The setting for the first inaugural Toronto Chapter Summer picnic could not have been more perfect. The grounds of the historic Ashbridge House (where the OAS administrative office is located) were beautiful and weather cooperated with a warm sunny day. For more views of this event, see page 19.
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EVOLUTION

Yesteray, while attending a lovely barbecue hosted by the Toronto Chapter on the grounds of our headquarters at the Ontario Heritage Trust’s Ashbridges Estate, I was asked by a Toronto Chapter member when the ‘main’ OAS would be organizing an event. I confess I was a little puzzled by this inquiry, but later, while chatting with past president Charles Garrad, I began to understand.

Charlie pointed out that, unlike the Ontario Historical Society, which is an umbrella society for a large number of autonomous affiliates, the OAS is a unitary organization which has charted chapters to serve as local vehicles for member activities throughout the province. This much I already knew. Charlie then offered the following observation: “Surely more than half the OAS members do not belong to a chapter.” As someone who has been a member of three chapters—Ottawa, my home town; London, where I first worked; Grand River, where I now live—for decades, I had always assumed that the majority of OAS members also belonged to a local chapter. I knew, however, that there would be a certain number of members who would not have easy access to a local chapter, as well as a number of institutional and other members who would join in order to support the organization and get our journal and newsletter, but would not seek membership in a local chapter or wish to routinely participate in society activities.

A quick query of our new Wild Apricot membership database revealed that slightly more than one-third of members have self-identified as belonging to one or more chapters. Perusal of the remainder indicated that there are probably a fair number of members who have not yet indicated chapter membership in their online member profile, although I know that some actually do belong to a chapter. Regardless, Charlie’s observation would seem to be essentially correct, and although I don’t have the numbers at my fingertips, if you divvy up about half our membership among our nine chapters, you would get an average chapter membership of just over thirty, which seems about right to me.

Returning to the original question, then, do members who are unaffiliated with one or more chapters constitute by default an entity considered by some to be the ‘main’ OAS? Or is the ‘main’ OAS simply the entirety of our society, as I tend to think of it? Moreover, since the original query was posed to me as OAS president, does the OAS Executive Board also function as the executive of what amounts to a tenth, unnamed chapter, capable of functioning in a similar capacity to carry out tasks such as organizing the annual symposium? This seems to be what is implied by the query, regardless of how the membership of such an entity is conceived.

I argue that it is inappropriate to think of the function of the OAS Executive Board in these terms, even if historically it may have functioned in this way.1) First, the mandate of the Executive Board is to attend to the affairs of the society as a whole, including supervising the day-to-day administration as carried out by the Executive Director and to fulfill the various roles and responsibilities of our various portfolios as officers and directors. Aside from the routine activities, this also involves the on-going completion of tasks ratified by the membership in our five-year strategic plan. Together, these roles and responsibilities consume all available volunteer and staff resources of the Executive Board.

Second, the logistics of drawing on people spread across the province in order to organize events is unrealistic. It is enough of a challenge for the geographically dispersed Executive Board members to come together for meetings every two months, without trying to coordinate a larger organizational body. Additionally serving as the executive of a virtual tenth chapter just doesn’t make practical sense.

Third, the demands on Executive Board resources have grown and evolved significantly over the years. We are constantly involved in meeting the demands, compliance requirements, and expectations of a wide range of constituencies, including but not limited to the following: our membership; the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, which is our primary source of funding as a provincial heritage organization; the Ontario Heritage Trust; other provincial agencies, such as Ontario Parks; the Canada Revenue Agency; our bank; our accountants; various vendors and service providers; the general public; the academic sector; the consulting archaeology sector; the Association of Professional Archaeologists; museums and other heritage organizations. Because much of this is carried out behind the scenes, I understand why the average OAS member may not appreciate or even be substantially aware of what the Executive Board does on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis. Clearly it would be advantageous to improve the visibility of this work and, indeed, this is one of our strategic plan objectives.

So to answer the original question, the ‘main’ OAS—however conceived—will not be organizing an event under the sole

---

1. For example, the Executive Board assumed responsibility for organizing the 2013 annual symposium in Niagara Falls, with support from the Hamilton Chapter. Although it was a very successful symposium, the Executive Board thereafter deemed this to have been a significant burden which drew valuable volunteer and staff time and effort away from our primary mandate and was therefore an inappropriate use of Executive Board resources.
leadership of the Executive Board anytime soon. Instead, we will be working to support and enhance the ability of our chartered chapters to organize events. This is a much more efficient and effective way of leveraging geographical clusters of members in order to achieve our collective goals as a society. This does not preclude the possibility of the Executive Board or its individual officers or directors working in partnership with one or more chapters to carry out a project or event. Indeed, several such initiatives are currently under development. Here are some examples:

• Coordinating Archaeology Day activities amongst our chapters province-wide.
• Providing chapters with corporate promotional materials (e.g. brochures, business cards, banners, publications, buttons, pens, etc.) that they can use for public outreach activities.
• Consolidating all chapter web sites onto the Wild Apricot platform\(^2\) in order to save costs while facilitating membership enrollment functions and retaining the ability of chapters to develop and maintain their own individual web presence but with a design that is more consistent and identifiable with the OAS ‘brand’.
• Renewing our material culture ‘Edu-kits’ and avocational manual for the use of chapters engaged in public education activities.
• Many other initiatives are on the drawing board, all of which seek to provide chapters with the tools and resources they need to further our joint objectives. These recognize the fact that the OAS achieves the majority of its objectives through the efforts of volunteers, and the stewardship of this invaluable resource needs to be done thoughtfully and effectively to ensure that we get the most bang for our buck.

The same prudent approach is being applied to our limited financial resources. Currently the Executive Board is reviewing all aspects of our operations to see where efficiencies and cost savings can be realized. These include such things as a review of our telephone and internet service provider with respect to the competition, acquisition and control of our own internet domain (ontarioarchaeology.org) and transition to a new web hosting service, upgrading and on-going maintenance of our IT technology to reduce staff down time (and frustration), and transition of our costly teleconferencing system to new and more functional voice-over-internet-protocol (VOIP) options. Included in this review has been examination of our on-going publication and distribution costs for our journal, *Ontario Archaeology* (OA), and our newsletter, Arch Notes. Whereas members already pay a premium beyond the base membership fee if they wish to subscribe to OA, Arch Notes continues to be provided to some members in hard copy format at no additional cost. Due to rising production, mailing, and administration costs, this practice is unsustainable, so the Executive Board has approved a subscription premium (the amount to be determined) for members who still wish to receive a hard copy of Arch Notes. Digital versions will remain a free download from our website for all members.

As always, I welcome feedback from members regarding any of the topics discussed in this message, or anything else that is of concern to you. I can be reached via our new email system at president@ontarioarchaeology.org. Please have a safe and happy summer.

Rob MacDonald
President

---

2. Pilot projects to transfer the web sites of the Peterborough and Grand River chapters to the Wild Apricot platform are nearly complete and we expect to launch their new sites shortly.

---

**ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY**

**42ND ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM**

**CALL FOR SILENT AUCTION DONATIONS**

The Silent Auction is a popular event during the OAS Symposium and a great way to raise money for the Society. To ensure the success of our one and only annual fundraiser, we need your help!

Please consider donating new or gently used items such as archaeology and history books, services, jewelry, antiques, crafts, tools, gift certificates, gift baskets, etc. This is also a great opportunity for businesses to showcase their products and services. All donations will be acknowledged on silent auction donor boards during the symposium and in the program package. You will also receive much personal gratitude from your silent auction organizing committee!

Last year, several OAS chapters assembled and donated unique one-of-a-kind gift baskets with items that showcased their chapter and regions. These were a big hit with our bidders and we hope that more chapters will participate this year!

Silent auction donation items are now being accepted for the OAS 2015 Symposium. Please contact Ellen Blaubergs at eblaubergs@rogers.com by October 13 and include the following information: donor name and contact info, description of item(s) to be donated, value of donation, minimum/starting bid (if you like).

Please also indicate if you are bringing the donation to the symposium, giving it to someone to bring, or would like to send/courier it. We’ll provide an address if you prefer this last method.

Thank you for your support!

---

July/August 2015
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REVISITING SOUTH’S MEAN CERAMIC FORMULA TO DATE ONTARIO HISTORIC SITES

by Tom Arnold

During the summer of 2014, I was doing some house cleaning and came across a file with some old (1970s/1980s) historic archaeology articles. Among other documents in this file was a copy of an ArchNotes article dated 1980 by J.K. Jouppien (1980:24-29) entitled ‘The Application of South’s Mean Ceramic Formula to Ontario Historic Sites’, a single page dated February 14, 1988 with the title ‘CeramicDating (sic)’ (Figure 1), that as I recall was given to me by Ian Kenyon, and finally a document by Ian Kenyon entitled ‘A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario: 1780-1890’ which, according to the acknowledgments “was a paper prepared for distribution at the ‘An Introduction to English Ceramics for Archaeologists Workshop’, sponsored by the Association of Professional Archaeologists, and held on 20 April 1991 in Toronto” (Kenyon 1991:13). This latter document was apparently an update and amalgamation to Ian’s research published throughout the 1980s in ArchNotes (Kenyon 1985a:41-57; 1985b:13-28; 1985c:14-21; 1987:22-25; 1988a:5-8; 1988b:7-9).

Despite having read many – and even written a few – consulting archaeology reports that dealt with historic sites, I have not seen the use of South’s Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) mentioned to help date sites. It is certainly possible that people have used the formula in their analysis and have simply not reported it, but I suspect that in fact it is simply not used. This may be due in part to the fact that most historic sites dealt with by consulting archaeologist in Ontario date to the 19th century and can be readily identified with some degree of certainty from documentary sources. In addition, the debate surrounding South’s technique (see below) may have also lead people to question its usefulness.

Due to the recent technical bulletin for consulting archaeologists concerning work conducted on rural historical farmsteads (Government of Ontario 2014) it may be time to reassess the use of this dating technique. In the technical bulletin, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport stresses the importance of South’s overall approach, I refer the reader to South’s original description for a detailed explanation of his method (South 1977:214-217).

South initially created these tools to analyze 17th and 18th century British-American sites but felt that it could be extended into the 19th century through the addition of more types and their manufacturing dates (South 1977:213). The foundation of the technique is based on two assumptions: the horizon concept and the unimodal curve.

The former as defined in archaeological terms is “a primarily
spatial continuity represented by cultural traits and assemblages whose nature and mode of occurrence permit the assumption of broad rapid spread” (Willey and Phillips 1958:31-34, as referenced in South 1977:203). South was convinced from his excavations and documentary sources that groups of British made ceramic types reflect the same time period regardless if they are found in a port city or a frontier settlement and thus constituted a horizon. His reasoning went something like this: ceramics were made in Britain, then transported by ship to east coast American ports, where they were distributed throughout the colonies relatively quickly. Thus, each ceramic type was a horizon marker in South’s view (South 1977: 203, 204-207).

The unimodal assumption is based on the idea that each ceramic type had an inception, a period of peak production followed by a decline and end date of production (South 1977:203). Although he does not state it, this may be why he uses the term median manufacturing date since this would more or less correspond with the period of peak production, but you would also have to assume a normal distribution (a bell shaped curve) as well.

South used sherd count because at that time, in the 1970s, historic archaeologists often used simple vessel occurrence (presence or absence) on a site, which meant that “...a single sherd of creamware...[had] the same weight as 500 sherds of white salt-glazed stoneware...(South 1977: 217) in determining the time period of a sample. He noted that his mean date formula took both into account. The date obtained from his formula was not meant to be used alone in determining a site mean date. It was to be used in concert with dates derived from other artifact classes and documents that together would allow the researcher to obtain a period of occupation for the site. South was so convinced of the strength and usefulness of this approach that he thought that it could be used with other historic artifact types once manufacturing period lists could be established. He even thought it could be used for Pre-contact ceramic types from First Nations sites (South 1977:237, 249). In fact, Christenson (1994) did that with Pre-Contact ceramics from the Kayenta Anasazi area of the American Southwest dating to between AD 1100 and 1300.

Sherds vs. Vessels

Not everyone agreed with South on the use of sherd verses vessel counts. Adams (2003:42) states quite emphatically that one of the greatest flaws in the way researchers used the MCD was applying it to ceramic fragments instead of vessel counts. Fragment counts are entirely meaningless for most kinds of analysis, so multiplying fragment count of ceramic types with a median date for that type can only produce garbage.

As I recall, Kenyon himself recommended using vessel counts in his list for Southern Ontario or more precisely, determining the minimum number of vessels from the sherds collected from a site.

Yet others would not agree with this assessment of the usefulness of sherd counts. Christensen (1994:309) noted that “...the evidence from both historic and prehistoric assemblages is that sherds can provide useful and sensitive dating information.” Hull (2007:86-87) noted that in her limited comparison between three Irish sites that sherd count and vessel count provided more or less the same information, suggesting that calculation of the latter was not necessary.

Accuracy

Another critique is that the MCD is grossly inadequate compared to historical documentation. This appears particularly true for sites of long occupation (i.e., more than a century). Turnbaugh and Turnbaugh (1977) noted that for this reason some re-
searchers abandoned the technique. They claim, in fact, such inconsistencies validate the basic tenets of the technique (1977:90). Their research used the MCD separately in three different approaches; intrasite/intrafeature, intersite/interfeature and intrasite/interfeature, essentially subdividing a site ceramic assemblage into smaller units based on areas of concentrations or features. They concluded that the MCD used in this way along with quantitative and qualitative analysis, documentary sources, architectural features and stratigraphy will provide a consistent site explanation (1977:103).

As noted above, Christenson (1994) used MCD on Pre-Contact ceramics from the American Southwest. He concluded that this dating technique was as accurate as either radiocarbon dating or tree ring dating for that area and period he investigated (Christenson 1994: 312).

**Discussion**

Jouppien (1980) appears to have been the first to suggest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waretype</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Median Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1760 to 1820</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>1796 to 1830</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitreous white earthenware</td>
<td>1820 to present</td>
<td>1917.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly vitrified white earthenware, Ironstone</td>
<td>1840 to present</td>
<td>1927.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin glaze, or tin enamelled</td>
<td>1796-1840</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone china</td>
<td>1805 to present</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware (salt glaze)</td>
<td>1796 to 1900</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>1830 to 1920</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse red earthenware</td>
<td>1796 to 1920</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration and Colour</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Median Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue shell edge</td>
<td>1800 to 1850</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green shell edge</td>
<td>1800 to 1835</td>
<td>1817.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed beaded edge</td>
<td>1830 to 1840</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken claw edge</td>
<td>1840 to 1850</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow impressed edge</td>
<td>1840 to 1850</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge decoration with scalloped rim</td>
<td>1800 to 1840</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue sponge</td>
<td>1840 to 1870</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome sponge</td>
<td>1850 to 1880</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-colour trailed slip or finger slip</td>
<td>1796 to 1840</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailed slip</td>
<td>1796 to 1840</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>1835 to 1900</td>
<td>1867.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham-type glaze</td>
<td>1855 to 1890</td>
<td>1872.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue transfer</td>
<td>1800 to present</td>
<td>1907.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olde Blue</td>
<td>1815 to 1835</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowing blue transfer</td>
<td>1844 to 1900</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink or light red transfer</td>
<td>1828 to present</td>
<td>1921.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown transfer</td>
<td>1828 to present</td>
<td>1921.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green transfer</td>
<td>1828 to present</td>
<td>1921.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale blue transfer</td>
<td>1830 to 1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black transfer</td>
<td>1800 to 1850</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry transfer</td>
<td>1930 to 1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip inlaid</td>
<td>1800 to 1850</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark brown/black thin annular banding</td>
<td>1830 to 1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome heavy annular banding</td>
<td>1850 to 1920</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine painted polychrome with floral pattern in pastel colours</td>
<td>1796 to 1820</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy painted polychrome with floral patterns in chrome-based colours</td>
<td>1820 to 1850</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted chinoiserie</td>
<td>1796 to 1820</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lustre</td>
<td>1820 to 1880</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>1796 to 1830</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Basalt</td>
<td>1796 to 1813</td>
<td>1804.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyplesware</td>
<td>1796 to 1850</td>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage pipe, course red earthenware, extruded</th>
<th>1848 to 1890</th>
<th>1869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage pipe, course red earthenware, moulded</td>
<td>1890 to present</td>
<td>1947.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage pipe, stoneware</td>
<td>1900 to present</td>
<td>1957.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South’s MCD be applied to Ontario historic sites. He constructed a list of 43 ceramic types with date ranges and median dates (Jouppien 1980: Table 3, 26-27) (Table 1). This list, however, does not list manufacturing date ranges as South had constructed based on Colonial American sites. Instead Jouppien adjusted these date ranges to account for temporal and historic difference between Colonial America and Ontario. In particular he adjusted the date ranges based on the recovery of ceramic artifacts from known historic military sites in Ontario (Jouppien 1980:25, Table 1). This included adding diagnostic traits and types to the list. He then confirmed these adjustments by conferring with material cultural experts (Jouppien 1980: 25, Table 2).

In making these adjustments Jouppien is taking into account what Adams (2003:47) calls global market context of consumer goods. It should also be noted that South (1977:213) also anticipated the need for such adjustments by stating that: “...the need for separate models for different cultural traditions...It should be kept in mind that additional types can be added by the archaeologist, provided the manufacturing dates are known. Thus the degree of refinement of the tool is dependent upon the degree of sophistication of the archaeologist’s ceramic knowledge.”

Jouppien noted that his list was based on military sites. He reasoned that this would be accurate for non-military historic sites because military sites often purchased goods from local merchants and these would have provided ceramics to the local farming community as well. Kenyon took a different approach: he based his ceramic list on a variety of archived general store and family records. He researched general store invoices, day books, ledgers, inventories, memoranda, probate inventories and newspaper advertisements. Family records included bills of account, household account books as well as probate inventories (Kenyon 1991:9). In this sense he follows Majewski and O’Brien 1987:102) who note that the use of such historical documents to group or classify historic ceramics (or an archaeological object) may be more historically ‘real’ since store owners and consumers made conscious decisions to stock and purchase certain objects.

Although Kenyon does not state it directly, his research focused on the stores that catered to those farm households at some distance from the larger urban centres of Ontario at that time. He notes that such stores from the early to mid-19th century provided goods to roughly 300 people or 50 families (Kenyon 1991:1) in a township or county. It is some of these farmsteads that are now being impacted by urban expansion and that require mitigation by consulting archaeologists. Again, the use of these sources of data should be seen as another ‘refinement of the tool’ as noted in South’s quote above.

It is from these records that Kenyon developed his initial list (Figure 1). In this list, there are no ranges for the dates, only median dates. When compared to those from Jouppien, there are some differences. These I believe can be attributed to the differing data sources.

Kenyon’s approach covers what Adams calls the ‘Popularity of Consumer Goods and the Effect of Dating Sites’ (Adams 2003:48-49). Essentially, as in today’s market place, if an item does not sell well, then stores stop carrying the item. Kenyon (1991:4-9) gives several examples where he thinks consumer preference impacted what stores would carry. In several cases it appears that some areas of rural 19th century Ontario had conservative consumer tastes and older, more familiar, ceramic wares remained popular and stocked store shelves thus delaying the acceptance of newer styles in those areas.

Burke (1991:85) has suggested that new ceramics types are most popular soon after their introduction, not at the mid-point of their production range as suggested by South’s unimodal assumption. At least in one instance in Ontario, Kenyon would suggest otherwise. His data suggests that ironstone or white
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initial Date</th>
<th>Median Dates</th>
<th>Terminal Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Median Dates</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Granite –</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1867.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>Blue Edged</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Edged</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1835.5</td>
<td>1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted/Sponged</td>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td></td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painted - Blue</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painted - Red</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enamelled</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>1803.5</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td></td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1834.5</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1838.5</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1855.5</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1859.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
granite was first introduced into Ontario in the latter half of the 1840s and then slowly gained popularity over the next several decades until it almost completely replaced the earlier decorated ceramics (Kenyon 1991:6-8, 11).

In my opinion both Jouppien and Kenyon provide sound arguments for their respective lists and the date ranges and median dates associated with each. Jouppien’s list is more extensive and detailed but its reliance on ceramics from military sites may not always be relevant for all areas of rural 19th century Ontario, in particular, those that were not in the immediate vicinity of military establishments. The extensiveness of Jouppien’s list includes rare types (Jouppien 1980:24) that were quite possibly seldom seen on the dinner tables of most 19th century Ontario farms. Kenyon’s initial list from 1988 and his updated research in his unpublished 1991 distributed paper were obviously a work in progress. I can only imagine that he would have further updated and refined his list if it had not been for his untimely passing in 1997 at the age of 50. The fact that the Ontario Archaeological Society dedicated an entire issue of Ontario Archaeology in his memory attests to his influence (Ferris 2007).

Although Kenyon’s list may be more relevant and possibly more accurate for dating 19th century farmstead sites removed from military establishments, it does remain unfinished. I have taken the liberty of constructing a revised list based on the results in his distributed paper that I have labeled Kenyon 1991. Yet even this remains unfinished, since the data provided by Kenyon’s research ends at 1890. Additionally, the updated Kenyon list does not include some types such as creamware due to the nature of his archival resources. He notes (Kenyon 1991:9) that: “...undecorated earthenware, known in the 19th century as ‘cream coloured’, ‘C.C’, ‘plain’ or ‘white’. These C.C. wares are mentioned throughout the 1795-1890 period, using similar terminology. The historical records consulted give no clue to the fact that about 1830 the glaze of C.C wares changed significantly. Before about 1830, most C.C. wares had distinctive yellowish ting...After about 1830, undecorated tea and dinner wares unusually had an early clear glaze (whiteware).”

In this case, Jouppien’s more extensive list would be more useful with the major difference between the two being the established date ranges and median dates.

**Conclusion**

Initially I had hoped to be able to conclude, for my own purposes, which list would be useful in helping to date 19th century sites encountered during consulting work. In particular I wanted to help resolve the issue of when a relatively small number of early ceramic sherds (e.g., creamware) is found mixed in with a large number of more recent (20th century) artifacts. This is similar to the situation that South discussed (noted above) in the early 1970s where a single sherd of one ware type held the same weight as multiple sherds of other types. The Mean Ceramic Date corrects this problem to some degree, whether one uses sherd or vessel counts. Despite the debate among historic archaeologists about the usefulness and accuracy of the technique, South’s Mean Ceramic Date is the only technique I have come across in the literature that provides a quick and possibly dirty date, which is sometimes needed in the consulting industry, for historic period sites.

Despite these uneven results, as Majewski and O’Brien (1987:171) call it, the fact is, it is sometimes effective and should not be rejected out of hand. As an example, Burke (1991) used a modified MCD, similar to Kenyon’s popularity based mean ceramic dates, on ceramics from a seasonally occupied site on Saddle Island near Red Bay, Newfoundland and Labrador. He obtained a date of 1859.4 using vessel counts, a date of 1861.2 using sherd counts and a date of 1862 using makers’ marks. All of these fall midway through the 1830-1890 occupation of the site (Burke 1991:85-86). In this particular case the MCD does provide an accurate mean date of the site occupation, which is its purpose. Anything more profound than that must come from more detailed ceramic analysis. This single example can of course be countered with examples of where the technique failed. What this suggests is that the technique needs refinement, not abandonment.

Jouppien (1980:28) had requested that other historic researchers help him refine the date list. I am uncertain how successful he was at this request since I have found no updated list published by him. I suspect he was not very successful in getting responses. It can only be assumed that the inconsistent success of MCD and methodological and possibly theoretical critiques of the technique may have unduly influenced the few historic archaeology practitioners in Ontario at that time.

Another factor of equal importance is the lack of assemblages being generated by consulting archaeologists. As I recall few historic sites were mitigated late 1970s and early 1980s by consulting archaeologists, with a few exceptions. Thus there were few assemblages to analyze or submit. This practice changed over the course of the decade in part due to Kenyon’s presence at the London Office of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (or one of its various incarnations). Yet despite these critiques and lack of hard data from the field, Kenyon felt the MCD technique had merit since he persisted in his documentary research to refine the date ranges of ceramic types throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s.

In that same vein as Jouppien, I have concluded that, in order to use MCD in Ontario, what is needed is to first determine which MCD list provides the most accurate date, or alternatively to determine that the technique truly is of no use whatsoever. In addition, it may be useful to add a Skew statistic and graph to deal with the popularity effect that some researchers have noted. The popularity effect is when new styles become very popular early in their manufacturing life followed by a slow decline (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:171).

To this end, and for my own purposes, I have set up a spreadsheet with the three lists mentioned above that calculates the Mean Ceramic date and the Standard Deviation, modifying the formula provided by Christensen (1994:306) (as of yet I have not programmed the list with a Skew statistic). If anyone would like a copy of this list, please email me at tarnold@sympatico.ca.
have programmed the spreadsheet in both WordPerfect Quatro-Pro and Microsoft Office Excel formats, so please specify which you prefer. I plan on creating a database in order to record my own results. I would recommend that others do the same.

Ideally, what is needed is a central database where all results could be recorded. The logical location would be the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, however, staffing and other concerns at the Ministry would appear to make this unlikely. Thus, such a responsibility would fall to someone in the consulting industry, or preferably an academic historic archaeologist who would be independent of both consulting archaeology and government regulators. This individual would take on the task of setting up the database, maintaining it and periodically (i.e., once a year) publishing the results of which list or which ceramic types appear to be the best for dating historic sites. Perhaps, eventually, a composite list or lists for different parts of the province could be developed from this data that would be useful to all archaeologists in Ontario.
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Circles of interaction:
The Wendat and their neighbours in the time of Champlain

The Huronia Chapter of the OAS invites you to the 42nd annual symposium. This will be a joint meeting with the Eastern States Archaeological Federation.

Hotel information:
The conference will be held from Oct. 16 to 18, 2015 at the Best Western Highland Inn and Conference Centre in Midland, Ontario.
The Best Western is providing special conference rates for rooms starting at $84.99 per night, including a hot buffet breakfast. Book online at the conference rates using this link http://book.bestwestern.com/testwestern/groupSearch.do?groupid=5X0UZ8D2 or book by phone (1 800 461 4265) and request the OAS symposium rate.

Program and Registration information:
A full preliminary program and registration information can be found online at www.wendatcircles.org.

Registration (before Sept. 18): (For registration after Sept. 18, add $10 to the registration fee.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced registration – OAS or ESAF Member</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced registration - Non-Member</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (with ID at registration)</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday morning bus tour of archaeological sites in Huronia</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday morning tour of the Huronia Museum and Ste. Marie among the Hurons</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday afternoon MTCS/OHT workshop</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday evening reception</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday evening banquet: Member, Non-member or Guest</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday evening banquet: Student</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday tour of Ahatsiatarie site</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday tour of Martyrs’ Shrine and Archives</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation to support the symposium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: ____________________
Affiliation: ____________________
Address: ____________________
Email: ____________________
Phone: ____________________

Register on-line at http://www.wendatcircles.org or print this out and send a cheque payable to Huronia OAS Symposium. Registration forms and cheques should be sent to:

Kristin Thor
PO Box 2164,14 Bill Street
Walkerton, ON N0G 2V0
AGENDA FOR THE
ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
SATURDAY, OCT. 17, 2015 FROM 4:30 TO 6:00PM AT THE
BEST WESTERN HIGHLAND INN, MIDLAND ON

1. President’s opening remarks

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

3. Matters arising from these minutes

4. President’s report
   Constitutional amendment(s) (see Page 19)

5. Treasurer’s report
   Financial statement
   Discussion of membership rate for e-mailed versions of Arch Notes
   Endowment funds
   Appointment of auditors

6. Election of Directors


8. Progress of 2014–2019 Strategic Plan

9. Other business

10. Motions of thanks

11. Adjournment
The Ontario Archaeological Society
Budget for 2015 compared to results from 2013 and 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees (excl OA subscription)</td>
<td>18,946</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>18,167</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHO Grant (Note 1)</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP Grant</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income - Other grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium net income (Note 2)</td>
<td>6,217</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter fee adjustment</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating income</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,656</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,977</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office Expenses**

- Salary and payroll costs (incl. SEP): 39,397 - 40,200 - 43,000 - 40,200 - 24,500 - 44,000
- Rent: 6,009 - 6,100 - 6,130 - 6,100 - 4,700 - 6,100
- Insurance: 4,216 - 4,970 - 5,160 - 4,970 - 2,450 - 5,000
- Audit fees: 467 - 600 - 468 - 600 - 600
- Legal fees: 2,249 - 2,200 - 2,411 - 2,200 - 1,340 - 2,000
- Office supplies: 558 - 500 - 553 - 500 - 942 - 600
- Postage: 1,184 - 1,200 - 1,137 - 1,200 - 160 - 1,000
- Office equipment: 100 - 100 - 61 - 100 - 255 - 200
- Bank charges: 858 - 900 - 1,465 - 900 - 735 - 1,500
- PayPal charges: 572 - 600 - 515 - 600 - 282 - 600
- Depreciation: 300 - 300 - 300 - 300 - 300 - 300
- ABM Expenses (inc ED): 1,819 - 1,300 - 1,208 - 1,300 - **1,300**

**Program Expenses**

- Promotion expenses: 34 - 200 - 1,500 - 200 - 400 - 500
- Grants awarded: 1,491 - 3,000 - 1,500 - 3,000 - 1,810 - 2,000
- Web Site Upgrades: 60 - 500 - 740 - 500 - 500 - 500
- Outreach expenses: 119 - 120 - 93 - 120 - 93 - 120
- Board meeting expenses: 318 - 350 - 434 - 350 - 150 - 300
- Exec Board conference calls: 1,433 - 900 - 970 - 900 - 1,842 - 1,000

**Arch Notes Expenses**

- Production AN: 2,197 - 2,250 - 2,160 - 2,250 - 1,020 - 2,250
- Postage AN: 2,042 - 2,300 - 3,075 - 2,300 - 1,500 - 2,000
- Packing Arch Notes: 600 - 600 - 500 - 600 - 300 - 600
- **Total Arch Notes costs**: 4,839 - 5,150 - 5,735 - 5,150 - **2,820** - **4,850**
## Total Administration Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>65,623</th>
<th>68,890</th>
<th>73,080</th>
<th>68,890</th>
<th>42,479</th>
<th>72,170</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Administration Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17,526</th>
<th>(905)</th>
<th>9,576</th>
<th>(905)</th>
<th>24,498</th>
<th>(920)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Ontario Archaeology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Income</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production OA</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing preparation OA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage OA</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OA costs</strong></td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>8,170</td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OA Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(3,488)</th>
<th>(3,750)</th>
<th>(7,400)</th>
<th>(3,750)</th>
<th>(4,920)</th>
<th>(3,750)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Money Deposited to Funds (note 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinvested Income Earned</td>
<td>12,492</td>
<td>17,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life membership (Future Fund)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fund</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA publication fund</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards fund</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Sonstenes Fund</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggi Armstrong Fund</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Deposited</strong></td>
<td>17,268</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>21,196</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Money Charged to Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awards Fund Purchases</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>13,459</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>20,636</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Combined Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15,005</th>
<th>(455)</th>
<th>5,193</th>
<th>(455)</th>
<th>21,601</th>
<th>(470)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2014 Budget approved by Board Jan 18, 2014

Last update: July '15  by D. Steiss

Notes:

1. PHO annual operating grant is generally received later in the year
2. symposium 2015 advance payment recorded here
Proxy Form

I _____________________________, a member in good standing of the Society, hereby exercise my right of proxy by identifying:

☐ ______________________________, a voting member in good standing, or

☐ the President of the Board of Directors

As my proxy to attend, act, and vote on my behalf at the Annual Business Meeting of members to be held on Oct. 17, 2015

1 Regarding agenda items in the Notice of Meeting for which I have full knowledge and understanding - circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion

2 Regarding amendments from the floor regarding agenda items in the Notice of Meeting -circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion

3 Regarding items that arise in Other Business -circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion

Optional

I wish to present the following amendment to Agenda Item No _____ which I wish my proxy holder to propose:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Further, I wish to register the following limitations to the exercise of my proxy with respect to any Agenda Item or amendments thereto;

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Signature _________________________  Date _____________________

Name____________________________

Please ensure delivery to the OAS Office on or before Thursday, Oct 1, 2015
Proposed Amendment to the OAS Constitution

The following amendment to Article 7, Section 7 of the OAS Constitution is proposed in order to up-date the title and role of the current Membership Director portfolio, as follows:

Existing Title/Description in OAS Constitution:

Article 7 – Duties of Directors

7. The Membership Director shall maintain and update the Society’s membership list, ensure notifications of membership renewals and proof of memberships are being issued, review and propose to the Executive Board membership fee structure and categories, and develop membership drives.

Proposed Title/Description Amendment:

7. The Director of Member Recruitment will develop and supervise member recruitment programs, assist members with the creation and maintenance of their profiles in the online membership system, supervise and help maintain the online membership database, and undertake periodic analyses of membership data to inform recruitment and other Executive Board initiatives.

---

**WHY WE NEED YOUR EMAIL ADDRESSES**

By Debbie Steiss, Treasurer

We are missing current email addresses for a number of members. If you have not added or updated your email address in your membership profile on the new OAS website, please take a moment to log on to http://www.ontarioarchaeology.org and review your contact details for missing or out of date entries (emails have also been returned as undeliverable due to inactive/incorrect addresses).

For those with Family memberships, consider adding a separate email address for the family member so they may receive communications individually.

Mailing address should also be verified for those members subscribed to Ontario Archaeology to prevent returned mailings.

Keeping your contact information current helps the OAS stay in touch with members and ensures delivery of membership news, Arch Notes and OA. Your personal information will be kept in strictest confidence and is never shared with outside organizations.

Thank you.
Toronto Chapter hosts BBQ for its Members and Executive Board

by Mima Kapches, Toronto Chapter President

On a beautiful sunny summers’ day, Saturday July 19 to be precise, the Toronto Chapter hosted a BBQ lunch for members and the executive of the OAS. We sat in the shade of the trees surrounding the Ashbridge Estate house and barely noticed the blistering and stifling heat that had invaded our city. Ably organized by Sylvia Teaves and the Clarence family (Christine, Brian and Garnet) and the Gray family (Neal and Ann) it went off with nary a glitch. Neal did the BBQ honours and everyone else brought salads and desserts. The OAS executive provided fruit and veggie trays, as well as applying for permission to have the event at the house (Thanks to Lorie!) As well, my sister in law Mary Kapches of Bosley Real Estate paid for the rental of the BBQ that made the day possible (thank you Mary!).

The chapter was happy to host this social event and everyone had a good time. Since this is only the first BBQ we have hosted it can’t be called an annual event, but by next year that’s what we will title it, the Toronto Chapter’s Annual Picnic and BBQ!

Some of the members of the Executive Board (such as President Rob MacDonald – far right) managed to join in the fun after the Executive Meeting ended.

Executive Director Lorie Harris gets a hug and well deserved thank you for all her work from a former Executive Director Charlie Garrad

Toronto Chapter President Mima Kapches takes a break in the shade with her sister in law Mary Kapches of Bosley Real Estate who paid for the rental of the BBQ.

And, of course, the food was great.

Photos courtesy of Lynna Nguyen
The Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Ontario chapter

President: John MacDonald
Treasurer: Bonnie Glencross
Secretary: Kathryn McLeod

Hamilton chapter

President: Gary Warrick
Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
Treasurer: Ruth Macdougall
Events Co-ordinator: Meagan Brooks
E-mail: hamiltonOAS@hwcn.org
Web: http://hamilton.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
Mail: c/o Dr. Gary Warrick, Laurier Brantford, 73 George St. Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3
Phone: (866) 243-7028
Meetings: 3rd Thursday of the month, 7:30, Sept. to May, Fieldcote Museum, 64 Sulphur Springs Road, Ancaster
Membership: Individual $20, Family $25, Student $12

Peterborough chapter

President: Tom Mohr
Treasurer: Harry Johnson
Vice-President: Bill Fox
Web: peterborough.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca.
Meetings: 2nd Thursday of every month Sept. to May at the Midland Public Library
Membership: Individual $15, Family $18, Student $12

Andrew chapter

President: Nancy Van Sas
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