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Editor’s note ...

This issue brings a wealth of new information, reviews and items for your consideration. We have Lawrence Jackson’s in-depth review of the Parkhill monograph, joined by responses to the Red Tape Commission, OAS awards criteria, the OAS Egypt trip, Jim Wilson’s open letter to the Ministry, and Marianne Murphy’s experiences with the OAS Passport to the Past program and the artifacts of the historic Butler homestead. I’ve added an item on the recent Doors Open Toronto weekend, and phew, there you have it!

Special thanks to Chris Ellis for permission to include his Parkhill web page material.

Frank Dieterman, Arch Notes editor

Welcome New OAS Members

D. Babcock – Thunder Bay
S. Boyd – Mississauga
A. Duc-Triano – Queenston
C. Eberle – Guelph
J. Horne-McKaiig – Napean
K. Hull – Pickering
R. Hurlburt – Hillsburg
L. Attenborough-Deakin - Stouffville

A. Jansen – St. Catherines
A. Marshall – Owen Sound
K. Murphy – Kitchener
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Mr & Mrs Balasiuk
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A. Henwood

Mr & Mrs Dodson
J. Ormsby
C. Rigby

R. Taylor
B. Waugh
I. McEwan

Dr. R. Merritt
E. Lloyd
C. Tarnoy

G. Hambleton
T. King
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President's notes

Upon application from 15 new and 3 existing members of the Society, and as recommended by Ron Williamson, the Board of Directors takes great pleasure in awarding a charter to form a new chapter in Niagara-on-the-Lake. Congratulations are extended to the Founding Members: Pat Balasiuk, Ron Balasiuk, Ron Dale, Jim Dodson, Laura Dodson, Andrew Henwood, Ellen Lloyd, Ian McEwan, Richard Merritt, Joy Ormsby, Caroline Rigby, Krista Stephenson, Clara Tarnoy, Aggie Tarnoy, Richard Taylor, Marty Ububink, Susan Ubbink, and Bob Waugh. What a way for the Society to celebrate its 50th year.

Bill Renison has informed the Society of the recent passing away of Murray Corbett, a 50-year member who was President of the Society in 1953 and later served as Auditor and Recording Secretary. In 1949, Murray was one of the original members of the class that took Dr. Norman Emerson's course “Ontario Before Champlain” from whose members was formed the Ontario Archaeological Society.

During his tenure as President, the Society excavated part of the renowned Draper site, an Iroquoian village near Stouffville that was excavated to varying degrees during the 1970s by Marti Latta, Brian Hayden, Peter Ramsden, and Bill Finlayson. Murray received an Honourary Life Membership on April 21, 1976. The President of the Society at that time, Dr. Howard Savage, remarked on Murray's “unbroken and dedicated service to our Society having participated in every excavation during its first fifteen years”. A full obituary is planned for the July-August issue of Arch Notes. Our condolences are extended to his wife and family.

Lise Ferguson has requested a leave of absence from the Board of Directors and has stepped down as Director of Heritage Advocacy. We wish Lise well and look forward to working with her again in the future. The Board of Directors has appointed Tony Stapells as her replacement for the remainder of the year. Thanks Tony for agreeing to fill in.

Bob Mayer, President

With this column, Arch Notes begins a new feature dedicated to Archaeology in the classroom - Teacher’s Edge. The column's objective is to be a resource and portable 'bulletin board' from teachers within our membership. This first column lists the resources that the OAS has to offer the elementary and secondary panel. I would also like to encourage our members to email archaeological classroom success stories, tips, or networking links to oas@globalserve.net.

The OAS wants to become part of your classroom, school, family of schools and your Board’s Resource Department. As you go into planning mode for the fall 2000 term consider these resources:

DISCOVERING ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGY
A Museum Quality Outreach kit designed for use with grade threes to eight. Call the OAS office for content and rental details at 1-888-733-0042.

COMMUNITY SPEAKERS KIT
An outreach kit with slides illustrating archaeological techniques, history, and the human occupation of Ontario. This kit is designed for grade six through to adult audiences. Call the OAS office for further details at 1-888-733-0042.

RESOURCE BOOK OF THE MONTH

PLACES TO SEE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXHIBITS
Woodland Cultural Education Centre. 184 Mohawk Street P.O. Box 1506, Brantford, Ontario N3T 5V6 (519) 759-2650

WEBSITES www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

Look forward to more books, CD’s, websites, suggestions of museum programs and attractions in the fall issue of Arch Notes.
From the OAS office...

At this time last June the Board of Directors, interested stakeholders and myself were in the process of shaping the goals and the objectives of the Strategic Plan that would take the OAS into the first few years of the new millennium. I am very pleased to report that the Strategic Plan is completed and is a very workable document. Caroline Thériault, who was charged with taking all the tweaks and modifications, brought it to us April 8, 2000 as a finished product. I find that I refer to it often, as I should, to make sure the Board and the Society are on track. If any member would like to review it please call the office and request a copy be sent to your home.

I would like to welcome the founding members, you can see their names in our new members column, of the Niagara-on-the-Lake OAS Chapter. With the addition of this group the OAS now has eight Chapters.

I look forward to receiving word of their activities and wish them the all the very best as they work through the initial days and months of forming a new organization.

It has been a very busy, early spring. I have attended two conferences, the Association of Professional Archaeologists, and the Canadian Association of Archaeologists, both were opportunities for me to meet and network with the professional community, which I enjoyed thoroughly! I am also involved in various stages of planning, participation and coordination of events for our membership and the larger pictures detailed within our Strategic Plan.

The agenda for late spring is filling up and I look forward to keeping the admin wheels rolling and the Society's visions in line.

Jo Holden, Executive Director

From the dust of ages ... to www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

I am working with Norma Knowlton to catalogue the complete OAS library collection by the end of the year. Distributing it on disk and on-line will then be easy and provide a good OAS-specific bibliography of archaeological publications.

As we arrange the collection, we are making some minor weeding decisions. Since we don't know everything, we'll ask members for their advice. Anything we don't want will be sold at a future book sale. During the cataloguing process, we've been entering the collection into a computer database. The software we're using is a DOS program called InMagic, used for many years by large libraries for their collection management but also quite useful for smaller collections like ours. InMagic's advantages include ease of searching, fast operation and low cost. In fact, since I have donated my trusty old 386 to the office and the software is available free from the InMagic website, there has been no cost at all so far.

Most of the 800 current entries are courtesy of Charlie Garrad and other previous librarians who have spent countless hours entering information over the years. We cannot thank them enough for their hard work. The catalogue right now includes most of the vertical files, Arch Notes from 1955 to 1997, KEWA (London chapter newsletter) from 1977 to 1991, and Ottawa Archaeologist (Ottawa chapter newsletter) from 1976 to 1991. Left to catalogue are about 200 books including many government publications (Mercury series mostly), Ontario Archaeology (our journal), and many dozens of regional journals.

Some of the journals are not collected by local universities and are unfortunately incomplete runs since the OAS doesn't have enough money to subscribe to them any more. Please think of the OAS library if you have any collection of archaeological journals or books that you don't want any more. By the next Arch Notes we will know what we are missing and hope some of you may help us to complete or at least add to our collection.
Finally, I would like to ask you for some help. If you have a catalogue of or index to your chapter’s newsletter, could you send it to me? It does not matter if it is incomplete, and if you have it in electronic form I can decipher almost any type of file. Contact me if you would like to compile an index and we can discuss what information to include.

By working together this year we can, by the true beginning of the 21st century, have an OAS library we can really use! We are andys@sentex.ca at (416) 462-0961 at home, knowlton@neptune.on.ca (Norma Knowlton) or you can write us at the OAS office. Also messages can be relayed via Jo Holden at the OAS toll free number 1-888-733-0042.

Andrew Schoenhofer

For the second year, the Toronto Chapter is collaborating with Bronte Creek Provincial Park to present a public Archaeology Day. Last year, despite an error in the local newspaper mismatching the day and date, 350 adults and children enjoyed the various activities. This year the event will be held on Sunday July 30, 2000 from 12 noon to 4 P.M.

Activities will take place in the Nature Centre, an old brick farmhouse, and in a marquee tent, set up in the field on the way to the animal barn. In the Nature Centre there will be slide lectures by archaeologists, a video program and archaeological displays. Jo Holden has volunteered to explain and display the “Discovering Ontario Archaeology” kit. The tent will house instructed pottery making, lithics instruction and production and pottery reconstruction. In the field nearby a sand-box “dig” is being constructed for participants 8-15 years of age. An all-age range is also planned in the field for those over 10. A “Footprint Game” will cater to the young ones.

Activities have been planned and scheduled. However, the success of this outreach depends on chapter members and any other OAS members who wish to help on a volunteer basis. Last year the ramparts were manned by the Toronto Executive and invited specialists. We require 5 to 7 people to assist with pottery making, supervising an artificial dig and archaeological information. Lunch and free parking are provided by the park to volunteers. Those who would like to volunteer should contact Norma Knowlton at (905) 476-4747 or knowlton@neptune.on.ca. For members lacking transportation, arrangements can be made.

Even if you do not feel able to participate as a volunteer, your presence would be welcomed as a member of "the public". In addition to the activities noted above, Bronte Creek Provincial Park is a bit of old Ontario farmland preserved near population centres. Its presence is often unknown to people in the Toronto area. Come out and see your society in action.

Bronte Creek Provincial Park is most easily accessed from the QEW by going north on Burloak Drive (on the border of Oakville and Burlington). The park entrance is on the east side of Burloak a short distance north. In fact the southern park boundary abuts the QEW.

We hope to see lots of people, including OAS members, on July 30 at Bronte Creek Provincial Park.

Norma Knowlton
Response to the Red Tape Commission inquiry

The OAS invited its members, in the January/February 2000 Arch Notes (New Series Vol. 5, Issue 1) to comment on various issues pertaining to the management and regulation of archaeological practice in the province with particular reference to the consulting industry. This query was prompted by a letter to the OAS from the Red Tape Commission and subsequent discussion between the Board of Directors and Mr. Rudi Wycliffe of the Commission in January of this year.

The nature of the responses represents the range of discussion and positions articulated in the Board’s deliberation over these issues. Respondents expressed a range of positions form ranging from the OAS having no role in the discussions concerning this issue to that of ensuring other affected groups be kept in mind when these issues are considered. Based upon this response the OAS is faced with three general directions: 1) to leave the resolution of these consulting issues to the Ministry, consultants and any other organization(s) representing more specifically the concerns of professional archaeologists; 2) to inform its members, professional and non professional alike regarding these issues as they relate to the protection and preservation of archaeological resources; or 3) to provide direction or at least facilitate communication for the establishment of some consensus on these issues and how they may be resolved.

For the OAS to retract from this dialogue would be inconsistent with its mandate and the direction it has set for itself in the recently adopted strategic plan. At the very least, and perhaps, based on the majority of the respondent positions, the role the OAS should play with regard this issue is to serve as a means for disseminating information in a generalized format as to what is happening with regard to these concerns and encourage discussion on how these issues affects management of archaeological resources and the general practice of archaeology for individual members to comment through submissions to Arch Notes.

Based upon these observations the OAS will relay documented developments associated with these issues to its members. Arch Notes has been one of the principal forums for discussion of these and other concerns relating to Ontario Archaeology for the past 25 years and we continue to encourage this healthy dialogue through letters to the editor by its members. Finally the OAS encourages a positive resolution these and any other issues affecting the conservation and management of Ontario’s rich archaeological heritage.

Hugh J. Daechsel
Director of Marketing and Promotion

"First Notice of the Annual Business Meeting &
First Notice of the President’s Meeting"

The Ontario Archaeological Society will hold its ABM and its President’s Meeting at the OAS 27th Annual Symposium held this year in Midland Ontario.

As the final arrangements are made for this Symposium further news regarding the date, time and location of the meetings will be posted in Arch Notes, and on the Registration Flyers detailing the Symposium Events. Look for this in your July/August 2000 Arch Notes.
OAS news

OAS awards criteria

The following are the criteria and processes for three of the awards currently bestowed by the Ontario Archaeological Society.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION AWARD

1/ Eligibility shall consist, as in the Award description, of a significant voluntary contribution to heritage preservation within the Province of Ontario, above the requirements of Canadian law, within the year prior to announcement of the award.

2/ The Award shall be in the form of an Honourary Certificate presented by the President of the OAS or his/her representative at the annual symposium.

3/ Closing date for written nomination is July 1st, 2000.

The OAS Board of Directors shall consider the nominations and rank them on the following scale. In the event of a tie, a Board vote shall be held to determine the winner.

i) Significance of site(s) impacted
ii) Active participation of nominee
iii) Field contributions by nominee
iv) Financial contribution of nominee above that required by law
v) Setting an example of conservation awareness in the community
vi) Long-term conservation planning.

THE J. NORMAN EMERSON SILVER MEDAL

The J. Norman Emerson Silver Medal is intended to be awarded on occasion to an outstanding Ontario non-professional archaeologist whose work has been consistently of the highest standard, who has made an exceptional contribution to the development of Ontario Archaeology and who has earned acclaim for excellence and achievement. It is the highest honour the Society can bestow. Closing date for nominations, July 1st, 2000.

1/ The nominee must have been a member in good standing of the Ontario Archaeological Society throughout the period under consideration.

2/ The nominee must have made a significant contribution to archaeology in Ontario as suggested in the following guidelines: i) The nominee will have published work, preferably, but not restricted to, Ontario Archaeology, Arch Notes and/or chapter newsletters; and/or ii) The nominee will have been active in chapter and/or Society executive or committee work; and/or iii) The nominee will have made substantial contributions to the advancement of the goals of the OAS through Public Education and/or community outreach programs; and/or iv) the nominee will have made outstanding contributions to the understanding of Ontario’s archaeological record through active fieldwork, conservation and/or research of the highest caliber.

3/ While it is intended that this award recognize the contributions of private scholars, professionals will be considered if it can be demonstrated that their contributions are clearly independent of professional requirements and capacities.
THE KENYON CITATION OF MERIT AWARD
(FORMERLY THE CITATION OF MERIT AWARD)

The Ian and Tim Kenyon Memorial Award is intended to be awarded to Ontario non professional archaeologists who have made an exceptional contribution to the development of Ontario archaeology, and who has earned acclaim for excellence and achievement. Next to the J. Norman Emerson Award for Lifetime achievement, it is the highest recognition that the Society can bestow. Closing date for written nominations is July 1st, 2000.

1/ The nominee must have been a member in good standing of the Ontario Archaeological Society throughout the period under consideration

2/ The nominee must have made a significant contribution to archaeology in Ontario as suggested in the following guidelines: i) The nominee will have published work, preferably but not restricted to, Ontario Archaeology, Arch Notes and/or chapter newsletters; and/or ii) The nominee will have been active in chapter and/or Society executive or committee work; and/or iii) the nominee will have made substantial contributions to the advancement of the goals of the OAS through public education and/or community outreach programs; and/or iv) The nominee will have made outstanding contributions to the understanding of Ontario’s archaeological record through active fieldwork, conservation and/or research of the highest caliber.

3/ While it is intended that this award recognize the contributions of private scholars, professionals will be considered if it can be demonstrated that their contributions are clearly independent of professional requirements.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO TWENTY-FIVE YEAR OAS MEMBERS

Any member who believes him/herself eligible but has not been contacted by the OAS office, please contact the office and identify yourself. To be eligible, you would have joined the Society in 1975 and been a continuous dues paying member since that year. The special recognition of the 25 Year Member was introduced by the Society in 1987. The award consisting of a special 25 Years Membership Pin and an accompanying testimonial certificate will be presented at the 2000 OAS Symposium, Saturday, October 14, 2000 in Midland, Ontario. Recipients unable to attend personally or by a representative will receive their awards later. Eighty-nine members have previously received the award.

OAS tour of Egypt in 2001

At the time of the 1998 Symposium the Society announced its intent to organize a tour of Egypt in the fall of 2001. Recently, Charles Garrad, a former President and Executive Director generously offered his time to organize this tour. Charlie has organized many such events for the benefit of members and in the last twenty years he has already organized three tours to Egypt. The Board of Directors was therefore pleased to accept his offer with gratitude, and has appointed him the “2001 Egypt Tour Leader”, in the firm knowledge that this tour will once again become a memorable experience for all participants. At the time of the announcement in 1998, we received 35 responses from members who expressed interest, and since then this number has grown. All of these members will be contacted in due course, and additional information is available in this issue and in future issues of Arch Notes.

Leslie Currie reports that next Nautical Archaeological Survey Level I Course is being held in Ottawa by Peter Englebert on the weekend of June 2/3, 2000. If you are interested in attending, please contact Brian Prince at 613-591-9551.
Proposed changes to the OAS constitution

Two years ago the Society made minor changes to the Constitution that resulted in simpler wording, and that neutralized the gender of the text. At the last Annual Business Meeting in October 1999, the Board indicated that it may wish to amend the Constitution in two areas, namely the section that deals with the number of Board meetings that have to be conducted during a year, and the section that deals with the number of Directors. The proposed changes, as indicated at that time, are now proposed hereunder.

Then there are two major additional topics that the Board wishes to introduce into the Constitution. One provides for the protection of Restricted Funds (such as the Publication Fund), and the other for the creation of a mandatory Annual Report.

In addition to these changes, there are opportunities to make the Constitution a little more structured, without deleting any of its provisions. The current Constitution contains 22 Articles, 12 of which contain only one sentence. These 12 Articles should properly be grouped with other existing Articles, thereby reducing the total number of Articles from 22 to 10. The changes proposed here deal with structure only, there are no changes to existing text.

Below are the Articles affected by the proposed changes, and reasons for these changes are shown with the asterisk (*) below each Article. Additional wording is shown in bold, while deleted wording is shown in brackets (...)

1992 Any Funds of the Society that are restricted for specific use, cannot be used for purposes other than authorized by that Fund. Such Funds are identified in the audited financial statements of the Society, and existing restrictions on the use of these funds can only be revised by way of a two-thirds vote at the Annual Business Meeting of the Society.

* Our major Fund is to cover the publication cost of our journal, Ontario Archaeology, but there is no protection for this Fund being used for other purposes. Because this Fund was the result of a major fund-raising effort a few years ago, which was matched with a Government grant, it is proper to ensure that a future Board honours the intent of this Fund.

2. The Society shall publish an Annual Report by March 31 of each year. This report shall contain information on the current and future financial position of the Society, minutes of the prior Annual Business Meeting, an overview of achievements during the preceding year, and major activities planned for the current year in support of the strategic objectives for that year.

* For the purposes of securing private and public grants, and for any promotional purposes we need a ready publication in support of such applications and promotions. At this time we do not have a document that serves this purpose.

3 The Annual Business Meeting of the Society shall be held in conjunction with the Society's Symposium, or at such other time and place as the Board of Directors shall decide. The membership shall be notified of the venue and agenda 60 days prior to the Annual Business Meeting. Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting shall be ratified by the Board of Directors at its next meeting, and shall be published in the Annual Report of the Society.

* Currently we wait for the next Annual Business Meeting (ABM) to ratify the minutes of last year's ABM. This is not a feasible approach because last year's attendees may not be present for next year's ABM, and even if
there are any people that attend both ABMs, these persons may not recall whether the discussions and decisions of last year are correctly reflected in the minutes that are now 12 months old.

4 The Secretary shall call a meeting of the Board of Directors at least four (ten) times a year, and notice thereof, together with the Agenda, shall be given in writing to all members of the Board of Directors at least five business days prior to such meeting.

* The current requirement is for 10 Board meetings per year, all of which are typically held in Toronto. This presents a natural impediment for members who live in other communities to stand for nomination to the Board. By making Board meetings more focussed on policy issues, instead of day-to-day issues, the need for 10 meetings is greatly reduced, thereby making a Board appointment more attractive for members resident outside of the Toronto area.

5 Management of the affairs of the Society shall, except as hereinafter provided be vested in the Board of Directors, which shall be composed of seven elected Directors. Annually, and at the discretion of the elected Directors, two additional Directors may be appointed to the Board, provided that these appointed Directors have skills that are not usually found amongst the membership. The rights and duties of these appointed Directors are the same as for the elected Directors.

* The intent of this Article is to empower the Board to supplement its skills in areas of deficiency. Two examples that come to mind are in finance and in marketing.

6 A Nominating Committee of at least three members shall be appointed by the Board of Directors (in July) to prepare a slate of members suggested for election. The membership of the Nominating Committee shall be duly notified to the membership. The Nominating Committee shall present its candidates to the Membership (Board of Directors) at the Annual Business Meeting, at which (meeting) additional nominations may also be accepted (made) from the floor, providing the member nominated has consented (allowed his name to stand). The Nominating Committee shall close the nominations at that meeting. Should the number of candidates be equal to, or less than seven, then these candidates are elected as directors by acclamation. Should the number of candidates exceed seven, then an election will be called, and the nominations will be advised to all members of the Society no less than 30 (40) days prior to the election.

* The additional wording serves to clarify an existing deficiency.

7 To be eligible for Chapter membership, an applicant must be a member of the Society. Each Chapter shall have the right to determine who shall become members thereof; however, membership once granted cannot be withdrawn by the Chapter unless the member is suspended or expelled as prescribed by the Constitution of the Society. Chapters may have a membership class that permits subscriptions to its publications only, and such members are not required to be members of the Society.

* The additional wording recognizes a reality of current membership in some chapters.

The Board hereby invites comments from the membership. A copy of the complete text of the amended Constitution is available from the office, please call if you wish to receive a copy. Alternatively, a copy may be obtained from our web site 'www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca'.
ANNOUNCING EGYPT 2001

The Ontario Archaeological Society is pleased to announce it will sponsor a two week tour from Toronto or Cairo to the principal archaeological remains in Egypt, with a third optional week extension, late in the year 2001.

The trip will be limited to about 45 members. A unique itinerary is being planned not available elsewhere, drawing on the Society’s experience in 1981 and 1991. The final itinerary, costs, and details of options will be available later this year.

As in previous years the tour will be coordinated and conducted for the Society by Charles Garrad.

Use the following format to register your interest in the OAS EGYPT 2001 trip:

Telephone (recorder will answer) or fax: (416) 223-2752
Email: charles.garrad@sympatico.ca
Mail: Charles Garrad, 103 Anndale Drive, North York, ON M2N 2X3, Canada

Please provide the following information:

Your names(s) and how many people? Address
Telephone and Fax (residence and work) Email
Signed by member Date
Any comments, questions, suggestions

Members interested in participating should:
(1) register without obligation for further information as it develops
(2) plan now to take two or three weeks off in November 2001
(3) start saving
(4) keep reading about Egypt!
MCzCR licences

The following list consists of the type of licence, name of licensee, licence number and site location. Unless otherwise noted, all licences are for the Province of Ontario. For information, contact the Archaeological Licence Office, Heritage & Libraries Branch, 4th Floor, 400 University Avenue, Toronto. Tel. (416) 314-7123; fax: (416) 314-7175.

Licences issued during February & March 2000:

**Conservation - surface collecting only:**
- Brian David Cross, 2000.003, Delaware and London Townships (under supervision of MCzCR’s SW Regional Archaeologist)
- Douglas Todd, 2000-014, Niagara Region & Hamilton-Wentworth (under supervision of MCzCR’s SW Regional Archaeologist)
- Mark C. Warrack, 2000-043, City of Mississauga
- Arthur F. Howey, 2000-049, Brant and Wentworth Counties

**Conservation:**
- Charles Garrad, 2000-022, Townships of Nottawasaga-Clearview, Collingwood and Mulmur
- Robert Pearce, London Museum of Archaeology, 2000-032
- Heather Broadbent, 2000-034, Town of Caledon
- Robert W. C. Burgar, Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, 2000-040, lands under the jurisdiction of the TRCA

**Consulting:**
- Jim Wilson, Archaeologix Inc., 2000-002
- Andrew Hinshelwood, 2000-005
- Phillip J. Woodley, New Directions Archaeology, 2000-008
- David Spittal, 2000-009
- Southern Ontario
- Elizabeth Alder, Alder Heritage Assessments, 2000-010
- L. R. Bud Parker, Parker Archaeological Consulting, 2000-012
- Andrew Murray, A. M. Archaeological Associates, 2000-015
- Lawrence Jackson, Northeastern Archaeological Assoc., 2000-017
- Donna Morrison, Advance Archaeology, 2000-018
- Ken Swayne, 2000-019
- Garth Grimes, Detritus Consulting, 2000-020
- John Pollock, Settlement Surveys Ltd./Woodland Heritage Services Ltd., 2000-023
- Hugh J. Daechsel, Heritage Quest Inc., HH12000-025
- Tom Arnold, 2000-028
- Robert Pearce, London Museum of Archaeology, 2000-031
- Peter Sattelberger, 2000-035
- Gordon C. Dilb, York North Archaeological Services, 2000-036
- Robert W. C. Burgar, Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, 2000-038
- Nicholas R. Adams, Adams Heritage Consultants, 2000-041
- Allyn H. Gliddon, 2000-042
- Marilyn Cornies, Amick Consultants, 2000-044
- Carl R. Murphy, 2000-045
- Rita Griffin-Short, ROS Archaeological Services, 2000-051
- Geoggine M. Pastershank, 2000-053
- Michael B. Henry, Amick Consultants, 2000-056

**Consulting - including underwater:**
- Phillip J. Wright, Mount McGovern Co. Ltd., 2000-048

**Excavation:**
- Charles Garrad, 2000-021, McQueen-McConnell (BcHb-31)

**Field School:**
- Robert W. C. Burgar, Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, 2000-039, Seed Barker (AgHh-l)
- Robert Pearce, London Museum of Archaeology, 2000-033
- Susan Mary Jamieson, Trent University, Dept. of Anthropology, 2000-054
- Bark (BbOp-12) North Half Lot 6, Concession 13, Cavan Twp., Peterborough County

**Survey & Test Excavation:**
- John D. a. MacDonald, 2000-052
- Christopher Ellis, University of Western Ontario, Dept. of Anthropology, 2000-055

**Underwater:**
- Diane F. Cashmore, 2000-004, Gunilda, off McGarvey Shoal in Schreiber Channel, N. of Copper Island, Lake Superior (for photo & video documentation of deterioration only)
- Barbara Marshall, The Niagara Divers’ Association, 2000-007, Lake Erie, 5 miles south from Port Colborne Pier including Ed Kelly Wreck, Nichol Beach
Review by Lawrence J. Jackson

The Parkhill site, discovered in the early 1970s, has long been known to have a unique and impressive Early Palaeo-Indian artifact assemblage. Until this major effort by Ellis and Deller, however, a complete account of the site’s excavation and its artifacts remained unpublished. The untimely death of William Roosa, major excavator of the site, has not deterred the authors from providing what I found to be one of the clearest, well-reasoned site accounts which it has been my privilege to read. The acknowledgements set the tone for this work with a straightforward delivery and chronological accounting - including a fine acknowledgement to the site discoverers Gary and Randy Laye and Ray Baxter. The authors give full credit to the intuition and diligence of those who find remarkable sites.

The Parkhill site book is divided into four parts: Part 1 (two chapters) deals with Site Context and Excavations; Part 2 (five chapters) with Lithic Assemblages; Part 3 (five chapters) with Site Areas and Overall Layout; and Part 4 Conclusions.

Introductory Chapter 1 provides all necessary background for reading this book, including the early history of Parkhill site investigations, naming of the Parkhill Phase (including the slight confusion surrounding use of the term Complex), later occupations of the site, and actual field techniques utilized. Although excavated in premetric days (using 5 foot squares), the entire Parkhill excavation is internally consistent and extremely well organized. Well ahead of its time, parts of Parkhill were excavated using 1/8 inch mesh. My only wish is that more extensive work had been possible in unifacial areas of the site using this technique - which I have found particularly useful in fine discrimination of unifacial activity areas.

Considering the fact that nearly every major Early Palaeo-Indian site in the Great Lakes area has been excavated with 1/4” mesh, the Parkhill results are eminently comparable with those from other sites.

Chapter 2, authored by Alan Morgan, John McAndrews, and Chris Ellis provides a succinct yet engaging discussion of the Geological History and Palaeoenvironment of the Parkhill site. The most useful results of this chapter are a significant revision to the suggested age of Main Lake Algonquin, recognition that it may actually be post-Algonquin Lake Ardtrea associated with Parkhill’s Palaeo-Indian oc-
occupation, and clear documentation that Parkhill was, in fact, a lake-edge occupation. Although this is termed the "revisionist" geological view for the history of the southern Huron basin, these ideas were well-developed by Ellis in an earlier paper (Jackson et al. 1995) and may stand the test of time. Some of the geological confusion surrounding the lake associations of the Parkhill phase Fisher site (see Storck 1997) may actually be resolved by this new suggestion. Widely fluctuating terminal Pleistocene levels in the Huron basin also draw our attention to new possibilities for site locations under the modern lake, a suggestion being actively explored today by Scarlett Janusas and associates.

The lithic assemblage analysis of Part 2 is authored primarily by Ellis, with one chapter posthumously co-authored with William Roosa. Attribute analysis is strongly emphasized in Chris Ellis' work and Part 2 of the Parkhill book lives up to expectations. Many of the tool classes and types used in the Parkhill analysis, such as alternately bevelled bifaces, were defined by Ellis and Deller (1988). Chapter 3 discusses systems of tool use and clearly lays out measuring procedures used throughout the analysis. And here is one of the great strengths of the volume, virtually every measurement on every tool is available. Unlike the companion Parkhill phase Fisher site publication (Storck 1997), with its strong emphasis on fluted bifaces, it is not difficult or impossible to locate measurements for other tool types such as trianguloid end scrapers. There is an excellent discussion in Chapter 4 of the Parkhill assemblage viewed in terms of raw material procurement and primary stages of tool manufacture - essentially looking at each individual artifact as a blank type and reconstructing how it became what it was. Chapters 5 and 6 look at the artifacts as tools/preforms rather than as flake blanks - thus delineating the later stages of tool manufacture and use. Chapter 5, Fluted Points and Other Bifaces, by Roosa and Ellis, will be of immense interest to specialists for its complete presentation of the Parkhill site bifaces - essentially defining the Parkhill Phase. Good comparisons should be possible with the Parkhill phase Fisher site publication (Storck 1997). Instances of point rejuvenation and reworking are also well discussed. Chapter 6 gives us a detailed discussion of the unifacial tools including well-argued speculations on hafting differences and recycling among tool forms, e.g. broken scraper hafts into gravers. Finally, Chapter 7 offers a precise discussion of 6,000 pieces of flaking debris in only 13 pages. The principal conclusion of this section is that primary stages of lithic manufacture were not carried out at Parkhill, an observation consistent with most Early Palaeo-Indian sites in the Northeast with the possible exception of the Fisher site. Unfortunately, there is no comparable flaking debris chapter in the Fisher site monograph (despite its other strengths) to facilitate comparisons with Parkhill.

Part 3, authored by Deller and Ellis, discusses total assemblages by site excavation area, their general make-up, and sampling and distributional implications. Chapter 8 on Area B uses a significant innovation, taking a sample obtained in the field using 1/8" mesh (to recover small channel flake fragments), and screening out the finer materials in the lab to make it comparable to analyses of fluted point areas excavated by 1/4" mesh alone. Considering the importance placed on fluted bifaces in other Northeastern site reports this strategy is well-considered. Highlights of this important chapter (and site area) include logical speculations on total numbers of fluted points produced and on fluted point attribute variability - which brings us a step closer to seeing the traces of individuals in the archaeological record. Indeed, I am reminded of Bill Roosa's contention that he could recognize individual fluted point makers at Parkhill. While we may be a long way from demonstrating such patterning, it certainly should be among the things we continue to search out! The most significant aspect of Area B is that it alone outproduces any known eastern Great Lakes site in terms of numbers of fluted bifaces and, further, has the most extensive area of point re-hafting known, possibly in the entire Northeast. Intriguing data is also presented in each Area chapter on the density of remains surrounding known subsoil Features. Deller and Ellis reaquaint us with one of Bill Roosa's suggestions, that of "two-man work areas" around features. Again, this is the type of speculation we need to pursue, by any testable means, in further elucidating Early Palaeo-Indian lifeways. I have myself encouraged reconstruction of "feature event units", combining actual feature contents and estimates.
of probable contents from surrounding plough zone soil artifact densities, as a means of approaching the perplexing problem of what activities were carried out at features (Jackson 1998).

Chapters 9 and 10, on Areas C and D respectively, follow the same format as Chapter 8. Some highlights include recognition of greater use of local secondary chert sources in Area C, separation of areas of fluted biface manufacture from other site activities, and a very clear discussion separating later period and Palaeo-Indian materials in Area D based on tool attributes and raw material types.

Chapter 11 discusses a large sample of artifacts collected mainly from the surface in other areas of the site and projects possible activity area sizes. This section brings up my only criticism of the Parkhill site field work and this is not in any sense critical of Ellis and Deller's treatment of the materials. For such a truly important and early site, Parkhill did not see the extent of excavation which it should have had in some of the unifacial tool producing activity areas identified from surface collection. This may have been a product of limited research funding and/or the preoccupation of researchers in the 1970s with locating fluted bifaces.

Chapter 12, the second last but perhaps most important chapter of the Parkhill site monograph examines the overall layout of the site's activity areas and compares it with other Northeastern sites. The nine lithic areas of Parkhill compare favourably with many large Northeastern sites, such as Gainey and Shoop. Ellis and Deller clearly lay out their arguments for site significance and function, refuting some earlier criticisms based on perceptions of sample size. I was also intrigued by the side-by-side mapping comparison of the Parkhill and Fisher site complexes which draws attention to the nine areas of Parkhill versus what may be two sets of nine areas at Fisher. There are strong indications of significant Palaeo-Indian reoccupation of Fisher which might support two significant occupations, as well as more minor re-uses suggested for both sites (see Ellis and Deller; also Storck 1997). Another feature of comparison is the apparent location of the main fluted point producing areas at both Parkhill and Fisher closest to the Lake Ardrea shoreline. This pattern of highly specialized biface production areas and generalized unifacial tool use areas is mirrored at other Parkhill phase sites and is persuasively used by Ellis and Deller to argue the possibility of sexually differentiated areas used simultaneously at such sites. The Gainey phase, although still rather poorly known, has also produced evidence of highly specialized unifacial tool use areas at sites such as Sandy Ridge (Jackson 1998), Murphy and Culoden Acres (Ellis et al. 1992), also noted by the authors.

One of the important things accomplished by the Parkhill monograph is to explode the myth of site significance based solely on total numbers of fluted points. Clearly, it is how activity areas can be defined archaeologically and their complexities unravelled by systematic analysis which will help us understand how these peoples interacted with their landscapes. This contribution by Ellis and Deller is a remarkably good example of how such analyses can be accomplished, even with data excavated by others, and raises numerous intriguing questions for further study. I will leave the bulk of these for the reader to discover in Chapter 12 and the Chapter 13 Conclusions. It is very refreshing to see the level of scholarship in this work and to know that the Canadian Museum of Civilization recognizes this outstanding achievement in Ontario Palaeo-Indian studies. Not too shabby for sites which more southerly Palaeo-Indian scholars once wrote off as "plough disturbed" and therefore uninteresting!

I highly recommend purchase of this book, even for non-Palaeo-Indian researchers. The 9 by 6 inch format with glossy cover and
strong binding looks attractive and an enormous improvement over earlier Mercury Series efforts. Technical editor Dr. Richard Moran is to be congratulated for his work - rivaling that of the University of Michigan's well known Memoirs Series.

There are only very small glitches in production of this volume - a few typos appear here and there and Chapter 7 Flaking Debris is mis-labelled as Chapter 5. Photo quality is also variable with some lacking crisp detail. However, photos are more than adequate to explain the points made by Ellis in the lithic discussion. On a research scale of 1 to 10, I would have to give An Early Paleo-Indian Site near Parkhill, Ontario a 10, even with the American spelling of Palaeo-Indian!
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Parkhill: the site

Courtesy Chris Ellis

This site is located in the vicinity of the modern town of Parkhill, Ontario just south of Grand Bend on the southeastern shore of modern Lake Huron. It was the first major Early Paleo-Indian site to be reported in Ontario and to see any degree of extensive excavation.

The site was discovered by some local residents (Randy Laye, Gary Laye and Ray Baxter) who reported the site to Dr. Brian Deller. Excavations were carried out at the site between 1973 and 1975 under the overall direction of the late Dr. William Burton Roosa of the Department of Anthropology, University of Waterloo. Funding for the investigation has been provided by the former Canada Council, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Ontario Heritage Foundation. The site has been named of National Historic Significance by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.
Arch features - Parkhill: the site

Geological studies carried out at the site by Drs. Alan V. Morgan of the University of Waterloo and John H. McAndrews of the Royal Ontario Museum demonstrate that at the time the site was occupied some 10,500 years ago it was immediately adjacent to a lakeshore (on the west) and a major inlet (on the south) attributable to either Main Lake Algonquin or a subsequent Post-Algonquin lake called Ardtrea.

The site consists of at least nine concentrations of stone artifactual material distributed over an area of ca. six hectares. Four areas at the western edge of the site seem to be specialized ones in that they have the highest percentage of fluted projectile points ever reported from the eastern Great Lakes area but areas at the eastern site edge have more diverse tool inventories suggesting they are generalized domestic camp areas. One of these eastern areas (Area D) can be linked by artifact cross-mends to one of the specialized fluted point dominated areas on the west (Area B) indicating they were used relatively contemporary [Editor’s note: see graphic page 13].

Most of the points recovered are finished ones discarded due to damage in use and in fact, there are more finished fluted points from Parkhill than any other Great Lakes site. However, there are also many channel flakes detached in making the flutes on the point which indicates point manufacture was also important. The points expand slightly from the base, have moderately deep basal concavities and often have fishtails. They are assigned to the Barnes style of fluted point. The site has also yielded a number of other distinctive Paleo-Indian stone tool forms including miniature points made on channel flakes which may have served in ritual activities, scrapers with triangular outlines probably used in hide preparation, and large massive tools with pointed working ends suitable for use in slotting or engraving bone or antler called beaks or beaked scrapers.

Most of the stone tools from Parkhill are made on Fossil Hill formation chert which originates in the Collingwood area some 175-200 km northeast of the site. The transportation of certain cherts long distances is characteristic of Paleo-Indian groups and is a major source of information suggesting they had a quite mobile lifestyle.

In addition to the Paleo-Indian occupations evidence was found of occupation by several later groups and particularly, in the vicinity of Area D. Notable here are several occupations dating to the end of the Late Archaic (approximately 4000 to 2800 radiocarbon years ago) and the Early Woodland (approximately 2800 to 2300 radiocarbon years ago). Besides artifactual material, these later occupations were represented by several pit features, some of which have been radiocarbon dated.

Text and graphics:
www.sscl.uwo.ca/anthropology/cje/Parkhill.htm

Parkhill Site Published References (CJ Ellis)


C. J. Ellis - 1998 - The Pits (Part III) or Evidence From the Parkhill Site Bearing on the Age of Late Archaic “Small Points”. Kewa 98(7-8):18-24.


**Arch shorts**

**Butler homestead artifacts and volunteers**

Marianne Murphy, OAS Volunteer

At the beginning of 2000, a Passport to the Past volunteer opportunity was organized by members of Archaeological Services Inc. to assist with the cleaning and sorting of artifacts into classes for analysis. Since January 25, a great group of volunteers has been busy with the artifacts excavated from the Butler Homestead, a site occupied by Colonel John Butler and his family circa 1784-1813.

We have had approximately 27 volunteers working very hard, a good number of whom have been out almost every Tuesday evening since we started. Some evenings as many as 15 people have participated, on others there have been as few as eight. No matter the numbers, we always have an interesting and enjoyable evening and we have gained hands-on experience as we work through the approximately 50,000 artifacts to be processed.

After cleaning the various types of artifacts, we sort them into proper classes for analysis by learning how to identify the different types of ceramics, glass, metal and bone artifacts that represent a site of this time period. We also have an opportunity to learn how to mend and reconstruct vessels where possible.

On April 18th, Eva MacDonald and Bev Garner of ASI gave us some information on how we were doing with the artifacts. According to their records, we have processed about 15% of the items found. They showed us some of the interesting finds as well as some of the ceramics that have been reconstructed. We have found that there is a large quantity of glass from windows and bottles and a great deal of creamware. One artifact with an intaglio design was probably from a fob seal. It has the head of a gentleman carved into a carnelian stone.
We have been working at the University of Toronto in the Sidney Smith building, Room 561A, 100 St. George Street, Toronto (basement). The volunteers come every Tuesday evening from 6:30 to 9:00 PM. There is no minimum time commitment. We show up whenever we can.

We will be taking a break this summer but will continue to have these evenings in the fall as long as there are volunteers willing to come out. The bulk of the folks are Passport to the Past members, joined by those who participated in the Day on a Dig at the Butler site and Toronto Chapter members. Everyone is welcome to come out and give a hand. No experience is necessary. If you are interested in processing artifacts or are just curious, please give Eva or Bev a call at (416) 966-1069.

**Volunteers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don Portghese</th>
<th>Marianne Murphy</th>
<th>Alan Jupe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Wojtowicz</td>
<td>Leila Lessner</td>
<td>Louis Badone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Tapajna</td>
<td>Anna Newman</td>
<td>Stewart Jones Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Shropshire</td>
<td>Anne LaFontaine</td>
<td>Jane Cottrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Frere</td>
<td>Dorothy Tapajna</td>
<td>Dave Lister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Priestman</td>
<td>Mary Tournour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rand Schultz</th>
<th>Donalda Badone</th>
<th>Norma Knowlton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Brennanh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allison Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Stapells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Smeding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The human family tree: 10 Adams and 18 Eves

**New York Times** (May 2, 2000)

"...In 1998, Dr. Wallace and his colleagues discovered the X pattern, a rare European lineage, among the northern Native Americans such as the Ojibwa and Sioux. At first they assumed it came from intermarriage with modern Europeans. But the American X lineage turned out to be pre-Columbian and its owners would have arrived in America either 15,000 or 30,000 years ago, depending on certain genetic assumptions.

The European X lineage seems to have originated in Western Asia around 40,000 years ago. Dr. Wallace suggests a part of this group may have made their way to America via Siberia, even though no traces of the X-lineage have yet turned up in eastern Asia. A trans-Atlantic route is a possible alternative...."

"...Last month a company called Oxford Ancestors set up business with the offer to tell customers which of the seven daughters of Eve they are descended from. (Almost all Europeans belong to only seven of the nine mitochondrial lineages found in Europe).

The test (see www.oxfordancestors.com) requires sending in a sample of cells brushed from the inside of the cheek. For a mere $180, anyone of European ancestry can establish the start of a genealogy far senior to Charlemagne's.

The company's founder is Dr. Bryan Sykes, a human geneticist at the University of Oxford in England. On the reasonable basis that the founders of Dr. Wallace's mitochondrial DNA lineages were real women, Dr. Sykes gave them names and sketched in details of their likely dates and origin. Thus people found to belong to haplogroup U will be told they are descended from Ursula, who lived about 45,000 years ago in Northern Greece. The ancestor of the X's is Xenia, who lived 25,000 years ago in the Caucasus Mountains.

As if fulfilling Dr. Wallace's suggestion, Dr. Sykes said he had "worked out a mythological framework for these seven women," in respect of the arduous times in which they must have lived and the triumph of spreading their mitochondrial DNA to almost all the inhabitants of Europe...."
Re: a licence is not transferable...

Jim Wilson (Archaeologix Inc.)


I am writing to provide you with what I hope will be taken as constructive comments regarding the recent Out-of-the-Field Notes concerning "A Licence is not Transferable". I believe the Ministry should be applauded for its ongoing attempts to raise the standards of archaeological fieldwork and reporting, as well as for the ongoing provision of clear direction for the consulting industry through the license and development plans review process. It is apparent based on your preliminary comments that the Ministry now wishes to engage in a discussion with the pertinent stakeholders in order to move forward toward an acceptable and shared solution to the problem of license transferability. It is understood that some form of change is required in order to bring archaeological practice in line with the letter and intent of the Heritage Act. Hopefully any changes adopted will also result in the practice of better archaeology.

As the president of Archaeologix Inc., the second largest provider of archaeological consulting services in the province, I welcome the invitation by the Ministry to provide some preliminary input regarding this matter. From an "in-the-field" perspective, I anticipate there will be some serious problems with the proposed requirement to have field directors hold a consulting license. If my understanding is correct, this will also mean that the field director will be responsible for the production of a satisfactory license report.

I question the wisdom of this approach for two reasons. First, most field directors will have no significant control over the project budget, and therefore short of quitting, will not have the final word regarding either excavation strategies or the level of detail of the final report. I believe it is highly unfair for the Ministry to require a field director to risk their professional future when there will be so many potential uncertainties regarding their ability to successfully discharge their license requirements.

I can think of many problematic situations that will arise if the Ministry transfers the obligation of report production from the company principle to the field director. For instance, envision a situation in which a Stage 4 excavation is partially complete when a land developer goes bankrupt. Under the conditions of the proposed changes, it will then be the responsibility of the field director, not the consulting company, to complete the report on the work conducted in the field. If a satisfactory report is not produced, it will be the field director, not the company principle, who will not be licensable in the future. This is an extreme example, however many other scenarios are also possible. Consider the case of a field director working for a consulting company on a temporary basis, perhaps a graduate student employed from May to August. Will this individual be held responsible for required revisions on reports after he or she is no longer in the employ of the consulting firm? Given the transitory and seasonal nature of many of the employment opportunities in archaeology, combined with the lengthy review period by your Ministry, this situation will arise. It is not difficult to envision a situation in which, if an antagonistic relationship were to arise between a company principle and a field director, the field director may not even have access to the materials necessary to provide the Ministry with the required revisions.

My second concern stems from the first. As the president of my firm, I make all major decisions concerning budgeting, excavation strategies and reporting. Because I have total project control, I can use my experience to provide my clients with budgets with a sense of certainty that I can provide the
services required at a fixed cost. I would view with concern any proposed changes that would diminish my ability to fully control the provision of services by my firm.

For instance, what would happen if a field director, under who’s name a Contract Information Form had been approved by the Ministry, were to quit or be fired before the production of a report? Would I then have the right to submit a report in that individual’s name? I doubt this would be possible. I am sure the Ministry can see how a consulting firm could be exposed to potential liability for the delay of a development project if such a situation were to occur.

While my comments to this point have been admittedly negative, I do not believe this problem is without solution. I believe that most of the problems now being experienced regarding licensing stem from the fact that current Heritage Act was not written in anticipation of the rapid development of the archaeological consulting industry. While the Heritage Act provides the specific direction regarding archaeological licensing, our industry has developed largely in response to other, subsequent pieces of legislation, such as the revised Planning Act, Aggregate Resources Act, etc.

Because this is the case, I believe it is time to revisit the Heritage Act. Based on the examples I provided above, it is clear that it would be a major mistake to require field directors to work under their own consulting license. I believe this will result in the further fragmentation of our industry, and ultimately have the effect of lowering, not raising the quality of consulting services in the Province.

One possible solution to this problem would be to establish three different classes of archaeological license; a consulting license, a field director license, and a research license. In this scenario the consultant would retain the responsibility for report production, although it would be necessary for the fieldwork to be supervised by a licensed field director.

I would strongly support any efforts made be the Ministry to require a convincing demonstration of competence by anyone seeking a license to conduct archaeology. In particular I would like to see the Ministry established some form of standardized examination for those individuals who wish to hold a consulting license. This examination should be very comprehensive, requiring an expert level of knowledge regarding the legislation pertaining to archaeology in Ontario, the culture history of the province, as well as archaeological field and lab methods. I would also support the payment of a not inconsequential annual fee as part of holding a consulting license.

The requirements to hold a field director’s license could be somewhat less stringent, perhaps based on a combination of education and experience, while the research license category could remain little changed from current practice.

If the province were to take on the responsibility to establish this process, I suspect it would not take too many years before it could be passed on to a self-governing body of professional archaeologists. If these changes are to occur, it will take strong direction from the top down for them to succeed, as the lack of consensus among the current consulting archaeologists renders productive cooperation difficult.

I hope these comments may prove to be of some use and I look forward to continued involvement in this ongoing process. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.
Doors open Toronto

"Doors Open Toronto, a free weekend celebration – and heralded as a North American first -- will give architecture and history buffs their chance to explore and take guided tours of 96 city buildings, including churches and synagogues, some of which are not normally open to the public. Open-door events in Europe have been extremely successful. In 1998, 19 million visitors attended Doors Open Days held in 40 European countries" (National Post 2000.05.26).

When I first learned of the Open Doors Toronto weekend, I immediately thought of the Don Jail. Apparently, so did the rest of the population of Toronto. Choosing to pass on the multi-hour lineup to get into the Don, we instead inadvertently retraced a William Lyon Mackenzie related path with visits to the Necropolis and Spadina House. Mackenzie is buried in the Necropolis (as are a host of Toronto and Canadian luminaries: George Brown, Ned Hanlan, Joseph Tyrell, Joseph Bloore [Bloor St.] to name but a few) while Spadina's James Austin was an apprentice printer for King's press, fled post-Rebellion, then came back to strike it rich, heralding four generations of Austin's at Spadina House.

However, for those who wanted to get into the jail – but couldn’t...

City opens doors to its palaces, jails
Mark Gollom
(National Post, 2000.5.29)

(Edited from the original) - Hundreds of people waited hours in line—and dozens more were turned away - to get into jail over the weekend. “Just want to show the boys what lying, cheating and stealing will get them,” said David Wilson, who, along with his family, waited patiently for their chance to go inside the prison walls of the Old Don Jail on Gerrard Street East. The historic Victorian jail - currently unoccupied and located beside the Toronto Jail - was one of 96 landmarks included in Doors Open Toronto, a free weekend event allowing citizens to explore some of the city’s proudest historical and architectural buildings.

By far the most popular stop were the small prison cells, where visitors took turns going behind the iron gates to pose for pictures. “I don’t like it, it’s freaky. It’s too small,” said one young visitor pretending to be an inmate. Initially intrigued by the graffiti scribbled on cell walls, the group was let down when they learned it was all fake, created by film producers using the jail for a film set. In fact, film crews have done such damage to the interiors they are no longer allowed to shoot inside. (Tom Cruise’s film Cocktail was apparently the last straw.)

People also got to see the four death row cells, which were described by one of the guides as the “luxury suites” because of their spaciousness compared with regular cells. The final site was the gallows area, where walls are still marked by the wooden scaffolds used to hang prisoners.

Not too far from the Old Don Jail, over at Queen and Victoria Park streets, sits one of the grandest Art Deco structures in the city, if not all of Canada. Indeed, when the R.C. Harris Filtration Plant was still being built in 1938 (it opened in 1941), critics in the press called it "The Palace of Purification."
Despite its elementary function, the building is decked out like no one's business. The walls of the administration building, for example, are in "Cobweb-veined Black & Gold and Notre Dame (taupe coloured) marble." There's also a polygonal ceiling dome containing a spider's web skylight.

The filtration complex is actually three buildings: the administration centre, a service building and the filter building—the setting for the climax of Michael Ondaatje's In the Skin of a Lion.

Visitors poured though the long arched galleries to see the filter operating tables. Some poked their heads though open doors to see the water as it slowly makes its way down the filters, later to be chlorinated and sent throughout the city.

"It's a beautiful building, the handrails the marble floor the architectural detail," said visitor Peter Goldthorpe. "[Doors Open] is great idea in making people appreciate what we've got in this city."

Back in print and available again!

**Textbook of Pollen Analysis, 4th. edition**

by Knut Faegri, Johs. Iversen, Peter Emil Kaland and Knut Krzywinski


This book is a reprint of the fourth edition of the Textbook of Pollen Analysis and is unique in its approach as it discusses both the practical and theoretical aspects of palynology. It uses palynological techniques as tools for solving problems in quaternary geology, ecology and archeology.

This edition of this standard reference has the same objectives as the earlier ones but the objectives have been widened, particularly the archaeological.

There are over 130 illustrations and the identification keys have been thoroughly revised and are now illustrated. "Will certainly benefit all in understanding the principles of pollen analysis. All students, palynologists and libraries should have it as a text book for reference." Marine Geology.

**The Seed Identification Manual**

by Alexander C. Martin and William D. Barkley

ISBN 1-930665-03-2 / US$ 64.95 / http://blackburnpress.com

This title was first published by the University of California Press and is an attempt to deal with the long-standing need for a reference work dealing exclusively with seed identification.

The immediate aim of the manual is to help agriculturists, foresters, wildlife biologists and others interested in land-use programs to identify the seeds in their particular fields of interest. The authors have, in the main, restricted the content of the description to those characteristics useful for identification. The descriptions are, to the extent possible, non-technical and therefore useful to a broader range of interests and skills.
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