

AN EVALUATION OF PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY IN CANADA

by Joanne Lea

To understand public archaeology in Canada - its definition and practice, an understanding of the history of its development and the milieu for archaeological work is necessary. In Canada, archaeology - as part of cultural heritage - is a provincial or territorial, rather than a national mandate. There are, therefore, thirteen sets of laws governing archaeological heritage - one set for each of the ten provinces and three territories. There is currently no national heritage legislation *per se* that calls for or requires the practice of public archaeology, although consultation with First Nations communities is required in order to obtain archaeological permits in British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut (Spurling 1988: 74).

Table 1 – Examples of archaeological terminology used in Canadian heritage legislation and guidelines

Province/Territory/Agency and legislation/guidelines	Terms to describe process of archaeology	Terms to describe focus of archaeological research
Alberta (Historical Resources Act 1988:14-15)	research	archaeological resource, archaeological property
British Columbia (Heritage Conservation Act 1996: 2)	heritage inspection, heritage investigation	heritage object, heritage site, heritage wreck
Manitoba (The Heritage Resource Act 1985: 1, 21)	heritage resource impact assessment, excavation, investigation	heritage object, heritage resource
New Brunswick (Historic Sites Protection Act 1983: 1) (Municipal Heritage Preservation Act 1978: 2)	heritage resource management	historic or anthropological site
Newfoundland Labrador (Historic Resources Act 1990: 3)	archaeological investigation	archaeological object, historic resource
Northwest Territories (Archaeological Sites Regulations 2001: 1,3)	search for or excavate archaeological sites	archaeological site, artifact

Nova Scotia (Nova Scotia Museum Act 1989: 3)	manage property; identify, mark, acquire, preserve and develop sites	articles or materials relating to human activities
Nunavut	archaeological research activities	heritage resources, archaeological resources
Ontario (Ontario Heritage Act 1990: 35)	archaeological fieldwork	resources of archaeological value
Parks Canada (1994: 119)	cultural resource management	heritage resource, cultural resource
Prince Edward Island (Heritage Places Protection Act 1988: 2-4)	only mention of: heritage plan, heritage impact statement	heritage place, historic resource
Québec (Loi sur les biens culturels 2005: 1, 14)	recherche archéologique	bien archéologique, découverte/fouille archéologique

Archaeology in Canada developed professionally with the 1910 and 1911 appointments of British-trained anthropologists, Sapir and Barbeau to federal positions in order to record indigenous peoples whose cultures were thought to be soon lost because of colonization policies (Taylor 1982: 3). Institutions such as provincial museums developed to house artifacts related to these kinds of studies, but archaeology itself was not a degree subject in Canadian universities until 1967 (Mackie 1995: 181). Prior to that, archaeology outside of government or museum auspices was practised by foreign-trained academics, or by avocational archaeologists such as Wilfrid Drury of London, Ontario (Van Sas 2006). The post-war construction boom led to the uncovering of archaeological heritage at an increasing rate in Canada, as elsewhere (Cleere 1989:2). Archaeology then became more professionalized through the development of the provincial/territorial legislation noted above. It was in the decades surrounding this rapid growth of archaeological practice that communities within Canadian archaeology came into being and became more and more entrenched. The academic foundation of Canadian archaeology gained a public presence with the development of the Archaeological Survey of Canada (ASC), as a government agency, associated with the national museum.

Through its members, the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA) was founded (Simonsen 1996:1). The focus of the ASC and hence the CAA on pre-contact archaeology led to the need for other archaeologists to focus on post-contact sites and resources. This came into being through the establishment of a National Historic Sites management mandate for the Parks Canada Agency, also a creation of the federal government (Burley 1994: 83). The development of provincial/territorial heritage legislation led to the concomitant development of provincial/territorial archaeological offices. These administered the legislated requirements for both existing avocational archaeologists and for consulting archaeological companies that came into existence. Each of these archaeological groups: federal academic (pre- and post-contact), provincial/territorial, avocational, consulting/professional had its own interests and affiliations, spread across the extensive geographical area that is Canada. The only national body to link all of these archaeological practitioners was the CAA, but its academic roots and pre-contact focus were sometimes seen (Ibid.) as not relevant to changing needs and practices in Canadian archaeology.

Public archaeology, in Canada developed within this milieu, but at the same time, outside of it since it did not fit into the established communities when it became practice in the late 1970s and 1980s. The Archaeological Survey of Alberta's (ASA) program at the Strathcona Interpretive Centre, near Edmonton opened in 1979 as did the Boyd Outdoor Education Centre's field school, near Toronto (Devine 1985; Lea pers. comm.). The then Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture's program would become the Toronto Board of Education's Archaeological Resource Centre (ARC) in 1984 (Smardz

1994). Canadian public archaeology was at the forefront in the international development of public archaeological programming at this time (Ibid.) but was to be a victim to budget cuts and financial restraint by the 1990s. Strathcona and the ARC were closed and while Boyd continued, it became a floating program without a base at the Boyd Outdoor Education Centre, which was also closed (Respondent 5). In this climate of financial restraint, Canadian public archaeologists such as Smardz, and Hansen (pers. comm.) joined international archaeological communities such as the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) and the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) and continued to develop resources for public archaeology in those venues and to share with colleagues in Canada. Public archaeology programs did continue to develop, but locally and in smaller formats with affiliations to avocational groups, museums and even private companies. Innovative and engaging practices such as those at the Museum of Ontario Archaeology were ongoing in these programs, but taking place in splendid isolation from one another.

Studies in Canada by Pokotylo and Mason (1991), Pokotylo and Guppy (1999) and Pokotylo (2002) showed that the Canadian public in the province of British Columbia and nationally felt that archaeology was worthy of support, but that it did have misinformation about practices and cultural history (e.g. that of First Nations). A study by Rowley (2006) showed that Canadian archaeologists within the CAA had general support for public archaeology, if not direct practice and wanted it to serve as a vehicle to educate and inculcate the public. King's study (2006) showed that municipal officials in British Columbia supported archaeological work but required further information in

order to include it routinely in the planning processes. However, these data remained uncorrelated with each other.

The development of public archaeology in disparate communities in Canada and the disparate understandings about public archaeology were therefore the focus of a study. Its goals were to evaluate the definitions and practices of public archaeology by stakeholders across Canada in relation to the understandings that participants in Canadian public archaeology programs held.

The research was undertaken as part of doctoral studies at the International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies (ICCHS) at Newcastle University in the U.K., under the supervision of Dr. Peter Stone. In the study, areas of convergence and divergence in understanding about public archaeology between stakeholders and program participants were explored and recommendations made about future directions for Canadian public archaeology.

The study consisted of English or French survey questionnaires and/or interviews completed by fifty-three (of 180 contacted) stakeholders from across Canada. Stakeholders were defined as those charged with the investigation, presentation and curation of Canada's archaeological heritage. They represented a variety of sectors of archaeological work (government, academic, avocational, professional, museum-based, First Nations). As well, survey questionnaires were completed by one hundred and seventeen participants in public archaeology programs that agreed to take part in the study. These programs were in Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. In addition, focus group research was conducted with elementary teachers in Ontario and Alberta - the two provinces in which archaeology *per se* is mentioned in official

provincial curricula - and with CAA members who joined a public archaeology interest group. Public archaeology programs were also directly observed, with one at Bonnechère Provincial Park serving as the basis of a case study. Further questionnaire data from participants in public archaeology programs were provided by the Manitoba Archaeological Society and by the Grace Adams Metawewinihk Archaeological Project, in Saskatchewan. Data were analysed for trends, using SPSS (2006) and NVIVO7 (QSR 2007) software. Individual respondents' identities remained confidential.

AREAS OF CONVERGENCE

Preliminary results from this study point to the following areas of convergence.

Among Stakeholders

Stakeholders most frequently (25 of 53) defined archaeology in terms of study related to the past. Most frequently, public archaeology was defined in terms of presentation of archaeology to the public. The culture studied was most frequently seen not to have impact upon archaeology. Neither did legislation (outside of licence/permit requirements) or codes of ethics have any major impact upon archaeological practices. Instead, personal beliefs or experience were the most common reasons cited for the practices adopted. Answers to questions about which attitudes among the public to encourage and discourage centred predominantly around protection of archaeological sites and heritage from looting and vandalism. A majority of stakeholders (28) indicated that they had taken part in public archaeology in the past and thirty-one indicated that they did so in the present. The majority response to a question about future participation in public archaeology was to leave the question unanswered.

Among Participants in Public Archaeology Programming

Table 2 - Participants in the study came from the following groups

Programs whose participants completed survey questionnaires	Programs directly observed	Programs visited but not observed	Programs that provided additional data
Boyd Archaeological Field School Toronto, Ontario	Archaeological Services Inc. Toronto, Ontario	University of Calgary, Fish Creek Provincial Park, Alberta	Grace Adams Metawewinihk Archaeological Project Saskatoon, Sask.
Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation Kingston, Ontario	Bonnechère Provincial Park Round Lake, Ontario	Wanuskewin Heritage Park Saskatoon, Sask.	Manitoba Archaeological Society Winnipeg, Man.
Father Leo Austin Catholic Secondary School Whitby, Ontario	Boyd Archaeological Field School Toronto, Ontario		
Grace Adams Metawewinihk Archaeological Project Saskatoon, Sask.	Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation Kingston, Ontario		
Ontario Heritage Trust Toronto, Ontario	Father Leo Austin Catholic Secondary School Whitby, Ontario		
Underwater Archaeology Society of British Columbia Vancouver, B.C.	Ontario Heritage Trust Toronto, Ontario		
	Museum of Ontario Archaeology London, Ontario		
	Pointe à Callière Montréal, Québec		

The most common definitions for archaeology and public archaeology respectively were "digging up artifacts" and "public participation in excavation". An overwhelming majority of participants felt that archaeology, artifacts and sites were important and deserving of protection. A majority of participants also had no idea how archaeology, artifacts or sites were or should be protected. Archaeologists were seen as the most common practitioners of archaeology in Canada and study/becoming an archaeologist was therefore the most common way suggested to take part in archaeology.

There was a general understanding that increasing knowledge of the past was the goal of archaeology as was the protection of archaeological heritage. The vast majority of participants were aware that First Nations were the first people in Canada and felt that their past was important, but also could not provide much related information about First Nations' history (even when working on sites with First Nations components).

Successful (those of more than five year duration) public archaeology programs observed such as that at the Museum of Ontario Archaeology showed some common characteristics i.e. permanent paid staff, nearby permanent facilities to house services (washrooms, telephone, first aid) and artifact storage, institutional support (insurance, infrastructure such as computers).

The characteristics of participating programs are outlined in Table 3 below.

Teachers in focus groups most commonly felt archaeology was a study of the past but that it took place outside of Canada (e.g. in Egypt). They could see avenues through which to include it in classroom teaching. All wanted access to more reaching resources since most did not know of any available locally, on site, as outreach or online.

Participants in the CAA focus group, including staff from the Museum of Ontario Archaeology saw a need to continue to work together to promote public archaeology in Canada and saw the CAA as the national vehicle and communication route to link this process.

Convergences between Stakeholders and Participants

The areas where stakeholders and participants in public archaeology programs shared understandings for the most part were:

- that archaeology is important and should be protected

- that archaeology is undertaken primarily by archaeologists
- that the public is defined primarily as non-archaeologists
- that archaeology is undertaken/sites protected in order to understand the past

Table 3 - Public Archaeology Programs Directly Observed

	ASI	Bonnechère 1	Bonnechère 2	Boyd	CARF	Fr. Leo Austin	OHT	MOA
location	Markham, Ont. suburb	Bonnechère Provincial Park interpretive centre Round Lake, Ontario	Bonnechère Provincial Park interior Round Lake, Ontario	Claremont Conservation Dormitory and site in Scarborough (Toronto), Ont.	CARF offices and Royal Military College, Kingston, Ont.	secondary school and 19 th century barracks, Whitby, Ont.	Spadina House, Toronto, Ont.	Lawson Site on museum grounds, suburban London, Ontario
duration	one day	one morning	one day	three weeks (110 hours)	one week	three months (110 hours)	one week	one week
site type	Iroquoian village	not on site, simulated	post -contact farm settlements	Iroquoian settlement	19 th century military fortification	19 th century barracks	19 th century stately home	Iroquoian village
program type	tour, screening, demonstration	activity centres	site tours	high school credit with instruction, excavation and reporting	summer camp with instruction, excavation and reporting	high school credit with instruction, excavation and reporting	summer camp with instruction, excavation and activities	summer program with introduction and excavation
promotion used	mailed invitation	posters in park	posters in park and word of mouth	poster and e-mail contact with all Ontario high schools	online information, newspaper, radio, TV, community presence	high school calendar of courses offered	word of mouth, recreation department publication, online	posters, online, newspaper, word of mouth
clients	members of Heritage Toronto	park visitors the day of program	park visitors, Friends, OAS members	all Ontario and other interested high school students	children aged 10 to 13 (in Kingston)	high school students from the school	children aged 10 to 13 (in Toronto)	children aged 10 and older
staff	3 company partners, 4 staff archaeologists, 1 First Nations representative	8 volunteers from Ottawa OAS	1 park staff 1 historian	2 Conservation Authority archaeologists, 2 student staff, 1 teacher	1 staff archaeologist, 3 student staff	1 archaeologist, 1 teacher	1 staff archaeologist, 4 student staff	1 museum staff archaeologist

	ASI	Bonnechère 1	Bonnechère 2	Boyd	CARF	Fr. Leo Austin	OHT	MOA
ratio of archaeological staff to participants	1: 3	1:4	no archaeologists but 1: 15 staff to participants	1:6	1:5	1:22	1:5	1:4
financing	CRM company subsidized program	park paid for posters, OAS provided volunteer staff and materials	park staff paid by MNR, historian volunteered time	Toronto Conservation Authority paid staff archaeologists, School board pays teacher, participants pay tuition to cover other costs	CRM company subsidizes staff cost, grants to hire student staff, participants pay fee to cover other costs	School board pays teacher, fee charged to students for transport, supplies and some services of archaeologist	OHT pays staff archaeologist, grants to hire student staff, participants pay fee to cover other costs	museum pays staff, participants pay fee to cover other costs
transportation	busing provided to site from parking area	participants provided own	participants provided own (car pooled)	participants provided own to dormitories and bus provided from there to site	participants provided own	school bus to school and to site	participants provide own, site on public transit	participants provide own, site near public transit
facilities	portable toilet, 1 pail water, staff cell phone	interpretive centre, washrooms, phone, tables, food services, garbage collection, first aid kit and staff	cell phone of site staff	on site: staff cell phone, lunches, portable toilet, first aid kit, table with one tarpaulin at dormitory: phones, food services, security, first aid, lounge, classes, bedrooms,	on site: washrooms, tarps, phone, first aid, security at office: phone, washrooms, first aid, security, class space, lunch room	on site: cell phone of teacher in class: washroom, phone, first aid, security, class space, food services	phone, washrooms, first aid, security, tarps, rain shelter, lab space, tables, snacks	phone, washrooms, first aid, security, use of museum during poor weather and for storage, enclosed site with long-term usage

	ASI	Bonnechère 1	Bonnechère 2	showers Boyd	CARF	Fr. Leo Austin	OHT	MOA
First Nations input, contact or participation worked well	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no
needed to be addressed	ratio of staff to participants, respect for First Nations ancestors lack of :weather shelter, first aid, water; focus on finding unprovenienced artifacts from midden in screens	activities engaged public interest, ratio of staff to participants, facilities available public gained no overall understanding of archaeology - just wandered from activity to activity, promotion	access to sites and parking, use of visual aids lack of washrooms, shade, water, poor condition of road access, few public attended, lack of site security	facilities in dormitories, expertise and ratio of staff, promotion lack of weather shelter on site, lack of site security	facilities both in office and on site, quality of instruction and staff, promotion, shade, site security more accessible transportation	facilities, curriculum, staff staff to student ratio, reliance on voluntary services of archaeologist	facilities, staff expertise and ratio to children, promotion, public transport available, site security curriculum could address ethical issues more fully	facilities, staff to participant ratio, staff expertise, site security promotion, continuous on-site supervision, protocols for interaction with human remains

ASI - Archaeological Services Inc.

Bonnechère - Bonnechère Provincial Park

Boyd - Boyd Archaeological Field School

CARF - Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation

Fr. Leo Austin - Fr. Leo Austin Catholic Secondary School

OAS - Ontario Archaeological Society

OHT - Ontario Heritage Trust

MOA - Museum of Ontario Archaeology

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

Among Stakeholders

The first point of note about divergence among stakeholders is that so many of those who a) were approached, b) originally agreed to take part and in particular c) took the time to reply that they declined to participate, felt that their contributions were not relevant. Of special concern is the lack of participation by First Nations communities and the statements by municipal planners, provincial curriculum consultants responsible for history/related studies and by the Canadian Museum Association implying that public archaeology was not within their mandates. Perhaps this confusion about mandate is owing to a very disparate overall definition of public archaeology (twenty-three different responses given in total) and definitions for archaeology itself that divided the focus among humans, artifacts and methodology.

Other glaring areas of divergence involved

- a) What was defined as public archaeology. While stakeholders did have a most frequently given definition for public archaeology, there were, in all twenty-three different definitions given. The variety of definitions could be categorized into definitions to benefit archaeologists/archaeology and definitions to benefit the public.
- b) The same categorization of responses was noted in the answers to what the public should know about archaeology and why.
- c) Again categories of answers that split stakeholders between those who saw public archaeology in the service of archaeology and those who saw it in the service of the public were evident with respect to the question about what parts of archaeological

research the public should have access to. About one third of respondents expressed a desire for the public to have unrestricted access to archaeology in order to empower and enrich itself. Other respondents saw the need to limit and restrict access - especially to site locations - usually to protect archaeological heritage from the public.

- d) It is true that most stakeholders saw no impact of culture studied upon practice, but the vehemence of those who disagreed with the majority points nonetheless to an area of divergence in understanding.
- e) The thirty-seven different answers about future directions for archaeology suggested a lack of focus by stakeholders regarding this concept. Most responses were about continuing with current practices.

Among Participants in Public Archaeology Programs

Participants in public archaeology programs gave generally consistent responses to each question, irrespective of age, education or program length. The divergences in participant responses came in the form of contradictions. Participants saw archaeologists, not themselves taking part in public archaeology despite their presence at an archaeological program. They also felt that archaeologists both do and should put artifacts and research in public venues (museums, displays) foremost, in order to share results. Sharing with the public, not archaeologists was thus the prime focus seen for archaeology. Also contradictory was the desire by participants to take part in other programs while having no real interest overall in acquiring further information about archaeology.

Between Stakeholders and Participants

The most flagrant area of divergence between stakeholders and participants is in the definition for archaeology. Stakeholders focused on the study of the human past while participants and teachers focused predominantly upon excavation of artifacts. Most stakeholders expressed that a focus on excavations and artifacts was a misunderstanding to be addressed by public archaeology on the one hand. On the other hand, many stakeholders also listed public excavation as a key form of public archaeology. While stakeholders also saw public archaeology as a key vehicle to educate the public in order to protect archaeological heritage, nonetheless, participants in public archaeology programs could not give information about First Nations heritage, about who protected archaeological heritage, about what they could do themselves to protect archaeological heritage or even about where to visit sites of archaeological heritage in Canada. Finally, even though stakeholders saw numerous avenues for public archaeology, most participants in public archaeology programs had not been inspired to want to know more about archaeology in Canada.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY IN CANADA BASED ON DATA

Implications from the analysis to date of areas of convergence and divergence of understandings among study subjects are discussed below.

Definitions: In order for the public to have the understanding of archaeology that stakeholders preferred it to have, there would need to be a discussion among stakeholders first about just what archaeology and public archaeology are and are not and about how that message should be conveyed. If excavation is the prime vehicle for public archaeology, it is not surprising that program participants see it as archaeology *per se*.

One key point to figure in discussions about the definition and practice of public archaeology centres around control over the resource as the purpose of public archaeology. As early as 1988-89 (Trigger; McGee) the control over/sharing of archaeology in Canada was raised as an issue with respect to pre-contact heritage and First Nations. The issue of control with respect to First Nations was discussed within the Canadian museum community (Canadian Museum of Civilization 1996). It was implied in the adoption of the CAA's Principles of Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal peoples (1996). However, the lack of influence of such principles in on stakeholders across Canada and the lack of First Nations participation in most study programs underscores the need for discussion of an inclusive definition of public archaeology.

Communication: In the absence of clear understandings of what archaeology or public archaeology are across the country, or even within provinces/territories, the public unaware of what archaeology is; where to find it; what to do if they do. Also, stakeholders, such as some key educators, planners and museum administrators do not consider public archaeology as part of their mandates. This is of particular concern since schools (MacDonald and Burtness 2000) and museums (Cannon and Cannon 1996) are the face of archaeology for much of the public. Museums also house many archaeological collections and are repositories for data for the national Historic Places Initiative (HPI) to record significant archaeological sites (Canada 2003). Only one stakeholder was aware of the HPI. Stakeholders across the country or within the same province or even building were unaware of the public archaeology work of colleagues. This kind of isolation among public archaeology practitioners has led to the continual re-invention of the public archaeology wheel in Canada and the perpetuation of programming difficulties. Pockets

of excellence and expertise in public archaeology programming such as at the Museum of Ontario Archaeology exist across the country, but without readily available channels for sharing information or practices or for addressing areas of concern with public archaeology colleagues.

The existence of public archaeology resources has not led directly to public awareness of them. Most program participants surveyed could not name Canadian archaeological sites other than that of their own program and most teachers were unaware of local resources.

The above communication difficulties point to the need for a forum in which stakeholders can discuss definitions and practices and for a more organized and direct effort to convey these definitions and practices to the public.

Protocols: Within discussions of definitions of public archaeology should be discussions of what constitutes good practice. This was a key requisite of recent planning discussions by the CAA (Hanna pers. comm: 2006). If personal beliefs are the key governing factor for current practice, as indicated from the study, questions about ethical and legal obligations of public archaeology beg to be examined and should be informed by national and international best practices. Questions across Canada to be addressed include:

1. What are and should be the relationships between public archaeology programs and First Nations on sites with evidence of pre-contact, or with other descendent populations?
2. What safety, medical and ultimately [liability] insurance protocols are and should be observed for the presence of non-professionals on a work site (particularly one that could include metal and bone fragments)?

3. What safety and supervision protocols are and should be in place specifically when working with minor children (e.g. supervision ratios, criminal checks of staff, photograph permission forms, responsibilities of care such as in child custody matters)?
4. What protocols are or should be in place when there is a possibility that program participants would interact with culturally sensitive materials such as sacred items or human remains (on site and in terms of media relations)?

Avenues: The key avenues for discussing definitions, protocols and practices for public archaeology programming in Canada at a national level would be Parks Canada and the ASC; the Canadian Association of Provincial and Territorial Archaeologists (CAPTA) to link key federal and provincial/territorial archaeologists and the CAA for the majority of stakeholders in Canadian archeology. Discussion generated within and among these communities about public archaeology needs to be inclusive of other stakeholder groups such as museums, educators, planners and First Nations. An institution such as the Museum of Ontario Archaeology, with multiple affiliations across stakeholder groups can serve as a link and a catalyst for such discussions.

This study to evaluate definitions and practices of public archaeology in Canada will be completed within the year. It will then be available through ICCHS and to stakeholders in Canada such as the CAA. In the interim, initial findings are presented, with the permission of ICCHS, in part for review and comment by selected study participants and at an international level such as at this forum.

RESPONSE TO THE EVALUATION

By: Nancy VanSas, Program & Exhibit Co-ordinator, Museum of Ontario Archaeology

The Museum of Ontario Archaeology, formerly the Museum of Indian Archaeology (1931 – 1992) and the London Museum of Archaeology (1991 – 2005), is a premiere institute devoted to the study of archaeology. The Museum contains a Research Institute and a Public Program Branch. The mandate of the Public Program Branch is: *“to encourage public understanding of human occupation of southwestern Ontario over the past 12,000 years; will stimulate respect for the cultural achievements of Ontario’s pre-contact and early historic peoples; and will engage the public in an appreciation of the archaeology that generates this knowledge. Through a variety of learning experiences, establishing a sense of connection with the living cultures of today’s First Nations”*.

The Museum is an advocate of ‘public archaeology’ by promoting the discipline of archaeology through its educational programs, while teaching its visitors on the importance of archaeology in documenting Ontario’s pre-European contact history. A key component in public archaeology is public excavation, but should only be considered one aspect. The dissemination of information gleaned from archaeological excavations is equally important and should also be considered a key component of public archaeology. The Museum strives to incorporate both aspects of public archaeology into its mandate, while providing quality programming, exhibitions, special events and services to its audiences, a diverse community of visitors, through its galleries, theatre, laboratories, and adjacent partially reconstructed Iroquoian village. The Museum also strives to provide a

phenomenal visitor experience that is recognized throughout Ontario provincially, Canada nationally, and the world internationally.

The Museum is adjacent to the Lawson Neutral Iroquoian site, a nationally recognized archaeological site that was once the home of approximately 1,500 to 2,000 Neutral Iroquoians c. AD. 1540. The site is a very rich, mainly undisturbed site, atop of a bluff, at the juncture of Snake and Medway Creeks, two tributaries located off the Thames River in the northwest corner of the city of London, Ontario, Canada. The site was inhabited for approximately 15 to 20 years, leaving behind a rich, cultural deposit before its occupants relocated to the Brantford/Hamilton area where they are reported to have been living at the time of European contact.

The disturbed portion of the site, comprising approximately 1 acre or 20% of the site, was excavated during the late 1970's by Museum staff using controlled research methods of excavation. The undisturbed portion, approximately 4 acres, are currently being excavated through public programs, such as field schools, high school programs, weekend excavation programs and summer day camps for children 11+ and simulated excavations for children under eleven years of age. These programs are taught by qualified Museum staff. A 1 to 5 ratio is maintained to ensure that there is sufficient trained staff to monitor the participants to ensure the preservation of the archaeological site. Approximately ten 1 metre by 1 metre units are excavated yearly through these programs. It is estimated that the Museum will be able to offer public excavation programs over the course of the next 200 years.

As a public institution, the Museum maintains policies for handling archaeological materials, including human remains. Dr. Michael Spence, leading

physical anthropologist on Ontario and Mexican osteology, is the former Lawson Chair and since his retirement in 2006, a professor of meritass at the University of Western Ontario. Since 2005, Spence has been a part of the Museum team. He assists in the identification of human remains uncovered at the Lawson site and sets the protocols to follow in handling human remains.

The Museum is also increasing its relationships with First Nations' communities in the London region, to ensure the proper handling of sacred objects discovered through excavations on the Lawson site. Recently, the Museum was approached by the N'Amerind Friendship Centre, a Native healing centre in the city of London, to work collaboratively with the centre and the Thames Valley District School Board on the creation of a school devoted to the training of aboriginal and non-aboriginal students on the culture, traditions and history of First Nations of southern Ontario as the core of their curriculum. The Museum has worked with other institutions, such as the Gathering of the Good Minds, a committee of aboriginal and non-aboriginal people from the city of London devoted to the education of residents on the importance of First Nations' traditions and cultures. These collaborations are building up relationships between the Museum and the First Nations' communities to document, preserve and educate others on the importance of archaeology in documenting southern Ontario's pre-contact histories.

The Museum, as a public facility, is also responsible for ensuring the safety of its visitors, including participants in the 'public archaeology' programs. Policies are in place to ensure proper conduct on the archaeological site. In addition, the Program & Exhibit Co-ordinator, the staff person delivering the programs, is the Health and Safety representative at the Museum. A criminal check was also done on that staff person to

ensure the safety of the youth who participate. The Museum also has a 2 million dollar liability insurance policy to protect the Museum and its participants in case of an accident on the site.

Public Archaeology is a relatively new term, coined in the archaeological field to indicate the education of the public on the importance of preserving the archaeological record in order to document our pre-European contact history. However, public archaeology is certainly not a new discipline. Wilfrid Jury, the Museum of Ontario Archaeology's founder, was instrumental in advocating public archaeology in Ontario and Quebec. Jury taught field schools in the Midland area (approximately 1.5 hours north of Toronto), the home of the Huron (Wendat) Iroquoians and the location of the first Jesuit missions in Ontario. Through this advocacy many university and high school youth were able to learn the techniques of archaeology while excavating on many of these unique cultural sites. Volunteers of all ages were also welcome and encouraged to participate. These 'public archaeology excavations' were occurring during the 1940's through to the late 1970's.

The Museum continued Jury's legacy through public excavations at the Lawson site during the full scale excavation of the disturbed portions of the site from 1977 to 1979. Museum visitors were encouraged to interact with the archaeologists and to try their hand at excavations. An Archaeological Interpreter is hired annually during the summer months to interact with the visiting public to educate them on the importance of archaeology and the artifacts that are uncovered through the course of excavations.

The Museum works very closely with such organizations as the Ontario Archaeological Society, namely the London Chapter. Joint programming between the

Museum and the London Chapter occur on a regular basis. Each summer, the London Chapter hosts an 'Artifact Identification Clinic', where members of the local community can attend to learn about their artifacts. The Ontario Archaeological Society main body also hosts a similar event, 'Archaeology Days', where the Society opens its doors to the public to educate, through hands-on activities, the discipline of archaeology and the histories of the people that inhabited this land prior to European contact. In addition to 'artifact clinics' the London Chapter also conducts public excavations, enabling participants to interact and learn from trained archaeologists.

In order to undertake any archaeological field work in Ontario, the Ontario Heritage Act requires that a person, presumably the field supervisor, obtain a valid archaeological licence [under Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, section 48(1)]. This places the responsibility of public archaeology in the hands of 'archaeologists', rather than the lay society. The bulk of excavations, approximately 99%, that occur in southern Ontario are carried out through cultural resource management (CRM). Due to various reasons, including liability, CRM firms are unable to accept volunteers to participate in excavations. It then becomes the responsibility of research archaeologists and museum staff, such as the Museum of Ontario Archaeology, to provide opportunities in public archaeology.

Public archaeology, in its new or old form, is a growing interest in the field of archaeology. Institutions devoted to archaeology, such as the Museum of Ontario Archaeology, is delivering programs to meet the demand, however, other institutions, organizations and individuals can assist in this educating process. Collaboration does need to occur between 'public archaeology' facilities, such as the Museum of Ontario

Archaeology and the Cataraqui Archaeological Centre. However, this collaboration should not end there. Other organizations, such as the Canadian Archaeological Association and the Ontario Archaeological Association should be an instrumental part in educating people on the importance of archaeology in Ontario and providing opportunities for hands-on learning through public excavations. In addition, research archaeologists should provide more opportunities for 'public excavations' and consulting archaeologists (working in CRM) should publish reports on their excavations to disseminate their findings to the public and other researchers at large. The educational system should also promote the preservation of the archaeological record as part of Ontario's heritage. All efforts should be made to work with First Nations' communities to protect, and educate themselves and others on the importance of their culture and traditions as they are preserved through the archaeological record. Together, we will all make a difference in providing opportunities for 'public archaeology'.

REFERENCES CITED

- Burley, David V. 1994. 'A Never Ending Story: Historical Developments in Canadian Archaeology. The Quest for Federal Heritage Legislation' in *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 18 pp. 77-98
- Canada. 2003. *Historic Places Initiative* on http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/ieh-hpi/index_e.cfm (Ottawa: Canadian Heritage) [accessed 28 December, 2004]
- Canadian Archaeological Association. 1996. 'Principles of Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal Peoples' in *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 21 pp. 5-6
- Canadian Museum of Civilization with the Commonwealth Association of Museums and the University of Victoria. 1996. 'Curatorship: Indigenous Perspectives in Post-colonial Societies - Proceedings' in *Mercury Series Paper 8* (Hull P.Q: Canadian Museum of Civilization)
- Cannon, Debbie and Aubrey Cannon. 1996. 'Archaeology's Public: A Perspective From Two Canadian Museums' in *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 20 pp. 29-38
- Cleere, H. 1989. *Archaeological Heritage Management in a Modern World*
- Devine, H. 1985. *Curriculum Development in Archaeology and Prehistory* (Edmonton: Archeological Survey of Alberta)
- King, Amanda. 2006. *Archaeology and Local Governments* (Toronto: unpublished paper presented at the Canadian Archaeological Association conference)
- MacDonald, Cathy and Paula Burtness. 2000. 'Accessing Educational Systems in Canada and the United States' in Smardz, Karolyn and Shelley Smith *The Archaeology Education Handbook* (Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press) pp. 42-53
- Mackie, Quentin. 1995. 'Prehistory in a Multicultural State; in Ucko, Peter J. 1995. *Theory in Archaeology* (London and New York: Routledge) pp. 178-196.
- McGee, Robert. 1989. 'Who Owns Prehistory? The Bering Land Bridge Dilema' in *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 13 pp. 13-20
- Pokotylo, D. 2002. 'Public Opinion and Canadian Archaeological Heritage: A National Perspective' *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 26 pp. 88-129
- Pokotylo, D. and A. Mason. 1991. 'Public Attitudes towards Archaeological Resources and their Management' in Smith, G.S. and J.E. Ehrenhard (eds.) *Protecting the Past* (Boca Raton: CRC Press) pp. 9-18

- Pokotylo, D. and N. Guppy. 1999 'Public Opinion and Archaeological Heritage: Views From Outside the Profession' in *American Antiquity* 64(3) 400-416.
- QSR. 2007. *NVivo7* (Doncaster: QSR Internationaly Pty Ltd.)
- Rowley, S. 2006. *Communicating with the Public* (Toronto: unpublished paper presented at the Canadian Archaeological Association conference)
- Simonsen, Bjorn O. 1996. 'The Canadian Archaeological Association and the Development of Archaeology in Canada' in <http://www.canadianarchaeology.com/history/bjorn.lasso> [accessed 11 March, 2005]
- Smardz, Karolyn. 1994. 'Archaeology in the Toronto School System: the Archaeological Resource Centre' in Stone, Peter G. and Robert MacKenzie (eds.) *The Excluded Past One World Archaeology Series no. 17* (London: Routledge)
- Smardz, Karolyn, 1995. *Doing Archaeology in Public: Heritage Interpretation in a Multicultural Society* (Minneapolis MN: The Institute for Minnesota Archaeology)
- Spurling, Brian. 1988. 'Archaeology and the Policy Sciences' in *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 12 pp. 65-79
- SPSS. 2006. *Graduate Pack 15. for Windows* (SPSS Inc.)
- Taylor, William E. (ed.). 1982. 'Marius Barbeau 1883-1969' in *Oracle Series* no. 44 (Ottawa: National Museum of Man)
- Trigger, B. 1988. 'Who Owns the Past?' in *Muse* 6(3)
- Van Sas, N. 2006. (Toronto: unpublished paper presented at the Canadian Archaeological Association conference)

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS CITED

- Hanna, M. - president Canadian Archaeological Association 2007-2008
- Hansen, D. - affiliated with Parks Canada, Atlantic Service Centre
- Lea, T. - [no relation to the author] principal of the Boyd Archaeological Field School
- Respondent 5 - individual identity is covered by study confidentiality. Affiliation was with the Boyd Archaeological Field School
- Smardz, K. - currently executive director of the Ontario Historical Society and now using the name Smardz-Frost