
Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop

**Hull, Quebec
11-13 March 1992**



**Environment Canada
Parks Service**

**Environnement Canada
Service des parcs**

Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop

**Hull, Quebec
11-13 March 1992**

National Historic Sites
Parks Service
Environment Canada

©Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1993

Published under the authority
of the Minister of the Environment
Ottawa, 1993.

Cat. No.: R61-51/1-1992 E
ISBN: 0-662-20364-X

Editing and design: Jean Brathwaite
Production: Lucie Forget and Rod Won

While supplies last, copies of this book are available free of charge to interested researchers. Write to National Historic Sites Publications, Parks Service, Environment Canada, 1600 Liverpool Court, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0H3.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français.

The videotapes and audiotapes from the Reconstruction Workshop are now housed in the Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Environment Canada, 5th Floor, Jules Léger Building, 25 Eddy Street, Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A 0H3.

Contents

- 5 **Goals and Objectives**
- 6 **Program Framework**
- 10 **Introductory Remarks**
Christina Cameron
- 13 **The Cultural Resource Management Policy and the Reconstruction Imbroglia**
George Ingram and Gordon Bennett
- 17 **Feedback on Participants' Expectations**
David Huddleston
- 21 **"Raising the Dead": Reconstruction within the Canadian Parks Service**
Shannon Ricketts
- 30 **CPS Reconstructions across the Country**
Mahlon Robinson
- 34 **The NPS Experience with Reconstruction**
Barry Mackintosh
- 36 **Evoking the Past or Provoking the Gods? Some Observations on Period Reconstructions**
Gordon Bennett
- Issue One**
- 41 **What Are the Challenges CPS Faces with Existing Reconstructions?**
George Ingram
- 43 **Fortress of Louisbourg NHS: Recapitalization of Reconstructions**
Bill Hockey
- 45 **Fort George**
Marilyn Watson
- 47 **Conservation Treatment of a Cultural Resource: Lower Fort Garry Walls**
Guy Masson
- 48 **The Fort Anne Officers' Quarters; A Reconstruction Case Study**
Bill Naftel
- Issue Two**
- 51 **What Are the Values of Reconstructions as They Relate to Presentation?**
Opening Remarks
Richard Lindo
- 52 **Period Reconstruction and Interpretation**
Richard Lavoie
- 56 **Value of Reconstructions to Fort George**
Mary Taylor
- 58 **The Place of Landscape, and Landscape as the Place**
Linda Dicaire Fardin
- 61 **The Value of Reconstruction**
William A. O'Shea
- 65 **Interpretation in a Building Re-Created to its Period Volume: The Case of the Grande Maison at the Forges du Saint-Maurice**
Michel Barry
- 67 **Contemporary Buildings within Historic Zones: An Alternative to the Reconstruction of Missing Structures at Fort Langley**
David Whiting and Jervis Swannack
- Issue Three**
- 70 **What Should CPS Do with Its Ageing Reconstructions?**
Compiled by Janet Weatherston

Issue Four		Issue Five	
75	What Are the Alternatives to Period Reconstruction? Moderator's Remarks Compiled by Janet Weatherston	88	What Are the Criteria for Reconstructions in the Future? Gordon Bennett et al.
76	Alternatives to Period Reconstruction: The Forges du Saint-Maurice Jean Barry and Pierre Paré	91	Plenary Working Session Tony Bull
79	Alternatives to Reconstruction: New Buildings Andrew Powter	94	Closing Remarks by Christina Cameron
82	Artists' Depictions as Alternatives to Reconstructions Steven Porter	95	Epilogue, January 1993 George Ingram
85	Point Wolfe Bridge, Fundy National Park Bill Naftel	97	Appendix A Confirmed Participant List
86	My Life Is in Ruins; or, The Limitations of Stabilization as a Presentation Technique Bruce Fry	100	Appendix B Recommended Readings on Reconstruction
		101	Appendix C Workshop Evaluation

Goals and Objectives

The Reconstruction Workshop will bring together expertise at all Program levels to work together on the issue of period reconstruction within the Canadian Parks Service. Its purpose is to provide a forum for Program discussion of the issue, to elaborate the CRM Policy, and to move towards consensus on implementation of the policy.

With the introduction of the CRM Policy, no one issue has created so much debate as period reconstruction. Traditionally, following American precedents such as Colonial Williamsburg, the Canadian Parks Service and other Canadian services have made extensive use of substantial built resources not deriving from their periods of historical significance to achieve presentation objectives. Although international documents such as the Venice Charter decry period reconstruction, rebuilt and animated sites are popular with the visiting public and can be an effective form of presentation. Approved management plans and other Program documents also contain commitments to further reconstruction. At the same time, ageing reconstructions in the CPS system

pose critical questions of resource investment for maintenance and intervention. Moreover, historical accuracy to the period represented is questionable in many cases, and inaccuracy is documented in others.

- The workshop will explain how thinking on the practice of reconstruction has evolved and how CPS has translated this thinking into policy.
- The workshop will examine reconstruction as an interpretive medium.
- The workshop will examine implications and approaches to managing CPS's ageing reconstructions.
- The workshop will examine alternatives to period reconstruction.
- The workshop will result in a position paper which will interpret policy and which will provide guidelines for implementation of the policy.
 - it will clarify how maintenance of and interventions to existing reconstructions will be applied under the CRM Policy.
 - it will clarify how proposed reconstructions will be considered under the proposed CRM Policy.

Program Framework

DAY ONE — MARCH 11, 1992

0830–0845	—	WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	
0845–0930	—	PLENARY — INTRODUCTION TO WORKSHOP <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Definition of the problem• Policy origins• Policy principles• Definition of reconstruction• What CRM Policy says on reconstruction	C. Cameron G. Ingram
0930–0945	—	PLENARY — FEEDBACK ON PARTICIPANTS' EXPECTATIONS Based on responses to questionnaires, the expectations of participants will be shared.	D. Huddleston
0945–1015	—	PLENARY — RAISING THE DEAD: HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF THE PRACTICE OF RECONSTRUCTION IN CPS — IDEOLOGY AND INFLUENCES Participants will be presented with a chronological overview of the practice of reconstructions in CPS and what influenced this practice.	S. Ricketts
1015–1030	—	Break	
1030–1100	—	PLENARY — SLIDE SHOW OF RECONSTRUCTIONS ACROSS THE COUNTRY (CPS) A visual voyage across Canada to demonstrate the wide practice of reconstructions within CPS.	M. Robinson
1100–1130	—	PLENARY — THE USNPS EXPERIENCE WITH RECONSTRUCTIONS Participants will learn how the United States National Park Service handles reconstructions.	B. Mackintosh
1130–1200	—	PLENARY — PERIOD RECONSTRUCTION: EVOKING THE PAST OR PROVOKING THE GODS?	G. Bennett
1200–1330	—	LUNCH — FUNCTIONAL GROUPS Participants are encouraged to lunch with their functional colleagues in order to exchange viewpoints. Details provided in participants' package.	
1330–1515	—	ISSUE ONE — WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES CPS FACES WITH EXISTING RECONSTRUCTIONS? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ageing buildings at critical stage• maintenance levels and costs• interventions — historical accuracy• FHBRO designations of heritage value	MODERATOR: G. Ingram
1330–1345	—	INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT	G. Ingram

- 1345–1445 — PRESENTATIONS:
- Fortress of Louisbourg B. Hockey
 - Fort George M. Watson
 - Vessels A. Barbour
 - Lower Fort Garry Walls G. Masson
 - Fort Anne Officers' Quarters B. Naftel
- 1445–1515 — Discussion; the moderator will summarize key points.
-
- 1515–1530 — Break
-
- 1530–1700 — ISSUE TWO — WHAT ARE THE VALUES OF RECONSTRUCTIONS AS THEY RELATE TO PRESENTATION? MODERATOR:
R. Lindo
- 1530–1550 — INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS:
Period reconstructions as interpretive tools R. Moreau
Period reconstructions from the perspective of the visitors' experience R. Lavoie
- 1550–1700 — PRESENTATIONS:
- Fort George M. Taylor
 - Landscapes L. Fardin
 - Louisbourg B. O'Shea
 - Forges du Saint-Maurice M. Barry
 - Fort Langley J. Swannack/
D. Whiting
- 1700–1730 — Discussion; the moderator will summarize key points.

END OF DAY ONE

DAY TWO — MARCH 12, 1992

- 0830–0845 — Summary of Day One discussions and introduction to Day Two S. Bugey
- 0845–1030 — ISSUE THREE — WHAT SHOULD CPS DO WITH ITS AGEING RECONSTRUCTIONS?
- restate challenges and values
 - what guidance does CRM give
- WORKSHOP SESSION ONE
- After a plenary introduction, participants will be broken into groups of interdisciplinary diversity to examine CRM's principles as they relate to reconstructions. Each group will have a discussion facilitator and a rapporteur who will report back at a plenary session.
- LEADER:
M. Archibald
- | GROUP | FACILITATOR | RAPPORTEUR |
|-------|--------------|-------------|
| A | M. CULLEN | D. SULLIVAN |
| B | T. KYNMAN | C. LACELLE |
| C | J. GRENVILLE | L. FARDIN |
| D | T. KOVACS | G. ATTAR |
| E | B. O'SHEA | J. DE JONGE |

Program Framework

1030–1045	—	Break	
1045–1145	—	PLENARY — Reports from Workshop Group rapporteurs.	
1145–1200	—	PLENARY — Leader will summarize the key points.	
1200–1300	—	Lunch	
1300–1430	—	ISSUE FOUR — WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES TO PERIOD RECONSTRUCTION? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• stabilized resources• new construction using historic fabric• volumetric representation• new technologies• audio visuals, models, fixed displays• artists’ depictions	MODERATOR: R. Thompson
1300–1310	—	INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT	
1310–1400	—	PRESENTATIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Forges du Saint-Maurice– Green Gables– New Technologies– Artists’ Depictions– Point Wolfe Bridge– Stabilized Ruins	J. Barry A. Powter M. Lafrance S. Porter B. Naftel B. Fry
1400–1430	—	Discussion; the moderator will summarize key points.	
1430–1445	—	Break	
1445–1600	—	ISSUE FIVE — WHAT ARE THE CRITERIA FOR RECONSTRUCTIONS IN THE FUTURE? WORKSHOP SESSION TWO After a plenary introduction, participants will break into groups to discuss the criteria for existing and future reconstructions. Each group will have a discussion facilitator and a rapporteur who will report back at a plenary session.	LEADER: G. Bennett
		GROUP	FACILITATOR
		A	L. BLANCHET
		B	C. LACELLE
		C	S. ALGIE
		D	J. SWANNACK
		E	G. FORTIN
			RAPPORTEUR
			J. HARTLEY
			R. BRAY
			A. ROOS
			D. HUDDLESTONE
			R. GILLESPIE
1600–1645	—	PLENARY — Reports from Workshop Group rapporteurs.	
1645–1700	—	PLENARY — Leader will summarize the key points.	

- 1800–2000 — Guided visit of the Grand Hall and the History Hall at the Canadian Museum of Civilization to see how a museum has used reconstructions.

END OF DAY TWO

DAY THREE — MARCH 13, 1992

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 0900–0930 | — | Synthesis of Day Two and introduction to Day Three | S. Buggy |
| 0930–1030 | — | PLENARY WORKING SESSION
Working session to refocus, reshape and transpose points from discussion to date for integration into position paper. | FACILITATOR;
T. Bull |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 1030–1045 | — | Break | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 1045–1130 | — | CONTINUATION OF PLENARY WORKING SESSION | |
| 1130–1145 | — | Evaluation | |
| 1145–1200 | — | Closing Remarks | C. Cameron |

END OF WORKSHOP

Introductory Remarks

Christina Cameron

I am delighted to welcome so many of you to this Reconstruction Workshop. As I look around the room, I realize that you have come from all parts of the country and that you represent most of the functional disciplines that work together in the cultural heritage field.

I would particularly like to welcome our colleagues from Quebec Region, who bring us a profound knowledge of and extensive experience in the area of period reconstruction. It is probably in Quebec Region that we find the most experimental examples of reconstruction and reconstitution.

I would like to extend a very special welcome at this time to our colleague from the United States National Park Service, Barry Mackintosh. Barry has kindly agreed to share with us the experiences of our sister agency on the issue of reconstructions. Welcome, and thank you.

The exercise that we are about to begin is an important one. From a personal point of view, the issue of period reconstructions has been debated since I joined the Parks Service in 1970. Over the next three days, we will be engaged in the process of developing policy and building a common understanding among ourselves on the issue. That is why this workshop has been exempted from the budget freeze. It is a training opportunity which should enable each of us to carry out our work more effectively. Because it is a training opportunity, and in order to help improve future workshops, you will be asked to fill out an evaluation form before you leave on Friday.

Before addressing the question of *why* period reconstructions are an issue, let's raise the question of how to define the term. I think that for the purposes of this workshop, we should accept a fairly general definition of the term "period reconstruction." I suggest something such as "period reconstruction applies to a broad range of works related to creating a sense of the past." If we don't do this, the workshop may well degenerate into a philosophical debate about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Now to the question of *why*. Why are reconstructions an issue with the Canadian Parks Service? First of all, because we have inherited or built a lot of them. Sometimes they seem to be fairly accurate, as far as we know from our current state of research. Sometimes they are mostly fantasy, created to correspond to someone's idea of what the past was like. Accurate or not, these reconstructions are a major part of our interpretative program.

They are also part of the CPS asset base and as such, they have to be looked after. This brings me to my second point and that, of course, is cost. Reconstructions are very expensive to build, demanding as they do extensive research and design, special, often rare, materials, and skilled craftsmen. In addition, we are learning just how expensive they are to maintain! The dramatic deterioration of the buildings at the Fortress of Louisbourg, not to mention the blockhouses at Fort George, serve to underscore the extent of the problem and the high costs of maintenance and repair.

We are in a period of extreme budget constraint and I am convinced that there is no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow to help us out. Faced with the pressing challenges of preserving our cultural heritage sites that are genuinely the work of the past, we have to give serious consideration to how much money we should allocate to our reconstructions.

On a more philosophical level, reconstructions raise the issues of site integrity and public understanding. To illustrate this point, I would like to describe an incident that happened to me at my first meeting of UNESCO's World Heritage Committee. It was at the time when CPS had just published its booklet on Canadian world heritage sites. I was proudly distributing copies of it to members of the committee when I heard a shriek across the room. The UNESCO director of Cultural Programmes was looking at our booklet and repeating: "This is outrageous! This site must be de-designated!" "How could Canada have done this?" Needless to say, I hurried over to see what the problem was and found her looking at the photograph of the reconstructed sod huts at L'Anse aux Meadows.

She remembered the site when it was reviewed by UNESCO, *before* the sod huts were built. She assumed that the sod huts had been reconstructed *on* the archaeological field, thereby destroying the integrity of the site. Unfortunately, I did not know then what I know now, that is, that the sod huts are an interpretive device built nearby, but not on, the archaeological field. I therefore spent the rest of the week in misery, imagining our national humiliation as the first world heritage site to be de-designated. You can imagine my relief when, on my return, Atlantic Regional Director General Bill Turnbull set me straight.

I tell this story in some detail to underline how important it is for CPS to respect the integrity of the sites that are entrusted to our care. And I would go further. We are also entrusted with ensuring that we do not confuse our visitors, that we do not mislead them, for example, into believing that the sod huts are the *actual* sod huts built by the Vikings a thousand years ago. You may smile in disbelief, but I would wager with you that a certain percentage of our visitors believe, for example, that the visitor reception centre at Bellevue House was built at the same time as the main house!

I said earlier that we are engaged in developing policy. By this I meant that we will be fleshing out one aspect of the Cultural Resource Management Policy. At this time, I want to say a few words about the CRM Policy, but before I do so, I would like to have each of you answer a short quiz. This *is* an exam, but you can do it in your heads. How many of the principles of CRM can you name? A hint. There are five. The reason I draw your attention to the principles of CRM is that these are the broad principles which will guide our decision making for the next few years.

I think it important to point out that the CRM Policy neither prohibits nor encourages reconstruction. Rather, it establishes the policy framework within which the appropriateness of activities such as reconstruction should be considered. CRM Policy does not decide the matter in advance. It is true that the policy was drafted with full knowledge of the important role that reconstructions have played in CPS. However, the policy was not designed — wittingly or unwittingly — as a referendum on reconstructions.

I should just discuss briefly the status of the CRM Policy. It has been approved on an interim basis, pending final approval of the Proposed Canadian Parks Service Policy, of which CRM forms an integral part. As such, this version of the CRM Policy is the approved service-wide policy on the management of

cultural resources on all CPS-administered properties. This includes our national parks, as well as the 114 national historic sites under the administration of CPS. It has replaced the former National Historic Parks Policy in the so-called “beaver book” of 1979. Given the possible confusion about the word “interim,” which some may have interpreted as indicating “no real status,” it should be noted that the policy remains in effect for as long as it takes to get the new CPS Policy officially approved.

I have been asked whether the CRM Policy was going to be changed as a result of the public consultation and review of the whole CPS Policy document. That was and is a question of obvious interest, since people do not want to apply a policy that may be substantially revised. I can tell you that while there will be minor editorial changes, the policy will not be changed in any substantive manner.

Indeed, the CRM Policy has been the most highly praised policy in the whole CPS Policy document. The national policy review coordinator, John Carruthers, in his summary of the public consultation done to date, has reported that “there is strong support for CRM, for the broadening of the National Historic Sites Policy, particularly with reference to non-CPS administered sites, and for the attempt to develop a closer relationship between the natural and cultural aspects of the policy.”

As many of you are aware, the 1979 policy was generally regarded as woefully inadequate on the cultural side. The new policy statements are perceived much differently. Heritage Canada, the Canadian Historical Association, and the Ontario Archaeological Association, to name only a few, have commended CPS for the CRM policy initiative.

The B.C. deputy minister of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture wrote that “we strongly support the content of this significant new policy and the conservation principles upon which it is founded,” and the Government of the Northwest Territories wrote that the Proposed CPS Policy, in particular those sections dealing with national historic sites and CRM, is a significant improvement over the 1979 policy.

Not all comments have been provided by cultural groups. The Federation of Ontario Naturalists wrote that “one addition of major importance is the cultural resource management policy which is commendable and represents the holistic perspective needed in many issues.” A professor from the Outdoor Recreation, Parks and Tourism department of Lakehead University wrote that “the addition of a policy for cultural

resource management which extends across all program areas is a welcome and far-sighted addition to CPS Policy.”

I am proud of the CRM Policy. We have a policy of which all of us can be proud, not merely because CRM is a good policy, but because it is a policy that grew out of broad internal consultation and input. Many of you in this room participated in that consultation process. Moreover, unlike other CRM policies, ours is unique in its integrated rather than separate treatment of the various categories of cultural resources and in its linking of conservation and presentation.

This brings me to the issue of interpretation. Interpretation is an essential part of our business. I want to emphasize that concerns about reconstructions should not be taken as an indication of secondary status for interpretation. After all, our over-riding mission is “commemoration,” which is the word that the drafters of the Historic Sites and Monuments Act found to bridge the gap between “conservation” and “presentation.” It is not enough simply to protect our sites and

put up fences around them. We have a further responsibility to make them accessible to Canadians by interpreting them in relevant and memorable ways. And reconstructions are part of this interpretation. The question is: “When is reconstruction an appropriate and necessary interpretive tool?”

My expectations for the workshop are clear. I hope that we will reach consensus in some areas and provide direction for further study of the thornier issues. I know that the workshop will provide invaluable input into the policy process and I am confident that we will get a better sense of how to prioritize our expenditures.

This session provides us with an opportunity — for the first time, as far as I can recall — to develop some common understanding and consistent approaches to this challenging issue. I know that many of you have strong views, and I encourage you to present them clearly, so that all aspects of the reconstruction issue will be thoroughly and thoughtfully considered. I look forward to the next few days.

The Cultural Resource Management Policy and the Reconstruction Imbroglio

George Ingram and Gordon Bennett

“Imbroglio” is one of those ten-dollar words that one encounters and spends a lifetime looking for an opportunity to use. “Imbroglio” is defined in Webster variously as a confused mass; an intricate or complicated situation; a violently confused or bitterly complicated altercation. It seems to be a particularly appropriate term to apply to the reconstruction debate, for no one issue has been the focus of more attention over the past few years.

As Christina Cameron has indicated in her opening remarks, the Reconstruction Workshop provides us with an excellent opportunity, in fact our first, to examine together the application of the Cultural Resource Management Policy to an important issue which is program-wide. And through the presentations and workshop sessions over the next two days I would hope that we would learn together more about the policy itself, about how we can deal with the myriad issues posed by the reconstruction imbroglio, and finally, collectively develop a better understanding about how to apply the CRM Policy generally to a complex issue such as this.

Before we embark on this great journey I thought that it would be useful to take a brief look at the CRM Policy and to talk a bit about how it applies to the issue of reconstruction. Here I would like to acknowledge the important contribution of the National Historic Sites Policy Task Force under the leadership of Gordon Bennett. Three of the members of the task force are with us today: Claudette Lacelle, Margaret Archibald, and Gordon himself. To Gordon I am particularly indebted for pulling together notes for this presentation today.

In fact, the issues that we will be addressing during this workshop, including the evolution of thinking on the practice of reconstruction and how this thinking should be translated into policy, are not new. The same issues were raised, discussed, and debated during the internal consultations on the NHS components of the proposed policy. Many of you will recall the “yellow frameworks document” prepared by the policy review

task force and the discussions in all regions that took place at that time on how reconstructions as well as a host of other matters should be dealt with in policy. The policy represents a synthesis of the contributions that were made by those who participated in the discussions. There was broad consensus that reconstruction should not be prohibited by policy, but there was also broad recognition of the need to devise a far more effective statement than that provided by the 1979 Historic Parks Policy, which many recognized discouraged reconstruction only when there was not sufficient information to undertake an accurate reconstruction. It should also be noted that there was a strong sentiment that these issues should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis *but* within an overall policy context of what should be considered appropriate for a specific national historic site. The CRM Policy does this, and I believe that this is its real strength. In short, it provides a policy framework in which issues can be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Although we will be focussing on the CRM Policy, it is important to note the CRM Policy should always be read in conjunction with the appropriate activity policy, since it is the necessary complement to each of those policies. Since most questions and concerns about reconstruction relate to national historic sites, a sound familiarity with the NHS Policy is a prerequisite.

What does the CRM Policy have to say about reconstructions? I would like to deal with the issue under three heads:

1. Reconstructions as a form of commemoration,
2. Existing reconstructions, and
3. Proposed reconstructions.

Reconstructions as a Form of Commemoration

These reconstructions are distinguished from other proposed reconstructions on the simple but crucial ground that they would be the product of a specific ministerial decision, based on a recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, that the form of commemoration should be a reconstruction. The key words here are “specific ministerial decision” and “form of commemoration.” In fact, I do not believe that any existing reconstruction satisfies this criterion. The closest approximation is probably the 1964 ministerial decision that George-Étienne Cartier’s residence in Montréal be acquired and *restored to period* (emphasis added).

As previously noted, one can not consider the issue of reconstruction as a form of commemoration without looking at the policy on national historic sites. Taken together, both the NHS and the CRM policies provide direction to deal with this matter, based on the concept of the primacy of ministerial decisions. Make no mistake about it, a ministerial decision, based on an HSMBC recommendation that the form of commemoration should be a reconstruction, decides the matter. Bear in mind also that the CRM Policy accords the highest priority to ministerial commemorative decisions (CRM Sections 3.2.2, 3.5.2.2).

This is why the NHS Policy statement 2.3.4 specifies that the Canadian Parks Service will advise the Minister on the implications of accepting an HSMBC recommendation *before* the recommendation is approved by the Minister. Objections, if any, to reconstruction as a form of commemoration must be made *before*, not after, the Minister makes a decision. Otherwise the Minister would be put in an invidious position, and ministerial decisions would not be regarded as being based on sound advice or having the force and status that ministerial decisions must be perceived to possess.

Existing Reconstructions

What does CRM policy say about *existing* reconstructions?

According to CRM (3.5.2.10), period reconstructions and reproductions are by definition contemporary

work and have no a priori historic value, but because of their special character the principles and practice of cultural resource management *may* apply to them.

Some clarification of what is meant by the previous clause may be in order. Since a reconstructed feature of a site is one of the site’s resources, it must be inventoried *and* evaluated for purposes of determining whether it is *cultural* resource within the meaning of the policy; that is to say, a level 1, level 2, or level 3 resource. If it is found to be a level 1 or level 2, it is a cultural resource; if level 3, it is not. The clause under consideration permits a reconstruction that has been determined to be level 3 to be covered by the CRM Policy. This provision is a useful one because it means that sensitive maintenance can be applied by choice to a reconstruction even though it may not be accorded level 2 status.

The determination of levels is a fundamental aspect of CRM Policy implementation, and a number of questions have arisen as to how the determination takes place. The determination of level 1 is *relatively* straightforward and is based on an application of the ministerial decision of national historic importance. If the reconstruction itself has not been declared to be nationally significant, it is not a level 1 unless it can be demonstrated that it is directly related to the reasons *for* the site’s designation. Obviously, where the reconstructed feature did not exist at the time of designation, it can hardly be considered to be related — directly or indirectly — to reasons for the site’s designation.

With respect to the determination of level 2, it is important to note that the Federal Heritage Buildings Policy is not *the* sole mechanism for determining level 2. It is *a* mechanism, but it is not the only one, nor is it *necessarily* the most important one. A couple of points need to be made here.

- The first is that because CRM is a policy, it quite consciously did not assign roles and responsibilities to various levels of the CPS organization; that is, it did not make headquarters responsible for this, the field responsible for that, and the regional offices responsible for something else. It was assumed by the task force that the inventory and evaluation would either be done during the management planning process or by a team specially set up by the region and the superintendent if management planning were not under way, in either case consisting of technical experts in the historical, conservation, and presentation disciplines and the superintendent. To

give this group the required flexibility, CRM Policy stated that CPS “will establish and apply criteria.” It did not spell these criteria out beyond noting that historical, aesthetic, and environmental qualities, or factors such as local association or designations by other levels of government, could be taken into account. This was the sort of framework which was deemed appropriate for determining level 2.

- The second point is that if a reconstruction gets an FHB designation, it becomes a level 2 cultural resource. If it *fails* to get an FHB designation but is determined by CPS to have historic value, it is *also* a level 2 cultural resource. In other words, if FHB says it’s not a Federal Heritage Building, that’s all it says, and it does not relieve CPS of the obligation to carry out its own evaluation, which need not be anywhere near as elaborate as the FHB process may be.

With respect to the treatment of reconstructions that fall under the purview of the CRM Policy as a result of having been designated levels 1 or 2, the policy makes no distinction between reconstructions per se and other cultural resources. This is as it should be. To do otherwise would be inconsistent with the over-riding philosophy of this CRM Policy, which deliberately has not distinguished between the types of cultural resources, in contrast to other CRM policies which do. In short, such an approach also ensures that reconstructions are not accorded a lower — or higher — status than other cultural resources.

This does not mean that there is a treatment vacuum. CRM Policy provides the *national* policy framework for making decisions on a case-by-case basis for actions (or non-actions) that might affect cultural resources, including those reconstructions that have been deemed to be cultural resources in accordance with the policy. Any proposal or activity that might affect a cultural resource — whether a proposed reconstruction at Signal Hill or snowmobiling in Chilkoot Trail NHS — must be carefully evaluated — in advance — on the basis of the five general CRM principles and the more detailed elaborations thereof. These principles are the principles of value, respect, understanding, public benefit, and integrity.

From a policy point of view, the issue would be whether the proposed activity affecting a reconstruction was consistent with these principles, considered at both the macro-level — the national historic site and its commemorative integrity — and the micro-level — the specific cultural and natural resources referred to in CRM that might be affected.

I can not over-emphasize the fact that these considerations must be elaborated *and documented*. It is not enough merely to say, as has been done in the past, that the proposed activity is consistent with policy. There must be a written analysis and justification which serves as a statement of accountability in order to ensure that our stewardship responsibilities are seen to be taken into account. Such documentation need not be elaborate, but it must be meaningful and effective.

Proposed Reconstructions

The various issues relating to proposed reconstructions will be dealt with at length in Gordon’s paper, “Evoking the Past or Provoking the Gods? Some Observations on Period Reconstructions.” At this point it will be useful to lay out the basic policy framework for considering proposed reconstructions. Here again, a written record of the considerations is essential. The point of departure, as with existing reconstructions, must be the application of the five CRM principles at both the macro- or site level, especially within the context of the commemorative integrity of the site, as well as on any specific cultural resources that might be affected by a proposed reconstruction.

At this point it might be useful to describe the concept of commemorative integrity. First devised for the 1990 *State of the Parks* report for national historic sites as the parallel to ecological integrity in national parks, the value of this concept has been more widely recognized and will be the over-riding concept for both national parks and national historic sites in the 1992 SOP report. Briefly, the concept as used in the 1990 report states that

A national historic site may be said to possess commemorative integrity when the resources that symbolize or represent its importance are not impaired or under imminent threat, when the reasons for its national historic significance are effectively communicated to the public, and when the heritage value of the site is respected.

In the case of proposed reconstructions, the concept would require that the proponent evaluate whether and how the proposal would relate to the effective communication of the reasons for the *national* historic significance of the site and how the proposed reconstruction would contribute to ensuring that the

heritage value of the site is respected. This is not to say that if the proposal does not relate directly to the national significance of the site, it should be rejected. It does indicate, however, that managers should have an honest assessment of this before making a decision to proceed to the next step. Most importantly, if it were to be determined that the proposed reconstruction might compromise the commemorative integrity of the site — for, by example, detracting from the message of national significance — the proposal would have to be rejected.

Any proposal for a new reconstruction must be considered in light of NHS Policy Section 4.0, which is entitled “Rescinding Commemoration.” If the proposed reconstruction affected a resource in such a way as to compromise the qualities that led to its designation of national historic significance, the proposal would either have to be rejected or the designation reviewed for purposes of revocation. Clearly this would be no small matter.

Sections 3.5.2.5.3 and 3.5.2.8 of the CRM Policy, which deal with “Creating a Sense of the Past” and period reconstruction, and which refer to issues such as commemorative objectives, accuracy, visitor demand, knowledge, cost, and threat to extant resources, provide some specific guidance on the issue of proposed reconstructions. Whether one begins with these and

then proceeds to the more general considerations described above or vice versa is not important. What is important is that there be a clear understanding that a demonstration that the reconstruction proposal satisfies the criteria outlined in Section 3.5.2.8 is not enough to justify reconstruction. What distinguishes this policy from the Environmental Assessment Review Process is that the latter is not designed to determine whether an activity is “appropriate.” For example, one may legitimately be able to demonstrate through EARP that building a waterslide in a former gravel pit in a national park will not result in a negative change to the bio-physical environment. Section 3.5.2.8 deals with these sorts of issues. But CRM requires that there be a determination of “appropriateness.” This is accomplished by applying the principles and the concept of commemorative integrity. If we could determine appropriateness in advance for each and every conceivable activity in every national historic site, existing and future, there would be no need for a policy like CRM. Alas, such is not the case. This is why we need superintendents and functional experts of high calibre and senior management that is sensitive to the basic issues involved. And finally we need tools like the CRM Policy to help us work through these issues, this imbroglio, as we will in the days ahead.

Feedback on Participants' Expectations

David Huddleston

PERIOD RECONSTRUCTION WORKSHOP

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE to provide a forum for program discussion of the issue,
to elaborate the CRM policy, and
to move towards consensus on implementation of the policy.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

1. Participants will know how thinking on the practice of reconstruction evolved and how CPS has translated this into policy.
2. Participants will understand the implications of ageing reconstructions and examine varied approaches to managing them.
3. Participants will understand the role of reconstructions as tools to interpret heritage messages.
4. Participants will be presented with alternatives to reconstruction.
5. Participants will participate in developing a position paper to assist in applying the CRM to existing and proposed reconstructions.

Participant:

Date:

My job title/function:

Site/function I am representing:

Given the learning objectives of this workshop, please respond to the following questions:

1. From your perspective, what are the issues surrounding period reconstruction?
2. What questions would you like to see addressed during the workshop?
3. What contribution can you make to the workshop?
4. What do you expect to get out of the workshop?

In order to prepare ourselves for this workshop, the organizing committee decided to find out what was on your minds. This would assist us in determining what discussions should take place to address the issue from your perspective in order to meet your needs and expectations for this workshop. We had not intended to present your responses at the workshop, but as they came in, it quickly became apparent that the issue was complex and its implications far-reaching. Therefore, the organizing committee decided it would be best to present to you what is on your minds about period reconstruction.

Each of you received a questionnaire with your participant's package. To date I received 20 responses.

In preparing to present these to you, it seemed logical to combine the two questions together: "From your perspective, what are the issues surrounding period reconstruction?" and "What questions would you like to see addressed during the workshop?"

Issue/Question: Applying CRM Policy with Respect to Reconstructions

(No. of times raised: 26)*

- Lack of experience applying CRM
- Need definitions of reconstruction at various levels
- When is reconstruction a legitimate planning proposal?
- What level of information is appropriate for reconstruction to be considered a viable option (assuming we come to a consensus that it is a viable option)?
- Who will make the above decisions? Who should be making these decisions? Who will be involved in the decision making? What degree of public involvement will there be in this decision-making process?
- How can the CRM's principles assist planners and decision makers in assessing planning proposals for the future management and operation of a park or site?
- How do we apply CRM to decisions made in the past, when criteria were different?

- The problem is one of differentiating (for the general public) a historic building from a reconstruction. What architectural treatment should be given to reconstructions? Should they be faithful reproductions, yes or no!! Should we continue to build them, or should we avoid them? [T]
- Are there alternatives to reconstruction that would do the job? We must look at alternatives.
- What alternatives to reconstruction are more effective in communicating the commemorative objectives in a given circumstance? Is period reconstruction the only way to create an effective sense of place?
- When is it most appropriate to choose reconstruction over other forms of interpretive techniques? Should further, more specific criteria be devised?
- Who determines which option to follow?
- What are the respective roles for site, region, and headquarters?
- How, when, and under what conditions will we NOT reconstruct? We need clear principles and guidelines. Help us avoid "black holes."
- Do you repair the building as it might have been done in the period, OR do you renew the element? Is cost the only issue?
- Do we correct known inaccuracies during recapitalization?
- To what degree are we permitted by an improved information base to render more accurate an existing reconstruction?
- In what situation is a [new] reconstruction considered the most appropriate form of treatment? Why?
- What type of justifications are required for new reconstructions?
- What should be done about preserving the reconstructions at Louisbourg as compared to restoring the original fortifications at Halifax?
- When is it appropriate to reconstruct? When is it appropriate to restore?
- What criteria must be met for a structure to be rebuilt?
- Are CRM principles applied differently to [reconstructions] which are not of national significance?

* Some responses were virtually identical, which explains the discrepancies between the stated number of times an issue/question was raised and the number of responses actually listed under that issue/question.

T Translation of the original French by the Department of the Secretary of State.

Issue/Question: Understanding the CRM Policy with Respect to Reconstruction

(No. of times raised: 20)

- What do we mean when we say reconstruction?
- What is the policy on period reconstruction?
- Don't understand CRM
- Apparent overlap with FHBRO: when does a reconstruction become a historic structure?
- What are the criteria that make a historic structure nationally significant?
- At what point does a building move from being just a building to being a protected artifact and hence subject to CRM guidelines on reconstruction?
- Do all CPS reconstructions have historic value?
- Are there different levels of value in CPS reconstructions?
- Does the FHBRO process distinguish levels of value adequately?
- When does the reconstruction become an end in itself and no longer subject to upgrading when an improved information base makes a greater accuracy possible?
- CRM is not subscribed to, due to lack of understanding.
- Lack of understanding that reconstruction is at one time a policy issue, interpretation issue, architectural issue, history issue
- Are we willing to come out with a very clear policy statement that will guide us in the future?

Issue/Question: Construction Issues

(No. of times raised: 11)

- Poor information available when constructing
- Some reconstructions were badly constructed.
- How far do we go in using modern methods in reconstructions?
- Design approach
- Public safety concerns in reconstructions
- Access for the disabled in reconstructions
- Need standards and guidelines to know when a given technique should be used: restore or reconstruct? Or even replace at all?
- Is dismantling a stone structure, rebuilding it in concrete, slicing the original stone and using it as

veneer a form of reconstruction, or is it simply a reconstruction?

- What degree of flexibility do we have in utilizing preservatives for wood?

Issue/Question: Cost Issues

(No. of times raised: 6)

- We must look at alternatives. It costs too much to keep on doing things this way.
- Affording the research, the construction, the maintenance
- Are reconstructions cost-effective?
- Do you repair the building as it might have been done in the period, OR do you renew the element? Is cost the only issue?
- Period reconstruction generally requires substantial expenditures; in a context of scarce resources, would it not be better to devote available funds to protecting or preserving the *authentic* evidence of the past? [T]

Issue/Question: Meeting the Expectations of Those We Serve: The Public

(No. of times raised: 6)

- In spite of their deficiencies, historical reconstructions, in association with various forms of animation in period costume, continue to attract visitors' preference. The options used to replace them are not successful, to my knowledge, in supplanting reconstructions in popular favour. Should we respect the tastes and expectations of taxpayers who expect such reconstructions? [T]
- Keeping the "end" in focus [why we reconstruct]
- Keeping informed of user needs and expectations
- Staff lack an integrated, interdisciplinary view of why we do what we do and who benefits from the opportunities we provide.
- Need improved socio-economic data on visitor needs and their responses to our interpretation efforts [in reconstructions]
- Period reconstruction reduces, in most cases, the visitor to a relatively contemplative role; the

“visitor-spectator” should move around in a totally artificial museum-space, where the search for “ambiance” too often takes precedence over a concern for respecting historic reality.

Issue/Question: Respect

(No. of times raised: 3)

- Not trivializing the original when interpreting the reconstruction. How can we achieve a balance between interpreting the original and interpreting the reconstruction?
- “Not driving out the ghosts”

Issue/Question: Other

- What does CPS do when the heritage character of buildings on a site is different than the reason for designation of the site?
- How does CRM fit with the CPS Strategic Plan?
- Maintenance of all resources in an appropriate manner
- Revenue:

- Can we charge admission to a reconstruction?
- Improved potential for renting or sale if a property is restored more accurately to a given time
- Landscapes will probably rarely meet the criteria for reconstructions, but they significantly enhance a site and give it context.
- What happens when the resource, the HSMB designation, and the site’s themes and objectives don’t match?
- Are we serious about reconstruction?
- Can we have better lines of communication between those enforcing CRM and those applying its conditions?
- If you take a previously submerged historic ship and reassemble part of it for display, what do you do with the rest of it?
- Reconstruction necessitates the fixing, at a specific historic period, of the form, size, and functions of works and buildings; in the case of buildings that have evolved over a long period, what period should be chosen? On the basis of what criteria?

[Responses to question 3 were not presented as this was intended only for use by the organizing committee. Responses to question 4 were not presented because they hinted too strongly at solutions before in-depth discussions had taken place.]

“Raising the Dead”: Reconstruction within the Canadian Parks Service

Shannon Ricketts

In 1846 the English conservationist John Ruskin wrote, “it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture.”¹ This may seem an extreme statement — and so it is — but it represents the inception of the philosophy which has informed much of our present attitude toward conservation. Ruskin was one of the most uncompromising in a long line of writers and architects who preached maintenance over restoration (or reconstruction) and a fitting humility in dealing with historic buildings. Even before Ruskin’s impassioned statement, French archaeologist A.N. Didron (1839) set down a dictum which has since become so familiar that present-day conservationists sometimes think it is a recent statement: “it is better to preserve than to restore and better to restore than to reconstruct.”²

This hierarchy of values was formally recognized in the code of ethics concerning treatment of historic architecture produced by UNESCO in 1964 and known as the Venice Charter.³ Since the 1960s, conservationists in various countries have devised national charters based on this principle. One of these is the Appleton Charter, formulated by the English-speaking branch of ICOMOS Canada in 1983.⁴ This philosophy also forms the backbone of the Levels of Intervention System used by many heritage professionals within the Canadian Parks Service. This set of guidelines subdivides conservation into two categories: at the level of minimum intervention is preservation (or protection), which consists of interim protection and stabilization; more radical intervention is defined as development (or enhancement). The latter includes period restoration or rehabilitation and, at the maximum level of intervention (i.e., replacement), means either period reconstruction or contemporary redevelopment. The recently proposed CPS Cultural Resource Management Policy is also based on the concept of a “continuum of strategies,” but has placed reconstruction within the category of presentation. This clearly stated distinction between conservation and

presentation is fairly recent and reflects the accumulated experience of CPS over the greater part of a century.

According to the CPS Policy, the general objective for the Service is “to fulfill national and international responsibilities in assigned areas of heritage recognition and conservation; and to commemorate, protect and present both directly and indirectly, places which are significant examples of Canada’s cultural and natural heritage in ways that encourage public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the heritage in a sustainable manner.” Within this apparently bland statement lie the seeds of a dilemma — namely, the directives both to protect and to present significant examples of our cultural heritage. While physical remnants may be best protected by simply guarding them against natural and human interference (i.e., the natural ravages of time), this does little to explain or to present those remnants within a cultural or historical context. In other words, how can the sometimes competing demands of conservation and presentation be weighted given limited resources? Amongst the myriad methods of interpretation, reconstruction has been, and remains, one of the most popular, especially in the view of the general public for whose benefit heritage professionals are charged with the protection and presentation of cultural remnants.

Seen in its historical perspective in Canada, reconstruction was driven by a desire to enhance the presentation of a site and/or remnants of a cultural resource. In many ways, each reconstruction can be seen as a product of its time, reflecting changing attitudes to interpretation and to conservation. If CPS accepts this view, then do reconstructions themselves have a heritage character or value which should be protected? Or, as presentation tools, are they to be compared with the story line whose accuracy should be enhanced as new information becomes available? If, to paraphrase John Ruskin, it is as impossible to restore a building as to raise the dead, then to reconstruct is even more hopeless. Nevertheless, however imperfect such

re-creations may be as historical documents, they have served an interpretive purpose. In addition, they have acquired a new level of meaning as documents of their own time.

This presentation will trace the practice of reconstruction as carried out by CPS over the course of this century and will attempt to place it in the context of related activities by other organizations, both national and international, at similar points in time. By following this historical development, I hope to clarify how CPS has reached its present philosophy regarding conservation and presentation and to test its reconstructions against Ruskin's maxim.

The first known act of conscious historical reconstruction in Canada was the rebuilding of three gates in the walls at Québec City by Lord Dufferin in 1875. Outraged by the city's desire to pull down part of the walls in order to improve transportation routes, Governor General Lord Dufferin hired Irish architect William Lynn to apply his specialty in "picturesque medieval military construction" in rebuilding gates which would maintain the flavour of the originals while allowing the desired improvement in street access.⁵ It has been suggested that Lord Dufferin was influenced by French architect Viollet-le-Duc's conservation of the walled city of Carcassonne in southwest France earlier in the century.⁶ The rebuilding of the Québec gates was an anomaly in Canada and was more representative of the views of Lord Dufferin than those of Canadians of the time. Nor was this reconstruction project intended to re-create a vanished resource in a historically accurate manner. Rather it was expressive of the romantic views and picturesque tastes of the era. This very early occurrence of reconstruction was not repeated until much later in the 20th century.

The Era of the Military Site: The 1920s–1940s

The first stage of reconstruction history in Canada really occurred in the 1920s and 1930s and coincided with a growing momentum in the architectural conservation movement. At that time, Canadian conservationists were encouraged by developments in the United States, where historic sites were receiving attention from both the private sector and the federal government. In Canada, private sector sponsors were not involved to the same extent, and the public looked

to governments at both the provincial and the federal levels to ensure the preservation of the nation's heritage. Quebec passed heritage legislation as early as 1922, and in 1925 British Columbia enacted laws to protect Indian artifacts. Academic interest in the nation's architectural heritage was reflected in the schools of architecture at McGill and at the University of Toronto, where students were directed in the production of measured drawings of historic architecture. In Nova Scotia, A.W. Wallace produced similar records of that province's early buildings. Enthusiasts formed action groups such as the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario.

While interest in historic buildings and sites continued to grow in the 1930s, the economy was in shambles. Following the precedent of U.S. President Roosevelt's New Deal, the Canadian federal government passed the Public Works Construction Act in 1934 to provide funding for the erection of public buildings across the country. Through this program the Parks Branch was able to finance construction work at various historic sites, including the Prince of Wales Martello Tower in Halifax, Fort Anne, Fort Prince of Wales, and Fort Langley. Depression relief funds also were made available at a provincial level and in Ontario resulted in such projects as the reconstructions at Fort George and Fort Henry as well as the restoration of Fort York.

In most cases it was local historical organizations which had provided the initial impetus to commemorate, preserve, and ultimately, to interpret. This was so in the Niagara area, where local enthusiasts had been encouraging governments at all levels to develop historic sites, particularly those which would commemorate the War of 1812. During the 1930s the Ontario government, through the Niagara Parks Commission, sponsored four reconstructions — Fort Erie, the William Lyon Mackenzie House at Queenston, Navy Hall at Niagara-on-the-Lake, and Fort George.⁷ The reasons for the Ontario government becoming so highly involved in historic sites at this time are complex and comprise a mix of altruism and pragmatism.

Firstly, as has been mentioned, these sites had been the focus of local preservation efforts for some time. Secondly, the great popular success of Colonial Williamsburg, opened in 1933, and the even earlier reconstruction of Fort Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain, re-created though archival and archaeological evidence in 1907, provided examples of the happy conjuncture of patriotism and capitalism. Closer to home, the 1930s

reconstruction of Fort Niagara on the American side of the Niagara River underscored the neglected condition of the historic sites on the Canadian shore.⁸ For politicians like the dynamic Minister of Ontario's Department of Highways, T.B. McQuesten, Williamsburg and some of the reconstructions carried out by the American National Park Service provided examples of how a lagging economy could be primed. Relief funds provided salaries for a small army of crash workers who would create a local attraction capable of drawing badly needed tourist dollars to a depressed area.

Thirdly, the gradual professionalization of the discipline of history was beginning to bear fruit in the increasing numbers of trained historians and archaeologists, and in the improved organization and collections of archives and research libraries. Confidence in the ability to recover verifiable facts concerning historic sites encouraged policy makers to attempt reconstructions. Ironically, these same officials sometimes became cavalier in their impatient assessments that "close enough was good enough" in the creation of historical replicas.

In the case of Fort George, the hiring of a lone historian, Ronald Way, fell far short of the team of historians and archaeologists working at a site like Williamsburg and set up an impossible tension between the time-consuming pursuit of historical data and the immediate demands of a large work force which had to be kept busy. Additionally, the architect-in-charge, William Lyon Somerville, while well known for his revival-style homes for wealthy patrons in Toronto, had no previous experience in reconstructing historical sites. Inevitably, the needs of the present won out over those of the past. Later, Niagara Parks historian Ronald Way, while acknowledging that the Fort George reconstructions were based largely on a concept of typical building types and, therefore, could not be defended from the point of view of historical accuracy,⁹ went to some lengths to defend the concept of reconstruction as the visual teaching of history. This is a sentiment still shared by defenders of reconstruction today.

At the same time, a parallel project was being undertaken in Nova Scotia. What is now known as the Habitation of Port Royal had long been supported as a potential national historic site by the local Annapolis Royal Historical Association. During the 1920s, wealthy American summer residents, aware of re-created sites in the United States, became active in raising money and supporting research with the aim of

constructing replicas of the original buildings on the site. It was declared a national historic site in 1924, and in 1938 the Dominion government acquired land comprising the original site and its immediate surroundings.¹⁰ The American Associates of Port Royal paid the salary of an American archaeologist who excavated the site (an improvement over the total lack of archaeological investigation at Fort George) while others, including the site's American patroness Harriet Taber Richardson and Canadians C.W. Jeffreys, Marius Barbeau, Sylvan Brosseau, and Ramsay Traquair, carried out historical and architectural research.

In the end, many of the conclusions about the original structures were reached by making leaps of judgement across considerable gaps in available archaeological and historical data. Reconstruction work was carried out under the direction of the Surveys and Engineering Branch of the Department of the Interior using local craftsmen who, like those at Fort George, imitated the techniques of the past in a general way without having site-specific documentation. The supervising architect was K.D. Harris, the same Department of the Interior architect who had rehabilitated the officers' quarters at nearby Fort Anne in 1934-35 (a national historic park since 1917). In that case the objectives had been to remodel a late-18th-century building and to make it fireproof. To these ends the officers' quarters were, according to Harris, "reconstructed." Historical veracity was not, in this case, the guiding motive. In fact, the exterior was "greatly improved in appearance by the introduction of moulded cornices and Georgian entrances with columns and pedimented roofs" and the walls were clad in a clever cement version of wooden clapboarding.¹¹

Even when historical fact was the goal, the truth was often elusive. In the cases of both Fort George and the Habitation of Port Royal, many of the conclusions about the original structures were incorrect. Consequently, the reconstructed buildings were built according to false assumptions. The results, while evoking an aura of history and providing a believable backdrop for popular interpretive schemes of the living museum type, were ultimately misleading. Contemporary critics were painfully aware of these dangers. Brigadier General E.A. Cruikshank, along with other members of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, were generally opposed to such reconstructions. Cruikshank clearly stated that

in my opinion these attempts to reconstruct buildings which have entirely disappeared and are only known from vague descriptions or plans

*of doubtful authenticity with modern materials and workmen of the present time are absurd and a mere waste of money.*¹²

Nevertheless, outdoor museums — whether consisting of a “restored” house like the Barnum House in Grafton, Ontario, purchased and restored by the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario in the 1930s, an assemblage of buildings moved from other sites in order to create an impression of a coherent historical community like the first (1891) outdoor museum in Skansen (a Stockholm suburb), Sweden, and the later Henry Ford Greenfield Village at Dearborn, Michigan, or elaborately reconstructed sites like Fort George and Port Royal — were (and continue to be) enormously popular with the public. More widespread use of automobiles by the 1930s encouraged this trend in cultural tourism which continues to grow today. Such sites blend education and entertainment. Disneyland is, perhaps, an expression of this trend carried to its extreme at a site which frankly forsakes the educational component and creates a confectionary version of a mythical main street representing an indulgently interpreted middle-American past.

In fact, in the years before World War II the Parks Branch was both philosophically and fiscally cautious regarding reconstructions. In 1920 the HSMBC recommended the preservation of six historically significant forts — Prince of Wales Fort at Churchill, Manitoba; the Fortress of Louisbourg and Forts Beauséjour, Gaspereaux, and Piziquid (Edward) in the Maritimes; and Fort Pelly in Saskatchewan. None of these was fully reconstructed. In the case of the old Hudson’s Bay fort at Churchill, development became possible with the availability of Public Works Construction Act funds in 1934.¹³ From 1934 to 1937, repair work was carried out on the exterior walls, which were largely reassembled. To some extent, this happy circumstance was undoubtedly largely a result of fiscal restraint and the fort’s remote location rather than consciously applied conservation standards.

Nevertheless, it is Parks historian C.J. Taylor’s opinion that the Parks Branch was aware of conservation philosophy and generally agreed with Ruskin’s dictum that restoration “means the most total destruction which a building can suffer.”¹⁴ In 1920 James Harkin, Parks Branch Commissioner, stated as Parks policy: “If there is nothing but a pile of stones, it is not considered good policy to erect a fort on the lines of the original one.”¹⁵ Not all Board members agreed with this view, however. Already it was evident from developments to the south that beneficial economic

results could be achieved by the reconstruction of historic sites as tourist destinations. Maritime province members were very interested in developing sites with tourism potential, as were politicians anxious to assist in the economic development of the areas they represented.

Local pressure also played a determining role in the development of both Louisbourg and Fort Beauséjour. The latter was designated a national historic site in 1928, and initial work included cleaning up of the grounds and repair work to the gateway, the mess room, and the powder magazine with the aim of stabilizing the remains until a policy for the site’s development was decided on by the Branch.¹⁶ In fact, the development of this site was decided largely by New Brunswick Board member Dr. J.C. Webster, who directed the erection of commemorative cairns and signage to guide visitors, as well as the clearing of trenches and acquisition of appropriate ordnance. Interventions to the existing ruins were modest and consisted of some archaeological digging and the building up of an exterior wall to a height of about ten feet. Much of Webster’s energy was taken up in the consolidation of land associated with the fort and in the establishment of a museum. This was made possible in 1934 by including the construction of a museum at Fort Beauséjour in the Public Works Construction Act allocations. From 1936, when the Fort Beauséjour Museum was opened, attention became focussed on improving its exhibits rather than on further development of the ruins.

A similar course of development occurred at the Fortress of Louisbourg. Declared a national historic site in 1928, it was initially allocated \$23,000 for development.¹⁷ At Louisbourg, wealthy entrepreneur and history enthusiast J.S. McLennan paralleled the role of Webster at Fort Beauséjour. McLennan, however, was more ambitious and believed that the reconstruction of Louisbourg was both possible and desirable.¹⁸ He is reported to have been very impressed with American reconstructions at Fort Ticonderoga and at Valley Forge. Despite the views of the Parks Branch and British town planner Thomas Adams, whom the Branch sent to evaluate the site in 1923 and who advised against reconstruction, the development plan submitted to the HSMBC in 1930 reflected McLennan’s point of view and called for reconstruction of part of the King’s Bastion and the West Gate, along with limited restoration of other parts of the ruins as well as the construction of a museum. Budgetary restraints ensured that work progressed relatively slowly and,

while repair work was carried out on the casemates and some excavating of buildings was accomplished, reconstruction work was limited to the partial rebuilding of the walls of some four structures.

As at Fort Beauséjour, the museum, completed in 1936, became the operational and interpretive focus of the site until reconstruction work resumed in the 1960s. The device of the historical museum also was used at Fort Anne, Fort Chambly, Fort Malden, and Fort Langley. At sites where remains were fragmentary and potentially mysterious to the average visitor, the museum display became the didactic focus and a much less expensive means of interpretation than reconstruction. It is interesting to compare the attitudes of this period to those of later years which resulted in a much more ambitious reconstruction project. During the 1920s and 1930s, while opinions were split over the issue of reconstruction, even proponents like Webster envisioned only a modest project. There seems to have been a belief that the real value in a site like Louisbourg was to inspire Canadians with the drama of their own history and, to this end, the wild site and romantic ruins evoked a suitable setting for this Canadian version of the fate of Ozymandius. Quebec politician Henri Bourassa reportedly likened a visit to the site to "passing through the ruins of Pompeii."¹⁹

The Era of the Outdoor Museum: The 1950s-1960s

With World War II, activity declined until the 1950s, by which time an improved economy and more highly developed cultural agencies brought a renewed vigour to the heritage field at both the provincial and federal levels. These postwar years ushered in a new era in reconstruction. The concept of the outdoor museum gained immense popularity during the postwar period. The earliest identified example in Canada was an individual effort, Earle Moore's *Canadiana Village* in Quebec, which started with one relocated building in 1946 and gradually was added to, creating a nucleus of structures evoking life in a pre-industrial rural Quebec.²⁰

In Ontario during the 1950s and early 1960s, several local groups established their own "pioneer villages." Perhaps reacting to a rapidly changing environment which included an increased rate of urbanization and a concomitant building boom, as well

as a wave of immigration which brought new citizens who often did not share an awareness of Canada's earlier history, community organizations strove to save examples of the country's rural past. While Upper Canada Village was the most sophisticated and best-known such site, Black Creek, Doon, Fanshawe, Westfield, and Century pioneer villages also drew appreciative audiences. The best known is Upper Canada Village, conceived when it became obvious that the planned St. Lawrence Seaway would result in the flooding of numbers of historic buildings. Representative examples were removed from their threatened sites and relocated to the new "village" where they were restored and, in some cases, substantially reconstructed.

At a pragmatic level, these developments were made possible by increased levels of affluence and leisure amongst the general population who could access these sites by automobile and who were anxious that their children develop an appreciation of their past. By the mid-1960s, this trend was reinforced by patriotic responses to the celebration of Canada's centennial. Perhaps the most ambitious heritage project in Ontario in the 1960s was the reconstruction of Sainte-Marie I near Penetanguishene. The scope of such provincial projects reflects the growth and development of provincial heritage agencies by the 1960s.

In the West the image of the idyllic pioneer village was traded for that of the 19th-century trading post and fort. During the 1940s the Royal Canadian Mounted Police created an early and interesting version of a reconstructed historic fort at Fort Walsh, Saskatchewan. Located on the site of a late-19th-century North West Mounted Police post, the re-created fort comprised ten log buildings intended to evoke those at the original fort while satisfying the functional requirements of a contemporary horse-breeding station.²¹ Largely the brainchild of RCMP Commissioner Stuart Taylor Wood, the fort was intended to preserve the force's traditions and did not accommodate tourists until the 1960s, when the RCMP enhanced the historic atmosphere in order to open the site to visitors in honour of the Canadian centennial. By this time the RCMP were planning to relocate the horse-breeding station and hoped that the National Historic Parks Branch would take over the site.

The RCMP figured large in the memory of the old West. In Alberta the first reconstructed historic site was the NWMP post at Fort Macleod. Rebuilt by a group of local enthusiasts in 1957, it preceded other reconstructed forts at Lethbridge, Red Deer, Calgary,

and Edmonton. In Saskatchewan, Fort Walsh was followed, in 1967, by a provincial historic park at the former RCMP post at Wood Mountain. The park's museum was housed in a reconstructed barracks building. Similarly in British Columbia, the former RCMP post at Fort Steele was made a provincial historic park in the 1960s and developed with reconstructed buildings. The gold-rush town of Barkerville was also partially rebuilt and developed as a tourist venue. By the late sixties, the idea of "heritage parks" was leading the development of many historic sites in the West as outdoor museums there reflected the historic and ethnic flavour of a relatively recent past.

At the federal level, the Massey Commission on the Arts, which published its report in 1952, was influential in broadening the HSMBC's commemorative scope and, during the immediate postwar years, the National Historic Parks Branch responded to its national mandate by attempting to develop at least one major heritage site in each region;²² hence the establishment of a historic park (developed with reconstructions) at Fort Langley, British Columbia, the acquisition of Fort Battleford and the Batoche rectory in Saskatchewan, the acquisition of Woodside in Ontario — former Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King's childhood home, which was reconstructed initially by local enthusiasts before being further developed by the federal government — the restoration of the former Canadian Arsenals (now Artillery Park) in Québec City, as well as the Halifax Citadel in Nova Scotia and Signal Hill in St. John's, Newfoundland. By the 1960s the elaborately interpreted historic site was considered *de rigueur*. The living or outdoor museum concept had replaced the by-now outmoded regional museum collections as the preferred mode of interpretation at the sites.

This emphasis on the acquisition and development of historic sites was criticized by some outsiders, however. Organizations like the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, which were not so much interested in the commemoration of historical events or persons as they were concerned with the preservation of the Canadian architectural heritage, pointed out the need for programs to ensure the survival of representative examples of Canada's domestic architecture in particular. At this point the seeds sown by such early proponents of architectural conservation as Ramsay Traquair, Eric Arthur, and A.W. Wallace began to flower. While the 1920s had seen the beginnings of an

appreciation of architecture for both its aesthetic value and as a form of historical evidence, this attitude was confined to a few connoisseurs until the postwar years when the intellectual atmosphere encouraged ideas such as art for art's sake and a recognition of intrinsic values in art and architecture. Movements such as abstractionism in the art world and the parallel modernist mode in architecture focussed attention on more purely aesthetic values. Once one begins to view buildings as unique historical documents or as artistic products, the concept of replicating them becomes as suspect as forging archival manuscripts or artworks. This is what Ruskin and Morris appreciated in the 19th century and what was becoming more obvious to greater numbers of both heritage professionals and laymen by the 1950s and 1960s.

Clearly, distinctions between commemoration, interpretation, and conservation were critical to heritage policies at all levels. At the federal level there had always been members of the HSMBC and staff within the Parks Branch who were aware of the pitfalls inherent in confusing these issues. More often than not, the acquisition and development of heavily restored or reconstructed sites had been as much the result of political realities as it had been a reflection of directives from the Board or preferences within the Branch. Nor was it likely, given the popularity of reconstructions, that pressure to replicate historic structures would disappear. The success of reconstruction as an interpretive vehicle and the established association between elaborately developed historic sites and potential tourism earnings combined with more purely patriotic sentiments to ensure the continued desirability of reconstructions. In fact, many of the megaprojects pursued by the Branch during the 1960s relied heavily on reconstruction.

The very scale of these projects reflects their importance beyond the Parks Branch. The restoration of the Halifax Citadel, the reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg, the development of Lower Fort Garry and that of the Yukon boomtown of Dawson all implied a substantial contribution to regional economic development at a ministerial level. For its part, the Parks Branch increased its professional capabilities to ensure that development would take place within controlled guidelines and with the fullest possible archaeological, historical, and architectural information. Nevertheless, at Louisbourg in the 1960s we again meet the now-established heritage consultant Ronald Way, who reports that the tensions between pragmatic project delivery and historical research were

as vexing here as they had been 30 years earlier at Fort George.²³ Once again, pragmatism won out over professional ideals. This is not to say that the standards of historical veracity had not risen. Yet, despite the enormous investment of time, expertise, and money that went into Louisbourg, Ruskin's conviction of the impossibility of re-creating the past was born out.

The birth of Dawson as a national historic site reveals a similar pattern. A federal policy of northern economic development during the late 1950s included a scheme for tourism at Dawson hinging on a theatre festival to be held in the Palace Grand Theatre. Once again, time was of the essence and, given the decayed condition of the structure — an example of boomtown vernacular architecture erected without a great deal of concern for longevity — the Branch recommended that the building be demolished and reconstructed to meet contemporary fire and safety standards.²⁴ As at Louisbourg, in order to build a replica, original fabric had to be destroyed.

The Intellectualization of Interpretation: The 1970s–1980s

It is in the 1970s that we see a considerable shift in Parks' treatment of historic sites coincident with the maturation of its organizational capacities. The 1970s began the third stage in the history of reconstruction in Canada. By this time a fairly large staff of specialists was on hand and regionalization had resulted in a pool of professionals in close proximity to the sites. Canadian heritage professionals were also linked by national and international organizations which kept them abreast of the latest theories and practices in their fields. By 1964 the Venice Charter had been drawn up, establishing internationally accepted methods of conservation and maintenance. According to this document, "all reconstruction work should ... be ruled out a priori."²⁵ In 1976 Canada, via CPS, became a signator to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (the World Heritage Convention). By doing so, the federal government committed itself to safeguarding world heritage sites within Canada and implied that the highest possible standards of conservation would be followed.²⁶

Reconstruction survived, but with significant differences. The first historic site in Canada to be

entered on the World Heritage list is that of the first known European settlement in North America at L'Anse aux Meadows, Newfoundland. Discovered by Norwegian archaeologist Helge Ingstad in 1960, it became a national historic site in 1968. Because of its significance internationally, an international research advisory committee was formed in 1970. This committee of experts from Scandinavia, Iceland, and Canada was responsible for research and conservation at the site. Remains were carefully excavated, stabilized, and reburied for protection until later in the 1970s when Parks pursued further archaeological excavations and built replicas of the original sod houses. The difference was that, this time, the reconstructions were not built on top of the archaeological remains but at some remove in order to ensure that the remains were undisturbed.

Two of the most innovative reconstructions were carried out by Parks Canada at national historic sites in Quebec. Fort Chambly had been in federal hands for many years when Parks decided to carry out a major development of the site. It has been suggested that the volumetric reconstruction carried out at Chambly in 1982 was inspired by a similar restoration process at the Castle of Visegrad in Hungary.²⁷ There, contemporary materials had been used to create the broad outline of the original structure without trying to second guess what period details for which there was no historical data might have looked like. Under the direction of Parks, a private architectural firm was awarded a contract to do much the same thing at Chambly. It was felt that this sort of treatment avoided historical romanticism and potential falsification, while rescuing the ruins from further deterioration in a manner which lent itself to public interpretation. In this way both conservation and interpretation could be achieved legitimately.

Another approach to volumetric reconstruction has been implemented at the Forges du Saint-Maurice. This site had been acquired by the provincial government in the 1960s. Some archaeological investigation and stabilization had taken place by the time that Parks took it over in 1973. After several years of research and evaluation, a complex development plan was formulated in 1981 which made use of a variety of interpretive methods. These, implemented over a period of several years, include a volumetric reconstruction of the blast furnace complex which uses a three-dimensional space frame to express the industrial processes which took place within the original structures.²⁸ The ruins and underground spaces are

enclosed but visible to the public, while the transparent frame traces the shapes of the major components of the complex aboveground. More literal replicas of significant machinery have also been built using contemporary materials and placed at historical locations. Although volumetric reconstruction is a technique which has been utilized at other historic sites, perhaps the best known of which is the Benjamin Franklin house in Philadelphia, the approach used at the Forges is much more complex in its attempt to illustrate a process rather than the simple outline of a building.

A second major project produced a historical reconstitution of La Grande Maison (1990) which, like Fort Chambly, visually suggests the original building on the exterior while providing a modern interior used as an interpretive centre. The latter responds to an expressed public wish for a more traditional reconstruction. Great care has been taken to protect archaeological remains and to distinguish between original and re-created structures.

This last project brings the outline of reconstruction at CPS sites up to the present. Reconstruction has always been a hotly debated procedure. While purists like Ruskin would have none of it, many others have accepted it under certain terms. These historically focussed on the degree of accuracy with which original buildings were replicated. More recently, issues such as unity of style (should a building be reconstituted to reflect only one era in its longer history) and the need for visible distinctions between original and new fabric have become determining factors in the manner in which reconstructions are carried out.

Several things become clear from tracing the history of reconstruction. One is the ongoing popularity of reconstruction as an interpretive tool both with the public and with politicians. Secondly, there is a traceable economic influence threading its way through this history. Put simply, more ambitious projects are generally undertaken when large amounts of money are available. Barring another Public Works Construction Act for the 1990s, our present atmosphere of fiscal restraint may result in a more conservative approach in the immediate future. It becomes even more essential, therefore, that decisions are based on the pre-eminence of the historical artifact and on our responsibility to our history. If reconstructions are to be funded, they must argue their worth with this in mind.

Meanwhile, what value are we to place on our reconstructed sites? If you agree that this brief history has illustrated the difficulty of "raising the dead," then

we must look to values other than historical accuracy in these resources. While reconstructions may still perform a valuable interpretive function as visual aids, their intrinsic value only emerges after a close visual analysis. Visually, this history shows that reconstructions reflect the spirit of their time as surely as does contemporary architecture. For instance, Viollet-le-Duc practised what has come to be called romantic reconstruction, creating evocations of a medieval past not dissimilar in appearance to early Gothic Revival architecture. In Canada the reconstructed gates at Québec City are examples of this phenomenon. Later, North American reconstructions from the twenties and thirties tend to look disconcertingly like the Colonial Revival designs of their time. The symbiotic relationship between reconstructions and revival-style architecture of this period is currently receiving much academic attention. Our present fascination with volumetric reconstruction and reconstitution (*see* the Forges du Saint-Maurice) mirrors the trend in Post-Modern architecture to create visual metaphors of the past. Like contemporary architecture, volumetric reconstructions are sometimes criticized for an overly cerebral wit which can undermine content.

Rather than dismissal as flawed creations akin to Dr. Frankenstein's monster, then, reconstructions deserve recognition as valid expressions of their own time and as historic documents in their own right. Given their demonstrated intrinsic value, reconstructions become candidates for preservation in much the same way that other "historic" structures do, and we must be aware of our custodial responsibility to them. Perhaps we are witnessing the inception of the fourth stage in the history of reconstruction in Canada — the era of reconstruction reconsidered.

Notes

- 1 John Ruskin, "The Lamp of Memory" in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1849), n.p.
- 2 A.N. Didron, *Bulletin Archéologique*, Vol. 1 (1839), n.p.
- 3 Quoted by William J. Murtagh in *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (New York: Sterling Pub., 1990), p. 18.
- 4 The charter states, "intervention within the built environment may occur at many levels (from preservation to redevelopment), at many scales (from individual building elements to entire sites), and will be characterized by one or more activities, ranging from maintenance to addition." *The Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment* (Ottawa: ICOMOS Canada, 1983), n.p.

- 5 Christina Cameron, *Charles Baillargé, Architect and Engineer* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989), p. 116.
- 6 Quebec [Province]. La commission des bien culturels du Québec, *Les chemins de la mémoire: Monuments et sites historiques du Québec* (Québec: Les publications du Québec, 1990), p. 3.
- 7 Ronald Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks; A History* (Hamilton: Niagara Parks Commission, 1946), p. 267.
- 8 Edward T. Williams, *An Interpretation of Old Fort Niagara* (Niagara Falls, N.Y.: The Old Fort Niagara Association, 1929), pp. 66–68.
- 9 Ronald Way, "The Reconstruction of Fort George, 1936–1940," manuscript on file, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec, 1973.
- 10 Charles W. Jeffreys, "The Reconstruction of the Port Royal Habitation of 1605–13," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Dec. 1939), p. 371.
- 11 Margaret Coleman, "Officers' Quarters, Fort Anne National Historic Park," FHBRO Report 88–56, manuscript on file, Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec [1988], p. 8.
- 12 C.J. Taylor, *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Canada's National Historic Parks and Sites* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), p. 116.
- 13 Canada. National Archives, RG 84, Vol. 1131, FPW-2, Vol. 6, pt. 2.
- 14 John Ruskin, *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, p. 179.
- 15 Quoted in C.J. Taylor, *Negotiating the Past*, p. 80.
- 16 Barbara Schmeisser, "The Creation and Development of Fort Beauséjour National Historic Park," manuscript on file, Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec, 1979, n.p.
- 17 Shannon Ricketts, "Museum and Caretaker's House, Fortress of Louisbourg National Park, Nova Scotia," FHBRO Report 90–304, manuscript on file, Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec [1990].
- 18 A.J.B. Johnston, "Preserving History: The Commemoration of 18th Century Louisbourg, 1895–1940," *Acadiensis*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Spring 1983), p. 65.
- 19 Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 78.
- 20 Mabel Ringereide, "Canadiana Village," *Canadian Collector*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (July/Aug. 1976), p. 24.
- 21 James De Jonge, "Ten Buildings, Fort Walsh National Historic Park, Saskatchewan," FHBRO Report 88–68, manuscript on file, Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Sites Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec [1988].
- 22 C.J. Taylor, *Negotiating the Past*, p. 145.
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 179.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 173.
- 25 ICOMOS Canada, *Preserving Our Heritage: Catalogue of Charters and Other Guides* (Québec: International Symposium on World Heritage Towns, 1991), p. 14.
- 26 Marc Denhez, "The Heritage Un-treaty," *Canadian Heritage*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Feb/Mar. 1987), p. 2.
- 27 George Galt, "The Battle for Fort Chambly," *Canadian Heritage*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Feb/Mar. 1984), p. 13.
- 28 Francois Leblanc, "Les Forges du Saint-Maurice ... We've seen this before. No, not really. Have a closer look....," *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 18, Nos. 1 & 2 (1986), p. 13.

CPS Reconstructions across the Country

Mahlon Robinson

We have heard how the practice of reconstruction has evolved within CPS. I would now like to take you on a quick journey across Canada to provide you with a general overview of some of the locations where we have used reconstructions. These reconstructions include buildings, structures, vessels, canals, and bridges. Many of these sites will be discussed later in the workshop. Some of the resources in the slides you are about to see do not involve reconstruction, but they have been included to provide the context within which reconstruction has taken place or to provide a greater understanding of the site itself. Where necessary in the presentation, I will differentiate between reconstruction and other site practices.

L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site

- Located near the tip of Newfoundland's Great Northern Peninsula
- Commemorates the earliest known site of European settlement in North America, *circa* A.D. 1000.
- CPS has reconstructed three Viking sod houses away from the archaeological remains.
- The objective is to allow the visitor a greater appreciation of the Norse site by experiencing the reconstructed sod replicas of buildings once constructed on the site by the Norse.

Fortress of Louisbourg

- Located in Louisbourg, Nova Scotia, southeast of Sydney
- Commemorates the 18th-century French fortress of Louisbourg as a place of profound significance in the great Franco-British struggle for empire in North

America and as the most significant French fishing and commercial centre in North America.

- The reconstructed fortress includes some 50 major buildings, a dozen smaller structures, the fortifications, streets, quay, yards, and gardens — comprising about a quarter of the original town. Approximately half of the original landward fortification has been reconstructed, including the King's Bastion, the Dauphin Demi-Bastion, two curtain walls, and some outer defensive works.
- Its reconstruction was begun in 1961 so that future generations seeing it might understand the role of the fortress in our history. A living, working period environment, portraying the summer of 1744, is offered through reconstructed buildings, structures, fortifications, and landscapes.
- Costumed animation is a fundamental part of the presentation of 18th-century Louisbourg and is popular with visitors.

Fort Anne National Historic Site

- Located in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia
- Commemorates the pivotal role of Fort Anne in the clash for empire between France and Britain in North America and in the history of Acadia and Canada
- Site consists of earthwork ruins (among oldest in the National Historic Sites system), restored 1708 powder magazine (the oldest structure in the system), underground storehouse, sally port, and reconstructed 1797 field officers' quarters; there are also underground remains of various building foundations from French and British periods.
- In 1934–35 the officers' quarters were gutted and reconstructed as a fireproof museum.

Port Royal National Historic Site

- Located near Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia
- Commemorates the habitation established at Port Royal in 1605, the first successful attempt by the French to establish a settlement on mainland North America north of Florida
- The habitation was reconstructed in 1938–39.
- It was one of the earliest historical reconstruction projects in Canada and is felt to be a significant memorial to Canada's early historic preservation movement.

Prince Edward Island National Park

- Green Gables is located within the national park.
- This house as presented to the visiting public is a composite conception of the house described in *Anne of Green Gables* and provides a convenient setting for visitors seeking to associate with the storybook house of the character "Anne."
- Due to the popularity of this site, recent proposals have been made to expand the period environment by constructing a 19th-century farmstead.

Fort Chambly National Historic Site

- Located in Chambly, Quebec
- Commemorates the fort built by the French in the 18th century and later maintained by the British to control the Richelieu River route
- Site of three forts; the later stone fort was restored and stabilized in 1980–82 to the 1750 period.
- The 1814 guardroom was restored in 1977–78.

Forges du Saint-Maurice National Historic Site

- Located north of Trois-Rivières, Quebec
- Commemorates the birthplace of the Canadian iron industry

- The archaeological remains of the blast furnace and of La Grande Maison were topped with volumetric representations of the originals in order to protect and display them.
- Major thematic exhibit in the *haut fourneau*. (Jean Barry will provide more on this later in the workshop.)

Coteau-du-Lac National Historic Site

- Located southwest of Montréal
- Commemorates the site of a military post that defended the passage of goods on the St. Lawrence and one of the first lock canals in North America
- Site consists of remnants of 15 structures used for river transportation and defence purposes dating from 18th and 19th centuries. Reconstructed blockhouse interior repaired in 1987.

Fort Wellington National Historic Site

- Located in Prescott, Ontario
- Commemorates the role of Fort Wellington in defending the St. Lawrence frontier from American attack during the 19th century
- Site consists of preserved remnants of 1813–38 fortifications, 1838 blockhouse, officers' quarters, latrine, earthworks, reconstructed palisade, and main gate. Original granular surface of parade square is under existing earth layer.

Woodside National Historic Site

- Located in Kitchener, Ontario
- Commemorates the life and career of one of Canada's prime ministers, William Lyon Mackenzie King
- In 1950 the Mackenzie King Woodside Trust was incorporated with a mandate to restore the house and grounds to the time of the King family's occupation. The achievement of the trust's mandate required the demolition of the house and its reconstruction using as much of the original material as possible.

- Woodside depicts a two-storey, middle-class Victorian residence furnished to the 1886–93 period.
- At the time of the reconstruction, the original small cellar was enlarged, as was the service wing, a one-storey structure when Woodside was first built.

Fort George National Historic Site

- Located in Niagara-on-the-Lake
- Commemorates the role of Fort George in the defence of Upper Canada during the War of 1812 and its place in the military history of the Niagara region
- Palisades, gates, ravelins, bastions, and earthworks of Fort George were reconstructed during the 1930s to comprise the rebuilt fortress.
- The guardhouse, officers' quarters, offices, kitchen, octagonal blockhouse, three square blockhouses, and shop reconstructed in the thirties as well
- The present Navy Hall, although it has been moved from its original location, contains material from the 1817 reconstruction period.

Lower Fort Garry National Historic Site

- Most of the structures at Lower Fort Garry are original to the site and have been restored or partially reconstructed. Located north of Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Commemorates the role of Lower Fort Garry as a major transportation staging point; composes the largest assemblage of original fur-trade structures in Canada

Prince of Wales Fort National Historic Site

- Located across the Churchill River from Churchill, Manitoba
- Commemorates the role of Prince of Wales Fort in the imperial and commercial rivalry centred on Hudson Bay in the 18th century
- Most elaborate example of stone fortification built in connection with the fur trade in Canada

- Fort partially restored/reconstructed in 1930s and 1950s

Fort Walsh National Historic Site

- Located southwest of Maple Creek, Saskatchewan
- Commemorates the role of Fort Walsh in establishing Canadian control in the Northwest following the 1873 Cypress Hills Massacre
- Established by North West Mounted Police in 1875; dismantled and abandoned 1883
- RCMP established remount ranch to breed horses in 1940s. To evoke historical associations, many structures were reconstructed in the 1940s.
- Eleven buildings were partially reconstructed including non-commissioned officers' quarters, workshop, stable, and commissioner's residence; as well, Solomon's and Farwell's trading posts reconstructed — Farwell's restored and furnished to the 1873 period.

Fort Battleford National Historic Site

- Located in Battleford, Saskatchewan
- Commemorates the role of Fort Battleford in the establishment of law and order on the Northern Plains
- Site consists of five restored buildings dating from 1870s and 1880s including the officers' quarters, sick-horse stable, guardroom, barracks Number 5, CPS-reconstructed stockade.
- The guardroom and sick-horse stable were moved in the 1940s from outside the stockade to the interior.

Dawson City Buildings National Historic Site

- Located in Dawson City on the Yukon River
- Commemorates the role of Dawson City as the "Metropolis" of the Klondike gold fields
- Most of the buildings in Dawson City are original and were restored in 1970s and 1980s. These include the Bank of British North America, post office, Winaut's stores, and Robert Service cabin.

- The Palace Grand is a reconstruction which was undertaken in 1960s.

Fort Langley

- Located on south bank of Fraser River east of Vancouver, British Columbia
- Commemorates the role of Fort Langley in the maritime and interior fur-trade activities of the Hudson Bay Company west of the Rockies
- Built in 1827, moved to present location in 1839
- Mixed interpretation (period and didactic) in artisan's shop, blacksmith's shop, and Big House.
- The only original building is structure K, the storehouse.

* * *

Reconstruction has also been used on other forms of heritage resources: boats, canal structures, and bridges.

Cartier-Brébeuf

- At Cartier-Brébeuf NHS, located in Québec City
- A replica of one of Cartier's vessels, the *Grande Hermine*, was constructed for interpretative purposes, to interpret the themes associated with Jacques Cartier's explorations of the New World.

Rideau Canal

- I have chosen to include canals in this topic since, with resources like locks, dams, and weirs, repairs

can be undertaken to a point at which time more major interventions are required. Questions arise, therefore, as to what resource treatment is best if we wish to perpetuate the historical ambience of a site. Various treatments have been used from covering concrete with limestone blocks to just concrete replacements.

Covered Bridges

- Some resources, such as covered bridges in Fundy National Park and in particular the Pt. Wolfe bridge, due to the nature of their materials and continued use can no longer be repaired. CPS has employed a variety of techniques to extend their lifespans — including reconstruction. (Bill Naftel will speak more about this particular bridge later.)

King-Post Bridge

- Other examples of bridges with interesting and rare architectural forms are the few remaining king-post swing bridges such as this one at Kilmarnock on the Rideau. Due to the material and use placed on the structure, from time to time repairs are required, but eventually reconstruction is the outcome if the historical ambience is to be maintained.

* * *

As you can see, CPS has used reconstructions extensively over the years to help interpret site history. During the next two days, our imaginations will be challenged in order to see if there are more effective ways of presenting history to site visitors. Thank you.

The NPS Experience with Reconstruction

Barry Mackintosh

During the 1930s the U.S. National Park Service went from managing a western park system comprising mostly natural areas to a truly national park system with numerous historical areas in the East. This expansion began in 1930 with George Washington Birthplace National Monument in Virginia. Here the NPS inherited and completed a reconstruction of Washington's birth house for the bicentennial of his birth in 1932. Unfortunately, the private association that launched the project had proceeded with little archaeological or documentary evidence. The resulting "memorial mansion" was highly conjectural and was soon found to have been built on the wrong foundations. At least the right foundations had been saved — purely by accident.

This major embarrassment with its first high-profile historical project caused the NPS to adopt a restrictive policy on reconstruction by the mid-thirties, summarized by the oft-quoted phrase, "Better preserve than repair, better repair than restore, better restore than reconstruct."

But park managers tended to be more sympathetic than cultural resource professionals to reconstructions for their public appeal and interpretive values. In 1939 the superintendent of Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, Virginia, joined local civic leaders in urging reconstruction of the house where Robert E. Lee had surrendered to Ulysses S. Grant at the end of the Civil War. Although there was ample information about the building, the Service's chief historian wanted to display just its foundations and interpret the rest through graphics or a model. Management and public opinion prevailed, and the Service finally reconstructed the house. Later it rebuilt the nearby courthouse as the park's visitor center, an "adaptive reconstruction" obviating a modern intrusion on the historic townscape.

What helps justify these reconstructions in my mind is that they are not stand-alone attractions, but fill key gaps in a historic complex. Considering the complex as a whole, what has been done is not reconstruction but restoration (defined in part as the

replacement of missing elements). This is really a subjective judgment of mine — others might argue that reconstruction is *less* justifiable amid original structures because it could call their authenticity into question. Neither of our nations' policies appear to address this issue, and I would be interested in learning whether you think they should.

During the 1970s we undertook several reconstructions for the American Revolution Bicentennial. Because of its proximity, some of you may be familiar with our rendition of Fort Stanwix in Rome, New York. At the hub of Bicentennial activity, Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia, two houses were slated for reconstruction. Reasonably good evidence permitted a reasonably accurate replica of the Graff House, where Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence. But evidence proved inadequate to reconstruct Benjamin Franklin's house with the accuracy befitting its importance. Instead, an open steel framework was erected above its exposed foundation remnants to delineate the standing structure. This "ghost reconstruction" was widely applauded as a creative solution to the problem of recreating a structure where detailed information is lacking. (I note that you call such things "volumetric representations.")

The Service's official reconstruction policy during this period continued to reflect the restrictive posture of its cultural resource professionals. Most of us had — and continue to have — four basic concerns about reconstruction: 1, evidence is usually insufficient to achieve accuracy in detail; 2, archeological resources and data are usually destroyed in the process; 3, reconstructions, however *accurate*, are *inauthentic* and therefore dilute our agency's special role as custodian and preserver of genuine historic remains; and 4, the considerable resources required to build reconstructions and maintain them in perpetuity might better be devoted to preserving original features.

Speaking of maintenance, it seems that often the structures we are called upon to reconstruct are ones that were not originally built for permanence — which is why they are gone. They are frontier buildings or

defensive works hastily thrown up with materials never intended to last. Reconstructing things made of earth and logs usually involves making substantial compromises to prolong their survival. Even so, maintaining them is difficult. And as they age, they tend to evoke less and less the raw character of the original structures in their brief heydays.

Our current reconstruction policy, part of our overall management policies for the national park system published in 1988, reflects something of a compromise between the relatively permissive attitude of the NPS director at the time and the restrictive attitude of most of our cultural resource professionals. It says that a vanished structure may be reconstructed if: 1, reconstruction is essential to permit public understanding of the cultural associations of a park established for that purpose; 2, sufficient data exist to permit reconstruction on the original site with minimal conjecture; and 3, significant archeological resources will be preserved in situ or their research values will be realized through data recovery. It goes on to say that a structure will not be reconstructed to appear damaged or ruined, generalized representations of "typical" structures will not be attempted, and reconstructions will be clearly identified as such to the public.

The first criterion should logically rule out most reconstructions, because under our criteria for additions to the national park system, we should not have any historical parks so bereft of their historic features that they cannot be understood without rebuilding those features. In fact, we have been awarded some such parks over the years. And those bent on reconstructing something can always argue how important doing so is for public understanding. Professional judgment can claim no clear superiority over lay judgment in this area. The best professionals can do is to present decision makers with a full range of interpretive alternatives to reconstruction.

The second criterion is more clearly a matter of professional judgment. Yet professionals can and do

disagree, as they did in the case of Fort Union Trading Post, North Dakota. Not surprisingly, those sympathetic to reconstruction are more likely to find a sufficiency of data than those who are unsympathetic. The requirement tucked in here that reconstruction be on the original site is really another issue, still controversial. Those who would give primacy to the preservation of original remains would generally argue that reconstruction should *not* be on the original site. But the NPS consensus is that a structure's site is such an important aspect of it that rebuilding the structure elsewhere would constitute a fundamental inaccuracy. Another reason for maintaining this requirement is to pose an additional impediment to reconstruction, since the original site is sometimes unavailable. In any case, almost never have we knowingly reconstructed a structure off its original site. As I read Canada's policy on reconstruction, I don't see this issue addressed.

The third criterion to my knowledge has never prevented an otherwise allowable reconstruction, even when it was worded to bar the destruction of preservable remains regardless of whether data would be recovered. A problem here, exemplified again by Fort Union Trading Post, is that reconstruction project funds have seldom been sufficient to allow for the full curation of salvaged remains and proper publication of findings. Archeological resources and data still tend to be victims where reconstruction is concerned — yet archeologists have often colluded quite happily in reconstruction projects for the employment it gives them.

At bottom, as I concluded in my first *CRM Bulletin* piece on reconstruction, NPS reconstruction policies have had less impact in practice than public and political influences and the tendency of our own managers — and some of our own professionals — to yield to these influences and perhaps even abet them. I'm sure this could not be true in Canada!

Evoking the Past or Provoking the Gods? Some Observations on Period Reconstructions

Gordon Bennett

I begin with a confession: Not only do I try to visit Upper Canada Village once a year, but I have never been so proud of being an employee of the Canadian Parks Service as I was on an August day in 1984 when I first visited Louisbourg. Indeed, my chest — such as it is — swelled with pride as I marvelled at the reconstruction and overheard one after another of my fellow vacationers say that this was the best such place they had ever visited — better even than Williamsburg.

Since my presentation leans toward the “provoking the gods” side of the reconstruction debate, I am very conscious — after the above admission — of appearing to be a hypocrite. I have given this a lot of thought, and I think the only way I can rationalize the apparent contradiction is to go back and reexamine my reaction. As you will recall, I said that I was never so proud to be an employee of CPS. I did not say that I was struck by Louisbourg’s great importance to our history. In fact, I’m not sure that even occurred to me. I put the value on what we had created, not on the legacy we had inherited. Indeed one might say that the latter was incidental, if not irrelevant. Paradoxically, then, it was my very enthusiasm that sowed the seeds of doubt. I ask you to think about this as we continue.

As has been noted by a number of the speakers who preceded me, this workshop is welcome. In a world where operational demands are such that there is not enough time to get day-to-day things done, let alone keep abreast of what is going on in the organization or the world outside, workshops such as this give us an opportunity to look at the larger picture in a cross-functional forum that brings together people from the sites, the regional offices, and headquarters. In the case of National Historic Sites this is doubly important, because unlike our colleagues in National Parks, we do not have a sense of organizational identity that situates us in the larger universe of cultural heritage sites in Canada and elsewhere. We reap the consequences of our lack of identity, whether in the recent report prepared by the Evaluation Branch entitled “Canadian Parks Service Special Report on Consultations with

Historical Heritage Experts,” which documents — unintentionally — an appalling ignorance of our program and, more importantly, a disturbing insensitivity both to history and to heritage, or in the feelings of many in CPS, particularly at the field level, that CPS senior management regards national historic sites as a minor concern.

Having just come off a long run of public consultations on the proposed CPS Policy document, I have come to the conclusion that one of the reasons why national historic sites do not figure prominently in either the public or senior management mind is that there do not appear to be significant policy issues associated with historic sites or with cultural resource management. Robert Fulford’s lament “In Canada, an unexplored and unknown past remains one of our most crippling cultural problems,” has not been accorded the same degree of urgency by CPS as have threats to natural areas, nor has it been translated effectively into the organization’s mission. I see this workshop as an opportunity to develop a higher policy profile for historic sites. We will not resolve all or perhaps even many of the issues relating to reconstruction at this workshop, but we should all come away with an enhanced appreciation of the significant business we are in. Reconstruction raises fundamental questions about integrity, respect, value, public benefit, and understanding of national historic sites and cultural resources — the very principles upon which the CRM Policy is based. Considered in conjunction with the concept of “commemorative integrity,” reconstruction pretty well covers the spectrum of CRM issues.

Any discussion on reconstruction needs to distinguish between the reconstructions we already have — some of which we’ve made, some of which we have inherited — and those that might be proposed in the future. Too often the debate gets couched or interpreted by proponents, opponents, or both as a direct or indirect attack on what has been done in the past. We will make little progress if the workshop conforms to this model. I think we should celebrate,

not denigrate, the reconstructions we have, where it has been determined through the application of CRM that these works have heritage value, and we should acknowledge that much of the finest work we have done on a broad range of activities has been done as a direct consequence of certain reconstruction projects.

We should also acknowledge that there is a range of reconstruction activities (from large-scale projects such as Louisbourg to reconstructions of individual buildings) and that generalizations will not apply in all instances. This is why the CRM Policy directs us to proceed on a case-by-case basis.

The focus of this paper is on future reconstructions. None of what I have to say is new or original, but given the nature of our work, an acknowledgement of the value of the old and existing hardly seems to be a damning admission.

While I do not subscribe to the view expressed by architectural historian Douglas Richardson that reconstructions are "as dead as any artificially animated rubber dodo that might be mounted on a genuine skeleton from Mauritius," I don't think any of us can or should avoid careful contemplation of Northrop Frye's insight that

The kind of preservation that we have in Williamsburg and similar large-scale open museums is in a sense almost anti-historical: it shows us, not life in time as a continuous process, but life arrested at a certain point, in a sort of semi-permanent drama. There is nothing wrong with this, but it gives us a cross-section of history, a world confronting us rather than preceding us.

If there is one key message I want to communicate, it is that in considering any proposal for reconstruction, the burden of proof must always fall on the proponent. Too often we reverse this and put the burden on those who object to the proposal. Good practice demands that the proponent consider and assess honestly the pros and cons of a proposal and describe clearly who is to be held accountable for the information on which decisions are made — for example, who loses his or her job if the visitor projections upon which a reconstruction was approved are not met. I am surprised at how superficially the issue of reconstruction is often dealt with. Until this workshop, I don't think anyone in CPS had addressed whether visitation figures supported the widely held assumption that reconstructed sites are more popular than non-reconstructed ones, or whether reconstructions were an effective medium for communicating fundamental messages. In one planning

document I read, the proponent merely reproduced Section 3.5.2.5.3 of CRM and the section of the old National Historic Parks Policy on reconstruction as the policy justification. This kind of non-analysis trivializes national historic sites. But before we blame the planners or the interpreters, we must admit that real analysis of significant policy issues has seldom been encouraged. And before someone dismisses such analysis as unproductive and time-wasting, let me remind you that these are the very sort of policy issues that people in National Parks rightly raise, and that debates about how some proposal might impact on ecological integrity are considered essential to sound decision making. We have experienced the consequences of being less rigorous.

To me, the fundamental question that should be asked whenever a reconstruction is proposed is: What is the net heritage benefit of the proposed reconstruction, particularly with respect to the national historic significance of the site? In other words, what, if anything, will the reconstruction add to the commemorative integrity of the site? In some cases, reconstruction may result in a net loss of heritage value. For example, the Minister directed that the Rideau Canal locks be preserved — that is to say, be considered nationally significant — because they possessed integrity as original works. As these locks are reconstructed they lose those qualities that led to their designation; that is to say, there is a net loss of heritage value.

One of the arguments most frequently advanced in support of reconstruction is that the public likes it. This argument has broad appeal, in part because it incorporates a genuine interest in what the public apparently thinks. But there is a darker side that few want to acknowledge, and that darker side is really an echo of Flip Wilson's popular expression of the 1970s that "the devil made me do it." In other words, public demand becomes something for the heritage professional to hide behind, particularly when tough questions get asked. I really admire the head of Program and Public Relations for the Royal Ontario Museum who cut through much current marketing pap and said, "We are not in the business of adapting our product to market taste, but rather we are in the business of educating public taste to appreciate our offerings." Of course, such a view is elitist. But it is also a view that respects the public and the public's intelligence. The fact is we probably could do a much better job getting the public to appreciate our offerings. As a first step, I would suggest focussing on communi-

cating why our sites are nationally significant and hence important to all Canadians.

Another variation on the theme of public expectations is that reconstructions and other major forms of evoking the past are done in order to give the public a better idea of what the period or the place was really like. Yet it is also true that the public would have a better perception of what the flora and fauna in each national park look like if we established zoos and park-specific botanical gardens in each national park.

In considering reconstructions, I think it essential that we consider the reasons or motivations for reconstructing. We have already discussed, if only briefly, the considerations of public demand and public education. Proponents of reconstruction might reasonably ask whether critics would argue that the reconstruction of Leningrad after the Second World War should not have taken place. My answer is that this reconstruction grew out of a passionate conviction that what had been destroyed during the war was so significant to the Soviet Union and to the world that the reconstruction symbolized something well beyond the mere re-creation of an outstanding cultural landscape. I'm not sure that any of the reconstructions we are talking about fall into that category, but if Province House were to be destroyed by fire, I would probably be a proponent of its reconstruction because of its symbolic significance. I rather suspect that a similar impulse led the RCMP to reconstruct Fort Walsh, and I think we should respect this even though we would not be moved by the same impulse to undertake reconstruction there.

I acknowledge that my statement on Province House sounds very much like "it's OK if I like it, but not OK if you like it." My only response is that we may differ on the specific example, but perhaps we can agree on the criterion of symbolic significance.

To a very real degree, reconstructions appeal to a sense of heritage rather than to a sense of history. There is nothing inherently wrong with this, but we have always to keep in mind that the visitor should not leave sites of national historic importance with the impression that he or she has just visited blacksmithing or candle-making or bread-baking national historic sites.

Similarly, I think we also need to ask if it is a good idea for a reconstruction to become the signature feature of a site, as La Grande Maison has become for the Forges du Saint-Maurice, the *Grande Hermine* for Cartier-Brébeuf, and the sod buildings for L'Anse aux Meadows? To the extent that these features become the

principal symbol of the site, have we not lost something or trivialized the genuine as well as the site's true significance?

Within CPS I have noted a curious reality, which I suspect is reflected in other agencies as well. As an organization we often place a higher *heritage* value on our own reconstructions than we place on genuine historic fabric. I recall being at a meeting where maintaining the "integrity" of the reconstructions at Louisbourg was considered to be the most important issue facing CPS. I left convinced that none of the proponents of that viewpoint would have accorded the same zeal to preserving the Halifax Citadel. Clearly, we have a problem when professional staff insist on higher standards for preserving existing reconstructions or making new ones than for preserving the real thing. There can be no better symbol of the value we attach to what we create than the pride of place accorded to the reconstructed HD-4 at Alexander Graham Bell NHS while the real HD-4 is relegated to the sidelines, a virtual piece of historical detritus. At the same time, we tend to discount the heritage value of those reconstructions we did not make, but rather inherited (for example, Fort Walsh, Fort George). Ironically, anti-reconstructionists may place a higher heritage value on extant reconstructions than so-called pro-reconstructionists. Within heritage agencies, nothing appears to be more disposable than existing heritage interpretation. This is truly a curious phenomenon.

To a considerable degree, the impulse to reconstruct is very much part of the historic park ethos (although obviously not exclusively so). This ethos tends to value the place as an agency creation, that is to say as a "park," rather than seeing value or significance as emanating from the attributes (tangible and intangible, extant and missing) of the historic site.

There is a fascinating account in C.J. Taylor's *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Canada's National Historic Parks and Sites* that deals with the internal controversy over the reconstruction of Louisbourg. Taylor offers the interesting hypothesis that historic parks à la Louisbourg provided CPS with an opportunity to do things it would never contemplate doing in a national park such as Cape Breton Highlands because of the "damage" that would be caused to a natural park by such a degree of intervention.

"Reconstructionists" sometimes describe those opposed to reconstructions as elitists. Underlying the elitist charge are certain assumptions, the most important of which is that there is not much that is

genuine ("real") that is worth preserving in Canada and/or there isn't much significant period fabric that is under threat. To compensate, we in Canada have to re-create the past, unlike European countries, which having — apparently — escaped the scourge of two world wars and the postwar economic boom, have a lot of period stuff.

There are some 750 national historic sites across Canada, the vast majority of which are not managed by CPS. Many of these latter are among the most significant places in our human history, and almost all of them are under some continuing threat of impairment. Some 40 years ago the authors of the Massey Royal Commission Report wrote that "certain places still have the history of the past written on the very surface of the land, but this history is threatened every day with obliteration." As true as that was 40 years ago, it is even more the case today.

Given such a situation, it is difficult to argue that we should place a higher priority on re-creations at CPS-administered sites (in order to "improve" these sites) as opposed to focussing efforts toward preserving significant sites, regardless of ownership, that remain to be commemorated, or that have been designated but whose future is not secured because there is no funding.

We have worn a set of blinkers for so long that we are not even aware that over 80 per cent of our vision of national historic sites has been impaired. We live in a world where the Rideau Canal is considered more important than the Welland Canal, the Chilkoot Trail more significant than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Anne of Green Gables more important than the Château Frontenac, even though the latter is, along with the Parliament Buildings and Niagara Falls, probably the most recognized Canadian landmark. These levels of value or significance are based solely on the grounds that we own the Rideau, the Chilkoot, and Green Gables, but not the others. Caution suggests that if our impulse to reconstruct is not kept in check, we will be condemned to managing the ersatz while others deal with the genuine. Surely we can do better than play the role of fiddling Neros in the Canadian historic sites movement.

I find it interesting that one of our issues is entitled "What are the Alternatives to Period Reconstruction?" Apart from the fact that some of the listed alternatives appear to be little *less* than period reconstructions under another name, the question seems to elevate period reconstruction to an end in itself, as though if we don't have or can't have a period reconstruction, we must have an alternative. To me, the question puts the

emphasis on the wrong thing and tends to reinforce the regrettable notion that we have encouraged to the effect that national historic sites are little more than half-empty or half-full containers. What we should be asking instead is: How can national historic significance be communicated effectively without period reconstructions? For example, it seems to me that a place that served as the headquarters for Hudson's Bay Company operations in the Pacific Northwest, was the site of the first salmon-packing operation in British Columbia, and the site where British Columbia was proclaimed a crown colony puts a challenge to our imaginations and to interpretation that reconstruction may simply not address.

To a degree, arguments against reconstruction are often considered to be a veiled attack on the interpretation function or on the need for interpretation itself. This is unfortunate. I sometimes think that we put so much *relative* emphasis on the needs of threatened resources and on the entertainment of visitors that we don't even ask the question of whether the average visitor leaves knowing (let alone knows beforehand) why the site he or she has just visited is one of only 750 places (out of literally millions of cultural heritage sites in this country) that have been recognized formally by the Government of Canada as national historic sites. I believe that the effective communication of national significance is the biggest challenge facing the interpretation function, if not CPS itself, over the next ten years.

If one is going to do a reconstruction, then it goes without saying that one should do it as accurately as possible. But the old argument that we won't do a reconstruction if we don't have sufficient information to do it accurately has taken a twisted turn that has led us now to the point where the existence of accurate information is considered sufficient justification for a reconstruction, provided — of course — that funds are available. Budget rather than policy has become the determining factor. People in the specialist technical disciplines — not interpreters — are often the worst offenders (i.e., strongest proponents) here, dragging out arguments that make much of science and contributions to science.

There is a wonderfully symbiotic relationship between "historical accuracy" and "reconstruction." Indeed, these are the two essential ingredients in what I sometimes regard as the closest humanity has come to producing a perpetual-motion machine. It is hard not to crack a smile after 22 years of working for NHS when one reads a proposal to the effect that **RESEARCH**

(always in upper-case, boldface letters) has recently come up with new information that reveals that reconstructed or restored building "A" is not entirely accurate and that, in the interests of historical accuracy, changes should be made. It is harder still not to emit an audible chuckle if the identical situation has happened before. Now, I have a high regard for historical accuracy, but I think that the exigencies of historical accuracy may often better be respected by admitting that we got it wrong, but have decided to leave things as they are out of regard for the fact that the historical truth may not even yet have been revealed to us in all its majesty, and that an identified "mistake" may have a higher pedagogical value than a "possible or even probable" truth that is subject to change in the future. In fact, I can think of no better way of exposing the public to history and to the nature of our business than by pointing out where and why we got things wrong, and why we may never get them precisely right. What a wonderful interpretive device, one that does not discourage — indeed must not be allowed to discourage — the continuing search for accuracy, one that encourages the communication of the most up-to-date information, and yet one that does not put the entire burden for perceptions of accuracy on the site's physical fabric.

Closely related to the desire for "accuracy" is the desire for "authenticity." Much is made of authenticity by proponents of reconstruction. But Louisbourg does not stink, and the lawns at Fort Anne and Fort George are mown (and fertilized) to aesthetic (not period) standards. Herein lies a major discrepancy in the so-called "authentic historic environment" arguments that are put up to justify reconstruction and animation (which is another form of reconstruction). Generally speaking, such environments are not historic at all: they are highly sanitized to correspond to peoples' expectations.

It is important to acknowledge that many proponents of reconstruction, particularly field people, are acting out of the highest "corporate" motivation of doing what's best for their sites (as expressed by enhanced profile, greater facilities and services development, increased visitation, etc.). CPS is now reaping the harvest of the corporate values it has practiced over the last three decades. If we honestly expect field people to take seriously the latest fashion,

which can be described as "mildly anti-reconstructionist," then it is essential that they and their sites not be penalized in status or classification levels because they have fewer reconstructions than some other site. This is why it is important that superintendent positions at the Halifax Defence Complex and Dawson be classified at the same level as Louisbourg.

There is an issue that has been raised at Fort Langley that merits discussion during this workshop. A perception has arisen in the last year or so that a building or structure can be added to a national historic site where it is required for operational purposes provided that the structure is not a reconstruction and cannot be confused with a reconstruction. Some people are, in my view legitimately, concerned that inappropriate, incompatible structures will be approved whereas those that evoke the past in a manner sensitive to the site will not. I think that consideration of this leads to one of the most interesting questions that was asked during the public consultations on the proposed policy: How does one determine when a national historic site or national park is "complete"? I invite you to contemplate the implications of that question and the reasons that may have led to the question. Simply stated, are we dealing with *Canadian Parks Service* sites or parks, or with *national* historic sites and *national* parks?

Finally, it seems to me that a large part of the attractiveness of reconstructed environments is that they possess a cultural landscape quality that has broad appeal. Louisbourg and Lunenburg, Upper Canada Village and Niagara-on-the-Lake, Village Québécois d'Antan and the Historic District of Québec City offer the same thing to the visitor — a relatively coherent cultural landscape. The only difference is that in the case of Louisbourg, Upper Canada Village, and Village d'Antan, one is visiting a re-creation and — in Northrop Frye's words — "confronting the past." There is another difference: people keep going back to Lunenburg, Niagara-on-the-Lake, and Québec City, which attract more visitors than the theme parks, while the operators of the theme parks are constantly trying to devise something new (or old?) to encourage people to return. Perhaps instead of trying to make each of our sites a cultural landscape in its own right, we should be putting the emphasis on how they fit into the larger cultural landscape around them.

Issue One

What Are the Challenges CPS Faces with Existing Reconstructions?

George Ingram

Introduction

The purpose of this session is to identify some of the problems and challenges posed by existing reconstructions in the system in order to set the stage for the discussions on Day 2, when we will review these issues in a Cultural Resource Management Policy context.

This morning Shannon and Mahlon have shown the breadth and extent of the reconstructions currently existing throughout the system. They exist at many of our sites in all regions, and recently issues, challenges, and opportunities have arisen in association with many of them.

In terms of the structure of this session, I will provide a brief introduction and this will be followed by a series of presentations on selected topics which relate more or less to the subject under consideration. We will then open the topic to the floor for discussion, with our presenters seated at front to provide clarification of any points raised in their presentations and to provide a focus for discussions. Please keep in mind the fact that the objective of this session is to get out on the table the challenges posed to the Canadian Parks Service by existing reconstructions. During the discussion period I would encourage you to identify examples from your own experience. At the end of the session I will attempt to provide a brief summary of some of the key points raised in the session.

What Are Some of the Challenges Posed by Existing Reconstructions?

At the outset it should be noted that we are dealing with an ageing asset base. As noted in the introduction this morning, many of the reconstructed buildings

located at national historic sites across the system were constructed several years ago. They were not erected with permanency in mind, and in fact often replicated structures which were never intended to be permanent. Quite often, modern design modifications introduced into the reconstruction have accelerated this deterioration. In short, simple life-cycle has brought deterioration to the point where significant interventions are in order. Often arguments are advanced for complete replacement or extensive recapitalization. How should we approach their treatment?

Reconstructed buildings often demand a high level of maintenance. Almost by definition, period reconstructions represent the most fragile of historic resources, those structures and features which have not survived intact to the present day. They are often built in wood or other materials which are fragile or temporary. Should we attempt to build into the reconstruction modifications which will prolong their lives? How should we approach their maintenance?

To prolong their lives in reconstructed form dictates high levels of costly maintenance. How can we take steps to ensure that we have truly costed the maintenance of a reconstructed asset to ensure that we can undertake a cost-benefit analysis to guide future reconstructions?

Many of the existing reconstructions contain known inaccuracies. In some instances modifications were consciously built into the design in order to accommodate a requirement at the time of the reconstruction. At Woodside, for example, a basement was added and a wing enlarged to allow for modern services and to accommodate a caretaker. In other instances, research undertaken subsequent to the reconstruction has revealed errors in the original design of features and details of a reconstructed building. To what extent should we attempt to correct these errors,

which range from minor blemishes to major inaccuracies?

A particular challenge is raised by the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office designation of a structure. As you know, buildings 40 years or older must be considered under the Federal Heritage Building Policy, and many of our reconstructed buildings now fall into this category. As some of these buildings have come forward, they have been determined to have heritage value in their own right as either "recognized" or "classified" buildings. The heritage character of the building must therefore be taken into account, must be respected in CPS management of the building. The challenge facing us, therefore, is how to achieve our presentation objectives when dealing with a designated building. I think that we should have a good discussion on this item, for over the next few days we will find that the CRM Policy in many respects brings to bear many of the same considerations as FHBRO.

Finally, there is a related issue which has fallen into this session for consideration. At many of our national historic sites, original cultural assets have reached a state of deterioration where it is felt that the ultimate intervention is necessary; that is, in the interest of "restoring" the structure it is considered necessary to dismantle the existing structure and to erect it anew. It is an occurrence which takes place in varying degrees at many of our restoration projects. What have we here? Is it a new reconstruction to be looked at in *that* context in one of the later sessions, or is it a variation on the treatment of an existing reconstruction? At any rate it was felt important to at least raise the issue in the session.

The Presentations Which Follow Touch upon the Themes Noted Above

Bill Hockey will talk to us about the Fortress of Louisbourg, where an ageing plant of reconstructed buildings has posed the need for extensive re-reconstruction.

Marilyn Watson will talk briefly about Fort George, where we face similar problems of deterioration. In addition, many of the reconstructed log buildings have been designated as "recognized" by FHBRO, which poses particular challenges to the planning process.

Alex Barbour will speak of reconstructed vessels and, I suspect, will stray a bit from the challenges posed by existing vessels because there are currently few in our own system and it is the only opportunity he has to speak to the subject.

Guy Masson will speak about Lower Fort Garry and the problems posed by the wall there. It is not a reconstructed feature per se, but one much modified over time and one which has demanded extensive intervention to the point of reconstruction.

Finally, Bill Naftel will talk briefly about the Fort Anne officers' quarters, a reconstructed building whose FHBRO designation has had quite an extensive impact on the planning process.

I hope that these presentations will provide a backdrop for our discussions later in the session.

Fortress of Louisbourg NHS: Recapitalization of Reconstructions

Bill Hockey

Background

In 1961 the federal government announced a recovery program for Cape Breton, which included a 15- to 20-year \$40-million reconstruction program of part of the historic Fortress of Louisbourg. The site was to be reconstructed as accurately as possible from an archaeological and historical viewpoint, with deviations from authenticity necessary to ensure stability, long life, and minimize maintenance. The project team struggled with policy, never quite establishing a sense of direction for the project or providing a balance between 18th-century detailing and 20th-century building practices. Construction was undertaken by laid-off miners inexperienced in construction, who had to be trained in historic building techniques on the job site. The construction phase officially ended in 1982, and Louisbourg officially started to portray a "moment in time," the summer of 1744.

About five years ago it was discovered that the reconstructed historic buildings were failing at an astonishing rate. This appears to result from inherent design weaknesses of reconstructed 18th-century details plus misapplication of 20th-century building technology. The poor condition of several structures on site showed that Atlantic Regional Office needed to analyse the historic reconstructions to decide: which 18th-century techniques were acceptable, what undocumented changes occurred during construction, and which 20th-century practices are inappropriate. Many buildings are now used for different purposes than originally intended, and this has been a factor in their deterioration.

The inspections were conducted by restoration architects and engineers, assisted by general works carpenters who exposed details for them. Reports for each building contained a narrative describing conditions and a detailed analysis of the causes of

deterioration, accompanied by photographs and drawings. Reports have also defined the extent of recapitalization required and the consequences of inaction: accelerated deterioration.

Deterioration/Solutions

The severe climate of Louisbourg provides three modes of moisture transmission which contribute to the deterioration process: air-borne moisture including rain, snow, and fog; rising damp from below; and moisture generated within buildings.

Charpente construction, wood frame with wood or masonry infill, was studied to see how deterioration developed. A review of Rodrigue House illustrates typical failure patterns and their causes:

1. The sill had been installed with anchor bolts and did not appear to be treated with a preservative. There was a very heavy vinyl membrane on top of the sill, stopping the moisture of rising damp and encouraging premature development of rot in the sill, which was undetected until it caused the early demise of other members;
2. The frame connection below window sills has been shown to be weak, with deterioration occurring from the underside of the sills down. This failure could have been delayed by better connections to vertical frame members to eliminate moisture penetration;
3. The other weakness in the system was the connection of wood furring strips to the centre of the framing members to hold the stone-faced poured-concrete infill in place;
4. The upper portion of the frames is in good condition and does not appear to have suffered much from fungal attack. Concentrations of moisture at this height are lower, so that conditions favourable for fungal attack were less likely to occur. The lower a horizontal member is in the wall, the more likely

water sheeting down the wall will enter the wood, leading to an incidence of rot in the member.

Failure in *piquet* construction, which is vertical logs resting on a sill at grade or buried directly in the ground, is similar. Moisture migrates down the wall and gets trapped by hard mortar fillets, both at the base and between the vertical faces of the *piquets*, causing their early demise. Finally, moisture wicks up the *piquets* at the base, keeping them wet, producing conditions at this location which are conducive for rot to develop.

A number of masonry buildings had joist ends that were wrapped in plastic when installed and have now failed. All wood components embedded in masonry, with no air space to permit breathing of the wood, are in some stage of failure whether wrapped in plastic or not, the plastic only accelerating deterioration.

Conclusions

The historic reconstructions at the Fortress of Louisbourg have deteriorated, so that their condition requires immediate and drastic action to address the effects of deterioration. The potential impact on both building fabric and park operations required establishment of an extensive recapitalization program to address these problems, including a number of "temporary works" to minimize operational impact and provide planning and design time. There are approximately 70 historic buildings reconstructed on site with over 15,000 square metres of enclosed floor space and a combined replacement value of approximately \$37.6 million. We have now appointed a project manager and a restoration architect, as well as support staff, to assume responsibility for this project at the Fortress of Louisbourg. Implementation will be largely through the use of day labour with materials purchased through the Department of Supply and Services, as period construction skills are not readily available in the private sector.

The restoration architect is now examining the compromises which introduced 20th-century building technology into 18th-century details during design and construction, the relative merits or misuse of the

combinations, and whether they should be retained, modified, or eliminated to enhance asset performance. Masonry is generally sound; deterioration is largely confined to wood members. The present design and construction program intends to correct technical errors of the original program to ensure an acceptable life for the recapitalized reconstructions through the following process:

1. review of original design-team minutes for the reconstruction plus any new information required to understand the 18th-century approach; development of details based on the 18th-century approach to be used as a basis for design;
2. design development using the research, modifying the detail based on previous performance and the research base;
3. discussions of detail development with the design team and finalizing the approach;
4. implementation of the recapitalization of the building, with 20th-century technology only applied as necessary to ensure optimum asset performance; 18th-century technology was used where it would perform properly. For example, this wall section is a building that is heated year around and is occupied by the costume department. The wood species was changed to oak for durability, and the detail development took great care to ensure that moisture would migrate outwards and not lie in the wall.

The optimum program for recapitalization was estimated at 8 years; however, this was increased to 11 years to minimize the impact on the multiyear operating plan, which established a fixed recapitalization budget of \$560 thousand per annum for the reconstruction. Considering inflationary increases, in five years the fixed budget will provide less than three-quarters of the work it provides today. Unless the recapitalization is funded at higher levels, the backlog of work is expected to increase and it may not be possible for the Canadian Parks Service to keep the site operational. Neglect can only be entertained for a short time before irreparable damage occurs, and Parks will not be able to continue with its portrayal of the summer of 1744; it may be forced to change its program to portray the summer of 1745, when the fortress was besieged by New Englanders.

Fort George

Marilyn Watson

Fort George will be used to illustrate several points of dealing with restorations, to describe how we got from here to there.

Fort George was built by the British between 1796 and 1799, then extensively and frantically remodelled by them in order to prepare for the War of 1812. It was destroyed by the Americans in 1813, reoccupied by the British the following year, and abandoned as a useless ruin by the 1820s. In October 1920 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada declared it to be of national historic significance for its role in the War of 1812. At that point only the powder magazine still stood, and it was in a ruinous state.

Although the land was still owned by the federal government, the province requested permission to rebuild Fort George as a make-work project. Permission was granted and the project went ahead under the auspices of the Niagara Parks Commission, which is an arm of the provincial government.

The reconstruction was not accurate. It wasn't accurate as there was very little historical research, no archaeology was done, and deliberate decisions were made to accommodate either practical requirements of what was intended to be a "tourist trap" or the aesthetic preferences of the Niagara commissioner of the day. One of the key decisions that were made was to not provide weatherboarding on the log structures because the Parks commissioner of the day didn't like that look — he liked the "frontier look." In other words, they knew it wasn't accurate, but they didn't care. Accuracy in the 1930s wasn't that important.

So the site is not authentic, and it isn't accurate, but we inherited the problem when in 1969 the site was transferred from the provincial government to the Canadian Parks Service.

By 1980 the buildings were beginning to deteriorate, which is not surprising as by then the buildings were 50 years old and the logs had been exposed to the weather for 50 years. At that time Ontario Region began an extensive program to replace rotting logs and to rebuild foundations where required.

At the same time, the decision was taken to utilize this maintenance program as an opportunity, where possible and practical, to increase the accuracy of the structures. This was in keeping with the policy of the time. Although we couldn't correct everything, such as the building dimensions, we could correct things such as the placement of doors and windows. Most importantly, we intended to put clapboard on all of the wood structures, so that they would be maintained for many, many years to come.

This attempt at incremental accuracy caused us a big, big problem. Where do you stop? On the surface some things appeared to be very simple, such as removing verandas that were never there historically from the façade of the officers' quarters, but we found that in the 1930s the verandas were added as extensions of the roof rafters, so to remove the verandas you end up having to remodel the roof.

Nevertheless we proceeded. In 1982 we carried out ultrasonic examination of several structures. This was felt to be a more scientific, accurate, and less destructive method of determining the level of decay than boring and tapping, which was the method used up until that point. This ultrasonic technique worked extremely well. It confirmed the findings of the first two or three log-replacement contracts, which were that boring and tapping were giving us a very low level idea of how much decay had actually happened. It was actually much worse than we thought.

In fact, one of the buildings, the guard house, was found to be over 50 per cent rotten. Because of the amount of logs that had to be replaced and because the construction techniques used in 1938 made it very difficult to replace individual logs, it was recommended that the guard house, which is not a historic structure (or at least it wasn't then), be completely torn down and rebuilt.

A Project Initiation and Planning System approval document was prepared recommending this approach, and it was rejected on the grounds that you can't reconstruct a reconstruction. At that point, Ontario

Region decided they would never use words that began with "re" anymore.

By 1987, when funding for the log-replacement program dried up, we had fixed four buildings, but three key buildings had not been addressed (two of the blockhouses and the guard house).

In 1991 we got FHBRO'd. The powder magazine, an original historic structure although much restored, was "classified," and most of the others were "recognized." The theme they were recognized for is their expression of 1930s attitudes towards Canada's heritage and towards the restoration movement.

The Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office did indicate that there would probably be no great objection to clapboarding when we fixed up the rest of these buildings because it would reduce maintenance costs. So we think we have authorization to go ahead, if we can figure out what other problems go together with clapboarding.

Our far too many years of deferred funding caught up with us. In 1992 further testing of the three remaining buildings (guard house and blockhouses 2 and 3) indicated we were up to about 70 per cent rotting in those three buildings. A consulting structural engineer has recommended that all three buildings be closed unless immediate remedial work is undertaken. Now he didn't use the word "condemned," but he said "closed to the public and the staff right away."

There is a project in hand to shore up these buildings so that they can be opened to the public this year. As some of you might know, 1992 is Ontario's second bicentennial. We are celebrating the 200th anniversary of the first legislative assembly of Upper Canada. The Queen is expected to attend and to visit Fort George. This shoring will be apparent to the public, and it will be explained — what it is, and that we hope to be able to do something more permanent in the near future.

What will the Cultural Resource Management Policy and FHBRO permit us to do? What can we afford to do?

I want to touch briefly on five points that arise from a close study of Fort George.

1. It's not authentic, nor is it accurate, but it's there and it's ours, it has our name on the front. Without those reconstructions this site, the key site for our commemoration and interpretation of the War of 1812, would consist of one little building in a lumpy green field.

2. We are currently halfway through a transformation that was intended to turn a "sow's ear" into a better sow's ear, and we ran out of money. With the remaining buildings in poor condition and three virtually condemned, the issue of very high maintenance costs comes to the fore. We are looking in the order of 1.5 to 3 million dollars for the three buildings that are currently an issue, and it depends on which method of addressing the problem we adopt.

But I don't think that this high maintenance thing should be overstated. This is the first significant maintenance that these buildings have had in 50 years, and they have been exposed for 50 years because they weren't built the right way in the first place.

3. When you consider incremental changes to increase accuracy, where do you stop? One thing always leads to another. Incremental changes are probably not a good way to go. Either take it down and start over, or forget it — leave it the way it is.
4. We have a Board designation and a FHBRO designation that are at odds. The Board says it's important for the War of 1812. The resources which are currently at the site do not reflect that. FHBRO says it is important because of the 1930s preservation movement. The resources at the site do reflect that, but which is the more important theme? I think the Board's theme is more important, but I don't work for FHBRO.
5. And a point that is going to be raised a little further on but which I want to raise now: because of Fort George's lack of authenticity and accuracy, the region has been using it as a kind of glorified stage set upon which we can present the stories of the War of 1812. The lack of visual accuracy creates an interpretative problem. Visitors come to the fort and think they are seeing something with which they are already familiar — Fort Laramie — not the elegant, refined Georgian compound Fort George had become on the eve of the War of 1812. When they look at Fort Laramie they also think they know the story to be told there. Visitors come to the front gate, look at the fort, and say that this fort was built to protect us from the Indians. Before the visitor ever sets foot in the fort, we are battling a preconceived notion. We find it difficult to convince the visitor that no, the Indians were our honoured allies; we were fighting the Yankees.

Conservation Treatment of a Cultural Resource: Lower Fort Garry Walls

Guy Masson

Historical Background

Construction of the walls at Lower Fort Garry did not actually commence until 1838, when Governor G. Simpson determined that the fort should be “defensible or secure from attack.”

Simpson ordered Chief Factor Christie to get the stone quarried and hauled so as to form a strong wall with flanking bastions for protection.

Characteristics

1. Total area enclosed by walls is 4.5 acres; 3 gates and 4 bastions.
2. Walls are 3 feet thick, 7–11 feet high, 6 feet below ground.
3. Limestone material, lime mortar, rubble masonry with filling, over-buttered jointing.
4. Work on the walls was completed by the 6th Regiment during their occupation of Lower Fort Garry between 1846 and 1848.

Maintenance

1. 1925 — Hudson’s Bay Company Land Development Records: “a layer of bitumen was applied along the top of the walls so as to keep moisture from penetrating the masonry.”

2. 1952 — National Historic Service Department: “a new asphalt mastic capping to the top of the walls was applied and repointing done at various places.”
3. 1974 — A report from Restoration Services recommended a program of treatment and repair of walls: repointing, replacement of damaged stones, and new capping.
4. 1987 — Conservation treatment: selected based on physical condition of cultural resource:
 - a) setting of stones, damaged stones, variety of mortar;
 - b) bulging, structural stability.Conservation treatment not based on heritage values (integrity, original fabric).

Implementation of Conservation Treatment

- a) dismantling of the walls,
- b) cut centennial trees,
- c) replacement of damaged stones with new stones,
- d) impact on the cultural landscape, archaeological resources,
- e) reconstruct (new foundation, new mortar),
- f) rebuild a new “integrity,”
- g) re-create a new product for the public.

Note: The Lower Fort Garry Management Plan Team recommended to revise the wall conservation works by developing a new conservation strategy for future works.

The Fort Anne Officers' Quarters; A Reconstruction Case Study

Bill Naftel

The fact that we are here considering the officers' quarters as a reconstruction and not a restoration case study is indicative of how perceptions, and hence the definitions we use to describe them, have evolved over the past half century.

It is also, I hope, a question of hindsight and water under the bridge, for the issues which arose from the application of cultural resource management to the officers' quarters came about because the Program, or at least Atlantic Region, was totally unprepared for what in effect was a dramatic shift in emphasis, if not policy. By now, however, CRM is a known quantity and will be taken into account in any future planning process.

In 1917 the military reserve in Annapolis Royal, incorporating surviving 18th-century earthworks, the old officers' quarters building (1796), and a gun shed (1809), was created a Dominion park under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. This was not a last-minute rescue of a threatened site, but its acquisition as a Dominion park represented a victory for local preservationists who wanted a permanent form of protection. It had been protected under local auspices since 1886, when railway expansion brought with it a recognition of the historic and aesthetic contribution the old fort could make to a burgeoning tourist industry.

Improvements began almost immediately with the demolition of a number of structures on the grounds, including the 1809 gun shed, and the officers' quarters were opened as a museum and park office in 1918.

The next 20 years saw a remarkable flowering of historic-site advocacy in this corner of the Dominion. Handsome museum buildings were erected at Louisbourg and Fort Beauséjour, an elegant memorial chapel commemorated the vanished Acadians of Grand Pré, and the Habitation of DeMonts and Champlain was reconstructed better than new at Port Royal. Better still, at Fort Anne there was already an existing historic structure that need only be properly "restored" to

establish for the Annapolis area an attractive, efficient, fireproof museum.

So, in 1934–35 the 1796 British officers' quarters, with a ruthlessness that certainly strikes the modern observer (and must surely have raised a few eyebrows at the time amongst those who had manoeuvred so successfully for the preservation of the site), were transmogrified from an old wooden barracks building of the 18th century into the desired attractive, efficient, and fireproof museum. The restoration transformed a pleasant but undistinguished late-18th-century building into a snappy, stylish golf club house à la Grosse Pointe, Michigan. Clearly the restorers were animated by the feeling that this was what the army should have put up and/or would have put up if they had had the money and taste of their successors of a later century.

Unwittingly, however, the preservationists of the 1920s and 1930s bequeathed to their successors a knotty dilemma. The field of CRM has evolved rapidly in the generation and more that has passed since 1935, and with it has evolved the definitions which constitute its rationale. The dilemma revolves around the definition of the word "restore," a word which a half century later came to have a much more precise meaning which did not include replacing wood framing with poured concrete.

By the 1970s, historical research accompanying the management-planning process revealed to a new generation of cultural resource professionals that by any definition then current, the restoration of the officers' quarters was a full-scale 20th-century reconstruction. The amount of original fabric that survived the creation of the museum was miniscule. Clearly the planning team was not dealing with a 1796 building but a gussied-up 1935 replica incongruously located within worn but authentic 18th-century earthworks. Approved themes and objectives had no role for a building now clearly identified as 20th century in design and inspiration. Once the Program was prepared to admit that it had on its hands a reconstruction and a less than perfect one at that, it was

prepared to make modifications that, from an interpretive point of view, would give the building a genuine role in informing the visitor about the themes which have made Fort Anne nationally significant.

The result was a 1984 management-plan recommendation to return the exterior and parts of the interior to a conjectural 1835 appearance. Communicated to the public via a consultation process and subsequently approved by the then Minister Charles Caccia in 1984, this then became Parks policy.

As a necessary precursor to implementation of the management plan and as part of the process of bringing forward buildings over 40 years old for evaluation by the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office, the officers' quarters were submitted to FHBRO in 1988. FHBRO, it should be noted, was to all intents and purposes a new player since it had not existed when "management planning" started in the late 1970s. The end result, was not, as was widely expected, a formal recognition that the officers' quarters were indeed a 20th-century building and hence had little or no heritage value, but rather a decision to award the building a Classified designation, not on the basis of its status as a 1797 officers' quarters, but as an excellent example of the conservation ethic of 1935. The features of the building that made it worthy of preservation were precisely those that would be obliterated by the implementation of the management plan. With the issuance of the Heritage Character Statement, and approval by the Minister, this then became Parks policy.

So now we have two ministerially approved documents dealing with the same building, signed within a few years of each other, and recommending what amounts to two courses of action at a 180-degree remove from each other.

So what in the end has been the result? In the end, the FHBRO recommendation applying the principles of CRM has prevailed.

We will take the high ground of principle wherein application of CRM has preserved for posterity a fine example of the realization of the first stirrings of heritage conservation in Canada, and in hindsight who can argue that this was not the best decision? So drastically had the building been restored in 1935 that one can now say that what we really have is a 1935 building with but a few fragments of 18th- and 19th-century origin incorporated therein. It is indeed a really interesting building and I personally am happy it is to be left alone.

But the thrashing around that certainly resulted in Atlantic Region when the implication of the FHBRO decision sank in does raise a few issues.

One retrospective issue which comes to mind is a less than flattering insight into the minds of our predecessors who could, without an apparent qualm, demolish a structure they had fought to preserve and not feel that they were doing anything other than conferring an inestimable benefit upon a grateful posterity. I suppose the casual demolition of the unaesthetic artillery shed in 1923 should have been a forewarning.

A more pressing issue, however, arises from the application of CRM to a reconstruction, a building considered until very recently as much a tool to instruct the visitor as it was a replica of what has gone before. In Atlantic Region, the unannounced arrival of CRM left the region with a management plan in ruins. The 1835 officers' quarters were the keystone of the plan and without it we will have to start at square one.

A secondary issue here is that, other than those who spent a measurable proportion of their working careers on the old plan, no one seems to care that all that time, money, and effort went down the drain with the application of CRM.

Thirdly, when does a reconstruction cross that shimmering line which turns it from being simply a handy but carefully crafted interpretive tool to become in and of itself a historical artifact in which even the errors and omissions of its creators are given protected status?

In terms of the officers' quarters, the 1935 museum building has now become an artifact in its own right, sitting in the midst of 18th-century earthenworks. It is right now a white elephant, a Detroit golf club from the roaring twenties, out of context, a museum building designed to house and display a specific collection according to the tenets of the time. We don't want it there and we need something else entirely.

Fourthly, the application of CRM has willy-nilly created a brand new theme for Fort Anne — the early conservation movement in Canada. It cannot now be entirely avoided, as the largest artifact in the historic site represents that theme and indeed overshadows all the others. But is Fort Anne really the best place in the entire Dominion of Canada to commemorate this nationally significant theme?

If CRM is to apply to reconstructions, I would suggest three lessons arising from the officers' quarters experience:

- Develop a mechanism whereby the potential effect of any new policy direction is made abundantly clear well in advance of the adoption of any such policy.
- We must come up with regulations sufficiently flexible to enable the buildings that we build for one purpose to continue to fulfil that purpose. Either we do such sloppy jobs that they can never be subject to its strictures, or we establish guidelines that build in flexibility so that we are not encumbered with structures that have outlived their usefulness.
- Or else we undertake that those reconstructions that we build in the future will be so carefully crafted, in terms of quality of research, design, and production, that we aim for a future heritage designation from those who will succeed us and hence no such designation can ever be anything other than a sought-for honour.

Issue Two

What Are the Values of Reconstructions as They Relate to Presentation?

Opening Remarks

Richard Lindo

This morning we were reminded more than once that there are two sides to our commemorative efforts. One side is the protection side. The other side, which is the more interesting side, is the presentation side.

Period Reconstruction and Interpretation

Richard Lavoie

Translated from the original French by the Department of the Secretary of State

A Natural Pair

Some things pair off almost of their own accord, like bread and butter, which seem to go together so inevitably that it is all too easy to forget about cholesterol. Interpretation and period reconstruction form just such a complementary pair, but clients' expectations, the economic context, our policy review, and our new working methods make it imperative for us to stop and ask ourselves some questions. So at the end of the day it is appropriate for us to take a few minutes between technical discussions to consider just why the Canadian Parks Service undertakes period reconstruction. My own involvement as an interpreter has led me to turn for my answers to my experience working with the public and with other interpreters in much the same situation as myself.

What Do We Mean by "Interpretation"?

Every interpreter has his or her own answer to this question, needless to say. To simplify matters, I have selected the definitions offered by three organizations in which interpreters constitute a strong presence. In addition, I have attempted to use each definition as an approach to the task facing us in these workshops. First, Interpretation Canada tells us that interpretation is "a communication process designated to reveal meanings and relationships of our cultural and natural heritage to the public through first hand involvement with an object, artifacts and landscape or site."¹

AQIP, the Association québécoise du patrimoine, defines interpretation as "a technique for enhancing the visiting public's awareness of the value, significance and human resonance of our cultural, natural or other

heritage by making the material forms of that heritage meaningful through a variety of techniques that rely primarily on conscious perception, that is, that lead to understanding in an experiential and descriptive sense rather than a rigorously rational sense [translation]."² And lastly, CPS informs us in a chapter dealing with its Cultural Resource Management Policy that it uses interpretation to communicate "an understanding and appreciation of the historic value of particular places, things, events and activities to visitors and the public," and that "this communication may be accomplished through firsthand experience of historic places, appropriate use of cultural resources and the use of media."³

The interesting feature of these definitions is that they all include three constants:

- **interpretation is a form of communication**; it sets up an interactive process involving a transmitter (such as a historic canal or site), a receiver (the target public), and a message (the message being extracted from a set of themes and objectives);
- **interpretation is associated with the material world**; it is intimately bound up with a particular location, artifact, site, or structure. In the absence of such a tangible reality — something that can be seen, touched, and felt — interpretation would be reduced to a mere analogue of other forms of communication, such as television programs, newspapers, and the like;
- **interpretation seeks to involve its audience**, to secure the participation of that audience. Interpretation leads to understanding in an experiential and descriptive sense rather than mere cerebral knowledge.

It appears, then, that what is required is an actual physical site whose function is to convey Environment Canada's messages about conservation and presentation to a selected audience. What could be better suited to this purpose than period reconstruction?

Relationships with Period Reconstruction

The approach adopted in CPS's CRM Policy is aimed essentially at determining under what conditions period reconstruction is a valid option. Accordingly, it is pointless to look for a definition here. However, the conditions identified in that policy are specific and shed much light on our experimental efforts at many sites in various parts of Canada.

In the first place, period reconstruction, like all our actions in conservation and presentation, must conform to the five basic principles that underpin the CRM Policy: value, public interest, understanding, respect, and integrity.

We find a second clue in the role played by period reconstruction in the context of the CRM Policy.

Restoration, for example, is identified as a conservation activity. Period reconstruction is treated as a form of presentation; as such it is analogous to reproductions, special events, facilities, services, and interpretation. In point of fact, the CRM Policy identifies period reconstruction as a form of interpretation that should be adopted "in exceptional circumstances."⁴ It thus appears that to CPS, period reconstruction and interpretation are closely related.

Lastly, period reconstruction is enhanced by other interpretation techniques. It is not exclusive. Its impact can be heightened by audiovisual means, such as sound-and-light displays. A period room full of artifacts supplements period reconstruction in a very natural way. Personalized interpretation services fit comfortably into such a setting, in the cases of both regular staff and those wearing period costumes.

A Powerful Interpretation Tool

Interpretation is a form of communication that is bound up with the material world and seeks to involve its audience. The process penetrates deeply because of its impact on the recipient, and the term "involvement" is the key to it. An effective interpretation experience can lead to a significantly altered perception of historical reality and may even elicit new forms of behaviour in a participant, inasmuch as it generates an amalgam of cognitive understanding and awareness derived from sense data. Robert Moreau, who will be presenting the

next paper, will tell you something about the living experience in which visitors will be invited to participate.

We really do succeed in producing this shock effect, as we know from customer studies and focus groups. Our interpreters in the parks enjoy a high degree of credibility with visitors. Our interpretation programs are the most effective means of communication that CPS has at its disposal; however, not all interpretation programs yield the same results. Some of them use low-key approaches, while others are very powerful tools indeed.

In my own view, there is no more effective way of interpreting our past than to, in effect, pick visitors up and transport them to the setting of a historic house, ship, or fortress. For an interpreter, in fact, a period reconstruction is a most evocative aid, one that has an impact comparable to that of an IMAX film, for example. While these two interpretation megavehicles are certainly very different, they share many characteristics. Both are very costly. Both rely on an elaborate high-tech support system that must be maintained over a long period of time. Both target a clientele that is as broad as it is non-specific. Both may, on occasion, have such powerful impact on the customer that the message tends to be overshadowed by the technology.

In many instances, the result of these phenomena is a measure of loss of control over the medium, which acquires a life of its own instead of playing its designated supporting role: the Rolling Stones, for example, have now achieved respectable status as museum exhibits. Given this context, it is really not surprising that the CRM Policy includes a warning about using this interpretation vehicle with caution!

It thus appears that over and above actual interpretation-related needs, any choice relating to period reconstruction should be made with an eye to this risk of possible loss of control. The interests of various institutions and other associates are a source of pressure that may lead to uses unrelated to CPS's basic terms of reference. These parties see period reconstruction as a promising forum for attaining their own objectives. The higher the visibility of a particular project, the greater the interest it is likely to generate.

The Aims of Outside Parties

It is here that the experience of the entire CPS team, interpreters included, has an essential role to play. These outside parties are legion, and more of them appear every passing day. The following survey offers a few examples rather than an exhaustive list.

The tourism sector pricks up its collective ears at the first rumours of a prospective reconstruction project. Experience has repeatedly shown what a potent impact the professional or "Hollywood" approach to period reconstruction can have. And the tourism sector has big, powerful allies whose aims are entirely legitimate. Tourism Canada, provincial or municipal agencies, strong pressure groups comprising these institutions working in tandem with Chambers of Commerce and with transport, restaurant and hotel interests, all these and more, we may be certain, are constantly on the alert.

Community pride is another important factor. A recent article on the historical reconstruction of the city of Dresden⁵ speaks for itself. The source of motivation and funding for this gigantic effort is a population that is proud of their city's past and determined not to miss this opportunity of asserting their faith in a better future. Regardless of whether the community concerned is a village, a great city, or an entire country, the effect is the same: these projects generate a unique sense of belonging.

Economic benefits are a factor that is often mentioned by advocates of a period reconstruction project. In human terms, those benefits are quantifiable as numbers of jobs, some temporary and some permanent. There are corporate profits to be made, obviously: think of the building contractors and the various firms that will be engaged to do the maintenance work, run the restaurant, and carry out other functions associated with the project's operation. What would become of Louisbourg without "its fortress"?

Period reconstruction has something to offer the learned professions as well, namely contributions to knowledge. Theoretical constructs have their limitations. The skills and abilities of Canada's original colonists arouse our surprise and admiration, especially when we realize what determination and sacrifices were called for. Furthermore, reconstructions have been known to afford a means of ascertaining whether particular historical assumptions were plausible or

mere fantasy. Reconstructed ships, for example, are fruitful sources of information about voyages of discovery and the lives of these enterprising pioneers.

Re-creating and reconstructing demand time, resources, and effort. Much can be done with the aid of contemporary technology, but even so, these projects are inevitably difficult and costly. For CPS, limited human and financial resources are serious constraints that affect our planning. We must make sure that in every decision to undertake a period reconstruction project as an interpretation vehicle, the site in question is appropriate in terms of messages that will be conveyed and in visitor volume.

Tourist activities, economic fall-out, community pride, the advancement of knowledge in the field of history and in related disciplines are all legitimate, essential aims for the people who work with us. It is just as important for us to be receptive to their needs as it is for us to perform the tasks that are spelled out in our own terms of reference, so much so, in fact, that we have regularly allowed this aspect to overshadow our own primary function — interpretation.

Our associates must understand that when they join forces with us in one of our reconstruction projects, they have to assume a proportionate share of the resulting responsibility every step of the way, from the design stage through the construction and maintenance stages. Genuine partnership implies fair division of both advantages and liabilities. The discussions that have taken place in the course of this conference have clearly shown that CPS can no longer bear single handed not only the burden of its own objectives, which are concerned with interpretation, but that of all its associates' objectives as well.

The Art of Turning One's Assets to Good Account

When I heard about this workshop project, my initial reaction was one of surprise. We should not lose sight of one of the cardinal rules of management: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it!" For an interpreter, such a helpful interpretation vehicle as period reconstruction may prove essential under some circumstances. The problems that have been brought to our attention are not significant in this connection, as in most instances they have had more to do with the way this vehicle is used than with its use as such. I suggest that we should

look instead at our planning and presentation processes. Powerful and costly instruments should be used only with discrimination and only at locations where they can function with maximum efficiency. How can park development be intelligible in the absence of a management plan?

Any decision for or against period reconstruction, period rooms, and the systematic reproduction of artifacts is part of that same presentation process. By keeping an eye on our associates, we will be keeping ourselves informed about the context and likelihood of their involvement. In the end, the decision should be founded essentially on a maximally efficient configuration of the messages that we wish to convey, the receptiveness of the target clientele, and the means at our disposal. If whatever we are commemorating is important enough, a period reconstruction project may

well turn out to be the most desirable of the available options.

Notes

- 1 B. Peart, "Definition of Interpretation," *Interpretation Canada*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Autumn 1978), p. 5.
- 2 P. Bégin, D. Blanchet, M. Cayer, J. Major, R. Pommerleau, "Interprétation du patrimoine," *Néologie en marche*, Nos. 38–39 (1984), p. 66.
- 3 Environment Canada, Parks Service, "Cultural Resource Management Policy," *Canadian Parks Service: Proposed Policy* (Ottawa: 1990), p. 108, sect. 3.5.2.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 109, sect. 3.5.2.8.
- 5 D. Benjamin, "Dresden Redivivus," *Time, The Weekly Newsmagazine*, Vol. 139, No. 1 (6 Jan. 1992), p. 57.

Value of Reconstructions to Fort George

Mary Taylor

The value of Fort George's reconstructions to the presentation function is at this time a little difficult to address. We are about to begin the visitor activity concept planning work for this site this summer. This will help us to better understand our visitors, their needs, and their expectations; to establish objectives relating to presentation message and resource protection; and to develop a strategy for providing appropriate visitor experiences. In the analysis involved in this work, we should come to a better understanding of the value of the reconstructed resources in helping us to deliver essential departmental and site messages. We look to national policy to give us overall Program direction in our planning work.

The Cultural Resource Management Policy and Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office are policies which, perhaps due to our lack of understanding to date, have given us some concern as we begin our planning work. How much do resource-protection policies affect our presentation capabilities? At Fort George we have two resource challenges in terms of delivering national messages: 1, inaccuracies of the present reconstruction, and 2, incompleteness of the resources (i.e., the buildings normally associated with a fort) that are required to tell the story. Fort George is meant to present the fort on the "eve of war," but of course, we can't hope to really do this with what we do have. We have only one building from that period.

Fort George tells the story of the defence of Canada during the War of 1812. No other Canadian Parks Service site in Ontario can tell this story as well as Fort George.

This is an inspirational story. You all know it: faced by superior military forces, a small colony survived, establishing a distinct North American identity and ultimately a separate, independent nation. It's an extremely important story in the context of the overall national story.

For those of you who don't know, across the river from Fort George, very dramatically positioned at the spot where the Niagara River empties into Lake

Ontario, sits Fort Niagara. The two forts are in clear view of each other and at the start of a visit to either site you are made critically aware of the opposing fortification.

Fort Niagara is a much more accurate historic resource than Fort George. Visitors coming to Fort George expect to hear the story of military defence. This story is the one designated for Fort George by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board. But the historic resources at Fort George in many ways present a challenge to telling this story. Some parts (the powder magazine and parts of the earthworks) are original to the war period. The major portions of the site are reconstructions from the 1930s. These reconstructions were not based upon the best base of historical research and hence contain major inaccuracies; e.g., we have log buildings in place of "original-look" log buildings covered by weatherboarding.

Many important buildings are missing from the overall site experience. Nevertheless, the significant Depression-related public works project which led to the reconstruction of Fort George and the philosophy and technology behind this 1930s commemoration are considered to be important in themselves and are the basis for the FHBRO Registered designation which has been given to most of the site's buildings.

This is our presentation challenge at Fort George: tell the important stories relating to the War of 1812, as instructed by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, with resources that seem to tell another story.

Some points to consider:

1. The FHBRO-designated and CRM-protected log buildings are not just historically inaccurate, they create a very false first impression of Fort George for visitors. They suggest a "frontier fort" designed to protect new European settlers against the hostile Indians, and indeed, the chief of Visitor Activities reports that the most common first question is, "So, this was built to protect against the Indians, eh?" This reconstruction primarily symbolizes the American concept of "forging into the wild frontier," not a visual presentation of a British

Georgian military establishment, and in the words of the chief of Visitor Activities, it puts quaint "Oldie Timey" in place of the controlled, orderly Georgian reality. He also points out that the 1930s restoration architect identified and tried to correct this inaccuracy and the falsification of the restoration, but the politically appointed Niagara Parks commissioners prevailed in creating the image that they wanted.

2. All of this is a pretty interesting story in itself and worthy to be told. However, we have no direction with regard to telling the 1930s story; i.e., What is important about it? How does it fit into the much bigger national story? Visitors to Fort George expect a military, War of 1812 story. The 1930s reconstruction story really can't compete with this in terms of capturing visitors' interest.

A visitor survey conducted at Fort George in the summer of 1991 recorded the following visitor expectations:

- 78 per cent of visitors reported that "seeing how soldiers lived in the 19th century" was important to enjoying a site visit.
 - 70 per cent of visitors considered it important that they find out more about the War of 1812.
 - 90 per cent of visitors considered it important that they see buildings accurately furnished (and one has to conclude, accurately constructed) to their historic period.
3. While modern media are important tools in telling vital stories, they can't take the place of an accurate historic resource or reconstruction in terms of creating a meaningful site visit. This affective value of a re-created setting cannot be underestimated. It is the reason why reconstructions keep getting recommended as best planning approaches. It is the reason that during preliminary visitor activities concept planning work, the need to complete the story of Fort George by reconstructing the hospital and other missing buildings was recommended. What you can see first-hand and feel has more

impact than what you are told about. Sites such as Fort St. Joseph can present engaging site experiences without structural remains, but rely heavily upon personal services (which are pretty scarce these days) supplemented by orientation through major media within visitor centres. Fort George has no visitor centre.

4. Fort George receives approximately 100 thousand visitors per year. We could more than double visitation at Fort George without negative impact on the physical resources. The Niagara Region, because of Niagara Falls, is Canada's number 1 tourist destination, attracting 11 million visitors per year. There are large numbers of organized bus tours which target the Niagara area. We get a very small percentage of them. The decision to target to attract these visitors would come as a result of recommendations from management and visitor activities concept planning. However, any attempt to attract new visitors might be seriously hindered by our "non-competitive" product; i.e., inaccurate, decomposing buildings.

* * *

In making any decisions with regard to improving the accuracy of current buildings, repair of current reconstruction, or further reconstruction, we must take into consideration what our public needs and their expectations.

There is a last point that I would like to add to counter a misconception that the visitor activities function is a hard-line proponent of reconstruction. We are on the front lines at sites such as Fort St. Joseph, Rocky Mountain House, and other "ruins," sites helping our visitors to understand and support our national policies on reconstruction and heritage commemoration. But if we are charged with telling the site stories and delivering our Program messages, we must have policies and direction which help us to achieve these objectives.

The Place of Landscape, and Landscape as the Place

Linda Dicaire Fardin

In the final scene of the film *Gone with the Wind*, Scarlett O'Hara is sitting at the bottom of the staircase in despair, and the words which keep echoing in her mind suggest "the land, there will always be the land..." And so it is with our national historic sites; we designate and we acquire land which is tied in a very important way to a chapter of Canadian history. I should like to place Mr. Moreau's earlier example of cannons in another context. Whereas we have already compared the impact of "here is the original cannon which Montcalm fired" to "here is the reproduction of the cannon which Montcalm fired" and to "here is the replica of the reproduction of the cannon which Montcalm fired," we have not yet addressed the impact of saying "you are standing on the very place where Montcalm fired his cannons."

In the spirit of Gordon Bennett's address, I should also like to suggest that we look at our sites, at all of our sites, as individual cultural landscapes that are part of a broader cultural landscape spectrum. In this context we place ourselves in the business of landscape management. There is more to the relationship between man and his environment than architecture, although architecture does provide a very important vehicle to understand in part that relationship. But buildings do not exist in isolation, they do not exist without a site. They are built on and evolve with and within a landscape. Shannon Ricketts' slides illustrated this despite her opening statement that she would not deal with landscapes.

One of the commentaries which David Huddleston received and presented to us stated that "landscapes significantly enhance a site and give it context." I beg to differ; landscapes do not enhance a site, they provide the site. As to whether they give context, one can argue that the symbiotic relationship between buildings and landscapes demonstrate that they are mutually dependent for context. Buildings can give context to landscapes; it is not necessarily the other way around.

The subservient role which landscapes have been associated with has sometimes influenced our commitment to their conservation or lack thereof. If we

looked at our sites as resources rather than as settings for collections of resources (and I use the term "resources" to include buildings, archaeological foundations and objects, et cetera), would we neglect or vandalize them as we do? I do not use the term "vandalize" loosely, for what else does one call the intermediate processes which destroy landscape fabric, character, or relationships that have perhaps until site acquisition rested intact for a hundred years or more.

I am frequently called upon for technical advice and assistance in matters of cultural landscape conservation, and I am sometimes in the happy position of seeing the potential for repair or restoration explored and developed. But when the project is finished I sometimes have to confront the reality that, because of processes which could not be prevented, there was a moment in time when the perfect restoration actually became a reconstruction. This happened with Inverarden House NHS in Cornwall, Ontario.

Mahlon Robinson also showed you the Ottawa locks during their reconstruction, and it is also clear there that the landscape suffered damages as well.

Can we find solace in the fact that we have recorded the landscape? To a degree, if we have. But some of the biting questions remain: Have we recorded it sufficiently? Have our contractors respected the minutiae of our conservation drawings and specifications? And more importantly, has something been lost in the process? We could turn to the repair of the walls of Lower Fort Garry NHS to ponder this question.

Because of the technical realities involved with conservation interventions, reconstruction is hard to avoid, a necessary evil at times, and if this provokes the gods, so be it.

In the case of landscape interventions there is always a very serious problem of semantics. Landscapes are by their very nature living things. They cannot be frozen in time because they are ruled by dynamic forces. It is impossible to address the value of landscape reconstruction without coming to grips with the overlap which exists between landscape repair,

restoration, and reconstruction. It is good to remind ourselves:

- that landscape restoration may require some degree of reconstruction (in Dawson City, Yukon, the Robert Service cabin landscape was restored, but a select few items, such as the fence, required reconstruction).
- that landscape restoration does not necessarily involve conjecture, but it might.
- that landscape reconstruction does not necessarily involve conjecture, but it is likely to.

Landscape restoration and reconstruction both share some common ground in presenting the design intent or cultural relationship as it was in living form with a concern for the authenticity of fabric, character, and relationships. But landscape restoration enjoys the link of unbroken, continuing processes; it deals with surviving fabric and form, and I make here for the purposes of this presentation a distinction between surviving and authentic fabrics and forms. Fabrics and forms can be duplicated, and authentic duplication falls into the realm of reconstruction.

"Before" photographs of Ardgowan (Pope House) in PEI reveal to a limited degree the archaeological and plant resources which could be depended on for the landscape restoration. An "after" photograph shows how integration of these elements ensured a convincing presentation, yet a few individual elements — like benches and plantings — were reconstructed based on site-specific and comparative data. This is where we can fall into Christina Cameron's "nitpicking" category. A few reconstructed elements do not turn a restoration project into a reconstruction. In this respect it is a question of degree, of the quantity and quality of the surviving fabric, character, and relationships.

The value of reconstruction can rest in completing a picture already begun by the reconstruction of individual elements. At Louisbourg it makes sense to reconstruct the various gardens associated with the buildings. But does it make more sense at Louisbourg than at Fort Lennox?

If you agree with me that the addition of a few reconstructed objects in a restored landscape is legitimate because it is in accordance with Cultural Resource Management article 3.5.1.1 (i.e., that the presentation enhances the historic value of the whole), then, ergo, you might agree that the reconstruction of the landscape is legitimate in association with archaeological resources or with one building or with a complex of *restored* buildings because again the presentation enhances the historic value of the whole.

No matter what we do, we do not have a chance to make a first impression twice. From the moment a visitor approaches our site he is creating his first impression, and in this context the fate of the broader landscape in which our individual sites are contained is of concern to us. Nevertheless, there are finite boundaries to our sites, and the first impression which the contained site can make is equally important. A visitor should begin to understand the sense of place and the sense of time *passed* from the moment he (she) leaves his (her) car, and preferably even before that. A visitor's first contact is always with the landscape, and yet how many NHS landscapes communicate the impressions we seek to communicate? In truth we have an increasing number, but it is not a majority yet.

Many of our sites are still in conditions which can be restored to preserve the witnesses of the past and which do not require reconstruction as a means of recovering the past. I think there are many people in the NHS system who are acquainted with sites which they feel would need reconstruction, when in fact there is a dormant landscape there requiring restoration, not reconstruction. The land is there, the footprint is often there. There are countless sophisticated techniques to read a landscape and to recognize not one but the many layers before us.

Restoration and reconstruction also share a common requirement for appropriate maintenance. The irony is that the restoration of the heritage character of a site can often be achieved by a change in maintenance tools and techniques. But inappropriate maintenance techniques can also destroy historic fabric and take a site out of the realm of restoration into one of reconstruction. One flower head chopped off at the wrong time can mean the end of a unique seed source for plant propagation. Fertilizing and irrigation can damage archaeological resources or alter soil humidity content so that tell-tale crop marks indicating the presence of former features can no longer be recognized. Tree stumps can be removed without recording, ring counts, or replacement planting. So there is a very real situation where our daily interim management of sites can eventually destroy the possibility of restoration and force us to look at reconstruction.

I should like to mention that works in landscape conservation are governed by principles set out in international charters like the Venice and Florence charters, the latter dealing more with the "architectural" garden. It is revealing that the Florence Charter tells us that reconstruction work might be undertaken

more particularly on the parts of the garden nearest to the building it contains in order to bring out their significance in design.

May I end here by reminding you that landscapes are living documents which require constant renewal.

They provide us with immediate tools to establish a sense of place and a sense of time. The next time that you are confronted with a question of reconstruction, please ask if the site does not require restoration, but simply maintenance instead.

The Value of Reconstruction

William A. O'Shea

Reconstructions are valuable for at least three reasons.

1. Reconstructions can be excellent models of historical data.
2. Reconstructions are opportunities for community development.
3. Reconstructions can become icons.

Reconstruction as a Model of Historical Data

The great challenge for Parks historical interpretation is to construct effective models, based on historical information, that encourage insight into the past.

We might say that writing historical and archaeological reports and articles in journals and mounting displays provide a sufficient model of the past, but we know that it is not true. The reality is that the great majority of people do not identify with this sort of model formulation. Even professionals in other fields, who use words like we do and read extensively in their own fields, do not have the time or interest to read our stuff. We might say, as Victorian romanticists, that mouldering ruins provide a sufficient model to evoke images of the past. But this is largely mysticism, for unless you approach ruins with a large baggage of preparation, ruins don't reveal much information.

We might even say that in acquiring and caring for original structures, we have accomplished our goals of preserving and presenting the past. But conserving original fabric is only a part of our challenge. Surviving artifacts do not present all of the past and, as pointed out by critics, surviving artifacts can present a highly selective and culturally prejudiced view of our history.

We live in a world of high visual literacy. And reconstruction is an excellent solution for the problem of communicating and interpreting the past and its ideas. It appeals to a wide range of people. It appeals because it is three dimensional and life size. It surrounds. It absorbs. And, done well, reconstruction

can achieve the goal of any good model. It can aid memory, assist in discovery, explain, and test ideas.

A reconstruction has a singular advantage over an artifact in that it can be torn apart, put back together in different shapes, permitted to fall down, jumped upon, scratched, and hammered. We can actually use a reconstruction in the way the original thing was meant to be used — as a place to live and use and maintain, as opposed to a place to conserve and limit access.

An excellent reconstruction — determined on the basis of its adherence to the existing knowledge base — can suggest important historical context, spatial relationships, textures, patterns of use, technologies, and above all, a sense of another world. The extent to which it can accomplish this is based on how successfully it translates historical data into physical reality.

Reconstructions have forced us to understand history beyond mere conservation of the physical remains of the past. They have made us proactive in knowing history.

The problem is that we have never aspired to use reconstruction as a complete model of historical data. We agree that the purpose of reconstruction is to assist in the interpretation of the past. We just can't decide whether reconstruction is an integral part of the interpretation or merely an expensive but far from accurate backdrop.

If we were to consider reconstructions as historical, archaeological, and curatorial reports in the round and apply the same critical evaluation to these structures as we do to other professional studies, we would get back on track.

Reconstruction as Social and Economic Community Development

In the part of the country from which I come, the reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg was from its beginning a conscious contribution to community

building and economic development. Excerpts from the Royal Commission on Coal, the Rand Report, provide rationales that could fit many situations across the country.

The island ... can be so exhibited and revealed as to bring its people that new outlook and spirit, as well as economic betterment.

Here are resources of profundity as well as of enjoyment; the scenes are a national property to be brought to an attainment of their potentialities. What is proposed will be not only of economic benefit to the Island; it will introduce elements to regenerate its life and outlook, dissolve the climate of drabness and let into human hearts and intelligence the light of new interests, hopes and ambitions. Mechanical industry remains uncertain, but there are pursuits of deeper purpose lying within the will and action of people and governments.

We are naïve if we think that this use for reconstruction is invalid or will cease. As long as we are a caring people, and as long as politicians accept the local implications of public works that leave tangible capital assets, and as long as there is a multi-billion-dollar tourist industry, we can still look forward to discussing this value of reconstruction well into the next century.

Some may think it an insufficiently noble calling, but I like giving people work. And what is more, I like to think that our work may have helped inspire a community. Reconstructions are tools to accomplish both.

Reconstruction as Icon

Sometimes a reconstruction moves into heritage hyperspace, becoming "a two- or three-dimensional entity that evokes multiple meanings or values, transcending its simple visual appearance." Then the fact that it is reconstructed — a new old building as opposed to an original old building — no longer matters. What matters is how it is perceived by the community. This perception imparts a sanctity which we must protect.

The town clock in Halifax is a perfect example. The only "original" thing about the clock is the idea that it existed in that particular location on Citadel Hill from time immemorial. The structure, from the

foundation to the top of the dome, was completely reconstructed in the early 1960s. And the original building may have been very much modified in the late 19th century. It's like George Washington's axe: over the years it got two new heads and the handle was replaced four times, but it is still the same axe. (N.b., parts of the clock mechanism are original.)

The town clock cannot be treated as a simple reconstructed model of historical data. It has moved beyond that to become an idea and an identity shared by Haligonians which we have to treat with care and reverence.

It is a similar situation for the Habitation at Port Royal. But the construction of the Habitation was done with its continental symbolism in mind — it was instant icon. C.J. Taylor quotes James Harkin, who wrote that "this old Fort reconstructed and its story as the cradle of literature on the North American continent properly exploited, could be made a real shrine for literary and would-be literary people and that, of course, means tourist dollars."

It is not a bad thing to have these two icons in our system of parks. It can't hurt our reputation to be stewards of "heritage holies." But what really interests me is that the reconstructed town clock and Habitation teach us that it is ideas and perceptions of the past that motivate and that ideas and perceptions can be expressed as effectively in reproductions as in original artifacts.

Louisbourg Reconstruction as an Example of the Three Values

Louisbourg is an example of icon, social and economic value, and the applied-history model.

AS ICON we are the jewel in the crown — not our expression, by the way. We are an expression of a national commitment to heritage and a desire to move into a continental marketplace with our historic sites. We are an inspired idea and an ideal that, after 30 years and in spite of our bumps and warts, transcends the specific physical manifestation.

AS COMMUNITY SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT we have been eminently successful on both a national and a regional level. On a national level Louisbourg has graduated a number of people into our system and provided heritage protection with a popular and high-profile manifestation. After all, we are still

the only three-star Michelin attraction east of Québec City. On Cape Breton Island — and it was for Cape Breton that we were invented — Louisbourg has served as an impetus to the local heritage movement. Louisbourg and its potential were used as rallying points in support of the Highland Village at Iona, the Miners' Museum in Glace Bay, and North End development in Sydney, to mention three instances.

The value of the fortress in awakening heritage awareness has been expressed by a former president of the University College of Cape Breton. And as someone familiar with Cape Breton development aspirations over the past 15 years, I know that the fortress as a community development (tourism) tool is still very actively pursued. And given the status of the fishery on the East Coast, tourism is getting a serious look these days. Our value to the community as a work generator and an example to others will grow over the next five to ten years.

As an example of the APPLIED-HISTORY MODEL we have had much success. We have captured scale and relationships in our buildings, frighteningly close approximations in some of our reproductions, good lines and detail in costumes, and a fine flavour in our presentation. It has encouraged some first-class archaeological and historical research.

We have a growing compilation of material research, a great deal of social history, and an increasingly large data bank of information about building technology of the 18th century.

But in our success there have been shortcomings, reflected in the extensive recapitalization now under way at Louisbourg.

Part of the problem is that when the Louisbourg project started, no one had ever reconstructed to the scale which we were planning. Nor, in the heat of an economically driven decision, did we have the lead time to carry out sufficient historical, archaeological, or engineering research. But, most importantly, no one defined what we wanted our model of the past to accomplish as physical structure.

There were positions — usually opposing positions and frequently coming from the same source. For example, in *A Plan for the Restoration of the Fortress of Louisbourg and the Area Surrounding the Fortress which has Historical Significance*, produced by the National Parks Branch:

It is believed the restoration should be a replica of the original works and so true or authentic in manner that it will achieve genuine respect from all who visit and appreciate such work. The

temptation to make concessions for speed or convenience will exist.... This tendency must be resisted and much will be done to reinforce the desire for a really true restoration if thorough and persistent research is continued prior to and throughout the building programme....

But the report continues, "in the common sense interest of the programme, compromise with a true and fixed definition of work as originally done, will be necessary to ensure stability, long life and minimize maintenance."

This was the view from the guys living inside the Parks tent. When we invited Ronald Way into the tent with us, he was given instructions to "advise the Director as to the overall and detailed means to be taken for a partial restoration of the Fortress of Louisbourg, which shall be as accurate as possible from an archaeological and historical viewpoint."

Way worked with this direction, cautioning architects to restrain their creative instincts and be content with the role of mere copyists. He wrote that modern engineers would have to comprehend the necessity of cruder and more laborious methods of construction solely for the attainment of authentic effects. But then he reflected the same old schizophrenic tendencies when he wrote, "the historians and archaeologists for their part can be oblivious to costs and adamant in their insistence on authenticity even in minor things completely concealed from the public eye ... when serious differences of opinion arise compromise will often be the only practical expedient."

This "we want to be authentic but we have to be reasonable" approach evolved through the 1960s' policy and is still haunting us as recently as a workshop aimed at deciding on an approach to Louisbourg's recapitalization in May 1991.

Our inability to resolve the purpose of the model — along with the hard truth that there was insufficient lead time for historical, archaeological, and engineering research — has left us feeling ill at ease, with a child of the process that is brilliant but slightly embarrassing because of its flaws.

So What Are We To Do?

The strength of reconstruction is the strength of all models. We construct them for our use to answer our questions about the past. Reconstructions have great

potential in terms of recalling the past, discovering truths about the past, explaining the past, and testing ideas.

The weakness is that we have not reconciled ourselves to any particular model. We don't have a firm idea why we want reconstructions from the perspective of explaining the ideas and technologies of the past.

We want to be accurate; we want to be durable. We want truth and beauty; we want it forever. Our wants may not be compatible. And in trying to be all things to ourselves, as well as to all other people, we may fall victim to the "final perversion," Ada Huxtable's devastating evaluation of all reconstructions. We have not only reconstructed new old buildings, but we may have reconstructed buildings that are arguably neither exemplars of research method nor of engineering practice. Our buildings never existed in the past, and we should ask if they would normally exist in the present if we applied the same standard that we expect from professional research reports. I'm still trying to sort that one out for myself.

A Solution Is to Keep the Baby and Revitalize the Bathwater

At Louisbourg we have to recognize that we are not as historically accurate as our public relations would lead us to believe.

This deviation from accuracy is defensible when you consider the conditions under which reconstructed Louisbourg was born — as community development and with too little lead time for historical, archaeological, and engineering research.

Where our defence weakens somewhat lies in the largely unsuccessful generation-long struggle to define the nature of the model — what do we want the reconstruction to accomplish. And I believe we are

faced with the same dilemma with all, or most, of our reconstructions.

As part of a solution, I would like us to adopt the position that reconstructions are models of our knowledge of material history. I want us to admit that they do not have to last forever and that when they fall down, we apply the latest historical insights into rebuilding or renovating or recapitalizing them.

At the same time I recognize that Louisbourg will never be in a financial position to do what I would like to have done. But within the financial constraints we can do something, as can anyone who has a reconstruction.

During repair, recapitalization, and replacement we can introduce changes that reflect our evolving awareness of historically appropriate technology where it is necessary and reasonable. The reconstruction should move closer to a three-dimensional report.

Where it is necessary is when it can be seen.

When it is reasonable is harder to define, but I would suggest that we might start the discussion by saying that change is reasonable when it will not add more than another 20 per cent to recapitalization costs. Some people might suggest more. Of course, I am speaking only of reconstructions now standing, not any new, from-the-ground-up reconstructions.

I still don't feel completely comfortable with just that, because I feel that we are doing an injustice to years of research and not being totally honest with our public — whose interests we should protect.

What we ought to do is choose two or three or four substantial structures and actually build them the correct way — to the state of our knowledge — from the ground up. We ought to do this to justify ourselves professionally and actually use reconstructions as models representing an intellectual interface between us and the past.

Then we might be able to rest on our laurels and take the bows.

Interpretation in a Building Re-Created to its Period Volume: The Case of the Grande Maison at the Forges du Saint-Maurice

Michel Barry

Translated from the original French by the Department of the Secretary of State

I. The Context of the Site

- 150 years of history revolving around the production of iron, 1729–1883.
- 100 years of abandonment and progressive obliteration of the original industrial site.
- Today, a spatial arrangement of the remains that can be deciphered only with great difficulty.

II. The Context of the Presentation

To commemorate Canada's first industrial community.

The main facts to be considered:

- Extensive archaeological excavations;
- Three production centres that had evolved continuously over time;
- Nothing left of the Grande Maison but its foundations, which did not extend above ground level;
- A complex presentation problem.

The proposed concept: volumetric expressions of the main structures to convey the nature and functions of the industrial operations.

The reaction from public hearings: a more traditional approach also designed to express the domestic functions.

The compromise solution: re-creation of the Grande Maison to its period volume in order to present it as:

- the showpiece building of the Forges;
- the administrative centre;
- the home of the master of the ironworks;
- the store, the warehouse, the centre for social activities.

The Grande Maison was therefore reconstructed as a historical outer shell set on the consolidated remains of the original structure, with contemporary interior facilities designed for functional use with barrier-free access.

The modern functions of the Grande Maison:

- the main reception and service centre at the site;
- the visitors' departure point;
- the place where the site's history is summarized;
- the place where visitors are provided with the introductory information they need to understand the site;
- the staff's workplace.

III. Interpretation in the Grande Maison

Interpretation has a twofold task here: to enable the public to understand the physical layout and functions of the Grande Maison and the main stages in the history of the Forges. Both aspects have to be addressed simultaneously.

Ground Floor

Reception, exhibition, service, and work areas.

The themes presented:

1. The Forges as the first industrial community in Canada, interpreted by means of a thematic visual display series.
2. The functions of the Grande Maison, interpreted by means of six reference columns and a model of the house, split open to reveal its interior.

3. The Forges in three stages of existence, interpreted by means of three likenesses of individuals who were prominent in the establishment's history. They stand in front of an exhibit of iron products.
4. 150 years of anonymous daily life, from birth to death, interpreted by means of a scene viewed against a backdrop of the heavens.

Cellars

Exhibition areas and mechanical services.

The themes presented:

1. The Grande Maison: a shop and a warehouse, interpreted by means of a simulated warehouse scene.
2. The Forges in three production phases, interpreted by means of three types of product presented in three different contexts.
3. 100 years of attempts to return the Forges to production, interpreted by means of folk tales: three typical legends.
4. The Grande Maison: below-ground cellars only at the back, but today an excavated space used for modern purposes.

The Upper Storey

A performance area, a multi-use room and a documentation area.

The themes presented:

1. The Grande Maison: an attic; its original function is described.
2. The Forges du Saint-Maurice village in 1845, interpreted by means of a very detailed 16-square-metre scale model; identification of eight major components; a 25-minute sound-and-light display.

* * *

All this enables the public to:

- see, at last, what no longer exists;
- understand how the Grande Maison fitted into the establishment as a whole;
- imagine the daily lives of the inhabitants of the Forges;
- grasp the role played by the Grande Maison; and
- prepare for the rest of the tour around the site.

Contemporary Buildings within Historic Zones: An Alternative to the Reconstruction of Missing Structures at Fort Langley

David Whiting and Jervis Swannack

Introduction

Fort Langley National Historic Site is situated on the Fraser River 50 km east of Vancouver. The fort was originally part of a network of Hudson's Bay Company trading posts on the Pacific slopes constructed in the early 1800s. While trade in furs was initially profitable at the site, the fort's main role eventually became a supportive one to the other HBC forts, including farming, salmon packing, and foreign commerce. The fort was constructed in 1839–40.

In 1923 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board first declared the site to be of national significance. It was subsequently declared a national historic park in 1976. In commemorating the site, the theme of Fort Langley as a source of commodities to the HBC was identified. All that remained of the original fort was a single building — structure K. Pictures taken in the 1920s show this building standing by itself surrounded by fields, all other remnants of the original fort having disappeared. The site had been used extensively for agriculture. Ploughing contests apparently had been held on the site, effectively destroying much of the archaeological remains on or near the surface. Since 1955 a number of structures and buildings have been reconstructed, including the palisade walls, bastions, blacksmith shop, servants' quarters, and the Big House.

In spite of the extensive reconstruction work carried out on the site to date, Fort Langley is missing a number of significant historic structures that are vital to the effective presentation of the key themes for the site. One of the key missing structures is the cooperage, where barrels were made for the storage and transportation of goods. With the advent of the Canadian Parks Service Cultural Resource Management Policy, the period reconstruction of missing structures at Fort Langley is no longer a possibility because of the

lack of accurate information on which to base their designs.

Historic reconstructions have been and continue to be useful interpretive devices and effective media for conveying to the public information about period buildings, including design, materials, construction practices, etc.; however, in the case of Fort Langley, reconstruction is discouraged by policy. In addition to reconstructions being expensive to research, design, construct, and maintain, they are not in themselves cultural resources, they can confuse the public as to what are authentic cultural resources, they can damage extant historic resources (archaeological remains), and they can diminish and dominate authentic resources.

In the case of the cooperage there are basically two alternatives for the presentation of this activity at the site:

1. continue to interpret the site "as is," supplemented by additional new interpretive facilities outside the historic zone of the fort, basically in a new administration and visitor reception centre complex.
2. build a new building within the historic zone that evokes the scale and character of the original cooperage in a manner which could not be confused as being original.

CRM Policy and the Site

CRM Policy emphasizes the importance of "integrity" — that evidence should be specific to a site and that reproductions should be clearly identified so they can be distinguished from the authentic. It also places period reconstructions within the interpretive rather than the conservation sphere of the CPS mandate. Finally, it identifies a number of circumstances that must be present before reconstructions may be undertaken. The reconstruction must make a significant

contribution to knowledge, cost can be justified, no significant preservable remains would be threatened, and there is sufficient information available to carry out an accurate reconstruction. At Fort Langley neither the requirement that would justify a reconstruction nor the information required to design it accurately is present.

There is little in the way of detailed evidence or records of what the original buildings and structures looked like, including plans and details of construction. There is a variety of early sketches and drawings that provide an overview of the site, such as the 1858 drawing by Mallandine. There are also historical photographs of the site; however, these only illustrate views from the exterior of the fort and only hint at the location and form of buildings within the fort. The most useful of drawings is the survey of original buildings and palisades completed by McColl in the 1800s. Archaeological investigations have confirmed the layout of the site and details of subsurface building foundations, wells, storage pits, etc. "As found" measured drawings have been completed for structure K. The details of this structure (Red River framing) were typical of the original buildings.

Since the site's commemoration there has been a significant amount of development in the historic zone. A number of buildings, including the servants' quarters (structure C) and the Big House, were reconstructed in the fifties. Roads which passed through the site have been eliminated and the palisade walls rebuilt. The earlier construction of railway tracks and a road between the fort and the river altered the configuration and integrity of the site and destroyed archaeological resources, including the site of the original cooperage and the north palisade and bastions.

Present Condition of the Site

Today a visitor to Fort Langley experiences a site much changed from when reconstruction activities commenced in 1955 and incomplete in terms of the number of structures and buildings that would have been found in the original fort. Most of the development presently found and experienced by the visitor on site are reconstructions completed at various times over the last 35 years. Much that has been reconstructed has not been based on direct evidence. Because of a lack of an appropriate setting, the

cooperage interpretive function is currently accommodated in the ground floor of structure C, which historically was the location of the servants' quarters.

A Vision for the Site

The management plan for the site, which was approved in 1987, has identified the need to complete the reconstruction of the fort consistent with the park's interpretive concept.

The recently completed "Service Implementation Strategy" presented a "vision" for the site where the atmosphere, feeling, and drama of the fur trade as it existed in the 1850s, including all major buildings and the palisade walls, are re-created. The completed site would provide a backdrop for a dynamic, friendly, colourful, personal services program that presented the activities, sounds, and smells of a busy fur-trade fort.

In order to meet the requirements of the management plan and the service implementation strategy, there is a need to find a way to build new facilities within the historic zone.

How Do You Build New Structures in the Historic Zone?

Other than our knowledge of the location of the original building, little evidence exists on the details of the cooperage building itself. It is proposed to not reconstruct this building, but rather to construct a contemporary building within the historic zone at a location close to its original site. The objective would be to design a new structure in such a way that it is clearly a contemporary facility while evoking the character of a 19th-century fur-trade fort. This would facilitate the presentation and interpretation of the cooperage function as an integral part of the historic zone.

There is a variety of sources of information that would assist in the design and construction of a new building to house the cooperage function, including:

- historic photos
- the McColl survey plan identifying location
- notes and records indicating that the cooperage was a Red River framed structure, two bays by four bays,

with windows overlooking the centre of the fort, a large centrally located door, a centrally located fireplace and chimney, and an open attic

- other similar designs of the period on which to base the design
- structure K
- Fort Vancouver
- Fort St. James
- HBC typical details

Using this information as a basis, it is possible to develop a design that is contemporary, while at the same time evoking the original building. In designing a new cooperage, the following principles would be followed:

1. The integrity of the archaeological resource on the site would be paramount. In the case of the cooperage, the original site is gone and the proposed site had no buildings on it and has been cleared for use as a result of previous archaeological investigations.
2. The new structure would be designed in such a manner that it would be clearly understood to be a contemporary building, while at the same time evoking the character of the 19th-century HBC Fort Langley.
3. New facilities should adhere quite closely to the traditional patterns in the area, including site and building plan, building form, scale, and finishing materials. Traditional design patterns would be used for inspiration, including:
 - building plan (two bays x four bays)
 - form (gable roof)
 - scale (one storey with attic)
 - finish materials (wood)
4. Windows and doors, etc., would be determined by functional requirements for light and access (i.e., they could be in the same relative location but possibly larger) and could include contemporary hardware and related details.
5. Interior finishes could be of a more contemporary, interpretive flavour.

Adaptive Reuse (Implications for the Future Development of the Site)

The concept of constructing a contemporary cooperage facility within the historical zone has implications for the future interpretation and presentation of the site as

well as for the requirement for new administrative and support facilities at the site.

There is a need for a large variety of new facilities at the Fort Langley site, including new office and administration space, public staging, orientation, interpretation and theatrical facilities, and staff support facilities. There is an opportunity on this site to accommodate a variety of essential park functions *within the historic zone* in new structures. Such buildings would be evocative of the original fort buildings, would be constructed on sites of minimal or no archaeological significance, and would house new functions on the site in structures that made use of traditional building forms.

The completion of these new structures would contribute to the "vision" for the site noted earlier and create a backdrop for a more effective presentation program. This approach would also maximize the benefit to the site by constructing essential and necessary new park facilities in such a manner as to contribute to the 1850s character of the site.

In terms of placing new buildings on the site, it is essential to consider the impact that any proposed new development would have on the archaeological resources that exist. Archaeological investigations have indicated that there are a number of sites that could accommodate additional buildings without destroying archaeological resources.

Conclusion

By constructing new facilities within the historic zone on the site, existing cultural resources would be presented in a manner that more accurately reflects the range and diversity of activities that characterized the site in the 1850s. Preliminary public response to the concept of the adaptive reuse of the fort has been positive.

We believe that the construction of a cooperage as a contemporary building would significantly contribute to creating a sense of the past on the Fort Langley site and could be done consistent with CRM principles and practices. We also believe that the principles followed in developing the cooperage could be applied to the construction of other buildings within the historic zone, which could house a variety of site functions while at the same time evoking the character of the site as experienced in the 1850s.

Issue Three

What Should CPS Do with Its Ageing Reconstructions?

Compiled by Janet Weatherston

Plenary Introduction: Margaret Archibald

Review of Day One's Issues

- Reconstructions are also products of their own time (Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office often messenger of this).
- What are the products of the nineties going to look like?
Influencing factors:
 - period of less money
 - public more experienced with reconstruction
 - we are no longer alone in the business of re-created pasts (heritage cultural agencies, Disney World, theme parks); we are sharing the industry now.
- A "sense of the past/sense of place" — evocative phrase. Re-creating the past and immersing the visitor in it is a very successful interpretative approach — idea of "participatory experience."
- Must keep the end in focus. While we may be successful in re-creating the past, this is not the end. An appreciation of the past is the end. Re-creating the past is only one way to achieve that end.
- Reconstructions may not be the best way of achieving an appreciation of the past. The example is given of Lowell, Massachusetts, an American site that commemorates the textile industry. The building was empty except for one piece of machinery and two lines to illustrate distance between machines. This was a very effective, evocative, interactive, and simple way to communicate the past without re-creating all of it.
- We are faced with the challenge of dealing with existing reconstructions (such as Louisbourg, which is in serious condition), complications with many repairs, reconstructions that speak against

commemorative objectives for sites, and rethinking objectives for sites based on new policy.

- Our challenge at this workshop is to work towards a decision-making framework that might be useful in coming up with good, defensible decisions on how to manage these reconstructions.
- Our tool is the Cultural Resource Management Policy and in particular the five principles of CRM.

Principle of Value

- Historic value is what is protected and what is communicated (protection/presentation). Some resources have more value than others.
- The first step in any decision-making process is to determine what value the resources have. FHBRO is one mechanism, but not the only one.
- CRM and FHBRO are not discontinuous, and in fact the CRM Policy, if carried out fully, could ultimately replace FHBRO as a mechanism for the Canadian Parks Service.
- Assumption is that new reconstructions have no value as cultural resources; however, some reconstructions gain value over time (i.e., Louisbourg, Fort George).
- The truly valuable cultural resources are those of national significance.
- Value over time must be recognized and respected.

Principle of Public Benefit

- "Why we are in this business." We are not owners, we are trustees of resources that are ours to protect and present for future generations.
- We must focus our attention on the need to effectively communicate the importance and the value of the resources and the themes they represent.

- We must keep in mind to communicate that which is of historic significance. We are not commemorating candle-making or bread-making activities.

Principle of Understanding

- We must understand the resource, its history, and the people that must understand the resource.
- We must be knowledgeable professionals to protect and present this resource.
- Admonishes us to document what we do; keep a record of decisions in order to track decision-making process
- The lack of information is often source of problem. We need information before proceeding; however, just because information is available, this does not justify proceeding with a reconstruction.

Principle of Respect

- These significant resources are irreplaceable, and accepting that determines how we act on their behalf.
- What is respected is the historic character of the resource.
- Understanding the resource should give us guidance in terms of what should be respected. Understanding the historic character and agreeing with what in particular about a structure has value gives direction for decision making in cases like Fort Anne and Fort George.
- This principle leads to concept of minimum intervention; we do the very least to intervene and impact on the historic character.

Principle of Integrity

- CPS will accurately present the range and complexity of the history that is being commemorated.
- Don't beautify or falsify to present a "clean story."
- Encourages us to always go to the specific over the general and to steer clear of the conjectural
- It is this principle that requires us to distinguish that which is not original — do not confuse the visitor — be honest about what is original.

* * *

Workshops should discuss how the CRM principles will help the decision makers decide what to do. Moderators are not charged with arriving at consensus.

Workshop Reports

Group B (Claudette Lacelle rapporteur)

Translated from the original French by the Department of the Secretary of State

After the discussion period, each member of the group spoke in turn to summarize his or her view of the main gist of the opinions and comments that had been put forward.

- It was pointed out that very little time had been allowed for exchange of ideas.
- The answer to the question, "What should the Canadian Parks Service do about its ageing reconstructions?" was that the first step should be to determine the value of the reconstructions in question. It was noted that the way to assess their value would be to apply the CRM principles. This approach constitutes an interesting blend of the principles and practice of CRM, inasmuch as in this instance it would be the principles that would serve as standards for determining these reconstructions' historic value.
- In endeavouring to determine the historic value of our reconstructions, we inevitably came to realize that they have a value over and above their historic value; i.e., a "real" value.
- Evaluation should be carried out on a case-by-case basis in accordance with good CRM practice.
- While the CRM Policy contains highly useful guidelines for dealing with internal problems, it is not always helpful in cases where we have to deal with outside factors such as pressure groups, environmental communities, or groups interested in attracting tourists; those groups should be informed that the CRM Policy constitutes our procedural basis.
- The issue of money is always a factor in a value assessment.
- It is also important to identify the level of intervention for our reconstructions. Is it survival, barrier-free access, or interpretation tool? It is

important not to lose sight of the fact that this assessment will be followed by a decision.

- It is not easy to have a measure of flexibility for reaching interim decisions, as this results in cost increases. The length of time required for a particular course of action has a direct impact on costs, as witness the case of the Gulf of Georgia Cannery.
- Maintenance is important; to neglect it is contrary to the CRM Policy.
- The group did not address the question, "Is reconstruction the most cost-effective solution?" That question carried over into the afternoon session in any case, since consideration of it must necessarily involve relating our present situation to the future.

Group A (Doug Sullivan rapporteur)

The approach used in this group was to:

1. encourage discussion by looking at case examples,
 2. come up with recommendations — highlighted some issues they felt should be brought to forefront — and
 3. encourage dissent.
- Looked at role of FHBRO and CRM
 - Looked at FHBRO as part of overall process — FHBRO as a complimentary process which feeds into the overall CRM process
 - Looked at the principle of value — has to be determined. Using CRM we must determine various levels of value of resources and we must have a clear understanding of the criteria for determining value.
 - Issue of who develops the criteria was raised. Is it done on a national level or on a local level, and how should it be applied?
 - Consensus was that no matter how criteria were developed, in the context of ageing reconstruction, each must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
 - Discussed question of does a reconstruction have value, and does this value contribute to the overall value of the national historic site?
 - Is there a hierarchy of value?
 - Is there an inventory of CPS reconstructed buildings? Do we know where we stand?
 - We must accept symbolic value in context of reconstruction (i.e., Louisbourg); we have an obligation to local people.
 - There is an intrinsic value of reconstructions.
 - Financial considerations — priority should be given to level 1 cultural resources.

- Public likes reconstructions — are we in business of making reconstructions? Can the public dictate this?
- Maintenance is a big issue. There was never a maintenance program set up for reconstructions. What should be done in future?
- Is reconstruction a means to an end or is it an end?

Group D (Ghassan Attar rapporteur)

This group set out two objectives:

1. to relate the CRM principles to the existing reconstructions, and
 2. to decide which factors should be considered in decision making when dealing with resources.
- Lack of resources seems to be a major issue, and the group decided that when determining what to do with existing reconstructions:
 1. prioritize our assets — should they be maintained or improved? We must determine relative historic value, physical condition, and visitation.
 2. assess its contribution to the understanding of original theme of site — define level of historic value
 3. reevaluate commemorative intent of site — see if original historic values are clear, if the asset base does not contribute to understanding of the approved historic theme
 4. educate public — in terms of understanding structure and understanding the problem CPS is facing in order to elicit public contributions. People must be involved in decision making; media must be involved to communicate the consequences.
 5. be more innovative — technical and financial (i.e., cost sharing with large corporations) should be more honest. *State of the Parks* gives a brighter image of our resource than is the case.

Group C (Kevin Van Tighem rapporteur)

- Working group covered a large number of issues, many not resolved.
- Issue of defining value when conflicting direction given (i.e., FHBRO).
- Any decision must be based on analysis, and the appropriate place for the analysis would be in preparation of management plan or management-plan review.

- Many tools are available for use in analysis. These tools include:
 - CRM Policy
 - Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada themes and direction
 - historic significance
 - FHBRO designation
 - Visitor activities management plan — how does reconstruction effectively communicate with our visitors?
 - Why do we communicate in the first place? We are dealing with limited resources. We must prioritize our resources. Differing views on how to prioritize resources between conservation and visitor-activities functions
 - If primary role is protection, then perhaps limited resources should be put into educating people.
 - Immediate need to conserve resources that may not be supported by public (i.e., conservation of resources in the North), and there is a long-term need to invest in our public constituency.
 - Site management plan, if properly done, is your primary tool for making decisions. “Properly done” means with reference to CRM and does speak to the needs and expectations of the public we serve.
 - Important role — maintenance allows conservators to develop skills (CRM section 3.5.2.ii, applied archaeology), a theoretical benefit in investing in reconstructions.
 - Cost-sharing agreements — CPS provides some investment, but the skills development takes place in the private sector. This is a different world than the seventies, and expertise is available elsewhere.
 - There is a public role in the conservation of heritage resources. If the public values a resource highly it should be possible to raise funds externally to maintain that resource. Change needed from thought that government can do everything. Concept of land trusts suggested
 - Consensus in working group that people who are involved in making decisions regarding reconstructions must be well versed in CRM principles
- the brunt of frustration with CRM, since FHBRO is really the first process the Program has used to determine value (level 2 cultural resources).
 - FHBRO is just one process; the Program using its own process would likely arrive at same conclusions as FHBRO.
 - CPS as an agency has the most difficulty with FHBRO, although FHBRO’s goal of ensuring long-term survival of heritage characteristics most closely resembles our Program’s mandate.
 - We as a Program have not fully attempted to assess the value of the resources on our own sites.
 - Feeling that we should be making FHBRO part of the broader issue of site development (they are only one tool)
 - Discussion on Fort George, where the building is at the end of its life cycle. It was suggested that FHBRO would likely not be the “roadblock” to proposed interventions that they are perceived to be.
 - Discussion on Woodside — superintendent has no clear idea on what this reconstruction represents. Is it just an interpretative tool, or does it have value as a representative of 1950s reconstruction, or value because of original material used in reconstruction? Suggestion that Program should conduct evaluation rather than looking to FHBRO to solve issue
 - There is a clear need to make FHBRO fit into the Program’s evaluation.
 - Recognition that management planning and service planning processes provide mechanisms for solving issues
 - Recognition that we should respect the evolutionary quality of buildings — the idea that reconstructions can gain value over time, but that value varies and the Program should put effort into determining means of assessing relative value
 - The thirties and forties reconstruction phenomenon may be an important theme that should, perhaps, be commemorated and interpreted at a site, but further research is needed on this subject. Suggest HSMBC look at this issue in a broader context
 - Feeling that reconstructions that had aged well should be lower on priorities. Research should be directed to threatened resources.
 - Recognition that reconstructions are valuable learning mediums, but we should look at whether they are continuing to meet presentation objectives
 - Consensus that we don’t understand the value of our structures. In the past, many structures have been removed for interpretative objectives. We must

Group E (James DeJonge rapporteur)

- General feeling of frustration that our Program seems to be going in a different direction
- Discussion on FHBRO and dichotomy with the Program. The group agreed that FHBRO has taken

consider how future generations will view our decisions to demolish reconstructions.

Workshop Summary: Margaret Archibald

Summarized rapoteurs' observations under the headings of CRM principles

Value

- Realization that out of the process of determining value comes the ability to prioritize
- The time has come to understand the relative value of all of our reconstructions. We haven't yet looked at the range across the system and determined where the value lies.
- What criteria do we use — national/local?
- FHBRO is a tool, not the only tool (analogy to Environmental Assessment Review Process)
- We must understand all the tools available to us.
- We are faced with diminishing resources and must balance the prioritization of assets, conservation versus visitor needs, maintaining existing infrastructure, and acquiring the valuable resources that we have determined we need to complete the system.

Public Benefit

- There is a sense that people like reconstruction.
- Awareness issue — we need to build a solid, deep public support for our commemorative mandate.
- Used experience/awareness mandate for National Capital Commission as example
- Involving public in conservation mandate

Understanding

- To what degree does the resource contribute to the overall commemorative purpose of the site?

Respect

- The importance of maintenance was recognized.
- Recognition that deferred maintenance approach may have got us where we are now
- Maintenance is an enormous issue across the government and is an area of first cuts when budgets reduced.

Integrity

- Interestingly, integrity was not discussed much, although possibly because it applies more to issue of new reconstructions.

Conclusions

- We need to take a holistic approach (FHBRO is not a holistic approach). CRM offers us the opportunity to take a holistic approach.
- Management plan offers way to take a holistic approach.
- Issue of resources cannot be ignored — it forces us to take a close, careful look at what we have and where to put limited funds.
- Role of FHBRO should be better understood.
- The importance of innovation — we challenge the interpreter to be more introspective; this must also apply to the conservation side.
- We have a responsibility to our existing reconstructions. We must better understand the inventory of reconstructions and the relative value of reconstructions.
- Restated some key points:
 1. prioritize;
 2. determine what role existing resources play in contributing to understanding of commemorative intent;
 3. clarify; don't lose sight of commemorative intent;
 4. educate public;
 5. be more innovative, both technically and creatively.

Issue Four

What Are the Alternatives to Period Reconstruction? Moderator's Remarks

Compiled by Janet Weatherston

Moderator Rob Thompson opened up the discussion by giving an example in Atlantic Region that focussed on Grassy Island in Canso. This situation predated cultural resource management by several years.

In the early 1970s the community of Canso, particularly the mayor and council, could see the spires of Louisbourg rising on the horizon and were very anxious to see the site of Grassy Island reconstructed in the same fashion as Louisbourg.

The site-establishment phase of site development coincided with three full seasons of archaeological field work. The archaeologists, while working at the field site, did a lot of good networking with the local people, the community, and the local historical societies in presenting their findings to them and perhaps suggesting the idea that there were ways to approach the commemoration of this site other than reconstruction itself. The historians were also involved, as well as the planning team, in presenting this idea to the public.

Fortunately, the planning team was successful in convincing the community that there were other ways

besides reconstruction to approach the commemoration of this site, and a successful management plan was developed.

The point being that when dealing with the public, you cannot just tell them that reconstruction is not possible. You have to give them the reasons, and most importantly, you must give them alternatives. You must present alternatives that in turn the public will support, and ones that they will see as effective ways and means of presenting the commemorative intent of a particular site.

The case of Grassy Island was successful. The mayor has come a long way in his thinking about the site, and the Canadian Parks Service has been able to put an investment into this site, through co-operation with others, that is one that we can support over the years to come.

In introducing the speakers, the moderator noted that although there is no specific presentation on the subject of new technologies, participants are encouraged to address this issue during the question period immediately following the presentations.

Alternatives to Period Reconstruction: The Forges du Saint-Maurice

Jean Barry and Pierre Paré

Translated from the original French by the Department of the Secretary of State

Part I

Jean Barry

By 1976, after several years of research and archaeological excavations at Forges du Saint-Maurice National Historic Site, the Department was considering three possible options for preserving and presenting the historical and archaeological resources that had been brought to light:

- stabilizing the ruins and turning the site into an exhibition as it stood (the "archaeological park" option), in which case the presentation of historic themes would be concentrated at an interpretation centre located at the outskirts of the site's "historic nucleus";
- re-creation of some of the former buildings to their period volumes (but using contemporary techniques and materials), combined with landscaping and other operations designed to suggest the original atmosphere of the site;
- volumetric representation, creation of "expressive" spaces; i.e., a frankly modernistic architectural approach aimed not at reproducing the appearance of the original buildings (of which, it must be admitted, only the Grande Maison was of much interest architecturally), but rather at expressing their characters and industrial functions.

It was soon realized that volumetric representation was a very attractive way of expressing the industrial character of the Forges, and accordingly management agreed to invite a number of reputable firms of consulting architects to participate in an "idea competition" to determine how this concept, completely new at the time, could best be implemented.

The firms in question met this challenge with great imagination and creativity, producing some strikingly avant-garde illustrated plans. One of the proposed

architectural concepts stood out in particular and consequently was selected to serve as a general guide and source of inspiration for the development of the presentation project.

The information document that was produced at that time as part of the public consultation process emphasized that the volumetric representation approach being contemplated would:

- seem more suitable than any of the available alternatives as a means of expressing the themes of village and industry;
- respect the building and site changes that had evolved during the Forges' 150-year history;
- afford a broad range of possibilities for turning the Forges remains to good account, while simultaneously protecting them more effectively than other approaches;
- accommodate all possible uses that could be made of the site, especially with respect to interpretation, and conform readily to the various applicable legal codes relating to access and movement in public buildings.

The document also stressed the highly original nature of this concept, pointing out that the contemplated approach was unprecedented, a "world first," so to speak, in the presentation of heritage sites, and as such would undoubtedly have considerable drawing potential.

The public, which quite clearly would have preferred a more traditional approach (i.e., period reconstruction of the village), finally accepted this concept, somewhat grudgingly, to be sure, and then only provided that this "futuristic" approach (to adopt a term freely used at the time) was restricted to the industrial buildings, and that a more "traditional" form of presentation was used for the domestic buildings, in particular the Grande Maison.

In the event, owing to budget constraints, only one of the three "expressive," volumetric representations that were originally to have been erected along the

creek has actually been built to date, and of the two groups of domestic buildings, only one, the Grande Maison, has been re-created to its period volume. Unfortunately, then, the concept as a whole remains incomplete to this day. I shall now yield the floor to Pierre Paré, who will describe the results of these two projects in greater detail.

Part 2

Pierre Paré

Reconstruction of the Blast Furnace

Historical Context

The Forges du Saint-Maurice were originally established in 1730, when a Montréal merchant, Poulin de Francheville, was granted the right to work the bog iron deposits in the vicinity of Trois-Rivières.

The Forges were in operation for over 150 years.

The upper forge, the lower forge, and the blast furnace that was built in 1736 together constituted the technological means by which pig iron and wrought and cast iron were produced. Essentially, the Forges consisted of a stone stack surrounded by wooden sheds with stone foundations.

Implementation

The concept selected for the volumetric representation of the blast furnace features a lightweight three-dimensional aluminum structure set on a concrete foundation with a perimeter that runs just outside the remains of the original foundation. The new structure can thus serve as a shelter for the remains that have been brought to light and can also accommodate original interpretation activities.

The architectural design is centred on the industrial process. The result is unrelated to the architecture of any particular period; rather, it evokes the characteristic functions of and activities at the blast furnace.

Re-Creation of the Grande Maison

Historical Context

The Grande Maison, originally built in 1737, is actually only one part of a more ambitious initial project that had to be trimmed back because the cost was becoming prohibitive. It was an impressive building in the Burgundian style (with roofs whose common rafters were carried on purlins and with interior divisions created by numerous masonry partition walls) designed by the ironmaster at the Forges, Olivier de Vézin. The Grande Maison had various functions: it was the administrative centre where the decisions that governed the life of the enterprise were made; it was the permanent residence of the managers, clerks, and the like; and on occasion it provided temporary lodgings for homeless workers.

Another important function of the Grande Maison was as a storage place for the perishable foodstuffs (wheat, meat, vegetables, and so on), that the people who lived at the Forges needed in their daily lives.

Implementation

The Grande Maison was re-created to its period volume on the existing remains of its foundations.

This work was based primarily on the Forges du Saint-Maurice inventory prepared by Estèbe in October 1741. In that inventory Estèbe has left us quantified descriptions of all aspects of the Grande Maison (length and height of every wall and gable, height of every chimney, and so on).

By comparing these data with the existing remains and contemporary plans and drawings, we were able to re-create the period volume of the Grande Maison as it was when the Forges finally closed, about 1880. With this approach it is essential to use contemporary techniques and materials to build the structure. The siding and roofing materials used give the building a general similarity to the original, and this re-creates the period atmosphere and outward aspect, at any rate from a short distance away.

In general, the archaeological remains have been preserved as they were before construction work began.

The outside walls and load-bearing interior walls were bored out, reinforced, and injected so that they would be strong enough to carry the new structure. The four cellars on the east side of the longitudinal partition wall were excavated for the first time since the original construction, the object being to provide the necessary

space for mechanical and air-circulating systems. Four openings were bored through the masonry to allow circulation between these spaces.

We decided against repointing and cleaning the visible masonry surfaces in order to preserve the original character of the masonry in freshly excavated areas and what might be called the imprint of the hand of time and man on masonry in other areas.

The steel skeleton is supported by a reinforced concrete slab shaped to fit the outline of the existing remains. The exterior walls are built on a light wooden framework.

The roof is supported by a massive main beam that, in contrast to the original roof structure, made it feasible to create large open spaces.

The configuration of the roof structure had to take the presence of dormer windows into account. The roof is covered with wooden shingles nailed to wooden sheathing fastened to purlins.

The stucco that was used to finish the walls is moulded so as to reproduce the lintels and sideposts of doors and windows.

Some of the kitchen flagstones, which were removed in the course of the archaeological excavations carried out in 1981, have now been replaced in their original positions as an aid to the understanding and interpretation of the site.

The Result

Contemporary materials resembling the original materials were used to re-create the building's outward appearance.

Inasmuch as the original structural design would not have permitted accommodation of the modern functions needed for the building, the interior layout was adapted to meet modern requirements. At the same time, an effort was made, through judicious selection of materials, to evoke an atmosphere of former days and to establish visual harmony between the inside and outside of the house.

* * *

To sum up, we consider that these approaches to preserving and presenting historic resources represent attractive alternatives to period reconstruction. They are consistent with Program policy, and the costs involved are very competitive. Volumetric representation is, in our view, a preferable architectural approach inasmuch as it respects the site's changing and diversified character.

Alternatives to Reconstruction: New Buildings

Andrew Powter

Having determined that a built facility is required in a national historic site to meet functional or operational requirements, the question remains, how to go about achieving a suitable design given the sensitivity of the environment. Generally it has been the practice in the Canadian Parks Service to design reconstructions to meet these needs. Reconstructions can contribute to interpretive programs and are usually “safe” designs with regards to “fitting in” to the context. This presentation is about an approach to design of new facilities in national historic sites or other sensitive historic areas as an alternative to the reconstruction approach. The methodology I’m going to describe here should sound familiar as it could relate to many kinds of facilities managed under Cultural Resource Management Policy, in this case an interpretation and visitor services facility at the Green Gables site in Prince Edward Island National Park.

Before beginning, a few words about the context. The Green Gables barn reconstruction project was well advanced when CRM became interim policy in CPS. The project team was asked to reconsider the basic approach to the design. Resolution of the matter was difficult, but was reached.

One speaker has mentioned “not deciding the matter in advance,” and another referred to the benefits of analysis. It is those two ideas that this paper is all about — I hope a not-too-self-conscious process of analysis to develop design guidance for new construction in a particular historic area.

First, some background on the operational issues. Visitors overload the Green Gables site — some 350,000 per year. With the house itself the object of every visit and the only place to go, the following requirements had to be addressed:

- alleviate demand on the house through dispersal — somewhere else for visitors to go;
- space was required for assembly of groups;
- washroom facilities (a second location);
- staff facilities;
- enhanced presentation program for diversification
 - improved orientation

- interpret Lucy Maud Montgomery
- interpret Cavendish history and pioneer life (reconstruction of the barn was an important aspect of this)
- density of traffic — provide a visual buffer from the activity of nearby contemporary services which range from bus arrivals to golf balls flying over from the nearby golf course; and
- create an area of period character, a larger zone of visual integrity.

The team had been developing designs for three reconstructed buildings — the barn, granary, and pump house — to house these requirements.

While the above requirements indicated that construction of a new facility was required and that for operational reasons it probably should be in the historic area, this really was a case of reconstruction as the solution of “first resort.” There was no indication that optional design approaches had been considered. Indeed, some operational compromises were necessary with the proposed reconstructions. This is not surprising — there was considerable local pressure in this direction.

Any project has external constraints. In the case of Green Gables there was no Federal Heritage Buildings Policy concern as this was to be a new building; however, there were the usual array of legal requirements (national building code, Labour Canada), budget, and the recently arrived CRM Policy, against which the others were minor.

As written, CRM offers considerable guidance that is applicable to design of new construction.

For example, under “Principles” one finds references to the least destructive means of accomplishing objectives, the least intrusive, and minimal impact/minimal intervention. The matter of integrity is also important. Cultural resources should be distinguishable from and “not overwhelmed by efforts to enhance and present them,” new work should be distinguishable from historic, and historic character should be treated with sensitivity. With respect to CRM practice, “strike a balance between protection and enhancement based

on respect for character," and with respect to presentation, "new structures will respect and be compatible with historic character at the site." And it provides a framework for consideration of reconstruction.

It was clear that the reconstruction approach proposed at Green Gables would not hold up under the scrutiny of policy.

A design statement revised to be consistent with policy might read something like this: "to design a new structure to accommodate contemporary functions in such a way that it is clearly a work of this time, while respecting and enhancing the heritage character of the farmstead"; i.e., a contemporary facility of 1990.

Design of new structures in such an environment is a challenge indeed. There are a multitude of examples of historic-area infill projects that acknowledge their neighbours in awkward and poorly crafted manners. Compatible and enhancing examples are more difficult to find. How to go about achieving this at Green Gables?

In a case such as Green Gables, one could turn to traditional design patterns for analysis and inspiration, at least for guidance. Once defined, these patterns could be applied with varying degrees of strength or weakness, boldness or subtle expression or interpretation, and with care would result in *new buildings designed in a contemporary vernacular* — I should say, a *restrained* contemporary vernacular — which in my opinion would be appropriate.

There is nothing new about this approach. Many of the national parks have design motifs, including PEI, that offer this kind of advice. The early decision to reconstruct had only forestalled use of it. Let's look at the individual design elements in this way and make some judgements along the way to illustrate the point.

1. Site plan. The traditional vernacular is one of cohesive, compact groups of buildings. This implies that the new facilities should occupy several units rather than one. However, siting close to the existing house may impact extant archaeological resources, a CRM concern.

2. Building plan. The traditional form is a simple rectangle. Complex and angular forms would make a strong visual statement and should be avoided. The exact proportions of the rectangular plan is variable within certain limits.

3. Building forms. The vocabulary is very limited here: steeply pitched roofs with shallow soffits.

4. Scale. Scale and form need to be considered together. Scale would limit maximum dimensions, particularly width of any facility because of the implications of extreme width for roof height.

5. Secondary forms. Elaboration, such as bays, corners, porches, does not generally appear on agricultural buildings. Such elements would add an inappropriate complexity to the facility.

6. Structure. Traditional construction for larger buildings is heavy-timber-braced frame. Connections are made with a variety of joints. Timbers are shaped with the adze.

An approach to design of a structure suitable to a contemporary visitors' facility might be to interpret traditional forms rather than express them literally. For example, the use of dressed timber and lumber, simplified joints, perhaps finish the timber with oil or even varnish.

The complex jointing is not necessary and is expensive; if traditional barn construction is part of the interpretive program, there may be more effective ways to do this than through a full-scale building.

7. Fenestration. Usually highly irregular, reflecting a long evolution of changing function and use of the interior.

One could adopt "irregularity" in general for guidance, or consider that as a contemporary facility, doors and windows should relate to functional requirements.

As it happened, the proposed reconstruction was imposing some limitations on meeting some functional requirements, particularly those of site staff. I would suggest that placement of these features need not be dictated by traditional practice.

8. Finishing materials and applied finishes. The traditional materials are unfinished shingles on roof and walls, and painted or unpainted trim.

The National Parks motif of unfinished shingles and white-painted trim could be adopted here, creating a subtle unity between the new buildings of the Green Gables site and other park facilities.

9. Details. Meticulous use of period hardware, rainwater goods, mouldings contributes to the illusion of period buildings. In view of the approach taken to the above criteria, contemporary elements could be used. These are serviceable, economical, and non-disruptive to the overall atmosphere.

* * *

In general the result would be a building that is generally vernacular in character with subtle contemporary features on the exterior, and on the interior, more overtly contemporary. It would be constructed in dressed unfinished lumber, and some spaces (LMM display area) could be treated as gallery

display space, an interpreted environment rather than a literal re-creation of one. From a presentation point of view, such an approach may be more appropriate considering the proposed presentation media — display of artifacts, panels, video, and some replicas. One also should consider that given the number of visitors and the traditional character of the historic barnyard (muddy and rough), creation of a sense of the past was never really possible at Green Gables.

A building developed along these lines, if handled with care and restraint, would result in a group of farmstead buildings that is compatible and complimentary to the house nearby, while establishing its own period and place of construction.

Artists' Depictions as Alternatives to Reconstructions

Steven Porter

Theme

I have been asked to speak briefly on artists' depictions as one alternative to reconstruction. Before doing so, I would like to offer a brief context statement relating to our mandate, which I believe to be of prime importance when considering any form of intervention (i.e., access to our cultural built heritage or resources) at historic sites.

Visitor Context

It can be argued that historic preservation exists to provide a *medium* of communication to the public of today and in future. In other words, the heritage *resource* is the medium through which cultural resource managers communicate heritage values to visitors.

The relationship between resource manager and visitor is one of relative expert versus the uninitiated. In the North American context, visitors often have limited contact with heritage resources in their daily experience. Their focus is more commonly on a site's *relevance to themselves* and not on the Canadian Parks Service mandate.

Any choice of interpretive media, whether it be a reconstruction or an artist's depiction, therefore necessitates a clear understanding of specific visitor needs, interests, and expectations. It takes very little field experience to realize that visitor motivation is highly varied and often not based on a desire for formal learning, in a traditional sense, as we as cultural resource managers often would like to believe.

Rather, the provision of opportunities which allow for socializing, family bonding, novelty, and exploration, and provide for basic access, shelter, sustenance, and sanitation may make or break our agency's ability to convey its management and heritage messages.

Artists' Depictions: Examples

Artists' depictions have been used in Atlantic Region for many years as an interpretive technique to link visitors with abstract heritage concepts or resources. Examples include:

Grassy Island

18thC fishing community and commercial centre; British ruins (Canso, east shore of N.S.)

- reconstruction of known architectural features
- volumetric reconstruction of Howe property
- actual reconstruction

Notes

- pure example of visually reconstructing what is known in terms of site

Conditions:

- foundations and written descriptions extant
- archaeological information limited and abstract to non-professional
- not enough information to fully reconstruct site

Benefit to visitor:

- provides concrete image to visitor of size and layout

Benefit to organization:

- inexpensive solution
- controlled perspective, using not otherwise available existing facts
- based on clear documentation

Castle Hill

17/18thC French and British ruins; Basque fishing station — cod drying (Placentia, east shore of Nfld.)

- volumetric reconstruction of fort

Notes

Example 1:

- volumetric reconstruction of fort

Conditions:

- stabilized ruin
- do not know what the fort looked like
- black-line contour on photo of extant resources
- visitor reaction: Is that all there is?
- visitors think it is just a heap of stones; do not see significance of pattern as a building or fort
- visitors think it *is* reconstructed
- reconstruction not possible

Benefit to visitor:

- visitor sees the resource/fort for what it was and sees some form of physical orientation

Benefit to organization:

- message communicated that the fort is a stabilized ruin
- direct response to visitor perceptions

Example 2:

- reconstruction of a way of life (activities)
- description of a process (fish-splitting sequence)

Conditions:

- "typical" way of life, in no specific location
- location not known
- not taking place at one time or place

York Redoubt

Key Halifax defence 1793–WWII

- reconstruction of fort elements (five distinct phases of evolution)

Notes

- direct reconstruction of fort elements in five evolutionary stages: 1800, 1873, 1900, 1942, 1991
- each sketch is done from the same perspective
- sketches are seen in sequence

Conditions:

- stabilized ruin
- large site
- features overgrown or abstract
- reconstruction of some elements possible and possibly desirable
- many periods of evolution represented on site

Benefit to visitor:

- gets to see the whole view (not otherwise possible)
- gets to see the evolution

- helps in orientation
- 3-D view versus traditional plan (cannot read)

Benefit to organization:

- inexpensive program
- only orientation to site and site messages

Fort Beauséjour

Mid-18thC French-Anglo rivalry; pentagonal

- reconstruction of a stabilized ruin

Notes

- reconstruction of fort and activity
- placed directly adjacent to stabilized ruins

Conditions:

- not to be restored

Benefit to visitor:

- direct translation of abstract resource into visual image

Grand Pré

Monument to Acadian deportation (mid-18thC)

- reconstruction of an event
- reconstruction of an activity

Notes

- reconstruction of an event (deportation)
- replaces the resource

Conditions:

- no physical resource extant

Benefit to visitor:

- evokes emotion
- creates relevance to abstract concept

Benefit to organization:

- message conveyed in provocative manner

Fort Anne

Acadia — colonial capital; Anglo-French rivalry; pre-contact to modern day

- reconstruction of a community's heritage

Notes

- tapestry of four centuries of Annapolis Royal history

Conditions:

- elements of Fort Anne from many different periods
- some reconstruction
- major archaeological site
- 1930s officers' quarters made into a museum
- visitor reaction: Where's the fort? Are these hills real or are they man made?
- visitor behaviour: quick focus on museum (physical structure) and out *or* walk around on grounds for romantic recreation only (message missed) in contrast to *Habitation* ("reconstruction") where people spend time

Benefit to visitor:

- involving
- participatory
- physical evidence of key messages (resource to relate to)
- colourful

Benefit to organization:

- community project
- deals with complexity of messages without intervention of resource

Benefit/Cost Analysis

Benefits of Choosing Artist's Depiction

Responds directly to visitor concern:

"So, where's the fort?"

"Are these hills man made or are they real?"

Offers a controlled perspective, highlighting "known" facts

Conveys straightforward to complex messages effectively

Links visitor to partially visible resources

Provides visual image of a non-extant resource (person, place, activity, event)

Interprets "typical" activities, not attached to a physical resource

Provides a non-invasive form of interpretation

Deals with the evolution of the resource

Provides a versatile resource upon which to base other interpretive media

Provides a relatively inexpensive form of media

Associated Costs

Cannot fully respond to visitor concern: "Is that all there is?"

Cannot stand entirely alone; personal and/or non-personal support is required

Cannot fully meet visitor need to interact with resource/person

Does not provide a multi-sensory experience

Does not meet visitor need to experience the "real thing" ("time travel" is a high priority)

Does not draw and hold visitors

Does not protect visitors from the elements

Summary

To summarize, the discriminate use of artists' depictions as an alternative to reconstruction can be an effective way of garnering support for the research and protection aspects of the CPS mandate, while also meeting needs of targeted visitor groups.

It must be kept in mind, however, that CPS can only provide the *opportunity* for visitors to understand, appreciate, and enjoy our resources. It is the visitor who creates his/her own *experience*. Our choice of interpretive media must therefore relate closely to these needs, otherwise our resources will lack relevance and our heritage and management messages will not be conveyed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank David Q. O'Brien, chief, Training and Professional Development, and Douglas E. Kolmer, regional manager, Service Planning, Atlantic Region, for their assistance in the preparation of this paper.

Point Wolfe Bridge, Fundy National Park

Bill Naftel

The reconstruction of the Point Wolfe covered bridge is a good example of an early application of cultural resource management to a reconstruction project that, in the design stage at least, went well for all the wrong reasons.

In terms of background, as the entire country knows, an unfortunate construction accident caused the collapse of the Point Wolfe bridge 29 December 1990. In place since 1910, the bridge was a much-photographed scenic attraction and historic resource in Fundy National Park and almost immediately the decision was made that it would be replaced in kind.

By January 1991, however, the implications of the CRM Policy were well known and understood. What was not known anywhere, either in region or headquarters, was a mechanism for applying the policy to a specific project.

All the chief of Transportation Architectural and Engineering Services, Atlantic Region, knew was that, for a variety of reasons, he had to have a new covered bridge in place by the beginning of the visitor season in 1992. To meet that deadline, construction must be underway by September 1991.

The bad-news side of this story arises from the fact that, since there were no guidelines telling him how to apply CRM and because he could not, on account of his tight deadlines, afford any holdups in the approval process, he had to go to unusual lengths to consider sometimes bizarre alternatives so that no one anywhere could possibly have an excuse to say, "Aha, you are reconstructing a 1910 bridge here; you cannot do that."

The irony is that, whether in 1910 or 1992, a wooden covered bridge is a very simple structure, and it was very difficult not to produce something that did not look precisely like the one it replaced. It is in effect, a simple Howe truss, covered by a simple wooden shed, devoid of all but the most basic trim. Assuming that plywood is not an option, the easiest

approach would have been to simply build another wooden shed — just like the one that was there before — over another wooden Howe truss.

And in the end, that is pretty well what was done, but before that point was finally reached in a memo from the director, Federal Heritage Policy Branch, 9 July 1991, six months of networking and reviews — in the regional Heritage Buildings Review Committee; A&E Services, Atlantic Region; Historical Research Division, PHQ; director general, National Historic Sites; and director, Federal Heritage Policy, National Historic Sites, PHQ — agonized over a multitude of options. Such things as what kind of lumber should be used, whether or not the bridge should be painted the same colour as the one it replaced, what kind of fastenings should be used, etc., etc., all in the name of "What if someone thinks this would look too much like a reconstruction?"

The good news is that, in the end, as a result of good will, hard work, and common sense, it was deemed that just so long as the final design made use of materials that were readily available on today's market, and given the fact that the truss would have been clearly upgraded to meet 1992 and not 1910 load factors, the new bridge need look little different to the eye of the average park visitor.

The issue arises from the fact that it ought not to have taken six months, at who knows what cost in staff time and salaries, to officially arrive at an obvious and sensible conclusion which probably everyone involved had come to privately back in January.

This one worked because of a network of long-established contacts, individuals who knew and trusted each others' judgements. But that may not always be in place, and for a future project such as this, managers should have at hand a set of clear guidelines to guide their approach to defining what constitutes a reconstruction and what does not.

My Life Is in Ruins; or, The Limitations of Stabilization as a Presentation Technique

Bruce W. Fry

Ruins are emotional and deeply evocative components of our concept of the past. Western society's awareness of the achievements of past civilizations is intimately tied to an appreciation of the ruins those civilizations left behind and to attempts to identify those ruins with specific historical references going back to classical times. Long before archaeology emerged as a discipline and as a means of systematically discovering and analysing ruins, tours of areas rich in visible reminders of lost empires and societies formed an essential part of the education of all who would lay claim to being cultured.

The attraction ruins held inevitably found expression in a concern that they not be allowed to vanish because of natural decay or because of human intervention. For if ruins stood as priceless reminders of the past for some, for others they were impediments to ploughing or represented a rich source of construction material or valuable artifacts — to be quarried like any naturally occurring deposit. The scrupulous recording of ancient monuments by officially appointed antiquaries (beginning as early as the 15th century in England) documented the destruction and loss of sites and heightened awareness that here were things worth preserving.

The all-pervading, inescapable evidence of ruins from past civilizations in Europe and the Middle East enabled society to establish direct links with the medieval and classical past familiar to readers of the history and literature from those times. Some monuments, indeed, survived functionally, if somewhat modified, throughout the centuries, particularly the great cathedrals, châteaux, and fortresses. Others, such as Stonehenge, passively endured and acquired patinas of age and mystery.

The famous archaeological expeditions of the 19th and early 20th centuries revealed to the world the buried but largely intact splendors of Knossos, Pompeii, and Herculaneum, as well as the tombs of the Pharaohs and the remains of Mycenae.

Small wonder, then, that the stabilization and presentation of such ruins for the benefit of future generations became essential to an educated appreciation of the past. Nevertheless, for stabilization to succeed as a technique for interpreting history, several important and interconnected conditions have to be met.

First, to state the obvious, there have to be ruins sufficiently extensive and coherent to merit stabilizing. We may debate what exactly constitutes a ruin, since we may envisage a continuum with a decrepit but functional structure at one end and barely visible mounds decipherable only to the experienced archaeologist at the other. Ruins must, at least in popular perception, retain enough of their original form as to provide readily grasped indicators of what they were originally: an abbey, a castle, a house, or a factory. Unfortunately but perhaps inevitably, such evidence is most readily apparent in masonry structures, and indeed the very work "ruins" surely conjures up images of jagged masonry segments, partially collapsed walls, and massive columns, some upright, some prone. The original form and function of works built from wood or earth are much more elusive and difficult to visualize.

Secondly, the original structures, if they are to survive substantially intact, have to exist in an environment that will ensure that survival, or at least delay disintegration. Through no coincidence, the earliest ruins to be recognized and appreciated were in the temperate Mediterranean and European areas, where masonry was not rapidly shattered and heaved by frost on the one hand, nor overwhelmed by jungle on the other. But change the environment, and monuments that have withstood centuries are suddenly in peril: the Acropolis because of atmospheric pollution arising from modern Athens, the Sphinx from a drastic change in the water table.

The third condition lies with the technology of stabilization itself and is directly related to both environment and materials. Unfortunately, the very

characteristics that make the most readily understood ruins are those that make them the most vulnerable to disintegration in North America: the freeze-thaw cycle so familiar to much of the continent has devastating effects on unprotected masonry. This in turn means that for stabilization to succeed, it must be massive and intrusive; underpinnings must go below the frostline, drainage must be extensive, and the old mortars replaced with modern, stronger mixes if the ruins are to remain exposed to the elements. The results more often than not are affronts to both aesthetics and authenticity: what remains of the original is barely discernable, suspended in a frozen sea of modern cement, tidied up to assume an appearance it never had when functioning as an intact structure.

Finally, there is the question of presentation, or interpretation. The degree to which this is essential is in inverse proportion to the condition of the ruin: the more intact it is, the less needs to be explained about original form and function. It follows that if all that has survived is a few courses of masonry uncovered by archaeologists, to stabilize these ruins and leave them as objects of curiosity in an open field will achieve little. Ruins have to be explained so that the visitor may form a complete picture of what was there originally, both structurally and socially. The somewhat literal and direct approach, pioneered by the French architect Viollet-le-Duc in the 19th century at

such fortresses as Carcassonne and Pierrefonds, found its ultimate expression in the work at Williamsburg in the 1930s or at the Fortress of Louisbourg in the 1960s. If such approaches are intellectually out of favour these days, they nevertheless provided a comprehensive and readily appreciated model of what the original was thought to have looked like.

Stabilization alone cannot replace this; ruins have to be placed in an overall context and a convincing image of the original conveyed. Rather than subject them to the indignity and assault of a total "life-support" system designed to enable them to continue, as stabilized ruins, to withstand the rigours of the climate, new approaches might be more promising. Beneath the *parvis* of Notre-Dame de Paris, a subterranean exhibit enables visitors to examine the archaeologically exposed but fully protected ruins of many centuries and compare them to scale models of the city. At the national historic site of the Forges du Saint-Maurice, Quebec, a similar technique enables visitors to see a realistic model of the original industrial site alongside the remains of blast furnaces and forges, protected from the elements by modern structures.

Mute stones may indeed speak, but if they speak only to an initiated few, then we as custodians of the past have failed.

Issue Five

What are the Criteria for Reconstructions in the Future?

Gordon Bennett et al.

Plenary Introduction: Gordon Bennett

- Focus of this workshop is on future or proposed reconstructions, not existing ones.
- Interpretation is one of the fundamental aspects of the commemoration of national historic sites (along with protection/preservation); it is not a secondary activity or mandate.
- Quick overview of cultural resource management: application of five principles at the site as well as the resource-specific level to determine what is appropriate; concept of commemorative integrity; consideration of NHS Policy statement 4.0; sections 3.5.2.5.3 and 3.5.2.8 of CRM
- To the extent that reconstruction proposals arise from a sense of embarrassment about the site, we must be very wary of whether the proponents are acting in accordance with the CRM principle of respect.
- Some justify reconstruction on the basis of visitor questions such as “where’s the fort?” Such problems can be *minimized, if not eliminated, if we make it clear that the visitor is coming, for example, to Fort Anne National Historic Site, rather than Fort Anne.*
- Some of our “creations” (reconstructions) may later be deemed to have historic value. Proponents must deal with this.
- It is important that CRM not be seen as discouraging accurate reconstructions while actively encouraging what amounts to deliberately inaccurate “reconstructions” (e.g., stylized reconstructions built for operational purposes).
- Where reconstruction is undertaken, there is a need for a coherent vision such as that mentioned by Bill O’Shea yesterday (Louisbourg as a laboratory).
- Some issues to be considered in workshop discussions might include:
 - will the reconstruction add anything to the national historic significance of the site?

- ensuring the burden of justification falls on the proponent
- what is the net heritage benefit?
- heritage versus history
- the impossibility of accuracy, and
- the selective or cafeteria-style approach to most reconstructions.

Workshop Reports

Group C (Arnold Roos rapporteur)

- Reconstructions must be considered in context of management and service planning; such plans must take into account the long-term maintenance requirements of reconstructions.
- Must be a careful evaluation of alternatives. Reconstruction might be considered at isolated sites, but not in the centre of a metropolis.
- “Point in time” nature of reconstructions militates against communicating the larger story of “time.” Industrial sites will pose real problems because most of the important sites were highly modified over time.
- Volumetric reconstructions are reversible, but are not sufficient because they don’t speak for themselves.
- What is a reconstruction?
- What message are we trying to convey? Who is the constituency? How does the visitor relate? What is the relevance to society and culture? There needs to be a holistic approach to the site.
- Interpretation is essential, both at the site and the resource-specific level.

Group E (Rob Gillespie rapporteur)

- CRM does not prohibit reconstruction, but whereas the 1979 policy provided a door, CRM provides a crack.
- Need to consider options; to look at costs (including recapitalization). Discussed range of reconstruction options — from exact to using same materials but changing dimensions
- Reconstruction has to be justified on the basis of themes and objectives and the commemorative intent of the site.
- Need a holistic approach to reconstruction, including landscape; referred to Fort George landscape and the possible adverse local reaction to introducing a period landscape; need to be concerned with “beautifying” the past
- Reconstruction is effective when there are very few or many (cultural) resources, but is almost always detrimental to archaeological resources.
- A minority in the group said that for reconstruction to work effectively, an exceptional site was required.

Group B (Rosemarie Bray rapporteur)

- CRM deals with period reconstruction. The absence of a definition of reconstruction is a problem. When does restoration become reconstruction?
- Visitor must leave the site knowing clearly the commemorative intent. Options for communicating commemorative intent must be considered. Reconstructions should contribute to the achievement of commemorative objectives.
- In considering the appropriateness of reconstructions, we must change the mind set; reconstruction should not be viewed as the highest form or best means. Nature of the site is critical; if evolutionary, reconstruction is not appropriate.
- Spirit of place important
- When done well, restoration and reconstruction can create a sense of the past; people like reconstructions. The dangers of reconstruction include the baggage that comes with it (e.g., need to conserve).
- Need to analyse when reconstruction is or is not appropriate

Group A (Jim Hartley rapporteur)

- Difference between western and eastern sites
- Not an issue of principles per se, but rather one of scale. CRM principles did not do the job. There is a need to go “below” the principles. For example, criteria might include:
 - contribution to history (e.g., communicating period construction techniques; facilitating presentation of a primary theme not now presented)
 - contribution to science
 - contribution to interpretation. Is it the best way to communicate to the client? Will it improve the historical accuracy of the site (e.g., Fort Langley)?
- There is a need to test the “best way” (accuracy? visitation increase? opportunity for interactive experience).
- How does one determine if resources are significant, particularly if they have no value for interpretation?
- Cost effectiveness is important, but is not a criterion of appropriateness. Therefore it should be considered only after appropriateness has been determined.

Group D (David Huddleston rapporteur)

- The key question is: In what circumstances will we consider reconstructing?
- First consider the overall Program context. What pressures — from political to internal — are on us to do anything?
- Then look at “the fit” of the proposed reconstruction with what we currently have at a given site, in a given region, and for a given historical subject area. In which context(s) will we consider reconstructing?
- Respect the principles of CRM; e.g., are we being true to the integrity of the cultural resource? Are we putting enough emphasis on the value of the original fabric?
- Establish (or review) the objectives for site interpretation, which is everything from the Historic Sites and Monuments Board intentions to the identified themes and objectives to what the site staff feel is reasonable for that site. Inherent in that is a very good understanding of visitors, their needs, and our capability to deliver.
- Consider alternative ways of achieving the objectives. Will a reconstruction really meet our objectives? Will other ways also meet the objectives?

- How will each of these alternatives meet public demand and visitors' needs?
- Finally, do we have enough knowledge of the existing historic resources on ground/in ground and in our research to do a reconstruction that will achieve the objectives?

General Discussion

- Importance of dealing with issues during public consultation. Referred to work currently under way pertaining to the Bar U
- Need to determine what we want to do with the site before we go to the public; must identify alternatives, conduct public survey(s)
- Word "reconstruction" should be struck from the language; it's an easy way of not doing something innovative. Local residents invariably want reconstruction.
- Need to recognize that there are different approaches to presenting a site; need to acknowledge others' goals. CRM does not address how we should deal with the public.
- Communicating objectives is fundamental. We need to seriously address this, particularly for archaeological sites.
- Availability of materials (organic/inorganic) an important criterion. Need to tie this into long-term planning

Plenary Working Session

Tony Bull

Where We Started

- Review of expectations
- Key issues identified by participants were:
 1. need to understand rules of the game;
 2. principles of cultural resource management;
 3. how to apply CRM;
 4. understanding of the use of reconstructions as an interpretive tool.

Objectives of Workshop

1. How the practice of reconstruction has evolved over the decades;
2. Reconstruction as an interpretive medium;
3. Examine approaches to managing our existing reconstructions;
4. Examine alternatives to period reconstructions as an interpretive tool;
5. Prepare a position paper;
6. Clarify the issue of proposed interventions to existing reconstructions;
7. Decide how to deal with the issue of proposed new reconstruction in the context of the policy.

* * *

Following a brief overview of the main points of the various speakers and panel participants, as well as the main points coming out of the workshops, some themes and next steps were proposed. The main points of discussion that followed can be organized under the headings of "Planning," "Client," "Reconstructions," and "Training":

Planning

- Themes and objectives as an important first step in objective setting — and need to focus on the *communication* objectives and how can communication objectives serve and become protection objectives
- On the process for management planning: it seems to be very good for holistic or integrated planning
- Planning should be an invigorating exercise for an organization.
- We have been guilty of focussing on the plan as the product rather than on decisions and understanding that are results of planning.
- Management plan is not an end in itself.
- Use CRM as a tool to make planning more robust

Client

- We need to focus on client more — up front, not secondary
 - resources
 - message
 - constituency } go together as a whole
- What would we like the visitor to know, feel, and do as a result of a visit?
- Include a wide notion of constituents as clients, site by site and as a whole
- We have to understand our public, what benefits they are getting.
- We need better tools to do that.
- Most important factors giving a sense of the past in one survey were costumed interpreters and what they do and create.
- The least important were period or reconstructed buildings: in a U.S. survey, 1/3 of visitors come for a learning experience, others for nostalgia, escape, and so on.

Reconstructions

- In doing an evaluation of reconstructions, we need to include in that an examination of benefit and impact on users of these sites.
- Need for an analytical paper, a reflective piece about reconstructions
- Need also to be clear about what reconstructions are; how do we define them?
- A bit worried about the value we are attributing to the existing; sometimes we may have to bite the bullet, to let these “toys” go.
- Reconstructions *are* an interpretive tool and they do need other forms of support.
- Can we compare the effectiveness and attractiveness of “authentic” sites with reconstruction sites?
- Interpretation can also provide input on use of reconstruction world wide (as well as use of other interpretive techniques) as part of the evaluation.

Training

- Must be done more widely than chiefs of planning
- All planning practitioners and operational staff
- Also include Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office training in the CRM training
- Bringing together all the people in this forum has been a unique and productive event — it has paid good dividends — need to organize these forces more often; a very good learning event

* * *

Incorporating the main points of discussion, the themes coming out of the conference could be as follows:

1. The Need for “Integrative” or “Systems”

Thinking in Decision Making

- That we need to use management planning to make good decisions, to develop real options
- Use CRM as an analytical tool

2. Understanding

- Need to really get a handle on our present stock of reconstructions

- *And* to do an evaluation of them in terms of CRM; how “valuable” are our reconstructions?
- Need to develop analytical criteria

3. Resources

- Choices have to be made; how do we make good spending decisions?
- What do we trade off in making choices?
- Need to be innovative in attracting resources, in engaging our stakeholders

4. Client Focus

- Need to keep in touch with our clients
- An investment in our clients may generate support that will have long-term payoff.

5. Decisions

- The dominating theme
- The need to know the dynamics around decision making
- How to harness the forces of public pressure, political pressure, agency pressure, and resource scarcity; not be victimized by them

Tools

- public engagement
- negotiation
- education/information
- process tools
- management planning and service planning
- The importance of objective-setting in strategy decisions
- Don’t decide too early — avoid “the decision of first resort” (to use Andrew Powter’s phrase) — develop options; focus on the issue

The Next Steps

The next steps that were agreed to were:

1. Report of the meeting;
2. Case book; e.g., Pt. Wolfe Bridge, Fort Anne;
3. Power up planning with strong analytical tools; e.g., the five principles of CRM; not to lay on another *requirement*, but to provide useful analytical tools;
4. Develop a position paper on how to determine levels 1, 2, and 3 on all resources;
5. Evaluate present stock of reconstructions;

6. Establish overall context for FHBRO review of reconstructions to situate it with respect to other principles of CRM;
7. Prepare a paper on the relationship of FHBRO to CRM;
8. Training — using Green Plan resources;
9. Training workshop for chiefs of planning and planners;
10. Collaborate with Program Planning and Analysis in the funding allocation issue — it is a *Program* issue, not just a National Historic Sites issue — perhaps using the Atlantic Region model.

Closing Remarks by Christina Cameron

Christina thanked the participants of the workshop for their thoughtful input and remarked, especially, on the airing of a number of complex issues from a wide range of points of view. She noted that, given the unique nature of each site, proposed reconstructions would be considered on a case-by-case basis and urged that the Cultural Resource Management Policy be utilized in the decision-making process.

Citing the recent Windsor Station/Montréal Forum development issue that necessitated public meetings where some 35–40 individuals as well as several interest groups made oral and written submissions to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Christina noted that heritage groups' generally unfocussed presentations might have been improved by the application of a set of principles such as those that have been incorporated in the CRM Policy. These were used by the HSMBC as their guide in examining the issues and as a framework for their final recommendations to the Minister. She urged participants to read the 28-page report to the Minister as a possible model for applying CRM values in the decision-making process.

Christina noted that the historically ad hoc and even serendipitous nature of decision making within the Program, traced in Shannon Ricketts' paper, spoke of the need for a philosophical framework. The CRM Policy can now be used as such a framework. This workshop may be seen as the beginning of much-needed CRM training, and Christina urged that such training and the consensus reached through such

endeavours be extended to the operational management line.

Concerning the dissemination of information, Christina spoke of the partnership with the U.S. National Park Service in the production of the CRM bulletin. All Canadian Parks Service staff are welcome to contribute, and Quebec Region has discussed preparing a synopsis of the bulletin in French. She also stressed the need to broaden our constituency and to clearly assess the needs of our client base if we are to survive. The 75th anniversary of National Historic Sites is being used as a means of accomplishing some constituency building through activities on Parks Day and through the planned two-hour national television program on national historic sites. We must also reach beyond the 114 national historic sites we administer to the some 750 sites that have been recognized as nationally significant.

On a lighter note, Christina had asked Arnold Roos to tally the CPS experience represented in the room. This totalled over 1200 years, placing us somewhere equivalent historically to the Carolingian Renaissance. The Council of Elders (those with over 25 years of CPS experience) was composed of Bruce Fry, Robert Grenier, DiAnn Herst, George Ingram, Terry Smythe, and Jervis Swannack.

Christina closed by thanking the organizers and the participants, with special mention of Susan Buggey, whose idea this workshop largely was, Gaetane Diotte, and the working group led by Gouhar Simison. Happy 75th.

Epilogue, January 1993

George Ingram

At the wrap-up session, participants discussed "The Next Steps," key steps that will ensure long-term success in addressing the issues relating to CPS reconstructions. Outlined below is a brief summary of progress to date.

1. Report of the meeting.

Following the Reconstruction Workshop, three of the key papers given at the workshop were published in *CRM* (Vol. 15, Nos. 5 and 8 [1992]) along with a brief account of the meeting; a fourth paper will appear in a later issue.

The *Proceedings* will be widely distributed throughout CPS and to appropriate outside institutions to provide a basis for common understanding and future work in the field.

2. Case book.

We remain committed to the idea of a case book that would document examples of CRM applications not only to reconstructions, but also to the whole gamut of issues that arise in cultural resource management. The case book would document successes and failures and in each instance would carefully demonstrate how the principles of CRM have been applied in arriving at an approach. Preliminary work has been undertaken on the project, and it will be pursued as a priority in 1993/94. In addition, it is proposed to undertake preparation of a guide to CRM that will provide additional commentary, with examples, on the application of the policy to specific issues and various activities.

3. Power up planning with strong analytic tools.

CRM was on the agenda of the National Planning Workshop held in Calgary/Pincher Creek in September 1992. Gordon Bennett presented a paper, "The Cultural Resource Management Policy as a Planning Tool." The presentation and subsequent discussion provided an opportunity to focus on the importance of the CRM Policy in the planning process, and efforts will continue to develop in the planning community a working familiarity with the policy.

4. Develop a position paper on how to determine levels 1, 2, and 3 on all resources.

A discussion paper entitled "A Proposed Approach to the Determination of CRM Levels 1 and 2" has been prepared by Gordon Bennett and circulated in draft to Program Headquarters functional branches. By 31 March the document will be revised and circulated throughout the Service for comment.

5. Evaluate present stock of reconstructions.

The Recapitalization Management Process (RMP) Phase I data base will provide condition ratings for each asset. (At present, some specific information related to components can be entered in a "remarks" field.) Once RMP Phase 2 is implemented (planned for fiscal year 1993/94), the condition assessment will be regularly done for each component by site staff and conservation specialists.

6. Establish overall context for FHBRO review of reconstructions to situate it with respect to other principles of CRM.

During recent years FHBRO's experience in attempting to place reconstructed buildings within the context of the traditions of conservation and/or reconstruction for the purposes of heritage evaluation has pointed up the need for a more comprehensive understanding of the conservation movement in Canada. It was with this shortcoming in mind that Shannon Ricketts prepared the brief overview of reconstruction within CPS which she delivered at the Reconstruction Workshop and which has been published in *CRM* (Vol. 15, No. 5 [1992]). A more in-depth and comprehensive history of architectural conservation in Canada — one that will focus on CPS activities, including reconstruction practices — is now being undertaken. It is expected that this study will provide a more complete contextual perspective on conservation, including FHBRO initiatives, in relation to CPS policy and the current principles of CRM.

7. Prepare a paper on the relationship of FHBRO to CRM.

A discussion paper is currently in preparation and will be completed and distributed prior to the end of March 1993.

8. Training — using Green Plan resources.

Planning is well advanced on the CRM Green Plan training initiative, and a training module on the CRM Policy is currently under development for delivery as a pilot in March 1993, with a view to a more extensive delivery throughout the program commencing in 1993/94. Other projects treating various facets of CRM are currently in various stages of development under the Green Plan initiative.

9. Training workshop for chiefs of planning and planners.

Participants expressed the view that since CRM is a Program-wide concern, no single function, such as Planning, should be singled out for priority training. This, therefore, will be the approach used in pursuing the CRM Green Plan training initiative. As noted (item 3 above), however, the linkage between the CRM Policy and the planning process was on the agenda of the planning workshop in Calgary, addressing in part the intent of this recommendation.

10. Collaborate with Program Planning and Analysis in the funding allocation issue.

Events have overtaken this recommendation in that reference levels have now been assigned to Regions, and various approaches are being employed in each Region to govern funding allocation. However, initiatives such as the results framework provide overall direction to ensure focus on priority issues.

Appendix A

Confirmed Participant List

CPS Atlantic Region

Bill Naftel (Co-ordinator)	Historical Research
Bill Hockey	Architecture and Engineering
Bill O'Shea	Louisbourg — Historical Resources
Steve Porter	Visitor Activities
Dan Mullaly	Halifax Defence Complex
R. Thompson	Management Planning
Barry Rich	Curatorial Services
Eric Krause	Louisbourg

CPS Ontario Region

Tom Kovacs (Co-ordinator)	Operations
Marilyn Watson	Management Planning
Mary Taylor	Visitor Activities
Judy Sutherland	Visitor Activities
Martin Brooks	Historical Resource Conservation
Joe Last	Archaeology
Maria Terrance	Architecture and Engineering
John Grenville	Superintendent Bellevue House
Kim Seward-Hannam	Superintendent Woodside

CPS Quebec Region

Jean Barry	Management Planning
André Charbonneau	Historical Research
Michel Barry	Visitor Activities
Gilles Fortin	Architecture and Engineering
Marc Lafrance	Historical Research
Pierre Paré	Architecture and Engineering
Francine Auclair	Architecture and Engineering

CPS Prairie and Northern Region

Susan Algie (Co-ordinator)	Management Planning
Guy Masson	Architecture and Engineering
Rob Gillespie	Visitor Activities
Tom Kynman	Superintendent Fort Walsh
Sandy Siepman	Regional Restoration Workshop

CPS Western Region

David Whiting	Architecture and Engineering
Jim Hartley	Management Planning
Kevin Van Tighem	Historic Interpretation
Jervis Swannack	Superintendent Fort Langley
Pat Inglis	Superintendent Fort St. James
Dan Gaudet	Superintendent Rocky Mountain House

CPS National Capital Region

Christina Cameron	Director General NHS
Gouhar Shemdin-Simison (Project Manager, Reconstruction Workshop)	Heritage Conservation Program
George Ingram	Federal Heritage Policy
Rosemarie Bray	Federal Heritage Policy
Gordon Bennett	Federal Heritage Policy
Terry Smythe	Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office
Tony Bull	Operations
Janet Weatherston	Operations
Mahlon Robinson	Operations
Doug Sullivan	Operations
Gerry Crouse	Operations
Richard Lindo	Interpretation
Dave Huddleston	Interpretation
Richard Lavoie	Interpretation
Robert Moreau	Interpretation
Susan Buggey	Architectural History
Shannon Ricketts	Architectural History
Mary Cullen	Architectural History
James DeJonge	Architectural History

DiAnn Herst	Archaeological Research
Maurice Salmon	Archaeological Research
Bob Harrold	Archaeological Research
Robert Grenier	Archaeological Research
Bruce Fry	Archaeological Research

John Stewart	Conservation
Louise Fox	Conservation
Michael Harrington	Conservation
Gail Cariou	Conservation

Claudette Lacelle	Historical Research
Alan McCullough	Historical Research
Arnold Roos	Historical Research
Elizabeth Vincent	Historical Research

Ghassan Attar	Heritage Conservation Program
Andy Powter	Heritage Conservation Program
Linda Fardin	Heritage Conservation Program
Alex Barbour	Heritage Conservation Program
Fernand Rainville	Architecture and Engineering
Lyse Blanchet	Architecture and Engineering

Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Citizenship

David Firman	Historical Resources Branch
--------------	-----------------------------

National Capital Commission

Johanne Fortier (Co-ordinator)	Capital Planning
Jean-Yves Tremblay	Realty and Development
David Scarlett	Realty and Development
Donald Pineau	Capital Planning
Margaret Archibald	National Programming

United States National Park Service

Barry Mackintosh	Bureau Historian
------------------	------------------

Appendix B

Recommended Readings on Reconstruction

Addyman, Peter, and Anthony Gaynor

"The Jorvick Viking Centre: An Experiment in Archaeological Site Interpretation." *The International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (March 1984), pp. 3, 7-18. Guildford, Eng.

Cliver, E. Blaine

"Reconstruction: Valid or Invalid?" *Historic Preservation*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (1972), pp. 22-24. Washington, D.C.

Faucher, Paul

"The Medium is the Message: Perceptions of the Consulting Architect on the Restoration of Fort Chambly." *APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology*, Vol. 18, Nos. 1 & 2 (1986), pp. 69-73. Fredericksburg, Va.

Galt, George

"The Battle for Fort Chambly." *Canadian Heritage*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Feb/March 1984), pp. 13-17. Ottawa.

Hedren, Paul L.

"The Reconstruction of Fort Union Trading Post: A Cause, a Controversy, and a Success." *Journal of Interpretation*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (1989), pp. 10-15. Fort Collins, Col.

Leblanc, François

"Les Forges du Saint-Maurice ... We've seen this before. No, not really. Have a closer look...." *APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology*, Vol. 18, Nos. 1 & 2 (1986), pp. 13-14. Fredericksburg, Va.

Lounsbury, Carl R.

"Beaux-Arts Ideals and Colonial Reality: The Reconstruction of Williamsburg's Capitol, 1928-1934." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Dec. 1990), pp. 373-89. Philadelphia.

Mackintosh, Barry

"The Case against Reconstruction." *CRM*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1992), pp. 17-18. Washington, D.C.
"To Reconstruct or Not to Reconstruct: An Overview of NPS Policy and Practice." *CRM*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (1990), pp. 5-7, 14. Washington, D.C.

Smith, Julien

"Avoiding Compromise." *APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology*, Vol. 18, Nos. 1 & 2 (1986), pp. 11-12. Fredericksburg, Va.

Wheaton, Rodd L.

"Considering Reconstruction as an Educational Tool." *CRM*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1992), pp. 16, 18. Washington, D.C.

Appendix C

Workshop Evaluation

PURPOSE to provide a forum for program discussion on period reconstruction and to create awareness of the Cultural Resource Management Policy and its application to the issue.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

1. Participants will know how thinking on the practice of reconstruction evolved and how CPS has translated this into policy.
2. Participants will understand the implications of ageing reconstructions and examine varied approaches to managing them.
3. Participants will understand the role of reconstructions as tools to interpret heritage messages.
4. Participants will be presented with alternatives to reconstruction.
5. Participants will participate in developing a position paper to assist in applying the CRM to existing and proposed reconstructions.

1. How well do you think the purpose and learning objectives of the workshop were accomplished?

	Not at all					Very well		Participants	
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	No.	Mean
Purpose	1	2	3	4	5			60	4.25
Objective 1	1	2	3	4	5			62	3.80
Objective 2	1	2	3	4	5			61	3.6
Objective 3	1	2	3	4	5			61	3.52
Objective 4	1	2	3	4	5			62	3.32
Objective 5	1	2	3	4	5			59	3.66

2. How well did the following sessions provide you with useful and coherent information on the background, the interpretation, and the application of the CRM policy?

	Not beneficial		Very beneficial			Participants No. Mean	
Day One							
Opening Plenary	1	2	3	4	5	48	3.85
Feedback on Expectations	1	2	3	4	5	59	3.83
Raising the Dead (S. Ricketts)	1	2	3	4	5	57	4.44
Slide show	1	2	3	4	5	58	3.93
USNPS Experience	1	2	3	4	5	61	3.57
Evoking the Past (G. Bennett)	1	2	3	4	5	59	4.38
Issue One: Challenges	1	2	3	4	5	54	3.89
Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	59	4.05
Issue Two: Values	1	2	3	4	5	56	3.71
Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	59	4
Day Two							
Issue Three: What Should CPS Do?	1	2	3	4	5	48	3.59
Workshops (5)	1	2	3	4	5	58	3.54
Reports from workshops	1	2	3	4	5	56	3.77
Issue Four: Alternatives	1	2	3	4	5	56	3.48
Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	59	3.68
Issue Five: Future Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	50	3.57
Workshops (5)	1	2	3	4	5	62	3.29
Reports from workshops	1	2	3	4	5	59	4.2
Day Three							
Preparation of position paper	1	2	3	4	5	53	3.77

	No! Not at all So so Yes					Participants No. Mean	
3. Did this workshop contribute to your understanding of the CRM Policy as it relates to reconstruction?	1	2	3	4	5	62	3.89
4. Was there enough opportunity for participation?	1	2	3	4	5	60	3.96
5. Were the concerns raised by you in your responses to the Questionnaire dealt with to your satisfaction?	1	2	3	4	5	44	3.66
6. Were your expectations met?	1	2	3	4	5	61	3.82
7. Were time allocations adequate?	1	2	3	4	5	60	3.58

Evaluation Comments

3. Did this workshop contribute to your understanding of the CRM Policy as it relates to reconstruction?

- Very helpful — especially with respect to how FHBRO can be used as a tool
- This workshop has shown me how to use CRM as a whole. It is finally nice to have some indication from PHQ on its application.
- We did not dwell on CRM too much.
- Good multidisciplinary approach
- Would have been more useful if we had more focus on future & less on past
- I was very familiar with the policy and its implications.
- We need to clarify end purposes.
- Understand policy much better. I have a much more open mind, but I am not sure that PHQ staff are at all disposed to consider reconst. as an option under any circumstances.
- How do we assess the integrity of a reconstruction, which no matter how accurate, is not authentic?
- "Reconstruction" must be defined.
- Definition as reference. I would have liked to have seen a position paper, "Interpreters versus Conservation Architecture." [T]
- Contributed to my understanding of reconstruction and the constraints associated with it [T]

4. Was there enough opportunity for participation?

- The large plenary was a little intimidating; by and large ample opportunity was afforded.
- The afternoon session on Day 2 could have continued a little longer.
- More workshops
- Full sessions — didn't have much info sharing through Q&A's
- Workshop format good; larger in-common commentary less successful due to an intimidation factor — fewer topics, longer thought is preferable.
- It is always difficult with so many people; we did probably as well as possible.
- Very well organized
- Admirable amount given size of group

T Translation of the original French by the Department of the Secretary of State.

- Too many participants, therefore time restrictions for discussion & participation
- Time was limited in the workshops. Smaller groups or more time or structure
- The statements were somewhat evasively worded, and this limited discussion time. [T]
- Well organized in terms of the time allocated [T]
- The bulk of the work remains to be done. [T]
- Too far-reaching and too long [T]

5. Were the concerns raised by you in your responses to the Questionnaire dealt with to your satisfaction?

- N/A. But yes if I had submitted one
- The definitive answers were not received, but how to apply CRM is a little more clear.
- Did not receive questionnaire
- Did not respond
- Didn't submit
- I think it is impossible to deal with all issues in this length of time.
- Did not receive questionnaire
- More balanced representation required to do this — but much effort shown to accommodate variety of concerns
- Definition of reconstructions
- Not enough time to address the problems
- No questionnaire sent forward
- Majority: yes, but the historical values were not adequately developed. [T]
- Too broad to cover [T]

6. Were your expectations met?

- Having a workshop that cross cut functions was extremely successful.
- I was not sure what to expect, therefore I did not have any.
- A good discussion, debate
- Insufficient time
- Overall I was impressed with the organization and handling of the workshop and the capability of carrying out the scheduling and the input of individuals doing the session, kept the focus in line.
- The heart of the subject, alternatives to period reconstruction, was not dealt with. [T]
- Teamwork [T]

7. Were time allocations adequate?

- Day two — not enough time for group discussions
- Again, same issues could be discussed by dep.
- See #4; I think we needed another day.

- Allocations were realistic. There may never be enough time.
- Yes; with some advance preparation, it was possible to discuss all the essential points within the allotted time. [T]
- Needless to say, an extra day might have made it possible to shed additional light on the issues. [T]
- It is difficult to maintain concentration for more than three hours. [T]

8. What did you like best about the workshop?

- Integration of views from a wide variety of different functions; also [thought] the format of the workshop & organization was well thought out and effective.
- Well organized — variety of participants & knowledge
- The opportunity to communicate with individuals from across the Program
- Interdisciplinary mix
- Opportunity to meet people with common interests
- Exchange
- The working in groups
- The opportunity to exchange with other sites/regions and PHQ. Use of visuals from site — More!
- Good organization, good presentations & audience
- Staff from all disciplines, all regions discussing a single topic and training others re point of view
- Cross-disciplinary involvement
- The multidisciplinary approach & coming together of a wide variety of ideas
- Chance for interdisciplinary exchange
- Cross-discipline viewpoints
- Chance to have block of time to discuss & reflect on CRM
- Small working groups & reporting
- The multidisciplinary approach — all groups who are concerned made points.
- The fact that it was allowed to proceed in direction driven by the participants
- Smaller groups offer more freedom of expression.
- Hearing different experiences
- Case histories illustrated by slides
- Openness of discussion. Willingness of participants to listen
- The opportunity to hear and debate a whole range of policy and practical issues related to period reconstruction
- Dealt with topics in a + manner — no fights, no arguments — all ideas respected
- More opportunity for participation
- Very participatory
- Meeting people from other disciplines across the system and sharing ideas
- Multidiscip/regional/HQ — good balance (i.e., one group did not dominate) — Having some senior mgrs, especially DG, there for whole 3 days & very available to discuss & participate & provide guidance — very good
- Multidisciplinary; senior staff present
- Exchange; mutual respect shown; opportunity to learn
- Exchange of views, perspectives, ideas from all regions & PHQ
- Opportunity to hear my colleagues & senior mgt — participation of many levels
- Interchange of ideas, team building. Contact with divergent groups
- Best part was the Friday A.M. discussion/debate; presentations from regions re their problems/solutions also good
- Well organized
- The opportunity to hear, and realize that there exist, legitimate points of view other than one's own
- Finding out what is happening in the field in various sites in other divisions. We need improved communication — so many of us feel we are operating in a void at times.
- Opportunity to hear views from people in various functions
- Opportunity to discuss reconstruction and other issues with colleagues across the country
- The workshop reports and the participants' expectations [T]
- Case-study presentations [T]
- The approaches to conservation — they describe reality. [T]
- The *concrete* presentations [T]
- Workshops and general discussions, exchanges of views and opinions [T]
- The presentations placed reconstruction in a meaningful context. [T]
- Workshops [T]
- The participation of different functions [T]
- The work done in subgroups and the analysis of the results [T]
- Discussion on criteria and context that can lead to a choice regarding reconstruction [T]
- Exchanges of views confirm what everyone already knows. [T]

- Overview of past experiences with reconstruction
- Discussion and game identification
- Well-organized agenda/time management

} “Comprehensive” approach [T]

9. What aspects of the workshop could have been improved? How?

- Would have had superintendents from each of the major parks under discussion (i.e., Fort Anne, Fort George) at meeting to express the views from the field
- Very little improvement can be suggested.
- Time — more of it; e.g., Tues., Wed., Thur., with travel days Monday & Friday — start at same time each A.M.
- Location. Less crowded agenda; no workshops
- There was information overload — there were far too many presentations with not enough time for discussion and exchange of views.
- The main room was too crowded, thus too hot. A larger room with tables
- Lead time preparation
- Very well done; more specific cases — deeper coverage, therefore more discussion
- More activity sessions — some plenary sessions were too long.
- Who are the organizers of this workshop? Introduce yourselves properly.
- Individual workshops: provide expert facilitators (i.e., process people); more time for individual workshops
- More focus to question thru case-study approaches
- More time/more workshops
- Discussing more alternatives; discussing visitor/interp components of reconstruction
- Contacts & sharing points of view & experience with colleagues
- Clearer identification (discrete aspects) of subject, presentation purpose, to avoid possible duplication of messages
- More chances for after-hours sessions
- More critical discussion of the case histories; a couple of devil’s advocates from outside CPS — one from the tourism realm and one super-purist CRM type
- More senior mgrs from regions
- Better opportunity for Quebec reps to feel more comfortable and to participate in the workshops
- Too much sugar in the snacks!
- Still no guidelines as to how to implement CRM
- Fewer presentations in greater depth
- Time — would have been helpful to have at least another day — people have to have time to vent frustrations, concerns, experiences, as well as discussing issue at hand.
- Distribution of material earlier; greater lead time for presentation preparation; clearer statement of objectives sent out with first notice of workshop
- Balance of expertise represented; more timely information for presentations
- Smaller break-out groups
- Practical aspects of period reconstruction should have been addressed in greater detail. Further case studies on other methods should have been presented.
- The issue was too broad to resolve in 2.5 days.
- Better introduction and common understanding of CRM and what it is
- More direction to facilitators on where the group should be headed
- Focus was sometimes lost and hobbyhorses ridden to death in the group discussions especially.
- Strong focussed case studies on sites (i.e., Fort George) to use as examples for solutions and other alternatives
- More time for discussions
- More specific and more clearly drafted objectives, and restated *during* the workshop (not only at the beginning) [T]
- Discussion workshops in French [T]
- Workshops: difficult for a Francophone to catch all the details and to make his views known [T]
- A workshop every 2 years to keep participants from losing sight of the importance of reaching consensus [T]
- Control of discussions [T]
- Workshops made up of both Anglophones and Francophones: unsatisfactory for the Francophones, who were unable to express their views [T]
- Bilingualism [T]
- Alternatives to reconstruction [T]
- Presentations better structured around such themes as challenges and values, which the presenters complement. [T]
- For *enhanced effectiveness* in workshop discussions. A Francophone group should have been set up, enabling them to express their views more fully. [T]
- Organize these workshops at historic sites to put participants at the scene of the action and to give more time for personal contact with people from other regions. [T]

- Greater use of Canadian examples other than national historic sites [T]

10. Did we miss anything?

- May have focussed on EARP/CRM connection
- We could have done a little more in the area of what happens with reconstruction after this has happened.
- With list of participants there should be a short briefing of site issues and good things being done.
- How to deal with existing reconstructed assets, some of them historic?
- A timetable for follow-up. Communications strategy to participants and staff
- As next group may not be as familiar with CRM, work in a longer overview of the policy and the NHS Policy
- Application of ideas/criteria — maybe needed to use a specific “future” case study — to experience the application
- Definition of reconstruction; discussion of long-term implications of reconstruction (i.e., O&M implications)
- Ft. Langley proposal — an approach similar to Anne of Green Gables proposal — not understood & no opportunity to explain it adequately in this context
- Larger visitor-activities focus; in future could co-ordinate such a meeting at the same time as chiefs of V.A.
- Should have dealt with restorations too to add depth to the discussion
- Not being able to accommodate others who also wanted to attend and could have (should have benefited from this)
- I don't think so. [We] focus[sed too] much on buildings. [We] neglect[ed other] holdings and concerns — how about vessels & machinery reconstructions for the future?
- New innovations/real alternatives to achieving commemorative objectives could have been addressed more thoroughly. We still seem to be a bit myopic (either reconst. or nothing) — surely there are some creative approaches we don't use that others do.
- Directors from regions should have been present. Invitation from DG should have been sent to regional RDG's & DG's to clearly explain purpose of workshop — initial memos were too vague and thus passed over.
- Links of period reconstruction with other elements; i.e., original resources, other types of presentation, etc.

- No list or research on the policy of CPS on reconstruction as the article by B. Mackintosh of the U.S. NPS outlined
- Other perspectives as a presentation
 - European
 - should have been a presentation of statistics/market analysis
 - visitor questionnaires
- Some discussion of other people's reconstructions would have been helpful.
- Clearly define “reconstruction” at the outset. [T]
- Bravo! [T]
- Not necessarily; an experiment that should be repeated [T]
- Yes: an outside point of view [T]
- No; reasonably satisfactory [T]
- It would have been useful to do some brief studies of critical cases and to devote more discussion to the considerations underlying choices. [T]
- In my view, no, and it is essential to carry on. [T]

11. Comments and suggestions for future workshops:

- Would continue with the same format but perhaps have groups on second or third day to act as a reinforcement of the 2-day proceedings. Would have changed working groups' membership in 2nd workshop to get different profile
- Timing and numbers were very appropriate. Keep up the good work and do not modify what's proved to be successful.
- Book out-of-town people into one hotel; may get a better rate & it would be easier to arrange extra-curricular activities
- Choose a case study that we can all work on to sort out approaches. Leave time for the “Buts” & “What if's”
- Widen participation: marketing, visitor activities, field staff
- I also appreciated the handling of the financial aspects.
- Larger room; more group exercises
- Broad CRM changing; e.g., to restore or not restore
- We do not need more workshops on reconstruction, but workshops on topics related to management of our assets are most welcome; e.g., CRM & N.B.C.
- With this many people and with the complexity of the issue, 2+ days is not long enough.
- Love to have one on the alternatives, a think-tank approach to imaginative & creative presentation
- Region-specific workshops to deal with problems

- Widen participation; e.g., Nat. Parks, Socio-Economic, etc.
- Need to focus more on alternatives to reconstruction; i.e., value of some acts — volumetric outline, technology....
- Ensure that they are kept interdisciplinary; ongoing communication critical (example — USNPS CRM bulletin)
- I think that more multidisciplinary workshops are necessary to promote ... dialogue....
- More focussed topics — long time for idea development
- Involve outside experts; engage people to present case histories in a critical “negative” manner to more effectively stimulate discussion; invite directors and superintendents
- 1st — there should be other workshops on this subject which would broaden the circle and involve more regional and field staff. The regions could do these, but only with the help of HQ’s and inter-regional co-operation and participation.
- 2nd — there could be more emphasis on policy and process, less on technique. That (policy) is where the crunch is at this time. We need to know more about the larger context in which the real decisions about reconstruction are made.
- *Heritage value of reconstructions would be an interesting theme in itself. Reconstruction on industrial sites. Experimental archaeology — bloomeries, etc.*
- Use case study (either real-new site or hypothetical) and work through application of principles, justification, etc.
- Greater regional input — earlier on; involve National Parks staff, as well as outside partners: NCC/ provincial/municipal/NGO’s
- Multidisciplinary balance
- How about a workshop on “restoration,” on scrape/ anti-scrape
- There should be a follow-up after the development of the policy prior to it being formalized.
- Whatever workshops are held should aim for the same inter-unit, interdisciplinary mix.
- A set of small workshops on the final day with changed groups — take note of all the compulsive speakers and put them together in one group. Perhaps even discuss the same question a second time with rearranged groups. Further training or instruction for facilitators on the purpose of the group discussions might ensure that better focus is given.
- Workshop should examine case study for proposed reconstruction at site. Objective would be to have participants (the proponents) prepare justification for reconstruc[tion], plus other innovative alternatives.
- Fewer case studies — more focussed discussions on fewer sites that have worked the problems; i.e., Ft. George, Walsh, Anne, Woodside, historic vessels
- More discussion in small groups [T]
- This evaluation form is written in unacceptable French! A little more consideration, please. [T]
- *I must think about these issues*, that is the challenge that I should address. Carry on. [T]
- Greater awareness and receptiveness re projects implemented outside CPS to keep up with what is being done elsewhere. [T]
- There should be more of them. [T]
- It would have been more useful to have a workshop for Francophones. Furthermore, the last page of this evaluation form should have been *corrected!* It’s not French. [T]
- Have a workshop for Francophones [T]
- This questionnaire is written in bad French.
- Fully bilingual group leaders and rapporteurs [T]
- Other workshops [T]
- Yes, other workshops on other issues relating to NHS [T]
- Very good technical organization could be reused; excellent opportunity for individuals and small groups to consider the issues [T]
- The words were translated ... the essence is not there. [T]
- Greater receptiveness toward outside bodies. (Invitations to outside agencies and organizations — e.g. Treasury Board, the provinces, and Heritage Canada). [T]



Canada