



Ontario Archaeological Society

Arch Notes

New Series Volume 24 Issue 3

ISSN 0048-1742

July/September 2019



Figure 1: Chris Ellis engages with some of the visitors to the first ever Lake Whittaker Archaeology Day sponsored by the London Chapter. See page 15.

OAS News

3. President's Message
5. Draft Agenda for the 2019 OAS ABM
6. Proxy Form for the ABM
7. Proposed Revisions to the Provincial Policy Statement
10. 2019 Symposium Registration Forms

Articles

13. In Memoriam: Charles Garrad
14. Helen Devereau: An Appreciation
15. Lake Whittaker Archaeology Day
17. IAM Training Partnership
19. Symposium Photo Contest

Visit us on the Web at www.ontarioarchaeology.org

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Alicia Hawkins
president@ontarioarchaeology.org

President-Elect

Jim Sherratt
preselect@ontarioarchaeology.org

Treasurer

Debbie Steiss
treasurer@ontarioarchaeology.org

Vice-President/Secretary

Rob Pihl
vicepres@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Chapter Services

Amy St. John
chapters@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Heritage Advocacy

Abbey Flower
heritageadvoc@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Recruitment

Dana Millson
membership@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Services

Bill Ross
memberservices@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Publications

James Conolly
publications@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Public Outreach

Kaitlyn Malleau
outreach@ontarioarchaeology.org

APPOINTMENTS

Editor, Ontario Archaeology

Chris Ellis

Editors, Arch Notes

Sheryl Smith & Carole Stimmell

Symposium Liaison:

Dana Millson

Moderator – Ontario Archaeological Society Listserve (OAS-L)

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/OAS-L/>
Vito Vaccarelli

Contact Information

PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
(416) 406-5959
info@ontarioarchaeology.org
www.ontarioarchaeology.org

The Ontario Archaeological Society gratefully acknowledges funding from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture through the Provincial Heritage Organization Operating Grant Program.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

TALKING WITH MILLENNIALS

Over the course of this summer I had the chance to spend time with a number of people that fit into the much maligned demographic group we refer to as millennials. As we bumped along various country roads in northern Ontario or picnicked at the site where I ran my field school, the conversation often turned to archaeology and how the discipline and its future looks from the perspective of someone less than 35-years-old. It struck me that a substantial number of practicing archaeologists fit in this demographic, yet rarely do they have the opportunity to have their voices heard in places such as *Arch Notes*. So for this president's message I am going to use this space to try to convey some of the highs and lows of Ontario archaeology from the perspective of a small group of that large number of people who are 'doing archaeology' in the province today.

On pretty short notice, I reached out to 22 people through my networks and networks of another board member. In total eight people responded, all of whom are actively working in archaeology (one is on parental leave). They include people who have different educational backgrounds and levels of education; who work for different companies in different roles (field tech, field director, project manager); and who are current graduate students. Both men and women are represented, as well as people who identify as straight and as queer. I posed five questions and asked people for written responses. Below are the questions and summaries of the responses. If you are an OAS volunteer, or someone like me, who is mid-career and in a position to try effect change within your organization, please read through this whole message and then ask yourself how you can contribute to shaping our future discipline with millennials.

Why did you get into archaeology?

For many people, archaeology presented a challenge – they appreciated that it is both

physically demanding and intellectually challenging. The idea of working in different environments (indoor and outdoors) was attractive, as was the possibility of working with different teams of people. Some people identified an interest in archaeology as early as elementary school, and others not until partway through university. For several people, mentors played an important role, whether they were teachers or relatives. As a subject, it would appear that history (not anthropology or Indigenous studies) was the hook that landed them in the archaeology camp. One person recounted how her view of archaeology changed over time from being “the best puzzle I ever encountered” to something that is highly political, and therefore important in a larger Canadian context as well.

Do you see yourself in the field in 20 years?

All of the people who replied to this question, even those who replied in the positive, expressed some degree of doubt about their futures in the field. Most hoped that they would be, but wanted to be realistic and reflected on the unstable nature of the CRM industry and the lack of benefits outside sectors such as government and academe. The pessimism expressed may in part be a reflection of the difficult field season that we have been through in 2019, with weather and contract delays, but a number of themes are repeated in the replies and these are worth thinking about seriously.

The body wears out. If someone has devoted decades to doing excellent field work, and does not see themselves analyzing artifacts or writing reports, there are few alternative career paths. Better to get out when you are young.

Seasonal work sucks (because it is so unpredictable, except inasmuch as layoffs are inevitable) and full time work appears to be more and more difficult to find. What are some of the issues with seasonal work? No

RRSPs, minimal benefits, a person has to live in a centre with multiple firms to maintain full-time employment. Waiting on a phone call for a job: even when compensated at a decent rate, fieldwork is weather dependent and when all is said and done if there is no work for long periods, then overall the rate of pay can be something less than minimum wage.

Academic and research positions are few and difficult to obtain. Graduate departments do not clearly communicate the low potential of landing a tenure stream position. There are many more talented people who have important knowledge and skills to share than there are academic posts.

In what way do you think we are doing well as a discipline in Ontario?

It is interesting that while the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeology (S&Gs) have been a bit of a punching bag for Ontario archaeologists, especially when they were first released, several people identified them as one of the positive aspects of our practice. One reason cited is that the S and Gs, while imperfect, do provide clear methods for how to approach excavation and this is seen as preferable to the situation in other jurisdictions where no guidelines exist. Further, it is believed that if sites are excavated in the same fashion, artifact assemblages will be more comparable.

A second theme that several respondents touched on relates to efforts towards reconciliation and building better relationships with the Indigenous descendants of the people who created archaeological sites in Ontario. This includes capacity building efforts within Indigenous communities, increased respect on the part of practicing archaeologists for Indigenous sites and artifacts, and good will amongst various parties on CRM projects aimed at arriving at the 'best possible outcome'. It is recognized that we still have a long way to go towards reconciliation.

Other points that were mentioned include that there are fewer “white guys in positions of authority” and that this is a positive change.¹

Archaeology has the potential to influence the way in which other heritage sectors work, and archaeological firms have shown leadership in at least three areas: data management, community engagement and standardization.

Finally, as a community we have come together to analyze and challenge changes in government policy, and this is seen as positive.

What areas do you think need improvement and how would you improve them?

Again, there were several identifiable themes in the responses, and for the first two, there are clear links.

A major concern, already expressed above, pertains to job security. One person states simply, “Contract field work in its current iteration is not a viable career for someone hoping to start a family.” Other people touched on the plight of field techs – in particular noting that a number of companies hire by the job (rather than for a season), so a person can have long periods of unemployment during which they are on-call but without compensation. The idea of a pool of field techs that could be drawn on by various companies was suggested, and needs further consideration with respect to issues like the role of seniority, distance to jobs, etc.

A second serious concern voiced by several people pertains to the ‘assembly line model’ of doing archaeology that is practiced by at least some CRM firms (including engineering firms): “the field director and the field technicians excavate the site, the lab technicians wash and analyse the artifacts, and the report writers play fill-in-the-blanks with previously established templates.” Two serious issues were brought up in this regard:

That the disaggregation of archaeological

data (field contexts, different types of artifacts) and assignment of responsibility for these various data to different individuals who don’t communicate to the extent that they could, may lead to poor archaeological interpretations. “The fact that the reports are being written, and interpretations being made by people who have never seen the site and sometimes barely looked at the material culture is a problem.”

That the personnel who undertake different components in this assembly line have very few, if any, opportunities to learn about what the other people in that line are doing, how they are doing it, and what its importance is. This seems to lead to alienation from the overall *raison d’être* of archaeology, as people act as and see themselves as cogs in the machine of clearing a property of cultural heritage value or interest.

There are good reasons to try to practice a more holistic, integrated type of archaeology, as difficult as it may seem from a business standpoint: “the more lab time you log, the more you understand artifacts; the more field time you log, the more you learn about how the artifacts are related to one another and why that’s important; the more time you spend writing site reports, the more you learn about bringing the small pieces together into the larger picture of the site. I’m not sure if any archaeologist should go without some training in all of these areas, but today we have many specialists who only ever do one thing.”²

In terms of the solutions to this issue, respondents proposed various things including starting new firms, complete restructuring of the way CRM works, to a more middle ground in which CRM firms aim for a lower degree of specialization and higher degree of general archaeological knowledge, allowing for fluid movement between field and lab.

A related but separate issue is that of career development. Without formal learning opportunities (either within companies, or by government, or professional organiza-

tions), early career archaeologists find themselves stuck in particular positions or roles. At a minimum, it was suggested that we revisit the idea of annual meetings such as those held for R-licensees.

Diversity in who practices and holds positions of authority in Ontario archaeology was also something that was identified as an issue by more than one person. And, just in case I have to spell it out, the concern is with ‘white male bias’. We are called upon to ‘notice the voices that are excluded’. And within one sector specifically, “universities need to start hiring a young, diverse Ontario archaeological cohort to fill tenure track positions and who can build research programs and institutions that will employ other young Ontario archaeologists.”

Do you see a role for the OAS in this (improving various of the above issues)?

Everyone who replied sees a role for the OAS, something that I find heartening.

The OAS has made reconciliation with Indigenous peoples a priority and should continue this role.

They see the OAS is a place where people can share ideas, share knowledge and hold discussions on topics like those outlined above. Because of our wide membership base, we can serve as a place where archaeologists from different generations meet and elders can learn from youth and vice versa.

On a more tangible level, a few ideas were suggested to build the knowledge and skill set of younger archaeologists, particularly field workers: provide training opportunities in laboratory analysis methods; perhaps chapters could take on working up legacy collections during the winter, and bring in some junior archaeologists to assist with the analysis; make available key publications about Ontario archaeology through our web page, either as pdfs, or if this is not possible because of copyright, then provide assistance with obtaining such publications.

In terms of bigger picture, down-the-

1. We still have some distance to go in this respect: in the academic sector in Ontario, women hold less than 20% of the tenured/tenure stream positions in Ontario archaeology in the province, and there are no Indigenous people holding tenured/tenure stream positions in Ontario archaeology

2. As an aside, I note that while field directors (R-licensees) and P-licensees must demonstrate a breadth of experience for licensing, the same is not required for those people who undertake lab work and report writing. Perhaps something to be addressed in revisions to the S and Gs?

road-vision, it was suggested that the OAS might have a role in the data management and possibly also in self-regulation.

Finally, “The OAS has the power to champion research that is innovative, interdisciplinary and inclusive! By encouraging this sort of work and giving the practitioners that are leading it a space to share it, we can encourage growth and diversity in this field.”

Change on the horizon

“I think there is a generational reckoning coming in academic archaeology as boomers retire and Ontario’s millennial archaeologists face uncertain and internationally competitive scholarly prospects.”

“I think the industry itself is in the middle of a transformation and it’s hard to know what it will look like in a few years from now, let alone in 20 years.”

“I feel like there will have to be a major shift in CRM in the next five years or so.”

Several of the respondents clearly stated

that they see a change coming in the practice of both academic and CRM archaeology. In the case of academic archaeology, this is related to retirements that may be coming in the next few years. It is incumbent upon those of us who will remain in the academic sector a little longer to argue strongly for tenure stream positions in Ontario archaeology. While only a small number of graduates (M.A. and Ph.D.) are ever likely to work in the academic field, it is essential that the larger number of people who have P-licenses and who are principals in archaeology firms have access to geographically and culturally specific training opportunities.

With respect to changes in the CRM field, the responses were not specific enough for me to be able to pass on what transformations are envisioned or why, but there may also be a change related to retirements.

In sum, the comments that these people

have generously shared make it clear to me that they care deeply about the heritage of our province and are committed to seeing an improved archaeological practice in the future. For those of us who do have greater ability to effect change by virtue of our positions, let’s take a listen, think creatively, and see what we can do.

CREDITS

I am very grateful for the rapid and candid replies from a number of younger practicing archaeologists. They are directly quoted here in several instances because they have expressed their views particularly eloquently. Because some of the comments are critical of some of the current practices of CRM and academic archaeology, in which some of the respondents are employed, all of the responses are presented anonymously. I would like to emphasize that none of the responses made negative reference to the practices of any specific



The Ontario Archaeological Society

Draft Agenda for the Annual Business Meeting

Saturday Nov. 2, 2019 at 4:30 p.m.

Chelsea Hotel

33 Gerrard Street West, Toronto



1. President’s opening remarks
2. Minutes of the previous meeting
3. Matters arising from these minutes
4. President’s report
5. Treasurer’s report
 - i. Financial statement
 - ii. Appointment of auditors
6. Constitutional Amendments
7. Election of Directors
8. Next Symposia
9. Report on Progress – 2019-2024 Strategic Plan
10. Other business
 - i. Motions of thanks
11. Adjournment



The Ontario Archaeological Society

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 SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2019 AT 4:30 P.M.

- 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, 1444 Queen St. E, Toronto on or before Thursday, Nov. 1, 2019

Postal Address: OAS, PO Box 62066, Victoria Terrace Post Office, Toronto ON M4A 2W1

Proposed Revisions to the Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The Ontario Archaeological Society has been called on to provide comment on proposed changes to the *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS). For those members who are not part of the CRM community and may be unfamiliar with the PPS, this is an important document that is issued under the *Planning Act* R.S.O 1990 by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The PPS applies across the province and provides guidance on matters related to land use planning. The scope of the PPS is broad and some language applies to archaeology and Indigenous rights.

We have summarized the proposed changes that pertain to archaeology below (changes in bold):

Current language	Proposed new language
1.2.2 Planning authorities are encouraged to coordinate planning matters with Aboriginal communities.	1.2.2 Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and coordinate on land use planning matters.
<p>2.6 Cultural heritage and archaeology</p> <p>2.6.1 <i>Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.</i></p> <p>2.6.2 <i>Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.</i></p> <p>2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit <i>development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property</i> except where the proposed <i>development and site alteration</i> has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the <i>heritage attributes</i> of the <i>protected heritage property</i> will be <i>conserved</i>.</p> <p>2.6.4 Planning authorities should consider and promote archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.</p>	<p>2.6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</p> <p>2.6.1 <i>Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.</i></p> <p>2.6.2 <i>Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.</i></p> <p>2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit <i>development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property</i> except where the proposed <i>development and site alteration</i> has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the <i>heritage attributes</i> of the <i>protected heritage property</i> will be <i>conserved</i>.</p> <p>2.6.4 Planning authorities should consider and promote archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.</p>

<p>2.6.5 Planning authorities shall consider the interests of Aboriginal communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.</p>	<p>2.6.5 Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and consider their interests when identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage and archaeological resources.</p>
<p>Archaeological resources: includes artifacts, archaeological sites, marine archaeological sites, as defined under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</p> <p>Areas of archaeological potential: means areas with the likelihood to contain <i>archaeological resources</i>. Methods to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province, but municipal approaches which achieve the same objectives may also be used. The <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> requires archaeological potential to be confirmed through archaeological fieldwork.</p>	<p>Archaeological resources: includes artifacts, archaeological sites, marine archaeological sites, as defined under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</p> <p>Areas of archaeological potential: means areas with the likelihood to contain <i>archaeological resources</i>. Criteria to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province. The <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> requires archaeological potential to be confirmed by a licensed archaeologist through archaeological assessment and/or fieldwork.</p>

For those members who want to see a comprehensive list of all of the proposed changes to the PPS, an unofficial blackline comparison can be found here:

<https://www.osler.com/osler/media/Osler/Content/PDFs/2019-pps-blackline.pdf>

The OAS supports changes the changes to subsections 1.2.2 and 2.6.5 that strengthen language pertaining to Indigenous rights. Specifically, we support the changes that indicate that planners shall engage with Indigenous communities.¹

We are seeking clarification on the reasons for the proposed change to the definition of areas of archaeological potential that would appear to take out language specific to permitting the

¹ This change reflects the current direction in planning a the national level: <http://www.cip-icu.ca/Indigenous-Planning#>

use of municipal approaches to determining archaeological potential such as Archaeological Management Plans. We note that in some cases municipalities may have developed Archaeological Management Plans that are specific to their region, and which may have criteria that are fine-tuned to the contexts of those municipalities. The proposed change would seem to have criteria for potential determined at the provincial level through the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.

The comment period ends Oct. 21 and comments can be made through the Environmental Registry:

<https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-0279>

The OAS will be submitting a formal statement, but we also encourage individual OAS members to make their voices heard.

Proposed revised Provincial Policy Statement:

https://prod-environmental-registry.s3.amazonaws.com/2019-07/EN_PPS%20Proposed%20Policies_July2019.pdf

Current Provincial Policy Statement (2014):

<https://www.ontario.ca/document/provincial-policy-statement-2014>

OAS 46th Annual Symposium – Toronto – November 1-3, 2019
Call for Silent Auction Donations—Deadline October 25, 2019

The **Silent Auction** is a popular event during the OAS Symposium and great way to raise money for the Society. To ensure the success of our one and only annual fundraiser (and 12th Silent Auction), **WE NEED YOUR HELP!**

Please consider donating new or gently used items such as recent publications, jewellery, services, crafts, tools, gift certificates, comestibles (no perishable), memberships, passes, art, and gift baskets. This is also a great opportunity for businesses, institutions, and organizations to showcase their products and services. Items should be fairly portable and easy to carry. Feel free to be creative!

All **Silent Auction** donors will be acknowledged during and after the event. You will also receive many personal expressions of appreciation from the Auction and Symposium Organizing Committees!

Once again, we invite all OAS Chapters to donate a “Chapter Basket” featuring items unique to their region. These baskets with their often-creative contents have become extremely desirable.

Silent Auction items are now being accepted for the 2019 Symposium. Please **contact Christine Caroppo at glebeholme@bell.net by October 25th** and include the following information: donor name and contact info, description of item(s) to be donated, value of donation, and minimum/starting bid (if desired).

Please also indicate if you are bringing the donation to the Symposium personally, 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!**



46TH ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM
OF THE
ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

NOVEMBER 1-3, 2019
 CHELSEA HOTEL,
 33 GERRARD STREET WEST
 TORONTO

JOIN US AS WE EXPLORE
THE PAST BENEATH THE PAVEMENT:
ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE CITY

Planning for exciting workshops and tours that complement the theme is underway. Registration Details are available on the OAS website.



Reservations for the **Chelsea Hotel** may be made by calling the hotel directly, toll free at 1-800-CHELSEA (243-5732) or 416-595-1975. Please identify yourself as part of the **Ontario Archaeological Society** to take advantage of the discounted group rate of \$155.00 per night (Single & Double rate); \$185.00 (Triple rate) and \$215.00 (Quadruple rate).

Reservations must be cancelled by no later than 48 hours prior to arrival.

Private web link for reservations is as follows:

<https://gc.synxis.com/rez.aspx?Hotel=59052&Chain=10316&start=availresults&arrive=11/1/2019&depart=11/3/2019&adult=1&child=0&group=OAS110119>

Cut-off date for early bird reservations is October 2,

<i>Indigenous Archaeological Monitors (IAMs) and Field Archaeologists: Present Concerns and Future Considerations Workshop</i>	10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	Restricted to 60 pre-registered participants
--	-------------------------	--

Special Events

Please indicate if you and/or any additional individuals will be attending each of the events below, **RSVP** for Friday's event is required.

Opening Reception and Celebration of Charles Garrad's Contributions to Ontario Archaeology

Friday, November 1 st 7:00 – 9:00 p.m.	Fort York - Blue Barracks 250 Fort York Blvd. Toronto, Ontario	<input type="checkbox"/> Attending
--	--	------------------------------------

If bringing guest(s), please provide name(s): _____

Awards and Recognition Reception*

		<i>Number of Tickets</i>	
Saturday, November 2 nd 6:30 – 9:30 P.M.	Chelsea Hotel – Bb33 Bistro & Brasserie	<input type="checkbox"/> Student - \$35.00	→ _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> Regular – \$40.00	→ _____

If bringing guest(s), please provide name(s): _____

*Note: Tickets for the Awards and Recognition Reception are **ONLY** available for purchase through pre-registration and will not be available after pre-registration for the symposium closes on **Friday, October 25th, 2019**.

Totals and Signature

Please record the totals for each of the above sections.

Registration Fee: \$ _____

Workshop/Tour Fees: \$ _____

Saturday Reception: \$ _____

Symposium Donation: \$ _____

I would like my donation to go towards the Friday Opening Reception and Celebration of Charles Garrad.

Total Payable: \$ _____

PAYMENT OPTIONS:

CREDIT Name on Card: _____ Credit Card Type: _____

Expiration Date: _____ Card #: _____

CVC: _____

If paying by **CHECK**, please make payable to **2019 OAS Symposium** and see below.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

FAX: (416) 406 – 5959

Mailing Address:

Ontario Archaeological Society, P.O. Box 62066 Victoria Terrace, Toronto, Ontario, M4A 2W1

IN MEMORIAM: CHARLES GARRAD

These tributes to Charlie were received subsequent to the publication of the April/June issue of ArchNotes.

By Jim Sherratt

As we have seen from the last *Arch Notes* (and this one as well), Charlie played a part in the careers of many people within the archaeological community. My career has been no different. When I joined the Ministry in 2008 as an Archaeology Review Officer I was assigned to the Eastern Region which then included Simcoe County and part of the Blue Mountains. When I arrived in Toronto I found a sparkling clean desk with several boxes tucked neatly under the desk – including a stack of reports filed diligently each year by Charlie describing his activities for the year. I read through the reports with interest as they described the visits with landowners, small collections made and archival research completed.

Once read, or skimmed really, I proceed to draft letters including a short summary of the content of the report (as was the custom then) which were sent to the licensee informing him that his reports had been accepted into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. I moved on to other reports, but later that week the phone rang and when I answered (on second ring as any diligent public servant does) an older gentleman with a slight accent replied with a greeting of someone with whom I was familiar.

Slightly confused, more than a little panicked – licensees did not call to express their gratitude at receiving a ministry letter – I affirmed my identity upon which he informed proudly that it was Charlie Garrad and that he had received my letters. He noted, seemingly impressed, that no one had ever sent him such a letter – panic increased – but he followed with a discussion of the contents that would require some intimate knowledge of the content of each report to fully comprehend. That was my first impression of Charlie. After a lengthy conversation, during which I managed to escape without revealing I did not have the familiarity with the content of the reports he had expected given the receipt of the letters, he promised to visit with his yearly report in the near future. As part of the conversation Charlie had suggested that it would be beneficial for some senior level bureaucrats (Minister, maybe even the Premier) to visit the Blue Mountains on which occasion he could give them a tour and familiarize them with the importance of the area. I proudly presented the offer to my Manager, who surprisingly did not seem as keen as I was for the Minister to accept the invitation.

Several months passed and Charlie checked in with regularity

about the proposed visit without any confirmation. But then there was an offer to visit the Laurentian field school which created the opportunity to take Charlie up on his offer, although it would only be me and my manager. The tour did not disappoint and Charlie's enthusiasm left quite an impression. He enlisted me as his co-conspirator with a quick wink to impress upon this bureaucrat the importance of the archaeology in the Blue Mountains (but also more generally in Ontario) and why it was critical the ministry take a more active role in its promotion and the protection of archaeological sites. He organised a tour showing all the highlights of the archaeology of the Blue Mountains, pausing with dramatic effect as the tour reached its crescendo in the middle of the road on the spot of the Buckingham Ossuary. Back at the Research Institute, I recall him excitedly describing the collections he cared for, and the potential both in the archaeology and its interpretation, as Ella quietly offered refreshments. It was a brief, yet memorable visit.

In the years that followed Charlie continued to promote archaeology to anyone who would listen with the same vigour. I would have the occasional conversation with Charlie at the symposium, with the release of new information from the ministry and when there was development threatening one of the sites he had spent his life trying to protect. Each year following our tour, he made a brief visit to drop off his annual report. I remember the last time he visited the ministry offices. There was desperation I had not heard before in his words and some resignation that the dream he had long held would not be realised in his lifetime. But there was also a confidence that others would continue to make efforts to realise the goals we all share with respect to the documentation, protection and promotion of the archaeological record of Ontario.

●

By Caroline Walker

Charlie Garrad is the closest I've known to a Renaissance person. His *Petun to Wyandot*, the distillation of a much larger manuscript, touches upon almost every area of Ontario Iroquoian research. He had the good fortune of learning from the greats of early 20th century archaeology: Fr. Jones, Hunter, Wintemberg, Boyle, Ridley, Emerson, Blair, and the Kenyons.

Charlie also had the great good luck to settle upon sky country north of Toronto, Collingwood west of Muskoka, and to find there an enigmatic and less studied branch of the Iroquoian family, the Petuns. Both were isolated, geographically and research-wise, from the larger, complex, and relatively less known Hurons and Neutrals.

He soon befriended local residents, collecting family histories and lore, and exploring Collingwood's fields and dales, and starting collecting and conserving their artefacts. The collection soon comprised most of the artefact types and all bead periods, from 1560-1652. He earned certification, established a charitable foundation and organized summer volunteers. Together they learned and applied up-to-date excavation techniques to a growing number of Petun villages and 'camp' sites. The sites, pairs of sites, suggested the historically known 'two nations' moving north to Georgian Bay. Together, artefacts and sites made possible research in very many areas. In the late 1990s the collection of copper based artefacts was sufficient for Ron Hancock to do statistical analysis, by INAA, of Petun site sequences, and by extrapolation, relations of other artefacts to a reasonable level of confidence.

Charlie exhaustively studied every artefact type: tobacco and pipes; glass and shell beads; iron axes, knives, swords, projectile points and spear heads; Jesuit rings, pottery types, stone weapons and tools; crops—adding much to our knowledge.

He carefully researched Champlain and the Jesuits. His correspondence with experts in every discipline, from New York's Public Library, the Ashmolean, Jesuit archives, fellow archaeologists everywhere, even to the Chateau de Chantilly, France.

Two researches he likely thought 'distractions' stand out. A Princesse de Conde, Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency, had sponsored the Jesuit "Mission of the Apostles" to the Petun. She belonged to a family much involved in the fortunes of New France, was related to five successive Viceroy's and worked with the aristocratic women who did so much of benefit to Quebec. She survived religious wars, the assassination of Henry IV, Cardinal Richelieu, and the disgraces and honours bestowed on her husband.

In the 1970s Charlie came upon the adventures of a Jesuit, Fr. Greslon, who served the Mission to the Petuns in 1648 in the village of St Matthew, followed their retreat from Ste. Marie 2 to Quebec and return to France with the unsupportable Jesuits. Sent to China in 1657, he met a "Huron" (perhaps a Petun) woman he had known in America. She had been "sold a slave from tribe to tribe until she reached that place" (JR59:309n5). Over the next 30 years Charlie tracked down a dizzying web of Catholic and Jesuit scholars and journals, living and dead, eventually finding sources confirming this "improbable" story.

REQUEST FOR PHOTOS TO CELEBRATE CHARLIE

The opening reception for the OAS Symposium will include a tribute to the late Charles Garrad, and will be held at Fort York National Historic Site at 7 pm, Friday November 1st. If you have pictures of Charlie that could be shared at the gathering, then please send them no later than October 25th to Bill Fox at foxarch@bell.net. Thank you.

HELEN DEVEREUX: AN APPRECIATION

By Caroline Walker

Helen Devereux, who died April 1, 2019, said she wanted no memorials. I'm sorry Helen. You were a kind and generous 'elder' whose work and experience, from the 1940s, is indispensable. Unlike her mostly male colleagues who eagerly documented the smallest aspects of these excavations, I could find few written reports, except for her reports of Beothuk living sites.

I met Helen in 2000 while cataloguing copper-based artifacts (from disintegrating paper bags), from the Huron Warminster site, for an Access database to do statistical analysis. Was either of the large Warminster and Ball sites, only 0.8 km apart, Champlain's 1615 'Cahiagué'?

Helen admitted to a "bit of a problem" with the grid system adopted by McIlwraith and Thompson in 1946-7. Their "Chicago Method" laid out trenches 40ft apart, 400ft long and 10ft wide. The trenches were subdivided into two 5ft strips, then 5 ft squares, each divided into 4 quadrants. Artifact proveniences, if any, were "I7d 6-8 palisade" and "OlcL5a 1-3 trench". Helen had revised the system

for Heidenreich, Emerson, and Tyyska's excavations in 1961-66 but artifacts again were not catalogued. Allen Sykes' 1978-79 excavators had assigned five digit numbers prefixed with 'W' to 561 copper-based artifacts, and his photographs were a help, but not a catalogue.

In the 1990s, Ron Hancock's INAA study, identifying 10 or so trace elements in cuprous artifacts, offered a scientific (repeatable) way of positing relationships between Contact Period sites. The late Larry Pavlish sampled 473 Warminster 'coppers' (identifying them "as best he could") and 142 were analyzed by INAA by Ron Hancock. Similarly 349 artifacts from the Ball site were analyzed. All of these contributions resulted for these sites in the identification of artifact provenience, type and data for statistics, facilitating much subsequent analysis.

Thank you, Helen. All of this work is ultimately based on your memory of archaeology begun 50 years ago. And thank you, Larry. Today most probably agree that Ball was settled before Warminster but the identification of Champlain's Cahiagué remains a mystery. (Much work still needs to be done, on artifacts never catalogued, from sites long ago excavated.)

LAKE WHITTAKER ARCHAEOLOGY DAY: A NEW LONDON CHAPTER OUTREACH EVENT

By Darryl Dann

In the fall of 2018, two members of the London Chapter OAS executive, Jim Keron and Shari Prowse, were making a presentation to the Board of Directors for the Kettle Creek Conservation Authority (KCCA) about progress they had made on a collaborative fieldwork project. As often happens, the KCCA folks were intrigued by the archaeological information that was presented and had lots of follow-up questions. During the ensuing discussion Jim or Shari, depending on who you ask, made mention of the London Chapter's annual picnic which takes place at Ska-Nah-Doht Village in the Longwoods Conservation Area which is run in collaboration with The Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority. This event has evolved over the years and has for some time offered an 'outreach / educational' component. Not only is the event well attended by Chapter members but also by the local public. Some come to have artifacts identified that they have found when gardening or working their land. Others want to try their hand at flint knapping with instruction and coaching from our group of expert knappers. Long story short... someone at the meeting suggested that maybe the London Chapter could offer some kind of 'Archaeology Day' at the Lake Whittaker Conservation Area, which is run under the auspices of the KCCA.

The London Chapter has a long history of creating opportunities



Figure 2: Darcy Fallon (background) and Stephen Haig: great flint knappers and teachers

to broaden the interest in archaeology "to all Ontarians and beyond," not only at the annual picnic but also through our monthly meetings that are open to the public; by publishing a widely read and cited newsletter, KEWA; by working in partnership with The Museum of Ontario Archaeology to offer Archaeology Days and Doors Open events; via school visits; and offering public lectures. So when Jim and Shari brought the idea to the next Chapter Executive meeting there was an immediate consensus that this would be another great outreach opportunity for our Chapter to pursue. Lafe Meicenheimer, Staff Archaeologist at Golder Associates Ltd. was tasked to put an 'Archaeology Day' plan together and shortly thereafter an organizing committee was formed and went to work on the plan. From the first planning meeting the committee built the plan on a foundation of partnerships, some tried and true and some brand new. Over the next few months we received ongoing encouragement, support and input from the Museum of Ontario Archaeology (MOA), the OAS provincial executive, the Kettle Creek Conservation Authority and the Lake Whittaker Conservation Area staff.

Lake Whittaker is a beautiful venue with large campground areas and hosts a number of special events throughout the summer for its campers. So the first task was to pick an open date, which was Sunday, August 11, with the event running from 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. The hope was that we could catch many of the campers before they packed up to leave on a Sunday and with all five partners advertising we could hopefully attract some of the local non-camping public... and we did. The first (annual?) Lake Whittaker Archaeology Day was, by all accounts, a real success. In spite of the unpredictable weather we have all experienced this summer, it was a beautiful sunny day. Perfect for an outdoor event in the conservation area's open air pavilion. We had a reasonably good turnout, between 130-140 people. As expected many of the attendees were families who were already at Lake Whittaker camping but we also had several visitors who came specifically for the Archaeology Day event. A total of 21 vehicles used the promo code to gain free admission, which according to, KCCA, Public Relations Supervisor, Marianne Levogianis, is a great number for a first time event! The Lake Whittaker staff were also very pleased with the program and the turnout,

We had 15 volunteers conducting a variety of activities and providing educational information to our guests. Eleven of the volunteers were London Chapter members joined by two representatives from the MOA. The volunteers were, in a word, amazing. They exceeded expectations on every

front! The level of their engagement with the public was excellent throughout the event. There were several activities for the attendees to take advantage of, many of them hands-on. Most of the activities generated great interest and remained extremely busy throughout the event. Chapter President, Chris Ellis, had a never ending line up at the artifact identification table, using diagnostic artifacts from Western University to capture and hold the interest of visitors young and old (Figure 1 on Front Cover). Beside him various Chapter members took turns at the Chapter table offering handouts about the OAS and the London Chapter while engaging the public in conversations about archaeology in southwestern Ontario. Children were encouraged to choose an OAS pin to wear and adults were challenged to expand their archaeological vocabulary by completing our ‘Can You Dig It’ crossword puzzle and/or ‘What’s In Your Square’ word search. The MOA, with its extensive outreach programming had a beautiful display and handouts about upcoming programs at the museum. Another very popular activity was the flint knapping workshop organized by London Chapter Vice President and master flint knapper, Darcy Fallon (Figure 2). What a sight it was to see children, parents and grandparents talking and working together while producing their own little works of art.

There was an activity table with crayons and pencils where children could colour archaeologically themed pictures and adults could help or work on their word puzzles. There were also temporary OAS tattoos (thanks to OAS President Alicia Hawkins). They were a hit... everyone seemed to want one, children, parents, even some of the volunteers. It was also a great spot to just relax and watch all the action.

Speaking of action, the three simulated excavations were also a very popular activity... crazy busy from start to finish. The organizing committee was determined to have a simulated dig but the logistics seemed, at first to be formidable. Where can we have it? What will they be digging in? We decided on plastic swimming pools filled with sand. Sand? How do we get that much sand to Lake Whittaker, put it in a bunch of plastic swimming pools and then get it back out and take it away four hours later? Arrgh! Enter Michael Buis, Lake Whittaker Conservation Area Coordinator and problem solving superhero. Mike calmly suggested, “I’ll get my tractor with its front end loader and scoop sand from the beach or the volleyball court. Then I’ll dump it in the pools in time for your 10:00 start and then return at 2:00 and take it back where I got it from.” Which also answered the question of how we would convince the children to stop excavating at the end of the event. Was it worth it? The simulated digs, and the volunteers who ran them were amazing! Many children worked independently, some cooperatively and others with their parents or grandparents (Figure 3). Armed with trowels, paint brushes and screens they received a quick lesson on the proper use of their tools and then got to work.



Figure 3: The activity table with simulated excavations in the background

After recovering several artifacts they were given a clipboard with a data sheet that asked them to choose their most interesting ‘find’, identify what it was and what it would be used for, then draw an accurate picture of it. They did it and they did it well. The focus, the care and the concentration they demonstrated would bring tears to any site director’s eyes. But that wasn’t the end of it. In the planning stage for this activity, Darcy Fallon challenged the plan saying, “You are going to have children search for the artifacts, excavate them carefully, identify and draw them... and then you’re going to take them away from them to bury again. That’s just not fair! What you could do is have them bring their artifact data sheet to show me. I’ll congratulate them on a job well done and, with their parent’s permission, I’ll give them one of the projectile points that I have knapped.” We did and you should have seen the children’s eyes light up as they held their special Darcy points.

All in all, this outreach event was, we think, an unqualified success and well worth the time and effort that went into it. Would we do it again... absolutely! Why are educational outreach programs important? Outreach activities are an organization’s point of contact with the community it serves. It not only broadens interest in archaeology, particularly in the province of Ontario, it also helps plant the idea in their mind of community service and outreach, especially the children. This way, when they are older and successful, they will remember the importance of giving back to the community. Being able to work with young children helps to influence the future.

In closing we would like to thank all of our partners who helped make the day so successful, especially the KCCA and Lake Whittaker Conservation Area staff for hosting this event. We would also like to acknowledge the many volunteers who gave of their time, shared their expertise, let their passion show and brought the event to life.

INDIGENOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITOR TRAINING PARTNERSHIP

By Sarah Hazell

In 2019, the OAS received an Ontario Trillium Foundation (OTF) grant in the amount of \$270,000 to conduct indigenous Archaeological monitor (IAM) training with First Nations communities in the northern Ontario districts of Algoma, Cochrane, Manitoulin and Sudbury over a two-year period. As part of the OAS's ongoing reconciliation efforts, this training provides an important opportunity to facilitate heritage and archaeological capacity building in First Nations' communities. While the OAS has offered IAM training to indigenous communities in the south (for instance, to the Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, the Oneida of the Thames First Nation, and Mississauga of the Credit First Nation), this is the first time the OAS has offered IAM training in the north.

The OAS worked with Kevin Restoule of the Anishinabek Nation, with whom it is building a long-term relationship, to identify potential communities. As a result, Mississauga First Nation, Sagamok First Nation, and Serpent River First Nation expressed interest in participating, in addition to the Ojibwe Cultural Foundation (OCF) on Mani-

toulin Island. Between June and August of this summer, training was coordinated by Sarah Hazell (Nipissing First Nation) with workshop assistants Jake Cousineau and Griffin Assance-Goulais (Beausoleil First Nation), and involved OAS volunteers Paige Campbell, Alicia Hawkins, Bill Fox, Kaitlyn Malleau, Carla Parslow, Jeff Siebert, Jim Sherratt, and Gary Warrick, as well as Sagamok FN's historian Allen Toulouse. Others who contributed to our work were: Hillary Kiazzyk, Sophie Belley, Holly Martelle, Matthew Beaudoin, Dana Poulton, Christine Dodd, and Amanda DiLoreto.

Participants were instructed in modules on Ontario archaeology, local archaeological culture history, research and professional archaeology, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines, the business of archaeology, Ontario heritage legislation, artefact identification, and test pitting (Stage 2). Over 50 youth, adults, and elders were trained from 11 First Nations communities, which exceeded the OAS target of 36 individuals from three First Nations. This demonstrates there is a significant desire for First Nations to learn about archaeology and develop local capacity. It was an honour to work with all of the participants and a huge success!



Participants of Indigenous Archaeological Monitor Training from the Ojibwe Cultural Foundation on Manitoulin Island. The training was provided by the OAS.



Members of the Sagamok First Nation(above) and the Mississauga First Nation (below)also took part in the training.





2019 OAS SYMPOSIUM PHOTO CONTEST



All members of the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS) or registered participants of the 2019 OAS Symposium are invited to participate in the 2nd Annual OAS Photo Contest. You can submit a maximum of three photos, and each needs to fall into one of the following four categories:

Archaeological landscapes

Field/Lab life

Fun Finds

Vintage Archaeology

Please submit all photos digitally to the OAS by email; the photo must be in a .jpeg format and be 4MB or less in size. Send email submissions to oas-symposium@ontarioarchaeology.org. The competition will be judged by you during the Symposium on Saturday, the people that make archaeology happen in Ontario. Winners will be announced during the Saturday reception, so please make sure to attend. All submitted photos will be available for viewing during the day on Saturday for voting purposes which will close at 4:30p.m.

All category winners (first place) will receive a complimentary year membership to the OAS and a selection of top photos will be featured in Arch Notes in 2020 as well as on our social media platforms. The photos will also be displayed via projection at the Symposium during the Saturday evening reception.

Rules:

- Photos can be either in colour or Black and White
- For all categories, except the Vintage Archaeology, the photo must have been taken within the past five years.
- For Vintage Archaeology category, the photo should be over 25 years old
- The photo should be of a subject captured in Ontario.
- If the photo clearly shows an individual who can be readily identified, the photographer needs to submit a completed Release Form to OAS for each identifiable individual in the photo. If the identifiable individual is a child (18 years or under), a completed Release Form signed by the parent/guardian is required
- By submitting the photo to OAS you are giving OAS the right to show your photo for the duration of the Symposium and to use the photo for a two year period afterwards for marketing purposes.
- If Photoshop or any other media manipulation program is used, it must be declared at submission; manipulation should be kept to a minimum.
- The photo must conform to the OAS Code of Ethics. No offensive, inappropriate or images that reflect poorly on OAS will be considered.



The ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY Inc.

Grand River

chapter

President: Chris Dalton
Vice President: Chris Watts
Treasurer: Bonnie Glencross
Secretary: TBA
Meetings: 2nd Tuesday of each month Sept.-April
Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology building (PAS) 1241
(First Floor), University of Waterloo (South Campus)
Website: <https://sites.google.com/site/grandriveroas/home>

Hamilton

chapter

President: Emily Anson
Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
Treasurer/Membership: Ruth Macdougall
Events Co-ordinator: TBA
E-mail: hamiltonOAS@hwn.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 \$11, Family \$18

Hurononia

chapter

President: John Raynor
Vice President: Dayle Elder
Secretary: Peter Davis
Treasurer: Jo-Ann Knicely
Member-at-Large: Jim Stewart
Meetings: Year Round at the Midland Public Library
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$18
Student \$10

London

chapter

President: Chris Ellis
Vice President: Darcy Fallon
Treasurer: Jim Keron
Secretary: Nicole Aszalos
Directors: Nancy Van Sas, Chris Watts, Shari Prowse
and Larry Nielsen
KEWA Editors: Christine Dodd,
Chris Ellis & Chris Watts
Web: www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/oas
Email: oaslondonchapter@gmail.com
Mail: Museum of Ontario Archaeology, 1600
Attawandaron Rd.,
London, ON N6G 3M6
Phone: (519) 473-1360 Fax (519) 473-1363
Meetings: 7:30 pm on 2nd Thursday of the month
except May–August; at MOA
Membership: Individual/Family \$18, Student,
\$15, Institutional \$21

Ottawa

chapter

President: André Miller
Vice President: Stacey Girling-Christie
Secretary: Karen Lochhead

Treasurer: Bill MacLennan
Directors at large: Bradley Drouin, Elizabeth
Imrie, Glenna Roberts, Sarah Taylor, Phil Trotter,
Mel Massey & Ben Mortimer
Ottawa Archaeologist Editor: Marian Clark
Web master: Yvon Riendeau
Peggy Armstrong Public Archaeology Award:
Lois King
Web: www.ottawaaoas.ca
Email address: ottawaaoas@gmail.com
Mail: PO Box 4939, Station E,
Ottawa ON K1S 5J1
Meetings: Every 2nd Thursday of the month
from Sept. to May; usually at Routhier
Community Centre, 172 Guigues Street,
Ottawa (in the Byward Market)
Membership: Individual \$20, Family \$25,
Student \$12

Peterborough

chapter

President: Sheryl Smith
Treasurer: Deb Mohr
Vice-President: Tom Mohr
Sec: Dirk Verhulst
Directors: Kate Dougherty, Julie Kapyrka, Jolyana
Saule and Morgan Tamplin.
Meetings: the fourth Tuesday of each month,
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$15,
Student \$8
Strata Editor: Dirk Verhulst
Web: peterborough.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
Facebook: Peterborough Chapter Ontario
Archaeological Society

Thunder Bay

chapter

President: Clarence Surette
Vice-President: Dave Norris
Secretary/Treasurer: Tasha Hodgson
Director: Jill Taylor-Hollings
Newsletter Editor (Wanikan): Clarence Surette, Jill
Taylor-Hollings, and Scott Hamilton
Web Design/Photography: Chris McEvoy
E-mail: clarence.surette@lakeheadu.ca
[http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?
display=page&pageid=80](http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?display=page&pageid=80)
Meetings: 7 pm on the last Friday of the month
in Room BB0017, Braun Building, Lakehead
University
Membership: \$5

Toronto

chapter

President: Carole Stimmel
Past President: Mima Kapches
Vice President: Christine Caroppo
Treasurer: Sam MacLoed
Secretary: Neil Gray
PROFILE Editor: Carole Stimmel
Web: <http://toronto.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>
Email: TorontoArchaeology@gmail.com
Meetings: 7:30 pm on the 3rd Wednesday

of the month, except June–August
in U of T Anthropology Building,
Room 246, 19 Russell St.
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$14

Windsor

chapter

President: Amanda Black
Vice President: Rosemarie Denuzio
Secretary: Barbara Johnson
Treasurer: Michael McMaster
Student Outreach: Zach Hamm
Website/Newsletter Editor: Katherine Graham
Web: <http://sites.google.com/site/windsoroas>
Contact: oaswindsor@gmail.com
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$20,
Students \$5

MEMBERSHIP

	Without OA / With OA
Individual	45 (65)* / 57 (77)*
Family	52 (72) / 64 (84)
Student	25 (45) / 34 (54)
Institutional	75 (includes OA)
Life	800 (includes OA)

* Effective 2017, the print version of *Arch Notes* will cost \$20 per year to mail. Those receiving the email version of *Arch Notes* pay the lower fee.

ARCHNOTES SUBMISSIONS

Contributor Deadlines:
February 15
May 15
August 15
November 15
Send Articles to:
aneditor@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
or
Arch Notes editor
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1