



# THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

P.O. Box 493 Port Hope, Ontario, L1A 3Z4

2006-02 Autumn Edition

This newsletter is just in time for the APA's General Meeting on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Members who are present at the meeting will be able to pick it up then, and those who are not in attendance will have them mailed shortly after the meeting.

---

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President:	Lawrence Jackson
Vice President:	Scarlett Janusas
Secretary:	Peter Timmins
Membership:	Penny Young
Director:	Donna Morrison
Director:	William Ross
Director:	Lisa Merritt
Treasurer:	TBA
Grievance:	Gary Warrick
Newsletter:	Jacqueline Fisher

---

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

---

The APA is compiling an Ontario Consultant's List for the Ontario Archaeological community. Please see our web page (new address):

[www.apaontario.ca](http://www.apaontario.ca)

---

## MAY CAA CONFERENCE -- REVIEW

The CAA Conference was well attended this spring when it was held in downtown Toronto.

The APA hosted a session on Saturday morning May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Peter Timmins did a great job of organizing this session; all the speakers were lively, there were no technical

glitches -- all went well. Between 40 to 60 people attended the session. The most irreverent, but most hard-hitting talk was Paul Racher's concerning the state of CRM in Ontario (see below).

In total, there were nine speakers, addressing various archaeological issues from discussing a Euro-Canadian military site, what happened to bones in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and to CRM issues. What follows is a brief exegesis of each of the talks, listed in order of presentation.

1) **Dana Poulton & Christine Dodd:** *Military Life on a Victorian Frontier: The Framed Infantry Barracks in London, Ontario.*

Since 1995, archaeological work has been conducted as part of the Victoria Park Restoration Plan. The park encompasses a 10 acre barracks of the former military reserve (73 acre) that was established following the Rebellion in 1837. Excavations occurred in the soldiers' privies (1830s to 1840s) in the NE and NW corner of the bastion; the replacement privies are somewhere under the modern street. Transects were excavated through the soldiers' barracks, the officers' barracks, and a stone-lined root cellar.

2) **Mike Henry:** *Feast on the Dead.*

This talk focussed on the use of bone as raw material for various industries. The bone trade in the mid to late 1800s rapidly expanded across the world as demand greatly increased. Bones were used as fertilizer, buttons, combs, creams, brushes and fans, but also were being utilized in large quantities in industries as a source of carbon (for steel & ceramic production), and use in refining sugar. Other uses included tallow, as part of the bleaching process, in ink, make-up, and a leavening agent in bread.

Sources for the bones included the massive numbers of buffalo skeletons found on the Plains in North America after their deliberate annihilation. As the larger sources of bone were used up other sources were found, such as the dead from the Crimean war, the American Civil war, and Egyptian mummies. Archaeological sites, and cemeteries were robbed of skeletons to keep up with the demand of bone. The demand for all this bone has implications for the analysis of archaeological sites. Sites such as Head Smashed in Buffalo Jump were mined as late as 1943 during WWII. Faunal analysis of some sites may be problematic.

3) **Peter Timmins & Andre Polsky:** *An Archaeological Survey of the French River.*

MTHC conducted a survey of a section of the Voyageur Trail. The Trail is a historic portage route for the French River, adjacent to Dokis Indian Reservation No. 9. The survey was conducted prior to landscape and restoration activities, and the Dokis First Nation was involved in both community consultation and field work. At the east end, the Portage Dam Site was re-discovered and at the west, a new

site, the Second Bridge Site was located.

Artifacts recovered from the survey ranged from 900 B.C. to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, showing a span of 2,500 years of occupation of the area. The artifacts are to be returned to the community.

4) **David Slattery:** *CaGw-2 A Dodge Gone Wrong: A Huron-Nipissing Village Destroyed ca. 1652.*

CaGw-2 was first discovered in 2001 in Restoule Provincial Park. The site has been excavated as part of a public archaeology programme, and each of the three field seasons has had 170 volunteers excavating on site.

The site was a Nipissing seasonal encampment, and may represent a place of refuge of Nipissing and Huron as they fled the Iroquois. Severe destruction of the site (a burning layer), a profusion of lead shot, and the remnants of a bayonet suggests the site was quickly abandoned. Some parallels may be drawn to the Frank Bay site on Lake Nipissing.

5) **Andrew Murray:** *Is the East Holland River Site the Lower Landing?*

The East Holland River site is located along the Bradford Bypass, as it crosses the East branch of the Holland River. The site's location is along a major transportation route from Lake Ontario via Lake Simcoe to Georgian Bay, and has been utilized by Aboriginal groups in pre- and post-contact periods. Archaeological investigations on the site have attempted to determine its function and time frame.

The Stage 3 investigations at the site resulted in the excavation of 98 units, of which 13 units contained no artifacts. The stratigraphy of the site indicated that flooding was not prevalent. The lithics recovered indicated a wide distribution, and included Hudson Bay Lowland chert and Flint Ridge chert. There were no 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century artifacts present. The results were compared with historic documents as well as an 1815 painting depicting the Lower Landing, and altogether there is not enough information from the archaeology to prove or disprove that the site was the Lower Landing.

6) **Peter Timmins:** *A Buried Archaic Component in the Southeastern Lake Huron Basin.*

Peter discussed the discovery of a large lithic scatter dating to the Middle Archaic, found on a gently sloped, low sandy ridge in the Huron Basin. The excavation of the site (South Bend) revealed a buried paleosol containing some 12,000 artifacts and faunal elements dating to the Middle Archaic.

There were two projectile point types present: Group 1 artifacts were contemporary with the Nipissing high water stage and resembled Matanzas Side-notched points dating to 5,700 to 4,000 B.P.; and Group 2 resembling Brewerton Eared and Otter Creek points, dating to 4,500 to 5,000 B.P.

The presence of lots of turtle bones indicate a possible warm weather site, and a date taken from a mammal bone resulted in the calibrated date of 2,740 +/- 110 years B.P.

7) **Holly Martelle:** *Of Bifurcates and Burnt Chert: Two Early-Middle Archaic Sites in Paris, Ontario.*

Holly provide an overview of this poorly known time period in Aboriginal history, dating to approximately 8,000 B.P.. Holly discussed the cluster of four lithic scatters from Paris and their relationship to each other and the landscape. The Farrugie site was interpreted as a base camp, with three activity areas (Leschuk-Weisz being satellite camps around the base one. These sites overlook the Nith River and are near relic channels and ravines.

Holly also discussed the point type classification in that they were from the transition from Early Archaic to Early Middle Archaic, and shared characteristics from both designations, and provide an example of a continuum of the point sequence. There was also some indication of heat alteration, but there was no selective artifact types for this exposure and the alteration could have been from post-depositional exposure such as from grass burnings or forest fires.

8) **Dena Doroszenko & Sean Fraser:** *Sizing up the Situation: Tools for the Protection of Archaeological Resources in Ontario.*

Dena & Sean provided a summation of the tools that archaeologists in Ontario may use to protect archaeological sites. The legal protection of sites comes in two forms: The Heritage Act and the Environmental Act. They also looked at short term and long term protection of sites. The authors provided a list of 17 ways of protecting sites, from site registration to commemoration (such as plaquing at the Historic Places Initiative, the Ontario level and the Federal level). Other means of protection listed included securing a conservation easement agreement at the municipal level, or with the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) under Section 10 of the Ontario Heritage Act. As well as utilizing the

Archaeological Zoning (site specific) under Section 34 of the Planning Act. Dena then proceeded to discuss New Tools that are available to the archaeologist for site protection. The New Tools disc is available from the Ontario government on their web page at [www.culture.gov.on.ca](http://www.culture.gov.on.ca) under Heritage, and look for the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit icon on the right hand side of the screen. Hard copies are available at 1-800-668-9938.

**9) Paul Racher:** *Up from the Muck: Towards a Truly Professional Archaeology in Ontario.*

During Paul Racher's talk, he asked some fairly poignant questions, but were delivered in such a way that made for a memorable paper. The questions asked are basic ones: what good are we [archaeologists], and what have we done? The stakeholders in the archaeological world of Ontario were defined as: 1) the public, 2) the Provincial Government (represented by a small boy holding a knife in front of a socket); 3) the avocationalists; 4) Aboriginal communities; 5) the developers; and 6) the professional archaeologists. Paul then went on to state that Ontario archaeology as it stands today is defined by: 1) a lack of an orderly, regulated market place -- it is too unstable & developers care about their bottom line, that of clearance; 2) a lack of literature -- this is CRM's problem since we do not publish; and 3) lack of commitment -- there are breaches of standards, and there are no regulatory officers from the government. Paul then outlined some solutions to these problems, such as 1) establishing a mission and vision statement for the consulting community; 2) MCL has to provide the leg work and regulation to support that vision; and 3) there has to be meaningful self regulation that supports numbers 1 & 2. Paul concludes that he advocates being a member of a professional organization that has a high fee for

membership and have something meaningful, rather than a lower fee that is based on volunteers, as they cannot provide the services to address all the problems.

---

After the APA session, a light lunch was provided and then an APA meeting was held where members and non-members were welcomed. Approximately 28 people, plus the APA board of directors were in attendance.

The meeting started with an introduction of the board and a quick up-date on the status of various concerns. Marg Hanna, the President of the CAA introduced herself and indicated that the CAA has a lack of CRM people and wondered what would draw professionals to the association.

Peter Timmins provided a synopsis of where the Standards and Guidelines; Penny Young indicated that the consulting list was on-line; Lawrence Jackson outlined a meeting with the Ministry of Culture concerning funding and that the APA does not have any core funding. Lisa Merrick is on the board to track down sources of funding. Scarlett Janusas opened up discussions asking members what they would like to see as Professional development for the APA.

Suggestions from the floor included: how to draft legal contracts, and have a lawyer in to discuss this; artifact identification sessions (ie. Smoking pipes); professional liability and insurance issues; marketing (how to do it?); use of Global Positioning Systems; computer problems and solutions for archaeology; Aboriginal consultation; site preservation issues; and paleobotany workshop.

Some major themes came from the open forum at the meeting. These were: 1) policing ourselves and accreditation; 2) outreach to various groups; 3) disposition of artifacts; 4) First Nations' involvement in archaeology; 5) With what to provide members?

1) Policing -- the government simply does not have the ability to be in all places at once during the field season, and it is up to the consultants to monitor ourselves. This led to a discuss of accreditation. Lawyers and doctors are self regulated, and it was asked if we wanted to head in this direction? No resolution of this was provided.

2) Archaeologists do not have a good track record of conducting outreach initiatives. Suggestions included programmes with different groups such as public schools, high schools and conservation groups. Universities were also mentioned in terms of building CRM into the curriculae. Public and community projects were also mentioned as avenues to investigate. Environmental planners were another group that was suggested to be contacted.

3) The disposition of artifacts raised its head again. This one needs to be addressed before we all start becoming part of the archaeological record! A question was asked if the APA has a Collections Policy? I think the answer was no. The Ministry of Culture does not seem to have one either. A suggestion was made concerning building in a "deposit" fee for artifacts into contracts, and that there should be infrastructure funding provided. It was also suggested that the APA should advocate having Collections funding. Another question was asked about where does the government stand on artifact collections? No clear answer was provided. This is a big issue with no clear

resolutions.

4) First Nation liaison. Aboriginal groups were recognized as having been left out of the consultation process and the APA should be doing more to liaise with First Nations. It was suggested to start contacting groups.

5) Members' services. There are 220 licensed archaeologists in Ontario, and how can the APA attract them? The APA needs feedback from people concerning this. Suggestions included the various workshops for members, and a members only section on the APA web site. An area for an electronic newsletter, a listing or abstract of reports done were also suggested. Feedback is much appreciated for this topic.

---

### **Standards & Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists Workshop**

This workshop was held on Saturday September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2006 in Toronto from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm.

The workshop was well attended by consultant archaeologists from across the province, the Ministry of Culture's staff, as well as a number of members of various Aboriginal communities. Neal Ferris led the review and feedback discussions. Neal started with a review of the Stage 1 to 4 guidelines and standards, holding off the discussion of Units 5 and 6 until after lunch.

Discussions were mostly concerning nomenclature of the initial Stages; what constitutes a large versus small site, "many years of ploughing" and how to avoid ambiguities in using such general terms; and various small technicalities.

After lunch, Units 5 & 6 were opened up for discussion. Unit 5 concerns the Discovery of Human Remains: Best Practices, and Unit 6 the Engaging of Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology. These two Units appeared in the Final Draft for the first time.

The general impression seemed to be from the discussions that while the intent of the Ministry of Culture is on the right track of consultation with Aboriginal communities, the process has not been implemented in a timely or correct manner. A couple of Aboriginal people indicated that their groups did not feel that they had been consulted. Some consultants felt that we were being put in the middle of everyone and that a conflict of interest would arise. It was felt that the archaeologists were put in a compromising position in the middle of the Ministry, the Aboriginal communities and the developers who were paying for the services. A number of consultants agreed that the responsibility was being downloaded by the government onto the consultants, and that the Ministry was taking no further responsibility themselves, and that really the process should be from government (provincial) to government (Aboriginal).

A question was also asked of the Ministry of why was Unit 6 just included in this final draft, and that this was the first time that anyone had seen it? Why was it added so late into the process?

After the dust had settled a bit, Neal asked the pertinent question of what then should we do with Unit 6? The choices were: strike it out of the document entirely; leave it in but keep it as a draft and not as a final section; or accept it as it is. The majority opted to for the second choice. The APA then suggested that it was willing to contact various First Nations to

garner feedback specifically concerning Unit 6.

This has been done, and the initial contacts have resulted in the APA's General Meeting focussing on Aboriginal involvement for the afternoon session.

In the wrap-up discussion, Neal focussed on where the document was heading. Written feedback was to be in by September 30<sup>th</sup>, and by the end of October a revised final version would be ready. By March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 it would be implemented, and in 2008-09, there would be a review of the document by Ministry staff and stakeholder feedback. Neal also indicated that other issues to be discussed included: archaeological collections (there it is again); the Primer/Standards for non-professional archaeologists; marine archaeology and the implementation of the new Heritage Act.

### **APA General Meeting**

The APA general meeting is being held on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006 at the Oneida Business Park at the corner of Fourth Line and Highway 6, Ohsweken. The meeting starts at 10am and a luncheon will be provided. The morning workshop is being conducted by Dena Doroszenko and Sean Fraser about Site Preservation, and the afternoon is about consulting with First Nations. A number of First Nations have been invited to discuss their concerns.

---

### **MEMBER FEEDBACK**

The APA newsletter is open to letters, ideas, articles from our members concerning. Please contact the newsletter editor. [jacquie.fisher@sympatico.ca](mailto:jacquie.fisher@sympatico.ca)