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Historical Skeletal Remains from Dundas County, Ontario: A Cautionary Tale Concerning Individual Identification.

Lynda S. Wood and Janet Young

A single burial dating to the historic period was unexpectedly discovered on a farm in rural Dundas County, Ontario. Based on a preliminary investigation, the remains were believed to be those of Margaret Ellen Bellway, an 8-year-old girl who lived on the property and who died in the year 1881. The objectives of this article are to demonstrate that establishing individual identification of historical remains is possible, to demonstrate the importance of exploring all relevant avenues of research prior to finalizing individual identification, and to demonstrate the means by which this is done. Skeletal analysis of the remains indicated a child of 5 to 6 years of age and coffin hardware analysis indicated a burial date between 1860 and 1871. The latter information was used to restrict the search of land registry, census, vital statistic, and parish records. Information derived from these sources strongly supports the identification of the remains as those of Daniel Veitch, whose family lived on the property from 1866 to 1874, and who died at the age of 6 in 1870.

Une sépulture isolée, datant de la période historique, a été découverte de façon inattendue dans une ferme du comté rural de Dundas, en Ontario. D’après une investigation préliminaire, il s’agit, croit-on, des restes de Margaret Ellen Bellway, fillette de huit ans qui habitait la ferme et qui est morte en 1881. Le but de l’article est de montrer qu’il est possible d’établir l’identité individuelle de restes de la période historique, de faire valoir qu’il importe d’explorer toutes les pistes de recherche pertinentes avant de terminer l’identification, et d’indiquer les moyens de le faire. L’analyse ostéologique des restes a montré qu’il s’agit d’une enfant de cinq à six ans et l’analyse de la quincaillerie du cercueil a fixé la date de l’inhumation entre 1860 et 1871. Ce dernier renseignement a servi à limiter la recherche dans les registres des terres, les recensements, les statistiques de l’état civil et les archives paroissiales. D’après les renseignements provenant de ces sources, il semble bien qu’il s’agit des restes de Daniel Veitch dont la famille vécut sur les lieux de 1866 à 1874 et qui est morte à l’âge de six ans en 1870.

Introduction

In North America the increased frequency of analysis of historical skeletal remains has arisen as an alternative to the analysis of aboriginal skeletal remains. It has also arisen as a result of the increased availability of such remains as more and more historical cemeteries are excavated prior to or in conjunction with construction activities on “vacant” land. Two recent publications, Grave Reflections: Portraying the Past through Cemetery Studies (Saunders and Herring 1995) and In Remembrance: Archaeology and Death (Poirier and Bellantoni 1997), exemplify the increased attention to and interest in historical skeletal studies.

The objectives of such research vary considerably but can be said to fall into three general categories. These categories are: 1) to compare skeletal data with documentary data (e.g., to test methodologies or to test the accuracy of parish records); 2) to learn more about certain groups that are not well understood or are underrepresented in the written record (e.g., African Americans and almshouse and asylum residents); and, 3) to learn about historical events (e.g., wars or specific battles). Individual identification is rarely the focus of the research (but see Saunders and Lazenby 1991) and when it does occur it often results from the recovery of a preserved coffin name plate. The name plate would have originally been secured to the coffin lid and was engraved with the name and birth and death dates of the deceased.

The present research is unique in that (1) it deals with a single individual instead of a cemetery sample, and (2) it has individual
identification as its primary goal. Specifically, the objectives of this article are:

1) to demonstrate that it is possible to determine the individual identity of remains that date to the historical period even when no documentary evidence pertaining to the interment exists;

2) to demonstrate the importance of exploring all avenues of evidence pertinent to the task of individual identification even when preliminary research appears to establish identification; and,

3) to demonstrate the investigative approaches used in this study for establishing individual identification of historical remains.

Inevitably, the process of determining individual identification reveals information about local and family history, burial practices, and beliefs about death and dying. This in turn can add to our understanding of the lifeways of the families who settled in the region and who cleared and ultimately lived off the land.

Background

The remains were discovered on a farming property in Mountain Township, Dundas County, located approximately 50 km south of Ottawa, Ontario (FIG. 1). The region was initially settled by pioneers in the first few decades of the 19th century. By a provision of the British Government, all children of United Empire Loyalists who had fought during the American Revolution were granted 200 acres of land in Mountain Township and adjacent Winchester Township. Many such individuals never relocated to the area but instead sold their land allocation. Those from the United States who did relocate were predominantly of Irish or Scottish descent, and those who purchased the granted land emigrated directly from Ireland or Scotland (Belden 1879). Just as it was over 150 years ago, the area remains inhabited by a large number of families of Irish and Scottish descent and is primarily a rural farming community.

During the initial phases of construction of a barn, a skull was dislodged from the earth. It rested in a trench approximately 104 cm below the surface and approximately 41 cm below visible fragments of decomposing coffin wood. The police were called but identification of the remains of a coffin ruled out the possibility of a suspicious death. The landowners were unaware of the existence of a burial on their property, and a search of the
township's municipal records by the investigating police officer revealed no documentation of a burial having taken place on the lot.

The police informed the County Coroner of the discovery. They also contacted the Cemeteries Branch of the Government of Ontario and were advised to solicit the assistance of a physical anthropologist. At this time the police provided the landowner with a copy of the Cemeteries Act which outlined the land owner's responsibilities. Since the excavation was conducted under the auspices of the police and the County Coroner the physical anthropologists did not require a permit to complete their work. In circumstances in which this is not the case, the Cemeteries Act division of the Ontario government should be approached for the appropriate permits.

Recovery of Skeletal Remains

Excavation

Following initial assessment the loose, fragmented skull was removed. A backhoe was used to excavate the first foot to foot-and-a-half (ca. 0.3–0.45 m) of subsoil, which was composed mostly of shale, from approximately 5 ft² above the suspected location of the burial. The newly exposed surface clearly showed an area of darkened earth which indicated that the burial was oriented in an east-west direction with the feet to the east and head to the west. This is the standard orientation for Christian burials. As the excavation proceeded the area of dark earth broadened, eventually encompassing the width of a small coffin, and representing the original grave trench. The exposure of the left humerus and left os coxa confirmed that the skeleton was oriented in the east-west direction with the feet to the east and head to the west. The remainder of the skeleton was exposed (FIG. 2) and was removed and bagged by individual bone. In addition, artifacts including coffin hardware and a straight pin were removed and bagged. All loose earth from within and surrounding the grave was screened so that neither bones, bone fragments, nor grave inclusions would be lost.

Recovery of coffin handles, white metal screw covers, white metal tack covers, screws, and nails indicated that the burial dated to the historical period. While investigating the possible identity of the skeleton the police officer in charge spoke to a local historian who informed him that a Scottish family, the Bell-
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Figure 3. Margaret Ellen Bellway’s tombstone at Brown’s cemetery. The inscription on the tombstone reads “Margaret Ellen/Daughter of William and Eliza Bellway/Died Oct. 22nd, 1881/Aged 8 Years/Suffer little children to come unto me.”

Two descendants of the Bellway family still live in Dundas County: 91-year-old Ena Bellway and her son Lyle. Ena was married to John, the son of James, who was one of Margaret Ellen’s older brothers and who would have been 13 (possibly 14) years old at the time of her death. Ena and Lyle’s response to the published newspaper article was swift: Yes, Margaret Ellen had died at the age of eight but at the time of her death had been buried and continues to rest in what is known locally as Brown’s cemetery. A trip to Brown’s cemetery confirmed the existence of Margaret Ellen’s tombstone at this site (Fig. 3).

Inventory of Grave Inclusions

All coffin wood present, three coffin handles in various states of preservation, 31 white metal screw covers and coffin tacks, and numerous rusting and corroded screws and nails were collected. A single straight pin was retrieved from the lumbar region of the skeleton. No evidence of clothing (e.g., buttons) or personal accouterment was recovered.

Identification of the Skeletal Remains

Laboratory Analysis

The use of archaeological techniques allowed for the complete recovery of the skeleton including the small ends or epiphyses of still growing bones. The reconstructed cranium was deformed as a result of the collapse of the coffin. Age at death assessment was derived from the gross morphology of the dentition and skeleton and radiographs of the mandibular dentition. Dental eruption indicates a child of approximately 5 to 6 years of age (Ubelaker 1984). This concurs with the stages of dental root development visible on radiographs of the mandibular dentition (El-Nofely and Iscan 1989). The stage of fusion of the principal elements of the skeleton also indicate immature remains. The unfused nature of the occipital and atlas indicate an age older than 5 and younger than 7 years.
The partial fusion of some of the vertebrae gives an age range of 3 to 7 years (Bass 1984). Long bone length assessments produce age estimates of 4 to 5.5 years of age. In summary, an age range of 3 to 7 years is indicated; a more specific range of 5 to 6 years, however, seems highly probable. Margaret Ellen was 8 years old when she died. Even if her death occurred very shortly after her eighth birthday, the discrepancy between the skeletal age estimate and her age at death is troubling.

Sex could not be estimated because of the immature nature of the remains.

No pathological or traumatic lesions are visible on the skeleton that could be used to determine cause of death. There is also no evidence of earlier childhood trauma or lengthy illness. The lack of enamel hypoplasia, cribra orbitalia, and porotic hyperostosis indicate that this individual did not suffer prolonged nutritional or physiological stress or anemia.

Artifact Analysis

Only recently have there been any attempts to analyze coffin hardware recovered from interments located in Ontario (Kogon and Mayer 1995; Pearce 1989; Woodley 1991, 1992). In 1992 Woodley published a chronology of coffin shape and coffin hardware for 19th-century Ontario. It is assumed here that the chronological differences for Dundas County will be essentially the same as those established for southern Ontario.

The presence of decomposing coffin wood delineated the original rectangular shape of the coffin. Rectangular coffins were introduced in the mid-19th century and quickly became the coffin shape of choice. Prior to 1850, hexagonal coffins were commonly used and continued to be used, in some instances as late as 1880 (Coffin 1976). The rectangular coffin indicates an interment date of post-1850.

Three coffin handles and associated lugs were recovered during the excavation. Litmus paper tests indicate that they are composed primarily of lead. They are of the swing bail type which post-dates 1860 (Kogon and Mayer 1995; Woodley 1991, 1992) and are embossed with a vine motif (FIG. 4). Woodley notes (personal communication, 1997) that the combined width of the handle and lug is approximately 12 cm which is smaller than the 17–21
cm width used for adult coffins but larger than most coffin handles used for children. The significance of this size variation is not clear.

The white metal screw covers are associated with machine cut screws, the latter of which post-date 1850 (Kogon and Mayer 1995; Woodley 1992). These screws were used to secure the lid to the coffin, and the white metal covers were used to conceal the screws and consequently give the coffin a more decorative appearance. The white metal covers not associated with screws are coffin tacks and were used for decorative purposes only. The covers would normally be associated with steel tacks which do not preserve well. White metal coffin screws and tacks first appear in Ontario around 1860. The absence of stamped tin screw and tack covers from the burial is significant. In southern Ontario, after 1871, stamped tin screw and tack covers were used in conjunction with white metal coffin screws and tacks (Woodley 1991, 1992). Tin preserves well and tends to stain the surrounding soil green. It is not unreasonable to assume that tin fittings would have been recovered had they originally been associated with the coffin. For this reason the white metal screws and tacks from this burial are believed to date from 1860 to 1871.

The nails, most of which are extensively corroded, are machine cut. Machine-cut nails were used between 1825 and 1880, while wire nails, introduced in 1870, were predominantly used after 1880 (Kogon and Mayer 1995; Woodley 1992).

In summary, the handles post-date 1860 and white metal screw covers and tacks that are not associated with tin stamps date prior to 1871. This suggests that the burial took place between 1860 and 1871, too early for Margaret Ellen’s 1881 interment.

The only other artifact recovered was a single straight pin retrieved from the lumbar region of the skeleton. A second straight pin may have been present in the forehead region but this could not be proven because of the dislodged nature of the skull. Pairs of silver straight pins associated with infant burials have been recovered from southern Ontario historical cemeteries (Woodley 1991, 1992) and are thought to have secured burial shrouds. This practice may have resulted from the need to keep the child’s or infant’s clothing for use by younger siblings and reflects the fact that producing hand-sewn clothing was labor intensive and the supplies and fabric required for such a task were in short supply.

Three lines of evidence, two of which are archaeological, support an alternate identification than that of Margaret Ellen Bellway for the skeletal remains. They are:

1) that Margaret Ellen’s great-niece maintains that Margaret Ellen was interred elsewhere;
2) that the skeletal analysis of the remains indicates an age of 5 to 6 years; and,
3) that the coffin hardware analysis indicates an interment date between 1860 and 1871.

Clearly, further research was required. The authors turned to documentary evidence and focused on the history of the property prior to the Bellway’s habitation of the site.

Historical Documentation

Land registry records

Many settlers designated a small piece of their land for burial of family members, and even when town cemeteries were established, rural families continued to bury their dead on their own property (Owsley, Ellwood, and Richardson 1997). Government of Ontario land registry records were examined at the Land Registry office in Morrisburg to determine the history of ownership of Lot 21, Concession VIII, Mountain Township (Tab. 1). The land was purchased by a Thomas Veitch in 1852 and was willed to another Thomas Veitch, probably his son, in 1857. In 1866 the latter Thomas Veitch (son) sold 10 acres of this
Table 1. History of ownership of the west half of Lot 21, Concession 8, Mountain Township.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Date</th>
<th>Instrument Type</th>
<th>Parties From</th>
<th>Parties To</th>
<th>Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 1857</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Thomas Veitch</td>
<td>Thomas Veitch</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1866</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Thomas Veitch</td>
<td>Adam Veitch</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 1874</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Thomas Veitch</td>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>All except 10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12, 1875</td>
<td>Release of dower</td>
<td>Rachael Veitch</td>
<td>Adam Veitch</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12, 1875</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Adam Veitch</td>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 1880</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>William Bellway</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Composition of the Robinson and Samuel Veitch families based on the 1881 census records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname, Parent</th>
<th>First Names</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Age in 1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, John</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effie</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veitch, Samuel</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Jane</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
land to his brother Adam Veitch, and in 1874 Thomas (son) sold the remainder of the land to John Robinson. In October of 1875 Rachael Veitch released her dower of 10 acres, which she most likely inherited from her husband Thomas (son) upon his death, to Adam Veitch. We know Rachael's husband Thomas died sometime between June 15, 1874, when he sold most of his land to Robinson and 1881, when he is missing from the census records and Rachael is identified as a widow. On the same day Adam Veitch sold this 10 acres to John Robinson. In January of 1880, John Robinson sold the land to William Bellway, who was Margaret Ellen's father. To summarize, Thomas Veitch lived on the property from 1857 to 1874, and Adam Veitch lived on the land from 1866 to 1875. The Robinson family lived on the property from 1874 to 1880 and the Bellway family from 1880 to 1947.

It should be noted that Samuel Veitch, the brother of both Adam and Thomas, lived on the east half of Lot 21 until October, 1887 (FIG. 5). It is unclear when he first moved to the property but it was likely at the time when the older Thomas Veitch willed the west half of Lot 21 to Samuel's brother Thomas. Thus, the three brothers and their families lived on Lot 21 for approximately 10 years, and it is possible that the area where the body was found was intended as a family burial ground. For this reason Samuel’s children were also considered as possible candidates for the identification of the skeleton.

**Census Data**

Census records for the years 1871 and 1881 were assessed at the National Archives in Ottawa, to determine if any of the children of the relevant families had died between one census and the next.

**The Robinson family**

The whereabouts of the Robinson family for the 1871 census count is unknown but because they moved from Lot 21 to Lot 22 in 1880 we were able to find their 1881 census records. Table 2 shows that John Robinson and his wife Mary Ann had three children in 1881. The intervals between the birth of Maggie and Effie and between the birth of Effie and Mary Ann are large. Conceivably, a child could have been born within either of these two intervals. A quick calculation indicates that if a child was born after Maggie (post-1870) but before Effie (pre-1875) and died before the Robinsons moved off the property in 1880 that child could have ranged in age from 1 to 9 years old. It is possible that the skeleton is in fact that of a Robinson child, though the coffin hardware dates suggest an

---

1. *Dower* is defined in *Webster's Dictionary* as “the portion of a deceased husband's real property allowed to his widow for life.”
Table 3. Composition of Veitch families based on the 1871 census records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First Names</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Age in 1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veitch</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veitch</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veitch</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

earlier date (pre-1876, the first possible date for a 5-to-6-year-old Robinson child to have been buried).

**Thomas Veitch’s family**

Census data for 1871 indicate that Thomas and his wife Rachael had 6 children (TAB. 3). By 1881 Thomas was deceased but all children are accounted for. The interval between Margaret and Thomas is four years. A child could have been born between these two children (e.g., in 1861) and died at the age of 6 (in 1867). This date concurs with the coffin hardware analysis.

**Adam Veitch’s family**

The 1871 census records indicate that Adam Veitch and his wife Harriet had four children (TAB. 3). Rachael would have been approximately one year of age and David a newborn when the family moved to the property in 1866. The authors were unable to find 1881 census data for this family. It is assumed that by 1881 they had moved to another township.

**Samuel Veitch’s family**

Samuel Veitch, his wife Elizabeth, and their children lived on the east half of Lot 21. Based on the 1871 census records (TAB. 3) they had four children, and all four of these children are accounted for in the 1881 census records. The ages of the four children recorded in the 1871 census suggest that the possibility of an additional birth occurring between the births of any two consecutive children is slim.

**Vital Statistics**

Death indices were consulted. These were available through the Archives of Ontario and begin in 1869. The death record indices were scrutinized for the years 1869 to 1875 for Veitch deaths and 1874 to 1880 for Robinson deaths. There were no death records for any Robinson children for the period of time that this family was on the land. In contrast, two Veitch children were listed as dying in the
year 1870. They were Emma and Daniel. Emma’s death certificate indicates that she died of jaundice in February, 1870, at 6 days old. Figure 6 is a photograph of a copy of Daniel’s original death certificate. It indicates that he died in December, 1870, and that he was 6 years old. The date of death concurs with the coffin hardware analysis and the age at death concurs with the estimated skeletal age of the remains. The cause of death, “shot by accident,” was not apparent on the skeleton but blood loss or infection from a superficial wound could have been the ultimate cause of death. The fact that a physician, Dr. Hickey, attended the patient suggests that Daniel did not die immediately. Because the death record did not list the name of either parent it was not clear who Daniel’s parents were.

Head-of-household census data for 1871 were available on the World Wide Web. This information was originally compiled by the Ontario Genealogical Society in celebration of their 25th anniversary in 1986. The information includes records of children of the household head who died within the previous 12-month period. It is here that both Emma’s and Daniel’s deaths were listed under the name of Adam Veitch. Daniel was the oldest child of Adam and his wife Harriet.

Parish Records

Ontario birth records are not available prior to 1869. The census data indicate that the Veitches were Presbyterian; an attempt was made, therefore, to locate a baptismal record for Daniel (the Presbyterian Church records baptisms but not births) through Presbyterian Church Archives. St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church was established in the town of Winchester in 1857 (Reverend Heather Jones, personal communication, 1997). This would have been and continues to be the town closest to the site. Unfortunately, the earliest documented baptism is from 1923. City of Ottawa Archives for Presbyterian and United Churches in the Winchester area post-date 1900. If parish records do exist for this time
and place, their location is unknown. For these reasons, Daniel Veitch’s exact birth date cannot be determined.

Conclusion

The evidence presented above strongly supports the identification of the skeletal remains as those of Daniel Veitch. The potential misidentification of the remains as those of Margaret Ellen Bellway was highlighted by an event that followed within days of the excavation. Analysis of the skeletal material had just begun when the authors received a call from an employee of a Winchester funeral home. Based on the County Coroner’s instructions, arrangements were being made for the reburial of Margaret Ellen. Had the analysis and report been complete and had the County Coroner insisted upon immediate return of the remains, this individual would have been buried as Margaret Ellen. Whether or not this is cause for concern is a matter of personal opinion.

An effort was made to positively identify the remains as those of Daniel Veitch. With the help of a Winchester historian, a living descendant of Daniel’s female line was identified so that a match through mitochondrial DNA testing could be attempted. Unfortunately, uncontaminated DNA could not be extracted from the archaeological bone.

This paper demonstrates that though some effort is required, the potential exists for assessing individual identification of single interments that date to the historical period. Agencies that are in a position to fund such work (e.g., municipal and provincial governments in Canada) should take note. As population growth and subsequent development continue to encroach upon rural land, the unexpected discovery of skeletal material will occur with increasing frequency. For this reason, the necessity for specific procedures and professional involvement beyond what currently exists is required in order to ensure that all available avenues are explored prior to finalizing identification of the remains, and as the antecedent to their reburial.
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