



Ontario Archaeological Society

Arch Notes

New Series Volume 23 Issue 4

ISSN 0048-1742

July/August 2018



Graduates of the joint OAS-MNCFN field liaison training session with Mark Laforme, director of the Department of Consulation and Accommodation, and Peter Epler. A number of OAS members volunteered to share their experience and knowledge with the young students. (See story on page 17)

OAS News

- 3. President's Message
- 4. From the Office
- 9. The 2018 OAS Symposium
- 13. 2018 Annual Business Meeting

ARTICLES

- 5. A Little on the Foster Site and Some More
- 17. Sharing Knowledge

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

It is a rainy Saturday afternoon and I am standing in a parking lot in a suburb of Quebec City. There is a mesh fence erected around an excavation on the site of a former Catholic Church. The site, Ancienne Lorette, is indeed an interesting place as it is also the location where a number of Huron-Wendat long-houses were erected and occupied between 1673 and 1697. And, like many urban sites, it is multi-component with a later French and English occupation as well.

You can learn more about what was found here:

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montriel/archeology-dig-artifacts-quebec-city-huron-wendat-history-1.4764246>

(ou, pour ceux qui préfèrent lire en français: <https://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/1102614/fouilles-archeologiques-pipe-monnaie-histoire-ancienne-lorette> et <https://www.lesoleil.com/actualite/chantier-archeologique-denvergure-a-lancienne-lorette-a-cadda37d844e-06a32d6b8ed34923b3d>)

But, as much as the site and the artifacts recovered are fascinating to me, on that Saturday afternoon, what was more intriguing was that I was by no means alone in that suburban parking lot. On two successive Saturdays, the CRM company doing the archaeology opened up the excavations for public tours.

Even on a gray and rainy day, groups of about 30 people were toured through the site every half an hour or so. In total, the excavators estimate that over the course of two Saturdays about 700 people visited the site. In addition, attached to the fence protecting the site were a series of signs explaining elements of the site and basic archaeology, so that any one who happened by at other times could learn something about what was going on in this location.

I joined one of the tours and the people

who came out were, “Monsieur et Madame Tout-le-Monde” – i.e., everyday folks. They were not tourists visiting Quebec City (who would probably have no clue as to how to find the place), nor were they academics or members of local history clubs (although some might have been in attendance). They were people from the suburb of l’Ancienne Lorette, they were kids, older folks, just interested people. They seemed really happy to learn more about the site, including looking at the artifacts and structural remains, and they didn’t seem to need to participate in excavations to find the visit meaningful. And I don’t think I dreamed this, but I am sure that someone later told me that the proponent was really pleased with these open house days because, obviously, it helped to generate public support for what was a costly project.

There are things that Quebec does really well. Although I have no scientific data to back this up, my impression is that the overall awareness and support for archaeology in the general public is higher than in Ontario.

August, it turns out, is the month of archaeology in Quebec: <https://www.moisdelarcheo.com/> All over the province there are guided tours, workshops, talks, and, in a few cases, excavations or simulated excavations presented about archaeological sites of all types and ages. Some are free and some have small fees associated. The events are put on by independent organizations, with the main organizational feature being that they all take place during the month of August.

And this has been going on since 2005! It is organized by a non-profit called ‘Archéo-Québec’ which has, as its goal, “Raising public awareness of the importance of archaeological heritage in Quebec.” If my Saturday morning in Ancienne Lorette is any indication, it seems to be working.

One of the stated aims of the OAS is, according to our website, “To broaden the interest in archaeology to all Ontari-

ans and beyond.” Feedback from our members relating to our upcoming strategic plan supports the idea that public outreach is a priority for our members. We have some great examples of OAS members and organizations that have been working hard to do this. We see this in publications, such as the one recently launched and edited by Holly Martelle, Michael McClelland, Tatum Taylor and John Lorinc, *The Ward Uncovered*: (<https://chbooks.com/Books/T/The-Ward-Uncovered2>) which documents the excavations, artifacts and history of the Ward, through a series of short and accessible essays.

Archaeological Services Inc. has also long demonstrated a commitment to accessible publication about some of the high profile sites where they have worked (e.g., *Death at Snake Hill, Government on Fire*).

Work at the Niagara Apothecary in 2017 by the Ontario Heritage Trust demonstrates just how eager the public is to learn about archaeology in Ontario too. The Trust documented 8,000 visitors to their excavations which occurred over the course of five weeks. Through partnering with 24 volunteers from the Niagara-on-the-Lake Historical Society and Museum, they were able to provide visitors with the opportunity to see, learn about, and also touch artifacts from the apothecary.

There are certainly other public archaeology projects in Ontario too, and I highlight these ones as examples only.

When I gushed about the Quebec approach to our Board of Directors, Dana Millson, our Director of Membership Recruitment who has experience working in England, shared something of the British approach. In her words, “it is an unwritten rule that when an excavation is undertaken, it is the obligation of the archaeologist to engage with the local residents or descendants. This is practiced by many CRM companies and all academic archaeologists, especially in

the North.... There is usually someone assigned as ‘tour guide’ to take passers-by around a site and to explain what is being done and what is being found; a talk is usually arranged for an evening (with refreshments) at a community hall near the end of the project to discuss findings; publications are made accessible to communities; and any replicas that are made through experimental archaeology projects are designed as ‘mini-museums’ and usually kept in the community.”

Our chapters do a great job of promoting archaeology to the public, primarily through public talks, but I am convinced there is a great deal of potential for further public engagement. Insituated Heritage (<https://insituated.com/>) records the number of PIFs issued by MTCS each year, and in 2016 there were nearly

2,500. Now, granted that many of these are Stage 1-3, with little potential for public interest, there were still many at Stage 4 (212, according to MTCS), each one of which should present some potential for engagement because an archaeologist has determined that this site has sufficient “cultural heritage value or interest” to warrant full scale mitigation (excavation, or avoidance and protection, or some combination of the two). There were a further 36 research projects, 13 of which did have a public archaeology component. Some projects may be considered sensitive by First Nations, others may be too remote to be logistically feasible sites for public outreach, but I am convinced that there are many more that would still be great candidates for public outreach projects.

And here is the thing, with something

like 98% of the archaeological projects in Ontario being CRM projects, I think we must ask the members of that community to consider how they can further help with the outreach component. I can see that there may be barriers: proponents may not support this type of work, the cost of paying staff for an extra day or two devoted to public outreach may be prohibitive, the cost of producing explanatory signage may also be prohibitive, and so forth. But, we probably should ask ourselves, what is the potential cost of not having broad public support for archaeology?

*Alicia Hawkins
President*

FROM THE OFFICE

(A FEW WORDS ON SOME OF THE THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN HAPPENING AROUND THE OAS OFFICE AND ELSEWHERE IN THE LAST FEW MONTHS)

Fundraising

Wow! We held a fundraising campaign in June to help get our Awards Fund back on its feet. And our members stepped up. One very generous member pledged to match donations up to \$2,000, and we achieved that and more. At the beginning of the year the awards fund stood at about \$99 and now it is over \$5,000. Thanks so much to all those who contributed!

Students hired

We are very fortunate to once again have three summer students supporting the work of the OAS.

In Thunder Bay we have a student working with Bill Ross and Scott Hamilton on ‘Bordenizing’ a number of local sites.

In London, we have a student assisting

with symposium organization, and in Toronto we have a student working on archiving and digitizing symposium program materials so that we can put them on the website.

Look for an article on how our SEP students spent their summer in a future issue of *Arch Notes*.

Website

It is great when a member of the public finds our website and finds it useful. This month, a younger person did so, and in response our webmaster has added a section ‘For Kids’ under ‘Links of Interest’.

If you have some great suggestions for additional links, feel free to send them along.

Symposium 2017 wrapped up

Thanks to generous support of the 2017 symposium by the Government of Ontario we were able to video and audio record a number of sessions at that symposium. During the fall and winter we employed several individuals to produce recommendations based on the contributions of Indigenous participants at the Nations United session, and we collated contributions from participants who provided permissions, into a single document. These can now be found on our web page and OAS members are encouraged to read them.

Public Outreach

In case you missed it, we now have blog postings on the website. Check out the first one, and if you are interested in contributing, contact our Director of Public Outreach.

A LITTLE ON THE FOSTER SITE AND SOME MORE

by Jeff Bursey

I read with great interest the contributions of Bill Fox (2017) and Peter Ramsden (2017) concerning the Foster site and congratulate both for bringing this site to light and raising some of what I think are important issues in archaeology. I know Bill has been getting valuable insights from curated assemblages and this has a long tradition in Ontario archaeology going back to much of the work of Boyle and continuing to the present (e.g., Glencross et al. 2015). Much of my own work has developed from the examination of archived collections (1993) and I have another paper coming out this summer/fall elsewhere that is similarly based on an assemblage initially recovered by an avocational archaeologist. I also feel I have a personal connection with the Foster site because I did a small write-up on another avocational's assemblage from that site that was donated to U of T while I was a grad student there.

From my recollections, the Foster site assemblage included some relatively convincing St. Lawrence-like pottery. This was of note to me because I had seen many other examples of St. Lawrence-like pottery in assemblages from Simcoe County recovered by Frank Ridley and interpreting these and other 'exotic' styles was ultimately what started me in the analysis of pottery under the tutelage of Dave Smith. This initial spark was prompted by my initial difficulty in distinguishing St. Lawrence-like pottery from other, similar styles around the lower Great Lakes including different local versions of Lalonde High Collar.

This, of course, was entirely due to my inexperience and lack of direct, hands-on familiarity with the material when I began back in the 1980s. After having examined thousands of rim sherds from hundreds of sites, although I didn't think the St. Lawrence-like rims from the Foster site were all quite as crisply decorated as those from 'real' St. Lawrence Iroquoian sites (e.g. Gates-St. Pierre 2016:55, Figure 7) I thought they were much more convincing than some rims other people have identified as St. Lawrence. But what does this actually mean?

By way of example, I have seen enough Princess Point pottery from various contexts to be confident I can identify it at a glance from across a room. Just over five years ago I moved to northwestern Ontario and recently had the opportunity to examine a number of Blackduck assemblages. Frankly I find that the similarities between Blackduck from northwestern Ontario and Princess Point (and Sandbanks) pottery exceed the similarities between 'real' St. Lawrence pottery and most of the St. Lawrence-like pottery found on sites like Foster although it is tough to find an objective metric (and I can't be confident that the rims people choose to use in photos are necessarily typical).

Clearly I don't think we can equate the underlying processes involved (although I wouldn't be surprised to hear someone claim the opposite) and we need to bring in many more differ-

ent kinds of data and contextual thinking to the problem but a return to some kind of evidence-based reasoning seems an obvious first step.

I am of the opinion that there is a real need for a return to more systematic studies of pottery in order to explore questions of enculturation and style drift in the context of addressing the age-old questions of whether it is people, pots or ideas moving around vs. more localized, independent processes of invention (i.e., some 'agency' related hypotheses). I remember well, for example, trying to argue that the appearance of Genoa Frilled pottery in Huronia signaled the movement of people, specifically Wenro refugees, while others argued for style drift and even independent invention. The same concerns will be applicable to considerations of shell-tempered pottery among the Neutral and New York, Susquehannock-like, Monongahela/Fort Ancient-like and St. Lawrence-like pottery among the Huron, Petun and Neutral, etc.

For the most part, all of these analyses are based on curated assemblages as there has been little or no contextual information brought into the discussions such as identifying 'barrios' or enclaves of different people based on the differential distribution of distinctive material culture. Even Ramsden's distribution maps of St. Lawrence-like pottery do not convincingly show concentrations of possible exotic material. And so we are back to the age-old debate of whether these were the products of mental templates moving around, the products of captives or war brides, migrants or visitors, or just transported pots to pee in. I admit that I find it odd that, in this day and age, when so many political, economic and ideological stances seem to be based on these kinds of inferences, so little effort has been made to offer (or even gather sometimes) solid evidence to support some of the assertions people seem to prefer making.

I will note that I also briefly found some interest in a rather large collection of pottery disks that also ended up attracting the attention of another avocational interested in the question of whether these might have been used in the making of fabrics/cording (the results were inconclusive as I recall). While seemingly disjointed, compared with many earlier sites that I was more familiar with, the assemblage from the Foster site seemed to raise the spectre of a community becoming increasingly complex and cosmopolitan, a topic of some interest in modern (colonialist?) archaeology with its interest on evolutionary themes as well as the nearly universal preoccupation with the cause(s) of the rise of more complex societies.

Also of note is the reminder that we can't predict what kinds of questions different stakeholders will have, so we shouldn't overlook the possibilities of all assemblages, a point that will be returned to.

I will also note that although I wasn't aware of some of the information brought forward by Fox (2017) my feeling at the time was that the Foster site was relatively late, probably post A.D. 1550 based on what I had remembered from the Ridley

collections but admit I have very little solid data to point to. The assemblage I looked at did seem to have a very different feel to it than, for example, what I have gotten from reading about sites that Ramsden has drawn reference to like Mantle (Birch and Williamson 2013) and Benson. However, I think there are at least two aspects of sampling that have to be considered. In contrast to excavations conducted since the preoccupation with settlement and house patterns began in the 1970s, the Foster site collections were made by avocationalists who tended to focus on middens as a form of cost saving strategy to meet their own interests in material culture. There is no reason to believe the same kinds of depositional processes occurred in both pits and middens and every reason to think they differ. Thus each may well have entirely different kinds of assemblages with neither being fully representative of the universe of artifacts that could be recovered from a single site. Additionally, even where pits might have been used as middens/refuse deposits after their original function had been abandoned, this refuse would be stratigraphically higher in the deposits and this would be preferentially removed during mechanical stripping. Consequently, if not carefully separated by stratum, excavation of a pit would result in materials that would not be exclusively a product of time but would also reflect changing function. All other things being equal, the bottoms of pits are more likely to reflect the original function of the pit while higher deposits are more likely to reflect the deposition of refuse after the original function of the pits was abandoned. Since avocationalists tend to dig top down, they would preferentially recover the uppermost and therefore later deposits which are more likely to be dominated by refuse. CRM projects, however, typically scrap all of the upper material which has become incorporated in the surrounding topsoil/plough zone in order to clean up the settlement patterns. In terms of both functional composition and reflection of the occupational span, therefore, it is entirely possible that there is very little overlap between the samples targeted by avocationalists and those recovered in CRM excavations.

So, one bottom line here is that I am far from convinced that there is any compelling evidence that either kind of assemblage is in fact any more representative of the entire span of occupation and all the different functional processes that occurred in the village than the other. One would think there would be solid empirical evidence available by now in order to assess the consequences of mechanical stripping or even looting but I am not aware of it. Consequently I certainly suspect the analysis of curated assemblages like what Fox and others are engaged in might be of tremendous value here.

One topic of common interest is identifying European trade goods. Both Fox and Ramsden have long expressed an interest in the appearance of trade goods in southern Ontario and in how these may have impacted on other processes already at play as well as introducing new dynamics to the indigenous communities. Sites like Foster certainly have a role to play in addressing these kinds of questions but it then becomes crucial to determine the occupational history of these sites including

the age(s) of the various kinds of deposits recovered. Specifically needed is the recovery of European trade goods from well-dated deposits. However, since most of our dating of sites is based on relative dating techniques, much will depend on how we infer occupational dates in comparison to other sites. To illustrate some of the concerns I have, I will turn to another site that has recently been published and has been referred to by Ramsden: the Mantle site (Birch and Williamson 2013).

While I don't dispute a guess date for Mantle of around A.D. 1550, unfortunately I am not quite as confident about the strength or basis for this estimate or the range of the occupation dates for the community beyond my own or others' 'appeals to authority'. For Mantle, at least, there is no solid seriation available to assess either the intra-site variation between houses and other deposits or the relative date of the village compared to others. In fact, neither is there enough data provided to assess the authors' hunches regarding the relative dating of any of the other sites in southern Ontario that they argue to be related.

Truth be told, to check some of the guess dates for other communities I had to go back to Warrick's Ph.D. dissertation from 1990, when I had been looking at tons of rim sherd assemblages. There has been precious little made available since then from all the other Late Woodland villages lost to development. (In fact there really hasn't been that much quantity or quality in the reporting of Late Woodland villages since the days of Ramsden's and Noble's students.) I have reservations about the sampling strategy used at the Mantle site, in large part because of the mechanical stripping, and I have concerns about the problem of inter-observer error/variation when it comes to the use of both types and attributes. From the little I have seen of the pottery from this site, I think I would have typed many of the rims differently and that could have a significant impact on guess dates from seriation. I also acknowledge the ambiguity with the radiocarbon dates noted by Birch and Williamson (2013:63) and would add the uncertainty over the context of the material dated.

For most of the purposes of their volume these dates pose no problem for me but they are not precise enough to posit an early date for the appearance of trade goods in Ontario. I have no doubt that if I could go back in time and visit the site around A.D. 1550 I would see houses and people and some of these people would be acquainted with St. Lawrence country and European trade goods but how much I could surmise beyond that becomes increasingly sketchy. Could there have been people there as early as A.D. 1500, perhaps if only occupying a cabin site related to Draper? Maybe. Could there have been people at Mantle as late as A.D. 1600 either as the last occupants of a now largely abandoned ghost town or for a very brief stay? Again, why not? Given such a broad span of possible occupation dates we would need to be very careful about how we assign a relative or absolute age to the deposits containing any material culture of interest.

For reasons noted rhetorically by Ramsden for the Foster site (2017), I think we need to be cautious about accepting the association of trade goods with any of the occupation stages of the

Mantle site. Specifically, Ramsden noted that there is the possibility that the Foster site was visited some time later than the main occupation and that at least some of the European trade material reported by Fox for the Foster site may have resulted from a later visit like this. This suggestion was based on a comment written in the 17th century that a party of French and Huron had passed through the area and stayed overnight in an abandoned village. I will leave it to the historians to argue that the abandoned village referred to was more likely Foster than Mantle.

I am a mere dilettante as far as history goes but might be tempted to note that since I don't take the Gospels as gospel I am not inclined to take much else as gospel either. Instead, as an archaeologist I prefer to look for some other kind of supporting evidence, ideally from the archaeological record. Thus, since there is nothing in this note to indicate that this was an unusual event, we should be open to this possibility on virtually every site we investigate. Would there be any reason to preclude that a party of Uren substage travelers wouldn't similarly stay in an abandoned Glen Meyer or Pickering village? Consequently I think we should consider just how confident we can be regarding the association of the European trade goods with one of the main occupation stages at the Mantle site guess dated to around A.D. 1500.

The authors of the Mantle site report (Birch and Williamson 2013:149-151) note that the iron axe was found in a pit that could have been under the bunk line of either one of two overlapping houses, Houses 28 and 29, or in an assumed plaza dating to an earlier stage of the village. Parenthetically, I have some reservations about the existence of this plaza, at least in this area, partly because of the proximity of houses 30 and 31 which overlap and are overlapped by House 29 and because there are at least two other cases with at least three overlapping houses in this assumed plaza area: 50, 51 and 52; and 71, 72 and 73. Consequently, if the assumed plaza existed in this area, then at least four stages of occupation would need to be identified. But of course, there really is no evidence of a plaza that I can see. This site really needed a Timmins (1997) type of analysis!

However, returning to the iron axe in a pit, there is no evidence offered to preclude the possibilities that the deposition couldn't have happened either while clearing the land before the village was built, or after the village was abandoned, other than that the pit appeared to be within a bunk line of a house. But that could simply be a coincidence. Missing is the solid contextual reasoning used by Timmins (1997) or in Ramsden's (2009:303) discussion of the relationship between middens and house walls. For example, there is no indication that the pit was sealed under an AD 1550-dating midden deposit. Sadly the two (or three?) copper beads are no more helpful. One is described as coming from a midden but there is no mention of where. Did it come from a sealed stratum free of evidence of burrows or other later disturbance/intrusion? Did it come from the surface and derive from a later occupation? Or was it already on the ground when the main occupation began? Another copper

bead is described as coming from a post. Was it driven in when the post was inserted? Did it fall in with trash deposited around the walls during occupation. Or, did it fall into an open socket after the wall pole was removed or rotted away? (Another piece of bent copper is not discussed.) How do we establish that any of these were really found in good context and didn't in fact get there during some later visit to the site?

Sadly I think this question could also be raised for European trade goods recovered from Benson or Kirche (Ramsden 2016) or even the now seemingly legendary Skandatut site (which is also rumored to have been multicomponent. But it is also worth noting that different CRM firms got wildly different artifact yields at this site, including European trade goods, which again raises questions about the reliability of different sampling strategies in CRM – but then again, these are just rumors. Alas, rumors are all we really have on this one, given that there isn't even an *Arch Notes* or *Kewa* paper on it. Odd, considering how significant some think the site to be).

Granted, I think that as we find more of these things in reasonably good context the odds grow that they belong to the main occupations, but I also think we need to maintain a good healthy degree of scholarly skepticism and seek better ways to strengthen the data base should we want to heap inferences on this kind of data.

Thinking about my publications over the years, I am aware that from Day One a constant theme has been the question of sampling and whether the samples and other data we obtain/recover is adequate for addressing some of the questions we pose of the archaeological record. Frankly, more often than not, my skepticism grows. We have far too few studies addressing sampling in Ontario although the topic goes back to Bellhouse and Finlayson (1979) and occasionally rears its head in some of the programmatic literature for historical archaeology (e.g. Poulton and Dodd 2007; Tourigny 2017) only to be studiously ignored. From what I can tell, most samples, including those obtained from even the most casual excavation strategies, have some value to them although the real problem is ensuring that the sample obtained can be used to address the topic of interest. Consequently, even 'looted' assemblages can be of some value particularly since, as noted above, they often are preferentially derived from contexts that may not overlap (much) those obtained after mechanical stripping. I grant that even under the best of circumstances the necessary data may not be obtainable to generate confidence in some of the claims being made.

As an example, I have no doubt that Paleoindians consumed spring greens and summer berries but I wouldn't want to try to address that topic without material recovered from secure well-dated contexts. So, although I certainly have no particular axe to grind (okay, pun intended) about 15th or 16th century trade, I do definitely believe that we can sometimes recover much better information if and when we decide to use better techniques. I certainly think we would be better off with sites like Foster carefully and fully excavated before the belly loaders and grade-alls get there. Even the assemblages from uncertain contexts can be of particular value as these discussions illustrate.

I can even suggest one context where a heavily looted assemblage may shed some light on a particularly elusive topic that has long been bandied about in Great Lakes archaeology (and beyond). It has long been argued, asserted and/or assumed that smoking pipes had some kind of symbolic meaning beyond being merely tools to smoke with. However, beyond empathetic assertions, perhaps gained mostly through gazing fondly into the eyes of an effigy, I am not sure there has been much real empirical data to support this contention (although von Gernet (1982, 1985) certainly makes a heroic start). Nonetheless, during the complete excavation of an isolated and relatively undisturbed Neutral cabin site, the stems from three clay smoking pipes were recovered although missing the bowls (Burse 2006). The pipe stems were broken and distributed in such a way that I found it impossible to account for this pattern other than through deliberate action. Wouldn't it be interesting if the missing bowls turned up in some collection from a neighboring village site? Even lacking more precise contextual information, couldn't the deliberate transport of pipe bowls after deliberate breakage at an argued medicine lodge (Burse 2006) provide a level of ritualistic-like behavior we just haven't had before? (I would argue it would be even more interesting if the pipe bowls turned up at in an assemblage from a site much further away but how much can we hope for?)

I do have one other reason for being supportive of the kind of work Fox is doing. The avocationalists 'out there' were displaying a genuine interest in learning about the prehistoric past, however unschooled or non-systematic many might accuse them of being, and that kind of interest in archaeology has become all too rare these days. Again, perhaps it is only in my opinion, but too few of those drawing their paychecks from archaeology in one form or another display any real interest in spending much time digging, analyzing artifacts or actually trying to learn from the past in a real concrete, evidence-based way (I avoid using the term 'science' because it seems to have become a dirty word to many from the post-modernist and 'Trump Nation' schools).

Indeed it seems that an increasing proportion of those in the various 'professional' cadres view archaeology as somehow beneath them and rarely if ever want to get their hands dirty in the field or lab. So, more and more, I have respect for those who used to get out in the field and dig for fun. And even more respect for those that still do. So my hat is off to all those avocationalists who went out and did some digging for reasons other than just clearing the way for development, and to Ramsden and Fox for trying to learn from it all.

REFERENCES CITED

- Bellhouse, D. R., and W. D. Finlayson
1979 An Empirical Study of Probability Sampling Design. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 3:105-123.
- Birch, J., and R. F. Williamson
2013 *The Mantle Site: An Archaeological History of an Ancestral Wendat Community*. AltaMira Press.
- Burse, J. A.
1993 Prehistoric Huronia: Relative Chronology Through Ceramic Seriation. *Ontario Archaeology* 55:3-34.
2006 The Frog Pond Site (AhGx-359): The Identification of a 17th Century Neutral Iroquoian Medicine Lodge in Southern Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 30:1-39.
- Fox, W. A.
2017 The Foster Site Glass Beads. *Arch-Notes* New Series 22(4):10-11.
- Glencross, B., G. Warrick, K. Anderson, S. MacKinnon, S. Millar and S. Patterson
2015 The Chew Site (BeGx-9): A Case Study in the Value of Archived Collections. *Ontario Archaeology* 95:3-20.
- Poulton, D. R., and C. F. Dodd
2007 Approaches to the Excavation of Plough-Disturbed Early Nineteenth-Century Domestic Sites in Southern Ontario. *Ontario Archaeology* 83-84:30-57.
- Ramsden, P. G.
2009 Politics in a Huron Village. In *Painting the Past With a Broad Brush: Papers in Honour of James Valliere Wright*, edited by David L. Keenleyside and Jean-Luc Pilon. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Mercury Series, Archaeology Paper 170, pp. 299-318.
2016 Becoming Wendat: Negotiating a New Identity around Balsam Lake in the Late Sixteenth Century. *Ontario Archaeology* 96:121-132.
2017 A Response to "The Foster Site glass beads" by Bill Fox. *Arch-Notes* New Series 22(5):10-11.
- Timmins, P.
1997 *The Calvert Site: An Interpretive Framework for the Early Iroquoian Village*. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Mercury Series, Archaeology Paper 156.
- Tourigny, E.
2017 Minimal Sample Sizes, Recovery Techniques, and the Reporting of Animal Bones from Historic Period Assemblages in Ontario. *Ontario Archaeology* 97:44-61.
- Von Gernet, A.
1982 Interpreting Intrasite Spatial Distribution of Artifacts: The Draper Site Pipe Fragments. *Man in the Northeast* 23:49-60.
1985 *Analysis of Intrasite Artifact Spatial Distributions: The Draper Site Smoking Pipes*. Museum of Indian Archaeology, Research Report 16. London.

CONNECTIONS AND PATHWAYS THROUGH THE PAST



ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM 2018



2018 Chatham-Kent

From Nov. 9-11, 2018 the Ontario Archaeological Society will be hosting their 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. The symposium's papers reflect all aspects of Chatham-Kent's diverse heritage and highlight the theme of connections and pathways, between the past and present, regional centres, archaeologists and the public, archaeology and history, Canada and the United States.

Confirmed sessions include:

- Connecting Black History and Archaeology
- Past Lives Lived: Chatham-Kent and Environs
- A Unique Pathway to the Past: Papers in Honour of Dr. Karolyn Smartz Frost
(Public and Community-based Archaeology or Collaborative Archaeology)
- The Archaeology of Water in Ontario

Other conference events include:

Friday, November 9 – 1 p.m. Archival research workshop with Guylaine Petrin at the Chatham-Kent Black History Society's Black Mecca Museum followed by a 3 p.m. tour of the Museum, the historic neighbourhood and B.M.E. Freedom Park

Friday, November 9 (evening) – Opening Reception

Saturday, November 10 - 4:30 p.m. OAS Annual Business Meeting

Saturday, November 10 - 6 p.m. Closing Reception and Awards Presentations

Sunday, November 11 (morning) – OAS sponsored workshop: *Does that apply to me??? Best practices for avocational and chapter-based archaeology projects on Indigenous lands*

Sunday, November 11 - Remembrance Day Service

Sunday, November 11 (afternoon) - Tour of the historic Buxton community and Museum and Uncle Tom's Cabin

SYMPOSIUM UPDATE

"Connections and Pathways through the Past"



2018 Chatham-Kent

The 2018 OAS Symposium is approaching quickly!
The (www.oas2018symposium.org) is now live! Check regularly for Symposium updates.

Registration

- Registration is available online via the OAS website <http://www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca/page-1767522>, and rates depend on your OAS membership
- You can pay through PayPal or sending in a payment to the OAS office
- Early Bird registration rates end September 30th, 2018

Silent Auction & Exhibit Room

- If you have any donations, or know someone that wants to donate, please contact Shari Prowse, archaeologist@rogers.com and Amanda Black, amanda.n.black86@gmail.com
- If you are interested and want to discuss booking a table, please contact: Shari Prowse, archaeologist@rogers.com or Holly Martelle, hmartelle@tmhc.ca

WHEN

November 9th-11th, 2018

WHERE

Chatham-Kent John D. Bradley Convention Center
565 Richmond St, Chatham, ON

CONFERENCE HOTEL

Holiday Inn Express

Chatham South, 575 Richmond St, Chatham, ON

Accommodations

- The symposium has a room block available until October 26th, 2018, with a negotiated conference rate of \$114 a night
- For those interested, the group code is **OAS**

Poster & Photo Contest

- Those interested in the poster session, please send abstracts to Holly Martelle, hmartelle@tmhc.ca
- Please submit all photos digitally (JPEG or PNG format) to the OAS via Twitter or Facebook

Sponsors & Donations

- We have donation and sponsorship opportunities available for individuals and businesses - and all donations are eligible for tax receipts!
- If you are interested and want more information, please contact: Josh Dent, jdent3@uwo.ca



2018 Chatham-Kent

Paper Registration Form

The 45th Annual Ontario Archaeological Society Symposium

Connections and Pathways through the Past

November 9th-11th, 2018

Conference Venue:

Chatham-Kent John D. Bradley Convention Center, 565 Richmond St, Chatham, ON

Conference Hotel:

Holiday Inn Express - Chatham South, 575 Richmond St, Chatham, ON

Conference Rate: \$114 a night

Group Code: OAS

Room block available until October 26th, 2018

IMPORTANT NOTICE: To help us plan for numbers, please indicate all the events you wish to attend, even if there are no separate charges involved.

Early Bird Rates (Ends September 30th, 2018)

Type	Fee	Enclosed
<input type="checkbox"/> Early Bird Member (Includes members of the OBHS and CKBHS)	\$65.00	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Early Bird Non-Member	\$70.00	_____
*Green option - Subtract \$5 from price		

Normal Rates (Available October 1st to November 10th, 2018)

<input type="checkbox"/> Member (Includes members of the OBHS and CKBHS)	\$75.00	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Member	\$80.00	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Student** Member	\$35.00	_____

Additional Items

<input type="checkbox"/> Saturday Evening Closing Reception (If guest, please provide name) _____	\$25.00	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> One day Registration	\$50.00	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Friday Reception		_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Donation		_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Green* - Subtract \$5 from total price		_____

*Green: Conference Bag is paperless; all material accessible online

**Students must provide a copy of their current student identification at the registration desk

TOTAL: _____

Payment Methods

- ◆ By cheque or money order, made out to The Ontario Archaeological Society London Branch mailed to:

OAS Symposium
c/o Museum of Ontario Archaeology
1600 Attawandaron Road
London, ON, N6G-3M6

- ◆ By PayPal at the Symposium web page: <http://oas2018symposium.org>

THE OAS BANQUET CIRCA 2018

by **Jim Keron and Holly Martelle**

After much debate, budgeting and negotiating, and with OAS Board approval, the organizing committee has made changes to the format of the traditional Saturday night banquet for this year's meeting.

At last year's banquet, an official 'anti-banquet' was organized and held in the conference hotel. This was a highly successful social event that offered free (donated) beer and pizza and attracted over 70 people, largely folks employed in the CRM industry and of the upcoming or younger generation of archaeologists. A good number of attendees have not traditionally attended the OAS banquet and welcomed an opportunity to gather more informally on the last evening of the symposium.

After last year's symposium there was much discussion about the success of the 'anti-banquet' and the consequences of having two Saturday evening events that serve to separate out 'generations' and 'segments' of the OAS membership. In essence, the majority of more senior archaeologists and archaeological elders (silver-backs if you will) were at the banquet while the younger generation of practitioners (largely CRM folk and students) were at the anti-banquet having pizza and free beer. Some of the younger generation argued that there is nothing "bringing" them to the banquet and it is too highly priced with no opportunity for socializing.

There is generally a growing concern that many of the younger generation of practitioners are not engaged with the OAS and some believe it does not offer them much, with the conference being just an opportunity to socialize. It was also clear to some as Mima Kapches accepted her award at the banquet last year and told important oral histories about the elder days of the society, that the younger generation needed to be "brought" into the room somehow to hear about the OAS's past and the story telling of our elders. So, how do we bring the generations together on Saturday night?

Rather than support the continued separation of events and after some brainstorming, the conference committee proposed another alternative. We propose having a less formal Saturday evening event that would be lower in price (\$25), could be well-sponsored and would be attractive to all groups. It could maintain some level of formality but in a way that encourages a larger turnout from all sectors of the membership and is more engaging overall. The food would be partially served and partially buffet-style but slightly lighter overall and two free drink tickets would be included in the cost of admission.

Here is what the Saturday evening event (reception and awards presentation) will look like this year:

6:00: Doors Open – bar service; poster and photo contest displays available for viewing

6:30: Hors D'oeuvres (Served and Buffet-style) (Classic, Mediterranean, Southwest, Antipasto) with Entertainment

7:00: Formal OAS Award presentations

7:30: Light Hot Dinner – Pub Grub (chicken wings, nachos, pizza), Pasta and Salads

8:30: Dessert and Announcement of Contest Winners

9:00: Closing Entertainment

The seating during the reception will also be less formal to allow folks to mingle more during the evening. There will be both standing 'cocktail' tables and normal round tables; people would have the choice of standing and drinking/eating or sitting for longer at a single table.

We hope that this alternate format, while representing a break from tradition, will provide an entertaining and sociable evening for all generations of archaeologists!

The Ontario Archaeological Society



DRAFT

Agenda for the Annual Business Meeting
Saturday Nov. 10, 2018 at 4:30 p.m.
at the

Chatham-Kent John D. Bradley Convention Centre
565 Richmond Street, Chatham.



- 1. President's opening remarks**
- 2. Minutes of the previous meeting**
- 3. Matters arising from these minutes**
- 4. President's report**
- 5. Treasurer's report**
Financial statement
Appointment of auditors
- 6. Election of Directors**
- 7. Next Symposia**
- 8. Presentation of the draft 2019 - 2014 Strategic Plan**
- 9. Other business**
- 10. Motions of thanks**
- 12. Adjournment**

The Ontario Archaeological Society

Budget for 2018 compared to results from 2017 and 2016

INCOME/EXPENSE STATEMENT	2016		2017		2018	
	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget
	Jan -Dec.		Jan.- Dec.		Jan.- Aug.	
Membership fees (excl OA subscription)	22,758	22,500	25,873	25,000	27,542	27,000
Grants						
PHO Grant (Note 1)	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	-	42,000
SEP Grant	8,625	8,625	8,937	8,937	10,974	10,974
Income - Other grants						
Symposium net income	2,000	6,000	23,946	5,000	-	5,500
Other income						
Sales	2,339	1,000	2,353	2,350	1,368	2,300
Other Income	607	800	123	425	62	250
Total Operating income	78,329	80,925	103,232	83,712	39,946	88,024
Office Expenses						
Salary and payroll costs (incl. SEP)	56,181	54,000	53,617	56,750	34,218	55,000
Rent	6,432	6,400	6,562	6,551	4,455	6,700
Insurance	4,676	5,000	4,748	4,770	3,760	4,900
Accounting fees	468	500	4,680	2,500	1,507	3,000
Legal fees	-		-		-	
Telecom	2,099	2,000	1,684	2,000	1,212	1,700
Contract services; IT	6,638	4,000	3,650	3,650	955	3,650
Office supplies	82	800	303	400	228	800
Postage	512	500	460	525	102	500
Office equipment	-	300		1,000	-	500
Bank charges	853	1,300	706	850	502	700
PayPal; Moneris; Canada Helps charges	856	500	874	855	697	880
Depreciation			889	-	-	
ABM Expenses (inc ED)	780	800	295	500		350
Program Expenses						
Promotion/ Outreach expenses	1,148	1,000	401	700	-	400
Web Site; software licence expenses	1,760	1,500	1,787	1,785	2,863	4,050
Board meeting expenses		500	342	500	98	300
Other expenses	-	500	-		-	
Arch Notes Expenses						
Production AN	2,358	2,500	1,251	2,000	1,037	1,600
Postage AN	3,223	2,500	1,925	1,800	794	1,200
Padding Arch Notes	500	600	500	600	100	600
Total Arch Notes costs	6,081	5,600	3,676	4,400	1,931	3,400
Total Administration Expenses	88,556	85,700	84,674	87,736	52,546	86,730
Administration Surplus (Deficit)	(10,227)	(4,775)	18,558	(4,024)	(12,600)	1,294
Ontario Archaeology						
Subscription income	3,831	4,000	3,885	3,800	3,825	3,900
Production OA	3,583	5,300	6,981	7,000	3,068	6,500
Mailing preparation OA	250	250	250	500	490	500
Postage OA	2,521	2,800	3,162	5,000	1,862	4,000
Total OA costs (Note 2)	6,354	8,350	10,393	12,500	5,220	11,000
OA Surplus (Deficit)	(2,523)	(4,350)	(6,508)	(8,700)	(1,395)	(7,100)

The Ontario Archaeological Society

Budget for 2018 compared to results from 2017 and 2016

Text

INCOME/EXPENSE STATEMENT	2016		2017		2018	
	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget
	Jan -Dec.		Jan.- Dec.		Jan.- Aug.	
Money Deposited to Funds						
Reinvested Income Earned	23,620		<i>tbd</i>			
Life membership (Future fund)	3,200	1600	800	-	-	800
Future fund	315	2000	44	2000	610	300
OA publication fund	48	250	20	250	-	-
Awards fund		500		500	5,000	500
Valerie Sonstenes fund	350	2000	870	2000	125	500
Archaeology Manual fund	300		50		59	50
Peggi Armstrong Fund						
	4,213	6,350	1,784	4,750	5,794	2,150
Money Charged to Funds						
Awards Fund Purchases	161	300	540	150	48	500
Total Funds Surplus (Deficit)	4,052	6,050	1,244	4,600	5,746	1,650
Combined Surplus (Deficit)	(8,698)	(3,075)	13,294	(8,124)	(8,249)	(4,156)

Last update: August 2018 by D. Steiss

Notes:

- 1 PHO annual operating grant is generally received later in the year
- 2 2018- based on 2 issues produced

The Ontario Archaeological Society

Proxy Form

I _____, a member in good standing of the Society, hereby exercise my right of proxy by identifying:

_____, a voting member in good standing, or

the President of the Board of Directors

As my proxy to attend, act, and vote on my behalf at the Annual Business Meeting of members to be held on SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2018 AT 4:30 P.M.

- 1 Regarding agenda items in the Notice of Meeting for which I have full knowledge and understanding - circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion
- 2 Regarding amendments from the floor regarding agenda items in the Notice of Meeting -circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion
- 3 Regarding items that arise in Other Business -circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion

Optional

I wish to present the following amendment to Agenda Item No _____ which I wish my proxy holder to propose:

Further, I wish to register the following limitations to the exercise of my proxy with respect to any Agenda Item or amendments thereto;

Signature _____

Date _____

Name _____

SHARING KNOWLEDGE: FIELD LIAISON TRAINING AT THE MISSISSAUGAS OF NEW CREDIT FIRST NATION

By Alicia Hawkins

In June of this year, the Department of Consultation and Accommodation (DOCA) at the Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation (MNCFN) contacted the OAS to ask if we could assist with a training session for Field Liaison Representatives (FLRs), known by some as ‘monitors’.

For those of you who might not work in cultural resource management, FLRs are representatives of Indigenous communities who are present during archaeological field work to ensure that the work that is being undertaken meets the standards of their community.

Given the current focus of the OAS on reconciliation projects, we were happy to assist in whatever way we could. In 2017, we had organized a similar training for the Chippewa of the Thames First Nation, so several modules from the previous session could

be ‘recycled’. And, a number of our members have been undertaking training sessions through CRM companies or otherwise for some years now.

This training session differed from the one that we offered last year, in that it was conceived of and offered in partnership with MNCFN. Megan deVries, from the DOCA office, provided us with their preferred curriculum, and, several modules were offered by MNCFN themselves.

It was truly impressive to see how many archaeologists volunteered their time and expertise to participate in this training session. And they did so on pretty short notice!

OAS board members Bill Fox and Paul Racher offered sessions on the nature of archaeology, and the archaeology of Ontario from the beginning; Meaghan Brooks from MTCS (and a former OAS board member) provided information on the Ontario government’s Standards and Guidelines; Scott Martin from



Hands-on training: Andrew Riddle walks students through identifying different attributes of lithic debitage



Wrap up: At the end of the training session, OAS President Alicia Hawkins took a few moments to ask students which part of the exercise they found most valuable and how to improve on future sessions.

Sustainable Archaeology at McMaster introduced the group to field methods – and he actually brought some dirt to screen with him. Andrew Riddle, Rob Wojtowicz, and Sara Cherubin from ASI did a crash course on artifact identification – they also arrived with many demonstration objects (and the students also really loved this module too). Rudy Fecteau, Dean Knight from ARA, and I introduced the group to plant remains, and bones – human and animal. Finally, Gary Warrick and Paul Racher finished off the OAS contribution with a module on Indigenous En-

gagement in Archaeology.

So, a big thank you goes out to all of the archaeologists who volunteered their time and travelled from near and far to share their knowledge and passion for archaeology. We hope to develop a standing list of people who could participate in such trainings in the future, so if this is of interest to you, please contact me (president@ontarioarchaeology.org) or Paul Racher (past-president@ontarioarchaeology.org).

CONFERENCE ON IROQUOIS RESEARCH

Our colleague Francis Scardera sent along a notice that the 73rd anniversary conference will be held at Ganondagan State Historic Site in Victor, New York from **October 12-14, 2018**.

Further information can be found at their website
<http://www.iroquoia.org/program.php>

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 promotional materials and are asking you to hone your artistic skills to design the next face of the society.

You may use any combination of design style, including drawing, computer imaging, photography, etc... but 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 September 15, 2018 11:59 pm EST and must be submitted digitally to: membership@ontarioarchaeology.org**
- 3. Three winning designs will be announced in *ArchNotes* and will be featured on promotional materials sold at the 2018 OAS Symposium in Windsor, Ontario. Prizes will be awarded to the three winning artists for their designs.**
- 4. The winning artists will submit all rights to the image to the Ontario Archaeological Society to be used on promotional materials representing the society. Credit will be given to the artist on the image, however, and will also be published in the OAS *ArchNotes* publication.**



The ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY Inc.

Grand River

chapter

President: Chris Dalton
Vice President: Chris Watts
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 Davis
Treasurer: Jo-Ann Knicely
Member-at-Large: Jim Stuart
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
Peggi 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
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 Stimmel
Past President: Mima Kapches
Vice President: Christine Caroppo
Treasurer: Sam MacLoed
Secretary: Neil Gray
PROFILE Editor: Carole Stimmel
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