

---

# ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

---

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

---

## NEWSLETTER, VOLUME 3 NUMBER 2, 1992

---

### *PRESIDENT'S REPORT*

Several new developments have taken place with the APA recently which I regard as very positive signs for our future. Dr. William Fitzgerald, on returning from field work outside of Ontario, volunteered his services as Secretary and has since been appointed to this position. Given the six month vacancy in this office, filled by the President as acting Secretary, I can say with no hesitation that Bill's arrival is both timely and welcome! Another significant change is the recent appointment of our Director, Dr. Dean Knight, to the position of Grievance Coordinator. The APA now has a functioning system for addressing professional grievances - a level of self-regulation unique to Ontario! To accommodate the growth of our Association, which now has more than 40 professional members, the Executive recently decided to separate our Annual Meeting from the Ontario Archaeological Society's Meeting, and to host our own mini-symposium and Awards Dinner on November 21, 1992. To be held at the University of Waterloo, this event is being organized by Bill Fitzgerald, Bud Parker, and Dean Knight. This Newsletter issue will, we hope, be quickly followed by yet another before

year's end so that the APA can catch up on its obligations to members. We are working very hard on your behalf so get out there and support your organization!

Lawrence Jackson, President  
Submitted September, 1992

---

### **APA ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING, SYMPOSIUM & AWARDS BANQUET**

**SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1992**  
Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo

- 10:00 AM: Annual Business Meeting  
(202 Regina Rm. 103)
- 1:00 PM: Symposium  
(Central Teaching 2C8)
- 6:00 PM: Achievement Award Banquet  
(Waterloo Inn, Heritage Rm)

Speakers for the afternoon symposium include Michael Spence, Nick Adams, Laurie Jackson, Bud Parker, Dean Knight, Rita Short-Griffin, Peter Engelbert and Paul Lennox. Admission to the Symposium is free. Banquet Tickets cost \$30.00, and there is limited seating.

## ADVOCACY ISSUES

The following reports detail some of the advocacy issues tackled by the Executive in the last few months:

### Cemeteries Act

The following is a draft of a letter to be sent to Gary Carmichael, Cemeteries Branch Registrar of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Dear Mr. Carmichael,

On behalf of the Association of Professional Archaeologists, Michael Spence, Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, and I have looked over the revised Cemeteries Act (Revised 1990). We see a few problems with the revisions as presented, which we are a bit confused in places and deliberately vague in others. The points we would like to raise are as follows:

#### Burial Sites:

In Act Section 70(1) "The Registrar may order the owner of the land on which a burial site is discovered to cause an investigation to be made to determine the origin of the site." It does not specifically mention who is to investigate these burial sites. The only role for scientific study is at the order of the Registrar, who may decide it is unnecessary or may appoint whomever he or she wishes regardless of professional qualifications to do the assessment. Our position is that only a professional archaeologist or physical anthropologist is qualified to assess or investigate these burial sites.

Act Section 70(3) and Regulations 2(2) suggest that this investigation would be limited to identifying the cultural affiliation of the deceased and determining the extent of the

burial area. Section 70(3) specifies that "...A person conducting an investigation shall do so with the minimum disturbance to the site in the course of the investigation." Any further work would be done only in accord with the site disposition agreement. There is no role for the participation of archaeologists, even as advisors.

Also, note that there are two possible alternatives for final disposition: either the burials remain where they are (and the land declared a cemetery), or they are reinterred in a cemetery elsewhere. These regulations would also apply to "irregular burial sites" (whatever these may be). We would like to see an allowance made for storage and maintenance of artifacts and skeletal material in a repository where they will be available for future study.

As well, in 70(4) it states that "If the Registrar is of the opinion that an investigation under subsection 1 would impose an undue financial burden on the landowner, the Registrar shall undertake the investigation." To the best of my knowledge this not yet happened. Examples that come to mind are the Poole Ossuary in eastern Ontario and the Zamboni Cemetery in Brantford, where in both cases the landowner paid the entire cost of excavation and analysis. What is "undue financial burden"? How much money is to be allotted when there is such a burden? Where is the money to come from? If the Registrar is to undertake the investigation, does this mean that MCCR will hire an archaeologist or will they conduct the investigation themselves? The regulations should spell out what money is available where, and who is eligible.

### Type of Cemeteries:

The Act discusses three types of burial sites. These terms need to be clearly defined to avoid confusion. This is what these terms appear to mean to us:

A) an Irregular Burial Site: this term appears to me to be a catch-all category to lump all skeletons which are not located in a group.

B) an Unapproved Cemetery: cemeteries containing anybody but Indians.

C) an Unapproved Aboriginal Peoples Cemetery: Indian burial grounds.

It is not clear why B and C are distinct, except as a convenience and to treat Native People as distinct members of society.

We presume that "irregular burial sites" [A 71(2)] is a catch-all category which would include the sites of longhouse burials on late prehistoric Iroquoian villages, burials in pits also used for trash disposal, etc. Hopefully, this category does not include scattered human bone from middens (garbage dumps) or the bones of executed enemies that were casually disposed of, since these are not "burial sites". That is, the mere presence of human bone in a place does not make it a burial site. If we are wrong, and midden bone is included in this definition, it will be a nightmare for archaeologists excavating Late Woodland period village sites (circa A.D. 900-1650), since human remains are often encountered in locations of incidental disposal. Thus the exact meaning of this definition must be clarified in the regulations.

### Fines:

We applaud the increase in fines for disturbing marked or unmarked cemeteries

and burials. Hopefully this will stop developers from gouging out burial sites without "noticing" them. But most likely charges will have to be laid and the fine levied before developers will take notice.

### Closing A Cemetery:

Regulation 49(3) states that closing a cemetery requires that the Ontario Archaeological Society and the Ministry of Culture and Communications be notified. It is unclear whether "cemetery" here includes unapproved cemeteries, unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemeteries, and/or irregular burial sites. We suspect that it does not. There is no provision for notification of the scientific community about burials in which archaeologists would be interested. The Registrar may wish to inform us as persons "with interest in the disposition of the remains" [A 52(1)], but this need not be so. And if the archaeologist is notified, the Registrar may still not listen to us [A 52(40)]. There is no role for archaeology in the arbitration process, except to examine extant data if one of the parties so wishes [R 13(1b and 20)].

Archaeologists and physical anthropologists have legitimate interests with this issue, one which, in general, is shared with Native people. It is only through archaeology and physical anthropology that direct biological and cultural links can be shown for existing Native peoples and prehistoric populations, and therefore with prehistoric cemeteries. As stated, these regulations leave virtually no openings for legitimate scientific interests. The reburial of skeletal remains closes these scientific options forever.

Act Section 54 requires that the certificate of the Medical Officer of Health be attached to the container when remains are being disin-

terred. This would be onerous and unnecessary if it applies to unapproved cemeteries - but we suspect that it does not. The Act seems to use the term "cemetery" to apply exclusively to approved cemeteries. We would also like to see this clarified.

#### Burial Sites:

Regulation 1 states that "In the case of an unapproved Aboriginal Peoples Cemetery, contact the nearest First Nations government or other community of aboriginal people which is willing to act as a representative and whose members have a close cultural affinity to the interred person." The phrases "other community of aboriginal people", and "close cultural affinity", are not very clear. The term "close" is comforting, but this appears to be at the judgement of the Registrar. Such judgements could fall prey to political pressures, and two sections in the revisions make it clear whose politics count: Regulation 8, which gives aboriginal representatives and landowners all the authority to make decisions; and Act Section 87, which states that the Cemeteries Act overrides the Heritage Act.

As well, "cultural affinity" is difficult to identify. Indian cultures have changed during the last 10,000 years. In most cases it is impossible to state cultural affinity, even though there is biological continuity.

These are our initial comments on the revised Cemeteries Act. If you have any questions about these comments please contact me. If we have further comments we will also forward them to you as well.

Phil Woodley

#### Provincial Parks Policy

MNR has issued a document, entitled *Ontario's Provincial Parks: Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Park Management - Social Report Number One: An Invitation to Participate*, inviting participation in developing guidelines for Class Environment Assessments in Provincial Parks.

I have reviewed the document, and found it to be a concise introduction to the history of provincial parks, and the environmental assessment process. Heritage concerns are met in the classification system for parks. Of the six types of provincial parks, "Historical Parks" are specially administered to reflect human heritage. Also, "historical zones" which "protect important historical and archaeological resources" are found in all six classes/types of parks. Archaeology is also mentioned as a discipline that will be involved in any park management planning process. As part of a multidisciplinary approach to planning, archaeology will be part of a Park Management Plan to be prepared for all 260 provincial parks. Although no formal schedule appears in the document to indicate when and if this type of planning will occur, it is a positive step toward archaeological resource management in the park system. The report also states that for certain activities more detailed planning is needed, and this will take the name "Implementation Plans", which include: resource management; operating; and development. In some cases a park will need one or more of these types of implementation plans. Under the heading of "Resource management plans" cultural features are identified, which include archaeological and historical sites, features or artifacts, and historical buildings and landscapes.

A response form in the document was completed, with comments that simply stated APA was interested in continuing with the consultation process for the development of this new class environmental assessment guideline, and "management plans" as they are drafted by MNR, especially concerning the issues of cultural heritage resources.

Submitted by L. R. Bud Parker

. . .

#### Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

The APA has drafted a submission to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. It will be sent to the Commission in early November 1992. The Commission is interested in receiving presentations (both oral and written) on the Native self-government issue. After examining the Commission's literature, mandate, and focus, the APA submission will deal with the issue of increasing positive relationships between Aboriginal governments and archaeologists. The dialogue between archaeologists and the Aboriginal communities has not always been enlightening for either party. It is stated in the APA submission that archaeology can be beneficial to both the Aboriginal and archaeological communities, such as in cases of outstanding land claims, or Aboriginal history research. The APA membership will be informed through this newsletter of the response from the Commission to our submission.

Submitted by L. R. Bud Parker

. . .

#### Canadian Parks Service Proposed Policy

In July 1991 the Canadian Parks Service (CPS) released a document entitled, *Canadian Parks Service Proposed Policy*. With this came a request by the CPS for input in the form of comments from the public and organizations regarding the proposed policies.

On January 30, 1992, as the APA executive member assigned the task of submitting a response to the new CPS proposed policy document, I sent a letter to Mr. Jean-Marie Morin in Cornwall. In the letter I commended CPS on their positive approach to cultural heritage, particularly archaeological resources. I directed questions to parts of their proposed policies which I felt needed clarification. These questions involved their definitions of "protection", "significance", and their criteria for designation of important cultural heritage resources under such labels as "Levels I, II and III". I also added my support of them separating cultural resource management (CRM) as a separate policy

After one month's time I had had no response, so on March 5, 1992 I sent a brief letter to Mr. Morin, requesting a response to the concerns in our letter of January 30th.

On March 12, 1992, I received a call from Ms. DiAnn Herst of CPS in Ottawa. She thanked me for my letter of January 30th, then proceeded to address each of my questions, and promised to be available if any other questions arise regarding the CPS proposed policy document or any other CPS matter. Below are my notes of the responses given to me by Ms. Herst:

.      The      Environmental      Assessment

Review Process (EARP) used by CPS compares well with the federal FEARO. It has been a policy for CPS to use EA approaches like EARP for more than 20 years.

- Shipwrecks: Under the administration of CRM policies using Levels I and II (see below) for designation. These designations are always used with wrecks, and are recommended by CPS archaeologists to the Minister via the Historic Sites & Monuments Board (HS&M). Wrecks are treated the same as all archaeological sites. They have no arbitrary date for significance of wrecks.
- CRM: 1) Criteria used by CPS archaeologists are longstanding and designations go to the Minister through the HS&M Board. 2) The CPS staff is separated between building experts and archaeology experts. They both use "functional" terms to identify and designate sites. They have the latest techniques, ie. GIS mapping. Much of the inventory of heritage resources is done by contract to outside archaeologists, as well as some assessments and mitigations. 3) Levels I to III are better defined in a "guideline" paper to be sent to the APA. This will indicate the linkage between policy and the work actually done. Level I: any collection or site recommended by HS&M Board to the Minister. Level II: everything else identified, but not yet recommended (may not ever be recommended). This does not necessarily make some sites more significant than others. Universal approach to all heritage

stressed. Level III: contemporary/modern assets.

- Re: "contract procedures". CPS sends Terms of Reference out on a project-by-project basis. These are written by regional archaeologists and vary a little by region. There is no prescribed format, nor are any generic forms to be developed.

CPS will send us their EARP forms and data relating to the proposed policy document.

On April 23, 1992, I received a letter from John A. Carruthers, the CPS Policy Review Coordinator. He assured me that my "thoughtful and detailed comments" will assist CPS in refining their next policy draft. He also encouraged me to continue my correspondence with Ms. Herst if I have any further questions regarding EARP matters. He concluded by stating that CPS will not be preparing individual written responses to submissions regarding their proposed policies, but will instead wait until April 30, 1992 in order to receive any further comments. At that time they will prepare more detailed individual responses. His final statement was that a copy of the new CPS policy will be sent to me when it is completed.

I have sent Ms. Herst a thank you letter for her verbal response, with a note of encouragement to her and any of her CPS archaeological colleagues to join APA (brochures were enclosed). My general impression of CPS archaeology policies are that they are very positive, although once in a while one gets the impression that CPS archaeology is the "best" or "most well done" in the country. I suppose CPS does have federal funding and facilities behind them, but let us

not let them assume that they know everything. After all, they cannot possibly do all the work and will always require outside consultants for contracts involving most aspects of heritage management.

Submitted by L.R. Bud Parker

. . .

Mr. Jonathan Birks  
President, Henry Birks & Sons

I am writing you on behalf of the Association of Professional Archaeologists. We would like to acquaint your company with the mandate of our organization and with our concern regarding the sale of archaeological artifacts by your company. Previous correspondence between our outgoing President and your company suggested that there was no common ground in our respective approaches, specifically with regard to artifacts from the Atocha galleon recovered by Mr. Mel Fisher. The argument was made that since "artworks" are regularly sold, why not artifacts. We submit to you that the Atocha itself, regardless of ownership, is itself a "treasure" and that to break it into bits for sale is to destroy its value both for the public posterity and for archaeological science.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this case with you and to try to reach some understandings involving both Canadian Federal and Provincial statutes, as well as international agreements.

Laurie Jackson

---

## OPINIONS AND VIEWPOINTS

### On the Matter of Repatriation

As part of my work reviewing the proposed revisions to the Cemeteries Act for the APA, it struck me that this association would soon need to address the issue of repatriation, and specifically develop a formal policy statement on the matter. Thus I decided to write a brief opinion statement on repatriation, and to solicit comments back, first from the rest of the Executive, and now from the membership as a whole. I have purposefully written this opinion to "raise some hackles", not in order to get the lynch mob after me, but to be provocative, and by being so to ensure that enough people would react strongly enough that I would be assured of some responses. An issue as important as repatriation, and how the archaeological community needs to proceed in dealing with this issue, must be approached through open and participatory dialogue. Thus your responses will be used to form that APA policy statement on Repatriation. So please send your comments and criticisms to me so that I can directly address specific issues about repatriation and best represent the APA membership.

#### Opinion:

Repatriation is a very sensitive subject for the archaeological community, and most of us have very specific ideas and views about how to deal with the matter. My view is that all material recovered from burials, including all skeletons and all artifacts, should be reburied. This includes both Euro-Canadian and Native burials. It seems reasonable to expect that archaeologists and physical anthropologists should completely analyze burial material within a pre-arranged

and specified time limit, and then return all material for re-interment. I am unsure what should be done about extant collections (eg. should all material be returned and reburied or should they remain institutionalized as collections), but I personally am leaning towards reburial.

I also think that we should develop a consensus with the Ontario Association of Professional Osteologists, and hammer out the details between us before presenting them to the Cemeteries Branch of MCCR, and to Native groups. Together, professional osteologists and archaeologists essentially represent the two parties most interested in the scientific aspect of this issue, and therefore it will be better if we present our ideas together rather than separately.

#### Follow-up

So far, I have received a few responses from the Executive of the APA, which have raised a number of concerns:

1. Burials are an essential part of the archaeological record, that cannot be ignored or lost through reburial. At what point does the respect for the individual outweigh the historic or cultural importance the interment can provide?
2. Is the control of archaeological resources something that governments can turn over to Native groups, as some sort of response to Euro-Canadian guilt or the "Columbus Syndrome"? Will the reinterment of burials be followed by the reburial of all extant archaeological collections?
3. What links are appropriate between

Native communities and past cultures to justify control of what should happen and occur to those remains? Is the notion of "Pan Nativism" acceptable to demonstrate a link from present to past? Who determines the legitimacy of those links?

4. Does the archaeological community have a legitimate voice in these issues? Should the archaeological community take the lead in generating dialogue with Native groups and governments over the issue of repatriation, with the aim of developing compromise, or should we refuse to accept compromises which may lead to the loss of a database?
5. What guarantees can there be to protect reburied cemeteries? Will those art from relict hunters? Should we be arguing for regional repositories of artifacts and skeletal material recovered from burials?

Again, I need your comments on this issue. Certainly we all have opinions on the topic, so please provide me with yours. Feel free to discuss the issues raised here, or other aspects of the issue. Examples from other areas and jurisdictions facing this issue would also be helpful:

Phil Woodley, Vice-President,  
Submitted October 26th, 1992

. . .

#### On CRM in Northwestern Ontario

Northwestern Ontario, for the purposes of this report, is defined as the region north of

Lake Superior and the international boundary, and west of the Nipigon River. It is a region to which few in the Ontario archaeological community have travelled for the purpose of field work, although under the terms of most consulting licences, it is a region for which most archaeologists are licensed. This is the primary issue facing the archaeological consulting business in northwestern Ontario: the place of regional experience in the determination of professional qualifications.

The perspective from up here is that often regional experience is claimed by southern archaeologists on the basis of time spent in the Arctic, a summer season spent in Algonquin Park, or the landing of a plum contract for northern Ontario, let from Toronto. These are fine achievements in of themselves, but are mere résumé fodder when used to assert real experience in the vast area of northwestern Ontario! As well, it is important to realize that northern Ontario does not start immediately north of Barrie, so to suggest that work done north of Toronto represents regional experience in northern Ontario is like asserting that the ability to dig holes is the primary skill of the archaeologist! This premise towards northwestern Ontario archaeology (essentially that any fool can do it) can be dangerous, not only for the archaeology of the region, but also for the long term viability of the discipline.

A variety of consulting opportunities have occurred in northwestern Ontario in the recent past. Activities of a local level, such as subdivision and other municipal developments seem to have weathered the recession fairly well, although overall the number of starts is down. This good performance is generally a result of the view that tourism is

the primary engine of economic growth in the north. As a result, most subdivision properties are lakeshore cottage lot developments. While the procedures in the draft archaeological assessment guidelines for subdivision assessments apply to cottage lots (standard procedures being defined as those published in Arch Notes 88-4), it is important for all archaeologists to recognize that, in northwestern Ontario, these assessments in all probability represent the first research conducted on a lake. There may be no local site and survey reports available for reference, and a quick read of Ontario Archaeology just won't fill in the gaps.

Another problem arising from these guidelines is that they tend to be followed on a selective basis. For example, the Stage 1 review of existing archaeological data rarely entails a trip to the MCC regional archaeological offices in Thunder Bay and Kenora, where many collections are stored, and a wealth of unpublished data may be accessed. In addition, unverified site leads and Site Record Forms not yet entered into the main MCC database in Toronto are available from these offices. Thus a Stage 1 review completed from Toronto is often not complete. This lack of first hand knowledge also renders "predictive models" ineffective. Also, Stage 2 guidelines are supposed to restrict field work when the ground is frozen or covered by snow. The winter season northwestern Ontario is quite long, from late October to late May, and yet I recall occurrences of general field survey and even salvage excavation taking place in December and later. How can you screen frozen soil? What effect does -20 degree celsius temperatures have on the accuracy of artifact provenance recording? The drawbacks of winter excavation have been made clear even

from southern Ontario projects such as the Grimsby site.

Government agency adherence to the terms of both the Environmental Assessment Act and the Planning Act represents a major opportunity in the northwest. Highway and airport projects being developed by the Ministry of Transportation are most frequently noted. Recently, MTO has begun to request competitive quotes for all highway archaeology assignments. This represents a change from earlier practice, where particular firms were approached for a cost estimate for specific assignments. The new policy involves the distribution of invitations to bid on assignments to three consulting firms selected on the basis of their experience in the area of the assignment, or with the type of archaeological site involved. As a result, an element of competition has been introduced in to the awarding of contracts. It is to MTO's credit that they take into consideration the consultant's actual experience with the archaeology of a particular region or site when distributing invitations to bid. By doing so they not only ensure that their assessments pass MCC review, but also that they contribute in some way to the sum total of archaeological knowledge.

Special projects, such as the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines funded public archaeology has fallen to budget cuts. However, research projects continue with organizations such as the Ontario Rock Art Research Association White Otter pictograph recording project as a means of raising awareness of archaeology among the general project. The identification of prehistoric native burials at Poplar Point along the east shore of Lake Nipigon has also provided a clear example to developers of the need for

assessment prior to development and of the value of Native informant data in regional archaeological survey. Consultant research in northwestern Ontario must be based on these already existing links, and contribute to this database.

Well, now that you know that northwestern Ontario exists, enough of being cranky! In future issues of this Newsletter, I hope to offer further insights into the realities of archaeology in northern Ontario and offer some practical ways of meeting the archaeological demands of this very unique and interesting (if sometimes forgotten down south) part of Ontario.

Andrew Hinshelwood,  
Submitted November 5th, 1992

---

### NEWS AND NOTES

#### Region of Waterloo Restructures their Cultural Offices

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, one of the first municipalities with an archaeological master plan, has just re-organized its Department of Planning. A new division called the Cultural Services Division has been established in the Planning and Culture Department. The director of the new division is David Newlands (519-743-1122), while Scarlett Janusas (885-9794) continues with her work in the Archaeology Office, which is now part of Cultural Services. Scarlett has also informed the APA that Waterloo Region will be requiring "Cultural Heritage Assessments", instead of just archaeological assessments for things like zone change applications, new developments, etc. This requirement is in the near future, so all consultants

should be aware that they will soon have to assess more than just archaeological heritage for projects in Waterloo Region.

#### APA To Award Its First Special Achievement Award at Annual Meeting

The Executive of the APA recently announced the creation of a special achievement award. This award is to be issued yearly, and is given to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution to Ontario Archaeology. The 1992 recipients of this award are Dr. Christopher Ellis and Neal Ferris, for their role in editing and bringing together the publication: **Southern Ontario Archaeology to A.D. 1650**, published as Occasional Publication Number 5 of the London Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological Society. This volume is a significant and much needed contribution to the archaeological discipline in Ontario. Pat Weatherhead, President of the London Chapter, OAS, reports that the volume has been so successful that in less than two years the original 1000 copy run has been sold out. Pat stated that the Chapter fully intends to proceed with a second printing of the volume in the near future. Suggestions for future recipients of the APA special achievement award are welcome, so pass along your ideas to the Executive.

---

#### **EDITOR'S NOTE**

##### Submitting Material for the APA Newsletter

I know that readers must be jamming mailboxes with material for subsequent issues of the newsletter(!), but before you do, just a couple of reminders:

- Please provide a computer disk with your hard copy submission (preferably on 3.5 inch disks). I prefer files written on Wordperfect 5.0 or later, but I can work with almost anything (sorry, no Apple conversion yet). Also, don't format your submission or customize it (eg. underlining sections, centring lines, special justifications, etc.). It is sometimes hard to clean up the file of all the customized codes.
- If you can't provide a computer disk, then send a clean, preferably non dot matrix printed copy. The copy should have been printed or typed with a new ribbon, so characters are dark and solid. In this way I can scan the text into the computer.
- If you've got something to submit, fire it off to the editor, don't hold onto it. I often have various items floating around which can fill an issue, with just 1 or 2 more contributions. So if you want your newsletter to be sent out regularly, get me material to fill the pages!

Your attention to these reminders would be most appreciated, and will help get the next edition of this newsletter off as soon as possible. So start firing in those contributions!

---

**TREASURER'S NOTE**

The APA Executive has approved a change in our fiscal year policy in order to co-ordinate all APA business. Beginning this year, APA will operate by the calendar year. Thus, all memberships that were due in 1992 have been extended to December 31st of this year. Anyone joining the APA after October 31st of 1992 will receive full 1993 membership as well.

Included in this newsletter are your renewal notices for the 1993 year. Please note that this is the only formal notice you will receive, although a reminder will appear in the next APA Newsletter.

Rita Griffin-Short, Treasurer  
Submitted October 26, 1992

---

**OFFICERS OF THE APA**

---

**President:**

Lawrence J. Jackson, P.O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z4 Phone: 416-342-3250

**Vice-President:**

Philip Woodley, 255 Bold St., Apt. 405, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 1W1 Phone: 416-527-2670

**Treasurer:**

Rita Griffin-Short, 907-981 Main St. West, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1A8 Phone: 416-524-1384

**Secretary:**

Dr. William Fitzgerald, 24 Mapleside Ave., Hamilton Ontario L8P 3Y5 Phone: 416-442-6964

**Directors:**

Phillip Wright, R.R. #2, Oxford Mills, Ontario K0G 1S0 Phone: 613-258-2795

Bud Parker, 279 Sandowne Drive, Unit 28, Waterloo, Ontario N2K 2C1 Phone: 519-888-0169

Dr. Dean Knight, R.R. #2, Petersburg, Ontario N0B 2H0 Phone: 519-744-7729

**Newsletter Editor:**

Neal Ferris, 451 Tecumseh St. East, London, Ontario N6C 1T6 Phone: 519-432-2165

