



Ontario Archaeological Society

Arch Notes

New Series Volume 23 Issue 2

ISSN 0048-1742

March/April 2018



Who do you recognize from this photo taken at Charlie Garrad's excavations at the Kelly-Campbell site in 1974? There's Charlie on the far right. See more starting on Page 5.

OAS NEWS

3. President's Report

16. Draft Minutes of the 2017 Annual Business Meeting

ARTICLES

5. Lessons from Charlie Garrad's Legacy Collections

8. A Tale of Two Archaeological Collections

12. Working with Private Collections in Simcoe County

18. Comment from Peter Storck

Visit us on the Web at www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Alicia Hawkins
president@ontarioarchaeology.org

Past-President

Paul Racher
pastpresident@ontarioarchaeology.org

Treasurer

Debbie Steiss
treasurer@ontarioarchaeology.org

Vice-President/Secretary

Rob Pihl
vicepres@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Chapter Services

Amy St. John
chapters@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Heritage Advocacy

Bill Fox
heritageadvoc@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Recruitment

Dana Millson
membership@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Services

Bill Ross
memberservices@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Publications

James Conolly
publications@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Public Outreach

Kaitlyn Malleau
outreach@ontarioarchaeology.org

Executive Director

Lorie Harris
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
Phone/fax: 416-406-5959
execdirector@ontarioarchaeology.org
(Please note that all OAS email addresses
have changed from .on.ca to .org)

APPOINTMENTS

Editor, Ontario Archaeology

Chris Ellis

Editors, Arch Notes

Sheryl Smith & Carole Stimmell

Symposium Liaison:

Dana Millson

Moderator – Ontario Archaeological Society Listserve (OAS-L)

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/OAS-L/>
Vito Vaccarelli

Contact Information

PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
(416) 406-5959
info@ontarioarchaeology.org
www.ontarioarchaeology.org

The Ontario Archaeological Society gratefully acknowledges funding from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture through the Provincial Heritage Organization Operating Grant Program.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In pondering the content of this message, I have been thinking a lot about ‘things’ – which is to say, artifacts. To begin, I would like to borrow some words from two Indigenous scholars in order to try – I hope – to tie together two themes relating to recent OAS activities. In her contribution to a book on the pedagogy of Indigenous archaeology, Sonya Atalay writes (2008: 123):

Each of the hundreds of diverse Native nations present at the time of European contact had its own unique, culturally appropriate method of managing its heritage and sharing that knowledge with the next generation. Through the processes of contact and the devastating effects of colonization that followed, these groups' ability to manage their cultural resources and heritage, to tell their own histories, and to educate their descendants in culturally appropriate ways was severely compromised.

To this, I would like to link an observation made by Anong Beam during a meeting with some members of the newly forming Reconciliation, Restitution and Reclamation committee of the OAS. Anong Beam is the Executive Director of the Ojibwe Cultural Foundation in M'Chigeeng on Manitoulin Island, one of only a very small number of Indigenous-managed curatorial facilities in Ontario. The OCF cares for some of the archaeological artifacts from the region, and Anong described how members of her community interact with these and value them. In her words, they are a source of hope and inspiration because they “speak to a time before trauma.”

In our newly-adopted Statement of Ethical Principles, we “affirm that Indigenous communities have an inherent right to practice stewardship over their own cultural properties ...” and these two accounts should make it clear why Indigenous stewardship is so important. With this in mind, the OAS board has been working on initiatives related to the new Statement of Ethical Principles. As was discussed in the 2017 Annual Business Meeting, board members

have been in discussion with Indigenous organizations to develop relationship agreements. In March of this year, Paul Racher and I met with two representatives of Anishinabek Nation, Kevin Restoule and Ron Bernard, to discuss the details of one such agreement. While we are still in the draft stages, it was a productive meeting during which the importance of Indigenous stewardship of cultural materials was articulated. You can expect to see more on the subject of this and other agreements in the months ahead.

Much of this issue of *Arch Notes* is devoted to artifact collections. Collections are a subject that has received more than a little attention in recent years, but most of it pertains to those collections produced in compliance archaeology. There are, however, other collections in the province about which the OAS should be concerned. As an organization, we have our roots in avocational archaeology. Having been founded in 1950, the OAS existed long before licensing. Many of our early members were not professional archaeologists – indeed there was only a minute number of professionals at that time. In *The Presidents Remember* several of them recount their experiences on excavations led by Emerson and others, including OAS-run excavations. These avocational archaeologists – licensed or not – have taken part in amassing artifact collections from numerous sites across the province.

The papers in this issue address several dimensions of the problems of care of collections created by avocational archaeologists and collectors. In this issue, we see papers that describe the full range of artifact curation possibilities, but in all cases the authors describe collections that were highly valued by the people who collected them. Concern arises when those collectors reach a time in their lives when they are no longer capable of, or wishing to, care for the materials. How can we, as members of the OAS assist with the transition of these collections into stable facilities? And what are our priorities in terms of the nature of the facility?

Firstly, given our affirmation that Indigenous communities have an inherent right to stewardship of Indigenous artifacts, we may want to prioritize finding curation facilities that are consistent with this goal. Indigenous-managed facilities, such as the Ojibwe Cultural Foundation and the Woodland Cultural Centre, should be priority locations for such collections, but these facilities must also be supported appropriately. Institutions such as the National Museum of History and Sustainable Archaeology have policies in place that recognize the special relationship between Indigenous peoples and their ancestors' artifacts.

Secondly, we may ask ourselves what we can do facilitate these transitions. As Caitlin Coleman describes, the OAS was involved in preparation of the Garrad collections through students hired under the Summer Experience Program. Importantly, however, ASI also contributed significantly to this project. If we accept that the current practice of archaeology in Ontario has its deep roots in the work that avocational archaeologists and collectors undertook before licensing, then perhaps it is incumbent upon all of those who benefit from this ‘industry’ to assist with rehousing of these older collections. Certainly, ASI is to be commended for the contribution that they have made.

Chris Ellis outlines a second important way in which we may be able to assist with the transition of collections: the issuing of tax receipts. While this may seem problematic to those of us who do not want to assign a monetary value to artifacts, it may be the best way to compensate the descendants of collectors, who are likely to see their parent's six quart baskets of artifacts as more of a source of revenue than an important archive of the past.

Thirdly, there may be situations in which physically-transitioning artifacts out of the hands of collectors and into curatorial facilities is untenable, either now or forever.. Bonnie Glencross and Gary Warrick outline an alternative approach in these types of situations.

Artifacts, objects, things clearly have a myriad of values and meanings. While they may not speak to many of you in the way that Anong Beam has described, even workaday archaeologists should be concerned about older collections and the information they hold. Michael Shott has described the impact that collecting has on the archaeological record in Michigan: sites with diagnostics that can be interpreted may be transformed into sites with little Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, in MTCS-speak. If we can prevent collections from being sold at auction and/or having documentation removed from them, we have a hope of linking some of those collections back to those sites they come from. Next month's *Arch Notes* will include a couple of case studies outlining the detective work that has gone into investigation of some of these.

In closing, I want to mention a few other items. First of all, you might have noticed that there are some changes on our website. We are very pleased to welcome Josh Dent as our new Webmaster. Josh is a Mitacs post-doctoral fellow at Timmins-Martelle Heritage Consultants and Sustainable Archaeology. You may want to check out his

project Insituated Heritage (<https://insituated.com/>).

One thing Josh has done is to put the chapter events up on the front page. This really gives us a great sense of the degree to which OAS members from around the province are active and telling archaeological stories throughout the year.

Sometime in the upcoming months you will probably see minor changes to the look of the webpage as we move towards a format that will be readable on your mobile device. One thing that members have asked for is a better sense as to what the Board of Directors is doing. To address this, we will be posting finalized board meeting minutes in the 'members only' section on the website.

I also want to give a shout out to our new Director of Public Outreach, Kaitlyn Mal-leau, who has been active on Twitter (@OntArchSoc) and Facebook. You will soon be seeing an Instagram account and a Facebook page (as opposed to simply a Facebook group).

Finally, I should mention that on my last trip to Toronto I had an opportunity to visit with (as far as we know) the society's oldest

member, Helen Devereux, who is cheerful in her recollections of Norman Emerson and others.

REFERENCES

- Atalay, Sonya
(2008) Pedagogy of Decolonization: Advancing Archaeological Practice through Education. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, ed. by Stephen Silliman, pp. 123-144. Tuscon, University of Arizona Press.
- Garrad, Charles, editor
(1990) *The Presidents Remember: Forty Years of the Ontario Archaeological Society*. Special Publication No. 9. Willowdale, Ontario Archaeological Society.
- Shott, Michael
(2017) Estimating the Magnitude of Private Collection of Points and Its Effects on Professional Survey Results: A Michigan Case Study. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 5(2): 125-137.

Alicia Hawkins

HOW WOULD YOU REPRESENT ARCHAEOLOGY IN ONTARIO IN ONE IMAGE?

ENTER THE ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S LOGO COMPETITION!

Your art could be featured on the Ontario Archaeological Society's promotional materials! We are looking for the next great logo to represent Ontario archaeology on OAS materials and are asking you to hone your artistic skills to design the next face of the society.

You may use any design style, including drawing, computer imaging, photography, etc., but your submission must include the name of the society. The top three images will be awarded first, second, and third prizes and their artists will have their logos featured on OAS materials.

Contest rules:

1. Only one design per person may be submitted.
2. All submissions are due by June 15, 2018 11:59 pm EDT and must be submitted digitally to: membership@ontarioarchaeology.org
3. The winning designs will be announced in Arch Notes and will be featured on promotional materials sold at the 2018 OAS Symposium in Chatham, Ontario. Prizes will be awarded to the three winning artists for their designs.
4. The winners must cede all rights to the image to the Ontario Archaeological Society, Inc. to be used on promotional materials representing the society. Credit will be given to the artist, however, and will also be published in the OAS Arch Notes publication.

LESSONS FROM CHARLIE GARRAD'S LEGACY COLLECTIONS

By Caitlin Coleman

Since 2014, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) has had the privilege of working with one of the most significant archaeological collections in Ontario – Charlie Garrad's assemblage of Tionontaté (Petun) artifacts. In collaboration with the OAS, we undertook the project of reorganizing, re-boxing, and documenting these significant collections with the long-term goal of preparing them for a later transfer to a museum or research institution. I will discuss our decision-making process for how to best organize these collections, how we managed this large pro bono project within the framework of a for-profit business, and what resources we employed to bring the project to fruition.

Most members of the OAS will already be familiar with Charlie's work, as he was a long serving OAS Executive Director (and President) and involved members in his excavations. Charlie organized many field schools focused on these Tionontaté sites, in collaboration with the OAS, Centennial College, Georgian College, and Scarborough College at U of T. These field schools were very important within the history of Ontario archaeology, as they caught the imagination of many students and avocational archaeologists. With their world-class quality artifacts, these sites served as a training ground and inspiration for a

new generation. Charlie's collections continue to inform the work of many PhD students, including Megan Conger who has sampled his work as part of the Dating Iroquoia project, spearheaded by Dr. Jennifer Birch at the University of Georgia.

The artifacts that were collected are related to a population known as the Tionontaté or Petun, who lived in the Collingwood area around Georgian Bay during the 16th and 17th centuries. They were Iroquoian speakers and were closely related to the Huron-Wendat. Materials in the collection include unique effigy pipes, stone tools, worked bone artifacts and ceramics along with European trade goods. The collection consists of approximately 170 boxes derived from over 30 archaeological sites that were investigated beginning in the 1960s until the early 2000s.

Managing Legacy Collections

For collection managers, legacy collections can bring their own special challenges. Artifacts can become separated from their field notes and documentation, they can be stored in poor conditions and become home to pests or mould, and collections can become fragmented and deposited in multiple locations. As archaeologists get older, artifacts can be left in the hands of family members who are unsure what materials they have, or their significance. Fortunately, these worst-case scenarios were not remotely true for Charlie's collections. In Charlie, we had an archaeologist who had meticulously labelled his finds, who was active in ensuring that his collections would be well cared for by a museum, and who was happy to answer all of our questions.

When we assumed care for the Tionontaté artifacts, they were organized in a way that was very logical for a single archaeologist to oversee. Charlie kept the diagnostics or prime examples from his collection on pull-out wooden drawers, making it easy to access and showcase pipes, trade objects and other special items. The bulk of the excavated artifacts,



Ella and Charlie Garrad welcome staff of Archaeological Services Inc. (Alexis Dunlop, Ella, Lauren Vince, John Dunlop, Caitlin Coleman, Charlie, Andreas Vastistas (seated), Robb Bhardwaj, and Allan Jones) as the collection moves to its temporary home.

such as undecorated body sherds and lithic debitage, were boxed up separately. Many artifacts were grouped together by material type, rather than by site, for the purposes of cross site analysis. The artifacts were housed in a variety of packaging, ranging from paper and plastic bags to milk cartons and pill bottles. Despite these packaging materials, all artifacts had been kept in good condition and we had very few instances of lost provenience.

Collections managers know that artifacts tell only half the story. For a collection to be fully informative, it needs to be paired with field notes, field maps, photography, a catalogue, and site reports. These elements amount to a full record of the work that was done, and ensures that artifacts will not become separated from their context. We faced a fairly typical issue with Charlie's collections, in that we had all of these resources, but none of them were digitized. Scanning in important documents is a good first step, but in the long term paper catalogues will need to be moved into searchable spreadsheets so as to make them useful for future researchers.

Organization Methods

Our goal in reorganizing the collections was to consolidate them in a form consistent with current industry standards while we awaited arrangements being made for a later transfer to a museum or research institution. We decided to reorganize all of the material by site, reuniting all diagnostics with the rest of their collections. This process helped us ensure that we had complete

assemblages, and made the artifacts searchable for future researchers or museum workers. Charlie could put his hands on any artifact that he wanted since he knew his collections like the back of his hand, but we needed to make it easy for other researchers or collection managers to navigate this resource.

The first step in our process was to undertake a rough sort and inventory, to ascertain generally how much material was from each site, and make some quick notes as we went. Next, we began the slow process of going through each site individually and organizing it by artifact class, then by provenience. This method involved a fair amount of detective work, as Charlie had developed his own documentation practices and conventions. It is worth remembering that standard terminology and excavation practices are actually quite new in Ontario. Discovering how the sites were recorded and catalogued was a history lesson on how archaeology developed in our province. As we reorganized each site, artifacts were placed in archival-quality plastic bags with new provenience cards and were placed in new banker's boxes. We also created a detailed spreadsheet containing the specific contents of each box, and a master list of complete site information.

Resources for Pro Bono Work

It is worthwhile to discuss the challenges of taking on this type of time intensive pro bono project within the framework of a for-profit business. We had a commitment to this project from the highest level of management in the company, since this undertaking involved a not insignificant commitment of non-billable time from our full time staff. To offset that, we looked to collaborate with other institutions to secure students to work with us on this venture. Our most significant partner was the OAS, who obtained an Ontario Summer Experience Program grant for young workers which allowed us to get full time assistance for two consecutive summers. We also collaborated with two different internship programs, through the Centennial College Museum and Cultural Management Program, and University of Toronto's Faculty of Information.

The Faculty of Information internship program was not an obvious choice, since their program has no connection to archaeology, but they became a great collaborator on this project. We ended up working



Bear mandible tool from Charlie Garrad's collections. (Photo credit Jenny Lu)



Ground stone tools from Charlie Garrad's collections. (Photo credit Jenny Lu)

with three of their archival Masters students over a period of four years. We realized that a large feature of this work was organizational rather than archaeological, and so we committed to training these students on recognizing different material types. We were more than repaid for this effort by receiving some very high quality assistance from students who were up to date on the best practices in archival work.

Through the OAS and University of Toronto, we ended up with students who were very committed to this project, so much so that they offered to extend their time as unpaid volunteers. From the young people who worked for us, two have returned to work for ASI in different capacities, one is

Charlie Garrad directs his 1976 excavation with Centennial College students.



doing archival work in the Yukon, one is working at the Ontario Heritage Trust, and another is currently working at the Buffalo Nations Luxton Museum in Banff. I am quite proud of the high quality of students we attracted to this work, and the success they have since attained. The final result of four years of hard work is that we have now finished reorganizing all of Charlie's collections. The collection expanded as we worked on it and we have a final box count of 178, which have all been reorganized and rehoused. Charlie's artifacts are now almost ready for their next home, whether that is a museum or research institution.

An Enduring Legacy

There is a general enthusiasm in our discipline for new fieldwork and the discovery of new, exciting artifacts. But if we keep our legacy collections in good order, and place them in readily accessible facilities, there are countless exciting and useful research projects that can be undertaken using existing collections. To be effective archaeologists we need to be constantly looking back to re-assess earlier assemblages. Charlie Garrad has given us, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, an incredible gift; it was our privilege to help ensure that these collections will be preserved for future generations.

A TALE OF TWO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS

by Chris Ellis

In this paper I discuss some of the advantages and problematics of dealing with archaeological collections amassed by individuals who do not do archaeology for a living. I focus on these insights through the lens of two collections housed in the Anthropology Department at Western, those of Croft Garnham and George Connoy. I describe these collections below and, following that, examine some of the implications for archaeological knowledge and practice.

The Garnham Collection

Croft Garnham grew up in and spent his whole life in Stratfordville, Ontario. Apparently inspired by finds of artifacts on his own family's farm, he became addicted to knowing about local indigenous history. By my latest counts he amassed material from at least 120 locations largely in and around his home between 1915 and 1970, locations that are recorded in a large notebook. Most of the collection consisted of gifts from local landowners to Garnham although on very rare occasions he made some purchases for a few dollars (\$6 is the maximum I can find). My impression is he was not that much interested in the monetary value of the collection but truly in their historical/cultural value.

Some of the locations are represented by single artifact finds but there are some larger ones of note; the most extensive is a large series from the Early Ontario Iroquoian Goessens site, the type site of Glen Meyer (Lee 1951:45). It was Garnham's knowledge that brought the site to Thomas Lee's attention during his 1949-1950 surveys through the area for the National Museum of Man. Garnham was good friends with the collector Fritz Knechtel and it was Knechtel that facilitated the donation of the Goessens site collection to that Museum. Subsequently, when the site was bulldozed by the landowner, Garnham managed to amass the collection from the disturbed site areas now housed at Western, which includes many rim sherds and other items.

Although I never personally met Mr. Garnham, he was visited by Dana Poulton (1980), who viewed his collection and recorded some details. In addition, Dana recorded details of several other collections/collectors in the area known to Mr. Garnham. Aside from publications that use the Garnham Goessens' collection at the National Museum (e.g., J. V. Wright 1966), and a detailed description I did of an unusual slate gorget fragment from one site (Ellis 2002), the collection remains unpublished.

After Mr. Garnham's death the collection resided with his widow until her passing in the early 1990s. It was only fortuitous that the collection came to my attention. One of Mr. Garnham's grandchildren just happened to be an acquaintance of a former Western Anthropology faculty member, Dr. Lee Guemple. Lee told me about it and facilitated my examining the collection.

Public charitable institutions such as universities and museums can offer tax receipts for collections at a value determined by a third independent party that would be demonstrably commensurate with that on the open market. This collection was donated to Western for a tax receipt equally divided amongst the grandchildren and a promise that the collection would be housed with appropriate acknowledgement to Mr. Garnham and his grandchildren.

The George Connoy Collection

George Connoy was an avid archaeology enthusiast based in St. Thomas, Ontario, who began collecting in the 1950's. He focused his main attention on the area from London south to Lake Erie although – in the 1950s – while vacationing in eastern Ontario, he visited and obtained material from sites in that area, notably the Roebuck (Wintemberg 1936) and apparently Maynard-McKeown (J. H. Wright 2009) St. Lawrence Iroquoian sites. He was a founding member of the London Chapter of the OAS and served for many years as its treasurer until his death in July of 1990. He was recruited by Bill Fox into the Archaeological Conservation Officer Program (ACOP) in the 1970s and did licensed archaeological surveys for which he submitted detailed reports during that time frame. However, his extensive collection from over 130 locations includes many significant Iroquoian villages. Some had never been previously reported at the time he found them and a few are still unknown to the archaeological community today!

I knew George quite well and I am certain he had little monetary interest in his collections – he was simply fascinated by discovering relics of Ontario's past and using them to draw insights into past cultures. He volunteered on Paleoindian field projects carried out by Brian Deller and I, and every time I saw him afterwards he had to tell me how excited he had been to have actually found and handled a fluted point made and used in Ontario over 12,500 years ago!

When George passed on, his collection could have been totally lost but most was saved through the efforts of Paul Lennox. Paul was aware of the extent of the collection (it filled about 30 cardboard boxes of various sizes in a garage) and its cultural/historical value so approached me to try and get the collection transferred to Western. Paul saw some urgency to this endeavour because, as soon as George died, collectors had descended upon the family. Some gained access to the collection and purchased certain items and obviously rarer items with greater commercial value. They also seem to have rifled through some materials to the extent that certain artifacts lost their provenance information and it did not help that some plastic bags used to house certain site collections had disintegrated mixing up certain collections or separating collections from labels within boxes.

Regardless, we managed to have most of the remainder do-

nated to Western and a tax receipt was issued to members of George's daughter's family. The only exception was a small part of the collection, mounted on a display board, that was donated to a local Museum.

Implications

My experiences in obtaining these two collections are not necessarily typical of all those that have been donated to institutions with whom I am connected. For example, the late Vince Pilon, who was also a member of the ACOP program, monitored several Post-Contact Neutral sites in the Brantford vicinity and upon his passing, his daughter and grandchildren donated his collection to Western. They did not even want to consider a monetary reward in terms of a tax receipt. Nonetheless, many of my experiences with other collections mirror closely that of the Garnham and Connoy examples and these collections do provide certain insights. These include:

1) On many occasions I have been asked to consider or advise whether these private collections would be acceptable for donations to institutions such as Western or its affiliate at the Museum of Ontario Archaeology. If the finds have no provenance of any kind I basically advise the institution not to accept the donation regardless of other strings the donor may attach. They are largely useless for academic purposes. If they have clear provenance, even to Lot and Concession, I argue one consider acceptance of their donation – and stress the better/more specific the contextual data attached, the more the donation becomes of scholarly/cultural value.

The amount of contextual data available can vary considerably. In some cases, one only has provenance to a specific piece of property, as is the case with many of the sites in the collections of concern here. In other cases, however, there can be some very specific locational data provided. For example, in the Connoy Collection there are some sites that have location data of features containing Late Woodland pots that were plough-truncated. Also, there are even collections I am aware of where particular artifacts were piece-plotted on the site surface such as Rogers, perhaps Ontario's oldest documented site (Deller et al. 2018). It should be clear that even with only provenance to a general property these can be very valuable. Such collections can be very useful to verify existing sites, track down new ones and increase sample sizes for specific examples (for an example from the Connoy collection see Keron [2018]).

Large series of data available in the kinds of occupations at various places on the landscape, combined with already known site locations, can also be useful to model and track down additional site locations. The large collections also can demonstrate how rare or common some sites are, or show the limitations to our knowledge. For example, despite the size of these collections there are no fluted point sites recorded in either of them, reinforcing the rarity of such sites. Also, the only recorded early sites are Late Paleo Hi-Lo ones, both of which are represented by two points in each collection! These substantiate the idea that Hi-Lo is the most common of all Paleo developments but such sites are still very rare. In contrast, Early Archaic sites, notably Corner-

Notched (Kirk) Horizon finds are relatively common in these collections.

2) I stress that in both cases monetary concerns were not a primary (or any) concern to the collectors themselves who, as with many if not most collectors, were generally interested in the human past and what such collections can tell us about that history. However, one cannot assume that their descendants have that emotional connection and often they do not. As a result, they would tend to see the items more as mere collectibles and antiques and presume a monetary value of some kind. This does not mean families have no sense of the historical/cultural value of these collections. Their mere willingness to talk to Paul Lennox or me, and the donation of some of the Connoy collection to a local museum, indicates this.

In any case, virtually every academic/scholarly archaeology body, or one that aspires to that end, decries the buying of collections or placing a monetary value on such materials as, among other things, it encourages collecting and looting of sites (for a recent discussion of the complexities of this problem and related issues see Pitblado [2016]). Public charitable institutions do have somewhat of an 'out', in that they can offer tax receipts for a value that would be demonstrably commensurate with that on the open market. As noted earlier, the institution must have an independent estimate of that value acceptable to the Canada Revenue Agency.

Getting those estimates is not easy, as professional archaeologists including me do not want to place such a value on collections, even though, with help from on-line auctions and other web sources, one could relatively easily obtain such an estimate. I am often asked to provide estimates and always decline and explain why I will not do so. However, local auction house evaluators, which often sell such collections, whether we like it or not, are a good potential source for providing such estimates. In that way, archaeologists can avoid enhancing the commercial value of archaeological object which is often foreseen as major roadblock in most ethic statements – the market, not the archaeologist, determines its relative monetary value.

3) I am certain that a tax receipt, while it was not the primary impetus (they could get more in cash on the open market), certainly facilitated donation of these collections and associated documentation. Without it, the valuable historical/cultural information the collections can yield would have been entirely lost. In the case of the collection, while I was examining it a major local London auctioneer was viewing the house contents. The collection could have been sold off with the rest of the materials for a substantial gain. They would have been auctioned off as many separate lots and dispersed with loss of most, if not all, of the useful information it contained. In fact, in my experience often families do not provide the contextual records along with the artifacts. I know the same auctioneer has sold other major London area collections as several lots. As well, parts of other collections I have dealt with were dispersed in the same manner, especially ones where there are several heirs amongst whom the collection can be divvied up prior to sale.

For example, part of the Rogers Paleindian site collection (Deller et al. 2018) was dispersed via auctions and other means before donation of its remainder to the Sustainable Archaeology facility at Western.

4) In both cases it was simply fortuitous that the collections were brought to my attention and lucky that they were salvaged. I am certain many more collections have simply disappeared and even if the artifacts do not, their provenance does often disappear. As the collectors who descended upon the Connoy collection show (even destroying the contextual information in the process), it is the artifacts themselves that are often their primary concern and not the ‘people behind the artifacts’.

5) In many cases the records indicate several other collectors were gathering material off the same sites as the ones in the collections noted here. I think we vastly underestimate just how much collecting activity has gone on or how endemic it is/has been in some regions. The geologist William Parkins told me he used to observe groups of as many as seven collectors systematically collecting fields in the Grand River and Welland River areas in the 1970s. Also, I have examined the records of Merle Franklin of Dunnville, Ontario, whose collection is housed at the Sustainable Archaeology Facility in London, and he lists over 70 collectors largely from that same general area. The amount of material that has been removed from such sites is often astounding and of course, those many collections have largely lost their contextual data.

As Bill Fox (2018) and others (e.g. Nolan 2017) have stressed, it is becoming evident that the amount of material removed from many, perhaps even most sites in long cultivated fields, has decimated them. Yet, we often do not realize or acknowledge that has been the case. As the collector tends to focus on more complex artifacts of diagnostic value they have probably turned many more substantial sites of unknown age into lithic scatters than we care to acknowledge (Dunlop 2018). The Connoy Collection demonstrates this very well. One example is a registered site AeHf-21 that was recorded by archaeologist Dana Poulton in 1980. Based on Ministry records single surface survey produced of six lithic flakes plus some fire-cracked rock although the presence of material in the hands of collectors is noted. Yet, in the Connoy collection are two banker’s boxes of artifacts from the site strongly suggesting the site is, among other things, a Late Woodland (Middleport) village! While it is certainly true these activities can result in loss of information, it is also true that in some cases they can provide all or the bulk of information we have about such sites, especially ones that are largely destroyed such as the Goessens site. If we cannot make efforts to save such collections our view of the past undoubtedly will be severely biased and incorrect as Pitblado (2014:392) has recently demonstrated in the Clovis Paleo case.

6) From the perspective of the archaeologist, I must argue that it is often up to us to make sure ‘fellow travelers’ are aware that such donated collections exist. Anyone who is doing CRM in areas where these collections were made needs to check them for relevance as they could also indicate your flake scatter may be something more! I believe that I personally have been lacking in

my efforts in this direction and one reason I wrote this article is to alert readers to the presence of these two collections! But one cannot know when such a collection may come to light and be thoroughly documented. Most academic archaeologists are heavily involved in their own research projects, teaching, and so on. Hence, it is a very involved process to go through these collections and develop documentation. It is only now after more than 20+ years that these two collections at Western are being thoroughly documented and evaluated (and mainly because I am retiring!). It is my hope that sites already in the Ministry data base will be updated with reference to the availability of these collections. As Bill Fox (e.g., 2017) has long argued, efforts must be made to make available to the CRM and other concerned parties, knowledge of the presence of collections from other, previously unreported locations residing at Western (and elsewhere!).

7) As the above examples attest, though the amassers of these collections had a genuine interest in Ontario’s past, it is somewhat incongruous that they did not arrange to ensure that those collections were preserved intact such that the information contained in them would always be available in the future. Note that in the George Connoy case this even included material collected under archaeological licence! These collections are not alone. Most donated assemblages come as after-thoughts or as noted above, due largely to pure luck. Not all end up this way to be sure, but with a couple of outstanding exceptions, most that are donated are largely smaller farm collections that the current or past landowners have gone out of their way to preserve. They often see the donated collection as a family legacy and part of their own family’s history, not just that of the peoples who came before. More work needs to be done among even responsible collectors or, as I prefer to call them, ‘avocational archaeologists’, to ensure the collections remain intact when offered to public institutions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the Garnham and Connoy families for the generous donation of these collections to Western and to Brian Deller, James Keron, Paul Lennox and Dana Poulton for information that allowed me to pull this paper together. I also thank my RAs and volunteers who have done a super job sorting the collections and compiling information about them: Corbin Berger, Carolina Degaldo, Gabryell Kurtzrock Belyea, Felipe Gonzalez-Macqueen, Hillary Kiazzyk and Kayla Golay Lausanne. Felipe deserves a special vote of thanks for going above and beyond to document the Connoy collection and track down potential site matches in the Ministry data base.

REFERENCES

- Deller, D. Brian, Christopher Ellis and Merle Franklin (2018) The Rogers Site: An Early Paleindian Site in the Niagara Peninsula Region of Ontario. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 46: forthcoming.

- Dunlop, John
(2018) Pushing the Limits: Testing, Magnetometry and Ontario Lithic Scatters. MA Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London.
- Ellis, Christopher
(2002) An Unusual Slate Gorget Fragment from Oxford County, Ontario. *Ontario Archaeology* 74:22-42.
- Fox, William
(2018) The Old Collections Project (An Uncertain Future). *Arch Notes* 22(6):5-7.
- Keron, James A.
(2018) A Bag Labelled Owner, Lot, Concession and Township. *Arch Notes*: In Press
- Lee, Thomas A.
(1951) A Preliminary Report on an Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Ontario for 1949. In: *Annual Report of the National Museum for the Fiscal Year 1949-1950*, pp. 42-48. National Museum of Canada, Bulletin No. 123. Ottawa.
- Nolan, Kevin
(2017) The Single-Pass Survey and the Collector: A Reasonable Effort in Good Faith? Paper presented at the 2017 MAC Sponsored Symposium, Working with Responsible Private Collectors and Collections. Indianapolis, Indiana, November. (Available on academia.edu)
- Pitblado, Bonnie
(2014) An Argument for Ethical, Proactive, Archaeologist-Artifact Collector Collaboration. *American Antiquity* 79:385-400.
- Poulton, Dana
(1980) Catfish Creek Archaeological Survey Field Notes: Book 2. On file with author and at the Museum of Ontario Archaeology.
- Wintemberg, William J.
(1936) *Roebuck Prehistoric Village Site, Grenville County, Ontario*. National Museum of Canada Bulletin No. 51.
- Wright, James V.
(1966) *The Ontario Iroquois Tradition*. National Museum of Canada Bulletin, No. 210.
- Wright, Joyce, M.
(2009) A Quest for Meaning at the Early Sixteenth-Century St. Lawrence Iroquoian Maynard-McKeown Site. PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

CALL FOR APPLICATIONS TO THE VALERIE SONSTENES STUDENT RESEARCH FUND

In 2011, the Ontario Archaeological Society established the Valerie Sonstenes Student Research Fund after receiving a generous bequest from the estate of Valerie Sonstenes. In the time that has elapsed, the fund has grown from the original \$10,000 to nearly \$19,600 through investment income and regular donations. We are thrilled to announce that, at the March board meeting, we agreed that the OAS is in a position to make the first award from this fund.

The fund supports the following types of costs that are directly related to research:

Specialist study

Travel and accommodation related to Visiting archives; Studying collections; and Visiting communities to interview participants

Other direct and justified research costs

The fund does not support costs related to large scale fieldwork. Students at all levels (Honour's, Master, PhD, and Postdoctoral) are eligible to apply. In 2018, we will be awarding up to \$1,000. Applications are due by June 1, 2018. Please see the OAS website for a complete application package.

WORKING WITH PRIVATE COLLECTIONS IN SIMCOE COUNTY

By Bonnie Glencross (Wilfrid Laurier University) and Gary Warrick (Wilfrid Laurier University)

Private collections, made by farmers, artifact collectors, and amateur archaeologists, are often the only remaining vestiges of ancient sites, and represent a substantial portion of the archaeological record. Whether the result of chance finds, excavation, or looting, these collections are deemed illegal, destructive, and perpetuating colonial subjugation of Indigenous peoples. Their contested nature raises the question how best to deal with the legacy of private collections in Ontario? While examining approaches to dealing with private collections outside of Ontario, we argue that the value of research using private collections is seated in public outreach and education, and in identifying missing information about the past. We draw on our own experience using historical data, private collections, and field investigations in our research involving Huron-Wendat archaeological sites in Ontario.

An approach taken by some provinces (i.e., New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador)(New Brunswick Heritage . . . [updated 2018]) (The Community Collections . . . [updated 2015]) and some states in the U.S. (i.e., Texas) (Documenting Archaeological Collections [updated 2018]) involves the creation of private collection registries. In these instances, private archaeological collections are either turned over or loaned to provincial or state archaeology offices for inventory/photography and analysis. Collections are returned with the understanding that the collection does not personally belong to the individual, and that the act of collecting artifacts is illegal. The Missouri Archaeological Society has been publishing private collections for years to ensure continued documentation, analysis, and public access (Hranicky 2011).

Proponents of this approach argue the value of these registries and ultimately private collections lies in the ability to fill considerable gaps in the archaeological record, public outreach making the collections and the information they hold more accessible, and in education of collectors, stakeholders and the public on our common heritage. Crucial to the success of these programs is the need for collaboration with the shared goal of preserving archaeological heritage. Implicit in this approach is the building and maintaining of relations with collectors for continued monitoring of collections and sites, and the recovery of information potentially lost when a collection is no longer kept or

cared for.

Professional archaeologists, those best equipped to take on the role of documenting and analyzing private collections and positioned to perform public outreach, are challenged on ethical grounds from both within and outside of the profession. The broader ethos in archaeology has (and remains) that collectors destroy cultural resources and that the incentive to do so is driven by a market in undocumented antiquities. The act of looting destroys the context of any physical object, causing the loss of essential information and degrading the value of a shared cultural heritage. This point of view is representative of the Archaeological Institute of America, Society for American Archaeology, Society for Historical Archaeology and American Schools of Oriental Research. These organizations also



Figure 1: A small reconstructed pot, pieces of which were found at two sites, a possible cabin site and village site separated geographically. The mended pot speaks to the nature and relationship between the two sites.



Figure 2: Sword or dagger guard (a), traveling spoon (b), and jetton (Page 14) (c) provide evidence of a strong European presence, the extent of commercial trade between Europeans and the Indigenous community in early 17th century Ontario.

believe that, with only a few exceptions, publishing undocumented archaeological objects only works to enhance their commercial value which in turn encourages looting and trade (Pitblado 2014a, 2014b). Opposition to the study of private collections also comes from descendant communities, where stewardship of archaeological artifacts is contested whether collections are held privately or publicly, and whether made by collectors or professionals. For Indigenous communities in Ontario, current legislation does not recognize Indigenous stewardship of their archaeological heritage, except for human remains and associated artifacts recovered from burials (Warrick 2017). All collections held privately or by institutions are viewed as disconnected and voiceless, destined to lie in storage (Hill 2006).

We are currently documenting a private collection, representing the accumulation of over 30 years of casual artifact collection on two 17th century Huron-Wendat sites in Simcoe County, in the hopes of bringing new and valued information to light. We have inventoried, photographed and analyzed over 1,000 diagnostic artifacts in this collection: iron awls, axes and knives; pieces of copper and brass trade

kettles; lithic, iron and copper/brass projectile points; drawn glass, shell, stone and copper beads; and relatively complete ceramic and stone pipes and portions of pottery vessels (Figure 1). These artifacts contribute significantly to our understanding of the occupational history of two village sites and a possible cabin site. Collation and analysis of the fragmented record has brought to light previously unrealised information about site sequence and village relocations, as well as interactions with other Indigenous communities and Europeans.

A few of the European artifacts (Figure 2) in the collection may be instrumental in helping to identify the sites as Huron-Wendat villages named and located in the accounts of French explorers and missionaries. It must be mentioned that, despite the obvious ethical concerns and potential problems (e.g., possibility that a collector will consider the collection valuable because of archaeological interest in it, resulting in its sale) (Pitblado 2014a), our study of this collection is widely supported by the Huron-Wendat Nation, MTCS, and our archaeological colleagues. Furthermore, while the collector is not willing at present to donate the collection to a public repository, the collector is no longer collecting (new awareness of the value of site preservation and licenced archaeological investigation), is opposed to selling the collection in whole or in part, and is keenly interested in learning more about Huron-Wendat history and archaeology to place the collection in a wider context.

Working together is advantageous to all stakeholders in preserving and documenting archaeological heritage in Ontario. Collectors learn more about the artifacts and how they fit into history. The study of private collections has the potential to lead to the recording of new sites and/or previously unrealized information (Shott 2017). Essential knowledge is made accessible to Indigenous and descendant communities and the public. The study of private collections of artifacts in Ontario, provided it is done ethically and with a clear goal of educating

the collector about the importance of preserving archaeological heritage, will add significantly to our understanding of the past in Ontario.

REFERENCES

- Documenting Archaeological Collections [Internet]. [updated 2013 July 30]. Austin (TX): Texas Historical Commission; [cited 2018 Mar 21]. Available from http://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/publications/archeology-documenting-collections_0.pdf
- Hranicky, William Jack
2011 *North American Projectile Points*. Bloomington (IN): AuthorHouse. pp. 549.
- Hill, Richard Sr.
2006 Making a Final Resting Place Final: A History of the Repatriation Experience of the Haudenosaunee. In *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*, edited by Jordan Kerber, pp. 3-17. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- New Brunswick Heritage Conservation Act and Artifact Discovery [Internet]. [updated 2018]. Fredericton (NB): Tourism, Heritage and Culture; [cited 2018 Mar 21]. Available from <http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/departments/thc/heritage/content/archaeology/NBHCAartifactDiscovery.html>
- Pitblado, Bonnie L.
2014a An Argument for Ethical, Proactive, Archaeologist-Artifact Collector Collaboration. *American Antiquity* 79:385-400.
- 2014b How Archaeologists and Artifact Collectors Can – and Should – Collaborate to Comply with Legal and Ethical Antiquities Codes. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 2(4):338-352.
- Shott, Michael
2017 Estimating the Magnitude of Private Collection of Points and Its Effects on Professional Survey Results: A Michigan Case Study. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 5(2):125-137.
- The Community Collections Archaeological Research Project 2015 [Internet]. [updated 2015 July 14]. St. John's (NL): Newfoundland and Labrador Archaeological Society; [cited 2018 Mar 21]. Available from <https://nlarchsociety.ca/2015/07/14/the-community-collections-archaeological-research-project-2015/>
- Warrick, Gary
2017 Control of Indigenous Archaeological Heritage in Ontario, Canada. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 13(1): 88-109.



CONNECTIONS AND PATHWAYS THROUGH THE PAST



ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM 2018

Call for Papers and Posters

From November 9-11, 2018 the Ontario Archaeological Society will be hosting its 45th Annual Symposium in Chatham, Ontario. The conference will explore the theme of **CONNECTIONS AND PATHWAYS THROUGH THE PAST**. Come and explore the historic 'Forks' of the Thames River and MacGregor Creek, a meeting place for Indigenous people, War of 1812 battle site, connection point on the Underground Railroad and mecca of early Black settlement. We invite papers reflecting all aspects of Chatham-Kent's diverse heritage and highlighting the theme of connections and pathways, between the past and present, between regional centres, archaeologists and the public, archaeology and history, Canada and the United States.

Suggested topics include:

- The Underground Railroad and Early Black Settlement History and Archaeology;
- The Archaeology of Chatham-Kent;
- Transportation and Travel Routes of the Past (trails, waterways, railways);
- Cross-border and Cross-disciplinary archaeology; and
- Public and Community-based Archaeology or Collaborative Archaeology.

General papers on any topic pertaining to Ontario Archaeology are also welcome.

Interested participants please send titles and abstracts to:

Program Committee
OAS Symposium 2018
1600 Attawandaron Road
London, Ontario N6G 3M6
Or by email to Holly Martelle, Program Chair

Conference sessions will be held at the Chatham-Kent John D. Bradley Convention Center, 565 Richmond Street, Chatham. Tours and workshops are being planned to take advantage of Chatham-Kent's rich heritage sites, including local Underground Railroad and early Black settlement centres. Watch for more information at [www.oas-society.ca](#) and forthcoming *Arch Notes*.

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY INC.



ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING BEST WESTERN BRANTFORD HOTEL

BRANTFORD, ONTARIO

Nov. 18, 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.



Draft Minutes

Board Members in attendance

Paul Racher, President
Alicia Hawkins, President-Elect
Rob Pihl, Vice-President
Debbie Steiss, Treasurer
Amy St. John, Director
Dana Millson, Director
Matt Beaudoin, Director
Grant Karcich, Director
Bill Fox, Director
Bill Ross, Director
Lorie Harris, Executive Director

Regrets

Nicole Brandon, Director

There were 52 members in attendance.

Call to Order (at 4:05 pm).

President Paul Racher called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm and remarked how pleased he was to see so many people in attendance, attributing it to the interest in the proposed significant changes to the OAS Constitution and Statement of Ethical Principles (SEP). Sheryl Smith (seconded by Jim Keron) moved to adopt the agenda for the 2017 OAS Annual Business Meeting (ABM): carried.

Sheryl Smith (seconded by Jamie

Hunter) moved to adopt the minutes from the 2016 ABM: carried. No errors or omissions to the minutes were presented. No matters arising from the minutes were noted.

President's Report

President Paul Racher encouraged those in attendance to refer to his report published in the Annual Report (AR, pp 6-7) and reminisced on what he had wanted to accomplish during his presidency back at the 2015 symposium: then along came the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) which became a game-changer for the OAS, with huge implications for archaeology. The call to action from the TRC has since resulted in two 'reconciliation projects' for the OAS:

The Mohawk Institute: during the 2017 field season, volunteers from the OAS London, Grand River, Hamilton and Toronto Chapters participated in Stage 2 and 3 assessments of the property to identify archaeological resources in advance of proposed repairs to the building and landscaping of the grounds. The project is expected to continue into 2018; and

Chippewa of the Thames First Nation (COTTFN): with less than two weeks no-

tice this fall, volunteers from the OAS created and then taught a course to help train a class of Indigenous archaeological monitors for evaluating projects within their traditional territory. The course is now available to be offered gratis to any other First Nation community wanting such training.

The significant outcome of the TRC involves making changes to the OAS constitution that reflect the spirit of the "94 Calls to Action" and the UNDRIP. Accordingly, a committee was struck that included members Gary Warrick, Paul Racher and Scott Martin as well as Dr. David Lubbell, and they reviewed ethical policies from heritage organizations world-wide to provide new language to augment our Constitution and to supplement our current Statement of Ethical Principles (SEP). The proposed changes to both documents have been published in *Arch Notes*, were posted on the OAS website, and are printed in the AR that was distributed for this ABM; in a Power-Point presentation, Paul reviewed the changes to both documents, and then both were presented to the membership in attendance for further discussion.

Changes to the OAS Constitution

Upon motion (Rob Pihl/Alicia Hawkins), the OAS membership was asked to approve

the change to the constitution by adding Item #4 to Article 10 according to the proposed wording as published in the AN, the OAS website and the AR. In the discussion, Norma Knowlton challenged whether the 60-day notification period for motions to change the constitution had been met in advance of a called vote. Smith reported that the digital version of all proposed changes had been circulated to the membership in advance of the 60-day notification period, but that the mailed copies of the AN were likely not received within the proper period; never-the-less, the notification period requirement had been met. No other discussion ensued, and a recorded vote was called and carried (55 For, 1 Against, 0 Abstained).

Changes to the Statement of Ethical Principles

Upon motion (Rob Pihl/Alicia Hawkins), the OAS membership was asked to approve the change to the SEP according to the proposed wording as published in the AN, the OAS website and the AR. Dena Doroszenko proposed a friendly amendment to add the phrase “Descendant group” after “Indigenous communities” in Item #5, and this was accepted. Gary Warrick questioned whether Item #4 was still needed since it seemed to contravene Item #1. Rob MacDonald suggested adding “In spite of Item 1...” at the beginning of Item #5, however, Mima Kapches suggested instead that we call the vote on the accepted wording and let the new Board of Directors deal with any further language refinement, and this was accepted. Grant Karcich, however, questioned whether in Item #6 it was possible to identify the Indigenous community for all customs and traditions, particularly for archaeological remains with some time depth. The consensus was that the vote should still proceed with the current, accepted wording, however, Eric Beals proposed a friendly amendment to Item #6 that the reference to treatment of “human remains” be changed to “ancestors,” and this was accepted. There was no further discussion, and the vote was called and carried.

Treasurer’s Report

Debbie Steiss discussed the current fi-

ancial situation (see AR, p 11, along with supplements handed out at the meeting), and she reminded us that Kate Oxley, Programs and Services Branch, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, had encouraged us to move to fund accounting for our financial statement at last year’s ABM. Since our current accountant, Thamesford Accounting did not conduct financial audits which would also include fund accounting, the ABM decided to switch accounting firms, and a search was conducted resulting in the selection of Weinburg & Garspiric LLP. They conducted the financial review for 2016 and will conduct an audit for 2017 since our projected revenues for this year will exceed the \$100K threshold due to revenue from the 2017 symposium.

Debbie highlighted information from several hand-outs she provided to the OAS membership pertaining to the audited financial statements:

Membership fee revenue is up compared to 2016, which reflects the fee increase that went into effect;

Subscription revenue for *Ontario Archaeology* is up compared to 2016, and we are almost caught up with the release of the 2017 issue slated for early 2018;

The 2016 symposium posted a \$6K profit which was split between the OAS and the OAS Grand River Chapter;

Although there was an operating deficit of \$8,700, revenue from our investments allowed an overall balance of \$15K, however this suggests we need to work on correcting the structural deficit;

2017 revenue has increased by \$4K due to the fee increase; and

the OAS received a Student Experience Programme grant.

The various OAS funds have been reviewed out and their balances re-established:

Future (unrestricted use); Publication (restricted use); Awards (restricted use by Board); V Sontenes SR (can now start using it since balance has grown). Debbie also suggested that the OAS needs to actively start fund-raising. Upon motion (Debbie Steiss/Jim Keron), the 2016 Financial Statement was proposed for adoption. Jim Keron remarked that the various fund amounts looked fine. With no further dis-

ussion, the vote was then called and carried.

Upon motion (Debbie Steiss/Alicia Hawkins), the accounting firm of Weinburg & Garspiric LLP was proposed for appointment to perform the OAS financial audit for the 2017 fiscal year. There was no discussion, and the vote was called and carried.

Election of Directors

The Nomination Committee consisted of Matt Beaudoin, Alicia Hawkins and Paul Racher, and they were tasked with finding nominees for three Director positions that would be vacant in 2018. Alicia was pleased to announce that they had secured three nominees: Bill Fox, Kaitlyn Malleau and James Conolly. After further calls for nominations, the question was called (Alicia Hawkins/Matt Beaudoin), and the three nominees were acclaimed for 2018 and 2019. Alicia also noted that there would be no new appointments next year to keep the Board membership lower.

Next Symposia

Jim Keron announced that the OAS London and Windsor Chapters will be co-hosting the 2018 Symposium on November 9-11, 2018 at the Chatham Convention Centre, in Chatham with accommodations at the hotel next door. The theme will focus on Black History and there will be an open session and possibly another session on the role of Indigenous communities in archaeology.

Alicia Hawkins proposed that the 2019 Symposium be located somewhere other than southwestern Ontario with a preference for eastern Ontario if possible.

Strategic Plan

Alicia Hawkins stated that a committee is actively working on the new Strategic Plan, and they are soliciting input from the OAS membership. She encouraged everyone to please fill out the form that was provided at the registration desk.

Other Business

Motion of Thanks to:

Lorie Harris, OAS Executive Director

Outgoing Board of Director members—Matt Beaudoin, Grant Karcich and Margie

Kenedy

Ontario Archaeology editor—Chris Ellis with assistance of Suzanne Needs-Howarth
Arch Notes co-editors—Sheryl Smith and Carole Stimmell

Carried.

Carole Stimmell, President, OAS Toronto Chapter. The OAS Toronto Chapter wishes to thank the OAS Treasurers past and present for their devoted volunteer service on the OAS Board.

Upon motion (Carole Stimmell/Mima Kapches), in light of the increasing complex nature of the financial/auditing/taxation landscapes, a Financial Advisory committee consisting of three to five individuals be established, beginning in 2018, as an Ex-officio (Non-Voting) committee to advise and assist the OAS Board of Directors on financial matters. In the discussion

that followed, Jean-Luc asked why this was necessary. Debbie stated that while the financial side of the Treasurer's job was very manageable, especially with the recent acquisition of the accounting firm of Weinburg & Gaspirc, she would like help with some of the other duties such as fund-raising and applying for grants. Neal Ferris stated that the OAS constitution stipulates that only the Board can establish a committee and proposed a friendly amendment that substituted "considered" instead of "established"; this was accepted. Alicia Hawkins also proposed a friendly amendment that added "This committee would be chaired by the Treasurer"; this was accepted. The vote was called and carried.

Julie Kapyrka asked if the OAS would enter into an agreement with the Union of Ontario Indians per the Briefing Note that was prepared and circulated to the Board.

Paul Racher stated that the spirit of the document seemed to be quite good but that much further and detailed discussion is necessary before a commitment can be made. Sheryl Smith believes the full OAS membership would need to be involved, including full publishing of the document, before any agreement is made.

Motion of Thanks to the 2017 OAS Symposium Organizing Committee—Matt Beaudoin, Paul Racher, Debbie Steiss and Gary Warrick, and all the volunteers—that helped to make the symposium a success (Holly Martelle/Sheryl Smith): Carried.

Adjournment

Upon motion (Bill Ross/Holly Martelle), the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 pm. Carried.

Notes taken by Rob Pihl, Vice President

THE PEGGI ARMSTRONG PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY AWARD

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Members of OAS are invited to consider nominating an individual, group, or institution for the **Peggi Armstrong Public Archaeology Award**. This is an OAS award administered through the Ottawa Chapter. A page featuring previous winners of the PAPA Award can be found on the Ottawa Chapter website (www.ottawaoas.ca), illustrating the variety of contributions they have made.

Public Archaeology, for the purpose of this award, stimulates public interest in the study of archaeology, promotes awareness of cultural resources and heritage preservation, and fosters individual and collective efforts to advance the ethical practice of archaeology.

Nominees must have contributed significantly to promoting archaeology of and in Ontario, by means of public archaeology. If a professional, the nominee must have

demonstrated commitment to public archaeology over and above his or her normal job description.

The nominator should endeavour to address the nominee's contribution to public archaeology under each of the pertinent **award criteria** listed on the Ottawa Chapter website (www.ottawaoas.ca). Wherever possible, supplementary materials should be included in support of the nomination, such as letters of reference from other individuals, and information on institutions such as brochures or descriptive hand-outs or web-site material about programs.

Send your nomination by **July 1st** to the PAPA Award Selection Committee via contact@ottawaoas.ca or c/o Ottawa Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society, P.O. Box 4939, Station E, Ottawa K1S 5J1.

IN DEFENSE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

(submitted February 9, 2018)

by Peter L. Storck

I'm writing in response to an article published January 22 in the *Globe and Mail* about the OAS Reconciliation Project at the Mohawk Institute for the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford.

Before I begin I would like to applaud the OAS for its role in this project. It has wonderful potential for supporting the Truth and Reconciliation process, especially if the discoveries (the writing on the brick walls and objects found in the walls of the institute) will be preserved for educational purposes. These tangible items, like the building itself, have an immediacy – and power to educate – far beyond the printed word.

I am disturbed, however, by the tone and some of the remarks in the *Globe and Mail* article. In reference to the history of archaeology in the province, the reporter refers to David Boyle as “crudely” excavating sites in the 1880s; and quotes Paul Racher, the president of the OAS, as saying that archaeologists in the 1980s practiced “... a rough and ready ‘pith helmet’ approach [to field work] that often led to the manhandling and effective confiscation of sacred artifacts.”

At the conclusion of the article, Mr. Racher is again quoted as saying that the “... profession is still colonial to its roots ...” and comprised of “... a bunch of archaeologists who are almost universally from the settler society ...”

I accept the fact that archaeology's historic relationship with First Nations is not what it should have been. However, a different relationship has been emerging over the past several decades and is quite different from what the newspaper article suggests. Overall, I believe the article gives a negative impression of the discipline to the general public.

As for the comments on the history of archaeology, it is a distortion to accuse David Boyle of conducting “crude” excavations in the late 19th century, because it is not appropriate to compare field methods in the infancy of the discipline with those of today. And Racher's anecdotal account of the “rough and ready ‘pith helmet’ approach” to field work in the 1980s cannot be regarded as characterizing field work across the discipline. Certainly not my projects or those of my close colleagues.

It is also not correct to say that archaeology “... has long been dominated by disinterested academics and contract archaeologists working for developers.” These remarks, apparently condemnations, suggest that academics have been insular and contract archaeologists somehow tainted by their work. These innuendos are dismissive and insulting. Academic archaeologists do not work in an ‘ivory tower’ vacuum and over the past several decades an increasing number of university- and museum-based archaeologists, and government archaeologists as well, have been working with First Nations to both discover and

preserve Aboriginal heritage.

And CRM archaeologists do not work for developers; their work, although financially supported by development, is motivated (in my closest colleagues at least) by a deep interest in, and a commitment to preserve, Aboriginal heritage. And it is done well; the best CRM work, much of which has also been produced working with First Nations, is certainly equal to (in some instances exceeds) that produced by the academic community.

I realize that Mr. Racher may have had little control over what the reporter wrote or how he used interviews with other people. I do think, however, that people being interviewed by the media can often temper the media's perspective by urging more accurate and balanced reporting.

Most importantly, I object to Mr. Racher's comment that the profession is “... colonial to its roots ...” The debate about possible colonial attitudes in archaeology, however they might be defined, should not ignore the fact that archaeology is, at its core, a science – a social science obviously, but still a science – because it employs the method of testing alternative hypotheses using objective data; a methodology that is separate from the ethnicity of the people who conduct the work and, in the long run, self-correcting for individual and social biases (those that are particular to the time in which the work is done).

I do not mean to imply that archaeology should ignore other ways of knowing. It cannot because it is a social science. But without the scientific methodology, and the tools of science, our knowledge of human history (in the largest sense of the word) would be limited to the span of human memory and historical documents – neither of which are without bias; beyond those time frames our deeper history would be unknowable. The scientific core of archaeology must not be denied, no matter who does the work. Nor should it be subverted to other agendas. This is not an issue about control over cultural heritage as some claim; it is about the nature of science.

I expect the Ontario Archaeological Society to promote archaeology, beyond the discipline's historical and current limitations. This does not mean ignoring contentious issues. Nor should it prevent avocational and professional archaeologists from using those issues in efforts to change the discipline – and government policies as well. But it does mean targeting those issues appropriately and also presenting to the media and the general public balanced information about the discipline and the value of archaeology for informing us about the discovery and occupation of Ontario by Aboriginal peoples – from the late Ice Age to the recent past. And in so doing, play an important role in the collective effort of archaeologists everywhere to reveal the story of the human journey on Earth and our shared heritage as human beings.



The ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY Inc.

Grand River

chapter

President: Chris Dalton
Treasurer: Bonnie Glencross
Secretary: TBA
Meetings: 2nd Tuesday of each month Sept.-April
Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology building (PAS) 1241
(First Floor), University of Waterloo (South Campus)
Website: <https://sites.google.com/site/grandriveroas/home>

Hamilton

chapter

President: Emily Anson
Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
Treasurer/Membership: Ruth Macdougall
Events Co-ordinator: TBA
E-mail: hamiltonOAS@hwn.org
Web: <http://hamilton.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>
Mail: c/o Dr. Gary Warrick, Laurier Brantford,
73 George St. Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3
Phone: (866) 243-7028
Meetings: 3rd Thursday of the month, 7:30, Sept. to
May, Fieldcote Museum, 64 Sulphur Springs
Road, Ancaster
Membership: Individual \$11, Family \$18

Hurononia

chapter

President: Jamie Hunter
Vice President: Dayle Elder
Secretary: Peter Thor
Treasurer: Kristin Thor
Social Media: Stephanie Duffy
Mail: P.O. is PO Box 638 Midland On L4R 4P4
Meetings: 2nd Wednesday of every month Sept.
to July at the Midland Public Library
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$18
Student \$10

London

chapter

President: Chris Ellis
Vice President: Darcy Fallon
Treasurer: Jim Keron
Secretary: Nicole Aszalos
Directors: Nancy Van Sas, Chris Watts, Shari Prowse
and Larry Nielsen
KEWA Editors: Christine Dodd,
Chris Ellis & Chris Watts
Web: www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/oas
Email: oaslondonchapter@gmail.com
Mail: Museum of Ontario Archaeology, 1600
Attawandaron Rd.,
London, ON N6G 3M6
Phone: (519) 473-1360 Fax (519) 473-1363
Meetings: 7:30 pm on 2nd Thursday of the month
except May-August; at MOA
Membership: Individual/Family \$18, Student,
\$15, Institutional \$21

Ottawa

chapter

President: André Miller
Vice President: Stacey Girling-Christie
Secretary: Karen Lochhead

Treasurer: Bill MacLennan
Directors at large: Bradley Drouin, Elizabeth
Imrie, Glenna Roberts, Sarah Taylor, Phil Trotter,
Mel Massey & Ben Mortimer
Ottawa Archaeologist Editor: Marian Clark
Web master: Yvon Riendeau
Peggy Armstrong Public Archaeology Award:
Lois King
Web: www.ottawaoas.ca
Email address: ottawaoas@gmail.com
Mail: PO Box 4939, Station E,
Ottawa ON K1S 5J1
Meetings: Every 2nd Thursday of the month
from Sept. to May; usually at Routhier
Community Centre, 172 Guigues Street,
Ottawa (in the Byward Market)
Membership: Individual \$20, Family \$25,
Student \$12

Peterborough

chapter

President: Sheryl Smith
Treasurer: Deb Mohr
Vice-President: Tom Mohr
Sec: Dirk Verhulst
Directors: Kate Dougherty, Pat Dibb, Rita Granda,
Julie Kapyrka and Morgan Tamplin.
Meetings: the fourth Tuesday of each month,
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$15,
Student \$8
Strata Editor: Dirk Verhulst
Web: peterborough.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
Facebook: Peterborough Chapter Ontario
Archaeological Society

Thunder Bay

chapter

President: Clarence Surette
Vice-President: Dave Norris
Secretary/Treasurer: Tasha Hodgson
Director: Jill Taylor-Hollings
Newsletter Editor (Wanikan): Clarence Surette, Jill
Taylor-Hollings, and Scott Hamilton
Web Design/Photography: Chris McEvoy
Event Volunteers: Cory Vickruck, Jackie Berry
& Daniel Szo
E-mail: clarence.surette@lakeheadu.ca
[http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?
display=page&pageid=80](http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?display=page&pageid=80)
Meetings: 7 pm on the last Friday of the month
in Room BB0017, Braun Building, Lakehead
University
Membership: \$5

Toronto

chapter

President: Carole Stimmell
Past President: Mima Kapches
Vice President: Christine Caroppo
Treasurer: TBA
Secretary: Neil Gray
PROFILE Editor: Carole Stimmell
Web: <http://toronto.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>

Email: TorontoArchaeology@gmail.com
Meetings: 7:30 pm on the 3rd Wednesday
of the month, except June-August
in U of T Anthropology Building,
Room 246, 19 Russell St.
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$14

Windsor

chapter

President: Amanda Black
Vice President: Rosemarie Denunzio
Secretary: Barbara Johnson
Treasurer: Michael McMaster
Student Outreach: Zach Hamm
Website/Newsletter Editor: Katherine Graham
Web: <http://sites.google.com/site/windsoroas>
Contact: oaswindsor@gmail.com
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$20,
Students \$5

MEMBERSHIP

	Without OA / With OA
Individual	45 (65)* / 57 (77)*
Family	52 (72) / 64 (84)
Student	25 (45) / 34 (54)
Institutional	75 (includes OA)
Life	800 (includes OA)

* Effective 2017, the print version of *Arch Notes* will cost \$20 per year to mail. Those receiving the email version of *Arch Notes* pay the lower fee.

ARCHNOTES SUBMISSIONS

Contributor Deadlines:
January 15
March 15
July 15
September 15
November 15
Send Articles to:
aneditor@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
or
Arch Notes editor
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1