
ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Box 101, McMaster University P.O., Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1C0

NEWSLETTER, VOLUME 2 NUMBER 1, 1990-1991

President's Message

The past several months have been eventful for the A.P.A. The Association sponsored a workshop on the regulation of archaeology in Ontario, in addition to holding its first annual meeting as an incorporated body. The Executive has been kept busy with a number of projects and issues including efforts to increase our membership, definition of long and short term goals, participation in discussions pertaining to the review of the Ontario Heritage Act and responding to a number of advocacy concerns.

It would seem that the regulation workshop was a success, something that can be attributed to a number of variables, the most significant of which being the willingness of the participants to share freely their ideas and concerns on a variety of issues raised for discussion. The Ad Hoc committee which arose from this workshop will have, by the time this Newsletter has reached you, circulated letters to various organizations that may be interested in participating in the development of a task force. The mandate of this task force will be to explore more thoroughly issues raised at the workshop

and report back to the community (see the more detailed report on these developments and a summary of the workshop later in the newsletter).

The Annual business meeting which followed the workshop last October could hardly have been characterized as dull. Issues raised during the meeting, as well as subsequent discussions, revealed clearly that there are varying perceptions on the progress the Association is making. Members of the Executive are working hard to resolve many of the issues raised at the meeting, which include improving communication between members and clearly defining the process and use of the Association's Rules of Order and By-Laws. The experience underscores the importance of both being familiar with and adhering to the articles of the Association.

One other fronts, Ann Balmer and myself represented the A.P.A. at the June workshop on the proposed changes to the Ontario Heritage Act. The workshop generally proved to be an enlightening experience with contributions presented from a broad range of heritage organizations. Among the issues being considered in this review and of interest to the APA are proposals regarding licensing, specifi-

cally the removal of the OHF from the licensing process, and the separation of the concept of qualification or accreditation from a resource management function similar to the one that MCC currently serves. Currently the A.P.A. is planning to provide a more detailed position statement on the proposed changes in forthcoming months to the Ministry of Culture and Communications. Any member willing to assist us in developing and drafting the A.P.A. position statement on this matter should contact either Ann or myself as soon as possible.

On other fronts, the first phase of our Membership drive took place in November with a mailing to 75 prospective new members. As a result, we have received several applications for membership over the last three months, and we hope more members will be forthcoming as we grow and offer new services. If you are not a member and think you would qualify please do not hesitate to contact us through our postal address. Also, if you are a member and have some ideas about how the APA could improve to better serve you, please address your correspondence to our Membership Liaison Committee (Rita Michael, Director). You know what you would like to see and what you don't like, so your input is essential in improving the way we do things in the Association.

As advertised elsewhere in this newsletter, the Association is pleased to be sponsoring a professional development workshop on historic ceramics, to be held April 20th at the Heritage Centre in Toronto. Hosted by George Miller, formerly of the Canadian Parks Service and now with the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, this will be the first of what I hope will be a series of professional development workshops the APA will sponsor for members and the archaeological community. Ideas for other workshops would be greatly appreciated.

Hugh J. Daechsel
President,

Submitted January 30, 1991

1991-92 DUES REMINDER TO ALL MEMBERS:

As the Association of Professional Archaeologists operates on a fiscal year, April 1, 1991 is the date for membership renewals. If you have not yet done so, please mail your membership dues for the 1991-1992 fiscal year to the A.P.A. mailing address.

Native, Archaeological, and Bureaucratic Perspectives on Burials and Cemeteries: Or Why the Regulations to Bill 31: an Act to Revise the Cemeteries Act (Ontario) Have Not Been Completed.

Recent pressure from Native groups, archaeologists, and the public has resulted in the introduction of a wide variety of legislations at the Federal, Provincial and State levels across North America in the hopes of resolving some of the many conflicting views on the disinterment, study, and disposition of human skeletal remains. Bill 31: An Act to Revise the Cemeteries Act of Ontario was passed in 1990 despite protest from heritage and native groups (McKillop 1989; McKillop and Bothwell 1989; OHS 1989). The new Cemeteries Act will only be proclaimed when the regulations to the Act have been finalized. Draft Regulations prepared by the Cemeteries Branch of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations (MCCR) have tried to address some of the Native and heritage concerns that were not addressed in the Act itself. However, draft regulations as they now stand place the First Nations peoples and archaeologists in untenable situations.

BILL 31: AN ACT TO REVISE THE CEMETERIES ACT

Bill 31 gives the Cemeteries Branch of MCCR complete jurisdiction over human burials in Ontario. Nowhere in the Act is there a statement addressing the potential heritage significance of graves, whether they are in registered cemeteries or unmarked burial sites. Bill 31 supercedes the Ontario Heritage Act and effectively removes the traditional, informal participation of the Ministry of Culture and Communications Archaeology Unit in burial investigations. Unfortunately, the Cemeteries Branch has traditionally been unconcerned with heritage issues and research, as they apply to human remains.

The Cemeteries Branch has viewed the proposed regulations to the Cemeteries Act as the opportunity for the views of the Native and heritage communities to be expressed. In sharp contrast to the absence of MCC's support of the heritage community during the introduction of Bill 31 to the Legislature, MCC has actively participated with the heritage community in discussions regarding the drafting of regulations. Between the Fall of 1989 and 1991 there have been a series of meetings, often confrontational, between the Cemeteries Branch and heritage groups in an unsuccessful attempt to produce satisfactory regulations. Whereas the Cemeteries Branch would like to pass a set of Draft Regulations they had prepared with only minimal revisions, so that the Cemeteries Act could be proclaimed, the heritage and Native communities have persistently pressured MCCR for necessary changes.

DRAFT REGULATIONS TO THE CEMETERIES ACT

The draft Regulations include important requirements for heritage preservation, particularly with respect to (1) the closing of cemeteries; (2) Native burial sites; and (3) monu-

ment preservation and restoration in registered cemeteries. These heritage concerns are a welcome addition, considering that there is nothing in the new Cemeteries Act itself which requires any consideration of heritage concerns. However, despite the apparent good intentions of MCCR - with considerable input from MCC, the First Nations, APA, OAS, OHS, OGS, among others - I have serious reservations about the draft Regulations, particularly as they pertain to the disinterment of human remains in registered cemeteries and unmarked burial sites of any cultural or ethnic group.

UNMARKED NATIVE BURIAL SITES

Bill 31 requires a "Site Disposition Agreement" to be made between the landowner and interested parties when an unmarked burial site is accidentally discovered. Also, Bill 31 provides the Registrar of the Act with discretionary authority with respect to the investigation of unmarked burials. However, the Regulations more specifically define much of the Native burial site investigation process: The Registrar may appoint an archaeologist who is licensed under the Ontario Heritage Act or any other expert to conduct an initial investigation to determine "the origin of the burial site" with a report specifying the cultural or religious origin of the site, the site boundaries, associated artifacts, type of burial site, and other information pertinent to the Site Disposition Agreement (Sections 76-77). Heritage and Native communities have expressed to MCCR that archaeologists are the only experts qualified to undertake the investigation.

The Act stipulates that if the investigation places "undue financial hardship on the landowner" then the Registrar will undertake the investigation. However, there is currently no budget or funding source within MCCR to cover the costs of initial investigation of unmarked burial sites. While many cases, where only small burial sites are involved, the costs described

might be relatively minimal to the developer or even a private landowner, this certainly is not the case in larger situations, such as the discovery of the large Poole-Rose ossuary in 1990 during house renovations by a private landowner (McKillop and Jackson 1991). Clearly, an adequate funding source needs to be established within MCCR. It seems inappropriate to have the Ontario Heritage Foundation cover investigation costs when the Ontario Heritage Act has been superseded by the Cemeteries Act.

There are other, more specific serious issues that need to be addressed in the Site Disposition Agreement process that was created in the Cemeteries Act, but defined in the Regulations. For instance, in the draft Regulations, if a site is determined to be an unmarked Native burial site, then the nearest Native band and the landowner must negotiate a Site Disposition Agreement within one month. If they cannot agree, then a decision is made by binding arbitration, with one arbitrator appointed by each party and a third jointly (or appointed by the Cemeteries Branch from a list of adjudicators), and the involved parties will share in the cost of arbitration. While some people may feel that it is inappropriate for the nearest Native band to assume responsibility for prehistoric remains that may be more closely related to a more geographically distant group (if that can in fact be determined), the Chiefs of Ontario have generally accepted responsibility as "interment rights holder" for prehistoric Native burial sites in the Province. However, because of potential legal or other costs associated with binding arbitration, or simple unwillingness to become involved, the nearest Native band may decline to enter into a Site Disposition Agreement. Because of this, Section 75(2) and 80(1) of the draft Regulations could be revised to include the following: "If the nearest Native band is unable or unwilling to assume responsibility for the burial site, then the Chiefs of Ontario are to be contacted to appoint a band or assume responsibility themselves."

A serious flaw in the Draft Regulations is the lack of participation in the site disposition agreement process of an archaeologist and the omission of any requirement or concern for the potential heritage value of unmarked Native burial sites, despite the clear role of archaeologists in the initial investigation of the site. If the site cannot be left undisturbed and it has to be excavated, the interests of the landowner and the nearest Native group will often be dissimilar: It might well be expected that a private landowner building a home and unexpectedly finding a burial site would want to minimize costs in whatever way possible, which would entail removal and immediate reinterment, by machine or archaeologists. Some government agencies or large corporations familiar with funding archaeology as part of the development review process (or with internal standards of research performance for archaeological sites), such as the Ministry of Transportation, Ontario Hydro, or the Ontario Heritage Foundation, might consider archaeological excavation, study and reburial and appropriate action. Similarly, views of the First Nation peoples of Ontario are not uniform with respect to the disinterment of Native burial sites: Whereas it has been my experience with the Alderville First Nation that they will only accept Native skeletal remains for reburial on their land after the remains have been archaeologically excavated and identified with respect to age, sex, and health status of the people buried at the site, other First Nation groups believe that disinterment by machine and/or immediate re-interment without any form of identification may be appropriate methods. The lack of any requirements on the Site Disposition Agreement beyond the requirement that the landowner and nearest Native group come to an agreement on the type of disinterment and ultimate disposition of the remains and any other procedures, creates too much variability.

If archaeologists as experts are to be involved in the initial investigation of burial sites and registered cemeteries and burials are

subsequently to be removed, then they must be archaeologically identified to age, sex and health status. It might be quicker, cheaper, and easier for a consultant to have graves removed by machinery and reinterred without identification. However, this latter process is carried out by the profession of grave-diggers. The code of ethics of the Association of Professional Archaeologists, for example, describes archaeological research as including the fieldwork, analysis of recovered remains, and report writing. Simply on an ethical and professional basis it is inappropriate for archaeologists to be involved in an initial burial site investigation where the process of archaeological research is truncated. Section 82(1)a of the Draft Regulations could be amended to read as follows: "Shall cause the remains to be disinterred in accordance with Section 9 of the Act, identified to age, sex, and health status, and reinterred in a cemetery in the same or adjacent municipality at the owner's expense or if some or all of the remains are not reburied then their ultimate disposition shall be agreed to by the Native band in the Site Disposition Agreement."

CEMETERIES REGULATION BRANCH AS LAW ENFORCERS

Bill 31 and the Draft Regulations create significant penalties for individuals and corporations who fail to report unmarked burial sites, in a perhaps naive view that burial sites will be protected. The government wants contractors, the public, health inspectors, the police and landowners, among others, to report discovered burial sites which will place the financial responsibility on the landowner for the disinterment of burials or the creation of a cemetery. There must be a clear provision for financial compensation to landowners for costs involved with disinterment of burial sites on their land or creation of cemeteries, where appropriate. This is particularly important with large burial sites on private property, as was the case with the unexpected discovery of the Poole-Rose Ossuary

in 1990. Alternatively, MCCR will have to devise a suitable means of enforcing its requirements of reporting unmarked burial sites. The present system of Regional Inspectors is clearly insufficient.

CLOSING A REGISTERED CEMETERY

Registered (existing) Cemeteries create additional heritage concerns which need to be considered. Bill 31 allows for a registered cemetery to be closed by the Registrar if it is in the public interest, but the Draft Regulations should require consideration of the heritage value of cemeteries in that decision-making process as well as the views of the non-Native people whose ancestors are buried in registered cemeteries. Cemetery owners should provide justification for closing the cemetery and documentation regarding the number, location and identity of graves, if it is an old cemetery. My experience in excavating the St. Thomas Anglican Church Cemetery in Belleville, in which we removed some 579 nineteenth century coffin burials (subsequently analyzed with collaboration of S. Saunders and reburied) is that the general public is not in favour of the closing and disinterring of registered cemeteries, but when they are closed people prefer archaeological excavation to disinterment using machinery.

If an old cemetery is to be closed, MCCR could suggest that MCC evaluate its heritage significance by requiring a heritage assessment and/or archaeological excavation and analysis of excavated remains to age, sex and health status and study of associated artifacts. For archaeological purposes, "old" has often been arbitrarily defined as 100 or 50 years of age (Bowman 1989).

Since the tombstone and its location are part of the heritage interest and significance of graves in registered cemeteries, the Draft Regulations must protect these resources and the information they contain. The following state-

ment could be added to the Draft Regulations pertaining to the closing of all or part of a cemetery: "The owner shall maintain records of the location of markers and their orientation on a site plan as well as the decorative and written information on the marker, including a photo and/or drawing and record the location to which the marker is relocated and if the grave has also been moved its former and new location, depth and orientation shall also be recorded."

CONCLUSIONS

The Draft Regulations to the new Cemeteries Act have the potential to include a concern for the heritage value of unmarked burial sites and registered cemeteries that was omitted in Bill 31. This represents a sincere attempt by MCCR to address the concerns of the Native and heritage communities. Major issues which still need to be addressed in the Draft Regulations include:

- 1- the requirement for archaeological excavation and study of excavated remains in Native burial sites, particularly where archaeologists are involved in the initial investigation of the site as stipulated in the Draft Regulations;
- 2- clear financial compensation to landowners for the costs of the initial investigation as set out in Bill 31, but also for the disinterment, study, and disposition of the remains, where undue financial hardship can be demonstrated;
- 3- clarification of the role of the nearest Native band in the Site Disposition Agreement and possible legal and financial responsibilities that might be incurred when no clear or direct ancestral relationship can be made between those buried in the burial site and the nearest Native band;
- 4- a requirement that the heritage value of registered cemeteries be addressed and archaeological excavation and study be mandatory for cemeteries of heritage significance that are closed; and
- 5- some tangible evidence that unmarked burial

sites will be protected by the introduction of heavy penalties for those who do not report burials, when it seems more likely that burial sites will not be reported in the course of development since under Bill 31 and the Draft Regulations, the costs of disinterment and disposition fall entirely on the landowner.

REFERENCES

Bowman, M.

1990 The Reburial of Native American Skeletal Remains: Approaches Resolution of a Conflict. The Harvard Environmental Law Review 13(1):147-208.

McKillop, H.

1989 Act Now Before its Too Late: comments on Bill 31: An Act to Revise the Cemeteries Act. Newsletter of the Association of Professional Archaeologists 1(1):4-8.

McKillop, H. and N. Bothwell

1989 Comments on Bill 31: An Act to Revise the Cemeteries Act, Ontario. Paper presented at the Annual Symposium of the Ontario Archaeological Society, London.

McKillop, H. and L. Jackson

1991 Discovery and Excavation at the Poole-Rose Ossuary. Arch Notes 91(1):9-13.

Heather McKillop

Vice-President

Submitted February 5, 1991

Editor's Note:

The following report is a draft version of a brief which is to be circulated with an accompanying letter encouraging participation by the organizations listed at the end of this report in the formation of the Task Force. The Ad Hoc Committee is presently working toward comple-

tion of a more detailed report summarizing the questionnaire and workshop results discussed below. This will be circulated to the participants of the workshop and to any other individual or organization requesting a copy. APA members may direct their requests through the Association's mailbox. Also, APA members who may want to be part of the Task Force discussed in the following brief can nominate themselves to the Executive for consideration.

Brief on the Ad Hoc Committee's Questionnaire and Workshop on Self Regulation

The Ad-Hoc committee on self regulation (a list of members to this committee is included at the close of this submission) was drawn together by the Association of Professional Archaeologists (Ontario) in April of 1990. The purpose of the committee was to facilitate discussion and action from the archaeological community with regard to the issue of the regulation of archaeology in the province. Towards this end a questionnaire was drafted and circulated to the Ontario archaeological community. A workshop was then organized to further explore the issues raised in the questionnaire. The objective of this brief is to summarize the results of both the questionnaire and the workshop.

QUESTIONNAIRE - RESPONSES

Most of the information provided in this overview has been summarized from R. Pihl's overview of the questionnaire results presented at the workshop. The questionnaire was circulated in mid-June of 1990 to approximately 1,100 individuals including members of the Ontario Archaeological Society, and Save Ontario Shipwrecks. There were 332 responses to this circulation (a 30% response rate).

The questionnaire was designed to solicit information on the orientation of the archaeological community with regard to the issue of

regulation and to generate data on the composition of the community. Of the respondents 27% (n=91) considered themselves to be professional archaeologists, 26% (85) avocational archaeologists, and 17% (57) student archaeologists. The remainder of the respondents identified themselves as other. Most of those responding in the other category did not respond to questions dealing with regulation. Consequently, the breakdown of responses provided below is summarized within the context of the three identified archaeological groups.

Regulation of archaeology was considered to consist of a variety of elements with licensing and monitoring of reports identified most frequently. Also identified but with less frequency were the notions of restriction of archaeological activity, and accreditation. About half of the respondents felt that more regulation was required.

Over two-thirds of those respondents favouring regulation felt it should be jointly controlled by government and the archaeological community. Less than half favoured self regulation by a committee of peers. A strong majority of professional archaeologists (93%) were in favour of exploring alternative ways of regulating, while only 41% of avocationalists concurred with this action.

With regard to current licensing practices, over two thirds of the professional archaeologists and only one third of the avocational archaeologists wanted changes to the annual process of renewing licences. There was even less of a consensus as to what length the term of the licence should apply, with almost half of the respondents expressing no opinion. Changes to the OHF's role of reviewing licence applications and reports were favoured by professional archaeologists, while only a third of avocational archaeologists wanted to see new procedures adopted.

While there appears to be a general awareness of guidelines to standardize and/or control archaeological activity from both the professional and avocational communities, less than half of the respondents admitted to following them. The three guidelines cited in the study and their usage included the Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines (47% of professionals), Archaeological Conservation Officer Program Guidelines (28% of avocationals), and the Licence Reporting Guidelines (67% of professionals, 40% of avocationals). There is a general lack of enthusiasm for the quality of these guidelines, with less than half of the professional community rating the Technical Guidelines as average or above average, while only 18% of avocationals responded similarly for the ACO Guidelines.

Both communities indicated a general dissatisfaction with the Ministry of Culture and Communications and the OHF in respect to the enforcement of acceptable standards in archaeology. A large number of the respondents either declined to comment or were unable to evaluate this question.

In sum, the questionnaire provided a general indication of interest in re-examining the process of regulating archaeological activity in the province. This appears, in part at least, to be due to dissatisfaction with current regulatory practices including licensing, provision of adequate guidelines and the roles of the Ontario Heritage Foundation and the Ministry of Culture and Communications. There did not emerge a clear picture from the community of what the next step should be. A majority of the respondents favoured a workshop while less than half considered the development of a task force as a viable option.

WORKSHOP - RESULTS

Following the excellent response to the questionnaire the Ad Hoc Committee proceeded

to organize a workshop that would explore some of the issues emerging from the questionnaire and provide the basis for the next stage in the review of regulation of archaeological activity in the province. Sixty five people attended the workshop, which was held on October 26, 1990 at the Heritage Centre in Toronto.

The workshop was divided into two components. The first consisted of introductory remarks and outline of the process by the Ad Hoc Committee Chair, followed by a review of the current status of the Ontario Heritage Act review process by A. Tyyska, and a brief overview of the questionnaire results by R. Pihl.

The second component, the Plenary Session, chaired by Mima Kapches, consisted of a brief introduction followed by the dispersal of the attendees into five groups to discuss a series of questions dealing with regulation and future courses of action. Each of these groups selected its own chair. The chair was responsible for ensuring that the discussion moved along, and was expected to summarize the issues raised in responses to the questions. These responses were then summarized into key points by the chair and a resolution from the floor was drafted to empower the development of a Task Force to continue the process.

The discussion resulted in a consensus on a number of issues. The key points which could be drawn from this process consisted of the following (adapted from Kapches' summary presentation made to the OAS on October 27):

Avocational and Professional archaeologists should not be divided into two distinct communities. All those practicing archaeology should be evaluated using the same criteria. This would necessitate the establishment of different levels of accreditation.

Accreditation should be separate from the permit granting process. Accreditation is self regulation

by peers. There should be levels of accreditation. Any committee or board empowered to conduct this process should include archaeologists and non-archaeologists.

Permit granting should be conducted by the government, either through its own staff or by appointed body, board or agency. "As long as regulation and protection (of the resource) is the mandate of the government, then a government delegated body must grant permits." There should be levels of permit granting, possibly based on the existing four stages of contract work, with only the fourth stage requiring a permit.

That a Task Force be established and empowered to study this and report to the various representative constituencies.

The discussion in the workshop led to the development of the following resolution:

Resolved, On Friday October 26, 1990 that:

- A Task Force be formed to investigate accreditation of Ontario archaeologists, both avocational and professional, by self regulation; and to investigate the permit granting process, by a government appointed board, agency or committee;

- The Task Force is to take into account the concerns expressed in the workshop;

- The Task Force is to consist of at least one, but no more than two, duly appointed representatives of the following organizations: OAS, SOS, CAPHC, APA, OMHC, CAA, COA, Native representations (to be selected). If any of these organizations do not respond to the request of the Ad Hoc Committee, or decline to send representation, then the Task Force will function with those representatives who do participate. This Task Force may also include members at large, if so required. The Task Force will select

their own chair and establish their own rules of operation, deadlines, etc. The Task Force will communicate with their respective constituencies;

- Once established, the Task Force will contact the Ministry of Culture and Communications or the Ontario Heritage Foundation to consult and discuss funding;

- Once established, it is recommended that the Task Force consult with secondary interest groups, such as Community Heritage Ontario, OHS, OMA, and others;

- The Ad Hoc Committee will communicate with those who registered at the workshop;

- The Ad Hoc Committee will dissolve once the task force has met.

List of Ad Hoc Committee Members

APA - Hugh Daechsel, Ann Balmer, Robert Pihl and Heather McKillop
 CAPHC - Ron Williamson
 OAS- Christine Caroppo
 OHF (observer)- Gloria Taylor
 ROM - Mima Kapches
 Tyendinaga Mohawk First Nation - Donnie Maracle
 Avocational Community - Art Howey
 Laurentian U. - Pat Julig

Other individuals who have participated in related discussions include Peter Ramsden (McMaster), Dean Jacobs (Walpole Island First Nation), Fred Gregory and Eric Sharp (SOS).

Hugh Daechsel
 Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Self Regulation
 Submitted February 11, 1991

A.P.A. EXECUTIVE OCTOBER 1991- OCTOBER 1993, CALL FOR NOMINA- TIONS

The Association of Professional Archaeologists is currently seeking nominations for the seven elected Executive positions on the Association, for the October 1991 to October 1993 term of office. Seven positions are open to contest, including President; Vice-President; Treasurer; Secretary; and 3 Directors positions. Candidates must be A.P.A. members in good standing. If interested, please submit your name to the A.P.A. through its mailing address, c/o Chris Ellis Nominating Committee Chair or other members of the nominating committee (Neal Ferris, Christine Dodd, Peter Timmins). Deadline for submitting nominations is September 1, 1991. Should any position be contested by 2 or more candidates, an all membership election will be held in the month of September, and the successful candidates would be announced at the A.P.A.'s annual business meeting in late October.

Ministry of Natural Resources Timber Management: Class EA

Almost two years ago MNR began an Environmental hearing into the development of a Class EA process for Timber Management activities in northern Ontario. As part of this process, a commitment was made to address heritage issues and concerns related to Timber Management activities. Consultation with the heritage community was initiated through a Steering Committee and a specific heritage Task Force, and after extensive discussion, a set of draft Timber Management Guidelines for the Protection of Heritage Resources were produced and circulated for comment. The APA, along with many other heritage organizations, submitted comments to MNR on these draft guidelines.

We were pleased to observe the broad approach taken in the guidelines towards a definition of cultural heritage, as well as the recognition of the non-renewable and fragile nature of heritage resource, and the need to include their identification in the early stages of the planning process.

An excerpt from the APA submission in response to these guidelines follows:

The Association of Professional Archaeologists (APA) was not formally organized until after consultation on the Timber Management planning process began. We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on this draft of the Timber Management guidelines and hope our comments will be of assistance in finalizing the guidelines. Our organization is composed of professional archaeologists. In addition to our archaeological work, many of us work with broader heritage resource assessment and planning issues and are concerned with the process for deriving meaningful guidelines for the protection of heritage resources within the Timber Management planning process.

A commitment to the development of a standard approach to the identification of heritage concerns, data collection, and reporting in Timber Management units across the province is critical to the proper implementation of the guidelines and the protection of heritage resources.

While we are encouraged to see the production of guidelines such as these, we have several general concerns. Although heritage resources and potential impacts to them are generally adequately defined in the document, implementation of the guidelines and procedures for ongoing incorporation of new data are not adequately described. The role and the position of the Heritage Planner in the process has not been explained adequately. The Heritage Resources database Project and the Compliance and Effectiveness Monitoring Program, compo-

nents which will play a major part in the implementation of these guidelines, are not presented in any detail...

Each of these issues was addressed in more detail with specific reference to the Draft Guidelines Document. To date, however, the MNR guidelines have not been circulated in their final form for further comment. The hearing is nearing a close and it must be ensured that heritage concerns are addressed and not passed over.

To this end, the Canadian Association of Professional Heritage Consultants, and active participant in the drafting of the guidelines with members on the Steering Committee and Task Force, has applied for and received standing before the hearing board. A Presentation will be made on the definition of heritage, and the planning for the management of heritage resources within the Timber Management process. APA members will be informed as further developments occur.

Ann Balmer
Treasurer,
Submitted February 15, 1991

AVOCATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY WORKSHOP

On behalf of the APA, I attended the Avocational Archaeology Workshop, sponsored by the OHF, held at Trinity College, U of T, January 19th, 1991. The workshop format consisted of, first, morning presentations on various aspects of avocational archaeology - archaeological site warden programmes which were very well done and informative, especially those on such programmes in Arkansas, Saskatchewan and Arizona. In the afternoon, the participants broke up into separate workshop groups, each of which was asked to discuss a separate theme, such as how should avocational

be trained and who should run site warden or avocational programmes. Then, spokespersons for each workshop presented the gist of each discussion to the reassembled audience.

I was struck by the very real differences in outlook and opinions on avocational archaeology express by the two major groups represented at the workshop: the SOS (Save Our Shipwrecks) and OAS. My impression was that these two groups could never really work together to form some sort of joint avocational programme. Also, the proceedings, which until that point had been generally quite good, ended on a sour note when none of the interest groups represented seemed willing to take the bull by the horns and forge ahead with proposals to develop an avocational training programme or archaeological warden programme, which was unfortunate since it appeared that the OHF were giving signals that they were willing to fund such endeavours subject to getting a half-decent proposal. Reluctantly, the OAS, SOS and Rock Art Association people agreed to have a future meeting to try and develop some sort of joint programme, but really, from the attitudes of those present, it is doubtful that anything positive would really come from such a meeting. In my opinion, if the OAS or SOS or Rock Art people really want to develop some sort of programme, they should do so separately.

[Since that workshop in early January, the OAS has formed a committee (consisting of Mike Kirby, Art Howey and Bruce Welsh) to look into developing a avocational programme for land-based archaeologists. I wish them luck in this venture -- it is certainly a programme which is sorely needed in this province.]

Chris Ellis,
Secretary
Submitted February 1, 1991

PROPOSED BY-LAW CHANGE, RE: ELECTION PROCEDURES

Enclosed in this newsletter please find a ballot for a proposed change to the Association's election procedures, which will greatly simplify the electing of new executive members. Members should fill out the ballot and return it to the Association mailing address by June 1, 1991. Your prompt attention to this matter would be appreciated.

HISTORIC CERAMIC WORKSHOP

The APA is sponsoring a one day workshop, with George L. Miller, a noted expert in Historic English Ceramics, will be held on Saturday, April 20, 1991 at the Ontario Heritage Centre, Toronto, Ontario. Cost is \$20.00 for APA members, \$25.00 for non-members and \$15.00 for students. Please try and attend, but note that space is limited. For further information, call Dena Doroszenko at (416) 963-2874.

OFFICERS OF THE APA

President:

Mr. Hugh Daechsel, c/o Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation, 370 King St. West, Kingston, Ontario, K7L 2X4, Phone: (613)542-3483.

Vice-President:

Dr. Heather McKillop, Dept. of Geography and Anthropology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803-4105, U.S.A. Phone: (504)388-5942.

Treasurer:

Ms Ann Balmer, 403 Montrose Ave., Toronto, Ontario M6G 3H2, Phone: (416)537-7367.

Secretary:

Dr. Christopher Ellis, Dept. of Anthropology, Social Science Centre, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Phone:(519)661-2111, ext. 5101.

Directors:

Mr. Laurie Jackson, c/o Northeastern Archaeological Associates, P.O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z4, Phone: (416)342-3250.

Ms Rita Michael, 907-981 Main St. West, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1A8, Phone: (416)524-1384.

Mr. Dana Poulton, 69 Langarth St., London, Ontario N6J 1P5, Phone: (519)434-8853.

Newsletter Editor:

Mr. Neal Ferris, 34 Gerrard St., London, Ontario N6C 4C7, Phone: (519)433-8401.