



P
P.R.R!

ARCH NOTES

ISSN 0048-1742

March 1977

77-3

O.A.S. LONDON CHAPTER	Page 2
O.A.S. MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTION CHANGE	2
C.A.A. MEETING	2
OLD FORT WILLIAM - Can We Learn Anything?	3
O.A.S. BANQUET	5
THE NOBLE REPORT	7
E.S.A.F.	10
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	11
"POPULAR ARCHAEOLOGY"	12
THE DAVID BOYLE SCHOLARSHIP	13
EDITOR'S NOTE	14
O.A.S. SYMPOSIUM 1977	14
JOSEPH BRANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY	14

Newsletter of

The Ontario Archaeological Society (Inc.)

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

O.A.S. LONDON CHAPTER

The first organizational meeting of the newly initiated London Chapter of the O.A.S. was held on February 16 at the University of Western Ontario.

Thirty four O.A.S. members and others from as far away as Windsor attended the meeting. After an introduction by Dr. Bill Finlayson the meeting was addressed by Bill Fox and Murray Tuck.

Motions were adopted establishing a Chapter fee structure - individual \$4, family \$6, institutional \$10 - and a meeting schedule - 2nd Thursday each month September through May at 8:00 p.m.

A steering committee was established to proceed with the organization of the Chapter and provide a slate of candidates for office. The committee comprises Ron Williamson, George Conroy, Arlene Yaworsky and Bill Fox.

Twenty eight fee-paying members were enrolled, of whom seven were not previously members of the O.A.S.

Further details will be published as they become available. We take this opportunity to wish our new Chapter great success in their undertaking.

Membership Subscription Change

The O.A.S. Executive has decided that membership will extend one year from the date of subscription. Up to now, membership has been for the calendar year - Jan. 1st to Dec. 31st. It is felt that this is unfair to many of our members who join during the year and have to re-subscribe again at the end of December even though they may have been members for only a very short while. The majority of you will not be affected as your year starts on Jan. 1st and finishes on Dec. 31st and this will automatically continue as you re-subscribe each year. Membership renewal cards will be mailed individually to members (probably with their copy of the newsletter) before the month in which their subscription becomes due. Society publications will be mailed, shortly after production, to paid-up members only. Lapsed members will be permitted to backdate their renewals if they require the missed publications and if these are still available. The Executive will be pleased to receive any comments on this change.

C.A.A. MEETING

The tenth annual meeting of the Canadian Archaeological Association will be held in Ottawa from May 5 - 8, 1977, at the National Museum of Man. Prices are as follows:

Registration Fee:	\$10.00 (Student \$7.00)
Membership Renewal:	5.00

Accommodation is available at either the Sheraton El Mirador, or in the modern YM-YWCA building. All enquiries concerning the C.A.A. meeting should be addressed to Richard I. Inglis, Archaeological Survey of Canada, National Museum of Man, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0M8. Telephone (613)996-5250.

OLD FORT WILLIAM

Can We Learn Anything?

In November, 1976, a 29-page critique of the Ontario Government's multi-million dollar reconstruction of North West Company Fort William was distributed to representatives of various public information, governmental, academic and professional organizations. The essential message in this critique was that "Old Fort William", as the reconstruction is called, is by no means historically "authentic", as claimed. The criticisms, based on archaeological and documentary evidence, fell under three major headings, and can be outlined as follows:

1. Improper Location The reconstruction is nine miles upriver from the original site, which sits on a delta where the Kaministikwia River meets Lake Superior. Originally, Fort William was a lake port harbouring schooners as well as large freight canoes, and could never have served as such at the reconstruction site. In addition, the natural settings of the old and new sites are vastly different.
2. Inaccurate Structural Characteristics. Serious inaccuracies in forms of reconstructed palisades and fencing, gross structural dimensions, kinds of construction materials used, types of building foundations, types of exterior wall coverings, styles of roofs, window and door locations, heating facilities, and divisions of interior space, are so all-pervasive that each of the approximately fifty structures involved are implicated in several of these ways at once.
3. Inaccurate Functional Interpretation. Serious misunderstandings of historical activities within buildings, functional relationships between buildings, and the nature and numbers of people who used buildings are as equally all-pervasive. They manifest themselves not only in many structural ways, but also in much of the verbal information disseminated as "fact" at the reconstruction.

As author of the critique, I was asked by the O.A.S. Executive to submit a summary of my thoughts for Arch Notes. My views are based on five years of full-time work on Fort William from the perspective of historical archaeology. This work was done in the context of the Fort William Archaeological Project -- a group hired under separate contract by the same governmental departments as was the private company (National Heritage Limited) which reconstructed Fort William on the basis of its own research. Responsibility for Old Fort William was taken first by the Department of Tourism and Information (1971-1972), then by the Ministry of Natural Resources (1972 - 1975), and presently rests with the Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

Since I had an extremely side-line view of the process behind the actual reconstruction, I cannot speak with the authority on the reasons why Old Fort William turned out as it did. In my own work, however, I became aware of certain points which, in the reconstructors' final product, seem to have been trouble-spots. Below, I have tried to express six of these points, primarily as aspects of historical archaeology. Except, perhaps, for part of the first point, I believe that they apply in some degree to prehistoric archaeology and to most other forms of historical research (including "reconstruction"). As examiners of the past, in whatever capacity, we might learn an important lesson from the "Fort William Affair" by simply realizing that the following points are not yet generally accepted or understood.

1. The body of direct information from which an historical archaeologist must draw seldom consists primarily of data found in the ground. It consists, as well (sometimes even more so), of data found in archives and other repositories for written or pictorial statements on the subject under study. Just as the ground data must be evaluated in terms of form, function, context and significance, so must the archival data be evaluated. An historical archaeologist, then, must be as much an historian as an archaeologist.
2. In examining any physical aspect of the main subject, it is important to consider form and function as inseparable. Where information is lacking on form, information on function may provide valuable insights, and vice versa. For example, there is no direct evidence on aperatures for the south sides of Fort William's two Corn Stores. When it is understood that the Corn Stores held goods which came in from the south and largely went out toward the south, however, one must consider south doors (which are absent at the reconstruction).
3. The subject under study has not been approached adequately until the known components have been integrated into some more-than-vague idea of a working whole. Failing to integrate can be disasterous. For example, the reconstruction provides accommodation for only half the number of men who can be shown from documentary evidence to have wintered regularly at Fort William. Had the number of suspected wintering houses been integrated with winter population statistics, this error would have been discovered before it was "reconstructed". As another example, south doors on the above-mentioned Corn Stores become almost certainties when it is known from direct evidence that the buildings on either side also held goods largely entering from and leaving toward the south, and that these buildings had several south doors each.
4. In order to see the working whole, it is necessary to have a basic appreciation of the subject's physical, temporal and social contexts. Had this been done for the reconstruction, for instance, a site would not have been chosen which excluded schooner traffic, two types of extensively reconstructed fences would not have belonged to a much later and distinct era, and the "farers" at Fort William would not have been conceived of as something akin to landed gentry.
5. Simple and conclusive "proof" in historical archaeology is largely a myth. This does not mean that one interpretation is as good as another. Good interpretation comes from logical conjunctions of lines of evidence drawn from demonstrably reliable and pertinent data. The best interpretation usually involves the most irrefutable evidence and the most irrefutable logic. It must also pass the test of integration. To be evaluated, the lines of evidence, the data from which they arose, and the logic drawing them together must be expressed. (At Old Fort William, there is not one publication to explain how the simplest reconstructed conclusion was reached. Nor are there historical justifications available to reseachers such as myself.)
6. The largest block of time involved in meaningfully productive historical archaeology is not spent on collecting data or on making relatively final statements. It is spent on becoming familiar with the data, evaluating it, analyzing it and synthesizing it. Conclusions (positive or negative) and "reconstructions" (on paper or otherwise) are the end product of these processes, and cannot be soundly formed during or prior to them. As implied above, Old Fort William was built before these processes had been completed on even a very basic scale. A major problem here is the all too common assumption that thorough research can be scheduled to a completion date. This is somewhat analagous to saying that, on a given budget, and within a given block of time, the cure for disease "X" will be

discovered. At the outset of any research project, many problems and their magnitude are still to be discovered, and the time required for their best solutions cannot be even estimated, let alone pre-scheduled. An awareness of this from the start might help in setting up realistic priorities. Many aspects of Old Fort William are obviously the result of a very pressing schedule, wherein the quality of research has been severely sacrificed to meet deadlines.

- A. Marie Taylor

OAS ANNUAL BANQUET - SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 19

Sixty-five members and friends attended our Annual Banquet, held this year at Lichee Gardens in the heart of Toronto's Chinatown. Our guest speaker for this special occasion was Dr. Bill Irving, director of the University of Toronto's Northern Yukon Research Programme. This project was initiated in 1975 and will continue through 1980.

As an introduction to his slide presentation and progress report on the multi-disciplinary work being carried out at Old Crow Flats in the Yukon, Dr. Irving commented briefly on the nature of science and its relation to archaeology. The common focus of his team of scientists on the Northern Yukon Research Programme is an interest in the place of man in the ecology of a past that reaches as far back as we are able to discover evidence of his presence; this multidisciplinary approach is, in Dr. Irving's opinion, largely responsible for the success he has had in the Yukon. Observing that such an approach to archaeology presents many challenges to each of us individually, he then reminded us that, as a group, we are in a position to help other scientists bring their work into focus; this is an important responsibility and one we must all work to fulfil. The knowledge and skills of many different kinds of scientists can provide the archaeologist with valuable information as he unearths the history of man; they can help him discover new ways to see that enable him to recognize as-yet-undiscovered kinds of evidence.

We were also reminded that the prevailing opinion a mere two decades ago was that man arrived in the New World after the retreat of the glaciers by crossing the Bering Strait and moving into the Mackenzie Valley, where he produced the Clovis culture and spread out to areas as distant as South America. It would now appear that man had certainly arrived in North America some 18,000 to 20,000 years ago, before the maximum Late Wisconsin glaciation; the newest evidence puts him in North America some 30,000 years ago, at a time when, in Europe, fully modern man was replacing Neanderthal man. In North and South America, we have, as yet, no indication of any man different from modern man. But, Dr. Irving noted, this does not mean that an earlier form of man will not be discovered in future excavations. Because of the paucity of evidence available from South Asia and the Far East, we cannot reasonably speculate on the nature of the man who arrived in the New World some 30,000 to 40,000 years ago; not knowing what we can expect to find makes a multidisciplinary approach of the utmost importance.

Field investigations show that the Rocky Mountain and Laurentide ice sheets met only once; we cannot yet say precisely when this passage into North America was closed, but the knowledge we do have concerning ice sheets suggests that they did not present an impenetrable barrier for very long.

Progress Report

Dr. Irving described Old Crow Flats as an intermontane basin, in a basin-and-range situation where the highest points reach some 5000 to 6000 feet. It is part of "Beringia", the only area of Canada habitable during the Pleistocene when it escaped glaciation.

One aspect of the Northern Yukon Research Programme is a focus on some of the oldest evidence for man yet recognized in the Western Hemisphere. This takes the form of artifacts made of the bones of mammoth, horse and bison -- species now extinct, but which flourished under environmental conditions quite different from those that now prevail. Three of the artifacts, first found in 1966, have been dated by radiocarbon to between 25,000 and 30,000 years ago. The artifacts represent a technology that was not previously known to North American archaeologists, and one that has been viewed with skepticism by some archaeologists. This "new" bone technology has, however, become better understood and more generally accepted in the course of the 10 years since it was first discovered.

Last summer, a breakthrough was achieved with the discovery of part of a human jawbone among the animal fossils of Pleistocene age. The jawbone, which is too rare and important to be sacrificed for radiocarbon dating, appears mineralized like the animal bones, and chemical tests are likely to show that it is of about the same age as some of them, that is, more than 20,000 years old. On first examination the human bone, which is that of an individual approximately 11 years old, is similar to that of modern man and not particularly reminiscent of such extinct varieties as Neanderthal, which, in any case, is well-known only in western Eurasia.

Other studies are progressing on, for example, the archaeology of post-Pleistocene periods (now represented by more than 165 sites) and the history of vegetation through the study of pollen found in lake sediments. The results will begin to appear about 1978, when it will be possible to begin interpreting the intricate records of environmental and cultural change.

Yet another focus of the Programme is the archaeology of the 18th and 19th centuries which has already shown evidence of a highly-organized subsistence strategy that included, in addition to individual quests for food, the impoundment of migrating caribou in the spring and fall and the use of fish traps at other seasons. The archaeological evidence supports and augments ethnological data from the Indians of Old Crow, who are important participants in the research.

The Programme's Toronto group of scientists, in collaboration with colleagues in the National Museums of Canada and the Geological Survey of Canada, are accumulating masses of evidence which will reveal the environmental conditions and something of the culture and technology of human populations in the only large part of Canada that escaped glaciation during the Pleistocene; it is therefore here that the fullest record of man's activity and experience during the Ice Age is likely to be found.

*** Janet Cooper

 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *

THE NOBLE REPORT

Licensing (Part II)

It has already been stated in last month's report that the licensing and permit programme in Ontario is primarily designed to regulate human behaviour towards our non-renewable archaeological resources. In this month's report, I intend to examine specific licensing problems and policies.

Licensing and Archaeological Reports

All holders of an Ontario archaeological licence or permit are required under Section 65 of the Ontario Heritage Act to submit a report on the work for which they have been licensed. Such reports must contain "full details of the work done, including details of any stratification or other chronological evidence encountered", as well as the specific details outlined in Ontario Regulation 249/75 Form 3. This latter information is given to each person upon his application for a licence.

The year-end reports are important, for they stand as the principal means by which a licensee's ability and the project can be assessed by the O.H.F. archaeological committee. Also, a new licence cannot and will not be recommended if the reporting aspects of an individual's previous licence are inadequate or unfulfilled.

In order to evaluate submitted reports and delineate general standards of report writing, the archaeological committee has formulated the following criteria for what constitutes unacceptable reporting:

1. Instances where a report manifests unintelligible English and a lack of internal consistency.
2. Instances where too little information is provided in relation to the original scope of the project.
3. Instances where the stated purpose of the licence is not the same as that presented in the report.
4. Instances where there is no direct statement of purpose and programme.
5. Instances where the manuscript does not meet even the most elementary standards of physical presentation (e.g., failure to provide a front and back cover).
6. Instances where the report fails to give the information required according to the Regulations under the Act (i.e., O. Reg. 249/75 Form 3).

No licensee need encounter problems with reporting if he pays attention to and avoids the above mentioned pitfalls. Too, reports are held as confidential with the requirement that one must, as a matter of common courtesy, obtain the author's permission if a report is to be cited.

Reports from Ministry personnel and the general public are read and evaluated by the O.H.F. archaeological committee.

Licensing of Archaeological Field Schools

The archaeological field school is an important avenue for the training of future archaeologists, as well as for serving public education. The O. H. F. archaeological committee has spent considerable time formulating policies and guidelines on this subject over the past year, and has rendered advice to the Minister to refuse licenses in some cases and to issue licences in others. What general information can be stated here to guide those interested in operating an archaeological field school?

1. It must be realized that a field school is a place and situation where indoctrination in ways of the profession is given to students in a setting that gives the students some realization of what they have learned in theory, and to see its practice in the field. A field school is a controlled situation in which constraints are exercised over participants.

The committee is concerned that the general public realize that the former popular definition of field schools is no longer adequate, that is: "a place where people learn to dig". Today, we are operating within an expanded definition which includes not only excavation techniques, but an integrated problem-oriented researched curriculum including analysis and reporting.

2. The committee recognizes a need for field schools in Ontario, but would like to see their number restricted at present in order to gauge their effectiveness and quality. It is also our firm resolve that the director be professionally competent, that is: a) have at least some post-graduate training in archaeology; b) have experience in the area of research; c) have competence in synthesizing analytical results and writing reports; and d) have leadership abilities to guide, motivate, and otherwise administer to school participant's needs.
3. It is deemed desirable that there be continuity in the field programme over time, and to this end fixed sites would be preferable locations. It is the committee's concern and recommendation that sites with low archaeological significance be selected for training purposes. To train on sites of high significance or uniqueness will normally be considered not in the public's best interest.
4. Regarding curriculum, the committee is concerned that the following archaeological principles be incorporated: observations, principles of association, stratigraphy, taxonomy, floatation, analysis, and utilization of recording techniques suitable to various excavation conditions (i.e. middens as opposed to longhouses, etc.). All of the above are intended to lead the student and the director to a full statement about the people being studied.
5. The size of a field school will be limited, and for training purposes the ratio of one supervisor to five novices is desirable.

6. Only the director of a field school will be licensed, and it is expected that he will be on the site at all times throughout the duration of the school.
7. Preference will be given to field schools at the university level, without restricting participants solely to post-secondary students.
8. Field schools will not be located at burial sites.

Grounds for Refusing Licences

Currently, the grounds for refusing an archaeological licence or permit are set out in Sections 48(8), 48(9), 49(1) and 51 of the Act. Here, refusal, suspension and revocation of licences are legally within the Minister's powers after he has consulted with the Ontario Heritage Foundation. Five basic reasons are enunciated in the Act, and some of them obviously require interpretation and future expansion. They include cases where:

1. The applicant is not competent to conduct archaeological exploration or field work in a responsible manner;
2. The past conduct of the applicant affords reasonable grounds for belief that his intended work will be irresponsible or of low quality;
3. The licensee is in breach of a term or condition of the licence (including reporting responsibilities from a previously granted licence);
4. The Minister deems it necessary to do so for the immediate protection and preservation of a property or an object;
5. The exploration or field work is an immediate threat to the public's interest.

It is the archaeological committee's belief that the above grounds for refusing a licence should be broadened, and refined in definition. For instance, the judgment of competence or non-competence in an applicant constitutes a very difficult problem indeed. For operational utility, we currently assess competence in an individual if his personal expertise is commensurate with the scope of the project, and the significance of the site(s) involved. It is commonsense to aim at a project within your capabilities.

All persons who are refused a licence are entitled to a hearing before the Conservation Review Board. Such hearings are conducted according to formal courtroom procedures, complete with powers of subpoena. To date, one such archaeological hearing, undertaken to test the Act, returned a verdict upholding the Minister's decision to refuse a licence.

Penalties

The new antiquities legislation has "real teeth". A person convicted of an offence under the Ontario Heritage Act is liable to a fine of up to \$10,000. and/or one year in jail. A corporation can be fined up to \$50,000. and any of its officers might also be prosecuted individually if they were party to an offence. In other

The Noble Report (cont'd.)

words, the intent of the law is to ensure that persons take archaeological and heritage matters seriously; it remains to be seen how various judges assess archaeological infractions when they are brought to court.

Other Licensing Features

1. A licence is not transferable.
2. A licence normally expires on December 31.
3. The Minister consults with the O.H.F. archaeological committee on all licensing matters including granting or renewing a licence, and refusing, suspending or revoking a licence.
4. The archaeological committee has advised the Ministry that all incoming licence applications be dated upon receipt, and then handled on a first-come, first-serve basis.
5. In order to clarify factors in unclear licence applications, the committee has instituted personal interviews. Applicants can request, or be asked to appear before the archaeological committee to explain their case.

- Wm. C. Noble, Chairman,
O. H. F. Archaeological Committee.

E.S.A.F.

The Eastern States Archaeological Federation, up to now a federation of societies and institutions, has now opened its membership to individuals.

For \$10 per annum an individual member will receive a membership card, four newsletters, and one major publication for the year.

Enquiries or subscriptions contact:

Richard George
Corresponding Secretary
E.S.A.F.
Carnegie Museum of Natural History
Anthropology Center
P.O. Box 28
Meridian Station
Butler, Pa 16001
USA

Letters to the Editor

Dear Sir:

Brian Hayden's article, "The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology", published in Arch Notes October 1976, contains so many errors and misconceptions, explicit and implicit, that some comment is required. My first comment concerns the National Museum of Man policy for rescue archaeology. The goal is, very briefly, to retrieve and present archaeological information before it is destroyed by the activities of federal and shared federal-provincial projects. It is simply not true that "the most distinguished characteristic of the Ottawa policy has been an extreme aversion to research," and that "salvage archaeology is not, and must not be, research archaeology.". Anyone knowing the history of Canadian archaeology might find that a bizarre contrast with this Museum's role in that history. Is that why we published over 50 research volumes in four years in archaeology? Professor Hayden might possibly be ignorant of the history of Canadian archaeology, but one might reasonably expect him to be familiar with the research and publishing done by this Museum in Canadian archaeology in the past three years. "A revulsion for research and theory"?

Dear me!

The accusation that the National Museum of Man is "anti-research" appeals, for we are so often accused of being too research oriented. After all, what other Canadian museum sponsors research by other than its own staff - or has done so for nearly 20 years - or funded or co-funded up to 150 outside research projects in Canadian studies annually? And what of the British Museum, Musee de l'Homme, the Smithsonian, Dahlem and other national museums by contrast - or our provincial museums in this respect on their own levels? Hayden might have been more accurate to suggest that our archaeologists did not consider Draper a suitable rescue archaeology situation in which to emphasize a field study in theory or method. One might wonder whether such would be a selfish scholarly orientation or, perhaps, even the kind of orientation that threatens archaeologists' credibility in the eyes of non-archaeological agencies who are funding such projects. This museum and its rescue archaeology contractors have more than a simple or narrow responsibility to archaeology; there exists a responsibility to the funding agencies and to a wider, albeit duller, data base - and a duty to perform so well that outside funding of future rescue projects is encouraged. "Do your own thing" archaeology might not do that, nor do the fulsome claims of even the most promising young theoreticians and methodologists. We still require scholarly humility born in hard experience.

Even with the establishment of cost-sharing agreements between the National Museum of Man and the federal agencies involved in developments destructive to prehistory, the available funds are far from sufficient to meet but a fraction of the national requirement. Under the circumstances, priorities must be established, based upon acquiring the maximum amount of information for the funds available. It is a hoary old maxim in the Archaeological Survey of Canada that research, relevance and potential are among the criteria for establishing the priorities required by that simple fact of life in rescue archaeology.

This note does not provide a statement on National Museum of Man archaeological policy, rescue or otherwise, although, perhaps, a few of its general observations pertain. The Harvard Business School system surely has a merit I cannot challenge, but one might question the broadcast unthinking devotion accorded it as some sacred totem of administrative sachems. We have not elaborated a soothing overall policy for National Museum of Man rescue archaeology that seeks to be all things to all people.

Letters to the Editor (cont'd.)

Such commonly reduce flexibility which is a rare and valued quality in a bureaucracy. Rather, we seek to judge each project or possible project within its particular conditions. That requires much professional ability and maturity within the Archaeological Survey of Canada as well as their confidence in those receiving the contracts and my faith in both. That regard remains unaffected by Hayden's excited inaccuracies. Conversely, I suppose if our rescue operations grow, we might require a more formal policy net for it. May I hope, should that occur, that Professor Hayden will not conclude he is its lone godfather.

The \$23,000 contract accepted by Professor Hayden yielded the exposure of part of one house pattern. Professor Hayden's field performance was judged inadequate to the task at hand and the scientific officers of the Archaeological Survey of Canada concluded that his field method badly suited the rescue responsibility he had accepted in the contract. Additionally, Museum archaeologists considered his 72 page report on the Draper site and White site excavation to be a theoretical study with limited reference to the actual field work and one marred by major errors of interpretation. Another more substantial report (circa 400 pages) was submitted to the National Museum of Man for publication in the Mercury Series. This report was judged unacceptable for publication. In short, Professor Hayden's dissatisfaction with the Archaeological Survey of Canada is matched by the Archaeological Survey of Canada's dissatisfaction with both Professor Hayden's field performance and his final report.

There are many other facets of Hayden's article on which one could comment and, as a museum director and an archaeologist, I am tempted. A more informed comment, however, is better given by Dr. William D. Finlayson, the director of the 1975 salvage excavations of the Draper Site.

W. E. Taylor, Jr.
Director,
National Museum of Man,
National Museums of Canada,
Ottawa.

" Popular Archaeology "

Popular Archaeology is happy to announce its new series, "Readings in American Archaeology, Memorial Editions", which will be published beginning in the Spring of 1977. This series is designed to give additional respect and honour to those amateur/professional archaeologists who have made major contributions to our national heritage and culture. In addition to each edition's containing papers by the memorial archaeologist, there will be papers by nationally known archaeologists on subjects of national interest and concern. The first edition is dedicated to Ripley P. Bullen of Florida. We welcome nominations for memorial archaeologists as well as for papers that you think would be of national interest. This series will be issued at a zero profit level and is not part of a subscription to Popular Archaeology. Additionally, all state archaeological societies may request one free copy for their library. Cost of each edition is: \$2.75 before publication and \$3.75 afterwards, \$2.50 for libraries (this discount is extended to interested groups ordering ten or more copies). Address all orders to: Popular Archaeology - Memorial Series, P. O. Box 4190, Arlington, Virginia 22204, U.S.A.

ONTARIO HERITAGE FOUNDATION

THE DAVID BOYLE SCHOLARSHIP FOR ARCHAEOLOGY

The Ontario Heritage Foundation has established the David Boyle Scholarship for Archaeology in Ontario. The scholarship commemorates the remarkable contributions of a creative Canadian scholar, David Boyle. It is also intended to encourage and stimulate creative research in Ontario archaeological studies.

The scholarship of \$10,000 is offered annually.

Conditions of Award:

1. The David Boyle Scholarship for Archaeology will be awarded on the basis of the candidate's scholarly record and other relevant documentation. Particular consideration will be given to innovative and thought-provoking proposals. The proposal must have a major emphasis on the archaeology of Ontario.
2. The scholarship will be awarded, at the discretion of the Board of Directors. If there are no suitable candidates in any particular year, the directors reserve the right not to award the scholarship.
3. The candidate must be willing to attend a personal interview with the Committee of Selection if such an interview is required. Candidates will be reimbursed for normal interview travel expenses.
4. The scholarship must be taken up in the year for which it is awarded.
5. The Ontario Heritage Foundation reserves the right of publication for any manuscript that may be produced through this award.

Application Procedure:

1. Before April 1, the applicant must submit, or arrange to have submitted the following documents:
 - a) One complete copy of the prescribed form of application available from the Archaeological Coordinator listed below.
 - b) One copy of a current curriculum vitae.
 - c) Letters of recommendation from two references.
2. The applicant is required to submit a resume of not more than 500 words detailing the activities proposed while holding the award.

3. Applications and all other documentation are to be submitted to:
The Archaeological Coordinator,
Historical Planning and Research Branch,
Ministry of Culture and Recreation,
Parliament Buildings,
Queen's Park,
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 2R9

4. Applicants will be informed when their files are complete. If this notification has not been received by April 1, applicants are requested to contact the Archaeological Coordinator, at 416-965-4490.

EDITOR'S NOTE

This issue of Arch Notes will be the last issue in this format. With our next issue we shall be doubling our content, though not our size, and be publishing bimonthly instead of monthly. This will enable us to include longer articles and more illustrations with articles. Our size won't be increasing because we shall be using both sides of the paper. To do this we are retiring our duplicator and our stencils and will be "instant printing" from typewritten pages (like the present front cover).

Perhaps the new April/May issue would be a good time to change our front page layout, or even the name ARCH NOTES? Any suggestions? And how do you like our 1977 blue cover?

The Editor will welcome articles, reports, book reviews etc. from members for this expanded publication. The first issue will include: "The Crisis in Canadian Salvage Archaeology - A Reply to Hayden" by William D. Finlayson; "Some Petun Area Data" by Charles Garrad; "The Early Archaic in Ontario - A Request for Data" by Mima Kapches; plus a report on the recent McMaster Symposium, and much more.

Ottawa, London Chapters - can you use a good duplicator? It's just printed 500 copies of this!

O.A.S. SYMPOSIUM 1977

Advance details: The Symposium will again be held in October and will be followed this year by a banquet with an after-dinner speaker. The theme this year - "Ethno-history and Archaeology". Surrounding displays of artifacts, etc. will be a feature at this symposium. Further details later.

JOSEPH BRANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Programme: March 28 - Members Night
 April 25 - Chas. Garrad - Wyandotte
 May 30 - Film - Cracking the Stone Age Code
 June 18 - Picnic tour to an archaeological/historical site.

More details - phone: 632-3711 or 335-2204.