trend.

The property also reinforces the deep and continuing familial connections present in Emily Township from the first half of the nineteenth century. Catholic Emily was, and remains in many respects, a tight and interconnected community, in large part due to its shared historic, cultural and religious values. Not included the original Collins occupation, the property, between 1857 and 1927, remained within the same extended family, connected through the wider Brennan family, including Thomas Brennan and the husbands and descendants of his cousins, Margaret and Catherine Brennan. Although the property changed hands and was sold several times throughout this period, its pattern of occupation demonstrates how the large Catholic families in nineteenth and early twentieth century Emily were interconnected with one another through marriage and property, alongside their country of origin and religious affiliation.

Contextual Value

1884 Pigeon Lake Road has contextual value as a contributing feature to the historic, rural agricultural landscape of Emily Township. The property, which was first settled by non-Indigenous people in 1825, is located in Emily Township's rural area which is characterized by farmland, forest, wetlands and historic agricultural buildings and itself supports these land uses across approximately 100 acres of property. In general, the historic survey patterns in this area have been retained, as have a variety of built and natural features that

reinforce the area's rural character. Although the subject property has been extensively replanted since it was originally cleared for agricultural purposes, the continued existence of its historic residential and agricultural structures, as well as cleared areas support its continuing value as a former agricultural property and a supporting feature in the wider landscape.

Emily Township was first cleared for non-Indigenous settlement beginning in the early 1820s. Surveyed in 1818 into rectangular lots along concession lines, the first settlers in the township arrived in the early 1820s and primarily settled along its southern concessions and near the present-day site of Omemee, on 100 acres parcels. The area in which the subject property is located, in the northern half of the township, received its first settlers in 1825 with the arrival of the Robinson settlers who received land grants throughout the area, including for the subject property. Over the next century, the land, which until that time was primarily forested, was extensively cleared to make way for agricultural use. Clearing was gradual throughout the second quarter of the nineteenth century but, by the end of the century, most farms had in the realm of thirty to seventy acres cleared, dependant on the topography of the land, waterbodies, and the uses of the farms. Nearly all of the farms had retained woodland areas while others had substantial portions of swampland that could not be used for agriculture, resulting in a landscapes mixed with agricultural lands and areas of natural woodland and wetland, with the latter particularly present near Pigeon Lake, the Pigeon River, and Emily Creek. These vegetated areas were punctuated with built features, including farmhouses and barns that spoke to the non-Indigenous occupation of the landscape.

The landscape as it exists today has retained those settlement patterns and natural and built elements. The survey pattern of the township, particularly away from the waterfront, has remained effectively the same with a consistent lot layout from the nineteenth century, as has its predominant use for agriculture on 100 to 200 acre parcels. As in the nineteenth century, these lots are a mix of cultivated and forested land, although the proportion of forest land has increased since the late nineteenth century; this is particularly the case on the subject property which was extensively reforested in the late twentieth century. A substantial number of historic built resources also remain extant, including both farmhouses and agricultural buildings, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century which reinforce the historic agricultural landscape of the township.

The subject property has retained its historic boundaries from the original land grant in 1825, as well as its historic built features from the early twentieth century, with a farmhouse and barn both constructed around 1920. Although the property has been substantially reforested since the nineteenth century and its original agricultural settlement, it retains cleared land on the north side of the property in close proximity to its historic agricultural structures that

speaks to its historic use and fits within the broader landscape context. Through these retained landscape features, it supports the broader character of northern Emily Township and its historic nineteenth and twentieth century uses.

The property also has a specific relationship to Pigeon Lake, which it borders on its south side. The southern portion of property is primarily wetland along the western shore of the lake. This is a significant landscape change from the early nineteenth century. When the land was first settled, this portion of the property was wetland along what was then Pigeon Creek, but the portion of wetland was much smaller. The level of the lake rose in the late nineteenth century with the construction of dams along the water system to facilitate both the development of the Trent Severn Waterway and critical settlement infrastructure such as mills. As a result, a substantial portion of this land was flooded and has developed into the large wetland that currently exists; the 1888 Assessment Roll noted that there were 25 acres of drowned land on the property, equivalent to around a quarter of its total area, where earlier maps and surveys show a substantial smaller portion of wetland within its southeast corner. This relationship has defined the development of the property since the late nineteenth century, and it retains this key relationship with the adjacent waterbody.

Summary of Reasons for Designation

The short statement of reasons for designation and the description of the heritage attributes of the property, along with all other components of the Heritage Designation Brief, constitute the Reasons for Designation required under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Short Statement of Reasons for Designation

Design and Physical Value

1884 Pigeon Lake Road has design and physical value as a representative example of a nineteenth century rural farm in Emily Township and as evolved cultural heritage landscape. First settled by non-Indigenous settlers in 1825, the property typifies the 100 acre parcels granted to settlers in the township throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, retaining its lot layout from the time of its land grant. Although it was extensively reforested in the late twentieth century, the property retains key features of a historic farmstead, including cleared property, an early twentieth century farmhouse, and historic barn. The house is an important example of a concrete block Edwardian Classical house in Emily Township, while the barn demonstrates the evolution of agricultural structures by the turn of the twentieth century.

Historical and Associative Value

1884 Pigeon Land Road has historic and associative value through its pattern of settlement throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century. First settled by non-Indigenous settlers in 1825, it was originally occupied by John Collins, who arrived in Emily Township as part of the Peter Robinson settlement and subsequently by other Irish Catholic settlers and families who arrived in Emily Township throughout the nineteenth century and occupied the property into the twentieth century. Through this pattern of settlement, the property yields information regarding Irish Catholic settlement in northern Emily Township throughout the nineteenth century, its impact on the landscape and the demographics of the community.

Contextual Value

1884 Pigeon Lake Road has contextual value as a contributing feature to the historic, rural agricultural landscape of Emily Township. The property, which was first settled by non-Indigenous people in 1825, is located in Emily Township's rural area which is characterized by farmland, forest, wetlands and historic agricultural buildings and itself supports these land uses across approximately 100 acres of property. In general, the historic survey patterns in this area have been retained, as have a variety of built and natural features that reinforce the area's rural character. Although the subject property has been extensively replanted since it was originally cleared for agricultural purposes, the continued existence of its historic residential and agricultural structures, as

well as cleared areas support its continuing value as a former agricultural property and a supporting feature in the wider landscape.

Summary of Heritage Attributes to be Designated

The Reasons for Designation include the following heritage attributes and apply to all elevations, unless otherwise specified, and the roof including: all façades, entrances, windows, chimneys, and trim, together with construction materials of wood, brick, stone, stucco, concrete, plaster parging, metal, glazing, their related building techniques and landscape features.

Design and Physical Attributes

The design and physical attributes support its value as an nineteenth century evolved agricultural landscape, as well as the value of the house as a representative example concrete block Edwardian Classical architecture and the value of the barn as a turn of the century agricultural building.

Property

- Lot configuration
- Presence and relationship of house, barn, cleared areas, woodland, and wetlands
- Frontage onto Pigeon Lake Road
- Remaining evidence of field configuration
- Views within the property of elements including the house, barn, cleared areas, woodland, and wetlands

House - Exterior

- Two-and-a-half storey concrete block construction
- Rock face concrete blocks with tooled edges
- Hipped roof
- Dormers
- Panel faced concrete blocks
- Inset entrance porch and balcony including:
 - Square columns
 - Concrete piers
 - Entablature
 - Balustrade
- Fenestration including:
 - Sash windows with fixed multi-pane top sash
 - Grouped and single windows
 - Dormer windows
 - Concrete lintels
 - Lug sills
- Entrance and door

House – Interior

- Two-storey centre hall plan
- Staircases
- Wood flooring
- Trim
- Moulding
- Decorative grates

Barn

- Gambrel roof
- Timber frame construction including:
 - Squared posts
 - Squared beams
 - Round beams
 - Knee braces
- Ladders
- Sawn lumber granary
- Barn doors
- Vertical plank cladding
- Wide plank flooring
- Concrete stables including:
 - Doors
 - Fenestration

Historical and Associative Value

The historical and associative attributes of the property support its value in showing the pattern of settlement of Irish Catholic families in northern Emily Township throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

- Associations with the Robinson settlement
- Associations with additional waves of Irish settlement in Emily Township
- Local family histories associated with the property through the Collins, Brennan, Crowley and Twomey families

Contextual Value

The contextual attributes of the property support its value as a contributing feature to the historic agricultural landscape of rural Emily Township.

- Location along Pigeon Lake Road
- Frontage onto Pigeon Lake
- Proximity to rural lots of a similar age and size
- Views of the property from Pigeon Lake Road

Images



1877 Victoria County Map



1965 Aerial Photo, Trent University Aerial Photo Collection









Select Bibliography

- Akenson, Donald Harman. *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984.
- Arnett, Jan Corey. *American Barns*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.
- Blumenson, John. *Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms, 1784 to the Present*. Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1990.
- Butterfield, David. *Anglo-Ontario Farm Buildings: An Architectural History Theme Study*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism, n.d.
- Guillet, Edwin C. *The Valley of the Trent*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.
- Harris, Cole. *The Reluctant Land: Society, Space and Environment in Canada before Confederation*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2008.
- Hart, John Fraser. "On the Classification of Barns." *Material Culture* 26, no 3 (1994): 37-46.
- Hedican, Edward J. *After the Famine: The Irish Family Farm in Eastern Ontario, 1851-1881*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2020.
- Kirkconnell, Watson. *County of Victoria: Centennial History*. 2nd edition. Lindsay: County of Victoria Council, 1967.
- Mikel, Robert. *Ontario House Styles: The Distinctive Architecture of the Province's 18th and 19th Century Homes*. Toronto: James Lorimer, 2004.
- Ó Gráda, Cormac. *Ireland: A New Economic History, 1780-1939*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Pammett, Howard. *Lilies and Shamrocks: A History of the Township of Emily in the County of Victoria*. Emily Township Historical Committee, 1974.
- Simpson, Pamela Hemenway. *Cheap, Quick and Easy: Imitative Architectural Materials, 1870-1930*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999.
- Slaton, Amy E. *Reinforced Concrete and the Modernization of American Building*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Stevenson, Katherine Cole and H. Ward Jandl. *Houses by Mail: A Guide to Houses from Sears, Roebuck and Company*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1986.
- Visser, Thomas Durant. *A Field Guide to New England Barns and Farm Buildings*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2012.