



ARCH NOTES

ISSN 0048-1742

February, 1977

77-2

ANNUAL BANQUET

The O.A.S. annual Banquet will be held this year on Saturday, February 19, at The Lichee Gardens on Elizabeth Street just south of Dundas. Meet at 6:30 for dinner at 7:30 - a pay bar will be available.

Speaker at the Banquet will be Dr. Bill Irving, who will talk about the North West Yukon Archaeological Project.

Cost per diner will be \$6.00 payable in advance or at the door, but we must know by Wednesday, February 16, how many will be coming.

Menu is as follows: Egg rolls with plum sauce; deep fried wonton; breaded shrimp; chicken chop suey; beef with vegetables and almonds; sweet and sour chicken balls; barbecued pork fried rice; cookies and tea or coffee.

To book your seats, please phone Marg Brennan at (416)759-5564 in the evening, or Patsy Cook at (416)466-5484 at any time. Last date for booking is Wednesday, February 16. If you wish to book by mail, please send your cheque for \$6.00 per person, and your name, address and telephone number, to: Chris Kirby, 29 Tournament Drive, Willowdale, Ontario M2P 1K1, to arrive by February 16.

No General Meeting will be held in February, as the Banquet will take its place.

Newsletter of

The Ontario Archaeological Society (Inc.)

P.O. Box 241, Postal Station P, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2S8

C O N T E N T S

O.A.S. Annual Banquet	Title page
O.A.S. Election Results	page 3
The Noble Report	4
Letters to the Editor	
"The Real Crisis in Canadian Archaeology"	7
"Chicken Chuckles"	8
O.A.S. General Meeting - January	9
McMaster Symposium	11
O.A.S. Income and Expenses for 1976	12
The State of Archaeology in the Province of Ontario	13

- - - - -

Canadian Archaeological Association

The C.A.A. meeting will take place in Ottawa on May 5th - 8th inclusive. Further details will be published in the April Arch Notes.

- - - - -

ARCH NOTES - Important Announcement

Beginning with the April issue, Arch Notes is broadening its scope to include general articles of up to 10 pages in length. Arch Notes will become a bi-monthly publication with this issue.

If you have any papers you would like published in Arch Notes, please forward them to The Editor, Arch Notes, 29 Tournament Drive, Willowdale, Ontario M2P 1K1.

N.B. If you haven't renewed your subscription to the Society this issue of the newsletter will be the last you receive.

Arch Notes was mailed this month to 488 members.

- - - - -

ANNUAL ELECTION

The annual election for the executive committee of the Society was held at the January 19th meeting. 103 ballots were cast, and the results were as follows:

President	Peter Ramsden
Vice-President	Patsy Cook
Treasurer	Christime Kirby
Corresponding Secretary	Sharon Hick
Recording Secretary	Margaret Ann Clark

As past president, Dr. Howard Savage remains on the executive committee this year.

At the first executive meeting after the election the following appointments were made:

Editor, Ontario Archaeology	Dr. Richard B. Johnston
Chairman, Arch Notes Committee	Michael W. Kirby
Chairman, Constitution Committee	David G. Roberts
Librarian	Marion Press
Curatrix	Marti Latta
Programme and Social	Marti Latta
ESAF Representative	Patsy Cook
Symposium Co-ordinator	Sharon Hick
Symposium Convener	Patsy Cook
Audit	Frank Mee

Any further appointments will be announced in future Arch Notes.

- - - - -

March Meeting

The March General Meeting will be held at the McLaughlin Planetarium Lecture Theatre on Wednesday, March 16th at 8:00 p.m. Jerry Melbye will be speaking on the physical anthropologist's view of burials.

- - - - -

 * * * * *
 * THE NOBLE REPORT *
 * * * * *

Licensing (Part 1)

My report this month will address the topic of archaeological licences and permits. This is an important element of the new antiquities legislation in Ontario, and it directly applies to everyone who intends excavation of a Provincial site, be it historic or prehistoric.

Licensing is a form of protection, conservation, and a regulatory mechanism. With respect to Ontario Archaeology, its primary purpose is to govern human behaviour towards our non-renewable archaeological resources. Many of Ontario's archaeological sites are irreplaceable, and thus, to ensure their preservation or quality excavation, licensing procedures have been deemed the most effective way of effecting conscientious and responsible behaviour. Under Part VI of the new Ontario Heritage Act, all persons are required by law to have a licence or a permit, to test, excavate, or otherwise disturb any archaeological site within Ontario's jurisdiction. In other words, apart from certain Federal properties and inland harbours within Ontario, this law applies Province-wide to all persons.

The new licensing system does offer freedom and opportunity for involvement in Ontario archaeology to many individuals. Unlike Alberta, where only persons with an B.A. degree or higher can realistically apply for an archaeological licence, Ontario has seen fit to leave the door open for all to apply. This does not mean that all persons will necessarily be granted an Ontario licence, but fair opportunity is extended to academics and non-academics alike. It is important to remember that to excavate a site is not a right; it is a privilege sanctioned or not sanctioned by the Province.

The difference between an archaeological licence and a permit is not understood by all. Simply stated, a permit refers to designated properties where a Provincial plaque has been erected. A special permit from the Minister of Culture and Recreation is needed to excavate such sites (e.g., Shequiandah, St. Louis, Cahigué). A licence, on the other hand, covers all other site excavation situations. Notably, a licence is not required for archaeological survey where the investigator does not disturb or remove archaeological objects. Regarding this latter situation, I think it obvious that common sense must prevail when an item of historic significance is found; it should be turned over to authorities immediately. To personally retain a specimen(s) is a criminal offense.

The actual mechanics of licensing are a concern to many of us, and the O.H.F. Archaeological Committee has spent considerable time drawing up policies, as well as reviewing applications associated with this practical problem. All applications are obtained from and sent to the Archaeological Co-ordinator, Mr. Hm. A. Russell, of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. Here they are screened for deficiencies before being considered and evaluated by the O.H.F. Archaeological Committee.

(more)

The Noble Report -- cont'd.

The committee in turn approves, approves in principle pending completion of an application, or rejects licence or permit applications. The committee's decisions are then given to the Minister (in this case The Honourable Robert Welch) who has the final decision.

Since the Ontario Heritage Act was proclaimed, 141 licences have been issued, 78 of which were granted in 1975 and 63 issued in 1976. In only one instance has the Minister over-ridden the archaeological committee's advice, a situation that occurred before expansion of the O.H.F. Committee and this Chairman's participation on it. Too, the Minister has suspended a single licence for a short period in order to defuse a particularly sensitive archaeological situation. In large, it is gratifying that the archaeological committee's advice has been upheld by the Minister, for it helps in making the new laws work. Too, I believe my committee is not only regionally representative, but has been eminently fair in their decisions regarding licences. It has not yet been necessary to break a tie vote with a Chairman's ballot.

Perhaps the single most common complaint I have heard regarding the new licencing programme is that "it takes too long to get one". This in fact is not the case if applicants have taken the trouble to complete their application forms properly. Nine times out of ten a delayed licence simply lacks clear exposition and documentation about the intended project. A cavalier approach to the licence can only result in it being messy, incomplete or unintelligible and, therefore, impossible to bring before the archaeological committee. Poor writing, too little information concerning the scope and purposes of the project, failure to provide information regarding team members (if any), and lack of letters of permission from landowners are the most common problems encountered. This I believe will straighten out in the future as applicants learn how to fill out the licence forms. The Ontario forms, incidentally, are modelled after those used in neighbouring Quebec.

Recognizing that licencing is usually a seasonal phenomenon, and that the archaeological committee usually only meets once a month, certain deadlines have been established to cover normal licencing for an applicant. It is advisable that for a summer project, an applicant get his or her application into the Ministry by March 1; for an autumn project, August 1 will ensure that one's licence or permit will be processed in time for the field work to commence. At all other times applications normally take two months to process.

Normal licencing procedures are clearly set out in the existing Act; yet, what about emergency situations? They have and will continue to arise. To offset such salvage exigencies, the archaeological committee has advised the Minister to prepare and adopt an additional form of licencing called Conservation Licencing. In effect as of this January, 1977, conservation licences allow their holders to react immediately to archaeological salvage situations that arise and warrant attention within the year. Reporting responsibilities are similar to those expected under normal licencing, although the Ministry would like to hear by telephone about specific incidents as they arise.

(more)

The Noble Report -- cont'd.

Conservation licences will be given only to a few persons in various regions of the Province. It is our recommendation that one archaeologist at each Ontario university and select museums where an archaeologist is on staff, be granted such a licence. Too, the contract archaeologists heading the Ministry's regional offices are logical persons to hold a Conservation licence. In this way it is hoped to be able to cope with future emergency problems.

For both normal and emergency licences, one policy stands fast. This is, that only individuals are licenced, not corporations, groups or institutions. Indeed, it is the archaeological committee's policy to licence only the particular individual who is directly undertaking the survey or excavation. This person is responsible for the project, the communication of its results, and the performance of his assistants.

Extensions to licences are possible under the terms of the Act (Part VI, section 50 (1)). Normally a licence or permit expires after each one year term (January 1 to December 31), but in special circumstances this period can be prolonged. To date, the archaeological committee has not formalized a policy on extensions, but when it does it is obvious that different factors will enter depending upon whether the project is a survey or a set-piece operation.

The entire licencing laws can be found in the Ontario Heritage Act. However, my committee found that much of it was written in a legal fashion unfamiliar to most public readers. As a result, we direct you to the public information booklet entitled "Archaeology and the Law in Ontario". Drafted by Mr. Donald MacLeod and revised and ratified by the O.H.F. archaeological committee, this booklet is far more than a mere statement of can'ts and don'ts. It contains concise instructions on how to get responsibly involved in Ontario archaeology. A positive reaction to this new Act and its licencing procedures can only enhance the state of archaeology in Ontario. This is not the time for negativism, and I ask that everyone act in unison.

In next month's report, "Licencing (Part II)", I shall present topics involving: Licencing and Archaeological Reports; Licencing and Policies concerning Archaeological Field Schools; Grounds for Refusing Licences or Permits; Penalties; and Specific Changes Needed in the Act.

- Mm. C. Noble, Chairman,

O.H.F. Archaeological Committee.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"The Real Crisis in Canadian Archaeology"

Dear Sir:

A recent edition of "Arch Notes" (October, 1976) published an article by Mr. Brian Hayden entitled "The Crisis in Canadian Archaeology" (emphasis mine, though it appears to be the intention of the article), which purports to expose the negative policies of the National Museum of Man in archaeology. As invited by the editor, I am certainly interested in commenting on the matter, particularly as I did have some involvement in the original arrangements on the Draper project.

I may say that on the whole I should find the article highly amusing, were it not for the fact that the tone is so scurrilous and the misconceptions so gross. The article appears deliberately contrived to leave the impression that the project undertaken by Mr. Hayden was intended to be entirely preliminary in nature, and that once completed there should be no trouble in expanding subsequent season's operations to any length necessary. In fact just the opposite is true since protracted negotiations with Ministry of Transport in 1972 and 1973 had resulted in no commitment on their part to the project, and in fact there was constant danger of cancellation of the project at any time. Consequently, when Mr. Hayden states that he did not need to worry about village patterning in his studies since it "would be manifest when the entire site had been excavated" (page 8), this was an assumption based on wishful thinking rather than a proper appreciation for the situation, since at the time he undertook his work it was understood that there would only be one more season of work at the site at best and possible there would be no more at all.

The reason for this lack of certainty in this matter is quite simple. That is, in the absence of effective federal legislation with respect to the conservation of archaeological resources there is never any kind of guarantee that proper measures will be taken at any site which is to be affected by a federal construction project. It is all very well to state that certain requirements are obvious in conjunction with a specific construction project, but the assumption that public opinion alone will be sufficient to ensure that sufficient funds are allocated for archaeological needs is naive to say the least. The failure of the National Museum to implement an effective "salvage archaeology" programme within the federal system is not a reflection of the policy of that institution, but rather of the lack of any legislative base to undertake the measures which federal archaeologists would like to see accomplished.

This, in fact, is one of the main reasons why I resigned from the National Museum and took a position with Archaeological Survey of Alberta. This province has one of the strongest pieces of heritage legislation in the country, and among its provisions are some which permit the requiring of archaeological conservation projects in conjunction with both government and private development programmes. Given this situation it is far easier to conceive and implement specific conservation projects than anywhere in the federal system at this time. Consequently, since I believe that I am the unnamed assessor referred to by Mr. Hayden who is reported to have concurred with the need for a salvage project at the Draper site of the scale recommended by the Ontario Archaeological Society

cont'd.

Letters to the Editor -- cont'd.

but who is no longer employed by the National Museum of Man (page 9), I feel I should make it clear that not only did I not agree fully with the OAS proposal but also that my leaving the Archaeological Survey of Canada was not a function of the absence of a positive policy with respect to salvage archaeology in this or any similar situation. Rather it was in good part a result of dissatisfaction with the fact that even when federal archaeologists are able to clearly identify a much needed salvage archaeology programme they are usually unable to undertake the necessary work because of an absence of sufficient funds and an absence of legislation to permit the generation of those funds. This, to my way of thinking, is the real crisis in Canadian archaeology.

- Dr. H. J. Byrne
Director
Archaeological Survey of Alberta

"Chicken Chuckles"

Dear Sir:

At a recent meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Dr. Howard Savage announced a startling discovery.* (DOMESTIC CHICKENS IN 17th, 18th, and 19th CENTURY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IN EASTERN CANADA - Society for Historical Archaeology Meeting, Ottawa, 6 January 1977 by Dr. Howard Savage, Dept. of Ornithology, Royal Ontario Museum.)

.....
Abstract

Domestic chicken skeletal elements from six historic archaeological sites in eastern Canada have been studied and measurements taken. Comparison with reference skeletons of two present day breeds of differing size has established that the chicken elements at three 18th century forts were from small to medium-sized chickens. Those from a 17th and 18th century farm on a St. Lawrence River island were of a larger size, while those from Cherry Hill, a 19th century pioneer farm near Toronto, were from both large and medium-sized chickens. Relevant specimens from the 17th century Jesuit mission near Midland are under study.

The demonstrated size differences are believed due either to small to medium-sized breeds of chickens at the military forts, or to small, under-developed individuals. Archival sources may provide informative data on these possibilities.

.....
* He proved quite beyond question, that chickens on military sites during the 17th - 19th centuries in Canada, were consistently smaller than those found on domestic sites. Dr. Savage failed to discern any profundity in this fact, and, in true scientific fashion, refrained from speculative comment.

It is our contention that the situation is very easily cleared up the moment one considers the true conditions prevailing on a military site. We suggest that given more conducive conditions, military chickens would indeed have attained the stature of those reared by farmers and other individuals.

(more)

1. One must begin with a clear picture of a soldier's life. Most of one's time is devoted to marching, very little to scattering wheat and corn to eager beaks. Neglect must therefore loom large in any analysis of the full life of a military chicken. The untold psychological anguish of a hen in such a predicament will be studied in a subsequent paper.
2. The first cause leads naturally to the second. The thud of hundreds of marching feet makes any ground so hard that the usual scratching around of a chicken is reduced to a minimum, perhaps to certain failure.
3. With marching among the chickens a matter of course, no doubt broken feet would be commonplace. No lame hen or rooster stands a chance.
4. The danger of lead poisoning is a factor hitherto neglected entirely in the literature. We suggest an interdisciplinary team approach Canada Council for funds to explore this potentially vital factor.
5. It is generally understood that soldiers crave purity above almost every other virtue. Since the Leghorn, a smaller chicken, lays white eggs, while the larger Plymouth Rock produces brownish eggs, it is easy to understand why the smaller Leghorn would be the first choice of any discriminating soldier.
6. So we could continue to put forward our case. In essence, the apparent discrepancy is only in the eyes of Dr. Savage. Had he been a poultry man he would soon have seen simple explanations for his dilemma. He can only hope that this note will encourage him to rethink his position.

In closing, we reiterate the point made in the title, can a soldier really love a chicken?

- Norman E. Wagner & Sandra Woolfrey
Wilfrid Laurier University

O.A.S. MONTHLY GENERAL MEETING - JANUARY 19

Mr. Hubert Buck and Mr. Jimmy Skye were our special speakers of the evening. Both are Faithkeepers for the Longhouse People of the Six Nations Indian Reserve at Brantford and they talked to us about some of the religious aspects of their culture and discussed how these have affected the success or failure of native-white interaction.

Hubert Buck pointed to the difficulty native representatives experience trying to provide answers to problems arising between native peoples and white people by asking us if it would be easy for everyone present to become of one mind, when each of us obviously has his own interpretations. To guide them in their interpretations and actions, the native peoples have the words of the Creator and the prophecies, learned from listening to the talk of the elders of each community. To give us some idea of the relationship each native person acknowledges between himself and the Creator, Mr. Buck described for us a typical meeting where proceedings always begin by giving thanks to the Creator for being alive and able to carry out one's duties, and by asking Him to care for his people and to heal those that are sick.

(more)

O.A.S. Meeting -- cont'd.

In Mr. Buck's words, "He give thanks for everything, all the time. Each gives thanks in his own way, but it all means the same thing". He stressed the native person's close relationship with Mother Earth and consequently with all living things; for his people, everything is here for the purpose of making the world beautiful and this extends, for example, to the weeds which provide medicines and which bloom beautifully in their season. The spirits of those who have died are laid to rest in Mother Earth. We may look at overgrown grave sites and imagine that this indicates a lack of concern for those who have died, but our interpretation would be totally wrong; in the native peoples' religion, such graves are sacred and it is forbidden to disturb them beyond an annual weeding of the site.

Jimmy Skye told us that he had accepted our invitation to speak because he strongly believes that by so doing he may be able to help in the development of a real understanding between native and white peoples. He assured us that it was very difficult for people like himself to talk about native religious beliefs with non-native peoples, especially with those considered to be authorities of one kind or another on the native peoples. He himself does not feel that it is possible for non-natives to be authorities on native religion or culture, because they do not speak the language. Without the language, true communication on the realities of native beliefs is impossible, no matter how much good will, genuine interest or scholarship is involved. For Mr. Skye, learning is listening; all his knowledge has come from listening to others, both in the Longhouse and in the daily round of life. Archaeological excavations, such as those at Grimsby, are not necessary for him to learn about the past; the source of such knowledge comes from the religion he has learned from the people he has met and lived with during his life. For the future, he has the many prophecies of his people; he knows, for example, that when one is finished on earth, one goes to the Happy Hunting Ground and he has been told that the dead should rest in peace. For himself, he would never dig up any buried bones, but he does not have the right or the authority to tell us that such an action is either right or wrong; only the Creator can be the judge of such matters. He can only suggest that we work together to understand one another better and to build up mutual trust. Problems which arise between natives and whites must be solved by first realizing that each is a unique situation where language and an understanding of the beliefs of the native group involved are critical factors in the successful resolution of a particular situation.

CALL FOR PAPERS

A meeting of The Society for Historical Archaeology and an International Conference of Underwater Archaeology was held in Ottawa January 5 to 8. Dr. Savage noted with pleasure that some 25 or 30 OAS members were present on this occasion. In addition, papers were given by five of our members and, since we feel sure that the membership-at-large is interested in reading these, we would request that those members who gave papers provide Arch Notes with copies or abstracts, so that these may appear in a future issue of the Newsletter.

(more)

A NEW LONDON CHAPTER TO BE FORMED

Dr. Savage reported that an application has been received from three London members of the OAS requesting that the membership approve the formation of a London Chapter. Bill Donaldson, Mike Spence and Bill Cox, the three authors of this petition, advise us that there are a number of professional and non-professional archaeologists in the London area who would support the establishment of a London Chapter in a variety of ways, allowing for considerable optimism for its future. If such a move is approved, they hope to arrange an organizational meeting in the very near future, so that the London Chapter could be fully functional by this coming summer. The matter was opened for discussion, whereupon it was moved and seconded that we accept the application of the London members to form a chapter, and this motion was unanimously approved by those present. Dr. Savage advised us that he will inform Messrs. Donaldson, Spence and Cox that their application has been approved, so that they may proceed to organize the London Chapter and apply for a Charter.

- Janet Cooper

**

McMASTER SYMPOSIUM

**

The annual symposium/workshop on archaeology arranged by the McMaster University Anthropological Society will take place on Saturday, February 26th.

For further information, or if you would like to attend, contact Eric Damkjar, McMaster University Anthropological Society, c/o Dept. of Anthropology, 1280 Main St. W., Hamilton L8S 4L9

One of the speakers at the symposium/workshop will be past-president of the O.A.S., Chas. Garrad, who is giving a major paper on the Sidey-Mackay site. Other speakers are expected to include Jock MacAndrews and Marti Latta.

**

**

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY (INC.)Statement of Income and Expenses for
the year ending Dec. 31,
1976

Balance on hand, January 1, 1976				\$3,557.74
<u>Receipts 1976</u>				
Active Membership	\$2,092.05			
Family Membership	332.00			
Institutional Membership	262.45			
Life Membership	200.00	\$2,886.50		
Publications	233.75			
Banquet 1975	2.00			
Symposium 1976	1,135.00			
Courses	166.59			
Donations	51.00			
Canada Council	2,835.00			
Min. Culture & Recreation	1,000.00			
Bank Interest	105.37			
Book Sales	130.80			
E.S.A.F. rep.'s refund	9.75	5,569.36		8,555.86
				<u>\$12,213.60</u>
<u>Disbursements 1976</u>				
"Ontario Archaeology"	3,066.04			
Arch Notes Committee				
Arch Notes	\$1,774.07			
Allied Projects	134.25	1,908.32		
Misc. Postage		124.45		
Expenses: President		114.98		
Librarian		70.28		
Treasurer		13.67		
Corr. Secretary		120.20		
E.S.A.F. Rep.		100.00		
Ott. Chapter Rep.		90.70		
Banquet 1975		70.35		
Honorarium		50.00		
Returned Cheques		12.00		
Bank		2.92		
E.S.A.F. Membership		67.00		
Archaeobotany Course		226.14		
Symposium 1976		853.31		
Miscellaneous		27.73		6,928.09
				<u>\$ 5,285.51</u>
Balance as per bank books:				
C.I.B.C. Curr. A/c	\$866.61			
C.I.B.C. Life A/c	734.62			
Royal B. Curr. A/c	3,729.16			
		\$5,330.39		
Less Outstanding Cheques		44.98		
		<u>\$5,285.51</u>		
Balance in Cherry Hill account:	\$181.93			

Christine Kirby
TreasurerAudited Jan 9/77
Frank B. Nee

The following paper was presented at the recent E.S.A.F. Convention.

THE STATE OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO 1976

by Mima Kapches & John Reid

INTRODUCTION:

In a recent 1976 publication entitled "Archaeology Atlas of the World" by David & Ruth Whitehouse, it is of interest to note that there are no archaeological sites in Ontario. Since there are many archaeologists working in this province one wonders what there is for them to look at!

We decided to write to all the people we thought might be at work in the Province this past summer. The response was gratifying. The following report includes both field and laboratory work being carried out in Ontario. The review is not exhaustive, there is more work proceeding than that which we have chosen to illustrate. We also include an appendix with a list of contributors and where you may contact them if you wish for additional information on their projects.

The review is arranged generally by time periods and includes both references to site excavation and survey and laboratory work.

PALEO-INDIAN:

Dr. Peter Storck of the Royal Ontario Museum excavated the Fisher Paleo-Indian site, which is situated on an abandoned shoreline of glacial Lake Algonquin. Five distinct areas of artifact clusters have been excavated, and large numbers of fluted points and channel flakes have been found in three of these areas.

Dr. Bill Roosa of the University of Waterloo is working on the Parkhill Paleo-Indian site. He notes the similarity between the Barnes complex in Michigan and the Parkhill material. It is suggested that Parkhill may be the winter camp location of the group that summered at the Fisher site. The site age is estimated at 10,500 years B. C. Artifacts from Parkhill include portions of about 80 - 100 fluted points.

A survey for sites of the Paleo-Indian period was conducted by Laurie Jackson, of Trent University, around the Rice Lake area, without much success.

ARCHAIC:

Surveys for Archaic sites were conducted by several individuals: Ken Dawson, of Lakehead University, found evidence of the Shield Archaic transition into the Laurel culture; these sites are followed by unexpanded Algonkian culture. Gord Watson of Trent University surveyed the Rideau Lakes for habitation sites of the Paleo-Indian to the Historic Period; he located eleven sites which are suitable for excavation. Peter Hamalainen, Ministry of Culture and Recreation, worked in the area northeast of Lake Erie and discovered 73 sites; many are Archaic, including quarry sites, but evidence of Middle and Late Woodland sites was also discovered.

(More)

Steve Thomas, of the University of Toronto, is surface collecting four Archaic sites in the Burlington area of Ontario. These sites range from early Archaic and Laurentian to the terminal Archaic period.

EARLY WOODLAND:

Michael Spence, University of Western Ontario, excavated at Bruce Blvd, an Early Woodland Burial site. Several burials and cremations were found, grave goods included red ochre, copper beads, awls, axes, and bracelets, cache blades, meadowood points. Pottery similar to that of Vinette I was also found; the site is guess-dated approximately 800 B.C.

Dr. Spence, would also like to draw to your attention his interest in the identification of source areas of native silver from Middle Woodland sites. Using a mass spectrometer the silver samples will be analysed with little or no damage to the specimens; persons with silver materials or any information on silver are requested to contact Dr. Spence, Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

Laurie Jackson, in his survey of the Rice Lake area discovered an early Woodland station with Vinette I pottery which has been C14 dated to 480 B. C.

LATE WOODLAND:

Bob Pearce, Trent University, excavated the Richardson Village site. This is the most easterly Pickering village site in Ontario and is dated about A.D. 800. Two houses, secondary interments, and a palisade were excavated during the work at the site.

The Reid site was excavated by Milt Wright of McMaster University. This site is late Glen Meyer dated approximately 1400 A.D. Of interest is the association of Middleport and Glen Meyer pipes and Middleport houses with Glen Meyer Ceramics. Six houses were excavated within a double palisade. Evidence was also discovered of the Glen Meyer burial pattern.

Grant Tripp, Museum of Indian Archaeology, University of Western Ontario, continued the excavations at the Late Woodland and White site; to date 9 houses have been completely excavated.

Excavations by D. Smith, Museum of Indian Archaeology, University of Western Ontario, were conducted for Parks Canada at the prehistoric Neutral Southwold and excavations resulted in the discovery of 20 longhouses.

Surveys for Late Woodland sites were conducted by staff of the Museum of Indian Archaeology, University of Western Ontario; J. Dawkins surveyed in the Toronto International Airport area and located 7 previously unknown Iroquoian villages, one ossuary, and more than a dozen Archaic campsites.

Another project involved a continuation of archaeological survey and test excavation in the Crawford Lake Region. This work was undertaken by M. F. Brown and C. Turton of Toronto. Three new sites were located, bringing the total of known sites in the survey to more than a dozen. Two sites were briefly test excavated.

(more)

Bill Ross has surveyed in the Algonquin Park area and has discovered sites of Archaic to Historic affiliation. A prehistoric Algonquin burial was discovered in the Tasso Lake area; grave goods included stone axes, quartz flakes, a possible whet-stone, and part of a birch bark liner.

LATE-HISTORIC WOODLAND:

Peter Ramsden, of McMaster University, excavated at the protohistoric Benson site. Sixteen longhouses and a palisade pattern were uncovered. A survey of the upper Trent River area demonstrated the existence of two Iroquoian populations, one indigenous; the other entered the area in the protohistoric period due to intensification of the trade network with Europeans.

Richard Johnson, Trent University, continued excavation at Le Caron, an early historic Huron site. Thus far, five longhouses have been uncovered in this large fortified village.

Dean Knight, of Wilfrid Laurier University, continued work on the early historic Huron Ball site. Four houses were excavated in this village which was apparently unpalisaded. It is of interest to note the strong influence of St. Lawrence Iroquois ceramics in the artifact collection.

Charles Garrad, of the O.A.S., has been working at three historic Petun sites in the area of Collingwood. This summer work was directed at obtaining artifact samples from midden areas rather than the study of settlement patterns.

Walter Kenyon, of the Royal Ontario Museum, is at this moment excavating a mid-seventeenth century, Neutral cemetery at Grimsby. Several burial pits, with both multiple and single, primary and secondary, interments have been excavated. Grave goods are very abundant and include trade axes, copper kettles, pottery vessels, trade beads, segments of beaver pelts, bone artifacts, shell and catlinite beads, and conch shell pendants.

Apart from field work laboratory analysis was conducted this summer on a series of projects that were begun in other years. Jim Pendergast, an O.A.S. member, has been collecting clay samples from various stream beds in the St. Lawrence River area; three samples will be analysed for trace elements, and the results will be compared with trace elements in pottery from St. Lawrence Iroquoian and one Huron site

Various laboratory projects are being conducted under the auspices of Laurentian University. The materials from the Michipicoten River project of 1972 are being analysed by Ken Buchannan and Morris Brizinsky. The sites studied range in age from Middle Woodland to Late Historic Algonkian. The Renard site, a prehistoric Algonkian site, is being studied by Ms. L. Kilpatrick and Ms. M. Bertulli of Laurentian. Work is also being conducted on the analysis of materials from the Chiblo II site, an historic Algonkian site.

Bill Finlayson of the Museum of Indian Archaeology, University of Western Ontario, is continuing to direct the analysis of materials recovered in the 1975 Draper site rescue operations.

(more)

The following students at the University of Toronto are engaged in research projects: Faunal analysis is being completed by Deborah Pihl on the bone from a Neutral contact site which was excavated by McMaster University. Robin Dodds is analysing the faunal material from several sites in the Lake Superior and Lake Nipigon. Robert Pihl is studying the artifactual material from the Ault Park site; Dave Johnson is studying the material from the late Woodland McKenzie-Woodbridge site, and H. Kapchès is studying the material from the Middleport period Pound Village site.

CONCLUSIONS:

We said this was to be a brief survey and hope that this statement wasn't exaggerated. We intended to demonstrate that archaeological research in Ontario is continuing in all time periods, and, we hope this paper will serve as a method of disseminating information from researchers in Ontario and will encourage contact between Ontario and the members of the Eastern States Archaeological Federation.

Adenda:

There were 2 lab reports overlooked in the original paper. David Keenlyside of the Archaeological Survey in Ottawa is to continue to work on the Point Pelee material for his Ph.D. thesis. Jock McAndrews, Sharon Hick and Rudy Fecteau are working on a book entitled "Handbook of Ontario Archaeobotany".

The following reports came to us too late for the E.S.A.F. paper but we felt they could be included in the report for Arch Notes:

J. V. Wright surveyed in the Georgian Bay Area and located ten sites. They ranged from late archaic (circa 1500 B.C.) to early historic Algonkian. The survey also included the islands between the Bruce Peninsula and Manitoulin Island and proved that prehistoric man was capable of navigating open water up to at least 5 miles. Jim hopes to return to the area in 1977 to do some excavations.

Thor Conway, working for the Ministry of Culture and Recreation at Sault Ste. Marie, surveyed the eastern shore of Lake Superior. This included test excavations of the multi-component Whitefish Island site. Ceramics included prehistoric Late Woodland vessels up to historic Ojibway. Small ovate dwellings, bear cult ceremonialism and native copper workmanship revealed different aspects of this large village site.

Over 85 Middle and Late Woodland Sites as well as early and middle historic components have also been recorded along the eastern shore line of Lake Superior. Other types of sites included rock art cobble head religious sites with stone pits and Hudson's Bay Co. furposts.

Twelve Late Archaic sites are being studied in the Sault Ste. Marie area. One of the sites, the Money Musk, has a C-14 date of 1660± 80 B. C. (DIC 567).

David Arthurs conducted a survey of the Missinaibi River for the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. The survey ran some 250 miles from Lake Missinaibi north of Chapleau to its confluence with the Mathagani to form the Moose River just

(more)

a few miles south of Moosnea. In the James Bay Lowlands there were a total of 36 Archaeological sites recorded including aboriginal, fur trade, 3 recent trapping and aboriginal sites and 7 multi-component sites. Despite rapids and rocky shoals this river seems to have been well travelled during the Historic period with the Hudson's Bay Company and the Northwest Company setting up posts along the river during the mid 1700's. Of the 12 fur trade features investigated only the New Brunswick House has been identified previously.

APPENDIX A

COMPILATION OF RESEARCH PROJECTS IN ONTARIO, 1976.

KEY TO PERIOD:

- PI - Paleo-Indian
- A - Archaic
- EW - Early Woodland
- MM - Middle Woodland
- LW - Late Woodland
- HW - Historic Woodland
- S - Survey S(PI-EW) indicated survey and range of sites discovered.
- H. - Historic

(more)

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>RESEARCHER</u>	<u>SITE NAME</u>	<u>SOCIETY*/INSTITUTION</u>
PI	P. L. Storck	Fisher	Royal Ontario Museum
PI	H. Roosa	Parkhill	University of Waterloo
S(PI)	L. Jackson	-survey-	Trent University
S(A-EW)	K. Dawson	-survey-	Lakehead University
S(AT-H)	G. Watson	-survey-	Perth Museum, Trent University
S(A-LW)	P. Hamalainen	-survey-	Ministry of Culture & Recreation
S(A)	S. Thomas	-survey-	University of Toronto
NW	M. Spence	Bruce Boyd	University of Western Ontario
LW	B. Pearce	Richardson	Trent University
LW	M. Wright	Reid	McMaster University
LW	G. Tripp	White	Museum of Indian Archaeology University of Western Ontario
LW	D. Smith	Southwold	" " "
S(A-LW)	J. Dawkins	-survey-	" " "
S(A-H)	B. Ross	-survey-	Ministry of Culture & Recreation
LW-HW	P. Ramsden	Benson	McMaster University
HW	R. B. Johnson	Le Caron (Santimo)	Trent University
HW	D. Knight	Ball	Wilfred Laurier University
HW	C. Garrad	3 Petun sites	Ontario Archaeological Society
HW	M. Kenyon	Grimsby	Royal Ontario Museum
S(A-HW)	J. V. Wright	-survey-	Archaeological Survey of Canada
S(MW-HW)	T. Conway	-survey-	Ministry of Culture & Recreation
S(HW-H)	D. Arthurs	-survey-	" "

* The OAS did not conduct any excavation in 1976; these individuals are members of the OAS and may be contacted by writing the authors.